
The Ultimate Alchemy, Vol 2

Talks on the Atma Pooja Upanishad
Talks given from 01/07/72 pm to 09/08/72 pm
English Discourse series
18 Chapters
Year published:

Original title was "Atma Pooja Upanishad".

The Ultimate Alchemy, Vol 2

Chapter #1

Chapter title: Awareness: The Gateway Toward Eden

1 July 1972 pm in

Archive code: 7207015
ShortTitle: ULTAL201
Audio: Yes
Video: No

CHIDAGNI SWAROOPAM DHOOPAH

"TO CREATE THE FIRE OF AWARENESS IN ONESELF IS DHOOP, THE INCENSE."

FOR PHILOSOPHY, many are the problems -- infinite. But for religion there is only one problem, and that problem is man himself. It is not that man has problems, but man is the problem. And why is man the problem?

Animals are not problems. They are so unconscious. blissfully unconscious, ignorant, that there is no possibility of there being any awareness of problems. Problems are there, but animals are not aware. There are no problems for gods because they are totally conscious. When the mind is a total consciousness, problems simply disappear like darkness. But for man there is anguish. The very being of man, the very existence of man, is a problem, because man exists between these two realms: the realm of the animals and the realm of the gods.

Man exists as a bridge between two infinities: the infinity of ignorance and the infinity of knowledge. Man is neither animal nor Divine. Or, man is both -- animal and Divine; that is the problem. Man is a suspended existence -- something incomplete, something which is still to be -- a becoming, not a being.

Animals have beings. Man is a becoming. He is not; he is only becoming. Man is a process. The process is incomplete. It has left the world of ignorance and it has not reached the world of knowledge. Man is in between. That creates the problem, the tension, the anguish and the constant conflict.

There are only two ways to be at peace, to be without problems: one is to fall back, to regress, to fall back to the world of animals; the other is to transcend, to go forward and to be a part of the Divine Being. To be either animals or gods: these are the two alternatives.

To fall back is easy, but it is going to be a temporary thing -- because once you have grown you cannot fall back permanently. You can regress for a moment, but then you are again thrown forward, because there really is no way to go back. There is really no possibility of falling back. You cannot be a child again if you have become a young adult, and you cannot become young again if you have become old. If you know something, then you cannot fall back to the state when you were ignorant. You cannot go back. but for a moment you can forget the present and relive the past in your memory, in your mind.

So man can regress to the animal level. It is blissful, but temporary. That is the reason why intoxicants, drugs, alcohol, have such an appeal. When you become unconscious through some chemical you have fallen back for a moment. For the time being you are not a man, you are not a problem. You are again part of the world of animals, the unconscious existence. Then you are not a man; that is why there are no problems.

Humanity has been constantly finding things from *soma rasa* to LSD in order to forget, to regress, to be just childlike, to regain the animal innocence, to be without problems: that is, to be without humanity, because to me humanity means to be a problem. This falling back, this regression, is possible, but only temporarily. You will come back again, you will be a man again, and the same problems will be standing and waiting for you. Rather, they will be more acute. Your absence is not going to dissolve them. They will become more complicated and complex. Then a vicious circle is created.

When you are again back and conscious, you have to face problems which have become more complicated because of your absence. They have grown. Then you have to forget yourself again and again, and every time you forget and regress, your problems are growing: you will have to face your humanity again and again. One cannot escape that way. One can deceive oneself, but one cannot escape that way.

The other alternative is arduous: that is, to grow to be a *being*. When I say "regress", I mean to become unconscious -- to lose the small consciousness that we have. When I say "to be a Being", I mean to lose unconsciousness and to be totally conscious.

As we are, only a part is conscious -- only a very small fragment of the Being is conscious, and the remaining whole continent is just dark. A small island is conscious, and the whole continent, the mainland, is under darkness. When this small island also becomes dark, you have regressed, you have fallen back. This ignorance is blissful because now you are not aware of the problems. Problems are there. but you are not aware. So at least *for you* it appears there are no problems. This is the ostrich method: close your eyes, and your enemy is not there because when you cannot see -- this childish, juvenile logic says that when you cannot see something -- it is not: unless you see something it is not. So if you cannot feel problems they are not there!

When I say "to be a Being", to transcend humanity, to become Divine, I mean to be totally conscious -- to be not only an island, but the whole continent. This awareness will also lead you beyond problems because problems are there basically because of you. Problems are not objective realities: they are subjective phenomena. You create your problems! And unless *you* are transformed, you will go on creating problems. You solve one, and really, in solving that one, you will create many because you remain the same. Problems are not objective things. They are part of you. Because you are such, you create such problems.

Science tries to solve problems objectively, and science thinks that if there are no

problems man will be at ease. Problems can be solved objectively, but man *will not* be at ease -- because man himself is the problem. If he solves some problem, he will create others. He is their creator. If you give a better society, the problems will change, but *problems* will remain. If you give better health, better medicine, the problems will change, but *problems* will remain.

Quantitatively, there will be as many problems as ever because man remains the same; only the situation changes. You change the situation: old problems will not be there, but there will be new problems. And new problems are more problematic than any old problems because you have become accustomed to old problems. With new problems you feel more inconvenience. That is why, in our times, we have changed our whole situation, but problems are there -- more fatal, more anxiety creating.

That is the difference between religion and science. Science thinks problems are objective, from outside somewhere -- that they can be changed without changing *you*. Religion thinks problems are here inside, in me -- rather, that I am the problem. Unless I change, nothing is going to be different. Shapes will be different, names will be different, but the substance will remain the same. I will create another world of problems; I will go on projecting new problems.

This man, unconscious to his own being, unaware of himself, is the creator of problems. Not knowing who he is, what he is, without any acquaintance with himself, he goes on creating problems -- because unless you know yourself you cannot know for what you are existing and living, you cannot know where you have to move, you cannot feel what your destiny is, and you can never feel any meaning. You will go on doing many things, but everything will ultimately lead you to frustration -- because if you do anything without knowing why you are, for what you are, it is not going to give you a deep contentment. It is irrelevant. The very point is missed, your effort is wasted. And, ultimately, everyone is frustrated. Those who succeed are more frustrated than those who are not successful because those who are not successful can still hope. But those who are successful cannot even hope. Their case becomes hopeless. So I say nothing fails like success.

Religion thinks in terms of subjectivity, science in terms of objectivity: "Change the situation; do not touch the man." Religion says, "Change the man; the situation is irrelevant." Whatsoever the situation, a different mind, a transformed being, will be beyond problems. That is why a Buddha can exist in absolute peace as a beggar, and a Midas cannot live at peace even when he has the alchemical miracle with him: whatsoever he touches becomes gold. The situation with Midas has become golden; everything he touches becomes gold. But this doesn't change anything. Rather, Midas is in a more complicated problematic situation.

Now our world has created, through science, a Midas situation. Now we can touch anything and it becomes gold. A Buddha living as a beggar lives in such a deep peace and silence that emperors become jealous of him. What is the secret? The emphasis on man -- the inside of man -- is significant, not the situation. So you must change the inside of man. And there is only one change: if you grow in your awareness, you change, you mutate. If you fall down in your awareness, again you change, you mutate. But if your awareness is lessened, you fall down toward animals. If your awareness is increased, you move up toward the gods.

This is the only problem for religion: how to increase awareness. That is why religions have always been against drugs. The reason is not moral or ethical -- no! And the so-called moralist puritans have given a very wrong colour to the whole thing. For religions, it is not a question of morality that someone takes drugs. It is not a question of morality at all because morality only begins when I come in contact with someone else. If I take alcohol and become

unconscious, it is no one else's affair. I am doing something with myself. Violence is a question for morality, not alcohol. Even if I give you a promise to meet you at a particular time and I miss it, it is immoral because somebody else is involved. Alcohol can become a moral question only if someone else is involved, otherwise it is not a moral question at all. It is something you do with yourself. For religions it is not a question of morality at all. For religions it is a deeper question: it is a question of increasing or decreasing awareness.

Once you have the habit of falling down into unconsciousness, it will be more and more difficult to increase your awareness. It will become more and more difficult because your body will not support you in increasing awareness. It will support you in decreasing it. The very metabolism of your body will help you to be unconscious. It will not help you to be conscious. And anything that becomes a barrier in being more aware is a religious problem, not a moral problem.

So sometimes it happens that you may find an alcoholic to be a more moral person than a non-alcoholic, but never a more religious person. An alcoholic may be more compassionate than a nonalcoholic; he may be more loving than a non-alcoholic, he may be more honest, but never more religious. And when I say "never more religious", I mean never a more aware and conscious person. This growth into awareness creates anguish.

It will be good to understand the old Biblical story of Adam and Eve. They were expelled from Heaven; they were expelled from the Garden of Eden. It is a very deep psychological story. God allowed them to eat anything they desired except one fruit. One tree was not to be touched at all, and that tree was the Tree of Knowledge. This is strange, God forbidding his children to eat the fruit of the Tree of Knowledge! This looks very contradictory. What type of a God is this? And what type of a father is against his children becoming wise and knowing? This story has troubled many minds. Why should God prohibit knowledge? We value knowledge very much, but it was forbidden.

Adam and Eve existed in an animal world. They were blissful, but they were ignorant. Children are blissful, but they are also ignorant. And children, if they have to grow, must grow in knowledge. There is no other way of growth. And if you are ignorant you may be blissful, but you cannot be aware of your blissfulness.

This has to be understood: you can be blissful when you are ignorant, but you cannot feel your blissfulness, you cannot be aware of your blissfulness. The moment you begin to feel your blissfulness, you are out of ignorance. Knowledge has entered; you have become a knowing one. So Adam and Eve existed just as animals -- absolutely ignorant and blissful. But remember, this blissfulness, too, was not a known fact to them. They were just blissful without knowing it.

The story says that the Devil tempted Eve to eat the fruit, and the reason the Devil could tempt Eve was this: he told her, "If you eat this fruit, you will be like gods." This is very meaningful. Unless you eat this fruit of Knowledge, the fruit of the Tree of Knowledge, you can never be like gods; you will remain animals. And that is why God had prohibited, forbidden them, to touch this tree. But they were tempted!

This word "devil" is very beautiful, and particularly for Indians. It has a different significance than for Christians because "devil" comes from the same word, from the same root, from which "deva" or "devata" -- god -- comes. "Devil" and "divine" both come from the same root. So it seems that the Christian story is a misrepresentation, somehow incomplete. One thing is known: the Devil himself was a rebellious god, a rebellious angel who rebelled against God. But he was a god himself.

Why am I saying this? Because to me there are not two forces in the world of God and the

Devil; that dichotomy is false. There is only one force! And the dichotomy is not of two enemies, but of two polarities of one force: God and the Devil. It is one force working as two polarities, because unless a force works in two polarities it cannot work.

So to me this Biblical story takes a new meaning. God prohibited because you can tempt only if you prohibit. If the Tree of Knowledge had not been mentioned at all, it seems improbable that Adam would ever have thought of or imagined eating of this particular tree. The Garden of Eden was big, there were infinite trees. We do not even know the name of any other tree.

This tree became important because it became prohibited. This prohibition became an invitation; this denial became the temptation. It is not really the Devil who tempted. In the first place, God himself tempted. This was the temptation: "Do not go near the Tree of Knowledge; do not eat the fruit of it. Only one tree is prohibited; otherwise you are free." Suddenly this one tree becomes the most important in the Garden.

And to me "devil" is just another name for the Divine -- the other polarity, and the Devil tempted Eve because then she could be "like the gods": this was the promise. And who would not like to be like the gods? Who would not like it?

Adam and Eve were tempted and then they were expelled from Heaven. But this expulsion is part of the process. Really, this Heaven was an animal existence -- blissful, but ignorant. Because of this eating of the fruit of the Tree of Knowledge, Adam and Eve became human beings. Before that they were not human beings at all. "They became human beings": when I say this, I mean they became problems.

It is reported that the first words Adam asserted just coming out of the gate of the Garden were this: "We are living in a very revolutionary time." It *was* a revolutionary time. Never will the human mind know such a revolution again as this expulsion from the animal world, this expulsion from a blissful, ignorant existence. The times were really revolutionary. Other revolutions are just nothing by comparison. The greatest revolution was that -- the expulsion.

But why were they expelled? The moment you know, the moment you become aware, you cannot live in bliss. Problems will arise. And even if you are in bliss, this problem will come to your mind: "Why am I in bliss? Why?" And you cannot feel bliss unless you feel anguish, because every feeling is possible only with its polar opposite. You can feel happiness only if you begin to feel unhappiness; you can begin to feel a healthy well-being only when you begin to feel illness; you cannot be aware of life unless you become afraid of death.

Animals live, but they are not aware that they are alive because they are not aware of any death. Death is not a problem for them, so they pass through life, but they are not alive in the same sense as man is. Man becomes alive, aware of his being alive, only because of death. With knowledge polarity comes into existence, and with polarity come problems. Then every moment is a conflict. Then every moment you are suspended as two. Then never again will you be one. You will be continuously divided, in conflict, in inner turmoil.

So, really, that was a revolution -- *the revolution*, rather: Adam and Eve were turned out, expelled. Really, this story is very beautiful. No one expelled them, no one ordered them. No one said, "Go out!" They *were* out. The moment they became aware, they were not in the Garden at all. This was automatic. Think about this: a dog sitting here suddenly becomes aware of the situation. Then he is expelled. No one expels him, but he is no more an animal. He is thrown out of the animal state and he can never again be the same.

Adam and Eve tried again and again to enter, but they have not yet found the gate again. They go around and around, but the gate is always missed. There is no gate. The expulsion is

total and ultimate. They cannot enter again because knowledge is a sweet and bitter fruit -- sweet and bitter both: sweet because it gives you power and bitter because it gives you problems; sweet because for the first time you become an ego, and bitter because with the ego every disease will be yours. It is a double-edged sword.

Adam was tempted because the Devil said, "You will become like the gods. You will be powerful." Knowledge is power, but if you know, you have to know both sides of the coin. You can feel more life, you can be more blissful, but you will become aware of death. You will be more blissful, but in the same proportion you will have to suffer anguish. This is the problem, this is what man is -- a deep anguish, a deep division between two polarities.

You can feel life, but when death is there everything is poisoned. When death is there, every moment everything is poisoned. How can you be alive when death is there? How can you feel blissful when suffering is there? And even if a moment of happiness comes to you, it is fleeting. And when the moment is there, even then you are aware that somewhere behind the unhappiness is there, misery is there, hiding. It will come up soon -- sooner or later. So even a moment of happiness is poisoned by your consciousness that somewhere unhappiness is hidden, is coming near. It is just by the corner, and you will have to meet it.

Man becomes conscious of the future, conscious of the past, conscious of life, conscious of death. Kierkegaard has called this consciousness "anguish". You can fall back, but that is a temporary measure. Again you will come up. So the only possibility is to grow -- to grow in knowledge to a point from where you can jump out of it, because the jump is possible only from the extremes. One extreme we have: to fall back. We can do it, but it is impossible because we cannot remain in it. We are thrown forward again and again. The other possibility is that if we grow in awareness, there is a point when you are *totally* aware, where you transcend.

We have "known", now we must know something beyond knowledge. We have come out of the Garden because of knowledge and we can enter this Garden again only when we throw this knowledge. But this throwing is possible not by regression -- that gate from which Adam was expelled we can never find again -- we can find another gate from which Christ was invited or Buddha was invited. We can throw this knowledge, we can throw this awareness, but only from the extreme point where we are totally aware.

When one becomes totally aware, when even this feeling that "I am aware" is thrown, when one becomes just like the animals when they are happy and blissful (they do not know that when you are totally aware you become a god), if that awareness is total, then you are simply aware *without knowing* that you are aware. This simple awareness will begin the entry -- will be the entry. You will be again in the Garden -- not as animals now, but as gods. And this is an inevitable process. This expulsion of Adam and the entry of a Jesus is an inevitable process. One has to be thrown out of one's ignorance: this is the first step. And then one has to be thrown out of one's knowledge: that is the second step.

This sutra is concerned with awareness: "To create the fire of awareness in oneself is the incense" -- to create the fire of awareness *in oneself!*

First it must be understood what is meant by awareness. You are walking; you are aware of many things: of the shops, of people passing by you, of the traffic, of everything. You are aware of many things, only unaware of one thing: yourself. You are walking on the street: you are aware of many things; you are only not aware of yourself! This awareness of the self Gurdjieff has called "self-remembering". Gurdjieff says, "Constantly, wherever you are, remember yourself."

For example, you are here. You are listening to me, but you are not aware of the listener.

You may be aware of the speaker, but you are not aware of the listener. Be aware of the listener. Feel yourself *here*; you *are* here. For a moment a glimpse comes, and again you forget. Try!

Whatever you are doing, go on doing one thing inside continuously: be aware of yourself doing it. You are eating: be aware of yourself. You are walking: be aware of yourself. You are listening, you are speaking: be aware of yourself. When you are angry, be aware that you are angry. In the very moment that anger is there, be aware that you are angry. This constant remembering of the self creates a subtle energy -- a very subtle energy in you. You begin to be a crystallized being.

Ordinarily, you are just a loose bag. No crystallization, no center really -- just a liquidity, just a loose combination of many things without any center -- a crowd, constantly shifting and changing, with no master inside. By awareness is meant be a master! And when I say "Be a master", I do not mean to be a controller. When I say "Be a master", I mean be a presence -- a continuous presence. Whatever you are doing or not doing, one thing must be constantly in your consciousness: that *you are*.

This simple feeling of oneself, that one is, creates a center -- a center of stillness, a center of silence, a center of inner mastery -- an inner power. And when I say "an inner power", I mean it literally. That is why this sutra says "the fire of awareness". It is a fire. IT IS A FIRE! If you begin to be aware, you begin to feel a new energy in you -- a new fire, a new life. And because of this new life, new power, new energy, many things which were dominating you just dissolve. You have not to fight with them.

You have to fight with your anger, your greed, your sex, because you are weak. So, really, greed, anger and sex are not the problems. Weakness is the problem. Once you begin to be stronger inside, with a feeling of inner presence that *you are*, your energies become concentrated, crystallized on a single point, and a Self is born. Remember, not an ego but a Self is born. Ego is a false sense of Self. Without having any Self you go on believing that you have a Self. That is ego. Ego means a false self. You are not a Self, and still you believe that you are a Self.

Maulungputra, a seeker of Truth, came to Buddha. Buddha asked him, "What are you seeking?"

Maulungputra said, "I am seeking my Self. Help me!"

Buddha asked him to give a promise that whatsoever was said would be done by him. Maulungputra began to weep and he said, "How can I promise?'I am not.'I am yet not. How can I promise? I do not know what I am going to be tomorrow. I do not have any Self which can promise, so do not ask me the impossible. I will try. I can say this much at the most: I will try. But I cannot say that whatsoever you say I will do, because *who* will do it? I am seeking that which can promise and which can fulfill a promise.'I am yet *not*."

Buddha said, "Maulungputra, to hear this I asked you that question. If you had promised, I would have turned you out. Had you said,'I promise that I will do it,' then I would have known that you are not really a seeker for the Self, because a seeker must know that 'he' is yet not. Otherwise, what is the purpose of seeking? If you are already, there is no need. You are not! And if one can feel this, then the ego evaporates."

Ego is a false notion of something which is not there at all. "Self" means a center which can promise. This center is created by being continuously aware, constantly aware. Be aware that you are doing something -- that you are sitting, that now you are going to sleep, that now sleep is coming to you, that you are falling. Try to be conscious in every moment, and then you will begin to feel that a center is born within you, things have begun to crystallize, a

centering is there. Everything now is related to a center.

We are without centers. Sometimes we feel centered, but those are moments when a situation makes you aware. If there is suddenly a situation, a very dangerous situation, you will begin to feel a center in you because in danger you become aware. If someone is going to kill you, you cannot think in that moment, you cannot be unconscious in that moment. Your whole energy is centered, and that moment becomes solid. You cannot move to the past, you cannot move to the future. This very moment becomes everything. And then you are not only aware of the killer: you become aware of yourself -- the one who is being killed.

In that subtle moment you begin to feel a center in yourself. That is why dangerous games have their appeal. Ask someone going to the top of Gaurishanker, of Mount Everest. When for the first time Hillary was there, he must have felt a sudden center. And when for the first time someone was on the moon, a sudden feeling of a center must have come. That is why danger has appeal. You are driving a car and you go on to more and more speed, and then the speed becomes dangerous. Then you cannot think; thoughts cease. Then you cannot dream. Then you cannot imagine. Then the present becomes solid. In that dangerous moment, when any instant death is possible, you are suddenly aware of a center in yourself. Danger has appeal only because in danger you sometimes feel centered.

Nietzsche somewhere says that war must continue because only in war is a Self sometimes felt -- a center is felt -- because war is danger. And when death becomes a reality, life becomes intense. When death is just near, life becomes intense and you are centered. But in any moment when you become aware of yourself, there is a centering. But if it is situational, then when the situation is over it will disappear.

It must not be just situational. It must be inner. So try to be aware in every ordinary activity. When sitting on your chair, try it: be aware of the sitter. Not only of the chair, not only of the room, of the surrounding atmosphere, be aware of the sitter. Close your eyes and feel yourself; dig deep and feel yourself.

Herrigel was learning with a Zen Master. He was learning archery for three years continuously. And the Master would always say, "It is good. Whatsoever you are doing is good, but not enough." Herrigel himself became a master archer. His aims became one hundred percent perfect, and still the Master would say, "You are doing well, but it is not enough."

"With one hundred percent perfect aims!" said Herrigel. "Then what is your expectation? How can I now go further? With one hundred percent accuracy, how can you expect any more?"

The Zen Master is reported to have said, "I am not concerned with your archery or your aims. I am concerned with you. You have become a perfect technician. But when your arrow leaves the bow you are not aware of yourself, so it is futile! I am not concerned with the arrow reaching the aim. I am concerned with YOU! When the arrow in the bow is arrowed, inside also your consciousness must be arrowed. And even if you miss the aim it makes no difference, but the inner aim must not be missed and you are missing that. You have become a perfect technician, but you are an imitator." But to a Western mind or, really, to a modern mind (and the Western mind is the modern mind), it is very difficult to conceive of this. It appears nonsense. Archery is concerned with a particular efficiency of aiming.

By and by Herrigel became disappointed, and one day he said, "Now I am leaving. It seems impossible! It is impossible! When you are aiming at something, your awareness goes to your aim, to the object, and if you are to be a successful archer you have to forget yourself -- to remember only the aim, the target, and forget everything. Only the target must be there."

But the Zen Master was continuously forcing him to create another target inside. This arrow must be double-arrowed: pointing toward the target outside and continuously pointing toward the inside -- the Self.

Herrigel said, "Now I will leave. It seems impossible. Your conditions cannot be fulfilled." And the day he was leaving, he was just sitting. He had come to take leave of the Master, and the Master was aiming at another target. Someone else was learning, and for the first time Herrigel was not involved. He had just come to take leave; he was sitting. The moment the Master would be finished with his teaching, he would take leave and go. For the first time he was not involved.

But then, suddenly, he became aware of the Master and the double-arrowed consciousness of the Master. The Master was aiming. For three years continuously he was with the same Master, but he was more concerned with his own effort. He had never seen this man -- what he was doing. For the first time he saw and realized, and suddenly, spontaneously, with no effort, he came to the Master, took the bow from his hand, aimed at the target and released the arrow. And the Master said, "Okay! For the first time you have done it. I am happy."

What had he done? For the first time he was centered in himself. The target was there, but he was also there -- present. So whatsoever you are doing, whatsoever -- no need of any archery: *whatsoever* you are doing, even just sitting -- be double-arrowed. Remember what is going on outside and also remember who is inside.

Lin-chi was lecturing one morning and someone suddenly asked, "Just answer me one question: Who am I?" Lin-chi got down and went to the man. The whole hall became silent. What was he going to do? It was a simple question. He should have answered from his seat. He reached the man. The whole hall was silent. Lin-chi stood before the questioner looking into his eyes. It was a very penetrating moment. Everything stopped. The questioner began to perspire. Lin-chi was just staring into his eyes. And then Lin-chi said, "Do not ask me. Go inside and find out who is asking. Close your eyes. Do not ask 'Who am I?' Go inside and find out who is asking, who is this questioner inside. Forget me. Find out the source of the question. Go deep inside!"

And it is reported that the man closed his eyes, became silent and suddenly he was an Enlightened One. He opened his eyes, laughed, touched the feet of Lin-chi and said, "You have answered me. I have been asking everyone this question and many answers were given to me, but nothing proved to be an answer. But you have answered me."

"Who am I?" How can anyone answer it? But in that particular situation -- a thousand persons silent, a pin-drop silence -- Lin-chi came down with strained eyes and then just ordered the man, "Close your eyes, go inside and find out who the questioner is. Do not wait for me answer. Find out who has asked." And the man closed his eyes. What happened in that situation? He became centered. Suddenly he was centered, suddenly he became aware of the innermost core.

This has to be discovered, and awareness means the method to discover this innermost core. The more unconscious you are, the further away you are from yourself. The more conscious, the nearer you reach to yourself. If the consciousness is total, you are at the center. If the consciousness is less, you are near the periphery. When you are unconscious, you are on the periphery where the center is completely forgotten. So these are the two possible ways to move.

You can move to the periphery; then you move to unconsciousness. Sitting at a film, sitting somewhere listening to music, you can forget yourself; then you are on the periphery.

Even listening to me, you can forget yourself. Then again you are on the periphery. Reading the Gita or the Bible or the Koran, you can forget yourself. Then you are on the periphery.

Whatever you do, if you can remember yourself then you are nearer to the center. Then someday, suddenly you are centered. Then you have energy. That energy, this sutra says, is the fire. The whole life, the whole existence, is energy, is fire. Fire is the old name; now they call it electricity. Man has been labelling it with many, many names, but fire is good. Electricity seems a little bit dead; fire looks more alive. This inner fire, the sutra says, is the incense. When someone is going to worship, you take some incense, *dhoop*, with you. That *dhoop*, that incense, is useless unless you have come with your inner fire as the incense.

This Upanishad is trying to give inner meanings to outer symbols. Every symbol has an inner counterpart. The outer is good in itself, but it is not enough. And it is only symbolic; it is not the substance. It shows something, but it is not the real. You must have seen incense. It is burning everywhere in temples. It is good in itself, but it is only an outer symbol. An inner fire is needed. And just as incense gives a perfume, the inner fire also gives it.

It is said that wherever Mahavir moved, everyone would feel his presence as a subtle perfume. That has been said about many persons. It is possible! The more you are centered inside, the more your whole presence becomes a perfume. And those who have the receptivity, they will feel it. So enter a temple, not with outer incense, but with inner incense. And this inner incense can be achieved only through awareness. There is no other way.

Act mindfully. It is a long, arduous journey and it is difficult to be aware even for a single moment. The mind is constantly flickering. But it is not impossible. It is arduous, it is difficult, but it is not impossible. It is possible! For everyone it is possible. Only effort is needed -- and a wholehearted effort. Nothing should be left: nothing should be left inside untouched. Everything should be sacrificed for awareness. Only then is the inner flame discovered. It is there. If one goes to find out the essential unity between all the religions that have existed or that may exist ever, then this single word "awareness" can be found.

Jesus tells a story: A master of a big house has gone out, and he has told his servants to be constantly alert -- because any moment he can come back. So for twenty-four hours they have to be alert. Any moment the master can come -- any moment! There is no fixed moment, no fixed day, no fixed date. If there is a fixed date, then you can sleep, then you can do whatever you like, and you can be alert only on that particular date because then the master is coming. But the master has said, "I will come at any moment. Day and night you have to be alert to receive me."

This is the parable of life. You cannot postpone. Any moment the Divine may just come; any moment the master may come. One has to be alert continuously. No date is fixed; nothing is known about when that sudden happening will be there. One can do only one thing: be alert and wait!

Rabindranath has written a poem, "The King of the Night." It is a very deep parable. There was a great temple with one hundred priests, and one day the chief priest dreamt that the Divine Guest was to come that night -- the Divine Guest for whom they had been waiting and waiting. For centuries the temple had been waiting for the King to come, the Divine King to come. The deity of the temple was to come! But the chief priest was in doubt: "It may be just a dream. And if it is just a dream, then everyone will laugh. But who knows? -- it may be true. It may be a true intimation."

The chief priest brooded that morning over whether to tell it to others or not. Then he became afraid. It may be time! So, then, in the afternoon, he told it. He gathered all the priests, closed all the doors of the temple, and said to them, "Do not go out and do not tell

anyone! It may be just a dream; no one knows. But I have dreamt it, and the dream was so real. In the dream, the deity, the King of this temple, said, 'I am coming tonight. Be ready!' So we have to be alert. This night we cannot go to sleep."

So they decorated the whole temple; they cleaned the whole temple; they made every arrangement to receive the Guest. And then they waited. Then, by and by, doubts began to arise. Then someone said, "This is nonsense. This was just a dream, and we are wasting our sleep." Half the night passed, then more doubts began to arise. Then someone rebelled and said, "I am going to sleep. This is nonsense. The whole day is wasted, and still we are waiting. No one is to come!" Then many supported him. Many laughed: "It is just a dream, so why pay so much attention to it!"

Then even the chief priest yielded and said, "It may have been just a dream. How can I say that it was real? We may be just stupid, foolish, just following a dream." So they said, "Only one person should wait at the gate and all the rest can go to sleep. If someone comes he will inform us."

Ninety-nine priests went to sleep, and the only priest who was appointed said, "When ninety-nine think that this is just a dream, why should I waste my sleep? And if the Divine Guest is to come, let him come. He will come in a great chariot, so there will be much noise and everyone will be awakened."

He closed the doors, then he also fell asleep. Then the chariot came and the wheels of the chariot created much noise. Then someone who had been asleep said, "It seems the King is coming. It seems the wheels of the chariot are making much noise." Someone else who was just going to sleep said, "Do not waste time; no one is coming. This is not the chariot. These are just clouds in the sky." And then the Guest came and knocked at the door. Someone again said, in his sleep, "It seems someone has come and is knocking at the door." So the chief priest himself said, "Now go to sleep. Do not go on disturbing again and again. No one is knocking at the door. It is just the wind."

In the morning they were weeping and crying because the chariot had come in the night. There were marks on the street and the Divine Guest had come up to the door and knocked. There were footmarks on the dust, on the steps.

There are many parables. Buddha and Mahavir have told many stories with only one essential idea -- that Enlightenment is at any time, at any moment, possible. It can happen any moment. One has to be alert and conscious and aware. This parable of "The King of the Night" is not just a parable. It is real. We all are interpreting things in that way, and all our interpretations are just rationalizations of our sleep and for our sleep. We say, "It is nothing but the wind, it is nothing but the clouds." Then we can sleep at ease. We go on denying religion, we go on denying anything that will break our sleep. We rationalize that there is no God, that there is no religion, that there is nothing -- nothing but wind, nothing but clouds. Then we can sleep at ease, comfortably.

If there is a God, if there is Divinity, if there is a possibility of something higher than we are, then we cannot sleep so conveniently. Then we will have to be alert and awake and struggling, making efforts and endeavouring. Then transformation becomes our immediate concern.

Awareness is the technique for centering oneself, for achieving the inner fire. It is there hidden; it can be discovered. And once it is discovered, then only are we capable of entering the temple -- not before, *never* before.

But we can deceive ourselves by symbols. Symbols are to show deeper realities to us, but we can use them as deceptions. We can burn an outer incense, we can worship with outer

things, and then we feel at ease that we have done something. We can feel ourselves religious without becoming religious at all. That is what is happening; that is what the earth has become. Everyone thinks they are religious just because they are following outer symbols, with no inner fire.

Make efforts even if you are a failure. You *will* be in the beginning. You will fail again and again, but even your failure will help. When you fail to be aware for a single moment, you feel for the first time how unconscious you are.

Walk down the street, and you cannot walk a few steps without becoming unconscious. Again and again you forget yourself. You begin to read a signboard, and you forget yourself. Someone passes, you look at him, then you forget yourself.

Your failures will be helpful. They can show you how unconscious you are. And even if you can become aware that you are unconscious, you have gained a certain awareness.

If a madman becomes aware that he is mad, he is on the path toward sanity.

The Ultimate Alchemy, Vol 2

Chapter #2

Chapter title: Questions and Answers

2 July 1972 pm in

Archive code: 7207025

ShortTitle: ULTAL202

Audio: Yes

Video: No

OSHO, AFTER EATING THE FRUIT OF THE TREE OF KNOWLEDGE, ADAM AND EVE, FOR THE FIRST TIME, BECAME AWARE OF THEIR NAKEDNESS AND FELT ASHAMED. WHAT IS THE DEEPER MEANING BEHIND THIS FEELING? AND, SECONDLY, IT HAS BEEN SAID THAT THE FORBIDDEN FRUIT OF THE TREE OF KNOWLEDGE IS KNOWLEDGE OF SEX. WHAT IS YOUR VIEW ABOUT THIS?

NATURE in itself is innocent. But the moment man becomes aware of it many problems arise, and what is natural and innocent is interpreted. And when it is interpreted it is neither innocent nor natural. Nature in itself is innocent. But when humanity becomes aware of it man begins to interpret it, and the very interpretation begins to produce many concepts of guilt, of sin, of morality, of immorality.

The story of Adam and Eve says that when the fruit of the Tree of Knowledge was eaten, for the first time they became aware of their nakedness and felt ashamed. They were naked, but they had never been aware of it. The awareness, the very awareness, creates a gap. The moment you are aware of something, you begin to judge. Then you are different from it. For example: Adam was naked. Everyone is born naked like Adam, but children are not aware of their nakedness. They cannot judge it -- whether it is good or bad. They are not aware so they cannot judge. When Adam became aware that he was naked, judgement entered over whether this nakedness was good or bad.

Every animal was naked around him, but no animal was aware of his nakedness. Adam became aware, and with this awareness Adam became unique. Now to be naked was to be like an animal, and Adam, of course, would not like to be an animal. No man likes it, although every man is.

When for the first time Darwin said that man is a growth, a growth from certain animal species, he was opposed vehemently because man has always been thinking of himself as a descendant of God -- just a little bit lower than the angels. And to conceive of the ape as man's father was very difficult -- in a way, impossible. God had been the father, and suddenly Darwin changed it. God became dethroned and apes were throned; the ape became the father. Even Darwin felt guilty about it as he was a religious man. This was a misfortune, that the

facts were saying that man has come through animal evolution, that he is part of the animal world, that he is not something different from animals.

Adam felt ashamed. That shame came because he could now compare himself with animals. In a way, he was different now because he was aware. Man clothed himself just to differentiate between animals and himself. And then we are always ashamed about something which looks animal-like; the moment someone is doing something animal-like we say, "What are you doing? Are you an animal?" We can condemn anything if we can prove that it is just animal-like. We condemn sex because it is animalistic. We can condemn anything if somewhere it can be linked with animals.

With awareness came condemnation -- condemnation of the animal. And this condemnation has produced the whole body of suppression, because man is an animal. He can go beyond it; that is another thing. But he belongs to animals. He can transcend, but he comes from the animal. He is an animal. One day he may not be; he can go beyond. But he cannot deny the animal heritage. It is there. And once this thought came to the human mind, that we are different from animals, then man began to suppress everything in him that was part of animal heritage. This suppression has created a bifurcation, so every man is two, double. The real, the basic, remains the animal; and the intellectual, the cerebral, goes on thinking in terms of fallacious things that are abstract -- about the Divine. So only a part of your mind is identified by you as yourself and the whole is denied.

Even in the body we have divisions. The lower body is something condemned. It is not only physically lower; it is lower in terms of values also. The upper body is not only upper; it is higher. You feel guilty about your lower body. And if someone says, "Where are you located?" you will point to your head. That is the locus -- the cerebral, the head, the intellect. We identify ourselves with the intellect, not with the body. And if someone presses us more, then we will identify ourselves with the upper body, never with the lower. The lower is something condemned.

Why? Body is one. You cannot divide it. There is no division. The head and feet are one, and your brain and your sex organs are one. They function as a unity. But to deny sex, to condemn sex, we condemn the whole lower body.

Sin came to Adam because for the first time he could feel himself different from other animals. And sex is the most animalistic thing. I use the word "animalistic" in a purely factual way, without any condemnatory tone. The most animalistic thing is bound to be sex, because sex is life and the origin and the source of life. Adam and Eve became conscious of sex. They tried to hide it not only outwardly: they tried to hide the very fact even in inner consciousness. That created the division between the conscious and the unconscious mind.

Mind is also one, just as the body is one. But if you condemn something then that condemned part will become unconscious. You condemn it so much that you yourself become afraid of knowing it, that it exists somewhere within you. You create a barrier; you create a wall. And you throw everything that is condemned by you beyond the wall and then you can forget it. It remains there, it goes on working from there, it remains your master, but still you can deceive yourself that now it is no more.

That condemned part of our being becomes the unconscious. That is why we never think that our unconscious is ours. You dream in the night: you dream a very sexual dream or a violent dream in which you murder someone, in which you murder your wife. In the morning you do not feel any guilt; you say it was just a dream. It is not *just* a dream. Nothing is *just* something. It was your dream, but it belongs to your unconscious. In the morning you identify yourself with the conscious, so you say, "It is just a dream. It does not belong to me;

it just happened. It is irrelevant, accidental." You never feel associated with it. But it was your dream and you created it. And it was your mind and it was you who did the act. Even in the dream it was you who murdered, who killed or who raped.

Because of this condemnatory phenomenon of consciousness, Adam and Eve became afraid, ashamed of their nakedness. They tried to hide their bodies -- not only their bodies, but later on their minds also. We are also doing the same thing. What is "good", what is taken as good by our society, you put into your conscious, and what is "bad", what is condemned by our society as bad, you throw into the unconscious. It becomes a rubbish bag. You go on throwing things into it and they remain there. Deep down in your roots they go on working. They affect you every moment. Your conscious mind is just impotent against your unconscious, because your conscious mind is just a by-product of the society, and your unconscious is natural, biological; it has the energy, the force. So you can go on thinking "good" things, but you will go on doing "bad" things.

St. Augustine is reported to have said, "My God, this is the only problem for me: whatsoever I think is worth doing I never do, and whatsoever I know is not to be done I do always." This is not a problem only for Augustine -- it is a problem for everyone who is divided into the conscious and unconscious.

With the feeling of shame Adam was divided into two. He became ashamed of himself. And that part of which he became ashamed was cut loose from his conscious mind. Since then man has lived a bifurcated, fragmented life. And why did he become ashamed? There was no one -- no preacher, no religious church -- to tell him to be ashamed.

The moment you become aware, ego enters in. You become an observer. Without awareness you are just part, part of a great life; you are not different and separate. If a wave in the ocean can become aware, the wave can create an ego different from the ocean that very moment. If the wave can become aware and think "I am", then the wave cannot think itself to be one with the ocean, one with other waves. It becomes different -- separate. Ego is created. Knowledge creates the ego.

Children are without egos because they are without knowledge. They are ignorant, and ego cannot come up in ignorance. The more you grow, the more you grow toward ego. Old men have very strengthened, deep-rooted egos. It is natural. Their egos have existed for seventy or eighty years. They have a long history.

If you go back in memory and try to remember your childhood you may be surprised to know why you cannot remember. You cannot regress beyond your fourth or third year. Ordinarily, you can remember facts which belong to your fifth year or fourth year, or at the most to the third year, but the first three years are just vacant. They were there and many things happened, but why can we not remember? It is because the ego was not there, so it is difficult to remember. In a way, you were not, so how can you remember? If you were there you would remember, but you were not.

You cannot remember. Memory exists only after the ego has come into existence, because memory needs a center on which to hang. If you are not, where will the memory hang? Three years is a big thing. and for a child every moment is an event. Everything is something phenomenal; nothing is ordinary. Really, he should remember more. He should remember the first years, the first days of life, because then everything was colourful, everything was unique. Whatsoever happened was new. But there is no memory of it. Why? Because the ego was not there. The memory needs an ego on which to hang.

The moment the child begins to feel himself as separate from others, he will begin to feel shame. He will begin to feel the same shame that came to Adam. Adam found himself naked

-- naked like animals, naked like everything else. You must be different and unique, you must not be like others; only then can you grow in ego. The first act was to hide nakedness. Suddenly Adam became different. He was not an animal.

Man is born like Adam and with Adam's shame; with Adam's feeling of shame, man is born. A child is not a man. He becomes a man only when he begins to feel himself separate, different from others -- when he becomes an ego. So, really, it is not religion which gives you the feeling of guilt, it is your ego. Religion exploits it; that is another matter. Every father exploits it; that, too, is another matter. Every father is saying to his son, "What are you doing, behaving like an animal? Do not laugh, do not cry; do not do this, do not do that; do not do this before others. What are you doing? -- behaving like an animal!" And if the child thinks that he is an animal, his ego is hurt. To fulfill his ego, he follows, he falls in line.

To be an animal is very blissful, because there is a freedom, a deep freedom, to move, to do. But it is painful to the ego, so one has to choose. If you choose freedom, then you will be like the animals -- condemned. In this world and in the other world, too, you will be condemned; you will be thrown into Hell by the society. So you must "Be a man; do not be like an animal!" Then the ego is fed.

One begins to live around the ego, then one begins to act according to what is ego fulfilling. But you cannot deny nature absolutely. It goes on affecting you. Then one begins to live two lives: one, the pre-Adam life; the other, the after-Adam life. One begins to live two lives; one begins to live a double-bind existence. Then a face is created to show to the society. One is a private face and one a public face. But you are your private face, and everyone is Adam -- naked, animal-like. But you cannot show it to the public. To the public you show the after-Adam face -- everything clean, everything fitted to the social norm. Everything you show to the other is not the real but the desired, not that which is but that which should be.

So everyone has to go continuously from one face to another. From private to public you are changing every moment. This is a great strain. This dissipates much energy. But I am not saying to be like an animal: now you cannot be. The forbidden fruit cannot be returned. You have eaten it; it has become your blood and bones. There is no way of throwing it; there is no way to return it and go to God the Father and say, "I return this -- this forbidden fruit of Knowledge. Forgive me." There is no way! There is no way to go back!

Now it is your blood. We cannot go back; we can only go forward. There is no going back. We cannot go below knowledge. We can only go beyond knowledge. Only a different innocence is possible -- the innocence of total awareness.

There are two types of innocence. One is below knowledge -- the childlike, the pre-Adam-like, the animal-like. Below knowledge you are not, the ego is not, the troublemaker is not; you exist as part of the Cosmic Whole. You do not know that you are part, you do not know that there is a Cosmic Whole; you know nothing. You exist without knowing. Of course, there is no suffering because suffering is impossible without knowledge. One has to be aware of suffering to suffer it. How can you suffer if you are not aware?

You are being operated upon: a surgeon is operating on you. If you are conscious, you suffer. If you are unconscious, there is no suffering. The leg is cut completely, thrown, and there is no suffering because suffering is nowhere recorded, nowhere known -- you are unconscious. You cannot suffer in unconsciousness. You can suffer only when you are conscious. The more conscious, the more you suffer. That is why the more man grows in knowledge, the more he suffers.

Primitive people cannot suffer so much as you can suffer -- not because they are better,

but because they are ignorant. Even today, villagers are not yet part of the modern world and they live in a more innocent way. They do not suffer so much. Because of this, many fallacies have come to the thinkers, to the philosophers. For example, Rousseau or Tolstoy or Gandhi: they think that because villagers are more blissful it would be good if the whole world became primitive again, went back to the jungle, back to the forest, back to nature. But they are wrong because the man who has lived in a civilized city will suffer in a village. No villagers have suffered that way.

Rousseau goes on talking about going back to nature, and he continues to live in Paris. He himself will not go to the village. He talks about the poetry of village life, of the beauty, of the innocence, but he himself will never go. And if he goes, then he will know that he will suffer as no villager has suffered, because once consciousness is attained you cannot throw it. IT IS YOU! It is not something that you can throw; it is you! How can you throw yourself? Your consciousness is you.

Adam suffered shame; he felt his nakedness. Ego is the reason. Adam attained a center; though false, it was still a center. Now Adam was different from the whole Cosmos. Trees were there, stars were there, everything was there, but Adam was now an island suffering. Now his life was *his* life, not part of the Cosmic Whole. And the moment your life is your life, struggle enters. You have to fight inch by inch to exist, to survive.

Animals are not in a struggle. Even if they appear to us or to Darwin to be in a struggle, they are not in a struggle. They appear to Darwin to be in a struggle because we go on projecting our own ideas. They cannot be in a struggle. They appear to us to be in a struggle because for us everything is a struggle. With the ego everything is a struggle. They seem to be fighting to exist, but they are not fighting to exist: they are just flowing in the Cosmic Unity. Even if they are doing something, there is no doer behind it. It is a natural phenomenon.

If a lion is killing some victim for his food, there is no doer, there is no violence. It is a simple phenomenon -- just hunger after food. There is no hungry one but simply hunger -- a mechanism of finding food, not violence. Only man can be violent, because only man can be a doer. You can kill without hunger, but a lion can never kill without hunger -- because in a lion the hunger kills, not the lion. A lion can never kill in play. There is nothing like hunting for a lion. It exists only for man. You can kill in play, just for fun. If a lion is satisfied, there is no violence, no play, no game, nothing. It is a hunger phenomenon. The doer is not there.

Nature exists as a deep Cosmic flow. In this flow Adam becomes aware of himself, and he becomes aware because he has eaten the forbidden fruit of knowledge. Knowledge was forbidden: "Do not eat the fruit of the Tree of Knowledge!" was the commandment. Adam disobeyed it, then he could not go back. And the Bible says that every man will suffer for Adam's rebelliousness, because in a way every man is Adam again.

But you cannot suffer for it. How can you suffer for something someone else did somewhere? But it is a continuous history repeated every day. Every child has to pass from the Garden of Eden to the expulsion. Every child is born as Adam, and then he is expelled. That is why there is so much nostalgia in poets, in painters, in literary persons. In all those who can manipulate to express, there is always a nostalgia. They think that the golden age was childhood.

Everyone thinks that childhood was something good, utopian, and everyone wants to go back to it. Even an old man just on the deathbed thinks nostalgically of childhood -- of the beauty, of the happiness, of the bliss, of the flowers, of the butterflies, of the dreams, of the fairies. Everyone is in a wonderland in his childhood -- not only Alice but everyone. This

shadow follows.

Why is childhood so beautiful, so blissful? Because you were still a part of the Cosmic flow, with no responsibility, with absolute freedom, with no conscience, with no burden. You existed, not as if it was something to be done by you, rather it was just there, taken for granted. And then comes the ego, and then comes the conflict and the struggle. Then everything becomes a responsibility, and every moment is a bondage with no freedom.

Psychologists say that religions only reflect this nostalgia -- the wish to be again in childhood. And they go even further: they say that ultimately everyone longs to be in the womb of the mother because when you were in the womb you were really part of the Cosmos. The Cosmos was even feeding you. Even to breathe was not required of you. The mother was breathing for you. You were not aware of the mother, you were not aware of yourself. You were there without awareness.

The womb is the Garden of Eden. So every man is born as Adam, and everyone has to eat the forbidden fruit of knowledge, because the moment you grow you grow in knowledge. That is inevitable. So it is not that Adam rebelled. Rebellion is part of growth. He could not do otherwise: he had to eat the fruit. Every child has to rebel, has to eat the fruit. Every child has to rebel, has to disobey. Life demands it. He has to go further away from the mother, from the father. He will long for it; again and again he will desire and dream, but still he will go further away. This is an inevitable process.

It is asked, "What is the deeper meaning behind this feeling?" This is the meaning: knowledge gives you ego; ego gives you comparison, judgement, individuality. You cannot think of yourself as an animal. Man has done everything to hide the fact that he is an animal. He has done everything! We are doing things every day to hide the fact that we are animals. But we *are* animals. And by hiding the fact, the fact is not destroyed; rather, it becomes a perverted fact. So whenever that hidden perversion comes up, man proves to be more animalistic than any animal. If you are violent, no animal can compete with you. How can it? No animal has known anything like Hiroshima, Vietnam. Only man can create a Hiroshima. There is no comparison.

All the animals in all of history are just playing with dolls in comparison to Hiroshima. Their violence is nothing. This is accumulated violence -- hidden, accumulated. We go on hiding, and then we are accumulating. And the more we accumulate, the more ashamed we feel, because we know what is hidden inside. We cannot escape it.

A certain psychologist was experimenting with hidden facts, which, howsoever you try, you actually cannot hide. For Example, if someone says that he is not attracted to women, he can practise not being attracted, and he can convince himself and others also that he is not attracted. But Adam is bound to be attracted to Eve, Eve is bound to be attracted to Adam; that is part of human nature -- unless one goes beyond, unless one becomes a Buddha.

But then Buddha never says, "I am not attracted to women" -- because even to say that, you have to think in terms of attraction and repulsion. He will not say, "I am repelled by women," because one cannot be repelled by anything unless one is attracted. If you ask him, he will simply say, "Men and women both have become irrelevant to me. I am neither. If I am a man, then a woman will be there hidden somewhere. If I am a woman then a man will be there hidden somewhere."

Anyhow, this psychologist just recently experimented with a man who said, "I am not affected by women." And he was not, as far as outer things go. He was never seen to be attracted to anyone. Then this psychologist showed him some pictures -- ten pictures of different things. Only one picture was of a naked woman. The psychologist was not seeing

what picture he was seeing. He was just seeing his eyes. The back of the picture was in front of the psychologist. He would show a picture to the man and just look in his eyes. He said, "If you are not attracted, I will know. Otherwise I will tell you when you are seeing the picture of a naked woman just by seeing your eyes. I am not seeing the picture."

The picture was shown, and that very time the psychologist said, "Now you are seeing the naked woman," because the moment a naked woman is there, the eyes extend. And that is non-voluntary; you cannot control it. You cannot do anything. It is a reflex action. Eyes are made that way biologically. The man says, "I am not attracted," but this is only the conscious mind. The unconscious is attracted all the same.

When you hide certain facts they go on manipulating you, and then you become more and more ashamed. The higher the civilization and the higher the culture, the more ashamed the human being will be -- *the more ashamed!* Really, the more ashamed you are about sex the more civilized you are. But then civilized man is bound to be insane, schizophrenic, divided. This division started with Adam.

And, secondly, it has been asked, "It has been said that the forbidden fruit of the Tree of Knowledge is knowledge of sex. What is your view about this?"

Of course, it is. But *not only* that. Sex is the first knowledge, and sex is also the last knowledge. When you enter humanity, the first thing you begin to feel and be aware of is sex, and the last thing, when you go beyond humanity, is again sex -- the first and the last. Because sex is more foundational it is bound to be the first. It is the alpha and the omega.

A child is just a child unless he becomes sexually mature. The moment he becomes sexually mature, he is a man. With sexual maturity, the whole world becomes different. It is not the same world because your approach, your outlook, your way of seeing things, changes. When you begin to be aware of women, you begin to be a man.

Really, in the old Biblical texts, the word "knowledge" is used in the Hebrew language with a sexual meaning. For example, with such sentences: "He did not 'know' his wife for two years" or "She did not 'know' her husband for two years," it means there was no sexual relationship for two years. "He 'knew' his wife for the first time on that day": it means there was a sexual relationship for the first time. "Knowledge" in Hebrew is used for sexual knowledge, so it is correct that Adam became aware of sex after eating the apple.

Sex is most foundational. Without sex there is no life. Life exists because of sex and life disappears with sex. That is why Buddha and Mahavir say that unless you go beyond sex you will be born again and again. You cannot go beyond life, because with the sexual desire inside you will be born again. So sex is not only giving birth to someone else; ultimately, it is giving birth to yourself also. It works in a double way. You reproduce someone through sex, but that is not so important -- because of your sexual desire, you are reborn; you reproduce yourself again and again. Adam became aware of his sex; that was the first awareness. But this sex is only a beginning. Then everything else will follow.

Really, psychologists say that every curiosity is sexual in a way. So if a person is born impotent, he will not be curious about anything -- not even about Truth, because curiosity inside is basically sexual. To discover something hidden, to know something which is not known, to know the unknown, is sexual. Children will play with each other to find out the hidden parts of the body. That is the beginning of curiosity and the beginning of all science -- to find out that which is hidden, that which is not known.

Really, it happens that the more sexual a person, the more inventive he can be; the more sexual a person, the more intelligent. With less sex energy, less intelligence exists and with more energy, more intelligence -- because sex is a deep fact to uncover: not only in the body,

not only in the body of the opposite sex, but in everything that is hidden.

So if a society is very sex-condemning, it can never be scientific, because then it condemns curiosity. The East could not be scientific because of so much antagonism toward sex. And the West also could not have become scientific if Christianity had retained its hold. It was only when the Vatican disappeared, when Rome was not significant at all, only within these three hundred years when the palace of Christianity came down and disappeared, that the West could be scientific. The release of sex energy also became a release into research.

A sexually free society can be scientific, and a sexually prohibited society will be non-scientific. With sex everything begins to be alive. If your child begins to behave rebelliously when he attains maturity, sexual maturity, forget it. It is but natural. With a new energy coming into his veins, with a new life running, he is bound to be rebellious. That rebellion is just a part. He is also bound to be an inventor. He will invent new things, new ways, new styles, new manners of life, a new society. He can dream new dreams, he will think about a new utopia. If you condemn sex, then there is no rebellion of youth. All over the world, the rebellion of youth is a part of sexual freedom.

In the old culture there was no rebellion because sex was so much condemned, the energy was too much suppressed. With that energy suppressed, every rebellion is suppressed. If you give freedom to sex energy, every rebellion will be there, every type of rebellion will be there.

Knowledge in itself has a sexual dimension, so it is right in a way to say that Adam became aware of sex, the dimension of sex. But with that dimension of sex he became aware of many other things also. This whole extension of knowledge, this explosion of knowledge, this probing into the unknown, this going to the moon and to other planets, is a sexual thirst. And it will go further and further into knowledge, because now the energy is released, and now the energy will take new shapes, new adventures.

With sex and the awareness of sex, Adam started on a long journey. We are on it, everyone is on it, because sex is not just a part of your body -- it is you. You are born of sex, and you will die of sex, exhausted. Your birth is a birth of sex and your death is a death of sex. So the moment you feel that sexual energy has vanished, know that death is coming near.

Thirty-five is the peak age. Sex energy is at the peak, and then everything declines and one begins to be old, on the dying path. Seventy or so will be the death age. If fifty can be the peak of sexual energy, then a hundred will be the death age. The West will soon attain a hundred years as a normal, average age, because now a fifty-year-old behaves like a boy. It is good. It shows the society is alive. It shows that now life will be lengthened.

If a hundred-year-old man can behave like a playboy, then life will be lengthened to two hundred years, because sex is the basic energy. Because of sex you are young and because of sex you will be old. Because of sex you are born and because of sex you will die. And not only that: Buddha and Mahavir and Krishna, they say that because of sexual desire you will be born again. Not only is your present body run by sex, but all your bodies in continuity are run by sexual desire.

Of course, when Adam became conscious for the first time, he became conscious of sex. That is the most foundational fact. But this was misinterpreted by Christianity and then much nonsense followed. It was said that because Adam became aware of his sex and felt ashamed, sex is bad and a sin -- the original sin. It is not. It is original light. He became ashamed not because sex is bad; he became ashamed because he saw that sex is an animal affair and thought, "I am not an animal." So sex has to be fought, cut and thrown. Somehow, one has to become without sex. This is a misinterpretation -- the Christian interpretation of the parable.

So: "Fight against sex!" Religion became just a fight against sex. And if religion is a fight against sex; then religion is a fight against life.

Truly, religion is not a fight against sex. Rather, it is an effort to go beyond, not against. If you are against you will remain on the same level with sex. Then you can never go beyond.

So Christian mystics and saints, they are fighting until their deathbed against sex. Then temptation comes, and every moment they are tempted. There is no one there to tempt them. Their own suppression is the creator of their temptation. They live in a very tortured world of the inner mind in which they are constantly fighting with themselves.

Religion is to go beyond, not against. And if you want to go beyond, you have to step beyond sex. So use sex energy to transcend it. You have to move with it, not fight with it. You have to know it more. To be ignorant now is impossible. You have to know it more. Knowledge is freedom. If you know it more and more and more, and the moment comes when you are totally aware, then sex disappears. In that total awareness, the energy is transformed, mutated. You now have a different dimension of the same energy.

Sex is horizontal. When you are totally aware, sex becomes vertical. And that vertical movement of sex is kundalini. If sex moves horizontally, then you go on reproducing others and reproducing yourself. If the energy begins to move upward, vertically, you just go out -- out of the wheel of Existence: as the Buddhists say, out of the wheel of life. This is a new birth -- not in a new body, but in a new dimension of Existence. This Buddhists have called Nirvana. You can call it MOKSHA -- liberation -- or whatsoever you like to call it. Names do not mean much.

So there are two ways. Adam became aware of his sex, then he could suppress it: he could move horizontally, fighting with it in a constant anguish, always knowing that the animal is hidden inside and always pretending that it is not there. This is the anguish, and one can move horizontally for lives together reaching nowhere, because it is a repetitive circle. That is why we call it a wheel -- a repetitive circle. But you can jump out of the wheel. That jumping will not be through suppression; it will be through more knowledge. So I will say you have eaten the fruit of the forbidden tree; now eat the whole tree. That is the only way. Now eat the whole tree! Do not leave even a single leaf! Let there be no tree: eat it totally! Only then will you be free from knowledge -- never before.

And when I say eat the whole tree, I mean now; when you have become aware, be aware totally. Fragmentary awareness is the problem. Either be totally ignorant or be totally aware. Totality is bliss. Be totally ignorant; then you are in bliss. You will not be aware of it, but you will be in bliss; just as when you are in deep sleep -- not even dreaming, but simply asleep with no movement of the mind -- you are in bliss, but you cannot feel it. You can say in the morning that the night's sleep was very blissful, but it was not felt when the sleep was there. It was felt only when you came out of it. When knowledge enters, awareness comes, then you can say the night was very blissful.

Either be totally ignorant, which is impossible. or be totally knowing, which is possible. With totality there is bliss. Totality is bliss. So eat the tree, root and all, and be aware. This is what is meant by an Awakened man, a Buddha -- an Enlightened One: he has eaten the whole tree. Now no one is left to be aware, but a simple awareness exists. This simple awareness is a re-entry into Eden. You cannot find the old way again; it is missed forever. But you can find a new way; you can enter again. And, really, whatsoever the Devil promised to Adam will be fulfilled: you will be like gods. He was right in a way. If you eat the fruit of knowledge, you will be like gods.

We cannot conceive of this in our present state of mind because we are just in a hell.

Because of this Devil's temptation, we are in hell. We are as if suspended in between two things, always divided -- in agony, in anguish. It seems that the Devil deceived Adam, deceived us. This is not the whole thing; the history is incomplete. You can complete it, and only then can you judge whether whatsoever the Devil said was right or not. Eat the whole tree, and you will be like gods.

A person who has become totally aware is Divine. He is not human. Humanity is a sort of disease -- I mean a "dis-ease", a continuous "dis-ease". Either be like animals and you are healthy, or be like gods and you are healthy -- healthy because you are whole, in a wholeness.

The English word "holy" is good. It doesn't only mean fully pure; really, it means to be whole. And unless you are whole you cannot be holy. Be whole! And there are only two types of wholeness: one is the animal type, the other is the god type.

OSHO, YOU SAID THAT AWARENESS CREATED CENTERING AND CRYSTALLIZATION, BUT I PERSONALLY FEEL THAT AWARENESS BRINGS A FEELING OF DEEP VOID WITHIN ME. PLEASE EXPLAIN THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CENTERING AND INNER VOID.

As man is, he is without a center -- without a real, authentic center. He has a center, so to speak, but the center is false. He only thinks he has a center. The ego is a false center. You feel that it is there, but it is not. If you go to find it, you will not find it at all.

Bodhidharma reached China 1100 years after Buddha. He was a Buddha himself. The Emperor Wu came to receive Bodhidharma. When no one was there, he asked Bodhidharma, "I am very, very disturbed. My mind is never at ease. What can I do? Tell me. Make my mind at peace, at ease. I am in deep conflict; an inner struggle continues -- so do something."

Bodhidharma said, "I can do something. Come early in the morning at four o'clock, but remember to bring your self."

The Emperor felt: "Either this man is mad or I have not understood what he is saying." He said, "Of course, I will come. I will come with my self."

Bodhidharma still insisted, "Do not forget. Bring your self with you. Otherwise, whom am I going to put at ease?"

The whole night the Emperor could not sleep. It was such a strange thing. I looked weird. What does this man mean? And then he began to feel doubtful about whether to go or not, and it was to be in the early hours, at four o'clock in the morning. And Bodhidharma had said to come alone: "Let your self only be with you; no one else." So no one could know what he was going to do, and he looked mad. It was even dangerous. But still, he was tempted. This man was really a different type of being. He attracted! He was magnetic! So the Emperor couldn't stay at home, he came.

When he was coming near, Bodhidharma said, "You have come, but where is your self?"

Wu said, "You make me puzzled. The whole night I couldn't sleep. What do you mean by 'my self'? I am here."

So Bodhidharma said, "Give me your self. I will make it silent, at peace, at ease. Close your eyes and find out where it is. Point it out to me and I will make it disappear totally, and there will be never any problem again."

So the Emperor Wu closed his eyes and sat before Bodhidharma. The morning was absolutely silent. No one was there. He could even hear his own breath; he could hear his own heartbeat. And Bodhidharma was there constantly telling him, "Go in and find out where

it is. If you cannot find it, then what can I do?" And he searched and searched and searched for hours together. Then he opened his eyes, and he was a different man.

He said, "I do not find it anywhere. It is all void. There is no self."

Bodhidharma said, "If there is no self and there is void, are you disturbed now? Is someone at a dis-ease inside? Now where is the anguish you were talking about? So much talking about it, and now where is it?"

Wu said, "It is nowhere, because the person has disappeared, so how can dis-ease exist without him? I tried and tried, but it is nowhere to be found. Really, I was myself in deception. I always thought 'I' am inside. I tried to find it, and it is not there. There is simply a void -- SHOONYA -- an emptiness, a nothingness."

So Bodhidharma said, "Now go to your home, and whenever you feel that something is to be done with your self, first find out where it is."

It is a false entity. Because we have never searched for it, it seems to exist. Because we have never gone in, we go on talking about the "I". It is not there. So the first thing to be understood is that if you meditate, if you become silent, you will feel a void, because you cannot find the ego. The ego was all the furniture; now the furniture has disappeared. You are just a room -- rather, a room-ness. Even the walls have disappeared. They were part of the ego. The whole structure has disappeared, so you will find a void.

This is the first step -- when the ego disappears. It is a false entity; it is not there. It only appears to be, and you go on thinking that it is there. It belongs to your thinking, not to your being. It belongs to your mind, not to your existence. Because you think it is there, it is there. When you go to find it, it is not found. Then you feel the void, emptiness. Now persist in this emptiness, remain in this void.

The mind is very cunning. It can play games. If you begin to think and observe this, this voidness, if you begin to think, you will fill it again. Even if you say, "This is void," you are out of it, already out of it. The void has disappeared -- *you* have come in. Remain with the void; remain void. Do not think. It is difficult, very frightening. One gets dizzy. It is an abyss -- an infinite abyss. You are falling down and falling down with no bottom to reach. One gets dizzy; one begins to think. The moment you think, you have found the ground again. Now you are not in the void.

If you can be in the void without escaping it by any thinking whatsoever, suddenly the void will also disappear, as the ego has disappeared -- because, really, it is because of the ego that it looks like a void. Ego was the thing which was fulfilling. That was the furniture, and there was no void. Now the ego has disappeared; that is why you feel it as a void. This feeling of emptiness is just because something which was always there is now not there.

If you see me in this chair, then suddenly if you do not find me in the chair, the chair will look empty -- not because the chair is empty, but simply because someone was there filling it and now he is no more there. So you see the void, not the chair. You see the void because the absence of something looks like an emptiness. You are still not seeing the chair. You were seeing a person there; now you are seeing the absence of the person. But the chair is still not seen. So when the ego disappears, you feel the void. This is only a beginning, because this void is also the negative part of the ego -- the other aspect. This void must also disappear.

It is reported about Rinzai, a Zen Master, that when he was learning with his Teacher, the Teacher always insisted that he should attain the void, the nothingness, the *shoonya*. So one day he came; he had attained it. It was a long effort. To dissolve the ego is a long effort. It was a long journey -- difficult, sometimes virtually impossible -- but he had attained. So he came, laughing, dancing, happy in ecstasy. He fell down at his Master's feet and said, "I have

attained. Now the void is there."

The Master looked at him very unsympathetically and said, "Now you go and throw this void also. Do not bring it here. Throw this void also. Throw this nothingness, because if you have nothingness it becomes something again."

Even a void is something. If you can feel it, it is something; if you can know it, it is something; if you can observe it, it is something. Even nothing becomes something if it is in your hands.

The Master said, "Throw this void out. Only come to me when even nothingness is not there."

Rinzai wept. Why couldn't he see it himself? A void is an attainment, it is something. If you have achieved nothingness, nothingness becomes a thing. When you go deep in the void -- without any thinking, without any vibration in the mind -- if you remain in this, suddenly the void just disappears and then the Self is known. Then you are centered. Then you have come to the real center.

There is the false center, the absence of the false center, and then the real center. By "centering" I mean the ground, the very ground of Being. It is not your center, because you are the false center. So it is not *your* center. It is *the* center -- just the center of Being. The very Existence is centered in it.

You are the false center; you will disappear. But even in your disappearance, if you begin to feel fulfilled with void, the ego has returned in a very subtle way. In a very subtle way, it has come back. It will say, "I have attained this void," so it is still there.

Do not allow it to come back. Remain in the void. Do not do anything with the void: do not even think about it, do not even feel anything about it. The void is there: be at ease; let it be there. It will disappear. It is just a negative part. The real thing has disappeared. It is just shadow. Do not catch the shadow, do not cling to the shadow. because the shadow can remain only if the real thing is nearby. Only then can the shadow remain. Ultimately the void disappears, and then there is centering. Then for the first time you are not and YOU ARE -- not as you, but as pure Being; rather, as the All. And this point must be noted carefully -- that it is not *your* center; it is the center of All.

Forget your false center. Go in and dig for it: then it dissolves. It is never found. It is not, so you cannot find it. Then a more arduous thing befalls you: you encounter the void. It is very silent. Compared to the ego world, it is *very* silent. You are in a deep peace. But do not be satisfied with it. It is false, because it is part of the ego. And if you feel satisfied, the ego will re-enter; it will come back. A part of it was still there. That part will bring it back again, whole. Remain with the void without any thinking.

That is just deathlike. One is dying before one's own eyes -- everything dissolving in a great abyss. And soon you will disappear and only the abyss will be there -- not even the knower of the abyss, not even the observer of the abyss, but just the abyss. Then you are centered -- centered in the Cosmic Center: it is not your center. For the first time, you are.

Now language will have a different meaning. You are not and *you* are. Here, yes and no lose their traditional difference, their customary meaning. You are not there as you. Now you are there as the Divine -- as the Cosmos itself. This is the existential centering -- the centering in the Existence.

The Ultimate Alchemy, Vol 2

Chapter #3

Chapter title: The Lamp of Awareness

3 July 1972 pm in

Archive code: 7207035

ShortTitle: ULTAL203

Audio: Yes

Video: No

CHIDADITYA SWAROOPAM DEEPAH

"TO BE ESTABLISHED IN THE SUN OF AWARENESS IS THE ONLY LAMP."

ONE DAY a lady came to Mulla Nasrudin's school with her small child, her son. The lady asked Mulla to frighten the boy. He had become unruly and he would not listen to anyone. He needed to be frightened by some big authority. Of course, Mulla was a big authority in his village. He assumed a very frightening posture. His eyes were bulging, all fiery, and he began to jump. The lady felt, "Now it is impossible to stop the Mulla -- he may even kill the boy."

The lady fainted, the boy escaped, and Mulla became so frightened of himself he had to run out of the school. He waited outside and the lady came back. Then he entered, slowly, silently, seriously. The lady said, "Mulla, it is strange! I never asked you to frighten ME."

Mulla said, "You do not see the real fact. It was not only you who was frightened; I myself was frightened of myself. When fear takes over, it destroys all. To start it is easy, but to control it is difficult. So I was the master when I started, but soon fear took over and it was the master and I was the slave; I could not do anything. And, moreover, fear has no favourites. When it strikes, it strikes all."

This is a beautiful parable, one which shows a deep insight into the human mind. You are conscious in everything just in the beginning, and then the unconscious takes over. The unconscious takes charge and the unconscious becomes the master. You can start anger, but you can never end it. Rather, the anger ends you. You can start anything, but sooner or later the unconscious takes charge; you are relieved of your duty. So only the beginning is in your hands, never the end. And you are not the master of the consequences that follow.

This is natural because only a very small fragment of the mind is aware. It works just like a starter in your motor car. It starts, and then it is of no use; then the motor takes it over. It is needed only to start; without it, it is difficult to start. But do not go on thinking that because you start a certain thing you are the master. This is the secret of this parable. Because you started, you begin to feel that you are the master. Because you started, you think you could have stopped.

You may not have started, that is another thing, but once started soon the voluntary becomes the non-voluntary and the conscious becomes unconscious, because the conscious is

just the upper layer, just the surface of the mind, and nearly the whole mind is unconscious. You start, and the unconscious begins to move and work.

So Mulla said, "I am not responsible for what has happened, I am not responsible! I am responsible only for starting, and it is you who told me to start. I started to frighten the boy, then the boy was frightened, then you fainted, then I was frightened, and then everything was a mess."

Everything is a mess in our lives also, with the conscious starting and the unconscious taking over every time. If you do not feel it, if you do not realize it, this mechanism, you will always be a slave. and the slavery becomes more convenient if you go on thinking that you are the master. It is difficult to be a slave knowingly, knowing that you are a slave. It is easy to be a slave when you go on deceiving yourself that you are the master -- of your love, your anger, your greed, your jealousy, your violence, your cruelty; even your sympathy and your compassion.

I say "your", but it is yours only in the beginning. Just for a moment, just a spark is yours. Then your mechanism has started, and your whole mechanism is unconscious. Why is this so? Why this conflict between the conscious and the unconscious? And *there is* a conflict. *You* cannot predict even about yourself. Even you, your acts, are unpredictable to you, because you do not know what is going to happen, you do not know what you are going to do. You are not even aware of what you are going to do the next moment because the doer is deep in darkness. You are not the doer. You are only a starting point. Unless your whole mechanism becomes conscious, you will be a problem to yourself and a hell. There will be nothing but a long misery.

As I have been emphasizing daily, one can become whole in only two ways. The first is that you can lose the fragmentary consciousness, throw this fragment of the mind which has become conscious, into the dark unconscious, dissolve it, and you are whole. But then you are just like an animal, and that is impossible. Whatsoever you may do, it is not possible. It is conceivable, but not possible. You will be thrown forward again and again.

That small part which has become conscious cannot become unconscious again. It is like an egg which has become a hen. Now the hen cannot move back to be an egg again. A seed which has sprouted has begun the journey to be a tree. Now it cannot go back; it cannot regress and become a seed. A child which has come out of the womb of his mother cannot now go back, no matter how pleasant the womb may be.

There is no going backward. Life always moves in the future, never in the past. Only man can think of the past. That is why I say it is conceivable, but it cannot be actualized. You can imagine, you can think to go back, you can believe in it, you can try to go back, but you cannot go. That is an impossibility. One has to move forward. That is the second way to become whole.

Knowingly or unknowingly, one is moving every moment. If you move knowingly, then the speed is accelerated. If you move unknowingly, then you do not waste energy and time. Then the thing can happen even in one life which will not happen in a million lives of your just moving unknowingly, because if you move unknowingly you move in a circle. Every day you repeat the same, in every life you again repeat the same, and life becomes just a habit, a mechanical habit, a repetition.

You can break the repetitive habit if you move knowingly. Then there is a breakthrough. So the first thing is to be aware that your awareness is of such a small measure that it works only as a starter. Unless you have more awareness than unawareness, more consciousness than unconsciousness, the balance will not change. What are the hindrances? Why is this the

situation? Why is this the fact? Why this conflict between conscious and unconscious? This must be considered.

It is natural. Whatsoever is, is natural. Man has evolved through millions of years. This evolution has created you, your body. your mechanism. The evolution has been a long struggle -- millions and millions of experiences of failures, of successes. Your body has learned much; your body has been continuously learning things. Your body knows much, and its knowledge is fixed. It goes on repeating its own ways of behaving. Even if the situation has changed, the body remains the same. For example, when you feel anger, you feel it in the same way as any primitive man, you feel it in the same way as any animal, you feel it in the same way as any child. And this is the mechanism: when you feel anger your body has a fixed routine, a ritual, a routine work to do.

The moment your mind says "anger", you have glands which begin to release chemicals into the blood. Adrenalin is released into the blood. It is a necessity because in anger you will have to strike or else you may be struck by your opponent. You will need more blood circulation, and this chemical will help more circulation to be there. You may need to fight or you may need to escape from a situation, to run away. For both cases, this chemical will help. So when some animal is angry, the body becomes ready to fight or to take flight. And these are the two alternatives: if the animal feels that he is stronger than the opponent, he will fight; if he feels that he is not the stronger one, he will escape. And the mechanism works very smoothly.

But for man the situation has become totally different. When you feel anger, you may not even express it. That is impossible for the animal. It depends on the situation. If it is against your servants, then you may express it. If it is against your master, then you may not express it. Not only that: you may even laugh or smile; you may even persuade your master, your boss, to think that not only are you not angry, but that you are very happy. Now you are confusing the whole mechanism of the body. The body is ready to fight, and you are smiling. You are creating a mess in the body. The body cannot understand what you are doing. Are you mad? It is ready to do one of two things which are natural: to fight or escape.

This smiling is something new. This deception is something new. The body has no mechanism for it, so you have to force the smile without the chemical flowing in which helps you to smile, which helps you to laugh. There are now no chemicals to laugh. You have to force a smile, a false smile, and the body has released chemicals into the blood to fight. Now what will the blood do? The body has a language that it understands very well, but you are behaving in a very mad, insane way. Now a gap is created between you and your body. This mechanism is unconscious, this mechanism is non-voluntary. Your volition, your will, is not needed because will takes time and there are situations in which no time can be lost.

A tiger has attacked you: now there is no time for meditation. You cannot contemplate about what to do. You have to do something without the mind. If the mind comes in you are lost. You cannot think; you cannot say to the tiger, "Wait! Let me think about it -- about what to do." You have to act immediately, without any consciousness.

The body has a mechanism. The tiger is there: the mind just knows that the tiger is there; the body mechanism begins to work. That working is not dependent on the mind because mind is a very slow worker, very inefficient. It cannot be relied upon in emergency situations, so the body begins to work. You are frightened. You will run away; you will escape.

But the same thing happens when you are standing on a platform to address a big audience. There is no tiger, but you are frightened by the great gathering. Fear takes shape; the body is informed. That information that you are in fear is automatic. The body begins to

release chemicals -- the same chemicals that it will release when a tiger attacks you. There is no tiger, there is really no one who is attacking you, but the audience seems to be making a great attack. Everyone there is really aggressive, it seems. That is why you have become afraid.

Now the body is ready to fight or to take flight, but both the alternatives are closed. You have to stand there and speak. Now your body begins to perspire, even on a cold night. Why? Because the body is ready to run or to fight. The blood is circulating more, heat is created, and you are standing there. So you begin to perspire, and then a subtle trembling takes over. Your whole body begins to tremble.

It is just the same as if you start a car and press the accelerator and the brake both simultaneously. The engine will be heated, raced, and you are braking also. The whole body of the car will tremble. The same happens when you are standing on a platform. You feel fear, and the body is ready to run. The accelerator is pushed, but you cannot run. You have to address the gathering. You are a leader or some such thing. You cannot run. You have to face it, and you have to be there standing on the platform. You have to take the floor.

Now you are doing two things simultaneously that are very contradictory. You are stepping on the accelerator and pressing the brake also. You do not run, but the body is ready to run. You begin to tremble and heat is created. Now your body wonders, "How are you behaving?" The body cannot understand you. A gap is created. The unconscious is doing one thing and the conscious goes on doing something else. You are divided. This gap has to be understood deeply.

In your every act this gap is there. You are looking at a film, an erotic film: your sex is aroused. Your body is ready to explode into a sexual experience, but you are only seeing a film. You are just sitting on a chair and your body is ready for the sex act. The film will go on accelerating, it will go on pushing you. You are aroused, but you cannot do anything. The body is ready to do something but the situation is not, so a gap is created. You begin to feel yourself different, and there is a barrier between you and your body. Because of that barrier and because of this constant arousal and suppression simultaneously, this acceleration and braking simultaneously, this constant contradiction in your existence, you are diseased.

If you would fall back and be an animal. which is impossible, then you would be whole and healthy. This is a strange fact: animals are not ill in their natural state, but put them in a zoo and they begin to imitate human diseases. No animal is homosexual in its natural surrounding, in its natural state, but put animals in a zoo and they begin to behave absurdly: they begin to behave homosexually. No animal goes insane naturally, but in a zoo animals go mad.

It has never been reported in the whole history of human understanding that any animal has committed suicide, but in a zoo animals can commit suicide. This is strange, but not strange really, because the moment man begins to force animals into a life which is not natural, then they become divided inside. A division is created, a gap is created, the wholeness is lost.

Man is divided. Man is born divided. So what to do? How not to create this gap and how to bring awareness to every cell of the body, to every nook and corner of your being? How to bring awareness? That is the only problem for all religions, for all of yoga and for all systems for Enlightenment: how to bring consciousness to your total being so that nothing is unconscious.

Many methods have been tried, many methods are possible, so I will talk about some methods for how every cell of your body can become aware. And unless you as a total being

become aware, you cannot be in bliss, you cannot be in peace. You will continue to be a madhouse.

Each cell of your body affects you. It has its own working, it has its own learning, its own conditioning. The moment you start, the cell takes over and begins to behave in its own way. Then you are disturbed. "What is happening!" you wonder, "I never intended this; I never thought about it." And you are right. Your desires may have been completely different. But once you give your cells, your body, something to do, it is going to do it in its own way, in its own learned way. Because of this, scientists -- particularly Russian scientists -- think that we cannot change man unless we change the cells.

There is a school, a Behaviouristic school of psychologists, which thinks that Buddha is a failure, that Jesus is a failure, that they are bound to be failures. There is nothing strange in it because without changing the very structure of the body, the chemical structure of the body, nothing can be changed.

These Behaviourists -- Watson, Pavlov, Skinner -- say that if a Buddha is silent, it only means that somehow he has a different chemical constitution and nothing else. If he is silent, if peace surrounds him, if he is never disturbed, never angry, it only shows that somehow the chemicals are lacking which create disturbance, which create anger. So Skinner says, "Sooner or later we will be able to create a Buddha chemically. There is no need of any meditation, there is no need of becoming more aware. The only need is to change chemicals."

In a way he is right, but very dangerously right, because if certain chemicals are put out of your body, your behaviour will change. If certain hormones are introduced into your body, your behaviour will change. You are a man and you behave like a man. But it is not you who behaves like a man: it is only the hormones in you that make you behave like a man. If those hormones are changed and other hormones are introduced which belong to the feminine structure, you will behave like a woman. So it is not really your behaviour: it is hormonal behaviour. It is not you who is angry, but a certain hormone in you. It is not that you are silent and meditative; it is certain hormone in you.

Skinner says, "That is why Buddha is a failure: because he goes on talking about things which are irrelevant. You say to a man, 'Do not be angry,' but he is filled with chemicals, hormones, which create anger." So for a Behaviourist, it is just as if a person is in a high fever -- a one hundred and six degree fever -- and you go on talking about beautiful things to him and say, "Be silent, meditate, do not be feverish!" It looks absurd -- what can the man do! Unless you change something in his body, the fever will remain. Fever is created by a certain virus, certain chemical things. Unless that is changed, unless the proportion is changed, he will remain feverish. And there is no need to talk. It is absolutely absurd.

The same is with anger for a Skinner, for a Pavlov; the same is for sex. You go on talking about *brahmacharya* -- celibacy -- and the body is filled with sex energy, sex cells. That sex energy is not dependent on you. Rather, you are dependent on that energy. So you go on talking about *brahmacharya*, but nothing is possible by these talks. And they are right in a way, but still, only in a way. They are right that if the chemicals are changed, if every sex hormone is thrown out of your body, you will not be able to be sexual. But you will not become a Buddha. You will simply be impotent, incapable. You will lack something.

Buddha is not lacking anything. Rather, on the contrary, something new has come to his life. It is not that he has no sex hormones. They are there. So what has happened to him? His consciousness has deepened, and his consciousness has entered even into the sex cells. Now the sex cells are there, but they cannot behave independently. Unless the center orders them to act, they cannot act. They will remain inactive.

In an impotent person sex cells are not. In a Buddha they are there and more strong than in an ordinary person -- stronger, because never used, not used. Energy is accumulated in them, they are bubbling with energy, but consciousness has penetrated into the cells now. Now the consciousness is not only a starting point: it has become the master.

Skinner may prevail in the coming days. He may become a very great force. Just like Marx suddenly became a great force for the outer economy of society, just like Marx, any day Pavlov and Skinner may become a very central force for the inner economy of the human body and the human mind. And they can prove whatsoever they say -- they can prove it! But the phenomenon has two aspects.

You see an electric bulb. If you destroy the bulb, the light will disappear; it is not that the electricity will disappear. The same happens when you put off the current: the bulb is there intact, but the light will again disappear. So the light can disappear in two ways. If you destroy the bulb, electricity will be there, but because there is no medium through which to express it, it cannot become light. If your sex cells are destroyed, sexuality will be in you, but with no medium to express itself. This is one way.

Skinner has experimented with many animals. Just by operating on a particular gland, a ferocious dog becomes Buddha-like. He sits silently, as if in meditation. You cannot tempt him to be ferocious again. Whatsoever you do, he will look at you without any anger. It is not that the dog has become a Buddha, nor is it that the inner mind has disappeared. It is there all the same, but the medium through which anger can be expressed is absent. This is impotency. The medium has disappeared, not the desire. If the medium is destroyed, when the bulb is not, you can say, "Where is your light and where is your electricity?" It is there, but now it is hidden.

Religions have been working from the other corner -- not trying to destroy the bulb: that is stupid, because if you destroy the bulb then you will not even be aware of the current meaning behind. Change the current, transform the current, let the current move in a new dimension, and the bulb will be there intact alive, but with no light.

Skinner, I said, can prevail because he shows a very easy way. You are angry: you can be operated upon. You feel sexual: you can be operated upon. Your problems will be solved not by you, but by a surgeon -- by someone else. And whenever a problem is solved by someone else you have missed a very great opportunity, because when you solve it you grow. When someone else solves it, you remain the same. The problem can be solved through the body and there will be no problems -- but you will also no longer be a human being.

The religious emphasis is on transformation of consciousness, and the first thing is to create a greater force of awareness inside to help that awareness to spread. This sutra is beautiful. It says, "To be established in the sun of awareness is the only lamp."

The sun is very, very far away. Light takes ten minutes to travel to the earth, and light travels very fast -- 186,000 miles per second. It takes ten minutes for the sun to reach the earth; it is very, very far. But in the morning the sun rises, and it reaches even to the flower in your garden.

"Reach" has a different meaning. Just rays reach, not the sun. So if your energy becomes a sun deep inside your center, if your center becomes a solar center, if you become aware, centrally aware, if your awareness grows, then the rays of your awareness reach to every part of your body, to every cell. Then your awareness penetrates every cell of the body.

It is just like when the sun rises in the morning, everything begins to be alive on the earth. Suddenly there is light, and sleep disappears; the monotonous night disappears. Suddenly everything seems to be reborn. The birds begin to sing and they are again out on the wing, the

flowers flower, and everything is alive again just from the touch, just from the warmth, of the sun's rays. So when you have a central consciousness, a central awareness in you, it begins to reach to every pore, to every nook and corner; to every cell it penetrates. And you have many, many cells -- seventy million cells in your body. You are a big city, a big nation. Seventy million cells, and now they are all unconscious. Your consciousness has never reached them.

Grow in consciousness and every cell is penetrated. And the moment your consciousness touches the cells, it is different. The very quality changes. A man is asleep; the sun rises and the man is awakened. Is he the same man who was asleep? Is his sleep and awakening the same? There was a closed, dead bud, and the sun has risen, and the bud opens and becomes a flower. Is this flower the same? Something new has penetrated. An aliveness, a capacity to grow and blossom, has appeared. A bird was just asleep, as if dead, as if just dead matter, but the sun comes up and the bird is on the wing. Is it the same bird? It is a different phenomenon. Something has touched and the bird has become alive. Everything was silent, and now everything is singing. The morning is a song.

The same phenomenon happens inside the cells of a Buddha's body. It is known as BUDDHA-KAYA -- the body of an Enlightened One, of a Buddha. It is a different body. It is not the same body as you have, not even the same body as Gautam had before he became a Buddha.

Buddha is just on the verge of death, and someone asks him, "Are you dying? Then where will you be?" Buddha says, "The body that was born will die. But there is another body -- the *buddha-kaya*, the body of a Buddha, which is neither born, nor can it die. I have left that body which was given to me, that came to me from my parents. Just as a snake leaves the old body every year, I have left it. Now there is the *buddha-kaya* -- the Buddhbody."

What does this mean? *your* body can become a Buddha-body. When your consciousness reaches to every cell, the very quality of your being changes, becomes transmuted, because then every cell is alive, conscious, Enlightened. Then there is no slavery. You have become the master. Just by becoming a conscious center, you become a master.

This sutra says, "To be established in the sun of awareness is the only lamp." So why are you taking an earthen lamp to the temple? Take the inner lamp! Why are you burning candles on the altar? They will not help. Kindle the inner candle! Become a Buddha-body! Let your every cell become conscious; do not allow any part of your being to remain unconscious.

Buddhists have preserved some bones of Buddha. People think they are just superstitious. They are not, because those are not ordinary bones. They are not! The cells, the particles, the electrons, of those bones, have known something which happens rarely. In Kashmir, in a mosque, one hair of Mohammed is preserved. That is no ordinary hair. It is not just superstition. That hair has known something.

Just try to understand it in this way: a flower which has never known any sunrise and a flower which has known, encountered the sun, are not the same, cannot be the same. The flower that has never known a sunrise has never known a light to rise in it, because it rises when the sun rises. That flower is just dead -- a potentiality. It has never known its own spirit. A flower which has seen the sunrise has also seen something rise in itself. It has known a soul. Now the flower is not just a flower. It has known a deep stirring inside. Something has stirred; something has become alive in it.

So the hair of Mohammed is a different thing; it has a different quality. It has known a man, it has been with a man who was an inner sun, an inner light. This hair has taken a deep bath in something mysterious which rarely happens. To be established in this inner light is

the only lamp worth taking to the altar of the deity. Nothing else will do.

How to create this center of awareness? I will discuss several methods. Because I was talking about Buddha and the BUDDHA-AYA, it will be good to start with Buddha. He invented a method, one of the most wonderful methods, a most powerful method, for creating an inner fire, an inner sun, of awareness. And not only to create it: the method is such that simultaneously the inner light begins to penetrate to the very cells of the body -- to your whole being.

Buddha used breathing as the method -- breathing with awareness. The method is known as "Anapansati Yoga" -- the Yoga of incoming and outgoing breath awareness. You are breathing, but it is an unconscious thing. And breath is *prana*, breath is the Bergsonian *elan vital*: the vitality, the very vitality, the very light -- and it is unconscious. You are not aware of it. If you needed to be aware of it, you might drop dead any moment because then it would be very difficult to breathe.

I have heard about certain fishes which cannot sleep for more than six minutes, because if they sleep more they die: they forget to breathe. If their sleep is deepened, they forget to breathe, so they die. Those particular fishes cannot sleep for more than six minutes. They have to live in a group, always in a group. Some fishes are sleeping, other fishes have to be constantly alert not to allow them to go more into sleep. When the time is over, they will disturb the sleep; otherwise a sleeping fish will just go dead. He will not come back again.

This is a scientific observation. It would be a problem with you also if you had to remember it -- if you had to *do* breathing. Then you would have to remember constantly in order to do it, and you cannot remember anything even for a single moment. If one moment is missed, you will be no more. So breathing is unconscious; it does not depend on you. Even if you are in a coma for months together, you will go on breathing.

Really, just by the way, I would like to say that those fishes are rare. And someday science may come to know that they have a certain deep awareness which even man lacks, because to breathe consciously is a very difficult thing. Those fishes may have attained a certain awareness which is not with us.

Buddha used breath as the vehicle to do two things simultaneously: one, to create consciousness; and the other, to allow that consciousness to penetrate to the very cells of the body. He said, "Breathe consciously." It is not a *pranayama*. It is just making breath an object of awareness without any change. There is no need to change your breath. Let it be just as it is -- natural. Let it be as it is. Do not change it. Do something else: when you breathe in, breathe consciously. Let your consciousness move with the ingoing breath. When the breath goes out, move out. Go in, come out. Move consciously with the breath. Let your attention be with the breath; flow with it; do not forget even a single breath.

Buddha is reported to have said that if you can be aware of your breath even for a single hour, you are already Enlightened. But not a single breath should be missed. One hour is enough. It looks so small, only a fragment of time, but it is not. When you try it, one hour of awareness will look like millennia because ordinarily you cannot be aware for more than for five or six seconds -- and that too for a very alert man. Otherwise you will miss every second. You will start: the breath is going in. The breath *has* gone in, and you have gone somewhere else. Suddenly you remember again that the breath is going out. The breath *has* gone out and you have moved somewhere else.

To move with the breath means that no thought should be allowed, because thought will take your attention, thought will distract you. So Buddha never says stop thinking, but he says, "Just breathe consciously." Automatically, thinking will stop. You cannot do both --

think and breathe consciously.

A thought comes to your mind, and your attention is withdrawn. A single thought and you become unconscious of your breathing process. So Buddha used a very simple technique and a very vital one. He would say to his *bhikkhus*, "Do whatsoever you are doing, but do not forget a simple thing: remember the incoming and outgoing breath. Move with it; flow with it." The more you try, the more you endeavour, the more you can be conscious. Consciousness will increase by seconds and seconds. It is arduous, a difficult thing, but once you can feel it you are a different man -- a different being in a different world.

This works in a double way: when you consciously breathe in and out, by and by you come to your center, because your breath touches the center of your being. Every moment that the breath goes in, it touches your center of being.

Physiologically you think that breath is just for the purification of the blood, that it is just a function of your heart, that it is bodily. You think that it is a function of your heart -- just a pumping system to refresh your blood-circulation, to give to your blood more oxygen which is needed, and to throw out carbon dioxide which is excreta, used stuff: to throw it out, to remove it and replace it.

But this is only physiologically. If you begin to be aware of your breath, by and by you will go deep -- deeper than your heart. And one day you will begin to feel a center just near your navel. That center can only be felt if you move with your breath CONTINUOUSLY -- because the nearer you reach to the center, the more you tend to lose consciousness. You can start when the breath is going in. When it is just touching your nose, you can start being alert. The more inward it moves, the more consciousness will become difficult. And a thought will come or some sound or something will happen, and you will move.

If you can go to the very center, where for a single moment breath stops and there is a gap, the jump can happen. The breath goes in, the breath goes out: between these two there is a subtle gap. That gap is your center. When you move with the breath, then only, after a very long effort, will you become aware of the gap -- when there is no movement of the breath, when breath is neither coming nor going. Between two breaths there is a subtle gap, an interval -- in that interval you are at the center.

So breath is used by Buddha as a passage to come nearer and nearer and nearer to the center. When you move out, be conscious of the breath. Again there is a gap. There are two gaps: one gap inside and one gap outside. The breath goes in, the breath goes out: there is a gap. The breath goes out and the breath goes in: there is a gap. It is even more difficult to be aware of the second gap.

Look at this process. Your center is in between the incoming breath and the outgoing breath. There is another center -- the Cosmic center. You may call it "God". When the breath goes out and the breath comes in, there is again a gap. In that gap is the Cosmic center. These two centers are not two different things, but first you will be aware of your inner center and then you will become aware of your outer center, and ultimately you will come to know that both these centers are one. Then "out" and "in" lose meaning.

Buddha says move with the breath consciously and you will create a center of awareness. And once the center is created, awareness begins to move with your breath into your blood, to the very cells -- because every cell needs air and every cell needs oxygen and every cell, so to speak, breathes -- *every* cell! And now, scientists say, it even seems that the earth breathes. And because of the Einsteinian concept of an expanding universe, now theoretical scientists say that it seems that the whole universe is breathing.

When you breathe in, your chest expands. When you breathe out, your chest shrinks.

Now theoretical scientists say that it seems that the whole universe breathes. When the whole universe is breathing in, it expands. When the whole universe breathes out, it shrinks.

In the old Hindu Puranas -- mythological scriptures -- it is said that creation is Brahma's one breath, the incoming breath; and destruction -- PRALAYA -- the end of the world, is the outgoing breath: one breath, one creation.

In a very miniature way, in a very atomic way, the same is happening in you. When your awareness becomes so one with breathing, then your breathing takes your awareness to the very cells. Rays now penetrate, and the whole body becomes a Buddhabody. Really, then you have no material body at all. You have a body of awareness. This is what is meant by the sutra, "To be established in the sun of awareness..." this is the only lamp.

Just like we are learning about Buddha's method, it will be good to understand another method, one more method. Tantra has used sex. That is again another very vital force. If you want to go deep, you have to use very vital forces -- the deepest in you. Tantra uses sex. When you are in a sex act, you are very near to the center of creation -- to the very source of life. If you can go into a sex act consciously, it becomes meditation.

It is very difficult -- more difficult than breath. You can breathe consciously in a small measure, of course, that you can, but the very phenomenon of sex requires your unconsciousness. If you become conscious, you will lose your sexual desire and lust. If you become conscious, then there will be no sexual desire inside. So Tantra has done the most difficult thing in the world. In the history of experiments with consciousness, Tantra goes the deepest.

But, of course, one can deceive, and with Tantra deception is very easy, because no one other than you knows what the fact is. No one else *can* know. But only one in a hundred can succeed in the Tantric method of awareness -- because sex needs unconsciousness. So a Tantric, a disciple of Tantra, has to work with sex, sex desire, just like with breathing. He has to be conscious of it; when actually going into the sex act, he has to be conscious.

Your very body, the sex energy, comes to a peak to explode. The Tantric SADHAK -- seeker -- comes to the peak consciously, and there is a method to judge. If sex release happens automatically and you are not the master, then you are not conscious of it. Then the unconscious has taken over. Sex comes to a peak, and then you cannot do anything but release. That release is not done by you. You can start a sexual process, but you can never end it. The end is always taken over by the unconscious.

If you can retain the peak and if it becomes your conscious act to release it or not to release it, if you can come back from the peak without release or if you can maintain that peak for hours together, if it is your conscious act, then you are the master. And if someone can come to a sexual peak, just on the verge of orgasm, and can retain it and be conscious of it, suddenly he becomes aware of the deepest center inside -- SUDDENLY! And it is not only that he is aware of the deepest center inside of himself: he is also aware of the center of his partner, the deepest center.

That is why a Tantra practitioner, if he is a man, will always worship the partner. The partner is not just a sex object. She is Divine! She is a goddess! And the act is not carnal at all. If you can go into it consciously, it is the deepest spiritual act possible. But the deepest is bound to be virtually impossible. So use either breath or sex.

Mahavir has used hunger. That again is a very deep thing. Hunger is not just hunger for your taste or for something else -- it is for your very survival. Mahavir used hunger, fasting, as a method of awareness. It is not an austerity. Mahavir was not an ascetic. People have misunderstood him completely. He was not an ascetic at all. No wise man ever is. But he was

using fasting, hunger, as a vehicle for awareness.

You might have stumbled upon the fact that when your stomach is full, you begin to feel sleepy, you begin to feel unconscious. You want to go to sleep. But when you are hungry, fasting, you cannot sleep. Even in the night you will turn this way and that. You cannot sleep on a fast. Why can't you sleep? Because it is dangerous to life. Now sleep is a secondary need. The first need is food, to get food. That is the first need. Sleep is not a problem now.

But Mahavir used it in a very, very scientific way. Because you cannot fall asleep when you are fasting, you can remember things more easily. Consciousness comes to you more easily. And Mahavir used this very hunger as an object of consciousness. He would stand continuously. You might have seen Buddha's statue sitting, but Mahavir's statues are, more or less, standing. He was always standing. You can feel your hunger more when you are standing. If you are sitting you will feel it less; if you are lying you will feel it still less. When you are standing, the whole body begins to be hungry. You feel the hunger all over the body. The whole body flows; it becomes one river of hunger. From head to foot you are hungry. It is not only the stomach: the feet feel it, even the whole body feels the hunger. And Mahavir would stand silently watching, moving with hunger just like one moves with breath. It is reported that in his twelve-year period of silence, he fasted more or less for eleven years. Only for three hundred and sixty days in twelve years did he take food. Hunger was the method.

Food and sex are two of the deepest things, just like breath. When you go on being conscious of your hunger, doing nothing but just being conscious, suddenly you are thrown to your center, to your being. First hunger moves from the surface. If you do not feed the surface, the deeper layers become hungry. If you do not feed these deeper layers, then still deeper layers become hungry. And it goes on and on and on; ultimately the whole body begins to be hungry. When the whole body is hungry, you are thrown to the center.

When *you* feel hunger, that is a false hunger. Really, that is more or less a habit, not hunger. If you take your lunch at a particular time, say at one o'clock, then at one o'clock you begin to feel your hunger. This is a false hunger, not connected with the body at all. If you do not take food at one o'clock, then at two o'clock you will feel that the hunger has disappeared. If it was natural, it would have grown more. Why should it disappear? If it was real, then you would feel it more at two and more at three and more at four. But it has disappeared. It was just a habit, a very superficial habit.

If a well-fed man fasts for three weeks, then only can he come to a real hunger. Then, for the first time, he will know what real hunger is. Just now you can never feel that hunger is as forceful as sex. It is more forceful, but only the real hunger. So it happens, when you are on a fast, that your sex desire will die, because now a more foundational thing is at stake.

Food is for your survival, sex is for the survival of your race. It is a distant phenomenon, not related with you. Sex is food for the race, not for you. You will die, but through sex humanity can live. So it is not really your problem; it is a racial problem. You can even leave it, but you cannot leave food because that is your problem. It is concerned with you. So if you go on a fast, by and by sex will disappear; it will become more and more distant.

Because of this, many people are just fooling themselves. They think that if they take less food, they have become celibate, *brahmacharins*. They have not. The problem has only been shifted. Give the proper food, and sex desire will come back -- more forcibly, more fresh, more young.

If you fast for even more than three weeks, then your whole body hungers. Each cell, every cell of your body, begins to feel the hunger. Then, for the first time, you are hungry,

your stomach is hungry, your whole body is hungry. You are surrounded by a deep fire of hunger. Mahavir used this as a method for being aware; so he would be hungry -- fasting and aware.

A man can live without food for three months -- a healthy man, of course. A normally healthy man can live for three months without food -- for three months! If you go on fasting for three months, then, suddenly one day, you will be just on the verge of death. This is a conscious encounter with death, and that encounter comes only when you are on the verge of leaving your body and jumping into your center, inside. Now the whole body is exhausted. It cannot continue. You are thrown back to your source and you cannot live in the body. By and by you are thrown from the body -- inside, inside, inside.

Food takes you outside, fasting takes you inside. A moment comes when the body cannot carry you any further; then you are thrown to your center. In that moment the inner sun is released.

So Mahavir would fast for three months -- even for four months. He was extraordinarily healthy. And then, suddenly, he would go to the village to beg for food. It is yet a secret why suddenly, after three or four months, he would go to the village to beg for food. Really, whenever he came on the verge where even a single moment could prove fatal, only then would he go to beg for food. He would again enter the body and then again he would fast, then again go to the center; again enter the body, again go to the center.

Then he could feel the passage: just breath coming in, breath going out; life coming into the body, life going out of the body. And he would be aware of this process. He would take food and he would be aware of this process. He would take food and he would be back into the body, so to speak, and then he would fast again. This he was doing continuously for twelve years. This was an inner process.

So I discussed three things: breath, sex and hunger -- very basic, foundational things. Be conscious in any. Breath is the easiest. It will be difficult to use the Tantra method. The mind would like to use it, but it will be difficult. It will be difficult to use the hunger method. The mind would *not* like it. These two are very difficult. Whether you like them or not, they are difficult. Only the breath process is simple. And for the coming age, I think Buddha's method will be very helpful. It is moderate, easy, not very dangerous.

That is why Buddha is known always as the originator of the middle path -- MAJJHIM-NIKAYA -- the golden mean. Sex and food are between these two. Breath is the golden mean, the exact middle.

And there are many more methods. With any method you can be established in that inner light. And once you are established, your light begins to flow to your body cells. Then your whole mechanism is refreshed and you have a Buddha-body -- an Enlightened One's body.

The Ultimate Alchemy, Vol 2

Chapter #4

Chapter title: Questions and Answers

4 July 1972 pm in

Archive code: 7207045

ShortTitle: ULTAL204

Audio: Yes

Video: No

OSHO, MAN'S PARTIAL CONSCIOUSNESS IS A STAGE IN THE GRAND EVOLUTION OF LIFE. WHAT COULD BE THE SIGNIFICANCE OF HIS VOLITIONAL EFFORTS IN ITS GROWTH?

PLEASE ALSO EXPLAIN THE ROLE THAT THE BUDDHAS, THE ENLIGHTENED ONES, PLAY IN THE EXPANSION OF HUMAN CONSCIOUSNESS.

Evolution is unconscious. No volition is needed, no conscious effort: it is just natural. But once consciousness evolves, then it is a totally different matter. Once consciousness is there, evolution stops. Evolution is only up to consciousness; the work of evolution is to create consciousness. Once consciousness is there, evolution stops. Then the whole responsibility falls upon consciousness itself. So this has to be understood in many ways.

Man is not evolving now. Since long, man has not been evolving. Evolution has stopped as far as man is concerned. The body has come to its peak, the human body has not evolved since long. The most ancient bones and the most ancient human bodies that have been found are not basically different from our bodies; there is no basic difference. If a human body which is one hundred thousand years old can be revived and trained, it will be just like yours; there will be no difference at all.

The human body has stopped evolving. When did it stop? When consciousness comes in, evolution's work is over. Now it is up to you to evolve. So man remains static, not evolving, unless he himself endeavours. Now, beyond man, everything will be conscious. Below man everything is unconscious. With man a new factor has entered -- the factor of awareness, the factor of consciousness. With this factor, evolution's work is over. Evolution is to create a situation in which consciousness evolves. Once consciousness enters in, then the whole responsibility is on consciousness. So now man will not evolve naturally. There will be no evolution.

Consciousness is the peak of evolution -- the last step. But it is not the last step of life. Consciousness is the last step of evolution -- of all animal heritage. It is the last step -- the climax, the peak -- but for further growth, it has to be the first step. And when I say that evolution has stopped, I mean that now an inner effort is needed. Now, unless *you* do

something, you will not evolve. Nature has brought you to a point which is the last for unconscious growth. Now you are aware; now you know. When you know, you are responsible.

A child is not responsible for his acts, but an adult is. A madman is not responsible for his acts, but a sane man is. If you are under an alcoholic intoxicant and you are not behaving consciously, you are not responsible. With consciousness, with the faculty of knowing, you become responsible for yourself.

Sartre has said somewhere that responsibility is the only human burden. No animal is responsible. Evolution is responsible for all that the animal is. The animal is not responsible for anything: man is responsible. So whatsoever you do will now be your responsibility. If you want to create a hell and go down, it is up to you. If you want to evolve, if you want to grow and create a blissful state, it is up to you.

Existentialists have made a very fine distinction -- a beautiful one -- which is meaningful also. They say that for animals essence is first and existence is a later growth. This is difficult to understand, but try: they say for animals, for trees, essence is first and existence follows. There is a seed: the seed, in essence, is the tree. The essence is there and the existence will follow. The essential thing is there; it surely has to be manifested, expressed. The tree will follow! The tree is not going to be a new thing. In a way, it was already there. So, really, the seed has no freedom: the tree exists in it. And the tree is also without freedom: it is predestined by the seed. This is what is meant by essence being first, below man, and then existence follows.

With man, the whole thing is just the opposite: existence comes first and then essence follows. You are not born with any fixed future: you will have to create it. You are born, so you have an existence -- a simple existence with no essence. Now you will create the essence. So man creates himself. A tree is created by nature, but man creates himself.

Man is simply born as an existence with no essence. Then whatsoever you do will make your essence. Your acts will create you, and the freedom is multi-dimensional. A man can become anything or he may not become anything. He may remain just an existence without any essence; he may just remain a body without any soul. The soul is, in a way, to be created.

Gurdjieff used to say that you have no soul; you are without a soul. Unless you create it, how can you have it? It looks contradictory to all the teachings of religion, but it is not. When religion says that everyone has a soul, it only means that everyone *can* have a soul. That is a possibility. You can grow to be a soul. If you already have a soul, then there is no distinction between a seed and you. And if you are growing like a seed into a tree, if you are growing just like a seed into a man, then there is no difference between man and all that exists below man.

Man is a freedom -- a freedom to be. He can be many things; he can be anything. But it may be that he will remain just a possibility without being anything. That creates a dizziness and that creates fear.

Kierkegaard has given the concept of "dread". He says that man lives in dread. What is this dread, this fear? This is the fear: that you are simply a possibility and nothing else. You have only existence, no essence. You can create it, but you may miss it. The responsibility is yours. This is a very dreadful state. Nothing is certain; man is insecure. Every moment many directions open, and you have to move in some way, somewhere, without knowing where you are moving, without knowing what the result will be, without knowing what you will be tomorrow.

Your tomorrow will not come out automatically from your today, but the tomorrow of a

seed *will* come out automatically from its today. The death of an animal will be the automatic result of his life, but not so with you: that is the difference. Your death will be your achievement; you will be responsible for it. And that is why every man dies in a specific way. No man's death is similar to anyone else's; it cannot be.

Dog A, Dog B, Dog C, they all die in one way. This death is just part of their life. They are not responsible for their life, they are not responsible for their death. When someone says that he will die a dog's death, it means that he will die without being evolved, without being an essence. He will be just a possibility. Two dogs die similarly; never two men. They cannot die similarly -- and if they die similarly, that means they have missed the opportunity to evolve.

With consciousness entering, you are responsible for everything, no matter what. This is a great burden and a deep anguish. It creates fear. You are just over an abyss. This is what I mean when I say that man now needs a conscious effort. To be a man means entering a field of conscious evolution. Millions and millions of years have created you, but now nature will not help. This is the peak for natural growth. Now nature cannot do anything for you. It has done all it can already. Because of this, there is bound to be a deep inner tension every moment.

Man is in a tension. It is natural and it is good. Do not try to forget it: use it! You can try to forget it; then you miss the opportunity. So any effort to forget your tense state of mind is erroneous, dangerous. You are falling back. Use this inner tension to grow, to move further. Now you cannot move further in the body. The body has come to a dead end, a cul-de-sac. There is no further movement.

The body moves in a horizontal way. It is just like this: an aeroplane running on the earth, on the ground, along a strip, in order to take off. There is a moment when the horizontal running will stop. It will have to run for a mile or two or three just to gather momentum. Then a moment comes when no horizontal running is of any use. And if an aeroplane goes on running on the ground, it is not an aeroplane; it is behaving like a car. When the momentum comes, the aeroplane leaves the ground and a vertical upward movement takes place.

This is what has happened with man. Up to man, evolution has been running on the ground, so to speak. Now man is the momentum. Now with man, an upward vertical movement is the only movement. If you look at this point and think: "We must continue running on the ground because we were doing so for so many millions of years," you miss the whole thing -- because this whole running was just for this moment when you could take off.

Animals are running toward man, trees are running toward animals, matter is running toward trees -- everything on this earth is running toward man. So for what can man run? Man is the central focus. Everything is growing toward man. Horizontally, for man there is no movement. And if you continue horizontally, then your life will not really be a human life. Your life will consist of many layers which are not human.

Sometimes you will behave like an animal. If you go on horizontally, sometimes you may be just like a vegetable and sometimes you may be just dead matter, but never a man. So look deep down inside your life. It has not taken the vertical turn. Then what are you doing? If you think about each and every act, then you can know that one act belongs to the animal world, another act belongs to the vegetable kingdom, etc. Consider your activity, your life, and then you will know that something is just like dead matter, something is just like a vegetable growing and something is just like an animal. Where is the man?

With the upward thrust, man comes into existence -- and that is up to you. Conscious evolution is now going to be the only evolution. That is why religion will become more and

more significant every day. Every day, every moment, religion will become more and more significant, because now scientists feel that there seems to be no movement. Of course, horizontally there is no movement. You cannot progress further; everything has stopped. So science goes on just adding to your senses.

Your eyes have stopped, so now you can use instruments to see. Your brain has stopped, so now you can use computers. Your legs have stopped, so now you can use cars. Whatsoever science is giving is just additional instruments for a growth that has stopped.

Man is not growing; only new instruments are growing. And, of course, every instrument increases your power, but you do not grow through it. Rather, the contrary is the case. Cars have added much in speed, but they have destroyed your legs. This is unfortunate, but this is going to happen: if computers replace man's mind -- and they will replace it because man's mind is not so efficient as a computer can be -- they will do much, but ultimately they will destroy man's mind because whatsoever is not used is destroyed.

So science now feels that whatsoever is being done is just giving a false notion of evolution. If we go back to the past, then the highest speed was horse-speed -- 25 miles per hour. Now we have come to 25,000 miles per hour in speed. Speed has evolved from 25 miles per hour to 25,000 miles per hour. Not man, but speed has evolved -- not man! Man remains the same. Rather, on the contrary, man has regressed because a man riding a horse is a stronger man than a man flying in an aeroplane. Speed has progressed, evolved, but man has regressed.

A certain group of scientists thinks that man is a regression, not an evolvment. It may be so because in life you can never be static. If you are not evolving, you will regress. There is no static moment in life; you cannot remain at one point. You cannot say, "I am not growing, so I will remain whatsoever I am; I will maintain the status quo." You cannot maintain it! Either you go further or you fall down -- back. A certain group of scientists thinks that man is regressing day by day, that there is an "infantilization". Man is behaving more like a child than like an adult -- man everywhere on the earth.

If we look, many things become clear and obvious. One thing: in the past, it was always the old man, the evolved man, who was most predominant in society, but our society is the only society in the world's history where children have become predominant. They dominate everything -- every trend, every fashion, everything. They are the models. Whatsoever they do becomes religion, whatsoever they do becomes politics, whatsoever they do sets a trend all over the world.

If we go back, a thirty-year-old person was behaving in a mature way. Now that is not the case. Even a thirty-year-old person is behaving in infantile ways, juvenile ways -- with the same tantrums. the same childish attitudes. What are these childish attitudes? A child thinks that he is the center of the world and that his every wish is to be fulfilled immediately. It is fulfilled. When he is hungry milk is given, when he weeps everyone pays attention. The whole family is centered around him.

Children become dictators. They know how to dictate the whole family. A very small child dictates the whole family. The father persuades him, the mother bribes him. Even when guests come into the home, he will dictate everything! A child thinks that he is the center of the world. He is to be supported, helped by everyone, without any cost. He is not to give love: he is only to demand. Of course, we cannot expect from a child that he should love. He demands and demands everything, and if the demand is not fulfilled he gets violent, angry. Then he is against the whole world; he will smash things.

Now this has happened with everyone. This was always so with children, but now this is

with everyone. Our so-called revolutions are nothing else but childish efforts. Our so-called rebellions are nothing else but everyone thinking himself to be at the center. His every desire should be fulfilled immediately; and if it is not fulfilled, then he is going to destroy the whole world.

Students revolt in universities all over the world. They just show immature, juvenile minds. What does it mean, students throwing stones at university windows, setting fire to buildings, destroying? What does it mean? They have no sense of maturity at all. And if you begin to think about it, it is not only students and children, boys and girls: if you look at our modern man -- even at a father or a mother -- you will see that they are behaving childishly. If you look at our politicians, they are just behaving childishly with no maturity at all.

What has happened? Really, man's growth has stopped: evolutionary growth has stopped. And now we have just a substitute for this growth -- scientific accumulation. Man has stopped; *things* grow. Your house goes on becoming bigger and bigger, and you remain the same. Your wealth grows, and because of this growth you feel that you are growing. Your knowledge grows, your information grows, and because of this you think that you are growing.

Of course, obviously, a Buddha knows less than you, but that doesn't mean that you are more grown-up. A Jesus knows less than you. He knows less than any Catholic priest because he was never trained, never educated. He was just a carpenter's son -- uneducated, with no information of the world; but still, you are not more evolved than him. A Mohammed is just illiterate, a Kabir is just a nobody -- but they are more evolved. But then that evolution is something else: an evolution of consciousness, not just of things.

You can substitute having for being. Being is a different dimension of growth -- a vertical one; having is horizontal. Things go on and on, and you have so many things -- so much information, so much knowledge, so much wealth, so many degrees, so many honours. But this is accumulation: it is horizontal. There is no upward thrust. You remain the same. And you cannot really remain the same, because if you are not growing you begin to behave childishly: you regress. This is one of the greatest problems humanity is encountering today.

Science can only give you things. It can give you moons and planets, and it can give you the whole universe. Religion can give you only one thing: upward movement, a vertical growth, a conscious methodology to grow into being. It is not important what you have. It is totally irrelevant for your growth. The only significant thing is what you are, and this growth toward being is a responsibility because it is a freedom. Now you are not forced by evolutionary forces to grow: you are in freedom.

Evolution is not goading you. It is goading animals, it is goading trees, it is goading everything except man. Evolution is pushing hard so that everything may grow. But with man the thing is finished. Now you have become conscious, so you can do whatsoever you want to do.

Sartre says man is condemned to be free -- "condemned" to be free! The whole nature is at ease because there is no freedom. Freedom is a great burden; that is why we do not like freedom. Howsoever we may talk about it, nobody likes freedom; everyone fears freedom. Freedom is a dangerous thing. In nature there is no freedom; that is why there is so much silence. You can never say to a dog, "You are an imperfect dog." Every dog is perfect. You can say to a man, "You are not a perfect man": it is meaningful. But to say to a dog, "You are not a perfect dog," is absurd. Every dog is perfect because a dog is not free to be. He is goaded by evolution. He is made; he is not self-created.

A rose is a rose. However beautiful, it is not free; it is just a slave. Look at a rose: it is

beautiful, but just a slave -- goaded. There is no freedom to flower or not to flower. There is no problem, there is no choice: a flower is to flower. The flower cannot say, "I do not like flowering," or "I refuse." It has no say, no freedom. That is why nature is so silent: it is a slave. It cannot err, it cannot go wrong. And if you cannot go wrong, if you are always right,, and if your "right" is not in your hands, then you are just goaded by external forces.

Nature is a deep slavery. With man, for the first time, freedom enters. Man has a freedom to be or not to be. Then there is anguish, fear whether he will be capable, whether he may or may not be, fear over what is going to happen. There is a deep trembling. Every moment is a suspended moment. Nothing is fixed or certain, nothing is predictable with man: everything is unpredictable.

We talk about freedom, but no one likes freedom. So we go on talking about freedom, but creating slavery. We talk about freedom and then create a new slavery. Our every freedom is just a change of slaveries. We go on changing from one slavery to another, from one bondage to another. No one likes freedom because freedom creates fear. Then you have to decide and choose. We ask someone or something else to tell us what to do -- the society, the guru, the scriptures, the tradition, the parents. Someone else should tell us what to do; someone should show the path, then we can follow -- but we cannot move by ourselves. There is freedom and there is fear.

That is why there are so many religions. They are not because of Jesus and Buddha and Krishna. They are because of a deep-rooted fear of freedom. You cannot be just a man. You have to be a Hindu or a Mohammedan or a Christian. Just by being a Christian, you lose your freedom; by being a Hindu you are no more a man -- because now you say, "I will follow a tradition. I will not move in the uncharted, in the unknown. I will move on a well-trodden path. I will move behind someone; I will not move alone. I am a Hindu, so I will move in a crowd: I will not move as an individual. If I move as an individual, alone, there is freedom. Then every moment I have to decide, every moment I have to give birth to myself, every moment I am creating my soul. And no one else will be responsible: only I will be responsible ultimately."

Nietzsche has said: "Now God is dead and man is totally free." If God is *really* dead then man *is* totally free. And man is not so afraid of God's death: he is much more afraid of his freedom. If there is a God, then everything is okay with you. If there is no God, then you are left totally free -- condemned to be free. Now do whatsoever you like and suffer the consequences, and no one else will be responsible.

Erich Fromm has written a book called "The Fear of Freedom". You fall in love and you begin to think of marriage. Love is a freedom; marriage is a slavery. But it is difficult to find a person who falls in love and who will not think of marriage -- *immediately*. Because love is a freedom, there is fear. Marriage is a fixed thing; there is no fear. Marriage is an institution -- dead; love is an event -- alive. It moves; it may change. Marriage never moves, it never changes. Because of this marriage has a certainty, a security.

Love has no certainty, no security. Love is insecure. Any moment it may disappear into the blue as it has appeared from the blue. Any *moment* it may disappear! It is very unearthly; it has no roots in the earth. It is unpredictable. So: "Better get into marriage. Then roots are there. Now this marriage cannot evaporate into the blue. It is an institution!" Everywhere -- just as in love -- everywhere, when we find freedom, we transform it into a slavery. The sooner the better! Then we are at ease. So every love story ends with marriage: "They were married, and after that they lived happily ever after."

No one is happy, but it is good to end the story there because then begins the hell. So every story ends with the most beautiful moment. And what is that moment? Freedom turning into slavery! And that is not only with love: it is with everything. So

marriage is an ugly thing; it is bound to be. Every institution is going to be ugly because it is just a dead corpse of something which was alive. But with anything alive, uncertainty is bound to be there.

"Alive" means it can move, it can change, it can be different. I love you; the next moment I may not love. But if I am your husband or I am your wife, you can be certain that the next moment also I will be your husband or your wife. It is an institution. Dead things are very permanent; alive things are momentary, changing, in a flux.

Man is afraid of freedom, and freedom is the only thing which makes you a man. So we are suicidal -- destroying our freedom. And with that destruction we are destroying our whole possibility of being. Then *having* is good because having means accumulating dead things. You can go on accumulating; there is no end to it. And the more you accumulate, the more secure you are. When I say, "Now man has to move consciously," I mean this, that you have to be aware of your freedom and also aware of your fear of freedom.

How to use this freedom? Religion is nothing but an effort toward conscious evolution, an effort how to use this freedom. Your volitional efforts are now significant. Whatsoever you are doing non-voluntarily is just part of the past. Your future depends on your volitional acts. A very simple act done with awareness, with volition, gives you a certain growth -- even an ordinary act.

You go on a fast, but not because you have no food. You have food; you can eat it. You have hunger; you can eat. You go on a fast: it is a volitional act -- a conscious act. No animal can perform this. An animal will go on a fast sometimes when there is no hunger. An animal will have to fast when there is no food. But only man can fast when there is hunger and food both. This is a volitional act. You use your freedom. The hunger cannot goad you. The hunger cannot push you and the food cannot pull you.

If there is no food, it is not a fast. If there is no hunger, it is naturopathy; it is not a fast. Hunger is there, food is there, and you are on a fast. This fasting is a volitional act, a conscious act. This will give you much awareness. You will feel a subtle freedom: freedom from food, freedom from hunger -- really, deep down, freedom from the body, and still more deep down, freedom from nature. And your freedom grows and your consciousness grows. As your consciousness grows, your freedom grows. They are interrelated. Be more free and you will be more conscious; be more conscious and you will be more free: they are interdependent.

But we can deceive ourselves. A son, a daughter, can say, "I will rebel against my father so that I may be more free." Hippies are doing that. But rebellion is not freedom because it is just natural. At a particular age, to rebel against parents is *not* freedom: it is just natural! A child who is just coming out of the womb of his mother cannot say, "I am leaving the womb." It is natural.

When someone is sexually mature, it is a second birth. Now he must fight his parents, because only if he fights with his parents will he move further away from them. And unless he moves further away from them he cannot create a new family nucleus. So every child will go against his parents: this is natural. And if a child is *not* going against, it is a growth -- because then he is fighting nature.

For example, you get married. Your mother and your wife are coming into conflict, which is natural -- *natural*, I say, because for the mother it is a great shock. You have moved to another woman. Up to now you were wholly and solely your mother's. And it makes no difference that she is your mother: deep down no one is a mother and no one is a wife. Deep down every female is a woman. Suddenly you have moved to another woman, and the woman in your mother will suffer, will become jealous. Fight and conflict are natural. But if your mother can still love you it is a growth. If your mother can love you more than she ever

loved you now that you have moved to a new woman, it is a growth, it is a conscious growth. She is going above natural instincts.

When you are a child you love your parents. That is natural -- just a bargain. You are helpless, and they are doing everything for you. You love them and you give them respect. When your parents have become old and they cannot do anything for you, if you still respect and love them, it is a growth. Any time natural instinct is transcended, you grow. You have made a volitional decision, so your being will grow and you will acquire an essence.

The old Indian culture tried in every way to make life such that everything becomes a growth. It is natural for a small child to respect his father, but it is unnatural to respect him when the father has become old, dying, unable to do anything for the child and is just a burden to him. Then it is unnatural! No animal can do that; the natural bond has broken. Only man can do that, and if it is done you grow. It is volitional. You grow with any volitional act, simple or complex.

I will tell you a story. In the "Mahabharat", Bhishma's father fell in love with a girl. He was very old. But even when you are old, to fall in love is natural. Even on the deathbed you can fall in love. The girl was ready, but the girl's father made a condition. He said, "You have your son Bhishma." Bhishma was young, just to be married. The girl's father said, "Bhishma will inherit your kingdom, so make it a condition to me that if any son is born from my daughter to you, he will inherit the kingdom, not Bhishma."

It was so unnatural for the father to tell Bhishma this. He was an old man; he could have died any day. But he was worried and he became sad, so Bhishma asked him, "What is the matter? Something is on your mind. What can I do, tell me?"

So he fabricated a story. Old men are very efficient. He said, "Because you are the only son, only one to me, and because no one can trust in nature, if you die or something happens, then who will inherit my kingdom? So I have talked with wise men and they say that it is better that I marry again so that I can get another son." So Bhishma said, "What is wrong in it? You marry."

Then the father said, "There is a difficulty. I want to marry this girl, but it is the condition of her father that 'Your son Bhishma should not inherit the kingdom. Only my daughter's son should.' "

So Bhishma said, "It is okay with me. I give you my promise."

Bhishma went to the man whose daughter was going to marry his father. He said, "I promise you, I will not inherit the kingdom."

But that man was just a fisherman, very ordinary. He said. "I know. But how can you promise me? Your sons may create trouble. And we are just fishermen, very ordinary people. If your sons create trouble, we will not be able to do anything." So Bhishma said, "I promise you: I will never marry. Okay?" Then the whole thing was finished.

This was very unnatural. He was a young man, and he never married, he never looked at a woman with any carnal desire. This became a growth. This created a subtle being, an integration, a crystallization. Then there was no need for any other SADHANA (spiritual practice). Only this fact was enough. He was crystallized. This promise was enough! He became a different man; he began to grow vertically. The natural horizontal line stopped. With this promise, everything stopped. There was no biological possibility now. Everything natural became meaningless.

But Bhishma is rare. With no spiritual practice, with no spiritual effort other than this, he attained the highest peak possible. So with any act, simple or complex, which is a conscious decision on your part without any instructive goading behind it, without any natural force

forcing you to decide -- if it is your decision, through that decision you are created. Every decision is decisive for your birth: you grow in a different dimension. So use any act, even very ordinary acts.

You are sitting: decide that "Now I will not move my body for ten minutes." You will be surprised that though the body was not moving before, now the body forces you to move. You begin to feel many subtle movements in the body of which you were not even aware. Now the body will revolt. The whole past is behind it, and the body will say, "I will move." The body will begin to tremble, there will be subtle movements, and you will feel many temptations to move. Your legs will fall asleep. They will go dead, and you will feel to scratch somewhere. Many things will be there. You were sitting without any movements previously, but now you cannot sit. But if you can sit even for ten minutes without moving, you will not need any other meditation.

In Japan they call "just sitting" the only meditation. Their word for it is "Za-zen". "Za-zen" means just sitting. But then sit and do not do anything else. When a seeker comes to a Zen Master, the Master will say, "Just sit: sit for hours together." In a zen monastery you will see many, many seekers sitting for hours together -- just sitting, not doing anything. No meditation is given, no contemplation, no prayer. Just sitting is the meditation.

A seeker will sit for six hours without any movement, and when every movement falls down, withers away, when there is no movement -- not only no movement, but no inner desire to move -- you are centered, you are crystallized! You have used the very ordinary act of sitting for your volition, for your will, for your awareness.

It is very difficult. If I say to you, "Just close your eyes and do not open them," many temptations will be there. And then you will feel very uneasy at not opening them, and you will open them. And you can deceive yourself that "I am not opening them. Suddenly they opened themselves; the eyes opened themselves. I was not aware." Or, you can just deceive another way: you can have a small glimpse, a little glimpse, and then close your eyes.

If you can keep your eyes shut just as a volitional act, that will help. Anything can become a medium to grow, so contemplate on your habits. And whatsoever you do, do it volitionally. Anything, any habit can be used, any mechanical action can be used. Begin to do otherwise: change it, and then once you decide on something, do it -- otherwise it may prove fatal.

It does prove so! If you decide something and do not do it, it is better not to decide, because that will give your will a very deep shock. And we are doing that. We go on deciding and not doing. Ultimately, we lose every possibility for will, and we begin to feel a deep will-lessness, a deep impotency, a deep weakness. And you decide about very ordinary things. Someone decides, "Now I am not going to smoke," and the next day he is smoking. You may think, "What is wrong with it? It was my decision -- and I am the master of my decisions, so I have changed it."

You are not! You have changed because you are *not* the master. Smoking proves the master, not you. Smoking is more powerful than you. Then it is better *not* to decide -- to go on smoking. But if you decide, then let this decision be final. Then never move from it. That will give you a growth.

Of course, every habit will fight with you, and your mind will say, "What are you doing? That is wrong!" Your mind will rationalize in many, many ways. I do not say smoking is wrong. I say deciding not to smoke and then to smoke is wrong. Even do the vice versa: if you decide to smoke, then smoke. Then do not stop. Then whatsoever happens -- cancer or whatsoever -- let it happen. If the whole world goes against it, let it: if you have decided to

smoke, then smoke. Even at the cost of life, go on smoking. That will give you a growth.

So it is not a question of a cigarette or no cigarette, smoking or not smoking. Deep down it is a question of following a decision, of will, of a voluntary act. Whatsoever the object is, it is irrelevant, but decide and with small decisions you can create a great will -- with very small decisions.

Just say, "I will not look out of the window for one hour." It is a very, very small decision with no meaning -- meaningless. Who will bother to see whether you look out of the window or not? And nothing is happening out of the window. But the moment you decide not to look out of the window, your whole being will revolt and would like to see, and the window will become the focus of the whole world. It is as if you are missing everything -- something is going to happen there!

One day Mulla Nasrudin decided not to go to the market. It was just in the early morning at five o'clock. There was no question of the market. He just decided not to go! Then he began to think about the market. And he decided just because he remembered that every week, once a week, was market-day in the village. He thought, "Every week I go to the market uselessly with nothing to sell and nothing to buy."

He was a poor man: "nothing to sell and nothing to buy"! He thought. "Why do I go to the market unnecessarily? Because everyone goes, and it is a market-day, a festivity in the village? Why should I go? Today I am not going although it is a market day."

He decided early at five o'clock. Then he began to think about it: "What if something happens there? I should go in case something happens there." So he worked it out, and he was fidgeting inside. And then, by six o'clock, he was in the market. There were still four or five hours for the market to open, for people to gather, but he was in the market sitting under a tree, just in the center of the market.

Someone asked Mulla Nasrudin, "Why are you sitting here so early?"

Nasrudin said, "It is a market-day, and I thought that if something happens and a large crowd is there, I may not get to the right point. So I am just sitting here in the center. If something happens, then I will be the first. And who knows? In this world, everything is possible."

The market-place became very significant, the center of the world, and it became tempting just by the decision that "I am not going to the market, because every week I go uselessly with nothing to sell and nothing to purchase."

The moment you decide, you will be tempted, and to transcend temptation is a growth. Remember, it is not suppression. It is *not* suppression! It is transcendence. The temptation is there: you do not fight it -- you acknowledge it. You say, "Okay, you are there, but I have decided." Try it for your meditation.

You are sitting, and when you sit for meditation many thoughts will come -- uninvited guests. They never come ordinarily. When you meditate, only then do they become interested in you. They will come, they will crowd, they will encircle you. Do not fight with them. Just say, "I have decided not to be disturbed by you," and remain still. A thought comes to you; just say to the thought, "Go away." Do not fight! By fighting you acknowledge; by fighting you accept; by fighting you will prove weaker. Just say, "Go away!" and remain still. You will be surprised. Just by saying to a thought, "Go away!" it goes away.

But say it with a will. Your mind must not be divided. It must not be something like a feminine no. It must not be like that, because with a feminine no, the more forcefully it is said the more forcefully it means yes. It must not be a feminine no. If you say, "Go away," then do not mean inside, "Come nearer." Then let it be "Go away!" Mean it, and the thought will

disappear. If you are angry and you have decided not to be angry, do not suppress it. Just say to the anger, "I am not going to be angry," and the anger will disappear.

There is a mechanism. Your will is needed because anger needs energy. If you say no with full energy, there is no energy left for the anger. A thought moves because deep down a hidden yes is there. That is why a thought moves in your mind. If you say no, that yes is cut from the very root. The thought becomes uprooted. It cannot be in you. But then with the no or yes you must mean what you say. Then the no must mean no and the yes must mean yes. But we go on saying yes, meaning no; telling no, meaning yes. Then the whole life becomes confused. And your mind, your body, they do not know what you mean, what you are saying.

This conscious effort to decide, to act, to be, is now going to be the evolution for man. A Buddha is different from you because of this effort and nothing else. Potentially there is no difference. Only this conscious effort makes the difference. Between man and man, the real difference is only of conscious effort. All else is just superficial. Only your clothes are different, so to speak. But when you have something conscious in you, a growth, an inward growth which is not natural, but which goes beyond, then you have a distinct individuality.

Buddha was passing a village where many people had come to insult him. He said, "You have come late. You should have come ten years before because now I have become conscious. Now I cannot react. If you abuse me, if you insult me, it is okay with me. I am not going to react. You cannot force me to react."

When someone abuses you he is forcing you to be angry, and when you become angry you are just a slave to anger. "He" has made you angry, and you go on saying, without understanding what you are saying, "That man made me angry." What do you mean? He said something and he made you angry, so he is your master. He can say something, he can manipulate, he can push a button, and you are angry. You become mad. Your button can be pushed by anyone, and you can be made mad.

Buddha said, "You have come late, friends. Now I have become the master of my own self. You cannot force me to do anything. If I want, I do. If I do not want, I do not do. You will have to go back. I am not going to reply to you." They were puzzled because this man was behaving very unpredictably. When you abuse someone, he is insulted, he feels angry, he "must" react in some way or the other. But this man simply refused to react. Buddha told them. "I am in a hurry to reach the other village. If you are finished, then allow me to move. If you have something more to say, when I will be coming back be ready to tell me."

This is transcendence. Something natural has been transcended. Reaction is natural, action is growth. We all react. We have no actions -- only reactions. Someone appreciates you and you feel good, and someone abuses you and you feel bad, and someone will do this and this or that will happen. You are predictable.

A husband returning to his house knows what his wife is going to ask. He prepares the answer. Though he has not yet reached home, he prepares the answer. He knows that his wife is not going to believe it, and the wife knows what she is going to ask and what her husband is going to answer. Everything is predictable, and every day this will happen. And this will continue for the whole life. The same questions, the same answers, the same suspicions, the same doubts, the same tricks, the same games -- and people go on playing. These are just reactions.

Someone asked for some money, and Mulla Nasrudin said, "This is the first time you have asked, so I will give it to you." He gave the money. It was a small sum. Then Mulla thought, "This much money is not going to be given back." But the man returned it. After seven days the man returned it. Mulla was surprised.

A week later, the man again came to ask for some money. The Mulla said, "Now you cannot deceive me again. You deceived me last time."

The man said, "What are you saying! I returned your money."

But Mulla said, "But you deceived me because I was all set for you not to give it back. It was decidedly so. Then you deceived me by giving it back. Now you cannot deceive me again. I am not going to give you the money."

If someone behaves unpredictably, it surprises us. You are so predictable, everyone knows what you are going to do. You do this, and this will follow. It is a mechanical response. Go beyond mechanical responses; transcend natural forces; create a will. That is the path beyond human evolution. Below the human there is a natural growth, but that is no longer for man now.

And the second part of the question is, "Explain the role that the Buddhas, the Enlightened Ones, play in the expansion of human consciousness."

The Buddhas play a role because human consciousness is not only individual, it is also collective. It is in you, but it is also outside of you. In a way, consciousness is in you and you are in a greater consciousness, just like a fish in the sea. The fish is in the sea and the sea is also in the fish.

We exist in a great ocean of consciousness. And whenever a Buddha is born, whenever someone attains Buddhahood, becomes Enlightened through his efforts, through his conscious evolution, a wave in the ocean rises. With that wave everything in the ocean is affected. It is bound to be so because a wave in the ocean is part of a great pattern.

When Buddha rises to a height, the whole ocean is affected in multi-multi ways. Now this height will be echoed all over. You throw a stone into a lake: a small circle is created. Then it goes on expanding, and the whole lake will be affected ultimately. A Buddha is a stone in the lake of human consciousness. Now humanity can never be the same again as it was before a Buddha.

Christians have made it a very significant point. They divide history into "before Christ" and "after Christ". This is really very significant. Really, history is different and is not divided, but the division is made because after Christ there is a change. Because a Christ is born, humanity can never go back again to the same premature state of mind. Everything is affected. We rise with Buddhas, we fall with Hitlers, but this rise and fall is a natural thing for you. A Buddha is born: everyone rises with him. But this is not a conscious effort on your part.

You can use this opportunity. A Buddha is there: a possibility has flowered into its essence, one consciousness has become a peak. Now this is a very good moment for your conscious effort. You will take less time, you will need less effort. It is as if the whole history is flowing toward its height. Now you can swim easily. But if you do not use the opportunity you will go to a height and you will come down. With a Buddha you will go high, with a Hitler you will come down. You will go on moving up and down. This moving up and down will be a natural force for you. For a Buddha it is a conscious effort; for you it will be a natural force.

You can use it! Man can use it in two ways. When a Buddha is there, to rise is easy. The whole consciousness is open toward the peak. The peak is there. Deep down in you there are echoes of it. The music is heard deep down; you can follow it. If you make a small effort, you can attain Buddhahood very easily.

There is a very meaningful story. Buddha attained the Ultimate; then he remained silent

for seven days. He had no feeling to say what he had attained. The silence seemed total -- unbreakable. Then Brahma became afraid: "He may not speak, and it happens rarely that someone attains Buddhahood." So the story says that Brahma came to Buddha, bowed down at his feet and said, "You must speak! Do not remain silent. You have to speak!"

Buddha said, "It seems useless because those who can hear me and understand me will understand even without me. But those who *will not* hear me, even if they hear they will not be able to understand me. So there seems no need."

Brahma said, "There are a few more you are leaving out: there are a few more who are just on the verge. If you speak, they will hear and take the jump. If you do not speak, they may even fall back. They are just on the border. They will hear you and will take a jump."

A Buddha is there. This is a possibility to take a jump. But you are affected whether you take the jump or not. You will be affected! But this affect, without your conscious will, will be a natural force. And when a Hitler comes up you will go down. Just as you go higher with Buddha, you can go down with anyone else -- because the going up is not your achievement. With a rising wave you go up, then with a falling wave you go down. But you can use the opportunity. When you are rising high, then with a very small effort on the part of your will, you can attain more. So with a Buddha, thousands can become Buddhas.

I do not know whether you know it or not, but within five hundred years everything great as far as religion is concerned happened. Within five hundred years! Buddha -- Gautam the Buddha -- Mahavir, Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, Confucius, Lao Tzu, Zarathustra, Jesus, they all happened within five hundred years, in a particular period when everything was rising high. Every great religion was born within those five hundred years.

Something mysterious was at the root -- something very mysterious. Just in Bihar, in a very small place, in a very small province, at the time when Buddha was there, there were eight persons of Buddha's height. Just in the small area of Bihar there were eight great Enlightened persons. Mahavir was there, Buddha was there. Ajit Keshkambal was there, Belathiputta was there -- eight such persons! And these are the *known* persons.

Someone asked Buddha, "You have 10,000 *bhikkhus* with you. How many of them have attained Buddhahood?"

Buddha said, "So many, I cannot count."

The questioner asked, "Why are they silent? Why do we not feel them? Why are they not famous?"

Buddha said, "When I am speaking, there is no need for them to speak. And moreover, when for the first time I attained Buddhahood, I myself tried in every way to be silent. It was Brahma who asked me and persuaded me to speak. So they have become silent. No one will know about them; even their names will not be known."

One day Buddha came to his assembly of monks with a flower in his hand. He was to speak, but he would not speak. He just sat, and this continued for a long time. Everyone became puzzled and disturbed and began to whisper into one another's ears, "What is the matter? Why is he not speaking today?" He was just sitting there with a flower in his hand -- a lotus flower -- looking at it, totally absorbed in it. Then someone asked, "Are you not going to speak?"

Buddha said, "I am speaking. Listen!" And he remained silent.

Then someone else asked, "We cannot understand what you are doing, Sir. You are just looking at the flower and we have come to listen to something from you."

Buddha said, "I have said many things to you which could be said. Now I am saying something which cannot be said, and if someone understands let him laugh."

Only one person laughed -- Mahakashyap. He was not known before; no one knew about him. This is the only incident that is known. Mahakashyap was his name.

Ananda was a very known disciple, Sariputta was a very known disciple, Modgalayan was a very known disciple, but Mahakashyap was an absolutely unknown disciple. Neither Sariputta nor Ananda nor Modgalayan could laugh -- just a very unknown man, no one knew about him, but he laughed. Buddha called him: "Mahakashyap, come to me!" And Buddha gave the flower to Mahakashyap and said, "Whatsoever I could say I have said to others, and what I cannot say I say to you. Take this flower." This is the only incident known about Mahakashyap, the only mention of his name.

But when Bodhidharma reached China seven hundred years after Buddha, he said, "I am a disciple of Mahakashyap. Buddha was the first teacher, Mahakashyap was the second teacher, and in that line I am the twenty-eighth." So the Zen tradition in Japan says that Mahakashyap is their originator -- the man who laughed and the man to whom Buddha gave the flower.

In the night when everyone dispersed, when everyone had gone, Ananda asked, "Who is this Mahakashyap? We never knew about him. He is just a very unknown and strange man."

Buddha said, "How can you know about him? He has remained silent for years. And only he could laugh because he remained so silent. Only he could understand. It was a transmission without words, a communication without words. Only he was capable."

When a Buddha is there, with a very small effort of your will you can achieve much. When a Buddha is not there, you are fighting against a current. When a Hitler or a Genghis Khan is there, much effort is needed. Even then, success is very difficult.

Buddha is reported to have said, "Choose the right moment to be born. Choose a moment when a Buddha is there."

The Ultimate Alchemy, Vol 2

Chapter #5

Chapter title: The Ultimate Alchemy

5 July 1972 pm in

Archive code: 7207055

ShortTitle: ULTAL205

Audio: Yes

Video: No

PARIPOORN CHANDRA AMRIT RASAIKI KARANAM NAIVEDYAM
"ACCUMULATION OF THE NECTAR OF THE INNER FULL MOON IS NAIVEDYA, THE FOOD OFFERING."

YOU MUST have heard about the Taoist concept of yin and yang -- the concept of polar opposites into one reality. Reality exists through polar opposites -- through the positive and the negative, through the male and the female, through yin and yang.

Reality is a dialectical process, and when I say "dialectical process" I mean it is not a simple process: it is very complex. A simple process means one element working; a dialectical process means two polar opposites working in one direction. And though they appear as opposites, they create a symphony -- they create a musical harmony. And that harmony is reality.

Man and woman. they mean humanity. Man alone is not humanity, nor is woman alone humanity. Humanity -- the music, the synthesis we call humanity -- is a dialectical phenomenon. Man and woman both work to create humanity, they both help to create humanity. And the way of their creating it is dialectical: they exist as polar opposites. and the inner tension between the two creates the energy for movement, for a process of further growth.

It is the same on every plane. If we go deep down with the physicist to the atom's inner structure, then again we find two polar opposites working there: the negative electricity and the positive electricity. Because of these two polar opposites, matter is created. If there were only positive electricity, the world would disappear immediately. If there were only negative electricity, there would be nothing. But negative electricity and positive electricity create an inner tension, and because of that inner tension matter exists.

The same is the case with the inner being of man also. This sutra is concerned with that. We discussed how awareness creates an inner sun. But this sutra talks about the creation of an inner moon. The sun is symbolic of the inner positivity and the moon is symbolic of the inner negativity. The sun is the inner male and the moon is the inner female. These words are symbolic, and for Indian yoga particularly they are very meaningful. By "sun" the outer sun is not what is meant, nor by "moon" the outer moon. These two words "sun" and "moon" are used for the inner universe.

Indian yoga divides man into two parts: the sun part and the moon part. Even one breath is known as the sun breath and another breath is known as the moon breath. And, really, this is one of the deepest findings. If you stop the moon breath and just breathe from the sun breath, your body will become hot. And such a great heat can be created simply by using only one kind of breath that it seems inconceivable in physiological terms. Among Tibetans there exists a heat yoga in which breathing is done only through this sun breath. not using the moon breath at all.

Ordinarily the breath is continuously changing, but Western medical science has not yet taken note of it. Breathing is not a simple process. It is a dialectical process. You are changing your nostrils within each hour. Between forty and sixty minutes, approximately, your nostrils change, and you begin to take your breath from the other nostril; then again it changes. When you need more heat in the body -- for example, if suddenly you become angry -- your sun breath starts.

Yoga says that when you are angry, if you use your moon breath and stop the sun breath, you cannot be angry at all, because the moon breath creates a deep coolness inside. The whole body is divided between the sun and the moon, and the mind is also divided between the sun and the moon

So look at man not as one, because nothing can exist as just one. Everything exists through duality. You are divided into two: you have a negative part and you have a positive part. The positive is known as the sun in Indian symbology and the negative as moon. The negative is cool, silent, still. The positive is hot, vibrant with energy, active. The sun is the active part in you and the moon the inactive part, and if the active and the inactive both come to a deep equilibrium you are suddenly Enlightened. If one is more emphatic: you have an imbalance, but if both are of equal force, then they balance each other, negate each other, and the moment both are of equal force, your inner balance is regained and you reach to a different reality -- the reality of the non-dual. That one non-dual reality can be felt only when both of these dualities in you are balanced. Then you transcend them.

In the world we exist as duality. Beyond the world we exist as non-duality -- as one. Think of yourself as a triangle; two angles exist in the world and the third angle beyond the world. Two angles belong to this world and one angle belongs to that world -- the world of the Brahman. But if these two are in an imbalance, you cannot go beyond them. You go beyond them only when they regain balance. This balancing is Nirvana, this balancing is *moksha*, this balancing is the centering. Awareness works to balance this duality. And the moment this duality is balanced, you cannot be reborn again -- you disappear from the world.

You can be born again and again only if there is an imbalance. If the balance comes to a totality, if the balance becomes total, it is impossible to be born again. You disappear from the world; the body cannot exist any more. Then you cannot re-enter a body again. So first we will try to understand what this inner sun is and what this inner moon is, and how they are balanced.

This sutra says, "ACCUMULATION OF THE NECTAR OF THE INNER FULL MOON IS NAIVEDYA, THE FOOD OFFERING." You need a full moon in you to offer to the Divine as a food. That only can be the food for the Divine -- a full moon inside.

Awareness works in a double way. It creates a sun and it also creates a moon. We talked about how it creates a sun inside. When you become aware of whatsoever is happening in you, of the innermost unconscious activities, you become Enlightened. The very cells of your body become conscious; you become light. Your consciousness reaches to the very pores of your body. Just like the rays of the sun reach into the earth, your inner awareness, once

awakened, begins to work in every cell of the body and every fibre, every nerve of the body. Your whole body is filled with light. But this is only one part of awareness, this is only one process of awareness. Rays from your center also go to your periphery, to the circumference. The more your rays go to the circumference, the cooler your center becomes.

I do not know whether you have heard of a particular theory about the sun -- the outer sun; I do not know whether it is right or not, but it is meaningful in helping to understand the inner reality. They say the sun at its deepest center is the coolest spot in the solar system; it is not hot at all. The heat is only on the periphery, on the circumference, not in the inner center of the sun. Because of helium gas around the sun, heat is created; because of the helium and its chain explosion of atoms, heat is created, and then the heat spreads to the solar family.

The sun has a body and it is the center. The solar family is the body and the earth belongs to the body as a cell. The heat goes to the solar family, it spreads. But the sun in itself is a cold thing, absolutely cold, and at its deepest center, it is the coldest spot in existence. It should be so because reality exists in polarities. If the sun is the hottest thing, it must have something inside it which balances the heat. Take a wheel that is just moving on the street: the wheel moves, but in the center the hub on which it moves remains still. The movement must have something non-moving in the center, otherwise movement will not be possible.

In this world of manifestations, everything exists within polar opposites. You are alive because you have death inside. If you had no death inside, you could not be alive. So do not think that one day it suddenly happens that death comes to you. It is an inner growth. It is not something that you meet, that you encounter -- no! It is something toward which you are daily growing. One day the growth is complete, and you are dead. It is an inner phenomenon. You are alive with a death center. You cannot be alive without a death center.

Nothing exists without its polar opposite. Life and death are just two positive and negative realities. So it looks logical, dialectical also, but it is not yet proved that the sun has at its center a cold spot, an absolutely cold spot, the polar opposite to the heat on its circumference. It may be true, it may not be true: that is irrelevant. But inside it is absolutely true. When you become aware, the heat begins to travel toward your circumference. Each cell of your body will become heated, warm, because of the awareness penetrating. The second counterpart will be that your center of being will become cooler and cooler and cooler. That is the moon working. The sun is the warmth spreading, the light spreading.

And you must know that light has two qualities -- light and warmth. Heat is just concentrated light; light is nothing but dispersed heat. So when light travels to your body, every cell will become warm, enlightened, aware. Sleep is a cold thing, night is a cold thing. That is why we sleep in the night: it is a cold time. And in the morning, with the rising sun, everything becomes warm, alive. Then it is difficult to sleep and easy to be awake.

When your circumference is cold, when each body cell is cold. asleep, your center will be a hot spot. Because of that hot spot in the center you will be sexual, you will be angry, you will be greedy, you will be everything. Your center will be in a fever. This heat begins to travel. Of course, when heat leaves your center it spreads; and the more it spreads, the less it is heat and the more it is light.

The sunrays on the earth are life-giving. They have travelled much. If you go nearer and nearer to them they will become death-giving, because then they will not be warm: then they will be just pure fire.

As it is, the whole body structure is just cold. You feel heat only in anger, in sex, in desire, in passion. That is not light, but simply a feverish phenomenon. Because of this, sex is felt as a release -- because you lose a certain quantity of heat, and you are relieved; you lose a

certain quantity of fever, and you are released.

Because of this, militaries have not allowed their soldiers any sexual freedom -- because if you allow sexual freedom to soldiers, they cannot fight. Then inner fever is released. If you do not allow them sexual freedom, their inner fever is accumulated. That accumulated fever begins to be violent automatically.

That is why a certain very deep phenomenon, a great riddle of history, can be solved whenever a society is affluent: when the problem of food and hunger is solved, a society begins to be sexually free. Only poor societies can be sexually suppressive. Whenever a society is affluent, rich you cannot suppress sex -- because the food problem has become solved. Much energy is released, so what to do with it? So an affluent society will become sexually free.

An affluent society means a society which has progressed much technologically. And whenever any civilization comes to a point of affluence, sexual freedom is bound to be there, and then any less developed society can win over this higher civilized society. So this has always been the history: a greater civilization will always be defeated by a barbaric, uncivilized society.

India was defeated continuously because of its affluence. Tartars, Berbers, Huns, Moghuls, Turks, they were all uncivilized societies -- poor, poverty-stricken, sexually suppressed. They had much violence in them. You can see this in a modern phenomenon: in Vietnam. Americans can never win. Their youth is sexually free, and they are less violent. Thus, they cannot win in Vietnam. No affluent society can really win over any poor society. They may fight for longer periods, but they cannot win. They can kill a whole country, but they cannot win because the very fighting spirit is not there.

America is today one of the most sexually free societies in all history. America cannot fight; fighting is part of a suppressed sex. The inner fever must be accumulated in such quantities that you begin to be violent. Suppress sex, and you will be violent. That is why so-called saints are very violent in their behaviour. They are angry, violent, because of suppressed sex. That fever has to be released in some way.

In sex you are releasing a particular amount of energy. They say that in one sex act you release 120 calories of heat -- 120 calories! It is the same if you run fast for one mile. Then you will release the same amount of calories -- 120. That is why there is much talk about whether sex can help heart disease. It can help! It releases energy. For persons who are well fed, it helps to delay heart disease. It releases energy, but it is not a solution. It is just a temporary arrangement. It just creates a leakage in your system from which energy is released.

Any day that you are angry your whole body is heated. It becomes feverish. The center releases anger: energy comes to the periphery. Ordinarily it is cold. The periphery is cold ordinarily, and the center is hot. The reverse will be the case when awareness happens to you. When you meditate and go deep within, when you become aware of every activity, everything will take a turn -- an about-turn. Your periphery will not go into anger, not go into sex, not go into greed, not go into passion. It will lose its coldness -- its sleepy coldness. It will become warm, alive and aware. And because this energy is released to the periphery every twenty-four hours continuously, you will not need any anger or any sex.

A Buddha doesn't need anger. It is absolutely useless for him because the very energy system has changed. He is using his heat for light and you are using your light for heat. The same fuel can be used to burn your house and the same fuel can be used to light it. The fuel is the same, but the direction changes. The inner fuel, the inner energy, becomes fire -- suicidal.

It burns you down, and ultimately you are just ashes. In the end, when death comes near you, you are just ashes. Everything is burnt out because you used your energy not as a light, but as a fire.

It becomes fire if it is concentrated in the center and is released only temporarily, whenever it is overflowing. In a sudden shock it comes to the periphery and is released. This is a very chaotic state. You go on accumulating it inside. Then one day it is overflowing and you have to throw it.

We go on rationalizing our actions. When you Get angry you say that someone has made you angry. No, really, it is that you were ready: you were overflowing inside. You do not know this because you were not aware. You were overflowing with a certain amount of energy which was waiting to be released. When someone abuses you, insults you, and you become angry, you think that this person is creating anger in you.

No, this person is simply giving you a situation and opportunity to release the overflowing energy. In a way, he is your friend, a helper. If he is not there you will be in a very difficult situation. If no one is giving you any opportunity to throw your energy, you will project, you will imagine something, and you will get angry with anything at all.

People get angry with their shoes; they will throw them. They can get angry with the door; they become violent with it. They can be angry with everything. When no opportunity is given, they can even become angry with themselves. They will begin to harm themselves or they will create some substitutes.

We have created many. Someone is just smoking: we think it is a simple thing. It is not! Now psychologists say it is a deep violence You take the smoke in and then throw it out, you take the smoke in and then throw it out: it helps to release hunger, violence, sex. We have many, many devices. Persons who are violent will eat more. Just by destroying the food they are releasing violence.

You may not have observed it, but when you are loving you cannot eat much, when you are happy you cannot eat much, when you feel blissful, you cannot eat too much. Ordinarily it should not be so. It looks opposite to what we think should be the case. We think that when one is happy he should eat more. No, a happy person will not eat more. He cannot eat more because eating is part of violence. A happy person is not violent; hence. when you are in love you cannot eat very much.

Two persons, when in love, unmarried, will not eat much. But when married they will begin to eat more because love has disappeared. Now it is a violence, and it is related with many deep things. In animals violence is expressed through teeth, and we are related to animals. When one animal is violent, angry, the energy comes to the teeth and to the nails. These are the instruments for being violent for an animal.

But, still, the same happens with us. When you are violent, your teeth, your fingers, your nails, are filled with heat, with energy. Now you have to release it. You can eat, you can use gum, you can smoke, you can take PAN (a leaf preparation in India which is chewed), because you need something to crush. So there are people who are the whole day crushing *pan*. Their violence is thus released.

Even by continuously talking, violence is released. Women talk more than men because men can be violent in other ways while women cannot be. That is the only reason. They talk more! They talk continuously, they talk madly, because man has other possibilities for expressing violence -- in the office, with the car, etc. Have you observed a man who is angry driving his car? He is releasing his anger through the accelerator. The car will speed up He is releasing anger, and the car is just a medium. Fifty percent of car accidents are not because of

cars but because of drivers. not because of traffic but because of mental tension.

But women cannot release anger in so many ways. They have only one: going on talking. By their doing something with the teeth and the lips, much is released. A woman who is angry will break more saucers, more cups, unknowingly. She will be surprised why today everything is just breaking. It is the unconscious mind. Energy is in the hands. The energy wants to destroy something. So it is good to have breakable things in the house. It helps! Then before the husband is back, the wife is released. If you make everything unbreakable, it will break families. Breakable things help families to continue. Now these are proven facts.

If you have energy in the center which is feverish, not transferred to the periphery, not used as light for the whole body and for your whole being, this is bound to happen. Every day you will accumulate energy, and then you will have to throw it. And this is nonsense! For the whole life you are doing this: accumulating, throwing; accumulating, throwing. What are you doing twenty-four hours a day? Just accumulating energy to throw it. Then when energy is there, the only problem is how to throw it. So we throw it in sex, in anger, in greed. When energy is thrown, then the only problem is how to accumulate it

What sort of life is this? A vicious circle! With awareness the whole mechanism changes. With awareness, every moment your inner center is sending its energy to every pore of your body. And\ your body is not a small thing. It is a miniature universe: as above, so below. Everybody is a small universe. And when I say "small", I feel guilty -- because, really, it is not small. It is as vast as the universe. But because of our language, there are problems. The universe appears vast and your body appears small.

What is the difference between the two? They say that if we can throw out all space from the earth, if we can compress it and throw out the space, if the vacant space in it is thrown out, our earth will be just like a small ball. If we can throw out all the empty space from the Himalayas, they can be put into a match box. The material is not much, the matter is not much. The matter is very small, only the emptiness in it is vast.

So how to judge whether a thing is big or small? A very small thing can be blown up to any bigness if we put space in it. If we put as much space into your body as there is in the earth, you will be like the earth. So all the differences are of spaces -- empty spaces. No difference is there really.

But when I say "a small universe", I mean only this: that everything that exists in the universe exists in you also. Whatsoever may be the measure, exactly everything exists in you also. So when your solar center, your sun, releases energy, it releases it in two ways. Either you are unconscious: then it releases it into sex, anger, greed and other diseases. Or if you are conscious, through this consciousness heat is transformed into light: then it is released as light. Then you are under a shower of light continuously. Your every pore, your every cell, is bathed. There is a continuous shower of light. When this happens, your inner center begins to become cooler and cooler and cooler, and ultimately it becomes the coldest spot.

Hindus have a myth that Shankara lives on Kailash. Kailash is the coldest mythological spot -- the coldest peak, the highest peak -- and it is always covered with snow. This is just a symbolic way of saying that you have the coldest spot -- a Kailash -- in you. But you can know it only when the heat is transformed into light -- never before. And the more you become aware, the more heat is transformed into light, and you begin to feel a moon inside. You begin to feel a cool, silent pool.

This sutra says, "Accumulation of the nectar of the inner full moon..." In the beginning, of course, you will feel it and miss it. It is just like the first day's moon. Then there is the second-day moon, the third-day moon. You feel it and it is gone; then it grows :again; then

comes the full-moon night. Just like this, this inner spot of coolness grows. As your consciousness grows, your heat is transformed into light. As your periphery becomes enlightened, as your each and every cell is filled with light and becomes aware and awake, this inner moon grows. Sometimes you feel it and sometimes you miss it. Sometimes there is an inner cool breeze, and you know something has happened inside. You feel it, but then you miss it again. Then it goes on growing. Ultimately, when there is no unconsciousness left and your total energy has become light, you come to know the full moon.

Buddha has talked about this full moon in negative terms because it is the negative pole. So Buddha says that when this inner silence is achieved, it is Nirvana. The word is very meaningful in reference to this sutra. Nirvana means "cessation of the flame": a lamp is burning and then the flame disappears.

When your heat is totally transformed into light, there is no flame. That is why the moon symbol is used. The moon has light, but no flame. That is why its light is cool. It is without flame, without fire. Light is there without any flame. The flame has disappeared.

When one first becomes acquainted with the sun, the light becomes like a flame, burning, hot. So if you analyze the life, the inner life, of a Buddha or of a Jesus or of a Mahavir, many things will become apparent which are ordinarily hidden. For example, whenever a person like Buddha is born, the early life will be very revolutionary -- because the moment one enters the inside, the first experience is a fiery flame. The more Buddha grows older, the more the inner coolness is felt, the more the moon becomes perfect. Revolution is lost. Then Buddha's words are not revolutionary.

Jesus couldn't get this opportunity. He was killed when he was still a revolutionary. That is why, if you compare Buddha's sayings with Jesus' sayings, there is a clear-cut distinction and difference. Jesus' sayings look like that of a young man -- hot! Buddha's early sayings are also like that, but he lived to be eighty. He was not killed.

There are reasons. And one reason is this: India always knew that this happens: whenever a person goes in, the first expression is fiery, revolutionary, rebellious. That is why India never killed anyone. That is why India could never behave as Greeks behaved with Socrates and Jews behaved with Jesus. India knew much. It has known many, many such persons. India knows it is natural that whenever a Buddha enters into himself the first experience will be revolutionary. He will burst open, explode into a fiery flame. But then the flame will disappear, and ultimately there will be only a moon -- silent, cool, with no fire but only light.

Jesus was killed. That is why Christianity has still remained incomplete. Christianity was based on early Jesus -- on Jesus when he was just a flame. That is why Christianity has remained incomplete. Buddhism is complete. It has known Buddha in all stages. It has known Buddha's moon in all stages -- from the first day to the full-moon light. This crucifixion has been unfortunate for the West. It has proved one of the greatest misfortunes in history that Jesus was killed when he was only thirty-three, just a flame. The flame would have turned into moonlight, but the opportunity was not given. And the reason was only this: that the Jews were not aware of the inner phenomenon.

India knew many, many Buddhas, and it is always the case that whenever someone enters in, he first sees the fire, the flame, and the revolutionary spirit comes up. But if one goes on in and in, it dissolves, and then there is only silence -- a moonlight silence.

This sutra says, "Accumulation of the nectar of the inner full moon..." This silence, this cool silence of the moon, Hindus have called nectar, the *amrit*, the elixir. It is not to be found somewhere else. It is in you. This nectar is in you! Once you are established in this nectar, once you are in this pool of cool moonlight, then you are a full moon inside. Then you have

known both the polarities: you have known life, you have known death, you have known the sun, you have known the moon. You have known both the polarities -- life and death. And once you have known both you have transcended both. That is why it is called the nectar *amrit*.

Now you will not die. Now you are drunk with elixir; you cannot die. But you will not be alive in the old sense either. You have died in the old sense; you are reborn in a new moon. Now death will not be a death and life will not be a life. Now you will be beyond both.

I have heard about Tanka, the Zen Master, who one day declared before his disciples that Buddha was never born. He said, "This whole story is just false; this whole Buddha legend is just false. He was never born." His disciples were just perplexed. What did he mean? It seemed he had gone mad. Every day he had himself been teaching the life of Buddha, his birth and everything, and suddenly one day he said, "This whole thing is nonsense. He was Never born." Then he left the platform and went into his hut.

The disciples gathered around his hut and asked, "What are you saying? What about that which you were always teaching us for your whole life?"

Tanka said, "Tanka is no more. He was never born, so the whole legend is false. The teaching of Tanka and your listening to Tanka is just false. Someone has created a fiction. Do not be deceived."

Then they were even more perplexed. It may be that Buddha was not born, but Tanka was already there standing beside them. Tanka laughed and said, "That which is born, that which was born, was not Buddha."

In India we have two names: "Gautam Siddharth" is the name given by the parents. Then one day he became Enlightened: his consciousness flowered, bloomed. Then he used another name -- "Gautam the Buddha": "Buddha" means the Enlightened One. This second name doesn't belong to Gautam at all. Gautam is just a situation. In his place Buddha happened, and this Buddha did not really happen on the day of his Enlightenment. He had been always there, but it had been recognized only on this day. Gautam had come to recognize on that day something which was always there -- the Buddha.

This inner phenomenon is beyond birth and death. It is never born and never will it die, because that which is born can die and that which is not born cannot die. Death needs birth as a prerequisite, as a necessary prerequisite. You cannot die if you are not born. With this inner phenomenon -- when sun and moon are balanced, when the dialectical process is finished, when the synthesis is complete -- you come to feel in yourself something which is eternal.

That is why this sutra says, "Accumulation of the nectar of the inner full moon is *NAIVEDYA*." Now you have become food yourself. Now you can offer yourself to the Divine. Now you are food. Now you are eternal. And why is it called "food", *NAIVEDYA*? Because when you are eternal, you can become food for the eternal. And by "food" the ordinary meaning is also implied. When you take food in, it becomes one with you. It becomes your blood, it becomes your bones, it becomes you: you are your food! So when you have come to know this inner reality, the eternal reality, you can offer it as food to the universe, to the Existence.

By this is meant that now you can become the bones of the universe, you can become the blood of the universe. Now you can be one with it just like food becomes one with you. The meeting is complete because you have become food for the Divine. Then you are *naivedya*. Then the offering can be accepted.

But you cannot offer your body as the food. It will be food, but for the vultures, not for the Divine. This cannot be offered as food for the Divine. Your body comes out of the earth

and goes back to the earth. It can only be eaten by the earth again: "Dust unto dust. It can only return to dust, so this body cannot be offered to the Divine.

One young seeker came to Gautam Buddha. He said, "I have come to offer myself to you. Accept me"

Buddha asked him, "What are you offering -- your body? But that is already offered and the earth will claim it, so how can you offer it to me? What are you offering? Tell me exactly!"

The man was confused. He said, "Whatever I have I offer to you "

Buddha asked him, "What do you have? What is it that belongs to you? Do your thoughts belong to you? They belong to the society; your mind belongs to the society. Your body belongs to your parents, to the earth, to the sky, to water, to fire, to many things to the five elements. What do you have that you can offer to me?"

The man could not answer because he had nothing else. He could not think of anything else, so Buddha said, "Do not offer now. First find out what you are. And the moment you find it, it is already offered. Then there is no need to offer."

When you find the inner balance that is known from finding the sun and finding the moon, only when you know both, they balance each other, and in that balance you escape from duality. And then the third angle of the triangle is touched. For the first time you are above yourself: you are the inner self. Now you can look down at yourself -- at your sun, your moon, your body, your soul, your positivity, your negativity, your male, your female. Now you can look down at yourself -- at the whole world of duality, at multidimensional duality -- and now you can become *naivedya*, the food offering.

But now there is no need even to offer: you have already offered. Now there is no need to ask to be accepted: you are already accepted. You are one. Just as food becomes one with you, you become one with the Divine. And by "Divine" I mean the Whole, the Totality, everything -- the very Existence.

So what to do? Transform heat into light: that is the mantra

Transform heat into light! Do not use heat as heat: use it as light. When you think anger is coming to you, close your eyes and meditate on what anger is. Dig deep inside and find out the source from where it is coming. What we are doing ordinarily is just the opposite. When we get angry we begin to think about the object of anger. about who has created it, and not of the source of anger, from where it is coming. When you get angry, close your eyes. This is the right moment to meditate. Close your eyes, go in, and find out from where this anger is coming. Follow it to the very source. Go deep, and you will come to the source of heat from where the accumulated energy is bursting forth to go out.

Observe it; do not indulge in it -- because if you indulge in it, it will be thrown out without being transformed. And do not suppress it -- because if you suppress it, it will be thrown back to the original source which is overflowing. It cannot absorb it. It will be thrown back again with a more forceful movement. So do not suppress it and do not indulge in it. Just be conscious. Move inward to the source. This very movement slows down the process; this very observation transforms the quality of anger, because this calm observation is an antidote.

Anger and calm observation are different phenomena. When this calm observation enters into anger, it changes the energy, the very chemical composition of it, and the heat becomes light. That is the change: heat becomes light! Then the anger is neither thrown back to the original source which cannot contain it because it is overflowing, nor is it thrown to the object in a wastage, a foolish wastage. Then this energy neither moves out to the object of

anger, nor is it suppressed back to the original source. With observation this energy becomes diffused. It moves to the periphery of your body as light. When diffused, it moves as light, and the very anger becomes ojas, the very anger becomes a light, an inner light.

So do not be disturbed and disappointed if you have much anger. That only shows you have much energy. A person born without anger cannot be transformed. He has no energy. So be happy that you have energy, but do not misuse it. Energy can be misused, it can be transformed. Energy in itself is neutral. It will not tell you what to do with it -- you have to decide. This is the secret science of inner alchemy -- to change heat into light, to change coal into diamond, to change baser elements into gold.

These are just symbols. Alchemists were not really concerned with changing baser metals into higher metals, but they had to hide and they had to make an esoteric, secret symbology, because it was very difficult in past ages to talk about the inner science and not be murdered or killed. Jesus was killed: he was an alchemist. And the Christianity that developed, that followed Jesus, went quite against him. The Christian Church began to kill and murder those who were again trying alchemy.

This word "alchemy" is very beautiful. Our "chemistry" is born out of alchemy. The word "chemistry" comes from "alchemy", but "alchemy" itself is a very deep and significant word. The word "alchemy" comes from Egypt. The old name of Egypt was "Khem" and "Al Khem" means "the secret science of Egypt". The Egyptians were deep in the alchemy of inner transformation, in how to transform the inner chemistry.

Many Egyptian mummies are preserved. They are the oldest, most ancient mummies, and still scientists are not able to probe into how they were preserved, why and how they were preserved. But that "why" we can guess, and our so-called history is nothing but a guess. But about esoteric things it is always a fallacious guess.

Why they were preserved is difficult to understand, but more problematic is the "how", by what chemical process they were preserved. They are still as fresh as if they had just died. If there had been any outer chemical process, our chemistry could know it; we are more chemically developed than old Egypt. The real thing is that these bodies were preserved not by any outer chemical process, but by inner alchemy.

If your sex energy, which is the source of life, can be transformed inwardly, then your body can be preserved for any length of time very easily. If your sex energy is transformed, then your body can be preserved even for a million years. If the cells of your body lose sex then the body can be preserved, because birth comes through sex and death comes through sex. Your freshness, the youngness of the body, comes through sex, and then deterioration comes through sex.

These mummies were preserved not just as historians say or as Egyptologists say, that man has always been thinking in terms of ego to preserve himself. With the kings, the emperors, for example, that is not the case. Totally different is the secret. They were preserved only so that they would be recognized when their souls would be born again. When a man is born again in another body, if his old body is preserved it helps to further his inner progress.

But the old body will be useful only if it was transformed by alchemy; otherwise it is of no use. If you change your body inwardly, your body then becomes a laboratory. It is a lab; it is not just a body. If you have been working inside, experimenting inside, then you know this body from the inside, not only from the outside.

We know our bodies only from the outside. Whatsoever the mirror tells is our only knowledge -- it is from the outside. Our knowledge is as if someone goes around a house and

looks at it, and then says, "I know it." He has never come in; he has never looked from the inside. We look at our bodies from the outside, never from the inside.

If you begin to transform your anger, your sex, you will begin to look at your body from the inside. Then your body is a great experiment, a great laboratory, very complex, and then you will want to preserve it for further growth. When one enters another body, one can learn much from the old body. It was a great experiment in old Egypt, and many things were done with the body. They were successful in some things, failures in some things.

If you have again a new body, a new laboratory, then if the old is preserved you will not have to begin again from ABC. If the old is preserved, this is a record. Death had interrupted, but now you can proceed. You are not to proceed from the beginning again; you can proceed from the point where death interrupted in the last life.

So only Egyptians and Tibetans have preserved bodies for this reason, but only those bodies which were undergoing deep inner experiments. Otherwise it is useless to preserve your old body. Other wise you will not even be able to recognize it.

Lenin's body is preserved in Moscow, but he would not even recognize it. If he were born again, he would not even recognize it! His body was never used as a laboratory; he never knew it. He was just acquainted with it in the mirror, never with the body itself.

This process is alchemical: observe anger, and anger is transformed into light; observe sex, and sex is transformed into light. Observe any inner phenomenon which creates heat. Observe it, and through observation it becomes light. And if your every heat phenomenon is transformed into light, you will come to feel the inner moon. And when there is no heat left, then you have accumulated the nectar of the full moon.

And through this nectar you become immortal. Not in this body, not with this body: you become immortal because you transcend life and death both.

Then you are *naivedya*: then you are a food offering to the Divine -- to the Total.

The Ultimate Alchemy, Vol 2

Chapter #6

Chapter title: Questions and Answers

6 July 1972 pm in

Archive code: 7207065

ShortTitle: ULTAL206

Audio: Yes

Video: No

OSHO, WHAT ARE THE REASONS THAT VERY FEW PERSONS IN THE WORLD ARE INTERESTED IN TRANSFORMING THEIR INNER HEAT INTO SPIRITUAL LIGHT? DO YOU FEEL THAT THE PRESENT GENERATION IS CAPABLE OF CREATING ENLIGHTENED ONES LIKE KRISHNA, LAO TZU AND CHRIST?

MAN IS FREEDOM, absolute freedom, so spirituality is a choice. There is no force compelling you to be spiritual; there is no cause forcing you to transform. If there were any cause forcing you to transform, then no spirituality would be possible.

Causality is materialism. You seek food because hunger is there. It forces you; there is no choice. You cannot choose whether to seek or not to seek: you have to. Spirituality is not that type of seeking. No one is forcing you. You alone have to choose.

Spirituality is a choice. It is not causality. Everything else is causality: there is a cause, and the effect follows. The effect has no freedom. It is caused. Spirituality is beyond causality. It is not caused by anything; it is your inner choice. You may choose, you may not choose. For lives together you may not choose it, but no one is going to force you. This has to be understood, and this is a very significant thing -- because if everything is caused, then, I say, there is no spirituality. Then someone can cause you to become spiritual. If the cause is present, then the effect will follow. Then a Buddha can be caused; then we can create the cause, and then you will be a Buddha.

But we cannot create any situation in which you can become a Buddha, and you cannot create a situation in which you can be stopped from becoming a Buddha. You are free. Any moment you can choose to be one, and you may not choose for lives together.

This has been a long discussion between materialism and spirituality. This is the basic debate -- not whether God exists or not. That is not the basic debate because one can be spiritual without any God. Buddha never believed in any God; Mahavir denies any existence of God -- but no one is as spiritual as Mahavir or Buddha. So God is not the most significant thing; even the soul is not the most significant thing. Buddha says there is no self, no soul, and he is spiritual par excellence. Then what is the basic thing in spirituality? It is the concept of freedom -- whether man is free to go beyond humanity or not.

If everything is caused, then there is no freedom for you. You have a certain body because of certain causes -- because of a certain father, a certain mother, a certain country, a certain climate, a certain heredity. You have a certain body; it has been caused. You have a certain mind because of a certain country, a certain culture, a certain education. You have a mind because of certain causes. You speak a particular language because it has been caused. If you were born in China and were never taught any other language than Chinese, it is difficult to conceive that you could speak any other language. Language is caused. Certain factors are needed, then you will speak a certain language.

So there is no freedom in these things. Only spirituality is uncaused, and that is the debate between science and religion -- because science says that nothing is possible which is uncaused: everything has a causality. You may know it, you may not know it; that is another thing. The factor of causality may be unknown, but "everything is caused". This is the contention of the scientific approach toward life: everything is caused. The cause is known or not known, but "everything is caused".

If everything is caused, then there is no freedom. Then if a Buddha is a Buddha, it is not any achievement of his. He was "caused"! Then anyone else in his situation, X-Y-Z, will become a Buddha. Only a particular situation has to be there.

Then Buddha is replaceable by anyone. Then if you are put into the same situation, you will become a Buddha, just like water boils at a particular degree -- *any* water. So it is irrelevant which water, whether it is from the Ganges or from the Godavari or from anywhere. Any water will boil at a particular degree and will evaporate at a particular degree. At one hundred degrees, water will evaporate -- in any country, in any climate, in any age. So which water is irrelevant: at one hundred degrees heat, evaporation is caused. So use any water -- A-B-C.

Science says the same is with Buddha. They say put any man, A-B-C, in the same situation, and given the same situation a Buddha will be caused. It is only that we do not yet know all the causal factors -- that is another thing -- but they think we will know one day.

That is absurd! No one can create the situation for someone to be a Buddha, no one can teach it! If I say to water, "Now evaporate," water cannot evaporate. But create the situation and water evaporates. Water has no freedom to choose. The situation is the significant factor. If the situation is there, automatically water will evaporate. Science says that man's situation is very complex. It is not so simple as creating heat for the water to evaporate. It is complex, but still "everyone is caused" and "everything is caused".

If this is the case, then there is no freedom. Really, in this country, this thought has become very deeply rooted in the human mind. Because of this, now psychologists say that no criminal is a criminal: he is caused; and no Buddha is a Buddha: he is caused. Everyone is just a slave; there is no responsibility. With the concept of freedom gone, there is no responsibility. So when you ask me why people are not interested in transforming their lives, their inner energy into spiritual light, the "why" is irrelevant. It cannot be asked. With freedom, "why" disappears. But you can ask why *this* water is not evaporating; then you have to find out the "why" in the situation. Go deep down into the situation, and you will find out the answer to why this water is not evaporating. Some factor is missing. Bring the factor in, and the water will evaporate.

Why is a particular man ill? Diagnose, and something will be found: the answer will be there. Why is a particular man not spiritual? The answer is that the question is not valid, because with the question "why?" you assume that somewhere in the situation something must be there which is obstructing the process. There is no such factor. If you want to be

spiritual you can be; if you do not want it, it is up to you. It is up to you!

Given all the factors of the situation, a Buddha cannot be produced, cannot be manufactured. Really, in the life of Buddha, there are many things which will help us. He was born, he was the only son to his father, and he was born when his father was very old. The father asked the astrologers, "What is going to be the fate of my son?" The astrologers said, "There are two possibilities: either he will become a great emperor -- a *chakravartin*, an emperor of the whole world -- or he will become a sannyasin, a renunciate. The father asked, "What type of astrology is this? You tell me certainly what he is going to become!" They said, "This is the only possible thing we can predict. Either he will become a sannyasin or he will become a *chakravartin*."

These are polar opposites: an emperor of the whole world and a sannyasin, a monk, a beggar in the street. Everything else comes in between. These are the two polar opposites. So the father was worried and he asked the pundits of the court. He called a great meeting of all the wise men of the capital and asked them what to do so that his son may not become a sannyasin, so that he may live in the world and not leave the world. He asked them what type of situation should be given to him and what type of education so that he would never feel any urge toward spirituality.

This was a great experiment -- an experiment in causing a person to be a particular thing. He must be a great emperor, and both the possibilities were open. How to close one possibility and how to help only one possibility to grow? They decided. They must have been very scientific. Never was such an experiment done before and never after. It was a very great experiment in human destiny.

So they planned the whole thing. The childhood of Buddha was a planned childhood, absolutely planned. What he should eat, what he should do, with whom he should talk, who should teach him, when he should move -- everything was planned. They were great wise men. They said he must not see any suffering. He must not see any old man, he must not see any deceased man, he must not see illness or poverty. He must not become aware of the great suffering that life is. He must be in a world of dreams, a utopia, a euphoria. He must live in illusions so real that he will never feel the urge to leave the world.

So three palaces were built for him, one for each season. In his gardens not even a dry leaf was allowed. In the night everything dying would be thrown away. He never saw a flower dying. He would only see flowers that were young and fresh. Wherever Gautam was, no old man was allowed to move -- only young, healthy, beautiful men and women.

All the beautiful girls of the capital were brought for his service. They would serve him, and there was music and song and his whole life was just a sing-song, just a dreamy life. Absolute planning was possible because he was a king's son. When he was young he had never seen any old man, any ill man, any dead man; he did not even know that death existed. Of course, when there is no death, no old age, no suffering, where is there a question of becoming a renunciate? Why renounce the world? The world is as beautiful as you can wish.

He lived in this dreamland, and then suddenly everything shattered. One cannot go on in it. It is such a false thing, one cannot continue in it. One day or another something will enter and shatter the whole thing. And it happened that because of this planning, I say *because* of this planning, when he came to know the facts of life it was a great shock. They are not such a great shock to us; we are accustomed to them. But when Buddha saw an old man for the first time, he was not accustomed at all, so he asked, "What has happened to this man?" When he saw for the first time a dead body, the whole dream-world disappeared.

We see these things every day, so we become insensitive, accustomed. But he was not

accustomed so he asked, "What has happened to this man?" He had to be replied to, and that was such a shock -- such a great shock. There was such a big gap between his life and the facts of death that he is reported to have said, "If this man is dead, then the whole life is meaningless. Then I am also going to be dead. Then everything is useless. If death is the end, then life is meaningless, so I must go and find that which is deathless -- if there is such a thing. And if there is not such a thing, then we are living only in dreams -- wasting time, wasting energy, wasting ourselves."

The father had had a plan in his mind. He had been trying to cause, trying to force, a particular alternative. But the result was quite the contrary -- because when you force a particular thing the inner freedom begins to rebel. Buddha's life was a manufactured life -- artificial, false, unreal. And because everything was forced upon him, the inner freedom must have revolted. Because of that inner freedom, he moved into quite the opposite polarity. Buddha's father was just unable to understand what had happened. He had done everything in his power, and then the whole plan failed.

You cannot cause man to be something -- and if you can cause man to be something, then there is no humanity. Man is the uncaused factor in the world. So I cannot say why, because if I can say that because of this or that, man is not spiritual, then you can provide the factors, and man will be *made* spiritual. Then spirituality becomes a part of a great economics. Supply "this", and the demand will be fulfilled. I create a demand, and the supply will be there.

No, nothing can be done with man. Spirituality is not a commodity. And because of this, because spirituality means freedom, so few people become spiritual: because you never use your freedom. Rather, on the contrary, you go on forcing yourself into slavery, because slavery is convenient -- very convenient, comfortable -- and freedom is inconvenient, uncomfortable.

When everyone is a slave, you can adjust with everyone -- if you too are a slave. If you begin to act as a free agent, you become maladjusted. The whole world has progressed only through maladjusted individuals. The adjusted ones are always orthodox, traditional. They do what all the others are doing. They are adjusted. Freedom means you begin to move in a direction where no one is moving. Fear grips you; you begin to feel uneasy. You cannot be certain because no one is moving there. Because freedom is such a responsibility, and such a dangerous responsibility, you go on deceiving yourself.

At the most, you choose one slavery over another; you go on substituting slaveries. A Hindu becomes a Christian, a Christian becomes a Hindu: they exchange slaveries. A man belongs to a particular party, and then he leaves it and he thinks, "I am free." Then he joins another party. We simply change bondages. A new bondage is not a freedom. Freedom means to be without any bondage, moving without a bondage. That means moving moment to moment without any certainty, moving into insecurity. We are always interested in securities.

Only two or three days before, one old lady was here. Her husband is doing meditation deeply. Now she has become worried because he has become more silent. She came to tell me, "My husband has become more silent, and I fear that if this goes on he may become a sannyasin. He may leave us, he may renounce us. So stop my husband from meditation." So I asked her if he had become more of a bad man than he was before. She said, "No, he has become more good. He is not angry now as he was before. He is more loving, more compassionate. But the whole family has become disturbed. There is a fear that he may leave us."

This fear was not only the fear of the wife. I asked her husband also. He said, "I myself have become uneasy -- because the silence is going in, and as the silence is going in everything begins to look different. My family doesn't look to be at all mine. It is as if it is someone else's family. I feel more compassion for the children, but now they are not 'mine'. I am doing everything for them and I will go on doing it, but it is as if I am doing it in a play, in a drama. I am not involved, so I myself have become afraid. If this goes on, then anything can happen. Any day I may leave them."

This fear was of the unknown. A fixed pattern had been there; now a new factor entered it. And that new factor is so alive, it will change everything. So he asked me, "If you tell me to stop, I will stop meditation. And then, in my family, everyone will be happy."

You are afraid of your freedom and everyone else is also afraid of your freedom, so we have a society of slaves. And in our families we have such a deep investment. That is why we do not move toward freedom.

Every moment you are free to choose. You can choose spirituality every moment, or you can choose old habits. To be with old habits is easy. You know them; you have lived them. Nothing is new. With the new you are in the unknown, in the dark. You have to learn again. So a person who is moving in freedom has to be a learner every moment. And he cannot rely on the past. The past will not help.

But we are all past-oriented. Only because the past *once* helped, we are habit-oriented. This is the mechanism of the inner mind. Whenever you know something, you need not bother about it. When you know something as a habit, it is transferred from your consciousness to your robot mechanism inside. It is transferred to the mechanical part of your being. Then you need not bother about it. The mechanical part will go on doing it.

If you are a driver, you go on talking, you go on thinking, you go on singing, or you can put on your radio, and drive. You are not driving. The robot part, the mechanical part, is driving. You will be needed only when something new happens, when some accident happens suddenly; then you will be required. Otherwise you are not required at all. You can be at ease somewhere else: you need not be in your car at all.

When you are driving mechanically, you are not there. You may have already reached the destination, and the robot part, the mechanical part, is still driving. Your soul can fly to the stars or to the clouds, anywhere, but the robot part does everything. This gives you a feeling of convenience. So with everything routinized you feel a convenience. With anything more, you have to be conscious, aware. When you are learning to drive, then there is a problem. You feel some discomfort in learning because then you have to be conscious.

Unconsciousness is such a drug; consciousness is such an effort. When you learn something, you have to be conscious every moment. That consciousness is felt as a strain. It is not, but because we are always behaving in a mechanical way, it seems to be. The person who is thinking in terms of spirituality must think in terms of awareness -- more and more awareness. Awareness comes only when you go on facing new factors.

Biologists say that animals live in a world where awareness is not needed, in a routine circle. They perform acts that are exactly alike. One animal's birth is not different from another animal's birth in any way. Death is not different, sex is not different. Everything is similar because everything is done by instinct. A bird makes a nest, an animal makes a den, still another animal makes something else. They make them through instinct. No learning is needed; they are never taught. This is done by their robot part. It is inherent in their cells. They must go on doing the same things.

Even if a bird is hatched without its parents there, and no other birds are allowed to meet

him, when the time is ripe he will begin to make a nest. And the nest will be the same, exactly the same, as his ancestors have been making for centuries and centuries. No one has taught them, no awareness is needed. It is just in their cells. It is instinctive, a mechanical thing, so they do it.

With man, there is difficulty. Man has to be taught everything -- EVERYTHING! Now biologists say that soon, after this century, we will have to teach sex. You will have to be trained, because now even sex is not as instinctive as it was. You may feel that there has been an eruption, an explosion of sex books all over the world. Just as there are books on how to learn driving, they now have them on how to love -- books on how to love, how to achieve perfect sex.

No animal needs anything to know about sex, so why man? With man everything has to be learned. Why? Because the robot part in man is secondary, and consciousness, which is primary, has come in. It is the central force. You have to learn everything; then choice comes in. You have to choose what to learn, what not to learn.

Spirituality will be your greatest choice. It is up to you. You may choose to look at the world in a spiritual way, you may choose to look at the world in a materialistic way. No one will tell you not to choose it and no one can force you. If you choose the materialistic outlook you will have one kind of life, and if you choose the spiritual outlook, you will have a totally different life. This is freedom.

Biologists say that this consciousness came to human life because long before, at least two million years before, some apes, the forefathers of man, came down from the trees and began to walk on two legs instead of on four. Instead of four, they began to walk on two legs. The two hands were released. With these two hands released many things happened, and the greatest was that the factor of awareness came in. When the apes were on trees, they were not in any danger. They were secured in their trees. No lion could kill them, no tiger could attack them. They were secured in their trees. They were moving in their trees from one tree to another, and that was a mechanical thing -- inherent, hereditary.

But it is yet an unknown factor -- an X -- why certain apes came down to earth. It seems many reasons are possible. It seems that either there was a sudden population explosion: they were so many that they had to find somewhere new to live -- trees were less and they became more; or, suddenly there were no rains for many years, and trees died and became dry, and they had to come down. But whatsoever may have happened, these are all guesses.

Someone has suggested recently, a great scientist, that it seems that humanity was born out of illness. Some apes became very ill because of an attack of a certain virus, a certain illness. Apes became so ill that they could not live by hanging on the trees. They became so weak that they had to come to the earth. It is possible, but whatsoever may have been the basic cause, this man is certain that when apes came down to the earth they had to be more alert. Then their mechanical habits alone couldn't do, their inherited instincts weren't sufficient. They had to walk on an unknown territory. The very walking, the stature, the posture, was so new, and their bodies were not accustomed to it. With two-legged walking, they became biped from quadruped. In their cells there was no knowledge about it. That is why when a man is born, when a child is born, he still has to learn to walk. Still it is not instinctive.

A horse is born: he can run. A calf is born: he can run. No need to learn to walk. But man has to learn to walk. And if you put a small child somewhere where no one walks and he cannot imitate, then he will not walk for his whole life.

In certain wolves' caves, some children have been found who had grown up with wolves.

They could not walk. Just four or five years back, in a forest of U.P. (India), a boy of fourteen was found in a community of wolves. They must have taken him from the village, and then he was brought up by them. Fourteen years, and he couldn't walk! He was not a biped: he was still a quadruped. He would walk on all fours, and he would walk like a wolf, not like a man.

Walking is still an effort, so when a child walks parents are so happy. The reason is because this is something valuable, an achievement. We have in our language many things which show this attitude. We say that someone is "standing on his own legs; he is standing on his own two feet". This is something valuable, something worthwhile, something to be appreciated. We condemn someone by saying, "You are still not standing on your own two feet."

Because man came into a new situation from the trees to the earth -- in which everything was new, in which the robot would not work, in which instinct would not help -- that is why intelligence developed. He *had* to be aware, and he had to be aware every moment because there were so many dangers all around. He was surrounded by enemies, and he was weak because no instinct would help now. This dangerous situation was the first school for alertness. He *had* to be alert!

Now he has created a very, very secure state of affairs, so he can be just like a robot. There is no need to be alert. That is why the sharpness, the alertness, the awareness, has to be chosen again, and you have to put yourself into new dangers. If you move into a jungle or you begin to live with a wild animal, that is not real danger. You can accustom yourself to it; it can become part of your inner robot mechanism. The only danger for man now is to live from moment to moment without the help of the past, to live from moment to moment in the present -- alert, aware, conscious. That is going to be your choice, without any cause.

Look at it in another way: science is causal. That means it is past-oriented. If something is to be found, science will go to the past. If you are ill, science will go to your past history, your case history, to see why this illness happened. Science cannot move to the future; it always moves to the past. If you are blind, science will go to your past, to your parents' past. It moves to the past; it goes to find out the cause. Then the effects can be explained.

Religion is future-oriented, not past-oriented, so "why" cannot be answered in scientific terms. It is future-oriented; you can understand it. It is not that something is causing you to be spiritual. Rather, something is calling you to be spiritual -- not causing you, but *calling* you.

Always certain spiritual persons have said, "A certain call has come to me." The call comes from the future, not from the past. It is end-oriented, not origin-oriented. Freedom is there to choose. You can choose whatsoever is going to be your destiny; you can choose whatsoever you are going to achieve and to be. If you feel hungry, you seek food: this is caused. If you feel inner tensions and then choose meditation, this is caused. Then your meditation is a scientific effort.

But it is uncaused if you say. "I do not know why, but there is a certain calling -- a call toward you. I *have* to move in this direction. I feel an unknown scent. It is not coming from my past, but it is something from the future inviting me, something unknown inviting me. I will move. It is dangerous because I do not know what is going to happen; I cannot be sure what the consequence will be. But I will move." Then it is a jump. And, remember, this is not so only in this age. This has always been so and this always will be so.

I am also asked whether I feel the present generation is capable of creating Enlightened Ones like Krishna, Lao Tzu and Christ. Spirituality is not concerned with time at all -- time or age. A Lao Tzu is born not because of a particular time; a Buddha is born not because of a

particular age. There were so many in Buddha's age, but only one became the Buddha. The age was the same to all, time was the same to all.

Time is irrelevant for spirituality because spirituality exists in eternity, not in time. Any moment is as good as any other. You can be a Buddha this very moment. Time is absolutely irrelevant. Time neither helps nor hinders. It will not say what you are, what you are going to do, or that Enlightenment cannot happen, or that because this is the twentieth century it cannot happen in this century. Time has no determining capacity for spirituality.

For other things it has. For example, you could not fly in the sky in an aeroplane in Buddha's age. You had to move in a bullock cart because only after a certain period of evolution was the aeroplane possible. Now you can move in an aeroplane, but you cannot yet go to other solar families. Whatsoever you do, you cannot go just now. We have moved only as far as the moon. It will take at least twenty centuries more to go to another solar system. To go beyond the family of this sun it will take at least twenty more centuries. It is a gradual process.

Many things will have to be developed. A bullock cart will become an aeroplane, but many steps will have to be taken. So you could not do certain things in Buddha's age as far as the outside world was concerned. But as far as the inside world is concerned, any moment, any time, is as good as any other, because when you move inside time disappears. This has to be understood.

A Buddha is meditating: he has gone deep inside. There is no time. Time ceases; he is not even aware of time. Time stops. If you move inside, time will stop. Buddha meditating twenty-five centuries before will drop out of time; meditating just today, you will also drop out of time. And there will be no difference between you and Buddha because all differences are time differences.

You wear certain clothes which Buddha cannot wear; you know many things which Buddha cannot know. You belong to a different world, a different education, a different culture, and Buddha belongs to a different world. But when you move in, you move outside -- outside of culture, outside of society, outside of education. When you go in, you go into a different world uncreated by the society, and then you can move. But it is a human tendency to think that our own age is bad, evil, that our *own* time is bad. This is a human tendency!

And this is not only the case today. It has always been so. The most ancient record has been found in Babylon. It is at least 7,000 years old, but if you publish it in any of tomorrow's morning newspapers as an editorial, it will do. You need not change anything in it. It says, "This is the age of darkness; this is the age of corruption; this is the age of immorality and sin. Everything good has disappeared, everything wise has disappeared. Youth has gone rebellious; the wife will not listen to her husband; the son will not listen to his father; the teachers are no more respected by their disciples." This is a 7,000-year-old document.

Every age thinks that it is the worst one. Why? Because we are only aware of our own age and everything around us, and we begin to compare our neighbour with Buddha. We do not know what neighbours were like then. Buddha was not your neighbour. Buddha is only one. So we compare the best one of the past with the worst one of the present. That is the problem; that is why every age appears to be the age of sin.

We think of Jesus: we do not think of Judas. We think of Ram: we do not think of Ravan. We think of Buddha: we do not think of Devadatta. He was Buddha's cousin and he tried many times to murder Buddha. He was jealous, simply jealous of why this man should be honoured and respected so much. He was just a cousin to him and nothing more. When he felt that this would not do, he renounced the world. He renounced it because it seemed to him

that people honour only that one who renounced the world. So for this reason he renounced the world, and he went into deep austerity. He practised meditation, yoga, everything, just to become higher than Gautam.

That also did not do because you cannot force yourself to be a Buddha, you cannot imitate. But Devadatta is forgotten and Buddha remains. The *whole age* is forgotten; only Buddha remains. Everything has disappeared; only Buddha remains. And then we compare Buddha with our own age. Because of that, this problem arises over whether a Buddha or a Jesus can be born today. It looks impossible. How is it possible in "this age of darkness, corruption, immorality"? How is this possible!

Another factor also enters: whenever a person is dead for twenty centuries, we forget how we behaved with him when he was alive. Jesus was crucified not because he was a great Teacher or a great Enlightened One, but only because he was "immoral, undisciplined -- against the code and against the tradition". This behaviour was not that of a respectable man. And when he was killed, it was a unanimous resolution.

Few, very few, were with him, and the whole country was against him. He had only twelve disciples, and they too left when the moment came for him to be crucified. They left! They also were doubtful inside. When everyone is against him, something must be wrong! Jesus was crucified as a hippie, as a vagabond.

You may be surprised that there is no record of his crucifixion. Jews have not even recorded the incident. It was such a minor incident, no Jew has recorded it in the Jewish history. Romans have not recorded it. If you go to find any historical record to indicate whether Jesus existed, you cannot find one. There is nothing. The Bible recorded by his disciples is the only record.

So there have been certain persons who have doubted the very existence of Jesus. They say he never existed. They say, rather, this Jesus Christ was a drama which was played in every village -- that this was only a drama, not a real historical fact, and later on, by and by, people forgot that this was a drama and it became a history. If the Bible is lost, there is no record that Jesus ever existed. If he was a very significant, prominent person, if the age was influenced by him, then it is impossible to conceive why there is no record.

It is as if he was not. He was unknown; nobody knew about him. Later on only, when disciples gathered and created an organization, by and by he became known. Otherwise he was an unknown carpenter's son. If Jesus meets you, you will not recognize him. If Buddha meets you somewhere suddenly and no one introduces you to him, you will not recognize him -- because this inner flowering is such a subtle, hidden force, that unless you are a fellow traveller, unless you are also moving in the same dimension, you cannot recognize him.

So when you ask whether it is possible now, in this age, for a Buddha to be or a Christ to be,, you again ask a meaningless question. Anywhere, in any time, Christ is possible, Buddha is possible, because the possibility belongs to the innermost realm of your being, not to the procession of events which we call history. It doesn't belong to history, it doesn't belong to time. It belongs to the innermost realm of Being which is in eternity, not time. You can be a Buddha. Take the jump and you will be! And time will not hinder you so that you cannot take the jump. This factor about time is irrelevant.

It must be understood deeply and pondered over because we are very cunning and very self-deceiving. If someone says that in this age to become a Buddha is not possible, then you begin to feel, "It is not my responsibility to transform." And there are religions which say that in this age becoming a Buddha is not possible, and in a way every religion says it. Any organized religion will say that a Jesus is born only once: "He is the only begotten son of

God, and now no one can be a Jesus again. You can only be a Christian, not a Christ."

Jains say you cannot be a *teerthanker*, you cannot be a Mahavir. The quota is finished. Only twenty-four persons can be *teerthankers*. There can be no twenty-fifth. Mohammedans will not allow you to be a prophet -- a *paigamber* -- because Mohammed is the last *paigamber* and he has brought the complete and the final message from God. No alteration is possible now, and there is no need, they say. Every organized religion will say to you that now you need not bother to be a Mohammed or a Mahavir, so just follow. You can only be a follower.

Why? Why do they say this? For two reasons: deep down you like it very much, and the responsibility is not upon you to transform yourself. The time is bad, so you are not a Jesus. It is not your responsibility. Religions will say, "In this *kaliyuga*, in this age of sin, no one can be a Christ, so, therefore, you are not one." Then it is not your responsibility. "It is the very times which hinder you; otherwise you could flower like a Jesus at any moment. You are ready, but the time is not helpful."

Everyone likes this deep down, appreciates it. Then you can be whatsoever you are. There is no burden on you to flower into a Buddha. Because of this deep satisfaction and deep, cunning deception, we are happy. We think that we can only be criminals, we can only be weak human beings. "That is all that the age allows!"

And, secondly, every religion thinks that if a Buddha is going to be born again and again, then you cannot have an organized church for Buddha because every other Buddha will disturb the whole thing. Christians cannot allow anyone to be a Christ again. Another Christ will disturb the whole Christian kingdom, because such persons are bound to be non-traditional, such persons are bound to be non-sectarian, such persons are bound to be absolutely free, independent. They will destroy any organization if they are born.

So no religion would like or appreciate a Jesus to be again in any form. The Pope is the representative and he is enough; Jesus is no more needed. So every religion goes on insisting that nothing can be done at this moment. All that you can do is to follow, worship and follow: "Just be a follower in the crowd; do not try to be an individual."

Buddha was an individual: he was not a Buddhist. He was born a Hindu, and then the organization could not contain him. No organization could. Jesus was born a Jew, he died a Jew. He was not a Christian. But because the Jews could not contain such a seed, because he could not be contained, they threw him out. And because he was thrown, the seed sprouted into Christianity.

Buddha was a Hindu. He lived as a Hindu and he died as a Hindu: he was not a Buddhist. But Hindus could not absorb him, because if you want to absorb a Buddha you will have to transform the whole society. He could not be absorbed so he was thrown out.

If a Buddha is born now into a Buddhist society he will also be thrown out. If Jesus is born now into a Christian society, he will be thrown out. It is not that Jews or Hindus are against Buddhas and Christs: any organization will be against them -- even their own organizations -- because organizations live in tradition. They exist because of tradition, and these persons are absolutely anti-tradition; rather, they are "traditionless". They move every moment in freedom; you cannot say what they will do.

That is why it is very difficult to create a sect with a living Enlightened person. It is very difficult! You are never at ease with what he is going to do, what he is going to say. When the Teacher is dead, a sect can be created. Now you know what the Teacher wants, how he behaves. Now you can categorize everything. Now you can separate, divide, analyze; now you can make a doctrine and principle out of it. Now a creed is possible.

Only a dead Teacher will allow a creed to be there. With a living Teacher, the seed is every day growing, changing, transforming, moving into the unknown. You are never certain with him. So only with a dead Teacher are creeds born. And when creeds are born, you begin to think in high terms about Jesus and Buddha. They were not thought of so highly in their own day.

So remember these two things: one, religion is a continuous process; it never stops in any age. And, secondly, spirituality is an individual phenomenon. If you choose it, it will happen to you. But no one can buy it. It needs a *total* decision.

Buddhas and Christs are not bound to any age. At this very moment there are persons who are Enlightened -- but you cannot recognize them. It will take hundreds of years for society to recognize them. When they are long dead then the society will come to feel that they were rare, that something unique had happened in the past.

I will tell you a story. Nietzsche has written one of the most wonderful books in the world -- "Thus Spake Zarathustra." In this book he has given a parable. A madman comes to the market and asks everyone, stares in their eyes and asks everyone, "Have you seen God? Where is God? I am searching; I am seeking. Where is God?"

Everyone laughs. Of course, they are all believers, but, as believers are, it is a formality with them. They think that this man has gone mad. Someone says, "Of course, there is God and He created the world. Now He is finished with us and we are finished with Him. Why are you seeking? For what purpose? Are you insane? These things are good to talk and write about -- that God is, so seek Him -- but are you *really* seeking Him?"

And that man stares in everyone's eyes and he says, "Have you heard anything about God? Where is He?"

Then the whole crowd gathers around him and they tell him, "We have not heard about Him since long. You go somewhere else. Do not disturb the market."

The man says, "I have come to deliver some news to you. I am not seeking Him. I have come only to know whether you have heard anything *lately* about Him. Do you know that He is dead?" Now they feel that certainly he is mad. He was mad when he was seeking, but he is still more mad if he says God is dead.

We believe in a dead, yet alive God -- dead so that he may not touch us and alive so that we can worship him on Sundays. But this man is mad. Either he thinks that He is still alive and He can be found or he thinks that He is dead. So they ask, "Who has told you?"

He says, "I have seen it for myself. And a still more mysterious thing is this -- that you have killed Him. But it seems that the news has not yet reached you. It will take time. You yourselves have killed Him! He is dead! But it seems that the time is not yet ripe, and I have come early. The news has not reached to the market-place, but you have killed Him. I must take this news back. The time is not ripe; I have come early. The news will take time to reach you."

Even sunrays take time. Even star-rays take time to reach you. There is thunder and there is lightning in the cloud, but it takes time to reach you -- even when you have seen it -- because there is a gap. Light travels faster than sound. And when there is thunder and lightning in the clouds you have seen the lightning, but you will hear the thunder later on. So the madman says, "He is dead, and you have killed Him. But it seems the news has not reached you yet. It will take time."

It takes time to recognize that a Buddha is a Buddha. It takes time! And it takes so much time that when Buddha is no more you recognize him, when Jesus is no more you recognize him. And when he is, you not only do not recognize him, but if someone says that he is, you

will deny it. It takes time! This is one of the most unfortunate tendencies of the human mind. Because of this we miss much.

There are stories. People have come to ask Buddha, "Someone said you are an Enlightened One. Are you really? Have you attained the unattainable?" If Buddha says, "Yes, I have attained," then they will go and say that he is an egoist. If he says, "I have not attained," they will say, "We knew it already." If he remains silent, they will say that he knows nothing.

There are hundreds and hundreds of stories. Pilate asked Jesus, "Really, you think that you are the Son of God? Really, you think so?" If Jesus says, "Yes, I am the Son of God," he is a madman. If he remains silent, he is afraid. If he denies, then they think, "We knew already that you were not." So what can a Buddha say? What can a Jesus say? But if he has been dead for twenty or twenty-five centuries you cannot go to him and ask, "Are you an Enlightened One? Really, you do not think that you are deceived by yourself? Are you not in a self-deception?"

You cannot ask it. During this long death, you cannot reach him. You begin to recognize it, but then it is useless. That recognition will not help. And if Buddha comes, you win again raise the same questions.

Why is this so? When a Buddha is present amongst you, he looks just like you. He lives like you, he eats like you, he falls ill like you, he dies like you, so how can you think: "A person just like me is Enlightened and I am not"? It is humiliating. It is deep down a hurt to the ego. Because it hurts the ego, because you feel humiliation, you deny. When you deny, you feel good.

So I will say to you that whenever you are in contact with someone who may be an Enlightened One, if you feel the tendency of the mind to deny, remember this: because of this tendency you have missed many Buddhas, and because of this tendency you will never be able to recognize one. And unless you recognize this something which has happened in someone, it is not going to happen to you. When you go on denying, and thinking that no one is a Buddha, ultimately you will come to believe that you cannot become one yourself. When no one can become one, how can you become one?

When you recognize Buddhahood in someone else, deep down you have recognized your own Buddhahood in the future. To recognize a Buddha in the present is to recognize your own future, your own future possibility, your own destiny.

The Ultimate Alchemy, Vol 2

Chapter #7

Chapter title: Toward the Silence of the Innermost Center

7 July 1972 pm in

Archive code: 7207075

ShortTitle: ULTAL207

Audio: Yes

Video: No

NISCHALATWAM PRADAKSHINAM

"STILLNESS IS PRADAKSHINA, THE MOVEMENT AROUND THAT FOR WORSHIP."

SILENCE is meditation and silence is basic for any religious experience. What is silence? You can create it, you can cultivate it, you can force it, but then it is just superficial, false, pseudo. You can practise it, and you will begin to feel and experience it -- but your practice makes it auto-hypnotic. It is not the real silence. Real silence comes only when your mind dissolves: not through any effort, but through understanding; not through any practice, but through an inner awareness.

We are filled with sounds, outside and inside. In the outside world it is impossible to create a situation which is silent. Even when we move to a deep forest, there is no silence -- only new sounds, natural sounds. At midnight everything stops, but it is not silence -- only new sounds, sounds you are not acquainted with. They are more harmonious, of course, more musical, but they are still sounds, not silence.

A modern musician and composer, John Cage, has said many times that silence is impossible. You can have musical sounds, you can have non-musical sounds; you can have sounds you like and sounds you do not like. When you do not like sounds, it becomes noise; when you like noise, it becomes music: but you cannot have silence. Cage said you cannot have silence!

He reports one incident; he thought previously, before this incident, that silence is a possibility, but he had not meditated over it. Once he entered a hall in Harvard University built particularly for some scientific engineering purpose. The hall was absolutely soundproof and echo-proof -- absolutely. He entered the hall, but he has an ear so he found sound. He is a great musician, one of the greatest of this century. In that hall he began to hear two sounds: one a high sound, another a low sound.

He said to the engineer-in-charge, "You say this hall is absolutely soundproof; you say it is echo-proof. But I hear two sounds: one high and one low."

The engineer said, "The high sound is your nervous system working and the low sound is your blood in circulation."

Cage says, "That day I become absolutely certain that unless I die silence is impossible."

Silence is impossible in the outside world, and your nervous system is part of the outside,

not of the inside; your blood circulation is part of the outside world, not of the inside. The real inside is absolutely silent. If you allow me, I will say that the absolute point of silence is the inside. Sound is outside, silence is inside. "Silence" and "inside" are synonymous. If you move out, then you move in sound. If you move in, then you move in silence. You must reach a point where no-sound is, or as the Zen Masters say, the soundless sound. The Hindu yogis have always called it *anahat nada*; the uncreated sound of silence.

But one need not use these paradoxical words: it will be easy to understand with simple words. Outside is sound, inside there is silence, soundlessness. But Cage is right. If you are thinking in terms of objective silence, there is no possibility of silence. If you are thinking of silence as being somewhere other than your inner center, then there is no possibility of it. But you can create a pseudo silence very easily. You can cultivate it, you can practise it.

For example, you can use any mantra. Constant repetition will give you a pseudo-feeling of silence, a false feeling of silence. Constant repetition of a mantra hypnotizes you. You begin to feel dull, your awareness is lost, you become more and more sleepy. In that sleepiness you may feel that you have become silent, but it is not silence. Silence means that the mind is dissolved through understanding. The more you understand your mind, the more you become aware of its mechanism and working, and the more you are disidentified with your mind.

It is identification which creates inner noise. Anger is there in the mind: you are identified with it; you do not see it as an object. The anger is there somewhere outside you, but you begin to feel angry, you begin to become one with it. Then you miss your inner center, you have moved. Many thoughts are flowing in the mind continuously, the thought process is on, and you are identified with each and every thought. Any thought is yours; you become one with it. Then you have moved.

Not only with thought do you become one, but with things still further from your center. Your house is not only your house: you have become your house. Your possessions are not just your possessions: you are identified with them. When your car is damaged, your innerness is also damaged. When your house is on fire, you are also on fire. If all of your possessions are just taken away, you will die.

We are identified with our possessions, we are identified with our thoughts, we are identified with our emotions, we are identified with everything *except* ourselves. We are identified with everything except with the innermost center. Because of this identification, noise is created, conflict, a continuous anguish, tension.

It is bound to be there because you are not your house. There is a gap and you have forgotten the gap. You are not your wife, you are not your husband. There is a gap: you have forgotten the gap. You are not your thoughts, your anger or your love or your hatred. There is a gap. When you begin to feel this gap, you are always *outside* it a witness, not involved in it. With anything in which you are not involved, you are outside it.

If John Cage, as he reports, heard his own sounds -- the nervous system working, the blood circulating -- then two things are there: one is the awareness, the knowledge, the knowing, the consciousness. A point is there inside which becomes aware that two sounds are there. But he is aware of only two sounds. He is not aware of the center which is aware of these two sounds. If he becomes aware of this center of alertness, then those two sounds are just far away. There is a gap. And the moment your focus of consciousness is transferred from object to sounds, to the soundless center of awareness, you are in silence. So I would like to say that YOU ARE SILENCE, and everything else except you is sound. If you are identified with anything, then you will never attain this soundlessness.

This sutra says: "Silence, stillness, is *pradakshina*, the movement around That for worship." You go to a temple and then you move around the altar of the deity seven times. This is a ritual of worship, but every ritual is symbolic. Why seven rounds? Man has seven bodies, and with each body there are identifications. So when someone moves in, he has to leave seven bodies and the identification with each body. There are seven rounds; when these seven rounds are complete, you are in the center.

The altar in the temple is not something outside you. You are the temple, and the altar is your inner center. If the mind moves around the center and comes nearer and nearer and nearer and, ultimately, is established in the center, this is *pradakshina*. And when you happen to be at your center, everything is silent. This silence is achieved through understanding -- understanding of your anger, your passion, your greed, your sex, everything. It is an understanding of your mind. But we are identified with our minds; we think we are our minds. That is the only problem: how to be detached from our own minds, how to be divorced, so to speak, from our own minds.

I am reminded that Mulla Nasrudin applied for divorce. The whole village gathered in the court. Everyone was just surprised, because Mulla Nasrudin was eighty-seven and his wife seventy-eight. The judge was also surprised. He asked Nasrudin, "What is your age?"

Nasrudin said, "My age is just eighty-seven -- *just* eighty-seven!"
The judge asked, "What is the age of your wife?"

Nasrudin said, "Just seventy-eight."

"And how long have you been married? How long have you lived together, Nasrudin?" the judge asked.

"Excuse me, my Lord, not more than sixty-five years -- only sixty-five years!"

The magistrate said, "I am surprised. When you have lived together continuously for sixty-five years, what is the reason for applying for divorce now?"

Mulla Nasrudin said, "My lord, enough is enough!"

With our minds also a point must be reached when you can say enough is enough. We have lived with our minds for lives together, for millennia, but still the point is not reached where we can say enough is enough. We are still not aware that our whole misery, the whole hell that we call life, is because of our minds and the identification with them. There is no need to leave the world. The only religious requirement is to leave the mind, because the mind is the world. Sometimes we get bored, frustrated, fed up -- not with the mind, but with a particular mind. Then we change it, but the change is not for no-mind. The change is again for another mind.

And that very thing happened with Mulla Nasrudin. His divorce was allowed. It was granted, and he was thinking, "When I am free from my wife I will be free at last, and then I can sleep at ease." But he couldn't sleep that night at all. He was so excited. Not that the divorce was such an excitement: the moment the divorce was allowed, he began to think of remarrying again.

This is how we go on. He was fed up with this wife, but not fed up with being a husband, not fed up with women. He was fed up only with *this* woman, not fed up with the mind which creates all these relationships and suffers. And within a week, a rumour appeared that he was going to marry a girl of seventeen. Everyone became disturbed -- the whole village. He had sons up to fifty-five years old, grand-children and children of grand-children.

His eldest son who was fifty-five approached him and said, "Dad, it does not look good to advise you, but to marry a seventeen-year-old girl at the age of eighty-seven is just absurd. And the whole village is against it, and moreover it is not good for health. It may even prove

fatal to life."

Nasrudin said, "Do not bother about it. If this girl dies, I will marry again."

This is how the mind goes on working. It is always changing outside things, things that are somewhere else, that are on the periphery. It never changes itself. The mind is the problem, and the mind is always looking outside, never in. A divorce is needed not with a particular mind, not with this or that mind, but with *mind itself*. With "minding" itself a divorce is needed, and only then do you enter silence.

So what is to be done? You can do two things: one is to transform mind itself. Another, which is very ordinary and which is done everywhere, is not to try to change this mind, but to use some technique to drug this mind. Then the mind remains as it is; no transformation is needed. A mantra is given to you, a method, a certain technique: you do it with this very mind.

You are capable of dulling it and drugging it. Then it will be less active on the surface, but it will be more active in the deeper realms. It may become absolutely inactive on the surface and you may be befuddled by it, but the activity will continue inside. Use a mantra: go on repeating Ram-Ram or Krishna -- any name -- and on the surface the mind will become silent. But inside you will feel the activity.

Just below the surface of the mind much activity is going on. Thinking continues in subdued terms, in subdued tones. Everything continues; it just goes underground. This is very easy. That is why mantra yoga is a very prevalent thing. It has appeal. Mahesh Yogi's transcendental meditation is just this sort of self-deception. It is just a trick; you can play it. It will help in the beginning, and for a few days you will feel very much edified, elevated. Then everything stops. A plateau is reached. When the surface has become a little bit silent, then you cannot do with this technique; you cannot do anything with it. And then, by and by, the subdued notes will become again clear.

This is simple auto-hypnosis. Even if you think, "I am silent, I am silent, I am getting more silent every day," you will begin to feel a certain silence. But that feeling is just thought-created. Stop thinking, and it will evaporate. This is Coue's method: just go on thinking repeatedly, continuously, that you are silent, that you are getting more and more silent day by day. Go on continuously repeating this. Constant repetition will befool you. You will begin to think, "Of course, now I am silent." This is self-deception, and it leads nowhere. You remain the same; there is no transformation.

This sutra is not concerned with such stillnesses. This sutra is concerned with the authentic silence which comes not through techniques, but through understanding. And what do I mean by understanding? Do not fight with the mind; try to understand it. Anger is there: do not be angry against anger, do not fight anger. Rather, try to understand what anger is, what this energy is, why it comes, what the cause of it is, what the origin of it is, and where the source is. Meditate upon anger, and the more you become aware of it, the less and less anger will come to you. And when there is no anger, you are thrown into your inner silence.

Sex is there: do not fight it; try to understand it. But we are fighting with ourselves. Either we are identified with the mind or we are fighting with the mind. In both the cases we are the losers. If you are identified, then you will indulge in anger, in sex, in greed, in jealousy. If you are fighting, then you will create anti-attitudes. Then you will create inner divisions. Then you will create inner polarities. And *you* will be divided -- no one else, because the anger is *your* anger. Now if you fight it, you will have double anger -- anger plus this angriness against anger -- and you will be divided. You can go on fighting, but this fight is just absurd.

It is as if I am trying to fight my right hand with my left hand. I can go on fighting. Sometimes my right hand will win, sometimes my left hand will win -- but there is no victory. You can play with the game, but there is neither defeat nor victory.

I have heard a story about D. T. Suzuki. He was a guest in a certain family -- Suzuki was a great thinker; he introduced Zen into the West, and he was himself deep in meditation -- he was staying with a certain family, and because of him the family had invited many guests there -- to meet him. They discussed many, many philosophical problems. The discussion was prolonged up until midnight. It was a long discussion of three, four or five hours. Everything was discussed without any conclusions, as always happens in philosophical discussions.

When the guests had left, the host said to Suzuki, "It was a long discussion and we enjoyed it, but there was no conclusion. It is frustrating."

Suzuki laughed and said, "I like philosophy because of this: because you can go on fighting, and there is no victory, no defeat."

This is a very refined game in which no one is defeated and no one ever wins. This is not a vulgar game in which someone wins and someone is defeated. This is such a game that you can go on playing it. No one ever wins and no one is ever defeated; and the beauty is, moreover, that everyone thinks that he has won. This is the beauty of it -- it is so.

The same happens inside also. You begin to fight with yourself because you are fighting from both the sides. No victory is possible because there is no one except you. You are playing with yourself, dividing yourself. This fight, this inner fight, is the curse of all religious persons, because the moment they become aware of the hell their minds have created they begin to fight it. But through fight, you will never move anywhere.

Many reasons are there. When you fight with your mind you have to remain with it, and when you fight with your mind it shows ignorance. The mind is there only because you have a deep cooperation with it. If the cooperation is withdrawn, the mind dissolves. Then there is no need to fight. The mind is not your enemy. It is just the accumulation of your own experiences. It is your mind because you have accumulated it. And you cannot fight with your experiences. If you do, then the greater possibility is this -- that your experiences may win. They are more weighty than you.

This happens every day. If you fight with your mind, your mind wins in the end -- not ultimately, but it wins and you have to yield. Real, authentic stillness is not achieved through fight. Fight is suppressive, repressive. And whatsoever is repressed has to be repressed again and again, and whatsoever is repressed will try to rebel against you. You will become a madhouse -- fighting with yourself, talking with yourself, taking revenge upon yourself, yielding to yourself, being defeated by yourself. You will become a madhouse!

Do not be in a fight with the mind. This will create such noise that even ordinary persons are not so filled with inner noise as religious persons are. Ordinary persons are not even bothered like this. They go on, they take it easy. They know it is a hell, but they accept what is. A religious person knows the mind is a hell, so he denies it, fights with it, and then a double hell is created.

You cannot create heaven by fighting hell. If you want to transcend, fight is not the way. Awareness, knowing what this mind is, is the way. So what is to be done? Be aware of suppressive methods. Only one thing is essential -- whatsoever you are doing, do it with full awareness. If you are angry, then be angry with awareness.

Gurdjieff used to create situations for his disciples. He would just create situations! You would have just come into the room, and Gurdjieff would create a situation in which you

were insulted. Someone would say something very abusive about you, someone else would say something else that is abusive, and you would begin to get angry. The whole group would help you to get angry, and you would be unaware of what was happening. And Gurdjieff would push you into more and more anger, and then suddenly you would burst, you would explode, you would become mad.

And then Gurdjieff would say, "Now be angry with full awareness. Do not go back, do not fall back from the anger. Just be angry." And it is easy to fall back from it. Then he would say, "Be alert inside and see what is happening in you. Close your eyes and see what is happening. From where are these clouds of anger coming? From where is this smoke coming? Find the inner fire inside from where this smoke is coming."

Gurdjieff was always creating situations. He was of the opinion that if we want a more silent world, we must teach our children how to be angry, how to be jealous, how to be filled with hate, how to be violent. We must teach them! We are doing quite the opposite. We say, "Do not be angry!" No one tells what anger is. No one teaches that if you are going to be angry, then be angry in a tactful way, then be angry efficiently, then be a master of anger. No one is teaching this! Everyone is against anger, and everyone is saying, "Do not be angry!" The child is even unaware of what anger is, but we tell him, "Don't be angry," and we go on laying down commandments: "Don't do this, don't do that."

A child was asked what his name was, and he said, "'Don't', because whenever I do anything, either my mother or my father shouts, 'Don't!' So I think this is my name. I am always called by 'Don't'."

This creates a fighting attitude. Without knowledge you are against certain things. And if you are ignorant you cannot win because knowledge is power. Not only scientifically in the outside world, but inwardly also knowledge is power.

There is electricity in the clouds. It has always been there, but we were ignorant in the past. The electricity in the clouds would only create fear in us and nothing else. Now we know about it. Now the electricity has become our slave, so there is no fear. Otherwise, the Vedas say that when God is angry with you, he will send thunder, he will send storms, lightning. When he is angry this will happen with you. It was God's anger, they said. Now we have channelized it. Now it is no more God's anger; it is no more at all related with God. We are manipulating it. Thus, knowledge becomes power.

Inner anger is just like electricity, like lightning. Previously the lightning in the clouds was God's anger; then we came to know about it. Knowledge became power, and now there is no "God's anger" in the clouds. Your anger is again an inner electricity. The moment you know about it, there will be no anger inside you. And then you can channelize your anger: it will become your servant.

A person who has no real anger will really be impotent. Anger is energy. If you do not know it, it becomes suicidal. If you know about it, you can transform the energy. You can use it. Then it is just your slave. And the same for everything. Your thoughts, they are energy; they can be used. If you become silent, you become the master of your thoughts. At present you have thoughts, but no thinking -- many thoughts and no thinking. When you have no thoughts, you have become the master of your process of thinking; you can think for the first time. Thinking is energy, but then you are the master.

With the discovery of the inner still point, you become the master. Without this discovery, you will remain a slave to your instincts, to anything. Knowledge will lead you in, so make *yourself* a laboratory. You are a universe. Find out what your energies are: they are not your enemies. What are your energies?

Choose your chief characteristic. Remember this: choose the chief characteristic. Find out whether anger is your chief characteristic or sex or greed or jealousy or hate. What is your chief characteristic? Find out first, because if you go on without knowing the chief characteristic, it will be a difficult process to go in -- because the chief characteristic has your energy in it. It is the central thing; everything else is just secondary to it, subsidiary to it.

If your anger is the chief characteristic, then all else will be just a support to it. Find the center of your energies, and then begin to be aware of it. Then forget everything else. If greed is your chief characteristic, then be aware of greed and forget everything else. When greed is solved, everything else will be solved. And remember this: do not imitate anyone else because another's chief characteristic may be a different thing.

Because of this imitative tendency, we create unnecessary problems. For example, Buddha had one thing to transform. Mahavir had another thing, Jesus something else. If you blindly follow Jesus, then you will begin to fight with the chief characteristic of Jesus rather than with your own, and that will misguide you. If you blindly follow Buddha, then again you are misguided. Understand Buddha, understand Jesus, but find your own disease and concentrate your awareness on that particular disease. If the main disease is solved, minor diseases will dissolve by themselves.

We go on fighting with minor diseases. Then you can waste lives together. You change one minor disease and another minor disease will be created, because the source of energy, the central source of your disease, remains intact. So you can only change a disease if you are working with minor diseases. We are even afraid to find out what our chief disease is.

Many, many persons come to me, and I am surprised, always surprised, that whatsoever they say is their problem is never the case. They even deceive about their problems. When I work with them, when I observe them and they become more frank, more naked, then new problems arise. One old man was here of about fifty-eight or fifty-nine. He would always come and talk about meditation and how to do it, and he said, "I am interested now continuously for twenty-five years in meditation. That is my only interest."

But that was not the case at all. Meditation was not his interest at all. By and by, it became apparent to him also that he was not interested in meditation. He was interested in a reputation that he is a great meditator. Reputation was his interest; ego was the problem. And he would always say, "Ego is not my problem: I am a humble man. But too many thoughts is my problem, so how to dissolve these thoughts?" The chief characteristic was only one thing: the thought of ego was the problem. And he was always avoiding the chief disease.

So you can go on cutting the leaves of a tree, and the tree will again put out new leaves. You cut one and the tree will supply two, and the tree will be greener for your effort, more green. You cannot cut leaves; you can only cut roots. Leaves and roots are different things. When I say "the chief characteristic", I mean the root. When I say "minor problems", I mean leaves. And the problem becomes more difficult to solve because leaves are apparent and roots are underground. They are the source of all the leaves. You cut the whole tree, and a new tree will come out because the roots are intact. You cut the roots, and the tree will disappear automatically. There is no need to be bothered with the tree.

But the roots are underground: your chief characteristic will always be found underground. So whatsoever you say is your problem, is never the case. It can be taken for granted that that is not the case. Rather, quite the opposite may be the case, because we go on hiding our inner weaknesses. And just to distract the mind, just to forget the real problems, we create minor problems.

One day a man came to Mulla Nasrudin. He was an old man from the village -- wise in

everything, wise in all worldly ways. The man was suffering from a cold for a long time. He was very ill. He had tried every medicine, but to no avail. So he asked Mulla if he could advise what to do. Mulla said, "You go to the lake at midnight." The night was ice cold and the lake was just freezing. "You take a bath, then be naked and run around the lake."

Winds were blowing fast; the man said. "What are you suggesting? I am suffering from a cold. I may become even more ill: I may get pneumonia."

Mulla Nasrudin said, "If you can get pneumonia, I have the medicine for it. But for a common cold there is no medicine. If you get pneumonia, then I can help you."

In your inner world, you go on avoiding problems which you cannot solve. You try to forget problems which you cannot solve; you begin to focus your mind on problems which you can solve. Because of that, your chief diseases go underground. Ultimately, you are not even aware of them, and you go on fighting with phoney problems that are not real problems. These phoney problems can take much energy and can dissipate your energies, destroy them; and you remain the same because you go on fighting with the leaves.

So the first thing toward inner stillness is to find out what the root of your problems, of your conflicts, of your tension, is -- what the *root* is! Do not think about how to solve it, because if you think of solving you will be afraid. Do not think of solving it. First, there must be a simple finding out of what the chief characteristic of the mind is, what the center of the mind is. No question about solving it, no idea about changing it, just take a simple inventory to find out what the chief problem of your mind is.

Do not go on escaping from the chief characteristic and do not create phoney problems. It will not help. Even if you solve them, it will not help. Once you know the chief characteristic of your mind, just be aware of it: how it works, how it creates inner nets, how it goes on working inside and influencing your whole life. Just be aware. Still do not think about how to change it, because the moment you begin to think about how to change it you miss the opportunity of being aware.

Anger is there, greed is there, sex is there: do not think of changing them, do not think of transcending them. They are there: be aware. Transcendence is not a result, it is a consequence. Remember this difference. The difference is subtle. Transcendence is not a result: it is a consequence! What do I mean? You cannot think about transcendence; you cannot think how to go beyond mind. By thinking you will never go. If I say, "Be aware," I do not mean that by awareness you can go beyond mind.

Someone was here just the other day. He is struggling to be in meditation, to be silent. But he is in such a hurry that that hurry becomes the obstacle. Whenever he comes, he asks "How many days more will it take? I have been doing meditation for three months, and nothing has happened yet."

So I told him, "Unless you leave this constant hankering over when it will happen, it is not going to happen at all."

The man said to me, "I can leave it; I will not hanker after the result. But tell me, if I leave this, then when will it happen? I can leave this; even this I can leave. I will not bother you again. But tell me, if I leave this, then when will it happen?"

So if I say that by awareness you will transcend, do not think that awareness is a method and that because you want to transcend then you will transcend. Do not think, "Of course, if awareness is the method, then I am going to practise it; through it I will transcend." Then you will never transcend. If awareness is attained, transcendence happens. It is a consequence: it comes. If awareness is, then transcendence will come. Then you will go beyond your mind; you will reach the inner center of stillness. But you cannot desire it.

That is what I mean when I say that it is not a result. A result can be desired, but a consequence follows. It cannot be desired! A result can be manipulated, planned, but a consequence cannot be manipulated, cannot be planned. If you are *really* aware, you will transcend. Awareness is not a method for transcendence. AWARENESS IS TRANSCENDENCE. This constant awareness of your mind dissolves your greed, your anger, your sex, your hate, your jealousy, by and by. They dissolve automatically. There is no effort to dissolve them, not even any intention to dissolve them, not any longing to dissolve them. They are there, so rather than an intention to dissolve them, acceptance is more helpful.

Accept your anger. It is there: accept it and be aware of it. These are two things: acceptance and awareness. And you can be aware only if you accept totally. If you do not accept me, you cannot look at my face. If you do not accept me, you will try to avoid me in subtle ways. Even if I am present in the room, you will look in some other direction, you will think of something else. If you do not accept me, if you reject me, your whole mind will try to avoid me. If you reject anger, you cannot be aware. You cannot encounter it face to face. And when anger is encountered face to face, it dissolves. When sex is encountered face to face, the energy is released into a different dimension. Encounter your mind and accept it.

The negative teachings, the condemnatory teachings, teachings which are based on struggle, have created this, our so-called world. The whole earth is a madhouse, and everyone is just on the verge of being mad.

Now psychologists say there are two types of madness: one, normal madness; and the other, abnormal madness. Normal madness means everyone is like that. Abnormal madness means you have gone a little further. There is no difference really of quality. It seems the difference is quantitative, only of degrees. And when you are angry, really, you are temporarily mad. You have gone from the average madness to the abnormal madness. When one is filled with passion, mad passion, he is not the average normal man. He is a different man altogether. And in a twenty-four-hour day, many times you touch the abnormal madness.

That is why when someone commits a murder we begin to think that man was not the type to do such a thing. We knew him, but we knew him only in his average madness. Someone commits a crime, and we cannot believe it. We feel that that man was not such a man. But we only knew him in his average madness. The non-average, abnormal madness is always there. Any time the abnormal mad mind can get hold of you -- any moment.

William James visited a madhouse, and for thirty-seven years afterwards he could not sleep well because in the madhouse, for the first time, he became aware that whatsoever has happened to others can happen to him at any moment. He saw a madman who was beating his own head, beating his head against a wall. He came back: he could not sleep that night. His wife was disturbed also. He said, "I am disturbed, very much disturbed. That which has happened to that man can happen to me also."

His wife laughed and said, "Why are you unnecessarily worrying! You are not going to be mad."

William James said, "Only a few days before, that man was also not mad and now he is mad. I am not mad, but tomorrow I can become mad. What is the guarantee?"

Of course, there is no guarantee because it is only a question of degrees. There is no guarantee! You may be just on the verge; then something happens and you are pushed beyond it. Your wife dies or your house is burned, and you are pushed a degree ahead.

This situation, this mad situation of humanity, is a by-product of constant struggle with one's own mind. Sanity is always based on acceptance. This is the secret. If a madman can accept his madness totally, madness will disappear. With whatsoever you can accept totally, a

new phenomenon happens inside. Through acceptance, conflict is dissolved, and the energy that was being dissipated in conflict is not dissipated now. You become stronger. With this strength and awareness, you go higher than your mind. So you should have acceptance of the mind and awareness of the mind -- and a third thing: you should move in this world, live in this world, not from the periphery, but from the center.

Someone abuses you; he is speaking against your name. The man who lives from the periphery will think, "He is saying something against ME." The man who lives from the center will think, "He is speaking against the name, and I am not the name. I was born without any name. The name is just a label on the periphery, so why become disturbed? He is saying something not against me, but against the name." You are identified with the name, so you become disturbed. If you can feel the gap between the name and you, between the periphery and you, then the periphery is hurt, but the hurt never reaches to the center.

One Hindu sannyasin, Swami Ramteerth, was in America. Someone abused him, but he came laughing and told his disciples, "Someone was abusing Ram very much. Ram was in great difficulty. He was being abused, and he was in great difficulty."

So the disciples asked, "About whom are you talking? Ram is your name."

Ramteerth said, "It is, of course, my name -- but not me. They do not know me at all. How can they abuse me? They know only my name."

Even if your action is abused, it is not you -- only the action. If you can maintain a gap -- and that is not difficult with awareness: it is the most easy thing -- then the periphery is touched, but the center remains untouched. If the center remains untouched, sooner or later you are bound to discover the point of deep stillness which is not only your point, but the point, the central point, of the whole Existence.

I was reading a story just this morning. It is one of the most beautiful stories. One young seeker, after a long and arduous journey, reached the hut of his Master, the Master of his choice. It was evening, and the Master was just sweeping fallen leaves. The seeker greeted the Master, but the Master remained silent. He asked many questions, but there were no replies. He tried in every way to get the attention of the Master, but the Master was there as if he were alone. He went on sweeping the fallen leaves.

Seeing no possibility of getting the attention of the Master, the disciple decided to make a hut in the same forest and to live there. He lived there for years. After a time, the past dropped, because in order for it to continue one has to go on creating it daily. You have to create your past again and again daily in order to continue it. But in the forest everything was silent. No man was there; only the Master was there who was just like "no-man". There was no communication. He would not even reply to a greeting; he would not even look at the disciple. His eyes were just vacant, an emptiness.

So after a time, the past dissolved. The disciple continued to be there. Thoughts were there; then by and by they slowed down because you have to feed them daily for them to continue. If you do not feed them, they cannot continue forever. With nothing to do, he would relax, sit silently, sweep the fallen leaves. One day, after many years, he was sweeping the fallen leaves and he became Enlightened. He stopped everything, and he ran to the Master's hut and went in. The Master was sweeping fallen leaves. The disciple said, "Thank you, Sir!"

Of course, the Master never replied. But this "thank you" is beautiful. He went to the Master and said, "Thank you, Sir." Only because of this Master not replying to him -- not giving any intellectual answers, not even looking at him, remaining so silent -- only because of this did he learn something from the Master. He learned this silence; he learned this living

in the center without being bothered by the periphery.

Someone is greedy: this is a peripheral matter; let him be greedy. Someone is asking something: this is a peripheral matter; let him ask. The Master remained undisturbed. He went on sweeping his dead leaves. He didn't say anything, but he showed a way. He did not say anything, but he answered. HE WAS THE ANSWER! Such a silence the disciple had never before known! Such an absent presence he had never witnessed! It was as if the man was not there, as if the man was a nothingness, not a man; a nobodiness, not a man.

Without saying anything, the Master had said much. Rather, he *showed* much, and the disciple followed. It was only one lesson, but a very secret one: to remain in the center and not be bothered by the periphery. For years together, the disciple tried to remain in the center not being bothered by the periphery. One day, while sweeping the fallen dead leaves, he was Awakened. Years had passed, and now there was such gratefulness! He stopped everything, ran to the Master and said, "Thank you, Sir!" Just by following a hidden answer, it happened.

But it depends on you. Someone else in his place might have felt humiliated, insulted, might have felt that this man is mad, might have got angry. Then he would have missed a great opportunity. But he was not negative. He took it very positively. He felt the meaning of it, he tried to live it, and the thing happened. It was a consequence; it was not a result. He could have imitated, but this was not imitation. He never came again. He was in the same forest, but he never came again until the happening. He came only twice: first he came to greet the Master, and then he came to thank him.

What was he doing for all these years? It was a simple lesson. There was only one secret, but it was the most basic one. He tried not to be bothered by the periphery. He accepted himself. Not bothering with the periphery, not being bothered by the periphery, he remained aware. He was so aware, really, that it was as if these twenty years were not there. And when the thing happened, when the happening was there, he ran as if nothing had happened within these twenty years. Twenty years before, the Master had shown him a way, but it was as if these twenty years were not there. He reached the Master to thank him -- as if he had shown him the way just a moment before.

If silence is there, time disappears. Time is a peripheral matter. If silence is there, you become grateful to everything -- to the sky, to the earth, to the sun, to the moon, to everything. If silence is there, any moment the old world disappears, the old you is no more there. The old man is dead, and a new life, a new energy, is born.

This sutra says that this is *pradakshina*. If you can enter into the center of your Being, this is stillness -- where there is no sound. Only then have you entered the temple, worshipped the deity, encircled, done the ritual. In a temple, we can go on continuously doing the ritual without ever being aware of what this ritual means. Every ritual is a secret key. The ritual in itself is childish. If you do not know that a key is a key, you can play with it. But then you might as well throw it, since in the end you will come to realize that this is meaningless -- because you do not know the lock and you do not know the key or that something can be opened by it. These are secret languages.

Rituals are secret languages. Through them something has been communicated. Books can be destroyed because languages become dead; the meaning of words goes on changing. Because of this, whenever there has been an Enlightened One he has created certain rituals. They are more permanent languages. When the scriptures disappear, when religions become dead, when old languages cannot be understood or can be misinterpreted, the rituals continue.

Sometimes a whole religion disappears, but the rituals go on. They become transplanted into new religions. They enter new religions without anyone being aware of what is

happening. Rituals are a permanent language, and whenever one goes deep in them the secrets are discovered. This Upanishad is basically concerned with the ritual of worship, and every act is meaningful.

In itself it looks childish. It is stupid to go into a temple and make rounds around the altar or around the image of the deity. It looks stupid! What are you doing? In itself it is stupid because we have forgotten that the key is a key. Its meaning is in knowing the lock; its meaning is in opening the lock. These seven rounds around the altar are concerned with the seven bodies, and the altar is concerned with the innermost center.

Move around your center, go on moving inwards, and a moment comes when every movement stops. Then there is no sound: you have entered silence. This silence is Divine, this silence is bliss, this silence is the aim of all religions, and this silence is the purpose of all life. And unless you attain this silence, whatsoever you may attain is useless, meaningless; even if you can attain the whole world, it is of no use.

But if you attain this inner silence, this center, and you lose the whole world, even then it is worth attaining. No bargain is bad -- even if everything is staked, sacrificed. When you achieve the inner silence you know that whatsoever you have paid for it was nothing. What you receive is invaluable; what you have lost for it was just rubbish.

But the rubbish is wealth to us, the rubbish is very valuable to us. And I will repeat again: if you think that you can purchase with this rubbish, then you will never be able to get to the center. The center cannot be a result. If you throw this rubbish, you attain to it: that is a consequence.

"Stillness is *pradakshina*, the movement around That for worship": around That, the inner center or the innermost center. "This" is the periphery, "That" is the center. So go on leaving "this" and go on moving toward That. This is all that *sadhana* consists of; this is the path.

The Ultimate Alchemy, Vol 2

Chapter #8

Chapter title: Questions and Answers

8 July 1972 pm in

Archive code: 7207085

ShortTitle: ULTAL208

Audio: Yes

Video: No

OSHO, LAST NIGHT YOU EXPLAINED INNER STILLNESS THROUGH THE DIMENSION OF INNER SILENCE. PLEASE EXPLAIN INNER STILLNESS FROM SOME OTHER DIMENSION.

STILLNESS has many dimensions. One is silence: it is the polar opposite of sound; it is soundlessness. The second dimension is no-movement: it is the polar opposite of movement. Mind is movement just as mind is sound. Sound travels and mind also. Mind is on a constant move, never standing still. You cannot conceive of a still mind. There exists no such thing, because when stillness is, mind is no more; when mind is, there is movement. So what is the movement of mind? Through it we can conceive of the second dimension of stillness -- no-movement.

Outwardly we know what movement means -- moving from one spot to another, from one place to another, from A to B. If you are at A and you then move to B, movement has taken place. So outside of the mind, movement means changing places in space. If there is no space, you cannot move. You need space to move outwardly.

Inward movement is not in space but in time. If there is no time, you cannot move inside. Time is inner space: from one second you move to another second, from this day to another day, from here to somewhere else, from now to then, in time. Time is inner space. Analyze your mind and you will see that you are always moving from past to future or from future to past. Either you are moving in past memories or you are moving in desires for the future.

When you move from the past to the future or from the future to the past, only then do you use the present moment -- but just as a passage. The present is nothing but the dividing line between past and future for the mind. For the mind, the present is not really existential. It is just a dividing line from where you can move to the past or to the future. Mind is never in the present because you are unable to move in the present. Understand this: you are unable to move in the present. In the present there is no time. The present is always a single moment. You are never in two moments together; only the moment is given to you. You cannot move from A to B because only A exists; there is no B.

Understand this quality of time in the present: you are always given only a single

moment. Whether you are a beggar on the street or an emperor, it makes no difference. Your time wealth is the same -- only one moment at a time -- and you cannot move in it. There is no place to move to, and mind exists only in movement. So mind never uses the present; it cannot use it. It goes back to the past. There it has many points to move to. There is a long memory: your whole past is there.

Or else it goes to the future. Again you can imagine because future also is basically only the past projected. You have lived, you have experienced many things. You desire them again or you desire to avoid them: that is your future. You loved someone; it was beautiful, blissful. Then you desire it again, so you project into the future your wish to repeat it. You were ill, you suffered, and you want to avoid it in the future. so you project not to be ill again. So your future is just a projected past, and you can move in the future.

But the mind is not satisfied with the future that belongs to this life. It projects heaven, it projects future lives. It is not satisfied with a small future, so beyond death also mind creates time. The past and future are vast territories; you can move easily in them. With the present you cannot move. No-movement means to be in the present. That is the second dimension of stillness. If you can be in the moment, just here and now, you will be still. You cannot be anything else. Then no other possibility exists but to be still.

Live in the now, and movement will stop because the mind will stop. Do not think of the past and do not project into the future. That which is given to you is all and all. Stick to it, remain in it, be content with it. This very moment is the only real existential time; there is nowhere else. The past is just a memory. It is just in your mind, just accumulated dust, accumulated experience. There is no past in the Existence, there is no future in the Existence. Existence is the present.

If man were not on this earth, there would be no past and no future. Flowers would flower, of course, but in the present. The sun would rise, but in the present. The earth would not know anything of the past, would not dream anything of the future. There would be no past, no future. The past is in the mind, in the memory, and because of that memory it is projected into the future. So ordinarily we divide time into three parts -- past, present and future. But, really, the past and future are not a part of time at all. They are parts of the mind, not parts of time. Time has only one division, if you can call it a division: that is the present.

Time is always the present. These three divisions are not divisions of time. Past and future belong to the mind, not to time at all. To time, only the present belongs. But then it is difficult to call it the Present because to us, linguistically, present means something *between* the past and the future. It refers to the past, it refers to the future. If there were no past and no future, then the word "present" would lose all meaning.

Eckhart is reported to have said that there is no time -- only the eternal now. There is an eternal now and an infinite here. When we say "there", it is only in reference to where we are; otherwise there is only here. If I am not here, then what point will be here and what point will be there? In reference to myself, I call the nearer place here, and that which is not near I call there. Where does the here end and where does the there begin? We cannot demarcate the line. Really, it is all one "hereness" -- an infinite here.

Because of the mind we divide time. Then that which we have experienced becomes the past, that which we expect to experience becomes the future, and that which we are passing through becomes the present. But if there is no mind, then it is again an infinite now, an eternal now. Here, just now, is the reality. There and then are parts of mind, not parts of reality.

To conceive of stillness from the second dimension means making an effort to live

moment to moment. Then you will be still; you will be silent. Then there will be no trembling inside, no wavering inside, no movement. Everything will have become a pool of deep silence.

Why does this mind move into the past and the future? Buddha has given the name *tanha* to *trishna* -- desire. Buddha says that because you have experienced something, you desire it again. Because you desire, you move into the future. Do not desire, and there is no future. It is difficult because when mind experiences pleasure it wants to repeat it, and when mind feels displeasure it doesn't want to repeat it: it wants to avoid it. Because of this it is a very natural thing that the future is created, and because of this future we go on missing the present.

You are listening to me: you can just listen; then you will not have any mind at all. It will be a mindless listening. But if you are listening and trying to understand also, then you have moved into the future. If you are thinking of what is being said to you, you have missed what is being said to you: you have moved to the future. And the present is such a subtle and delicate thing and such a minute, atomic thing that you can miss it in a single moment of the mind. Just a jerk, and you have missed it.

If you are listening, then just listen. Do not think about what is being said, do not try to find out the meaning -- because you cannot do two things in the present: listening is enough. And if you are simply listening, then you are in the present, and even listening becomes a meditation.

Mahavir has said that if you can just listen rightly you need not practise anything else. Just by being a *shravak*, a right listener, you will achieve everything that can be achieved -- just by being a *shravak*, a right listener -- because just listening is not *just* listening: it is a great phenomenon. And once you know the secret, you can apply it anywhere. Then just eating will be meditation, just walking will be meditation, just sleeping will be meditation. Then anything with which you are in the moment, without any movement into the future, will be meditation.

But we do not know any activity in which we are in the present. Either we begin to think of the past or of the future. The present is continuously missed. That means the Existence is continuously missed. And then it becomes a chain process; then it becomes a habit.

One evening Mulla Nasrudin was walking down a street. The street was lonely and suddenly he became aware of some horsemen, some troops coming toward him. His mind began to work. He thought that they may be robbers, that they may kill him. Or, they may be soldiers of the King and he may be pressed into military service or something. He made himself frightened. And when the horses and their sounds came nearer, he bolted, ran away and jumped into a cemetery, and just to hide from them he lay down in an open grave.

Seeing this man suddenly moving away, the horsemen, who were just innocent travellers, became aware of what had happened. They ran after Mulla Nasrudin and came near his grave. He was lying there with closed eyes as if dead. "What has happened?" they asked. "Why have you suddenly become so frightened? What is the matter?"

Then Mulla Nasrudin realized that he had unnecessarily frightened himself. He opened his eyes and said, "It is a very complicated thing, very complex. If you insist on asking why I am here, I will tell you. I am here because of you, and you are here because of me."

This is a vicious circle. If you desire, then you have moved into the future, and this will create the vicious circle. When that future becomes the present, you will again move into the future. Today I will think of tomorrow: this will become a habit. And tomorrow never comes. It cannot come; that is impossible. When it comes it is again today, and I have created a habit of always moving from today to tomorrow. So when tomorrow comes it comes as

today, then I again move toward tomorrow.

This is a chain! And the more you do it, the more you become efficient in doing it. And the tomorrow never comes. Always that which comes is today, and with today you have no relationship. You have a mechanism: because it is today, you move. This is a very great habit -- not only of this life, but of lives together. One has to break it, one has to come out of it. Whatsoever you are doing, remember only one thing: remain in the present while you are doing it. It is difficult, arduous, and you cannot succeed immediately. A long habit has to be broken. It is going to be a tough struggle, but try. The very effort will create a gap, and the very effort will sometimes give you some moments of the present. And once you know the taste, you are on the path.

But you do not even know the taste of the present. You have never tasted it, you have never lived in it -- *never*, I say. And it is always here. It is the very life; it is all that is in life.

Jesus says that we are just dead -- *not* alive! One day, he was passing by a fisherman just as the morning sun was going to rise. The fisherman had thrown his net into the lake, and Jesus put his hand on the fisherman's shoulder and said, "Are you going to destroy your whole life just catching fish? I can show you something better to catch. I can make you a fisherman of life." The fisherman looked at Jesus as if some magnet was working on him. Then he threw away his net and followed Jesus.

When they were just going out of the village, someone came running and told the fisherman, "Your father is dead. He has just died, so come home. Where are you going?"

The fisherman asked permission. He said to Jesus, "Allow me to go home. Soon I will come back. I have to bury my dead father."

Jesus said, "Let the dead bury the dead. You need not go; you follow me. There are many dead men in the village. They will bury the dead."

For Jesus, *we* are dead men because we have never tasted life. never tasted the present, the existential. We live in the dead past, and we go on projecting the dead past into the future. This is what Shankara says is MAYA -- illusion. Shankara has been very much misunderstood. When Shankara says that the whole world is an illusion, he means *man's world* is an illusion, not the world.

We do not know anything about the world. We have created our own mental world. Everyone has his own world -- this world of past and future, this world of memories and desires. This world is false, illusory. So when Shankara says that this world is false, it means *your world*, not the world. And when your world is no more, you will come to know the real world. And Shankara says that that is the Brahman, that is the Truth -- the absolute Truth.

It is as if we are living in a dreamworld, everyone surrounded by his own dreams, the cloudy mist of dreams. Everyone is moving surrounded by his own dreams. And because of these dreams we cannot see what is true, what is real. The real is hidden behind our dreams. This dreaming mind is the unstill mind; the nondreaming mind is the still mind. But desires create dreams. You dream in the night because you desire in the day. If you do not desire in the day you *cannot* dream in the night.

A Buddha cannot dream, because dreams are desires and desires are dreams. When they are in the day you call them desires; when they are in the night you call them dreams: But every desire is a dream. Why? Because every desire is in the future which is not: every desire is a future desire which is not. The future is not!

We go on dreaming. This dreaming must be broken. This dreaming is a movement, a continuous movement. You are filled with dreams -- dreams that are broken, burned, newly created. Every day we have to throw out old ones and create new ones.

Any moment, in any activity, try to be here and now. Even the effort is a barrier, but one has to begin. At the beginning you will *have* to make an effort. Even the effort is a barrier because effort again moves you into the future. But in the beginning one has to make an effort; then in the second stage one has to make an effortless effort; and then in the third stage effort disappears and you are in the present.

You are walking on a street: try just to walk; do not do anything else. It looks simple: it is not! It looks as if we are all doing it; it is not so! When you are walking, your mind is doing a thousand other things. Move with every step. Just walk.

Buddha has said, "When you are walking, just walk; when you are eating, just eat; when you are listening, just listen." Be in the act totally; do not allow your mind to move somewhere else. And this is a wonderful experience because suddenly the present will break in. Into your world of dreams, the world of reality will penetrate. And if you have this glimpse, even for a single moment, you will be a different person. Then you will know something which is just here and now, around you, and you are missing it. You are missing it only because of a mechanical habit, and one cannot do anything other than to try to be non-mechanical.

Sometimes, with awareness, miracles happen. I was reading that in Russia, in the old days before the revolution, in a small provincial town, a drama was enacted. Suddenly the manager became aware that one person was missing who was essential in the last act. One man was needed in a particular role in which he had to stutter. The man was missing, so they tried to find someone to replace him. Then someone suggested that it would be difficult to catch him just at that time; but in that village there was one boy who was just perfect. He did not need to undergo any training because he stuttered naturally. So the boy was brought. Many doctors had tried to cure him, many medicines were tried. but the stuttering had continued.

So the boy was called and given the role. There was no need for him to practise. Just when the boy entered on the stage, he tried to stutter and he could not. He began to speak as faultlessly as anyone. The more he tried, the more impossible it was. What had happened? For the first time the mechanical habit of stuttering was broken by awareness. Now he was doing it with full alertness. He was *trying* to do it. He was conscious, and the disease disappeared. It had been a mechanical habit, but the very effort to do it consciously made it impossible.

I was in a town. A professor was brought to me. He was a professor in a college -- a very learned, sensible, rational man. But he was suffering -- suffering much because he had imbibed the habit of walking like a woman. And that was a problem for him, particularly in a college. Everyone would laugh. He was psychoanalyzed, treated, hospitalized, but nothing would result from any effort. And the more he tried, the more he willed not to do it, then the more the thing would happen, so he became confused.

He was brought to me. I told him, "Do not fight with the habit. Rather, do it consciously. When you walk on the street, walk like a woman. *Try* to walk like a woman."

He said, "What are you telling me? I am already in so much trouble. And if I myself *try* to walk that way, then it will be even worse."

So I told him, "You have tried continuously for twenty years not to walk like a woman. Now try the contrary. You stand here. Just walk in this room before me."

He was very shy about it. Still, he tried, but he couldn't walk. He said, "What has happened? What are you doing? Have you done something? It is a miracle! I am trying, and I *cannot* walk like a woman."

I told him, "Go, and continue doing it. Go to your college. Try in every way to walk like a

woman."

In the evening he came. He was just ecstatic. He said, "How can I thank you? It seems impossible, but it is miraculous. The trick has worked. I cannot walk. If I *try* to walk, I cannot. What has happened!"

The moment you bring your alertness to any mechanical habit, it stops, because a mechanical habit feeds on your unconsciousness. So willpower won't do. Awareness will do! And remember the difference: in willpower you begin to fight with the habit, and if you try to fight with the habit, you have accepted it. When I say to do it consciously, I mean not to fight with it. Give it your full support; do not be "anti" to it.

You are walking on the street: give your full support to your walking. Be one with it; be aware of what is going on. Now the left leg, now the right, is moving. Feel every moment consciously. Remain with the moment; do not allow your mind to move anywhere else. If the mind moves because of old habits, bring it back again. Do not become frustrated. If the mind moves, then do not say, "It is impossible. I cannot do it" -- no! Bring your mind back again. Try again, and sooner or later you will begin to feel some moments, howsoever rare they are, when you will taste the feeling of the present. What it is to feel the present! And once you feel the present, you are just near the door of Existence. You can enter it.

Stillness in this dimension means no movement of the mind in the past or the future. No movement! Just remain in the present. You can understand it intellectually; you may even feel that it is okay. But intellectual understanding will not help. Rather, it may be a deception; it may prove a deception. You will have to DO IT! Thinking is of no help.

You are lying on your bed; you are just going to sleep: feel this state of lying on the bed. Feel the touch of the bed, the touch of the bedsheets and the sounds all around, the traffic sounds or whatsoever is going on there. Feel it! Be there; do not think, just feel. Be in the present. And in that feeling state, fall into sleep. You will have less dreams that night; you will have a deeper sleep. In the morning, you will have a fresher awakening.

When in the morning you feel for the first time that sleep has broken, do not just jump out of the bed. Remain there for five minutes. Feel again the sheets, the warmth, the coldness, or the rain falling on the roof, or the traffic that has begun again, or the world that is awakening, the noise, the birds singing -- feel them for five minutes. Do not rush into the day just now. Be with the morning. Otherwise your sleep will be broken, and you will have rushed and moved into the future.

You have gone to the market or to your office, but you have rushed, you have moved. For five minutes just *be there*. Do not move so fast: there is no hurry. These five minutes will become meditative. These moments in the morning and in the night are the best moments. At that time it is very easy to get the feeling of the present.

The moment of just falling into sleep is a very vulnerable moment. Be sensitive to everything around. Do not think. *Feel!* Feeling is always in the present and thinking is never in the present. So in the morning, when the mind is fresh after a night's sleep and the body is relaxed and you have no energy to work with, *feel* for five minutes and then come out of your bed. But be alert that you are coming out of the bed. Take every step with full awareness. And in the morning it is very easy. In the afternoon it will not be so easy; in the evening it will become more difficult.

Go to your bath and take a shower: FEEL! Feel the water of the shower falling on you, feel every drop falling on you. Forget everything else. Just remain under this shower and feel the present.

Even the morning bath can become a deep meditation. When the water is falling on you,

you can have a deep communion with nature. Remain there for a few minutes, and then try to continue this feeling. You are taking your breakfast or you are eating your food: try to continue it. It will be more and more difficult, but go on trying. A time soon will come when you can move throughout the day in the present, when you can remain in the present. And once this happens, you will know what stillness is.

This is the second dimension. There is a third dimension also, and it will be good to know about it. One is silence as against sound. That is one dimension: soundlessness. The second is stillness as against movement; that is non-movement, no-movement. And the third is non-being as against ego -- egolessness. The third is the deepest.

Buddha has said, "Unless *you* cease to be, you cannot be still. You are the problem, you are the noise, you are the movement. So unless you cease completely you cannot attain perfect stillness. Because of this, Buddha is known as *anatmawadi* -- one who believes in no-self.

We go on thinking that we are, that "I am". This "I" is a very false thing. And because of this I, many diseases are created; because of this I, you go on accumulating the past; because of this I, you go on thinking about repeating past pleasures. Everything else hangs on this I -- the past, the future, the desires.

Buddha came to know through deep meditation that we can leave the desires of the world, but if the I remains then it begins to desire MOKSHA -- Ultimate Liberation, freedom to be one with God, to be one with the Brahman. If this I remains, desires will be there, whatsoever their direction and whatsoever their object.

Buddha says, "Drop this I-centered existence." But how to drop it? Who will drop it? If there is no I, who will drop it? Who will think to drop it? By "dropping" is meant to go inside and find it, to search for it, to see where it is, whether it is or not -- because those who have gone in and those who have searched for it have never found it. It is only those who have never gone in, never searched for it, who believe in it, that it is there. No one has ever found that anything like "I" exists.

When I say "I am", the "am" is the reality, not the "I". When you go in you feel a certain "am-ness": a certain existential feeling is there. You know something is there, but it is not you. There is no feeling of I. Only a diffused am-ness is felt, the Existence is felt with no I.

So another thing for entering into the third dimension: whenever you have time, *whenever*, try to find out where this I is. You need not go to a temple. If you go, it is good, but you need not. You are just travelling in the train: close your eyes; try to find out where this I is. In the body In the mind? Where is it? Go with an open mind. Just find out where it is. Just sitting in your car or just Lying in your bed, whenever you have a few moments to close your eyes, then close them -- and with just one question: "Where does this I exist? Where is it? Where is I?"

Raman Maharshi has given a meditation. He calls it the "Who am I?" meditation. Buddha would say that this will not do, because when you ask "Who am I?" you have already supposed that you are. Then that is not questioned. If the only question is "Who am I?" then "I am" is settled already. You have presupposed it. Now you are just asking, "*Who* am I?" The I is not really questioned. Buddhist meditation says ask, "*Where* am I?" not "Who?"

Go to every nook and corner inside, search with an open mind, and you will not find yourself anywhere. You will find a silent Existence. but with no I. And do not think that this is very difficult. This is not! Even if you just close your eyes here and try to find out "Where am I?" you will not find out. You will find many other things. Your heart will be beating, your breathing will be there, you will find many thoughts floating in the mind. You may find

many things. but you will not find any I, any ego there.

Buddha says ego is just a collective notion -- just like "society", just like "nation", just like "humanity". You cannot find them anywhere. We are sitting here. We can call this a "class", but we cannot find it. If we go to search for it, we will find individuals, not any class. No group will be found -- only individuals. "Group" is just a name for a collectivity. We call many trees a forest. There exists no forest -- only trees and trees and trees. If you go in, then you will find trees, and the forest will disappear. This I is just a collective name. You are a group. The Buddhist word is *sangha* -- just a compound, a collective thing. You are many things, but not I. Go in and find out. Buddha says, "Do not believe me. Go in and find out; peep in and find out." Then it is never found.

So in this third dimension there is non-beingness or egolessness. When one finds that one is *not*, one is still: stillness has happened. You cannot be tense, you cannot be non-still, you cannot be in a deep inner noise if there is no ego. The whole show is withdrawn.

But what are we doing? Every moment we are doing things to feed this I -- to give it more strength, to give it more energy, to give it more fuel. We are every moment trying to sustain it. It is a false notion, but it can be sustained and maintained. You can go on believing in it and creating situations in which it becomes easier and easier to believe in it. I is a belief. It is not a fact.

Everyone is a believer in the ego. People will ask, "Where is God? Unless we find Him we cannot believe in Him." Even those persons will go on believing in their egos without trying to find out whether any such thing exists. This is a miracle. We can doubt God, but we cannot doubt ourselves. And unless We doubt ourselves, we cannot move into stillness. With that doubt everything is shattered. A religious man is born by doubting his ego and doubting himself.

We have taken I for granted. We never ask about it, whether it is there or not. And if someone makes us aware that it is not there, he is an enemy. Friends are those who help us to be stronger egos. Our family, our society, our nation, they all help us to be centered in our egos. Religion dethrones you. You are put down from your pedestal: you are not. And if you are not, you will be in a deep abyss of stillness -- bottomless, infinite -- because this I is the disturber, this I is the disease, this I is the nuisance. That is the problem.

Tanka was staying in a village. Someone comes and asks, "Help me! Teach me! Initiate me! I want to be free! I want to attain *moksha*!"

Tanka says to him, "I Cannot make you free. I can dissolve your 'you' but I cannot make *you* free."

There is no freedom *for* the I. There is only one freedom and that is freedom *from* the I. There is no *moksha* for the I, no Liberation for I. There is only one Liberation and that is *from* the I, not for the I.

So what can you do? You Can ponder over it without any preconceptions. Whenever you have time, just close your eyes, go in, and find out where you are. And soon you will stumble upon the fact that you exist as part of the infinite Existence, not as a separate island. No man is an island. We are parts of an infinite continent. The I gives you the false notion of being an island, and then every trouble is created. I is the troublemaker. Every violence, war, crime, every madness, is created by this I. We go on clinging to it and clinging to it. This clinging must be stopped.

You must be uprooted from your own I. No one else can do this and no yoga practice will help, because if you go on practising without searching for this I, then whatsoever the practice, the I will be strengthened by it. If you meditate, this I will say, "I am meditating." If

you renounce the world, this I will say, "I have renounced this world." If you become a sannyasin this I will say, "I have become a sannyasin, I have attained this, I have attained that." In this world or in that world this I will go on becoming strengthened by your efforts.

So it happens that a person who has practised much austerity becomes an egoist in a more subtle way. He becomes more of an I rather than becoming part of the great mainland, the great continent. He becomes a peak of ego. This is possible for everyone. So it is not only wealth or prestige or worldly things and possessions that will become food for the I. I can convert everything into its food.

So before entering on the spiritual path, Buddha's advice has to be always remembered. He has said, "Before you enter any path, first find out whether this I exists or not. Only then will your path be spiritual. Otherwise, whatsoever the path may be, it will ultimately prove worldly, because this I will exploit it."

Once Mulla Nasrudin came back from the capital to his village. The whole village gathered around him to ask the news about the capital, about what was happening there. And in those days of no newspapers, it was a big event for the village: A man has been to the capital and has come back! And no ordinary man at that, but Mulla Nasrudin himself, the only literate man in the town! When everyone was gathered, Mulla was just silent, very serious. He had just come back from the capital. The whole village was just mad, crazy to know what had happened. Then Mulla said, "At this time I will not tell you much, only one thing -- I met the Emperor. And not only that: he has spoken to me. But I will give you the details later on."

The village dispersed. The whole village became enthusiastic over only one thing: Mulla Nasrudin has met the Emperor. And not only that: the Emperor has spoken to him! But one man still remained there, and he persisted to ask, "What has he spoken? Tell me Mulla. Otherwise I am not going to leave. I cannot sleep now because I am so excited. What has he spoken? Just tell a little. Do not go into details, but just tell the essence."

So Mulla said, "There are not many details. When he saw me standing, he shouted, 'Get out of my way!' This was the only thing he spoke to me."

But the villager was satisfied because these were no ordinary words. They were spoken by the Emperor! The very same words spoken by the Emperor he has heard! The man who asked was satisfied, and he said, "It is so fortunate to be born in your village, Mulla. Imagine! I have heard the very same words that were spoken by the Emperor! He himself said to you, 'Get out of my way!' "

Nasrudin said, "He himself! He came near me and spoke not in a whisper, but in such a loud voice that everyone heard: 'Get out of my way.' He cried it, really. He screamed."

Mind is such, the ego is such, that it tries to fulfill itself in each and every way. Subtle are its ways, even foolish, but subtle. If you try to do something toward spirituality, the ego may poison it. Before going into that dimension, remember that you are not an ego. If you find out for once that this ego is not there, then everything becomes spiritual and every path becomes a spiritual path. Then wherever you go, you will go to the Divine. Then every path leads to the Divine. With the ego, *no* path leads to the Divine. With the ego, even if you go to Mecca or to Jerusalem or to Kashi, you will reach hell.

You cannot go anywhere because the ego is the hell. Without the ego, go anywhere, even to hell, and you will find heaven there -- because without the ego, *anywhere* is heaven. The ego is the root cause of all misery.

These are the three dimensions of stillness -- silence as soundlessness, silence as a no-movement of the mind, silence as egolessness. Start with any one, and the other two will

follow by and by. Or, you can start working on all the three. Then the whole work will be speedy. But do not go on thinking, because thinking is a movement, thinking is a noise, and thinking is a process of the ego.

Stop thinking and start doing. Only doing helps, only doing can make you existential. Only through doing is there the jump and the explosion.

OSHO, MODERN MAN, IN THIS INDUSTRIALIZED AGE OF SPEED, HURRY, ACTIVITY AND TENSIONS, FEELS COMPLETELY EXHAUSTED AFTER A DAY'S WORK. IN THIS SITUATION IT BECOMES DIFFICULT FOR HIM TO HAVE INNER SILENCE AND STILLNESS.

PLEASE EXPLAIN WHAT ARE THE REASONS AND WHAT IS THE WAY?

The situation appears so. It is not. Rather, the situation is quite the vice versa. You are not exhausted because of this industrialized age and the work and the tensions. You are exhausted because you have lost contact with your inner stillness. The work is not the problem: *you* are the problem. Neither is the age the problem: *you* are the problem.

Do not go on thinking that modern man is more burdened with work. He is *less* burdened. A primitive man is more burdened. Mechanization, industrialization, they all help to save time. They are for saving time and they *have* saved much.

But because you now have time and no stillness, because you now have time and no use for it, it creates problems. A primitive man has less problems, not because he is silent and still, but because he has no time, *no time*, to create troubles for himself. You have more time and you do not know what to do.

This time can be used for an inner journey. And if man cannot use it for that inwardness, he is done for. Then there is no hope because now more and more time will be saved. Soon the whole world will be under automatic mechanization. You will have time and you won't know what to do, and for the first time in history man will have achieved the utopia he has always longed for, desired. Then he will be at a loss as to what to do with it.

You have more time than any age, and you are not exhausted because of the work. You are exhausted because you have lost the inner contact -- because you do not know how to go deep in yourself and be revitalized. You have even lost the ability to sleep. That used to be the natural method to go in. Then one would be fresh in the morning, recharged, revitalized. But now we have lost the ability to sleep, and we have lost it because of the mechanical revolution, because now your bodies are not forced to work. Because of less work you are less exhausted, and because of less exertion you cannot sleep.

A villager still sleeps deeply; because his body is so exhausted, he falls deep into sleep. Your body is not exhausted; that is why you go on turning in your bed. Machines have replaced labour and you are *less* exhausted -- remember this. And then you cannot sleep, and even the natural source of inner revitalization is lost. In the morning you are more exhausted than in the evening, and then the whole day begins again and you feel again exhausted.

You are living an exhausted life. It is not only that you are exhausted in the evening: in the morning you are also exhausted. What has happened? Man needs continuous contact with the inner source. So do not ask me how an exhausted man can meditate. It is like asking me how a diseased man, an ill man, can take medicine. He needs it, and *only he* needs it.

You are exhausted, so meditation will be a medicine to you. And do not say that you have no time. You have much time, much that you can use. Everyone is wasting time in so

many ways. People are playing cards. If you ask them they will say, "We are killing time." The cinema houses are packed. What are people doing there? Killing time! They go to hotels, clubs. What are they doing there? Killing time!

But you cannot kill time. Time only can kill you. So no one is now without time. And do not think that time is a limited quantity. Do not think that every day consists of twenty-four hours -- no! It is up to you. It depends on you how many hours you put into it. It depends on that.

Someone asked Emerson, "What is your age?" He said, "Three hundred and sixty years."

It was unbelievable, so that man said, "Pardon me! It seems I have not heard you rightly. Tell it again. How many years are you saying?"

Emerson repeated loudly, "Three hundred and sixty years!"

But the man said, "I cannot believe it. This is impossible. You are not more than sixty."

Emerson said, "That is right, you are right. My actual age is sixty, but I have lived six times more than you. I have used my sixty years in such a way that they have proved to be three hundred and sixty years."

This man was about fifty and Emerson said, "If you say you are fifty, the same will be the problem for me. I cannot believe it because you look to me not more than thirty. You have simply wasted life. You have not lived."

The wasting of time is one thing, living is another. So every day is not a fixed thing. A Buddha can use it in such a way that it becomes a life. It is not "how much" -- it ultimately depends on how much you put into it.

You are a creator. We create our time, we create our space, we create our milieu, through living. So whatsoever your position in life and whatsoever your work and whatsoever your outward situation, do not make it an excuse. You can meditate all the same, and meditation doesn't need time. It needs a deep understanding, not time.

And it is not in conflict with other things. For example, if you are eating, eat with awareness. No extra time is needed. Rather, on the contrary, you will save time because you will eat less. With awareness you will eat less; with awareness you will become more efficient. You will save time. With awareness you will lose less energy, you will dissipate less energy. And even after a whole day's work, you will be as fresh as in the morning -- because it is not work that exhausts you: it is the attitude.

You walk to your office on a two-mile walk. You go to your office, and that exhausts you. But if it is Sunday and you are just walking for pleasure, and you walk to your office and come back, then it is just a play and it is not going to exhaust you. Rather, it will refresh you. If you are doing a certain thing as work, it will exhaust you. If you are doing the same thing as play, it will refresh you. It is not the work: it is the attitude. The mind which lives in meditation transforms all work into a play, and the mind which is not meditative will transform even a play into a work.

Look at people who are playing cards. They are tense. They are not "playing" cards -- it has become a work. Now there is a problem of life and death. It is not a play. If they are defeated they won't be able to sleep in the night, and even if they win they will not be able to sleep in the night. Either way they are going to be exhausted. It is not a play; it will not refresh them. It will only exhaust them.

Look at children. They are doing more work than you, but they are never exhausted. They are always bubbling with energy. Why? Because everything is a play. And because of industrialization, and sooner or later because of total automatic processes coming in, man will have only one dimension -- that is the dimension of play. Work will be useless then, and all

the old teachings that "work is Divine" -- that "work is duty and work is Divine and one must do work" -- they all will become nonsense.

Leisure, pleasure, fun, festivity, play, will be the key terms for the future. Seriousness will be taken as a disease; playfulness will become the symbol of sanity. Time will be saved more and more, and even old men will have to be like children playing. Only then will they be able to exist; otherwise they will commit suicide.

The whole human history up until now has been work-oriented. From now on it will be play-oriented. And meditation gives you a new childhood, a new innocence, a new festivity. Then the whole life becomes a ceremony. It is not work.

So do not make excuses. They may look valid, but they are dangerous. And meditation is not in conflict with anything. If you are going to your office, go meditatively. If you are doing work in your office, do it meditatively, do it relaxedly. Then you will not be exhausted. Take everything as a play, and you will not be exhausted. Rather, the work will become a pleasure.

Meditation gives you a new quality of mind, so it is not a question whether you have time or not. I am not saying that you have to meditate for three hours daily, that you should take three hours out of your life, out of your work-life -- no! If you can take it, it is good. If you cannot take it, do not make an excuse. Then try to turn and change and transform your work into a meditative act.

You are writing something: write with full awareness. You are digging a hole in the earth: dig it with full awareness. Whether you are working in the street or in the office or in the market, do it with full awareness.

Remain in the present and then see: you will not be exhausted. You will have more time, more energy, less dissipation, and ultimately your life will become just a play.

The Ultimate Alchemy, Vol 2

Chapter #9

Chapter title: Questions and Answers

9 July 1972 pm in

Archive code: 7207095

ShortTitle: ULTAL209

Audio: Yes

Video: No

OSHO, YOU SAID ONE NIGHT THAT AWARENESS BRINGS KNOWLEDGE AND KNOWLEDGE MAKES MAN AWARE OF MANY PROBLEMS AND SUFFERINGS WITHIN HIMSELF. BUT ISN'T IT TRUE THAT AWARENESS AND KNOWLEDGE GIVE MORE RICHNESS, GROWTH AND DEPTH TO MAN'S LIFE? PLEASE EXPLAIN ABOUT THIS DIALECTICAL SITUATION IN MAN AND THE WAY TO TRANSCEND THE KNOWLEDGE AS WELL.

IGNORANCE is blissful because in it one is not aware of any problem. But one is not aware of the blissfulness either. It is a bliss such as when you are in a deep sleep. No suffering is there, no anxiety is there, because no problems are possible when you are asleep. With knowledge one begins to be aware of many problems, and much suffering happens. This suffering will remain unless one transcends knowledge also.

So these are three states of the human mind: the first is ignorance, in which you are blissful but not aware; the second is knowledge, in which you are aware but not blissful; and the third is Enlightenment, in which you are *awake and blissful*. In one sense Enlightenment is just like ignorance and in another sense just like knowledge. In one sense, it is like ignorance because it is blissful, and unlike knowledge because there is no suffering. In another sense it is like knowledge because there is awareness, and unlike ignorance because ignorance is an absolute absence of awareness.

Enlightenment is blissfulness with awareness. Knowledge is a passage; it is a journey. You have left ignorance, but you have not achieved Enlightenment. You are in between. That is why knowledge is a tension. Either you fall back from knowledge or you go beyond. And falling back is not possible. You have to struggle to go beyond.

It is asked whether knowledge also gives richness, growth and depth to man's life. Of course, it gives! It gives a richness because the moment you become aware, with the expanding awareness you are expanded, with widening awareness you go on becoming greater and greater, because you are your awareness. When ignorant, you are as if you are not: you do not know that you are. Existence is, but without any depth, without any height. With knowledge you begin to feel your multi-dimensional being, and richness is given by

suffering.

Suffering is not something contrary to richness: suffering makes you rich. Suffering is painful, but suffering gives you depth. Someone who has not suffered at all will be just superficial. The more you suffer, the more you have touched deeper realms. That is why a more sensitive man suffers more and a less sensitive man suffers less. A shallow mind will not suffer at all. The deeper the mind, the deeper becomes your suffering.

So suffering is also richness. Animals cannot suffer: only man suffers. Animals can be in pain, but pain is not suffering. When the mind begins to feel the pain and to think about it, to think about the meaning of it and the possibility to go beyond it, then it becomes a suffering. If you simply feel pain, it is a very shallow thing.

It has been observed that rats have a four-minute range of thinking. They can think four minutes into the future and they can think four minutes back into the past. Beyond four minutes there is nothing for them. Their range of thinking is that much. There are other mammals whose range is twelve hours. Monkeys have a range of twenty-four hours. So the world that was twenty-four hours before, drops from their consciousness, and the world that may be twenty-four hours ahead is not. Their minds have a twenty-four-hour limit, so they cannot go deep.

Man has a very wide range. From childhood to death the whole life is his range, and for those who are more sensitive, for them, the range is still greater. They can remember their past lives and they can predict events beyond this life in the future. With this range depth is gained, but also suffering.

If a rat cannot go beyond four minutes, to suffer for the future is impossible, to suffer for the past is impossible. Within three or four minutes the whole world exists, so if there was pain four minutes before, it disappears after four minutes; no memory can be maintained. If there is fear four minutes ahead, it cannot be thought about, cannot be contemplated, cannot be perceived. It is not.

With man, suffering deepens because mind can move to the past and conceive of the future. Not only that: the mind can feel someone else suffering also. Animals cannot feel this. Higher animals have certain glimpses which lower animals cannot feel. In lower animals, if some member of the group dies they just forget about it. They will move on. Death is not a problem. Neither can they conceive of their own death, nor can they conceive that something has happened to some member of their group. It is impossible. It is as if it is not. But man conceives, feels, contemplates his own suffering and also others' sufferings. With a more sensitive mind, the sympathy can even become empathy. You are in deep pain: I feel that you are in pain; I understand; I am sympathetic. But if my mind is even more keen, more sensitive, I may begin to feel the same pain. Then it is empathy.

Ramakrishna was crossing the Ganges one day in a boat and suddenly he began to scream and cry, "Do not beat me!"

No one was beating him. All those who were present with him were his disciples, devoted disciples. They said, "What are you saying? Who is beating you? Who *can* beat you?"

Tears were rolling down his eyes and he was crying, "Do not beat me!" They were all puzzled, and then Ramakrishna showed them that just on the other bank one man was being beaten by a crowd. Then he showed his back: his back had the marks of having been beaten. They reached to the other shore and they went to the man who was beaten there. They saw his back also. They were just wonderstruck. It was a miracle. The same marks were on his back as on Ramakrishna's back.

This is empathy. Ramakrishna suffers more than you because now it is not only his

suffering. In a very subtle way the whole world's suffering has become his own. Wherever suffering is, Ramakrishna will suffer it. But this will give depth to Ramakrishna. Suffering itself is depth. So knowledge gives suffering and knowledge gives depth. It gives richness to life.

Socrates is reported to have said, "Even if a pig is absolutely happy, I would still prefer to be a Socrates and unhappy than to be a pig and happy." Why? If a pig is happy then be a pig. Why be a Socrates and unhappy? The reason is depth. A pig is just without any depth. Socrates has suffering -- more than anyone else -- but still he chooses to be a Socrates with his suffering.

This suffering too has a richness. A pig is just poor. It is like this: someone is in a coma, unconscious; he has no suffering. Would you like to be unconscious in a coma? Then you will be without suffering. If that is the choice, then you will choose to be yourself, whatsoever the suffering may be. Then you will say, "I will remain conscious and suffering rather than be in a coma and not suffer, because that 'not suffering' is just like death." Suffering is there, but still a richness -- the richness of feeling, the richness of mind, the richness of living.

Steinbeck has written somewhere in his diary, "It is better to have lived and loved than not to have loved at all." Tennyson also has said, "'Tis better to have loved and lost than not to have loved at all." Love has its own suffering. Really, a life without love has less suffering, so if you can avoid love, you can avoid much suffering. If you are vulnerable to love, you will suffer more. But love gives depth, richness, so if you have not suffered love you have not really lived. Love is a deeper knowledge.

The knowledge which we call knowledge is just acquaintance -- knowing someone, something, from the outside. When you love someone, you will know him from the inside. Now it is not acquaintance. Now you have gone deeper into someone and now you will suffer more, but love will give you a new dimension of life. So a person who has not loved has not really lived on the human plane, and because love brings so much suffering we avoid it. Everyone is avoiding love. We have invented many tricks to avoid love because love brings suffering. But then if you are successful in avoiding love, you have succeeded in avoiding a certain depth that only love can bring to your life. Grow in knowledge and you will grow in suffering; grow in love and you will grow more in suffering -- because love is a deeper knowledge.

Richness will be there, but this is the paradox -- and it is to be understood deeply: whenever you become more rich, you become aware of more poverty. Whenever you feel richness, you will also feel yourself more poor. Really, a poor man -- a really poor man -- never feels himself to be poor. Only a rich man begins to feel a deeper poverty. If you look at a beggar, he is happy with his small coins, very happy. You cannot even conceive of how he is happy. He gathers only a few coins in the whole day, but he is so happy.

Look at a rich man! He has gathered so much that he cannot use it even, but he is not happy. What has happened? The greater your riches, the more you begin to feel yourself poor. And this happens in every direction. When you know more, you feel more that you are ignorant. A person who doesn't know anything never feels that he is ignorant. He never feels it! It is impossible because that feeling is part of knowing. The more you know, the more you become aware that much is to be known. The more you know, the more you feel that whatsoever you have known is nothing.

Newton is reported to have said: "I have been just standing on the seashore, and whatsoever I have gathered is sand in my fist -- nothing more. This is a great infinite expanse.

Whatsoever I have known is just a few particles of sand in my hand, and what I do not know is this infinite expanse of the ocean!" So Newton feels more ignorant than you can feel, because that feeling is part of knowledge.

If you can love, then you can feel the impossibility of love. Then you can feel that it is virtually impossible to love someone. But if you do not love anyone, you will never become aware that love is a very arduous journey -- because when you go into something, only then do you become aware of your finite capacity and the infinite encounter. When I move out of my house, then I encounter the sky. If I go on remaining in my house there is no encounter, and I may finally come to believe that this is the whole universe.

The less you know, the more confident you are. The more you know, the less is your confidence. The greater the knowledge, the more will be the hesitance of the mind even to assert, even to say, what is right or what is wrong. The less the knowledge, the more you are totally certain.

Just fifty years before, science was totally certain, absolutely certain. Everything was clear and categorized. And then came Einstein who was perhaps the first scientific mind to encounter the full expanse of the world, of the universe. Then everything became uncertain. Einstein said, "To be certain about anything shows that you are ignorant. If you know, you can at the most be *relatively* certain." "Relatively certain" is just another name for uncertain. "When everything is relative," Einstein says, "then science can never again be absolute." And now we have come to know so much knowledge that everything is disturbed and shattered. All certainties have gone.

Mahavir, one of the most penetrating minds in the whole history of man, will not assert any statement without using "perhaps" in the beginning. If you ask him, "Is there a God?" he will say, "Perhaps God is and perhaps He is not." Even if you ask him, "Are you real?" he will say, "Perhaps I am real and perhaps I am not real, because in a certain sense I am real and in a certain sense I am not real. When I am going to die, how can I say that I am real? One day I will just evaporate, and you will not even be able to find out where I have disappeared. How can I say that I am real? I will disappear just as a dream disappears in the morning. But even then, I cannot say that certainly I am unreal -- because even to assert that I am unreal, a reality is needed. Even to dream, someone is needed to dream who is real." So he will say, "Perhaps I am real and perhaps I am not real."

Because of this, Mahavir could not gather many followers. How can you gather followers if you yourself are so uncertain? Followers need certainty, absolute dogmatism. Say: "This is right and that is wrong." Whether "that" is right is another thing -- but be confident, and then you create confidence in your followers: because they have come to know, not to inquire. They have come to feel certainties. They have come for dogmas, not for real inquiry. So a lesser mind than Mahavir will gather more followers. Really, the lesser the mind, the easier it is to become a leader, because everyone is in need of certainty; then they can feel secure.

With Mahavir everything will look uncertain. And he was so emphatic that if you asked him one question he would give seven answers. He would give you seven answers, each answer contradicting the previous one. Then the whole thing would become so complex that you would return more ignorant than you had come.

With Einstein, for the first time the genius of Mahavir has been introduced in science. Relativity is Mahavir's concept. He says that everything is related, nothing is absolute; and that even the diametrically opposite is also true in a certain sense. But then his statements become so qualified, so bracketed, that you cannot feel certainty with them.

That is why, in India, only 2,500,000 Jains exist. If Mahavir had converted only

twenty-five families, by now they would have become 2,500,000 just by reproduction! Only 2,500,000 after twenty-five centuries? What happened? Mahavir could not convert really. Such a keen mind cannot convert. It needs a lesser mind to create followers. The more stupid the leader, the better -- because he can say yes or he can say no with much confidence and without knowing anything.

What really happens when you gain knowledge? You become aware of ignorance. And, really, richness means: with polarities. You cannot be rich if you know only one part. When you know both the polar opposites, when you move in both the extremes, then you become rich.

For example, if you know only beauty and you are not aware of ugliness, your sense of beauty cannot be very deep. How can it be? It is always proportionate. The more you begin to feel beauty, the more you will begin to feel ugliness. They are not two things, but a movement of one sense in two directions. But the sense is one. You cannot say that "I am aware only of beauty". How can you be? With this sense, with the aesthetic sense of the feeling of beauty, the feeling of ugliness will come in. The world will become more beautiful, but at the same time more ugly; that is the paradox.

You begin to feel the beauty of the sunset, but then you also begin to feel the ugliness of the poverty all around. If a person says, "I feel the beauty of the sunset and I do not feel the ugliness of poverty and the slums," he is just deceiving either himself or others. It is impossible! When a sunset becomes beautiful, slums become ugly. And against a sunset, when you look at the slums you will be in heaven and hell simultaneously. Everything is this way and everything is bound to be this way. One thing will create its opposite.

So if you are not aware of beauty, you will not be aware of ugliness. If you are aware of beauty, you have become aware of ugliness also. You will enjoy, you will feel the bliss of beauty, and then you will suffer. This is part of growth. Growth always means the knowledge of the extremes which constitute life. So when man becomes aware, he also becomes aware that he is not aware of many things and that because of that he suffers.

Many times I have seen, observed, persons coming to me for meditation. They say, "I am very much disturbed, with pains inside, sufferings. Somehow, help me to still my mind." I suggest to them something to do, then in a week they come back and say, "What have you done? I have become more disturbed!" Why did it happen? Because when they begin to meditate, when they begin to feel a certain silence, they begin to feel the disturbance more. Against that silence, the disturbance is felt more keenly. Before they were simply disturbed, without any silence inside. Now they have something to judge against, to compare against. Now they say, "I am going mad."

So whenever someone begins meditation, he will become aware of many things of which he was not previously aware, and because of that awareness he will suffer. This is how things are, and one has to pass through them.

So if you start meditation and you do not suffer, it means it is not meditation, but just a hypnosis. That means you are just drugging yourself. You are becoming more unconscious. With a real, authentic meditation you will suffer more, because you will become more aware. You will see the ugliness of your anger, you will feel the cruelty of your jealousy, you will now know the evidence of your behaviour. Now, in every gesture, you will begin to feel where a hidden animal in you, and you will suffer. But this is how one grows. Growth is a painful birth. The child suffers when it comes out of the womb, but that is part and parcel of growth. So it is right that awareness and knowledge bring more richness and growth and depth in man's life -- not because man doesn't suffer, but because man suffers.

If someone has led just a snug existence -- as it happens in rich families -- you will feel, you will observe, that if a person is born rich, if he has lived without knowing suffering, without knowing the pain of living, without knowing anything, then whenever there is a demand, even before the demand the supply is there. He has not suffered hunger, he has not suffered love, he has not suffered anything. Whatsoever is demanded is supplied -- rather. It is supplied even before the demand is there. But then look in the eyes of that man: you will not find any depth. It is as if he has not lived. He has not struggled; he does not know what life is.

That is why it is always very difficult to find any depth in such men. They are superficial. If they laugh, their laughter is superficial. It just comes from the lips, never from the heart. If they weep, that weeping is superficial. It is not from the depths of the being: it is just a formal thing. The more the struggle, the more the depth. This depth, this richness, this knowledge, will create such a complexity that you would like to escape from it. When you suffer, you want to escape from it. If you are looking to escape from suffering, then alcohol can become appealing or LSD or marijuana or something else.

Religion means not escaping from suffering but living with it: living with it, not escaping! And if you live with it, you will become more and more aware. If you want to escape, then you will have to leave awareness. Then, somehow, you will have to become unconscious.

There are many methods. Alcohol is the easiest, but not the only method and not even the worst. You can go and listen to music and become absorbed in it; then you are using music as alcohol. Then for the time being, your mind is diverted toward music and you have forgotten everything else. Music is working as alcohol for everything else. Or, you can go to a temple or you can do *japa*. You can use these things as alcohol, as an intoxicant.

Anything which makes you less aware of your suffering is antireligious. Anything that makes you more aware of your suffering, and which helps you encounter it without escaping, is religious. That is what *tapas* -- austerity -- means. *tapas* means this: not escaping from any suffering, but remaining there and living with it with full awareness. If you do not escape, if you remain there with your suffering, one day suffering will disappear and you will have grown into more awareness.

Suffering disappears in two ways. You become unconscious; then suffering disappears *for you*. But, really, suffering remains there. It cannot disappear. It remains there! Really, your consciousness has disappeared, so you cannot feel it, you cannot be aware of it. If you become more conscious, in the meantime you will have to suffer more. But accept suffering as a part of growth, as a part of training, as just a discipline, and then one day, when your consciousness has gone beyond your suffering, suffering will disappear not just for you -- it will disappear *objectively*. Use suffering as a stepping-stone; do not escape from it. If you escape from it, you are escaping from your destiny, from the possibility of going beyond knowledge by using suffering as a device.

Mahavir has said, "Sometimes it happens that there is no suffering. Then create suffering, but do not lose any moment to create more awareness." Mahavir would go on long fasts in order to create suffering, to encounter it, because through encounter awareness grows. He would live naked. It may have been summer, it may have been winter, it may have been the rainy season, but he would live naked, he would move naked. In every village, when he would move naked, everyone would become his enemy. They would create many sufferings for him, but he would not speak. For twelve years he was totally silent. If someone beat him, he would not speak. One could do whatsoever one liked, but he would not react. These were consciously created sufferings.

Buddha was not in agreement with Mahavira's ideology, but even then Buddha has called him MAHATAPASWI -- the great ascetic. Really, no one is comparable to Mahavir in creating conscious suffering for himself. Why? When you can live with suffering consciously, you grow, you transcend it. Really, whenever you are in suffering you have an opportunity, so use it. Whenever you are not in suffering, this time will ultimately prove to be just a wastage. Only the moments when you are in suffering can be used. But, unfortunately, we try to escape suffering. We have been doing that for lives and lives.

Make an experiment, *any* experiment, and see what happens. The night is cold and you are on the terrace standing naked: feel the coldness; do not escape from it. Let it be there, and you remain there. *Feel it*, move with it, live with it, and see what happens: Beyond a certain point coldness will be there, you will be there, but there will be a gap between you and the coldness. Now the coldness cannot penetrate to you. You have transcended.

You are hungry: remain in it, and beyond a point you will know that you are not hungry. Hunger is somewhere else, and there is a gap between you and the hunger. When you begin to feel the gap, you will transcend it.

But there is no need to create suffering because suffering is already so much there. There is no need! Every day there is suffering. Suffer it consciously; do not try to escape. Then you have a key, a secret key to transform your suffering into a blessing.

This is what *tapas* means. It is an alchemical process. Then you transform the lower into the higher, the base metal into gold. But the baser metal has to pass through fire and the false must burn. Only then can the authentic emerge out of it. So knowledge is a fire. The ignorant soul must pass through this fire, and only then will the pure gold come out of it.

That pure gold is Enlightenment. When you have faced every suffering with consciousness, suffering will dissolve, disappear, because the very reason for it will have disappeared. You will go on and on, and suffering will be left behind and you will become a peak. This peak will have gone beyond it. This is Enlightenment.

There are three states: ignorance, knowledge, Enlightenment. Go beyond ignorance, but do not forget that knowledge is not the end. That is only the means. You have to go beyond it also. And when someone goes beyond knowledge, he becomes a Buddha. Then he is wise, not learned; wise, not more informed. It is not that he is more knowledgeable: he is simply wise, simply more aware. So knowledge is good because it brings you out of ignorance, and knowledge is bad if you begin to cling to it. If it becomes a clinging, it is bad. Use knowledge to go beyond ignorance, and then through knowledge go beyond it.

Buddha tells a story which he liked very much. He reported this story thousands and thousands of times. He says knowledge is like a raft. You cross a river on a raft, and then you leave the raft and the river, and you move on. Buddha says that there were five very learned men. They crossed the stream on a raft, and then they thought and pondered: "Because this raft has helped us to cross this stream, we must carry this raft on our heads. Now how can we be ungrateful? This is simply gratitude."

So those five learned men carried that raft on their heads into the market. Then the whole village gathered and asked, "What are you doing? This is something new."

They said, "Now we cannot leave this raft. This raft has helped us to cross the stream, and these are the days of rains and the river is flooded. It was impossible without this raft. This raft is a friend, and we are just being grateful."

The whole village laughed. They said. "Yes, this raft *was* a friend, but now this raft is an enemy. Now you will suffer because of this raft, now it will be a bondage. Now you cannot move anywhere, now you cannot do anything else."

Knowledge is a raft to go beyond ignorance, but then you must not begin to carry it on your head as these learned persons carried it. Really, it is not right to say "carry it", because the burden becomes so much that you cannot even move. Throw this raft! It is difficult to throw because it has saved you. You have come across a stream and your logic may run in this way; "If we throw this raft, then we will be again in the same situation in which we were before, before the raft was used." This *looks* logical, but it is not -- because when there was no raft you were on one bank of the stream; when you have used the raft you have come to another bank of the stream, and if you throw it you will not be in the same situation again.

Man is afraid of throwing knowledge because he fears that he will again become ignorant. You cannot become ignorant again. A person who has known cannot fall back into ignorance. But if he now clings to this knowledge, he cannot go beyond either. Throw it! You are not going to fall back into ignorance. You will rise into Enlightenment.

One rises into knowledge by throwing ignorance, and then one rises into Enlightenment by throwing knowledge. So it is good to teach knowledge to the ignorant, and it is good to teach again a different kind of ignorance to the knowledgeable ones. One has to become ignorant in a different dimension, with a different quality, just by throwing knowledge.

So it is inevitable that one must come to knowledge, but then it is not inevitable that one must remain there. You must pass through it. That is a must, it cannot be avoided; but you must not remain there. You must move -- move from knowledge: this is what is meant. How to move from this knowledge? As I said, if you become aware of suffering, you transcend it. If you become aware of your knowledge, you transcend knowledge. Awareness is the only technique of transcendence, whatsoever may be the problem. Awareness is the *only* technique of transcendence!

You know many things; then you become identified with your knowledge. Then if someone denies your knowledge or contradicts it, you feel hurt, as if he has denied you or as if he has contradicted you. Your knowledge is something different from you. Feel the gap. You are *not* your knowledge. The moment you can feel this, that "I am not my knowledge," then try to be aware of it. Be aware that "This I know, this I do not know, and that which I know may be right or may not be right." Do not become mad with it, do not become involved.

Socrates used to say, he would say always, "As far as my knowledge goes this seems to be true -- only *seems* to be true. And that is only as far as my knowledge goes. It may not be true because knowledge can go further; it may not be true because it only appears to be true to me." Then if someone contradicts him, he cannot feel hurt. Rather, that person is helping him. Why should he feel hurt?

If someone says, "You are wrong," he is giving you more knowledge -- something more, something different. If you are not identified, you will feel grateful; if you are identified, you will feel hurt. Then it is not a question of knowledge: it is a question of an egoist cycle. Then it is not that he has said, "Whatsoever *you say* is wrong." Really, he has said, "*you* are wrong." You feel it that way. If you feel it that way, then you can never be aware of your knowledge. Be aware! It is an accumulation, but it has helped. It has utility.

The Buddhist, the Zen Buddhist word for knowledge is *upaya*. They call it "just an instrument". Use it, but do not be mad, do not become obsessed with it, do not be identified with it. Remain aloof, remain detached. This aloofness, this remaining detached, is the first necessity. And then be aware. Whenever you are saying something, say it with a clear awareness that it is not you, but only your knowledge. This awareness will lead you beyond it.

So whatsoever may be the problem, being identified with it will create unconsciousness, and you will fall back. Being aware of it will create consciousness, and you will go beyond.

OSHO, ONE NIGHT YOU SAID THAT CHRISTIANITY HAS REMAINED INCOMPLETE BECAUSE FOR CHRISTIANS JESUS DIED AT THE AGE OF THIRTY-THREE WHEN HE WAS FIERY, REBELLIOUS AND ACTIVE, WITH SUN-LIKE CONSCIOUSNESS AS HIS INNER CENTER. DOES IT MEAN THAT JESUS COULD NOT ACHIEVE TOTAL SPIRITUAL GROWTH, INNER SILENCE, INNER PEACE AND AN INNER FULL-MOON STAGE OF CONSCIOUSNESS LIKE BUDDHA AND MAHAVIR?
PLEASE ENLIGHTEN US ON THIS POINT.

Many things may have to be considered: one, Jesus died for Christianity at the age of thirty-three. Remember, *for christianity*, because actually he did not die -- he lived to be one hundred and twelve. But that is another story, not related with Christianity at all. and he died a fully Enlightened One like Buddha, Mahavir and Krishna. So this is the first thing to be understood.

Christianity has only this much to say, that he was seen resurrected after his crucifixion. For three days he was seen somewhere by some disciples and somewhere else by some other disciples, and then he disappeared. So one thing is certain: even Christianity thinks that whether he died or not on the cross, he was seen after the crucifixion for three days.

They think that he died on the cross and then was resurrected, but then they do not have anything to tell about what happened to this resurrected Jesus. The Bible is silent. What happened to this man who was seen? When did he die again? He must have died again because on the cross he did not die. So what happened to this man Jesus? The Bible is incomplete because Jesus disappeared from Israel.

In Kashmir, there is a shrine which is believed to be that of Jesus Christ -- his tomb. He lived in Kashmir, in India, then he died when he was one hundred and twelve. At the time of the crucifixion he was just entering the moon center. On that very day he entered -- on the *very day* of the crucifixion. So that is the next thing to understand.

Jesus in the Bible is not like Buddha, Mahavir or Lao Tzu. He is not! You cannot conceive of Buddha going into the temple and beating the money-lenders -- you cannot conceive of it! But Jesus did it. He went into the temple; the annual festival was on. Many things were connected with this great temple of Jerusalem. There was a great money-lending business associated with it. Those moneylenders of this temple exploited the whole country. People would come for the annual gathering and other gatherings during the year, and they would obtain money at a high interest, but it was impossible to repay it. They would lose everything, and this temple was going on becoming richer and richer. It was a religious imperialism. The whole country was poor and suffering, but the money would come automatically to this temple.

Jesus entered one day with a whip in his hand. He overturned the money-lenders' boards, then began to beat them. He created a chaos in the temple. You cannot conceive of Buddha doing this. Impossible!

Jesus was the first communist, and, really that is why Christianity could give birth to communism. Hinduism could not give birth to it, no other religion could give birth to it -- impossible! Only Christianity! With Jesus it has a relevance. He was the first communist, and

he was fiery and rebellious.

The very language he uses is totally different. He gets angry with such things that we cannot even believe it -- such as a fig tree: he destroyed it because he and his disciples were hungry and the tree would not yield any fruit. He destroyed it! He has threatened in such language that Buddha could not utter. Those who are not going to believe in him and his Kingdom of God will be "thrown into the fires of Hell" -- the *eternal* fires of Hell -- and they cannot come back.

Only the Christian Hell is eternal. Every other hell is just a temporary punishment. You go there, you suffer and you come back. But Jesus' hell is eternal. This looks unjust, absolutely unjust. Whatsoever may be the sin, eternal punishment cannot be justified; it cannot be! And what are the sins? Bertrand Russell has written a book, "Why I am Not a Christian," and in that book one of the reasons he has told is this, that "Jesus looks absurd". Bertrand Russell says, "If I confess all the sins that I have committed and all those sins which I have thought about but never committed, then too you cannot give me more than five years imprisonment." Eternal punishment? Non-ending punishment? Jesus speaks the language of a revolutionary!

Revolutionaries always look to the other end -- to the extreme. He says to a rich man -- and you cannot conceive of a Buddha or a Mahavir saying it -- that "A camel can pass through a needle's eye, but a rich man cannot pass through the gates of my Father to the Kingdom of God." He cannot pass! This is the seed of communism, the basic seed. Jesus was a revolutionary. He was concerned not only with spirituality, but with economics, with politics and everything. Really, had he been only a spiritual man he would not have been crucified. He was crucified because he became a danger to everything -- to the whole social structure, to the status quo.

But he was not a revolutionary like Lenin or Mao. Of course, Marx and Mao are inconceivable without there having been a Jesus in history. They belong to this same Jesus, the early Jesus, the Jesus who was crucified. He was a fiery man, rebellious, ready to destroy everything, but he was not simply a revolutionary. He was also a spiritual man. He was somehow a mixture of Mahavir and Mao. But the Mao was crucified and the Mahavir remained in the end.

The day Jesus was crucified was not only the day of crucifixion. It was a day of deep inner transformation also. The day he was crucified, Pilate, the Roman Governor, asked him, "What is Truth?" Jesus remained silent. This was not like Jesus at all. It was more like a Zen Master. If you see the entire previous life of Jesus, this remaining silent when someone has asked, "What is Truth?" was not Jesus-like at all. He was not that type of Master who would remain silent.

Why did he remain silent? What had happened? Why was he not speaking? Why was he at a loss? Why was he incapable of speaking? He was one of the greatest orators the world has ever produced -- or we may say, even without hesitation, the greatest: his words are so penetrating. He was a man of words, not a man of silence. Why did he remain silent suddenly? He was just stepping, going to the cross. But Pilate asked him, "What is Truth?" For his whole life he was defining only that; for his whole life he was talking only about Truth: that is why Pilate asked him. But he remained silent.

What had happened to the inner world of Jesus? It has never been reported because it is difficult to report what had happened. And Christian theology has remained shallow, because the inner world of Jesus can only be interpreted in India and never anywhere else. Only India knows the inner changes, the inner transformation of what happened.

What has happened suddenly? Jesus is on the verge of death. He is to be crucified. Now the whole revolution is meaningless. Whatsoever he has been saying is futile; whatsoever he has been living for is just coming to an end. Everything is finished, and because death is so near he must now move inwards. Time cannot be lost now! Not a single moment can be lost now! He must move in before he is crucified; he must complete the inner journey.

He has been on the inner journey, but he was also entangled with outer problems. And because of these outer problems, he could not move to that cool point which this Upanishad calls "the moon point". He has remained fiery, hot. In a way, he might have done it consciously.

There is a story: Vivekananda achieved his first satori, his first glimpse of Samadhi, and Ramakrishna said, "Now I will keep this key with me; I am not going to give it to you. It will be given to you only three days before your death. Before you die, only three days before, this key will be given back to you. Now no more glimpses of Samadhi."

Vivekananda began to weep and he said, "Why? I do not want anything. I do not want the whole kingdom of the world. Give me only my Samadhi. The one glimpse was so beautiful. I do not want anything more."

Ramakrishna said, "The world needs you and something has to be done. And if you move into Samadhi, then you will not be able to do anything. So do not be in a hurry. Samadhi will wait for you. Move into the world; give my message. And when the message is delivered, the key will be given back to you."

Ramakrishna died, but these are not visible keys. And only three days before his death, was Vivekananda able to achieve Samadhi -- only three days before! So it may have been a very conscious thing when Jesus did not move to the moon center right away, because once you move you become absolutely inactive.

One story more: Jesus was initiated by John the Baptist. He was the disciple of John the Baptist who himself was a great revolutionary and a great spiritualist. He waited for Jesus for years together. On the day he initiated Jesus in the river Jordan, he said to Jesus, "Now take over my work and I will disappear. It is enough." And from that day he was hardly ever seen again. He disappeared in the forest. In the inner language, he disappeared from the sun point to the moon point. He became silent. He had done the work and he had given the work to someone who would complete it.

Just on the day of crucifixion Jesus must have become aware that now the work he was doing was finished. He must have thought, "There is no more possibility for it. I cannot do anything more now; I must move in. This opportunity must not be lost." That is why, when Pilate asked him, "What is Truth?" he remained silent. This is not Jesus-like. This is like a Zen Master; this is more like Buddha. And because of this, the miracle happened which has remained an enigma for Christianity. Because of this, the miracle happened.

When he was moving to his cooler, coldest point, the moon point, he was crucified. And when for the first time someone comes to the moon center, his breathing stops, because that breathing too is an activity of the sun point. Everything becomes silent; everything is as if dead.

He moved inward to the moon point when he was crucified, and they thought he was dead when he was not. This was a mis. conception -- a misunderstanding. Those who were crucifying him thought he was dead, but he was simply at the moon point where breathing stops. Then there is no outgoing, no ingoing breath. He was in the gap.

When one remains in the gap, it is such a deep balance that it is virtually death. But it was *not* death. So they, the crucifiers, the murderers of Jesus, they thought he was dead, so they

allowed the disciples to bring the body down. As was the custom in the Jewish land, his body was to be preserved just in a nearby cave for three days and then delivered to the family. It is reported -- and, again Christianity has only fragments -- that when his body was being carried to the cave, his body was dashed against some stone and there was blood. If he had really been dead, blood would have been impossible.

He was not dead. And when after three days the cave was opened, he was not there. The dead body had disappeared, and in these three days he was seen. Four or five people had seen him, but no one would believe them. They went to the village and said that he was resurrected, but no one would believe it.

So he escaped from Jerusalem. He came to Kashmir and remained there. But then this life was not the life of Jesus, but the life of Christ. Jesus was the sun point and Christ the moon point. And he remained totally silent: that is why there is no record. He would not talk, he would not give any message, he would not preach. Then he remained totally silent. Then he was not a revolutionary: he was just a Master living in his own silence, so then very few people would travel to him.

Those who became aware without any outer information about him, they would travel to him. And they were not few but many -- few only in comparison to the world, but many in a way. And a whole village came to be established around him. The village is still called Bethlehem. In Kashmir, the village is still called Bethlehem after the birthplace of Jesus, and the tomb is preserved which is Jesus' tomb.

I have said that Christianity is incomplete because it knows only the early Jesus and that, because of that, Christianity could give birth to communism. But Jesus himself died a fully Enlightened man -- a full moon.

The Ultimate Alchemy, Vol 2

Chapter #10

Chapter title: I am "That"

1 August 1972 pm in

Archive code: 7208015

ShortTitle: ULTAL210

Audio: Yes

Video: No

Length: 97 mins

SOHAM BHAVO NAMASKARAH

"THE FEELING OF I AM THAT -- SO-AHAM -- IS THE SALUTATION."

EXISTENCE is one, or rather, Existence is *oneness*. Al-Hillaj Mansoor was flayed alive because he said, "I am the Beloved; I am the Divine; I am That which created the world." Islam was totally unacquainted with this type of language. This language is basically Hindu. Wherever man has contemplated, man has come to duality: God, the Creator, and the world, the created. Hinduism has taken the boldest jump by saying that the created is the Creator and there is no basic difference.

To Islam or to other dualistic thinkings, this looks like sacrilege. If there is no difference between God and the world, between man and God, then for dualistic thinkers it appears that there is no possibility of religion, no possibility of worship, no possibility of salutation. If you are the Divine, then who are you going to worship? If you are the Creator, then who is superior to you? Worship becomes impossible.

But this sutra says that this is the only worship, this is the only salutation: "The feeling of I am That -- SO-AHAM -- is the salutation." Ordinarily, this sutra is absurd, contradictory -- because if there is no higher power than you, if you are the highest, then whom are you going to salute? To whom are you going to pay your respects? This is the reason Mansoor was murdered, killed; this is heresy. He was thought to be a heretic, a *nastik* -- an atheist. If you say that you are God, you deny Godhood. Then *you* are the Supreme.

To the dualistic way of thinking, this is egoistic. The division must be maintained. You must come nearer and nearer, but you must not become the flame itself. You must become intimate with the Divine source, but you must not become one with it. Then respect is possible, worship is possible.

So you can reach to the Divine feet, but you cannot become one with the Divine flame. How can the created become the Creator? And if the created becomes the Creator, that means the created was not the created at all. And if the created becomes the Creator, that means there is NO Creator.

This is one type of religious thinking -- the dualist type. It has its own reasoning and it appeals to our ordinary minds. So, really, even those who are born Hindus are not Hindus

unless they can come to conceive of this attitude -- of being one with the Creator. One may be born a Hindu, but there is no basic difference between a Hindu, a Mohammedan and a Christian attitude. Theirs is our basic attitude -- the attitude we learn and the attitude by which we behave.

A Hindu is really a deep absurdity, because he takes the impossible jump: the created becomes the Creator. And this sutra says, "This is the only salutation." If God is there high above and you are here low down, if something in you is not already Divine, there is no bridge possible. You cannot be related to the Divine. You can be related to Him only if you are *already* related; otherwise there is an unbridgeable gap. God remains God and you remain just the created.

Because of this, a third attitude develops -- the attitude of the Jains. They deny God altogether, because they say if there is a God as a Creator and we are just created beings, we can never become Gods. How can something created by you become you? The created will remain the created, and the Creator will always have the capacity to destroy you, because "Creator" also means the capacity to destroy, the capacity for destruction. If God has created the world, he can destroy it this very moment. He is not responsible to you. You cannot ask why because you have never asked why He created the world. So at this very moment, if there is just a whim in the Divine mind, the world can be destroyed. With all your holy men, with all your sinners, the world can at this very moment be destroyed.

So if there is a God, Jains say, then man is not really a spirit. He is just a created thing, not a soul, because then he does not have any freedom. If God is the Creator, then man is not free and then everything becomes meaningless: whether you are good or bad, it is meaningless. God remains the supreme power. He can do anything, He can undo anything. And He is not responsible to you. If you have created a mechanical device you can destroy it: you are not responsible to your mechanical creation. A painter creates a painting; he can destroy it. The painting cannot say, "You cannot destroy me." And if God is the Creator and man is just a created thing, how can the created thing evolve and become Divine? That is impossible. So Jains say that there is no God. Only then can man become Divine, because only then is man free. With a God we are slaves; with no God we are free.

Nietzsche has said, without knowing that Mahavir has said this before him, "Now God is dead and man is free." The same was the problem with Mahavir. If God is there, then man is not free. God's being is man's slavery, God's non-being is man's freedom. So Mahavir says that there is no God and that only then can you become Divine. Mohammedans, Christians, Jews, they say God is, man is, but man is just a created being. He can worship the Divine and come nearer. The nearer he comes, the more he will be filled with Divine light, bliss, ecstasy. But he cannot become one with the Divine, because if he *can* become one with the Divine that shows that potentially he was already one with the Divine; because nothing can happen in the world which is not already in the seed.

A tree evolves because the tree was in the seed. If you can become Divine, you were already Divine. So Jews, Christians and Mohammedans say that if you are already Divine, then evolving becomes meaningless. If you are already Divine in the seed, then there is no real evolution, then there is no growth, and whatsoever you do or do not do, you will remain Divine. Christians, Mohammedans and Jews say that religious growth is possible only if man is man and God is God. You come nearer and nearer, and that coming nearer is a growth.

It is your choice. You may not come near, you may go far away -- this is your freedom. But if you are already Divine, say Jews, Mohammedans and Christians, then there is no real growth. The whole growth becomes just illusory, just a dream growth. You were bound to

become Divine because in the seed you were Divine already. So the whole thing becomes hocus-pocus, they say. The whole evolution becomes meaningless.

Hindus take a standpoint just in between these two standpoints. They agree with Jains that man is Divine and they agree with Christians, Mohammedans and Jews that there is God as the Creator. And Still, they say, there is growth, there is evolution. Not only that: they say *only then* is growth possible. But to them growth means just unfoldment. A seed grows, and the growth is real, authentic, because a seed may not grow and may remain a seed forever; there is no inner necessity to grow But a seed grows only to be a particular tree because that tree is already potential in it.

Man can remain man, man can even fall down and become an animal, or man can grow to be Divine. This is choice! This is freedom! But *miS* possibility, that man can become Divine, shows that somewhere deep down in the seed form man is already Divine.

So it is an unfoldment. Something hidden becomes actual, something potential becomes actual, something that was just a seed becomes a tree. In a way, the Hindu God is totally different from the Mohammedan and the Christian God because for Hindus man can become God. And they say that if you cannot become God, then even the concept of coming nearer and nearer is false -- because if you cannot jump into the flame, what does it mean to come nearer and nearer? Then what is the difference between you and someone who is not near? If you can come nearer, then the logical conclusion will be more near, more near, more near, and ultimately you become one.

If you cannot become one, then there is a limit, a boundary, and beyond that boundary and limit there will be a gap between you and the Divine. That gap cannot be tolerated. And if there is a gap which it is not possible to bridge, the whole effort is useless. Hindus say that unless you become the Divine itself, the urge will not be fulfilled. The nearer you are, the more you will feel the gap and the more you will suffer. And when you come on the boundary line from where no growth is possible, you will stagnate and you will die, and the suffering will be unbearable, absolutely unbearable.

Man can become Divine because he is already Divine, and Hindus say you can only become that which you are already. You cannot become that which you are not; you cannot grow to be something else. You can only grow to be yourself.

This attitude has many dimensions. One is God the Creator: we can think of Him as a painter, but Hindus have not thought that way. They say the Creator is not a painter but a dancer: that is why there is the concept of Shiva the dancer. In dance the dancer is creating something, but the creation is not something separate from the Creator. In painting the painter and painting are two things, and the painter can die and the painting can remain. And the moment the painting is complete, it is independent of the painter completely. Now it will take its own course.

Hindus say God is a Creator like a dancer. A dancer is there dancing; the dance is the creation -- but you cannot separate it from the dancer. If the dancer dies the dance will die, and if the dance continues the dancer will be there.

One thing more which is basic and important: the dance cannot exist without the dancer, but the dancer can exist without the dance. Hindus say this world is a creation in this way. God is dancing, so whatsoever is created is part and parcel of it.

Another thing: a painter paints; he can complete the painting and then go to sleep. But a dance is a constant creation. God cannot go to sleep. So the world was not created on a particular day; it is being created every moment. Christians think the world was created on a particular day and date, and before that there was no world. They say in a week -- in exactly

six days -- God created the world, and on the seventh day he rested. Now, even if He is, He is no more needed. He may have died meanwhile. The painter can die and the painting can continue. The painter may have gone mad, but the painting remains as it was.

Hindus say not that the world *was* created but that it *is being created* every moment. It is a constant flux of creation; it is a continuum. It is a *constant* flux of creation; it is a continuum of creation. So really, if you look at things in this way, then God is not a person: God is energy. Then God is not something static: God is movement. He is dynamic because a dance is a dynamic movement. You have to be in it every moment: only then can it exist. Dance is an expression, a living expression, and you have to be in it continuously.

The world is a dance, not a painting, and everything is part of this dance, every gesture is Divine. So Hindus say a very beautiful thing. They say if not everything is Divine, then nothing can be Divine. If not everything is holy, then nothing can be holy. If not everything is God, then there is no possibility of any God. This is one dimension -- to look at this oneness. They never say there is oneness. They always say everything is non-dual, because Hindus think that to say that the world is one, that Existence is one, gives you a feeling that "one" can exist only if something else also exists.

One is a number. One can exist only if other numbers exist -- two, three, four. If there are no other numbers, one becomes meaningless. Then what do you mean by "one"? Because there are nine digits, from one to nine, one is meaningful. It is meaningful in a pattern of digits, of numbers. If there is only one, you cannot say it is one. Then numbers become meaningless.

Hindus say that Existence is non-dual, not one. They mean it is one, but they say it is non-dual. They say it is not two. This is a non-committal statement. If you say "one", you have made a commitment, you have committed yourself in many ways. If you say "one", you are saying that you have measured it. If you say "one", you are saying that Existence is finite.

Hindus say it is non-dual. They mean it is one, but they say it in a roundabout way, and this is very meaningful. They say that it is non-dual -- that it is not two. Thus, they only indicate that it is one. It is never said directly, but only indicated. They say only that it is not two.

This is very meaningful, because when we say that the dancer and the dance are one, then there will be many difficulties. If the dance ceases, the dancer will cease -- if they are one. Hindus say instead that they are not two. Then the dancer will be there even if the dance ceases, but the dance cannot be there if the dancer ceases.

This non-dualness is hidden; the duality is manifested. "Manyness" is manifest; oneness is hidden. But this many-ness can exist only because of that hidden oneness. Trees are different, the earth is different, the sun is different, the moon is different, but now science says that deep down everything is related and one. The tree cannot grow if there is no sun, but we have come to know only this one-way traffic. We know trees cannot grow and flowers cannot flower if the sun ceases to be. Hindus too say trees cannot grow if there is no sun, but they say also that if there are no growing trees, the sun cannot exist. This is a two-way traffic; everything is related.

Jains say if there is God, then man will be a slave. Mohammedans say if man declares that "I am God", then God is dethroned and the slave pretends to be-the master. Hindus say there is neither independence nor dependence: Existence is an interdependence. So to talk in terms of dependence and independence is meaningless. The Whole exists as an interdependent whole. Nothing is high and nothing is low because the high cannot exist without that which you call low.

Can the peak exist without the valley? Can the holy man exist without the sinner? Can beauty exist without that which you call ugliness? And if beauty cannot exist without ugliness, then it depends on ugliness. And if the peak cannot exist without the valley, then what is the meaning of calling the peak something high and calling the valley something low?

Hindus say the lowest is the highest and the highest is the lowest. By declaring this, they mean that this whole world is a deeply interdependent pattern and all religions are arbitrary. They are good for thinking, for analyzing, for understanding, but basically they are false. And this is the longest jump.

The *rishi* says, "SOHAN. BHAVO NAMASKARAH -- the feeling of I am That is the salutation." Unless the lowest can feel that he is the highest, he cannot be at home in this universe. But this is not a declaration: this is a feeling. You can declare that "I am God" and that may not be a deep feeling at all. That may be just an egoistic assertion. If you say that "I am God and no one else is God", then you have not felt it. When it is a feeling, it is not a declaration on your part -- it is a declaration on the part of the whole Existence.

The *rishi* says, "I am God, I am That." He is saying that everything is God, everything is That. With him, the whole Existence declares. So it is not a personal statement. Al-Hillaj Mansoor was killed because Islam could not understand this language. When he said, "I am God," they thought Al-Hillaj was saying, "'I am God.," It was not Al-Hillaj at all. It was simply that Al-Hillaj became vocal on the part of the whole Existence. It was the whole Existence speaking through Al-Hillaj, declaring. Al-Hillaj was no more -- because if he was, then this declaration becomes personal. So this is the second dimension.

Man exists in three categories. One is when he says "I am" without knowing who he is. This is the ordinary existence of everyone, the feeling of "I am" without knowing "who I am". The second stage is when he comes to know "I am not" -- because the deeper you ponder over this am-ness, the more you dig, the more you will find that you are not, and the whole phenomenon of "I" disappears. You cannot find it. So there is no question of making it disappear. You simply do not find it; it is not there.

If you exist without any search, you feel that "I am". If you begin to search, you will come to know that you are not. This is the second state: when man comes to know that he is not. First he was probing deep into the phenomenon of "I am"; now he will have to probe into the phenomenon of "I am not".

This is most arduous. The first is difficult, very difficult. Even to come to the second is a long journey. Many stay at the first. They never probe into "Who am I?" Only very few go into a deep search to know who it is that says "I am". Then, among those few, very few will go again on a new journey to know what this "I am not" is, what this feeling of "I am not" is. With "I am not", still I am, but now I cannot say "I am"; I feel as if there is a deep emptiness.

Hindus have said that the first is "I-am-ness"; the second is simply "am-ness". The "I" is dropped, but my existence is there. Even if I am empty, nothing, still I *am*. This is called "am-ness". The first they call *ahankar* -- ego; the second they call *asmita* -- am-ness. If someone goes deep into *ahankar*, the ego, he comes to *asmita*, amness. And now, if someone again goes deep into this am-ness, he comes to Divineness. Then he says, "I am That; *aham brahmasmi* -- I am God." Through emptiness, one becomes all. Through nonbeing, one becomes the very ground of Being. Dissolving, one becomes all.

This sutra, "SOHAM BHAVO NAMASKARAH," is the feeling of the third state. When man has dissolved completely, ego has disappeared. Even am-ness is not a finite thing now. One has come to the very source, as if one is just a gesture in a dance just a gesture in a dance! He has probed deep, and now he has come to the dancer. Now the gesture of the dance

is that "I am the dancer".

This is going in. First you go in yourself, but you are relative to the universe. So if you continue, then you are stepping down into Existence. If you go on continuing, then from the periphery you will one day come to the center.

Even a leaf in the wind has its own individuality. If the leaf begins to travel inwards, sooner or later it will go beyond itself; it will enter into the branch. If it goes on, then sooner or later it will not be the leaf, it will not be the branch: it will become the tree. If it goes on, sooner or later it will not be the tree: it will become the roots. And if it still continues, sooner or later it will become the Existence: it will go beyond the roots.

But the leaf can remain itself without moving in. Then the leaf can think, "I am"; this is the first stage. If the leaf moves, sooner or later it will find, "I am not the leaf. I am more: I am the branch." Then, "I am not the branch. I am even more: I am the tree." And then, "I am not even the tree. I am still more: I am the roots, the hidden roots." And if the journey goes on, from the roots also it will take a jump -- it will become the whole Existence.

This is a feeling, a realization. And this is the more difficult part because intellectually your ego *would like* to declare that you are God, you are Divine. Intellect tries always to be high, at the peak. The very effort of the ego is to be something supreme. So this can appeal to you, this can appeal to the ego. It can say, "Okay this is right: I am God."

But this sutra says this is the salutation, and salutation is a deep humility, a humbleness. It is not to put yourself on the peak, because then there is no one whom you can salute. This was the problem with Islam when Al-Hillaj declared. He declared himself God and Islam felt: "This is not humbleness -- this is the climax of being egoistic!" So those who killed him felt that they killed him very righteously, in good faith: this was the peak of ego!

This sutra is contradictory. It declares that you are That, and this is the salutation. If this is felt and realized, then the peak will salute the valley -- because now there is nothing else but the Divine, and now the peak will realize that it is dependent on the valley. Then light will salute darkness and life will salute death. because everything is interdependent and interrelated. At this peak of realization, one becomes humble -- because this declaration of "I am That" is not against anyone. It is for all. Now, through me, everything is declaring its Divinity.

Many people were there when Al-Hillaj was killed; many were throwing stones. He was laughing, he was prayerful, he was loving. There was a *sufi* fakir also present in the crowd. The whole crowd was throwing stones, and the *sufi* fakir, just to be one with the crowd, just in order not to let them feel he did not belong with them, threw a flower. He could not throw any stone, so he threw a flower just to be one with the crowd -- so that everyone would feel that he was with them, that he belonged to them.

Mansoor began to weep. When the *sufi's* flower hit him, he began to weep. The Sufi became uneasy. He came nearer and he asked Mansoor, "Why, when they are throwing stones, are you laughing, praying for them? And I have thrown only a flower!"

Mansoor said, "Your flower hits me more because you know. This is not a declaration for *me*. I have declared for you and you know, so your flower hits me more. Their stones are just like flowers because they do not know. But this has been a declaration for them. If Mansoor can be Divine," said Mansoor, "then everything can be Divine. If even Mansoor can be Divine, then everything can be Divine!" Mansoor said, "Look at me! I was no one and yet I declare I am Divine. Now everything can be Divine."

This is a declaration not from the ego: this is a declaration from a non-ego realization. When one begins to feel that one is nothing, only then can one come to this. Then it is

humble; then it is the most humble possibility. It becomes a salutation -- a salutation to the whole Existence. Then the whole Existence has a Divinity.

Mystics have denied temples, mosques, churches, not because they are meaningless, but because the whole Cosmos is a temple. Mystics have denied statues, not because they are meaningless, but because the whole Existence is the image of the Divine. But to understand their language is difficult. They appear to us as antireligious -- denying statues, denying images, denying temples, churches, denying scriptures; denying everything that we believe to be religious. They are denying only because the Whole is Divine. And if you insist on the part, that shows you do not know about the Whole.

If I say, "This temple is Divine," just by saying this I have said that the whole universe is not Divine. If this temple is just part of a greater temple, then it is a different thing. But if this temple is against the Whole, against other temples -- not only against other temples: if this temple is against any ordinary house even, if this temple says that houses are not holy and only temples are holy, it is a denial of the Whole.

For the Whole, mystics have denied the parts. But for us there is no Whole; we do not know anything about the Whole. So even when the part is denied it is uncomfortable, because that is all we know. If someone says there is no temple, it is enough for us that he is not religious. He may be saying this: that because *everything* is a temple, do not make anything in particular a temple; do not say anything in particular is Divine, because everything is Divine. This is the salutation.

We are also worshipping. We go to the temple, to the mosque, to bow. We bow down, but the ego remains standing. It is only a bodily movement. The inner ego remains unmoved. Rather, it may become even more straight *because* you have been to the temple, because you have been to the *teerth* -- because you have been on a holy pilgrimage -- because you have been to Quaba. Now you are no ordinary person! You are "religious" because you bowed down, but it was a bodily gesture. Your ego has become more strengthened by it; it has been a food for your ego. Your ego has been vitalized; it is not dead.

That is why so-called religious persons will always be more egoistic than ordinary worldly persons. They have something more that you do not have. They are "religious": they do prayer daily! When you go to a cinema hall your ego may not be strengthened, but when you go to a temple it is strengthened, because in a temple you can never feel that you are guilty. You may feel in a cinema hall that you are guilty; you may feel in a hotel that you are guilty, but you can never feel that you are guilty in a temple. You feel superior; you become more respectable; you gain something in terms of ego.

Look at the faces of persons coming out from temples. Observe them! Their egos are more strengthened. They are coming out with some gain; this has been a "vitamin". You can bow down without bowing down at all -- and that is the problem. Bowing must be inner. And if then the body follows, it is a deep experience. Even in the body it is a deep experience -- if you are bowing inwardly with the feeling that because everything is Divine, then wherever you bow down you are at the feet of Divine. If your body moves with this feeling, then your body also will have a deep experience, and you will come out of it more simple, more innocent, more humble.

What to do? Man has invented many things, but they have not helped. And man's ego is so subtle and cunning, and it can deceive you in such subtle ways that you cannot defeat it. If there is a God somewhere in heaven you can bow to Him, and you can still behave egoistically with the whole Existence because you feel that this world is not Divine. Your Divinity, your God, is somewhere high in heaven. To this world, you can go on behaving as

you were behaving, and you can behave even more badly because now you are related to the Supreme Authority. Now you have a direct link. You can dial any moment to the Supreme Authority; you can tell Him to do anything.

Jesus was passing through a village. The village was antagonistic. They would not shelter the disciples of Jesus; they refused. They would not give any food, not even water, so they were having to move to another village. The disciples said to Jesus, "This is your moment. Show your miracles: destroy this village! Such irreligious people should not exist." These are the disciples who later on created the whole Christianity. They said, "Destroy this village this very moment. This is the time! Show your miracles!" They are asking Jesus to prove that he is the Son, the only begotten Son. They are saying, "Now tell your Father who is high in heaven to destroy this village this very moment!"

Why this arrogance? Why this anger? And they were prayerful people. They were praying daily; they were living with Jesus. Why this arrogance? There were simply some ordinary people in the town. They had only refused to give food. This is not a sin. This is up to them. If I come to your house and you refuse me food, okay -- it is up to you. Why this arrogance? And not the whole city had denied them. There were small children and old men, they had not denied them: only a few people had. But the disciples said, "Destroy this whole city. This whole village must be destroyed this very moment."

The trees had not denied them shelter, but they were asking Jesus to destroy everything that belonged to the village. Why? Through prayer, through salutations, through worship, they have become more arrogant. They are not humble people; humility is far from them. And if they are not humble, how can they be religious? Why did this become possible? Because God is "in heaven." Then they could feel that "The person who has denied us food is not Divine; the village is not Divine. God is somewhere in heaven and we are God's chosen people. These people are anti-God, so destroy them."

Real humility is possible only when God is not far away. He is your neighbour every moment. Wherever you are, He is your neighbour. To put God somewhere else, far away, is very easy, convenient, because then you can behave as you like with your neighbour and God is "always on your side."

I was reading something: One French general was talking to an English general. It was after the Second World War. The French general said, "We were continuously defeated and you were not defeated. Why is this so?"

The English general said, "This is because of prayer. We pray before we start any fight. We pray!"

The French general said, "But that we also do."

The English general said, "That is okay, but we pray in English and you pray in French. From where did you get this idea that God knows French? He cannot know it."

This is how the so-called religious mind becomes arrogant. Sanskrit is the "only sacred language"; you can laugh at the anecdote, but can you laugh at this? You think Sanskrit is the only sacred language and that the Vedas are the only scriptures written by God Himself. You think: "The Koran? How is it possible! From where did you get the idea that God knows Arabic? He knows only Sanskrit!" Then you say, "God is always on my side. If He insists on not being on my side, I can change my God. That is always within my capacity." So because of that fear, "He always remains on my side. He is my God; He has to follow me."

This attitude is created because for you the whole Existence is not Divine. If the whole Existence is Divine, then God even understands the language of trees -- not only Sanskrit and Arabic, but even the language of the stones. And then it is not a problem of language at all.

Then language is irrelevant. It is not prayer which is meaningful now: it is a prayerful mind. And a prayerful mind is something totally different from a praying mind.

This sutra says that this is the only salutation, the only humbleness possible, but in a very paradoxical way. "I am God": to feel this is the salutation. We would have liked to say, "You are God," and then it would have been easy to salute. But this sutra says, "I am God. This is the only salutation." Then we will ask whom to salute. There is really no need to salute. There is *no need* to salute! It is not an activity; it is not something you have to do. If the whole Existence is Divine, then whatsoever you are doing is a salutation.

Because Kabir continued to work as he was working before his Enlightenment, he was asked about it. He was a weaver; he continued weaving. Disciples would come from far, very, very faraway places, and they would say, "Why? You are an Enlightened One; you are now a Buddha. Why do you continue weaving?"

Kabir would say, "This is the only prayer I know. I was a weaver, so I only know how to salute Him in this way."

Someone said to Kabir, "But Buddha, when he became Enlightened, left everything."

Kabir is reported to have said, "He was a king. He knew only I know only this way. This is my prayer, and when I am weaving these clothes I am weaving them for the Divine."

And then Kabir would go to the market to sell them. So someone said to him, "But you go to the market to sell them. You say these are for the Divine, so why do you not go to the temple and lay them at the Divine feet?"

Kabir said, "I always lay them at the Divine feet, but my gods are waiting there in the market. My Ram is waiting there, and I believe in living gods."

This attitude does not need any salutation. Now it is not an act to be done; rather, it is a way to live. *your* prayer can be just a part of your act -- just one act among many. But to persons like Kabir it is not an act. It is a way to live. So Kabir said, "Whatsoever I am doing is prayer." It can be, but then the whole Existence must be Divine. Then whatsoever you are doing, if you are eating, it is prayer because it goes to the Existence. Then it is not you who are eating, but the Existence through you. Then, when you are moving or walking, it is prayer because it is the Existence moving through you, walking through you.

When you are dying it is prayer, because it is the Existence taking back that which was given. That which was made manifest is now becoming unmanifest. Then you are not in between. You are no more. You are just an opening, just an opening for the Existence, a window. Existence moves through you, in and out. You are nowhere in between at this moment of nothingness. Man can say, "AHAM BRAHMASMI -- I am the absolute; I am That."

This is not an egoistic assertion: this is one of the most humble of assertions -- but it looks very paradoxical. Life is such a complexity that if you have to assert simple truths you have to be paradoxical. If you are asserting complex truths you need not be paradoxical; you can be very logical. This has to be understood: only *very* simple truths are difficult to express -- because the more simple they become, the more non-dual. And when it comes to the very center, then the statement has to imply all dualities.

Look at it in this way: the Upanishads say, "God is near and God is far away." If you say, "He is only near," it is false; if you say, "He is only far away," it is false, because that which is near can become far and that which is far can become near. You can move; you are already moving. "He is everywhere": this simple truth has to be expressed in a very paradoxical way. He is the nearest and the farthest; He is the minutest and the greatest; He is the seed and the tree; He is birth and death -- because if He is life, then He must be *both* birth and death.

Why not simply say that He is life? Because in our minds, life is *against* death, so this simple truth -- that He is life -- cannot be asserted in this way. It has to be asserted in a paradoxical way: "He is birth and He is death; He is both." He is life *only* because He is both. He is the friend and the foe, because the foe can become the friend and the friend can become the foe. He is both! We would like Him to be the friend and never the foe, but our likings are not truths. Really, unless our likings and dislikings cease, we cannot come to the Truth. We cannot come to it because we go on choosing and projecting.

This statement is again a paradox. The first part of it, "The feeling that I am Divine, I am That," is the peak; and the second, "... is the salutation," is the valley. It is the valley and peak both. First there is the most egoistic assertion possible -- "I am That." And then, falling down unto the feet of everything, the assertion, "... is the salutation." These are two extremes, two polar opposites, and many things are implied.

If you feel that you are inferior and then you bow down, it is not a salutation. It is just part of your inferiority. If you say, "I am superior," and you cannot bow down, then you are not really superior -- because one who cannot bow down is dead. He cannot be superior. And one who cannot bow down is still afraid somewhere of his superiority -- afraid that "If I bow down I will not be superior." Only one who is at ease with his superiority can bow down; only one who has gone beyond his inferiority can bow down. And this is the highest peak possible -- "I am That" -- and then from there you bow down.

Buddha has given his past-life memories. In one, he says, "I was just ignorant." Buddha says, "I was just ignorant. Then a Buddha, a person who had become Enlightened, passed through my village. I went to touch his feet. I touched his feet, but then suddenly I became aware that he was doing something. He was bowing down and then he touched my feet. I became afraid and I said, 'What are you doing? I should touch your feet; that is as it should be. But why are you touching my feet?'"

That Enlightened One said to Gautam Buddha, "You are touching my feet because I am a Buddha. I am touching your feet because you are a Buddha also."

Gautam Buddha, in his past life, said to him, "But I am not. I am ignorant; I am no one."

The Enlightened One said to him, "Because you do not know what you are, you do not know what you can become. You are bowing to a present Buddha; I am bowing to a future Buddha. I have become manifest; you will become manifest. It is only a question of time."

This bowing down of an Enlightened One is the secret of this sutra. He was a peak, and he is bowing down to an ignorant man. Now from his peak he can see another peak which is hidden in ignorance. It is not hidden for him; to him it is as clear as anything.

You can bow down to this ordinary Existence only when you feel that you are That! To say it in another way: unless you become God you cannot be humble, unless you become God you cannot be innocent. That innocence is expressed through this sutra. Salutations we know. We know about God, we know about salutations. But this sutra is very difficult. It is impossible to conceive of it. It makes you the God and it makes this being the God a basic condition for salutation.

To us, one must always salute to the higher, to that which is higher than us. But this sutra makes you the highest, and that is the basic condition for salutation. Whom to salute? You are the highest, so now salute the lowest. The salutation from the lower to the higher is just ordinary. There is nothing in it. It is the ordinary mind working -- the political mind, the ambitious mind. It is working to salute the higher. But you are the highest. Now the mind will say that you need not salute anyone. Now the whole Existence must salute you. You are the highest. Now let the whole world come to you to salute; now let the whole Existence bow

down to your feet.

This will be your feeling. If you take it as you are, if you begin to follow this sutra, this will be the feeling: "Now let the whole world come and salute me." But this sutra says that this is the basic condition for you to salute the Divine.

When there is no one whom you can ask, the ego feels starved. When you feel inferiority, you want someone to salute you. This is a hunger -- a hunger for food. This shows that you are still just at the first stage of the mind: "I am." And below this stage there is nothingness, so whatsoever you put into this "I am" goes deep into the abyss, and the "I am" remains always vacant.

One day a seeker came to Mulla Nasrudin to ask him how to find Truth. Nasrudin said, "There are many conditions to be fulfilled before I can accept you as a disciple. So come with me; I am going to the well to fetch some water." He went there. On the way he said to the future disciple, "Do not ask any questions because I have not accepted you yet as a disciple. When I accept you, you can ask. Just observe; do not ask anything. If you ask anything before I am back at my home, you disqualify yourself."

So the future disciple thought that it was not such a difficult thing to just go to the well, fetch a bucket of water and then come back. "I will remain totally silent," he thought. So he kept silent. But Mulla was doing such absurd things that it was impossible to keep silent. He had two buckets -- one bucket to pull water from the well and another, a bigger one, to fill with water. But the bigger one had no bottom, so he would pull the water and throw it into the bigger one with no bottom. The water would fall out, and then he would drop the bucket again.

So the future disciple said, "What are you doing?"

Mulla said, "Now you disqualify yourself. Now no more questions. Leave me! It is not your business. Who are you to ask me?"

The future disciple said, "I am going! And there is no need to tell me to go because there is no need for me to stay with you. I am leaving, but I have one piece of advice for you. You can labour on this bucket your whole life, and it will never be filled."

So Mulla said, "I am concerned with the surface, not with the bottom. I am looking at the surface. When the surface is okay; I will go back to my home. To consider the bottom is irrelevant."

The future disciple left, but in the night he could not sleep. "What type of man is this?" he wondered. He began to brood. And as sleep began to come, he wondered, "What could be the secret of it?" And he began to think of many, many clues. Then, by and by, he thought, "It may be just that he was examining me, testing me, just seeing whether I can keep silence in a situation where it is impossible to be silent."

So in the morning he ran back to Mulla Nasrudin and said, "Pardon me; excuse me. It was sheer fault; it was my fault. I should have kept silent. But what was the secret of it?"

The Mulla said, "Because I am not going to accept you as my disciple, I can let you know the secret. The secret is this -- that the bucket was nothing but the first state of man's mind. You go on filling it, but it will never be filled. But no one is concerned with the bottom. Everyone is concerned with the surface. You go on filling it with prestige, respect, wealth and everything else. You are only concerned with the surface. One day your ego will be found. But no one is concerned with the bottom -- whether this bucket has any bottom at all."

The disciple began to weep and said, "Accept me! You are the right man."

Mulla Nasrudin said, "It is too late. This bucket is so helpful to me. Whenever someone turns up with a mind to be a disciple, this bucket disqualifies. And it has disqualified many

and it has saved me much labour. But this bucket will not disqualify a person only if he has come to feel that his mind is a bucket without a bottom. Then he is qualified to be my disciple, because all discipleship is from 'I am' to 'I am not'."

To drop from the bottom to the abyss, to the second layer of the mind, is what every discipleship is for. Then there is nothingness, and beyond that nothingness is the feeling of "AHAM BRAHMASMI -- I am That".

The Ultimate Alchemy, Vol 2

Chapter #11

Chapter title: Questions and Answers

2 August 1972 pm in

Archive code: 7208025

ShortTitle: ULTAL211

Audio: Yes

Video: No

Length: 98 mins

OSHO, "SO-AHAM -- I AM THAT," OR "AHAM BRAHMASMI -- I AM THE BRAHMAN," OR "ANAL-HAK": ALL THESE STATEMENTS SEEM TO BE THAT OF A GYANI (ONE WHO IS ON THE PATH OF KNOWLEDGE). LAST NIGHT'S SUTRA SAYS: "I AM THAT -- SO-AHAM -- IS THE SALUTATION." THE SECOND PART SEEMS TO BE THAT OF A BHAKTA (ONE WHO IS ON THE PATH OF DEVOTION), WHEREAS THE FIRST PART SEEMS TO BE THAT OF A GYANI. THIS IS A RARE COMBINATION. PLEASE EXPLAIN WHY THE STATEMENTS OF GYANA AND BHAKTI HAVE BEEN PUT TOGETHER?

(I) IN THIS REFERENCE, PLEASE EXPLAIN THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN A GYANI AND A BHAKTA.

(II) HOW DO GYANIS LIKE RISHI KAPIL AND SHANKARA DIFFER FROM BHAKTAS SUCH AS CHAITANYA AND MEERA?

(III) WHY HAVE GREAT BHAKTAS PREFERRED TO KEEP THEMSELVES SEPARATE FROM BHAGWAN (THE DIVINE) SUCH AS MEERA FROM LORD KRISHNA?

(IV) DOES BHAKTI CULMINATE INTO GYANA OR GYANA CULMINATE INTO BHAKTI?

THE Ultimate is one -- but it can be viewed from many angles; it can be looked at from various points of view. It is one, but when it is expressed the expression can take multi-shapes. It is one, but when one reaches toward it the paths differ. And whatsoever is said from a particular path is just one aspect of the reality: it is not the total reality.

Experience of the Total is possible, but expression of the Total is not possible. Expression is always partial. You can feel and realize the Total, but the moment you express it, it is only a viewpoint: it is never the Total.

There are two basic divisions of approaches -- the path of knowing and the path of love. Man's mind is divided between these two aspects. These are not divisions of the Ultimate Reality: these are divisions of the human mind. The mind can look at the Truth as a knower

or as a lover. That depends not on the Ultimate Reality but on you. If you look through a lover's eyes your experience will be the same as when you look through the knower's eyes, but the expression will differ. When you look through love, your expression will be totally different.

Why this difference? Why this total difference? Because love has its own language, knowledge has its own language. Love has its own language! Those languages are quite contradictory. For example, knowledge always strives toward one, and love is impossible if there are not two -- love is possible only when there is a duality. But I must make haste to say that love is a very mysterious experience -- it is *oneness between* two. The two must be there, but just the two being there does not mean that love is there: when the two begin to feel a deep oneness, then love happens.

Love has a double duality: oneness in two. The duality must be there, and at the same time oneness should be felt. And the language of love will retain this duality: "the lover and the beloved." These are the two polarities. Between these two polarities, oneness has been felt, but that oneness cannot exist without these two polarities.

The lover will say, "I have become one with my beloved; the beloved is in me," but he cannot speak the language of knowledge. He cannot say that duality has disappeared; he can only say that duality has become illusory: "We are two and yet we are not two." This paradox -- "We are two and yet we are not two" -- is love's language. It is not mathematical; it cannot be. It is the language of feeling.

You can feel oneness without becoming one. There is no need to become one; that is irrelevant. You can feel oneness without merging, without dissolving. You can remain two outwardly, and inwardly you can become one. And the path of devotion, the path of love, says that if oneness means dissolution of the two, that oneness will be just that. That oneness will have no poetry in it; that oneness will be dry. It will be a mathematical oneness. Love says that oneness is something more alive; it is not a mathematical unity. The lover and beloved remain, and yet they begin to feel that they have dissolved. The two-ness remains, but it becomes more and more illusory. Oneness is felt as more real than two-ness, but two-ness remains.

The seeker on the path of love says that this is the beauty and the experience is richer for it, and mathematical unity means that the experience is not a rich one. In a flat way, two things have disappeared and there is one. It is less mystic. Lovers say, "We remain two and yet we are not two," and they go on taking in terms of this non-duality in duality, oneness in two-ness. The oneness is basic. On the surface, the beloved is the beloved and the lover is the lover, and there is a gap. Deep down, the gap has disappeared. Love is a poetic approach toward Existence, and minds differ.

I remember one anecdote about a British scientist, a Nobel prize winner, Dirac. A friend of Dirac's -- another scientist, a Russian scientist, Kapitza -- gave him one of the most highly praised novels of Dostoyevsky -- "Crime and Punishment". Kapitza said to Dirac, "Go through this novel and then tell me your impression." When Dirac returned the book he said, "It is nice, but there is one fault, one error in the book. The writer says that the sun rises twice in the same day. On the same day the sun rises twice." In the story somewhere Dostoyevsky has made this error: the sun rises twice in the same day. So Dirac said, "That is the only error, and I have nothing more to say."

And this was the only thing he said about Dostoyevsky's great novel "Crime and Punishment", and he is no ordinary man. But the approach, the approach of a mathematician, is not the approach of a poet, of an artist, of a lover. It is the approach of an impartial

observer. It is mathematical. Only this he had to say -- that there is one error: the sun cannot rise twice in the same day. About such a great piece of creation, such a great piece of art as "Crime and Punishment", only this struck his mind.

Why? Because of the training of the mind for impartial observation, mathematical observation. No one had ever detected this error. He was the first. Many have felt in Dostoyevsky's book a deep insight, a depth-psychology, a great poetry, a great drama, but no one has detected this error. It depends on how you look at the world.

A lover looks with different eyes. When the lover comes to the Ultimate experience, he knows that now everything has become one, but he says that if this oneness is simply oneness, just oneness, it is dead. It is an alive oneness. It is an alive, dynamic phenomenon. It is a constant movement between the two sources. It is a constant unity, a movement, a live process: it is not a dead unity. And the reality can be looked at with quite contradictory outlooks.

The mathematical mind, the mind of an observer, a detached observer -- that is the one on the path of knowledge, knowing -- will say that either the duality exists or oneness, but both together are impossible. This is a logical approach. How can you say that oneness exists while two are still there? Either dissolve the two and then there is oneness, or do not talk of oneness: talk of two. And he is also right in his own way; it is his approach. He says that if you have achieved oneness, then there is neither the lover nor the beloved. Both have disappeared; there is no distinction. You cannot talk of the beloved, of the Divine, of God; you cannot talk of the devotee. It is nonsense! Stop! Or, if you are still continuing to talk in terms of duality, then you have not come to oneness -- because both cannot exist simultaneously. This is just a mathematical approach, but mathematics is not life and life allows even the opposite, even the contradictory. So I will explain it in a different way; it will be easier.

This century has seen one of the greatest revolutions in science, and that is the dethronement of mathematics. With the discovery of the electron, the old rationalistic approach became absurd, out of date.

You might have heard about Immanuel Kant, a German philosopher. He had two cats. One was a smaller one and one was a bigger one. Both the cats would sleep with him, but there was a difficulty. Sometimes they would not come in time, and Kant was very particular about time. He would move only by the clock. He would have to wait for the cats: only then could he lock the door. So one day he asked his servant to bring a carpenter to make two holes in the door -- one for the smaller cat and one for the bigger one. "Then they can come at any time and I can go to sleep easily," he said.

The servant thought him mad, crazy, because the cats could come through just one hole; there was no need for two. But mathematically Kant is right; practically he is just foolish. Mathematically he is absolutely right! However, the servant thought that one hole would do, so one hole was made. When Kant came back from his university, he saw that there was only one, for the bigger one, so he said, "From where can my small cat get in? Where is the other hole?"

The servant said, "She can get in from this hole. She is not such a big philosopher. Cats are very practical, they are not theoretical, so do not bother about it." But it was inconceivable for Kant, so he waited. When he saw with his own eyes that both cats were coming from one hole, then only was he at ease.

We would laugh at this, but now a more crazy thing has happened. With the discovery of the electron, everything in physics has become muddled -- because one electron thrown at a

mirror, at a screen, shot at a screen with two holes, will pass through both the holes simultaneously. One electron must pass through one hole. If you are thrown out of the window you cannot pass from two windows simultaneously, but an electron passes.

When this was observed for the first time, the electron seemed absolutely impractical. The whole thing seemed weird. How can one electron pass through two holes simultaneously? But it passes, and electrons are not philosophers. So what to do and how to interpret this phenomenon?

Science had to develop a new concept. Now they say that the electron is both a particle and a wave: it is *both*. So when you throw it at a screen, it passes through two holes simultaneously -- because a wave can pass through two holes simultaneously, not a particle. A wave can pass through two holes simultaneously, but a particle cannot. When you look at it, it is a particle, but it behaves as a wave.

Now, old mathematics, old geometry, the old Euclidian mathematics, will not be ready to concede to this, because a wave is not a particle and a particle is not a wave; a point is not a line and a line is not a point. They had to throw out the whole Euclidian geometry, and now they say they cannot force mathematics on reality. We have to change our mathematics; there is no other way. If reality behaves non-mathematically, we cannot say to reality, "Now behave mathematically, behave logically." Physics has discovered a very weird world where all our laws are blurred. If you observe the electron, it appears as a particle, as a point. If you observe its behaviour, it appears as a wave, as a line.

The same has happened with the Ultimate Truth. If you look at it through love's eyes, it behaves like a wave. If you look at it through a knower's eyes, it appears to be a particle. Through a knower's eyes it appears to be one, and through a lover's eyes it appears to be two. It depends on the looker. It is both and it is neither.

Because of this, if one goes on emphasizing one's own standpoint too much, then that standpoint will look contradictory to the other -- because if someone says, "The electron is a particle; I have observed it myself," he is right, nothing is wrong, but then he will exclude the other. Then the other by itself becomes wrong. If he says, "Because I am right, you are wrong; because I have observed an electron to be a particle, it cannot be a wave," then you are rejected outright. Then there is contradiction.

But the same can be done by the others who have observed it behaving as a wave, who have seen it with their own eyes passing through two holes simultaneously. They can say, "It is not a particle at all, because a particle cannot behave like a wave." Then they go on insisting. Then they create sects, exclusive sects.

This sutra is rare; it combines both. It says that when you know you are That, this is the salutation. The first part belongs to the path of knowledge and the second part to the path of devotion, the path of love. This is to say, in other words, that when you know you are one, only then do you know that you are two. Or, when you come to know that you are two, you can come to feel the inner unity, the oneness.

This twoness and oneness belong to you, not to the reality. The reality is both or neither. Before a lover's eyes, it behaves like two: it is divided between the lover and the beloved. Before the knower's eyes, it behaves like a particle, like one. There is no real contradiction, but they will laugh at each other. The seekers on the path of knowledge will always feel that the devotee is missing something -- that he cannot achieve the Ultimate. They are right in a way, because from their standpoint it is so.

I will tell you one story that I heard one day. It takes place early in the morning; the sun is yet to rise. One earthworm is half awake, still sleepy. He is relating curled around a stone.

Then the sun begins to rise, the mist disappears, and this earthworm feels the presence of some other earthworm. He looks around the stone. Just by the other side, another earthworm is approaching. He falls in love, as it is the habit of men and earthworms to fall in love at first sight. And when the preliminaries of courtship are over, the first earthworm says to the other, "Baby, I am in deep love. Now I cannot live without you, so marry me."

The other has remained silent up to now. Then the other laughs and says, "You fool! I am your other end."

On the path of knowledge devotees look foolish. They seem to be talking to their own other end. They are calling the beloved "God, the Divine", but they are talking to their own other end. They look foolish to those on the path of knowledge. But knowers will say that they are good people because they admit their foolishness.

St. Francis is reported to have always called himself "God's fool". But as devotees are good people and they can laugh at themselves, St. Francis said, "I am a fool, but let me be a fool. I do not want to be wise because I have seen wise ones. I may be mad, but let me be mad. This love between myself and the Divine is enough."

Devotees are fools, but with a method. They are mad, but with a method. They say that this madness is the only wisdom possible. If you cannot love yourself, you cannot love. Let it be the other end -- but love is so good and love is so beautiful that even if one has to divide oneself into two to love, one should divide. That is why bhaktas, devotees, lovers, have said, "This world is a play -- LEELA" Radha is also Krishna -- disguised. God is loving himself through so many disguises. So bhaktas -- devotees -- are not very serious. They say, "We are fools, we are mad people. But we are happy about it, and we do not want your dry, dead knowledge. Of course, it is exact, but dry and dead. Our madness is alive."

For those who are on the path of knowledge, love is inconceivable. They say that if you love you cannot know, because love gives partiality. You cannot be detached. A seeker must be detached; he must not be involved. He must be aloof, indifferent. He must observe as an outsider; he must not be in the process himself.

A lover cannot be detached. You cannot ask Majnu to be detached about Laila; that is impossible. He will say that Laila is the only beautiful woman -- not only of this time, but of all times. This is absurd, but he is in love. Love creates this feeling. He is authentic. Whatsoever he is saying he feels, but this feeling is that of an involved man, one who is committed. He is not an outsider. He cannot look at Laila detachedly, so the followers of the path of knowledge will say that he can never come to Truth, that he will always live in his own illusions. Whatsoever he is saying is a subjective feeling; it is not objective Truth. They will say that bhaktas go on talking about their own illusions. If you want reality, then be objective. Then love will not do. Really, love is the hindrance because it colours everything.

In Sanskrit, we have the word *rag*. *rag* means attachment and *rag* means colour. Every attachment gives a colour to the object. It is a projection. The path of knowledge says, "Be absolutely unattached. Have *veetrag* -- no attachment, no love, no thought of devotion -- only then can you come to the Real."

This dialogue can continue infinitely, because on every point those on the path of knowledge will differ. And I would insist that they are right as far as they are concerned. Whatsoever they say about themselves is right, but they become wrong when they begin to say something about the others. When the followers of knowledge say something about devotees, it becomes wrong because the devotee's experience is not their experience at all. Whatsoever they know about love is one thing; whatsoever a devotee comes to know about love is absolutely different.

For the devotee, the follower of the path of love, it is not a projection, because the lover says, "I am no more, so who can project? I have no expectations, no demands, no desires, so how can one project without desires, without expectations, without ambitions?" The bhakta says, "I have nullified myself just to become a space for the Divine to descend, and now the Divine has entered."

This love, this communion, is not a projection, because projection is always through desires. So if you are desiring something by your communion, it will be a projection. If you simply desire communion and nothing else, it cannot be a projection. So bhaktas have said, "We do not want your *moksha* -- Liberation; *baikunth* -- heaven -- we do not want. We do not want any *punya* -- any merit; we do not want your heaven. We only want you."

Bhaktas say that those who are following the path of knowledge want Liberation. They want *moksha*, they desire heaven, they desire purity, they desire freedom. Their effort is ambitious. Bhaktas say, "If *baikunth* is there -- if heaven is there -- and your feet are here, then we choose your feet." They have never asked for *moksha*, Liberation, freedom. They ask nothing. One bhakta has sung, "Let me be a dog in Vrindavan (Krishna's birthplace) or let me be just the dust in the streets of Vrindavan. That is enough, and I will wait for your feet for eternity. I need nothing else."

Really, in a deeper way, bhaktas seem to be less ambitious than gyanis, but they cannot understand each other; that is difficult. You cannot make them understand. The dialogue seems impossible, because they use different languages, they use different realms, they give different meanings to their words. Bhaktas say that love is the only freedom -- the *only* freedom! For those on the path of knowledge, knowledge is freedom, not love. Love is a bondage: the moment you are in love you are in a bondage. And the bhaktas say that love is freedom, and that if you know love as a bondage you have not known love at all. They are talking in different languages, and there is no meeting.

Only sometimes, rarely does it happen that a person is both. It is a very rare phenomenon. Centuries and centuries pass, and only then does someone happen to be both. But then his language will become more difficult for you to understand. Look at this: a bhakta cannot understand the language of a gyani; a gyani cannot understand the language of a bhakta. But if a person is both, masses will not understand him at all. In itself, each language is difficult -- and when both languages become one, it becomes impossible to understand him. That man can understand both the bhaktas and the gyanis, but the masses cannot understand him at all because he will continuously appear to contradict himself.

Whenever he will speak the language of the path of knowledge he will say one thing, and whenever he will speak the language of love he will speak in contradictory, absolutely contradictory, terms. He will go on contradicting himself, and you will simply be confused. What does he mean? This is rare, and whenever it happens, that man is misunderstood completely.

This Upanishad belongs to such a man who is both. You may not have noticed, but the very name of this Upanishad is "Atma Pooja -- Worship of the Self". It is absurd! The title is absurd, contradictory. Worship of yourself? Worship is always of someone else! But here you are the worshipped. Worship loses all meaning, and he is continuously speaking in paradoxes. Every sentence belongs to both gyanis and bhaktas. He will use the symbols of the bhaktas and then give them meanings of the knowers, not of the lovers. The whole Upanishad is doing this consistently. The symbology is of devotees, of worship, but the meaning given to it is that of the knowers.

In this sutra also, the same is the case. If you know you are That, then this is the

salutation. Because of this consistently inconsistent attitude, he is consistently contradicting himself and using double languages. He is mixing two different realms. This Upanishad was neglected; no one has commented upon it. It is one of the most neglected Upanishads and one of the most beautiful ones.

To comment on it is difficult because commentators are, again, of two types. For those who believe in the path of knowledge, the whole language belongs to the other camp. And for the followers of the path of love, the whole meaning belongs to the former Camp. So this *rishi* of the "Atma Pooja Upanishad" really belongs to no camp. And because of this, this Upanishad has remained neglected, uncommented upon.

So the first thing is that these are two languages. Love has its own language; knowledge has its own language. And they cannot meet superficially. They can meet only in a person, not in a dialogue. One person can attain such a state, but this happens rarely. And why rarely? Because when you have come to the goal by one path, why bother about the other paths? There is no need. You have reached the goal by *one* path.

Ramakrishna tried one experiment. He was the only one who has done such an experiment in this age. He would reach to a particular state of consciousness, and then he would stop and begin to travel by another path, then by another. And he stopped this only when he found he could reach to the same state by so many paths. He tried Sufi ways, he tried Buddhist meditation, he tried Hindu paths. Deeply he was a devotee, basically he was on the path of love, but then he tried Vedanta -- the path of knowledge. It was very arduous, because it is not so easy to change from the path of devotion to the path of knowledge. Then everything has to be contradicted.

He was learning from Totapuri, one of the greatest Vedantists of his time, and Totapuri was absolutely a Vedantist, a follower of the path of knowledge. So he would laugh at Ramakrishna and would say, "You are foolish! What are you doing with this weeping, crying, dancing, praying? There is no one! To whom are you praying?" Then Ramakrishna became a disciple. And this is one of the rarest phenomena, because Ramakrishna had achieved whatsoever Totapuri had achieved. This is humbleness. He became a disciple of Totapuri. He said, "Teach me. Now, by your path I will travel."

Totapuri became the teacher, and he was a very rough teacher, a taskmaster. And he would teach him in the same way as he would teach anyone else ABC. So Ramakrishna was in a mess because Totapuri would say, "Throw this image of your goddess Kali! Throw this! Destroy this! Cut it into pieces!" And Ramakrishna would begin to weep. Then Totapuri would say, "This childishness won't do."

One day Ramakrishna said, "It is difficult! It is impossible! Whenever I close my eyes the goddess is there. I am bowing down to her Divine feet, and you go on saying to me, 'Throw, cut, destroy!' How can I do it? How can I destroy the Divine image? And it is so beautiful, and the experience is so lovely! And I am in such a high state of mind. I am not in this world at all."

Totapuri said, "This is all illusion, your projections. Take a sword in your hand and out the goddess into two. Kill!"

So Ramakrishna said, "From where can I get the sword?"

Totapuri said, "From the same source where you got this image, from inside where you got this image -- from imagination. So get one sword from imagination; and if you are not going to destroy this, I am going to leave. And you have taken a vow to follow me, to be my disciple, so do whatsoever is told! Otherwise I will leave this very moment!"

So Ramakrishna closed his eyes. He was weeping, tears were falling down, and Totapuri,

while laughing, said, "What foolishness you are doing! Why are you weeping? No one can reach Truth through weeping. Be a man and kill the goddess!" And then he brought a piece of glass. Totapuri brought a piece of glass and he cut Ramakrishna's forehead with that glass. Blood began to flow, and he said, "As I am cutting your forehead, just inside cut the image."

And Ramakrishna destroyed the image. This was very arduous. No bhakta has ever done this. This was done for the first time. But no bhakta will travel this path; there is no need. And then Ramakrishna said, "The last barrier has fallen away." That was the last barrier on the path of knowledge, so Totapuri was at ease, happy. He said, "You have achieved. Now you are Liberated.?"

And the second day Ramakrishna was in the Kali Temple and weeping. He himself had said that the last barrier had fallen, and now again he was weeping and crying and dancing. Then Totapuri left, and he said, "You are incurable."

But this is not a case of incurability. He was just trying to reach to the same point by so many paths. He became a Mohammedan for six months; then he would not enter the Kali Temple -- because how can a Mohammedan enter? So he would come just outside and he would inquire about his goddess, asking how she was, and then he would go back. Then he would sleep in a mosque and he would do Sufi methods for six months. For that period he was a Mohammedan. Then, one day, he came laughing to the Temple and said, "Now I am back. Mother, I am back! I have reached to the same through Mohammedan methods."

Sometimes only, this has been done. This Upanishad belongs to someone who knew both paths, and who knew deeply, so he goes on changing his track from one language to the other. And those languages are contradictory. If you understand this, then there can be no confusion.

OSHO, YOU SAID THAT LIFE EXISTS IN POLAR OPPOSITES -- BIRTH AND DEATH, GOOD AND EVIL, PEACE AND VIOLENCE, KINDNESS AND CRUELTY, BEAUTY AND UGLINESS. IT SEEMS THAT THESE POLAR OPPOSITES ARE INEVITABLE AND ARE BOUND TO BE THERE. THEN WHAT DO WE STRIVE FOR THROUGH RELIGION? THEN WHAT IS MEANT BY SPIRITUAL TRANSFORMATION?

SAINTS AND PROPHETS TRY TO CREATE A SPIRITUAL SOCIETY AND CULTURE. DOES IT NOT MEAN THAT THEY WANT TO CHANGE THE NATURAL STATE OF THINGS? AND IF WE SUCCEED IN CREATING A HEALTHY SPIRITUAL SOCIETY, THEN WHAT WILL BE THE SITUATION OF THE OTHER POLAR OPPOSITES LIKE CRUELTY, VIOLENCE AND UGLINESS?

This is one of the most significant problems, and much confusion exists about it. So first, know well that religion is not ethics, religion is not morality. Morality goes on endeavouring against that which is evil, bad, immoral -- that which is sin. So morality is a conflict, a struggle, against that which is evil. Morality is trying to create a moral world where no immorality should exist. That is impossible! Only you can change, but the balance remains the same.

This is one of the deepest laws of nature -- that it exists as polar opposites. If you destroy one, the opposite will also be destroyed. In a world where there is nothing bad, nothing will be good. Where there is no sinner, there will be no saint. The saint exists as a polar opposite to the sinner; they are interdependent. So moral effort cannot create a world where only good

exists. This is an unfulfilled hope, and it will remain unfulfilled. It cannot come to happen because it is denying the basic law.

Now physicists say that matter exists only because there exists something like anti-matter; a parallel world of anti-matter exists. Nature is a balance. You cannot destroy the balance. If you go on emphasizing one polar opposite, really, two things are possible. Either you will be able to make it stronger -- then the other polar opposite will also become stronger -- or, you will be able to destroy the other; then the one that you were trying to make stronger will also be destroyed.

Life is a balance, so morality is a futile effort. when I say this, I do not mean do not be moral, because then again you destroy the balance. So be whatsoever you can be.

Religion is a totally different realm. Religion is not after creating a good world *against* the bad. Religion is after a balanced world -- not against anything. Where good and bad both balance, they negate each other. And when a man is neither a saint nor a sinner, this man becomes a sage. This is a balanced person -- neither a sinner nor a saint, just a deep balance, an inner balance between the polar opposite forces.

When two polar opposites are balanced, you transcend them. Look at it in this way. Sometimes you feel that you are healthy: this is an imbalance. Sometimes you feel that you are ill: this is again an imbalance. Sometimes you do not feel yourself as either ill or healthy: this is balance. To feel that you are healthy means that you have moved to the other extreme. Now you will fall ill. Remember this: whenever you begin to feel you are healthy, you are on the verge -- you will fall ill. This happens every day, but you are not aware of it. Whenever you feel, "I am happy," happiness ends. Whenever you become aware of anything, it means you have moved very far. Now come back. The balance must be regained, and to regain the balance you will have to move to the opposite.

It is just like a NATA -- an acrobat -- walking on a rope, constantly moving from left to right. But have you observed that whenever he has moved too much to the left, then suddenly he will have to move to the right, to balance? When he feels that now he will fall if he goes further to the left, to balance this he will have to move to the right. We are all acrobats moving on a rope continuously -- from good to bad, from bad to good, from health to illness, and illness to health -- continuously! A sage is one who has come down from the rope. Now he is not bothered about going from left to right. He has gone beyond.

Religion is a transcendence. The sage knows that the bad cannot be destroyed because it is part of the balance; the good cannot remain alone -- both are necessary. So through these polar opposites, Existence exists. Seeing this, realizing this, the sage simply balances himself between the two. There is no choice. He has not chosen good against bad. If you choose good against bad, sooner or later you will have to choose bad against good. Because you have moved in one direction, now you will have to move in the other.

So saints are always moving toward sin and sinners are always moving toward sainthood. Saints have their sin moments and sinners have their saint moments. In each saint the sinner exists as a possibility, and whenever the saintliness is too much the sinner brings the balance. So they say, those who know say, that you cannot be a saint for twenty-four hours a day. You have to have some holiday. You cannot be -- it is too much, it is boring and heavy. One has to escape. So saints have their own tricks to escape from their sainthood.

You cannot be the whole time a sinner. It is difficult -- impossible! You will fall down, you will die. You will have to move! So it happens sometimes that sinners will do such saintly acts that you cannot even conceive of saints doing them. Sometimes sinners are so saintlike that it seems unbelievable. But they balance.

Religion is not concerned with good and bad -- with choice. Religion is a choiceless transcendence. Realizing this polarity of Existence, the sage, the one who knows about the polarity, just leaves choosing. Then he never moves to the right, never to the left. He remains in between. Buddha has called this *majjhim NIKAYA* -- the middle path. Buddha says, "I will not choose. I will remain in the middle -- just exactly in the middle."

When you do not choose, you transcend. It is possible. It may be; it may not be: but it is possible. A world is possible in which we have transcended this constant wavering between right and left, between sinner and saint, between good and evil, between good and sin -- in which the whole world is balanced. That will be a *religious* world. It will not be moral; it will not be immoral. It will be religious! So this constant confusion between religion and morality must be discarded. Religion is not morality. Morality is a choice against something and for something.

I will tell you a story: Once Mulla Nasrudin was a listener to a very learned scholar. He was listening to him: the scholar was a religious man -- a great religious teacher also. So in the end, when the discourse was just over, the religious scholar said to everyone present, "Who wants to go to heaven? Those who do, raise your hands." So everyone raised his hand except Mulla Nasrudin, and he was sitting just in the front row.

This happened for the first time. The teacher had asked the same question in many villages and towns, and never had he seen anyone just sitting there without raising his hand for heaven. So for the first time he had to ask the other question. He had never asked it. Then he asked, "Who wants to go to hell? Those who do should now raise their hands." No one raised a hand -- not even. Mulla Nasrudin. Then the scholar asked, "Are you hearing me? Are you deaf? Where do you want to go! I asked for heaven and you remained silent; I asked for hell and you remained silent. Where do you want to go?"

Mulla Nasrudin said, "Just in between. I do not want to go anywhere -- not to heaven, because I have seen those going to heaven fall down into hell. I do not choose hell either, because from hell where can you go? You can only go to heaven. So please allow me, if it is possible, to be just in between. Only then can I be at peace, otherwise it is impossible. In heaven, hell becomes an attraction. In hell one is hankering after heaven. So if it is possible, allow me to be in between."

This is the attitude of no-choice. Religion is no-choice -- choicelessness. But we go on thinking in terms of morality and confusing it with religion. Morality is a day-to-day necessity, and through morality you have not been able to create a moral world. Really, the more man becomes conscious of morality, the more immorality is found. Everyone says that the world has gone immoral. The real case is this, that you have become too morality conscious. The world has not gone immoral. Man has become too conscious of morality; that is why the world looks so immoral. It is a balance.

Now we are condemning war everywhere. Now war looks like total immorality. Are you aware that never in history, never before, have we condemned war? We have fought. We have never condemned. For the first time we are condemning war and we are creating atom bombs. We never condemned war because we never created atom bombs. They both create a balance. The more fatal, suicidal war becomes, then the more we will be against wars. The more we are against, the more fatal war will become.

So whatsoever you deny you also create. The world was never so poor, and when I say this I mean that the world was never so conscious of poverty. It has always been poor -- more poor than it is now; the world has always been poorer. The further back we move, the poorer a world we will find. But poverty was taken for granted, and it was not immoral to be rich.

Now to be rich is immoral. One feels guilty, and the poor man by your side is your sin. For the first time we have become so moralistic that to be rich is guilt-creating, and to have poverty around is a sin committed by the rich.

This is one thing: too much consciousness, too much awareness, too much morality. And then, simultaneously, the poorer have become more poor. Economically they are not, but now they feel poverty to be heavy upon them. So whatsoever we do goes in two directions. It develops both ways simultaneously, and a balance is always achieved.

Religion is not for a richer world, because a richer world can only exist with a deep poverty, a great poverty. In every dimension, you can change circumstances, you can change names, and then the same thing will become apparent with a new face.

Religion is for a balanced world -- neither rich nor poor. Try to understand this: neither rich nor poor, but a balanced world where no one is conscious of poverty, no one is conscious of richness. That is why a religious world is a very deep affair. It seems to be the impossible revolution. These polar opposites are there and they will always be there. All that you can do is to go beyond them.

For example, let us look from some other direction: man has been fighting with death continuously. The whole history of science is nothing but a fight against death. The history of medicine, the history of the human mind, is a fight against death. Now we have prolonged life. Man is now living the longest, but no human society was so much afraid of death as we are afraid of death. Now, in the West, they have achieved the longest life on earth.

We hear and we go on saying that in the old, golden days man lived to be a hundred. That is not a fact; it is simply a fiction -- but it has a reality behind it. Everyone felt that he had lived a hundred years because no one ever counted. Counting is a new thing; remembering one's birthday is a new thing. But, remember, when you remember a birthday, then the death-day will be continuously before you.

No animal is afraid of death because no animal is aware of birth. Primitive societies are not afraid of death, but they are not aware of birth either. Death happens as birth happens, and there is no counting of how long they have lived. The more precise your counting becomes, the more afraid you become of death. Now America is in the grip of death because time consciousness has come to a peak. Everyone is aware. The longest life becomes possible and death becomes more black. Why? It is a deep balance. If you go on prolonging life, you are prolonging your death also. If you live long, your death will also be a long spread-out affair. Both grow continuously and simultaneously. You cannot escape; you cannot choose.

Really, we have found every possibility for fighting diseases. But man is ill -- more ill than ever. With all the scientific growth in medicine, man is more ill than ever. Why? Why does your progress in medicine also create somewhere a progress in illnesses, in diseases?

Carl Gustav Jung proposed a very fantastic idea. He called it "synchronicity". He said, "For whatsoever is being done, there is also a parallel world growing." And you cannot do anything. If knowledge grows, ignorance will deepen. If health grows, then illnesses will explode. If you become good, somewhere someone may become bad. And nothing is wrong about it: it is simply a balance. The world cannot exist with good people only. It will be such a boring world. Can you conceive a world of only MAHATMAS? The whole world will commit suicide because even to exist for a single day will be such a tedious affair. All around MAHATMAS! You will simply die of them.

Now life is a constant polarity. The richness comes from the polar opposite -- from both opposites existing together. Religion is not a choosing between these two. Religion is just understanding this polarity and then remaining in a non-choosing attitude.

A religious man lives without choosing. If he is healthy, he is healthy. If he is ill, he is ill. When he is ill, he is at ease with his illness. He is not longing for health. When he is healthy, he is at ease with his health. He is not conscious of it. He moves easily between these polar opposites without any choice. And, by and by, his movements are slowed down. They become shorter and shorter and shorter, and a moment comes when there is no wavering. This non-wavering comes through non-choosing. If you choose, you will waver. If you choose, you will create the opposite.

This looks very paradoxical, but I would like to say do not try to be good: otherwise you will be bad. Do not try to be something: otherwise you will become quite the contrary. Just remain in a non-choosing attitude. Whatsoever happens, let it happen, *allow* it to happen.

This is very difficult. If anger happens, allow it to happen: do not choose. If love happens, allow it to happen: do not choose. And soon a day will come when neither love will happen nor anger. If you choose, then you are in the grip. Then you are in the wheel, and then the grip is automatic. When you go on changing from one to the other -- and this is a constant, repetitive process -- the whole life becomes just a wavering from one point to another. Do not be an acrobat on the rope -- just come down.

Look at it in this way: you are walking on the ground. You can walk even on a very narrow strip. We can make a chalk strip, a white strip on the ground, and you can walk on it without any movement to the right or to the left. Why? Now the same size strip can be set up between two houses, two roofs. Now walk on it! You will find you cannot walk. Why? You can walk the same strip on the ground very easily balanced, but when the same strip, when the same size strip is hanging between two roofs, you cannot walk a single step. You begin to waver. Why? Now you have become aware that you may fall down. Now you have chosen something: you have chosen not to fall down. Now you are not walking at ease. There is a choice not to fall down. You have chosen. Because of this choice, every step is toward falling down, so you will have to move right and left to balance.

Life is just a rope -- a very narrow rope. If you choose, you choose wavering. Neither good nor bad -- that is the only good. Neither this nor that -- this is the only religion. Upanishads have said, "*Neti, neti* -- not this, not that." You do not choose! It is an effortless understanding. It is a simple understanding.

OSHO, IN NEO-SANNYAS INTERNATIONAL, WHAT ARE YOU DOING -- BALANCING THE PRESENT IRRELIGIOUS STATE OF THE WORLD OR ARE YOU CREATING ANOTHER OPPOSITE POLE?

No opposite pole is to be created because Neo-Sannyas is not a choice. It is not against the world. If sannyas is against the world, it is a choice. Therefore, if sannyas is against the world, we will create a very worldly society. We have done this in India. These 5,000 years in India were a conscious choice for sannyas -- renunciation. Renunciation was the goal, and look at the Indian mind: the most worldly in the whole world! Why? We have tried to create an absolutely unattached society, but look at the Indian mind: the greediest! We have been saying that "Wealth means nothing -- it is simply nothing," and look at our society: wealth is everything!

Why has this happened? This was a conscious choice. We were against the world. Through that conscious choice, we moved to the other extreme. So now we go on talking against the world and go on living in a worldly way.

The same in the reverse order will become possible in the West. They have chosen the world, and now their children are going against the world, against society, against the establishment, against whatsoever has been held as valuable. America stood for wealth, and now its children are hippies: they are against wealth. America was a clean society, cleanliness was held just next to God, godliness, and now hippies are going just against this -- they are the most unclean.

Why? If you go against something, something else will happen to balance it. If you choose wealth, your children will be against wealth. If you choose some other world, your children will belong to this world: they will choose this world.

Neo-Sannyas is not a choice. It is a deep acceptance, not a choice. It is not against, neither is it for. It is a deep understanding -- a remaining in between. Not choosing: LIVING! Not choosing: flowing! If you can flow with a deep acceptance inside, sooner or later the day will come when you will transcend both worldliness and renunciation.

To me, sannyas means not renunciation, but transcendence.

The Ultimate Alchemy, Vol 2

Chapter #12

Chapter title: Breaking the Inner Monologue

3 August 1972 pm in

Archive code: 7208035

ShortTitle: ULTAL212

Audio: Yes

Video: No

Length: 85 mins

MOUNAM STUTIHI

"SILENCE IS THE PRAYER."

"SILENCE is the prayer." By prayer we always mean a communication, something said to the Divine, but the Upanishads say that whatsoever you may say will not be prayer. Prayer is not something to be done. You cannot do it. It is not an act; it is not your doing. So, really, you cannot "do" prayer, you can only be a prayer. It is not related with any of your doings. It is a certain state of your being.

So the first thing to be understood is that man has two dimensions in Existence: one is his being, the other is his doing. Prayer is not part of the second. You cannot do it, and the prayer that is done will be false, inauthentic. You can be: prayer belongs to the dimension of being.

The body cannot do prayer, cannot be in prayer. The mind cannot do prayer, cannot be in prayer. The body is meant to do something; it is the vehicle of action. The mind is also a vehicle of action. Thinking is doing: it is action. So you cannot do anything with your body which can become prayer, neither can you do anything with your mind which can be called prayer, because these are both parts of the dimension of doing, action. Prayer happens beyond body and mind. So if your body is in total inactivity, passive, and your mind is nullified, empty, only then is prayer possible.

This sutra says, "Silence is prayer." When mind is not working, when body is not active, it is silent. One thing to be understood is that silence is not part of mind. So whenever we say, "He has a silent mind," it is nonsense. A mind can never be silent. The very being of mind is anti-silence. Mind is sound, not silence. So when we say, "He has a silent mind," it is wrong. If he is really silent, then we must say that he has no mind.

A "silent mind" is a contradiction in terms. If mind is there, it cannot be silent; and if it is silent, it is no more. That is why Zen monks use the term "no-mind", never "silent mind". No-mind is silence! And the moment there is no-mind you cannot feel your body, because mind is the passage through which body is felt. If there is no-mind, you cannot feel that you are a body; body disappears from consciousness. So in prayer there is neither mind nor body -- only pure Existence. That pure Existence is indicated by silence -- *mouna*.

How to attain to this prayer, to this silence? How to be in this prayer, in this silence?

Whatsoever you can do will be useless; that is the greatest problem. For a religious seeker this is the greatest problem, because whatsoever he can do will lead nowhere -- because doing is not relevant. You can sit in a particular posture: that is your doing. You must have seen Buddha's posture. You can sit in Buddha's posture: that will be a doing. For Buddha himself this posture *happened*. It was not a cause for his silence; rather, it was a by-product.

When the mind is not, when the being is totally silent, the body follows like a shadow. The body takes a particular posture -- the most relaxed possible, the most passive possible. But you cannot do otherwise. You cannot take a posture first and then make silence follow. Because we see a Buddha sitting in a particular posture, we think that if this posture is followed then the inner silence will follow. This is a wrong sequence. For Buddha the inner phenomenon happened first, and then this posture followed.

Look at it through your own experience: when you get angry, the body takes a particular posture, your eyes become blood-red, your face takes a particular expression. Anger is inside, and then the body follows. Not only outwardly: inwardly also, the whole chemistry of the body changes. Your blood runs fast, you breathe in a different way, you are ready to fight or take flight. But anger happens first, then the body follows.

Start from the other pole: make your eyes red, create fast breathing, do whatsoever you feel is done by the body when anger is there. You can act, but you cannot create anger inside. An actor is doing the same every moment. When he is acting a role of love, he is doing whatsoever is done by the body when love happens inside -- but there is no love. The actor may be doing better than you, but love will not follow. He will be more apparently angry than you in real anger, but it is just false. Nothing is happening inside.

Whenever you start from without, you will create a false state. The real always happens first in the center, and then the waves reach to the periphery. That is why this sutra says that prayer is silence. The innermost center is in prayer. Start from there.

But that is very difficult. The difficulty arises for so many reasons. The first is that you have never known silence, so the word is meaningless really. You have heard the word, you know what it means, but you do not really know what the experience of silence is, so it connotes nothing. The word falls on our ears; we believe that we understand, but nothing is understood. The actual word is unknown to us as far as experience is concerned, only the sound of the word is known.

Mulla Nasrudin was practising silence in a mosque with three other friends. It was a religious day, and they had taken a vow to be silent for twenty-four hours. This was to be their prayer. "Silence is prayer": they had heard this.

Just five or ten minutes after they started, the first man said, "I wonder whether I have locked my house or not!"

The second one said, "What are you doing? You have broken the silence and now you will have to start again!"

The third one said, "You fool! You have also broken it."

Mulla Nasrudin was the fourth. He said, "Praise be to Allah! I am the only one who has not broken the silence yet."

They have heard the word "silence". They have heard that silence is prayer.

Why does this happen? When someone else was breaking the silence everyone was aware, but when someone was himself breaking it he was not aware. Why? Because to them, to talk, to utter something, was breaking the silence. Really, you never hear whatsoever you say. When someone else says it, you hear it. You are so accustomed to your own sound and voice, you do not know what you are saying, that you are talking.

Another difficulty is that you are constantly talking inside, so when you utter something outwardly there is no difference for you. Inwardly, you were already talking. Now you have uttered something outwardly, but as far as you are concerned nothing has changed, nothing has happened. But when someone else utters something, for you something new has happened. He was silent before and now he has uttered something. If you yourself are talking within, then when you utter something you will not be aware. Someone else may become aware that now you have broken silence.

You are aware of others because inwardly you are constantly talking with yourself. A monologue, a continuous monologue is there. Awake or asleep, you are continuously talking. This continuous talk has become such a habit that you have not known any interval. When you are not talking inwardly, when you are talking with others, you feel relieved, relaxed, because when you are talking with others you are relieved of the duty of talking to yourself. And that is such a boring thing -- to talk with oneself. You already know what you are going to say, and still you have to continue.

No one else can be such a bore to you as you yourself are. You have told a particular thing to yourself millions of times, and again and again you are telling it. You are not very inventive. You go on in circles saying the same thing again and again. Watch! Watch for twenty-four hours and note down what you are saying to yourself. Then you will feel a weird feeling and strange, to see that you have been saying the same thing continuously all your life.

Even in a single day, you go on repeating yourself. This has become just a habit, deep-rooted. And when something becomes a deep-rooted habit, you are not aware of it. It becomes automatic. The robot part of your body takes it and continues it. That is why silence is very difficult, because silence really means breaking the monologue within. It is not a question of not talking to someone else. *mouna*, silence, is not really concerned with others. Deep down it is concerned with your own monologue.

Not to talk with yourself is very difficult, so we will have to Find out reasons why we talk with ourselves. Why do we go on talking with ourselves in the first place? If you observe, then you can find out the cause. The cause is that nothing is complete in our lives; everything is incomplete. You were eating, and then you were thinking about your office. So eating will not be satisfied; it will not be fulfilled; you will not feel content. It remains incomplete.

You eat hastily. You fill your stomach and you run to your office. A process has remained incomplete. Then when you are in your office, you begin to think about your wife, about your children, about a thousand things; then you are not in the office. The whole day, you have been there and still you were not there. The work in the office has remained incomplete, and now you have come to your house. Now you are thinking about your office. You are with your wife, but you are not -- you are absent.

It is a rare phenomenon that a husband is present with his wife -- rare! And it hurts much because the wife can feel it. The husband also feels that the wife is not present. No one is present; everything is incomplete. The mind has to continue the thing which you have left incomplete, and so many things are incomplete. So mind goes on continuously in circles, completing things that you have left incomplete.

Do you remember anything which you have completed? Do you have any moment in your life, any experience, which you can say is complete, total? If you have any experience which is complete, the mind will never go back to it. There is no need. There is no need! It is absolutely useless. The mind simply tries to complete everything. The mind has a tendency to complete. And this is necessary; otherwise life will be impossible.

So this constant monologue within is really a part of your wrong living -- incomplete living. Nothing is finished, and you go on making new beginnings. Then the mind goes on becoming piled up with incomplete things. They will never be completed, but they will create a burden on the mind -- a constant burden, a growing burden, an increasing burden -- and that creates the monologue.

That is why the older you grow, the more the monologue grows with you. And old men begin to talk aloud. Really, the burden is so much that the control is lost. So look at old men. They will be sitting, and their legs will be working, and they will be talking, and they will be making gestures. What are they doing? You think they have gone crazy, that they are old and now they have become stupid. No, that is not the case. They have had a long incomplete life, and now death is coming nearer and mind is in haste, trying to complete everything. And it seems impossible! So if you really want to break this monologue, which means silence, then try to complete everything that you are doing. And do not start new things -- you will go crazy. Finish whatsoever you are doing, all the very small things.

You are taking a bath: make it complete. How to make it complete? Be there! Your presence will do it. Be there, enjoy it, live it, feel it. Be sensitive to the water falling on you, be saturated. Come out of your bath doing it completely, totally. Otherwise the bath will follow you. It will become a shadow; it will go with you. You are eating: then eat! Then forget everything! Then nothing exists in the world except your present act. Whatsoever you are doing, do it so completely so unhurriedly, so patiently, that the mind is saturated and becomes content. Only then leave it. Three months of continuous awareness about doing your acts completely will give you some intervals in your monologue. Then, for the first time, you will become aware that this monologue was a by-product of incomplete living.

Buddha has used the term "right living". He has shown an eight-fold path. In those eight principles, one is "right living". Right living means total living; wrong living means incomplete living.

If you are angry, then be *really* angry. Be authentically angry; make it complete. Suffer it! There is no harm in suffering because suffering brings much wisdom. There is no harm in suffering because only through suffering does one transcend it. Suffer it! But be authentically angry.

What are you doing? You are angry and you are smiling. Now the anger will follow you. You can deceive the whole world, but you cannot deceive yourself, you cannot deceive your mind. The mind knows very well that the smile was false. Now anger will continue inside; that will become a monologue. Then whatsoever you have not said you will have to say within. Whatsoever you have not done you will imagine as done. Now you will create a dream. You will fight with your enemy, with the object of your anger. The mind is helping you in completing a certain thing.

But that, too, is impossible because you are doing other things. Even this can be helpful: close your room -- you were not angry; the situation was such that you could not be -- close your room and now be angry, but do not continue the monologue. Act it out. There is no necessity to act it out on someone: a pillow will do. Fight with it, act your anger out, express it, but let it be authentic, real. Let it be real, and then you will feel a sudden relaxation inside. Then the monologue will drop, it will break. There will be an interval, a gap. That gap is silence.

So the first thing: *break* the monologue. And you can do it only if your living becomes a right, complete living. Never be incomplete. Release the inner madness. Not only one whole life: many whole lives that were incomplete is our situation.

When you love, you are doing a thousand things simultaneously. Then love becomes false. Now psychologists say that if you are loving someone and a thought crosses your mind, you have missed love. You are far away from your love object. There is a gap; the communion is broken. When two lovers are really in love, there is nothing else, simply love -- nothing else! They are playing with each other's bodies, absolutely absorbed in it. The whole world has dropped out of their consciousness; nothing is there. Then love is complete. And then they will not become sex maniacs. Then their minds will not be perverted minds.

Psychologists say that Don Juans like Byron, or others who go on changing their love objects, are really incapable of love. It is reported that Byron loved sixty women in his life, and his life was very short. And these are known cases. No one knows how many really. He was expelled from society because everyone became afraid. And he was such a beautiful person -- but why this madness?

One may think that he was a great lover. That was not the case. He was not a lover at all! Psychologists say he was not a lover at all. He was a maniac, just a perverted mind. He could not complete any love, and before any love could be consummated, completed, he had started another.

It is reported that he was forced to marry a girl. Of course, he was forced because he was not ready. How could he marry? The next day he would run after another woman. After he was forced, he was coming out of the church -- the bells were ringing and the guests were still there -- he was coming down the steps with his wife's hand in his hand, and suddenly he stopped; he let go of the hand. A woman was crossing the street. His eyes followed the woman. Being an honest man in a way, he said to his wife, "Now you do not mean anything to me. That woman has become everything."

He suffered, because love is a growth. Love is a *long* growth. It grows, and the more it grows, the deeper it goes. Butterfly minds cannot grow in love. That is impossible because the love never acquires roots. Before the love can acquire roots, they have moved. This type of mind will suffer, because it cannot love and it cannot get love. Nothing is ever completed; nothing ever becomes ripe. Then the whole life will just be lived in wound -- incomplete wounds -- and this happens in every field.

You have never loved, you have never been angry, you have never acted spontaneously. You have not really eaten, you have not slept totally, you have not done anything with your total being in it, with your total involvement in it. You have always been doing something else simultaneously.

Bokuju was asked, "What is your SADHANA? (spiritual practice)? What are you doing here in this lonely forest? What are you doing?" Bokuju said, "I have no *sadhana*; I have no method. When I feel hungry I eat; when I do not feel hungry I fast. When I feel that the hut has become cold, I move out into the sun. When the sun is too much to bear, I move into the shadows of the trees. But wherever I am, I am total. When I feel sleepy, I drop down into sleep. This is all I am doing here."

The man said, "But this is nothing. Everyone is doing the same!"

Bokuju said, "If everyone were doing the same, the world would be quite a different place -- silent, peaceful, loving. Then there would be no need to ask for Liberation. This very world would be a MOKSHA."

No one is doing it. Bokuju's answer seems very simple, but it is not. It is very arduous. It is difficult just to sleep and not dream, because dreaming means there has been an incomplete day. It is now being completed in the dream. Whatsoever you have left incomplete in the day will be completed in the dream. So if you have been a good man, if you have tried to be a

good man and the goodness was not natural to you, not something spontaneous but something forced, then in the dream you will move to the other extreme. If you have been honest with effort, then in the dream you will deceive someone. Then everything is complete.

Now psychologists say that if dreaming stops you will go mad, because dreaming releases much nonsense which you have left incomplete. And unless it is completed, it cannot evaporate: it cannot evaporate from your being. They say dreaming is the daily catharsis. So if you have not slept well, you will feel uneasy. It is not because you have not slept, it is because you could not dream.

Now they say sleep is not so essential. A man can live without sleep for many days, even for months and years. They say it is not so necessary. Dreaming is necessary, and you cannot dream without sleep; that is why sleep is needed. So sleep is needed only for dreaming.

But why is dreaming needed? You wanted to kill someone and you have not killed: you will kill him in your dream. That will relax your mind. In the morning you will be fresh: you have killed. I am not saying to go and kill so that you will not need any dream. But remember this: if you want to kill someone, close your room, meditate on the killing, and consciously kill him. When I say "kill him", I mean kill a pillow; make an effigy and kill it. That conscious effort, that conscious meditation, will give you much insight into yourself.

Remember one thing: make every moment complete. Live every moment as if there is no other moment to come. Then only will you complete it. Know that death can occur at any moment. This may be the last. Feel that "If I have to do something, I must do it here and now, COMPLETELY!"

I have heard a story about a Greek general. The king was somehow against him. There was a court conspiracy, and it was the general's birthday. He was celebrating it with his friends. Suddenly, in the afternoon, the king's manager came and he said to the general, "Excuse me, it is hard to tell you, but the king has decided that this evening, by six o'clock, you are to be hanged. So be ready by six o'clock."

Friends were there; music was there. There was drinking, eating and dancing. It was his birthday. This message changed the whole atmosphere. They became sad. But the general said, "Now do not be sad, because this is going to be the last part of my life. So let us complete the dance we were dancing and let us complete the feast we were having. I have no possibility now, so we cannot make it complete in the future. And do not send me off in this sad atmosphere, otherwise my mind will long again and again, and the stopped music and the halted festivity will become a burden on my mind. So let us complete it. Now is no time to stop it."

Because of him, they danced, but it was difficult. He alone danced more vigorously; he alone became more festive. But the whole group was simply not there. His wife was weeping, but he continued to dance, he continued to talk with his friends. And he was so happy that the messenger went back to the king and he said, "That man is rare. He has heard the message, but he is not sad. And he has taken it in a very different way -- absolutely inconceivable. He is laughing and dancing and he is festive and he says that because these moments are his last and there is no future now, he cannot waste them: he must live them."

The king himself came to see what was happening there. Everyone was sad, weeping. Only the general was dancing, drinking, singing. The king asked, "What are you doing?"

The general said, "This has been my life principle -- to be aware continuously that death is possible any moment. Because of this principle I have lived every moment as much as was possible. But, of course, you have made it so clear today. I am grateful because until now I was only thinking that death is possible any moment. It was just a thinking. Somewhere,

lurking behind, the thought was there that it was not going to be just the next moment. The future was there, but you dropped the future completely for me. This evening is the last. Life now is so short, I cannot postpone it."

The king was so happy, he became a disciple to this man. He said, "Teach me! This is the alchemy. This is how life should be lived; this is the art. So I am not going to hang you, but be my teacher. Teach me how to live in the moment."

We are postponing. That postponing becomes an inner dialogue, an inner monologue. Do not postpone. Live right here and now. And the more you live in the present, the less you will need this constant "minding", this constant thinking. The less you will need it! This is there because of postponing, and we go on postponing everything. We always live in the tomorrow which never comes and which cannot come; it is impossible. That which comes is always today, and we go on sacrificing today for tomorrow which is nowhere. Then the mind goes on thinking of the past which you have destroyed, which you have sacrificed for something which has not come. And then it goes on postponing for further tomorrows. That which you have missed, you go on thinking you will catch somewhere in the future.

You are not going to catch it! This constant tension between past and future, this constant missing of the present, is the inner noise. Unless it stops you cannot fall into that silence which is prayer. So the first thing: try to be total in every moment.

The second thing: your mind is so noisy because you always go on thinking that *others* are creating it, that you are not responsible. So you go on thinking that in a better world -- with a better wife, with a better husband, with better children, with a better house, in a better locality -- everything will be good and you will be silent. You think you are not silent because everything around is wrong, so how can you be?

If you think in this way, if this is your logic, then that better world is never to come. Everywhere this is the world, everywhere these are the neighbours, and everywhere these are the wives and these are the husbands and these are the children. You can create an illusion that somewhere heaven exists, but everywhere it is hell. With this type of mind, everywhere is hell. This mind is hell!

One day Mulla Nasrudin and his wife came to their home, to their house, late in the night. The house had been burglarized, so the wife began to scream and cry. Then she said to Mulla, "You are at fault! Why didn't you check the lock before we left?"

And by then the whole neighbourhood had come around. It was such a sensation! Mulla's house had been burglarized! Everyone joined in the chant. One neighbour said, "I was always expecting it. Why didn't you expect it before? You are so careless!" The second said, "Your windows were open. Why didn't you close them before you left the house?" The third one said, "Your locks appear to be faulty. Why didn't you replace them?" And everyone was pouring faults on Mulla Nasrudin.

Then he said, "One minute please! I am not at fault"

So the whole neighbourhood said in a chorus, "Then who do you think is at fault if you are not?"

Then Mulla said, "What about the thief?"

The mind goes on throwing the blame on someone else. The wife throws it on Mulla Nasrudin, the whole neighbourhood on Mulla Nasrudin, and the poor man cannot throw it on anyone present, so he says, "What about the thief?"

We go on throwing the blame on others. This gives you an illusory feeling that you are not wrong: someone else somewhere is wrong -- X-Y-Z. And this attitude is one of the basic attitudes of our mind. In everything someone else is wrong, and whenever we can find a

scapegoat we are at ease, then the burden is thrown. For a religious seeker, this mind is of no help: this is a hindrance. This mind is the hindrance. We must realize that whatsoever the situation is, whatsoever the case is with you, *you are responsible*, no one else.

If *you* are responsible, then something is possible. If someone else is responsible, then nothing is possible. This is a basic conflict between the religious mind and the non-religious mind., The nonreligious mind always thinks that something else is responsible. Change the society, change the circumstances, change economic conditions, change the political situation, change something, and everything will be okay.

We have changed everything so many times, and nothing is okay. The religious mind says that whatsoever the situation, if this is your mind, then you will be in hell, you will be in misery. You won't be able to attain silence.

Put the responsibility on yourself. Be responsible, because then something can be done. You can only do something with yourself. You cannot change anyone in this world: you can only change yourself. That is the only revolution possible.

The only transformation possible is one's own, but that can be considered only when we feel that we are responsible. Why are you so noisy within? Why so much anxiety within? You are responsible. This is the first step. Then you cannot go and change the causes. The cause must be within; only then can it be changed.

In a similar situation to one which makes you uneasy, someone else may not be uneasy at all. A Buddha in the same situation will pass through it differently -- unscratched. Why? Why are you so disturbed by such situations? You were ready. You were just waiting for the situation. Someone is angry against you; you also become angry. You say it is because he did something. You say, "He created the stimulus; I only heard it. I was not angry: he made me angry."

But religious analysis is different. Religion says that anger is always yours. There was anger there to be stimulated. He stimulated it, of course, but something was within you -- the energy, the tendency, the habit to be angry was there. That is why he could stimulate it. If there had been no energy, no stored up anger, no repressed anger, no habit, then whatsoever he was doing would not have touched you at all. It touched you because you were ready to be touched. You were ready to explode; he simply created the situation and helped you. He was your helper! If there had been no one to create the situation, you would have created it yourself. You needed it! You needed it very badly!

Remember this when you become angry again. Analyze the whole thing, meditate on it, and then you will know that you were already getting ready. You were prepared and you were waiting, and this man who aroused your anger simply gave you a chance.

There was a case against Mulla Nasrudin in a court. Suddenly, without any reason, he had beaten his boy and then gone out of the house. So the magistrate asked, "What was the reason? Why did you do this suddenly? There was no fight; there was nothing. Why suddenly did you do this?"

The Mulla said, "I was standing by the door, and the door was open, and the street was vacant and there was no traffic. The stick was just handy, and the wife was looking toward the house, so I thought I should not miss the opportunity."

You will create opportunities if they are not given to you. You will not miss them: you will create them. If you become aware of this phenomenon, then something can be done. Then it is within your control to do something. The source is within, but you go on projecting it outside. Then you cannot do anything. If you go on projecting the causes outwardly, then you are helpless. What can you do? If someone stimulates you, creates anger in you, what can

you do? You are just a helpless victim.

The second thing: remember, you are responsible for whatsoever you are. Even if someone gives you a chance, he gives you a chance to express *yourself*. It is always you who is ultimately, finally, responsible. Why this emphasis on one's own responsibility? Because if I am responsible, I will stop reacting. You do something, I react. Reaction is really a slavery. You are manipulating me. You can make me happy, you can make me miserable: then you are my master, I am your slave. If you smile at me, I am happy. Just a glance of angry eyes at me, and I am miserable. Then you are my master. If I think that you are responsible, then you remain my master and I remain your slave. If I am responsible, then you may go on smiling or you may do whatsoever you like. I will not react according to you: I will act according to me.

Mulla was sitting at a prayer-meeting in a mosque. His shirt was rather short and the man behind him thought it looked unseemly, so he pulled it down. Suddenly, immediately, Mulla pulled the shirt of the man in front of him. The man asked, "What are you doing?"

He said, "Don't ask me. This man behind me started the whole thing. I am not responsible. I have simply reacted. If this is the way a mosque prayer is done, I have to follow."

You go on doing things because someone is doing them to you. You go on passing them on. You may not be aware of it. Are you aware that when you are telling something to your children you are simply repeating whatsoever was told by your father to you? This is Mulla Nasrudin. Are you aware of it? The way you are behaving with your wife is the way you saw your father behaving with your mother. You are just passing things on. You are no one -- just a passage. What are you doing?

When you are with your servant, have you observed the way you behave? Is this not the way your boss behaves with you in the office? What are you doing? You are just a part of a long chain. Then you cannot be silent. How can you be silent? You are being pulled and manipulated from everywhere, and you are just vulnerable to everything, every nonsense. If someone is angry, you say, "I simply reacted. Why was he angry with me?" Why? He was angry; it was his business. How are you related? But now you feel it a duty, and whatsoever is being done to you, you will do the same religiously.

Remember, you are not a slave and no one has imposed this slavery on you. It is self-imposition. Throw it! Be a master! Only then can you be silent. Only a master can be silent. And when I say "master", I mean a person who *acts* from within -- who is not *reacting*. We are always reacting; there is no action in our lives. The moment you can act, you will feel a deep silence within -- because now you have become a master. No one can disturb you. Now you are not helpless.

Buddha is passing. Someone abuses him. He listens to it, and then he turns to Ananda and says, "Ananda, this was a long debt. Now it is paid. In some life I must have abused him. Now no more chain. Thank you, friend," Buddha said to that man. "Now the account is closed. I am not going to react." Buddha says, "Reaction is rebirth. If you react, you will have to be born again and again because you are in a chain. Accounts are not closed. Everything is open."

The day Buddha died, he gathered all his monks. Ten thousand monks were there. He said, "Now this body is to drop, so do you want to ask anything? Because now, no more can I be. No more will I be in this world!"

So someone asked, "Why? Why are you leaving us?"

Buddha said, "Now everything is paid. The whole account is closed. I was waiting only

for the account to be closed completely. Now nothing is left; I am a master. I have transcended the chain. Now I am no more amidst you."

So a third point: become a master. Whatsoever you are doing, do it as an action, never as a reaction. Resist the temptation to react. That is the only evil, the only sin -- to react. Laugh if you feel to laugh, but do not laugh as a reaction. Weep if you are feeling to weep, but do not weep as a reaction. Stop reactions! Act! If these three things are there, you will drop into the silence which is prayer.

This sutra says, "Silence is the prayer -- *mounam stutihi*." When you are silent, with no monologue within, no anxiety within, no reactions within, with nothing incomplete or suspended, everything complete and finished, you become a space, just a space -- infinite, because all the boundaries are your reactions, all the boundaries are your anxieties, all the boundaries of your being are just your madhouses. When you are silent, you are infinite space.

But why does this sutra call it prayer? Why bring prayer in? Better to call it meditation. Why call it prayer? When you are silent, it is meditation. Why bring prayer in? It is not brought unnecessarily -- because when you become an infinite space, the Divine descends in you. You have called, you have invoked. When you are totally silent, you have become a host. Now the Divine guest can come. And only in this emptiness, in this silence, in this nothingness, can the Divine guest come. This is the only invitation, the only invocation. This is the only prayer.

Prayer means asking for the Divine to come, asking the Divine to be a guest to you. Words won't do, invitations won't do. Whatsoever you do -- cry, weep -- it won't do. First become a host. Silence is becoming a host. Now you are ready. Now there is no need to pray, now there is no need to request. No invitation is needed -- the Divine descends. When you are silent the Divine is there.

It will be better to say it in other terms: the Divine is always there, but you cannot feel it because you are not silent. The guest is there, but the host is asleep. The guest is there, but the host is unaware. The guest has already come before the host, but the host is wandering somewhere else. That wandering is the mind.

Have you observed that your mind is a wandering? Mind means wandering. You are not here: that is what mind means. You are somewhere else. If you are here, then there is no mind, then there is no wandering. Mind cannot be in the present: it can only be in the past or in the future. Mind can never be here-now. It can only be there-then. It is a wandering. When you are a mind you are wandering somewhere else, but the guest is present always.

Buddha was asked when he became Enlightened, "What have you gained?"

He said, "Nothing -- because whatsoever I now feel as a gain was already there, only I was unaware. So it would be better to say, I should say, that I have not gained anything. Rather, I have lost much. I have lost my 'self' which was there too much really -- which was there TOO MUCH! I have lost my self and I have gained that which was always, eternally present."

One has to come back to his home. This homecoming is silence, this returning to your home is silence. And the *rishi* says that it is prayer, because when you are silent the invitation has reached. You have invoked. You have prayed! And in prayer many things are implied. If you pray, and if it is really a prayer, then there is no gap between your prayer and the answer to your prayer. If there is a gap, it means that the prayer was false.

If you are silent, the Divine is there; there is no gap. If you are silent and you find that the Divine is not there, remember, you are *not* silent. Even this thought that "the Divine should

come to me", creates disturbance.

Buddha has said that even the longing for the Divine is a disturbance. Then you are not totally silent. You are asking, and you have moved. You have wandered, you have gone away. If you are asking for freedom, for eternal life, for immortality, for Heaven, for anything, if you are longing, you have wandered. Total silence means total acceptance of whatsoever is -- of that which is. So the last thing to be understood: silence basically means total acceptance.

Non-acceptance creates noise in the mind, in the being. Whenever you say no to anything, your mind begins to move and work. Whenever you say yes, your mind stops. "No" is the starter, "yes" is the stopper. *astik* means a theist. In Sanskrit the word *astik*, theist, means one who has said a total and final yes to everything. Now he will never say no. Now this yes is ultimate. No going back!

Acceptance means you accept whatsoever is the case. If there is anger, you accept it. If there is suffering, you accept it. If there is lust, greed, you accept it. If there is anxiety, worry, you accept it. You accept everything! and, then, how is it possible to be disturbed? When one accepts everything, disturbance is impossible. So in the last analysis, silence means *total acceptance*.

Buddha has given it a name: he calls it TATHATA -- suchness. He says that whatsoever is, is. Whatsoever is, IS! Accept it, and then you are silent. Say no, deny, reject, try to change, and you have created disturbance. This silence is prayer and this silence cannot be created, cannot be forced.

In life, all that is valuable, all that is of any value at all, is always a consequence of many, many things. You cannot approach it directly. For example, happiness: you cannot approach it directly. And those who try to achieve happiness directly will become most unhappy -- and only because of their effort. When you are doing something, totally absorbed in it, happiness happens.

A painter painting: he has forgotten himself completely in the act. He is totally there. He is no more, really. Really, a great painter never paints. Painting happens! Just as we say it rains, "it paints".

Van Gogh was asked once, "Which of your paintings is the best?"

And Van Gogh said, "But I have never painted anything. I cannot say. and if you insist, then I can say only this one which is being painted JUST NOW! But I am not the painter: the painting is happening. The painter is not there. The painter has ceased!"

Van Gogh can have a happiness not of the world. A singer, a dancer, can have a happiness which doesn't belong to this world. But that is really a consequence of something else.

Silence is also a consequence of many things -- of right living, of right action, of right acceptance, of being a right host. Then suddenly, silence happens. It is there -- it has always been there.

The Ultimate Alchemy, Vol 2

Chapter #13

Chapter title: Questions and Answers

4 August 1972 pm in

Archive code: 7208045

ShortTitle: ULTAL213

Audio: Yes

Video: No

Length: 88 mins

OSHO, LAST NIGHT YOU SAID THAT ONE CAN GROW THROUGH TOTAL ACCEPTANCE. BUT THE EAST HAS REMAINED UNDEVELOPED DUE TO THIS PRINCIPLE OF ACCEPTANCE AND CONTENTMENT, WHEREAS THE WEST HAS BECOME MORE DEVELOPED ONLY BECAUSE OF NON-ACCEPTANCE AND DISCONTENTMENT.

THEREFORE, ISN'T IT OBVIOUS THAT DISCONTENTMENT AND NON-ACCEPTANCE IS THE PRINCIPLE FOR EVOLUTION AND GROWTH AND NOT TOTAL ACCEPTANCE? PLEASE EXPLAIN.

MANY things win have to be understood. One: Lao Tzu, Krishna, Buddha, Mahavir, they are not the total East. They were Teaching acceptance, but no one in the East has followed it. And those who followed, they evolved: Lao Tzu evolved into a perfect human possibility -- to the maximum possibility which a human being can reach; Buddha evolved to be a Divine person through acceptance and contentment. But the East has not followed them. Just because they were born in the East doesn't mean that the East has followed them. So that is one thing.

The second thing: the West has evolved, but evolved to such a crisis, into such a diseased state of mind, that now the West is looking toward the East. The West has followed the principle of discontent, so in a way the West has been more honest than the East. The East has been dishonest.

We go on worshipping Krishna, Buddha and Mahavir, and we think that we are following them. We have not followed them! Only lip service has been paid them. But the West has really followed the principle of discontentment and materialism. The West has followed it, and now it has come to the climax. Those in the West who have achieved a climax with whatsoever they have done, now they feel that the whole life has become meaningless -- because whatsoever they have achieved now proves to be meaningless. There has been an evolution of things, but not of consciousness. They have accumulated much, but man has become more and more empty.

And now, when everything is achieved -- now, when the West has succeeded in its

ambition -- the disparity becomes more clear-cut. Man has remained empty, unevolved. That is why now Western thinkers, the Western avant-garde, are thinking in terms of Lao Tzu, Buddha and Mahavir. Now they have known the futility of discontentment. It leads you to more discontentment, and contentment becomes impossible. From one discontentment you go to another, and from another to another, and contentment is never reached.

This is what the Upanishads have been telling. They say that if you start with contentment then only can you reach contentment, because the beginning is the end, the seed is really the tree. So if it is not in the seed, it is not going to be in the tree. If contentment is your beginning, the base, the ground of your mind, the very roots, only then can you flower into contentment. Those flowers are not coming from nowhere. They will grow from you; they will be *your* growth. So if you have contentment in the beginning, you will find it in the end.

If you start with discontent, discontent will grow, and it can never transform itself into contentment. The more you follow it, the more it will be there. And if discontentment grows, then ultimately madness results. A madman means a totally discontented man with no hope, with absolute frustration.

Now the West has come to a fulfillment -- a fulfillment of its ambition. The West has been authentically honest. It has followed a particular path, and when you follow only then can you know whether it leads to any goal or not.

The East has remained confused. Its leaders have been talking of contentment and the masses have been deceiving themselves. They go on talking about contentment and they continue being discontent. The East is ostensibly with Buddha -- only ostensibly! Basically, it is not with Buddha. When I say "East", I mean the Eastern masses. They are just as materialistic as Western masses -- but with a false face, with a mask.

The East is as irreligious as the West, but dishonestly. We go on thinking that we are religious, and we are not. So we have been in a ditch, in a deep confusion. We have not moved anywhere, not because of the Upanishads -- we have never followed them! we have not moved because we have been on two boats. We have been travelling in two diametrically opposite directions. Our minds go on talking of spirituality and our hearts go on following materialism.

This is the reason why the East has remained multi-dimensionally poor -- not only physically, economically, but spiritually also, because for any spiritual growth honesty is foundational. It is better to be irreligious than to be falsely religious, because from an honest irreligiousness religion can grow. But with a dishonest religious man there is no possibility of any growth.

So remember this, that the East is not really the East. There have been only a few persons who we can say are Eastern. So, really, East and West are not geographical. The division is more subtle. There have been persons in the West who belong to the East. Jesus belongs to the East, Eckhart belongs to the East, Francis belongs to the East, Boehme belongs to the East: they are NOT Western. And you all belong to the West: you are not Eastern. So East and West are not geographical. "East" means a certain approach toward life, and "West" also means a certain approach.

You are materialists unconsciously, so you cannot grow in materialism because growth needs a conscious effort. You cannot grow in materialism because you are not *consciously* materialistic, and you cannot grow toward higher states of consciousness because you are false, pseudo. So the first thing is that this is the confusion.

The second thing: when we say "acceptance", what do we mean? When the Upanishads say acceptance is happiness, Nirvana, what do they mean? Does it mean a death, a

stagnation? No! It means only that whatsoever happens, whatsoever is and whatsoever is going to be, we are not against it, we will not fight it -- we will flow with it

For example, a seed is there: the seed accepts itself. That doesn't mean that now the seed cannot grow. A seed only means a potentiality for growth -- nothing else. To be a seed means to be a potentiality for growth. A seed accepts itself: it means the growth is accepted; it is a natural thing. The seed is not going to make any effort to be a tree, because effort is needed only when you are going to become something which you are not. Remember this: effort is needed only when you are going to be something which you are not. But that which you are not you cannot be, no matter how much effort there is.

We grow only to be ourselves, so effort in its deeper sense is useless; you are wasting energy. Struggle is useless; you are wasting energy. Acceptance doesn't mean no growth. It means a natural flow of growth with no struggle toward it. Struggle creates a feverish mind. And why struggle? Against whom are you struggling? That which is possible for you, you can simply grow into. Accept yourself totally and then flow with the Existence. There will be growth, but this growth will be natural, spontaneous. It will not be a strained thing. A Buddha *grows* to be a Buddha. Really, there is no effort -- it is a flow.

If *you* want to be a Buddha, then there will be a struggle. So many have tried, thousands have tried, to be a Buddha. Then it is a struggle, because that Buddhahood is not in their seed. They can be something else, their destiny is different, but they are trying to imitate someone.

So, thousands have followed Buddha, but they have not created a single Buddha. They have created imitation Buddhas. They have created copies -- carbon copies false, dead, with no life in them. Whenever you follow someone else, you will have to struggle. Whenever you are ready to accept your own destiny, there is no need of any struggle: you will grow into it. And every individual is unique, and every individual has his own destiny.

Acceptance means be whatsoever the Whole wills to be through you. Do not fight. If you are a rose-flower, then be a rose-flower. Do not try to be a lotus. There is no struggle. A rosebud becomes a rose-flower. But teach it, give it ideals, and a rosebud can begin to imagine and think itself to be something else. Then there will be struggle, strain, worry. And not only is the whole effort going to be wasted, not only is there not going to be any positive result -- but there will be negative consequences also. If a rose-flower tries to be a lotus, that is impossible. So the possibility is cancelled -- but in the effort, in the struggle to be a lotus, it is possible that now this flower may not even be a rose-flower because the energy is dissipated.

The principle of total acceptance is simply this: accept yourself and flow with nature wheresoever it leads you. That is your destiny. Do not come in between; do not try to pull yourself to be something else. That is struggle.

This is what is meant by Tao, this is what is meant by *dharma*, this is what is meant by the inner *swabhava* -- the inner nature. Follow it! And when I say follow it, I do not mean make some effort. Really, I mean allow it to be: allow your destiny to be. Do not come in between: allow your destiny to grow. Then a different evolution takes place -- an evolution of consciousness, not of things. So you may not gain a bigger house through acceptance, but you will gain a greater soul. You may not become richer economically, but you will certainly become richer spiritually.

Jesus says that even if you gain the whole world and lose yourself, what is the meaning of it? You are a beggar: you remain a beggar. And if you gain yourself and lose the whole world, you have lost nothing. This is the basic Eastern approach toward life -- because the East says happiness exists not in things but in your consciousness. It is not related with

things. It is related with you: *you* have to grow!

Things can grow; things can become more and more; you can have more and more things -- but having is not being. You can have the whole world without any soul within, and you can be just a beggar on the street with the being of a sovereign. That growth of being is the end. And when acceptance is taught, it is taught for the growth of being. Those who have followed this teaching, they have grown, and they are incomparable.

Thousands, millions, have followed discontent; the whole world, the whole of humanity, follows it -- but the followers of discontent have not produced a single Buddha, a single Jesus, a single Lao Tzu. Really, outward growth depends on discontent, inward growth depends on contentment. Now it is your choice! If you want to pile up things more and more, you can go on, but then you are simply a servant who is just piling up things. Then death comes and everything is finished, and whatsoever you have gained, death nullifies it.

There is a different growth, an inner growth, which even death cannot nullify. Buddha says that unless you have achieved something which death cannot destroy, you have not achieved anything. Achieve something which transcends death: only then are you growing. Otherwise, every life is destroyed by death, and you are again a beggar and again you have to start from ABC

Growth means a continuity, a life process, but things cannot go with you. Whatsoever you have is not yours. It belongs to death, it belongs to the world: it doesn't belong to you. You are simply deceiving yourself. In the meanwhile you can deceive! So your growth comes through contentment, and when I say "contentment" I do not mean defeatism -- remember this.

So this is the third point: a person can be content just to console himself. You are poor: you do not want to be poor; still, you are poor and nothing can be done, so you impose a false contentment. You say, "It is okay. This is my destiny; I accept it." But deep down this is not acceptance. This is just consoling yourself. If some opportunity comes and you can become rich, you are not going to lose it. And if someone says, "Take this money in exchange for your contentment," you will throw this contentment and you will take the money.

So defeated consolation is not contentment. It is just trying to save your face. You do not want to feel defeated, so you put on a show of contentment. Many follow such contentment, but this is not the teaching of the Upanishads. Contentment for the Upanishads is not a defeated attitude. Really, it is a deep understanding.

Life is such that you are just a part in it, a very minute part. And the Whole is a very big thing -- the organic Whole. It is just like my fingers are part of my organic body: they cannot do anything against my body; they cannot hope for anything against my body. They are not anything except my body -- just parts. So if my body is healthy, they will be healthy; if my body is ill, they will be ill; if my body is dead, they will be dead. This understanding -- that "I am just a part of this great Whole, I will flow with the Whole, I will not fight it" -- is contentment.

This is a deep understanding. Remember, this contentment is so different from whatsoever is understood by the world that it is even difficult to conceive of it. This type of man will be contented when he is poor and he will be contented when he is rich. Remember the second part also. He will not try to be a poor man because, again, that is effort. He will not try to be a poor man because, again, that is an ambition. Again he will be fighting against the Whole; again he will be rejecting something, not accepting.

If it is the will of the Whole that he should be rich, he will be rich. If it is the will of the Whole that he should be poor, he will be poor. He can move from richness to poverty easily;

he can move from poverty to richness just as easily. Really, he is just a dead leaf in the wind. Wherever the wind moves, he moves. There is no will, there is no ego, there is no individual ambition. The Whole's ambition is his ambition. This is acceptance, and when a man lives in such acceptance he reaches the highest peak possible of inner growth.

This has been the innermost core of Eastern religion, but the East has not followed it. Those who have followed, they have grown to the ultimate peak possible. Those who have not followed and who have pretended that they are following are bound to be in an inner contradiction.

Masses in the East are in this inner contradiction: they think they are religious and they are not; they think they are spiritual and they are not. And this thinking that they are spiritual becomes a hindrance -- because if someone is ill and he thinks that he is healthy, then no treatment is possible. An ill person must realize that he is ill; this is the first step toward any health or any possibility of health.

This is the most fatal disease -- to think oneself healthy when one is not -- because then everything is closed. But this happens, and man can deceive himself very easily. So it is possible that the West will become more and more Eastern, and the East will become more and more Western. This is happening already.

The day is not far off when "the sun will rise in the West". because the highest consciousness in the West, the highest conscious peaks in the West, the individuals who can look ahead, are turning Eastern. And in the East, quite the contrary: the so-called intellectuals, the intelligentsia, are turning communist. If you are not a communist in the East, no one can think you are an intelligent man. "Is it possible that you can be intellectual and Still not a communist?" Even those who are not communists cannot dare to say they are not communists. Those who are not communists will at least say that they are socialists: that is their facade. Those who are absolutely anti-communist, they will also talk in terms of communism, socialism, equality.

In the East now, it is rare to find an Eastern mind -- very rare. In the West, communism is out of date. Even in Soviet Russia communism is going out of date. Even the Soviet intelligentsia, the Soviet intellectuals, are probing into the inner world. Now Soviet Russia is the only country in the world today which is spending so much money on psychic research that even America is behind. In many Russian universities, psychic research has become an integral part of all research programmes.

Man is not simply matter: man is mind also. And unless we know something about mind, nothing seems possible. Man cannot be changed; no revolution is possible. But in the East, the so-called East, the geographical East, to talk about spirituality, religion, is superstitious. If someone is talking about religion in the East, so-called intellectuals think that he is a reactionary.

Why is this happening? The West has followed materialism, but very honestly, very sincerely. And sincerity pays always, honesty pays always. Now they can feel that whatsoever they have been doing is wrong, has been somewhere basically wrong. And they are honest, so they can confess it. We are dishonest, we cannot confess anything. We go on changing, but on the surface we go on maintaining the old face. We cannot confess that we have been wrong. It is a very healthy sign to confess that one has been wrong because it shows that now that which has been done can be undone. Now you can change your path, you can move in another direction.

The East has lived a double-bind life, always looking at heaven and always living just on the earth. That creates trouble because you cannot look at the earth, and as you live on the

earth you go astray. You go on looking at heaven and there is no way to walk there. So our minds are divided, split, schizophrenic. Two lives are being lived continuously. Whatsoever you say, you know it is not right, it cannot be done, but still you go on saying it.

One old man was here. He has been a great professor -- one of the foremost educationalists in India -- and he suffers very much because of the conditions in the universities. He was telling me that the future of his children is just ark, and he was telling me, "Even my own children are not ready to listen to me. No morality, no religion, no honesty! What is happening?"

So I asked him, "Whatsoever you are teaching to your children, have you yourself followed it? Because you have been a very successful man in life -- *very* successful. You have reached to the very top." He has been a Vice Chancellor and on many posts. I said, "So, really tell me honestly, have you followed whatsoever you are teaching to your children?"

He became uneasy, but he is honest, so he said, "It is very difficult to be honest and to be successful."

So I asked him whether he would like his children to be successful or honest. I told him, "Really, your children are more honest than you because they see the hypocrisy. They say, 'Since we are going to be successful, why talk about honesty? Then talk about dishonesty and being successful. And if we are going to be honest, then we should leave all ambitions for success; then be unsuccessful and be honest.' Why confuse these students?"

But he thinks that he is a moral man and his children are immoral. The children are simply saying that your whole way of thinking and living is hypocritical. If honesty is the thing to be followed, then do not expect success. If it happens, then it is a miracle; if otherwise, then there is no need to hope. Then there is no frustration because you have chosen to be honest, then you have chosen to be unsuccessful. But the father's mind, every father's mind, would like you to be honest *and* successful. Then a double mind is created. So talk about honesty and be dishonest! Succeed and then teach your children to be honest and successful! Continue the whole race -- the rat race!

If you want inner growth, then acceptance is the law. I am not saying that inner growth will be followed up by outer evolution also. There is no intrinsic necessity. It may happen, it may not happen. You may remain poor, but with inner richness outer poverty is not a suffering. It is a suffering only when you are inwardly poor and outwardly also. With outer richness and inner poverty, it is a great suffering. And it happens rarely that you are both outwardly rich and inwardly rich also.

So the choice is between these two. What is your emphasis? If you are for inner growth and inner richness, then follow it. Then acceptance is the law. But if you are not for it, then be discontent. Then do not accept anything. Then go on fighting. You may grow rich outwardly, but ultimately you will come to know you have wasted your whole life.

OSHO, ONE DAY YOU SAID THAT LIFE IS AN INTERRELATIONSHIP -- THAT EVERYTHING IS RELATED. THE NEXT DAY YOU SAID, "ONLY YOU YOURSELF ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR EVERYTHING." BUT THE PSYCHOLOGISTS SAY THAT THE FOUNDATION OF ONE'S WHOLE PERSONALITY IS LAID IN EARLY CHILDHOOD, BETWEEN THREE AND SEVEN YEARS OF AGE, WHEN ONE HAPPENS TO BE A HELPLESS TOOL IN THE HANDS OF THE FAMILY AND ENVIRONMENT. WILL YOU KINDLY EXPLAIN THE CONTRADICTION? SECONDLY, IN SPITE OF THIS CONTRADICTION, THE TOTAL GROWTH OF MAN

LIES IN INDIVIDUAL EFFORTS AS WELL AS SOCIAL. SO IS IT NOT NECESSARY THAT THE RELIGIOUS MAN SHOULD SEEK TO BRING ABOUT A RADICAL CHANGE IN THE VERY PATTERN OF THE SOCIETY?

It appears to be paradoxical. One day I say that everything is related, interdependent, organic, and then I say you are responsible. These statements appear paradoxical, but they are not -- because when I say you are responsible, I mean YOU are the Whole.

One has to start from somewhere and you cannot start from anyone else. Really, you are the nearest point from where the Whole can be reached. You are a part of the Whole, and everything is interdependent, but the other interdependent parts are very far from you. You cannot start your journey from them: you have to start from yourself. So when I say that everything is interdependent, it is a philosophical statement, a truth -- a truth of one who has reached. When I say you are responsible, it is also a truth, but the truth of the seeker, not of the *siddha* -- not of one who has reached.

But for one who has to travel, from where can you start your journey toward the Whole? You cannot start from my place; you cannot start from anyone else's place. You will have to start from where *you* are. And if you feel that you are not responsible, you will drop and stagnate then and there. Then you have taken the whole thing in a very wrong light. Then this interdependence of the Whole is not a help, but a hindrance.

And this is possible: we can change even elixir into poison and we can use poison as elixir. It depends on us. So I will take a few examples: for example, Buddha says that whatsoever is to be attained is already in you. This statement can lead to two interpretations. One, that now there is no need to move anywhere because whatsoever is to be attained is already there. So, "No need to do anything; I am okay as I am!" Now you have made a very valuable truth poisonous.

It can be interpreted in another way also, totally different. When Buddha says you are that which you can become. it gives a hope. Now it doesn't seem impossible. You have the seed. The seed can grow to be a tree; you can move from the seed toward the tree. "Now the tree is not impossible: it is hidden in me. So I can move confidently; I can move with hope; I can move into the unknown without any fear." Then it can become a help.

When I say that the whole world is a cosmos, interdependent, it means that we are not islands, but we are a big infinite continent. We are related. No one is small. Everyone is really the Whole.

Ramteerth has said: "You may believe or you may not believe, but I created the world. You may believe, you may not believe, but these stars are run by me." He is mad. If you look only at the apparent meaning of his statement, he is mad. But if the Whole is interdependent, then he is not mad at all. Then whosoever may have created the world, I must have been a part of Him. It is impossible to have created the world without me. He is saying, "I am a part, and whosoever is moving the stars, I am a part of Him. Without me they cannot move."

When I say that everything is interdependent, I mean you are the Whole. You are not just a part, you are not isolated, you are not alone. The Whole is with you, within you. This is the ultimate realization, but for you this is simply a theoretical statement. This may be a realization for Buddha, but for you it is simply a theoretical statement. It is not your realization.

How to make this your realization? From where to begin? If you say, "I am just a part, so what can I do? I am no one," then no movement will be possible. You will drop dead then and there. Then this great truth becomes fatal to you. If you are to move and realize this truth,

you have to be responsible -- responsible for whatsoever you are. Then you can change it, and you can change it because you are not only you: the Whole is behind you. The moment you say, "I am responsible," the Whole has asserted it through you. The moment you say, "I will move," the Whole will move within you.

I will take another example: Hindus have believed continuously, for millennia, that everyone is a soul and that the soul is immortal, the soul is pure, the soul is Divine. Gurdjieff, in this century, said, "Do not deceive yourself. It is very difficult to gain a soul. Not everyone has a soul. It is very rare. Sometimes one attains a soul; otherwise you will be without a soul."

It seems absolutely contradictory. He says that only a few rare individuals attain to a soul. He says that soul is an achievement. It is not given to you at your birth; it is not in you right now. It is possible only if you make some effort. Then you may create a soul. Gurdjieff says that not everyone is immortal. Those who attain souls, they become immortal. Otherwise you are just a wastage. Nature creates you with a possibility of being a soul, and then, with no effort, you drop dead. Then nature has failed within you. You will not survive; not everyone is going to survive.

It seems absolutely contradictory to Hindu, Jain and Buddhist teachings. Christians, Mohammedans -- really, all religions -- teach that you have a soul, and Gurdjieff says "No!" And, really, he was one of the knowers of this age. But why this emphasis? He says that because of this teaching, that everyone has a soul. no one makes any effort. Everyone believes, "It is okay. The soul is eternally pure." Read the Gita: Krishna says that whatsoever you do, your soul remains untouched; it is pure.

This can become a very dangerous thing. Gurdjieff says that because of these teachings humanity has become irreligious. He says, "Now no more of this nonsense! Unless you attain, you have no soul." Gurdjieff creates a deep shock. He says, "What do you have so that the universe will need you forever? What do you have? Nothing! Just all your stupidities."

To think, to conceive, that all your stupidities are going to be eternal is a very dark prospect. You think all foolishnesses are going to be eternal because everyone is eternal, but Gurdjieff says, "No, the universe cannot tolerate you for so long unless you become something meaningful to the universe. Unless you become a part of the destiny of the cosmos, you are not needed. Why should you be eternal and why should you demand? Just to continue repeating this nonsense?" Gurdjieff says, "Attain first; be a soul. You can be, but it is a crystallization. You have all the elements. Combine them, pass through an inner alchemy, and then a new thing will be born within you which will be a soul."

So he says, "Buddha has a soul, Jesus has a soul, and because *they* have souls they go on talking as if everyone has a soul. No! Do not be befooled by them!" Gurdjieff says, "Do not be befooled by them! They have a soul and they know that they are immortal, but you are not, so do not be deceived by them." And, really, his teaching can be helpful, but we can turn anything into a harmful thing -- even Gurdjieff's teachings. Then we can say, "If it is so rare, then it is not for us. It is beyond us."

Nothing can be said to man which cannot be misused. The same mind will give new interpretations. So when I said that the world is a cosmic organic unity, that everything is interdependent, I meant by this that you are part of a great Whole and that great Whole is part of you: you are not alone. Through you the cosmos is progressing, evolving. You have a very deep mission, a great destiny. To realize this you will have to transform your total outlook, and that transformation starts only when you begin to feel responsible. If you feel that you are responsible, you can change. So make this principle of interdependence a help, a step toward

self-transformation. Do not make it a hindrance.

And it is right that man is approximately already made in his childhood. There are many things implied.

One psychologist says that you are born as a *tabula rasa* -- as a blank paper. Your first five or seven years write down everything upon that paper and that patterns your life: you go on repeating it.

In the first place, no one is born as a *tabula rasa* because this childhood is not the beginning, this life is not the beginning. So every child is not *just* a child, but many old men are within him -- many lives. He has reached old age many times, and that memory is always preserved. The mind continues with it -- so it is very complicated.

Psychologists will say that your parents, your education, your heredity, they determine everything. But the East knows something more. Eastern psychology knows something more because Eastern psychology says that this life is just one link in a great chain. And now, those in the West who have really gone deep into the human mind -- for example, C. G. Jung -- are also feeling that this life is not the beginning. No child is born as a child; he has many, many memories within him.

Eastern psychology says that it is not the parents who decide your life. Really, you have chosen them. You have chosen particular parents; you are responsible. If I am born to a particular mother and to a particular father, this is my choice. They will determine me because I have allowed them to determine me. I have chosen them because of so many actions in my past life. It is a chain.

So, ultimately, I remain responsible. If I choose a very violent father or if I choose a very wise man, whatsoever my choice is *it is my choice*. Then they determine me, but this determination by parents, education, etc., is not ultimate. Ultimately, you remain the master; you can throw it at any moment. It is difficult, but it is not impossible.

It is very difficult because it is not just like throwing your clothes. It is like changing your skin. It is so deep-rooted in you, everything that has happened has gone so deep, that it has become your blood and bones: you are made of it. Now you cannot conceive of yourself apart from it. Your identity has become mixed with it. But, still, to throw it is not impossible. You can jump out of it!

Really, all yoga is concerned only with this: how you can get out of all the influences that have made you whatsoever you are; how to jump out of them, how to go beyond; how to go beyond your parents, how to go beyond your education, how to go beyond your heredity, how to go beyond your past lives. The whole science of yoga consists only of this: to help you go beyond. So we will take a few things concerning how this becomes possible.

Education, upbringing, gives you a particular identity, a particular image. You begin to feel, "I am this." Everyone has an image of himself: "I am this." A good man, a bad man, a religious man, an intelligent man or a stupid one, everyone has an image of himself which has been given by the society, by the parents, by education. How to throw this? Sannyas was a method to throw this.

So, you may not have observed the fact but Hindu society is divided into four classes -- Brahmin, Kshatriya, Vaishya, Sudra -- but a sannyasin doesn't belong to any caste, any class. If a Brahmin becomes a sannyasin, he is simply a sannyasin. If a Kshatriya becomes a sannyasin, he is simply a sannyasin. A sannyasin is beyond caste and class. When you were not a sannyasin but a householder, you were a Brahmin or something else. When you take a jump into sannyas you are no more a Brahmin, and the whole thing that was associated with being a Brahmin is thrown away.

When you become a sannyasin, you pass through a death ritual. Originally, sannyas meant death, so initiation was given at *shmathans* -- cemeteries, burning places. A whole process was followed. Your head was shaved just like we shave the head of a dead man. You are dying to the society, to whatsoever you have belonged to. Then your name was changed because the name was part of your identity. And now your teacher will be your father, not your father; now you do not have any father or mother. Now you have a new start. You will have no home, you will have no caste, you will have no mother, no father, no wife, no husband, no relationship in the world. With a new name, there is a break, a gap. The past has dropped. Now you start from ABC. There were enemies, but now you cannot behave with them as you behaved before -- that man has died. There were friends, but you cannot behave with them in the old way -- that man has died.

There is a story. A Buddhist monk was passing through a village. He belonged to that village before he took sannyas, and a beautiful girl loved him. She recognized the face. Of course, it had changed totally. It was difficult to recognize, and he was moving with so many *bhikkhus*, so many Buddhist monks. And they were all alike -- the same clothes, shaven heads with no identities. But she recognized him, so she followed.

And then she said to the *bhikkhu*, "You cannot deceive me. I recognize you; you are the same man."

The monk said, "Only the face is the same. The same man is no more: he has died."
The girl said, "But you loved me."

The monk replied, "I again say to you: that man is dead. If ever I meet him, I will relate your story. I will tell him that this girl still loves you. But I do not think that that meeting is possible again."

This breaking away and the living of a new identity is what is basically meant by renunciation.

Buddha comes back to his home. Buddha's father is angry, but Buddha says, "Please, listen to me. I am not the same Siddharth who left the house."

Of course, the father becomes more angry. He says, "You are teaching me? I am your father. I have given you birth. I know you very well!"

Buddha again says, "You do not even know yourself. How can you know me?"

This works as a fuel, and the father becomes even more angry. He begins to scream, "What are you? How are you behaving with me? My own son, my own blood and bones! What are you saying to me?"

And Gautam Buddha says, "Calm down, please, because that man who left your home, who lived with you, is already dead."

This method of sannyas was used as a jump from the "skin" which society had imposed on you. Then there were many methods to *unlearn*. I have been saying again and again that meditation is a deep unlearning. So whatsoever you have learned, unlearn it, throw it out! Be a clean sheet again! Whatsoever society has written, wash it out. It can be done. Meditation is the method -- you can unlearn.

Education is the method to learn something; meditation is the method to unlearn. When you have unlearned your personality, when you have renounced the old identity, then only is something new possible. Otherwise you will move in a circle, and the circle is very strong. It is difficult to take the jump, but it is not impossible. And it is difficult only because you have not decided. If you have decided, then nothing is impossible. With the very decision, change starts.

It is related of Mahavir that he decided to leave his home. But his mother was alive, so

she said, "Do not go, do not renounce, unless I die. Do not ask again about renouncing the world. You talk of love and you talk of non-violence, but if you renounce the world it will be killing me, murdering me. So do not talk about it!" But even the mother was surprised, because then Mahavir never talked about it. The whole family was surprised. What type of renunciation, what type of sannyas, was this? Only once Mahavir talked of it; then the mother became angry, and he stopped.

For two years he would not talk about it. Then his mother died. He was returning home one day, so he asked his older brother, "Now my mother is dead, so allow me to renounce the world."

The brother became angry. He said, "What nonsense are you talking? We are suffering a great loss. Mother has died and you are talking about renouncing now? Do not talk about it at all!" So Mahavir remained silent again for two years.

The whole family was again shocked. What type of renunciation was this? But then they began to feel that he was in the house, but *he was not*. He was absolutely absent. No one felt him as being present. He became just a shadow. Months would pass, and then suddenly someone would say, "Where is Mahavir?" He was in the house. He became so absent that the whole family gathered one day and they said, "If you are doing this, then it now becomes our duty to allow you to renounce. You can go, because, really, you have already gone."

Mahavir left the house that very day. Someone asked him, "Why didn't you escape? Why didn't you run away?"

He said, "There was no need. I took the inner jump. The day I decided, I became a sannyasin. Only my shadow was there because my mother would have become disturbed. There was no need to leave. The shadow was there; I was not there. The very day I decided, the thing had happened. These four years were just nothing for me. I was a shadow. I could have remained in that house forever."

The day one really decides to take the jump, the jump has already taken place, because the decision is the jump. Even to become aware that "I am in a deep imprisonment", to be aware of this, is to have moved out of it. Now, sooner or later, this imprisonment cannot be a prison for you.

But Western psychology is creating a very harmful attitude. They say that you are already complete, that when you are seven your destiny is fixed and now nothing can be done. If this becomes your thought, then nothing *can* be done -- not because you are already complete, but because of this idea. If you say, "Nothing can be done because now I am already complete. Everything has been put in my mind, so what can I do? Now I *have* to be in this imprisonment. This is my life"; if one thinks in this way, this very thinking will become the barrier. Otherwise there is no barrier.

So Western psychology has held the Western mind to be very irresponsible. The Western revolts of the youth and other rebellions, other destructive movements, they are really created by the Western psychology of the last fifty years. Freud is more responsible for this than Marx because he has said, "You are already complete by seven years of age. Your parents are responsible: you are not responsible. So whatsoever you are doing -- if you are a criminal, if you are a murderer -- you cannot do anything; you have to be this way. Now your dead parents cannot be changed, and those dead parents are also not responsible: it is all because of their parents."

So, ultimately, Freud comes to the same conclusion as Christianity reached before -- that Adam committed the sin and we are not responsible. He is responsible -- Adam, the first father. Because of him everything is decided. Now we are born in sin and we will have to die

in sin. If you move with Freud you will reach to the same conclusion. If parents are responsible, then ultimately Adam and Eve are responsible.

But how to change Adam and Eve now? This is impossible. So whatsoever is, IS -- continues. This is not acceptance: this is defeatism. And human dignity is lost! If you cannot do anything, if you cannot transform yourself, you lose all human dignity. You have become just an automaton, a mechanical thing; you will run the course. Because your parents have given you a winding, you will run the course and then you will die. And in the meantime, if you have the opportunity you will give a winding to other fellows, and then you will continue.

This is most degrading. Man *can* change himself. That possibility is always with you. And this concept, this very concept that "I can change myself", starts the change. The revolution has begun.

And, lastly, it has been asked, "Is it not necessary that the religious man should seek to bring about a radical change in the very pattern of society?"

The religious man is himself the radical change in the pattern of society -- *the religious man!* He will not try to bring about any radical change in the society -- he is the radical change!

The Ultimate Alchemy, Vol 2

Chapter #14

Chapter title: Contentment: The Dispersion of Desires

5 August 1972 pm in

Archive code: 7208055

ShortTitle: ULTAL214

Audio: Yes

Video: No

Length: 95 mins

SARVA SANTOSHO VISARJANAMITI YA AEVAM VEDA

"TOTAL CONTENTMENT IS VISARJAN, THE DISPERSION OF THE WORSHIP RITUAL. ONE WHO UNDERSTANDS SO IS AN ENLIGHTENED ONE."

TOTAL contentment is wisdom. Three things have to be understood. First, what total contentment is; second, what wisdom is, what it means to be wise, to be Enlightened, and third, why contentment is wisdom. Whatsoever we know about contentment is a negative thing. Life is suffering, much suffering, and one has to console oneself. There are moments when one cannot do anything, so one has to cultivate a certain attitude of contentment; otherwise, it would be impossible to live.

So contentment for us is just an instrument -- a survival instrument. Life consists of so much suffering that one has to create this attitude. That attitude saves you from much which would become impossible to bear, which would be unbearable if there were no attitude of contentment. But this is not the contentment which is meant by the *rishi*. That is with all of us, so that contentment is not wisdom: rather, that contentment is part of ignorance. When you cannot do anything the situation will be unbearable. If you go on feeling that you cannot do anything, if you go on feeling that nothing is possible, the situation will become unbearable, it will be suicidal. So you change the whole thing. You interpret in such a way that, really, you begin to say that you *can* do much, but you do not want to -- that much is possible, that things can be different, but you are not interested. That change of emphasis is really deceptive. But life exists through so many illusions. They are helpful.

Nietzsche has said that without lies it is difficult to survive. If one thinks he will live simply by truth, he cannot live. So we go on believing in so many lies. They are our foundations in a way; they help us to be on this earth. And so many so-called truths are not really truths for you: they are simply lies. For example, you do not know that the soul is immortal, but you go on believing in it. That helps. That is a lie for you; it is not your experience. But to live with death will be almost impossible, so this lie helps. Then you can forget death. You know that life is going to continue. Only the body is going to be dead; you are not going to be dead. You will be there.

This is a lie to you. You do not *know* anything because you do not know anything more

than the body. You are acquainted only with your body, and that too not in its totality. You do not know anything which is immortal. If you know anything immortal in yourself, then this is not a lie. But to know that immortality one has to pass through conscious death.

All meditations are really an effort to die consciously. If you can die consciously, only then do you come upon something which is immortal, which cannot die. But we believe in an immortal soul just to deceive ourselves. Through this belief life becomes easier. You have solved the problem without solving it. Now there is no death for you, and you can live as if you are going to live forever. Not only those who are theists, but even those who are atheists -- who do not believe in soul at all and thus cannot believe in immortal souls -- they too live in such a way as if they are going to live forever. They also have to deceive themselves by believing that there is no death and that there are so many lives.

Kant has said that if there were no God, then too we would have to invent him because without God it is difficult to live. Why? Because without God no morality is possible. Without God the whole edifice of morality falls down. All heaven, all hell, the results of your karma, everything falls down. So Kant says that even if there is no God, He is needed. He is required because without him morality becomes impossible, and to live without morality will be very difficult.

We can live as immoral beings -- we are already living so -- we can live in immorality. That is not difficult: we always live in it. But even to live in immorality we need moral concepts. So an immoral person also goes on believing. He may not be good today, but tomorrow he is going to be good. He is not going to be good in this life, but he will be good in the next life.

So even a sinner goes on believing that he is not really a sinner. Any day he can be a saint -- that possibility helps. Then he can hope for the possibility and continue to be whatsoever he is. So whatsoever he is, is just in a shadow. His being a sinner is just a changing thing. It is not going to be permanent: he is going to be a saint soon. He can hope for the saint and he can continue to be a sinner. If you want to be a sinner, you need some hope against your being a sinner. If you do not have any hope, it will be difficult to continue. So even those who are immoral need morality, and a God is needed as a central force, as a governing energy, otherwise the whole thing will be a chaos.

Kant then says: "Do not deny God." Kant has written two books, very valuable books. First he wrote one of the most valuable books of these two or three hundred years. He wrote "The Critique of Pure Reason" in which he says that there is no God because reason cannot prove Him, and that book is based on pure reason. So he goes on thinking about it, he goes on, and ultimately he comes to say that there is no God, because for reason it is impossible even to conceive of a God since there is no possibility of proving the hypothesis. Since he is an honest man, he argues and finds that God cannot be proved.

So because this hypothesis is irrational, he concludes there is no God. Then he feels uneasy because he was a very moral, religious man. He was one of the keenest intellects, but a moral man, so he felt uneasy for twenty years continuously. Then he wrote a second book: "The Critique of Practical Reason." The first was "The Critique of Pure Reason." He followed pure reason wheresoever it led, but then it was not leading to God. For twenty years, concluding that there is no God, he felt an uneasiness, as if he had done something wrong. And the wrong was not that without God there was any inconvenience for Kant, but that he saw that if there is no God, then to the whole world morality disappears, evaporates.

Then he writes in the second book that it is not possible to prove God through pure reason, but practical reason needs Him. So God is not a rational hypothesis, but a practically

reasonable hypothesis. Without God the whole thing will become unreasonable, so he says God is -- *not* because God is, but because God is needed. Without God man is not possible, so if He is not He has to be invented because only then does morality become possible.

For us there are so many hypotheses like this. We go on believing in them not because we know, but because if we do not believe in them then we will know our ignorance, our deep ignorance. We want to avoid it, we want to escape from it.

Contentment to us is really a deep escape. We cannot fight life. We try, but we cannot succeed in it. No one ever succeeds. Everyone comes upon barriers; there are limitations. Not only those who are weak, but also those who are very strong in our eyes, who are more strong than others and who come a little further ahead, they also come to barriers, and from those barriers there is no escape.

Even a Napoleon has to die; even an Alexander comes to know things which he cannot win. Then what to do? One thing is to remain continuously in discontentment. That will become a cancer. You cannot sleep with it; you cannot forget it at any moment. It will become a continuous worry, an inner cancer in the mind. So create a facade of contentment: "I am a contented man. It is not that I cannot win these barriers -- I do not want to win." This is a rationalization: "I do not want to. It is not that I cannot win -- I am not interested in winning!" You withdraw yourself and you give a rational flavour to it. This contentment is a rationalization -- a shrewd, cunning rationalization. This gives you a certain hope that if you want you can do it.

Look at it in this way. I have known many people. One man I know is a habituated alcoholic. For thirty years he has been trying to leave alcohol, but he cannot leave it. It has become impossible. But still he will go on saying, he will come to me and say, "Any day I can leave it if I will it." And he has tried continuously for thirty years. He has willed so many times, and was defeated, and again he will fall, but he still goes on saying, "If I will, I can drop this habit in a moment."

Because of this hope that "If I will...." he still feels he is not a defeated man. He is already a defeated man, and this hope allows him to live. He goes on thinking that any moment he can drop it: he is not a slave; he can drop it -- he is only not dropping it because he does not want to drop it. So one day I asked him, "You go on saying 'If I will....' but have you not tried so many times, have you not willed so many times to drop it?"

Then he said, "Yes, I have tried many times, but the effort was not really wholehearted."

So I asked him, "Have you tried any time when the effort was wholehearted?"

He said, "No! If I try wholeheartedly I can leave it this very moment."

I asked him, "Is it possible for you to do it wholeheartedly? Is it in your capacity to will it wholeheartedly? Is your will your own?"

He became uneasy, because when you feel that your will is not your own you will have to face your imprisonment, your slavery. So he is in an imprisonment, but he goes on believing that he is free. That helps you to live in a prison as if it is your home.

This is how we go on rationalizing, and this man cannot leave alcohol unless he leaves this rationalization. If he begins to feel that "Even if I will I cannot leave," then he is realistic. Then he has come down to the earth. And if he comes to feel that "I cannot do anything even if I will," then he can do something because then he will not be living in illusion -- he will have stumbled upon reality. And you can do something with reality, but you cannot do anything with illusions.

To escape from reality we create many mental attitudes. Freud is reported to have said that religion will continue to have power over man not because religion is true, but because

man needs many illusions and man is not yet adult enough, mature enough, to live without religion. In a way he is right, because as far as the majority of humanity is concerned religion is a rationalized illusion. Only sometimes -- with a Buddha, with a Patanjali or with a Kapil -- does it happen that religion is not an illusion but the Ultimate Reality. But for others religion is an illusion. It substitutes for your life, compensates. Your reality is so horrible that you need some illusions to compensate for it.

For example, if a country is very poor, it is bound to believe in a heaven after this life. That is a compensation. The reality is so horrible, so ugly, and there is so much suffering all around for which nothing can be done. But you can do one thing: you can believe in some heaven after this life, and that will help you to live in this ugly poverty. Then you can live easily because it is a question of a few years, or only a few lives, then you will be in heaven. So this poverty is not something permanent which you have to be worried about. It is just a passing phase, just as if you are in a waiting room in a railway station. Let it be ugly, let it be as it is, because you are not going to stay here. It is not your home. A friend will come and you will be away from this waiting room.

If there is a heaven after this life, then this life becomes just a waiting room. Everyone is waiting for his train. When the train comes, you will go away. You need not be worried. You can close your eyes and chant the "Gayatri" -- a spiritual mantra -- close your eyes and chant a mantra, because this is only a waiting room. Religious people are reported to have continuously made the simile that this world is just a waiting room: you are not to be here forever, so do not be worried about it.

But if the waiting room is going to be your home, if it is not a waiting room but the whole of reality, then it will be impossible to live there. Then it will be impossible to live there even for an hour. But if it is a waiting room, you can live even lives in it, because the hope is always for something else. Really, you are not there. You have transferred yourself mentally to somewhere else. This is a trick. The mind has gone to live somewhere else; only the body is here, so you can continue.

Much of religion, so-called religion, is a compensation, a consolation. Whatsoever you lack in life, you substitute for it in your dream. Whatsoever you lack, you substitute in your dreams! That is why every religion, every country, every race, believes in different types of heaven and hell. You believe in one heaven; in another country the concept of heaven will be different -- because your problems are different and their problems are different, so you cannot compensate with one heaven.

For example, Tibetans believe in a heaven which will be warm, Indians believe in a heaven which will be cool. Indians believe in a hell which is going to be fiery, a burning fire, hot; Tibetans believe in a hell which is ice-cold. Why this difference? This difference is one of compensation. Tibetans are already in India's heaven and India is already in their hell. India cannot believe in a heaven unless it is air-conditioned. What type of heaven can it be if it is not air-conditioned? It must be air-conditioned! That is a compensation. Your contentment is a compensation. It is a cunning mental trick.

So do not think that those among us who are contented are very simple. They are very complex and cunning. Whenever a person says, "I am content with my poverty," do not think that he is a simple man. He has created a very cunning attitude.

Once I met a great Jain monk. He is a leader and he has a big following. Hundreds and hundreds of Jain monks believe in him as their teacher. So when I met him, he recited a small poem. He had written that poem. He is an old man, very old: he lives naked.

He recited the poem. The poem had only one central idea continuously repeated, and the

idea was this: "You may be a king, you may be on your golden throne, but I am happy in my dust. I do not care about it. I am contented in my hut. You may be in your palace, I am contented in my hut. Whatsoever you have is nothing to me, because death is going to snatch everything away from you."

Like this ran the whole piece. This mind is very cunning. What is he saying? If he is really not interested in being a king, why compare? If you are really contented in your dust, why think of golden thrones? I have never heard any poem written by a king that says, "You may be happy in your dust, but I am contented on my golden throne." Why has no emperor written this? There must be some reason.

And why does this man say that whatsoever you have will be snatched away by death? He feels happy about it. "Okay, be on your golden throne. Soon I will see that death snatches away everything, and then you will know who was happy. I am happy because death cannot snatch anything away from me." This is a very-cunning attitude; this is not contentment. But he was writing on contentment. That was the title of his poem -- "Contentment."

Is this contentment? If this is contentment, then this sutra is not concerned with it. This sutra has a different meaning, a different dimension of contentment. What is it? In your case, you desire something, you cannot get it; or, even if you get it, the desire is still unfulfilled. Then you rationalize. Then you say, "I must live in contentment because desire gives pain, because desire gives suffering, because through desire anxiety is created, through ambition one suffers unnecessarily. So I give up: I do not desire because I do not like suffering."

This is not the contentment of this sutra. This sutra means many things, so it will be good to enter through many doors. One door for total contentment is non-desiring. Our contentment comes after the failure of desire; this contentment comes through desirelessness. It is not that desires is suffering, but that desire is futile; desire is useless, absurd. Knowing this, feeling this, realizing this, one becomes desireless. Then one will not say, "I do not care about your golden throne." Then one will not compare and will not say, "I prefer my hut."

Buddha left his palace. The night he left and renounced, only his driver came along just to leave him on the boundary of his kingdom. The driver is weeping. He loves him and he feels attached to him. He thinks this is absurd: "What has happened to Prince Siddharth? What is he doing? Leaving the palace? Leaving the kingdom? Leaving his beautiful wife? Leaving everything everyone desires? He has gone mad!" So he goes on weeping. He cannot say anything. He is a mere driver of Buddha's chariot. But he loves him, he feels attached, and he feels that Prince Siddharth is going to do something foolish.

This is unimaginable to a poor man. His reaction is natural. He feels that it is obviously madness. What is Siddharth going to do? Then when he leaves, he says only one thing; he says, "I am no one to say anything to you; I am just a driver. And also, it is not my business to interfere. Your order is your order, so I have brought you to the boundary of your kingdom. But if you do not mind, let me say to you a few words. What are you doing? It seems mad! This is what man lives to attain. This is what everyone aspires to be. You were born in it. You are a fortunate one. Why are you leaving? Remember the palace! Remember your beautiful wife! Remember your father! Remember the kingdom and the happiness it brings!"

Buddha says, "I cannot understand what you are talking about. I have not left any palace behind, I have not left any kingdom behind. I have left only a nightmare. The whole thing was burning in a fire. I am escaping from it. I have not renounced it because the very word 'renunciation' means you are leaving something valuable behind. I have not renounced anything; there was nothing to be renounced. The whole thing is on fire. It was a nightmare."

So I have escaped from it, and I thank you because you have helped me to come out from it."

After that Buddha is never reported to have talked about his palace, about his kingdom, about his beautiful wife -- never again. If this renunciation is a bargain, if this renunciation is for something to be achieved in the future, if this renunciation is just an investment for heaven, *moksha*, then you cannot forget it so easily. He completely forgot it. Why? He was not leaving something for something else.

If you leave something for something else, it is a desire. If you simply leave it, it is desirelessness. If you leave it for something else, then it is still desire. If you simply leave it looking at its absurdity, futility, nonsense, then it is desirelessness. And when a man is desireless, he is content. This is the first door. When a man is desireless, he is content, because now how can you make him discontented? He is in contentment because no discontentment is possible now.

Chuang Tzu's wife died. The emperor came to pay his respects. Chuang Tzu was a great sage, so even the emperor came. He was also a friend; the emperor was a friend to Chuang Tzu, and sometimes he would call Chuang Tzu to his palace to learn his wisdom. Chuang Tzu was just a beggar, but a great sage. The emperor came. He rehearsed in his mind what to say because Chuang Tzu's wife had died. He thought of every good thing to console him, but the moment he saw Chuang Tzu he became very uneasy. Chuang Tzu was singing. He was sitting under a tree playing his instrument, singing loudly. He looked very happy, and just in the morning his wife had died.

The emperor became uneasy and he said, "Chuang Tzu, it is enough if you are not weeping, but the singing is too much. It is going too far!"

Chuang Tzu asked, "But why should I weep?"

The emperor said, "It seems you have not heard that your wife is dead."

Chuang Tzu said, "Of course, my wife is dead. Why should I weep? If she is dead, she is dead. And I never expected that she was going to live forever. You weep because you expect. I never expected that she was going to live forever. I always knew she was going to die any day, and this day it happened. This was going to happen any day. And any day is as good for death as any other, so why should I not sing? If I cannot sing when there is death, then I cannot sing in life, because life is a continuous death. Every moment death will occur somewhere to someone. Life is a continuous death. If I cannot sing at the moment of death, I cannot sing at all.

"Life and death are not two things. They are one. The moment someone is born, death is born with him. When you are growing in life you are also growing in death, and whatsoever is known as death is nothing but the peak of your so-called life. So why should I not sing? And, moreover, the poor woman has lived so many years with me, so will you not allow me to sing a little in gratitude when she has left? She must go in peace, harmony, music and love. Why should I weep?"

"You weep only when you expect and the expected doesn't happen. I never expected that she was going to be here forever. When you do not expect, when you do not desire, you cannot be discontented."

Look at the difference. We go on desiring, then there are failures. Then we try to cultivate contentment. This sutra means that you do not desire and you see also the futility of desire. So the second difference: you cultivate contentment only when you fail. If you succeed, then you are overjoyed. That shows your contentment was false. When you are a failure, you say, "I am contented." When you succeed, you are filled with joy. That is impossible. Behind your contentment, under your contentment, there must have been some sadness. Otherwise, in

your success this joy is not possible. If in success you feel happy, then it is impossible not to feel unhappy when you fail.

With a person like Chuang Tzu or a person like Buddha, whether they succeed or fail is immaterial. It is irrelevant. They remain contented. Your false contentment will be broken by your success. You use it only as a center when you are in failure, in misery. When you succeed, you come off the center into the open sky, dancing and jumping, happy and enjoying. This is impossible. That shows that your center was a false one. It was just an emergency arrangement. It was not your nature. The person who is in contentment will not feel any difference between success and failure. He cannot. Now there is no difference. Whatsoever happens he is contented. Whether he succeeds or fails is not his concern, because there is no desire to have a particular result, to have a particular future. Whatsoever happens, his future is liquid. He is ready to absorb it, whatsoever it is.

I remember another anecdote about Chuang Tzu. Whenever someone would say something to him, even before he had said it Chuang Tzu would say, "Good, very good!" This was a habit. So sometimes the situation would become very awkward, because someone would say something which was not good and he would not even hear. He would just say, "Good, very good!" Someone was saying, "My wife has died," and Chuang Tzu said, "Good, very good!" as if he had not heard. Someone would say, "My house has been broken into during the night, burglarized." But Chuang Tzu would say, "Good, very good!"

One day someone said, "Your son has fallen from the tree and broken both his legs." He said, "Good, very good!" So people began to think that he didn't know the meaning of "good" -- because if there is nothing bad, if everything is good, then you are crossing the boundaries of language. So the whole village gathered, and they asked him, "Please be kind enough to tell us what you mean by 'good' -- because we have been reporting all kinds of things, even misfortunes and deaths have been reported, and you have said 'good'. And this morning your own son has fallen from the tree, both legs broken. He was your help in old age, your only help. He was serving you up until now, and now you will have to serve him. In your extreme old age it is a misfortune, but you said 'good'."

Chuang Tzu said, "Wait! Life is a very complex affair."

And the next day it happened that the country was involved with the neighbouring country, at war, and it was compulsory that every young man be recruited into the military. Only Chuang Tzu's son was left because his legs were crippled. So they said, "You have a very deep insight into things it seems. You said 'good', and it has turned out to be 'good'."

Chuang Tzu said. "Wait! Don't be in a hurry. Life is very complex and things go on happening!"

The son was just engaged to a girl, but the next day the family refused to let her marry him because now there was no hope of whether he would even be able to walk again; his legs were very much injured. So again the people said, "It seems to be a bad thing after all."

Chuang Tzu said, "Wait! Don't be in a hurry. Life is very patient."

After a week, the girl who was going to be his son's wife, whom the family denied to him, died suddenly. So the villagers came and said again, "What are you doing! You have a very uncanny insight. Did you see that she was going to die?"

But Chuang Tzu went on saying, "Wait! Wait!"

Chuang Tzu had said that everything is good if you do not have any expectation. And life is infinite, God is infinite, but our patience is so small. Why are we so impatient? Why? We have expectations; we desire something. Something must be there! Something must happen!

Mulla Nasrudin had saved some money to have a new shirt. So he went to a tailor, the

most famous tailor in that locality. He waited a long time for it, and this was going to be his shirt for the new year. The new year was just about to begin. He asked impatiently, "Please, prepare it as soon as possible."

The tailor said, "The shirt will be ready, if Allah wills, within a week."

Nasrudin contained himself for a week. It was so difficult, he couldn't sleep. The new shirt haunted him continuously, day and night. In his dreams, he was again and again at the tailor's shop. Then seven days passed as if it were seven years. When you are expecting something, time is lengthened. It becomes longer and longer and longer. Seven days passed like seven years!

Then early in the morning, when the sun was just rising, before the shop had even opened, he was knocking at the door. The tailor said, "There has been a delay, so come after two days. If Allah wills, your shirt will be ready."

These two days were even more difficult, but Mulla Nasrudin contained himself. He tried to console himself in many, many ways. It was only a question of two days, so he told himself not to be so worried. He tried many religious tricks, and then he was again at the door of the tailor. The tailor said, "I am sorry. The shirt is not yet completely finished. So come tomorrow morning. If Allah wills, the shirt will be ready."

Now it was impossible to go back. So Nasrudin, exasperated, said, "Please tell me in how many days the shirt will be ready if you leave Allah out of it, because Allah is an infinite thing. It is enough! I have passed nine days, and it is difficult to conceive when Allah will will it. So leave Allah out and tell me exactly how many days it will take!"

Mind is impatient; life is not. Mind is impatient; God is not. Mind is temporal; life is eternal. Mind has a limit to how long it can expect, how long it can desire, how long it can feel, how long it can wait to achieve. Life has no limits. It goes on and on. It is an infinite process. Because we desire that some expectations be fulfilled in the future, the mind is a constant discontent. Looking at the infinity of life, looking at the endless process of life, one is contented. This is not a defense measure. This is wisdom.

Thirdly, let us look at this from some other door: contentment means consciousness *here and now*; discontentment means consciousness somewhere else, in the future. Discontentment is concerned either with the past or with the future. Contentment is here and now, in the present. A person who lives moment to moment will be contented, but we never live from moment to moment. Really, we *never* live in the moment! We always live beyond it -- somewhere in the future. We are moving like shadows, and we go on moving in the future. And the more you move in the future, the more discontented you will be, because the future never comes.

There is no future in Existence. In Existence nothing like the future exists. Existence is a continuity in the present; Existence is here and now. Expectation is somewhere else -- and they never meet. That non-meeting is discontentment. You hope, and there is no meeting. You dream, and there is no fulfillment. And there is a gap -- an eternal gap always between you and your hopes -- so you move in discontentment. Discontentment means a movement that is always in the future and never in the present.

Buddha says that only this moment is real. That is why philosophy is known as *kshanikvad* -- "momentism." This "momentism", only this moment, is real. Do not move beyond it! Be here and now! Consider it, think it over: just for this moment, if you are here and now, how can you be discontented?

Discontent needs comparison. You compare with the past which is no more. It is *no more*, but you compare with it. In some past moment you were somewhere else, and that moment

was very beautiful -- filled with happiness. But now you are sitting here, and you compare with that moment -- discontent is given birth. Or, you can contemplate into the future about some moment when you will be meeting with your beloved or your lover, or something else. You compare -- then you are discontented.

Discontent means comparison of something which is not in the present, which is either past or future, with your present. If you are really here with no comparison to the past or the future, then where is the discontentment? Then whatsoever is the case, you are contented.

Comparison brings discontentment; contentment is noncomparison. If you forget comparing, no one can make you discontented. It is you, your mind working in comparison, which creates discontentment. And then, to avoid this discontentment, you cultivate contentment. To negate one thing, first you create it; then to negate it, you have to create something else. And you will not succeed in it, because to think of creating contentment is moving again into the future.

So you will go on thinking that you have to cultivate contentment, and you will go on being discontented. You will begin to feel discontent even in relation to contentment, because you have not created it yet, because you are still far away from it -- far away from the goal. So even the goal of contentment, the ideal of contentment, will create more discontentment.

Our contentment is after we have created the disease. The contentment of the Upanishads is not to create disease at all. Do not move in comparisons. Each moment is unique; it cannot be compared. And this is the nonsense, the stupidity of the human mind: that the moment with which you are comparing your present moment was not so beautiful as you think, because when you were actually in that moment, you were thinking about something else. So the glory, the beauty, the happiness of it, is just a false phenomenon.

Everyone says that childhood was golden, and no child seems happy about his childhood. Every child is trying to grow up soon. If he can take a jump, if a child is allowed to take a jump, he will become his father immediately. No child is happy about his childhood, because childhood is such a slavery, and childhood is such a weakness, and a child is so much at the mercy of others. He feels it. Everything hurts. Mother and father and everyone is so strong, and he alone is so weak and dependent that he cannot do anything on his own. From everywhere comes the commandment "Don't!"

So every child is in deep misery. He contemplates the day when he will also be an adult -- powerful. But when he *is* an adult, he will begin to say, "Childhood was good." When he is old, just near death, he will create a golden dream. He will say, "What bliss childhood was! What a heaven!"

Psychologists say that this is also a trick of the mind. Because the reality is so hard, you have to escape somewhere. You are not capable of facing it, you do not want to encounter it. Really, the old man is now near death, so he wants to escape from it. When he begins to think about childhood, he has escaped, because childhood is as far away from death as anything. In his imagination, he has moved to being a child again. Now there is no death, no disease, no illness, no oldness. He is passing into the past, but why not into the future?

Old men always escape into the past, young men always into the future. Why? Because for an old man the future means death, so he doesn't want to see the future. Every day on the calendar a new date appears and death comes nearer. He doesn't want to see it, and the easiest way is to escape into the past. And to escape, you have to make it golden and beautiful, otherwise the journey will be boring. If you really escape into the *real* past, it is going to be a bondage.

Ask any old man, "If a chance is given by the Divine to you, will you be ready to repeat

the same life again?" He will say, "No! The same life?" He feels horrible. The same life? No one will be ready to repeat the same life -- not even the same childhood.

If you are given the opportunity that this can happen, that you are allowed to be born again to your parents and have the same childhood, you will say no. And just one moment before you might have been saying that "My father was just godlike, a holy man. And my mother? The climax of motherhood!" But if someone says, "Now be born to them again," you are going to refuse -- because whatsoever you have been saying about your mother, about your father, about your childhood, about your home, about your village, about your country, is just an imaginative creation. It is not concerned with reality. You have created it to escape from reality. A young man is thinking of the future, moving into the future, but contentment means to be here.

Socrates is dying, and on his face there is so much contentment that everyone feels it is strange -- because he is just on the verge of death, and death is a certainty with him. He is to be given poison. The poison is being made ready, being prepared just outside his room. The room is filled with his disciples and friends. They are all weeping and crying, and Socrates is lying on the bed. He says, "Now the time is coming near. Ask those persons who are preparing the poison if they are ready yet, because I am ready."

Someone asks, "Are you not afraid of death? Why are you so anxious to die?"

Socrates says, "Whatsoever is, *is*. Death is there; death is coming nearer. I must be ready to meet it, otherwise I will miss the moment of meeting death. So be silent. Do not disturb me; do not talk about past days."

Many are talking of past days, of how beautiful it was to be with Socrates, and Socrates says, "Do not disturb me. I have known you. In the past, in the days which you are talking about, you were not so happy as you are saying." His wife is weeping, and the same wife struggled with him for her whole life. It was a long conflict, a long problem -- never solved.

Socrates says, "It is strange! Why is my wife weeping? I would have thought she would be filled with happiness when I died, because my life was such a burden and such a suffering for her. Why is she weeping? She never enjoyed any moment with me, and now she is weeping for those golden moments. They were never there; only now she is creating a past which never was. It seems she has suffered because of me, and now she will suffer because of my absence."

Such is the stupidity of the human mind. You will suffer the presence, then you will suffer the absence. You cannot live with someone, and then you cannot live without him. When he is with you, you will see all the faults. When he is gone, you will see all that was good in him. But you never face the reality.

Then the poison comes and Socrates says, "Be silent; do not disturb me. Let me be here and now. Do not talk about the past. It is no more."

Someone asks Socrates, "Are you not afraid of dying? You seem so contented. Your face shows such silence. We have never seen anyone dying in such beauty. Your face is so beautiful! Why are you not afraid?"

Socrates says, "Only two are the possibilities, two are the alternatives. Either I am going to die completely. If this death is ultimate and there will be no Socrates, why bother? If I am not going to be at all, there is no question. There will be no suffering because Socrates will be no more. Or, the second alternative: only the body will die, and I, Socrates, will remain. So why bother? These are the only two alternatives possible, and I do not choose either of the two. If I choose, then it will become a problem. If the one I choose doesn't happen and the other happens, then there will be disturbance and discontent and fear and insecurity, and I

will begin to tremble.

"But these are two alternatives, and I am not the chooser. The Whole is the chooser. Whatsoever happens, happens. If Socrates will be no more. Socrates is unworried. Or, if Socrates will still be there, again there is no worry -- then I will be. If I am there, then I will be there. Then I will continue, so no need of any worry. Or, I will drop completely; then no one will remain to worry. But no more questions." Socrates says, "No more questions! Let me face death."

He takes the poison, he lies down, and then he begins to face, to encounter, death. No one else has ever encountered death in that way. It is unique -- Socratic. He says, "Now my legs have become dead, but I am as much alive as ever. My feeling of I-ness is the same. The legs have become dead, my legs are no more. I cannot feel my legs, but my wholeness remains the same." Then he says, "My half-body has become dead. I cannot feel it. The poison is coming up and up. Sooner or later my heart will be drowned in it, and it is going to be a discovery whether, when my heart has been drowned, I feel the same or not. But there is no expectation -- just an open inquiry."

Then he says, "My heart is going, and now it seems it will be difficult for me to speak more. My tongue is trembling and my lips are now giving way. So these are going to be the last words. But still, I say, I am the same. Nothing has dropped from me. The poison has not touched *me* yet. The body is far away from me, going away and away. I feel I am without a body, but the poison has not yet touched *me*. But who knows? It may touch, it may not touch. One has to wait and see." And he dies.

This is facing the moment without moving from it anywhere. Then you have contentment. Contentment means life here and now, living moment to moment without any escapes.

That is why this sutra says that total contentment is *visarjan*. *visarjan* is a particular process. *Visarjan* means dispersion.

In India, whenever someone worships, the deity is created. For example, Ganesh: Ganesh is created -- an image is created. For the worship, the image is taken as Divine, so Divinity is invoked in it. Then, for particular days, for a particular length of time, it is worshipped. When the worship is over, the deity has to be dissolved into the sea or into a river. That is known as dispersion -- *visarjan*. This is rare. This happens only in India, nowhere else in the world. Everywhere else they have permanent images of gods. Only India has impermanent images. This is rare!

India says that nothing is permanent and nothing can remain permanent -- not even your image of a god. Because you have created it, it cannot be a permanent thing. Do not fool yourself. When the time is over, go and throw it back. Your god cannot be permanent. Go on throwing your gods -- creating them and throwing them. Use them and throw them. Only then can you reach that God which is not your creation. The images are your creations, so they have an instrumental value. They are devices. They are necessary because you are still so far away from the reality, and it is difficult for you to conceive of an imageless God.

Create an image, but do not stick to it. No clinging is allowed. When the worship is over, throw it; throw it back into the mud. It is again mud. Then do not retain it. This is a very deep psychological process, because to throw a god needs courage, to throw a god needs detachment.

You were just worshipping -- falling at the feet of the god, crying, weeping, dancing, singing -- and now you yourself go and throw it into the sea. So it was just a device -- nothing permanent in it. You used it as an instrument. Now the worship is over, so throw it and create it again whenever you need. This constant creating and throwing will always help you to

remember that your created gods are not real gods. They are symbolic.

Hindus were never in favour of creating stone images. They came with Buddhists and Jains, and with Buddhists and Jains came temples. Hindus were really never in favour of stone images, because they give a false permanence. They give a false appearance of permanence.

A Buddha dies, but his stone image remains when even Buddha himself dies. How can an image of Buddha be permanent? But a stone image gives a false appearance of permanence.

Hindus have believed in mud gods. Make a mud god; then rains will come and you will know what happens to your god. It is *your* god; this must not be forgotten. And all gods created by men are mud gods. They are bound to be because man himself is an impermanent entity. He cannot create anything permanent.

So do not create a false appearance. This is called dispersion -- *visarjan*. This word is beautiful. First create the image, then uncreate it. It is not destroyed. *Visarjan* means "uncreated". Create, then uncreate it; then let everything go again to its basic elements.

Hindus say death is a dispersion. You are created in your birth; you are a mud image. Then in death the elements move again to their original source. You are dispersed, and that which was not born in you, which was even before your birth, will remain after your death. But your image will disperse. The same is to be done with human gods, man-made gods -- create them, then disperse them.

This sutra says that dispersion means contentment. Contentment is the dispersion -- the *visarjan* of your worship. Why? Why call contentment "dispersion"? It is very deeply related. Creation means desire. You cannot create unless you are filled with desire. Hindus are very logical in a way. They say God created the world because He felt the desire to create it. Even God cannot create the world without desire: He was filled with desire!

Creation means desire. You cannot create without desire. Desire allows you movement, effort, then you create. Then how to uncreate? If there is still desire, you cannot uncreate. Uncreation means no more desire, desirelessness, contentment. That is why this sutra relates *visarjan* to contentment. If a man is totally in contentment, then everything will disperse.

This is what Buddhists call Nirvana -- cessation of desire. Buddha says that when there is no desire you will cease: you will disperse into the cosmos. Still, the desiring mind will ask, "But I will be somewhere. Will I not be somewhere? Where will I be?" Buddha says, "It will be just like a flame going out." Can you find out where it is, where it has gone? You blow out a candle, and the flame goes out. Where is it? So Buddha says, "It has simply dispersed. It went to the elements, to the source."

It is everywhere or nowhere, and both are meaningful. If you say it is everywhere, it also means that now it is nowhere. You cannot find it anywhere now because it is everywhere. Or, you can say it is nowhere now because to find it is impossible.

Hassan, a Sufi mystic, relates in his life, "I was passing through a village, and I was so filled with knowledge that I wanted to teach anyone -- anyone who should meet me. Whosoever should meet me I would teach, but the whole day passed without teaching."

It is the teacher's itch. It is a disease. The whole day had passed and Hassan had not preached, so he caught hold of a child. The child was going with a candle in his hand, with a burning candle, to a temple. The evening was fading, and the child was going to the temple to put the candle there.

Hassan stopped him and said, "My boy, will you answer me one question? From where has this flame come into this candle?" He was asking a very metaphysical question, and he was certain that the boy would be caught in his net. But the boy did something, and Hassan

couldn't forget the incident for his whole life.

The boy laughed and blew out the candle, and he said, "Now it has gone just before your eyes. Tell me, where has it gone? If you can tell me where it has gone, I will tell you from where it came. And it has gone just before your eyes."

Hassan fell down at the feet of that child and said, "Forgive me. I do not know anything. I am only filled with knowledge. I do not know even this much -- where this flame has gone -- so what else can I know? You are *my* teacher. You have taught me much: you have taught me my ignorance."

When Hassan became Enlightened, the first thanks he expressed were toward this boy, this unknown boy. He thanked that unknown boy. So his disciples asked him "Whom are you thanking?"

He said, "There was a boy in a certain village who taught me my ignorance by blowing out a candle lamp and asking where it had gone. He was my first real teacher because all other teachers simply taught me more and more knowledge. He was the only one, and the first who taught me my ignorance. And only because of him did I become aware that my knowledge is false. And when your Knowledge is false, when you know it, only then can you progress toward an authentic, real knowledge -- toward a Knowing."

This sutra says that contentment is *visarjan* -- contentment *is* dispersion. When you are contented totally, you are out of the birth cycle. Now you will not be reborn again, because only desire is reborn, not you, and because of desire you have to follow. You become a shadow of your desire. The desires move ahead and you move behind. Now there is no desire, and one does not need any movement. One is freed from the wheel of rebirth, from *sansar* -- the world. This is what Liberation is.

Disperse *yourself*. Through this dispersion, you disperse your desires. Attain the center of Being through contentment. Contentment is a centering in oneself, and one becomes unmoving, still, silent.

The Ultimate Alchemy, Vol 2

Chapter #15

Chapter title: Questions and Answers

6 August 1972 pm in

Archive code: 7208065

ShortTitle: ULTAL215

Audio: Yes

Video: No

Length: 87 mins

OSHO, YOU TOLD LAST NIGHT ABOUT THE HINDU SYSTEM OF CREATING A MUD IDOL FOR WORSHIP, AND AFTER THE WORSHIP, ABOUT ITS VISARJAN DISPERSION -- INTO THE SEA OR A RIVER. THIS HAPPENS ON THE OUTER PHYSICAL PLANE. WHAT IS THE PSYCHOLOGICAL AND INNER MEANING OF THIS OUTER RITUAL? WHAT IS IT THAT MUST BE CREATED INWARDLY? WHAT IS IT THAT SHOULD BE DISPERSED AND WHEN SHOULD IT BE DISPERSED? SECONDLY, PLEASE EXPLAIN WHETHER THIS DISPERSION IS A GRADUAL PROCESS OR A SUDDEN HAPPENING AND WHETHER IT IS AN ACT OF AWARENESS OR JUST A LET-GO?

LIFE is a learning and an unlearning also. One has to learn many things, and then one has to unlearn them -- and both are necessary. If you do not learn, you remain ignorant. If you learn and cling to it, you become knowledgeable but you remain unwise. If you can also unlearn that which you have learned, then you become wise.

Wisdom has a childlike quality, but it is just "childlike" -- not exactly the same. The child is ignorant and the sage is wise. The child has yet to know and the sage has gone beyond. The child has no knowledge, the sage also has no knowledge. But in a child it is negative, in a sage that "no knowledge" has become positive. He has crossed beyond, he has transcended. So this is one of the basic principles of spiritual explosion: to unlearn, to go on unlearning, that which one has learned, and it is related to all planes of spiritual growth.

We discussed last night a very strange Hindu ritual. Hindus create images of gods, mud images, just for a particular ritual -- for a particular worship on particular days. Then they worship the mud image as Divine, and when the time is over, when the ritual is finished, they disperse it into the sea or into the river. The same image which was created is dispersed.

I told you that stone images came with Jainism and Buddhism. Hindus never believed in stone images because stone can give a false appearance of permanence while the whole life is impermanent. So man-created gods cannot be permanent either. Whatsoever man can create will remain impermanent; it is bound to be manlike. But we can create certain things which

can give a false permanence, which can appear falsely permanent. A pseudo-permanence is possible. With metal images, with stone images, with cement or concrete images, a false permanence is created.

Hindus have always believed in mud images. They create them and then they uncreate them, knowing that they were meant for a particular purpose, as a device. When the purpose is over, they dissolve them. Why? Because if you do not dissolve them, a deep clinging is possible, and that clinging will become a barrier. Ultimately, man has to reach to a point of absolute "unclinging"; only then is one free. That is what is meant by MOKSHA -- freedom -- no clinging, not even to gods.

So, ultimately, not only are images to be thrown, but gods also. Everything objective is to be thrown so that ultimately only the subjectivity remains, only consciousness remains, without any object of consciousness. This is the inward meaning of dispersion.

Look at it in this way: whenever we are aware of anything, we divide Existence into two -- the object and the subject. If I see you, I have already divided the Existence into two -- the seer and the seen. If I love you, I have divided the Existence into two -- the lover and the beloved. Any act of consciousness is a division: it creates a duality. Again, when you are unconscious there is no duality.

If you are deeply asleep Existence is one: there is no duality. But then you are not aware of it. When you are unconscious Existence is one, but you are not aware of it. When you are aware, you have divided by the very act of awareness and now you do not know Existence. You know something which has been created by your awareness. When you reach a third point, when you are aware and not conscious of duality, fully conscious without any object, then you have reached the world of the Ultimate.

A man asleep is just like a sage; a sage is just like a man asleep -- with only one difference: the man who is asleep is not aware of where he is, of what he is, and the sage is aware. But he is just like the man who is asleep because there is no division. He knows, yet without dividing Existence. One has to pass from unconscious to conscious, and then to superconscious. This is what is meant by ignorance, learning and unlearning.

We can divide it in many ways: first there is the *nastik* or atheist. He says there is no God: everyone is. This is the first stage. The second is that of the *astik* or theist who says that there is a God. And in the third stage, again there is no God. The third is the ultimate aim, when the *astik* again becomes a *nastik*.

When he was saying that there is a God he was saying that there is no God -- because even to say that there is God is to create a duality. Who is the sayer? Who is to declare whom? Buddha is such a *nastik*. He says there is no God. This is the ultimate goal. He is just like an *astik*, not really a *nastik*. He is the most supreme theist possible. But then duality cannot be, so he cannot say that there is God. Who can say that there is God? Now only One remains, so any assertion will be a violence against the One. So Buddha remains silent, and if you insist he says there is no God.

He is simply saying this: "Now I am alone. There is no one except me. Now my existence is the only Existence; the whole Existence is now my existence." Any assertion will create a duality.

So a *nastik*, an atheist, has to learn to be a theist and then unlearn again. If you go on clinging to your theism, you have not reached the goal. You are just on the bridge and you are falsely believing the bridge to be the goal. So, inwardly, not only are images to be thrown -- ultimately, that one of whom those images were carved is also to be thrown. First disperse God's mud images and then, ultimately, disperse God also. Only then do you become God

yourself.

Then the worshipper himself becomes the worshipped. Then the lover himself becomes the beloved. Then the seeker himself becomes the sought. Only then have you reached because now there is no further search, no further inquiry. So inwardly we will have to create many images, thought images, and then go on dispersing them.

I am reminded of Rinzai, a Zen monk. Someone was learning with him, meditating with him -- a disciple. Rinzai said, "Unless you are absolutely void, nothing is attained." The disciple was a lover of Buddha, a follower of Buddha, so he was ready to throw everything from his mind, but not Buddha. He said to Rinzai. "I can throw everything, the whole world, even myself, but how can I throw Buddha? That is impossible!"

Rinzai is reported to have said that Buddha could become a Buddha because he had no Buddha inside -- because there was no clinging to anything like a Buddha. That is why Gautam Siddharth could become a Buddha. "You will never be able to become that. Throw your Buddha!" Rinzai told him. The disciple entered inward. It was very arduous, very difficult, very painful. Ultimately he succeeded, and one day he came running. He was happy, very happy, filled with joy at his own attainment. He said, "Now I have attained the void."

Hearing this, Rinzai became sad and he said, "Now throw this void! Do not come here with this void within you, because even void Can be an image."

It is! When you can use a word, it becomes an image. Even when I say "void", a certain image is created in your minds. I say "emptiness", and a certain thought is created in your minds. So the word "emptiness" cannot create emptiness. The word "emptiness" creates a certain parallel image of emptiness in your minds.

So Rinzai said, "Now go and throw this void. Do not come near me with this nonsense of 'void' within you."

The disciple just couldn't understand. He said, "You yourself have been teaching me that one should attain void, and now that I have attained it you do not seem at all pleased."

Rinzai said, "You have not understood me at all, because when one attains the void he cannot say, 'This is my attainment.' He cannot say, 'Now I have attained the void.' He becomes the void." Others will know about it, but he cannot say it. Others will feel it, but he cannot assert it -- because the moment you assert, it becomes a concept, a word, an image.

Inwardly also, every image has to be discarded. But how can you discard if you have not created? How can you throw something which you do not have? So remember this also because these are the two fallacies; on the path of the seeker, these are the two barriers: one, you do not have anything so you think, "Now I have discarded." But you cannot discard something which you do not have.

For example, you can say, "I have discarded Buddha" -- but you never had him in the first place, so how can you discard? You can say, "I have discarded the void" -- but how can you discard unless you have achieved it? If, without ever having had images, you think that because you do not have any images now you have become one with the Ultimate, you are in the first state of ignorance. You are a child, not childlike. You are ignorant, you are not a sage.

Create, then you can renounce. But one will ask, "Why create? When something is to be renounced, why create it at all?" The very effort to create enriches you. And then the second act of throwing it enriches you more.

Look at it in this way: Buddha became a beggar, so any beggar on the street can think that "I am also like Buddha because he was a beggar." And he was! And if Buddha is begging before your house and some other beggar is there, what is the difference? Both are beggars.

But the difference is there in a very subtle way. Buddha is a beggar by his own effort. It is the highest thing possible when someone becomes, by his own effort, a beggar.

The other is also a beggar, but not by his own effort. He is a beggar in spite of all his efforts. When you are a beggar by your own efforts, you have become an emperor. And if you are an emperor not by your own efforts, you are a beggar. Buddha is a beggar knowing the futility of riches; the other one is a beggar not knowing the futility of riches. So the other can feel that he is a beggar, and Buddha can never feel that he is a beggar. The other will hide the fact that he is a beggar and Buddha will declare that "I am just a beggar."

These are the paradoxes of life. The real beggar will always hide the fact that he is a beggar. He will try to create a facade that he is not a beggar -- that even if he is begging he is not a beggar, that circumstances are such or that a particular circumstance has created this phenomenon, but he is not a beggar. Beggars are beggars in spite of themselves and their efforts. That is why they are unhappy. Even if one is an emperor in spite of himself and his efforts, he is going to be unhappy and discontented.

Buddha calls himself a *bhikkhu*-- a beggar. There is no hiding of the fact: he declares it. Why? Because he is not afraid of being a beggar. Only an emperor can declare that he is a beggar. A beggar can never declare it. Buddha with his begging bowl is a sovereign; he is a king. Even kings are just beggars before him. He had something and he has discarded it. Unless you have, you cannot discard. So remember this: do not go on discarding things which you do not have.

Many of us go on thinking that we have renounced many things. Then you deceive yourself, and this deception is very costly in the inward journey. For example, Krishnamurti goes on talking about discarding images, thoughts, beliefs. Then many people listening to him will think, "This is okay. We do not have any beliefs, so we are already in that state of mind that Krishnamurti is talking about." They are not! They are deceiving themselves.

First you must have beliefs, only then can you discard. If you do not have any beliefs, you cannot discard. If a child listens to me and I say to him that sages are childlike, that they unlearn, the child can then say, "Okay, I am already a sage. I am not going to learn. When one is going to unlearn, why this long suffering of learning? I am already a sage."

Jesus has said, "You will enter my Kingdom of God only when you are childlike." But remember the word "childlike". He never says "children" because many children die and they are not going to enter the Kingdom of God. "Childlike" -- that means a second childhood, not the first childhood: a second childhood after learning, after knowing, after experiencing, after attaining and then discarding.

You cannot know the flavour of this second childhood. It is absolutely different from the first childhood. To have something and then to discard it is a new experience. So I always say that a poor man is not really poor because he does not have riches. He is poor because he cannot discard anything. That is the real poverty. He cannot throw anything, he cannot say no to anything. That is the *real* poverty. When you can say no, you gain a strength.

But a poor man cannot say no. How can he say no? His whole being is saying, "Yes! Give to me." His whole being is just a hunger. He is a starved soul. He cannot discard, he cannot throw anything, he cannot renounce. That is real poverty. Inwardly, spiritually, that is the disease.

That is why in a poor country religion cannot flower; it is impossible. A poor country can only go on deceiving itself that it is religious. In a poor country, religion is impossible. I do not say that no poor individual can be religious -- individually, that is possible -- but as a society, no poor society can be religious, because the poor society cannot conceive of

discarding and renouncing. Only when a society is rich does renunciation become meaningful. So renunciation is the last luxury possible -- the ultimate luxury. When you can renounce, that is the highest peak of luxury.

A Buddha can renounce: he is a prince; a Mahavir can renounce: he is a prince. The twenty-four *teerthankers* of the Jains are princes: they can renounce. Krishna and Ram can think in terms of renunciation: they are kings. But when a poor man begins to think that "If Buddha has come to the streets to beg, then I am already a Buddha because I am already begging," he is misunderstanding the whole phenomenon.

And the same applies to learning: you can renounce learning, but first learn. Many times I am talking about the stupidity of knowledge. Then those who do not know, they think, "Okay! How good it is that we do not know!" When I talk about the stupidity of knowledge, I do not mean ignorance; I mean transcendence. Knowledge becomes stupid when you have it. When you do not have it, you are not higher than knowledge. You are lower than knowledge. So when I say knowledge is stupidity, I am comparing with wisdom, not with ignorance. Otherwise you may take it to mean that your ignorance is bliss.

Before renouncing anything, be sure that you have it -- only then can you renounce it. And when you *can* renounce something, anything, only then do you gain something through renunciation, and that which is gained is higher than that which is renounced. It is higher! That is WHY the lower can be renounced; otherwise it will be impossible to renounce. You can renounce knowledge because now you feel that wisdom is higher -- not only higher, but now you also feel that knowledge is a barrier to the higher. You renounce ignorance because knowledge is higher than ignorance. If you renounce knowledge FOR ignorance, then you have misunderstood the whole point, you have missed the point.

This sutra says to disperse -- but first create. First create a god, first create a god's image. What is meant by creating a god's image, or by creating a god? It is a very meaningful effort, and it changes you, it transforms you. It is not so easy as you think. When you make a mud image of Ganesh, for example, you know this is simply mud. You have given it a form; that is all. Then you worship it -- a mud image created by you yourself. Then to surrender yourself to it, then to touch the feet of the god you have created, is a transformation.

It is one of the most arduous things. It is not easy, because when YOU have created it how can you worship it? When you know this is mud and nothing else, how can you worship it? This very process of worshipping will change you. And if you can worship something which you have created, only then will you come to know the worship of that which has created you.

It is difficult, it is very arduous, but it begins from there. You become humble before your own image, your own self-made image, a home-made god, and you surrender. This gives you a deep humbleness, a deep humility. And then the image is not just an image -- it is transformed. You put your whole heart into it.

Really, look at the revolution that happens. You are the creator of the image, and then you worship the image as your creator. The whole thing has moved. You have become the created and the created image has become the creator. This is a total transformation of consciousness, so it is a metamorphosis. If it happens, then discard it. Then only can you know what dispersion is. If it happens, only then is there dispersion. Otherwise it was just a mud image; you worshipped it without any transformation, without any alchemical change. It was a mud image; you were just acting the worship. You knew already that this was just a formal act.

Vivekananda was speaking in an American city. He talked about a Bible principle and he quoted Jesus as saying that faith can move mountains. An old woman just sitting in the first

row was overjoyed because she was always troubled by a small hillock just by the side of her house. So she thought, "If faith can move mountains, then why not that small hillock?"

So she ran home. She looked through the window at the hillock for the last time, because now the hillock was going to disappear. Then she closed the window, and thrice she said, "God, I believe in you. Remove this hillock from here." And after three times she opened the window to see that the hillock was still there. So she said, "I already knew. Nothing was going to be moved. I already knew that this was nonsense."

If you already know this is nonsense, then faith cannot move anything. Then anything is a mountain because faith means that you know that the mountain is going to move. So, really, faith can move mountains if first it moves your heart -- otherwise it is impossible. You are worshipping a mud image, and you already know that this is a mud image which you have brought from the market. So it is a formality: one *has* to do it. And then you go and disperse it.

No! When really the mud image has become Divine, then your whole mind would like to cling to it. Then you can renounce the whole world, but you cannot renounce this image. Then suicide is easier than dispersion of this image. Then it is your heart, it is your being. Only then does the Hindu ritual say to go and disperse it.

When the real worship has happened, when the image has become Divine, then to disperse it is the greatest spiritual act, because then you are breaking your clinging to the last barrier. And when one can break this clinging to the Divine, nothing will create any attachment for him -- nothing!

But this is difficult. Dispersion is easy because the whole thing was just a formality. Ask Ramakrishna to disperse his image of Kali. For him the transformation has taken place. When he was made the priest of Dakshineswar, he was given only sixteen rupees per month. So he was a poor priest, the poorest, really, because the Dakshineswar temple was made by a Sudra *rani* -- a Sudra queen. No high-caste Brahmin was ready to become a priest there. No Brahmin was ready to become a priest in a temple made by a Sudra.

Ramakrishna accepted the position. Many asked him why. He was a high-caste Brahmin. Even his own family was against it. But Ramakrishna said, "I have fallen in love with the image, so it is not a question of service. Service is just an excuse so that I can enter daily. I have fallen in love."

But when a priest falls in love with the image, it creates problems. A priest should remain formal. He is not meant for *real* worship. He is meant for a formal show. Whenever you are in love with something, then difficulties are bound to arise. Love is such a disturber!

Within seven days he was called by the committee -- the management committee of the temple -- and they said, "We are going to fire you. What are you doing? It has been repeatedly reported to us, time and time again reported to us, that you are doing many wrong things in the temple. It has been reported that before you put flowers at the feet of Kali, you smell them -- *before!* Before putting them at the feet, you smell them! And food, the worship food: before it goes to the temple, it has been reported that you eat it -- *before* worship! That is not possible for a religious man. What are you doing? Are you mad? The food can be taken only afterwards. If you smell the flower, it has become impure."

So Ramakrishna said, "I resign then, because it is impossible for me not to smell the flower first. It is impossible!"

"Why it is impossible?" the committee asked.

Ramakrishna said, "I know that when my mother makes something, cooks something, she first tastes it and then she gives it to me. So I cannot give any food to Mother, to Kali,

without first knowing whether this is worth giving or not. And if love makes things impure, then I leave."

This man Ramakrishna will have very great difficulty in dispersion. If this Kali image is to be dispersed, it may even prove suicidal. He may die by the very shock. So remember this: this E dispersion is meaningful only when you have *really* worshipped. And to disperse the god then is the ultimate jump. Then you are thrown from the world of forms into the world of the Formless, because an image is a form -- beautiful, holy, but still a form. Unless you go beyond form and explode into the Formless, the journey is not finished. So, inwardly, that is what is meant by dispersion.

OSHO, TOTAL CONTENTMENT IS A CONSEQUENCE OF DESIRELESSNESS, MOMENT TO MOMENT LIVING AND TOTAL FLOWERING OF THE CONSCIOUSNESS. THIS IS THE STATE OF AN ENLIGHTENED ONE. BUT A SPIRITUAL SEEKER WHO IS JUST A SEED, A POSSIBILITY TO GROW INTO THE DIVINE, IS BOUND TO PASS THROUGH SPIRITUAL ANGUISH, SPIRITUAL THIRST AND THE UNEASINESS OF THE DARK NIGHT OF THE SOUL. THUS, A SEEKER IS BOUND TO BE IN A CONSTANT INNER DISCONTENTMENT UNLESS ENLIGHTENMENT HAPPENS.

HOW CAN A SEEKER COPE WITH THE FACT OF HIS INNER DISCONTENTMENT IN VIEW OF THE PRINCIPLE OF TOTAL CONTENTMENT?

Really, our minds move in circles -- and the same thing comes up again and again in different forms, in different words, in different phrases, but the logic remains the same. For example, this second question.

There are three states of mind: one is without discontent. An animal exists without discontent; a child exists without discontent -- but this is not contentment. It is only "without discontent"; it is a negative state.

Socrates has said, "Even if it is possible to be contented as a pig, I am not going to choose it. I would rather be a discontented Socrates than a contented pig." Pigs are very contented. When you look at a person and feel that he is contented, it doesn't mean that he is a sage. He may be just a pig. A life without discontent is not necessarily a spiritual life. It may be just that the man is foolish, because to feel discontent one needs intelligence.

Look at the eyes of the cows: no discontent, but no intelligence either. Look at the eyes of idiots: they are cow-like, no discontent! Why? Because discontent is part of intelligence. When you think, you are bound to worry. When you think, you are bound to think of the future. When you think, many alternatives become apparent. One has to choose, and with choice comes anxiety, with choice comes repentance, with choice comes trembling. The more intelligent you are, the more discontented you are.

But this sutra says, "Total contentment": that is the third state. The first is without discontent, the second is with discontent, the third is again without discontent -- but the third means contentment. It is positive. If you are intelligent, you will be discontented. But if you are really *totally* intelligent, you will pass through it, you will go beyond it, because ultimately your intelligence will show you the path; it will bring you the fact. You will be brought by your intelligence to know this fact that discontent is futile, useless. It is not that you won't be capable of discontent -- you will be capable of it -- but the very phenomenon of discontent becomes useless: it drops. So by "total contentment", this third state is meant.

Look at some examples: Buddha is not a contented man. A contented man is not going to leave his palace, he is not going to leave his wife, he is not going to leave everything. Buddha left everything that he had -- not only outward things, but inward things also. He went from one teacher to another for six years continuously. He would go to one teacher and then move again. With every teacher, whatsoever was to be learned, he would learn it, and then he would ask for more.

Then the teacher would say, "Please, now forgive me. I cannot show you anything more. This is all I can show you and you have achieved it."

But Buddha would say, "I am not contented yet. My fire is burning, my uneasiness remains the same, my longing is as alive as ever. Whatsoever you have said, I have followed it completely, but nothing has happened. So tell me if something more is to be learned."

Then the teacher would say, "Now you move; go to someone else. And if you gain something more than this, please remember to tell me."

So he moved continuously from one teacher to another for six years. He didn't leave any stone unturned. He visited all the teachers, both known and unknown, and then he became "teacherless". It was a long learning with teachers, then he became teacherless. Then he said, "Now I have come to a point where I have learned all that can be learned from others, and yet the discontent remains. So now I am going to be my own teacher, and there is no other way."

You can become your own teacher only when you have met many, many teachers and followed them. Only meeting will not do. When you have followed them and still your discontent remains, only then. Otherwise, listening to Krishnamurti you feel, "Okay! No teacher is needed. I am already a teacher." You are deceiving. A moment comes when no teacher can help, but that moment comes only through a long line of teachers -- and that, too, not just by meeting and listening to them, but by following them.

Then Buddha said, "Now no one can help me. I am helpless, so I will try on my own." And he tried, and that was a long effort. He did whatsoever came to his mind. It was an effort into the unknown, so everything was uncharted: no guide, no teacher. Whatsoever came into his mind he would try. He tried long fasts. He became just a bundle of bones. He was just on the verge of death when it occurred to him, "I am simply killing myself. This is not going to help. I have been simply starving myself."

After taking a bath in the Niranjana, he was trying to come to the shore, but he was so weak and the current was so strong that he was taken by the current. Flowing in that current, clinging to a root of a tree, he thought, "I have become so helpless and weak through this starvation, and if I cannot pass over this small river, how am I going to pass over the infinite river of Existence?" One day he reached a point where no teacher could be of any help. Then another time he reached to a point where no effort could be helpful. He thought, "I cannot do anything."

That night he achieved Nirvana. In the evening he relaxed under a tree. There was nothing to do now -- *nothing* to do! Others' minds proved useless; his own mind also proved useless. Now what to do? Where to move? Every movement stopped. There was nothing to do any more, so he relaxed under the tree.

For the first time, after many, many years, he slept -- because if there is any desire, sleep is not possible. You can dream, but you cannot sleep. So we are simply dreaming, not sleeping. Sleep is a very deep phenomenon. Either animals sleep or sages. For man, it is not meant to be. Man dreams.

Buddha slept for the first time, because there was nothing to do -- no future, no desire. no goal, no possibility of anything. Everything dropped that evening. Only simple consciousness

remained -- the consciousness of a child who was not a child: "childlike" consciousness, simple, but attained through long learning and effort.

He slept well. He is reported to have said that that night's sleep was a miracle. He must have become one with the tree, with the river, with the night, because when there is no dream, there is no division. What is the division between you and this tree you are sleeping under if there is no dream? Then there is no periphery, no boundary. In the morning, at just five o'clock, the last star was setting. He opened his eyes. Those eyes must have been like a lotus.

When *you* open your eyes in the morning, they are burdened, heavily burdened by the night's dreaming. They are tired. Do you know that eyes have to work in dreams much more than they work in the daytime? When you are seeing a film, your eyes go on moving continuously with the film. That is why, after three hours of seeing a film, your eyes are totally tired. You do not even blink; you forget to blink. You are so excited, and you have to move so fast. And if nothing is to be missed, you cannot blink. So in a film, you are not blinking. Your eyes are just following madly -- running. The same happens in the night on a deeper level. The whole night you are dreaming. Your eyes are moving.

Now psychologists can decode your eye movements from without. They call it "rapid eye movement -- REM." They can feel your eye movements and they can tell what type of dream you are dreaming. If it is a sexual dream, then the eyes move faster than in any other dream -- the fastest. You are so excited, and your eyes can reveal it. So now even dreams are not a private thing. Your wife can just put her fingers on your eyes and feel what you are doing in your dream. Are you seeing some woman? Your eyes show fast, rapid movements.

Buddha slept, but we dream. In the morning our eyes are tired from a whole night's work, so we have to open our eyes. That is why I say "lotus-like". A lotus never has to open itself: it just opens. The sun has risen and the lotus opens. That is why we call Buddha's eyes "lotus-like". The eyes opened because the night was over, the sleep was over. He was emerging, revitalized from deep inner sources without dreams, for the first time.

If your sleep is without dreams, it becomes meditation. It is just like Samadhi. So he was coming out of a deep Samadhi, a deep inner ecstasy. He saw the last star setting. And with the disappearance of the last star, everything of this world disappeared. He became Enlightened. Then later on he was asked, "By what effort did you attain?" He said, "With no effort." But then there is the possibility of misunderstanding. Of course, he is right that he attained with no effort. But how did he attain the "no-effort"? With a long effort! That must not be forgotten.

He is reported to have said, "I attained the Ultimate when there was no desire to attain it even." But how did he attain this no-desire to attain the Ultimate? Through a long discontent -- a discontent of lives together. Buddha said, "I have struggled for many, many lives, but through that struggle nothing was attained." But this is not a small thing. This feeling that "through effort nothing is attained" is a great attainment, because now something becomes possible without effort. Now only does something become possible with contentment.

So the first state is without discontent; that is an animal state. In it one is unaware of the problems life creates, unaware of the problem that life is -- blissfully unaware, but ignorant. It is a deep unconsciousness. Then the second state comes: discontent bursts forth. All that was blissful in unconsciousness disappears. Everything becomes a puzzle and a problem, and everything takes the shape of struggle, conflict, and everything has to be achieved through effort -- long effort. And then, too, it is not certain that you will achieve it. Then a world of anxiety surrounds you. You live in anxiety; you become an anxiety.

Kierkegaard has said that man is anxiety. He is! An animal is not anxiety, but man is anxiety! A sage like Lao Tzu or Buddha is, again, no-anxiety. These two no-anxieties -- animal-like and Buddhalike -- are absolutely different, qualitatively different. One has to pass through anxiety to gain again a state of no-anxiety.

So discontent is not disallowed, discontent is not condemned. But discontent cannot be allowed to be the ultimate state. Discontent is not the goal!

So this sutra means to go beyond discontent. Do not cling to it. It is a passage; one has to pass through it. But one should pass: one should not remain in it. Always remember this, because many questions will come up in your mind.

You think that these questions are different. Chuang Tzu has said somewhere that it is very difficult to ask different questions. We go on asking one and the same question, without feeling, without being aware, that the question is the same. Again and again it takes shape: only the shape is different, the words are different. But why does this happen? This happens because the question is not significant: the questioner is significant because the questioner remains the same. If you answer one question he will create another, but the question will be the same because the questioner remains the same. He will ask the same thing from a different angle. A slight change in the angle, and he will feel that now this is a new question. This is not a new question! Why does this happen? Because questions are not significant. The mind that asks is significant. Why does it ask?

I have heard about one man who married a girl of his choice. He was in love, and then within six months the love evaporated and life became a hell. So he thought, "I have chosen the wrong woman." Anyone will think that way; that is how the mind works. He did not think that "I am a wrong chooser -- I have chosen this woman, no one else." It was not an arranged marriage. When marriages are arranged, you have a consolation that you were not the chooser. Your father made the mistake or your mother or someone else -- some astrologer. But when you are the chooser, then the real difficulty comes.

America is facing the real difficulty. No one is at fault. *you* have chosen. Then the mind begins to play a trick. It says, "The woman was wrong. She deceived. That was not her real face. Now the real face has come up."

So this man divorced. He married again, and within three months the same thing began to happen again. The woman was different, but deeply she was the same because the chooser was the same. He married and divorced continuously eight times, and then it dawned upon him that every time the same woman turns UP -- *the same woman!* Why? The chooser is the same. How can you choose someone else? The choice is the same.

You fall again in the same trap -- because if you like particular eyes you will choose again those particular eyes. And those particular eyes, like a particular gesture, belong to a particular type of person. That particular gesture belongs to a particular type of person -- just like a particular laugh. That particular laugh cannot be laughed by anyone and everyone. That shape of lips, that gesture, those eyes. that laugh, they belong to a particular mind. You are again choosing the same person.

So you only go on changing names, and again and again the same person turns up because *you* remain the same. So unless you divorce yourself, no divorce is possible -- and no one is ready to divorce himself. When one begins to think of divorcing oneself, spirituality begins. So the question is the same.

The three states of mind are to be remembered always, and the first and the last appear alike. If you are thinking in terms of the first and second, then the second is to be chosen. Then the second is worthwhile to be chosen. Then discard the first. Discard childhood,

discard ignorance, discard that blissful unawareness of discontent. Choose discontent. Be adult. Choose struggle.

But when I say "choose", it is a relative statement against the first state. When I say "discard the second", it is for the third. So I will say use the staircase to come up, then leave the staircase. But our so-called logical minds will say, "If one is going to leave the staircase, then why take the trouble? Do not go up; do not go upon it at all. Remain where you are. Why travel? Why go when one has to leave?" But if the same mind is pushed, forced, then he will go. Then I will tell him, "Now leave the staircase," but he will ask, "Why? After so much effort, after so many difficulties, now I cannot leave this staircase!"

To reach a higher state, you have to go through passages and then leave them, to use staircases then leave them. And every step is a step only when you take it and leave it. If any step becomes a clinging, it is not a step: it has become a stone -- a blocking stone. So it depends on you. You can change blocking stones into steps, and you can change your steps into blocking stones. It depends on how you behave.

Remember this: everything that is to be used will have to be dispersed; everything that is used as a device will have to be discarded. But in the very process of using, one becomes attached. It happens like this: you are ill and you take a certain medicine. The illness may disappear, but then the medicine will create a problem. Then it is difficult to leave the medicine. So medicine can prove a greater disease, a bigger disease, because one becomes accustomed. And then one begins to think, "This medicine helped me to go beyond disease, so this is a friend. A friend in need is a friend indeed, so how to leave the friend?"

Now you are turning your friend into a foe. Now this medicine will become a disease. You win need another medicine -- an antidote. But then it is a vicious circle. You go on being attached to other things. Mind works in circles and goes on and on in the same rut. Remember this: if a thorn is there in your foot it can be removed by another thorn, but the second thorn is not to be put in the wound again just because it is friendly and because it has helped you. But we go on doing this. We cling to the second thorn without knowing that the second thorn is as much a thorn as the first one. It may even be stronger -- that is why it helped you pull out the first -- so it may prove even more fatal. Do not substitute. When one thing is finished, let it be finished. Do not create a chain.

It is difficult, arduous, but not impossible. With awareness it becomes easy. And do not believe in the mind too much. But remember, first you have to be a mind. First create a mind, but do not believe in it too much. Be logical, but be open. Life needs logic, but life is not logic alone. It goes beyond.

Mulla Nasrudin was serving in a house, in a rich man's house. But Nasrudin was a difficult man, very logical, and logical men are very difficult.

The master said one day, "Nasrudin, it is too much! I do not think there is any necessity to go to the market three times for three eggs. You are too mathematical, too logical, and I do not think I can convince you. But there is no need to go to the market three times for three eggs! You can bring them all at once -- one time is enough!" Nasrudin agreed to reform.

When the master fell ill, he said to Nasrudin, "Go and bring a doctor."

Nasrudin went, and he came back with a hoard, with many people, a crowd. The master asked, "Where is the doctor?"

Nasrudin said, "I have brought the doctor and all the others also."

The master asked, "Who are all these others?"

So he said, "One is an allopath. If he fails, I have brought one ayurveda man. If he also fails, there is one homeopath. If he also fails, then there are many others. And if everything

fails, then these four men are here with the last man: the undertaker -- to carry you out of the house." This mind is logical, legal, but also stupid.

Mulla Nasrudin was the only man in his village who could read and write. One day one yokel came and asked him to write a letter. So he wrote a letter, and when the letter was complete the yokel asked, "Now please read it, Mulla, so I can be sure that nothing is left out."

It was very difficult, because even for Mulla Nasrudin to read his script by himself was a very difficult feat. So he said, "Now you are creating problems."

He tried; he looked at the scrawl. He could read only, "My dear brother," and then he said, "Now everything becomes confused."

So the man said, "This is terrible, Nasrudin. If you cannot read it, then who will read it?"

Nasrudin said, "That is not our business. Our business is to write. Now let them read. It is their business. Moreover, the letter is not addressed to me, so how can I read it? It is illegal."

Logic, legality, they have their own stupidities. They are good compared to ignorance; they are stupid compared to higher things. Mulla Nasrudin's stupidities are apparent, but they are all human stupidities. When stupidities are apparent, they are not dangerous. When they are not apparent, they are dangerous.

Remember this: mind cannot help you to go beyond itself. It can help you to go beyond ignorance. It cannot help you to go beyond itself. And unless you go beyond it, there is no wisdom.

The Ultimate Alchemy, Vol 2

Chapter #16

Chapter title: Experiencing: The Essence of the Hindu Mind

7 August 1972 pm in

Archive code: 7208075

ShortTitle: ULTAL216

Audio: Yes

Video: No

Length: 92 mins

SARVA NIRAMAYA PARIPOORNOHAMASMITI MUMUKSHUNAM MOKSHAİK SIDDHIRBHAWATI
"I AM THAT ABSOLUTELY PURE BRAHMAN: TO REALIZE THIS IS THE ATTAINMENT OF
LIBERATION."

EXISTENCE is divided into two. Existence, as we see it, is a duality. Biologically, man is divided into two: man and woman, ontologically, Existence is divided into mind and matter. The Chinese have called this "yin and yang".

The duality penetrates every realm of Existence. We can say that sex penetrates every layer of Existence: the duality is always present. This duality also penetrates into mind itself. There are two types of mind, two types of mentality -- masculine and feminine. You can give other names also such as Western and Eastern, or, more particularly, you can call it Greek and Hindu. In a more abstract way, the division can be called philosophical and religious.

The first thing to be discussed today is the differences between the Greek mind and the Hindu mind. The Upanishads are the peak of the Hindu mind -- of the Eastern mentality or the religious way of looking at Existence. It will be easy to understand the Hindu mind in contrast to the Greek mind, and these are the basic minds.

When I say "Greek mind", what do I mean? The Greek mind is one aspect of the duality of minds. The Greek mind thinks, speculates; the approach is intellectual, verbal, logical. The Hindu mind is quite the contrary. It doesn't believe in thinking, it believes in experiencing; it doesn't believe in logic, it believes in an irrational jump into Being itself. The Greek mind speculates as an outsider standing out -- as an observer, an outlooker. The Greek mind is not involved. The Greek mind says that if you are involved in something, you cannot think scientifically. Your observation cannot be just: it becomes prejudiced. So one must be an observer when one is thinking.

The Hindu mind says you cannot think at all when you are standing outside. Whatsoever you think, whatsoever you try to think, will be just about the periphery: you will not be able to know anything about the center. You are standing out. Penetrate in! So much penetration is needed to know that ultimately you become one with the center. Only then do you know rightly; otherwise everything is just acquaintance, not knowledge.

The Greek mind analyzes: analysis is the instrument for it to know anything. The Hindu

mind synthesizes: analysis is not the method. One is not to divide into parts, but to look for the whole in every part. The Hindu mind is always looking for the whole in the part. The Greek mind, in Democritus, comes to atoms, because if you go on analyzing, then the atom becomes the reality -- the last particle which cannot be divided. The Hindu mind searches to the Brahman -- to the Absolute. If you go on synthesizing, then ultimately the Absolute, the Whole, is reached. If you go on dividing, then the last particle -- the last division of a particle -- is the atom. If you go on adding, then there is the Brahman, the Ultimate, the Absolute.

The Greek mind could develop to be a scientific mind because analysis helps. The Hindu mind could never develop to be a scientific mind because synthesis can never lead to any science. It can lead to religion, but not to science. The Western mind is the development of the Greek seed; so logic, conceptualization, thinking, rational analysis, they are the foundations for the West. Experience, not thinking, is the foundation for the Indian mind. So I would like to say that the Hindu mind is basically non-philosophical -- not only non-philosophical, but, really, antiphilosophical. It doesn't believe in philosophizing: it believes in experiencing.

You can think about love, you can analyze the phenomenon, you can create a hypothesis to explain it, you can create a system about it. In order to do this it is not necessary to be in love yourself. You can be an outsider, you can go on observing love, and then you can create a system, a philosophy, about love. The Greeks say that if you yourself are in love, then your mind will be muddled; you will not be able to think. Then you will not be able to be impartial. Then your personality will enter into your theory, and that will be destructive to it.

So you must be as if you are not. You must be out of it completely, totally. Do not become involved. To know about love, it is not necessary to be in love. Observe the facts, collect the data, experiment on others. You must always remain outside; then your observation will be factual. If you yourself are in love, then your observation will not be factual. Then you are involved, you are part of it, you are prejudiced.

But the Hindu mind says that unless you are in love how can you know love? You can observe others loving, but what are you observing? Just the behaviour of two persons who are in love. You are not observing love -- just the behaviour of two persons who are in love. They may be just acting. You cannot know whether they are acting or really in love. They may be hiding their real hearts. You can see their faces, you can listen to their words, you can look at their acts, but how can you penetrate into their hearts? And if you are not capable of penetrating into their hearts, how can you know love?

Sometimes love is absolutely silent and sometimes the destruction of love is very much vocal. So you can observe thousands and thousands of lovers, but still you cannot penetrate into the very phenomenon of love unless you are in love.

So the Hindu mind says that experience is the only way, not thinking. Thinking is verbal; you can do thinking in your own chair. You need not go into any phenomenon. When I say that thinking is verbal, I mean that you can play with words, and words have a tendency to create more words. Words can be analyzed in a pattern, in a system. Just as you can make a house of playing cards, you can make a system of words. But you cannot live in it: it is only a house of cards. You cannot experience it: it is only a system of words -- mere words.

Jean Paul Sartre has written his autobiography, and he has given a name to his autobiography which is very meaningful, very significant. He has called his autobiography, "Words". It is not only his autobiography -- that is the whole autobiography of Western thinking: Words.

The Hindu mind believes in silence, not in words. Even if the Hindu mind speaks, it

speaks about silence. Even if words are to be used, they are used *against* words. When you are creating a system out of words, logic is the only method. Your words must not be contradictory; otherwise the whole house will fall down. Your system must be consistent. If you are consistent with your words, then you are logical in your system.

So many systems can be created, and each philosopher creates his own system, his own world of words. And if you take his presumptions you cannot refute him, because it is only a play, a game of words. If you accept his premises, then the whole system will look right. Within the system there is an inner consistency.

But life has no systems. That is why the Hindu emphasis is not on word systems, but on actual realization, actual experiencing. So Buddha reaches the same experience that Mahavir reaches, that Krishna reaches, that Patanjali or Kapil or Shankara reaches. They reach to the same experience! Their words differ, but the experience is the same. So they say that whatsoever we may say, howsoever it may contradict what others have said, whenever someone reaches to the experience, it is the same. The expression is different, not the experience. But if you have no experience, then there is no meeting point at all. My experience and your experience will meet somewhere, because experience is a duality and the reality is one.

So if I experience love and you experience love, there is going to be a meeting. Somewhere we are going to be one. But if I talk about love without knowing love, then I create my own individual system of words. If you talk about love without knowing love, you create your own system of words. These two systems are not going to meet anywhere, because words are dreams, not realities.

Remember this: the reality is one; dreams are not one. Each one has his own individual dreaming faculty. Dreams are absolutely private. You dream your dreams; I dream my dreams. Can you conceive of it -- I dreaming your dreams or you dreaming my dreams? Can you conceive of us both meeting together in a dream, or of two persons dreaming one dream? That is impossible. We can have one experience, but we cannot have one dream -- and words are dreams.

So philosophies go on contradicting each other, creating their own systems, never reaching to any conclusion. The Greek mind taught in abstract terms, the Hindu mind in concrete terms of experience. Both have their merits and demerits, because if you insist on experiencing then science is impossible. If you insist on logic, system, reason, then religion becomes impossible.

The Greek mind developed into a scientific world-view; the Hindu mind developed into a religious world-view. Philosophy is bound to give birth to science. Religion cannot give birth to science: religion gives birth to poetry, art. If you are religious, then you are looking into the Existence as an artist. If you are a philosopher, then you are looking into the world as a scientist. The scientist is an onlooker; the artist is the insider. So religion and art are sympathetic, philosophy and science are sympathetic. If science develops too much, then philosophy, by and by, gradually transforms itself into science and disappears.

In the West now, philosophy has disappeared; it is already dead. It is now only professional. They say now only professors talk about philosophy with other professors. Otherwise philosophy is dead: it is a dead thinking, part of the past, part of history, a fossil. It has some interest, but that interest is only historical because science has taken its place. Science is the heritage -- the heritage of philosophy. Science is the outcome. Now science has taken its place and philosophy is dead.

In the West, religion has no roots. Poetry is also dying because it can exist only with

religion. These two types of mind develop into totally different dimensions.

When I say that religion gives birth to poetry, I mean that it gives you an aesthetic sense, a sense which can feel values in life: not facts, but values; not that which is, but that which ought to be; not that which is just before you, but that which is hidden. If you can take a non-rational, aesthetic attitude, if you can take a jump into Existence by throwing your logic behind, if you can become one with the ocean of Existence, if you can become oceanic, then you begin to feel something which is Divine.

Science will give you facts, dead facts. Religion gives you life. It is not dead: it is alive. But then it is not a fact -- then it is a mystery. Facts are always dead, and whatsoever is alive is always a mystery. You know it and yet you do not know it. Really, you feel it. This emphasis on feeling, experiencing, realization, is the last sutra of this Upanishad.

This Upanishad says: "I am that absolutely pure Brahman. To realize this is the attainment of Liberation."

Before we probe deep into this sutra, one thing more: if you have a logical mind, a Western way of thinking, a Greek attitude, then your search is for Truth, for what Truth is. Logic inquires about Truth, about what Truth is.

Hindus were never very interested in Truth, never! They were interested more in *moksha* -- Liberation. They ask again and again, "What is *moksha*? What is freedom?" not "What is Truth?" And they say that if someone is seeking Truth, it is only to reach freedom. Then it becomes instrumental -- but the search is not for Truth itself.

Hindus say that that which liberates us is worth seeking. If it is Truth, okay, but the search is basically concerned with freedom -- *moksha*. You cannot find a similar search in Greek philosophy. No one is interested -- neither Plato nor Aristotle: no one is interested in freedom. They are interested in knowing what Truth is.

Ask Buddha, ask Mahavir, ask Krishna. They are not really concerned with Truth: they are concerned with freedom -- how human consciousness can attain total freedom. This difference belongs to the basic difference of the mind. If you are an observer, you will be interested more in the outside world and less with yourself, because with yourself you cannot be an observer. I can observe trees, I can observe stones, I can observe other persons. I cannot observe myself because I am involved. A gap is not there.

That is why the West remained uninterested in the Self. It was interested in others. Science develops when you are interested in others. If you are interested in trees, then you will create a science out of it. If you are interested in matter, then you will create physics. If you are interested in something else, then a new science will be born out of that inquiry. If you are interested in the Self, then only is religion born. But with the Self a basic problem arises: you cannot be there as a detached observer, because you are both the observer and the observed. So the scientific distinction, the detachment, cannot be maintained. You alone are there, and whatsoever you do is subjective, inside you: it is not objective.

When it is not objective, a Greek mind is afraid -- because you are travelling into a mystery. Something must be objective so that if I say something others can observe it also. It must become social! So they inquire into what Truth is. They say, "If we all arrive at one conclusion through observation, experimenting, thinking, if we can come to a conclusion objectively, then it is Truth."

Buddha's truth cannot be Aristotle's truth because Aristotle will say, "You say you know something, but that is subjective. Make it objective so we also can observe it." Buddha cannot put his realization as an object on a table. It cannot be dissected. You cannot do anything with Self. You have to take Buddha's statement in good faith. He tells you something, but Aristotle

will say, "He may be deluded. What is the criterion? How to know that he is not deluded? He may be deceiving. How to know that he is not deceiving? He may be dreaming. How to know that he has come to a reality and not to a dream? Reality must be objective; then you can decide."

That is why there is only one science and so many religions. If something is true, then in science two theories cannot exist side by side. Sooner or later one theory will have to be dropped. Because the world is objective, you can decide which is true. Others can experiment on it and you can compare notes.

But so many religions are possible because the world is subjective -- an inner world. No objective criterion of judgement, of verification, is possible. Buddha stands on his own evidence. He is the only witness of whatsoever he is saying. That is why in science doubt becomes useful; in religion it becomes a hindrance. Religion is trust because no objective evidence is possible.

Buddha says something. If you trust him, it is okay; otherwise there is no communion with him, there is no dialogue possible. There is only one possibility, and that is this: if you trust Buddha, you can travel the same path, you can come to the same experience. But, again, that will be individual and personal; again you will be your own evidence. You cannot even say this, that "I have achieved the same thing Buddha has achieved," because how to compare?

Think of it in this way: I love someone; you love someone. We can say that we are both in love, but how am I to know that my experience of love is the same as your experience of love? How to compare them? How to weigh? It is difficult. Love is a complex thing. Even simpler things are difficult. I see a tree and I call it green. You also call it green, but my green and your green may not be the same because eyes differ, attitudes differ, moods differ.

When a painter looks at a tree he cannot be seeing the same green as you see when you look at it, because the painter has a more sensitive eye. When you see green it is just one green; when the painter sees a tree it is many greens simultaneously -- many shades of green. When a Van Gogh looks at a tree it is not the same tree as you see. How to compare this -- whether I am seeing the same green as you are seeing! It is difficult -- in a way, impossible -- even in such small simple things as the experience of green. So how to compare Buddha's Nirvana, Mahavir's *moksha*, Krishna's Brahman? How to compare?

The deeper we move, the more personal the thing becomes. The more in we go, the less possibility of any verification. And ultimately, one can only say, "I am the only witness of myself." The Greek mind becomes afraid! This is dangerous territory! Then you can fall prey. Then you can fall a victim of deceivers, of deluded ones! That is why they go on insisting on objectivity: "What is Truth?" is the inquiry. Then one is bound to fall on objectivity.

The Hindu mind says, "We are not interested in Truth. We are interested in human freedom. We are interested in the innermost freedom where no slavery exists, no limitation; where consciousness becomes infinite, where consciousness becomes one with the Whole. Unless I am the Whole, I cannot be free. That which I am not will remain a limitation to me. So unless one becomes the Brahman, he is not free."

This is the Eastern search. This too can be contemplated. You can think about it; you can also philosophize about it. This sutra says, "I am that absolutely pure Brahman. To *realize* this..." not "to contemplate about this", not "to think about this" -- because you can think, and you can think beautifully, and you can fall a victim to your own thinking. Thinking is not the thing. "To realize this is the attainment of Liberation." Know well the distinction between thinking and realizing.

Ordinarily, everything is confused and our minds are muddled. A person thinks about God, so he thinks he is religious. He is not! You can go on thinking for lives together, but you will not be religious -- because thinking is a cerebral, intellectual affair. It is done with words; life remains untouched. That is why, in the West, you will see a person thinking of the highest values and yet remaining on the lowest rung of life. He may be talking about Love, theorizing about love, but look into his life and there is no love at all. Rather, this may be the reason, the cause: because there is no love in him, he goes on substituting it by theories and thinking.

That is why the East insists that no matter what you think, unless you live it, it is useless. Ultimately, only life is meaningful, and thinking must not become a substitute for it. But go around and Look at religious people, so-called religious people; not only at religious people, but at religious saints: they are only thinking -- because they go on thinking about the Brahman, go on talking about the Brahman, they think that they are religious.

Religion is not so cheap. You can think for twenty-four hours, but it will not make you religious. When mind stops and life takes over, when it is not your thoughts but your life, your very heartbeat, when your very pulse pulsates with it, then it is a realization. And to realize this is the attainment of Liberation -- *moksha*, freedom. When one realizes that "I am the Absolute Brahman" -- remember the word "realization" -- when one becomes one with the absolute Brahman, it is not a concept in one's mind, now one *is* that, then one is free. Then the *moksha*, the Liberation, the freedom, is attained.

What to do? How to live it? This whole Upanishad was an effort to penetrate from different angles toward this one Ultimate goal. Now this is the last sutra. The last sutra says that you have gone through the whole Upanishad -- but if it is only your thinking, if you have been only thinking about it, then howsoever beautiful it is, it is irrelevant unless you realize it.

Mind can deceive you -- because if you repeat a certain thing continuously, you begin to feel that now you have realized it. If you go on from morning to evening repeating, "Everywhere is the Brahman, I am the Brahman, AHAM BRAHMASMI, I am Divine, I am God, I am one with the Whole," if you go on repeating it, this repetition will create an autohypnosis. You will begin to feel -- rather, you will begin to *think* that you feel -- that you are.

This is delusion; this will not help. So what to do? Thinking will not help. Then how to start living? From where to start it? Some points: first, remember that if something convinces you logically it is not necessarily true. If I convince you logically about something, it doesn't mean that it is true. Logic is groping in the dark. The roots are unknown: logic gives you substitutes for roots.

One night, just in the middle of the night, two persons were fighting in front of Mulla Nasrudin's house. They were creating much noise, and it was difficult for Nasrudin to sleep. The night was cold. He waited, but it was futile -- the noise continued. So Nasrudin went out with his only blanket; he wrapped it around himself, came out, and he tried to pacify them. Then, suddenly, one of the two snatched the blanket from Nasrudin and both of them ran away.

He came back. His wife asked him, "Nasrudin, what was the argument about? About what were they arguing?"

Nasrudin said, "Let me brood over it; let me think it over. It is a very complex affair."

So when he had brooded, again his wife asked, "Tell me. You have been thinking for quite a long time, it seems. An hour has passed, so tell me and I will be able to go to sleep

again. What was the matter?"

Nasrudin said, "It seems the blanket was the subject matter, because when they got it the fight broke up. My blanket seems to have been the subject matter of their argument -- because the moment they got the blanket, the fight broke up and they ran away."

All logic is working in the dark. You do not know anything about what has happened, why it has happened, but still you brood over it. Then the mind feels a dis-ease unless it knows the cause. So whenever you feel that you have the cause, the mind is at ease. Then Mulla Nasrudin could go to sleep easily.

The whole life is a mystery. Everything is unknown, but we make it known. It doesn't become known that way, but we go on labelling it and then we are at ease. Then we have created a known world: we have created an island of a known world in the midst of a great unknown mystery. This labelled world gives ease; we feel secured. What is our knowledge other than labelling things?

Your small child asks, "What is this?" You say, "It is a dog," so he repeats, "It is a dog." Then the label is filled in his mind. Now he begins to feel that he knows the dog. It is only a labelling. When there was no label, the child thought it was something unknown. Now a label has been put: "dog", so the child goes on repeating, "Dog! Dog!" Now, the moment he sees the animal, simultaneously in his mind the word "dog" is repeated. Then he feels he knows.

What have you done? You have simply labelled an unknown thing, and this is our whole knowledge. The so-called intellectual knowledge is nothing but labelling. What do you know? You call a certain thing "love", and you then begin to think that you have known it. We go on labelling. Give a label to anything and then you are at ease. But go a little deeper, penetrate a little deeper beyond the label, and the unknown is standing. You are surrounded by the unknown.

You call a certain person your wife, your husband, your son. You have labelled; then you are at ease. But look again at the face of your wife. Take the label off, penetrate beyond the label, and there is the unknown. The unknown penetrates every moment, but you go on pushing it, pushing it. You go on crying, "Behave as the label demands!"

And everyone is behaving according to the label. Our whole society is a labelled world -- our family, our knowledge. This will not do. A religious mind wants to know, to feel. Labelling is of no use. So feel the unknown all around; discard the labelling. That is what is meant by unlearning -- to forget whatever you have learned. You cannot forget it, but put it aside. When you look again at your wife, look at something unknown. Put the label aside. It is a very strange feeling.

Look at the tree you have passed every day. Stop there for a moment. Look at the tree. Forget the name of the tree; put it aside. Encounter it directly, immediately, and you will have a very strange feeling. We are in the midst of an unknown ocean. Nothing is known -- only labelled. If you can begin to feel the unknown, only then is realization possible. Do not cling to knowledge, because clinging to knowledge is clinging to the mind, is clinging to philosophy. Throw labelling! Just destroy all labelling!

I do not mean that you should create a chaos. I do not mean that you should become mad. But know well that the labelled world is a false creation of man -- a mind creation. So use it. It is a device, so it is good. Use it; it is utilitarian. But do not be caught in it. Move out of it sometimes. Sometimes, go beyond the boundaries of knowledge. Feel things without the mind. Have you ever felt anything without the mind -- without the mind coming in? We have not felt anything.

One day someone had given some meat to Mulla Nasrudin. A friend had given some meat

to him and also a recipe book to prepare it. He was coming home overjoyed. Then a buzzard snatched the meat from his hand, but he laughed at the buzzard and said, "Okay! All right! But do not think yourself very wise: you are a fool -- because what are you going to do with the meat? The recipe book is with me. The recipe book is more meaningful than the meat. Then what will you do with the meat? You fool! The recipe book is still with me!"

We all have our recipe books: that is our knowledge. Mind is our recipe book. It is always with us and the whole life has been snatched away from us. Only the recipe book remains.

You go to a tree. You say, "Okay, this is a mango tree." Finished! The mango tree is finished by your label. Now you need not bother about it. A mango tree is a great existence. It has its own life, its own love affairs, its own poetry. It has its own experiences. It has seen many mornings, many evenings, many nights. Much has happened around it and everything has left its signature on it. It has its own wisdom. It has deep roots into the earth. It knows the earth more than you because man has no visible roots into the earth. It feels the earth more than you.

And then the sun rises -- for you it is nothing because it is a labelled thing. But for a mango tree it is not simply that the sun is rising: something rises in it also. The mango tree becomes alive with the sun's rising. Its blood runs faster. Every leaf becomes alive; it begins to explode. We also know winds, but we are sheltered in our houses. This tree is unsheltered. It has known winds in a different way. It has touched their innermost possibilities. But for us it is just a mango tree. It is finished! We have labelled it so that we could move.

Remain with it for a while. Forget that this is a mango tree, because "mango tree" is just a word. It expresses nothing. Forget the word. Forget whatsoever you have read in the books; forget your recipe books. Be with this tree for a while, and this will give you more religious experience than any temple can give -- because a temple, any temple, is finally, ultimately, made by man. It is a dead thing. This is made by the Existence itself. It is something that is still one with the Existence. Through it, the Existence itself has come to be green, to be flowering, to be fruitful.

Be with it; remain with it. That will be a meditation. And a moment will come when the tree is not a mango tree -- not even a tree: just a being. And when this happens -- that the tree is not a mango tree, not even a tree, but just a being, an existence flowering here and now -- you will not be a man, you will not be a mind. Simultaneously, when the tree becomes just an existence, you will also become just an existence. And only two existences can meet. Then deep down there is a communion. Then you realize a freedom. You have expanded. Your consciousness expands. Now the tree and you are not two. And if you can reel oneness with a tree, then there is no difficulty in feeling oneness with the whole Existence. You know the path now. You know the secret path -- how to be one with this Existence.

So repeating a sutra like "AHAM BRAHMASMI -- I am Divine," will not do. Realize that knowledge is useless. Be intimate with the Existence. Approach it not as a mind, but as a being. Approach it not with your culture, your education, your scriptures, your religious philosophies -- no! Approach it naked like a child, not knowing anything. Then it penetrates you. Then you penetrate into it. Then there is a meeting, and that meeting is Samadhi. And once you feel the whole Existence in your nerves, when you feel yourself spread all over the Existence, "Then," this sutra says, "this is the attainment of Liberation" -- to realize this, not to think about it.

So realization is a deep communion -- oneness. What is the difficulty? Why do we remain outside this Existence? The ego is the difficulty. We are afraid of losing ourselves: that is the only difficulty. And if you are afraid of losing yourself, then you will not be able to know

anything in this life. Then you can collect money, then you can strive for higher posts, then you can collect degrees, diplomas, you can become very respectable, but you will be dead -- because life means the capacity to dissolve oneself, the capacity to melt.

When you are in love you melt: love is a melting. And if you cannot melt in love, then it is going to be simply sex; it cannot become love. When you love someone, you melt. When you do not love, you become cold: you freeze. When you love you become warm and you melt.

Religion is a love affair. One needs a deep melting into the Existence. Science is a cold thing. Logic is absolutely cold, dead; life is warm. The capacity to melt yourself is known in religious terms as "surrender"; and the capacity to be frozen, cold, is known in religion as "ego." Ego makes you ice-cold, frozen. Then you are just stone, dead. We are afraid of losing ourselves; that is why we, are afraid of love. Everyone talks about love, everyone thinks about love -- but no one loves, because love is dangerous. When you love someone, you are losing yourself: you will not be in control. You cannot know things directly; you cannot manipulate. You are melting. You are losing control.

That is why, when someone loves someone, we say he has "fallen" in love. We use the word "falling": we say "falling in love". It *is* a falling, really, because it is a melting. Then you cannot stand aloof, cold, in yourself -- you have fallen.

Look at a person who lives through mind: you can never feel any warmth in him. If you touch his hand, you cannot feel him there. If you kiss him, you cannot feel him there. He is like a dead wall. No response comes out of him. A man who loves is in continuous response. Subtle responses are coming from him. If you touch his hand you have touched his soul. It is not only his hand: he has come to meet you there -- totally! He has moved: his soul has come to his hand. Then there is warmth. And if your soul can also come to the hand to meet him, then there is a meeting -- a communion.

This can happen with a tree. And if it happens at all with anyone. then it can happen with anything else -- anything! It can happen with a stone, it can happen with the sand on the beach, it can happen with anything if at all it can happen -- if you know how to melt, if you know how to dissolve yourself, if you know how to move in response and not in words.

Words are not responses. You come and touch me and I say, "I love you." Then my lips remain dead and my hands remain dead. Even if I embrace you, it is simply a dead gesture. I do not come there; I do not flow in my body. I remain aloof. I say, "I love you": these words can deceive me, they can deceive you -- but they cannot deceive the Existence.

Religion is a love approach. It is a deep melting. And when you melt into the Existence, you become free. What is this freedom? When you are not, you are free. Let me say it this way: when you are not, you are free. Until *you* are not there, you cannot be free. You are your slavery, so you cannot become free: the "I" cannot become free. When the "I" dissolves, there is freedom. When you are not, there is freedom. So *moksha*, freedom, means a total dispersion of the ego. Learn or unlearn the coldness that everyone has created around himself. Unlearn the coldness and learn warmth.

I remember one man who came to Ramanuj -- a great Enlightened *bhakta* and said, "There is only one inquiry for me, there is only one goal for me. I want to reach the Divine."

Ramanuj said, "Right! Let me inquire some more about you, because unless I know you, the path cannot be shown. Please tell me, have you ever loved anyone at any time?"

The man was religious. He said, "What are you asking me! I am a religious man. I am a celibate -- a *brahmachari*. I have not loved anyone ever."

Ramanuj again said to him, "Think! Once more, think! You may have loved. Perhaps you

have forgotten."

The man said, "Why are you insisting on this? There is only one goal for me and that is God. Love is not for me! This whole world is not for me!"

Ramanuj said, "Then it is impossible, because you do not know how to melt. And it will be very difficult for you to reach the Divine. If you have known love, then you can understand the language of melting. If you have known love, no matter how little, you have broken the bar, broken the barrier. Then you have looked beyond. It may have just been a glimpse, but then something can be added to it and the glimpse can become a vision. But you say that you do not know love at all. You refuse it totally. Then I do not know how to help you toward the Divine, because it is a love affair."

And, really, this happens: if you love a mere human being, in the moment of love the human being disappears and the Divine is there. It is impossible not to have known it: in my language, it is impossible not to have known the Divine if you have known love, because in the moment of love you are not a human being at all. You have melted, and in that melting the other has disappeared as a mere human being. He has become an extended hand of the Divine. But if you have not known love, then there is only a meeting of cold individuals; no melting, just a cold, dead meeting; cold reasoning rather than meetings; conflicts rather than meetings -- encounters.

So learn the language of love and unlearn the language of reason. No one is going to teach you, because love cannot be taught. If you have become bored with your mind, if it is enough, throw it! Unburden yourself, and suddenly you begin to move into life. Mind has to be there, and then it has to be thrown. If you throw the mind, only then will you know that "I am the absolute pure Brahman," because only the mind is the barrier. Because of the mind you feel yourself finite, limited.

It is like this: you have coloured specs. The whole world looks blue. It is not blue; it is only your spectacles which are blue. Then I say, "The world is not blue, so throw your specs and look again at the world." But you do not know the distinction between your eyes and the specs. You were born with your spectacles, so you do not know the distinction between where specs finish and 'I' begins.

You have been thinking that your specs are your eyes: that is the only problem; that your thoughts are your life: that is the problem. The identity that your mind is your life: that is the problem. Mind is just like specs. That is why a Hindu looks at the world differently and a Mohammedan looks differently and a Christian differently: because specs differ. Throw your specs, and then, for the first time, you will reclaim your eyes. In India, we have called this approach DARSHAN. It is a reclaiming of the eyes.

We have eyes, but covered. We are moving in the Existence just like horses move when they are yoked in front of carts. Then their eyes have to be covered from both the sides. They must look straight ahead -- because if a horse can look around everywhere, then it will be difficult for the driver. Then it will go running anywhere and everywhere, so a horse is allowed to see only straight ahead in order that his world becomes linear. Now his world is not three-dimensional: he cannot look everywhere. The whole Existence is lost except the street. It is a dead street, because streets cannot be alive. It is a dead street, a dead road.

The horse can only see the road, this is utilitarian. Man also cultivates himself in this way -- in a utilitarian way. It is utilitarian to live with the mind and not to live with life -- because life is multidimensional: no one knows where it will lead you. So make a paved road. Close your eyes, have fixed specs, and then move on the road. But where are you moving? This road leads always to death, and nowhere else. This is a death road! Every road, it used to be

said, leads to Rome, but it can be true only if Rome means death; otherwise it cannot be true.

Every road leads to death. If you want life, then for life there is no fixed road. Life is here and now, multi-dimensional, spreading in every direction. If you want to move into life, throw your specs, throw your concepts, systems, thoughts, mind. Be born into life *here and now*, in this multi-dimensional life, spreading everywhere. Then you become the center and the whole life belongs to you, not only a particular road. Then the whole life belongs to you! Everything that is in it all belongs to you.

This is the realization: "I am that absolutely pure Brahman." You cannot reach to the Brahman by any road. The path is pathless. If you follow a path, you will reach something, but it is not going to be the All. How can a path lead you to the All? A path can lead you to something, but not the All. If you want the All, leave all the paths, open your eyes, look all around. The Whole is present here. Look and melt into it, because melting will give you the only knowledge possible. Melt into it!

Thus ends "The Atma Pooja Upanishad". This was the last sutra; the Upanishad ends. It was a very small Upanishad -- the smallest possible. You can print it on a postcard, on one side. Only seventeen sutras, but the whole life is condensed into those seventeen sutras. Every sutra can become an explosion; every sutra can transform your life -- but it needs your cooperation. The sutra itself cannot do it; the Upanishad itself cannot do it. *you* can do it!

Buddha is reported to have said: "The teacher can only show you the path; you have to travel it." And, really, the teacher can only show you the path if you are ready to see it. Finally, the teacher is a teacher only if you are a disciple. If you are ready to learn, only then can a teacher show you the path. But he cannot force you; he cannot push you ahead. That is impossible!

Rinzai was staying with his guru, with his teacher. It was impossible to leave the teacher, but the teacher said, "Now you are ready to leave me. Now move! Go wandering. Teach people whatsoever I have taught you. Now be a teacher in your own right. Move!"

But Rinzai was feeling very sad. It was so difficult, so he lingered on. Then the evening fell and the teacher said, "Go now! Because the night is just nearing and it is going to be a dark night." But, still, Rinzai stayed. At midnight the teacher said, "Now no more staying. You go!"

Just to have an excuse, Rinzai said, "But the night is so dark. I will move in the morning."

The teacher said, "I will give you a lamp. You take this lamp and move away. My work is finished. Do not waste a single moment here. Go and teach the people. Whatsoever you have learned, tell them and show them the path."

So he gives him a small lamp. Rinzai takes the lamp. In a very sad mood, he steps down from the hut. On the last step, the teacher laughs and blows the candle out. Suddenly, everything becomes dark.

Rinzai said, "What have you done? You give me a candle, a lamp, and then you blow it out?"

The teacher said, "How can my candle help you in the dark? How can my light help you in the dark? Your own light only can help. Now move into the dark with your own light only. My work is finished," the teacher said. "And it is not good to give you a light; it is not friendly. Now you move with your own light. You have enough."

The Upanishad can give you a light, but then that light will not be of any help, really. Unless you can create your own light, unless you start on an inner work of transformation, Upanishads are useless. They may even be dangerous, harmful, because you can learn them. You can easily become a parrot, and parrots tend to be religious. You can know whatsoever

has been said, you can repeat it -- but that is not going to help. Forget it. Let me blow out the candle. Whatsoever we have been discussing and talking, forget it. Do not cling to it: start afresh. Then one day you will come to know whatsoever has been said.

Scriptures are only helpful when you reach realization. Only then do you know what has been said, what was meant, what the intention was. When you hear, when you understand intellectually, nothing is understood. So this can help only if it becomes a thirst, an intense inquiry, a seeking.

The Upanishad ends; now you go ahead and move on the journey. Suddenly, one day, you will know that which has been said and also that which has not been said. One day you will know that which has been expressed and, also, that which has not been expressed because it cannot be expressed.

One day Buddha was moving in a forest with his disciples. Ananda asked him, "Bhagwan, have you said everything that you know:"

So Buddha takes some leaves from the ground into his handsome dead, fallen leaves -- and he says, "Whatsoever I have said is just like these few leaves in my hand, and whatsoever I have not said and have left unsaid is like the leaves in this Forest. But if you follow, then through these few leaves you will attain to this whole forest."

The Upanishad ends, but now you start on a journey -- deep, inward. It is a long and arduous effort. To transform oneself is the greatest effort -- the most impossible, but the most paying. This Upanishad has been a deep intimate instruction. It is alchemical. It is for your inner transformation. Your baser metals can become gold. Through this process, your utmost possibility can become actual.

But no one can help you. The teacher only shows you the path -- you have to travel. So do not go on thinking and brooding. Somewhere, start living. A very small *lived* effort is better than a great philosophical accumulation. Be religious -- philosophies are worthless.

The Ultimate Alchemy, Vol 2

Chapter #17

Chapter title: Questions and Answers

8 August 1972 pm in

Archive code: 7208085

ShortTitle: ULTAL217

Audio: Yes

Video: No

Length: 87 mins

OSHO, WHY HAVE WE NOT BEEN ABLE TO CREATE A SOCIETY WHICH COMBINES BOTH POLARITIES -- PHILOSOPHY AND POETRY, SCIENCE AND RELIGION?

IS THERE A POSSIBILITY OF THE TOTAL MEETING OF THESE POLARITIES?

WHICH LAND IS MORE FERTILE FOR THIS MEETING -- EAST OR WEST?

IS THIS MEETING POSSIBLE ONLY IN AN INDIVIDUAL, OR CAN IT EXIST SIMULTANEOUSLY IN THE SOCIETY ALSO?

IN WHICH WAY CAN MEDITATION BE USEFUL FOR THIS MEETING?

WHAT ARE THE FACTORS WHICH CAN HELP MAN TO GROW IN BOTH THE DIMENSIONS -- SCIENCE AND RELIGION?

HITHERTO, it was impossible to create a society which synthesizes both polarities of science and religion, of logic and poetry. It was impossible because this synthesis can become possible only when both the alternatives, taken alone, have proved to be total failures. Now, for the first time in the history of human consciousness, we are at the stage where both the alternatives have proved failures. Chosen alone, taken alone, each has proved a failure. So this age is really of very deep significance because the human mind will transcend the old conflict and the old polarities now.

The East tried one alternative -- choosing religion at the cost of science. The West tried the reverse -- choosing science at the cost of religion. The East succeeded in attaining the inner center in a few individuals. The West succeeded in attaining a prosperous affluent society. The East failed economically, technologically; it remained poor. The West failed spiritually; it remained empty inwardly. Thus, a synthesis began to happen.

A few individuals in the East and in the West also were able to conceive of it. They could look into the future. They are known as prophets because of this -- because they can know, because they can probe deep into the future. But prophets are never believed when they are alive because they go too far ahead. We cannot follow them and we cannot see how their innerness is working. So they are never believed, never followed. Only retrospectively do we

feel that they were right.

Many times this synthesis was proposed. For example, Krishna proposed it. His was one of the most penetrating efforts of synthesis. The Gita has been read, worshipped, but no one listened to him. Really, prophets are always born before their time. So the people who can understand them are yet not, and the people who are cannot understand them. There is a gap.

In a few individual cases, the synthesis was attained. There have been a few individuals who were both -- religious and scientific, logical and poetic. But that is a very subtle balance, and only a genius could attain it in the past. For example, a Michaelangelo or a Goethe or, even in our own times, Albert Einstein: they could attain a synthesis in their individuality. But then they became puzzles to us -- because they moved between two polarities so easily that they appeared inconsistent.

Consistency can be had only if you belong to one extreme. If someone moves between two, if a scientist is also a poet, then he has two personalities: he moves between the two. When he goes to his laboratory, he forgets poetry completely. He changes his being from a poet's being to a scientist's being. He begins to think in totally different categories. When he moves out of his lab, he moves again into a different being. The second being is not mathematical, not experimental. It is more like a dream than like any scientific experiment.

This is very difficult, arduous, but sometimes this has been attained in a few individuals who could move. Michaelangelo was a mathematician and also a great artist. Goethe was a poet and also a very deep probing logical thinker. Einstein was essentially a mathematician, a physicist, and yet he was aware and in deep contact with that which was mysterious around him. But then this was possible for only a few individuals. This should be possible for a greater number. Now the time is ripe, and the moment will come when society need not think in terms of opposites. Rather, it must think in terms of complementaries.

Two opposites are not really two enemies. They support each other; neither can exist without the other. Deep down they are related. We can call them "intimate enemies". They depend on each other. Each cannot exist without the other, and yet they are opposite. This opposition gives a tension, a certain energy, which helps them to exist.

But this was not possible in the past. Many tried one alternative because to try one is easy. You can be religious easily, you can be scientific easily -- but to be both is a very delicate balance, and then you need a very developed mind which can move from one group to another without any difficulty.

Look at our minds! When you move from your house to your office, your mind continues in the house. When you move from your office to your house, it is not that by leaving your office your mind leaves your office -- it continues to be in your office. Physical movement is easy; mental movement is difficult. And between a house and an office there is no opposition.

When someone thinks mathematically, it is a totally different approach toward life; when one begins to think poetically, it is totally different. It is as if you have moved from one planet to another, and the other cannot be allowed any voice. So a very deep control and integration is needed; otherwise the mind continues in one pattern. It is easy to move in one pattern. That is why it is easy for societies to choose.

The East experimented with one choice and the West with another. Both have failed. The whole history of man is the history of two failures -- Eastern and Western. Now both of these failures can be studied, and now we can become aware of the fallacies of history and the errors of the experienced standpoints. Now you can feel that a new world with a new attitude is possible -- a synthetic attitude.

Obviously, that world cannot be Eastern and cannot be Western. So do not ask which land

is more fertile, because then the whole world will become one world. Really, if you can still continue in terms of which land is more fertile, you again are trying to think in old categories. If East and West both have failed, then really this is the moment to drop the whole nonsense of being Eastern or of being Western. Now one humanity emerges. It is neither Eastern nor Western. It is *human*, and the whole planet earth becomes a small village.

A whole earth is possible, but the earth has not been whole. Now, for the first time, barriers are breaking. This breakdown of the old barriers will have to be consciously worked out. Unconsciously, it will take a longer time. Consciously, it can be done very easily and with less pain and less suffering. Now men should not belong to any land, to any culture, to any civilization, to any religion. Now, for the first time, men must belong to the whole earth.

The very base of thinking in terms of East and West, this and that, belongs to the past. For the future, it is not only foolish: it is deeply harmful. But how can this be made possible? This can be made possible in three ways. One, the mind must not be trained in any one attitude. The mind must be trained simultaneously in both the attitudes. A child must not be trained only in logic, doubt and science. He must be trained for trust, for meditation, for religious sensitivity, and both of these trainings must be given simultaneously.

For example, if one person marries someone who belongs to another group of languages, such as a German marrying an Indian, then the children will be bi-lingual from their very beginning. If you are born in one language group, you learn one language as your mother tongue. Then afterwards you can learn another language, but the second language will always be a second language. It will be imposed over and above the first, and the first will always colour it. Deep down in the unconscious the original language will exist, and the second language will only be in the conscious.

One of my friends was in Germany for twenty years. This was such a long time that he forgot his own mother tongue, Marathi. Then he fell ill and he was in a hospital. The doctors were in difficulty because whenever he was conscious he would use German, and whenever he became unconscious -- the disease was such that periodically he would go unconscious -- he would speak Marathi. Then he would not be able to understand German at all.

The deep unconscious knows the first language; the second is imposed. But for a bi-lingual child who is born between two languages, both are mother tongues. He will have no difficulty in moving from one to another. Really, he will never feel any difficulty in moving from one language to another.

Science is one language toward the reality and religion is another language toward the reality. Science is a detached language and religion is an intimate language. They both must be taught simultaneously, they both must become one. The child must never know that they are alternatives to choose between. A mind must be trained in doubt -- doubt for science; and a mind must also be trained in trust -- trust for life.

They are opposites to us because we were never trained that way: that is the only thing. To us faith and doubt are opposites. We say, "I have faith, so how can I doubt?" Or, "If I am a doubting man, if I can doubt, then how can I have faith?" Really, this division is stupid because their dimensions are different. Faith is for religion, faith is for deeper penetration into the reality, faith is for love, faith is for life. This is a different passage. Doubt is not needed. Doubt is for scientific research, for scientific approach, for facts, for dead facts, for observation.

For the outer world, doubt is a basic instrument; for the inner world, faith is the basic instrument -- and these two need not be in conflict. They are in conflict because we are trained in one, and we cannot move from one to another. That difficulty in movement is only

a difficulty of wrong training. Otherwise, when you are working a mathematical problem, use mathematics; but when you are looking at a flower, there is no need of your mathematics coming in between. Then be poetic. With a flower, mathematics is not needed. With a full-moon night, mathematics is not needed. Forget mathematics! Open another door of your being!

Jesus has said, "My father's house has many mansions," many dimensions. You are also not a one-door house; you need not be. If you are, it means that only one door has been opened or tried. There are other doors, and if they are opened you will be richer for that. If you can use other doors, then your personality will be less fixed, more river-like. Then you will be less dead and more alive.

Movement is life. And the more subtle the movement, the more abundant your life will be. So use doubt as an instrument, use faith as an instrument.

How is it possible? Now the second point: it is possible only if you are not identified with either. If you become identified with doubt, then you cannot move. Then *your mind* is doubt, so how can you move to faith? If you are identified with faith, then you cannot move to doubt.

So do not be identified with doors. You are different; doors are different. When you and the doors are different, there is no difficulty. Then you can move. So do not think that doubt is your being or faith is your being. Faith is a door; doubt is a door. You can move from either -- from one to another. If you are identified, then there is no choice.

But we are all identified. We go on saying, "I cannot believe, I cannot have faith, because I am a sceptic." Or someone says, "I cannot doubt because I am a religious man." This shows that your consciousness has become fixed, stone-like. It is not river-like, moving, flowing. Flow? Move! So the second point: the mind has to be trained *not* to be identified with instruments. Then you can use them. You can use a sword -- but if you so are identified that your hand has become the sword, then how can you have a rose-flower in your hand? Then you will say, "It is impossible! How can I have a rose-flower in my hand? My hand is a sword!"

And there is no relationship between a sword and a flower. You can take the sword, you can take a flower. If your hand is free from identification, only then does it become possible. So the second point is not to be identified! In the future, we have to create an educational system which teaches non-identification with instruments. Then it is very easy -- *very* easy!

Thirdly, remember this: the world exists as polarities, so if you choose one your world will be poorer. If you say, "I am going to be this and not that," then you will belong only to half of the world; you will be half alive. Remember, the Existence is polarity -- so if you want to be one with the total Existence, be able to move.

We think that someone is a very loving man, so we wonder, "How can he hate?" Or someone is a very hateful man, so "How can he love?" But if your love is such that you cannot hate, your love will be just nothing. It will have no life, no vigour. Your love will be impotent. If you cannot hate, then your love cannot be alive. And the same for the other extreme. If you can only hate and cannot love, your hate will be just a facade.

The opposite gives life. Your love will be richer if you can hate. There is no need to hate, but if you can hate? if that is your capacity, if you are capable of hate, your love will have a different quality, a deeper quality.

Everything that looks opposite to us is related, and the opposite gives strength. But we have been trained to be fixed beings. We have been trained not as processes, but as finished events, finished things. So we say that so-and-so is a man who is kind, and so-and-so is a man

who belongs to another category -- anger. But if a person who is kind is simply kind, if he cannot be angry, then his kindness will be shallow, his kindness will be just a clothing. If he can be angry also, then his kindness has a depth.

There is no need to be angry, there is no necessity -- but the *capacity* must exist. This capacity to incorporate polar opposites needs a different training. A different mind has to be brought into the world.

Remember this: all the great sages who have brought non-violence were Kshatriyas they belonged to warrior races. Mahavir, Buddha, all the twenty-four Teerthankers of the Jains, they were Kshatriyas: they belonged to warrior races. This seems absurd. It would be better if Brahmins were teaching non-violence, but no Brahmin has preached it. No Brahmin has ever preached non-violence. Only Kshatriyas have preached it. Why? And why do Mahavir and Buddha have such a depth into non-violence? They were capable of deep violence. They could move. They really belonged to a violent tribe, a violent type of mind. They were born to it, and then they moved to the other pole. They had a depth.

This is strange: if you go and try to find the opposite pole to Mahavir and Buddha, you will find Parasuram -- a Brahmin who killed millions of Kshatriyas. It is reported that many times he set about killing all the Kshatriyas in the world. This was a very violent mind, but he came from a non-violent caste. He was a Brahmin. Why? No Kshatriya can be compared to Parasuram in violence. He is unique. The world has not produced another like him again. Mahavir and Buddha, they are Kshatriyas. This is meaningful, significant. The capacity to be the other gives a certain strength.

Another example: you might have heard many anecdotes about great men, very wise men, sometimes acting very foolishly. No fool will act that way. We laugh; we say they are absent-minded.

It is reported of Immanuel Kant, after he came home one night from his regular walk with his umbrella, that he forgot which was which: he put the umbrella on the bed, covered it with a blanket, thinking it was himself, and then he stood in the corner of the room thinking he was his umbrella. And he could discover that something had gone wrong only in the morning when the servant knocked at the door. The whole night he was standing. He was sleeping: he was not standing. When the servant knocked at the door, Kant looked at the bed and then he began to think, "Why am I not going to open the door?" Then suddenly he realized that there had been a mistake.

But we can laugh at Immanuel Kant. We know that such great men are sometimes very absent-minded. But why? You cannot commit such a foolish act because you cannot move to the other extreme. Only Immanuel Kant can commit such a foolish act. He touches one extreme of intelligence, then the other extreme becomes possible. So no foolish men are reported to have committed such foolish acts as so-called wise, intelligent men are reported to have committed.

Sometimes the opposite also happens. A very foolish man, an idiot, sometimes will give you such a deep advice as no wise man can give. And this has been known throughout history, so every great king would appoint a court idiot: a court idiot was to be appointed with every great king. Such a king would have a big court of many wise men, but one idiot was to be appointed in the court -- the court fool.

And it has happened many times that when wise men were not able to suggest any advice, the court fool would suggest something. Why? Because many times wise men are so wise that they become impractical. Their very wiseness becomes a barrier. And a court fool is unafraid: he is unafraid of being a fool, so he can say anything. And sometimes, if you are

unafraid, then only your advice can be of any worth. Why? When you are at one polarity, the other polarity becomes possible. We must teach the future mind both the polarities. And I mean it when I say it. We must not teach a person only to be wise: we must teach him to be foolish also.

Why? Because if you are not foolish enough, you cannot enjoy life. You will become a sad and serious dead thing. All that is beautiful in life can be enjoyed by those who are capable of playing at foolishness, of being a fool, otherwise it is impossible. So the more wise you are, the more foolish you will be as far as life is concerned. We can think of a synthesis between religion and science, but we cannot conceive of a synthesis between a wise man and a fool because now the problem goes even deeper.

And when we think about a synthesis between a scientific mind and a religious mind, it is not our problem. It is far away; it is not concerned with us. But when I say that a deep synthesis is needed between being wise and being foolish, then it is directly concerned with you. Then it is neither. Then you become uneasy. Then the mind will say, "Choose wiseness; do not choose to be foolish." But why is foolishness so much condemned? And children are so beautiful because they are foolish, and animals are so innocent because they are foolish. And look at the pundits: they are so wise, so serious, so sad, that really they are pathological, diseased.

This deep synthesis between all the opposites can become a training, and for the future mind this is going to be the training. If a religious man cannot laugh and cannot dance, he is not whole. And one who is not whole cannot be holy. Wholeness is holiness.

In this way Zen Buddhism has achieved a deep synthesis. Zen saints and sages can act like fools, and that shows their wisdom. If you cannot act like a fool sometimes, that shows you are afraid to be a fool. That fear shows you are not yet wise. A wise man can move. I talk so much about Mulla Nasrudin because he is both -- a deep synthesis. He can act foolish, and it is rare to find such a wise man.

One day Nasrudin's village invited him to give a talk to the town. Some festival was on, and they needed someone to give a religious talk. So Nasrudin said, "Okay, I will come." So they came to receive him. He came out of his house sitting on his donkey in reverse order. His face was toward the back of the donkey and his back toward the donkey's face.

The whole group, those who had come to receive him, followed him, but they became uneasy because villagers began to stare. They thought: "This Mulla is a fool, and those who are following him and who are going to listen to him are greater fools. Who has ever heard of any man sitting on a donkey this way?" But the followers resisted. They controlled themselves, but it was impossible. When they were just passing the market, it became impossible. Everyone was laughing, so they asked Mulla, "Would it not be better if you changed your position?" The whole village was laughing.

Mulla Nasrudin said seriously, "If you are going to listen to me, if you are going to understand me at all, remember the first principle: you are paying more attention to what others are saying and no attention to what we are doing. Pay more attention to what we are doing. Now I will explain to you."

Mulla Nasrudin said, "Now I will explain to you! If I sit in an ordinary way, then my back will be toward you, and that will be disrespectful. If I allow you to move before me, in front of me, that will be disrespectful toward me. So this is the only human way possible. This is the only way it can be done without showing disrespect to anyone."

He looks foolish, but he is wise. But to find his wisdom will be difficult because it is shrouded with foolish acts. Only a wise man can penetrate into it. When you are paying some

respect to someone, what are you doing? When you expect respect because of your age, what are you doing? When you are paying respect, you would not like to sit in such a way that your back is toward the person to whom you are paying respect, so why laugh at Mulla Nasrudin? He is just acting as the human mind acts. It is only that he goes to the very logical extreme and he says, "This is the only possible way of doing it."

Really, he is laughing at your so-called respect, honour, etc. If you can laugh at him, then laugh at the whole human stupidity. If you are sitting on a chair and your father comes into the room, what will he do? If you do not stand, he will feel that you have been disrespectful toward him. But what nonsense! Sitting or standing, how does it make any difference? So the real thing is not whether you are sitting or standing. The real thing is that everyone is an egoist and everyone is expecting some gesture so that his ego is fulfilled.

There was one great teacher, A. S. Neill. He was teaching one day in his classroom, and his students were sitting as they liked. One Indian teacher visited him that day and he was aghast. He couldn't conceive what type of class this was. One student was smoking a cigarette, one was just lying on the floor with closed eyes, and the class was on and A. S. Neill was teaching. So the Indian teacher said, "This is indiscipline. What are you doing? Stop and first let them sit in a right way with respect toward the teacher."

Neill is reported to have said, "You do not understand what is going on here. They love me so much that they can be at ease with me. And if respect goes against love, then love is to be chosen. What can be more respectful toward me than love? They are feeling that they are at home, and I am here to teach them -- not to make them sit in a proper way. If one student feels that by lying down on the floor with closed eyes he can learn better, then okay. I am here to teach them certain things, so it is okay. If I make them sit forcibly, and if only because of that they cannot learn, then I am not doing the duty of a teacher."

So Neill can understand the anecdote about Nasrudin. Life is a multiplicity, a very paradoxical phenomenon. You must be capable of moving to both the poles and yet remain beyond. And only if you are beyond both can you move.

It is reported of Gurdjieff, by many of his disciples, that suddenly, at any moment, he would act foolish. He would create such a situation that his disciples would become very uncomfortable. Why? He was one of the wisest men possible. Why? Because to go on insisting on being wise is part of the ego.

One day one press reporter came to take an interview with George Gurdjieff. He was sitting there. A few disciples were there and he was answering their questions. The reporter came. Of course, as he was a press reporter of a big daily newspaper he was full of ego, feeling very important. Gurdjieff told him to sit down by his side, and then suddenly he asked a lady who was on the other side, "Which day is today?" The lady said, "Today is Saturday." Gurdjieff said, "How is it possible? Just yesterday it was Friday. How is Saturday possible today? And yesterday you told me that it was Friday."

The press reporter stood up and he said, "Okay, I am going."

When the reporter left, Gurdjieff laughed. But all the disciples felt very uncomfortable because they had arranged the interview, and now the reporter was going to report that they belong to a foolish teacher and they follow a foolish man.

But only a Gurdjieff can act this way. What did he do through this? He showed to his disciples that "you are trying, through Gurdjieff, to strengthen your egos, although you may or may not be aware of it." But the disciples insisted, "He will think you are a fool!" So Gurdjieff said, "Let him think. How does it matter? What others think is irrelevant."

This is really a humble man, because if you go on considering what others think about it,

you will go on using masks, false faces. You will try to appear beautiful, wise, because you are not concerned with what you are. You are more concerned what they think. and this is the foolishness of the ego.

So we must train a synthetic mind which is capable of turning beyond the duality and is capable of moving; a mind which can enjoy, be playful and be serious, and which can work. This liquidity is possible now. It was not possible before.

And because both alternatives have failed, a third possibility becomes open: meditation can help very much. Really, meditation is the only thing that can help. So if meditation makes you lopsided, it is not meditation.

If a meditation gives you a more balanced life, a more balanced consciousness, then only is it real. If meditation makes you withdraw from life, it is not meditation. If meditation helps you to be in the world without being in the world, if meditation helps you to be in the world but does not allow the world to be in you, then you have achieved a synthesis. Janak is a synthesis; Krishna is a synthesis. Life is not taken in opposites. One remains in both the polarities without being attached to any.

OSHO, LAST NIGHT YOU SAID THAT THE WEST DEVELOPED REASON, INTELLECT AND PHILOSOPHY, WHEREAS THE EAST DEVELOPED ART, MYSTICISM AND RELIGION. ONCE YOU SAID THAT THE HUMAN MIND DEVELOPS IN THREE PHASES -- IGNORANCE, KNOWLEDGE AND THE TRANSCENDENCE OF KNOWLEDGE THAT IS WISDOM. THEN IS IT NOT TRUE THAT THE WEST HAS PROGRESSED FROM IGNORANCE TO KNOWLEDGE, AND NOW CAN IT NOT STEP INTO THE THIRD REALM, WISDOM? SECONDLY, IS IT ALSO NOT TRUE THAT IT IS THE EAST WHICH HAS GIVEN BIRTH TO THE SIX GREAT INDIAN PHILOSOPHIES? THEN IN WHAT SENSE DO YOU CONSIDER THE EAST ANTI-PHILOSOPHIC?

There are three states -- ignorance, knowledge, and the transcendence of knowledge that is wisdom. These three states are basic to all dimensions, whether science or religion. A religious man is ignorant: he is in the first state. He doesn't know anything higher than the body, higher than the world. He lives like a child.

Then the second state is of knowledge. He begins to think. He gathers knowledge, information; he becomes knowledgeable. But this knowledge is borrowed. It is not his own; he has not known it.

Then he throws it. Everything that is borrowed is thrown. Now he jumps into himself, to the very source of his being. Then he becomes wise. He passes through ignorance, learning, unlearning, then he becomes wise.

The same happens with science also. The first stage is ignorance; then one becomes a scientist. This is a knowing about the outer world. This knowing is also borrowed. This knowing is technological. If one clings to this knowing, then he remains in the second stage. But if he can throw this scientific knowledge also and can take a jump into the Existence, the unknown Existence, then he becomes wise. So whatsoever the dimension may be, these three states will be relevant.

Whatsoever you know through others -- from others, from tradition, from scriptures, from someone else -- whatsoever is not immediate, without any medium, whatsoever is not known directly by you, is knowledge. Whatsoever is known by you directly, immediately, is

wisdom. So whether it is religion or science, it makes no difference. Learning must be unlearned; then there is the jump. And one can take the jump from any place, from wheresoever one is standing. Even if it is art, one must take the jump from the knowledge of art. Only then does wisdom flower. In Zen there has been training in meditation through many things through painting, through archery, through flower arrangement. This remains a basic principle.

Bokuju was learning with his teacher. He became a great painter, the greatest ever known. And then, one day, his teacher said, "Now stop painting." When he was at the height, at the peak, the pinnacle, when his name was penetrating far and wide, when emperors had become interested in him, when everyone had started talking about his painting, his teacher said, "Now you stop painting. For twelve years forget painting completely. Throw it!"

How difficult it was! He was just at the peak. Bokuju followed his teacher. He became just an ordinary gardener in his teacher's garden. For twelve years there was no painting, no talk of painting, then one day, the teacher said, "Now you can paint again."

Bokuju said, "Now I know. That time I simply trusted you. Now I know, because now whatsoever I paint will be mine."

This was learning, then unlearning. He said, "Now I can paint like a child without knowing anything of painting. I have forgotten everything; now I can paint like a child." And then it is reported that Bokuju would paint like a child. Then his paintings became of another world -- OF ANOTHER WORLD! They were not of this world. They were not even painted. He was just a child playing when he would paint.

Then his teacher said, "Now you are wise. There is no effort now -- no training, no art, no knowledge. You have become innocent. You cannot paint in the old way now."

One has to learn first and then unlearn. When art is forgotten, only then is the artist born. If you know that you cannot be totally in it, your knowledge will be a disturbance.

I will relate to you another story. In Thailand one temple was being built, and the greatest painter was called to plan for the great gate. The emperor said, "This gate, this temple gate, must be something unique in the world. There must be no comparison, so work hard."

This painter was a teacher, a monk. He tried hard. Whenever he would make something, it was his habit to ask his greatest disciple, who was just by his side, "Do you say it is okay?"

If the disciple approved, only then would he go ahead; otherwise he would throw it. He painted a hundred paintings, then he would look at the disciple, and the disciple would nod and say, "No!" Then he would throw it. Three months passed, and the emperor was asking again and again, "When?" But the teacher said, "I do not know. Not until my disciple says yes."

One day when he was painting, the ink was finished. He was just in the middle, so he asked his disciple to prepare more ink. The disciple went out to prepare more ink. Then without ink, just with his pencil, he drew a sketch. When the disciple came, he said, "What! You have done the thing! This is the thing! But how could you do it? You had endeavoured so much for three months."

The teacher laughed and said, "Because you were present, I was conscious of 'me'. That was the only error. When you were not here, I was also not here. I could forget myself. That is why this thing has come. I couldn't forget myself when you were there. Then the judge was there, and I was every moment afraid whether you were going to say yes or no each time, and I was making every effort so that you could say yes. That effort was the barrier. You were not here, so I was at ease, relaxed, and the thing happened."

The thing always happens when you are so relaxed that you are not. But a person of

knowledge cannot be so relaxed. Knowledge is the burden, the tension. So whatsoever the dimension may be -- art, religion, philosophy, whatsoever -- these are the three stages: ignorance, learning and then unlearning. Then you become wise.

And, secondly, it is asked, "Is it not true that it is the East which has given birth to the six great Indian philosophies? Then in what sense do you consider the East anti-philosophic?"

There are many reasons. First: the Indian philosophical systems are not philosophical in the Western sense. The Western philosophies call them "religious philosophies". They call them *religious* philosophies! They are not philosophies like those of Aristotle, Plato, Kant or Hegel. They are not -- because they state many truths, but their evidence is not logical. The ultimate verification is experience.

In the Western philosophies the ultimate verification is logical, not experiential. If I can prove a certain thing logically, it is okay. But the Indian mind is different. The Indian mind says even if you can prove a certain thing logically, it may not be true. And it may even be that I cannot prove a certain thing logically, but it is true.

For example, you say you are in love. Now prove how you are in love. What is the proof? How do you prove it? It cannot be proven. And if you try to prove it, it may happen that you yourself may become suspicious whether you are in love or not, because so many questions can be raised which cannot be argued. But still you know that you are in love.

There was a case in the court concerning Mulla Nasrudin. He was found with something which had been stolen from his neighbours' house, so he was suspected. But his advocate argued the case. There was no evidence. He had not been seen going into the house; no one had seen him coming out of it. But the thing was with him: he was found with the thing. He argued the case so beautifully, so logically, that Nasrudin won.

When they were coming out of the court, the advocate asked Nasrudin, "Now tell me, really -- were you involved in it?"

Nasrudin is reported to have said, "I thought before that I was involved, but you have argued the case so logically that now I am suspicious. You have convinced me also."

For Indian philosophy, logical conviction is not a criterion, that is the difference. The ultimate verification is experience. Indian religious philosophies talk logically. Mahavir, Buddha, Kapil -- they talk logically. Every Indian system talks logically, but they do not depend on logic. They say, "Our expressions are logical so that you can understand them, but whatsoever we are proposing is not deduced from logic -- it has come to us from experience."

For example, I experience something. Then I relate it to you and you begin to argue about it, so I also argue about it. But the experience has not come through argument. Rather, the argument has come through the experience; that is the difference. In the West, they say that if the argument is correct and cannot be refuted, then the conclusion is true. In India, they say that whether it is refuted or not, if it has been experienced it is true. So the truth of it lies in experiencing, not in argumentation.

So I also do not like to call Hindu systems of experiencing "philosophies". They are not! And why do I call them anti-philosophic? Because they are against the philosophical attitude. They say that Truth cannot be found through logical analysis. They say Truth cannot be proven through argumentation. Argumentation, logic, everything, is just a method of expression, nothing else. Basically, Truth remains an experience. That is why they are anti-philosophic.

Ask Buddha something, and if he feels that you are asking for asking's sake he is not going to reply. He will not reply! He will reply only if he feels that the inquirer is not just curious about it -- if he is an authentic seeker. That means if he is ready to go to the

experience. Otherwise Buddha is not interested.

Western philosophy -- Greek philosophy in particular -- says that philosophy starts with wonder. This has never been said in India. Hindu systems say that thinking starts in suffering, not in wonder. So note down this very deep foundational distinction.

The West says philosophy starts in curiosity. A child asks, "From where has this whole world come?" A philosopher also asks this. If you ask Buddha, "From where has this world come," he will say, "This is childish. How are you concerned? And whatsoever the cause may have been, it is irrelevant." He says, "If you are ill, then ask for the medicine." Buddha says that we are suffering, that life is *dukkha* -- suffering -- so the question is how to go beyond it; that is the difference.

Inquiry about Truth is against error. Inquiry about Liberation is against suffering.

The Indian mind is more psychological, less philosophical -- more concerned with actual human transformation, less concerned with idle curiosities. And it *is* anti-philosophic. But we have created nine systems -- six are Hindu, three non-Hindu. Those nine systems are not philosophical systems, but philosophical statements of inner experiences. They are called systems, but, really, "system" is not the right word. In Sanskrit they are called *sampradaya* -- schools, not systems. A school is a different thing and a system is a different thing. A system means it is philosophical; a school means that it is a training ground. A school means you are trained for a particular experience. All the nine are trainings -- trainings towards only one Ultimate goal: LIBERATION. That is why I call them anti-philosophic.

And because we have begun to think of them as philosophies, we are missing much. This is just one of the imitations of the Western mind. The way they teach and learn philosophy in the West has not been the way in the East ever, but now it is because our universities are just imitations of the West.

Nalanda was a different thing, Takshashila was a different thing. They were Eastern universities -- very different, basically different. In Nalanda only Buddhist philosophy was taught. And what was the training? The training was not simply verbal, not scriptural, not just knowing about what Buddhist philosophy is. The training was in Buddhist yoga. The student would follow verbal instruction, and then, simultaneously, he would go deeper and deeper and deeper into meditation. Unless meditation and verbal training grow simultaneously, the whole growth is futile.

A story is reported about when Huan Chuang came to Nalanda. He was entering the main gate. Nalanda was the biggest university in India; it had 10,000 students from all over the world. It is suspected that Jesus had been one of the students. When Huan Chuang came to the main door he met a *bhikkhu* -- a sannyasin. He began to ask questions about the university: "What is the training and what...?" The man began to answer. Huan Chuang was impressed by the man, and he was the greatest scholar in China in those days -- the greatest! He was so impressed with the man, and the man was so learned that Huan Chuang thought by chance that he was the Vice Chancellor -- but he was just a doorkeeper. He reports in his memoirs that he was just a doorkeeper, but he knew everything about philosophy.

So Huan Chuang remained for three years in that university. When going back, he again passed the door, and he asked the man, "Why are you still a doorkeeper? You know so much."

The man said, "Because I only know. I have failed in experience. I only know, so I am a failure. I know as much as the Vice Chancellor; there is no difference as far as knowledge goes -- but I am a failure because I couldn't grow into experience. That is why I am just a doorkeeper."

So learned men are just doorkeepers. The Indian attitude is for experience. Sometimes a Kabir can become the highest peak without any knowledge -- without any so-called knowledge. *Experience* is the thing; that is why the East is anti-philosophical.

The Ultimate Alchemy, Vol 2

Chapter #18

Chapter title: Questions and Answers

9 August 1972 pm in

Archive code: 7208095

ShortTitle: ULTAL218

Audio: Yes

Video: No

Length: 94 mins

OSHO, IT IS GENERALLY BELIEVED THAT RELIGION IS A SEARCH FOR TRUTH. BUT ONE NIGHT YOU SAID THAT WHILE THE GREEK MIND, THE SCIENTIFICALLY INCLINED MIND, SOUGHT TRUTH, THE EASTERN MIND, THE RELIGIOUS MIND, HAS Moksha, OR FREEDOM, AS ITS OBJECT OF SEARCH. BUT YOU HAVE ALSO SAID IN THE PAST THAT IT IS TRUTH ALONE THAT LIBERATES.

WILL YOU KINDLY EXPLAIN THE CONTRADICTION?

PHILOSOPHY is a search for Truth, but religion is not. Religion is a search for freedom -- Ultimate Freedom. What is the difference? When you are searching for Truth, the emphasis becomes more and more intellectual, mental. When you are searching for freedom, it is not simply a question of intellect, but of your total being.

The moment someone utters the word "Truth", your intellect is affected. Your emotions remain unaffected, your body untouched. It appears that Truth is for the head. How is Truth concerned with your toe? How is Truth concerned with bones and blood? But the moment you utter the word "freedom", it is concerned with your totality. *You* are involved in it -- totally! This is the first difference. Religion is not an intellectual affair. Intellect is involved as a part, but your total being is required in it. Freedom is for the total being.

Secondly, whenever one is thinking about Truth, it appears that Truth is to be found somewhere else. You are only the seeker; Truth is somewhere else as an object to be found. But when you are seeking freedom, freedom is not something objective to be found somewhere else. You have to transform yourself in order to find it because freedom means to drop your slavery. Truth appears to be something static, just like anything. Freedom is a process -- alive! That is why I say that religion is basically a search for freedom -- for ultimate, total freedom!

It is true that I have told so many times that Truth liberates. There is no contradiction. The search of religion is for freedom; Truth is instrumental. If you attain Truth, it helps you to be free. Truth liberates, but liberation is the end.

Really, it will be better to define it differently. That which liberates is Truth, and unless it liberates you it is not Truth. But freedom is the end for religion. This emphasis is not just a

small difference. It is a great difference -- because whenever mind begins to seek, to search for Truth, the total approach changes. You begin to think about it, you begin to argue about it, you begin to intellectualize about it. It becomes a philosophical endeavour. When freedom is the aim, it becomes psychological.

Truth is meaningful, but only as an instrument toward freedom. So religion is not against the search for Truth: religion is for freedom. Truth helps it, but then Truth is secondary. It is not primary, it is not basic. It is a means; freedom is the end. That is why *moksha* is the ultimate aim of all Hindu thinking, of all Hindu seeking -- *moksha*!

Truth helps to be free -- so seek Truth. but only as a part of the greater search for freedom. Do not make Truth itself the end. If you make Truth itself the end, then your search is not religious: it becomes philosophical. That is the difference between the Greek mind and the Hindu mind.

For Aristotle or for Plato or even for Socrates Truth is the end -- how to find it? Then logic becomes the means. Freedom is the end for the Hindu mind. How to find it? Yoga becomes the means.

If one is to be free, then one has to drop all his bondages. How to cut the chains? You need a science to cut those chains. That science is yoga. Then your search takes a totally different path. Why are you a slave? Why are you in bondage? How do you happen to be in bondage? Why are you suffering? Why? This "why" will change the whole approach. The bondage has to be known, then broken. Then you will be free.

If Truth is the search, then why is man in error? Then the problem is how to avoid error: that becomes the basic thing. Logic will help to avoid error; then argumentation, philosophical contemplation, is the means. That is why the Greek mind could not conceive of anything like yoga. Yoga is basically Eastern. The Greek mind could develop logic; that is the Greek contribution to world thought. They developed it to such a climax that, really, for these 2,000 years nothing has been added to it. Logic came to a peak in Aristotle. It happens rarely that one man can develop a science to its completion. Aristotle did that, but no concept of yoga is there.

In India, yoga is foundational. We have developed logical systems, but just to help the expression of those truths, of those experiences, which are beyond language. So we have developed logic as an instrument to express something, not to reach something.

Greek logic means a process of reaching toward Truth; Hindu logic means Truth has been achieved, freedom has been achieved, through something else. Then, when you have achieved the experience, in order to express it logic will be needed. To make this distinction clear I said that the Hindu mind is religious, the Greek mind philosophic. The religious mind is more practical.

I will relate one story to you. Buddha used to tell this story so many times: A man is dying. Buddha is passing through a forest and an arrow has penetrated into the man's body -- some hunter's arrow. The man is dying, but the man is a philosopher. Buddha tells him, "This arrow can be taken out of the body. Allow me to take it out."

The man says, "No, please first tell me who has been the cause? Who is my enemy? Why has this arrow penetrated into my body? Of what karmas is it a result? Tell me whether the arrow is poisoned or not."

So Buddha says, "These inquiries you can do later on -- but first let me pull out the arrow, because you are just on the verge of death. If you think that these inquiries should be made first and then the arrow should be pulled out, you are not going to survive."

This story he told many times. What does he mean by it? He means that we are all just on

the verge of death -- everyone. Death's arrow has already penetrated you. You may know it, you may not know it: death's arrow has already penetrated you; that is why you are suffering. The arrow may not be visible, but the suffering is there. Your suffering shows that death's arrow has penetrated you. Do not go on asking: "Who has created this world and why have I been created? Are there many lives or one? Am I going to survive after my death or not?"

Buddha says, "Inquire afterwards. First let this arrow of suffering be pulled out." Then Buddha laughs and says, "And I have never seen anyone inquiring later on, so inquire when the arrow has been pulled out."

This is yoga: it is more concerned with your state -- your real state of suffering and how to go beyond it -- more concerned with your bondage, with your imprisonment, and how to transcend it, how to be free. That is why *moksha* is the end -- the ultimate end, the practical end. It is not theoretical.

We have propounded many theories, but they are only devices. We have propounded *many* theories! We have nine systems and a vast literature, one of the richest literatures. But theories are devices. When I say that theories are devices, I mean that they are only to help you pull out the arrow. Really, theories are not meaningful: we have created many strange theories. But Buddha, Mahavir, they say that if a theory helps you to go beyond your bondage, then it is okay.

Do not be bothered about the theory, about whether it is right or wrong; do not be bothered about its logical argument. Use it and go beyond. Why bother about a boat? If it can help you to cross the river, cross the river. Crossing is meaningful; the boat is meaningless. So any boat can help. Because of this, Hindus could develop the only tolerant mind in the world -- the *only* tolerant mind! A Christian cannot be tolerant: intolerance is bound to be there. A Mohammedan cannot be tolerant: intolerance is bound to be there.

It is not his fault. It is because to him the boat is very important. He says, "You can cross this river only in *this* boat. Other boats are *not* boats; they are not true. The other shore is not very important: this boat on this shore is very important. So if you choose some wrong boat, you will not be able to get to the other shore." But the Hindu mind says that any boat will do; the boat is irrelevant.

Theories are boats. If you are aiming for the other shore rightly, if your eyes are fixed on the other shore, if your mind is meditative on the other shore, any boat will do. And if you do not have any boat, then swim!

Even one individual can cross; there is no need of an organized boat. Swim! And if you know the ways of the wind, then even swimming is not needed. Just float! If you know the ways of the wind, then just wait for the right wind. Then drop yourself and relax, and the wind will take you to the other shore.

No boat has any monopoly. Without boats also one can swim. And if one is wise, then swimming also is futile: that is the last thing which cannot be understood intellectually. Hindus say that if you relax totally, then this shore is the other shore. Then there is no going. If you are relaxed totally and surrendered totally, then this shore is the other shore!

For this Hindu mind, theories, philosophies, systems are just games, devices -- helpful, but they can be harmful also if you become too much attached to them. If someone becomes attached to a particular boat, he is not going to cross the river in that boat -- because ultimately that boat will become the barrier. Even if the boat leads to the other shore, he cannot go out of the boat. The clinging to the boat will be the barrier. This attitude about theories and systems as devices is non-philosophical. Philosophy lives with theories; religion is more practical.

Mulla Nasrudin used to say that practical methods are only religious methods. One day he was working on his roof. Rains were to come and he was working on his roof. One fakir, one beggar from the street, called Mulla Nasrudin; he called him down. It was difficult, but yet Nasrudin came down and he asked, "What is the matter? Why didn't you tell me from here? I could have heard."

The fakir said, "I have come to beg something, some alms, and I was ashamed to call so loudly."

Mulla said, "Do not be in false pride. Now come up with me." The fakir followed him.

The fakir was a fat man. It was difficult to reach the top of the house. When he reached there, Nasrudin started his work again. The fakir said, "And what about me?"

Nasrudin said, "I have nothing to give you; excuse me."

The fakir said, "What nonsense! Why didn't you tell me this there on the street?"

Nasrudin said, "Practical methods are more useful. Now you will know."

Religion is practical, philosophy is non-practical. What do I mean? If you ask me, "Is there God?" I can take your question in two ways -- philosophical or religious. If you ask me, "What is God?" or "Is there a God?" and I take it philosophically, then we need not travel anywhere. You remain as you and you stay where you are. No need of any travel to any point. I will answer you here. I will say whatsoever is my belief. If you argue, I will argue and give you evidence and proofs, but this can be done here. No practical travelling is needed.

If you ask me the question as a religious question, then note the difference. If you say that this is a religious question, then I cannot give you any theory, then I will give you a method. Then I cannot say whether God exists or not; that is useless. Then I will give you a method, and I will tell you to practise this method and then you will know. Then you will have to travel long, and only when you have reached a particular state of consciousness will the answer come to you.

Philosophical inquiry needs no individual transformation. You ask me and I will answer you, here and now. Your change of mind is not needed. If you ask me a religious question, the question may be the same -- but if you say it is religious, it means that now a certain change is needed.

A blind man comes and asks, "What is light?" If he is asking a philosophical question, I will propound a theory. It is irrelevant whether he is a blind man or not. Theories can be understood by a blind man also, theories about light. He may not be capable of seeing light, but he can understand a theory about light, that is an intellectual affair. And, really, he may be more capable of understanding a theory than you because he is not bothered by the light at all.

If you talk about light with a man who can see, he has his own experience about light. Your theory may suit his experience or it may not suit it, but he will argue more. However, to a blind man any theory will do. The only criterion will be whether it can be proved logically. If you can prove it as a logical statement, the blind man will believe it. But if a blind man asks it religiously, then something has to be done for his eyesight to be reclaimed: theories won't help. Some operation is needed, some surgery is needed, some method is needed, so that the blind man can see. And unless he sees, there is no light for him.

Now a very difficult thing is to be understood. Here is light, and you close your eyes. Do you think that there is still light when you have closed your eyes? Of course, logically, apparently, obviously, by closing the eyes light is not destroyed: light is there. When I open my eyes light is there; when I close my eyes light is there. With my closing of the eyes, light

is not disturbed: this is common sense.

But physics says something else. It says that light is a phenomenon in which your eyes are contributing -- that light cannot exist without your eyes. The source of light may exist, but light cannot exist. Light is your interpretation. Something, X-Y-Z, is there, which my eyes interpret as light. If my eyes are closed, there is no one to interpret -- light has disappeared.

Take an easier example. We are sitting here. So many colours, so many clothes are here. But colour needs your eyes; otherwise it cannot exist. You see a rainbow in the sky. Close your eyes and the rainbow has disappeared -- not simply for you, but it has actually disappeared because a rainbow needs three things in order to be there: drops of water suspended, then sunrays crossing, and then an eye looking at it. These three things are needed for a rainbow to exist. If one element is lacking, then the rainbow disappears.

If there were no men on the earth, there would be no rainbows. If there were no eye on the earth, there would be no colour. Why am I saying this? For a blind man, no light exists. For a spiritually blind man, there is no God. The source is there, but the source is not God. God is the interpretation when the source is experienced. The source is there; you are here, blind. Thus, there is no God. When the source and your eyes meet, the phenomenon is God, the meeting is God.

Religion is a practical science for how to open your eyes -- or, for how to make your non-functioning eyes function; or how to make your eyes adjusted to the angle from where you can feel the Divine. This is not theoretical, and freedom is the end because the bondage is suffering. If you penetrate your own mind, you can understand this. Who is interested in Truth? You are interested in your suffering. Who is interested in Truth? You are interested in your pains, in your suffering, in your bondage. So, naturally, you are ultimately interested in your own bliss, in your freedom, not in Truth.

Truth can become meaningful only if it is felt that without Truth you cannot be free. But then Truth has instrumental values as a means: this is the difference. And there is no contradiction. I say Truth liberates, but it is Truth *because* it liberates. Liberation should be the end; then you can use even Truth.

Truth should not be the end, otherwise you will be misguided. Then you will begin to approach the Existence through intellect. And each step leads into another and each step creates a chain. A slight difference in your question, a very slight change, and your whole path will be different. Very delicate is the path!

Someone comes to Buddha and says, "Is there life beyond death?"
Buddha asks him, "Are you really interested?"

The man says, "Of course." but he becomes uneasy. He was curious, not really interested. He wanted to know just as a curiosity whether life exists beyond death, whether life survives death.

Buddha asks him, "Are you really interested?"

And his eyes must have penetrated the poor man, so the man became uneasy and said, "Of course."

Then Buddha said, "You think twice. If you are really interested, then I can show you the way to die, and then note whether life survives or not. Who can die for you and who can know for you? You will have to pass through it. Even if I say that life survives, how are you going to believe it? Then someone else will say no, so how will you decide? But if it is just a curiosity, then go to some theoretician. Go to some philosopher. I am not a philosopher!"

Buddha used to say, "I am a *vaidya* -- a physician -- so if you are really ill, come to me. I do not have theories, but I have the method to treat you. I am a physician."

Religion is medicine; philosophy is theory.

OSHO, ON THE PATH OF MEDITATION MANY SEEKERS FIND IT DIFFICULT TO KNOW CLEARLY WHETHER THEY ARE MAKING ANY PROGRESS OR WHETHER THEY ARE JUST SUSPENDED ON ONE PLANE, SIMPLY MOVING IN REPETITIONS. WILL YOU PLEASE EXPLAIN IN DETAIL ABOUT THOSE FACTORS WHICH INDICATE THE MEDITATOR'S CONSTANT PROGRESS?

When meditating, working on yourself, if you wonder whether you are making any progress or not, know well that you are not making any progress -- because when progress is made you know it. Why? It is just like when you are ill and you are taking medicine. Won't you be able to feel whether you are getting healthy or not? If you do not feel it and the question arises whether you are getting well or not, know well that you are not getting well. Well-being is such a clear feeling that when you have it you know it.

But why does this question arise? This question arises for so many reasons. One, you are not really working. You are just deceiving yourself. You are playing tricks with yourself. Then you are less concerned with what you are doing and more concerned with what is happening. If you are really doing it, you can leave the result to the Divine. But our minds are such that we are less concerned with the cause and more concerned with the effect -- because of greed.

Greed wants to have everything without doing anything. So the greedy mind goes on moving ahead. Then the greedy mind asks, "What is happening? Is something happening or not?" Be *really* concerned with what you are doing, and when something happens you will know it. It is going to happen to YOU. You need not ask anyone.

Another reason for asking this question is that we think that there are going to be some signs, some symbols, some milestones we can reach that show: "I have progressed so much," that "to this plane or to that plane I have reached so much." We want to calculate before the ultimate goal is reached. We want to be confident that we are progressing.

But, really, there are no milestones -- because there is no fixed road. And everyone is on a different road; we are not on one road. Even if you are following one technique of meditation, you are not on the same road; you cannot be. There is no public path. Every path is individual and personal. So no one's experiences on the path will be helpful to you; rather, they may be damaging.

Someone may be seeing something on his path. If he says to you that this is the sign of progress, you may not meet the same sign on your path. The same trees may not be on your path; the same stones may not be on your path. So do not be a victim of all this nonsense. Only certain inner feelings are relevant. For example, if you are progressing, then certain things will begin to happen spontaneously. One, you will feel more and more contentment.

Really, when meditation is completely fulfilled, one becomes so contented that he forgets to meditate -- because meditation is an effort, a discontent. If one day you forget to meditate and you do not feel any addiction, you do not feel any gap, you are as filled as ever, then know it is a good sign. There are many who will do meditation, and then if they are not doing it a strange phenomenon happens to them. If they do it, they do not feel anything. If they do not do it, then they feel the gap. If they do it, nothing happens to them. If they do not do it, then they feel that something is missing.

This is just a habit. Like smoking, like drinking, like anything, this is just a habit. Do not

make meditation a habit. Let it be alive! Then discontent will disappear by and by; you will feel contentment. And not only while you are meditating. If something happens *only* while you are meditating, it is false! It is hypnotic! It does some good, but it is not going to be very deep. It is good only in comparison. If there is nothing happening, no meditation, no blissful moment, do not worry about it. If something is happening, do not cling to it. If meditation is going rightly, deep, you will feel transformed throughout the whole day. A subtle contentment will be present every moment. With whatsoever you are doing, you will feel a cool center inside -- contentment.

Of course, there will be results. Anger will be less and less possible. It will go on disappearing. Why? Because anger shows a non-meditative mind -- a mind that is not at ease with itself. That is why you get angry with others., Basically, you are angry with yourself. Because you are angry with yourself, you go on getting angry with others.

Have you observed that you get angry only with those people who are very intimate with you? The more the intimacy, the more the anger. Why? The greater the gap between you and the person, the less the anger that will be there. You do not get angry with a stranger. You get angry with your wife, with your husband, with your son, with your daughter, with your mother. Why? Why do you get more angry with the persons who are more intimate with you?

The reason is this: you are angry with yourself. The more intimate a person is with you, the more he has become identified with you. You are angry with yourself, so whenever someone is near to you, you can throw your anger upon him. He has become part of you. With meditation you will be more and more happy with yourself -- remember, with *yourself*.

It is a miracle when someone becomes happier with himself. For us, either we are happy with someone or angry with someone. When one becomes happier with oneself, this is really falling in love with oneself. And when you are in love with yourself, it is difficult to be angry. The whole thing becomes absurd. Less and less anger will be there, more and more love, and more compassion. These will be signs -- the general signs.

So do not think you are achieving much if you are beginning to see light or if you go on seeing beautiful colours. They are good, but do not feel satisfied unless real psychological changes are there: less anger, more love; less cruelty, more compassion.

Unless this happens, your seeing lights and colours and hearing sounds are child's play. They are beautiful, very beautiful; it is good to play with them -- but that is not the aim of meditation. They happen on the road, they are just by-products, but do not be concerned.

Many people will come to me and they will say, "Now I am seeing a blue light, so what does this sign mean? How much have I progressed?" A blue light will not do because your anger is giving a red light. Basic psychological changes are meaningful, so do not go for toys. These are toys, spiritual toys, but you can become a *paramahans* if you see a blue light!

These things are not the ends. In a relationship, observe what is happening. How are you behaving toward your wife now? Observe it. Is there any change? That change is meaningful. How are you behaving with your servant? Is there any change? That change is significant. And if there is no change, then throw your blue light. It is of no help. You are deceiving and you can go on deceiving. These are easily achieved tricks.

That is why a so-called religious man begins to feel himself religious: because now he is seeing this and that, but he remains the same. He even becomes worse! Your progress must be observed in your relationships. Relationship is the mirror: see your face there. Always remember that relationship is the mirror. If your meditation is going deep, your relationships will become different -- totally different! Love will be the basic note of your relationships, not violence. As it is, violence is the basic note. Even if you look at someone, you look in a

violent way. But you are accustomed to it.

Meditation for me is not a child's play. It is a deep transformation. How to know this transformation? It is being reflected every moment in your relationships. Do you try to possess someone? Then you are violent. How can one possess anyone? Are you trying to dominate someone? Then you are violent. How can one dominate anyone? Love cannot dominate, love cannot possess.

So whatsoever you are doing, be aware, observe it, and then go on meditating. Soon you will begin to feel the change. Now there is no possessiveness in relationships. By and by, possessiveness disappears, and when possessiveness is not there relationship has a beauty of its own. When possessiveness is there, everything becomes dirty, ugly, inhuman. But we are such deceivers that we will not look at ourselves in relationships -- because there the real face can be seen. So we close our eyes to our relationships and we go on thinking that something is going to be seen inside.

You cannot see anything inside. First you will feel your inner transformation in your outer relationships, and then you will go deep. Then only will you begin to feel something inner. But we have a settled attitude about ourselves. We do not want to look into our relationships at all because then the naked face comes up.

Mulla Nasrudin's marriage was arranged by his father. It was an arranged marriage, so Mulla had not seen the face of his would-be wife. Then on the wedding day, when the ceremony was over, the wife unveiled her face. She was terribly ugly, and while Mulla was just stunned by the shock she asked, "Now tell me, my love, your commands." That is a Mohammedan system. The first thing the wife asks is, "Tell me your commands, my love. To whom do I have to remain veiled? To whom am I allowed to show my face?"

Mulla Nasrudin said -- rather, groaned -- "You can show your face to anyone you like, as long as you do not show it to me! This is a contract."

We are also in a contract with ourselves. We go on showing our faces to everyone, but never to ourselves. That is a deep contract we have with ourselves -- not to feel one's face. And the way to remain veiled is not to look into your relationships, because relationship is the only mirror. So probe, penetrate into your relationships, and look there to see whether your meditation is progressing or not.

If you feel a growing love, unconditional love, if you feel a compassion without cause, if you feel a deep concern for everyone's welfare, well-being, your meditation is growing. Then forget all other things. With this observation you will also observe many things in yourself. You will be more silent, less noise within. When there is need you will talk, when there is no need you will be silent. As the case is now, you cannot be silent within. You will feel more at ease, relaxed. Whatsoever you are doing, it will be a relaxed effort; there will be no strain. You will become less and less ambitious. Ultimately, there will be no ambition. Even the ambition to reach *moksha* will not be there. When you feel that even the desire to reach *moksha* has disappeared, you have reached *moksha*. Now you are free, because desire is the bondage. Even the desire for liberation is a bondage. Even the desire to be desireless is a bondage.

Whenever the desire for anything disappears, you move into the unknown. The meditation has reached to its end. Then *sansar* is *moksha*. Then this very world is liberation. Then this shore is the other shore. But do not go for childish signs. Do not go! They are easy to create. If you think, if you imagine, you can create them.

I do not mean that every feeling of those signs is imagination, but if you think in those terms you can imagine them. If you think that a blue light will happen at a particular stage,

you can create it without reaching to that stage. This is very easy; to reach to that stage is very difficult. To create this blue light is very easy. Close your eyes, concentrate on it, and within a few days you will begin to feel it. Then your ego will be strengthened. Now you are "on a spiritual path". Think of kundalini, and you will begin to feel it in your spine. That is imagination. It is easy, not difficult. But then you are misleading yourself.

I do not say that every experience of that type is imagination, but if you are concerned, it is going to be imagination. Forget it completely. Be concerned with meditation, with your changing relationships, with your silence, with your contentment, with your love. Be concerned with these, and suddenly sometimes, there will be an upsurge of energy into your spine. But do not be concerned with it. Note it down and forget it. Suddenly, you will see a particular light: note it and forget. Suddenly a particular chakra will begin to revolve: note it and forget it. Do not be concerned with it. Your concern is harmful. Remain concerned with contentment, peace, silence, love, compassion, meditation.

These things will go on happening. Then they are real. When you are not concerned and they happen, then they are real. And they show many things, but you need not know what they show because when they happen you know what they are showing. Because the human mind is stupid, if I tell you what they show you will be less concerned with love, silence and compassion. These are very difficult things. It is easy to create a blue light and it is very easy to feel a snake rising in your spine. It is very easy; there is nothing difficult about it.

So, remember, there are two types of inner experience. One type is created by your imagination, another is of happenings. But for happenings, you are not needed; for imagination you are. Do not play with imagination. It is a dangerous game. One can imagine anything, you can imagine anything, but that is not going to help you in any way. And the mind is such that it always tries to find some false substitute, because false substitutes are cheap.

If you have to grow a real rose in your garden, it takes time. It demands patience, effort, and then too nothing is certain. The rose may come, it may not come. It is easy to buy a rose, but then it is not yours. It looks just as if it has come up in your garden, but it has not come up. When you purchase a rose-flower, it has no roots in you: it is just in your hand. It has not been a part of your being. You have never waited for it; you were not patient for it. It is not a child -- not your child. You have purchased it. It is there, but like a foreign element in you, not an inner growth.

But there are even more cunning people. They will not purchase a real flower. They will purchase a paper flower, a plastic flower, because it is more permanent. A real flower will fade away. By the evening it will be no more -- "So purchase a plastic flower! It is economical, less troublesome, permanent!" But then you are deceiving. Real growth needs time, patience, work. Imaginative growth is imitation. Remember this distinction always.

One thing more: whatsoever you are doing, do not think that results will be coming in the future. If you are doing something real, results are here and now. In inner work, if you have meditated today, results are not going to be tomorrow. If you have meditated today, the perfume of it, howsoever little, will be there. If you are sensitive you can feel it. Whenever something real is done, it affects you *here and now*.

So do not think that something will happen in the future. If whatsoever you are doing is not changing you now, it is not going to change you at all. Time will not help. Time alone will not help. Time will deepen it, but time alone will not help.

But you may not be sensitive. Whatsoever you are doing, you may not be sensitive. We have become insensitive because in insensitivity there is a certain security. If you do not feel

much, you suffer less. The person who feels much suffers much. Because of this, we have tried to make ourselves insensitive. So when something happens so intensely that it is impossible to avoid it, then only do we become aware. Other wise we go dead, asleep. We move on. That insensitivity will create problems. Then when you meditate, you will not be sensitive to what is happening to you.

So be more sensitive. And you cannot be sensitive in one dimension. Either one is sensitive in all dimensions or one is not sensitive in any. Sensitivity belongs to your total being. So be more sensitive; then every day you will be able to feel what is happening.

For example, you are walking under the sun., Feel the rays on your face; be sensitive. A subtle touch is there. They are hitting you. If you can feel them, then you will also feel the inner light when it hits you; otherwise you will not be able to.

When you are Lying in a park, feel the grass. Feel the greenness that surrounds you, feel the difference of moisture, feel the odour that comes from the earth. If you cannot feel it, you will not be able to feel when inner things begin to happen. Then you will go on asking whether you are progressing or not.

Start from the outer, because that is easier. And if you cannot Feel the outer, you cannot feel the inner. Be more poetic and less businesslike in life. And sometimes it costs nothing to be sensitive. You are taking your bath: have you felt the water? You simply take it as a business routine, and then you are out. Feel it for a few minutes. Just be under the shower and feel the water: feel it flowing on you. It can become a deep experience, because water is life. You are ninety percent water. And if you cannot feel water falling on you, you will not be able to feel the inner tides of your own water.

Life was born in the sea and you have some water within your body with a certain quantity of salt. Go on swimming in the sea and feel the water outside. Soon you will know that you are part of the sea and that the inner part belongs to the sea. Then you can feel that also. And when the moon is there and the ocean is waving in response to it, your body will also wave in response. It waves, but you cannot feel it. So if you cannot feel such gross things, it will be difficult for you to feel such subtle things as meditation.

How can you feel love? Everyone is suffering. I have seen thousands and thousands of people deeply in pain. The suffering is for love. They want to love and they want to be loved, but the problem is that if you ever love them they cannot feel it. They will go on asking, "Do you love me?" So what to do? If you say yes, they won't believe it because they cannot feel it. If you say no, they feel hurt.

If you cannot feel sunrays, if you cannot feel rains, if you cannot feel grass, if you cannot feel anything that surrounds you -- the atmosphere, then you cannot feel deeper things such as love or compassion; it is very difficult. You can feel only anger, violence, sadness, because they are so crude. Subtle is the path that goes inward -- and the more subtle your meditation goes, the more subtle will be the feelings. But then you have to be ready.

So meditation is not just a certain thing which you do for one hour and forget. Really, the whole life has to be meditative. Only then will you begin to feel things. And when I say that the whole life is to be meditative, I do not mean to go and close your eyes for twenty-four hours and sit and meditate -- no! Wherever you are you can be sensitive and that sensitivity will pay. Then there will be no need to ask, "Am I progressing or not?"

You are like a blind man. You cannot feel the path because you have never felt anything. And the way we are taught, educated, cultivated, is for insensitivity. A child is weeping; the whole house is against him: "Do not weep! Guests are coming." Guests are very important, and the child weeping is not at all important. Now you are crushing him for his whole life.

He will stop his weeping, but to-stop weeping is a serious affair. It will change the whole metabolism of his body. To stop weeping he will have to be tense; he cannot be relaxed. He has to push something under which is coming up. He will have to change his breathing. Really, he will stop his breathing -- because if the breathing moves easily, weeping will move with it. He will pull in his stomach; everything will be disturbed in his body. Then he will not weep, but he cannot laugh either. Then you are crippling him for his whole life.

Everyone is crippled and paralyzed. We live in a paralyzed world. Now there will be continuous suppression. He cannot laugh, he cannot weep, he cannot dance, he cannot jump. Whatsoever his body feels to do, he cannot do. Whenever the body feels to have something, it cannot have it. And then, when you allow him to play, it is not spontaneous. Even his play becomes fake. You say, "Now you can play." He was not allowed to play when his whole being was ready to play, and now you tell him to play. But now he tries to play, and it is a work.

Ultimately we create a human being who is more or less an automaton. Can you weep? Can you laugh spontaneously? Can you dance spontaneously? Can you love spontaneously? If you cannot, how can you meditate? Can you play? It is difficult!

Everything has become difficult. Man has become insensitive. Bring your sensitivity back again. Reclaim it! Play a little! To be playful is to be religious. Laugh, weep, sing, do something spontaneously with your full heart. Relax your body, relax your breathing, and move as if you are a child again. Then when you meditate, you will not ask, "What is happening to me? Am I progressing or not, or am I moving in a circle?" You will know.

I understand your difficulty. You cannot feel it now because you have lost feeling. Regain feeling -- less thought, more feeling. Live more by heart, less by head. Sometimes, live totally in the body; forget about soul, Self, ATMAN. Live totally in the body -- because if you cannot even feel your body, you are not going to feel your soul. Remember this. Come back into the body. We are really hanging around the body; we are not in the body. Everyone is afraid to be in the body. Society has created the fear; it is deep-rooted. Go back into your body; move again; be like an innocent animal.

Look at animals jumping, running. Sometimes run and jump like them, then you will come back to your body. Then you will be able to feel your body, the rays of the sun, the rains, and the wind blowing. Only with this capacity of being aware of all things happening around you will you develop the capacity to feel what is happening within.

OSHO, OF THE TWO PATHS -- THAT IS, BHAKTI AND YOGA -- YOGA IS ARDUOUS; IT REQUIRES A GREAT PENANCE. FOR A WORLDLY MAN, IT IS A DIFFICULT TASK. THOSE WHO ATTAINED THE BRAHMAN OR MOKSHA THROUGH YOGA HAD RENOUNCED THE WORLD. THERE ARE, ON THE OTHER HAND, INSTANCES LIKE THAT OF NARSI MEHTA OR MEERABAI WHICH SHOW THAT THROUGH BHAKTI EVEN A COMMON MAN CAN ATTAIN GYANA -- SUPREME KNOWLEDGE. WILL IT NOT, THEREFORE, BE CORRECT FOR THE COMMON MAN TO CHOOSE ONLY THE PATH OF BHAKTI?

There exists no such entity as the common man. Everyone is uncommon. You may know it, you may not know it, but no one is common. One thing.

The second thing: Meera, Narsi Mehta and Chaitanya have not attained their goal easily. That concept is absolutely false. Rather, on the contrary, Meera has travelled a more arduous

path. That is why you can name thousands of yogis, but you cannot name thousands of Meeras. If you go on counting bhaktas of the calibre of Meera, the fingers of your two hands will be more than enough. Then count yogis: they are innumerable. Why? If the path of yoga is arduous and the path of bhakti -- of love and devotion -- is simple and easy, why this disparity? Because it is not easy. But do I mean that the path of bhakti is more arduous than yoga? No -- it depends! It depends on you.

If your mind is of a certain type, then a particular path will be easy for you. If you are a devotional man or woman, then bhakti will be easy for you and yoga difficult. But it depends on you. The paths are not to be compared. If I happen to be a non-devotional man, then yoga will be easy for me and bhakti arduous. So it depends on the seeker, not on the path. No path is easier, no path is harder.

But then why have there been more yogis and less bhaktas? There are many reasons. Firstly, this fallacious idea that the path of devotion is easy has created much trouble. So those who are not for the path of devotion go on it. But then they cannot become like Meera or Chaitanya; it is not for them. It is *not* for them! They have not chosen according to themselves. They have chosen according to the fallacious concept that is prevalent.

Really, those who choose the path of bhakti, they do not really choose it to travel it. They think that through it there is nothing to be done and you gain everything. The path of bhakti is believed to be such that you need not do anything and you attain everything -- that just bhakti is enough. They say that not even bhakti, but just *naarn smaran* -- remembering of the name -- will do. And particularly for the Kaliyuga!

Really, those who do not want to do anything, they choose bhakti, and bhakti is not a promise that you will attain everything without doing anything. Bhakti demands your totality. It is not just *naam smaran* -- you have to surrender yourself totally, but total surrender is arduous. This false belief has created so many so-called devotional people, but they are deceiving themselves.

Secondly, this concept that the path of yoga is arduous also creates problems, because those who are egoists are attracted to it. Ego needs something arduous to do. If something is simple, it is not appealing to the ego.

If there is an Everest, a Gourishankar, then it appeals to the ego. If I reach, then I can say, "Only I have reached. It is so arduous! No one else has reached." If it is just a small hill and any child can reach it, it is not appealing to the ego. So because of this concept that the path of yoga is *durgam* -- very arduous, difficult, impossible -- egoists are attracted toward it. And ego is a barrier!

Those who do not want to do anything, they are attracted to bhakti, and bhakti involves much doing: it is not non-doing. Those who are egoists become attracted to yoga, but they are attracted because of the ego. They become more and more egoistic. If you want to see a perfect egoist, then you do not have to go anywhere else. Go to the so-called yogi; then you will know a perfect egoist. He is doing "the most arduous thing in the world"!

Both concepts are wrong. Choose according to you yourself; be aware of yourself first. Really, if you are aware of yourself you need not choose. You will begin to move on the path that is for you. Just be aware of yourself. Feel yourself more and more; meditate and feel yourself more and more. Then do not bother about any choice.

Meera has never chosen. It has happened! Nor has Mahavir chosen. It has happened! If you know yourself, if you feel yourself and you meditate, by and by, you will move in the direction which is for you. You will move toward your destiny. If you choose, you will disturb things -- because your choice is, after all, your choice. How can you choose your

destiny? You can only allow it to happen; you cannot choose it.

If you choose, then you fall into a deep fallacy. You are bound to choose wrongly. You are wrong, so you are bound to choose wrongly! Then much endeavour will be wasted, and you will go on rationalizing, "Why am I doing so much, and such and such is not happening? If it is not happening, then there must be some reasons! My past karmas are creating a barrier. Or, I have to make a much greater effort. Or, I need much more time. Or, I started late, so in the next life I will start early."

One anecdote about Mulla Nasrudin, and we will finish: Mulla Nasrudin bought a donkey. The owner of the donkey told Nasrudin to give it a certain amount of food daily. Mulla thought that this was too much, so he said, "Okay! By and by, I will reduce the food of the donkey and make him accustomed to a smaller ration." So he reduced it.

By and by, daily, the food was reduced, the ration was reduced. Finally, the ration was almost nothing -- ALMOST NOTHING! Then the donkey fell down and died. So Mulla said, "It is a pity. If I had had a little time more, if this donkey had not died so easily, I would have made him accustomed to no diet at all. The experiment was just about to be completed, and it is a pity that the donkey has died."

Man goes on rationalizing. Rationalizations will not help. Do not try to choose. Rather, allow! Feel your *swabhav* -- your nature -- your Tao; feel your intrinsic possibilities. Be sensitive, meditate, and do not try to choose. By and by, you will move in a particular direction. That movement will come to you; it will not be a chosen effort. It will happen to you, it will grow in you, and you will begin to move.

Then one day you will know whether bhakti is for you or yoga is for you. The direction that happens to you naturally is for you. The direction that is to be chosen and forced is not for you. A chosen direction will be arduous, difficult, and ultimately futile. A non-chosen direction, a direction which has happened to you, will be easy, natural -- *sahaj*.