

# V.S. Iyer Advanced Commentaries

## CONTENTS.

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Page.</u>
1. BEYOND YOGA. ....	1
2. FALLACIES OF RELIGION. ....	13
3. THE MEANING OF RELIGION. ....	23
4. THE MEANING OF MYSTICISM. ....	47
5. THE MEANING OF PHILOSOPHY. ....	59
6. LOGIC, SCIENCE & PHILOSOPHIC REASON. ....	83
7. CHARACTERISTICS OF PHILOSOPHIC DISCIPLINE. ....	107
8. THE NEED OF SEMANTICS. ....	137
9. RELATIVITY & THE TWO STANDPOINTS. ....	173
10. PHILOSOPHY OF SENSATION AND PERCEPTION. ....	181
11. ILLUSIONS OF SPACE, TIME AND EXTERNALITY. ....	205
12. DOCTRINE OF MENTALISM. ....	227
13. ILLUSION OF WORLD EXPERIENCE. ....	253
14. ILLUSION OF EGO EXPERIENCE. ....	295
15. AVASTATRAYA. ....	327
16. THE ULTIMATE AS TRUTH. ....	419
17. PRACTICAL PHILOSOPHY. ....	443
18. SAGEHOOD AS AN IDEAL. ....	493
19. DOCTRINE OF NON-CAUSALITY. ....	507
20. THE MIND. ....	539
21. THE ULTIMATE AS REALITY. ....	569
22. EASTERN AND WESTERN THINKERS. ....	595
23. EASTERN AND WESTERN SCHOOLS OF THOUGHT. ....	601
24. THE NEED OF ULTRA-MYSTICISM. ....	609

@@@@@@@@

## CHAPTER 1. BEYOND YOGA.

@@ In the primitive magical healing by mantras, magic exorcism etc. the solitary case of cure is widely noised abroad whereas the 99% of failures are not advertised. This is the way of common folk, untrained in scientific critical modes of enquiry.

@@ The argument that any teacher or mystic or priest has got so many followers and therefore there must be some truth in their teaching, is a fallacy. It proves only what I am often saying, that any fool can find a number of greater fools to follow him.

@@ We super-impose our own imaginations on things. Hence children and intellectually childish adults see spirits in trees and undines in water and gnomes in earth, and fairies in air because such ideas are in their own minds first.

@@ If you talk of sleep or samadhi, you are still in duality for you know that you were in those states only afterwards when awake. Hence Yoga, like Sankhya teaches duality, not non-duality.

@@ If you wait sufficiently long all the failures of Ashrams will come out. All the so-called miraculous "cures" by yogis of ailing people will have relapses or turn out to be no cures at all.

@@ Those who resort to gurus and asrams of a mystic character for peace do not know that they can get the same result by taking some opium pills.

@@ The pseudo-sage who distinguishes himself from others is evincing duality and thinking only of the body, i.e. ignorance. On the other hand if a sanyass in attains Gnana, he will not give up his yellow cloth but remain so, but henceforth devote his life to service of humanity.

@@ "Every fool has got a greater fool to admire him." Hence admiration is of no value as a guide.

@@ The yogi who is concerned with breathing exercises, holding his nose, and postures is

---

<sup>1</sup> The original editor inserted page number at top of the page read "1" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) is merely concerned with his body and unfit for Gnan.

@@ Let a single Indian Yogi stop one gun from being fired in this war by his 'occult' powers. It is impossible. Such super-natural powers do not exist. Talk of them is nonsensical.

@@ The multiplication of Meher Babas will do real harm to the country. Therefore if mysticism is over-valued it is a danger.

@@ "What is experience as a whole?" is the formula to be asked after "What is the world?" as latter is not enough.

@@ The five 'bodies' of Vedanta are five stages of progress, beginning with the physical standpoint (enquiry into the material world), and going up to enquiry in mental world, psychological, epistemological world etc.

@@ Cats have got the right to imagine what they desire; they are not concerned with truth of their imaginations; but not men!

@@ In spiritualistic phenomena or occult performances the mind of audience or sitters is paralised during that period and all sorts of fraudulent tricks can be performed. It is really mass mesmerism. If however, a counter-suggestion is present in the mind, then it may be difficult or impossible to mesmerise the person. The mind weakens itself by accepting the slightest suggestion that the feats are possible; the next step of being mesmerised follows.

@@ Only yogis who have not studied philosophy would make such nonsensical statements as that the soul, i.e. mind is situated in the heart, or in the chakras of the spine, or in the pineal gland. For how can mind, be spatially located?

@@ Give up all imagination; then alone can you know truth. That which knows them to be such is the Real.

---

<sup>2</sup> The original editor inserted "2" by hand.

CHAPTER 1.

@@ False Gnanis will bluff, pretend to omniscience and the power to know all future. Latter power is impossible for we cannot predict what will happen next minute, neither past births nor future, reincarnations can be proved; hence all such tales are fables and not indulged in by true gnani.

@@ Swami Yogananda's theory of yogic power controlling the cosmic dream is true only for the Gnani, not for the yogi. This magic feat is impossible. If it were why does he not demonstrate it? The physical body is a dream for the gnani, there is no second person to whom he wishes to show such magic.

@@ Stupid people are struck with awe or reverence at the outer indications of renunciation, and thus foolishly take a man to be a gnani. The two have no connection. "Look, he has no wife, no family, no possessions" they will mutter at a man who has merely repressed these desires as though these things had anything to do with the pursuit of truth.

@@ The first step is of knowing "your Self." The second is to know your self as Brahman, the "All." Then alone you know Satyam and Jnanam, i.e. the whole truth. Your Self is the key that opens the door of Brahman. This yoga referred to here is certainly necessary at the first stage, when the mind is wandering. At the end of this yoga the mind gets stilled and knows the self—individual self. Then it is free and fit to know Brahman, the All.

@@ When I say it is the stronger mind that alone can telepathically influence another, I mean by 'strong' one which has reasoning power well developed. Thought-transference is a fact but only under this condition.

@@ It is only people without brains who have gone to the ashrams and they are quite incompetent

---

<sup>3</sup> The original editor inserted "3" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) to judge whether yogis are gnanis or not.

@@ The formula “What am I?” presupposes the existence of an ‘I’. But this is only an assumption. Before proceeding to act on such a formula we ought first to enquire whether there is such a thing as an “I”.

@@ If criticisms of your indictment against yoga are made by Indian reviewers then you can show that dozens of different meanings are assigned to this ambiguous term, as proved by Pandit Lala Mitra’s introduction to his English translation of “Yoga Vasishtha.”

@@ Those who go on long journeys to see a reputed mystic guru, after they have been baffled by unsuccessful enquiry, reading, intellection, go filled with expectations of what will happen. They arrive with strained emotions and with their wits half gone. Thus their minds are self prepared to be cheated.

@@ Why did Krishna show Arjuna the vision of the Universal form and not stop there, if it was the highest goal? Why did not the Gita end there? Instead he went on to teach Gnana. This shows that he regarded yogic vision as not the ultimate.

@@ Yoga is intended to remove the hindrance to enquiry such as sexual desire, worries, anxieties, desire for money etc. Also to enable the mind to keep out irrelevant thoughts whilst making enquiry. All this has to be done before enquiry can begin. Therefore yoga has only a negative value and is a preparatory stage. It is quite unnecessary for enquiry itself. If you say that yoga and vichara must be equal partners what is it that tells you that the removal of these hindrances is necessary? Is it<sup>4</sup> not vichara reasoning? Therefore vichara must be the ruler and yoga only a subordinate.

@@ Vedanta starts from what it sees, i.e. the world.

---

<sup>4</sup> The original editor changed “It is” to “Is it” by hand.

@@ Gnan comes from both knowing the world and the self. To leave out one of these parts is to prevent attainment of Gnan. "Who am I?" is useful no doubt, it has certainly a value in its place, and gives some knowledge of self as Drik, the Witness. But what about the witnessed? The world still faces us. It must also be looked at. If the drsyam is ignored, then "Who am I?" cannot give the full truth. It is the yogic enquiry; not the philosophic: the latter deals with the whole of life whereas the former deals with a part only.

@@ P.B. has correctly pointed out in his new book that "Who am I" is un-vedantic, because there is no person in truth but only in the illusion of mystics. He is right in saying that it should be "What am I?"

@@ To meditate on the formula "What am I?" can only yield the thought 'I', just as the ascetic who says "I will not think of woman" will end up by always thinking of her.

@@ The question "Who am I?" is a religious, not a philosophical question. It is a most selfish one. It is on a par with "What shall I be after death?" and "What shall I get if I offer these coconuts to God?" It is purely ego-centred: it is an appeal to the interest in selfishness only. Only the philosophically-minded can lift their thoughts above ego and ask "What is the world?"

@@ All the experiences put together make the Atman, not merely the ego questioning itself "What I am I."

@@ Meditation on the whole is the best meditation: meditation on the parts are only steps towards that.

@@ What is the first thing that a man sees? It is the world. The mystic and religionist disregard this in order to think of self.

@@ Those who jump at once to Atman disregarding the world, are mystics or religionists, not philosophers.

---

<sup>5</sup> The original editor inserted "5" by hand.

@@ If you don't see objects, it does not mean you have Gnana. Whoever looks at objects alone, at the external world, he is wholly ignorant. But he who looks at both the outside and inside, inquires; he is led towards knowledge.

@@ We have to analyse both mind and matter to get at truth. Two things are necessary for Vedanta (1) knowledge of the objective world and (2) knowledge of the truth of the self or the subject.

@@ When man begins inquiry he does it to please himself, not for truth; hence he asks "Who am I?" It is an elementary stage of discipline because ego-bound but aiming at loosening ego.

@@ Those mystics who ask "Who am I?" may succeed in finding the common factor in all 'I's, the I-ness but they have to come back afterwards to the world. Their task is incomplete. They do not know the world is Brahman.

@@ It is a defect to make "What Am I?" a philosophic interrogation. It is not. The stages are: scientific: What is the world? mystic: What am I? philosophic: What is the whole. For philosophy puts both the world and the 'I' together after having examined each separately; it is interested in the whole of life, not a part. The world is only a part just as the 'I' is a part. C.F. Gita 13 Kshetra and Kshetrajna together.

@@ The "Who am I?" quest naturally troubles people first because everyone is most interested in himself before he gets interested in the world.

@@ The Who am I? formula is useful as a first stage to show the illusoriness of ego and thus help seeker to get rid of it. This prepares him to consider the higher question: What is the world, the truth about which cannot be learnt by those attached to their ego, with its prejudices against idealism, etc.

@@ If you ask why there are so many different animals and natural objects in the world you may regard them as teachers, there are lessons to be learnt from them by using Buddhi. Why did Brahman produce all there varied forms? It is so that the ignorant man may study them and get Gnan. We have to study the whole world.

@@ There are two things you have to consider: 1. My duty to the world to remove others' sufferings, 2 My duty to myself to remove all my doubts.

@@ There are two stock words used by mystics to protect themselves against criticism. They are 'ineffable' and 'insight.' The first refers to their experience, the second to their personal attainment. Both are fallacies.

@@ Instinct is a less developed form of intuition. But it is reliable only within certain limits. For a dog may be driven by animal instinct to eat food which has been poisoned and thus die.

@@ We do not deny the existence of intuition: only it must be tested if it be true; it must be verified. Everyone has intuition, for it comes spontaneously.

@@ The mystic who mutters "I am in the dog, the beggar, and everyone" or "I am Brahman" is merely repeating like a parrot words which he has read in the Upanishads or heard somewhere. It does not prove that he has realised Brahman. For, if asked he will be unable to prove that everything is Atman.

@@ Admitting that some swamis have given medicinal herbs and cured people, the latter then fall into the fallacy of attributing their cure to the Swami's spiritual power, status or greatness. The swamis may have expert knowledge of herbs but that does not prove their claim to cure spiritually is correct.

@@ The stories of sceptics coming to a swami

---

<sup>6</sup> The original editor inserted "7" by hand.



(continued from the previous page) denouncing him as charlatan, and then suddenly being converted to faith in him are easily explicable. Both attitudes are merely emotional. One emotion succeeded another; it is in the nature of emotion to change.

@@ People do not want to work persevering for real attainment. They expect to get a quality like peace suddenly and freely; hence they are emotionally carried off their feet when they first visit a famous yogi. But real achievements are not so cheaply acquired.

@@ Whoever speaks of knowing Brahman within us, is thinking only of his head or heart, i.e. of his body. He is talking mystical nonsense.

@@ Imagination is allowable in philosophy provided it is tested. Then, if it passes the test, it becomes a fact. We cannot kill any of the faculties of man. The same applies to intuition. In addition to both these faculties there must be reason.

@@ Mystics say "I am God." This presupposes that they have the same miraculous and creative powers of God. They do not however display possession of such power. Such is the fallacy of their logic.

@@ The Indian movements like Ramakrishna Mission may succeed to a limited extent in the West by appealing to the emotions of women, by creating a new religious 'ism, but unless they appeal to cold reason they cannot reach the thoughtful intellectuals and the influential men there.

@@ The notions of 'inmost self' and 'beyond phenomena' are mystic ones, not philosophic.

@@ Every yogi who shuts himself in a cave is not thereby freed from thinking.

@@ Mysticism can lead only to temporary peace, because the world is subject to change. Only knowledge of the world, i.e. flux as Brahman can yield permanent peace.

@@ We need not deny the honesty of the testimony of many mediums who communicate with the dead spirits. They may indeed have had the actual experiences they describe. We must not jump at once to accept their own views and explanations but also examine other views. For whether their interpretations are correct or merely conjectured, whether their after-death world is merely an imaginary world, is quite another question. Take for example the X-ray vision of interior of body. If a doctor came among 18th century with an X-ray machine and told them he was able to see this interior because of his clairvoyant communication with spirits, all the undisciplined minds would rush to believe him. Those who come to spiritistic performances predisposed to expect communication with the dead, just as much as those who go to yogi gurus predisposed to expect a thrill of mystic experience, often report psychic or mystic phenomena. Their minds are prepared, suggested to see these things and thereby weakened, made uncritical; thus their minds are acted on by these suggestions and false interpretations of the events are made.

@@ Panchadesi, P.509 v.109, shows the impossibility of yoga arriving at a successful end to its practices.

@@ The first thing we are aware of after waking just as the first thing in an infant's experience, is the world outside. Therefore the first thing we ought to study is the world, not the self; is that of which we are aware not that which is aware.

@@ The claims of swamis to perform miracles must be tested and this is to be done by verification.

@@ Vedanta is not anthropocentric like mysticism for the simple reason that it takes away the 'I' and eradicates the ego.

---

<sup>7</sup> The original editor inserted "9" by hand.

@@ Do not discourage women who are only fit for mysticism, who come to you looking for mystic peace for you have already built a reputation as an authority on yoga. So they will keep on coming and you ought not to throw cold water on them. Give them what help in mysticism they require and do not prevent them continuing it.

@@ When it is said that philosophy deals with the whole, this not only totalizes all natural phenomena in the universe but their Seer must also be included under this term. For the philosopher puts all the sciences together and the Seer comes under "psychology."

@@ Our reply to those who have gone through metaphysics and found it mere words, however true, and turned to mystical experience for the realization of those words, is: You use the term "experience" too lightly. What does it mean? It is ambiguous in meaning and to different mystics has different significances.

@@ Mysticism can give only part: the explanation of 'I'. This is good at its stage but not enough. For two parts are needed, the other being explanation of universe. Gnana considers both. Hence Maharishi cannot be a gnani because he omits the universe.

@@ Gnana means knowledge of the truth of everything. How can the mystic gain such knowledge if he ignores the drsyam, as he tries to do?

@@ Everybody has to think of money. No sanyassin is exempt from it, because all are faced with the problem of eating. Hence the world can never be given up in reality. Hence too the necessity of enquiry into the world, which is inseparable for all.

@@ Since the ultimate truth is the truth of this world which we see, how can it possibly be got by refusing to look at it, as yogis do?

@@ Mystic Ananda is a drsyam, for even if it did last all day, it disappears nightly in sleep.

@@ The self, the awareness, was present before and after the Yogi enters Nirvikalpa Samadhi. When he says or thinks anything, the Atman is there first. It is always there whether he has got duality or not. Hence he talks nonsense by saying that Nirvikalpa samadhi can produce Brahman.

@@ The mystic is still under the delusion that he is the body, when he thinks he must to Tiruvannamalai for meditation or to Himalayas or to a cave or Asram. When however, he is content to sit in his own room and practise meditation, to discipline his mind, he has risen to a higher level, for now he is thinking of body but of his ego: "I must do this meditation."

@@ All yogic miracles still start from standpoint of the body, and thus have nothing to do with Gnan.

@@ If a person is fit for yoga and practices yoga, it does good to him. If he is unfit for it and practices it, then it does harm. Many who have gone to Yogic Asrams have come away insane, because they were unfit for it. Care must be exercised. (See Hart's "Psychology of Insanity.") The right aspirant will get his mind concentrated, and sharpened by yoga, the wrong one will get it dulled and weakened.

@@ The 1939 War has shown conclusively the hollowness of yogi's claims, for one of them were able to stop it and thus help humanity in its dire need. They may imagine that they are dwelling in God's presence, but of what benefit is that to any other person?

@@ Every man can interpret from his standpoint. When a superior man, a gnani, says he sees the world as a world of light the inferior man the ignorant unintellectual type, imagines this to

---

<sup>8</sup> The original editor inserted "11" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) be seeing in his own sense, an objective 'vision' or a clairvoyant experience. Actually the gnani used the term "see" symbolically; it meant intellectual sight, the final conclusion of acute philosophic reasoning but nothing occult or mystic at all.

@@    Knower of truth can attend to all work; the meditator can't. Similarly one whose thought thoughts are fixed on meditation, pays but little attention to worldly concerns. But a knower of truth can afford to attend to them well, as they are not opposed to true knowledge.

## CHAPTER 2. FALLACIES OF RELIGION.

@@ When one man says A is true and another denies it, when men everywhere set up opposite opinions; the thoughtful person is bewildered and is driven by this confusion and contradiction to seek for the truth amid all these opinions. Thus it fulfils the ultimate purpose of human life, i.e. to seek truth, Brahman.

@@ Wherever sense-enjoyment comes, be it in heaven or on earth it is just the same, imaginary. Religious or mystic heavens are mere concoctions of the fancy.

@@ Nobody has gone into God's private room or looked into His mind. What prophets have done is merely to sit and imagine what you would have found there. And most prophets have anthropomorphized God because of this. They see a potter making a pot, so they assume the world is likewise made by a gigantic manlike being. When people say God is merciful they attribute to him a quality which they find in good human beings—there is no proof that God is merciful and it is just as anthropomorphic as to make Him the creator.

@@ All those mystic interpretations of sacred scriptures which twist them to suit the mystic's beliefs, are mere fallacies. They exist in his imagination.

@@ We have to face facts, however welcome, to ask "What has religion done?"

@@ The proof that religion will go is that every day new religious cults or sects are springing up. Had religion been true people would not have given it up and the earthquakes, bombs and drowned children of this war will make atheists.

@@ Most commentaries on the ancient books are merely the work of imagination. Every commentator goes on imagining as he likes.

@@ Life is too short to waste 25 years at a Sanskrit College to learn the mere interpretations of words. It is far better to devote the

---

<sup>9</sup> The original editor inserted "13" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) few years we have, to truth rather than to the punditry of interpretations of texts.

@@ The Pundits are great parrots who go on quoting Sanskrit texts without using their brains. However they served a useful purpose by preserving these texts for us, handing them down by mouth from generation to generation.

@@ The difference between advaita and all the so-called philosophies is that the latter leave you with doubts or questions, whereas the former fully clears them. Religion kills doubt by threats of hell while mysticism ignores them.

@@ Dull minds take the world to be real, miracles to have occurred, and scripture to be truth; they are content to have judged without enquiry. Hence the dull are also the deluded.

@@ Why worry about those who refute Sankara? What is Sankara to them? It is only an idea, they imagine Sankara in their own way. They never saw the actual Sankara. Therefore any criticism made of such a Sankara is a lie.

@@ Numerous books have been written about Sankara, which are mere philological quibbles, but entirely omit to deal with the question of the truth of his writing.

@@ Indian philosophy has been brought into a hopeless muddle because of those who start with dogmas which are imaginings.

@@ We have no quarrel whatsoever with religionists and dualist philosophers. It is only when they claim to have the highest truth that we must interrupt and ask, "What is Truth?"

@@ No God has ever come to the rescue of suffering people. All history proves this. Such a God who comes to the help of people is purely hypothetical, imagined, illusory. Most people have got the idea there is a God who controls everything, runs the universe and interferes with its working. This is purely theological and unproved notion intended for intellectual children.

CHAPTER 2  
FALLACIES OF RELIGION

@@ Many people are so weak-minded that in spite of their troubles and sorrows and disappointments and no answers to prayers they continue to worship God.

@@ Where there is no ego, there can be no religion. When ego goes, then only philosophy comes in. What is it that attaches you to this body? It is the I.

@@ Our criticism of religionists is "Show us your God and we shall believe." But they cannot.

@@ Where is the proof that your belief is true? This is what we say to those whose attitude is based on belief, whether in God or scriptures. Our principle is truth. Truth means proof.

@@ Many many Hindu women have drowned themselves in the Ganges at Hanuman Ghat at Benares in the wholly false belief that this would lead them into the presence of God. Blind belief is useless. Realisation can never be got in another world.

@@ When a man is made a bishop, a tall mitred hat put on his head, everyone respects him and his words. This is an illustration of what Bacon calls "the theatre." It is outward display to impress the mob, but it hinders philosophy.

@@ The Puranic stories of a cow speaking or a deer delivering a sermon are all fables for intellectual children.

@@ All the scriptural stories that God taught such and such knowledge to his son, who taught it to the sages; or that Brahma initiated somebody in knowledge or yoga, who passed it down a long line of primeval sages, is mere mythology.

@@ You may read so many books about Jesus, but each is only the imagination of the writer.

@@ Because so many persons say Aurobindo (or any one else) is a great yogi, everyone else jumps to the conclusion that he must be so. The fallacy is assuming that they are competent to judge him.

---

<sup>10</sup> The original editor inserted "15" by hand.



@@ All statements that God will do this or that are sheer imagination.

@@ Religion means imagination. You imagine what you like, and what pleases you. Its cure is science.

@@ Nobody will go to hell, but everybody will go to the heaven that he imagines. But remember that all imaginations are drsyam, they come and vanish.

@@ Children believe in fables, such as that an ox spoke to a frog. Religious stories often appeal to the same level of intelligence and teach similar things.

@@ How do we know that all the Gods ever known to history are merely imaginary? Reply: Because they are all thoughts, ideas, hence drsyams, i.e. all ideas have to go, you cannot catch hold of them.

@@ People give a name and form to Atman as God creating according to what they are most familiar with. Thus some give a man's face and figure, others worship snakes, others revere spirits, others female deities, others universal forces, others agni, the fire-deity, Kala, the deity of time and death, others abstract infinite duration, etc. All, whether anthropomorphic or abstract are merely imaginary – nothing more. There is no proof.

@@ Scriptures may be quoted for the common people who are unable to think well, but for educated persons the final appeal should be to reason.

@@ All religious promises of rewards in next world are nothing but lies. There is no proof of the next world. Modern civilisation has begun to see this and therefore imposes on religion of what it can do for us in this world.

@@ What was God doing whilst all the horrors and miseries were happening to his believers?

## CHAPTER 2 FALLACIES OF RELIGION

(continued from the previous page) Mere human pity ought to have brought his help.

@@ There are many varieties of Gods among different peoples—animal, human and nature—but all are indications that the people who worship them are merely children playing with toys undeveloped mentally.

@@ Yoga and mysticism are higher forms of religion. Philosophy rises above both, therefore it does not accept view that scriptures were given out by God, only by men of varying capacities.

@@ There can be no proved answer to the question “How do you know there is God?” other than “I feel it” or “I believe it.” etc.

@@ The omniscience and omnipresence of God are mere assumptions. How is it possible for anyone to test or prove these assertions: how can he discover whether God is in the sun as well as here, whether He knows what is going to happen a hundred years hence?

@@ All religions are based on duality. The very words “re”, “ligio” mean “to bind together.” That implies two things exist—the soul and God—which are to be joined.

@@ The worship of God is based on the supposition He exists and the one can relate oneself to Him.

@@ The fundamental thing is to get a knowledge of truth by your own experience and reason; to say that Sankara writes the truth implies that you already know the truth, and hence can certify Sankara’s work. Until then you have no right to say whether his work is true.

@@ Religion takes its stand on separateness (a) God is separate from me (b) I am separate from another man. Vedanta is based on non-separateness, the opposite.

@@ The Atman is called the Lord because It is the true God, whereas the God of Religion is an imagined (i.e. false) God.

---

<sup>11</sup> The original editor inserted “17” by hand.

@@ Vedanta has nothing to do with the next world. It wants proof, there is no proof in the next world, but there is proof available in this world. The next world belongs to the realm of faith and religion.

@@ The mind's own nature is to go on thinking. It can't be kept quiet. That is why religious doubts must arise, why sects multiply. This mental activity is feeble in the childhood of the race and grows stronger later. All attempts to unify the religions of the world and all attempts to unite religion and science are bound to fail.

@@ Those who say Vedanta is Pantheism talk rubbish. Why? "Those" means God; if everything is God where are you? The notion implies God is one and you are a second.

@@ Those dualists who say God is unchanging but his environment (the world) is changing, and that the world is in or part of God, are inconsistent. For how can a part change if the whole is changeless?

@@ People talk that God is immortal, but how can they know that he will not change tomorrow? To say anything about the future is merely to imagine it. It is impossible for a second thing to be immortal, because it will always change. To change is to be mortal.

@@ Re: God's omnipresence at the same time. Unless you yourself became God and are everywhere present with him simultaneously you have no possible means of verifying the truth of this doctrine. Therefore we say "Atman is God, and God is Atman."

@@ Religion, yoga, etc. have a value, for practical purposes. But people do not distinguish between value and truth.

@@ In religion, you want something from God for yourself. In Yoga you also want

CHAPTER 2  
FALLACIES OF RELIGION

(continued from the previous page) some state for yourself. Only in Gnan do you want welfare for all others.

@@ Men who have made similar enquiries, i.e. the rishis have found the same Vedantic truth but must enquire independently and verify it for yourself. The sages and scriptures may teach the same thing but you must prove it yourself by facts.

@@ Anyone can quote authorities or give interpretations agreeable to one self and these methods are proved to be fallacies in reasoning. This is admitted universally by rational thinkers both Eastern and Western, for any one in the street can say that what another says agrees or disagrees with one's view. This is what we find even among the most uncultured of men. Therefore, such methods are characterised in Sanskrit as childish or boyish. This is not Vedanta. What is fundamental in Vedanta is to answer the question: How do we know that any authority, interpretation or yogic experience reveals the Truth? Till this is proved the quoting of authority, interpretations and so forth are as the Upanishads say the play of children, howsoever learned the scholar that deals with them may be. They are of use for children only. By this method men deceive themselves and others too. Truth seekers do not have recourse to these methods. Till the Truth of any authoritative statement or interpretation or yogic experience is proved what is said or done is only child's play and self-deception. This Truth is Vedanta.

@@ I do not quote books solely to prove my position: that is the fallacy of authoritarianism. I quote them merely to show that what I have previously proved by facts and reason is all the same not inconsistent with the highest authorities.

---

<sup>12</sup> The original editor inserted "19" by hand.

@@ Intuitions will come because they are a natural phenomena. That we do not deny. What we say is that you must enquire after an intuition has come, how far it is to be relied on.

@@ The war is our greatest guru. It has revealed the utter helplessness of God to answer all the prayers to Him. It is making us open our eyes. Science too helps to open our eyes.

@@ My opponents accuse me of also using quotations. That is true. But it would only be a fallacy if I depended on them to prove my case, which I do not. I first prove my case by reason and quote afterwards.

@@ Anybody can start a religion and find people to follow him. For it does not deal with facts but with personal imaginations.

@@ Philosophy seeks to inquire. When bombs fall on churches, when earthquakes follow prayer, when yogis are unable to heal themselves, while pretending to heal others, when astrologers' predictions keep on going wrong, philosophy says: "What does this mean" Why do these things happen? "Let us examine into them! Let us think about them."

@@ Advaita goes to the very root where there is nothing more to doubt, nothing more to question.

@@ Every system may be demolished by another system, because all are defective as all are based on imagination.

@@ The masses cannot think for themselves: a child will not be frightened of falling into a well unless you shout at it. Therefore they must have authoritarianism: it only becomes a fallacy for the philosopher.

@@ It is not denied to the philosopher to quote the names of famous men in his support so long as he proves his case first and then only brings in names.

@@ Religion is a matter of passion and emotion.

## CHAPTER 2 FALLACIES OF RELIGION

@@ Scepticism is good if it means keeping the mind open, raising doubts, but it is bad if it means closing the mind (by saying truth is unattainable) or refusing to face doubts until they are removed.

@@ What you feel about God etc. is merely what you imagine.

@@ A man may be truthful and yet what he says may not be truth. He who mistakes the stump of a tree for a bear will be personally truthful in saying he sees a bear but the content of his statement will yet be false. Or he may say he sees God and yet it is not God. Hence we cannot accept authority.

@@ It is only in modern times that the sciences of anthropology and comparative religion have amassed an immense fund of knowledge about varying religions ideas and beliefs. Thus we know that in Central Africa a tribe believes a son should eat his father when latter becomes old because God wills it. Hence those sciences are extremely valuable to prove to us that all these different God-ideas were merely imaginations.

@@ Imagination and emotion are the distinguishing features behind religion, poetry, mysticism and music.

@@ In religion you can imagine as you please. Thus you can point your God with three lines on your forehead or with two or only one.

@@ We should say: Because this doctrine is true, and Bible teaches it, then the Bible is true. We should not say: Because the Bible teaches this doctrine, therefore the latter is true.

@@ We are not to take any doctrine to be truth merely because it is very old or because it is very new.

@@ Krishna taught people not to fall at his feet, but at the feet of Buddhi. Yet India has disregarded him, with consequent punishment.

---

<sup>13</sup> The original editor inserted "21" by hand.

@@ Sex complex is at the root of religious worship of Goddesses, Virgin Mary, World Mother, as it is behind the Gurus who keep female disciples around, like Aurobindo and Meher Baba.

@@ Millions prayed in Europe for the war to end, but it did not. Millions more prayed in India but no answer. Therefore religion's lie is exposed.

@@ A religion should be accommodating and provide for different kinds of men, for those who want rituals and those who dislike them. There should be a place for both: it should not be rigidly orthodox. Otherwise it will lose a section of its followers.

@@ Religion is based on desire; hence it is imperfect, egoistic, and bound in the end or on reaction to give no satisfaction.

@@ All the accounts of so-called fulfilled answers to prayer are based on logical fallacies.

@@ The reason why I advance the argument against religionists and mystics who make assertions of God's plans and wishes, that they cannot look into God's mind for they cannot look into their neighbour's mind, is not to deny telepathy and thought-reading – on the contrary I accept them as scientific facts – but it is because they (1) treat God as a separate person, set Him up as apart from themselves (2) because it implies that they have seen God and (3) because it implies there is more than one mind. From the practical standpoint thought-reading and thought-transference are genuine enough but from the philosophical they must be untrue because they imply the existence of two communicating minds, i.e. duality.

@@ If religion were absolutely true, how could it ever break up into sects, or conflicting dogmas? But people will not think about it.

### CHAPTER 3: THE MEANING OF RELIGION.

\$ If a man must pray to God, let him pray only for Buddhi.

\$ Religion is a fable for the use of mental children. When they grow up they can discard religion and use reason in Vedanta.

\$ Our position is not agnosticism nor atheism. It transcends both.

@@ Children must have fables because they cannot understand better. Similarly adults of little mentality i.e. the masses must have religion and mysticism. I have no quarrel whatever with that standpoint, it is correct. The error creeps in when the people are led to believe that religion is the goal, the end, and it is the final authority: they ought to be told that there exists something higher to which they may graduate when fit for it. The leaders, priests and teachers should not misdirect the masses by wrong teaching that religion alone is enough and hiding the superiority of philosophy.

@@ Religion is the primitive complex in the minds of men and it may (and often does) co-exist along with the civilised aspect; the latter meaning that the mind is quite alright in other respects.

@@ The R.K. Swamis in America are teaching Vedanta religion, and not Vedanta philosophy. Even then, they should remind students that there is a higher truth.

@@ The great majority of men are like children, not sufficiently educated. Hence they need religion to keep them in check. But when they grow up they become adikaris, fit for reception of philosophical truth.

@@ The only prayer you ought to make is that for Truth. Do not pray to God to give you this or that, it will be useless and wrong. Ask only for truth and you will be put on the path towards it.

@@ The Western people are honest in their thinking; therefore G.B. Shaw can write "I spit upon

---

<sup>14</sup> The original editor inserted "23" by hand.



(continued from the previous page) the face of God” This honesty will surely, if slowly, lead them one day to the Truth.

@@ Vedanta points to the question of truth as the supreme matter, not to religion.

@@ Religionists cannot give up the word truth because the idea is there in their soul, so that they extend it to cover what they believe.

@@ Many people have imagined God to be All-merciful etc. Error must go: to be free from it you must become a slave to reason, not intuition.

@@ Harmony between all religions is impossible. New religions start everyday. One man’s interpretation is disliked by another. Islam has 70 to 80 sects. A world religion alone will never come. But from three states all these religions are reconciled by Vedanta.

@@ Sex worship was the primitive worship. The cross was a symbol of sex thus (like lingam and yoni). Later it became. Thus Church-spire, the Mosque tower, the Hindu lingam are all sex symbols. Original religion was sex because God was thought of as creator, the best symbol was man who creates a child out of himself, i.e. out of seeming nothing, like God.

@@ The Indian rationalist journal “Reason” omits the one essential; its writers are full of ego. If “Reason” is spread on a wide scale, and the egoism retained and taught, then it will do harm, especially to the young students.

@@ The authors of the Vedas themselves say that they have given fables and stories for childish intellects, yet our Sanskrit Pandits waste their time in imagining fanciful interpretations of the Vedic myths, or taking them quite literally.

@@ It is very useful to have stories of God and creation as fables for intellectual children. The utility of religion is undeniable to

CHAPTER 3  
THE MEANING OF RELIGION

(continued from the previous page) duffers, children, idiots, i.e. the majority of mankind.

@@ What possible hope of getting this drunken slum dweller of lowest intelligence to understand Advaita? Therefore, he must be given religion, a theatrical show in a temple, a God to frighten to frighten him, etc. Otherwise there would be no means of keeping his conduct within the bounds of decency.

@@ If a man is purely religious, he lives an ethical life, does not injure others, and does not attempt to convert others by force. This sort of religion benefits society and is therefore to be praised.

@@ The World Fellowship of Faiths is meaningless and useless. Each attends the conference with an idea of God, which is different from the others. Not one takes the trouble to enquire into the definition of "God."

@@ Religious rites like arati are intended for the benefit of those who do not know and who do not think.

@@ Religion has not brought peace among men anywhere; it has brought self-delusion.

@@ Each religion or cult multiplies itself into various other religious movements: different schools spring up within the same faith. Look at the 300 sects of Christianity. This is inevitable because all of them depend on personal feelings, visions or opinions. You can gather one thousand opinions about the same subject among religious or mystical people. All this happens because they have not risen to philosophy and do not depend on proof.

@@ The various religious ceremonies and customs which have been laid down in Hinduism have a tremendous psychological value from the practical standpoint, even though from the philosophical standpoint they might be

---

<sup>15</sup> The original editor inserted "25" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) irrational, unsound and worthless. For instance the ceremony you witnessed to-day on behalf of a woman who was seven months pregnant has the effect of making her happier with the belief that she is more likely to get a male child who will be healthy and of good character than she would have been had the ceremony not been performed. This has been brought about by the suggestive power of the ceremony. Her thoughts will hence forward be bright and optimistic and to that extent will definitely help to produce a better child. In order to induce this frame of mind she had to be taught about Gods and Goddesses etc. What does it matter whether they exist or not so long as the practical end in view is achieved. Similarly when people believe that they must live a good life in order to secure a better fate after death it helps to keep them within moral bounds and even to perform works of charity. It is for this reason that Sankara did not condemn religion but only tried to purify and lift it, and encourage people to do their religious duties properly, but the whole system depends upon the belief and faith of the devotee and falls to the ground when he loses his faith in the existence of God and in the efficacy of religious rituals. It is at this stage of his mental development when the mind is filled with doubts that Vedanta permits him to obtain outward peace, grows with his criticisms to religions and affords him the philosophy of truth with which to replace it. Thus you must either uphold or attack religion according to the mental state or evolution of the individual to whom you are talking.

@@ In every community you will find persons of different grades of intelligence and they must have religions suited to their capacity. Therefore there will always be a demand for

### CHAPTER 3 THE MEANING OF RELIGION

(continued from the previous page) various kinds of religion, from the most superstitious up to the most intellectual. Vedanta will therefore be tolerant towards all religions as it knows that they fit in usefully somewhere.

@@ Wherever there is religion, it is only a sweetmeat given to mental children, giving them pleasure thereby.

@@ Buddhi is almost non-existent in many of the lowest castes and hence they are easily converted.

@@ The reverence for the goddesses and the worship of the Gopis with Krishna, are simply signs of sex worship, as Freud says.

@@ Religion has been tried for 2,000 years. What has it done to prevent wars and all the other evils? Its future promise must be judged by its past performance.

@@ It is utterly impossible to unite the different religions or churches together. Even if such a thing were possible (which it is not) what are you going to do with the millions who are atheists or agnostics? They will not unite with religionists. You can only say "Let there be tolerance" –and that will be useful work—but you cannot bring them together in a unified structure. The only way to real unity is the search for Truth.

@@ The place of religion: To persuade common people to go to the real God (Brahman) we have to start by creating religious systems, and show God as the creator of the world, and only afterwards tell them the truth. Hence religions are indispensable.

@@ Rites and temples are for those who cannot grasp the higher form of communion which is mental i.e. mysticism.

@@ Only Hinduism says "All religions are paths that lead to Me, whereas other religions deny it. Hinduism is therefore higher.

@@ Carrying a mental image of God is better

---

<sup>16</sup> The original editor inserted "27" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) than worshipping a solid idol, because it leads to next step, that God is everywhere.

@@ In religion you can never have reconciliation, for the emotional temperaments of people vary and therefore their religious tastes vary, because religion appeals to emotion.

@@ Religion cannot be done away with, it is necessary for the masses for they are mostly like children; but it should be kept within limits, proper bounds, otherwise it will do harm if excessively pursued.

@@ The close connection and interaction between religion and the sex instincts has been shown by psychology. When someone is under-sexed or over-sexed or perversely sexed or sexually unsettled there is generally a strong attraction to religion or mysticism. In this point Freud has not been refuted by anyone, but where he has gone so far as to ascribe everything to sex he went too far.

@@ The unconscious wearing of sex symbols by so many religious sects, as Christian a cross, Ramanujists a trident, Lingayats a male organ, is unconscious phallic worship, and although the people do not know the meanings of these symbols, nevertheless their origin is sexual.

@@ Those who talk of World Congress of Faiths to unite different sects are stupid. There can be no unity where two men respectively believe their religion to be the true one: for such differences of belief can only be settled by blows never by reason. It is impossible to agree.

@@ Who are the converts to Roman Catholicism in India? Mostly the lowest and most ignorant classes, rarely intellectuals.

@@ The ignorant masses will only learn of the futility of religion and the non-existence of God through bitter disillusioning experience, through wars, and troubles showing them that God does not help them and does not answer

CHAPTER 3  
THE MEANING OF RELIGION

(continued from the previous page) their prayers and does not protect them, through such cases as German bombs falling on Warsaw cathedral during ceremony and Muslim invaders killing the Hindu priests of Somnath Temple.

@@ People talk of religion being the cause of love, but they mean love only among themselves, among their own sect, and not the wider love of humanity.

@@ Our Pundits and theological scholars have killed the desire to know truth. So also if you go to the West, you find that Roman Catholic priests have done the same thing.

@@ It is the under-sexed and the hyper-sexed who become very religious: philosophy is for controlled people.

@@ Why do the Westerners worship Virgin Mary? and the Hindus Parvati? Because psychologically man runs after woman, as Freud showed, and their worship is a higher form of sex.

@@ As the intelligence of the masses slowly rises, they will begin to ask questions and to find religion unsatisfactory, thus they turn to atheism and with it communism. They begin to want satisfaction of a visible and tangible kind, not promissory notes on Heaven.

@@ Religion means what I see or what I feel, it does not ask for proof to be given. The Ramakrishna Mission has now misinterpreted Ramakrishna and presented only the religious side of his teaching as his highest doctrine. Thus they mislead. That is why the Ramakrishna Mission has now split into two sects. Both depend upon opinion and feeling.

@@ People in Poland today flock to Church and ask God to protect them from the German bombs, but in spite of their prayer death takes them. This will teach the futility of their religion, so far as they have failed to enquire whether it has any basis in fact or any reference to life as it is.

---

<sup>17</sup> The original editor inserted "29" by hand.

@@ If you go a little beneath the surface of religion, if you inquire just a little, you will find it full of inconsistencies and absurdities.

@@ If you say that God has creative power, then if God created us, why did he create in us the capacity to do evil? If He made evil, He is a rascal. This fallacy exists in all religious reasoning.

@@ The royal dynasty which built Belur, Halibub, temples were wiped out. What help or protection did these pujas to gods give them? Religion and temple worship is nonsense.

@@ Those who talk of "the life of God" imply thereby that God also dies.

@@ Religion cannot be stable. Every faith must split up into schisms and sects. Every mystic who sits idle, with nothing to do, starts a new cult or new religion. Yet enthusiasts imagine that religion will bring unity among mankind.

@@ Look at the facts of history. Has religion brought peace among men Christians fight Jains in Germany, each other in Spain, Hindus fight Panchamas in India and so on everywhere.

@@ Gandhi in an interview to-day confessed that he was in perpetual quarrel with God over allowing such evils as this new war. But how does he know that he has been talking with God? Yet he still believes he is having interviews with Him and receiving guidance. The first is religion, the second is mysticism or yoga. If God were really merciful, no petition or prayer to him would have been necessary as He would have stopped the war of his own accord. Those who have brains can't be satisfied with religion. Unfortunately 99% of the persons have no brains and for the sake of their piece of mind, you have to make them happy with religions and mystic doctrines, and as Gita says, not unsettle their minds. Therefore for dealing

CHAPTER 3  
THE MEANING OF RELIGION

(continued from the previous page) with the world, Gandhi is acting very cleverly, as religion is necessary for it. Humanity is composed of intellectual children.

@@ It is the hidden sex complex which is really responsible for the Bengalee Shakti worship, for the Lingayat Lingam worship, for the Hindu Yoni worship, for the Roman Catholic virgin Mary worship.

@@ A world unity of religions, such as Sir Francis Young husband's Congress is not possible. Religions will arrive at a common understanding when men cease to think altogether for so long as thought continues they will hold different opinions. The idea of world religious unity is imagination. I and my wife are so close together yet we cannot agree on so many points every day. The only possible harmony is "Let us agree to disagree." To say that essential religious truths are the same everywhere, is to use meaningless words, because no two definitions of truth are the same. But to advocate inter-religious tolerance is another matter and is good.

@@ Those who want to keep religions and yet have truth are trying the impossible. They may strive for harmonious relation and tolerance between religions, but they can never get agreement about God, Truth etc. among them.

@@ Missionaries who go to foreign lands to convert others are merely bringing their own idea of God to those who have other ideas: at best they substitute one idea for another!

@@ It is impossible to prevent a religion dividing itself up into sects, just as it is impossible to secure the union of all conflicting religions in a world fellow-ship.

@@ The war will kill a lot of superstition some years after it is ended, and especially the belief that God can work miracles or intervene amazingly in human affairs or that mystics and priests can perform magic.

@@ In my youthful days there was no clash between

---

<sup>18</sup> The original editor inserted "31" by hand.



(continued from the previous page) the Muslims and the Hindus. But during the last 20 years all this strife has come up. Why? Because so much emphasis has been placed on religion, so much talk about it indulged in. Hence the overdoing of religion brings trouble, division and quarrels.

@@ Russia has actually evolved by throwing over a decaying religion for the new religion of communism, because it shows they are tired of being promised imaginary heavens but want one here and now on earth, i.e. they want facts, not imaginations. Of course, they have made great mistakes in trying to bring about change and shown unpardonable brutality. Moreover their free sexual licence will lead to the spread of venereal disease which may kill them out.

@@ A deputation of villagers came to His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore yesterday to ask for a gift of an idol for a small shrine which they were putting up. His Highness gave them the required money although he was himself an Advaitin. He realised that the villagers could understand nothing higher and it would be cruel and useless to tell them the idol will not help them. Similarly the Vedantin has to meet people on their own level and just as I give toys to my children so he has to give the religious people things such as rites, ceremonies, creation stories, histories of Gods and Goddesses, etc. to those of undeveloped intellect.

@@ The pilgrimage to Mt. Kailas was instituted for the benefit of duffers; men with thinking capacity are not required to go there but to use their reason. The plunge into the physical lake of Mansowar which is required of the pilgrim is merely symbolic as meaning man's lake of mind. The thinker plunges into mind and uses his reason, but all others who

CHAPTER 3  
THE MEANING OF RELIGION

(continued from the previous page) are unable to think and can only perform physical actions are necessarily told to go to Tibet, i.e. to use their bodies only in the physical act of walking, because they cannot use brains.

@@ Religion means telling pleasant lies.

@@ The brainless common people who go to Lourdes and return unhealed; the brainless pilgrims who go to Benares and get no answer to prayer: learn little in spite of their disappointments and still go on believing! Only severer disappointment may teach them.

@@ All religions, all yoga, is based on the body and ego. Some even strengthen the ego.

@@ The race cannot go backwards to primitive religion. It is growing intellectually, however slowly, and the old religions will infallibly disintegrate and be destroyed. However as every society contains intellectual children, some kind of religion must be given them; otherwise they will be left hopeless unable to grasp higher teaching and bereft of the old creed. So for them new religion may be concocted to suit their temperament and capacity.

@@ Science has been opening the eyes of the people; that is why religion, with its fables instead of fact, its cock and bull stories of a next-world heaven instead of making a heaven of this practical world, must and is losing its power.

@@ The propagandists of every religion are merchants. The praise their respective wares just the same as merchants in the desire to find customers.

@@ You may practise Arathi ritual 24000 times but it will bring you no nearer true happiness.

@@ Kings who do not find a religion existing, will ask someone to invent one because they can give the people an opiate and keep them better under control.

---

<sup>19</sup> The original editor inserted "33" by hand.

@@ If you have the idea of a return for your prayer, that is not true religion. If you pray in self-surrender "O God do as Thou wishest to me" that will have value in diminishing strength of egoism, but prayers for healing, victory, prosperity are false and futile.

@@ China will gradually follow the path of Japan and imitate the West, which will result in the decay of Buddhism. The Buddhist religion like all religions, cannot produce enduring good results; only philosophy can do that. For practical purposes, this test of visible results is the best.

@@ The word "ME" as spoken by Krishna in Gita is not the individual me you imagine, but the universal ME in truth. The ritual worship and puja of statues of Krishna are only for mental children. Religion renders ethical services to mankind. We do not criticise religion, yoga etc. They are steps on the way, we say one "Know the Truth."

@@ The very fact that religions differ proves that each religion is a construct of man's mind.

@@ The Western world is giving up religion. That is inevitable owing to the decay of religious organisations. But their mistake is to rest satisfied with such negative inner life and not to aspire to something higher than religion after giving it up.

@@ Religions keep people within moral bounds; without their help there would have been no hope for mankind. That is, religions prevent the masses from becoming even more beastly than they already are.

@@ As Herbert Spencer pointed out, the people cannot give up religious ideas in one day. It will have to be a gradual process.

@@ Religion means two things: 1. you will be thrashed—Fear. 2. You will be rewarded—Hope.

CHAPTER 3  
THE MEANING OF RELIGION

@@ The credulous and unintelligent masses must have a religion but those who bestow serious study on truth need none.

@@ Religion is a matter which must be left to individual feelings, not to intelligence.

@@ Those who are worshippers and who have an object of worship, are like children, are in the lower stage. There is nothing wrong in this, as they are not ready for higher truth. There are different grades of intellect, so let them worship God or practise yoga, let them be reverent.

@@ Every man has got a right to believe in whichever religion he pleases. No religion should be criticised. Only in the sphere of philosophy and truth can criticism arise and do personal rights of faith disappear.

@@ Why are worship, devotion prescribed by scriptures? It is for those not competent by mental capacity to pursue the quest of ultimate truth. Those who do not want to think, who perversely believe they know (without enquiry), are of the dullest class, and for them worship of God and rites are prescribed. Hence all religions are meant for this class.

@@ Men who worship goddesses like Parvati have unconscious sex-complexes at bottom. Similarly women who worship Krishna are sex-complexed unconsciously. This does not mean they want physical intercourse, but that they still hold in mind the sex-distinction. Only the lowest tantriks want intercourse.

@@ Religion is a medicine for certain diseases.

@@ Religions in their primitive state are often based on sex, the admiration of the mystery of creation of a child. Such was Hinduism and signs are found in the temple shrines such as a down-turned triangle with circles inside. Circle is semen, triangle is womb etc.

@@ All scriptural stories of creation, soul

---

<sup>20</sup> The original editor inserted "35" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) evolution, etc. are kindergarten fables for children and should be regarded as means to an end.

@@ People will have and must have religion because you will find men of simple faith like children in intelligence. But even if a new world religion arises, the question is: Will it do any good?

@@ The world Congress of Faiths is talking fallacious nonsense when it says there is truth everywhere in all creeds.

@@ The stories in the Bible, the Mahabharata, the Vedas and the Puranas cannot be believed as historic truth because of the lack of verified facts to support them. It is safer to take them as poetry rather than history. They probably contain a few facts to which many imaginations have been added.

@@ It is fallacious to assume that religion is stable; it is constantly changing. For religion is only imagination, and you may imagine whatever pleases you from time to time as your taste changes. First the ideas of God change. Then the methods of propitiating Him change. Here in India, there were human sacrifices at first, then goats were sacrificed, now rice and sweets are offered etc. The religion of the Vedas is not the religion of today.

@@ Vedanta does not condemn even the most childish religion; only it asks that the religion be sincerely, honestly, and not hypocritically observed. It sees the need and place for these religions to suit low or middling mentalities so long as they keep an ethical value in keeping people to a path of righteousness. Thus it reconciles itself to religions and does not conflict with them.

@@ Religion is for the purification of the mind and not for the perception of Truth.

@@ Wherever there is religion, its effort

CHAPTER 3  
THE MEANING OF RELIGION

(continued from the previous page) at conversion or its division-making will lead to endless quarrels.

@@ Christianity itself is changing, numerous sects have developed out of the first one: so too if to a lesser extent with other religions. This change is natural because it is not based on unchanging truth, but fancy.

@@ No one who has ever read psychological science will ever take part in a Parliament of religions, because he will know it is impossible to unify the religions.

@@ The common people who lack reason, get psychological comfort from religious faith and prayers for material benefits, because they are thus helped to bear their troubles and endure misfortunes. Hence it is not wise to take this comfort away from them when they cannot live philosophically.

@@ Religion must be given to the masses, it is absolutely necessary for them, because philosophy is only for the educated. The need today is for orthodox religions to be first purified of undesirable features, and second, modified to suit modern needs.

@@ Religion is better than worldliness because it gives the impression that there is something beyond all this material appearance, something higher.

@@ The multiplication of sects cannot be prevented; it will go on. Always some man arises to start a new cult and those whom it pleases, will separate from their religion and follow him.

@@ Religion is useless only to him who wants truth. Teach according to man's capacity. Millions of rituals avail not to know God in truth.

@@ Look at the psychology of "Sunday Times." It is Freudianism. Religion and Sex go together. The creator and the creation go together; c.f. Ajanta caves the monk's cells containing nude

---

<sup>21</sup> The original editor inserted "37" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) pictures of women. One gets sick of them. Preach to people according to their character and temperament. "I want peace" means you have still the black-serpent "Ego."

@@ It is wrong to tell deeply religious people to abandon religion. Don't unsettle their minds when they cannot rise higher.

@@ Logicians may reason about abstractions, but masses need concrete representation in symbols and images etc. – the word symbolizes the wordless.

@@ Anything in scriptures which does not suit people is thrown out as interpolation. The right way to use scripture is to treat it as allegory, or as stories imaginatively written to illustrate certain teachings.

@@ If you displace common people's faith in God and give them nothing to replace it, they will lose ethical restraints and descend to steal and murder. Hence their faith should not be prematurely disturbed. It serves a useful social purpose, when operative.

@@ The value of religion is that it teaches you there is something beyond this earthly life, beyond death for men.

@@ I have no objection to people worshipping God, by all means let them do so if it makes them happy. But this has nothing to do with the question of truth. The latter is on quite different plane from that of satisfaction, which is the religionist's plane.

@@ Plunging into lake Manasorowar means plunging into the mind and seeing the whole world in it. The physical journey is prescribed for those who are incapable of performing the mental journey.

@@ Scriptures are like diaries, after experiences of truth have been written down for others' reference and guidance; but the full

CHAPTER 3  
THE MEANING OF RELIGION

(continued from the previous page) truth may be only partly revealed; the rest is fable.

@@ Individual happiness is sought by religion, whereas Truth seeks universal happiness.

@@ When you come in contact with mystery, the unknown, you best express the feelings of wonder, awe, etc. roused, through imagination which may take the form of art or of religion.

@@ Religion is a means whereby you keep society within a certain order. Those however who refuse to wait for the next world but want comfort here and now, are likely to follow the atheistical teachers. The rich and the rulers fear atheism because it may lead the masses to attack them and to rebel against established order of property. The poor are promised compensation in the next world. Yet religion is needed for the masses for without it they might arise and rebel every year: there would be no settled order, no stable peaceful society.

@@ It is an utter impossibility to have the same kind of religion always, or to continue it in the same form. The human mind, the world, society, are all changing and religion must change with them, for better or worse, according to circumstances. The impact of various alien invaders on India, for instance, has brought about an interaction on the native and alien faiths with mutual alterations, additions and modifications. It is madness to expect any religion to remain unchanged. Not one today is as it was in olden days. Certain things remain and others have been discarded or improved by pressure of social or economic forces.

@@ We want religion so far as it controls man's life and character for the better, but we do not want it for verified truth.

---

<sup>22</sup> The original editor inserted "39" by hand.



@@ For social purposes a religion is needed because it unites a body of people, brings them together in a common fold. Hence it is useful as a value: people however erroneously confuse social value with ultimate truth, for they jump to the conclusion that because it is useful in keeping people moral, for instance, a religion is therefore true.

@@ It is natural and inevitable for religions to multiply into sects and for the sects to multiply into sub-divisions, just as it is natural and inevitable for a seed to grow into a plant and for the latter to multiply into more plants. Hence, religion breeds divisions, not unity. Why? Because it is based on Matam, opinion, not on Tatvam, truth.

@@ If people are of the temperament to think over the failures and disappointments of religion, and lose faith in it, they should then be led to Vedantic truth. But if they lack the brains for philosophy they ought to be confirmed in religious faith so as to keep them ethical. But if they are too superior to fall back in blind religious faith, then the next and proper stage for them is yoga, which demands no brains but offers less violence to reason than religion.

@@ Women who have no children but long for them, as also women who have them, particularly favour the worship of God as a divine child, such as the boy Krishna or the child Jesus; this alone shows that religion is largely a matter of taste – not truth.

@@ Psychology shows that whatever evolution now takes place in the mind and religious belief of children today, formerly took place thousands of years ago in the history of the primitive race.

@@ If by God you mean the highest truth we are worshippers of God. If however you mean a God with moustaches, hat, etc. then we are atheists.

CHAPTER 3  
THE MEANING OF RELIGION

@@ India was going on the right path under Buddhism in giving up the God-idea and dogmatism. When the Muhamedans came they forcibly destroyed this path and diverted Indian evolution back to God and dogmatic religion. This was regression.

@@ Religion and art spring from the same source: both are merely outlets of emotion.

@@ If you observe a tree you find its trunk stems out into branches and each branch in turn sub-divides itself into further branches. This constant multiplication is what we find in Nature. You never find a tree returning back to its original seed. Similarly the history of religion is a history of continuous multiplication into sects. The idea that all the different religions can be brought together in a "World Faiths Movement" is absurd and unnatural and doomed to failure. Of course its desire to promote tolerance is excellent but that ought not to confuse other issues.

@@ Christianity condemns Hinduism for being idolatrous. Yet in insisting that its churches be built in a particular way or in placing a cross on the steeple, it is just as idolatrous.

@@ This war is utterly different from all previous wars in this respect; that it is a war of scientific techniques and weapons. Prayers to God do not show any sign of answer, for even churches are being destroyed by bombs. Hence its effect in teaching the masses the value of science as against the futility of religion will be immense.

@@ Every man has a right to hold his religion as being true, but he has no right to thrust it upon others.

@@ The elimination of religious superstition and priestly exploitation can come about by education. It is not to be done by suddenly banning them. It is to be done gradually, education proceeding side by side with elimination. It is senseless to

---

<sup>23</sup> The original editor inserted "41" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) ban religion and leave the illiterate coolie without any help and yet without the capacity to understand anything higher. The Rationalists and Atheists who would utterly destroy religion because it is useless to themselves are thinking egoistically and forgetting the needs of those who cannot rise above it.

@@ Religion and yoga are useless to the seeker after highest truth, but never say they are useless to others. They are helpful to 99.9% of humanity for one in a 100,000 is passionately seeking truth.

@@ What are we to do for the masses who cannot understand truth? Our sympathies must go out to them. Hence we let them remain with their crude religion.

@@ We have to tell fairy tales and fables, i.e. lies to children. Similarly religious scriptures have to be given to adult mental children.

@@ Religion is essential for bringing up children in the way of good life. Therefore we say, do not quarrel with religion; it has its valuable place for those whom it alone can help, who cannot even rise to the stage of mysticism. Those that criticise religion are quite correct so far as they themselves are concerned, but they are wrong where the world at large is concerned. It should not be taken away: to say the world can get on without religion, is foolish.

@@ Religion is for men who are mentally children. They are still playing tennis and football in the world of thought.

@@ Religion is based upon taste, not truth. And because men's tastes differ you will always have different religions.

@@ Religion does not enquire into the nature of the world as it is. It is no doubt an attempt to go beyond the work-a-day world, to reach something higher. But without a complete and rational enquiry into the nature of reality, there is no truth.

CHAPTER 3  
THE MEANING OF RELIGION

@@ The nature of religion is to change. And religious tastes differ. Unless it is based on truth and philosophy there is not any hope of permanence.

@@ Religion is meant for the ignorant and weak. It starts with the assumption of a superior (not necessarily supernatural<sup>3/4</sup> Power because man feels weak and helpless when confronted by Nature.

@@ Muhammad rendered great service to the Arabs by teaching them to be better than they were, as they were wild and degraded before his time. Buddha rendered great service to Indians by reducing animal and human sacrifices. Yet both Islam and Buddhism came to degenerate later and do harm. The values of religion are relative, therefore.

@@ Religion must advance, must change and come into line with modern conditions. It is as necessary as other things in life but it must not live only in the past. Even those who wish it to remain unchanged, offer interpretations of it which, like all interpretations, are unconscious attempts to bring it into conformity with modern understanding.

@@ Religion cannot disappear so long as intellectually immature people exist and so long as physically immature ones (i.e. children) exist. Both classes need and must have it because they lack the capacity to understand higher doctrines. And the first class is unlikely to vanish for another million years. Therefore religion must not be destroyed as M.N. ROY and the Rationalists would destroy it. It is useful, but however it should be brought into touch with modern ideas and altered unhesitatingly wherever needed. Adjustments must be made to suit the altered conditions brought about by evolution. The pundits and priests who resist such changes are unconscious

---

<sup>24</sup> The original editor inserted "43" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) enemies of religion.

@@ Religion enables man to get consolation, some satisfaction, and to do his duty in the world, but it will not enable him to get at truth.

@@ Religion is connected with one of the fundamental human instincts – sex. That is why religion appeals to everyone. Everyone fights for it.

@@ People rightly find comfort in God as friend or satisfaction in God as inner peace; they stop there and then have the audacity to say this is the true God, the final reality, merely because their imagined God gives personal pleasure.

@@ Why are religious writings presented in poetic style? Because that style charms the people, surrounds religion with awe and they believe it at once.

@@ The best illustration of the evolution of primitive ideas of God to the most exalted is given by the Vedas, which is a conspectus of all these varieties within a single system.

@@ The good side of religion is that it unites people for a time, keeps them on a moral path, and thus advances society. Hence children should not have their faith in religion unsettled nor adults of inferior intellect be made to doubt it. Philosophy should not be thrust on the unready.

@@ People who live like frogs in a well, in narrow circles and small environments, who do not travel or study comparatively, are unaware that the religious dogmas they believe are not exclusive to their own faiths, were believed in by other ancient people and are believed in to-day by other living peoples, although names may differ.

@@ The history of religion is the same all over the world even among lands far apart for it is a history of the evolution of the human mind.

CHAPTER 3  
THE MEANING OF RELIGION

@@ Ramanujaism is an immeasurably superior evolution to the barbarous grotesque idol worship of hill tribes, but both betray the same process of investing God with their own ideal attributes. Both cases are instances of man making God in his own (ideal) image. The savages' perfect man becomes God: the dualists' perfect man is far finer and set up as God but still only an idea of God. The dualist has risen to recognise that the individual is of the same class, or stuff, as God, only far inferior in degree and always separate, individual, but he has not seen Sameness, Oneness alone. Hence the whole of religion is nothing but human imagination.

@@ All religious conceptions are helpful on man's way to attain the highest. But to place any of them as a full stop and not a step forward, is wrong. It is only to lead man to something higher.

@@ Freud was not wrong when he said there was a connection between sexual symbols and religion. Sex is an apt symbol of the principle of creation and was therefore used for this purpose by the primitive peoples. They said we do not know how the world is created, it is a mystery, hence we use sex (male or female) as a picture to portray this mystery. It was later that religions degenerated and their phallic symbols and emblems, both lingam and yoni began to be thought of in connection with sex desires and enjoyment.

@@ Religion will always change. New interpretations, new rites, new dogmas will inevitably be born within old religions. Change rules the universe. Religion cannot escape it. What is useless in it will vanish. Notice how few believers keep up the full rituals nowadays. Modern economic-social system alone prevents it because it is outworn. People must change their religious and social customs or they will suffer.

@@ What you have to deal with men who have not risen to your level, who are mental children,

---

<sup>25</sup> The original editor inserted "45" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) there is no other way to help them than by descending to their low place. You may call this duplicity, but it is the practical way.

@@ Human mind is changing: new interpretations, new commentaries are absolutely necessary. Times change, men evolve and new interpretations of Advaita must be found. Knowledge must be brought up to date to meet modern conditions. Even Sankara uses an illustration which has become obsolete, perhaps erroneous, viz. that scorpions are born from cowdung. Today we need scientific presentations. We must use the language of the day.

@@ The teacher has to consider the kind of society in which he lives and their prevailing beliefs, and adapt his teaching to suit, i.e. to help them.

@@ The modern West is getting tired of religion; they want what will bear directly on this life here.

@@ When man begins to reflect that the world has had so many religions since prehistoric times, he sees the insufficiency of religion to change world for better.

@@ It is impossible to have one religion for all. For religion is exclusive and does not seek common good; only by excluding others does it form its own fold. It is bound to go on dividing and subdividing; that is what you find in Nature.

VIVIAN PHILIPS. "Children in years as well as children in knowledge have always been predisposed to the belief in supernatural.

HERBERT SPENCER: "Holding that forms of religious belief are in the main naturally adapted to their respective peoples and times, it now seems to me well that they should severally live and work as long as the conditions persist and further that sudden changes of religious institutions as of political institutions are certain to be followed by reactions."

#### CHAPTER 4: THE MEANING OF MYSTICISM.

\$ Two years ago the H.H. the Maharaja of Mysore was having many disturbances of mind through State and family troubles, and felt need of peace. Hence his visit to Ramanamaharishi. (This proves that philosophic study may give understanding, but cant alone give sufficient peace, for which the addition of yoga is necessary. – P.B.)

@@ When the mind is in distress through troubles and miseries it seeks an escape-mechanism in the form of religion, or assumes Sanyass or commits suicide. When a bodily pain becomes intolerable, an anaesthetic must be given, similarly when a man's distress becomes too poignant, he must be given yoga or mysticism for temporary relief. But this should not be confounded with the question of seeking truth. Truth requires other faculties for its pursuit.

@@ A book on Occultism like "God is My Adventure" by Ron Laudau is permeated by a fallacy throughout its length—the fallacy of looking for wonders and miracles. This wish exists in the unconscious mind of the author and when he is using his reasoning power and getting rid of the fallacy he merely moves in another direction and looks for another occultist! However the author knows there is a large public for this kind of book and it will sell.

@@ To feed those sanyassins who sit and do nothing is useless. Sanyass is for service, not for idleness. There is great misunderstanding in India about Sanyass. The three "Ashrams" or stages in life were originally intended for three grades of intelligence thus:- Religion: low intellects. had to do 'karmas' works, ritual actions, man-trams etc. Middle intellects: Yoga: taking yellow robes, going to caves, asrams etc. High intellects: philosophy: who wanted truth are concerned with no external rites or sanyas but depend solely on intelligent enquiry for their path.

@@ The male birth is regarded as superior in

---

<sup>26</sup> The original editor inserted "47" by hand.



CHAPTER 4  
THE MEANING OF MYSTICISM

(continued from the previous page) India because a man can more easily renounce home and become a Sanyassin than a woman who is tied down by the care of her children.

@@ Sankara definitely says that Truth can be attained in married state and that this path is easier; it can also be attained through Sanyas, he says, which however is harder, but quicker because no distractions and more concentration. He says it is better to have been married and had the normal pleasures of life, and thus to have learnt to evaluate sex at its proper worth instead of hankering always after sex so that the mind may pass on undisturbed to philosophy.

@@ Those who declare this anti-asceticism to be a new-fangled doctrine of my own, are referred to Chapter VII, verse 4 of Ashtavakra Gita which says "For the wise man there is nothing to be renounced." He knows that everything is unreal, hence cannot be given up.

@@ Those who are in the disciplinary stage ought not to go and expose themselves to temptations they cannot overcome in thought. But the Gnani may for he remains unaffected. The length of the period of discipline varies.

@@ Ascetic renunciation of the world and its desires may be usefully recommended as a temporary discipline to those who lack self-control. It will act as an antidote, counteract their inherent tendency, but the man who is already sufficiently level headed and calm needs no such external discipline. In any case this ascetic regime is to be recommended only until the practitioner achieves some degree of self-control after which he may relinquish his external asceticism.

@@ Renunciation of the world is a temporary discipline and training of the mind, for the mind to become detached and to achieve external peace, remaining unaffected amid troubles. It has no other purpose.

---

<sup>27</sup> The original editor inserted "47a" by hand.

## CHAPTER 4

### THE MEANING OF MYSTICISM

@@ The mystic who objects to introducing science into the quest adopts an attitude as though it were like introducing a Harijan out-caste to a sacred Hindu shrine.

@@ Don't discourage those who want yoga. It gives them some preparation.

@@ Keep the mind unconfused and unconfounded by other thoughts than those pertaining to the theme selected for concentration. This is the principle and virtue of yoga.

@@ Peoples' minds have natural tendency to run in various directions through pressure of attachments, environments, unbringing etc. Hence re-treatment into solitary place for yoga is good for them to stop this tendency, to get concentration. After that they should take up Vichara and not remain in yoga. This is the order Yoga first, next enquiry. At this first stage it may be useful to kill mind, keep it quiet, but it should awaken into full vigour in Vichara.

@@ If you are in the company of those who do not seek truth but want satisfaction, give them mysticism only.

@@ Why does man desire knowledge? Because man feels that he wants to complete himself, because he seeks to perfect himself. Brihad. Up. chap.2. explains this. This is one aspect of Vedanta thought. Man does everything—not only physical action, but also mental action—for the sake of some satisfaction.

@@ Concentration is merely having as few thoughts as possible. It is helpful because you then stop exhausting the mind in the drsyam, and give it the chance to know there is a drik. That is the philosophic value of yoga.

@@ Yoga will be most useful and helpful to the West in these troubled days, but they should not over-do it, otherwise instead of helping it will harm them, and make them insane and unbalanced.

@@ Vedanta does not say that Yoga has no value:

---

<sup>28</sup> The original editor inserted "47b" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) Everything in this world has its value, but that is not the highest permanent value.

@@ Whenever there is an interference with normal functioning, as when strict celibacy is enforced there is likely to be an unsettlement of the human organization, a lack of balance, which may manifest itself in various ways, such as mysticism.

@@ How to reconcile the recommendation of yoga to sharpen mind and the allegation that it weakens brains? Reply: When overdone it has latter effect; but to the limited balanced degree it has former effect. Excess is danger.

@@ Ignorant people who are impressed by the appearance of sadhus with long beards, and show reverence to them, are really prostrating to a beard!

@@ The glamour of yoga, mysticism and religion is mesmeric. It is extremely difficult to get anyone out of it, but when the spell does break they regrettably rush to the opposite extreme of gross materialism, as in Russia. There is a third and higher path available – philosophy – they do not know.

@@ This body is useful; treat it as it deserves; don't torture it by asceticism.

@@ Sanyassins really take a vow to give up thinking when they first put on the yellow robe.

@@ Religion means what I see or what I feel, it does not ask for proof to be given. The Ramakrishna Mission has now misinterpreted Sri Ramakrishna and presented only the religious side of his teaching as the highest doctrine. Thus they mislead. That is why the R.K. Mission has now split into two sects. Both depend on opinion and feeling.

@@ People admire mysticism because it demands no trouble in thinking, in contrast with science and philosophy.

@@ Where religions or mystics set up the cult

## CHAPTER 4

### THE MEANING OF MYSTICISM

(continued from the previous page) of female Goddesses or “the Divine Mother” it is a sign of repressed sex psychologically re-appearing in another form.

@@ Dissociation of Mind is what has occurred when a man who is quite sensible and balanced and practical in worldly or professional affairs, falls victim to some idiotic charlatan of a pseudo-guru. In other words the ‘I’ predominates, and refuses to listen to reason.

@@ For clergymen the protestant ideal of marriage is better than the catholic one of celibacy, because sex repressions has its limit but for Indians Sanyas may be practised provided the ascetic keeps aloof from privately meeting women, for given the least opportunity the mind will lose its control and repressed sex will overcome it.

@@ Sublimation, the process of diverting the mind to something higher, is what is good in asceticism, for in this any bad thoughts drop away.

@@ Repressed sex complexes often re-appear in swamis and sanyasins as over-insistence on the value of Brahmacharya in others, or as repeated mention of it by a Guru. If however, the guru does not continually talk of Brahmacharya, his advocacy of it is not a repressed complex.

@@ The fact that Aurobindo allows only the Mother to be near him, that Meher Baba keeps women always around him, indicates that they have sex complexes. Ramana Maharishi has none because he allows both sexes to come and go freely.

@@ Men with brains who are level-headed and not insane, should be at the head of asrams or institutions; otherwise they merely spread insanity.

@@ Unrequited love often leads either to lunacy or Sanyas, both being escape mechanisms for the disappointments.

---

<sup>29</sup> The original editor inserted “49” by hand.

@@ When the mind gets bothered and troubled, it seeks to escape, hence its lapse into mild or extreme lunacy or into mysticism. Therefore you find startling similarities between the symptoms of both. Mysticism and yoga are escape mechanisms, not pursuits of truth.

@@ The yogi who buries himself for 24 hours under the earth is no better than a worm, which does the same thing. What benefit is it to anyone? Only to bring him money.

@@ It is merely seeking individual gratification, i.e. the asserting of the I to take to Sanyas merely to escape from the responsibility, the bother of worldly duties. But if you start with the idea of taking Sanyas as a discipline to be more useful in the service of humanity, then it is right, correct and noble.

@@ "I am safe here. I have my food. I have nothing to do with their Karma. Let them suffer." This attitude of indifference to the troubles of others on the part of yogis indicates selfishness; thinking of the Aham. The very opposite of Gnan.

@@ Those who ascetically reject the world for wrong or low motives are demoniac as those who greedily seek it overmuch. Thus the man who takes to Sanyas to escape being worried or troubled by worldly care, is acting from low motives; but if he does it better to help others it is excellent.

@@ Aurobindo Ghose, Sri Maharishi know the art of mind-control. Let us give them credit for that, but that does not make them philosophers, that does not give them a knowledge of philosophy which is quite another matter.

@@ Yogis who set up Asrams, Swamis who travel with retinue, Sadhus who wear no loin cloth are all types which may be grouped under the

## CHAPTER 4

### THE MEANING OF MYSTICISM

(continued from the previous page) “the theatre” because they are really displaying their body and thinking of the ego. The true Gnani will exhibit no outward signs of difference whatsoever. Similarly the other two types of physical and egoistic display may be grouped under the heading “cave” and “Couch.” This three-fold classification was made by Bacon.

@@ Mysticism has its pragmatic value but mystics fail to stop and ask “what is the ultimate meaning of this pleasure which I feel in mystic experience?” Philosophy does this.

@@ Gerald Heard, and Major Chadwick who are meditating six hours daily will either go insane or die without having realized their goal of suspending thought of the universe in Brahman. If they over-meditate they will spoil their brains and become unfit for the gnana path which can alone save them.

@@ Both the word Yoga and Samadhi are used in a variety of senses. Even for doing ordinary duties in the world by an ordinary man it is called Karma Yoga. Therefore Yoga simply means a practice of a particular kind. In Vedantic discussion we must be careful not to confound one Yoga with another.

@@ Sanyas is not essential to realise truth. See Vedanta Sutras page 336: (Sacred Books of the East Series).

@@ Weak minds that have become effeminate resort to the path of least resistance – mental quiet, and withdrawal to asrams. In the mutts of India they will never admit that the chief swami is asleep! They will always say he is in deep Samadhi!!

@@ Sitting still is a physical action. Is not mental action more important? This is my criticism of Aurobindo, Maharishi etc. Similarly walking is also purely physical and those who walk for pilgrimage from Kailas to Rameswaram are wasting time, or life, which could be devoted

---

<sup>30</sup> The original editor inserted “51” by hand.

(continued from the previous page) to higher mental pursuits.

@@ Maharishi will bring peace to those who are disappointed, will allay troubled minds, but it is temporary. Even if it were permanent, it would still not give truth. But you can also get permanent peace by remaining drunk for two hours everyday! What is the difference?

@@ Religious rite, ashram organisation, are all theatrical show. The yogi who sits on a couch awaiting and expecting devotees or adores is a showman for he seeks consciously or unconsciously to attract attention to his person. If he really did not care for this he would arise and leave it all.

@@ If a person is fit for and practices yoga, it does good to him. If he is unfit for it, and practices it, then it does harm. Many who have gone to Yogic Asrams have come away insane, because they were unfit for it. Care must be exercised (See Harts "Psychology of Insanity.") The right person will get his mind concentrated and sharpened by yoga, the wrong one will get it dulled and weakened.

@@ Meditation with a guru in person, or at a distance, and similar spiritual works depends for its success on whether both are in tune with each other. If they are not in tune, they may move heaven and earth, but they wont succeed.

@@ It is allowable to retire from the world to be a student, but it should be only for a period, and then only in certain cases. Going to extremes is insanity.

@@ Asceticism, withdrawal from society should be done as a discipline, for a time, but not for life. The purpose is to get disinterestedness. After this has been obtained, you must begin to think and go back to society. Sadhus who say God sends their food are selfish and they are talking nonsense. They beg and somebody

CHAPTER 4  
THE MEANING OF MYSTICISM

(continued from the previous page) else works and cooks the food and gives it to them, not God! They are lazy.

@@ Those who give up the world and live as ascetics by begging or in asrams, are partly unbalanced. There is a want of sanity, level-headedness in their minds. Sometimes this condition is created by disappointment in life, sometimes through laziness to cope with the activity in demands. If they tried to get over their suffering by social service, by trying to solve India's industrial and social problems, they would be better advised. There is one exception, where a man becomes a Sanyasin, in order to serve the country, then it is alright.

@@ The heads of Mutts who want people, even Rajas to prostrate before them are thinking of the I. And what is the particular form this egoism takes? It is their yellow cloth. They expect people to prostrate to the piece of cloth.

@@ The Sanyasins who renounce the world but take food from others without doing some service (say, giving instructions) in return, are thinking only of their ego, of getting food without trouble.

@@ After yoga if you enquire with the use of sharpened subtle intelligence, then your dullness goes and the path toward truth followed. Hence yoga is useful as preparatory concentrativeness. But if it is not followed by Vichara then it becomes a soporific.

@@ Swami Nikhilananda wrote me lately that he was tired of his activities in U.S.A. and wanted to Himalayas. So I replied to him: Is this the result of your studies in Vedanta? Such misconceived ideals of running away are in the Hindu blood.

@@ The wearing of the yellow robes was intended to remind the wearer of his vows and aspirations and thus acted as a check on his impulses.

---

<sup>31</sup> The original editor inserted "53" by hand.



(continued from the previous page) This is its good point.

@@ Those who are undergoing discipline in the early stages may take Sanyas, but it is not necessary for attaining Gnana.

@@ Those who are undergoing discipline in the early stages may take Sanyas, but it is not necessary for attaining Gnana.

@@ But as yoga has more than one hundred meanings, meditation also follows suite. Unless we define yoga or meditation it will be simply 'childish' to talk about them. Panditry is not truth-seeking. The word nearest to it in the Jnana portion of the Upanisads is Nidhidhyasana. Now what this word means can be seen on page 720 of the English translation of Taitriya Upanishad. Nidhidhyasana or meditation is a part in the investigation or enquiry process. It is not something that comes after the enquiry stage.

@@ Those who are incompetent, impotent or incapacitated among Westerners come to India and sit in ashrams or on Himalayas, doing nothing and being fed. They are unfit for philosophy.

@@ The 700 sick people who went to Lourdes but returned uncured would be explained away by our Indian mystics as Karma: they have not the brains to see that the belief in the magical cure is itself unproved.

@@ The moment you use the word Himalayas it enchants you—tunes you to self-surrender.

@@ There are two primary things which make Indians take up Sanyassa and Mysticism—disappointment in life or poverty. Hardly any do it only for quest of truth.

@@ We do not condemn mystic cults: they have their place for those of mediocre intellect; but we do condemn their exploitation by humbugs and also the arrogant deceptive claims, made by some mystics like Maher Baba, to knowledge of Brahman.

CHAPTER 4  
THE MEANING OF MYSTICISM

@@ The body is valuable. It must be preserved and not ill-treated by asceticism. For it is our instrument of living. And whilst alive we know that we can reflect about truth. What happens after death, what opportunity to learn truth is there we do not know. Truth is the object set before all human beings as the purpose of their lives. Hence we must care for the body, keep it alive and avoid death.

@@ There is a swami of the Ramakrishna Mission who left his wife and family to starve and became a sanyasi. Had I been Head of the R.K. Mission, I would have refused him entry. For he was selfish, wrapped up in ego, or he would not have left his family to worry about their support.

@@ Nirvikalpa Samadhi is useful as a discipline to mystics in helping to subdue the ego and to control emotion, thus fitting themselves partly for philosophic discipline. But if they over-do it, they go insane.

@@ "Familiarity breeds contempt" is a true proverb whose opposite is therefore used by Popes or gurus to secure influence over public. The unfamiliar is surrounded with mystery. Hence they show themselves rarely to public (as Sri Aurobindo in seclusion) or speak rarely (as Meher Bana always silent).

@@ Those who become dissatisfied with mysticism usually become ripe for philosophy. The doubts must arise first.

@@ Sanyass is really given to divert your mind from all pleasures of body and mind and give it wholly to truth.

@@ For the purpose of getting concentration, you may say: "I give up cinema-going. I renounce marriage," It is alright. But for the purpose of philosophy nothing is to be left out or you merely show that you are prejudiced against it.

---

<sup>32</sup> The original editor inserted "55" by hand.

@@ The ascetic who teaches that the realized soul can give up all temporal and religious duties is teaching people to give up Brahman. What is there to give up for a true sage? He sees Brahman everywhere.

@@ The yogi has to undergo a particular discipline, he has to practice, so for him it is really necessary to abandon the world and retire into ashrams or forests. It is quite a correct duty for him. But for gnani, this is quite wrong. The gnani goes to the opposite, he goes into the world but is not of it. He wishes to set an example to others.

@@ The two primal needs of man are food and sex. He may fast for forty days but on the 41st he will need food. It is humbug to say he can do without feeling their need.

@@ If you pay too much attention to your body, if you over-eat and over-drink, then you hinder higher development. This is all the meaning of physical self-denial and asceticism. As the Gita teaches, do not go to extremes, be moderate, neither feast nor fast in food. If you fast too much you can't think effectively. It is alright for mysticism but not for philosophy.

@@ Our way is not ascetic denial of woman, or of the world, but to analyse them, to know their nature.

@@ The Buddhistic attitude towards woman to regard her body as a bundle of decaying corrupt flesh is given only for beginners. Later when this has detached them, they must alter, they must raise to higher level of regarding her as Brahman.

@@ The true Sanyassin should think in terms of others. If he thinks of himself he will go down.

@@ A knower of truth can afford to attend to worldly affairs as well, unlike man of meditation.

## CHAPTER 4

### THE MEANING OF MYSTICISM

@@ Ascetics may control the stomach by fasting or the tongue by silence, but all this is of temporary effect. From the standpoint of Gnan it is unnecessary as ultimately you have got to control the mind. However if not done to foolish extremes they may be useful to mental children as disciplines.

@@ The logical end of suppression of senses is to commit suicide and be finished with them altogether.

@@ Sanyas and yoga are merely instruments to help detach men from the ego via their wife, family, properties etc.

@@ The time has come to ask the question: What have the yogis done for the world? How has it benefited anyone else?

@@ Don't take a living unless you work. Renounce really means look upon the world as an idea.

@@ Yoga means only a line of action. In Gita it is used in this sense of a particular line of action to which you stick to with great determination.

@@ Yoga can give you satisfaction; but it cannot do any good to another person.

@@ A quarrel between Janaka and his wife: the former decides to take the formal sanyas. He says: there is no difference between a handful of mud and kingship. Wife asks: If there is no difference why do you prefer Sanyas? That shows you are still ignorant. Upon this Janaka yields and drops the matter.

@@ Those who give up the meditation on the attributeless Brahman and are engaged in pilgrimages to sacred places and in reciting sacred texts are like those who dropping the morsel of food from the hand, prefer to lick the bare hand.

@@ It is the best thing for the Western ladies who come mystic-hunting to India to go to such places as Tiruvannamalai. To suggest any else to them would be unwise as they have to find their own level.

---

<sup>33</sup> The original editor inserted "57" by hand.

@@ If people cannot practise meditation, if their mind is too uncontrollable, then advise them to read wise books or inspired scriptures.

@@ Hatha Yoga aims at control of body and senses and bodily desires by confining it to one place, one posture, etc. Raja Yoga aims at steadying the mind.

@@ Religion and science and mysticism are lower values but they are useful in so far as they lead to philosophy of truth.

@@ The ascetic, having freed himself from worldly troubles does not need philosophy. But the man immersed in worldly troubles needs philosophy as antidote to his suffering and to enable him to bear it.

@@ The Gnani's attitude is: if sex comes, alright. If it does not come also alright. He is calm, desireless and yet not rejecting.

@@ Egg-eating is just as much flesh-eating as meat eating. The difference is only in degree.

@@ Krishna had two wives and numerous sweethearts, Yagnavalka had two wives, Janaka had wives; they were not less gnanis and philosophers because of that.

@@ Why should anyone want to appear different from others as those yogis who wear no clothes or only a loin-cloth? It can only be because the I the ego, is still alive in him.

## CHAPTER 5: THE MEANING OF PHILOSOPHY.

\$ The Upanishadic guru teaches only what the seeker can comprehend, then waits until the latter after some period begins to ask further questions or rise doubts. Thus in one case he told the student “Look in the water, see you shadow that is your Atman.” The student believed and went away but after a considerable period he became dissatisfied with this explanation and returned to the Guru. Then the latter said: “Now you are ready for a higher teaching about Atman.” Thus the doctrine is made relative to the ripeness of the pupil; the guru withholding the most important secrets because they are difficult to understand at first.

\$ The facts of Vedanta are open to all but the individual capacity to understand them will naturally vary. This is the only esoterism of Vedanta.

\$ Vedanta says Truth is reached by stages. Hence there is one version for children, another for the more advanced. It is not a question of “esoteric” but of capacity to receive truth fit for one’s stage. Hence it reconciles all versions, whilst pointing to the highest goal.

\$ We must ascend to Truth by stages, through which the human mind must pass. To stop at the stage of meditation and yoga is to end in mysticism, not in truth. It is often useless to reveal truth to religious mystics. Often they will not listen, but often because they cannot understand. Only the ripening of the mind will fit them to appreciate the final viewpoint which is that unless one studies and interprets the whole one cannot enter into the fullness of truth.

\$ Do not say that modern scientific and educational development has spread use of reason; it has not reached that high point—call it intellect, if you wish but not reason. Still we have progressed; we shall progress beyond religion and beyond science; after that we shall use reason and achieve philosophy.

---

<sup>34</sup> The original editor inserted “59” by hand.

\$ There are different levels of understanding. So say "For those who want to know the highest reality this is the truth. But encourage the less evolved by saying "All will get to this stage in due course."

@@ You tell a child "Pass the middle school examination, after that pass the matriculation, then go in for B.A. and finally pass M.A. as the highest. Similarly you should tell aspirants that mysticism is a stage through which they should pass and then go on to philosophy. Those mystics and occultists who denounce philosophy are wrong and mistaken as you would be if you tell those who are only elementary that yoga is useless and that they should study only philosophy or if you told those who are fit for nothing better that religion is useless and an imposture. Better see what people are mentally suited for, what their tastes are and encourage them to go on with either religion or yoga as the case may be, but at same time show them the next point higher in these subjects, whilst finally warn them that these are not final, and that they should know there are more advanced stages to be gone through.

@@ First find out what stage a man is in. Does he want merely to get on in life, if so, prescribe religion; does he want peace? then prescribe yoga; or does he want truth? Then alone should you initiate him into philosophy.

@@ Shankara advises his students not to argue with the majority of dualistic critics because they will only injure them through hatred. Hence the silence of those who know esotericism.

@@ You cannot change the character of people suddenly, so you must accept the mystically inclined as such and prescribe suitable books and meditations for them. If they lack the brains for philosophy, what else can you do for them?

@@ I give that exaggeratedly mystico-religious book "The Gita Idea of God" by Gitananda to

CHAPTER 5  
THE MEANING OF PHILOSOPHY

(continued from the previous page) Swamis as a text to read. If it satisfies them, then I pronounce them as unfit to study philosophy with me.

@@ The publication and broadcast of highest esoteric truth may be done to-day because it will be interpreted by dualists and monists alike. The understanding of these publications will be limited by the mental limitations of the readers. So there need be no fear of unsettling their minds!

@@ Nature has formed men into three grades of intelligence, as the Mandukya points out.

@@ When you are talking to persons of small mind, you should praise, uphold and encourage their belief in religion, but not when you are talking to those who seek truth. Yet Krishna sadly points out that only one person in thousands belongs to the latter group. Keep these teachings to yourself and give to your students what will suit them; but as doubts come to them, instruct them further according to their mental capacity.

@@ Vedanta is intended only for the few who can understand it. Nevertheless as the common people cannot grasp it, we encourage them to practise yoga or to follow orthodox religion, but informing them at the same time that this is not the highest and there is a higher doctrine, and not to stop for ever in the lower stage.

@@ Never talk of philosophy to anyone unless he seeks and wants it, or unless he is bothered with doubts. If you do, you will be looked on as a madman or fool and do no good at all.

@@ Men are divided into three classes of intelligence. Those with lowest are given religion, those in the Intermediate are given yoga, those in the highest are taught truth. We do not say religion and yoga are bad; but only that they are steps, not the highest level.

@@ Sri Ramakrishna adapted his teaching to the people he was talking to. To common people he said "If you utter the name of God it is enough." This was the highest they could practise. But

---

<sup>35</sup> The original editor inserted "65" by hand.



(continued from the previous page) he had quite a superior teaching for the few who could grasp it. So when people say Ramakrishna taught this or that, and the teachings contradict each other you must stop to enquire "To whom did he teach this and with what idea?

@@ We must realise and note the different distinctions among men. There are religious people who practise rites, the Pandits who interpret scriptures, and mysticisms, and yogis who practise meditations, lastly seekers of the highest truths.

@@ You find different grades of intelligence among men as they rise in the scale.

@@ The different castes were prescribed for varying grades of intelligence. According to Mandukya (page 188) men are divided into three grades of intelligence (Buddhi), high, middling and low. Religion is prescribed for the lowest; they are there and not to be condemned, but as a man of more wisdom you must pray and worship with them because they are like children, not knowing better. The highest stage is that of the man who can think for himself, he has the right to think; whereas the lowest regards questioning as blasphemous and dangerous to religion. My own guru refused to teach Mandukya to most persons, for they could not understand it, even though they were sanyasins, and they would only misunderstand it. Hence we permit and approve of religion for others who cannot rise higher, but they ought not have the conceit that this is the highest. The former Dewan of Mysore wanted to spend his life with my guru to study the highest, but he was not accepted because unready. There is no inconsistency because this is meant for the lower stage, while that is meant for the higher stage: each is a step upwards. The Vedantin helps people according to their stage, telling religious or mystic fables to intellectual children but truth to the thinking man. In the Vedantin worshipping in a temple with the masses

## CHAPTER 5

### THE MEANING OF PHILOSOPHY

(continued from the previous page) practising yoga with yogis, and then denying God with his fellow Vedantins, there is thus no inconsistency.

@@ Only when a man begins to express doubts, or says he wants to know the highest truth while admitting his ignorance of it, should you talk Vedanta with him.

@@ European modern thinkers are often on the right track in their rationalistic outlook, but they can't tolerate wisdom coming from India. This is due to prejudice.

@@ Just as a new-born child cannot understand mathematics, so the mass of mankind must grow up intellectually before it can understand Vedanta. However Vedanta must now in this modern world be explained in a way by which a larger number of people can grasp it.

@@ Just as you cannot teach integral calculus to children in the A B C class so you cannot teach Advaita to the millions of grown-up children with moustaches. It is not telling lies, therefore to teach them what alone they can understand, i.e. religion.

@@ Those who are incapable of inquiry, of making use of reason, must be given religion or mysticism to get some peace. They cannot be left unhelped.

@@ Indian philosophy gives a connecting link from primitive religion to the highest truth "knowing which nothing remains to be known."

@@ You must be capable of knowing what is the questioner fit for, what he is capable of understanding, and then tell him nothing which he is not capable of understanding. Never say that which is the highest from your point of view. Unless people are found capable of understanding it, ever behave and tell them only what they want.

@@ You must not yourself instil doubts in the minds of others: these doubts must arise of their own accord and only then may you answer them. If the young college students are beginning to question the truth of religion and come to ask you to clear their problems, then you

---

<sup>36</sup> The original editor inserted "63" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) may give them one point nearer the truth; but it would be unwise to go and tell them that their religion is untrue. To unsettle a satisfied mind is to lead it into bewilderment, with probable immorality as a consequence.

@@ When there is no capacity for thinking, give people yoga, if there is still less capacity give them rituals.

@@ We condemn none. According to their stage of understanding, let people believe what helps them. Let them play with toys and follow fables. We may argue against God to our personal pupils but we would not do so to our children or to our coolies. If we did so, it would spoil them and perhaps ruin their character. Hence I do not agree with Chapman Cohen's extreme criticism of religious matters.

@@ Vedanta must be given only to those that ask; those that do not ask should be given mysticism or religion. Never publicly say that religion is bad: encourage those who believe in it. Your object must be to raise them, and this can only be done by assuming their standpoint.

@@ The name "system of Advaita" should not be used because incorrect. All systems are ours, because there is non-contradiction in our view. The advaitin feels there is no clash with others he quarrels with none. He sees all their points of view. He knows that they take things as they seem to be, hence are necessarily dualists. Our religion is Truth, our philosophy is truth, call it "search for truth" and leave out names.

@@ We do not object to giving the masses the spiritual pabulum they are fit for; that is alright. But always do something to lift them one step higher; always mix with the pabulum, or say something as some slight impetus towards Truth. This can be done with temple worship.

CHAPTER 5  
THE MEANING OF PHILOSOPHY

CHAPTER 5:

\$ The truth of Vedanta is so strong that it makes one feel impregnable in argument and invulnerable in exposition. Hence it gives intellectual courage.

\$ If people want truth, we ask them to come to philosophy; if they want to please themselves, let them do as they wish, go to orthodox relation for instance.

\$ No man without brains can take to jnana path. That is why we have to give religion, or if that fails, yoga and mysticism to ninety nine percent of the people. But the man of sharp acute intellect need not take to meditation but may go direct to jnana.

\$ When we say that all paths, all religions, all yogas lead to God or truth, we do not mean that they all lead directly to it, but that they are stages, one leading to the other successively, and so ultimately to God.

@@ So long as doubts or possibilities of doubts exist, you are NOT a Vedantin. When weak minds cannot understand, they say, "Why worry oneself over that?" But that is evading the issue.

@@ You may be born an animal, an insect, a plant, to be born a human being is the highest privilege because it is much less common numerically than the preceding (animal, plant, mineral) forms. Hence we should use this great opportunity to seek truth and reality.

@@ At every stage in life, wherever you turn or go, ignorance meets you. What is going to happen tomorrow to me, or to the world (war) this year? What will happen to this seed if I plant it, will it grow? What is happening inside my body? What is the ultimate condition of this table-matter? You must finally answer "I do not know" Why are there so many schools? All seek some kind of knowledge, the removal of ignorance. When you visit a foreign country as a tourist for the first time what do you seek? The satisfaction of it? But that really means that, at

---

<sup>37</sup> The original editor inserted "65" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) first you did not know this country, you wanted to know it; the satisfaction really consisted in removing your ignorance of this country. Hence everywhere everyone is seeking knowledge and the putting an end to ignorance.

@@ Animals and primitive men possess imagination. Animals possess thoughts. But man develops reason to guide and control this imagining faculty. Imagination is not opposed to reason, but the latter seeks and controls it and is far superior to it. Religious people allow imagination to reign supreme and unchecked.

@@ The form of philosophy must be adapted to our present 20th century environments if it is to become a living force and not a museum curiosity.

@@ People see objects and select what they like to see only. Their observation is limited to their personal interests. Therefore two persons may draw opposite conclusions from the same observed thing. They only see what their mind prepares them to see. This discovery is a harbinger of the higher Vedantic teaching that your seen world is an imagined one. Therefore truth can be known only when you take all sides of an object, not merely the part which interests you. That is why philosophy studies the whole and leaves nothing out.

@@ Never use the word “Advaita” or “Vedanta” etc. as it might lead one to suspect that you are a sectarian. Simply use the word “truth” in all your sayings and writings. However all this highest philosophy was first worked out in India you ought to give credit to our country. Therefore call it the ancient Indian Philosophy of truth.

@@ The West does not want philosophy because it seems to have no practical value and is mere imagination-spinning. They do not know that Vedanta Truth deals with the Real, not with imagination.

## CHAPTER 5

### THE MEANING OF PHILOSOPHY

@@ He who thinks Vedanta is mere intellectualism is unconsciously taking the body as a standard of reality. He is a materialist, whatever he says in favour of spiritual thought, because he wants to see yoga and sanyas practised.

@@ When the Western scientific thinkers go deeper in enquiry they will be compelled to come to our standpoint.

@@ Indian philosophy alone has pursued Truth to the farthest end. Many Westerners say "Ultimate truth is unknown." But Indian philosophy says, "if you will stick to the pursuit you will get it."

@@ I admit there have been definitions of truth in the West, but none evince a desire to go to the very end of truth, as we have done in India.

@@ Philosophy means an enquiry into the nature of the world. How it came to be? What is it? What is it for?

@@ Philosophy is not making various theories about the Absolute, nor hair-splitting of words, nor imagining things. It is directed towards life and has the highest value in weighing life properly.

@@ The practical-outlook man regards philosophy as a waste of time. He will say "This is a wall. Everybody knows it is a wall. Why waste time enquiring into it?" This attitude belongs also to the primitive man as well as to children. Therefore philosophical enquiry belongs to advanced humanity as well as to adults.

@@ People talk loosely of the philosophy of this and that, but there is only one philosophy, i.e. truth.

@@ Science is true so far as the world of science is concerned, yoga is true so far as I sit quiet in meditation: the yogi's experiences are not lies but truly described; all these are however only relative truths, true only from a certain narrow point of view, they come and go, they contradict each other; whereas we seek the Supreme Truth which is higher than all these, which is uncontradictable

---

<sup>38</sup> The original editor inserted "67" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) and does not conflict with anything else.

@@ The question never enters the mind of the crowd: Why are there so many contradictory religions, opinions, theories, authorities, books and men?

@@ It is wrong to say that Vedanta philosophy is only a theory. It is the pursuit of truth for which we are ready to die, for which we take sanyas and risk our life.

@@ Philosophic speculation is not philosophy.

@@ Philosophy is not religion, this is proved, because it enquires into the value of religion just as it enquires into the value of several other things.

@@ Because philosophy is so troublesome, people don't want to be bothered with it, but remain content with mysticism or religion, where the need of thinking is absent.

@@ Science is a needed step, yoga is a needed step, studying scripture is a step but Gnana comes only by transcending them all for it depends on uncontradiction.

@@ The Vedantin will always look thoroughly into all sides of a question, whether it be concerning a material or a philosophic matter, and decide upon it only then.

@@ The fear of death is often a cause of bringing people to the study of philosophy.

@@ Easy philosophy is false philosophy. Philosophy, a welter of contradictory arguments and conflicting conclusions – Europeans mistook Indian Religions for Indian philosophy.

@@ They have got the idea in Europe that Truth cannot be got, they are mistaken.

@@ No religion which exists will give you the goal of Vedanta, i.e. the knowledge of everything. It may make you happy, give satisfaction, but that is another matter. It cannot get rid of your ignorance. Therefore you must make

## CHAPTER 5

### THE MEANING OF PHILOSOPHY

(continued from the previous page) your mind clear as to what object or goal you want in life, because you cannot travel in opposite directions, as though you were trying to walk north and south to Rameswaram and Himalaya simultaneously.

@@ We need all phases of human thought and belief to help us if we want a complete answer to the problem of human life. Philosophy is all-comprehensive, assigns a place for everything, and thus supplies this answer. It surveys the whole. If you exclude religion, you have no philosophy. If you take only religion, if you view life from a particular standpoint, again you have no philosophy.

@@ If yoga was the same as Gnana, then such a term as Gnana-yoga would mean yoga-yoga, which is absurd.

@@ Philosophy wants to understand the world as much as it was a million years ago as it is now, i.e. it does not depend on and is unaffected by the personality, coming and going of avatars: that belongs to religion. Not does it deal with the next world: it can deal only with the world in which we live. It studies truth irrespective of time (epoch) or locality.

@@ The first step in the study of philosophy is to “analyse” e.g. as cloth when analysed is found to be nothing but thread.

@@ Truth is an interpretation of the whole of man’s life. Thousands of men have given their interpretations, which sages call mere co-opinions. But Truth is universal and ultimate.

@@ That Vedanta is the highest wisdom is acknowledged throughout India. Men of various schools hasten to quote from it as supporting their different views. Ramanuja, for instance, has given the cat-carrying-kitten and the monkey-clinging to-mother doctrines of getting to heaven, but it is only his imagination.

@@ Scientific truth is merely intellectual. Religious truth is merely emotional. Spiritualistic and Occult Truth belongs to the world of

---

<sup>39</sup> The original editor inserted “69” by hand.



(continued from the previous page) imagination. But final truth is the totality of all these, plus something higher.

@@ The gnani sees the incapacity, the difficulties, the taste, the temperament of a person, and presents yoga or religion etc. to suit. He knows.

@@ Why do you refuse to read Ramanuja? It is not a waste of time. The Vedantic student should be willing to examine everything, to enquire into all views and then only reject those that are unproved.

@@ Vedanta says "Never quarrel with anybody over truth because all are coming to it ultimately," as Gita says: Let them take their own time. You have no right to say they are on the wrong path.

@@ Wisdom consists in giving a man just what he needs. This applies to the young generations also. Are they inclined to action only? Give them Karma Yoga. Are they intellectual, then give them Gnana yoga. Are they in need of concentration, give them Dhyana yoga, meditation useful for studies, games etc. Regarding young educated, critics ask "How did you get the idea that economic problem is supreme?"

In what respect did you differ from the animal about this?" It is in thinking. Think out calmly the problem of the world. Never let go the word think. You must have some calmness first. If you want to think really rightly, you must do this, otherwise, you are like blocks of stone. You are asking me a question, re communism. If you do not co-operate fully, or as Gita says "Unless you feel for your fellow beings, there is no salvation for you.

@@ Until people have risen to the heights of reason, it is wiser not only not to instil doubts in their religious or mystic beliefs, but even to act when among them as they do. Thus you win their confidence and eventually you will be able to influence them for the

CHAPTER 5  
THE MEANING OF PHILOSOPHY

(continued from the previous page) better. If however, you refuse to do this and stand aside, indifferent to their immature play, you reveal your egoism, whereas the first way permits you to serve others and thus sink your ego.

@@ Vedanta does not assume a superiority-complex and patronising attitude towards all other sects. It regards itself as one with all, even the ass.

@@ There is no being who has not had and who will not have some dissatisfaction or sorrow. Through this man makes an effort to seek happiness. Thus he gradually turns to religion, for solace as a first step; the failure of God to answer to prayer will open his eyes. However, he strives for something higher and turns to yoga, next to yoga, next to science and there he will still want to know "What is the truth of this world? Finally philosophy.

@@ Philosophy is a pursuit of truth. Metaphysics is speculation. The philosopher weighs metaphysics even as he weighs religion and other subjects in order to find out how much they contain.

@@ When all these (Art, Religion etc.) are sufficiently analysed, they point to the ultimate truth as the goal of life.

@@ Westerners do not see the importance of Truth: they value their worldly affairs as being more important.

@@ I take pride on one thing about India, that is we assert that Ultimate Truth can be known if the seeker keeps up the pursuit to the very end, whereas Europe asserts that Ultimate Truth cannot be known.

@@ If you are dealing with emotional brainless creatures, who would be offended by the truth, the wise thing is to keep quiet and say nothing about truth to them.

@@ Nothing is outside the scope of Vedanta's

---

<sup>40</sup> The original editor inserted "71" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) enquiry. The various religions, the different forms of art, the numerous systems of philosophy, the opposing democratic and totalitarian political doctrines,—all these are equally carefully examined by Vedanta and found to be but single steps leading upward, not ultimates. They are alright in their places as steps. Vedanta alone deals with all the steps plus the highest goal too.

@@ It is not the masses who should be influenced, but the leaders. By influencing them we can ultimately reach the masses.

@@ At Mysore University Examinations in 1939 only two students out of 600 to 700 presented themselves for philosophy proper! This is the dry “museum-piece” it has been reduced to. Real philosophy must benefit all human life, and not be useless.

@@ Europe must suffer more before they will humble themselves before Indian truth. However our duty is to tell them the truth and leave its acceptance to them. Whether they accept or reject it is their affair.

@@ Vedanta is too lofty for the understanding of the masses. Most of them are in the child state of mind. So it should be taught only to the few who have to direct, guide or lead the masses, thus giving direction to the latter.

@@ Vedanta shuts nothing out, neither the inner world, nor the outer world. It accepts all, and specialises knowledge. But it asks “What is the Truth of all these specialised truths?”

@@ Philosophy is the interpretation of the whole of life. You are obliged to see, hear, eat, walk and read newspapers in the whole. Philosophy is not the interpretation of the Koran, Vedas etc.

CHAPTER 5  
THE MEANING OF PHILOSOPHY

@@ The whole of knowledge and the whole of experience must come into philosophy.

@@ What distinguishes truth from science, metaphysics, art and other departments of knowledge is that it takes the view of the totality of life—a comprehensive view of the whole.

@@ Vedanta says, keep your partial truths, scientific truth is valuable, medical truths ditto, but also know the whole truth.

@@ Vedanta seeks the truth of life, not of any individual science or art, which are all but steps to the highest truth.

@@ The artist will look at a singing lark in a different way from that of the biologist. The philosopher includes both their views in his all-comprehensive outlook.

@@ All these matters like art and religion are viewed from the higher standpoint which we call philosophy.

@@ Leave religion to the masses by all means but those higher up who lead and direct them should be taught the truth so that they might better direct the affairs of world or state.

@@ Why should we trouble with your philosophy of truth? People say: We have got on quite well without it, and we can get on in the future without it.

@@ “Has it a value in life?” and “Has it truth in it?” are two entirely different questions. Religion, for example often has a useful value, even when it is untrue.

@@ The Gnani can teach Advaita only to the few successfully, and these should aim at instructing and influencing the rulers of the world. It is hopeless to teach it to the masses.

@@ To make all men think, to make them all philosophers is impossible. Therefore we concentrate our efforts on the rulers of men,

---

<sup>41</sup> The original editor inserted “73” by hand.

(continued from the previous page) and leaders of thought, that they in their turn may apply their knowledge for the benefit of all. For the masses, we let them stay in mysticism or religion.

@@ The Gita and the Mahabharata record that: This “Gnan” was taught to the rulers. Why? Because they can apply it for the benefit of multitudes of people, whereas a beggar who learns Vedanta may find inner peace for himself, but be unable to help a whole nation.

@@ Man exists only for knowing the truth. If he does not seek that, he has no right to live: this is his justification. That truth is the knowledge of unity of all life.

@@ In Vedantic discipline we do not give up the objective world; but along with all the phenomena, we enquire. Nothing is given up. All the data are taken into account, and each is analysed, tested and found to be of the nature of the mind or Atman.

@@ The gnani will direct his teaching chiefly to those who lead and guide the people, such as rulers, statesmen and educators. When I went to Europe, I devoted my time chiefly to professors on the same principle, because through them thousands of students would indirectly be influenced.

@@ Ashtavakra Samhita, as an expression of the Hidden Teaching, can only be learnt at the end of a course of instruction, not at the beginning.

@@ The best European work on Sankara’s Advaita is “Mysticism, East & West” by Dr Otto, who was a first rate Sanskrit scholar.

@@ Just as there will always be children, youths adolescents and adults physically so they will always be there intellectually also. Hence we must provide a place for religions and mysticism because the latter have to grow up and these are steps for them.

## CHAPTER 5

### THE MEANING OF PHILOSOPHY

@@ It is impossible to look into the mind of an animal. Those who say animals reason are merely inferring, i.e. imagining, by looking into their own experience, according to their own personal mental processes, and then super-impose this on the animal.

@@ Philosophy is a general knowledge of experience as a whole.

@@ If you view a subject from your own standpoint alone, or from one technical standpoint only, you cannot view it rightly. Philosophy is the interpretation of the whole. Is it possible to get knowledge of the All? Vedanta says: Yes, not in its details but in the sense of knowing its essence.

@@ The six systems are only six speculations of Indian philosophy!

@@ The ancient Rishees and best early thinkers of India went to the Himalayas also because of their cooler climate. For in such coolness the mind can think better, philosophise better. Radhakrishnan's statement that India's tropical climate made men disinclined to activity and inclined to contemplation refers only to mysticism. Hot climate fosters mysticism and not philosophy.

@@ The widespread confusion and contradiction in philosophic circles, the bewilderment which results from its comparative study, is due to the facts that it does not begin by providing itself with a chart or compass. This it can find only in a correct definition of Truth.

@@ The effect of studying the numerous modern schools of philosophy is to be carried into the middle of a forest and dropped there. You will not know where you are at the end of all study. Why is this? Because they did not begin with the question "What is truth?"

@@ The ancient doctrines of Vedanta have got to meet the modern objections. Otherwise they will say you are insane and simply ignore you.

@@ Modern philosophy has got the right start,

---

<sup>42</sup> The original editor inserted "75" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) because it starts from facts; but it does not go far enough because it does not go to the very end.

@@ Why do we think at all? Why do we ask questions of life? Why do we want to reflect? It is because of experience, either our own or that of others. Thus philosophy starts from fact, not fancy.

@@ There are different explanations according to the different standpoints taken up. Thus Mr A will be regarded from the standpoint of his voice by someone interested chiefly in singing, or from that of his performing religious practices or yogic practices by others. Each view will be partial, incomplete by itself, perhaps prejudicial. But what is meant by explaining? It is incomplete, perhaps foolish unless we do what philosophy does, which is to assemble all the varied standpoints and to judge their value.

@@ Tomorrow I may die, what is this world in which I have lived? I have imagined God. I have imagined the next world. Now I want truth about them. Such questions and such doubts come into the mind of a candidate who is for philosophy.

@@ Our philosophy is suited to a very few. It should not be taught openly, promiscuously; otherwise it arouses unnecessary antagonism. The very word "Upanishad" means "teaching a few."

@@ There is no doubt that the idea of philosophy went from India to Greece. As research proceeds this is being proved.

@@ I have no disregard for the Swamis, I do not hate the public lecturers and writers on spirituality, because I do not have disregard or hate for my own children. It is simply that they cannot rise to our level of understanding.

@@ Men who do not need truth: when you speak with them speak only to their stage of understanding.

CHAPTER 5  
THE MEANING OF PHILOSOPHY

@@ It is not possible for all men to be attracted to philosophy so they must pass through earlier stages, the religious, the mystic, etc.

@@ In the old days the advaita was taught personally only to a very few pupils at a time, who had been examined and found fit for it, but it was taught to no others. There were no public lectures on it because the public was unfit for it.

@@ The Western thoughtful men who seek light from India will, after examining the present-day state of our country, have regretfully to admit that her boasted wisdom is to be found only in her ancient philosophies and texts, not in her living society; i.e. in the past and not the present.

@@ India is the original home of Asiatic philosophy, religion, and even yoga, for the Buddhistic form of these ideas was got by China, Tibet and Japan from us.

@@ Krishna (or rather Vyasa, the author) wanted to put the truth in form which his own people and time (i.e. Arjuna) could understand. Otherwise there was no reason for it, because the Upanishads already existed. Similarly, in our twentieth century the truth must be re-stated in scientific terms so that modern people can understand it. It must be brought up-to-date or it will go, perish.

@@ The old teaching must be made consistent with the present state of modern knowledge.

@@ What is the use of upsetting the minds of common people by offering them Advaita? They cannot understand it. Religion is all they can grasp.

@@ Truth is not open to all. The common man thinks everybody knows or can know it, whereas it is not so easy as that.

@@ Every man may call himself a philosopher, but that does not make him a true philosopher.

---

<sup>43</sup> The original editor inserted "77" by hand.



CHAPTER 5  
THE MEANING OF PHILOSOPHY

@@ It was the practice in ancient days and is inculcated in the texts for the guru to teach the Upanishadic doctrine in a quiet place or a secret one. For it would only lead the unfit ethically astray, should they be shown there was no personal God.

@@ Philosophy usually undergoes a certain historical evolution. It begins as mere speculation, opinion and discussion. At this stage it includes religion and mysticism. Gradually it begins to struggle and search for accurate verified knowledge and so lifts itself up to the heights of science and truth. Later it degenerates and falls back to the primitive state. This we see in Greece, India, etc.

@@ All this philosophic doctrine which I am teaching is not new. It was entirely taught in ancient India. But our country almost wholly lost it through historic reasons. Consequently religion and mysticism alone passed for esoteric philosophy.

@@ All the different schools of thought in philosophy, all the different sects of mysticism and religion, are really stages or levels through which men pass and gradually rise to truth. This applies to Indians and also to the West.

@@ What is this human life? So many million persons are born and so many die. What does it all mean? Every man has got a right to imagine, and so he may say God has willed it and leave it there. But we wish to know whether there is any proved evidence to help get this meaning; that is philosophy. There must be ascertained facts before we open our lips.

@@ This philosophy is not mine, is not Sankara's, is not any one's. Hence it cannot be labelled. It has come down to us from time immemorial. Who originally taught is unknown.

CHAPTER 5  
THE MEANING OF PHILOSOPHY

@@ Advaita is only to be taught in a secret retired quiet place. Hence it is a secret doctrine. "Upa" means "sitting near" and refers to the seeker who came asking questions and the guru replies "Draw away from others and sit close to me in a secret spot and I will whisper truth." Lectures on public platform are only for the rabble. Philosophy of this exalted character cannot be given publicly by mere lectures: that is only gossip.

@@ Indian philosophy corrects the Western error that philosophy cannot lead to truth because the latter has no finality and hence is unattainable. We teach that truth can be got, for here we have succeeded wherever else we have failed.

@@ Truth is the most important problem in philosophy.

@@ I used the term "truth" in preference to Advaita when visiting Europe because every man believes he has a regard for truth, whereas few care for an additional philosophy. Thus I hoped to reach more persons.

@@ The university teaching of philosophy fails because it does not discuss the question of what is true, the problem of truth.

@@ The man who does not seek truth is like the dogs and cats who procreate and then sit down and die.

@@ All men are unconsciously or consciously seeking for the truth about life but almost all men do not know how to seek in the proper way, i.e. the philosophic way. Hence they do not define truth and accept religion etc. because it pleases their imagination about truth.

@@ Truth means the evaluation of all knowledge and experience with a view to attain to the highest truth. Why are you quarrelling with each other? It is because each man thinks what he sees is truth and they fall out.

@@ We speak of the ancients as being all knowing, but the truth is that they knew some

---

<sup>44</sup> The original editor inserted "79" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) things but were ignorant of others. We have to use discrimination when estimating their knowledge.

@@ So long as the world lasts, there will always be differences of intelligence between people. For new children are being born. Hence there will not be Vedanta for all.

@@ It is not enough to be a yogi; it is not enough to be a pundit etc. You must also rise higher and enquire further and thus become a philosopher.

@@ It is incorrect to write of “false” philosophy. How can philosophy be untrue? If it is false, then it cannot be philosophy.

@@ Those who deny that there is a final truth and say we must mingle all views are wrong.

@@ Philosophy is the search for truth. It is not opinion, not speculation, but reality which is verified by appeal to life as a whole.

@@ Metaphysics is the equivalent of Indian punditry and probably descended from it. It is a part of philosophy but it is not to be confounded with philosophy.

@@ The Indian belief that philosophy has a three-fold aim, i.e. Sat Chit, Ananda is matched by the Western belief that it aims at reality, knowledge got from study and happiness. There are three classes of men in this world, the majority seeking happiness, ananda, overcoming misery, whereas others seek Chit, knowledge, while pure metaphysicians and scientists seek reality. All these are merely aspects which appeal to different tastes, or temperaments or tendencies. But Vedanta goes beyond these three for it seeks Ultimate truth.

@@ Metaphysics offers knowledge but not the knowledge of truth. Philosophy shows within what limits such knowledge is true.

CHAPTER 5  
THE MEANING OF PHILOSOPHY

@@ Philosophy examines and evaluates everything, rejects nothing, but it asks “Does this lead to truth?”

@@ Philosophy is far more comprehensive than metaphysics for it combines all the sciences with metaphysics, whereas the latter is often a matter of mere words or dogmas.

@@ The object of life is to get Gnan, realize Brahman, and he who gets gnan seeks the good of all, treats all like himself.

@@ After having done everything, achieved everything, had the greatest pleasures, even then I shall be taken away and must die. Hence the thoughtful man enquires into the meaning of death. Thus philosophy springs out of death.

@@ Metaphysics deals with what is beyond physics, whereas philosophy includes both physics and metaphysics.

@@ Philosophy is not the totalization but the general interpretation of experience.

@@ European view of truth is that Reality is something of which we can be conscious. An unknowable Reality is non-existent. What is meant by knowing Reality?

@@ An essential message of Vedanta is to help the helpless masses who lack wisdom.

---

<sup>45</sup> The original editor inserted “81” by hand.

ENGLISH PROVERB: "Whoso speaketh the truth to the unprepared, is a liar in his own despite."

MONTAIGNE: "Do not be wiser than is necessary, lest you become stupid."

BUTLER: 'RUDIBRAS': "The world is naturally averse to all the truth it sees or hears, but swallows nonsense and a lie with greediness and gluttony."

Sri RAMAKRISHNA (probably) "What does a brinjal-seller know of the price of diamond.?"

BACON: "Truth which only doth judge itself, teaches that the enquiry of truth, which is the love making or wooing of it; the knowledge of truth, which is the enjoying of it—is the sovereign good of human nature."

UNKNOWN: "Philosophy of a man is the mirror of his character."

ANATOLE FRANCE: "Nations live on mythology: from legends they draw all the ideas which are necessary for their existence. They do not need many, and a few simple fables suffice to gild millions of lives. Truth has no hold on mankind. Truth has so many points of inferiority to falsehood as practically to be doomed to extinction."

BRADLEY: "There is no more fatal enemy (to philosophy) than theories that are not also facts (ascertained)."

## CHAPTERS 6 LOGIC, SCIENCE & PHILOSOPHIC REASON.

@@ There are three stages of mental development, first, instinctive, which deals with sex, herd, nutrition and other animal instincts, second, Intuitive, which arises from repeated human experience, third, Rational. The last must be made supreme.

@@ European “reason” has two defects: (a) it is limited to data of waking world alone (b) it omits the drik whilst pre-occupied with drsyam.

@@ Intuition means thoughts which come of their own accord to you, spontaneously, through Nature’s working. But they are still thoughts and should still be checked by reason.

@@ Imagination is what you arrive at by your own effort. Intuition is what you involuntarily receive. It is innate. Both may be good, but must be checked by reason. Instinct is what is common to you and the animals.

@@ Intellect is confined only to the experiences of waking state, and therefore it is incomplete. But you cannot get on in this world without it, without intelligence. So those who denounce intellect are foolish.

@@ Intuition exists but it does not come from Brahman, it is a higher mental faculty. It is within the region of mental phenomena. So you will have to split the mind in two divisions, as Sankara does, one lower and one higher, and not ascribe intuition etc. to Overself.

@@ Intuition is truly extra-intellectual knowledge, but it is only the result of past experience. It is not to be ascribed to Brahman but to a higher mental faculty. It must be subject to checking by Reason. What you say of animal instinct evolving into primitive man is correct, and of it being checked by logical intellect, as well as of psychic powers being checked by this development. The future development is: if a man wants these mystic powers he may get them by various practices, but if he wants the ultimate truth, Brahman, then he may not get them.

---

<sup>46</sup> The original editor inserted “83” by hand.

(continued from the previous page) at all for he will not seek them. Nevertheless remarkable things happen of their own accord.

@@ Buddhi is the highest mental faculty. It is next to Atma. Buddhi is wanted. Gita says: "Through Buddhi you reach me." Even in material affairs it is the man with the sharpest intelligence who wins.

@@ Logic is not the same as my Reason. There should be a distinction between them. Logic cannot know the Absolute. It is of intellect, not reason. Reason can know the Absolute. Logic applies only to the objective (seen) world. Europeans have not analysed the mind itself yet. Hence they cannot understand us. If your Witness Self could see itself.

@@ Logic means you have to give illustrations showing that one thing is like another. But all these illustrations are taken from practical world. They are mere approximations which can only project truth.

@@ Animals have higher instinctive intelligence than man: there is no doubt about that. Hence they are superior in instinct than we are.

@@ Reasoning in Advaita is thinking applied to all three states to prove something. It is in this sense that Sankara used the word, which pundits do not grasp.

@@ There can be no logic without instances; hence we have the right, in logical argument, to demand illustrations.

@@ Reasoning must not be confused with intellectual argument. The latter is used by lawyers for logical building up of evidence of seen objects only but the former is used in philosophy to refer to evidence of all three states (avastatraya). Reason (Buddhi) sees the appearance and disappearance of objects including ego; whereas logical intellect (manas) is limited to them alone.

@@ Reasoning is meant for all mankind, and hence

(continued from the previous page) universal, and Panchadesi mentions it first. If you can't reason, take what you like. If you want the best you must have reason. By reasoning the oneness of Jiva and Brahman is established; hence the universality of Vedanta. The same is taught in the scriptures by eliminating all the contradictions.

@@ How can you witness the mind of another? All you can do is to witness his bodily actions and guess at the mind behind them. Yet Western psychologists, especially behaviourists and Freudians make this error. Vedantic view is that you can only know your own mind; never another man's mind. Even thought-reading is only looking first into your own mind, and saying what you believe is in the other man's mind. Hence it is your own mind, and saying what you believe is in the other man's mind. Hence it is your own mind which sees or tells you what is in the other man's. But is your mind confined to your body? No. It is everywhere; hence it is the same as the other man's mind. This renders telepathy possible, but the thought-reading must still be done by your own mind, not another's; you know of the other man's only such thoughts as appear in your mind, and therefore it is really and ultimately your own mind you know.

@@ Our criticism of the great scientists is "Why do you stop here? Why don't you go further?"

@@ When I advocate science, I do not mean mere elementary scientific facts about oxygen and hydrogen, but advanced science, that truth to which it leads, the meaning and aim of all science.

#### CHAPTER 6 only.

@@ The extraordinary rapid conquest of Poland by Germany is one more illustration to teach people the lesson that Buddhi alone matters most in this world. For such rapidity is due to the application of science to warfare, to

---

<sup>47</sup> The original editor inserted "85" by hand.



(continued from the previous page) the use of sharpest intelligence and applied reason. All the Polish intensely religious faith in God will not help them.

@@ Those mystics who say you have to rise beyond reason are insane. Common sense tells you that the only way to distinguish between stone and a fruit is to use your intelligence. Otherwise you will try to eat stones! That is, to arrive at the truth of any matter or objects, you must use reason. How much more when you want to arrive at the truth of life, and the universe? This is the only way.

@@ Vichara means that without thinking about the truth of it you cannot attain it. The mind must be used in reasoning: it is kept quiet in yoga, there is no possibility of knowing the final truth, because the instrument of knowledge—the mind—is not functioning. Vichara depends entirely upon Buddhi, i.e. reason.

@@ The word “intelligence” is dangerous to use because it has got different meanings.

@@ If contradictions are present, how can we be certain anything is true? Hence truth must be the uncontradictable.

@@ To the extent that you show there is no possibility of difference, you get at truth.

@@ We must distinguish between what is proved in science and what is theory.

@@ Truth is that which is not a lie.

@@ If people ask why should reason arrogate the final appeal to itself, we reply: Your use of the word why is sufficient proof that you are seeking a reason for your satisfaction. Thus unconsciously you make the reason highest.

@@ Until you verify any doctrine, whether it be dualist or non-dualistic, it remains only a hypothesis.

@@ Vedanta is not so much interested in the results of Science as in its method of verification. Experiment and observation we agree and follow as far as possible, but it cannot

(continued from the previous page) deal with ideas and thoughts. Hence it is the verification method used by science which we base our philosophy on. The collection and change of theories is not our task.

@@ Hasty generalisation is another fallacy. We should decide only after having examined and enquired into as many facts as possible.

@@ Logic holds good only in this world. An analogy drawn from this world may be quite inapplicable to other worlds. We do not know. Hence it is fallacious to argue that the laws of Nature must have had a Law-giver, God.

@@ Knowledge is the only means of attainment, not yoga.

@@ Europeans have now seen the destructive side of science as in war, so they turn away toward religion. This is a retreat or retrogression. It does not occur to them to seek beyond science into philosophy, i.e. truth instead of going towards mysticism.

@@ People cannot distinguish between ethical truth and philosophic truth, between a man's speaking what he honestly believes to be true and what really proves such after test or experiment and all others also agree.

@@ Reason is that which distinguishes real from appearance. There is a difference between reason (buddhi) and thinking which is most important you should grasp. Both are two different kinds of thought. When thought starts to reflect about itself, it becomes reason, but to do this requires the utmost concentration, which is difficult. The thinking process must critically return to itself, examine its own nature. When it does this, it will discover that it can only produce dualities, drsyams, ideas, and never yield the real perceiving that the Real is unity. Reason ceases to work for it is no longer needed. All is then real. So judgment, discrimination etc. becomes unnecessary. This is quite different from the intuition of mystics. But the mystics

---

<sup>48</sup> The original editor inserted "87" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) never achieve abolition of thought; he only changes one imagination for another. With the latter thought must disappear, the world objects must disappear, whereas with the philosopher, thought remains, world remains, but they are known as non-different, as Brahman.

@@ Intellect is precisely the same faculty as Reason, only the former is confined to waking whereas the latter applies to the three states.

@@ The question of verification follows immediately after the question of truth, because every man says, I know truth. "How does he know that what he sees or what he thinks is true? This is the work of verification. It is most important and most essential part of Vedanta.

@@ There are professors of philosophy whose minds are filled with a thousand memorized opinions and who have never paused to ask like a true philosopher, "Is this true?"

@@ Science deals with the many whereas philosophy seeks for the One.

@@ Epistemology is the way in which the mind is thinking.

@@ Just like removing the weeds to get at water, we have to remove ignorance by constant reflection and inquiry into the real nature of the self.

@@ Atman and the Brahman are identical. The method of stating the identity dogmatically is the Vedic method. Gaudapada's method is different; it is rational; it is the modern scientific method, i.e. the method of argumentation and reasoning. It has been declared that the subject of reasoning by affirmation and negation. The identity of both can be established only by reasoning and is possible only through enquiry. "Lack of faith is the obstacle" says religion. "Lack of enquiry is the only obstacle" says philosophy.

@@ What is the test of truth. The first test is its universality, as two plus two make four. The second test is that truth is beyond all possibility of contradiction.

@@ Vichara or enquiry is of the highest value. We can begin Vichara at any time for all the 24 hours the mind is with you. Discrimination, company of the wise, practise of detachment etc. are only helps to enquiry.

@@ It is not right to fire off judgments as one likes. Evidence should first be got, i.e. verification.

@@ Reason is that which tells you. Thus reason is the nearest to truth or self-knowledge.

@@ Verification is the chief characteristic of science and essential to philosophy. In this sense I say that even ancient Vedanta possessed the scientific method.

@@ The presence of contradiction indicates the presence of error.

@@ The spirit of fanaticism shows itself among the Rationalist Movement and is thus converting it unconsciously into a creed.

@@ The two main features of science in which Vedanta is interested are generalization and verification.

@@ People have not defined "truth" correctly. Why? People are usually too busy to have the patience to find out what truth is. And the other desires are usually more powerful than the desire for truth.

@@ We have to examine epistemologically as to what is meant by knowledge. Is it seeing or feeling something? For our impressions must be corrected by enquiry. All knowledge is not true.

@@ You will find that the scientific method is given in Chhandogya Upanishad when Indra's pupil took 120 years to learn the nature of Atman. He spent the first 30 years in examining matter, another thirty years in examining something else.

@@ The characteristic of Truth should be like

---

<sup>49</sup> The original editor inserted "89" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) the characteristic of fire which is hot to all men. Truth means that which is accepted by all to be alike. It is impossible to mistake truth, when you have it for anything else. If it is not like this then you have not truth but a conviction.

@@ People rebuke science for constantly changing its theories. Why not? Fresh evidence keeps accumulating and forces revision of former views. But these critics say: Let us therefore turn to mysticism and get peace, not the conflict of theories. This is feebleness and will not solve the problems for mysticism itself has a conflict of theories. But philosophy says: Stick to the quest of truth, hence it requires heroic qualities to preserve in the effort to solve these problems. It believes that the idea of truth which perpetually recur to us and is found in all material life, must be the hint of its existence: hence philosophy keeps on with its pursuit of truth in the belief that it exists.

@@ Science does not pretend to reach where philosophy goes. They are two different things. Philosophy deals with the whole of life, whether seen or unseen, whereas science deals only with what it can see.

@@ Vedanta says: If there is no proof, then it is for philosophy a false idea, i.e. a lie!

@@ Logic can never yield ultimate truth, but it has value and necessity in practical life.

@@ Scholasticism says "According to this theory it is so," or "According to that theory it is so" or "According to Sankhya it is so," etc. All this is being based on assumption, not fact, and can never arrive at truth, only opinion. We have to follow a certain method which is not followed by non-philosophical. People interpret the same thing in different ways. How are we to know which is the

(continued from the previous page) correct one? The aim must be to know truth; otherwise we fall a prey to imagination.

@@ Hitler is using applied science, thus impressing on the world its immense value. Of course, he is not using it for Gnan as we do.

@@ Those who talk of ancient events with certainty, talk as if they were present and knew these happened. We, however must admit we do not know.

@@ When people get tired of too many words, interpretations, etc. they rush from one extreme to another and go into mysticism.

@@ Every man uses the word "truth" and talks of it only from his own imaginary standpoint and not as it is.

@@ Those who talk of other worlds, whether mystic planes or religious death-worlds, go beyond our experience and I can only bow to them and withdraw. I can deal only in the world before me, the only world I know.

@@ Ask a Christian, a Jew, a Muslim and a Hindu to put their finger in a fire. Will they disagree about its power to burn and pain them? No. They will all agree about the nature of the fire: i.e. there will be contradiction. That is precisely the same as the Vedantic definition of truth: when men really rise to it they will never disagree about it.

@@ Two questions arise when claims are made

- (1) How do you know that it is the truth?
- (2) How do you know that it is final? Tomorrow you may change your mind. How do you know that there is something beyond your experience.

@@ "What is truth?" is the chief question above all others. It has remained unanswered because so few men have the capacity to think sharply and deeply.

@@ In the absence of philosophy science is supremely valuable because it tends toward racial non-discrimination and because it rises above national distinction and prejudices.

---

<sup>50</sup> The original editor inserted "91" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) Hence its spread is one of the most fitting to spread universal understanding especially if complemented by mysticism.

@@ Non-contradiction is the test of truth, says Max Planck.

@@ It is by the process of negation and affirmation that Brahman becomes the subject of reasoning. It is by reasoning that the identity of Jiva and Brahma is established. A direct knowledge of Brahman can never arise through any mystic initiation. Yoga has no place in it. It can arise only through reasoning. Want of faith is the obstacle to religion. Want of enquiry is the obstacle to philosophy. Even Vanadeva reached Brahman by inquiry. To one who makes no use of his reasoning faculty, knowledge of Brahman is impossible. If a person cannot undertake the inquiry through want of time etc. he should be engaged in meditation etc.

@@ Logic can never give you absolute truth.

@@ Philosophy is reasoned proved truth; mysticism relies on personal experience as truth; scholasticism takes private interpretation as truth.

@@ Science aims only at the unification of separate departments of knowledge, whereas philosophy aims at the unification of the whole. Hence the insufficiency of science.

@@ Vedanta does not care for the results of science, such as motors, airplanes, but for the unified knowledge it leads to.

@@ Panditry is an excellent exercise for the mind but not as a means to truth.

@@ Vedanta is the opposite of Yoga, for it wants you to exercise your mind and get at truth by discrimination.

@@ Whether you like it or not, people are interpreting scriptures, faiths etc by reason, more or less imperfect. For the fullness of reason is the only final arbiter man possesses.

@@ “What is truth?” is the question we must put first. Hence definitions are essential because it carries different meanings to different minds. The mystic says: “I know,” but what does he know? Gnosis is higher than mysticism.

@@ There are two samadhis, one yogic empty trance, and the other keen concentrative thinking.

@@ We appeal in philosophy to universal experience only. Scriptures are the experience only of the few; hence we do not appeal to it. Reason and universal experience must take precedence over it and over hearsay in the quest of ultimate truth regarding the world. No scripture can help in philosophy. Your mind will be prejudiced by this man’s or that man’s view.

@@ The Yogi who practices discrimination and enquiry during his meditation is simply thinking and using his reason; to what extent he is practising Vedantic Vichara and is like one of us. There are unfortunately so many different kinds of Yoga. But which yogi uses reason? When Yoga means killing reason, as in most cases it also does, then we refute it. Hence the meaning of yoga referred to in speech or writing should be given. Sankara upholds yoga as a preparation only.

@@ The yogi can realise truth if he supplements his method by vedantic discrimination, enquiry.

@@ People want to take as little trouble as possible and gain as much as possible. They disdain the hard labour of thinking needed in Vedanta and hope to get truth by doing nothing i.e. merely believing or refraining from thought in yoga.

@@ Conversion can occur only in the sphere of religion, never in the sphere of true Vedanta. When a man knows Truth, how are you going to get him to give it up for imagination?

---

<sup>51</sup> The original editor inserted “93” by hand.



@@ When Buddhi is not sharp, men must be satisfied with religion and take what pleases them.

@@ It is the business of the philosophers to examine both scientific and religious doctrines and discoveries and to evaluate them.

@@ “All men are mortal! Have you seen all men? How are you going to see them all? Therefore as logic is built upon mere imagination, assumptions, therefore it is no path to philosophical truth. It is like religion and mysticism. You postulate certain things and show they agree with others that you have already taken for granted. This is called the “coherence” theory of truth. But it is fallible. Logic is based on experience. Experience changes from time to time. Hence it is fallible. Thus the 18th century people said talking at a distance is impossible, today we have radio. The 18th century people went by their experience. Mathematical truths comes under the head of logical truths. When we speak of God, we cannot give either the correspondence or coherence theories. We cannot verify ideas of God. But these difficulties come only to a man who seeks Truth.

@@ As science goes on discovering facts the necessity for philosophy arises. Scientists now acknowledge the need of philosophy, when they want to go to the root of the matter. Till now they did not realise the importance of philosophic thinking.

@@ Yoga means don't think. Yet by only honest thought can we arrive at truth.

@@ When you kill thinking in yoga how can you get any philosophy? For philosophy needs thinking. When anyone avoids thinking, runs after religion and yoga, you may be sure that they do not want to be troubled by effort to think.

@@ If science did not stop midway, but went on to the very end, it would get Truth. All this science helps to make the reason clear, sharpens the mind, but it will take centuries for them to go to the end.

@@ Common people do not understand that natural evaporation and condensation account for rainfall, but they believe God sends rain and in times of scarcity they offer prayers and rites to propitiate Him. All the same famines keep coming, and I remember the terrible famine of the seventies when I saw dead bodies continuously being carried away. These beliefs are suitable for children but unsuitable to grown-ups. Those who tell you not to look at this world for natural causes but to look elsewhere for supernatural ones, are mental children.

@@ Theology is based on imagination; scholasticism upon logic.

@@ The truth can be got only by Vichara—enquiry, and not by millions of karmas (actions) says the Sanskrit text.

@@ We must deal with the facts of experience, not of imagination.

@@ Science finds its fruition in philosophy. Jeans & co. however do not fully realize this and take refuge in religion instead when they come up against things beyond their knowledge.

@@ The great learned pandits who made big volumes, and delivered long lectures on the nature and workings of Gods and God, indulge in mere exuberance of words, in which they are lost. The more they argue and discuss, the most they attain is merely another thought i.e. a Drsyam.

@@ The Vedantin's position is "If you show proof, I shall accept," and if you do not give proof, then I do not know and hence say nothing. This is not the same thing as saying "If you do not give proof, I disbelieve."

---

<sup>52</sup> The original editor inserted "95" by hand.

@@ The West will go on endlessly arguing. The way out is not through mysticism, which is merely mind-exhaustion, but through the fuller use of reason.

@@ Science is truer than religion. Therefore it is gradually replacing religion. But philosophy is truer than science, and will replace it eventually.

@@ Vedanta means Fact, verification, proof.

@@ Truth is that on which no two persons can disagree, in which there can be no contradiction, no difference and no doubts.

@@ Science will drop bombs and give lashes to wake up those who are asleep in religion or false belief, or who refuse to think and seek truth. Nature, God, Karma are behind this universal whipping.

@@ We cannot say human reason can know ultimate truth, but only that human reason can know there is an ultimate truth, that it is.

@@ Physical laws are after all only my idea of things. The only real way to know these things is to become them. Hence scientific laws do not explain, they merely describe.

@@ Correspondence Theory of Truth: All the objects I see are only ideas because they are interpreted to me by my own mind. Therefore the Correspondence Theory is fallacious because I only check one idea by another idea, not with any reality.

@@ Logical necessity merely means that if you assume the premise of causation, for instance, certain consequences will logically follow.

@@ Logic deals with causes whereas Reason deals with distinguishing between truth and falsehood.

@@ Reason is that which distinguishes truth from falsehood.

@@ Philosophy does not want what is merely 'conceivable,' for you may imagine in a thousand different ways. It wants what is ascertained fact.

@@ Asia and Africa despised the wisdom of the west and did not care for science. They imagined they could go on in their old way and keep aloof. But Nature, history, came and kicked them out of their rut through invasions etc. and now they have to accept science.

@@ Science gives you the facts. But it cannot give you all the facts. Therefore it cannot arrive at finality. Therefore philosophy has to go to the three states which alone can give the totality of experience. Hence when science starts with the waking state, it finds from this alone that all things are mental.

@@ We must distinguish between the scientific method and the practical applications of science. Philosophy depends on the former, not on the latter. The first existed in ancient times and does not change; it is only the latter that has changed. Hence philosophy is not affected by the alternations of the latter.

@@ To those who object that it is humanly impossible to learn all the facts as life is far too short for that, hence it is consequently impossible to attain truth. Our reply is if even if there are millions more facts unknown they will all turn out to be ideas. Every fact, whether known or unknown, is in the end mental construction. A further reply (although the West will be unable to see the point) is avastatraya which does give the totality of all possible facts. To those religionists who supplement the above objection by drawing the conclusion that therefore we are forced to rely on a mixture of facts and guesswork, we reply that you thereby confess you are not seeking truth.

To those scientists who supplement the objection by drawing the conclusion that we are safe

---

<sup>53</sup> The original editor inserted "97" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) in being guided by the facts we already know we reply then you thereby confess you are seeking only practical not ultimate truth.

@@ “All men are mortal” is a logical proposition but not provable because we cannot possibly see all men; therefore it can only be an assumption. Nevertheless it is an assumption which everybody accepts. For vivaharic purposes we too accept it but for truth it is unacceptable.

@@ Vedantic method of argument is, when a man makes a statement to ask, “Where is the proof?”

@@ What we value most in science are the facts it finds, not the theories or hypotheses.

@@ It is the scientific discipline of the mind that I refer to when saying that philosophy must be based on science. I do not refer to practical inventions of Science or its utilitarian side.

@@ The scientific conclusions are only hypotheses. Eddington differs from Einstein in regard to idealism, because this is a hypotheses. But the method which both use is one and the same, this scientific method is what I want you to practise.

@@ Logic applies to the practical vyavaharic world, it deals with drsyam but is unable to enter into the drik.

@@ What is agreement? The Coherence theory (intellectualistic theory or consistency theory): One thought agrees with another, it coheres in the other. The ideas must be in coherence with each other, applied in Law, archaeology etc. Coherence theory may point to a thing which is false to be true. Further enquiry makes what is coherent later incoherent. The Pragmatic Theory: You grow a seed and a tree is produced. So this is the truth. That which produces something or works is called truth.

The Absolutist theory of Truth—Ramanuja and Hegel—the parts are all held together in the

(continued from the previous page) whole. They are so co-ordinated as to make them One. When the mind asks questions of reality the mind assumes there is a reality. This is the reason why we seek for truth.

@@ The old argument of Europe—I have an idea of God and therefore God exists. But it is only an idea,—(Theism St. Anselm). Man is a concept.

@@ Everyone universally admits that water is composed of hydrogen and oxygen: that is to say, they acknowledge this is a scientifically corroborated fact. This is what we value in science: it seeks facts. This is why philosophy must be based on science for it must set up some standard which is universal. Otherwise how are you going to settle all these conflicts or opinion, belief and assertion which fill the circles of philosophy, religion and mysticism

@@ We may read all the conflicting theories and books in order to know what they say for a philosopher must be ready to listen to all, otherwise he is a dogmatist. But that does not mean we should lose our judgment.

@@ When the time for judgment as to truth of any doctrine arrives, the pupil should think for himself and follow no school, i.e. belief and no master, only facts. Until then, he may listen to all sides. Truth should be his primary object.

@@ What is this war? It is a war of applied science only. Inventions of every kind are being used on both sides. This is proof that science has justified itself. Life to-day is bound up with science.

@@ Those that have a philosophical temperament ask, “Has he proved his statements to be true?”

@@ Even a dog has got reason, the only difference is one of development. Intellect is that which governs the whole of the mind.

@@ The value of logic as an introduction leading to philosophy lies chiefly in that its starting point is facts, whether those facts are correct or not is another matter, but it is

---

<sup>54</sup> The original editor inserted “99” by hand.

(continued from the previous page) supposed to look at the world and not start with something imagined.

@@ Scientific theories may be many and do not much concern the philosopher, but scientific facts are essentially his concern. For unless his interpretation of Upanishads is based on scientific facts, people will retort "That is only your interpretation: why not I have my own interpretation?"

@@ All this division of people into conflicting groups and political parties will continue so long as people are guided by feelings and not by facts. Only science is based on facts. Therefore to get rid of these divisions we should our appeals to science. Thus the Pakistan plan is based on emotion, not scientific facts.

@@ Verification is essential to philosophy, but not required by religion.

@@ Science seeks simpler explanations hut philosophy simplifies most when it reduces everything to Mind, to Brahman.

@@ A truth is verifiable in science if it can be tested and in logic if it can be proved.

@@ The weakness of science is that it has no idea, no definition of truth.

@@ The facts upon which science must be based are the individual things and events which are found to occur. Science co-ordinates them by generalizing their significance into a hypothesis. The latter is then tested and verified. Philosophy now steps in and examines the hypothesis from the point of view of its ultimate truth. No human being can possibly study all available facts and sciences. Hence philosophy has to take their generalizations i.e. hypothesis based on facts.

@@ Your writings must be based on science or they will perish.

@@ Philosophy summarizes the whole of life, whereas science gets at the details.

@@ We should start with science to understand the world but we must finish with philosophy for the full explanation is essentially philosophical.

@@ The characteristic of truth must be that all men must agree to it. That is why we need the mathematical method. All men, even animals recognize that if you add one thing to another you have two things in consequence.

@@ We students of philosophy do not need to learn how steam-engines run or how to make electric bulbs: we need science only so far as it helps us ascertain truth: we need it to teach us precision, exactness and reliance on fact.

@@ The mind has to pass through various stages of growth as it progresses through disillusionment, enquiry, quest of truth, etc. to reason.

@@ We do not object to discussion in Vedanta: on the contrary we welcome it as helpful to remove mistakes. But it must be between the teacher and the pupil at the right time. What is the object of discussion? Not to carry it on for its own sake. It is to find out the contradictions inherent in all discussion! To show that duality cannot yield truth. To prove that words and thoughts can yield only *drsyam*, never *drik*.

@@ Indian logicians have got the idea of duality, hence have coined numerous technical terms about which you need not bother.

@@ The “most advanced” concepts are different from “the latest” concepts. The former means nearest to truth, the latter may be quite erroneous.

@@ The same truths which modern science gives can be found in our old Upanishads, Sankara and Gaudapada. But the old presentation does not convince now because it is based on authority,

---

<sup>55</sup> The original editor inserted “101” by hand.



(continued from the previous page) even though it be correct, whereas science proves its case.

@@ Philosophy is not occupied with personal interpretations or with views, but with facts.

@@ Unless a fact is ascertained and verified, it has no place in philosophy. The ancient and medieval “philosophy” was based on speculation and imaginations and mere logic regardless of fact, but now it must be based on science.

@@ Philosophy deals with the general and not the specific results of the sciences.

@@ It is unfortunate that your introduction of philosophy came through a religious rather than a scientific channel, for in religion men may imagine as they please but it is much harder to do this in science.

@@ Science is necessary not only to supply some of the facts for philosophy but also to show how it should gather its facts, i.e. impersonally and unbiassedly.

@@ Science was pursued in ancient India but only the philosophical aspect of it, which examined matter and ultimately found it to be idea, which thrust aside personal predilection in its investigation. India however ignored the practical aspect of science and was not interested in the applications of science: hence I am ashamed to say that India was backward in applied science but far ahead of Europe in pure scientific method. And I am ashamed to say that for 2000 years India has been a slave nation which has lost even this scientific knowledge which it once possessed as it has lost its philosophy of truth. Today the gate to Advaita must be modern science and nothing else.

@@ If science pursues its researches and does not stop, if it seeks constantly also to ascertain truth, it will be led into Philosophy because there is nowhere else for it to go.

@@ Science does not travel to ultimate and universal questions. It provides the ascertained facts, however, for dealing with those questions.

@@ The study of philosophy should go on side by side with the study of science: otherwise it degenerates into punditry, mere words.

@@ The usual objection that the ancient Indians did not know science and therefore our Vedanta cannot be correct is refuted thus: Modern science leads in the end to discovery that world is mind and that causality is non-existent. Precisely the same discovery was made by Gaudapada and Sankara. How? They had the spirit of science, the desire for ascertained fact, and being intellectuals of the highest order, saw the truth.

@@ What is the distance from here to Calcutta in your dream journey? It is only mental, in your mind, an imagination. Similarly in the waking state the same distance is also mental, idea, mathematics, inasmuch as applied mathematics is concerned with time-measurements, (days and years) and space-measurements (2 ins. and 5 miles) is bound up with time and space. When the latter are shown to be imaginary, mathematics collapses with them. Nevertheless, mathematics is the nearest science to philosophical truth, for scientific theories are based on mathematical calculations and the accuracy of science is derived from mathematics because it is an activity of pure reason. But reason works upwards from lower to higher certainties in the practical world, mathematics being the highest of these stages but still does not reach the absolute philosophic world. Hence the chief use of mathematical study from the philosophic viewpoint is that it makes the mind sharp. Pythagoras was perfectly right in demanding mathematical capacity from applicants for entry to his school.

---

<sup>56</sup> The original editor inserted "103" by hand.

@@ The word intellect must be defined when used because it is ambiguous.

@@ Reason becomes Atman when it is by itself, chained to no other thought: when it is so chained, then it is reason.

@@ Not one swami or yogi or Maharishi has ever prevented a plague or stopped a famine. It was left for science to do this. Yet these are the very persons who abuse science!

@@ Not one prominent philosopher in India today has taken the trouble to study science, and hence they all abuse science because they do not understand it, do not know it is the first step in philosophy. It is a case of sour grapes.

@@ PATRICK. "Philosophy is the attempt by use of scientific methods to understand the world in which we live."

@@ ROBINSON: "Only that which is scientifically verifiable supplies the entire content of philosophy."

@@ PAULSEN: "Modern Science is its (Philosophy's starting point and precondition. Whatever is not in accord with this lies outside the sphere of Philosophy."

RITCHIE: "SCIENTIFIC METHOD": "It would be possible for logicians to develop true and self-consistent systems of propositions which has at no point any important connection with the facts of the external world."

D. MACLEAN. "REASON, THOUGHT AND LANGUAGE:" "Any general proposition that is of scientific interest may have two different aspects which we shall call its material and formal aspect. Its material aspect is its relation of correspondence or non-correspondence with what accurately happens to exist (Upapathi in Sanskrit-Iswarananda). Its formal aspect is its logical relation with the whole system of propositions (formal) and abstract ideas that constitute Mathematics and Logic. Every proposition that is of scientific interest has its material aspect which is simply its truth or falsehood as a matter of fact, but only a comparatively small number have any formal aspect capable of development or are actually developed (because science is mostly descriptive-Iswarananda)...A proposition is materially false if it disagrees with fact and materially true if it is not false or if it agrees with facts as far as known. Logicians of whom mathematicians are a species have started by considering the formal relations of familiar propositions which are considered to be true as a matter of fact...Logic is formal because the validity of an argument does not depend on what we happen to know, outside the data (the author probably means data given or taken for granted i.e. data assumed-Iswarananda) of the actual properties of the objects about which we are speaking, but on the rational connection between premises and conclusions—he does not care whether the conclusion that Socrates is mortal is reached by affirming that Socrates is a man and all men are mortal or from the premises that Socrates is a fish, and all fish are mortal."

---

<sup>57</sup> The original editor inserted "105" by hand.

WESTWAY: “SCIENTIFIC METHOD: ITS PHILOSOPHY AND PRACTICE:” “Logic combats not falsity, but fallacy. Demonstration (this is the same as Reason) requires an ultimate postulate both of matter and of form—a criterion of the truth of the data and a criterion of the validity of the reasoning. But Logic is concerned with the latter only. It does ask whether a statement is true, but how it is justified formally. It does not require them to know the contents of terms, but only their formal inter-relations.

Logic is unable to show ideas may be formed so as always to agree with facts, but it guarantees that if a thought is true the facts shall be found to correspond—which is what is meant by truth. But beyond postulating the existence and laws of truth, the logician is not concerned with ontological enquiries.”

RITCHIE “SCIENTIFIC METHOD”. “Christ was quite right when he spoke of faith moving mountains for faith was so blinding that those who have it are incapable of seeing that the mountains have not moved.”

@@ “The philosopher should..have no favourite hypothesis; be of no school; and in doctrines have no master. He should not be a respecter of persons, but of things. Truth should be his primary object.”...FARADAY.

GOETHE: “Be but contemptuous of reason and science, the highest gifts of man, and you have given yourself over to Satan.”

WILLIAM JAMES: “What mankind at large most lacks is criticism and caution, not faith. What some most need is that their faiths should be broken up and ventilated, that the north-west wind of science should get into them and blow their sickness and barbarism away.”

@@ MOORE: “Philosophy is entirely dependent on the sciences.”

## CHAPTER 7: CHARACTERISTICS OF PHILOS. DISCIPLINE.

\$ Restlessness is the characteristic of the mind of the fool, says Gita.

\$ Unless a leader or statesman thinks calmly, without wrath or anger, he cannot judge rightly. Gita points out that wrath leads to delusion. For reason can be properly exercised only in an atmosphere of mental steadiness. Hence we prescribe calm as an essential part of the student's equipment.

\$ Qualifications for philosopher (1) In the first place, the seeker must be truthful himself. Taittiriya Up.Ch.1 points out. He must love truthfulness in thought and action. (2) He must be alert in mind, observant of Nature, noting her phenomena and not ignoring them like the yogi recluse. (3) He must have courage. If he is afraid of public opinion or the world's attitude toward him, the truth is impossible. (4) Gita and Upanishads constantly repeat the fourth necessity: steadfastness.

\$ A complete man must keep both thought and feeling and action properly balanced. Therefore the genius is defective for he has paid the penalty of neglecting other things. The philosopher cannot afford to reject any department. He finds a place for all of them, even religion and art, and thus achieves balance.

\$ If you come with a preconception, you will see things which do not exist but which you imagine by association of ideas.

\$ Ninety-nine percent of people allow their emotion to carry them away when considering evidence and arriving at a judgment, and this is not the way to arrive at truth. Religion depends on one's own feeling, but philosophy on reason.

\$ Do not allow personal experiences, nor your personal likes and dislikes to cloud your judgment.

\$ The intellect must be razor-sharp for Vedanta whereas Yoga deadens it.

\$ The discipline of yoga and the renunciation

---

<sup>58</sup> The original editor inserted "107" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) of the worldly desires is a pre-requisite, only then can Jnana follow. Also complete elasticity of mind is needed to study Vedanta.

\$ The realist philosophers and scientific thinkers of the West have developed the right kind of sharp mentality, only they will not go far enough but cling to the external world in thinking. They will not face the fact that world is an idea. The reason is that they are attached to world by their desires, such as sex. etc. This handicaps their thinking. Hence yoga disciplines are prescribed in order to purify the mind and render it free, unattached and thus unprejudiced in favour of external world.

\$\$ The value of meditation and yoga is to keep off extraneous thoughts. The average man cannot give attention to proper thought on Vedanta lines because he cannot keep his mind concentrated along this line: yoga builds up the power to do so. Hence it is useful as preliminary process. We still the mind in order to get thought-control, but once this control is attained, then we must begin to THINK, to use one's mind again in a perfectly concentrated way and endeavour to understand the Vedantic truth. So you kill thoughts only to use them again later.

\$ Yoga is valuable as a discipline for the mind, to enable it to become detached from its attachment to worldly desires which prevent it thinking impersonally and without prejudice. Thus Joad cannot see our position because he is too steeped in Sex. Asceticism is valuable therefore to purify the mind and set it free for this adventure of pure thinking. Yoga is necessary to give it depth and concentration and detachment. Hence you must teach yoga to the West as the elementary stage through which they must pass before arriving at pure philosophy.

\$\$ Truth lovers are one in a million. Only those who want truth need to come to philosophy.

\$ To get at ultimate truth one needs courage to fling aside all preconceptions and leanings; one must be a hero. And also one needs brains, one must think in the sharpest manner possible. Hence it is only the few who are ripe for Vedanta the others must be given yoga, religion, or mysticism. These are useful preparatory stages, however, and not to be condemned for those for those who can't rise higher.

\$ I wish you would put into the search for truth the same passion that you had put into your search for yoga and meditation.

\$ First tell people what is pleasant. Only after they reject the latter and declare "I want the real truth" should they be taught the esoteric doctrine.

\$ A sharpened intellect is necessary to perceive truth. Those who lack mental acuteness will not be able to grasp the meaning of the relativity of the three states. Such a dull intellect may, however, be perfectly adequate to handling the affairs of the world, and a man might be clever, astute and a successful business man and yet remain incapable of grasping truth. The sharpness which is required is the subtlety and ability to move amid abstract ideas. Similarly, the greatest scholar, however learned, may be unable to grasp it, because it requires real thinking and not mere memorising.

\$ Those who are still slaves mentally, lack the will to pursue Truth and accept ideas, imaginations, opinions of others.

\$ The mind must be open, uninfluenced, not attached to anything, for instance to yoga, but really free.

\$ Yoga is good because it frees man from worldly distractions and enables him to devote an unworried mind to enquiry into truth.

\$ People want comfort, not truth. Hence they prefer religion to philosophy.

---

<sup>59</sup> The original editor inserted "109" by hand.



\$ Yoga discipline has a value only as a means of making the mind capable of understanding.

\$ I waited till you were free of domestic and financial troubles before initiating you into the higher doctrine. The mind must be free from worries. (Hence good conditions, financial and domestic peace are desirable as pre-requisites to the study of truth..P.B.) Says the Katha Up. "A man who is free from desires and free from grief sees the majesty of the Self by the grace of the Creator."

\$ The Upanishads begin with the word "Atha"—then. This means that after fulfilling preliminary qualifications of eligibility, only then, may the enquiry into Brahman be begun.

\$ We must bring keenness of mind to bear upon the subject.

\$ "It agrees with my view, with what I feel, therefore it is true." That is the standpoint of most men and so-called philosophers. But it does not give truth.

\$ You should reveal truth only to those who have doubts and conscious ignorance and who want to know truth above all; if you reveal it to others who do not possess the examining and enquiring mind it is wrong because they think they know the truth already; they will only abuse you.

@@ The capacity to think is what seekers have to develop, for there is attainment of reality with rational enquiry only.

@@ The insanity of the primitive mind, as manifested in religion and yoga, the dementia of the modern's dissociated mind, as manifested in compartmentalised attitudes must be removed by Vedantic Vichara.

@@ He who argues "I think so" does not care for truth but opinion.

@@ Just as I cannot make the coolie outside, a proper teacher of Vedanta, so the pupil or disciple must be fit, adikari, before it is worth-while

(continued from the previous page) a guru to instruct him. Yet even the insane men do not like to be regarded as insane. Similarly mankind does not like to be told it is not competent to study truth.

@@ Vedanta welcomes men of any faith or of none to its study: atheists may come as readily as others. Our object is to make it of universal applicability.

@@ It is utterly impossible to get at Vedantic truth if you stick to the Aham. He who instead of submitting to reason says "I think so" or "I stick to my belief" or "My religion says this" bars out truth.

@@ To sit in your room and think 'I know' or to sit in your cave and meditate will not lead to realisation, for Truth will not walk in to visit you; you must go and search for her.

@@ Unless you know that you have got a disease, you will not go to a doctor for a cure: similarly unless you are aware of your ignorance and stop saying "I know" or believing that what you know is true, you will not resort to a guru for knowledge but only for confirmation of your beliefs!

@@ People who are not fit for Vedanta say that its enquiries are unnecessary, its efforts too troublesome and its analysis too burdensome; they avoid its demand for proof by resorting to imagination as easier.

@@ Likes and dislikes are usually the qualifications of Truth in religion. This is true which agrees with what I like! On the other hand, in philosophy we know its truth, and therefore we love it. Do not bring in your feelings.

@@ The ego of the Westerners has to go, before they can get at truth because they must be humble enough to come and learn from dark-skinned Hindus.

@@ Sraddha means the 1. the love of truth, the determination to get at truth, come what may. 2. A strong mind, 3. be a hero in the face of God's wrath.

@@ To be like a child (to enter the kingdom of

---

<sup>60</sup> The original editor inserted "111" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) heaven) means to be absolutely unprejudiced. If you start with ideas that Vedanta must teach this, then you merely get not truth but prejudices confirmed.

@@ Why is it so difficult to remove the world-illusion? Because of the strength of the finite ego. The 'I' idea and the identification with the body. Those who have the strongest personal ego are the most difficult to teach. Hence they must be given yoga first to detach and weaken their personal self and desires.

@@ Yoga's value is to detach the mind from this imprisonment in the body (see p.223. V.191, Panchadeshi, Srirangam Edn.)

@@ The seeker after truth must possess prejudiceless impartiality i.e. getting rid of ego in inquiry and judgment, and clear precise notions, i.e. brains or buddhi. He should not take only what suits his tastes, or select such facts as appeal to his temperament and reject the rest.

@@ Unless you de-personalize yourself, unless you become impersonal, it is impossible to get knowledge of truth.

@@ Emotion cannot be killed, but it must be brought under the control and check of reason. Reason must be kept on top, as emotion often leads the truth-seeker astray.

@@ 95% of our arguments are rationalizations; disguising emotions under the garb of reason and deceiving one's own or other minds.

@@ The achievement of full sanity depends on the permanent checking of all feelings emotions and passions by reason. This is the same as Gita's preaching and Shankara's requirement of dispassion in the would-be disciple. It does not mean that emotion should be killed or destroyed. Only that it should be subordinated and never get the upper hand. For Vedanta the mind must be kept calm; opinions, beliefs and prejudices based on feeling prevent it from attaining truth, which is achieved by reason alone.

(continued from the previous page) People's emotional likes or dislikes, i.e. complexes grip them so much that this is why only one in a million want Gnan.

@@ All the different forms of insanity and mental disorder, the dissociations, delusions, obsessisms, complexes and hallucinations are connected with the I. If you wanted to have a sane mind, get rid of the Ego.

@@ Vedanta demands perfect calmness of mind if you want to get truth, keeping out attachments and dislikes, anger and hatred, from the mind.

@@ Everyone has a superficial regard for truth and therefore wants to show the world and himself that he is reasonable, hence arises the psychological mechanism of rationalizing his wishes, feelings, prejudices etc.

@@ People cannot distinguish between reasoning and rationalization. Yet the difference is of the highest importance, in our quest of truth.

@@ Complexes force you to think along a particular way, but you are not aware of it. Thus your thinking is unconsciously biased and driven along a fixed line irrespective of whether it leads to truth or not.

@@ The mind must be of the same nature throughout, samatva, homogeneous. This is of supreme importance in Vedanta. That is why passions must not disturb it: otherwise enquiry is obstructed.

@@ If you want Gnan you must rise above all complexes. True yoga is a discipline whereby you get above them. But this disciplinary purificatory aim of yoga has been lost, and people use it merely to make a show, not realizing it is something to be worked at inside themselves. Thus they increase their complexes and insanity thro' Yoga instead of removing them!

@@ How to cure complexes? By giving the mind some noble and lofty ideal to pursue and think of it often. A psycho-analyst cannot succeed unless he is familiar with all the environment of the patient, hence a European Psycho-Analyst would not succeed in India.

---

<sup>61</sup> The original editor inserted "113" by hand.

@@ The phenomena of man falling in love with woman is merely his surrender to instinct. There is nothing marvelous in this falling in love, it is as instinctive as the dog running after the bitch. If however he stops to think and calmly consider this instinctive act, he rises to the level of reason.

@@ The fanatic is always a lunatic in the particular point about which he has a complex. He is mentally diseased.

@@ Yoga is an excellent discipline for the mind and character to produce calmness and thus reduce the strength of passions and emotional complexes, provided it is practised within limits. When however, it is overdone, it leads only to lunacy. Similarly a doctor will give you minute quantities of strychnine which will act as a tonic to you, but if you take too much then you will be harmed bodily and die. Yoga-practice acts in the same way: a little regulated yoga is beneficial, a lot ruins the mind. If the guru knew where to tell the student to stop his practice, he would be a true guru, but for this he needs scientific intellect which most gurus lack.

@@ The chief characteristic of madness is the inability to see reason in regard to certain points; nevertheless the patient will believe that he is thinking quite rationally, and it is true that in respect of all matters apart from these points, he may certainly be quite reasonable and sane. This is the noticeable fact of insanity, that the mind of a madman works in two separate water-tight compartments, the one quite unbalanced and the other sane. This same duality you will find among many mystics and their followers. They are all mentally diseased, but their sanity in certain directions hides their insanity in other directions. The fault does not lie in the lack of reasoning powers so much as in the existence of a complex which interferes

(continued from the previous page) and upsets those powers at a certain point.

@@ If you do not take away the ego, the 'me,' no proper enquiry into philosophical truth is possible, but only into religion.

@@ People are often unconscious of the motives that actuate them. They think they are doing the right thing but something at the bottom of their mind is really driving their thoughts and actions. This prevents getting absolute truth. The mind must therefore be carefully examined and purified from egoistic motives and emotional attachments before truth can be got, otherwise the mind will go on working in a particular way.

@@ Poets are particularly credulous and prone to look for the marvellous; they also tend to exaggerate things in their writings.

@@ Unstable mental balance and weak mindedness are such common factors that even people who will grant that a certain holy man may be either mistaken or a rogue, will yet add a rider that we cannot be certain but that there might be something after all in his words or 'miracles.'

@@ Emotion should not get the upper hand, but reason should be supreme; this does not mean that emotion should be condemned and killed.

@@ The primitive and the advanced mentalities are often combined in one individual by keeping each relevant to different subjects, as using the former for religious and the latter for professional thinking.

@@ By having the 'I' your thinking is unconsciously drawn into various channels of fallacy.

@@ The fallacy of enthusiasm is to assume that merely being enthusiastic about an enterprise indicates that it can successfully be carried out.

@@ It takes time to get at truth. The seeker therefore ought not to get discouraged but has the patient determination and courage which sticks to the quest.

---

<sup>62</sup> The original editor inserted "115" by hand.

@@ Evolution is from emotion up to reason. Primitive people are emotional; highly evolved races

(continued from the previous page) are rational. Hence you find yoga and mysticism (which depend upon emotion more than on reason) among primitive races and in earlier epochs of evolution.

@@ A little training in mathematics is also necessary because it forms the mind to be exact, precise and positive and certain.

@@ The intense concentration required to grasp the teacher's explanation of Brahman is so fine and "sharp as the razor's edge," as Upanisads say, that we prescribe Yoga at the beginning to assist the seeker to gain it. He must be able to keep all other thoughts away in order to perceive the Non-dual. Yoga fits him for the enquiry into Brahman, but he must afterwards make the enquiry.

@@ Pilgrimage to Mount Kailas was also enjoined symbolically implying that seekers after truth were to climb intellectually and not stop until they reached the summit. This requires mental courage, adventure and endurance, just as the physical pilgrimage requires the same qualities in a bodily way. It is heroic to think one's way through to the very end of all problems.

@@ We have to be able to rise above emotions if we want to find truth. It is emotion which leads to religion and mysticism.

@@ The proper qualifications must be possessed by the seeker; otherwise he will not meet with success. He must be bent on truth, knowledge, the removal of ignorance rather than peace only; for instance, and if he dogmatizes then truth is unattainable, he is also unqualified, and if he is merely curious he is unfit.

@@ The qualifications required of the seeker are (a) discrimination between real and unreal: this is the faculty of Buddhi, which discriminates truth from falsehood. Buddhi is not intellect, that is manas. Vichara means enquiry into the reason of everything.



@@ Calmness of mind, freedom from worries and yogic peace, are qualities of greatest help in quest of truth. But yogic calmness alone does not directly yield knowledge: it is not the end; the seeker must make use of his brains also.

@@ The personal qualifications of an aspirant must be supplemented by these (a) a competent guru, (b) study of truth-books like Upanishads (c) leisure to carry on these studies and to think about Vedanta.

@@ Europe must give up her conceit and vanity, and seek Truth.

@@ Pursue philosophical enquiry to the logical end, whether it yields satisfaction or not.

@@ At one stage of the quest of truth do not give it up half-way. There can be no understanding of truth unless you are determined wholeheartedly to get at it.

@@ We only want one theory. That is, what is the meaning of the whole universe, the truth regarding life and existence? We want to know the truth eternal, because everything else is perishable including ourselves. Therefore think calmly and consider what it is that you must want from life.

@@ Yoga is intended to remove conflicts, which exists, out of the mind and to keep out conflicts, doubts and passions. It means keeping the mind always calm and alert. Yoga is a psychological training which is necessary before philosophical enquiry.

@@ Need of Yoga: Its benefit is to give freedom of mind from worries, anxiety and troubles so that in short, to give the mind peace so that it may pursue the higher quest undisturbed.

@@ Man get worried by many things; his mind gets distracted, his family may trouble him. For such a man the practice of yoga will confer peace and thus provide useful preparation of mind, prior to taking up the course of thinking and reasoning which alone lead to truth. Yoga, religion, science, are all preparations.

---

<sup>63</sup> The original editor inserted "117" by hand.

@@ V.S. I. kept in his class a razor blade to remind students that unless the mind was made sharp as a razor it could not grasp truth. Enquiry takes away all those things which are not truth, and, if the mind is sharp enough eventually reveals truth.

@@ How can complexes be cured? By a good education which makes the students level-headed and calm-minded plus the training of the capacity to think. A deeper education in science alone will not suffice to remove complexes because their strength is often too great: thus even scientists will be affected sexually by the sight of a beautiful woman, so strong is this emotional complex.

@@ The ordinary persons wants this God or that, wants this belief or that, and thus renders himself unfit for enquiry because he is prejudiced at the start. Therefore he must get rid of these "wants" first: when he has done so, he is called level-headed. (samatva).

@@ Yoga as a mind-levelling and conflict-removing discipline should not be carried to excess, otherwise it will create new illusions and fancies.

@@ You have to develop an attitude of impartial cautious critical examination to be fit for science and philosophy.

@@ The mind must be level-headed (samatva) before it can profitably study Vedanta, otherwise its enquiries will turn into conflicts between ideas which please and ideas which are true. Yoga is for the removal of these conflicts.

@@ Unless the ego disappears you cannot know the truth.

@@ The first condition required of the seeker is to free himself from the egoism which prevents him seeing the truth of unity of mankind.

@@ Those whose minds are worried or disturbed should not come to Vedanta class; they should first get some peace of mind through yoga or

(continued from the previous page) religion or sanyas.

@@ What is the use of sense pleasures when their objects may disappear or die tomorrow? Is it not better to possess ultimate truth which does not die? This seriousness about life the majority of people have not got.

@@ At the beginning of "Katha Upanishad" the seeker is tested and put off by the guru telling him to find satisfaction in material things, but his unquenchable desire of highest truth enables him to pass the test.

@@ I never stated my philosophical position to Major Yeats Brown or to Douglas Grant Duff merely because I saw when they came to me for a talk that they were unfit for Advaita.

@@ Unless you keep out your likes and dislikes on the quest, you cannot know truth. "I like my body, therefore it must be real", "I like Hinduism, therefore it must be true". But what you like is only an idea. When you say I like Yoga it means you have an idea of yoga and therefore it is imagination, and will pass away.

@@ Those who are changeable by temperament, who flit from cult to cult etc. need to have their minds steadied, and for them prescribe Gnana yoga, mind steadying.

@@ Fear, spite, anger, blind credulity, are listed by Mandukya as obstacles to attaining Truth.

@@ The "I" is that which blocks man's way to realising truth. It is first to come, but last to go. Those who accept as truth that which agrees with their feeling are thereby revealing that the I is strongly there, so they are cheated and miss truth. The idea that the ego is separate is false and leads to delusion.

@@ Do not be carried away by this and that, but think, look at the facts.

@@ I do not want to induce you by saying that if you get truth, you will achieve bliss. I say, only pursue truth for its own sake.

@@ Love of pleasure and worldly gain may outweigh

---

<sup>64</sup> The original editor inserted "119" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) love of truth if a seeker is a pretender or humbug, deceiving himself or others.

@@ Tell the story of fisherwomen who went to sleep in a temple at night. They could not fall asleep and complained it was due to the smell of flowers on the shrine. So they put their fish-baskets over their heads and were able to sleep well! This illustrates prejudices and attachments of conservatism; antagonism to new ideas because of their unfamiliarity.

@@ The mind does not want to exert itself to get truth.

@@ Even in practical life, brains lead to success. The men without them have to do manual work and labour for two annas a day; the men with developed brains become chief engineers, etc. at Rs.2000/- per month. Yet yogis say "Kill brains" This advice will only lead to ruin.

@@ The seeker after truth must be absolutely and imperiously truthful himself. That is why it is very difficult for diplomats and politicians to become philosophers, and truth must be supported by courage and steadfast endurance.

@@ Mind must be free for this higher study. Suppose a man has done you injury, you must not be constantly thinking about it or feel hostile to him every day. Better be forgiving and forget it, so that you may be undistracted to philosophise. Similarly if you are overambitious and discontented with your lot, your mind will be disturbed again, so be contented with what you have.

@@ Humility= childlikeness= mind having no prejudices= free from egoism and variety= preconceptions or if one has them, one ought to forget them for the time being when I enquire into truth.

@@ When a student catches some thought some idea or doctrine, instantly from the teacher then he is said to have at that moment a sharp

(continued from the previous page) intelligence.

@@ Calmness of mind is one of the pre-requisites for being able to think uninterruptedly; needed for Vedantic study.

@@ Feeling by itself cannot, of course, exist alone amongst the undisciplined masses; there is also a tiny modicum of intelligence mixed with it.

@@ That which prevents Jeans and Co. going farther into Vedanta is that they cannot give up the ego, which is still predominant.

@@ Anyone can attain Gnana—be he criminal or outcaste—if he will only pursue it to the end, for he will rise by stages until he reaches the level of understanding non-causality, when the highest stage will open before him. Only his own dullness of intelligence can prevent him from attaining Gnana.

@@ Who is the body in school who shines best? He whose mind is not distracted from his subject, i.e. concentrated mind. Hence yoga is most useful to develop one-pointedness in study of Vedanta later on.

@@ All men have got the racial inheritance of primitive desires but the degree of more or less is different; this difference is due to previous incarnations. The most advanced man is he who exercises his rational thinking when desires or attractions present themselves whereas the least advanced is unable or unwilling to distinguish between primitive desires which arise from his unconscious and the paths laid down for him by his reason.

@@ Religious people confuse the childlike mind with the childish mind. The two are far apart.

@@ We must give some time to reflection upon this enquiry, and if we cannot find the time, if our mind is too distracted by activities or worries then we must go to yoga or meditation and get peace alone. For the seeker must direct the whole of his attention, his whole mind, to the

---

<sup>65</sup> The original editor inserted "121" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) subject of enquiry. Yoga must then be superseded by enquiry.

@@ Discrimination as used in Sanskrit books means reasoning or enquiry.

@@ Enquire further. Do not be disheartened, try over and over again. When you see that authoritarianism does not give you truth, you go further you must have the determination to get at it. Experience tells you that every time you attempt, you progress.

@@ Truth may be as bitter as poison, but you must like it as nectar. Those who cannot do this are unfit for Vedanta.

@@ The right kind of seeker will accept and search for truth whether it brings bitterness or sweetness, whatever it tastes like, for its own sake. He must be prepared to find God as impersonal, and to lose his own individuality for the sake of truth.

@@ So long as you say "I know", "I feel", "I believe" you are on the same level as the insane. They also assert "I know I am Napoleon," etc.

@@ Whatever agrees with my view is truth, whatever disagrees is false. This is the ignorant man's view. His 'I' must be removed first before he can get at truth. His ego is standing in the way. What pleases his ego is truth—is nonsense.

@@ Those who get disappointed with life take to yoga, but that does not qualify them for Vedants which requires a passion for TRUTH, not merely disgust with world. Still latter is useful preliminary stage to get the mind free for enquiry, untroubled by attainments and desires which hamper clear calm unprejudiced investigation.

@@ The I must go, then you have to ask and make enquiries.

@@ "Ask and it shall be given" — Without asking you cant get truth.

@@ The object of yoga is to enable you get free from attachment, to enable the mind to get concentrated: to get free from attachment means attachment to a second thing, and hence it is a discipline, a training for philosophy.

@@ The three classes of men mentioned by Gaudapada may also be divided as follows: Low: those governed by emotion alone: middling: those governed by emotion and intellect mixed more or less equally: high: those whose emotions are governed by reason.

@@ All interpretation of the world is according to the taste and capacity to understand of the person. Hence to remove all bias and fallacies from the mind, to render it impartial, is most difficult part of the work for beginners in Vedanta.

@@ Just as there are human beings who like a particular kind of fish or meat, so there are others who like a particular kind of yoga or religion or philosophy. This is the basis on which they take up their attitude to life instead of unpreferentially seeking its truth.

@@ When people do not understand our doctrine, they naturally dislike it. It is hard to grasp of course, but only psychological complexes cause people to use this difficulty as an unconscious excuse for dislike.

@@ Unless one is prepared to devote sufficient time to this study, our philosophy cannot be grasped. It is too subtle to yield to anything short of acute long-sustained thinking which is ever probing until it gets down to the last root of the matter. To get such amount of time it may be necessary to sacrifice attending cinemas, amusements etc.

@@ Egoism covers reality So long as the 'I' remains delusion persists. No possibility of philosophy.

@@ Whilst the mind is restless and unsettled, it cannot grasp the advanced tenets of Advaita.

---

<sup>66</sup> The original editor inserted "123" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) Hence need of yoga

@@ Qualification for Mumukshu (seeker after truth) are (1) Viveka= sound common sense which can distinguish between foolishness and wisdom. (2) Samadhana= balanced mind, and (3) Buddhi= sharp reasoning.

@@ By repetition one's mind becomes clearer. Hence Gita 18th chapter. When the mind has purged itself of impurities, i.e. become clearer through persistent Vichara, Truth as it is, and truth as "I know" is different. "I know I know."

@@ There are children of one month old, six months old, youths of 9,12,18 years old, men of 25, 40, and 70 years old. Their understanding differs progressively. Does a child three days old know the meaning of protons and electrons? We have to deal with the world as it is. Aurobindo Ghose says all world will be illumined simultaneously. He is a liar or insane. There are grades of understanding. No man on earth can make all human beings agree on truth. It is impossible so long as there are infants, old men, weak intelligences and strong ones, there will have to be differences of perceptions of truth. Teach people to get a correct idea of Truth, at least, and they can try to realise it at least in later births, if they wish.

@@ The value of Freud's theories is that they were based on the study of the cases of many of his patients. Hence they were not mere glib opinions, but considerations of fact. This is the scientific method. His cures are due to the true portion of his theories, his failures to the incorrect portions of his explanations. In medicine there is a mixture of correct knowledge and error. But the wise man does not reject the entire art of medicine as valueless because it is still imperfect.



(continued from the previous page) Similarly with Freud's work.

@@ Hearing means indirect cognition of witness from a teacher. Direct knowledge means: By reason and inquiry and analysis he comes to have direct knowledge.

@@ The awareness must itself be identical with Atman, or Brahman—i.e. that which is capable of knowing.

@@ The ego has also to be eliminated though when you are arguing and thinking the Drik identifies itself with ego and its functions through it.

That the I is of the same class of rogues as the other class of Drsyams and hence untouchables, is to be proved, yet it will be proved.

@@ Most of the followers of religion, mysticism and yoga are uncontrolledly emotional; that is why the majority are women. For men have to fight and struggle in the battle of life and they therefore bring their emotions under check by the reason. It is not that men lack emotion but they guide and control it more than women by use of reason.

@@ If a man's object is to make a thing clear to his hearer he will not express himself in poetry: if his object is to make it pleasant, he will use poetry. The first purpose is purely philosophic, the second aesthetic.

@@ "Whatever we know is the truth"—this is the preconception which everybody has. The first thing in Vedanta is to make sure that what you know is true.

@@ In theology everyone is entitled to his own view, i.e. what he likes; but in philosophy this is not permissible.

@@ That which dupes 99% of people is taking satisfaction for truth. Beware of that which satisfies your feelings.

@@ "Felt" experience is no guide to the highest, because my feeling may differ from yours.

---

<sup>67</sup> The original editor inserted "125" by hand.

@@ “I know” is the universal assumption, whereas “Have I known?” should be the self-query.

@@ Restless mind, distracted thoughts, changeable disposition and flitting desires are impediments to the concentrated study of philosophy which have to be treated and cured by meditation, discipline. When the mind gets steady it is called samadhi. This is the proper place of latter.

@@ Truth must be independent of yourself; it is not to be what pleases you: all prejudices must go.

@@ The man who has been in Samadhi, his mind becomes fit, sharpened like a razor, so that when he emerges he can enquire into the world before him and understand more easily.

@@ When I examine a candidate for instruction I wait for them to begin asking questions before I can regard them as suitable. If they ask no questions, but merely say “I believe it” or “I feel this...” or “I think so and so” I reject them as unsuitable for Vedanta.

@@ Those who talk of “I feel so and so” provide psychological and not philosophical reasons.

@@ Devotees seek to know God, because they seek some benefit; philosopher seeks to know him in truth, for its own sake, says Krishna.

@@ HART’S book on Insanity, because it is science, is essential for the understanding of Vedanta.

@@ Steadiness of mind depends upon what you are interested in. Your mind can be steady only on what your mind is attached to.

@@ Things and problems concerning truth appear simple at first, and hence ordinary people speak presumptuously and glibly about it. But when we enquire we find how little we know and that they are extraordinarily complex and we are obliged to go deeper and deeper into them.

@@ We too readily take it for granted that both we and everybody knows what objects are or what the world is because we have such immense conceit. Such an easy attitude arises because we do not know the complexity of these apparently simple matters, which in turn arises because of lack of thought and enquiry.

@@ It is emotional people who change from one religion or cult to another, for they look for novelties that appear charming to them.

@@ Often great scientists do not understand the difference between mere satisfaction and Truth. A pig may be fully satisfied but that does not give it truth.

@@ Dull intellects may need 20,000 years; sharp intellects may grasp Advaita in two days.

@@ AHAM: "I am so and so"—the 'I' prevents you from knowing truth. In Nirvikalpa Samadhi the 'I' disappears for a moment, and when this is repeated often enough it makes easier the dislodgment of the ego. Hence the West must master yoga before it can grasp Vedanta.

@@ When a man gives his opinion, you can at once see whether he is speaking from the plane of finite ego or of truth.

@@ People are carried away by their emotion, and take what they like as Brahman.

@@ Let a man, however foolish and ignorant he be get this one idea, "I will not keep quiet until I know Truth." Then he will progress.

@@ No gnani will ever say, "I know" or "I see". Only the fool or insane does so: it is one of the greatest weaknesses of the human mind that it says so, outside of the practical realm where it is quite alright.

@@ I like the society of little children, because they are free from prejudices.

@@ The ancient texts and teachers tell us to rise above desires because when we seek the

---

<sup>68</sup> The original editor inserted "127" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) satisfaction of desires we are not necessarily seeking truth. Hence we must transcend satisfaction.

@@ A temporary getting rid of ego will not suffice to gain "truth." Thus the scientist depersonalizes himself, for the purpose of experimental laboratory work, but as soon as he leaves that and returns to the world or begins to reflect on the meaning of his experiments, the ego returns.

@@ It is by constant repetition of enquiry and constant cultivation of weighing evidence that the philosophic-scientific attitude is developed. Dogged perseverance is essential to understand Vedanta.

@@ So long as you have differences or distinctions whether religious, racial or otherwise, you have not reached Brahman.

@@ The presence of emotion means the presence of ego.

@@ The whole mind must get sharpened, not merely a part or fragment. This is very rare and why compartmentalism is so often found. Professors of science, mathematicians even are numerous who are gullible idiots in mystic and religious affairs. See Hart for scientific explanation of this.

@@ Self-examination is the point. How do I know what I know is the truth?

@@ You admit to "prior predilections." These have no place in philosophy, only in practical life. We must leave them outside the door if truth is to be found. Are they correct?

@@ The study of Advaita is a process of hard thinking, not of mere learning like Panditry.

@@ Caution in acceptance of doctrines, the doubt of conclusions that have been quickly arrived at, is not only a scientist's qualification but also of a student of philosophy.

@@ When history shows that even scientific and verifiable facts have been criticized and ridiculed, how much more is this likely to happen with philosophic facts, which people can understand still less? This shows that the majority of men are ignorant and prejudiced, unable to appreciate truth.

@@ Chitta-Shuddhi = purifying the mind; this is the aim of yoga; what it really means is to purify the mind from all distracting factors. In this way yoga becomes an initiation into philosophy, to stop the mind from running away after desires, troubles, etc. and thus enables it to concentrate in pursuing philosophical study to the bitter end.

@@ We are tempted to use poetic or imaginative language when writing because this captures readers. Nevertheless when we wish to convey accurate truth we have to be absolutely precise for such imaginativeness leads to untruthfulness.

@@ Ask yourself the question: does my emotion lead me to the right goal? The answer which comes from the judgment of reason should be followed, not the emotion itself.

@@ Courage is a quality needed by the seeker because he must go to the very end of things.

@@ Emotion, art, heart are not despised but regarded as equally valuable with intellect, enquiry, study. That is the artistic is equal to the scientific. What is higher is the weighing faculty which sums them up. This faculty is the philosophical.

@@ The fundamental principle of a complex is that it is unconscious. Hence if a man has a realistic complex he may study philosophy for fifty years and never grasp that world is idea.

@@ If merely hearing or reading the truth were enough all the world would be philosophers by now. But it is not possible: they lack mental capacity.

---

<sup>69</sup> The original editor inserted "129" by hand.

@@ The seeker must not make up his mind beforehand, or there will be no philosophy for him.

@@ That idea which is constantly working in you without your knowledge, is called a complex in psychology.

EMERSON: "No man can learn what he has not the preparation for learning, however near to his eyes the object. A chemist can tell his most precious secrets to a carpenter, he shall never be wiser, — the secrets he would not utter to a chemist for an estate."

LEUBA: "Truth is powerful in the measure in which it agrees with things loved or disagrees with things hated." "Truth ceases to be truth when it disagrees with things we love or when it agrees with things we hate."

RALPH BARTON PERRY: "LECTURES": "The philosopher, then, is one who at the risk of being thought queer, challenges common sense; he sets himself against the majority in order that the majority may be brought to reflect upon what they have through inertia or blindness taken for granted. He is the reckless critic, the insuppressible asker of questions, who doesn't know where to stop. He has a way of pinching the human intelligence, when he thinks it has gone to sleep. Every time there is a fresh revival of philosophical interest, and a new philosophical movement, as there is periodically, this is what happens. Some eccentric or highly reflective individual like Socrates, or Bacon, or Descartes, or Locke, or Kant, strays from the beaten track, one is more likely to reach the goal if one beats out a new one. Such a thinker demands a re-examination of old premises, a revision of old methods; he stations himself at a new centre, and adopts new axes of reference."

@@ The first question which should be asked of a candidate by a Vedantic guru should be “What is it that you desire most?” If he replies peace give him yoga, if he wants truth, he is ready for instruction.

@@ The notion “I know” prevents the minds of all from entering truth. It stops them from changing. Change is necessary in life, in the practical as well as cultural life. People must be ready to change if they want to progress on any line. Nature herself shows us this lesson. They should be open to learn from their contacts with other nations both the useful national arts and cultural ideas.

@@ The Rishis examining a candidate for instruction, judge by the amount of egoism he shows as to whether he is to be accepted or rejected.

@@ If the mind is sharp and pure, you may grasp Vedantic truth, almost at once as soon as it is explained by the teacher, whereas others may study a lifetime and also misunderstand. Hence it is something dependent on nature, on the character and capacity of the student, on whether he has a clear keen mind. If they tell you that only a man who has practised Yoga or only a man who has been a University teacher or student of philosophy can grasp Vedanta, they are talking nonsense. Those who are unable through mental or egoistic incapacity to grasp Vedanta must then gradually train themselves for it by going through the stages of mysticism, punditry and academics aforesaid. Intellectual learning about Brahman is good if done as the stage before yoga is taken up as it gives a right direction to the meditation practice; but both must eventually be transcended by rising to the level of philosophical reasoning.

@@ When Buddhi is not steady—and that is the case of 98% of Europeans—yoga is absolutely necessary as a discipline to calm the mind. But

---

<sup>70</sup> The original editor inserted “131” by hand.

(continued from the previous page) it is nothing more.

@@ What pleases me is considered truth! This is the general attitude. This is why we say: get rid of ego.

@@ Advaita wants this pre-condition that you will vow not to deceive yourself, not to tell lies to yourself.

@@ Those impatient persons who are carried away by emotions and demand a direct answer to a philosophical question which can only be approached after preliminary questions are answered, are unfit for philosophy. How can they expect a sage to reveal immediately all that he has to say?

@@ If a man has the capacity, the mental razor-edge sharpness to understand truth, he does not need to do anything else, such as meditation or scholastic study.

@@ Everyone is anxious to get at the truth at once, is impatient to receive it all at a first conversation. Such is the vanity of people. They have not stopped to enquire whether they have got the capacity to understand, even if we told them. There must be a gradual course of leisurely analysis over a period of time and many lessons.

@@ The value of yoga is to strengthen the mind by making it more concentrated. Thus it will be better able to enquire into philosophy.

@@ The ego magnifies what it prefers or desires, thus distorting outlook and incapacitating it for truth.

@@ You must sit in judgment on yourself, find out your own faults of character and weakness of intellect; otherwise there is no possibility to begin study of Vedanta.

@@ Psychology is most valuable in dealing with religious or mystic people, for you will see their God-complex or Samadhi-is-the-way-to-truth complex popping up every time.



@@ Think self-watchfully, constantly, examine your thoughts, ask, "What is my mind doing?" Such reflection helps to purify and perfect the seeker.

@@ Every man has the arrogance to think he understands when he is changing his views from time to time, thus showing past error and his incompetence to judge.

@@ The self-corrective process of eliminating ego is part of science and part of philosophy.

@@ The complexes in the unconscious usually cannot be seen but they can be seen by a competent observer outside.

@@ What pleases you may be false: what is unpleasant to you may be true. Yet authors often put on their books such worthless phrases as "I am convinced that" or "I prefer to believe so and so." These are nonsensical phrases which are meaningless from the standpoint of truth. Take away I. This is the beginning of Vedanta.

@@ Those who do not want to be bothered with difficult Advaitic studies show thereby that they are not fit for philosophy and have a temperament suited only for mysticism or religion or theology, to which they should have recourse. They have little reason.

@@ It is almost impossible for women to get Vedanta because emotion is their strongest point. And emotion interferes with rational thinking thus preventing the acquisition of truth. The same applies to emotional men. Women are also inferior intellectually. It is necessary to tone down feeling to the lowest possible level when seeking truth. You can grade all religions according to their emotionalism. Dancing-religion is merely the yielding to emotionalism.

@@ You must be ever ready to criticise your own beliefs, to suspect your own fallacious thinking.

@@ It is dangerous to the quest to start with such a notion as that truth should be of a particular

---

<sup>71</sup> The original editor inserted "133" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) type, for then you will seek to interpret both text and teachers' words so as somehow to wring from them the particular meaning you favour. Disinterestedness is necessary. The I must go. But it will not go unless you examine yourself and question why you believe this or want that. Detach yourself from all your preconceived ideas. For instance, ask: "Why do I want peace in an asram or yoga?" You will then find it is because the I is there.

@@ Those who have a strong ego insist, "My interpretation is correct" rather than seek truth.

@@ The two pre-requisites essential for Vedanta are: a competent guru and a fit student. Otherwise it is a waste of time or as Jesus said, some seed falls on fertile ground and the rest on stony. The fertile ground is the prepared student, if he is unfit, then the guru gives whatever else, such as mysticism, which he can absorb and which will lift him up to his next step of understanding.

@@ Truth alone should be the end and aim of a philosopher: no respector of persons, dogmas or schools.

@@ The point to be noted is that we have to give up all pre-conceptions, and bias to begin with. Vedanta wants you to have a free mind, ready to receive Truth—that is why the intuition exists.

@@ Our reflective thinking must be free from subjective interest which produces errors of judging. Elimination of the personal equation 'I' is essential. I saw Krishna appear, I felt him etc. The idols of the theatre and cave are all appearances. Philosophy wants to go beyond appearances.

@@ Persons whose minds are distracted by too much worry and anxiety can never get knowledge of Brahman by enquiry. Meditation is necessary for such people as it tames down the intellect.

@@ Worried and anxious persons can never get knowledge of Brahman by enquiry.

@@ Fitness here consists in the unquenchable desire to know the truth alone, and not satisfaction.

@@ There is always the lurking fear in minds that are not heroes that my teaching may be wrong, that I may be mistaken, that the yogis may be right or the scriptures correct. But this is caused by mental weakness.

@@ Thinking makes all the difference between people. One who thinks more succeeds more. Thinking is of the greatest use for the discovery of truth.

@@ Sincerity is impossible so long as the 'I' exists.

@@ A period of mind training and preparation for years is needed before ordinary people could be fit to study Vedanta.

@@ We have to put an end to desires, i.e. eliminate the ego, if we want to find truth. The I is inevitably productive of error.

@@ Sharpen your buddhi as you would sharpen the edge of a razor. For only a sharpened mind can get Gnana.

@@ Yoga is needed to give the capacity to control your mind: when mastered the yogi should leave it and take to enquiry.

@@ The swami who ran away from the class after attending for a few days, thereby proved his unfitness for philosophy. He did not have the patience to wait and hear what my teaching really was but judged it by the few superficial impressions of the first contact.

@@ There is no special faculty of will, according to Indian psychology, for it is the whole mind itself in action.

@@ What pleases me most is considered truth! This is the general attitude. This is why we say: get rid of ego.

---

<sup>72</sup> The original editor inserted "135" by hand.

Chapter 8.

@@ A child defective from birth may always be colour-blind and associate the colour blue with red! There is no check on it because we cannot see into the mind of others.

@@ The object indicated by the word and the word itself are one and the same in class because both are mental, imagined.

## CHAPTER 8. THE NEED OF SEMANTICS.

@@ First find out the meaning of words; you will find that they are simple mental images. These again are just your constructions and concoctions.

@@ People talk without knowing meaning of things. Hence their ignorance.

@@ You must begin by strict definition. "What do you mean by the word God, creation, etc."

@@ We must begin by examining into the meaning of experience. Truth cannot be known before it is defined, before its meaning is understood. This does not mean indulging in speculation or forming opinions as to what may be true. It means inference based on life and experience in order to fix the goal of truth. It means that no important world should be received into the mind without asking of it what is felt in my mind when I use this word.

@@ The word spiritual has done a lot of damage. Analyse it. To have any spiritual experience or "consciousness" is to think about it. Therefore it is really a thought. There is no difference between "spiritual" and "mental."

@@ Do you know the meaning of the word IS? This table is here, for instance. But wait a 1000 years and it has crumbled away into dust and vanished. Where is that table now? It still is in some form or other. The enquiry into is—ultimate reality is philosophy.

@@ People easily fall victim to the word "spiritual" of whose meaning they have, and can have no clear notion.

@@ The fact known is the reality, the knowledge of the thing is the truth: this is correct only in practical affairs, until we reach the ultimate, when there are no two things, and hence no distinction between truth and reality.

@@ Why should a man trouble to learn or define truth if he is already practising goodwill to all beings, like Gandhi? Reply—Because he will not know that it is truth and may therefore change tomorrow, and so give up his goodwill!

---

<sup>73</sup> The original editor inserted "137" by hand.

@@ If Europe had a proper definition of Truth, it would not have to grope among its endless theories.

@@ Philosophers do not or cannot define truth. They may have many systems or theories,—therefore any definition which they do give will not be acceptable to other schools and will be contradicted by them. Therefore we say that first an uncontradictable definition of truth must be found before you can proceed.

@@ Creation, perfection, righteousness, spiritual and similar terms which are used in philosophical books should be explained, questioned and cleared up. They have different meanings to different persons, whilst the same word may have two or three meanings, assigned it, by the dictionary, as for instance, love. Of course, when used in purely literary and journalistic work or in merely religious treatises, such definition is not essential because readers may imagine what they please, but authors of work purporting to be philosophic have this duty laid upon them.

@@ What is the use of writing books on truth without giving its meaning? Suppose I use the word "X". Do you know what it means when I include it in a sentence? No—one man will think I mean a horse, another will picture a table, a third will think that it applies to a cow. In short, each imagines "X" as he likes. Substitute the word Truth for "X" and you arrive at the same ridiculous position. Without a correct definition, these pseudo-philosophers mean mere opinion when they say truth.

@@ Use the word Nature in preference to God.

@@ Define carefully the MEANING of each important term used, as it arises.

@@ Without defining reality, Patrick has written a whole volume, with merely repeating the word "Reality" many times. Indian philosophy starts just the opposite way—certain—exact.

CHAPTER 8  
THE NEED OF SEMANTICS

@@ It is useless for anyone to say the world is progressing and that humanity is getting better, unless they first deeply examine and carefully define the meaning of the words "progress" and "better."

@@ It is the characteristic of nearly every writer in philosophy to deal lengthily in words without analysing their implication and meaning. But his numerous pages cause admiration on the part of many of the readers, who do not realise that many of these pages are hollow, meaningless, and often a whole book is vitiated by the lack of definition of the term "truth" to start with.

@@ It is difficult indeed to define words. You speak of "practical life". What does this mean? "Dealing with utilities" you reply. "What is meant by utilities?" I ask again. Thus you see that a first or single definition does not solve these difficulties, but thoughtless persons will not trouble to enquire so deeply and answer that they know what they are talking about. They may conveniently do this in practical life, but it is indefensible in philosophy.

@@ Hundreds of books are written or reviewed, praised to the skies, yet neither book nor review contains one syllable of discussion of truth or real definition of meanings as a preliminary.

@@ What is meant by a "fact". Suppose I see a snake in the dark which turns out to be a rope. The seeing was a fact, but whether the object seen was really a snake is a question for enquiry. We usually take mental construction for facts. This is what we find in this world. We take ropes for snakes because we do not examine them, we are so familiar with this world that we do not enquire into it. Hence insufficiency of yoga, because it wont examine world.

@@ Nobody has been able to give a definition of truth. Yet every man in the street who has no brains and can't think is willing to talk to you

---

<sup>74</sup> The original editor inserted "139" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) about his own view of truth. None knows what is truth, but presumes he does!

@@ People take shelter to cover their ignorance under ambiguity of language and in hazy meaning Philosophy will not tolerate all that.

@@ Commonsense is usually a synonym for stupidity. It is usually the opposite of critical thinking.

@@ We must first define every important term we use—such as intellect, reason, time, eternity, consciousness—because it may carry one meaning to you and another to another man. Hence definition must precede explanation.

@@ Before discussing or teaching anyone I always ask him to define his terms and thus state his position first. Otherwise I may be using a word with one meaning given it in my own mind and the other person thinking something different. Hence when he asks what is the “cause of evil” for instance, I ask “What do you understand by the word cause?”

@@ Although truth includes the All, the meaning of the word is different from the area of knowledge which it covers, thus religion is included in the area, but excluded from the meaning.

@@ The difference between truth and reality—which is unknown to most Indian writers to-day who confuse both—is: Truth is your idea of reality. The reality itself can only be known as it is by becoming it. i.e. non-dual.

Knowing and being are different things. All those who talk of seeing God, contacting Reality etc. are only talking their idea of Him: for it is impossible to know a thing except through an idea of it. How can you know God when He is separate? To know all about Him the idea must go and must BE in Him. Hence Vedanta says the word “know” can’t be used, only the word “Being” can be used rightly. Hence I gave the definition of Truth in Europe as the Indian phrase “that agreement of idea with fact.” But my sentence



(continued from the previous page) includes theirs and is wider than theirs.

@@ Truth is the first thing which should be defined in any serious book and by every serious seeker. Without such prior enquiry, it is useless to describe experience, whatever kind it be. Even lunatics have experiences, men in delirium have experiences, mystics have experiences, scientists have experiences: we do not deny the fact that they do have them but we must not accept them at face value: we must however ask of them "Is this real? Is this true" Such questions demand definition first of the word used.

@@ Instead of going straight to the point of the matter, people are so fond of words that they spin out useless and meaningless sentences. Words reign supreme.

@@ People glibly use the word "True" without any awareness of the sense in which they do so.

@@ Truth must become exact, precise and verified in the mind. This it can do only through the aid of reason.

@@ Enquiry which goes to the root of the matter and penetrates words will discover that all concepts are mere thoughts, and hence cannot give you the truth.

@@ We imagine the meanings of words. A translator who has never known oxygen will be unable to translate its meaning, only give its sound, i.e. a word. Similarly with many religious and philosophic words we get only a sound and use our imaginations.

@@ Just as music cannot properly be appreciated unless one's taste and understanding is previously prepared and educated for it, so philosophic terms cannot be understood without prior training of the mind to make it fit to grasp them. Such fitness forms the Adhikari.

@@ I utter the word "philosophy", and I have one meaning. Gitananda (the prolix religious author) utters it and has quite another meaning; prof. Srinivasachar (the dualistic Vedantin)

---

<sup>75</sup> The original editor inserted "141" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) utters it and has quite a different meaning from us both. What then is philosophy? Words here do not fulfil the function of communication. Why? Because we do not enter into their meaning first.

@@ Just as the scientist approaches objects, so must approach words and study their nature and meaning. "Everything is name and form" says Chandogya Upanishad: What does it mean by name? The enquiry into this single term constitutes a profound philosophical activity which the Pundits always perform wrongly because they take the word superficially.

@@ The object of politician's and other public speeches is more often to arouse emotion rather than to point to truth. People admire them, saying "What a nice speech" merely because their feelings are pleased; they do not penetrate into the true meaning of its words.

@@ Semantic discussion of the meaning of words the sharpening of the brains, which are the tool of enquiry. This discussion may not lead to anything itself because it is later that we shall use the tool, but its preparation is necessary.

@@ Those who talk of "spiritual life" use words without meaning. Life is simply thinking, while 'spiritual' is as much thought as 'material' life. The yogi has the same life as others. Then again what is spirit? Only a word, a thought. You must be precise, exact and definite if you want to know truth. You must work your brains to see what do I really understand by this term which I use.

@@ We do not know what the word real means, that is the present scientific conclusion, for the word has been used with many different meanings.

@@ We do not halt even for a minute to understand what we mean by the words we use. Everyone uses "real" without knowing what he is talking about. Take the word "pain". To know what it is, we must contrast it with "pleasure." Without such contrast it is meaningless. Similarly

(continued from the previous page) there is no such thing as absolute. For we do not know what meaning it has. What is the characteristic of "reality?" The ordinary man takes what appears to his senses only as real. The scientists have reached no general agreement as to the definition of 'real'. Yet everyone calls himself a "realist."

@@ People do not know the distinction between truth and reality.

@@ It is characteristic of the human mind, it is youth or primitivity, to use words without accurate meaning.

@@ Even professors are often carried away by words when they write or speak. This sort of firing away mere words, sounds will not do for philosophy. We want every word to have a real defined meaning; we ask "what does this term denote?" We examine every term carefully.

@@ Philosophy is that which requires a knowledge of the Whole. Those who refer to the "positive philosophy of Comte use words wrongly. Positivists confine themselves only to what they can see outside; therefore their doctrine should be called a "view," or "opinion", –certainly not a philosophy. Similarly the 'realist' school talk of perceiving external reality only, but they have not enquired into the exact meaning of "perceive." They use the word without profound analysis of what they are talking about! Therefore their doctrines are superficial and of little value from standpoint of Truth.

@@ Philosophy in the West is slowly drifting to commonsense, because it is slowly understanding that it must get at the meaning of words, it must analyse them.

@@ Be satisfied with practical life, critics tell us who seek truth. Yet each man's idea of 'practical' differs according to his stand point. So even there we are left in the air.

@@ What is reality? If it is a word it must have a meaning. Every meaning is merely a thought. Then

---

<sup>76</sup> The original editor inserted "143" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) if it is a fugitive thought it cannot be true reality. Hence we say that Europeans do not understand what real is, have never perceived our non-dual position. Yet they constantly use the word not knowing what they are talking about.

@@ Vedanta wants you to start with clear and definite ideas: otherwise you merely flounder.

@@ We do not question that the practical world is real, as realists believe, but we say there is a higher reality still, and we ought to enquire into it.

@@ Europe has not defined truth, for it says that ultimate truth cannot be known. Without defining, they just fire away words. Hence its confused and contradictory outlook.

@@ The philosopher must be disliked by people because like Socrates, he keeps on troubling them with the request for definition. A favourite word now-a-days is “spiritual” but when he presses for its meaning, each person gives a different definition, thus showing that they are merely imagining as they wish.

@@ What do you mean by the word real? What are the tests and characteristics of “reality?” To reply that external world is real alone is to ignore that this is based on the feeling of its reality: but you have a similar feeling in dream. Hence it is useless to go by feeling. You must first find a definition that will hold. But people won’t define, they want to go by feeling alone.

@@ Definition of Reality: What we really are or what a thing really is, independent of man’s conception of it. Truth: man’s conception of reality: Consciousness: That which becomes aware of everything else in the world. Ego: Personality or individuality as distinguished from the rest of the world. Reason: That which resolves contradiction and unifies knowledge. Intellect: that faculty of the human mind which detects fallacies and errors of man’s reasoning in the

(continued from the previous page) waking state. Mind: The general sum of thoughts imaginations feelings etc.

@@ People say “I have studied Advaita for fifty years and got nothing out of it, no realization.” That is because they have imagined Advaita, they have studied their own ideas of it only. Like Pundits they have dealt in mere words.

@@ “Reality” is a word used in Vedanta with a different meaning from that given it by Europe. We regard it as permanent, That which does not change, whereas Europe regards it as the stuff of which the world is made. Their defect is that they have not studied Drg, Drsya Viveka, hence they have not arrived at our definition, and hence their confusion.

@@ We want that which cannot be contradicted by any man on earth. Vedanta has got this key—that it will do nothing before it has defined Truth. Thus it avoids deceiving itself into accepting what merely pleases us.

@@ The word “Real” has a meaning when it is based or distinguished from the word unreal. Therefore no adequate definition of the word reality can be found.

@@ You utter the word God and everyone is charmed. But each will have his own idea of God. People use this and other words without verifying its meaning.

@@ Many professors of philosophy are mere slaves of words, and pour them out freely in their writings, without critical or careful awareness of their meaning. Hence definition is needed to point out their futility.

@@ Almost all philosophical books and philosophers fail to define final essential Truth, and through this failure, their efforts invariably end in missing the right path, just as a mariner without compass or pole star has no guide. This failure is due in the West to the belief that final truth is unattainable, and in the East to satisfaction to truths less than the ultimate. When I tell the Western thinkers

---

<sup>77</sup> The original editor inserted “145” by hand.

(continued from the previous page) that Advaita can define Truth, they say we are insane and refuse to investigate. For example, Patrick gives various theories of truth in his book but dodges giving any definition of his own.

@@ That enquiry into word-meanings which lazy minds reject as hair-splitting in Vedanta, is not so but a most essential process of securing exactness and precision, i.e. correction in our thinking without which truth cannot be got.

@@ The word spiritual belongs only to religion; it has no meaning in the study of philosophy or truth: hence we do not use it.

@@ It is dangerous to fall into the clutches of such words which may carry various meanings. Always be precise, clear and exact when having to use such words so that the specific shade of meaning sought to be conveyed is really conveyed. Ultimately if we analyse them deep enough, we find that there is no meaning in all words; then we are in the realm of final truth, not of mere ideas, of oneness and not multiplicity. Then the philosopher remaining silent will speak for the benefit of others only.

@@ The word God is used by millions merely because others have used it. Otherwise it would not have arisen because it is without meaning. We must go into deep analysis to find why this word has come.

@@ The love of facts rather than words must come first: this is the virtue of science.

@@ The first thing sought by a philosopher is clarification. To philosophise is to seek clear notions as Plato held.

In a letter received from Europe recently (11th May 39) Swami Siddheswarananda, a most highly cultured graduate in philosophy of an Indian University, who has been endeavouring to spread in the West a knowledge of Indian thought, for some years past writes: "The European mind is constituted in a different way and our aim should be to understand sympathetically that mind. Only after two years I am able to

(continued from the previous page) understand that the words we use, taken from their language to convey our ideas, do not bring them the same implications that we give them." To illustrate what the learned swami says let me state here that the Sanskrit word Buddhi, for instance, has been translated into at least seventeen different words in English by various writers. How then is one ignorant of Sanskrit culture to know what Buddhi exactly signifies? Similarly what are we in India to understand by the European and American word "Philosophy?" That is the question before us now.

@@ We cannot properly understand a man's words unless we know not only what he means but also what he does not mean. (called in logic, the contrary and the contradictory). Similarly we cannot understand Brahman unless you first know what it is not. If everything is black, and there were no other colours to distinguish it how could you know it existed? Similarly if everything is Brahman how can you know it unless you discover its contraries and contradictories by analysis? No intuition can ever do what only analysis of meaning can do. Every word and every thought must be examined.

@@ The meanings of words change with man's advancement in knowledge. The words "philosophy" and "religion" have developed different connotations since Plato's time. To the ancient Hindus an eclipse of the sun was supposed to be caused by the dragon swallowing the sun. To-day we know there is no dragon and therefore the terms Rahu and Ketu have come to assume another significance. Small-pox in old days was looked on as a manifestation of evil spirits, but today it is regarded in another way. Yet we go on using the same words although they now mean something else.

@@ Semantic confusion is not only existent in religion ('God' means different things to different men) and philosophy ('truth' is similar) but

---

<sup>78</sup> The original editor inserted "147" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) everywhere. Thus 'vegetarian' in England means eating egg and even fish but not in India.

@@ If a word like "spirit" carries no meaning to you, then what is the use of using it? It is just like a madman who uses words in the same meaningless senseless way. Therefore those who use religio-spiritual terminology freely are suffering from insanity.

@@ Prof. Syed has written an article full of the usual confusions of thought in mystic's mind. He says, "this world is true". Had he written 'real' instead of true he would have been correct: as it is, the sentence is meaningless. Many people confuse the real with the true, but they are definitely different.

@@ Mystic should not write "men in all ages have experienced this illumination." Who can ever know what is in another man's mind even to-day; how then know what was in their minds thousands of years ago? We must be precise: so they should write, "It is said that men in all ages, etc." Always add the prefix "It is said" when dealing with mysticism or religion.

@@ The failure to determine the nature of truth and the consequent confusion of thought and word, is responsible for the Hindu-Muslim and all other religious differences and conflicts. If all sectarians had taken the trouble to define truth, they could not have adopted the attitude, "What I know or feel is truth."

@@ If you want to be really truthful and precise in your writings you should deal with dubious statements as follows: In this sense the —X— is not known." Similarly the phrases "No one ever did this" or "No such height of vision will ever be reached" are imprecise and careless use of words: for who can have looked into the minds of every person who has lived in the past? Hence these statements are mere unscientific imaginations. We have to watch not to get lost in our words, for human mind is fond of



(continued from the previous page) imagining, and we must query all imaginations with the question "Is that really true?"

@@ A meaning is what you have in your mind. How can any man compare what is in his mind with what is in yours, although you both use the same word "God." Had God been an external object we could have compared both, but we cannot see into each other's minds.

@@ God has got different meanings, whereas truth has the same meaning for all. The less contradiction, the greater the truth. Truth has no personality, will or attribute. It cannot be regarded as responsible for the creation of the world, pestilences, earthquakes, etc.

@@ Sankara's position is first of all to define Truth. Then he shows what leads to attainment of truth. Every man says 'I' know. But we ask him "Without defining Truth first, how can you be certain that what you know is true? This demands enquiry into meaning of truth.

@@ Ask anyone to define truth and you will be able to find contradictions in his definition, when it is closely examined. Different people have different meanings or conceptions of the word.

@@ Vedanta begins its study by defining Truth, so that it shall have a compass, direction in which to move.

@@ If the West would begin by defining the terms Real and Ideal they might solve their problems of antagonism between both. But they assume that every one know the meanings.

@@ I admire Ramakrishna because he taught "Do not be a fool" What is meant by a fool? Dictionary says "being subject to illusions." How could the devotee who bought the leaky pan for Sri Ramakrishna have avoided being a fool? By examining the pan. Hence in the same way we must examine the world and go deeper than appearances, and thus we may avoid being a fool. By such examination we discover that everything

---

<sup>79</sup> The original editor inserted "149" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) is Brahman, the differences being ideas, illusions, ignorance, hence foolishness. Such differences as “he is my enemy”, “she is a woman” etc. are ideas only.

@@ Meaning is an idea. Therefore it exists in mind. Until you look into a man’s mind how can you prove that what you mean by a word is what the other man means? How do you know that his meaning is the same as yours? For practical purposes of every-day life we do not trouble about these things, but for knowing the truth of things we have to enquire into their meanings. For practical purposes we all know what a table is, but for enquiry it seems different because it is observed differently in mind-images resulting.

@@ We must enquire into the meaning of every word you use, make sure you understand it. But people say “I know what matter is. Can’t I see the wall? You have nothing to teach as to what matter is. So they do not enquire and remain ignorant. Every word has one meaning to me and another to another man. Hence writing is not so satisfactory as personal conversation with a seeker. Then meanings and objections can be clarified.

@@ Everyone wants Truth. What is that truth? We define it. We must begin by examining the meaning of terms you use and defining to yourself such terms as real, exist, etc. You may say “The chair exists” What do you mean by ‘exists’? Even Joad could not define reality when I asked him. If people in Europe had been able to define reality there would not have been this quarrel between idealists and realists.

@@ What is Truth? Ninety-nine percent of the people do not understand what the meaning of truth is, despite they use the word every day. They have never stopped to define it.

@@ Students of religion, and metaphysics and

(continued from the previous page) mysticism usually learn by words, not truth, because they do not define their words and terms.

@@ There are many theories of truth but no answer to "What is truth?" is given. For if truth is defined in any way every definition can be overthrown. All definitions have a weakness. It is impossible to accept any current definition. For instance, Patrick defines it as "correspondence theory, i.e. that your idea or judgment corresponds with the fact. But how do you know that your idea is an exact copy of the fact? You have only an impression in your mind. How can you be sure that every item of your expression is exactly like the original? No. It can't be done.

@@ The Pundits give you only one word for another, and imagine they have explained things.

@@ In a Court of Law all these correspondence and coherence theories have to be adopted or they cannot get on. But for philosopher's truth that is another matter.

@@ The Guru must teach by demanding the meanings of every term used. He must be insuppressible asker of questions in order to make everything thoroughly clear. Just give an answer to the questions asked, no more, says Sage;

@@ Many professors of philosophy are mere slaves of words, and pour them out freely in their writings without critical or careful awareness of their meaning. Hence definition is needed to point out their futility.

@@ How do I know that my faith is based on Truth? This can be answered only by first defining Truth, and then showing whether by this measure my belief is correct or incorrect.

@@ To get at the meaning of anything you have to imagine, because word= idea, and idea= imagination.

@@ A critical examination of concepts is required. As soon as a man utters the word "God" we should ask what he means and let him make

---

<sup>80</sup> The original editor inserted "151" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) the word clear. Without understanding the words we are using, of what use or value is our knowledge? When we enquire we shall find how difficult it is to define exactly words which are commonly and superficially used in knowledge, such as "space" "law" "cause", "truth" etc. Brihad Upanishad even says it is impossible to define space; whilst Mandukya says we do not know what a cause really is. Nay, we have to go deeper in philosophy and ascertain the meaning of meaning.

@@ Certainty: Unless you are certain in your meaning, you cannot understand philosophy.

Exactness: Unless you are exact in your use of words you cannot understand philosophy.

@@ To understand a word is to have an idea, an idea is only a Drsyam: therefore all scriptures are only ideas and can never give any idea of the Drik. Even Mandukya does not give any idea of the Drik; it only negates by saying "It is not this, it is not that" etc. It only shows the contradictions of human thought and leads you to give up all systems and standpoints.

@@ The method of Vedanta is to negate by enquiry.

@@ Europe has only just begun discussing the meaning of meaning, of "what is a meaning?" It is a conception. What is a conception? Is it a mental act or something else?

@@ You will find one opinion implies the antithesis and conflict of words by opposites and contrasts. Self suggests non-self. White suggests black and so on.

@@ You are able to point out a particular wooden object, never to wood itself. You can see only an individual form, never Man, Wood, Man etc. are universal ideas.

@@ "Materialism and Spiritualism are opposite poles of the same absurdity that we know, anything either of matter or spirit." – Introduction to Science by Thomson.

CHAPTER 8  
THE NEED OF SEMANTICS

@@ It is of the utmost importance to define important terms at the beginning of writing all lectures, otherwise there will be confusion in the minds of different readers and hearers, who will variously possess differing notion of terms you commonly use, such as mind, self, consciousness, ego, you etc.

@@ Is the term “Mind” or “Consciousness” or “awareness” a word? Yes. Has a word a meaning? Yes. What is a meaning? Something which you imagine. Then how do you know whether your imagined meaning is correct? You refer to your own experience to see whether it corresponds. But this means that you are referring to your thoughts only.

@@ How do you know that the One is in the Many? or that “We shall be perfect?” or that “Every individual is an emanation from the divine?” What is meant by the word ‘divine’ or how are we to be merged in the divine? These are questions we ought to ask those who make such dogmatic mystical statements, for they take us to the higher region of philosophy. Otherwise they merely give satisfaction.

@@ When any man uses the word truth, simply ask “How do you know?” If he replies honestly, you can show semantically that he is merely blabbing.

@@ Every man uses the word God, Truth etc. but nobody understands it.

@@ People use the word “spirit”; but what is “spirit”? They will reply very learnedly and very lengthily, but their replies are merely their own imagination. They have not known “spirit.”

@@ How are we to know that all men experience in the same way? This is the problem which is raised by modern criticism and especially by Semantics and by Einstein, who show by proof that the same word may mean different things to different persons, i.e. men have different

---

<sup>81</sup> The original editor inserted “153” by hand.

(continued from the previous page) ideas of the same thing.

@@ There is no such thing as “spiritual.” It is a vague term.

@@ When an idea comes to you or an event happens then you can say it is. This can occur only when your mind distinguishes the idea from its previous non-existence. Therefore whenever you have an idea of the existence of a thing, you must also have the idea of its non-existence. Hence he who talks of attaining Ananda, talks of attaining an idea, an object. You cannot think of bliss without the mind differentiating it from its opposite – misery. Hence there is no change of idea when you know anything. Just the same, black would have no meaning without white. You have to rise above all ideas, hence also above the idea of attaining Ananda-bliss, above all objects to reach the subject Atman.

@@ What is more, to understand a passage you must know to whom the words are addressed. If I say “He is my nephew,” nephew may mean my sister’s son or brother’s son or even my wife’s sister’s or brother’s son. It depends upon the context to whom I refer by the word nephew. So the context, i.e. with reference to what enquiry and to whom the swami spoke has to be known, to get his meaning fully.

@@ My answers to questions may seem evasive but they are not really, for what I try to do is to get both sides to be clear about the particular sense in which certain words are used. Otherwise we may be at cross-roads.

@@ When you deal with “Truth” or Vedanta, pray do not use words the meaning of which you do not define first yourself.

@@ What is meant by using the word “satisfactorily”? A result which is satisfactory to one man may not be so to another. Hence it is most ambiguous.

CHAPTER 8  
THE NEED OF SEMANTICS

@@ All these differences are chiefly due to our using the same words in different senses, each of us attaching his own meaning to them. I have no right to question, I have never questioned and shall never question another's right to interpret such words as yoga, Advaita, Vedanta, God, Atman and so forth as he likes. Till we understand each other it is impossible to hope for any kind of agreement.

@@ The words "universally valid" are meaningless. For a notion to be truly universally held you would have to see and consult every man in the universe. But this is never done. Again, what is "valid?" One man's so-called validity is not acceptable to another.

@@ Where is the book that defines truth, reason, valid and similar terms which all use and few comprehend. How useless then are all these writings and discussions about other things if this is not done beforehand?

@@ What is meant by "wisdom?" Without defining it those who use it in the definition of philosophy as "the love of wisdom" are merely blabbing. For what a man likes he will call wisdom.

@@ We spend much time in philosophy to show that we know not anything about most of the things we fancy we know. We devote it to curing students of their vanity in presuming that they understand anything. It is not a waste of time to do so much eliminating work. It is absolutely necessary.

@@ We cannot look into any author's or any man's mind, be it Sankara's or anyone else. Complete communication is therefore impossible. We only read their books in order to have our minds directed to the facts so that we can see them and reason on them for ourselves, to get at truth, not in order to see into Sankara's mind.

@@ The need of simplicity in describing facts or experience is most important, otherwise we get carried away by grand words like "divine" or "spiritual"; also Occam's razor must be applied unnecessary multiplication of words.

---

<sup>82</sup> The original editor inserted "155" by hand.

@@ Words are changing their meaning. The term “rationalism” was used in the seventeenth century by writers like Christian Wolff to justify God’s existence by reason, whereas in the twentieth century it is used to deny God’s existence by reason. Hence we have to be on our guard against fighting for words rather than for things.

@@ There are two classes of ignorant men. Those who admire words, and those who admire body.

@@ Suppose you are travelling in a ship and it is dark. You do not know in which direction the vessel is going. What will you do? You have to know the direction, then only you can steer the ship to your destination. For knowing the direction you have to use a compass. The definition of Truth is this compass, in your philosophical inquiry as well as in scientific investigation. If we do not know where we are going with our discussions and investigations, it will lead us nowhere. We have to steer along the line which will lead us to truth.

@@ Whitehead in “Modes of Thought” writes “The philosophic attempt takes every word and every phrase in the verbal expression of thought and asks, What does it mean? The philosophic attitude is a resolute attempt to enlarge the understanding of the scope of application of every notion which enters into our current thought. The philosopher is always assaulting the boundaries of finitude.”

@@ Go into the meaning of words. Words do captivate the world. No discipline will be of any avail without such penetration. Go on thinking, is the motto of Vedanta.

@@ A meaning is only an imagination. The words spirit and spirituality are only imaginations. i.e. constructions of the mind, to put it pompously.

@@ People write the term ‘infinity.’ But what does it mean? Can they define it? For the mind can form no idea of it.



@@ The word “objective” has given rise to much misleading notions. It is ambiguous, unclear.

@@ Those who want ‘stillness’ of spirit cannot get it without its complementary ‘activity’ ‘activity’ or ‘peace’ without ‘agitation.’ The two must go together, otherwise both terms have no meaning. If those mystics who use it would only enquire deeply into the word, it would re-educate their mind. The peace they seek is unattainable. Real peace, real satisfaction can come only when you rise above these dualities and know Brahman

@@ We welcome the new semantic movement as a first step and a very good step towards truth.

@@ If you use the word “absolute” as Hegel did, you unconsciously co-relate it with ‘relative’. Hegel’s absolute is therefore not ours, but few grasp this even in India. The word has no meaning in that, cannot reach it.

@@ The mistake made by Madva in his criticism of Advaita illusion-theory lies in the ambiguous use of words and in the wrong meaning he gives to “reality” and to “existence.”

@@ The work of the Western semanticists is necessary for those who want truth but it has only begun. They have to go much deeper yet.

@@ We must examine if words correspond to our experience inside; otherwise it will be mere imagining.

@@ The term ‘formless’ is derived from the term ‘form.’ Both are inevitable dualities because both are ideas. Hence it is not adequate to describe Brahman.

@@ Brahman is everywhere. How can we be in Brahman?

@@ Voluminous speakers usually have little knowledge because they are pre-occupied with words, i.e. thoughts, i.e. drsyam, which never touches the Drik.

@@ Meaning means getting at truth. That is why so many people do not want to be bothered with

---

<sup>83</sup> The original editor inserted “157” by hand.

(continued from the previous page) semantics. It makes them tired.

@@ You may say a certain concept is valid but what is meant by the term? It occurs in every book on logic but it requires definition. What is valid to me may not be valid to me may not be valid to someone else.

@@ Without knowing in which direction you are going, whether north or east, but being only carried away by our likes and dislikes, you cannot find truth. Hence the need of Semantics.

@@ The word knowledge in India is applicable both to false and true knowledge whereas in Europe it is confined only to true knowledge. Therefore be careful in reading works by Indian writers or both will be misled.

@@ Modern philosophic criticism shows that words are misfortunes, because we do not know their meanings.

@@ Any meaning that you give to a word is only an idea, your idea, a thought. Why do you seek for meaning? It is because something urges you to it. For answering the question of meaning is finding the truth.

@@ The word "knowledge" is used in a double sense and this ambiguity leads to confusion or controversy. It is used first to indicate all things which come into consciousness, and second to mark the knowledge of what is true. The first is unproved opinion which is endless and egoistic and often erroneous and has nothing to do with truth. Opinion is not knowledge and yet the same word covers both: Indian philosophy points out that even false knowledge, opinion may be something known, as in the case of a rope which was actually known at the time, perceived, as a snake. Hence the Brihad Upanisad's sharp criticism that every man says 'I know' and he may be false, erroneous. Therefore words, opinions, cannot satisfy the earnest truth-seeker who takes

CHAPTER 8  
THE NEED OF SEMANTICS

(continued from the previous page) the time and has the capacity to penetrate their meaning. Most people think they understand the terms they use but they really do not.

@@ There are so many different kinds of 'truth' that it is no wonder writers are unable to define it. The Catholic has a different kind of truth from the protestant, yet both believe they are pursuing the same thing.

@@ What is meant by "best" in human nature? Different views of 'best' exist. How define it then?

@@ When it is said that "new truths supersede the old truths" the word "truth" is misused.

@@ I have just looked through a newly published book "Religion and Science" by Sir. R. Gregory. Like almost all older and newer books, it frequently uses the word "truth" but never once gives any definition of it. It should not be judged by philosophic standards because it is on a lower level. It is a most learned and lengthy book but of what use is it if it does not seek to get at truth? I am an old man and may die soon. I cannot carry this book in my memory. It does not help me one bit to know what I am here for, to know truth before I die. It is man's great conceit to write of truth taking it for granted that he knows its meaning.

@@ What is meant by "sacred?" It is a word which has no fixed meaning for all. What is sacred to me is not to another.

@@ What is meant by 'holy?' A few hundred years ago it was considered holy in Bengal to offer human sacrifices to Goddess Kali! Others consider it holy to protect human life and indeed all life, like Jains.

@@ The Nazis say their policy is helping human evolution but the Democracies say it is hindering it. Both say they are 'right.' The problem hinges on the definition of this word 'right,' a definition which neither side takes the trouble to find out. Where is this controversy as

---

<sup>84</sup> The original editor inserted "159" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) to what is the best social policy to end? It is endless so long as it avoids the semantic problem.

@@ People use this word “truth” in the loosest and vaguest manner. So many authors write it but each has his own imagination as to what constitutes truth. Hence so many books are unsatisfactory because they fail to define ‘truth’ and thus render it impossible to know what they are talking about. They do not use the word correctly, hence do not know how to lead their readers to the truth of the subject dealt with.

@@ Action cannot be understood unless one goes to the root of its meaning and then one sees that it is inseparably coupled with inaction, and that both are merely ideas, concepts. Therefore those who say Brahman is static, still, are wrong: this is merely their imagination about it; others who say Brahman is incessantly active are equally wrong. Brahman is beyond both these ideas.

@@ What is meant by ‘thing’?

@@ The word real must have a meaning. If it has a meaning then it is an idea and hence only applicable to objects, drsyam, which are unreal and has nothing to do with the subject.

@@ It is necessary to define the word “experience” when you use it because it has become quite ambiguous. It has three totally different meanings: (a) the things of which we are aware, (b) the mind which is aware of them, (c) the relation between the two, or idea. By forcing an analysis of this word, those who use it without responsibility may be led up to the Drg Drsya Viveka position.

@@ The weakness of all writings on philosophy is their failure to define the word truth, secondarily to define reality.

@@ The word soul is dangerous because it brings all sorts of imaginations into people’s heads: it is preferable to drop it and use the word mind.

CHAPTER 8  
THE NEED OF SEMANTICS

@@ Whenever an argument arises, ask your opponent whether he is seeking the truth of the Matter. If he says Yes, then ask him what he means by truth. He will be unable to do so satisfactorily, for you can criticise every definition.

@@ "Aesthetic judgment" is a meaningless phrase. The picture of Kali, with projecting eyes and teeth, grotesque large face and outstretched tongue, is regarded as beautiful by many of her Indian devotees but you will regard it as ugly. Hence the word 'judgment' in art really means personal taste. There is no judgment at all.

@@ The word "cognition" when applied to reality implies duality, a second thing that is cognised. It is wrongly used for Brahman.

@@ The word "substance" is something which we imagine, whether it be Descartes' "spiritual substance" or Spinoza's "God substance."

@@ Lecturers and writers often use mystic words like "spirit" often because they want to give the impression "I am a great man."

@@ The philosophic statement that we cannot look into the mind of another man is not to be confused with the practical statement of the same thing. Thought-reading as done in psychological experiment undoubtedly occurs, but this is on the lower plane. Philosophically we mean that it is impossible to understand perfectly what precise meaning Plato had in his mind when he used such words as "real", "truth" etc. or what a man is imagining when he says something.

@@ There are so many contradictory and conflicting schools of idealism, with and without God, that if you use the word "Idealism" each man will wrongly interpret it according to his school. Hence it is better to avoid the word, but if it must be used then the precise sense in which it is used ought to be defined. I

---

<sup>85</sup> The original editor inserted "161" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) strongly advise you to drop the word "Idealism" from published writing.

@@ It will take a long time before writers on philosophy will realize the extreme importance of precision in the use of words and of the dangers of using metaphors, and the need of tying words to assigned meanings.

@@ Philosophy cannot tolerate the use of an important word like life in the common sense of activity when what is meant is mind.

@@ Do not use the word "inspiring" for I must then ask you to whom is it inspiring? What is inspiring to one is repellent to another.

@@ To speak of a "source" of knowledge is to imply a cause of knowledge but cause is what you find in the outer world. Therefore "source" is a word to enquire into before we use it.

@@ We cannot get on without using words everyday but we should use them warily, looking to their inside, not outside, using them as counters not as coins.

@ We have to go the things themselves; not to words. You may use any word you like provided you define what you mean.

@@ What is real? This is a most important point. Everyone uses this word but in different interpretations. Doubt must come first, "How do I know that what I experience as real is so?" Then we shall enquire and be in the way of knowledge.

@@ The word "highest" is another ambiguous term. One man's highest is not another. And how can you measure "perfection?" Is it found anywhere?

@@ To objection that we can't define truth or reality in advance, we say then take any theoretical definition that appeals and try to work it out and see what the results are, always knowing that it is purely tentative! Thus you can check the worth of this definition.

@@ The words “validity” and “actuality” become worthless when their criterions are not defined definitely, as usually occurs.

@@ Europe is not only unable to ascertain truth but also to define it. The whole crux of philosophy hinges on the latter point, nevertheless. Yet despite their inability they will not have the patience or courtesy to listen to Indian voices which declare, since the Rishies days, that truth is attainable.

@@ If God has got a meaning as distinguished from wall from me, etc. then God cannot be everything, then Pantheism cannot be correct term. This is our criticism of Pantheism.

@@ The Greek word nous and the Indian word buddhi both mean the same, i.e. “reason”. Yet curiously they have undergone the same historical phases, being interpreted as ‘intuition’ by many mystics like Plato and as “reason” by the few philosophers.

@@ Those who say that there is an unknown power contradict themselves. For merely to assert that it is unknown is to make a positive statement about is and therefore to admit unconsciously something is known about it. Their mistake is to use the word is and thus dogmatise on its existence as being known.

@@ What is the meaning of “eternal verity.”? It is firing away words. For verity means truth and each sectarian has his own imagination about truth which conflicts with others. Hence it is really temporary: it is eternal only in his be life, i.e. in his imagination. How are we to distinguish, to know what is true? We have to enquire,—there is no other way.

@@ People often confuse Monism, belief that ultimate principle of universe is one, with Monotheism, belief in a Supernatural God, dictator.

@@ Do not get carried away by the brilliance of an orator, for quite often habitual orators have had time to think.

---

<sup>86</sup> The original editor inserted “163” by hand.

@@ The term Absolute may mean that which includes all things as a totality or it may mean that which has nothing in it. Hence it is an ambiguous word demanding care in its use.

@@ I agree with you that the use of technical metaphysical language is not essential and is partly responsible for the metaphysician's losing themselves in a forest of words, as Sankara says. Vedanta can be explained in simple terms; there is only one word students really have to learn the meaning of: that is the word truth.

@@ Brahman is neither Sat nor Asat, real nor unreal. We cannot postulate either description of it. For any word that you utter will immediately suggest its co-relative. Suppose you mention light. That will bring with it the idea of darkness. Or if you mention the existence of the soul, that will relate non-existence of soul. Hence words are of no use to describe Brahman, even such philosophic words as the Real.

@@ What is energy? What is it that causes dissolution? What is behind Atomic motion? What causes trees to grow? It is Mind. Mind is the active agent, the mover. You use the word move: the word is in motion. But what is it that makes it move? This is a semantic analysis of vital importance. What do you do when you try to understand this word (or any other)? This point is being discussed in modern scientific philosophy. But it was discussed and solved by Brihad Upanisad. Similarly with the word change. What is meant when you say a thing has changed? Let us get to the root of the matter. The answer is that you cannot have a meaning for a word unless you have it in your own experience. The ideas of change and motion must originally come to you within yourself, otherwise it is meaningless. Hence we say, philosophers must learn "the meaning of meaning." This is the Indian term "within your



(continued from the previous page) anubhava (experience).” This science will tell you the world works in such and such a way, but science can only get a meaning for you by looking into yourself. Hence “That Thou Art.” You see the world in yourself. Everything that you see in this world, is in yourself.

@@ Those like Sri Aurobindo, who talk of “transcendental” consciousness are using words merely. It is just consciousness pure and simple; the introduction of transcendental is not necessary.

@@ You may know that all books may be thrown in the dust bin, because they are all ideas, but this does not mean they are useless. They can be used like one thorn picking out a second one that is embedded in the flesh. So words, as expressive of ideas, although useless for knowing Brahman, are useful for removing ignorance and error which bar the way to such knowledge.

@@ The word pleasure can only be understood in your mind if you contrast it with the word pain. Hence the mention in Indian philosophy of “the pairs of opposites,” which constitute the world. The need of rising above them means the need of non-duality, where no opposite can exist. When you think of non-duality, you think of nothing.

@@ The word absolute is nonsensical and Brahman should never be translated by it. Yet the academic philosophers make this mistake. Ultimately there is only Mind. If you think of the Absolute then you are thinking of yourself as one and the absolute as another i.e. of duality. Hence absolute of philosophy is not the non-dual Brahman.

@@ Has the word Brahman any meaning? If so, then it is an idea which you form. What is an idea? only a Drsyam. But drsyams come and go, appear and vanish. So you do not get reality.

@@ To negate anything is unconsciously to affirm its opposite as existent. For affirmation and negation are an inseparable duality.

@@ The word thing has two meanings. I see a mirage.

---

<sup>87</sup> The original editor inserted “165” by hand.

(continued from the previous page) No water is really there. Yet I use the word thing equally for that illusion as for real water. Here the super-imposition is really nothing, i.e. nothing real. Semantic analysis is therefore needed.

@@ The fundamental principle of human thinking is that no word can give a meaning unless its opposite is by its side. Misery is to be marked off from happiness, etc. This principle that all meanings run in dualities has a most important application in Vedanta, for when applied to the notion of cause and effect, it destroys the illusion of causality.

@@ There is no book in Sanskrit on Semantics, India has applied Semantics to the notion of Reality, whereas Western semantics have applied the principle much farther and wider but to less serious notions.

@@ The term knowledge is usually used by Western philosophers as meaning something known to be true, whereas Indian philosophers use it differently. To the latter, all knowledge is not true, some are illusory. Hence guard against this confusion of meanings when reading translations of Indian Texts.

@@ Unless a writer has a training in Semantics, it will be difficult to write clearly on philosophy.

@@ You cannot be conscious of light without also being conscious of darkness and vice versa. One cannot exist without the other. Similarly he who knows implies that he possesses ignorance too. Therefore Brahman is beyond both: it is neither light nor darkness. This you can ascertain only by going deeply into the meaning of words, i.e. semantics.

@@ Those who talk of “the experience of Brahman talk nonsense. They need Semantic training. For you cannot have experience without a subject-object relation, i.e. duality, which is not Brahman.

@@ Has anyone ever seen another get heaven or else moksha after death? No. Therefore it is a meaningless statement, mere babble.

@@ The word valid is too nebulous, says Bradley rightly: what may be valid for me may not be valid for you. Therefore it should not be used in philosophy, but 'true' is clear and precise hence superior to 'valid.'

@@ Language misleads us when we say that things are seen outside us.

@@ Every student should possess the books "The Meaning of Meaning." and "The Tyranny of Words."

@@ The word fact means what is true. There may be misrepresentation of a fact, but to call it false is inconsistent.

@@ I may be in a library and ask "I want the book Mandukya" The attendant brings Taitireya and says "I call this Mandukya," and he insists on doing so. This is equivalent to the position of many philosophical difficulties arising out of the failure to define terms previously.

@@ We say to Science: "You have explained the world, but what is meant by explanation? This must be gone into. It is a mental process. It must be psychologically analysed. What is it that happens in you when you have "explained" anything?

@@ What is meant by meaning? It is a thought. Hence meaning is only a drsyam. This in turn implies a knower of it. Hence there are two. Hence it is not advaita. This is what I call "the meaning of meaning" which must be got at.

@@ How do you understand any word? Examine working of your mind. You call up the thought of its co-ordinate, its opposite, and distinguish from it. The word "contentment" is understood by thinking of discontentment.

@@ The 'meaning of meaning' is that you get only a thought. What value is that? It is rubbish. Meinong in Europe, is coming to see this and

---

<sup>88</sup> The original editor inserted "167" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) therefore his work is of great value.

@@ The Ramanujists use important words like jiva, bakti, gnan, in a different sense from the Advaitins. To them Gnan is knowing God, but to us it is “not-knowing God.” Such is the tyranny of words.

@@ If you examine the mind of even a magistrate who delivers judgment on overwhelming evidence and enquire into what it is doing, you find he is only imaginatively constructing the crime, i.e. he is imagining the whole thing. He is unable to know its truth.

@@ Science does not delve deeply enough into its terms. It seeks facts but what is meant by a fact? It seeks them as they are, but what is meant by exist? These questions are analysed with fineness and rigorousness only by philosophy; hence insufficiency of science for ultimate truth. The hands of hot/cold water experiment offers two contradictory “facts” of experience about the same water. So further reflection is needed.

@@ The word real is often confused with the word concrete, leading to the wrong conclusion that the abstract is unreal.

@@ You must make the meaning of words exact or misunderstanding will occur for Advaita is so subtle.

@@ If you say there is matter only, that is Monism. If you say there is mind only, that too is Monism. Hence it is in-advisable to use this word ‘monism’ in connection with our teaching.

@@ Truth means the knowledge of things as they really are.

@@ The meaning of a word cannot be understood, unless it is distinguished from other things. When you say “good” it can be understood only when it is distinguished from “bad”. To understand

(continued from the previous page) white it should be distinguished from black, and so on. Even to say that everything is God there should be another who is distinguished from God.

@@ If a thing exists, it must be expressible in words.

@@ Reality means permanent and unchanging. Existence has two meanings: 1. permanent existence, 2. existence for a moment.

@@ Even the word Drik has a meaning and therefore yields only an idea. A thought is only an object, not subject. Hence it is not the true Drik, which is indescribable. But we have to use it for instructional purposes.

@@ What is the mind doing when it is thinking? (We do not mean when it is thinking of this or that object, that is elementary, but of the very root of thought). It is dealing in dualities. Hence as soon as it forms a word, i.e. a meaning it falls into duality. For every word brings a correlative one, idea of light brings idea of darkness, idea of existence brings idea of non-existence. It is impossible to think without bringing up such duality, antinomies. Hence futility of metaphysical arguments.

@@ Every man super-imposes his own experience on others and imagines that their experience is like his: this is the fundamental fallacy of humanity everywhere. Thus you have never super-imposed another man's pain. You can know the meaning of pain only by looking into your own self-experience. Hence your pain is personal experience but your definition of the other men's pain is pure imagination. Hence your interpretation of a man's description of his pain is not in correspondence with it but only your imagination of it. That is why Vedanta ascribes such importance to the question: What is meant by a meaning? Such a query goes to the bottom of matters. For the answer to it is that we are imagining the whole world, including your own

---

<sup>89</sup> The original editor inserted "169" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) self, it is all nothing but our idea; and it all has nothing to do with the Seer of it, Drik.

@@ Whatever is imagined is not truth: to express it in words is to lie! Yet all verbal expressions of what is not inside our experience, are imagined.

@@ The word intellect is dangerous to use, as it has different meaning in India to Europe, whilst even there it has various ambiguous meanings and psychological associations. So be careful.

@@ Each man has got his own idea of the meaning of a word. Different associations arise in their minds in each individual with the word "night" for instance.

@@ The ultimate value of Semantics is to show the futility of all words in quest of truth; thus causing you to go beyond words into silence where alone Brahman can be got.

@@ The Madhvas have a different kind of Brahman from the Ramanujists, and the Vedantin's Brahman is different from both. Hence it is dangerous to use the term Brahman.

@@ Never utter a word without a meaning.

@@ What is my mind doing when it wants to get a meaning? This must be enquired into.

@@ How do you get a meaning for words? What is meant by understanding a word? Each time you get only an idea. To use the words truth, reality, Brahman, is merely to form an idea of them, i.e. a drsyam, an object. Sages use such words only to help others rise from lower to higher steps, not to explain them. Each dual statement is used to demolish another, to point out the absurdity of another, as one thorn is used to pull out another, so the guru has to use those incorrect statements of truth to help student rise to the final statement, which being non-dual must be unspoken. Hence discussion and learning about truth are not useless

(continued from the previous page) although they cannot yield finality, because they are all riddled with duality, with objectiveness (drsyam), i.e. contradiction. The best explanation is silence. So long as talk proceeds the words are helpful but still they are in duality, but in the highest stage all these words yield only subjective ideas whereas truth is not an object. To understand an idea means having a duality, i.e. a knower and a known, the driik and a drsyam. To rise to a higher level, Brahman, there is no question of understanding for there is no duality there. So long as we speak or write we can never leave duality; hence the only genuine expression of Truth is perfect silence. He who utters the word Brahman does not understand it, for in that moment he assigns a meaning to it, i.e. an idea, imagination.

@@ Contradiction is the characteristic of every definition of Brahman. All definitions will merely be imaginations. Those whose imaginations differ, quarrel with each other. Human thinking is contradictory. Hence Gnan comes when in the end we give up thinking.

@@ You are not entitled to use the word “we” regarding human mental operations but only as regards physical activities. For what others do can be seen but what their minds do, cannot be seen. You may therefore only speak for yourself. Otherwise you merely imagine.

@@ No commentator can look into the mind of a living man who is before him, how much less can he do so in the case of an author who died long ago. So what all commentators really do when they “explain” the meaning of a text is merely to imagine one. Let us not deceive ourselves.

@@ Meaning implies distinguishing one thing or thought from another, hence it implies duality. This is how the mind seeks for a meaning.

@@ There is a most valuable point in European philosophy lately. They are studying the “meaning

---

<sup>90</sup> The original editor inserted “171” by hand.

(continued from the previous page) of meaning". For all meaning without exception means a duality, hence there can be no approach to truth!

@@ The words "verify" and "validity" are two of the most difficult in philosophy. Every man may use them but none knows what he is doing. For they imply the whole problem of "What is truth?" What is valid for one man is discarded by another. Emotion is verification to A but not to B. The Rationalist association set up experience as the test of verification but they forget that although their experience excludes God the "experience" of religionists includes it.

@@ Touching, seeing, etc. have been found to be insufficient tests and proofs of the known. What is meant by "seeing" for instance. When walking in the street there may be thousands of things which you pass unnoticed, although your eyes are open, because your mind is elsewhere. Hence merely to open eyes is not necessarily to see. We really see with mind. Again you "see" a rope as a snake. The mind has concocted the snake and projected it. You see only your own idea. Hence Vedanta says the external world is like a dream, i.e. it is a construction of the Mind.

@@ What is the meaning of the phrase "divinely good?" It is meaningless.

@@ The word spiritual is quite without meaning. Whatever definition you give, it will be something imagined. For anything that is beyond sense-perception must be grasped only by imagination. "Spirit" can have no other meaning than that which is properly assigned to "mind" c.f. dictionary: "The intelligent immaterial part of man." c.f. Gita,13, "There are only Intelligence and Matter. (the known).

@@ Intelligible is a dubious word. The word may be intelligible to a lunatic in his own mad way.



## CHAPTER 9. RELATIVELY AND THE TWO STANDPOINTS.

@@ Just as we have demolished the notions that time and space are real in themselves, so in order to arrive at Truth from the highest standpoint, it is necessary to demolish the notion of causation and to show that this simply does not exist and that all so called pseudo-effects are already and pre-existently contained in and a part of the pseudo-cause. However, this represents an extremely difficult and most advanced stage of our enquiry and must be deferred until the earlier stages have been surmounted.

@@ Einstein showed that a man on the moon would have a different time from the man on the earth. Hence he said that every man has his own individual idea of time; i.e. relativity. He also showed thus that time and space are inseparable. Time space and causation are ideas, which again are collapsed ultimately in the Brahman.

@@ The relativity of time is proof that it is a creation characteristic of the human mind.

@@ How do you know, how prove that any particular ancient text was written by the reputed author however famous he be? It is not possible for philosophic purposes to establish who the author was, i.e. the truth of it, because you were not present to see, just as you cannot prove that God was the author of the world. But for practical purposes we are quite right in weighing the evidence and assuming some particular name is correct.

@@ Practical truth is not completely separated from philosophic truth; it is only a step leading to it. If you go more deeply into it, the same empirical truth takes you to the ultimate truth. The divorce is only apparent. You can stop enquiring wherever you like. If you want to stop at practical truth you may do so, thus creating the divorce yourself.

@@ To know only opinions, views and theories

---

<sup>91</sup> The original editor inserted "173" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) concerning truth is only Matam. Finality belongs to Tattvam.

@@ We have to draw a firm line between the practical and philosophic worlds of thought. It is impossible to apply the rigid analytic standards of the latter to the former.

@@ Einstein proves not only that each man sees the table differently, because he is in a different position, but the same common table as it is, never known or thought of by anyone in the same way. Hence Kant was refuted by Fichte showing there was no such thing as a “thing-in-itself.” After Kant showed that time space and cause are our mental conceptions and thing-in-itself cannot be known; and now that Einstein has strengthened this position, we see that there is no final position and no final truth. The analogy of all men feeling pain in fire proves certainty of the pain, but not the truth of it, for we cannot compare what kind of pain each man feels inside.

@@ Yes, you may say that Einstein’s relativity is a modern version of the snake/rope analogy. It is also an approach to Sankara’s adhyasa, but does not go so far because Einstein does not deal with where all this relativity is coming from, whereas Sankara shows it comes from the self.

@@ Those who say truth is manifold talk rubbish. Can 2 plus 2 equal ten for a Muslim, 7 for a Jew, 6 for a Hindu? No. It is only 4 always and for all. There is only one truth.

@@ The experiential world of facts is “the given” but the given is not yet “the proven.” This important difference must be noted. The former is the fruit of unenquired standpoint, vivahara, whereas the latter is the fruit of paramartika standpoint.

@@ Einstein’s theory of relativity leads you in the end to regard the world as an illusion.

## RELATIVELY AND THE TWO STANDPOINTS

@@ Vyavaharic plane is that which cannot be ignored, do what we like. It means that although this table is Brahman, and bread is also Brahman we cannot eat the table, do what we like. Only by ascending to the paramarthic plane can the bread and the table be seen as made of the same substance.

@@ Einstien's teaching cannot replace the value of the snake/rope analogy. It has points of similarity but there is a unique and important difference. The snake/rope analogy shows that you may actually see what is not there; this Einstein does not know.

@@ Regarding bent stick in water illusion critics may object that if you get inside water you will see the stick as straight. So far it is a matter of position like Einstein.

@@ Five men look at a table, one sees it as stick, other as flat board, third as round edge, this is relativity, but which sees it as table? None.

@@ Einstein's relativity is looking at different parts of the elephant from different places and so getting different results—tail, leg, etc. but what Einstein overlooks is that this still leaves unexplained what it is that is being looked at, that it is an elephant. Einstein leaves unanswered the question of what the world itself is. This he does not deal with because he won't venture from science to philosophy and it cannot be done otherwise. Hence he is defective. Thus there is need of an ultimate standpoint which enquires into the nature of the thing itself which relativity sees only in part or appearance.

@@ Value of Einstein is to show that mind plays largest part in our knowledge of world; that each man makes his own world.

@@ We are all fond of private opinions, matam, because we are fond of the ego.

---

<sup>92</sup> The original editor inserted "175" by hand.

## RELATIVELY AND THE TWO STANDPOINTS

@@ Einstein's greatest contribution is to point out two observers see a table, but the picture in each mind, the meaning given to 'table' is different in both minds and must always be so. Differences will ever be there when words are used or positions are taken, for what else is the mind doing when it ask for the meaning of a thing than imagining the object?

@@ The common weakness of Indian philosophy and mysticism is to think that experience is the same for all. This is wrong. Einstein has shown that we see things only from a particular point of view. No two persons can have the same eyes in the same precise position, hence they cannot see the identical object.

@@ When a man is making maps, the 'correspondence' or 'copy' theories of truth are quite enough for him. When a magistrate is hearing evidence the 'coherence' theory is enough. But for philosophy these are not enough. The former are relative and belong to vyaviharik standpoint. They are justifiable because practical life does not afford the time to go into fine proof.

@@ There are historic truths, archaeological truths etc. There are many relative truths and some, the scientific are coming nearer to absolute truth but still they are not the exact truth.

@@ Einstein has proved that no two persons have seen the same thing in the same way. Hence doubt must arise and certainty be impossible.

@@ Colour-blindness is scientific fact. Having been taught to use the word red, inside he is actually perceiving green. Yet both use the same name! How do we know that others see the world in the same way? Such a question is insoluble. All brains are relative. So Einstein says I may call this table, you also may call it table, but my experience is not same as yours. This he has proved mathematically and scientifically.

@@ The philosophical attitude or standpoint means that you detach yourself and that you spread out all three states for observation.

@@ We can only know a thing partially. We can know only an infinitesimal part of the whole. All our knowledge is inference.

@@ Men do not understand how to harmonize or co-ordinate the two viewpoints. It is to be done according to the particular conditions and circumstances under which you are living or working.

@@ Philosophy accepts that there are various degrees of truth but limits them to the practical world, whereas metaphysics extends them to the non-practical world also. Hence metaphysics is on a lower level, for philosophy does not permit degrees to enter the ultimate or highest truth.

@@ It is inevitable that thoughtful people will have to come to the position which recognizes two-fold viewpoint—viyavaharic and paramarthic—the immediate and the ultimate. For you cannot get absolute truth in this world. Time does not permit of proving every detail; hence we have to use belief to a large extent: For instance, we have to believe in our cook that he has not permitted poison to enter the food. We simply have not got the time to investigate his cooking each day. Also we have to believe in the doctor and other experts. For worldly life the practical view cannot be avoided because action is impossible if we have to wait to get all the facts. Hence the practical viewpoint is necessary for active life; it is the only possible one, but when you come to philosophy then it is too defective and we must adopt the ultimate view. Hence beginners who say “Henceforth I shall never believing anything” talk nonsense. As far as we can, we may use reason, but where time does

---

<sup>93</sup> The original editor inserted “177” by hand.

(continued from the previous page) not permit we must believe. Hence a two-fold truth is inescapable.

@@ We have to assume most things, to make surmises, from the practical standpoint because we lack time to verify everything. Even a lifetime of 100 years would be far too short if we seek fullest proof for every detail of life. In vyavahara you must have different kinds of truth, for we often have to get immediate action. One kind may be surer than another but none will be absolute. Hence we have to act on surmises, but they never become truth unless they are tested and verified.

@@ Modern science has discovered that the perception of a rose will in the case of a colour-blind person who has been so from birth, be called red as others do, yet he will be really seeing blue. This proves we cannot see into the mind of another person. So Einstein's law of relativity proves mathematically that no two persons have the same view of the world.

@@ If you take up any position, then you will be attacked by those who hold a different position. There will be no end to these disputations. But when you know that all positions are only ideas, that all is Brahman you refuse to identify yourself with any system, creed or advaitic philosophy.

@@ You will have wasted time in this study if you think you belong to any school, party or system. Do not wear a label, such as advaitin. Just keep quiet.

@@ Those who have not the patience or courage to enquire till the very end of things, but say, "This is enough for me. I shall stop here," remain in the empiric ignorant standpoint. The philosophic standpoint simply means the fully enquired view.

@@ VYAVAHARA= world of experience.

@@ When you say that from a far distance an object is small but from a near distance it is large, whilst during the intervening standpoints it offers a variety of sizes to the eyes, you are merely saying that the mind is imagining the object in these various ways. Einstein's Relativity also offers a variety of possible appearances of the same object to different possible observers which means that they are really only imagining the object; their mind gives them the whole thing and each forms a different idea of it. All that they get is an idea. Nor is it philosophic to talk of the object "as it really is apart from its appearances." For who has seen and which position is the ultimate one? Impossible. For any 'real Object' or 'object as it really is' is also only an idea and hence no more and no less real than the appearances.

@@ When we do not inquire sufficiently we say it is vyavaharic. This is true meaning. To say it is empiric or experimental is loose and incorrect

@@ Science may go beyond electrons protons etc. it will have in the end to confess "we do not know." Thereafter it will have to turn itself into philosophy if it wishes to remove its ignorance.

@@ It is a teaching of Mandukya that whatever may be asserted, its opposite can or will be asserted, hence it will be contradicted. Truth must be the Uncontradictable.

---

<sup>94</sup> The original editor inserted "179" by hand.

@@ When science says that the human race has been established for a X-million years it is utterly an unprovable dogma. Who can know? It is impossible for science to reach the truth—only philosophy can do that. However science has the idea of reaching the truth which is good.

@@ There are Western metaphysical writers on Value who say that truth is but one of a series of kinds of values. They do this because they consciously or unconsciously deem truth to be unattainable.

@@ Never label yourself—not even a follower of Sankara—or of V.S.I. Simply say you are a seeker after truth.

@@ Although I met so many cultured persons in Europe they all said that the understanding of highest truth is impossible. What could I do with such an attitude?

@@ Philosophy is the interpretation of the whole of existence, the whole of experience, the whole of the world.

@@ The human mind advances by steps through the different vadas, parinama, vivartavada, a jativada etc. gaining something at each step. They are ways of looking at world.

@@ To the West's assertion that ultimate truth is not attainable, we reply that it is, provided that you have the perseverance to continue to the end until all doubts are cleared.

@@ It is necessary to draw a line between the philosopher and practical worlds. The former aims at truth; the latter at getting along with the world.

@@ Einstein's relativity discoveries are still in the realm of science, not philosophy. He does not rise to ultimate view where there is no relativity.



CHAPTER 10 and WORLD FLUX. (PHILOS. OF & SENSATION PERCEPTION.

@@ You will never get anything unchanging in this world. Even science and religion undergo changes. Science however offers verification with its changes, where as religion, as it multiplies into numerous sects offers none.

@@ Brahman is unattainable to those who are not properly initiated by competent guru into enquiry which should begin with science that teaches the changeable nature of the world.

@@ What is all this that I have been saying? It is going every minute, the world is changing every minute.

@@ Sense knowledge cannot always be depended on and is to be accepted only after thorough investigation, if the real Truth about anything is desired. By “real” one means the truth in all its fullness. Now the ordinary man accepts his sense of knowledge without enquiry; without verification, therefore he has no right to regard his knowledge as true.

@@ We begin by enquiring into external world. We enquire into the nature of internal world, i.e. mind, ideas thoughts, etc. We enquire into the meaning of words we use. Finally we ask what is that which is unchanging and real?

@@ Nothing lasts. The British Empire will take its turn like the Roman Empire. All these things like Imperial Pomp, Imperial Glory are vanities. But truth is that which can never pass away.

@@ Truth is that which will remain until the end of time. It cannot change.

@@ The contradictions or antinomies in knowledge arise in epistemology. The example of the mystery of motion usually given by Zeno the Eleatic of Achilles' crossing the stream is no doubt difficult of solution but the enquiry into it does not go deep enough.

---

<sup>95</sup> The original editor inserted “181” by hand.

(continued from the previous page) (Achilles could go only half way each distance but never to the end; thus half the first yard, half the next inch, half the next hundredth of an inch etc.) This problem of motion can never be solved if you take space as a reality, but if you take space as an idea in mind, if you take the theory of idealism as embracing motion and space, the problem falls to the ground. These problems are not final, therefore, but they have a value in making us think.

@@ Ramanuja and Madhva speak of the mind going out of the body and coming back: all this is dualistic nonsensical theories arrived at without study of nature of mind. Commonsense says how dare you say how big is the mind. Where does it begin or end.

@@ When you see an object, memory plays an important part. Eye alone cannot see, the mind must be active also.

@@ Mind depends on sense organs as on servants in order to know external world objects.

@@ Hearing is different from touch etc. But the different operations are known to the mind, which is the unifying factor. Here is the starting point of analysis of experience or Vedanta. All the spokes meet in the axis.

@@ The materialists who say that thought messages travel from nerve to nerve in the brain are talking nonsense. How does he know? Nobody has seen the mind. How could you see the mind?

@@ When I cut off my finger, I see the blood pouring, I see the jagged end of flesh; all these are thoughts, which I know through the mind. That is what mind means. We know nothing of a "soul". We are only aware of a thinking entity which we call "mind."

@@ When you bathe in the Ganges you may see the sand there. Where did this sand come from?

(continued from the previous page) It came from the attrition of the Himalayas. What does this mean? That the great mountains also are in constant change, are disappearing, are Maya.

@@ Ask anyone, even a scientist, how a vibration is converted into an idea and none can answer. I refer to the vibrations along the nerves linking sense organs with brain. That is why even science must fall at the feet of philosophy.

@@ I want you to get a thorough grounding in the theory of perception which proves world as idea and to meditate on it for several days, and go over all the objections and get them answered, before we proceed further to the higher Vedanta. This is the foundation which must be solid before the superstructure of philosophy is built thereon.

@@ PERCEPTION: What happens when you see an object? Light rays are transmitted from it to your retina. The object itself does not impinge on your eyes, only the rays. After that vibrations or impulses travel up the optic nerve to the brain. What happens to the nerve during this passage of vibrations. Rapid oscillations! The sensation reaches the brain. What happens next? The sensations are converted into ideas or images. What converts them? The mind! At this moment alone – not before – you do become aware of the object. Moreover all you know of it is the idea or image which now registers in the mind. Analogy: A message is sent by telegraph. The electric current transmits a series of impulses along the wire. These splutter out at the destination in dots and dashes. The latter are meaningless by themselves. But the operator takes them up and interprets them, converting them into thoughts and ideas. The operator is like the mind in the process of sensation. The “Tripura” theory that the mind

---

<sup>%</sup> The original editor inserted “183” by hand.

(continued from the previous page) travels out of the body to the object is rubbish and mere mysticism.

@@ The ritual which you witnessed at Mysore Maharaja's Durbar during Dasra season, where H.H. prostrates and worships his golden throne, signifies: "You, O throne, go on eternally whereas I am but a temporary occupant. One day I shall have to vacate you and others shall continue the line which is ever-changing yet ever-continuous." Thus you see there is real Vedantic meaning in it.

@@ You cannot say that the body is all that exists; there is an unknown aspect. Even when all physical measurements are exhausted by science there still remains the mysteries of mind and life-activity.

@@ To say that nebulae and early planetary states are fiery, is to make an hypothesis. Science does not really know, for man could not have then existed. Therefore the truth is we can never know the origin of the universe, only suppose and guess. For practical purposes science is quite right in making such hypothesis, but for philosophical purposes it is unjustifiable.

@@ The contradiction of world as Maya is in thoughts and occurs when it is resolved into mind. Existence is meaningless without non-existence; hence you can neither say world exists or not exists. What are your grandfather and grandmother now? Are they entities? Where are the ruined cities of the ancient world? If you carefully analyse, the world and persons of yesterday are now memories, ideas. Similarly you think you have the same physical body as yesterday but that is only your illusion, your imagination. Yesterday's body has gone already.

@@ If you see anything it is bound to pass away. How is it seen? By the mind. Therefore

(continued from the previous page) mind alone produces ideas of world. Realise all things pass away, that just as dream world passes away, waking world also passes. It is not as Yogis suggest, the non-seeing of the wall which reveals it as maya, but on the contrary the seeing of it. For perception of objects is a mental act which involves mind and its ideas alone.

@@ At the first stage of human life, we are all realists. We see a table, bang it and feel pain, and accept its reality. The second stage is to enquire into the table's nature. Such Vichara leads to the discovery of its unreality. But most people say "why worry about truth? Don't ask continual questions. Let us have satisfaction." Yogis will say "Let us have ananda. That is the same as Gnan." But how do they know it is?

@@ The best way in which nature teaches you to enquire is giving you a number of deaths. Be born and die constantly and then you will begin to question seriously what death is. Then you will not be satisfied with what you see, but begin to ask questions of Nature.

@@ For this chapter regarding Everything in Nature is changing consult Philosophy of Henri Bergson and Buddhism and Lucretius and Rbayat of Khayyam.

@@ Positivism says external sense, perceptions, phenomena alone are real. Kant said there is something, noumena, beyond sense-perception.

@@ All the twenty-four hours, if possible, you should be making enquiry. Every object you see, seek to know the truth about it, not mere appearance.

@@ Millions of insects and animals suffer and die annually, let alone thousands of human beings. Why? Where is the benevolent God in all this? What is its meaning? Vedanta alone replies satisfactorily.

---

<sup>97</sup> The original editor inserted "185" by hand.

@@ If you wait a sufficiently long time even the Himalayan mountains will change and disappear, disintegrated by wind and water. Thus all form in the world visibly dissolves into its elements before our eyes.

@@ Discrimination between Self and Not-self is the first step in Vedanta. Begin by analysing the physical body: the same applies to all other objects in the sense-world. You find that the body is composed of elements, five in ancient analysis, more in modern analysis, whose union composes the body or object. But this union is only temporary as death is the law governing all compounded things. Therefore that which man dreads most, death, will inevitably come to him and dissolve the elements of his body. The lesson of this is to wean his mind away from the sense of reality of physical objects and thus to destroy his belief that they can yield real happiness.

@@ The Hindu theory that the mind actually travels to an object is absurd. Why does the mind get a different and more correct impression as it approaches nearer to a hill. Why did not the mind, if it travelled, bring a correct report at the very first. Mandukya alone of Hindu books has rejected this theory, which is unscientific.

@@ Scientific fact about visual sensation is correct so far as it says the optic nerve communicates its vibration to the brain. But how does the brain transmit it to the mind? Here all is theory and confusion.

@@ West does not understand meaning of "Immortality." If they had to live perpetually they would eventually lament their lot amidst the troubles, wars etc. of life, and pray for death to come! It will never find enduring satisfaction in any form of existence unless it learns the truth of life and of the nature of life.

@@ When you examine the plant world, you find it rejects oxygen you accept and takes only the carbon which you reject. Thus part of you passes into the plant. You eat plants and the latter passes into you. Thus one and the same substance circulates in different bodies or forms. It is impossible to say what is yourself and what is not, when everything is self. You cannot say that nothing exists, merely because we say all is Maya. That is the view of Sunyavada Buddhists. We say that non-existence cannot be understood without knowing the meaning of existence. It is impossible to talk of non-existence and use meaning as well as sound. You can only say a thing does not exist there or here. While we are actually seeing the world, it would be madness to deny its existence. Maya does not mean that. We see change, i.e. ideas come and go; experience shows that one thing changes into another, only foolish people say that anything can become non-existent; so the whole world must remain existent in some way or other and cannot totally disappear.

@@ The insoluble gap which exists for science between the physical sensation and mental awareness of it disappears for the Vedantin because on enquiry he finds that they never saw a physical sensation, it was really a mental sensation, an idea in the mind which you may easily copy into a second similar idea.

@@ Nobody has any experience nor is there any illustration in this world that the mortal ever becomes immortal. We Vedantins adhere to common experience only. How can I understand the meaning of death unless you take something in this world? You have never seen the invisible such as mind or soul. All we can say is that we have seen mortality of everything in this world because everything is mortal and remains so. Take anything: it is subject to change and destruction. It cannot be shown that any object has

---

<sup>98</sup> The original editor inserted "187" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) has changed its nature, once you really know the nature of things. Nothing has really been changed.

@@ The world-scene is constantly changing. The stars, moon and everything changes. Maya asks “What is the meaning of this change? People ignorantly attribute mysterious power to Maya, but it is simply change in its true meaning. Maya is that which appears and afterwards disappears. People accept the fading of a flower without enquiry: only when you ask what has become of its vanished colour you are asking the meaning of Maya.

@@ Where is the colour which has faded from the rose? Similarly with our body? Where is it after death? This is the question of Maya. If you say God has taken the dead, then you must show them as with Him. Who has seen that? Therefore it is a lie to say so: we must be truthful is a first condition for studying Vedanta, and not tell lies or imaginings which are the same as lies.

@@ Only the ultimate Truth tells what Maya is, where all things go and what becomes of them.

@@ Seed which becomes plant, plant which becomes tree, tree, which becomes seed again – all this is Maya, i.e. impermanent, changing.

@@ What do you mean by change? It means the coming-in of an idea and the going out of another idea. The moment the mind begins to think, change occurs. Thus the succession of ideas is called change. In deep sleep there is no idea and no change either. Ideas always indicate change. You never know change unless the mind is thinking.

@@ Maya means that which appears to be real but is unreal; also that which disappears when you know its real nature.

@@ In order to understand the problem, we begin by teaching that the imaginary snake dissolves in the rope. Now at a more advanced



(continued from the previous page) stage, we teach that as the snake was mind where could it have been lost, but again in the mind, which means that it was not really lost. Hence all that can be said of it (and the world) is that it appears and disappears. There is no destruction.

@@ Everything is continually momentary.

@@ When the image of an external object is cast upon the retina, there is a transmission of it from the eye along the optic nerve in the form of a vibration. This is carried to the physical brain. What happens next? It is taken up into the mind. How. We can only liken the operation to the sending of a message along telegraph wires. The message is received in the form of hissing sounds. The latter are interpreted by Morse code, and converted into alphabetical letters and thus into words: But where is this interpretation effected? It is done in the mind of the receiving telegraph operator. Similarly the nerve vibrations are decoded and converted into mental constructs the picture according to the message of the vibrations. What it constructs is purely and idea. But that idea is all it ever sees of the external object.

@@ All sense-knowledge is illusory because it is constantly changing.

@@ One thing is converted into another everywhere in Nature so that ultimately there is only one thing.

@@ The transitory nature of all material things justifies us in saying that they can hardly be said to exist, when considered as matter. Reality, Brahman, therefore is something that truly exists which means it cannot be material but of the nature of knowledge.

@@ The ever-constant changes of the world are only the effects of your mind.

@@ What is the flux in itself? That is called Maya, not the external changing.

---

<sup>99</sup> The original editor inserted "189" by hand.

@@ Unreality of the world means that everything is continually changing, is momentary.

@@ The circulation of microbes and matter is for ever going on. Grass becomes flesh and in turn this eventually re-appears as grass again.

@@ “I see the wall” means two things—not only the wall there but the mental picture, something transpiring in my mind. That is the first step, the ABC. After that we go into the analysis of the wall i.e. object to find out its real nature, which also turns out to be mental. This is the proper way to conduct philosophic analysis. There is the object first, that is undoubted, and there is also the thought of it. Only after grasping this may we proceed further to enquire what all these are—thoughts, things, words (names) etc.

@@ Maya in spite of being visible, is incapable of certain determination. Maya is visible just as your body is visible but its exact nature can't be determined.

@@ Do not suppose that the unreality of duality is established only by reasoning; it is being experienced; e.g. Take a liquid, when you touch it, it has already undergone a change. Science proves it. It has already gone in spite of “sealed tubes.” The continuous fact of change is called Maya; we do not know what it is, we can't know what it is. But the Atman sees the coming and going.

@@ Every time we exhale the outgoing breath takes away a part of your body. Every time we inhale our breath draws a part of the plant's body, and as this process is happening every second, it is continuous. Where then is your body? By the time you say it is yours it is already gone. Thus science proves the truth of Vedantic doctrine of non-variety, non-separateness and one-ness. Thus there is really no separate form when we enquire into the

(continued from the previous page) matter; but separateness exists for those who do not enquire but accept appearances. You may say I am a Brahmin; he is an outcaste. Nevertheless there is no difference between your bodies. They are one substance. For the carbon exhaled in his breath is absorbed by plants, the plants exhaled gas is re-absorbed by the Brahmin.

@@ It is immaterial what ideas you may have of the universe. Anything that you say is only a drsyam. The Atman only witnesses. One is King Emperor Edward VI. and in dream it has gone. Even the Rishis are dead and gone.

@@ Even when you wake up, your bed has undergone complete atomic change, your body is a new body, and it is only your delusion that makes you regard them as being the same objects as last night.

@@ Anything which is produced is bound to go. If you think of the teacher as Atman he is always there; but if you think otherwise through ignorance, then he will seem to disappear. When you know the waves as water, then it is always there but when you think of them only as waves then they will seem to vanish. Hence if you view the world of objects as different from Brahman, then you will see them disappear and appear: but when you go to the truth, the imagined differences will vanish and the world-unity as Brahman will remain. If you know that this body is of the same substance as the plant (via decomposition into manure where is it to be lost or cease to exist), the constant change seen in the world does not change the essence of the objects, only their appearance. When you know what the reality is, then you are unable to think of the appearance as being different. The essence remains, then, even though the forms change. The world that we see, this body and this mind, are all of one stuff. This explains the mutual inter-dependence and interaction which science discovers.

---

<sup>100</sup> The original editor inserted "191" by hand.

@@ This body of yours is only rice, dhal, water, in another form. It is only substance converted into another shape only, a change of form. So really the difference are ideas. Hence what is matter? No scientist knows. He can at best say with Jeans, it is a concept.

@@ Death follows death in continuous and unending procession. Science sees this. All forms are transient, changing almost immediately. Nothing is permanent. All disappears. Even your body is ever changing. New oxygen is being inhaled into my body every minute; carbon is being exhaled. Therefore my body is being built up from fresh components every minute. Similarly food curries build body.

@@ Maya is that kind of 'creation' which disappears when you enquire into it.

@@ Change is Maya, is idea. Ideas come and go.

@@ I plucked this flower only a few minutes ago. Already the colour is fading, the petals are dropping and the perfume is gone. It is changing its form. All will admit that this change has occurred. We must ask, what has become of the original colour, the original scent, the original form? All those were seen by the five senses. We said a few minutes ago that the flower was real. Now it has changed. The original flower has gone. What has become of it? Maya means law behind these changes. Your own eyes and nose saw and smelt the flower which is no longer there. When we ask what has happened to it, we begin to raise the doctrine of Maya. No one can refute the fact that the world is constantly changing. Hence no one can refute the fact of Maya. Who can show where the colour and scent of the flower went? It was there, but we do not see it now. That is all that Maya means. All other definitions are imaginary. You may call it Nature, or fact instead of Maya.

@@ Advaita does not deny the existence of the world. It only asks of what substance can the world be. The Advaitin sees the world as much as any one else.

@@ Look at your physical body independently without attachment and you will find it the same value as your body during dreams. Even science says you have a new body constantly. All religions have taught detachment for this purpose of preparing your mind to view the body independently. In this sense the body is an idea, passes away like an idea, and is thus ultimately an illusion.

@@ Nobody has seen non-entity; only the continuous change of one form into another.

@@ What is it that makes a child cry because it loses a toy in dream? It is because of its sense of reality. This sense of reality of the waking world is called Maya. This is ignorance, a creation of mind and is got rid of by obtaining knowledge that everything is only Atman.

@@ Science has now taught us that there is no such thing as the same world continuing for even a second. Every particle of world is changing with infinite rapidity.

At which point does a wall begin to crumble? It cannot be fixed. At what point does a flower fade and wither? Where are its previous shape, colour and scent? Does its decay begin suddenly? Obviously not; it is impossible to point out when its decay began. Yet you have the impression that your own body persists unchanged. This is false. Bergson says "World is a cinema show". So is our body; it is our want of knowledge which makes us think that the body is stable.

@@ How long can you live without breathing? What is meant by it? Exhalation gives our carbonic acid gas. Where did the carbon come

---

<sup>101</sup> The original editor inserted "193" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) from? It was in the body; it was a part of the body. Every minute you are throwing off carbon from the body. So you take in oxygen to replace it, from the plants, which exhales the oxygen. Thus part of your body becomes part of the plant; part of the plant becomes your body: how are you going to distinguish which is your body and which is the plant?

At death the body is eaten by worms and by plants and there we see plainly Nature's lesson that there is but one and the same stuff in these lives. How can you draw a line between them? When the world is so changing, how can you talk of my body. What and where is this body? Have you got it now? It has gone. It has become part of the body of the plants which took your carbon and you took oxygen from their bodies. Therefore you constantly have a new body. Which is your own body? Impossible to say. You have no body, in fact, nothing which you can call your own. This doctrine is the substance of Tattireya Upanishad.

Death of form is happening every second. Your body is never the same. It is man's ignorance and arrogance that makes him say "this is my body."

@@ How then do I get the idea of my own body? You have the idea in your mind that things are solid and substantial, when you are not really there. but it is only Maya, a cinema show.

@@ What is the thing which is always present, then in the body. It is only imaginary. There is nothing really here. What makes you think that the same body is still there, then? Hence 13th chapter of Gita says "Enquire into the nature of Prakriti, matter, and you find there is no solidity, no reality in it, but if you do not enquire then matter is still there."

@@ Science has to come to the rescue of Vedanta. All these assertions are made by modern

(continued from the previous page) science no less than by ancient rishis.

@@ When you understand the non-existence of the body, as science shows, which is ever changing, you know then that the body is but an idea. Even the body you had as a child has disappeared. What is permanent in it? If you refuse to face philosophy then death comes finally and teaches the lesson which all life has been trying to teach you, viz. that body is ephemeral, ever passing and illusory. It is only an idea. Only the ignorant say I am the same body as yesterday. They do not enquire but merely believe in what they consider to be truth. But the wise seek the permanent, the unchanging, the Atman which knows.

@@ Whenever I refer to the external world I always include the body under this reference.

@@ Maya means simply that every moment the world is changing. This is a scientific fact. It has nothing to do with magical powers, deities etc.

@@ (a) T.H. Huxley's exposition of idealism (re sensations and perceptions) is accurate and Vedantic. He was best of all scientists.

(b) We do not see the world; we see our concept of the world; we do not perceive objects; we perceive concepts of them.

(c) The incapacity of the masses to take in this single truth is due to the immature development of their minds, and to the imperious urgency of physical life. When such unready people apply themselves to truth they first bewilder themselves and then misrepresent the truth, both to themselves and then misrepresent the truth, both to themselves and to others.

(d) The mind is true perceiving power: the physical sense-organs merely provide conditions of perception.

@@ The old antiquated theories which prevail

---

<sup>102</sup> The original editor inserted "195" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) in India that the Atman goes out of the sense organs to the distant objects is nonsense. This is called "tarka."

@@ We know objects purely as mental sensations.

@@ You see John. What have you done by seeing him? His picture has fallen on your retina. That picture is say  $\frac{1}{2}$  inch long. He is six ft. tall. Hence you did not see him but the picture and hence it is the mind which has seen him. It has formed an idea of John. When I compare my idea of John with John and form a judgment, you have only compared one idea with another idea. It is impossible to see John in himself. Hence the impossibility of accepting "correspondence theory" of truth. The same applies to touching John and any of the other senses. It is the mind which really senses. Does the mind come directly in contact with John? No: Therefore it merely forms an idea of John. John is only an idea. To form a judgment of him is merely to compare one idea with another. Two ideas cannot come at the same moment. Hence one of these will be a memory, not a fact. Now what do you mean by comparing? Can you see the two things side by side? No—Because when one idea comes the other is gone. There is a difference of time. Hence how can they be the same? Hence Buddha said you can never step into the same river twice. The water has flowed and fresh water is here. You step into different water, hence not the same river.

@@ Reply to J. Lewis chapter "Refutation of Idealism" in his book "Introduction to Philosophy:" - The external world produces an image in the brain through the optic nerve. What does the latter do? Only vibrations, which are communicated to the brain. But how are the vibrations converted into the world? This question is unanswerable.



CHAPTER 10 only.

@@ If you are pricked with a pin, where is the pain, in you or in the pin? In you: This physiological argument for idealism is the best.

@@ The scientific notion that a wave-like vibration passes from sense-organ to the brain is, after all, only a concept. Nobody has ever observed this movement. It is an imagined one.

@@ Roughness, smoothness etc. are qualities which cannot exist without a mind to perceive them, i.e. they cannot exist unperceived; therefore the individual object to which these qualities belong cannot also exist unperceived. It is the mind that presents everything to us whatever is seen is seen by the mind.

@@ When the nerve-vibrations are present, mind knows the thing when they are not there. Mind is unaware of any object. Hence the scientific account of sensation and perception is purely inferential although based on sound facts as far as they are known. We are never conscious of how sense-impressions are manifested into perceptions but we infer the process. The only certain thing is the mind's own activity.

@@ If my mind were elsewhere, thinking of something else, then I would not see even the wall that confronts me. Hence the mind is the real seeing agent of things. We say in the elementary stage that mind conjoined with eyes does the seeing, but as we study deeper we find the eyes are themselves creations of the mind, hence mind alone is the seer, as Upanishads say.

@@ Colour is not the only quality of material things. Extension is just as essential. Hence you cannot say objects are only coloured appearances. You must add "extended in space."

---

<sup>103</sup> The original editor inserted "197" by hand.

@@ Science can never bridge the gap between conscious idea and the brain vibration from which it is decoded. Why? Because the brain vibration and nerve-system are mental; hence there is no gap really. But science thinking of them as material, i.e. non-mental, will never bring the two ends together, until it learns philosophy.

@@ All that we know is the visible world. That it is ever-changing we learn only after enquiry, until then we wrongly ascribe permanence, reality to it. Yet although the ascription is wrong, the sense of reality is there because it is within ourselves, in Atman, and we super-impose it on the world that is visibly seen.

@@ Suppose the mind does not know that you are touching something, as in paralysed hand. Then you will be unable to know that the thing exists. Hence sensation is a mental thing.

@@ The proof that our idea of the thing is known first, lies in the fact that if a nerve in the hand is paralysed or cut, I may touch this stick but will feel nothing. Why? Because the nerve fails to communicate the experience to the mind and so no sensation arises. The mental sensation is what I first know. All the rest, such as existence of an outside object, is inference or assumption.

@@ What does “seeing” mean? We are entirely in the hands of our mind. We cannot get outside it. The wall which we see is seen only by and through and in our minds: we are helpless without it. Hence we must admit that the known wall exists in our minds.

@@ If you go on enquiring into physical processes of sensation, your enquiry lands you into thoughts, the mental process. Science cannot discover the relation between physical and mental for the simple reason that the physical is ultimately mental. It has set us an artificial non-existent problem and vainly strives to solve it. So long

(continued from the previous page) as duality grips the mind, the latter seeks to establish relations. Hence it tries to find out the relation between mind and body—a hopeless task.

@@ See Huxley's writings for the best scientific account of the process of sensation as proving idealism.

@@ Injure the optive nerve and although an object is before you, you will see nothing. This is proof that we have the sensation first and only afterwards become aware of the object. When we receive no sensation, we never become aware of the object as in sleep. Why? Because the object is an inference which we make from the sensation itself.

@@ The whole system of sense-organ, nerve, transmission of the sense-reports and brain must be regarded as mental, as idea, if the gap between them and the conscious awareness of object as idea is to be crossed. Science has never yet crossed this gap and cannot until it sees the truth that matter and mind are one and the same, consequently the gap is an imagined one.

@@ The fact that objects are inferences drawn from sensation is obscured partly because of the rapidity with which the inference is drawn and partly because people never stop to enquire and reflect as to what is going on when they see an object, and partly because they will not think matters out to the logical end owing to their innate belief in causality predisposing them to look for a separate object as the cause of their impression of it. When everything is found to be but Mind—whether it be object, seer, senses nerves impression etc.—then all becomes a unity and there is no room for cause and effect because there are no two things.

@@ That mind is the real seeing agent is proved by the fact that when attention is elsewhere or distracted we do not see an object that confronts us.

---

<sup>104</sup> The original editor inserted "199" by hand.

@@ It is wrong to say we rely only on our senses alone for information, the mind also gives us things, such as peace, satisfaction.

@@ The word things may be used for the external objects. You had better qualify it by using the phrase: things felt to be external.

@@ It is better to say the object which produces the thought than the object which creates the thought.

@@ The word perception covers the activity of all the five senses, not merely sight alone.

@@ We must start with the first step in idealism and ask "What is our sense-perception?" For we know a thing only by what our senses tell us of it. What is beyond the senses is only an inference.

@@ What do I mean by seeing this wall? It is only when your attention is directed to the wall that you see it. Science says rays of light form an image on retina. This is proved by photography. Present an object to a camera. Picture of the object falls upon the sensitive plate because rays of light proceed from the object to lens or view-finder. This was not known to ancient India, so the pundits and old books said that the mind went out of the body to the object and brought an image back to the body. This is nonsense. The image's impression is carried by the optic nerve to brain. Cut off this nerve and the man sees nothing. This proves the nerve is necessary to communication. How? It vibrates and sets up these vibrations in the brain. Science has to stop at this point. It cannot explain, nobody knows how this vibration is converted into idea. The mind constructs from these vibrations, an image. This establishes beyond all doubt that it is the mind that constructs the image, the picture. Thus idealism is irrefutably proved. How do we see an object as six feet long? It is the mind that actually constructs the dimension. Here philosophy begins

(continued from the previous page) and physiology ends. Which is the first thing you get, the information about the object or the object itself? Science says the mind depends for its information upon its servants – nerves, eyes, brain. Philosophy says however “If the mind cannot go directly to see the object, it depends entirely on its servants, on what they tell it. They speak in vibratory language. This is the telegraph code. The mind never sees the object therefore.” Scientists have experimented by irritating certain nerve ends and this has produced certain images in the consciousness. This shows that the mind has concocted its own objects, has worked up the vibration-information received into ideas. What is the original stimulus for the vibration? The mind asking itself this question can only answer itself by inferring or assuming an object outside. But never forget that mind has never come into direct awareness of an object. There is no proof therefore that a separate objects exists outside but mind habitually assumes it to be there from the beginning. It has in no case seen it directly. What then is the stimulus? This very question involves unconscious assumption that the outside separate object exists. Those who say we must have previously seen the object in order to form an idea of it subsequently, we reply: Did they ever see an object independently of the mind? Is it not the mind that first gave information of the thing, of its qualities? The object, the rays of light and the whole sensory organ-nerve-brain process is not known by the mind at the time: It is only imagined afterwards when it analyses the way in which its knowledge arises. All the mind really and undubitably knows is the picture, the idea which it forms itself. All the rest has been imagined by it. All this is itself an idea.

---

<sup>105</sup> The original editor inserted “201” by hand.

(continued from the previous page) The object as cause of the idea is unprovable but is assumed by the mind at the very start of the process, it itself remaining unaware that it has started with the assumption. It wrongly takes the separate object for granted. Whatever else is offered in place of the object as cause, such as God, must also be something unknown and unknowable, for anything known can only be an idea; mind knows only its own constructions. This effectually kills materialism, for no matter is thus findable. Mind alone is. Dream illustrates this. In dream you can have a dissection room, objects, a body, sense organs, optic nerves, brains and vibrations along the nerves, just as you have them here—all the five senses in fact. But you know on waking that they are all mental. So why should it be impossible that the same series of things in our waking state are mental too? What is it that infers the objects? It is mind. What is an inference? An idea. What is it that asks for the cause of its sensations? It is mind. Thus everything resolves itself into the mind's own concoction.

@@ How do I see an object? The object produces rays, which produce a picture on my retina, as a camera lens shows an image. Vibrations in nerves carry the picture to brain which says the object is there. The whole process is based on the principle of causality. But what is it that made you think there was an object? Did your mind go directly to it or did your mind infer it? Take away the optic nerve and man sees nothing. Why? Because the sensation does not reach Mind. What we first become aware of is the mental sensation. It is the mind that sees the object. It is the mind that infers the object because it has the sensation of it, but the sensation is itself purely mental!

@@ We use the term “seeing” so frequently as though it were a simple process: really it is complicated. What is meant by “seeing” must be examined.

@@ Thinking is questioning experience. Something happens—a thing is seen or heard and we ask “What is that?” What do I see? What do I hear or feel? These somethings bring a message to the mind for enquiry. Reality is only inferred. Every object presented to us brings with it a question “What is it?” This is the natural condition of the mind. It wants to get at the true explanation of a thing. This is the basis of truth.

---

<sup>106</sup> The original editor inserted “203” by hand.





## CHAPTER 11 ILLUSIONS OF SPACE, TIME & EXTERNALITY. (and a few 9)

@@ Illusion does not mean the non-existence of anything. Those who do not understand Vedanta teach this wrong definition.

@@ When the mind is very weak, it says, I don't want to worry about the true nature of things and it is content to take things as they are, i.e. Maya. Only when it rises above this, can it know truth.

@@ Everybody says "oh! of course, this is a table, it is made of wood, wood is only matter. We know what it is." Thus they accept unquestioningly what presents itself to the mind, i.e. mere appearance.

@@ Experience of life shows that after deeper enquiry many things are not what they seem at first sight, that the naively realistic view of the ordinary man is insufficient as we go deeper.

@@ You may see a rope and mistake it for a snake. You say "I saw a snake". That you speak the truth is a fact. Yet we have to distinguish whether you are deluded or not, even though you speak truth. Similarly a yogi who says he has experienced Overself, may speak truth, but it is not the Truth, but enquiry into its meaning and doubt are essential.

@@ Empirical standpoint simply means "taking things as they are without enquiry."

@@ The vyavaharic standpoint means that you do not care for truth and that you prefer to remain in ignorance. Those who object that there cannot be two standards of truth forget that ignorance is in the world naturally: that is why we send children to school, read newspapers and books etc.

@@ It is an impossibility to avoid the doctrine of twofold viewpoint because you have to start with the point of view of ignorance and then rise to the higher; also because 99.9 percent of men cannot understand the language even of ultimate truth and so we have to adopt the primitive tongue they can understand. e.g. we have

---

<sup>108</sup> The original editor inserted "205" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) to use the language of causality when dealing with those who firmly believe in it; you have to start by tentatively accepting this universally held doctrine for purposes of earlier argument. Those who accuse Advaita of being two-faced because of holding this practical and philosophic standpoints, cannot see it is our only procedure.

@@ Apart from the idea of imperfection, we can't have an idea of perfection.

@@ Every man thinks he is pursuing truth and would be indignant if he were told that he was pursuing his own personal feelings about it. Admittedly the idea of truth comes to all persons, but who enquires into its nature? Every man has the conceit that his interpretation is true, although he has never taken the trouble to find out how it is true.

@@ You have as many mysticisms as there are human beings: you will find all kinds of religion from fetishism upwards; but there is only one Gnan. The former belongs to Matam, opinion, and may be unlimited, in number, whereas the latter is Tattvam, truth. The latter's nature cannot be changed whereas the former is changeable.

@@ An observation may be true from your point of view, yet it may not be the truth in itself. The two are different.

@@ Practical truth is temporary, whereas philosophic truth is true for ever.

@@ Truth is somewhat hidden, it wants you to go beneath what appears as truth.

@@ There are two standpoints, (1) without enquiring and merely going on as others do, and (2) with enquiry into the truth of a thing.

@@ Practical life is the un-enquired state, and provides the empirical standpoint. Truth provides the ultimate deeper standpoint.

@@ If you are easily deceived by the world you see with your senses, how are you going to distinguish between what is self and what is not

(continued from the previous page) self? How are you going to understand the Atma which is imperceptible to the senses?

@@ Find out Truth. Do not be carried away by appearances, as Gita says, "Know me in truth, as I am."

@@ Einstein has done a great service by teaching that knowledge is relative and no two persons can have the same view of the world. Six people seeing my table will see it from six different angles. Therefore each sees a different table.

@@ The substratum of hallucinations—seeing things which are not only there but have no material basis also, no rope beneath the snake—is the mind.

@@ Illusion is that which makes you think that what appears is real. It is not merely what you see outside, in the world it is difficult to judge and find truth, but it is harder still to find out what is true inside in our mind and feeling. "I" have this intention may seem true, but it must be examined if it be illusion or truth, reality or appearance, the belief of fools or otherwise. It must be tested. Science has studied the psychology of emotions and finds that insane men declare the reality of their experiences, although the latter are merely hallucinations.

@@ What is inside the mind can be seen outside. Yet people think the mind must be only within the confines of the skull. Science is no longer confident about brain matter producing thought. It now acknowledges that it does not know the beginning of mind.

@@ Vedanta does not dispense with externality; take the case of Dream when the 'fear' is inside and the 'tiger' outside. We perceive both internal and external. The external world is reduced to ideas and the ideas are reduced to Atman. Vedanta is neither Idealism nor Realism.

---

<sup>109</sup> The original editor inserted "207" by hand.

@@ A barren woman's son is meaningless, or hollow words; jugglers' shows and mirages are illusions, or Maya.

@@ Empiricism= taking things as they are known to the senses.

@@ European philosophers are so attached to the body, that they prefer lies to truth when it comes to giving up this attachment. They will not admit that you cannot see a wall independently of the mind, that the world is not real. It is the mind that co-operates in vision and is therefore responsible for what you see. The diagrams of illusions on plane surfaces prove this. They appear to have depth whereas there is only length and breadth. Nothing exists independent of the mind.

@@ Advaita does not deny existence of external objects: it denies their reality.

@@ People who use the word "external" ought to define it first. They speak of an external world. External to what? Is the body external or internal to the mind? If the body is included in the world (as it must be because it is built up from food, water, air, taken from it) then if the body is internal (as it must be to the mind) the whole world must also be internal.

@@ Sense-impressions can be incorrect. Eyes may be diseased. Colour-blind persons see a green object red. How can you prove that your idea of this table is the same as mine? But of course for all practical purposes, and not philosophic we fully agree about our knowledge of it.

@@ Those objects which you perceive with your senses, in a mirage or snake-rope are called illusions because they do not exist. Thus even in the waking state we may note the possibility of how seen objects do not really exist. Thus we show definite cases of how the mind creates a visible world of its own and assumes its reality.

@@ The word object may be misleading, as Europe uses it only for external things whereas Vedanta uses it for both external things and internal ideas.

@@ The mental picture is the picture that you see as an object outside. Science is now realizing this.

@@ People often make the mistake of supposing that because the world is unreal, therefore it should not be visible. A thing may be seen and yet not be real.

@@ The super-imposition of snake on rope simply means it was “imagined.”

@@ Illusion is that which is taken to be real at first sight, but when enquired into turns out to be unreal, as snake-rope. Thus the world is naturally real for the ignorant man.

@@ There is difference between the terms “unreal” and “non-existence.” The world is unreal because it is idea, but a barren woman’s son or a round square, are non-existent as you cannot even think or imagine them.

@@ “When you know a thing, there is knowledge” this is the axiom of European philosophy. We say however, there is both false and true knowledge that even when you know a mirage, it is false knowledge.

@@ The word exists is misleading, because people think that whatever appears necessarily exists.

@@ The snake in rope ultimately and permanently does not exist apart from mind’s imagination, but it is seen by you and is therefore termed unreal. Similarly the world is seen but is temporary, i.e. unreal.

@@ We do not ask the question: Does perception mean reality? We are satisfied to see a thing without enquiry. We see the waking world and are satisfied with its reality merely because we perceive it. This is our error. Mere perception is no proof of reality.

---

<sup>110</sup> The original editor inserted “209” by hand.

@@ The snake rope illustration is given only to show that the snake idea within you may be seen outside. Hence this shows that the impression that ideas are only to be seen within is false, they may be perceived as being external to you. This illustration has such purpose only, and not what is generally assigned to it.

@@ The plain meaning of illusion is that which is falsely imagined without reality, which disappears when you trouble to enquire.

@@ What is it that tells you of the chair? The mind, because if your attention is elsewhere you are not cognisant of the chair.

@@ Where do you see the snake? Outside. Where is the snake? In your mind. Thus enquiry shows that the body is really inside the mind. It is the nature of the mind to concoct scenes. That is the best word we can really say about it. With occasions those scenes will vary.

@@ When different people see a table how are we to know that one person's meaning or idea of table is precisely the same as that of another who is looking at it from a different angle?

#### CHAPTER 11 only.

@@ That which is really in your mind as a wall is what you see outside as a wall.

@@ To one who objects that the chair I am sitting on is surely real must first define reality, before he knows what he is talking about.

@@ Answer to Len Gill's question regarding the idea of ideal chair sitting on it is fallacy. He forgets he is also an idea, his body is also an idea. He has not given up his faith that body is an idea. Why does he think it impossible? He thinks his body is different from idea. He does not know that mind and matter are both ideas. It is same as Dr Johnson's objection.

@@ The solidity of the physical forms is created by the mind acting through our own senses. The apparent phenomena are created by mental operations within us. All are mental creations and ideas. It is the 'I' personality which has prevented Western thinkers from pursuing their enquiries into Truth itself. Hence they stop short at a prudent idealism.

@@ Amputated limb soldiers in war who had a certain nerve touched in the arm were at first telling the doctor, "do not touch my finger. It causes me pain." He felt as though the hand was there. There was nothing, still he felt it. It was his idea only. This is analogous to Idealism. We feel the external world is and real, but it is not there.

@@ What are your great grand father, his grandfather, to you now? You may say he was such and such man, but that only means he is an imagined figure for you have never seen him, and he is only an idea. Similarly yesterday we had a conversation. What is that to you now? Merely a memory, i.e. it has now been reduced to an idea. Ignorance makes men think that time, things, persons are real.

@@ To say that God exists eternally you must have someone who stops with God for all time, if this statement is to be truth-ful and not merely 'I believe'. There must be a witness or knower of the fact.

@@ What is Time? What is eternity? How can you know that God is eternal? Did he tell you so? If so, how does he know? For He might die tomorrow! How can you know that there is even such a thing as eternity. And if you say you know it you must yourself live all eternity, be co-existent with it. Are you?

@@ Take anything which grows and changes, say a seed, and state at what precise moment the seed became a plant, the babe a man. This is impossible, therefore the time change is really

---

<sup>111</sup> The original editor inserted "211" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) your own conception, not in the object. Can you have an idea of time unless you have in it beginning and ending, breaks and changes? But when you try to get hold of the latter, they vanish.

@@ “Past” must have a meaning. It is an idea. Future is an idea not yet come. Hence whenever you are thinking; when you think of the past you think it in the present I get the idea of present only by distinguishing it from the past or future. It is an idea. Can you experience the present really? What is meant by the present? It involves distinction, it depends on past and future. Both these do not exist. Therefore present does not exist as such. The conclusion is that all time, all thought exist in the present. Hence we call it eternal. But all idea of time is conception of mind. When can you draw a line and say this instant is the present? In reality you cannot do this, you cannot hold the present. Time is only an idea, and all events therefore are ideas with it. The present appears to exist and yet it does not. Hence we call time Maya. But that which appears is substantially the Atman, so if time and events go, we know the Atman does not go. Hence we are not after all terming time—whose flux of events seems our life—illusory.

@@ The mind appears to take thing in pieces, to cut time into distinction but even that is only imaginary. Bergson’s attribution of reality to this continuous flux is merely his opinion.

@@ When you advance in this inquiry you learn that the differentiation of objects into internal and external is meaningless. This body is as external as that wall.

@@ Ignorance has two aspects, one of which is Vikshepa or kalpana—means imagination, the superimposition of time space etc.

@@ Unreal in the snake-rope story means that which dissolves itself again into you. The



(continued from the previous page) snake you had seen is only an idea. When you approach nearer the snake disappeared. Where did it go? It went back into the mind. Similarly, the ideas we form of the universe go back into the mind whence they arose.

@@ Under certain circumstances ideas can be seen outside, as in the snake on rope.

@@ Illusory thing are not non-existent, like a barren woman's son. It is not that there are no thing but that they are not what they seem. The thing exist, i.e. they are seen, but when you go to ultimate truth you find then that they disappear.

@@ I once saw rupees pouring and falling from the ceiling of the room, shown by a fakir. I believe my mind was paralysed, mesmerized and hypnotized, and was made fooling for the time and imagined what the fakir wished me to. Thus a hypnotist once gave a piece of paper to a boy telling him that it was sugar candy, and the boy was eating them with enjoyment. Other cases I saw, were mere trickery or jugglery. This proves you may project, see outside what is really inside your mind.

@@ It is an incorrect thing philosophically to write of false imagination of objects or true imagination: suffice to say they are imagined.

@@ Whatever exists is only the mind. There is nothing outside it. The apparent duality of thing being outside us, whether in walking or dream, has reference only to the body. The whole duality exists, then, so far as we relate it to the body, but it still exists wholly as mind and therefore the outside-inside relation collapses ultimately.

@@ Most Western scientists, even among those who are idealists make the error of failing to see that the body also is an idea, and not only the world.

@@ Illusory means that a thing exists, but it is not what it seems. Phenomenal means that it

---

<sup>112</sup> The original editor inserted "213" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) exists, and exists also as it appears to be. Illusion is also a phenomenon: both are on the same level so far as they are appearances. But in the case of phenomenon you can't say it is non-existent, but you can of an illusion. The appearance of water in mirage is there; that is a phenomenon, but the idea that water is really there is illusion. Phenomenon is not the same as reality but somehow related to it.

@@ “External” is used by us in Vedanta to mean that the Drg is outside time, beyond and unaffected by time.

@@ By the time you say this is present, it becomes past. What we consider as present, is only imagination. How long does the idea of the present last even? It does not even last one second. By the time you thought of present it is gone, the present itself has vanished. Moreover the past is not here. The present can not depend on that even. Idea of time is our imagination, belief.

@@ By the time you utter the word “present” the future has come: So how long does the present last?

@@ Time is treated in page 116 Mandukya Upanishad: Time is always referred to some object or event composed of objects. It takes time to glance at any object because it has dimensions and the eye must travel from one border of it to another. Where does the present moment start or stop? It is impossible to distinguish these points, because it becomes past moment. Similarly where does the past or future begin or end? Impossible to say. Hence we cannot form an idea of either past, present or future, i.e. of time. In short, it is only an idea in our minds. Then what gives the strong sense of reality to time? If it were merely an idea, why is it felt by all mankind? Analyse each man, to him it is an idea also. A million noughts remain

(continued from the previous page) nought. Hence collective experience of mankind does not turn time as an idea in each individual mind into a reality.

@@ If time proved to be but an idea then eternity must be the same too: What is eternity? That which is without beginning or end—an idea merely, because who can say what is going to happen the next minute, let alone all eternity. Even God himself cannot say “I am eternal”. Even a God who has lived for a million years cannot say whether he is going to continue another single year. Hence even eternity and time, as ideas, must collapse or disappear. At this point people will fear to go further. Eternity consoled them with the thought of surviving death. If it vanishes, they feel lost. But no. Something is left. To whom has these ideas come? To the self. In whom do they appear and vanish? In the self. Hence the self as witness still remains. Now the world was shown to be but an idea. All ideas disappear into the self. Hence the world disappears into the self. Or the self contains the whole world. It is the witness of the three states. IT IS. Why add predicates? It embraces everything. What cause then for fear? This is the Upanishad teaching. Even the idea “eternity” disappears into self and is contained by it. Why fear?

@@ Kant has discovered that time is only a concept of the mind. Therefore past, present and future are but ideas.

@@ What are all past events now? Only an idea: If you analyse them very closely and deeply at the moment when they actually occurred, you will find that even then, in ‘the present’ and not merely the past, they were also ideas.

@@ The idea of time is impossible in the sleep state.

@@ There is no such thing as two points or even one point in time. Kant has shown this. For it would imply that time stops for a moment.

---

<sup>113</sup> The original editor inserted “215” by hand.

(continued from the previous page) It is we who imagine that it stops or divides itself. Sri Harsha, an old Indian writer has gone beyond Kant and asked, "Show me where can you draw the line between past and present?" Time is only your imagination, a concoction of the mind. Therefore you, the Witness of it are timeless: i.e. immortal, permanent as compared with drsyam.

@@ All things are found in time, space and cause. Hence the need of enquiring into the latter first.

@@ You may see an object externally but that is no proof that it is really external. The snake seems external but it is only an idea in your mind, an imagination.

@@ We must admit that the snake exists for it is seen by the senses, but it is not really there because it is an illusion: only the rope is there. Hence the word exists must be semantically analysed to get at its deeper meaning. Only a barren woman's son can be said to be non-existent but not the illusory but experienced snake. Hence philosophy has to enquire into experience and into existence to get at their truth.

@@ Critics will object to your illusion chapter by saying the thing itself has not changed despite what you see. Reply: Yes, but the sense of reality was in the illusory sight, not the other.

@@ Through ignorance we consider unreal things to be real, but when we get knowledge we know them for what they are. False knowledge, such as taking a tree at night for a man, is such ignorance and is removed by enquiry. Scientists have got so far as to see the world in electrons and protons; if only they will enquire further and not stop, they will see the world is idea, and still later they will know it is only Brahman. The criticism is often made of Vedanta that we base

(continued from the previous page) it on queer or abnormal events such as seeing mirages, snakes in ropes etc. We reply, No, we do not limit our enquiry to them. We also enquire into real water and not mirages alone, into real snakes and not ropes alone, imaginary snakes. Then we find the real nature of all these things—Brahman. Hence ours is a message of persistent enquiry, not stopping till the ultimate and is reached.

@@ The existence of illusions like mirages in the desert, which are seen by present-day travellers in the African desert, shows, shows that we cannot rely on our senses.

@@ Only after the world has been analysed, should we ask the question, What is it that sees the world? This leads to investigation into Atman, to What am I? But we should not begin with the latter.

@@ The critic who says there is an independent wall because even if you prove that my seeing it is an idea, I can touch it. Reply: that touch is also only your idea as shown by the illusions of touch.

@@ To those who object that illusions deal with abnormal instances only we reply: Philosophy asks: What is to be regarded normal or abnormal? This is a further question to be enquired into, it is not one (whose answer is)<sup>115</sup> to be immediately assumed as known.

@@ The world has existence; even the snake seen in an illusion has existence: even appearances have existence. It is therefore absurd to deny existence of anything experienced. What we ought to do however is to ask ourselves, what is meant by existence?

@@ You do not see the external object as outside your minds although you continue to see it as outside your body.

@@ Delusion is applied to mistakes of the mind or fancy whereas illusion is applied to

---

<sup>114</sup> The original editor inserted "217" by hand.

<sup>115</sup> The original editor inserted "(whose answer is)" by typed

(continued from the previous page) things seen physically. Both these belong to normal states of normal men whereas hallucinations arise when abnormal states or mind weakening occurs.

@@ I constantly ask you to define the words 'real' and 'exist' when writing, not because they have any special value, but because they are used so ambiguously that readers will either be confused or more likely assign their own pet belief to these words. For with us in India 'real' means permanent but not with the West. With us 'exist' means unchanging existence but not with you. Hence make clear in what sense the words are used.

@@ It is an error of all the European scientists, psychologists and philosophers to regard illusion as extraordinary abnormal and peculiar perception...What you have to grasp and explain is that it is perception—unadulterated plain perception operating as it always operates. It is the ordinary process of sight touch etc. This is the most important point. Therefore illusion must be treated in your writing as a part or continuation of the normal process of sense-perception and experience.

@@ A man thinks that what is seen is a fact. It is gossiping. A fact must be a fact to all. Then alone it is truth. Otherwise it is only imagination.

@@ It is because man discovers that he can experience illusions, that philosophy arises to enquire into the appearance of the world. When you begin to enquire you get science, further enquiry leads to discovery of illusions, still further leads to philosophy.

@@ The passage of Time is very noticeably faster as we get older. The reason for this is because the old have seen so many New Year days come that they have begun to realize

(continued from the previous page) life is intrinsically transient and most important that the world is really an idea. Hence elderly people should therefore be more amenable to belief in mentalism than the younger ones.

@@ People want something that would agree with their own unconscious belief in causality, their unconscious inference of an external world outside of the idea of it; then only will it be truth for them. They are victims of their complexes.

@@ There is no such thing as a measure of time. Close analysis will reveal that all our measurements based on planetary revolutions are ultimately nothing else than mental impressions. Time is how we think it. Einstein has begun to point to this truth without, however, realising the tremendous consequences which must ultimately follow when this path of analysis is pushed to its logical and fullest extent. Thus by comparing the dream state with the waking state, we may perceive how, as dreams occur in the mind, time is purely mental. The same discriminations apply to the notion of space also. Those who object that dream standards are hallucinatory and therefore inadmissible as evidence need to be reminded that were this discussion conducted in the dream state, they would use precisely the same argument about the hallucinatory character of the hallucinatory character of the waking state, whilst they would uphold the definite reality of the dream state. The fact is that they possess no proof beyond the idea that they are now in the waking state. And further, if dream is mere hallucination, why should nature have given us this state unless she regarded it as being at least as real as the waking state?

@@ We think there is an entity called time. Past is imagined, future also is imagined: What is more both past and future are imagined

---

<sup>116</sup> The original editor inserted "219" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) now; they are ideas of the present. But the present being a distinction between an imaginary past and an imaginary future, must itself be imaginary: thus the whole of time turns out to be a fiction, as Kant taught.

@@ Sankara used the idea of eternity only to oppose the idea of time, to show it as illusory. But he never meant eternity is real. That would be to misunderstand him.

@@ There is a hypothesis involved and hidden in Zeno's famous paradox of motion. It is that space can be infinitely divided. Even when you divide space you are only imagining that you are doing so.

@@ People always make a mistake in confusing reality with existence. Appearance may exist, as snake or mirage, and yet not be a reality.

@@ Though there is no such thing as a snake there, still it seems quite real for the time being.

@@ The snake is in your mind but appears to be outside. This is the first lesson of the snake/rope, that which is mental may be seen outside. Those who say there is something objectively real talk nonsense.

@@ Hallucinations are only particular cases showing world is idea: they do not prove the whole world is idea.

@@ That which changes and vanishes is called illusion.

@@ It is a psychological fact, proved by hypnotism, that an imagined thing can be seen to be a reality and can be seen outside the body.

@@ Those who say the world is like a barren woman's son talk nonsense. You can see the world; you can never see a barren woman's son.

@@ Inside and outside there is only illusion. Illusion means only that which comes and goes.



@@ As on a piece of canvas you draw a picture, it looks as if it has dimensions (though only a plain surface) the impressions of depth and thickness are produced because we think so. Both are ideas due to ignorance, or imagination of mind. The human mind has this tendency to imagine due to ignorance.

@@ The snake does not really appear nor does it really disappear. Appearance and disappearance of the snake is only your own imagination and hence it is only in your mind. If you realize that the whole of your imagination exists in yourself then it is unreal.

@@ If you go near the rope the snake disappears. What is in the mind is that which appears outside. The external world is all that your mind thinks, it is a world of ideas. If you stick to the idea that the world is there, without any enquiry the world does persist, of course.

@@ What is real and what is imaginary? is the question to be dealt with. When imagination is contradicted by experience you should begin to enquire.

@@ Do not use the terms "objective" and "real" as synonyms or it will lead to confusion. And do not write of raising the question of the "real nature" of anything such as space etc. Say only that you will enquire into its "nature" and leave the course of this enquiry to raise the problem of reality or not at its proper stage when it has proceeded sufficiently far.

@@ The statement that according to relativity an observer on the sun would see time-events in our planet occurring at a different time, is a scientific hypothesis not a scientific fact; for it is unprovable as nobody can go to the sun and verify it. Therefore be cautious in using this illustration.

@@ There is a difference between super-imposition and imagination. The first requires a second

---

<sup>117</sup> The original editor inserted "221" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) thing to support or receive it which resembles it; the other is only the mind manipulating itself. But when you know everything is Atman, you know there is no duality, hence super-imposition is impossible. What then did the mind do? You cannot explain adequately by saying it imagined because all your imagination will not bring London before you as it is. The mind has projected the appearance so as to make it appear outside the body. Hence it imagined it first and then projected it outside. How did it come to appear outside? This shows that if you say the world is imagination and stop there, it does not explain fully. You have to grant that the mind has a two-fold power, the second being projection or super-imposition of the form of objects upon itself. When you see anything outside you, it is the mind which has created it for you, and as in dream or mirage it can also project it to appear outside.

@@ There is a wide distinction between existence and reality. A mirage may exist, yet have no reality. Those who do not make this distinction get confounded and say whatever appears is real.

@@ How did the snake/appearance come to the rope? Because the idea of it pre-existed in you. Where is it seen? Outside the body. Yet it is actually in the mind. Maya, illusion means imagination, idea.

@@ We do not for an instant deny that objects are external to the body: that everyone can see. But so long as people do not know the meaning of mind, they will not be able to understand that the same objects which are external to body, are yet internal to mind.

@@ Both empty space and mountains are ideas in the mind and we are not other than mind.

@@ Those who cannot see truth of world is within you, fail because they cannot forget the wall is outside as they cannot rise above thinking in terms of the body.

@@ Scientists have now proved that time is not the same for every man. Einstein has shown it is relative to each mind according to where it is placed as observer.

@@ Where is space? When you take a journey is there so much space in your mind as distant Europe? You can't say, for space is imagination, as is the whole world.

@@ When you think of space, we form an idea of it: otherwise we do not understand it. Hence space too is an idea.

@@ The notions of 'outside' and 'inside' are fully seen to be illusory by examining dream. Berkeley did not go fully into the question of illusoriness of space because he held to the wrong belief that God was outside. Kant too did not completely grasp it because he did not see that the Noumenon was inside the Atman. Much of the difficulty in understanding space is due to thinking of distance from the body, instead of knowing it to be an idea in mind.

@@ Space, time and cause are mental constructions: so long as they are regarded as real there is maya.

@@ All mathematical calculations and spatial measurements are but ideas in the end.

@@ Science as Jeans points out has found there is no space outside: it is imagination.

@@ What do you mean by "extrinsic to us?" Who is the "us?" If mind, how can you measure its dimensions? Where is the inside or outside of mind? If body, how is it different from other material existences? What do you mean by true? What you regard as true is regarded as false by B.

---

<sup>118</sup> The original editor inserted "223" by hand.

@@ There are two kinds of unreality. Barren woman's son is unreal. The snake seen in rope is also unreal. But the two categories have no connection and must not be confused with each other.

@@ The words "projection" and "external" are unphilosophic. From where to where, can there be the projection, when you know that the body is also an idea?

@@ In Indian philosophy there are two kinds of knowledge, false and true; thus you cannot deny that you have knowledge of a snake even though it be false; later you find it to be a rope and then you have true knowledge. The West having only one meaning for knowledge, i.e. true, have been compelled to raise the question of validity.

@@ The word real is quite meaningless if any philosophical writer uses it but fails to define what he means by it.

@@ 99% of the European idealists have made the mistake of allowing that the world is an idea but not their body. Similarly Indian Swamis and pundits say the world is Maya, let there be wars, what does it matter, but they regard their body as real and are anxious about its support and feeding and residence!

@@ There is no such thing as "outside" teaches Mandukya. In your dream you see a mountain outside, but it is not really so. Sankara has said that you see the mirage or the snake outside, but they are really in your own mind. You can never have anything as outside without the mind showing it to you, without thinking it, without using the mind to tell you. This is the reply to the realists.

@@ Realists who deny idealism and assert externality, have never grasped that they are dealing with opinion, matam.

@@ That the soul, say individual mind exists in the head, in the pineal gland, in the heart or elsewhere, are mere unproved theories, for the soul must first be detected and then measured. Who has done this? Nobody.

@@ What is it that prevents us seeing world in self? The error of thinking mind is in the body instead of reverse; mind cannot be confined to the body: we do not know its extent: nobody has seen it inside the body.

@@ In experience we cannot say there is nothing outside us. We were all conscious of objects. But then we cannot at the same time say we know the object, what it is. So we know and yet do not know a thing. There is something and we cannot say there is nothing.

@@ In all your writings on idealism it will be advisable to drop the use of the word object, objective, subjective, inside, outside, in and out when referring to relationship between things and the mind or between ideas and the mind. All these spatial propositions give rise to fallacies of thinking. For instance the objective idealists may say that things are outside the body but as the body itself is only an idea as well as an outside thing, then both are ideas. The word outside becomes meaningless. It will be more correct to substitute the word mentalism for idealism to say that a thing is mental rather than to say that it is an idea. However at different stages of the students progress we have to make use of different kinds of idealism showing him first what is true in each kind and then later criticising what is incorrect thus leading him from stage to stage to idealism and eventually beyond it.

@@ "Inside" and "outside" are terms having reference to the body. But the body is mental idea, hence as dimensionless as Mind. What is the use of such meaningless spatial terms?

@@ European Idealists made the mistake of not

---

<sup>119</sup> The original editor inserted "225" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) understanding mind as spatial.

@@ Do not use the word subjective: it is erroneous. You may however say things are outside body but never inside mind. When dealing with illusions you may say mind's creations can appear as an outside body.

@@ If you can get rid of the false belief that mind exists only in the head you can then understand that everything is in mind.

@@ Without getting rid of the idea of the body, it is impossible to understand Vedanta. The external world is always changing. It is going without your trying to get rid of it; but your identification with your body is very difficult to be got rid of. This requires effort.

@@ We cannot say where the limits of the mind are. The mind is like a mirror and our body is like a reflection in this mirror, just as all other objects are. When you know Mind is unlimited and that your body is limited, then it follows that the latter must be within the mind.

@@ Do not use the words "reality" or "real" in writing until you come to the chapter actually treating of it.

@@ Time and space being only ideas, no thing can exist inside you nor outside you; it is really the same as you, i.e. non-different.

## CHAPTER 12. DOCTRINE OF MENTALISM.

@@ T.H. Huxley said “To attack idealism is like biting a file. You will lose your teeth.”

@@ Science has already reached two great conclusions which are so near to Vedanta: (a) that Consciousness is ultimate, (b) that world is an idea.

@@ So many things appear to be real which are only ideas. This is shown by the study of psychology of insanity and by psycho-analysis. The next step is to ask “Is this world real?” You will then find that you are yourself creating the world but are unconscious of it. You are not conscious of this remarkable working of the mind. This is what Mandukya teaches. Thus the world turns out to be a thought; also the world may appear to be real, but you have to ask if it is so.

@@ The external world is mental. Science is now beginning to teach this.

@@ In waking state even doctors say: “Put mind right first and you get body right,” as mind constitutes world.

@@ Vedanta does not say there is only your idea of an elephant and no elephant outside. This is what Europeans think of Vedanta mistakenly. We admit that the external world exists, but we say that if you inquire into the nature of this world you will find it a mental construction; if you enquire into the external world, you will find it idea also. Hence we say that the external elephant does exist, but it is only an idea while the idea of the elephant also exists: when analysed both are found to be of the same stuff—thought. We are not so mad as to say the external elephant is not there and that you can dash your body are ideas.

@@ You cannot deny the elephant is there. But when you ask the question “Of what is this elephant’s nature” you will find it is mental substance

---

<sup>120</sup> The original editor inserted “227” by hand.

(continued from the previous page) alone.

@@ The universe itself may be said to be pervaded by the mind, i.e. I can stretch my thought anywhere, to include any distant spot.

@@ That concept of matter is only in mind, is the first stage of idealism: that matter is only mind is the next stage.

@@ If you think the world is unreal and your own body is real, then you are wrong. Only when you regard your own body also as unreal, can you grasp idealism.

@@ How do you know that the wall you see has another existence apart from the “seen” wall? i.e. that there is duality of a real material wall and also your sense-experienced wall?

@@ Johnson’s crude refutation of Berkeley was natural because he was not a philosopher. Berkeley later visited Johnson in return. He knocked at the door. Johnson asked Who is it? Berkeley gave his name. Johnson refused to unlock the door, and called out “No matter: Come in” He meant that Berkeley regarding the door as idea, and not material, should come through it. The fallacy in Johnson’s thinking is not to see that Berkeley’s body is also idea, unreal. He regarded Berkeley’s body as real and the door as unreal.

@@ The external wall is dependent on my mind Unless my mind is active I see nothing and the wall does not exist when my mind is not there, as in sleep. To say that the wall is still there in sleep is unprovable, hence unacceptable for Vedanta.

@@ Critic objects that granting snake is idea, what about the rope? Reply: Even that too must be known by the mind, hence is an idea. Therefore the imagination of a snake has been superimposed on another imagination, i.e. the rope.

@@ The world is there, we do not say there is no such thing as the world. We only say that



(continued from the previous page) it is kalpana, idea, and hence imagined.

@@ Because we are always thinking of ourselves as body, we continue to see the universe apart from ourselves. But if by new habit we think we are Mind, the world is in us, this is the value of idealism.

@@ Matter apart from its qualities, cannot be imagined, for no idea can be formed of it. How then did the idea of matter come into your head? Somebody told it you! No experience, no test, will prove its existence for you.

@@ Idealism has been wrongly understood in the West, as almost always it teaches that the world is an idea but holds to the old error that the body is real.

@@ The external world is there only when you are thinking; when you are not thinking (as in deep sleep or coma) it is not there: therefore it is only an idea.

@@ Independently of the mind you have never seen or had anything. Even when you go away from an object, when you think of it you think of it only in the precise manner that you had perceived it. i.e. as your mind had told you about it, as an idea.

@@ Those critics who say that as I am an idealist, I ought to treat my tooth-ache as imagined and do nothing for it, or that I ought to imagine a chair and sit on it, make two errors. First they assume that I take the world as unreal but my own body as real; second, that I take the world as unreal but my own ego as real. The only way to deal with such critics is to put them in touch with latest science, where from they will learn that Jeans, Eddington, Whitehead regard the world as an idea.

@@ I agree with Berkeley's phrase "Esse est percipi". This is equivalent to my doctrine that to say anything exists, it is the mind which tells you it is there, for perception is performed by the mind.

---

<sup>121</sup> The original editor inserted "229" by hand.

@@ Berkeley has pointed out that things already placed in existence differ from those which you placed there in imagination; but still both are ideas.

@@ The old dualism which separated mind from matter is beginning to pass away from modern thought. Nevertheless there is no final certainty among Western thinkers because they cannot say that the mind is same as or different from matter, nor can they say what mind is or what matter is. Our solution is that all these are mere thoughts, and you can neither postulate existence nor non-existence of reality. Mind must be active, must see. Take away the mind and you know nothing. The mind tells you there is a wall before you.

@@ Whatever I see, I see through my mind only. Even the so-called direct commonsense experience of the world is a thought of the mind, it is the mind working. No experience is possible without the prior existence of the mind. Hence all I know are ideas. The position that the world is idea is irrefutable. Even when a critic denies it he succeeds only in producing a thought. Even critic can only produce further thoughts. The next question which Europe has to ask is "What is an idea?" Here no solution is possible without avastatraya.

@@ Critics object that objects pre-existed before you were born. So how could your mind have created them? Our reply is that it is an assumption, something imagined, to start with, hence an idea of yours. Even if you had said that no mountains existed before I was born, it would have been only your imagination. That the external world existed before you were born, is told you by somebody also. You did not see it existing independently of your mind. Now you hear of it, when the statement is nothing more than a thought. How do you know that the world

(continued from the previous page) pre-existed? Only because you are told, or you read. But all this knowledge still depends entirely on your mind. Therefore it becomes your ideas and world is only that – nothing more.

@@ When we say world is idea, we mean that the world as we see is only mental. We do not mean it is ideal—that is a totally different meaning. “Idea” is not synonymous with ideal.

@@ What is it that you could ever know without the mind? It is the mind that tells you everything which you know. This is proof of idealism.

@@ We agree with the idealists as far as they go, but we go beyond them.

@@ The old query “How can a nerve-vibration be converted into an idea?” has broken down! Vanished as latest science has solved it by saying that the two are not separate, that mind and matter are one.

@@ Who has seen the world and its objects before man came into existence? Nobody. Therefore to talk of world as having existed apart from man is beyond our certain knowledge and will for ever remain so. We should take an agnostic view of this point. Therefore all the descriptions given by science of the evolution of man and animal kingdom, the birth of planets and the dissolution of the future worlds are merely hypotheses, guesses, if you like, i.e. they are only ideas. It is impossible for science to travel beyond this position. The history of the entire universe past, present or future will for ever remain unknown as facts; science can only possess ideas which are given it by mind alone. Hence Jeans was forced to say that what we can be sure of is Mind. Even energy, force, the electrons and ions are something known only to mind, hence as idea. Jeans went wrong in saying world was a thought in the mind, of the Grand Architect. All the advances of science must

---

<sup>122</sup> The original editor inserted “231” by hand.

(continued from the previous page) inevitably bring it to understand that the world is in and is mind i.e. idealism.

@@ Mentalism is a better name than 'idealism' because Berkeley, and Jeans have associated latter with God.

@@ What is matter? It is that which possesses form, and especially dimension.

@@ Now with the mind one can think of the room where one is seated, of a country 20,000 miles away, with equal facility. Distance is no bar or limit, and the mind can travel or rather extend in every direction. Hence I say that the body is in Mind, rather than mind is in the body, as yogis say. And since there is no limit to the mind's extension, I go further and say that the universe is in the mind. Therefore the world is only an idea.

@@ If the mind can be influenced as it can in hypnotism to perceive other people's ideas as realities, why should it not be able to so influence itself as to perceive its own ideas as realities? The Indian rope trick which I have never seen is an instance of mass hypnotism, but the altered clock feat which I have seen is no less striking as an example of mass hypnotism and if 500 people, sitting together, can be hypnotised into seeing their watches and a large clock as being one hour slow, why cannot the entire population of the world be hypnotised by the power of Maya into taking their own ideas or the external universe as reality?

@@ We know only ideas through the mind, and it is only mind that knows them, by the light of Consciousness. We never come in contact with any external world—never know it but only our idea of it. Realists object and say: Look at the real external world. They are in the same position as that of the madman who says: Look up in the sky and see my castle. Just as we

(continued from the previous page) ignore the mad man and do not waste time denying the existence of his castle, so from the standpoint of Truth there is no need to demolish the realist's position, simply because it cannot exist. Mind is all we know. The onus of proof is on the realist. When science itself clearly states, to use the words of Sir James Jeans that: "To-day there is a wide measure of agreement which on the physical side of science approaches almost to unanimity, that the stream of knowledge is heading towards a non-mechanical reality; and the universe begins to look more like a great thought than like a great machine" it will not be long before this position will become absolutely impregnable. Berkeley advanced similar ideas in the 18th century, but then he had not the advantage of the scientific information which is at our disposal today and could not offer such a wealth of proofs. He took his ideas from Plato, who got them from Parmenides, who got them from the disciples of Pythagoras who finally learned them during his travels and studies in India.

@@ The answer to Realists is: Is it not the mind itself which must first tell you that the world exists? In this sense, we mean that the world is not apart from the mind.

@@ The world passes away like an idea. Famous historical figures are now only ideas.

@@ The point is that the external object is made of the same stuff as the internal viz. the mind.

@@ When you understand that the world is only mental, then only can you become a Sanyasi; until then no one is really a sanyasi. The giving-up, the leaving off a certain things really means giving up the idea that external world is real.

@@ People go on using words like matter without knowing what they are talking about.

---

<sup>123</sup> The original editor inserted "233" by hand.

@@ Yogi says mind is in body. Look within. I say: Yes, so far so good. Then add, body is in the mind, look without!

@@ Everything in the universe is only consciousness or mind, i.e. ultimately Atman, this is the final doctrine of Vedanta. We acknowledge no reality in matter, whether animate or inanimate. Therefore we do not need the scientific hypotheses of the development of living creatures from non-living matter. No one can say whether this is really true because no one can ever know or verify, only guess or imagine.

@@ It is not enough to know intellectually that world is idea; you have to realise it, to feel it completely. Many academic philosophers know this theoretically but have not deeply realised it.

@@ Dualists say there is a wall outside. Those who say there is a wall (object) outside the mind talk non-sense. Vijnanavadins who say the wall is idea are so far correct.

@@ "This position of world's ideality seems so clear: then why is it our great thinkers of West cannot see it?" Because they are attached to world's reality through desires.. Hence the value and place of yoga and meditation, for latter detach man from desires and from sense of world reality.

@@ The real world is the mental world, and not physical, according to B. Russell.

@@ Even when anyone says there is an object outside independent of mind, what is it that tells you it is there? It is the mind! Therefore the object is not separable from mind.

@@ How do you know there is a brain unless you have a mind first? Whether the brain is capable of thinking or not, the mind to tell you so must first be there.

CHAPTER 12  
DOCTRINE OF MENTALISM

@@ The process of perception described by science is correct but it hinges on the point where you become conscious of the object. And this point is only when the impression reaches the brain and mind says the object is there. until then you are unaware of the object. Now the belief that there is an object outside is the inference you unconsciously make because you are habitually gripped by faith in causality. Yet it is only an unjustified inference. Why do we not see that object is only idea and not outside the idea? Because we wrongly think mind is confined to the physical brain. Hence the need to get rid of causal belief before objective idealism can be transcended. It is this blind belief that there must be a cause which makes us look outside for a cause for the idea which we imagine to be inside the head. Mind cannot be measured, you cannot limit it to a small space. Berkeley must be credited with having seen this; when he said, *esse est percipi*, he meant nothing is perceived outside the mind; he did not mean to be perceived outside the body is to be existent. Kant however added to this by discovering the attachment to causality which holds the mind unconsciously.

@@ It is more correct to write that the physical world seems to be made up of matter than to say that it is material.

@@ Philosophy does not even accept that the object outside is an inference. It dismisses it entirely as unknown. It knows only that the thing is an idea, a thought. It proceeds only at the advanced stage to say that reality cannot be external when it is addressing those who have grasped the meaning of “objective” when it says that the object is only Mind.

@@ The only thing we know beyond the physical is Consciousness. All else is conjecture.

@@ Idealism does not dispute the experience of

---

<sup>124</sup> The original editor inserted “235” by hand.

(continued from the previous page) a thing or its perception: it deals with the question of how to interpret this experience of what is seen.

@@ Who has ever been able to go and see that there is another, a second object, independently of our idea of it, as realists say?

@@ We can only know that there is an object through our mind; there is no other way.

@@ Materiality does not exist independently of the mind. It is your ideas that make you think of length, depth, thickness etc. as though you perceive them.

@@ Jeans is correct in dropping the word "idea" and using "mental" instead, meaning the same mind stuff as in dream for example.

@@ The teaching that there is an excitation in the brain which is followed by a percept is quite correct for practical purposes of physiology but not so for higher standpoint of philosophy. For who can see what is going on in the brain of another, be it excitation of otherwise?

@@ How can that which exists in space i.e. the body, interact with that which does not exist in space i.e. mind? It is impossible. How does the mind raise the arm? It is not possible to imagine that it can do so. The theory of interaction between body and mind, which Descartes taught is erroneous.

@@ If the pain supposed to be caused by a pin is not in any way like the pin itself, as effects are usually related to causes, then in what way is the sensation of a wall like or related to the external wall itself?

@@ Even when dualists say it is material experience that results still they overlook that it is the self which is subject of these experiences, i.e. the conscious mind.

@@ Nobody has seen electrons in a laboratory: they are only useful ideas.



@@ Who has ever seen the vibratory signs in the brain? They are merely inferred; we can correctly speak of only “activity within the brain.”

@@ Do not use the word “thoughts” to indicate that objects are ideas unless you qualify it by using the phrase “thoughts of things!” Otherwise people may take the term to mean fancies.

@@ What is it that ultimately exists? is the question asked by ontology. When you think of how the mind works to get its knowledge, you deal with epistemology. My knowledge comes from ideas, is epistemology. What my ideas really are, is ontology. It is the difference between what wrists and what is known. Hence there are two kinds of idealists, epistemological and ontological. Hence the need of saying what you mean when you use the word “idealism.”

@@ The whole aim of your book is not to show that matter is non-existent or that it is not present to us or that we do not see it, but that it is existent. We do see it and it is present, but that it is none other than mind: it is the same as mind.

@@ Our criticism of realism is that it implies direct experience of things, but this never occurs for the sense-organs, nerves, brain are intermediate between the object and our knowledge of it. For without the mind we could not know it. How could you have anything independent of mind? The experience is not direct if we assert sensory system is non-mental.

@@ The entire sensory system is after all only a mental construct and as such exists only when you think of it. It is re-created every time it is thought of, which means every time it is observed or seen. Do not commit the error of thinking it existed prior to the thought of it.

@@ From the standpoint of physiology the object-eye-nerve-brain

---

<sup>125</sup> The original editor inserted “237” by hand.

(continued from the previous page) order is quite correct. But psychology starts from what is, philosophically, a higher standpoint. The first asks, how do we come to see the object? The second asks how do we come to think of the object? The result is that psychology is forced to recognise that we thought of the object comes first on the scene, whereas the object itself and the entire sensory process are only inferences made subsequently. Hence psychology here makes a beginning of the higher standpoint of philosophy. It is science growing towards philosophy whereas physiology is science alone. Therefore a consideration of the order of awareness will throw light on the problem and compel us to proceed from physiology to psychology, i.e. from a view that takes matter as solely real to one that adds mind as real.

@@ Even if we take matter to be the sole reality in the universe what is it that tells us it is such? Mind! Therefore mind is prior to matter and must be real.

@@ When you ask for the cause of an idea of an object it seems that you have to get behind it. But this is impossible. Thinking cannot penetrate through.

@@ Replace term "idealism" by term "mentalism" and its antonym "realism" by the term "materialism" in your writing.

@@ There are two interpretations of Ideas. First those ideas which are voluntary, second those which are involuntary and which you cannot help admitting to your mind. The word "idea" is therefore ambiguous, for sometimes it is used in the first sense which refers only to single ideas and sometimes in the second sense which refers to those of spirit and mental, e.g. the first is your voluntary thought of bread, the second is your involuntary mental experience that is perception of bread.

@@ The reply to the psycho parallelism theory is, what is it that must tell you these parallels exist? It is mind.

@@ The answer to those who say matter is fundamental is, The mind must first be there to think with and have the thought that matter is so and so. Mind therefore is fundamental.

@@ It is scientific poetry to describe conditions in pre-historic periods, or to estimate the length of time during which man has been upon earth or during which earth itself has existed. For we can only imagine, not observe. And even if we handed down a traditional record by some observer who lived thousands of years ago, how can we be certain that he observed correctly?

@@ Most of the conflicting schools of philosophy have started on the wrong road. They do not understand that nothing is outside the mind, everything is in the mind, and this is the cause of the countless problems and perplexities in which they get entangled. The schools and their problems will go on to multiply each other and waste their time unless they first understand world is mental. Not knowing this, innumerable questions are bound to arise and satisfactory solutions be unobtainable. It is a waste of time to tackle all these theories for they will never get at truth.

@@ We do not know how consciousness emerges out of unconscious substance. Bose discovered that even plants show some kind of consciousness. When atoms, gases or electrons attract or repel each other, does this not indicate that there must be some awareness, intelligence, i.e. consciousness present in them? Thus science is moving to the recognition that it is everywhere.

@@ We cannot know the mind through the senses experience, yet we know that it exists.

---

<sup>126</sup> The original editor inserted "239" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) Nirvikalpa samadhi produces the knowledge that everything disappears into the mind. That is its only value.

@@ Nobody really knows what man was like 50000 years ago. Science can only imagine, i.e. hold an idea; it can do nothing more because it was not then present and it forms these ideas from what it sees around it now.

@@ The physiological theories that a good brain is needed for a good mind is as unproved and imaginary as the hatha yoga theories that bodily postures can produce mental powers. The physiologists are merely theorizing: they do not know. All that we definitely know is that there is a relation, a connection between brain and mind; but in what way this operates is unknown.

@@ Science is still wondering what the 'object' ultimately is. It has got as far as protons, particles, waves, energies, but still it does not know what the object's stuff is. Whatever further discoveries it makes it will only finish up in the end with the ultimate discovery that the object is mental.

@@ Even when the critic says that the wall is non-mental, he does not grasp it is only with the aid of the mind that he knows it!

@@ Those who look for an independent external material object as the cause of the mental percept, do not see that as there is really no matter the object must itself be an idea.

@@ How can any object in the world not exist as part of the mind because we are not thinking or not perceiving it? For when you say you are not thinking of Calcutta you actually do so.

@@ Our answer to all the theories of mind, body, such as behaviourism, epiphenomenalism and parallelism, is, "What is it that tells you about all these?" It is mind. What is it that tells you there is a body? It is mind. Hence mind is fundamental.

@@ All that we know about matter is our own imagination about it.

@@ Why do the scientists disagree among themselves whether world is idea? Just as in a hospital you find men who are fit only to be compounders in the dispensary, and others who are so expert as to be surgeons and doctors, yet all are labelled as medical men, so all are labelled scientists but many or most are fit only for practical laboratory work, only the few are fit for thinking out the implications of this work. Hence we find these few, Planck, Jeans and Eddington—recognised as the leaders in science, and they accept idealism, In the case of Einstein, who rejects idealism, he is admittedly a brilliant thinker, but being a specialist his field of view is narrow; hence he suffers like Gladstone from compartmentalism.

@@ Our answer to those who say idealism is only true of known things but need not apply to the unknown, the unperceived things, is: If you are going to deal with the unknown what guarantee have you that they even exist? None except that either in past or present, either by some other person or mind it has been known, perceived. Thus you return to the fundamental fact that the existence of a thing depends on your knowing it. Otherwise you merely infer it, but inference is not direct verification. If you say the wall existed unperceived while you slept, this is not correct. It was only after waking that you inferred it had existed, i.e. your mind told you so, which is again turning the wall into an idea!

@@ Sankara nowhere says the world is mental except in his commentary on Mandukya. Here he says it is kalpana. Kalpana literally means “concoction” or construction. We take it to mean “mental concoction”; i.e. idea although

---

<sup>127</sup> The original editor inserted “241” by hand.

(continued from the previous page) other schools do not accept it as such.

@@ The proof of mentalism is given in Deussen's "Elements of Metaphysics." It is: Take away the mind and show that there is an external world! And even those who object can offer no proof against it other than the mind's own statement.

@@ The mind-body problem is impossible of solution on any dualistic theory. Hence the numerous modern theories and their consequent confusion. The only solution is Vedantic non-dualistic theory of mind and body.

@@ The criticism of subjective idealism that we cannot creatively imagine an elephant and ride away on it to Bombay has not been satisfactorily met by Berkeley (with his God as putting real ideas in our mind whilst ours are imaginations, but both are ideas) or by Jeans (with his divine architect) and can never be met unless we eliminate the ego. This is the absolute essential requirement to solve this mystery, give up belief in its reality. This problem is answered adequately only by Gaudapada's Karikas for it involves "What is meant by I, by the witness etc. Berkeley could not go so far as the analysis of the mind. He not go so far as the analysis of the mind. His mere epistemology is not enough. It is impossible to overcome this objection except as Gaudapada's Karika of Mandukya has done it. There is no other way. For things exist only for the perceiver of them; i.e. for the ego. What is meant by subjective? It is within one's self, as mind or body, i.e. within the I. But the I itself is something known, hence idea.

@@ Those who say we cannot know an object in itself talk rubbish. For when they say this they are imagining the object, and thus actually knowing it as idea.

@@ If it be said that telepathy shows that other persons exist, i.e. exist in a way that objects do not we reply: even then you are

(continued from the previous page) imagining them, hence they also are ideas.

@@ The Phenomena of hypnotism do not offer conclusive proof of mentalism but only of the fact that thoughts can be spatialised and externalised, can be seen outside. For the things seen by the hypnotic medium are not seen by the others who are un hypnotised, i.e. hence the phenomena are not universally valid, which is what science requires in proof. Adequate proof must show that this tree which everybody sees in the waking state is only idea. If you object that there are cases of mass or crowd hypnotism that is not valid because hypnotism only applies to weaker minds responding to stronger ones and if among the crowd there is a mind stronger than the hypnotist's, he will not see the same phenomena as the others. However, another conclusion which may be rightly drawn from hypnotism is that all minds are somehow connected.

@@ There is no body without mind; mere chemical and mechanical processes do not suffice to account for intelligence displayed in bodily existence. The solution of the mind-body problem is that the two are inseparable. For body is only a thought and individual mind is only a thought. It is your own mind that has told you the two are separate, i.e. your own thinking, and its product is only thought.

@@ The outside independent thing cannot be known except through your mind, except through your idea of it. How else do you know the thing is there except that you form an idea?

@@ There is some material object outside which causes the sensation in me, but the object has never been seen independently of your sensation of it. There is nothing to show that it exists apart from your sensations. It is in fact only an inference. The sensations are our only data. If you go to the root of the matter, it shows that you do not know what is meant by seeing.

---

<sup>128</sup> The original editor inserted "243" by hand.

@@ All schools of philosophy differ as to the nature of the object.

@@ Vedantin does not say there is no external world. He says only that the external world (of objects) as well as the internal world (of ideas) are all of the same stuff, i.e. mind.

@@ The idea of a chair is different from seeing the chair. So there is the idea and perception of the object, say, the chair. That is the European theory. Vedantic position is: that there is nothing outside the mind, an object is known only through the mind.

@@ Until a man comes to the firm conclusion that all this universe is illusory, i.e. an idea, and has perfect mastery of his sense he cannot understand Vedanta; he is fit only for "mountanism" and "ashrams."

@@ Do you know the world is an idea? This is the question of questions.

@@ The phenomenal world can neither be renounced nor be accepted as it is, i.e. it is to be accepted as only an idea.

@@ Atoms etc. are concepts only. See Thompson's "Introduction to Science." page 138.

@@ If you know the whole world is an idea the point is clear and everything follows. Even my body disappears when I am in deep sleep. If the mind is not sharp enough to grasp idealism, then put it on yoga. Everything is done by the mind. All the phenomenal world is a projection of the mind.

@@ Without drawing on dream analogy, science draws on waking alone and proves world is idea.

@@ Mind becomes the wall because the latter is only an idea. Hence mind becomes the whole world. Hence saying that world is mind.

@@ If you analyse you will find this externally seen world would be identical with the mental world. This is scientific task.



@@ Take away the mind. Can you then see the wall? No. Therefore we say it must be of the same nature as mind. Were it different how can you know it? Hence the best way to deal with antagonists to idealism is to ask them to give proof of their position.

@@ The real difficulty in the idealism versus realism controversy is that the realists cannot understand our position. So they misunderstand it. What can you do then?

@@ All ideas are ultimately one stuff, Mind itself.

@@ All the terms "Subjective," and "objective" used in connection with idealism betray the error which regards body as real, not as idea. For such terms have meaning only in reference to body; being meaningless in reference to mind.

@@ Realists say the real external elephant is not the same as the idea of it which we have got. But we cannot get at the external elephant because we are limited to our idea of it and hence cannot compare the outside animal with this idea.

@@ Materialists who say mind is unknown and inferred from brain, which is alone known, are wrong. For it is awareness, mind, which tells us that the brain exists. When one is asleep it is impossible to know there is a brain. Hence mind does have an existence apart from the brain, unless the latter be regarded as idea. Consciousness is first fundamental.

@@ The word 'imagination' is dangerous to use when we mean 'a mental construction' because it leads to objection that you may imagine a horse but it will not be there. The difference is: a mental construction appears to you to be real, whereas an imaginary thing does not appear real.

---

<sup>129</sup> The original editor inserted "245" by hand.

@@ Nobody has yet demolished idealism; they have only demolished their own idea or imagination about it! It is an impossible task.

@@ The wall is not different from your mind; it is a part of it. This is not denial of its existence; we fully admit that the wall is touched, felt and seen; despite that, it is idea.

@@ The word 'imagination' is unfortunate to use in connection with Idealism. For critics will then say "I imagine a horse but it is not there." Better say "mental construction."

@@ If you know science you will know the relation between mind and mannter, that there is no real distinction between the two. You will know that everything is mind.

@@ There are those who say 'yes, we know the world is idea.' But they hold this merely as opinion or theory. They do not know it as a fact. To do this they must inquire within themselves until it becomes truth from which they can never get away.

@@ Science (e.g. Jeans, Eddington) is now beginning to understand that it is mind that appears as matter. They call the latter mental rather than idea. Let Ramanuja show us prakriti, matter, and it is impossible: he can only show objects. Kant and Berkeley made a good beginning but latest science is proving idealism.

@@ What is it that makes me see or know the wall? It is my idea. Therefore my idea must project itself outside. Hence mind is the cause of matter. Then we go deeper and say mind is the same substance as matter. Finally we go deeper still, and learn from non-causality that there are no two, (mind and matter), no duality.

@@ An "Idea" = mental thing.

@@ Science once taught the existence of other, in order to be able to explain how light travels. But nobody has seen either. Hence it is only a hypothesis, a supposition. Where is this supposition? It is in the mind. It is imagined. Now this idea has been dropped.

Remember this that if you go deeper into science, if you enquire further into matter, you will discover that in the end it is only what you imagine. Hence the “abstractions” and the “mathematical descriptions” of latest science are themselves mere workings of imagination. This process can go on indefinitely, partly because as one man affirms an idea another will arise and point out its discrepancies and partly because daily experience reveals that the mind has unlimited possibilities of imagining, i.e. of making abstractions or mathematical ideas. One day science will wake up, as Jeans and co. have begun to wake up, and recognise that all its accounts of the universe, all its mathematical explanations, all its working pictures, all its physical hypotheses are in the end formed in its own mind, are imagined, are mental.

@@ Nobody has seen a nerve-impulse travel from the sense-organ to brain: it is a deduction: i.e. an imagination in the end. All the inconsistencies, contradictions and difficulties contained in scientific views will disappear only when science comes to see that they are all only ideas, imaginations, mental pictures, and nothing more.

@@ When we say the mind has come into contact with the wall, all that has happened is that one creation of the mind has come into contact with another creation of the mind! This also happens in dream.

@@ Materialistic science through biology formerly said that matter evolved and mind gradually emerged as a result of this evolution and was a by-product of matter. Latest science had to give up this materialism and now says that we cannot

---

<sup>130</sup> The original editor inserted “247” by hand.

(continued from the previous page) say when mind began nor what it is.

@@ Energy is only a scientific concept, i.e. a thought. Thus in the end Science is forced into idealism. Go where it will, it must come to mind ultimately.

@@ Because we cannot point out where mind ends, we say that no object is outside it. Therefore only the idea exists, nothing else, no two. Hence subjective idealism is more correct than objective idealism.

@@ Unless you know that Mind is everywhere, and not confined to the body, you can never grasp that the object is only an idea, not an outside object plus inside idea. Nothing has ever been seen outside the Mind, as Berkeley says.

@@ The mind forms the picture of the object and then presents it to itself.

@@ Matter has slipped away from us: the physical world is not what it appears before our eyes. Physical world is ultimately non-existent. The notion of matter or substance has dropped out of modern scientific mind as fundamental. Matter has become immaterial by scientific analysis and by reasoning.

@@ Idealism: It is impossible to know anything beyond ideas. It is implied in the very fact of consciousness itself.

@@ There is absolutely no difference between an idea of a hundred dollars and the idea of a hundred dollars existing. — (Mandukya).

@@ Although you are seeing so many different things and persons, nevertheless they are all Mind.

@@ The desire for travel, to see other lands exists because you seek to know the place and thus bring it into your mind, your memory, and to keep it there even as idea. Henceforth it, being known, exists inside you and you are non-different from it.

@@ When analysing sensation show that science is perfectly correct from the practical standpoint when it says there is both an independent object and separate idea of it, but that when we go more reflectively to the ultimate standpoint the gap between both disappears and then the external object is discovered to be an idea. You cannot say that there is only an idea and not an independent object. You can only say that the material object when analysed turns out to be an idea, but it certainly disappears as an independent object. Therefore there might be two ideas of the same object, but when we rise to philosophy we discover that there is only one idea, a percept.

@@ If another man testifies to the existence of the world during the period when I am not perceiving it, then the world is still a percept for him. And finally the other man is only a percept for me; he has no more and no less authority than other percepts for he has no more and no less existence than them. Everything is in relation to mind and we cannot get out of it. Nothing is that is not thought of.

@@ What is it that tells you there is nerve-action, nerve-transmissions, brain-vibrations? It is the mind. Hence materialism is inverted, upside-down.

@@ To know that the whole universe is mind is an essential pre-requisite to know what Brahman is. The failure to grasp this accounts for the punditry in India which makes them leap over a gap to the dogma that Brahman exists, but how to get to this Brahman the pundits and yogis do not know.

@@ The fundamental fallacy of materialism lies in its failure to enter into the meaning of word real when it speaks of the reality of matter. For such inquiry would have to yield precedence to mind because it knows matter and is therefore the real. Such questions are discussed

---

<sup>131</sup> The original editor inserted "249" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) in our Upanishads.

@@ When science deals with the phenomena of mind it is psychology; when however it rises to enquire into mind as a whole it is philosophy. Hence the science of psychology is forced to become philosophical when it wishes to pursue its activity to a deeper stratum.

@@ To those critics who say Idealism confused to exist with to know, we reply: Has exist any meaning? Yes. Then it is idea, thought, known to mind.

@@ Those critics of idealism who ask "What was the world before human minds existed?" ask an unaskable question which is quite out of order. The first fallacy is that matter existed before mind. How do they know this unless the mind is first there to tell them? Science now admits, moreover, that we do not know when mind came into existence. Hence no critic can definitely say it came later than the material world. We can only say that Consciousness is fundamental and everything else is derivative.

@@ Without the mind we can never know any object. Hence we teach mentalism as higher stage of idealism.

@@ Everyone can understand that ideas within the body are ideas but few grasp that objects outside the body are ideas. Hence the Objective Idealists are nearer advaitic truth. This is what Kant and the objective idealists teach. Berkeley's error was to say the objects are within mind, as though the mind had the three dimensions and could be measured, and to drag in God as the cause of these ideas.

@@ How can ideas be embodied? In what are they embodied? If in matter, science has proved there is no such thing.

@@ Nobody can draw a line between matter and mind, is the pronouncement of latest science.

@@ All we know are our thoughts. But the thought makes us think of an external object.

@@ After we have completed the physiological inquiry and shown that sense-experience is ultimately the experience of thoughts, you will be asked "What becomes of the original object which gave rise to the whole process? How to account for it?" Vedanta replies that whatever the object be it will have to be known as an idea because we can know only mental things, because we can know only mind. Even if we get at it, we shall find it cannot be independent of mind. If people say it is material we shall know this so-called matter as being mental, but science has already exploded matter and proved its illusoriness. But we do not stop there. Vedanta says that if we have to recognise the original independent object as being an idea then the intermediary parts of sensory process i.e. eye, nerve, brain, must logically be ideas also. What happens therefore is that we return to our starting point and discover that the original outside object which gave rise to the sensations is our perception of it, that the thing is the thought perceived, the seen image in the mind was also to cause the image to arise. How so? Because we began with an assumption that there was an object independent of the mind and we continued to assume that the thought which arose was independent of this object, so finally we have to decide that the object itself must be still there outside. But our initial assumption was unwarranted; it is only our imagination at work; and the truth is that there is no duality of thing and the perceived percept of the thing; rather there is only one entity: i.e. the thought itself. Much of this confusion has arisen because of the use of the word 'idea' of things, for we habitually believe that ideas are internal and do not grasp that they may be external too, that therefore space is as illusory as matter. The essence of this explanation

---

<sup>132</sup> The original editor inserted "251" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) is that the whole thing is travelling unconsciously in a circle. We start with an idea and end with precisely the same idea. What we start with we call outside object and what we finish with we call percept. Our illusion lies in thinking the two are different; they are not but one and the same.

@@ The materialistic theory that mind is built up by food, or by certain foods, and is therefore dependent and derivative on food, as also the scientific experimental psychological laboratory work to indicate that mental states depend on matter and to measure them, is limited because it does not rise above empiricism to philosophical enquiry into the meaning of terms "knowledge" and "experience" which it uses. Were this true why do you find men with weak bodies who are brilliant thinkers and men with strong bodies who have poor mentality?

@@ Do not use the word Idealism as both subjective and objective idealism are fallacious. Simply give one or two paras to explaining how such terms are used and why they are wrong. Use instead the word mentalism that things are mind, not ideas.

@@ If a man says Mind is the product of material evolution, we reply: Were you present 200 million years ago to note the beginning of such evolution? No. Then you are merely imagining. Secondly what is it that must be previously present which enables him to make such an assertion? It is mind, awareness! Hence mind comes first, matter, whatever it be comes afterwards.

@@ Your philosophic attitude which labels external things as "mental" does not change them. They still remain as they are, i.e. external, hard and tangible.

@@ Those realists who talk of any reality other than Mind, are elementary and childish.



### CHAPTER 13. THE ILLUSION OF WORLD EXPERIENCE.

@@ Science has never touched the Drik: it deals only with the objective world, the vyavaharic plane.

@@ The Witness itself is gnanam; it is quite erroneous to say it has gnanam. It is thinking, seeing, the distinction between objects and the knower is produced by itself.

@@ If you want the real, the permanent, think of the drik for the drsyam is ever changing. But how to think of drik without making it an object? Only by negating what is not drik (Neti, Neti); for you cannot do it by positing. That which sees, knows all the drsyams is Mind limitless.

@@ Every thought is an object, drsyam. That which cannot be cognised by any thought, which is beyond all doubt because it is that which is the ultimate consciousness of the doubter, that is Brahman.

@@ Europe does not know that whatever is known is only fleeting drsyam, whether it be idea or material thing.

@@ The danger of accounting for past epochs of world or distant regions where no humans exist, by Ferrier's doctrine is that it may introduce the God-Mind as their perceiver, thus overlooking that latter is itself a percept, hence an idea, imagined. (Why not of this God is Jovara, not Nrigusa – P.B)<sup>134</sup>

@@ If you analyse Mind you get only new ideas, thoughts, unless you understand the difference between Drik and Drsyam. West is not able to distinguish Witness from seen for its mind is not sharp enough to see that Mind cannot be made an object of thought, i.e. a drsyam, that which is aware of sensations and thoughts is different from the sensations and thoughts themselves. Hence Western psychology is giving up use of word 'mind' as hopeless. It has not yet gone into the meaning of awareness. It has to receive Drg Drsyam, the notion that there is an awareness on which we rely.

---

<sup>133</sup> The original editor inserted "253" by hand.

<sup>134</sup> The original editor inserted "(Why not of this God is Jovara, not Nrigusa – P.B)" by hand.

@@ Constant change, flux, gives the appearance of time and substance but they are not really there, only our ideas of them are there. The object as a stable separate thing does not exist, except in our imagination. Gnan cannot be got by those who are deceived by this appearance, maya, who take it as real. The only real is the Drik, that sees it.

@@ Rope is the sub-stratum of the snake in the rope: the snake which you see in the rope has no real existence. It is only in your mind. i.e. it is your imagination. The next step is then only "What is the rope". It is also your imagination. Everything is only a superimposition, i.e. an idea in the mind.

@@ Who knows the waves? The ocean knows the waves.

@@ The experiencer is ever changeless, while the experienced i.e. the objects of experience changes. The temperature at which a particular kind of substance burns is always the same. It does not depend upon the quantity of fuel consumed. The boiling point of water is also the same, changeless.

@@ If drik alone exists, how do you account for the existence of all the drsyam that appears and disappears? How do you account for the temporary existence even of the drsyam. Just like the son of a barren woman does not exist in fact or in illusion. Hence because drsyam appears, we have to account for it.

@@ Without appearance of the drsyam, we cannot even posit a drik. Because we comprehend, we say there is something which has got the power of comprehending things. If everything is a known, who is the cogniser? Only as long as we see a drsyam can we think of a drik which understands it. Can ideas stand in the air? There should be something to give meaning to

(continued from the previous page) them. Just so, the snake cannot exist without the substratum of the rope, nor the mirage exist without the substratum of the desert.

@@ The ideas can exist only in mind. Unless the rope is there, we would not have seen the snake.

@@ When the mind thinks about an object (or any idea) it forgets about the thinker, (or he who thinks the thoughts).

@@ What we can say is only that ideas appear and disappear in the mind. Now what is appearance and disappearance? These are also ideas in the mind. Hence we say that the ideas also are of the mind. Now what is Mind? The highest we can say is that it is that which becomes aware of ideas.

@@ If you have ideas, where are the ideas to stand? Can it stand in the void? No. There should be a substratum for the ideas to stand on and this is the mind. Turiya cannot be indicated by words for words indicate ideas and it is only that in which the ideas come and go. We see a snake in the rope. What is the relation between the snake and the rope? There is no relation.

@@ Everything else can be contradicted but not that which knows everything. Hence That Drik is the truth. This non-contradict ability characteristic exists because all the other things pass away, but Drik, Atman does not change.

@@ Both Seer and Seen are only the same stuff, the Mind, as dream teaches.

@@ Every drsyam which passes away is, after all, only passing into the drik.

@@ Everything is indicated to you by the awareness within you. It is that which enables you to prove things; that is the ever-present witness which is itself beyond doubt.

@@ Everything in this world appears and disappears, therefore it is not unchanging reality. Hence there is no reality to be found in this

---

<sup>135</sup> The original editor inserted "255" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) world. Europe does not see this because it does not distinguish between Drik and Drsyam. Hence all its definitions of reality are contradictable.

@@ We eliminate the drsyam, the object, as a tentative position, but afterwards we rise to Brahman, the All.

@@ To understand a thing, to imagine it, to form an idea of it, it must be in you. Those who say everything is in God talk nonsense.

@@ What is the nature of Drsyam? Change. Therefore any theory or any fact based on science must change.

@@ Two factors—knower and known—are always present. We have to examine what they mean.

@@ At no time can you say there is no witness. Otherwise how could you have been aware of it? The Witness is awareness.

@@ Where is change seen? Only in the objective world.

@@ Both the world of matter and the world of ideas, the objective and internal worlds, taken away will leave the real, drik, for both are things that pass away, drsyam, and are the seen.

@@ Unless you analyse with utmost keenness what is drsyam and what is Drik, higher Vedanta cannot be understood.

@@ Where is drsyam? After all, it is not outside the mind! All objects are still inside it. For without mind you could never know of their existence.

@@ Every form comes and goes; new forms arise and follow: science proves that all things change and vanish: what has become of the forms? What is form? Form is that which has no independent existence; it can't stand alone. Where does it go? It goes back into mind. Hence the first stage is to see form as Maya; the higher stage is to see it as essence of Mind, i.e. Brahman

@@ Duality cannot explain the mind-body problem: hence the two theories of materialistic monism or idealistic monism alone can hold the field: but adequate solution lies ultimately in non-duality.

@@ Everyone sees the stick is bent in a vessel of water. Yet everyone sees the Chamundi hill and believes it is there whether he sees it or not. Yet without the mind the hill cannot be seen, i.e. it must exist in someone's imagination as Einstein's discoveries have begun to indicate. For you can never prove that the hill exists when you are not seeing it. You can only infer that it still exists because other persons come and tell you they saw it. And even when you actually see it yourself, analyse the process of seeing, it was being seen in mind only. And if you think it is still there when you are not seeing it, then again you are only imagining it.

@@ The critical realists admit that everything is mental but that it can exist outside in others' minds and can exist without being known; the reply is that how do they know that these things exist for others? And how do they know that other minds exist? Both are unproved because both are necessarily imagined.

@@ We start with mind and matter. We bring matter into mind by enquiry. This is idealism. Next we have to inquire into mind, for its continuous existence is denied by Vijnanavadins and Nastikas, so there we have to examine meaning of existence and ascertain what it is that knows the ideas, and thus we arrive at Atman. Hence Atman is equivalent to mind after the latter has been enquired into but not before. For Atman presupposes permanent existence. And we have to do this because mind is a word which is understood by more people much easier than Atman, which is understood by few. We cannot jump to Atman. Moreover Atman is a Sanskrit

---

<sup>136</sup> The original editor inserted "257" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) term and what is the use of it to those who do not know Sanskrit?

@@ You must not fallaciously say mind is immortal merely because we cannot see it die. This is bad logic. Because a thing cannot be disproved, this does not prove it to be true. To prove immortality we have to rise higher than idealism, we have to go to the more advanced Indian teachings.

@@ Those who regard the world as real have to regard it as permanent also. But analysis shows it to be a flux, like cinema pictures whose figures are solid but actually unsubstantial.

@@ You think the world is solid stable and fixed but although you do not notice it, everything is passing, flowing away. The cinema is a fine illustration of this.

@@ What has become of the red colour of a faded flower? It was only a piece of your imagination. If colour were a thing where is it after fading? If perfume were a thing and not idea why can you not locate it again? Hence the meaning of Change is that it is only appearance, i.e. idea.

@@ So long as a man does not know the changing, ever passing nature of the visible world, he cannot get detachment. For he will think of the body as real along with the world, and will remain attached to it.

@@ We unconsciously superimpose the permanence of the Atman upon the flux of the visible world, and thus deceive ourselves. This is Maya. The sense of reality and permanence which we ascribe to the appearance arises from within ourselves. It is a genuine sense but it is misapplied.

@@ If you want to teach a man the meaning of Maya take him to a cinema. The pictures are continually passing away, yet their figure appear and talk like human beings.

@@ Maya: 1st stage - world is real. 2nd stage: world is always changing i.e. elementary notion of maya: 3rd stage: enquiry into what is this form. Where has it gone? What is it that is changing? i.e. advanced interpretation of Maya.

@@ Maya = anicca (Pali) = Anithya (Sanskrit), i.e. world is constantly changing, passing away.

@@ Maya means that which appears and disappears but cannot be accounted for. Where did the colour of a withered flower which your eyes saw, go to? If a thing that is seen by the senses must be permanent, real, (Johnson stamping his foot), where has this real colour gone? What is meant by the withering of the flower or by the decay of brick walls? Hence Maya is that which is seen but not known. It is same as Greek (parmenides) theory of world flux but we go farther and ask, Where did the flux go? We enquire into this and do not stop till the answer is found.

@@ Pundits do not understand Maya. They quote (barren woman's son) as example of it. This is nonsense. No such thing was ever seen, whereas Maya is the stubbornest of facts. It is the fact of the world that confronts you. If you wait thousands of years this world forms are momentarily ever-changing into decay and vanish. This mysterious vanishing is Maya.

@@ Drik is not the least affected by the drsyam, never touched by it. There is no connection between both because drsyam is ever appearing and disappearing where drik is the seer of these changes. It is the immortal part of self always looking at these things.

@@ In a duality one is the knower and the other is known. Experience implies such duality. The knower is the Mind. The known is an object, an object is an idea, a mental construction, an idea is eventually reducible to Mind's. Hence all experience is brought back to Mind and non-duality.

---

<sup>137</sup> The original editor inserted "259" by hand.

@@ We can only speak of existence in reference to objects. Appearance and disappearance of the world depend on activity or inactivity of mind.

@@ Words alone will not suffice. We must enquire: What does the mind do when it has studied all texts? Where is its knowledge? In the mind. But that which is in the mind is only an idea. Now ideas change every moment, they are drsyam. Ideas can never grasp the drik. Even if you get to the last stage and get an idea of Atman, that Atman is still only an idea. All drsyams must go before we can really know Atman. What is meant by “understanding anything, even God?” That you imagine it! It is only an idea.

@@ Where do you find decay? Only in the drsyam.

@@ When you speak of the existence of a thing, what do you do? You speak of a drsyam, never of the Drik. It is the same when you speak of non-existence. Hence we say drik is beyond both.

@@ We start by separating seer from seen, thus admitting the latter to exist separately. But this is only a concession to the mental weakness of novices. Later we go to the real truth, i.e. that anything other than Atman never existed.

@@ The first stage is to regard all things as Drsyam, and separate yourself from them. But this is tentative and is for those who still labour under the ego-complex. But the next and higher stage is to see them all as Brahman, when you no longer turn away from them, all is then I.

@@ When you are only getting a thought, you are getting a drsyam, the fleeting.

@@ Witnessing is also a function of the mind.

@@ The idea dissolves back into the mind.



@@ Reason can tell you only one thing ultimately, that every object and every thought you can think of is a drsyam and not highest reality.

@@ Of what can you be sure? I am sure of this wall, that object, etc. But I am more sure of myself. Assertion and denial presupposes the existence of one who affirms of denies.

@@ Guru is necessary to tell us that the Witness is different from the thought.

@@ The knowing capacity is the Witness and the known is the object. The going and coming must be known to something unchanging, i.e. ideas come and go and dissolve themselves in the mind.

@@ Mind consists of (a) Drik and (b) drsyam.

@@ Every object seen is changing every moment. Thoughts are changing, so also body. Drik is the only unchanging entity. Granting that you see God, is it a drik or drsyam? If it is drsyam it changes, it is not permanent. It comes and goes. Whenever the mind is active and you think, there is the drsyam which changes at every moment.

@@ Enquiry is the only remedy to get rid of ignorance for the philosopher will always be enquiring into the truth. The scientist is concerned with the different stages only of these changes of the world. Discrimination is the enquiry into the nature of both and knowing the drik as the entity which sees the appearance and disappearance of the drsyam.

@@ Drik means that which knows, that which is knowledge itself.

@@ If you analyse all the objects in the world, all the bodies, you will find that ultimately there is only one substance, one thing which changes into all these different forms. We then go further and say that this unitary substance can be traced to consciousness.

@@ The word drik has not meaning unless there is a drsyam.

---

<sup>138</sup> The original editor inserted "261" by hand.

@@ All thoughts are only Drsyam, objects.

@@ Look within yourself. You see Drik, perceiver, and drsyam, object, thought. Everything you think of is drsyam, hence never towards the perceiver. Anything that you may say, any answer you may receive, it will be in the world of objects only: it will never approach their perceiver. Hence objectiveness implies duality. Ideation implies duality, and duality denies the real.

@@ Indestructibility of Matter is the first lesson of science. Indestructibility of Energy is the second lesson. Indestructibility of Mind is going to be the third less of scientific psychology.

@@ If one thing has gone and another has come, then mind must have been there to note these two different points of time. The knower must be changeless. Yet Bergson wrongly thinks that both the knower and the known, i.e. experienced are changing.

@@ What are thoughts? These questions arise out of examining the working of mind, which is the essential and unique task of Vedanta. Western epistemology stops with aham; hence its failure to reach final conclusions.

@@ Everything is wearing out but we are under the illusion of the permanent nature of things. Mountains are crumbling down every moment. Similarly with ourselves. We can never think of death. Our ego seems permanent. But there is nothing permanent.

@@ That which changes cannot be Brahman. Hence ideas cannot be Brahman.

@@ All the elements such as prakriti, named by pundits as ultimate reality or realities of the world, are mere creations of the mind, hence imaginary, hence fictitious.

@@ Where can ideas stand except in Mind, Brahman? How it does so is a different and difficult question.

@@ Science proves by waking state reference alone that the world is a world of concepts, and concepts are ideas. It reduces world to a mind. Planck has admitted that everything is derivative from consciousness. The word “matter” has gone out of science. It shows things are only the essence of mind. It is not necessary to go beyond this, because Mind is Atman when it is enquired into. Without science Mayavada cannot be explained.

@@ I am not an Idealist. I only say that unless you rise to the level of idealism you cannot rise to the next level of Brahman. The word ‘idea’ is introduced to show that it may be seen outside you by the senses, and despite that it is only idea. I am not like the Buddhist Vijnanavadins who are idealists because they wrongly believe there is nothing higher than ideas.

@@ Unless you grasp that world is an idea, there is no other way of proceeding to the higher truths of Vedanta.

@@ All the past history of the world is now only a series of ideas. Thus what you consider so real now is known a little later as idea. Everything in this world is being converted into ideas constantly.

@@ The common factor of all thoughts is Mind. The common feature of matter and mind is Mind, because objects exist only when they are known to mind.

@@ We agree with nihilistic Buddhists that the mind does create its ideas, world; but there must be a reality behind this appearance. How can you have even the momentary appearance of objects unless a reality lurks behind? How can you see snake unless rope is there? Mind itself tells you about the snake or about the object, hence Mind is the hidden reality. The mind must get detached from the notion of world’s reality, i.e. look on it as idea. This is the first renunciation, sanyas.

---

<sup>139</sup> The original editor inserted “263” by hand.

20<sup>140</sup>

@@ As Bergson and the Buddhist idealists teach everything is idea, that each idea is fleeting. Thus this table lasts only a millionth of a second but the continuous multiplication of the same idea of table fuses the countless ideas of it and gives the impression that it is lasting for twenty years. The time itself is only an idea as Kant shows and Einstein implies. It is precisely the same with a cinema picture of a table; it shows for a half-hour the same table but actually it consists of thousands of separate pictures fused together. So our world of ever-changing flux appears stable because the multitude of ideas follow with such rapidity as to yield the impression of stability.

@@ Millions of thoughts come and go, still Mind remains the same, unchanged, just as images in a mirror are unable to affect the mirror itself.

@@ The first stage is to know the world is idea; the higher stage is to inquire what they are and to know all ideas are only mind.

@@ The mystic's stigmata show how mind influences body. Vedanta goes farther and says Mind creates the body.

@@ Death means conversion of forms considered real into ideas.

@@ Everyone talks of having been born but nobody has seen his own birth. He merely believes or infers, or supposes it. Birth implies having consciousness, yet you are not conscious of your birth. Similarly with death. It implies the end of consciousness, yet we cannot truthfully say that we are dead or know we are dead. All this indicates what Europe does not grasp, that consciousness can exist as Unconsciousness, without a second thing to be aware of, which is also proved by deep sleep. We therefore have no right to limit the existence of Mind only to what we are immediately aware of.

---

<sup>140</sup> The original editor inserted at top of the page read: "20 by hand."

@@ Western outlook must first be fully convinced of mentalism: only then should it proceed to the next step, which is Drg Drsya Viveka.

@@ If you could only wait long enough, this table, this Chamundi hill even, will crumble away under the action of weather, etc. and vanish.

@@ Consciousness is not a thing which can be made a drsyam. It cannot be seen as an object; it cannot be presented to itself.

@@ What did the Greeks mean by saying that philosophy was the study of death? Well, what is the chief characteristic of an idea? It is something which comes and goes, transient, hence always dying. This is what you mean by an idea in contrast with the objective world of mountains and bodies around you. The ideas live only for a few seconds and vanish whereas the objective things persist at least for the whole of your lifetime. It is this striking contrast which makes you say your thoughts are ideas whereas the surrounding things are realities. But now consider! What is the ultimate fate of these things and bodies? Will they too not have to die? They will—even though it take but 70 or 80 years in the case of your body and 70 or 80 million years in the case of a solar system. All will decay and disappear. Hence they too are ideas, the only difference being that they occupy a relatively longer time to exist. But consider again: during dream a few moments may seem to take a whole day. Therefore time itself is only an idea. Einstein found that planetary times differed but he did not see farther that the time of the entire universe was also idea. Thus the whole of existence is idea, because everything is subject to death. Death is the problem which faces every man; he cannot escape and therefore ought to study it. This study of what death means is philosophy: But what is it that knows these things as dying,

---

<sup>141</sup> The original editor inserted "265" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) these ideas as appearing and vanishing? That witness is what we call the Atman: that does not pass away and hence does not die. In this sense you can see all these ideas, bodies and things which vanish vanish only back into Atman and live perpetually therein. Thus ultimately there is no death when you can look so on all things as being Atman. It is thus that the philosopher conquers death, thus that he sees the universe in Atman, hence in himself as Atman. This is a secret teaching which I give you. The secret is that after death you will continue to live on in those you love most, for you have identified yourself with them.

@@ Thoughts are not the things we want. They are ephemeral. We want the permanent Atman. But thoughts are not useless. For they make us ask, who is the seer of the thoughts? And thus we get the idea there is a Drik. Similarly, that which says, "Neti, Neti," is there. And in eliminating world we must not make the mistake of eliminating the Drik.

@@ The purpose of illness and disease is the same as the purpose of death. They teach men that everything is in flux, vanishing and transient: yesterday you were strong and healthy, today you are weak and ill. What became of your health? It is the same problem of as what became of the faded colour of a rose? The lesson of all this transiency, of all illness, is that the body is only an idea.

@@ The definition of reality prepares the way for the definition of truth. That which reveals the meaning of reality is called truth. Everything that appears and disappears, i.e. drsyam contradicts itself and hence is not reality. It is the contradictable.

@@ Drsyam, the seen=that which changes constantly. Drik=that which sees all these changes.

@@ When you think of an object, then the notion of subject appears simultaneously with it, and vice versa. Similarly when you think of consciousness, the idea of something of which it is conscious, rises too. Unless you have a drik you cannot have a drsyam. These dualities are inseparable. But they rise together always, we must conclude they are of same substance, one thing. It is the way you think of them in their ultimate Nature, then you resolve the duality and call them both Atman.

@@ The unconscious object of science is to show that the world is unreal, drsyam, ever-changing.

@@ What we find to be unreal and changing is still an idea and therefore Mind in the end. Thus converting the world into unreality is a necessary half-stage to converting it to Reality. But it is only a stage and we should not stop there.

@@ European epistemology does not go to the last stage. It does not look into its own mind and ascertain what it is doing when it is thinking, what it is doing when it forms an idea. The portion of epistemology dealing with existence is not yet known in Europe. There is no such thing as existence without its implication of non-existence, and vice versa. Such duality is not Brahman.

@@ An idea, whether of God or of an ant, is only a piece of imagination; a drsyam which passes away. It is the knower of the idea, the drik, who does not pass away.

@@ The universe is seen and exists for the gnani as for others, only he has penetrated its illusion and finds its reality is not there. It exists as an appearance. It is constantly changing, here for a moment and then vanishing, as science proves. It is not what it was a minute ago.

@@ There is only one substance which appears as many even in this empirical world. The lovely

---

<sup>142</sup> The original editor inserted "267" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) mangoes which you get from Bombay are nothing but the transformed feces of Bombay people used as manure for the mangoe-tree.

@@ How do you know that you are not the body? 1. It is seen by you as an object. 2. It has all the characteristics of drsyam, i.e. it is changing gradually and you are seeing the changes.

@@ It is impossible for any two things to be exactly alike. In some respect they are bound to differ. For practical purposes we may take them as similar, however.

@@ Continuous change is the feature of Maya: the ignorant think its forms to be a sequence of cause and effect, a production of something new; the wise know its essence is always the same – Brahman.

@@ All talk of Maya is only a tentative position. It is for those who cannot think of Mind by itself, who cannot detach Drik from Drsyam. In truth, however, Maya is only an idea, and ideas are only Mind.

@@ The word change can only be applied to objects. You cannot think of change where the witness is concerned, for there must then still be a witness to note the change.

@@ By the time you say the wall is here, it has changed, moved. Hence you cannot say it is this or that for it is ungraspable. It eludes thought and determination.

@@ Maya's "concealing power" merely means that when you look at an ink-bottle you think only of the bottle. But a gnani will think of the Self too, of the ink-bottle as being Self. Hence in the first case the Self is concealed by the ignorance of the man.

@@ Outer world we see things appearing and disappearing. Where do they go? Inner world of dreams, we see ideas appear and disappear. Where do these go? That into which all these



(continued from the previous page) go is Mind but it is indescribable. We cannot say what it is ultimately, but we know it is.

@@ We exhale carbon and plants absorb it: we pass urine and flowers absorb it. It is one and the same thing which is being converted into various forms.

@@ Life means work going on, which means change, constant transformation.

@@ If there were not continuous change in all objects, how would there be gradual decay? It does not come suddenly. The change goes on every second. Science's investigation of atoms proves this experimentally.

@@ The flux-oneness principle applies not only to physical world but also to mental world. The very words you use were got from others, the ideas you think were learnt from others, hence which of them can you say are really your own? In this way the oneness of mind-world is seen.

@@ Change is continuous, says Bergson.

@@ Getting rid of world does not mean, that it must become imperceptible to the senses. It means that you must know that it is destructible, it is ever-changing. You must know its real nature; its unreality. You must give up the notion that it is real. The knowledge of Atman cannot destroy the objective world, but can only give you the idea that it is unreal. Modern science proves that everything is changing every moment. Philosophy has to consider and answer the question: How that which changes, appears to be changeless?

@@ World is not real, means: what you considered at one time real is not real, or what you considered as existing apart from you is not really so. To prove this we must go to modern science. The change is ever going on continuously.

@@ What became of the beautiful form, the colour and the smell? It changes at every moment. We do not know where it disappeared. We have no explanation for this. This is Maya.

---

<sup>143</sup> The original editor inserted "269" by hand.

@@ “Destruction of the world” does not mean that you should become imperceptible to the sense; but the actual knowing the nature of the world as destructible and unreal. What is lost is lost and does not come back. When the mental creations are themselves going away, in what respects is the objective world better. It is the notion that they are real should go. How are we to do it? The world appears, disappears continuously and you have to infer. If a true knowledge of Atman is able to destroy all the world it does not destroy it; are we not now reaping the effects of past karma? It only teaches the unreality of the universe. Know them to be unreal, the externality of the objects.

@@ The Himalayas, the sun, the moon etc. and even the stars are not permanent. Only the Drik is permanent for we have not yet seen it coming and going.

@@ A simple laboratory experiment will show that we perpetually exhale carbon. Breathe into a test-tube of lime-water and it turns into chalk. Analyse this: it is carbon.

@@ Every minute a thought dies and a new one is born. Hence there is internal series of birth and death, just as every minute external forms are born and die instantly.

@@ I see the world here. But what is meant by seeing it? What is it finally that you call the world? It is ever-changing. What is the ultimate which changes? Where does its vanished forms go to? Thus philosophy keenly enquires until it reaches the final reality.

@@ Maya is flux. It is a metter of keener observation. We see stable object but microscope sees the flux. Mind is behind both. Thus Maya disappears when you enquire into it.

@@ Everything known or seen is a drsyam, and must be transient. Hence give it up if you seek reality.

@@ How can Sunya Buddhists say there is void, Nothing: there must be something to note this void, i.e. a Drik. Words cannot reach Brahman, but you dare not say it does not exist, if you do you will stultify yourself.

@@ Science has failed to ask the question: "What is an idea?"

@@ The Ultimate is not a void because of this fact: the world illusion is there, you cannot deny its existence: the snake illusion is there, even though it is something other than snake. This is quite different from the barren woman's son, which not only does not exist but has not even an illusory existence. The distinction must be noted. When you speak of illusion, remember it has two meanings (a) non-existence like a barren woman's son, (b) illusive existence like snake-rope. The world illusion belongs to the second class, but not the first. There is something existent, but it does not exist as it appears. World is constantly changing and disappearing, this is maya, but it has a substratum. So we say just as snake illusion cannot exist without a rope, so ideas cannot exist without a mind as substratum.

@@ If the critics object that using a word like "substratum" indicates that the supposedly unreachable Brahman has been expressed by this word, we reply that you must analyse what happens when you think, when you bring thoughts into being and express them verbally. Here Einstein's discovery of relativity is a great achievement to prove Vedanta. He shows that every man views things differently: each may see something else, because the idea is seen there. Who is to say which man is right and which is wrong. All are right and wrong from their respective angle of view. Three persons seeing a rope may say it is a snake, a garland or a ribbon of water. Their inability to know what is superimposed renders it impossible to

---

<sup>144</sup> The original editor inserted "271" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) know substratum. Hence Einstein has failed to answer, "What then is the thing in itself?" Unless we get our minds clear as to what constitutes the super-imposed illusion how can you ever know the reality beneath it? Impossible. Hence we say that all such confusion about the nature of illusion, idea, etc. must be set right first. We have to advance from the known to the unknown in all methods of getting knowledge. But if the apparent-known (snake, garland etc. symbol of world illusion) is not really known exactly then we can never get at reality. Hence this super-imposition must be ascertained first. The Drik can be got only in one way, i.e. by eliminating the Drsyam. He who speaks of the world-idea having a substratum of reality, both his 'reality' and his 'idea' are drsyams, he has unconsciously tried to turn Drik into Drsyam. This is impossible, because they will always be another knower transcending it. The 'illusion' and 'reality' cannot co-exist; because this implies a relation between them as relation implies meaning, and meaning is a drsyam, an idea. You cannot convert Drik into Drsyam, because the moment you do so, there is another Drik to know it.

@@ The man who knows thoroughly that everything in his life is only a changing drsyam, that drsyams are but transient thoughts; if he then identifies himself with the Drik, he can stand unaffected by loss because he knows that he, himself, the Atman, can never be lost or lose anything in itself. Knowing the drsyam as a part of himself, he no longer considers it as drsyam. Such distinction exists only when enquiring. The ignorant man imagines he is related to objects, imagines there is causal relation with them and then imagines his sufferings because of their transiency. He foolishly believes that anything can go away from his Atman, because he separates

(continued from the previous page) himself from them.

@@ Vedanta teaches that there is no death— neither of body or mind. Death is change. What is change? A change is an idea, imagination. How can it affect the mind or Drik? Why are you afraid of the world, if you know it is only an idea?

@@ There is no such thing as perfect independence anywhere. Nobody and nothing is really separate from all else. The thief depends on his victim for money, we depend on the distant sun for life, etc. Separateness when analysed physically is seen to be illusive; and when analysed deeper, i.e. metaphysically it is seen to be completely unreal because then the whole universe is discovered to exist in your mind. All is really One.

@@ Why is there a universal desire for security of property, permanence of income length of bodily life etc? Because we are all seeking Atman unconsciously. Yet we are so foolish as to think this permanence can be found in the material existence, when the example of our body constituents daily vanishing is before us.

@@ Unity is here and now, always has been and will be. But so long as man is ignorant of this truth, he will only see variety.

@@ Though we start with doctrine of change continuous and everywhere, we end with the opposite doctrine that there is no change in reality, nothing is born or dies.

@@ Whoever speaks of the oneness of things must first of all prove the illusory nature of external world; otherwise he is only like the yogis. Then alone can unity be proved.

@@ Truth is not to be got by thinking only; you can go on thinking about the world until the end of time but you will only get one thought following another thought. On the other hand, neither is truth to be found by

---

<sup>145</sup> The original editor inserted "273" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) not-thinking. Thus the question of truth never arises in sleep, a non-thought state. The two must be combined in order to discover truth.

@@ What do you get by thinking? A thought! What do you get by more thinking? More thoughts! Thus you can never get at Atman by mere intellect alone.

@@ Can you have uniformity of Nature (which science postulates) without unity? Could it exist if Nature were really a multiplicity? No. There is only one step from uniformity to unity, hence science is so close to Vedanta.

@@ Duality or object is not useless, for it reminds us of the subject; there is nothing to be given up or accepted.

@@ This enquiry is much more than gramaphonic learning by heart; it is to distinguish the imagination from that which is unimagined in the mind. Vichara is that which helps you, after enquiry, to reject the useless, the imagined. Similarly when you analyse water you separate oxygen from hydrogen; once this is known it is unnecessary to analyse it again, you will immediately know that water is oxygen and hydrogen, i.e. two gases, whilst accepting water as liquid. So after you have analysed the world, know it to be idea and Brahman, once known there is no need to analyse it or to give up the world.

@@ "Attachment to objects" means taking them to be real. When attachment goes, gnana arrives.

@@ You will find some little defect in everything in this world.

@@ What is meant by unreal? In the waking world it means change; in snake/rope story, it means what you think to exist but which does not.

@@ The principle of unity alone can give you perfect satisfaction as then you can

(continued from the previous page) have nothing taken away from you, what you possess you will have until all eternity.

@@ All things change and contradict themselves every minute. What reality is there upon which I can always rely and which will remain non-contradictory and without variation?

@@ When you get rid of the idea that your body is separate from that of some one else, then you can see that there is only one common soul.

@@ That part of a man which is called body is born and dies, but we never see the whole man, i.e. body plus mind born or die. We usually use the word man without thinking of its meaning, we do not care to be precise. When you analyse deeper you will find it impossible to separate both body and mind. The two go together in truth. Vedanta says the two are not separate entities, but really one entity. Death is merely a change: when perceived by the eye, we call it death: when perceived by the mind, an idea, but both changes are really ideas. It is the mind, which is doing all this working. Religious people say, the body will perish, but the mind will go elsewhere. Philosophy does not agree. It finds man to be compound of both, both are unity, both are Atman. There was never a separate body. If there were, where is your body as a child? Mere perception of the body does not give it existence in truth, therefore we see illusions of mirage, but that does not mean mirages really exist; they are appearances.

@@ So long as you have the idea of multiplicity, that he is one and I am another, then you require Vedanta. The knowledge that the world is an idea does not suffice alone, because then you think this object is an idea

---

<sup>146</sup> The original editor inserted "275" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) that one is another idea, this man a third idea etc. which still gives you differentiation, separateness. He has to advance further and find all these other ideas or beings are beings are being no different from himself, that the food which he eats is the same as himself, that the negro is the same as himself—not merely another idea. As the plant absorbs carbon gas from you and you absorb gas from the plants so that really your body is non-different from the body of the plants; when I eat the plant I am eating my own carbon i.e. my own body, so that there is no real intrinsic separateness; we ignore this scientific fact and go on believing our bodies to be absolutely different, for we do not want truth. Science leads to this knowledge of non-difference of body. So Vedanta is needed to show non-difference of being; essence, of which whole is made. When you enquire into the essence of things you drop their forms. Hence we use the term illusory only in reference to their forms i.e. when you are thinking of form, hence the essence of the thought is Brahman. the goal of our knowledge.

@@ Not the perceiver as identified with this or that body, but the Atman is the real Drg, the seer, of both dream and waking phenomena. This seer sees all the myriads of bodies together and is common to all and is not to be limited to any particular body.

@@ Idea=thought=imagination=enters your mind= the seen. Like all drsyams (seens) thoughts lose their value for they come and go; are mortal. As you are not the seen, you cannot cease to exist, you are immortal in the sense of being unchanging.

@@ The body is part of the external universe; it holds its own reality and keeps you from



(continued from the previous page) seeing the world as idea. All the 24 hours you think body is real and occupy yourself with it. But as it is part of the Seen, and the world is seen, you take latter to be real also. Only when you perceive that both these, that whatever object the mind sees—even your own body—is only an idea, is your own mind, hence your own self, then you can go further and find that very self in its essence is Brahman. That truth reveals all objects and persons as ONE.

@@ This changing world is given to us so that we may learn eventually the important lesson that there is a permanent unity beneath the apparent multiplicity. Hence nothing in it is to be despised. The world is most useful to make us wise.

@@ The fear of death, which is the highest punishment, comes to all in order to teach them the true immortality, which is in Unity. If you think that you are one and he is another, then you have to die: if you think all are one, then you become deathless.

@@ Death causes fear. What is the meaning of this fear? It arises from the meaning you attach to the word death. The train of ideas (kalpanas) of the loss it entails comes into your mind and frightens you. Therefore it is the thought that causes fear. Hence when you know this why should you be afraid of a thought? The obstacle is that you do not want to look upon this body as an idea. Yet the word body brings to you only a thought. In dream and sleep all ideas sink back into the mind, like the waves into the ocean, why then be dissatisfied? The waves are still in the ocean, the ideas are still in the mind. Therefore nothing is really lost, as death is really a going back to itself. So you must enquire what is the self? If men

---

<sup>147</sup> The original editor inserted “277” by hand.

(continued from the previous page) knew this that higher than the mind is the Atman, that everything goes back into it and IS there, what room for fear?

@@ The world is deceiving and cheating you. It appears to be real when it is not. Examine it and thus learn it is an idea. The idea is in Me. Hence I am the Real, the Brahman.

@@ That which is true and permanent cannot be found in the objective world, but only in the seer. That alone is undying. "I am the seer of all this and of the three states." Step 1. Where do these ideas exist? Step 2. What substance or essence are they? Step 3. What is the cause of these ideas? Answers:

1. In the mind. Your mind can imagine Calcutta even now. Hence all these ideas are in the mind, whether they appear big or small.
2. Of Mind-stuff! This itself is the Atman. Those ideas which come, come into mind; those ideas which go, go back into the Mind. Similarly in dream the substance which changed itself into a tiger is the mind, ultimately the Self, the Atman.

@@ When you go to the root of matter you find all actions and objects are only mind in essence. When this body goes in death, there is still mind, and behind that Atman. So why fear death?

@@ Nobody has even seen the Atman die. We see the body die; that is all, nor has anyone seen the Atman born. Hence we say self is deathless and birthless. Even body cannot die. It merely changes its form. Vedantic immortality is not the same as religious immortality for it deals with the essential substance of man.

@@ Conflict, opposition, makes men think. He tries to overcome, or to find or invent means to improve his position in the strife,

(continued from the previous page) whether the latter be created by Nature or other men. The Katho Upanishad says that death made man think. Plato wrote that philosophy was born out of death too. War has promoted scientific inventions, i.e. it made men use their brains. It is the good of evil, every evil has some good with it. That good is Brahman; not that this strife is the only way to develop mind, but it is the only way open to Nature for those who will not learn in other and less sorrowful ways.

@@ All the world is in me. All mankind is in me as idea. The idea is not a dead thing because it is mind, a living entity. Therefore all men are not different from me and thus we arrive at the unity of mankind.

@@ You are not the pain, but the knower, the seer of the pain. You are not confined to this body as it is something which you see.

@@ If the body goes, the seer remains. If it no longer sees through someone else's body. Why be afraid of death?

@@ The body is Brahman; hence if it dies I am not deprived. My wealth also is Brahman. If I lose it, I shall still have Brahman; If I lose it, I shall still have Brahman; and can still be happy. When you can say "I am not the body," you will be free from 90% of the worries. This you can say only when you know you are mind, and that mind is everywhere.

@@ How far does the Atman go, where is it limited? I am the same being everywhere. Its separateness from others is only imagined, (as through the body). All other human beings are within this Self and non-separate from it. If you think of being different from others or from god, or from suffering

---

<sup>148</sup> The original editor inserted "279" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) people you can never realise self. This is true Ahimsa, only those who know it refuse to inflict injury to others.

@@ This great truth of dream-character of the world is to be taught only when the mind is prepared for it. Loss of wealth or relatives or other sufferings, cause disgust with the world and the mind turns away from it as a source of satisfaction. The bereaved man is more ready to have it imparted. You will not feel unhappy or miserable through the loss of a son, if you know the truth that the world is not real, but only an idea, a passing dream. Then you can retain your peace in the face of loss and suffering. After the mind is subjected to sorrows and miseries of the world, it begins to say "I want to know the truth." Then it begins to hanker after truth. Not when the man is in full spirit and possession of pleasure and satisfaction, is it ready to look for truth, for then it is deceived easily into taking these pleasures as real and will not listen to the truth that they are but dreams.

@@ These are ignorant suppositions that these losses are apart from minds. Where there is a sense of reality without there being reality as such, this is called ignorance. (Avidya). The opposite is knowledge (Gnan).

@@ The first lesson is to know the world to be an idea, and so why worry about it?

@@ An objection is made that pain is being suffered. So what use is Vedanta? In the same way as you see pain and pleasure, you should see also That, the seer to which they are attached. Hence become aware of Drik which is inseparable as you never see it along with pleasure and pain. If these were inseparably connected then when you see pleasure or pain,

(continued from the previous page) you must also see the Drik they are connected with; but we do not, hence they are not inseparably connected with the seer. Hence detachment is possible, as these attributes do not belong and do not affect Drik. If pleasure and pain were a part of Drik they would always be there. Hence in sushupti we do not find pain and pleasure because they do not belong.

@@ Such is the inter-dependence of world that an insect parasite may cause political revolutions; as in the coffee crop here, the failure of the crop leading to unemployment, and the latter to thoughts of communism and this to revolution. Again a single rat infected with plague may destroy the people of a whole town.

@@ Think always of the Witness. When the witness idea is strong you are on the road to Freedom, but do always that which elevates others. Drsyam won't-go, but you will no longer be affected by it.

@@ Pessimism is as important as optimism. Both are aspects of life which are necessary. One should not be carried away by either. Those who have sufficient wealth and pleasure call Hindus pessimistic. What else can Hindus be when you think of their poverty and disease? The truth is we must look at both sides.

@@ Suffering is also an idea; let it come and go. For every man has sorrow in this world. Similarly when you know body is only an idea, you can look forward to its death, the greatest of all sorrow with equanimity. For when an idea disappears, it goes back to its source: cannot be lost. The mountain you saw in dream has vanished. Where? Back into the mind. The form is not different from the essence, body from self; hence there is neither

---

<sup>149</sup> The original editor inserted "281" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) coming or going, that is, is and for ever.

@@ To be attached to things is to regard them as real: to be unattached is to know they are unreal.

@@ The man who knows that world sense-objects are unreal loses his taste for them and thus gradually becomes detached.

@@ Whoever thinks that he is the body, is bound to suffer. For that is how Nature teaches him.

@@ The sufferings of apparently innocent people, civilians, women and children, an inoffensive nation like the poles in the present war is a lesson in the inter-connectedness of all mankind. We cannot live in individual isolation. Our fate is bound up together. The fact that brutal evil persons like Hitler exist is likewise our responsibility; we cannot disclaim it; it is up to us to try to make them better. Thus through the suffering of the good, the latter learn that they cannot stand apart from the wicked without hurting themselves eventually.

@@ When you eat, you are establishing unity with the food. When you love another person, you are establishing oneness with him or her. When you go to sleep you are returning to the primal state of unity. When mountains crumble infinitely slowly it is being dissolved into unity of substance. When river flows into the ocean, it is seeking to merge in oneness. Everywhere you see every form, every individual whether animate or inanimate trying to kill duality and achieve non-duality. We Vedantins are doing this work consciously and quickly.

@@ The Mahatma, when his friends die or leave him knows that nothing is lost and does not grieve.

@@ Ideas are coming and going, objects are coming and going, both are unreal and the gnani knows it.

@@ On what else can you rely on except the Atman? The body will die, your parents will go, even your throne as a king will pass, but Atman is always there, never goes. Hence rely on it alone above all else. This is Gnani's outlook.

@@ "Perceived by the senses" means you will see the world, but they are only forms and names – ideas for the gnani.

@@ You may feel the pain if your finger is cut. But if you know the truth, you will only say that I am only the witness of the pain, which is a drsyam. The agnani gets identified with pain and says that "I have pain". c.f. Sri Ramakrishna's throat trouble not that he had no pain; but he saw it was only the body's.

@@ When we see that bodies change, decay and perish, we must begin to ask, Why is this?, what will happen if I die? Reason compels us to set up the query. Hence it is an essential part of philosophy.

@@ That mind influences body is known from the annals of medicine, but how it does so, is not known, is still a mystery. This is what Advaita says too, for it says that apart from and independent of the mind, we can only fall into mystery, we cannot say anything more than that everything is only mind; mind (i.e. Brahman alone is for certain.

@@ What is it that is meant by awareness? This is the root-problem which the West has failed to face because it is so difficult. For enquiry into it would show that Mind is fundamental, at the bottom of everything experienced.

---

<sup>150</sup> The original editor inserted "283" by hand.

@@ What is drsyam must be separated out. Then it is seen to be ideas and that mind first must be there to know them. If however the ideas are regarded as entities separate from the external objects, then it is a fallacy; if however they are regarded as being mental then further enquiry will show that the objects are also mental.

@@ Our immortality is that we survive in our own descendents and then in the whole race of mankind and finally in the whole universe. The first two tenets are already part of many scientists' teaching (e.g. Einstein) but the last one is advaitic and is to be found in Brihad Upanishad.

@@ Our view of the Unreal is that which is objective i.e. 'drsyam' because everything objective is found to be transient. For only the Seer of the transient, only the Drik, is non-transient, Real. And we not only include under this head of 'objective' external physical things, as the West does, but also internal mental things, which the West does not.

@@ Buddhist pessimistic viewing of all beautiful things such as woman or Nature as subject to decay and hence ugly is only true of individual things but not of the Whole. If we regard a woman only as a part, we see the decay but if we perceive that the decayed atoms are reborn into other parts, other beings and live afresh, if we see that there is Something in the woman which is not subject to decay, if we see parts as Brahman then they lose their ugliness.

@@ The summary of Drg Drsya is simply this: Everything can be reduced to two things: Thoughts and the knower of the thoughts.

@@ Body and mind only appear to be different but really we cannot separate them, cannot distinguish any relation between them.



@@ What do we know beyond the proton? Nothing. There is mystery beyond. If we want to go beyond we can only imagine. Thus the world is still wrapped in mystery for everyone even the scientist. This mystery is Maya.

@@ You cannot get any satisfactory explanation of the mind-body problem if you adopt the dualistic theory that they are two separate things. Common uninstructed sense does adopt this theory on a superficial experiential view. But when you examine it by deep rational thinking however, you find all sorts of insoluble problems arise. Mandukya points out that the same dualistic theory, applied to the larger question of the universe, (i.e. Mind and Matter as separate entities) is equally unsatisfactory when subjected to thoughtful analysis. Its final conclusion is the same, that dualism does not explain and must be given up.

@@ The object exists because the Witness of it exists prior to it. If the Witness were not there, we could not know whether any wall exists or not. Hence ideas must come first, then the objects follow.

@@ In the mind Western psychology studies only what is presented to it, not what witnesses these presentations. This is the omission of Western psychology, and can be rectified by study of the book "Drg Drsya Viveka."

@@ Every feels there is a body and there is a mind but nobody has satisfactorily been able to define them and their relation. The scientific position on the connection between the two is confused and held by contradictory theories. Europe will never solve this problem unless they go to avastatraya.

@@ Every minute we are in the presence of death: for we see ants and flies dying, whilst in a meat-eating country we see cattle sheep and fishes' bodies at every meal.

---

<sup>151</sup> The original editor inserted "285" by hand.

@@ Any kind of objective proof for the Drik can only be thoughts, hence an object, how can it prove the subject? The latter is its own evidence. And all thinking directed to discover the Drik will only be searching for an object, not for the subject. The only use of thinking is to pick out one thorn by another, i.e. to eliminate all thoughts.

@@ All that is objective, all that is imaginary such as the differentiated phenomena of names and forms i.e. all drsyam, all not-self must be eliminated in order to know that which can never be eliminated<sup>152</sup> viz. the Drik, the Self.

@@ There are two things in the world (1) which can be known, i.e. thought, as object. (2) knower as the subject. It is impossible to have thinking unless there were the knower, this principle of Mind.

@@ West has not analysed as India has, what is meant by knower, knowledge and known. Unless West deals with this question, it cannot solve its intellectual problems, for this is of foundational importance.

@@ Unless the subject becomes the object it is impossible to know whether your knowledge is true. Aristotle defines truth as being the agreement of thought and being. But how is it possible to know whether your thought of the wall agrees with the wall itself? For every time I perceive (sense) the wall, it is the mind that is working.

@@ If the body is a reality, where is your body as a child, when it ran about, was different in appearance and different in structure? It has vanished. Then what was it at the time? What else but an idea? And how can a thing which changes and disappears be real?

---

<sup>152</sup> The original editor deleted "in order to know that which can never be eliminated" by hand.

@@ We have a wrong idea of the body. We think it is static. It is not.

@@ Change proves there is only one thing which is changing.

@@ All things are objects and as objects we get knowledge of them, not of ourselves.

@@ The word “drik” is meaningless without the word “drsya” along with it.

@@ Every name or word such as God or Atman which can be uttered has a meaning and therefore is an idea. Every idea is an object. How can an object point to the subject? Hence even Atman explains nothing but remains objective.

@@ When you ask why knowledge is relative, partial and incomplete you have to learn the distinction between drik and drsya to find an answer. Relativity leads man to idealism. Idealism leads you to mentalism. Mentalism leads you to avastatraya. Avastatraya leads to Brahman.

@@ When we enquire deeply enough it is found in the end that both inanimate and animate Nature are mental and therefore it is not possible to draw a line between them. But at the beginning of enquiry we have to draw a theoretical distinction between both to get started.

@@ The first characteristic of Maya is change, impermanency. The second is “What has become of the forms which have gone, of the names and forms? They appear to be here but are not here now. Where are they? This is the same question as “What is this world?” and “What do I mean by change?” This requires a lot of ever-deepening semantic examination of the meaning of this apparently simple word “change.” We then find it merely means that we pass from one idea to another. Hence the forms which changed have vanished into the origin of idea, i.e. Mind. At this point Maya disappears and the illusion of stable forms produced by these imaginations was the Maya. You then discover that Maya, avidya, form, prakriti were really non-existent. Hence the answer

---

<sup>153</sup> The original editor inserted “287” by hand.

(continued from the previous page) to the question “What is this world?” is that it is an idea, and an idea is something that is unreal. In this sense the world is unreal. But this does not mean it is unseen.

@@ We must be careful of the use of the word “eternal.” In its strictest sense, it means that which is beyond time. To say as theologians frequently say that eternity is without beginning or end is to say something which is quite meaningless.

@@ Kala - Yama. God of Death is also God of Time in Hinduism.

@@ When we say Maya appears and disappears, we should semantically examine the meaning of disappear. It will then be found that a thing cannot disappear into nothing. “Nothing” really means something. Bergson saw it but did not know where the change goes to. We want to enquire where it goes, into the meaning of all this change. Ideas are Maya. They are there but when you enquire into them, they vanish. We find that we have got only a mental construction of the world.

@@ Critics object that if world is illusion why do those who hold this view waste time on writing books for illusory opponents or arguing with illusory people.

@@ Superimposition means placing one thing upon another, like superimposing a book on the table.

@@ Most Vedantins put Maya forward as a theory or even an assumption; we however put it forward as a fact.

@@ When you look at the world, you must know it as illusory. You have created it because you have been thinking of it previously. Who is the creator? Your mind. The meaning of illusory in Sanskrit is “that which you have projected, created. It becomes the corollary of transiency.

@@ Though the world is also mind, we think that it is separate from mind, due to our ignorance.

@@ The keynote to Vedanta is to understand that although a thing is present to the senses and appears to them, still it is unreal. Few can grasp this point.

@@ Just as the scientist simultaneously sees the table and yet knows it to be electrons, so the gnani sees the table and at the same time knows it to be Brahman. In both cases there is no conflict between the sense-perception and the mental knowledge.

@@ The snake/rope analogy is given in Vedanta to show that if you have a wrong impression, false knowledge, it has to be removed by examination and inquiry, the real truth of it has to be gone into and found to be rope. The mirage analogy is more advanced and given because even though you go and examine it, it is only an appearance, still when you retreat the mirage will continue to stand before you. It signifies that although you have enquired into world and know its reality still it will continue to appear. The barren woman's son analogy is to show that no such exists; to signify that imagined Brahmans and verbal Brahmans do not exist. The interpretation that rope is Brahman and snake Maya is not the correct use of this analogy. Those who use it in this way are mystics or pundits under the error that anything can be taken away from Brahman. Further the mirage will not cease to appear even though you know it to be as such. The world-appearance is not lost for nothing can be lost or gained by Brahman. When people speak of primitive realism, we use the snake-rope analogy to overcome them, to question their use of the word real, and show they are under appearances. But this is an elementary step.

@@ Illusions may be objective, but still unreal. This is the first stage of our enquiry. The next and the higher stage is to see all these in yourself, hence to be real ultimately as Self, Mind.

---

<sup>154</sup> The original editor inserted "289" by hand.

@@ European philosophy stops with Idealism and quarrels with realists over ideas. What are these ideas? They do not answer this, even the psychologists do not answer this. Indian philosophy says that all ideas merge into the one Supreme Self. This idea we cannot see in European philosophy.

@@ The mind is virtually the external world, i.e. in effect but not in fact. This is the first step. Second step: Convert everything into ideas. Third step: Where do these ideas rise from and into what do they disappear as in dream? It is the mind—just like waves rise and fall in ocean. Hence world is also Mind. Fourth step: That which sees all these changes of three steps, exists always.

@@ Maya does not mean that it is illusion. It means only that it is an idea, which exists momentarily, but is not really permanent. Ideas come and go continuously when the mind is active.

@@ When we say the world is within the mind, we do not mean to say it is within the ego-mind. It is within Mind, not ego. But people confuse both. That is why we say until you get rid of ego, this great truth cannot be seen. The I misleads you by preventing the sight of this truth.

@@ The mind and the world are of the same substance. Hence the first stage is to know each object is idea, mental. The next stage is to enquire of what stuff all these manifold ideas are made. They will be found to be made of Mind. Then the unity of self and world of the whole can be grasped.

@@ The external world is only idea, it becomes mental, hence it becomes “invisible.” So practise regarding all forms as being Mind.

@@ The world is there, so we cannot declare it to be nothing as some Buddhists do. It is none other than mind.

@@ Vedanta says the world is not real in the sense that it is not permanent. Vedanta never proves oneness of the manifold. It says only that *drsyam* comes and goes. Vedanta proves only non-duality.

@@ If you want to say a substratum should exist for anything, say for instance substratum of a rope for a snake, then why not a substratum of ideas? Turiya is that which is the substratum of our ideas. But if you say it is the substratum or support of ideas, then the question of relationship arises, between the meaning of idea and the knower of the idea. There is no meaning or relationship except as itself an idea, which is an object; and the object has nothing to do with Turiya. Turiya is the witness— that is all — but witness implies duality.

@@ You get an idea of space only when there is an object, a thought. With the absence of thought, there is no space as in deep sleep. When the ideas go what remains is what is called “the witness,” but you are not aware of it. If you know what it is, you get the Atman.

@@ What is gold? Do you know gold as such without its form? It can never be imagined.

@@ Till you know the external world is an idea you cannot master Vedanta. The practical application of this is to detach yourself and think of the body, its movements and states in the third person even when in the waking state.

@@ Every thought implies the thinker, the Mind, Atman.

@@ We know the All to be an appearance even though it is there, hence we call it unreal. But we go deeper, we ask what this appearance is, and then we find it is only Brahman.

@@ Why should there be non-attachment if the world is only my own creation after all? Because it will pass away, i.e. illusory. Those who are ignorant of this transiency, get attached.

---

<sup>155</sup> The original editor inserted “291” by hand.

@@ You cannot talk of the Seen without positing a Seer. That is the first stage. But later you discover that the former is not different from the latter.

@@ If all the objects that you see have no connection with Brahman, then how do they exist? e.g. the three states? They are seen at least as impermanent things—the snake may not be there in the rope, but the snake appearance is there but we require a substratum which suggests to you the idea of a snake or water, say in a rope or mirage. i.e. even to know the world there must be something on which these ideas are superimposed. Ideas cannot stand by themselves. They are superimposed on the background or on the substratum of Brahman according to Vedanta. Whatever may be their nature, the fact is that the objects are seen. This could not be without a substratum.

@@ Why does disgust with the body have to come eventually? Whether through illness, disease, hurt, war or other suffering, people who have been incarnated very often get weary of the disappointments and weaknesses of flesh. It is to dissociate them from the body. After that they are ready to learn that the body is in them, in Mind; that they are really mind.

@@ Happiness promised in the world after death, as by religion, or to one's posterity as by science, will not satisfy philosophy. It seeks happiness, here and now, in this life where one can be certain of getting it.

@@ A gnani may be reborn in three days or three years. And if he thinks of form in any shape when dying that will bring him back to incarnation again. So if he thinks of serving humanity just prior to death, and wills it, he will reincarnate in order to fulfil that task. And if he thinks of a particular



(continued from the previous page) work or service he will incarnate in such a way as to carry it out. And if he thinks of his group of disciples and wants to continue their instruction, then he will be reborn in their neighbourhood or they will be reborn so as to meet him again, and thus instruction will continue. Whatever picture he holds in mind just prior to death will draw him back to earth and materialise. Where he dies in sleep his subconscious tendencies will dictate the next birth. These tendencies are vasanas and samskaras. So the student should think of his guru when dying in order to meet him again. If student dies in sleep or suddenly then all his subconscious thoughts of devotion to his guru will bring about the same result and if he had thought prior to death. It is really the two together which determine next birth. Hence the importance of psychology to philosophy, with its teaching of the power of subconscious. Were the gnani not to hold this last thought of service of humanity he would not be reborn. It acts as a downward pull. However it does not cause him to lose his gnan because side by side with it he knows humanity or his disciples to be also Brahman.

@@ Just as in dream, you are the witness of all the things, friends, enemies, etc. which you see in your dream, so also the gnani is conscious that he is the witness of all.

---

<sup>156</sup> The original editor inserted "293" by hand.



## CHAPTER 14. THE ILLUSION OF EGO EXPERIENCE.

@@ Everybody says 'I' but every one sees differences in each 'I'. Remove the difference and take the common factor of all the 'Is'. This is the real 'I'.

@@ We say that Atman is self-evident and not inferred. Atman is a condition of knowing and thinking. Even to affirm "I think," you must admit that there should be one who thinks, one who is aware of thought.

@@ Egoism and nescience are inseparable, they go together.

@@ "I" does not mean the same thing to every one—but when 'I' is known to be same in all it is gnan.

@@ The point is when there is I, ego there is ignorance. Even when one says "I have given up", it is egotism and absurd.

@@ That which cannot be denied by you, and therefore that which cannot be inferred is Atman. Say what you will, you cannot get out of the "Atman." So Atman is established directly.

@@ "Individuality" has no meaning. That is the point. The Drik is that which has no limitations—all ideas regarding limitation are imagined. We have to catch that which is between two ideas in order to eliminate ideas. I am "the knower" in all. The mind creates many contradictions in dream and yet the mind is one. Know this and apply it to life as a whole and pierce delusion of individuality.

@@ You are an ego because you imagine yourself to be an individual.

@@ The individual mind can only imagine, it is identified by the ego etc. It is the universal mind that creates or projects the whole universe as well as the ego. If you can cast away the ego consciousness, the individual mind is the same as the universal mind.

@@ Is there a thing called the individual mind? Who asks that question? The question presupposes

---

<sup>158</sup> The original editor inserted "295" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) that there is an individual mind. What is this 'I'? Everybody uses the word I. But they are really different. What is the common factor of the different I's? That factor is the real I.

@@ 'I' plus the individual ideas is equal to the individual mind.

@@ When I enquire into the real nature of myself, the three however, knowledge, knower and known disappear.

@@ Two methods of disproving the existence of a Hell and Heaven for the ego: the first is scientific:- Where is the proof for the existence of hell or heaven. Nobody has seen it: it is not verifiable. The other is philosophical:- Has the word heaven got any meaning for you? If it has got a meaning for you, who gave that meaning? It is only your mind; hence it is only mental, i.e. a thought.

@@ The Temporal Argument against duality: We say that God and Soul exist. At the moment we utter the word God, we imagine a god, a god, is only an idea in my mind. When we utter the word "soul" the idea of soul enters the mind. Both the ideas cannot exist in the mind at one and the same time. When we enquire, duality disappears at once.

@@ Let your boat of ego be in water but let not the water into your boat. Be in the world but not of the world. "Dive deep into the ocean of bliss" said Ramakrishna. Don't be afraid because you will not be drowned, for it is the ocean of immortality.

@@ I know only one witness. Everybody says that he knows only his own witness. Hence we can only say there is one Drik, not two.

@@ The world is idea. The ideas are all in you. Therefore you are the only thing there is.

@@ Enquire into ego. It is only idea. You may

(continued from the previous page) treat it as you treat other ideas. Thus in the most literal sense knowledge confers power.

@@ The practical man says, Why should I practise anything, what benefit to me (the ego). The religionist says, Practise religion to get heaven in the next world for me (the ego) and the mystic-yogi says, Practise mysticism to get ananda for me (the ego). In all three cases the ego is present—hence no gnana is possible. On Advaita nothing is sought for me. Truth is sought for her sake alone.

@@ What is it that prevents you realizing Brahman? It is the ego! I want this thing, I want heaven, etc. The 'I' is always wanting satisfaction. Where is the man in the world that is free from ego? Hence the rarity of realised souls.

@@ There are no two things. If individual soul and universal soul exist independently, this is only a false and ignorant perception.

@@ If you use the word Mind to translate Atman or Brahman, people will interpret it in their own way, wrongly limiting it to the ego or to the waking mind. Mind will be misinterpreted to mean idea. The former is infinite, whereas the latter is finite.

@@ No one has ever seen a Jiva, only bodies can be seen. Yet people spin philosophies around the individual soul!

@@ Drik itself has never been subjected to causality time and space, but it sees them in the world of drsyam. It itself is always untouched by them. If you know yourself as Drik nothing can affect or touch you: if however you imagine yourself in drsyam, you will certainly be affected.

@@ The getting rid of ignorance is only from the standpoint of ignorance; from the drik's there has never been ignorance.

@@ He who gives up the ego with achieve gnan

---

<sup>159</sup> The original editor inserted "299" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) very quickly. So long as the black serpent of Aham, the ego, is, it completely covers the truth and prevents you from seeing it.

@@ You will know that everything is Brahman, when the 'I' goes, everything is immortal being Atman. It is impossible to die. Though thou art only the Drik, you identify yourself with the Drisyam. "I" which is dying everyday in sleep; the 'I' vanishes every moment in the waking state also—not to speak of the dream 'I'. The 'I' idea comes and goes; no idea of it is permanent. Think ever that you are witness of the changing 'I's. Use one thorn or idea to get rid of another thorn or idea.

@@ So long as Aham reigns in a man it is a guarantee of his ignorance. No matter what profound realization or knowledge he claims, if his conduct reveals that the 'I' rules him, do not believe his claims.

@@ Atman is not only itself but also the opposite of itself: hence everything is Atman.

@@ There is no such thing as liberation after death, this doctrine is punditry. It must be attained here alone.

@@ That which sees in us is the Atman; even if people live on other planets in theory too, it is the Atman that knows.

@@ We cannot say anything about the existence or non-existence of the Self. Yet without this knower nothing is possible for nothing could be known.

@@ That the Drik is everywhere common is easily proved because everyone refers to himself first by I; he adds his personal name only secondarily: the I is always spoken first—I am here, I am doing this. This is true in all languages, used by all men as the primary answer to any questions: personal

(continued from the previous page) names come later. Why does every man use the word I? If he is essentially different from others why does he use the same word I? This proves that if a man is really different from another why does he use the same notion I as the other man? How did he get this notion called I. How did it come to him. Why does a woman use the same word I as a man although she knows that she is so different in many respects? They should have used a different word. The whole of humanity is classified under the name I. What is the common feature of this multitudinous I? Just as various ornaments are all made of one element—gold, what is that finality which comprehends all and is common to all and what is the single common element in all human beings? The universal use of I indicates that one exists, admitting the various differences that exist. That common feature is which Vedanta seeks. In short we are enquiring into the meaning of the word Man. Similarly a thousand waves are all really water. So we enquire into meaning of word water. The unity cannot be taken together.

@@ No ego really disappears into annihilation. It is for ever in the self, as the waves disappear into ocean; it goes back just as it does in deep sleep, which is not external annihilation.

@@ Even the word Moksha, freedom, has a meaning only in the drsyam world. For it is only an idea.

@@ You can only talk of my body, his body, so long as you have the sense of I, the ego. When that goes, the other goes too. Where do you see all the human beings and separate selves? Only in the mind. Hence when they die, they disappear into you, yourself.

@@ The desire of liberation is also a thought, and therefore to be transcended.

---

<sup>160</sup> The original editor inserted “301” by hand.

@@ The certainty that you know that you are Brahman comes only from direct knowledge where there is no doubt. When you identify yourself with the drsyam you are the Jiva with various kalpanas. Remove the kalpanas and you are Brahman.

@@ In the Advaitin there is no 'I' or 'my' nor Advaitin or Dwaitin. Knowledge rises from enquiry, independent of your desire or inclinations or 'I' in any form—when 'I' disappears ignorance disappears. Do what you will, whether you like it nor not, the Witness is there. The Sakshin never varies. Dawn of this knowledge confers perfect contentment during life.

@@ But why does the world appear as other than yourself? Answer: Because you identify yourself with aham, which prevents you. Why does Aham come? That is your presumption: I do not make such a statement. You yourself imagine the aham.

@@ What is death? For novices we say it is an idea, but for advanced students we teach that death also is Atman, the Self, and hence not to be feared. Only you have to continually regard it in this way—this is Gnana yoga.

@@ We hold that there is only One when you know the truth, but when you have not risen to it, then the manifold variety of individuals still exists. This is our reply to criticism that the knower of Atman would feel all the miseries and joys of mankind and be affected by them.

@@ There is only One. Your separateness is the cause of all your trouble and ignorance and is itself the result of mere imagination.

@@ Nobody has ever seen someone else's Atman. It is impossible. Therefore we can call it non-dual.



@@ So long as you think of yourself as ego you will die; but when you think of yourself as Mind, you will be immortal.

@@ But can you apply the word 'permanent' to the Atman, the Drk? What is meant by impermanent? To understand it you must show me something, an object lasting. There must be contrast. Hence both permanent and impermanent apply only to things in the world of duality. Then why do we use the word permanent in Vedanta? It is to point your mind to something beyond, higher than both. We tell you to give up the transitory to lead you to what is less transitory. But our final aim is to lead you out of all dualistic comparisons; into non-duality. This is a still higher position of the most advanced Vedanta. (Mandukya P.314). The Drik remains untouched by all ideas; we seek that wherein no dualistic ideas are possible; where all things are of and same Entity hence where no question of transient or permanent arises: but helpful to contrast both. Anything said about Brahman is only imagination, even the praise of Brahman as being permanent!

@@ In Advaita there can be no conception of Brahman, as so many Vedantic authors think wrongly. Every conception is an interpretation, i.e. it will be in the realm of Drsyam; it will be an effort to think of the unthinkable, and in return you get only a thought, not Brahman.

@@ Because the bodies are different, everyone assumes that the individualities are also different. We do not see another man's self, or soul, or mind. Nor have we any proof as to what existent a man's soul prevails or where it is limited or how. Hence we say that there is no evidence of the birth of his separate self or mind.

@@ You may forget your idea of body, or get

---

<sup>161</sup> The original editor inserted "303" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) rid of it, but the most powerful of ideas, is Ahankara, the I. It is the hardest to get rid of.

@@ “Identity with Atman” means non-different from it.

@@ If all mankind has one self, why do we not feel simultaneously the same miseries or joys? Reply: Imagine some different sized and coloured pots, with dust in some and others empty. All these differences between the pots do not affect the space in the pots. Similarly the differences between individuals do not affect the Atman. Again in dream, the objects vary greatly, what you imagine as a tiger behaves like a tiger, but is the mind-substance affected thereby? No. It remains unalterably as Mind.

@@ Man has got the Aham which is attached to the body. The I is there always, all the 24 hours, at the bottom of our acts and thoughts. He has to get the widest I which is identified with the whole universe. Then he is Brahman.

@@ The Ego is the black serpent. We have to get rid of attachment to it in order to find truth. Wisdom will not come unless you conquer the I. This is the first step.

@@ He who talks of looking at the world from the standpoint of ultimate reality thereby assumes that there is somebody in the reality to look. Who is there then to look?

@@ Ten years ago you were a child playing, now you are an adult with a different outlook. The two personalities are changed and different, and both are therefore illusory. Hence we say get rid of the attachment to the ego and you get truth, or true self.

@@ A man writes “Individual life is a phantom.” He is wrong. The individual is a phantom, but never life.

@@ Those who talk of the I becoming merged in Brahman are not philosophers but mystics. Vedanta does not admit even the existence of the I. The proof is that it disappears every night in deep sleep. Yet in the book “Contemporary Indian Philosophy” all the essays except mine, proceed on the assumption that the I is real.

@@ Is there such a thing as an individual I? This is what Vedanta asks. The ordinary man and the religionist assume this and proceeds with strong dogmatism on such a basis; never suspecting the I is an illusion. Vedanta says I does not exist.

@@ If you do not get realization here, on this earth, in this world, you will never get it. Besides, we know only this present life and we cannot afford to take chances of suppositions of attainments elsewhere.

@@ Do not think of Heaven, which can at best be temporary. You can't get rid of yourself. The “knower of Brahman” is absurd. Liberation during this life is the final step, (why talk of after-death business) resulting as a consequence upon giving up all mental creations. If you are to get Brahman it must be only here – emancipation in this life. Christianity, Islam, all religions speak of next life and heavenly pleasures. Vedanta wants it here and now. Pleasures and pains of this world can affect only the Jiva, the ego, the I – not the Drik. Pleasure and pain are as much objects as the Jiva or ‘I’. This knowledge can be guided by enquiry. Therefore we must always be engaged in the inquiry into the nature of the Universe, the Jiva that sees it, and then the nature of the Jiva, a determination of its nature as Brahman. People mistakenly think that the ‘I’ is Atman, just as you take a shell (pearl) as silver. That which exists really is Atman only. The ‘I’ which is changing is wrongly

---

<sup>162</sup> The original editor inserted “305” by hand.

(continued from the previous page) identified with the unchanging Atman, Drik 'I' How do you know? Because the former 'I' changes, appears and disappears. Mind alone is the cause of bondage and Freedom. We do not rely on immortality, because it is said so in the Upanisads; but because it is actually experienced. Of what use is quotations? Vedanta appeals to facts.

@@ The enjoyer is more important than the enjoyed. You like most yourself, the Atman, I want to be happy. The seer or knower is the background of 'I'. 'I' gets its value through the witnessing or knowing Atman.

@@ The idea of Atman, the imagination of it, is required in order to show the imagined nature of all objects.

@@ What the commentators and most lower Vedantins do not realise is that Atman alone is not Brahman.

@@ Most people shrink in fear of losing their ego; this is due to ignorance for the truth is that the I, the ego, is also Brahman, and as Brahman cannot really be lost.

@@ The difference between us and other schools is that they have the erroneous belief that there is some Reality, apart from us which is unborn and eternal, whereas we know it to be our very own Atman.

@@ If one man has thought of hate and another has thought of love, how can both be one and the same-self? Our reply is that as seer they are the same: hate and love are only ideas, which are but the seen, and ignore the seer. They confuse both together. The seen is coming and vanishing.

@@ The Drik is everywhere. It has no limitations of time.

@@ So long as you have the idea that "I am doing this etc." counteract it with antidote thoughts "Not I am the doer etc." This I is

(continued from the previous page) poison, but people are unconscious that they have the ego. So you must tell yourself "I am only the witness."

@@ If you say you are limited to individuality or body you cannot understand: if you say that you are That in which all individualities, all bodies, appear (as they do in dream) then you understand.

@@ I know that I exist. Other existence I have not seen except the drsyam world. Then where could this world have come from? Only from myself! Everything is only mind, Me.

@@ That which is at the bottom of all bondage is the ego.

@@ The world is not the idea of the independent separate ego, but of THAT in which the latter itself exists as an idea.

@@ When the mind identifies itself with the ego or the body it gets false knowledge, but then you forget that you can get true knowledge. When the false knowledge is gone, nothing more remains to be done for Atman means pure knowledge in which there is no distinction or differences; in that there is no questioner and no questions can then be asked.

@@ Vedanta says that as Drg has never been produced, the thought of its destruction cannot arise. The drg is beyond imagination; who has seen either the birth or death of Drg? Hence there is no end to true gnan, as there is with yogic illusory Gnan. Moksha in vedanta is "always attained," "that which has ever been there, that which always has enlightenment in it."

@@ A word implies meaning; a meaning implies distinction between two things. Every word means a differentiation, a distinction between myself and the object, the thing seen or felt. Suppose white colour alone existed

---

<sup>163</sup> The original editor inserted "307" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) everywhere. Could you have distinguished it at all without a second colour to compare or contrast with it? If grief alone existed, would any other feeling be known? To say, "I am grieved" brings along with it the idea of happiness, for when you want to get rid of grief you think of happiness. So even if you went to orthodox heaven and got joy, bliss unending, you would not be able to appreciate it. Delusion does not exist where there is no second thing. Our words fail to reach unity, for words are possible only in a dual experience. So vedantins say Heaven and Hell are not of much value to us. The thought of Bliss will necessarily bring along with it the thought of sorrow. Hence we are enjoined to rise above duality of opposites. Duality means the existence of Perceiver and Perceived. If you feel and think that you are a Drsyā, an object, you will be born and die. Where is the ego? It appears and disappears.

@@ The Atman imagines the Jiva, the Jiva imagines the world—that is the Kalpana, the process.

@@ What is the meaning of appearance and disappearance? Appearance and disappearance is a thing of which you are conscious, they are ideas which come into your mind. You could not have thought without the thinker. But when a thought disappears, there is no proof that the thinker has also disappeared, for if I say so, there must be still another person to have seen the I disappear. So the thinker continues even though the thought vanishes. His existence has been proved; his non-existence could only be proved by assuming the existence of the Knower of non-existence. Hence there is no escape. Any

(continued from the previous page) statement (hence any thinking) about it must keep the existence of a knower or thinker in view. The words 'appear' and 'disappear' are always applied to the object, never to the subject the 'I'. Proof can be given of appearance and disappearance only in connection with objects, never with subjects. Without a thinker there can be no thought. This thinker or the knower is the Atman. All else are but ideas superimposed upon it. The ideas are in or created by the mind. No notion can be conceived without a knowing agent or entity – this is the Atman. Self-examination and introspection are needed to know that there is an Atman which is always present.

@@ The individual self is only an idea. Yoga is only an idea. Even Vichara-practice is only an idea, but it is the highest. Hence the personality is only born and dies as ideas, as imagination, not really. Hence the real self is neither born nor dies. Nobody has seen the Jiva go. Hence nobody knows what becomes of it. There are no two selves, the personality never exists apart from its ultimate entity, Brahman.

@@ All objects and creatures are mind alone. In advanced Vedanta you convert this statement into "are Atman alone."

@@ The moment you see that no other thing in your mind seeks or desires any second thing, you realise the Atman.

@@ The Vedantin does not have to imagine or merely to think that there is no ego, or that the world is within himself; he comes by effort and enquiry to Knowledge, to realisation of it.

@@ When you know that 'I' or 'me' is also your mental construction, then only can you attain Atmic consciousness. For the I also appears and disappears and changes like all

---

<sup>164</sup> The original editor inserted "309" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) other ideas. That which sees the 'I' coming and going is the pure consciousness. It is not individual consciousness, which is a 'seen.' The 'I' is thus a part of your imagination. Hence it is said so long as there is ego, there is bondage.

@@ In deep sleep all ideas of objects are converted into Atman, similarly in Samadhi. Even the idea of Ego, which is manufactured by the mind also, must be converted in Samadhi to Atman. Thus the finite ego is not the Atman. The Yogi who comes out of Samadhi has then to manifest the I, the ego, for he talks to you, he sits, he eats, he walks.

@@ Everyone has got the idea I. All use the same word I, although they are different from all other men. Why is this? Because every man has got his own meaning (idea) of this I. Now take away all the factors in each ego, which are different and take the common factor which is left to all. This is another way to find Atman, and it is seeking the real I. It is like trying to get at the meaning of space (Akas) in and outside many pots. Take away the shapes of pots and only one common space remains.

@@ The real I is in everyone, therefore everyone uses the word. This is one proof. But unfortunately we think only of the differences between us and so forget the truth.

@@ When you know that the One always is, the same Atman in you and the other person you know there is nothing and nobody to be lost. Loss is imagination, idea, and as such sinks back to the mind. There is neither increase nor decrease. Hence there is no real death, no real loss of property.



@@ If you work only for self, you could not get at the Truth in Vedanta. You must work for the benefit of all. Just as like prana if you get Vitality all the five senses participate, so by working for the All you benefit both self and others, and thus you can get truth. Always work for the common good.

@@ Activity means in Vedanta, mental as well as physical. The ego is the root of all activity. But if you know that the ego is only an idea, then you may do a thousand things. The ego does not exist in nirvikalpa or in deep sleep.

@@ Vedanta proves by reason that all humanity is one; and does not depend on emotion for this.

@@ The root - ego - must be cut out before realisation can ever come. The most important thing or virtue or key in all ethics, is this removal of the ego.

@@ Why should the fundamental instinct of love—in its various evolving phases from animal to intellectual—exist? Because the unity of mankind is the truth; its individualistic separation is illusory.

@@ Man invites trouble on himself by clinging to the I.

@@ It is the mind that gets perturbed, but you are the looker-on, the seer, the witness of the mind's condition. Hence detach yourself from mental conditions.

@@ The Atman in you is present in all your activities of work or pleasure, and hence you should one day find It as being the real hidden object of your activities. When this understanding comes, you are ready to give up the inner burden of those activities with their consequent anxieties, just to find peace, and be free of the anxieties. For that peace, that rest, is really the peace

---

<sup>165</sup> The original editor inserted "311" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) of Atman itself.

@@ The mind should not get confused. It should not think that “This particular thing is mine.” This is what is meant by attachment. If you say that the whole world is mine, if you think of the whole world, that is detachment. It is when you think of the individual thing or individual man or object that you have attachment, but it has to be got rid of. Give up the individual attachment and you will find the whole.

@@ The I or ego which we must efface is the individual I. When the I is present there is ignorance, when absent there is Gnana.

@@ Ego is only an idea, it comes and goes, not only in walking but also with other states. This point is not seen by those Westerners who see the need of disinterestedness in the quest of truth.

@@ Advaita says that the ego does not exist. It disappears everyday in deep sleep. It disappears every day also in dream because you talk of different personalities during your dreams, sometimes you are King, sometimes ordinary man.

@@ Religious dualists use the word “unity” without knowing what it means. They think it is a totalization of many parts or individual souls. Their unity is thus really a multiplicity!

@@ The first thing in ignorance, the root of it, is egoism. So long as you have I, it is useless to think you can find truth. This is the opposite of all other religions and philosophies, which take the individual self for real and build up promises or attainments on it.

@@ Chidabhava (Jiva) and Kutastha (Atman or Witness: Chidabhava constantly thinks of the Witness till he becomes the Witness. Just as ideas of being a man never disappears, so Drik remains.

@@ The man of knowledge thinks of the Seer of the I, the knower of the I, whereas the ignorant man thinks only of his I, which is transient, illusory. He cares only for the seer, the witness and refuses to identify himself with all these thoughts, whether of objective things or subjective ego, which come and go, are ever-passing. But where does the Seer, the Atman, the Nameless go? It cannot go anywhere.

@@ Death is one thing that is absolutely certain; what will happen after death in next world we cannot be certain of. Let us therefore seek the true immortality which can be gained here in this world, and once gained, will be for ever. This is to know ourselves as Atman, Drik which never goes but sees the vanishing body and is always there. This is the sage's outlook.

@@ To the jnani both death and rebirth are ideas and hence do not exist in reality. Do not ask him therefore what is going to happen after death, because the question is meaningless to him. Everything is but mind, ideas, to him.

@@ The religious belief in life after death requires not only conscious but also personal identity. It therefore requires the ego more or less as it was on earth.

@@ He who says "I know Unity" does not have realization because he is thinking that he, the personality, the ego, is the perceiver, the knower of this unity. His unity too is only an idea. His Witness is the ego; it should also be the witness of the ego.

---

<sup>166</sup> The original editor inserted "313" by hand.

@@ Vedanta is utterly intolerant towards the insufficient proof of personal immortality. Partial proof is not enough. Possibilities and probabilities are also not enough. Statements of renowned mystics are not enough. That is why Vedanta rejects personal survival as unproven.

@@ Where is the death for him who, knowing the whole world including his body and ego to be an idea with him, knows that he (as Mind) continues even if the idea passes away just as a dreamer remains alive even when his dream-ego and body dies? And just as the dreamer must awake to this fact so the man must find immortality whilst awake too, i.e. here and now in this world, not in some problematical next world.

@@ Solipsism spins the world out of my mind and makes all other minds mere ideas in my own mind. It is irrefutable only so long as we do not analyse the nature of the mind according to Drk Drsyam Viveka. Then we shall find that the mind's only certain characteristic is "seeing." It is a Witness. That which is "seen" is forever changing including "my" mind.

@@ Those who think the I is a fact, deceive themselves. A careful observer will detect that it is disappearing during the waking state but any observer can note that it disappears during sleep.

@@ Idealism leads naturally to solipsism. But the latter in its turn leads to difficulties, for if the world is my idea, then five different persons will say "I alone exist and other people are my ideas." Each I will claim to be the only real one. Indian philosophy alone solves this problem by asking at this point, what is the I? What is the Mind? It then shows that enquiry into the nature of the ego reveals it as unreal, for it disappears in sleep.

@@ There have been many moments in a man's life when he has forgotten his ego and thought of something else. This shows that a life free of ego-attachment is possible, for if it occurs sometimes it can be extended.

@@ What is the use of asserting that there is a multiplicity of souls when it cannot be established that a single individual soul exists? The ego is merely an idea. Advaita first asks what it means and then only says "in this universal sense" is man immortal.

@@ The idea that man has complete free-will arises out of egoism.

@@ Europe has not investigated into the meaning of the I, the ego. This is why I accuse the West of not having risen to the level of India in philosophy.

@@ We call the ego "the black serpent" in ancient Vedanta because black is the colour of what is most evil and snakes usually hide or lurk unseen.

@@ Examine yourself. Go to the root of your thought. Immediately one thinks one gets only an object (drsyam) and never gets the subject. And then the object passes away. Hence all arguments or statements cannot grasp ultimate reality or truth. It is beyond thinking, if thought of as an object. Now the ego itself is a thought. This is one reason why the ego cannot get truth: why it has to go if Brahman is to be found.

@@ The true sacrifice to which man evolves from sacrificing cattle, goats or human beings, is the sacrifice of his ego. Then he gets Gnan.

@@ Ego is the last thing that will screen the Atman. It is the most difficult of all to subdue. The I can be got rid of only by knowing that it does not exist, that it is only an idea, that it is dying every night.

@@ Atman is the thinking substance in man.

---

<sup>167</sup> The original editor inserted "315" by hand.

@@ The ego is called a serpent in India because it lives hidden in a dark hole, going in and coming out from time to time.

@@ Those who believe the ego to be real and refuse to budge from this belief can never find truth. For it is only an idea. This is why Vedanta asks for the qualification of giving up personal bias.

@@ If a thing is real it is lasting. Everybody says the world is real although they see their friends carried away by death constantly. They assume that they themselves are real although tomorrow they too may die. Thus none of the egos are permanent and therefore none are real, yet we go on saying individuals are real.

@@ The Mind as such must be carefully distinguished from the mind associated with ego. This is a point on which much confusion in Western idealism reigns. For the latter leads to solipsism and to the criticism, why don't you create a camel by thought and ride away on it? It is only the former which produces ideas that are seen by all, not merely by a single person.

@@ After ideas of objects are reduced to Mind, Mind itself must be reduced to Atman.

@@ There is no such thing as I. It disappears every day in sleep, yet the mystic formula, "Who Am I?" does not realise how complex this apparently simple question really is.

@@ The mere absence of ego does not produce Gnan. See deep sleep for instance. For a man may be egoless, and yet be deceived by the world appearing to be real. Hence enquiry, based on science, is also needed.

@@ When the ego is killed, then Solipsism disappears too. But Europe does not know the distinction between Atman and Ego.

@@ Western Idealism like that of Jeans' has come to see world as mental but has failed to rise higher and see that the ego, the I, is also unreal.

@@ So long as you are in waking state you cannot regard other men as unreal ideas and yourself as not, for you as well as they are on a level. This is the error many critics fall into. If one man—yourself—is taken as real, then all the other men must logically be taken as real also.

@@ The universal mind exists in everyone. Therefore it is possible for all to practise regarding the finite mind, the ego, as not one's real self, to look upon it as an object. When one does this, at that very moment one has become the Universal Mind. This is the gnana-yoga practice we ought to follow, although it is admittedly difficult. It involves constantly objectifying the ego, seeing the I as apart.

@@ Idealism refers to the individual's imagination and is solipsistic, fallacious; whereas Mentalism is much more correct because it refers to the Mind as a whole. We must be careful not to fall into this fallacy.

@@ Nobody can question that all objects are ideas and that therefore the whole world is a concept of mind alone. Here error creeps in because men think this refers to the individual mind, to my mind. Berkeley, Jeans and Eddington say therefore that there is a universal mind in which the myriads of individual minds exist. Advaita denies this. It points out the ego-minds within the one mind. The Vedantic tenet of myriad sunrays reflected from a single sun is of this order, but given only to help us to understand at a certain stage, not given as a final truth. Universal mind is not Brahman. The notion of creation is still there.

@@ We do not say the world is a creation of my mind, my ego, i.e. solipsism. The critics of solipsism are quite right. We make a distinction between my and the universal mind. But we say ego prevents us knowing the truth. If you

---

<sup>168</sup> The original editor inserted "317" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) say my mind, you are thinking only of mind associated with ego. It then becomes impossible to perceive truth about world. Why are my ideas not seen by others? This is the problem. But it is a fictitious one, for it is based on an illusion—that ego is real, that individual mind is real. You have to go to highest Mind to universal mind, to understand it, but then your question will fall to the ground as unaskable. To understand this better, we appeal to dream. In your dream you will see several other persons. Each does not see the ideas images objects and pictures in the minds of the other persons. Yet after waking you realize that all these separate persons, despite the fact that their individual zones of awareness were different from the others, were nevertheless one and the same mind, the mind of you—the dreamer. Similarly in the waking world we find the identical state of affairs. We are all deluded by separateness into being blind to the one mind of which we and the world are appearances.

@@ The fundamental fallacy of Jeans' idealism is to posit a "universal Mind." For what is he doing when he says this? He is introducing an idea (i.e. of the Universal Mind) into his own mind. Where is this universal mind except when in his own mind, as an imagination? Moreover what is the meaning of "universal?" If it has a meaning, it must be thought of, it must be an idea, hence it must be in Jeans' mind. Now you know why Gita says to see all universe in yourself. This is not solipsism which puts the universe in the ego. Advaita says ego is only the gate-keeper to Mind as it is really.

@@ The idea of the drik must precede idea of Brahman. The notion of the latter must come at the very end of the course.



@@ Vedanta also has the idea of a Universal Mind, like Jeans and Berkeley under the titles of Prajna, Isvara and Hiranyagarbha. But these are only stages above which we must rise: they are not the same as Advaitic Brahman, which is loftier.

@@ Perception or Consciousness without ego=the Witness. The danger of using this word Witness, Drik, is that it may cause the false notions of a human being to arise as its equivalent, of some man or woman.

@@ The I is a drsyam, a thing which comes and goes like so many other things.

@@ I cannot see my “mind” nor can I show it to another. How do then dualists know that minds are many?

@@ Mind pervades everywhere—ultimately in the external world everything is matter or matter pervades the whole and because it is the mind that knows of the matter, mind also must pervade the whole universe, mind has no dimensions.

@@ If you analyse to the last degree, mind is the same as Drik.

@@ The Ego is not the true self; that which sees the ego rise and disappear is the Atman, real Self.

@@ Heaven and Hell are for the ignorant: Vedanta does not believe in them. They are based on the reality of the Ego, which we regard as unreal.

@@ It is essential to know the position of the ego to understand Vedanta.

@@ You imagine that you are suffering when you do not know what you are.

@@ The mystic thinks his I gets peace through meditation, but the truth is the I is always in peace because it is really the drik, unchanging.

@@ Attachment implies ego; which is that idea springing from duality to which you are most attached. Unless you get rid of ego there is no chance of realization.

---

<sup>169</sup> The original editor inserted “319” by hand.

@@ Death exists in order to teach man that the individual is but a drsyam which appears and disappears, hence it is to urge him to seek immortal life.

@@ Even you do not exist apart from an idea: your existence also is only an idea.

@@ Getting rid of the ego does not mean losing the sense of individuality. It may be felt, experienced but it must be known for what it is—an idea, a drsyam. We cannot deny the ego being there but we can understand what it really is—a transient drsyam. Let the ego exist, it cannot be abolished, but don't be deceived by it into seeking its satisfaction at the expense of truth.

@@ Be the witness of your own ego, just as you are the observer of the egos of others.

@@ Those who talk of Paramatman and of a Jiva as both existing have fallen into the delusion of dualism. Whoever talks of a soul, is still in religion's stage.

@@ When the body and the ego become drsyam, then the I is known as Atman.

@@ When you want to use the word "mine" there is duality.

@@ Do not believe children's fables and intellectual cock and bull stories about a man's spirit passing at death into Chandraloka, and thence to Surya-loka and thence absorbed in God. He has only gone back into Mind and will come out of it again.

@@ Desire is synonymous with I. The I is synonymous with duality. When you know Brahman the I will be there but you will know it to be appearance, and the appearance to be reality.

@@ The moment that you give up ego you will get the "lightning-flash" and know that you are everywhere (not that you are acting everywhere) and that everything is in you. Like that other flash between two thoughts it is something extremely subtle, hence hard to detect, demanding extreme concentration.

@@ Whenever the mind is working, you think of certain objective experiences and then the ego comes up with them.

@@ Why does Vedanta stress the elimination of ego? Because it actually shows that the I is constantly changing, for it is a drsyam, hence cannot yield an unchanging truth.

@@ You must watch for the I egoism, in everyone of your acts and eliminate it, otherwise Gnan is impossible.

@@ Death sends the 'I' back to the universal "soul". In that impersonal sense nobody really dies, but as individual ego, mortality is a fact.

@@ Nature is teaching us but we are unwilling to learn the lessons. Death is the leveller and shows that all men without exception end alike, without previous differences of status etc. affecting it. This is physical proof that ultimately all egos are the same. The gnani does not really regard the differences between one man and another; he sees all alike. The ego is the fundamental thing to be killed.

@@ Nobody has ever seen the ego. We see only the body. Whoever talks of duality is thinking only of the body. And yet this body is passing away every moment or rotting and dying.

@@ No proof has ever been given of an individual soul, of a separate mind, yet whole religions are based on the delusion of separateness.

@@ Brahmagnanam is impossible so long as you have the I. You may not be thinking of it, however, for it often asserts itself unknown to you.

@@ I must first know what I really am. Then only can I understand what emanates from me. Because the whole external and internal world appear and disappear into mind it is also mind.

@@ When everybody has got the I, what right has anyone to appropriate it for his little self? It does not belong to one man.

---

<sup>170</sup> The original editor inserted "321" by hand.

@@ That which you call 'I' is everywhere, is Brahman.

@@ I know only one Witness. Everybody says that he knows only his own witness. I am not conscious of another man's witness, and hence we can only say there is one Drik, not two.

@@ The I is the first kalpana, the first idea the human mind imagines.

@@ That which knows the I is Brahman. When you forget that the ego is Mind it remains the ego; when you remember, when you hold to the knowledge that it is Mind it is then merged in Brahman. That which is behind the ego gives it awareness, consciousness, for it is only an idea like all other ideas and they get their light from Brahman.

@@ Everybody uses the word I: this common I is the true self, the drik in others, the knowing capacity in them, that which enables them to say, "I know." That which is I in all beings, not the John Smith I, is the true self.

@@ Solipsism is the strongest argument and greatest frailty against idealism. The weakness of Berkeley and the cause of confusion in the German philosophers is thinking that the world is my idea. The defect is that the ego is made real, the I is still there although others are made unreal. If you think your I is real, then all other I's are real. This is waking state view. But in sleep all I's disappear. European idealism falls down because it wants to keep the ego, which is itself an idea.

@@ Ideas disappear but not in your mind, you must get rid of ego to grasp this. Similarly when critics say world is still there when I am asleep, they are blocked by ego from seeing truth that world does not come or go in ego-mind, but Mind.

@@ So long as you have the idea of a separate individual, I, re-incarnation will be there.

@@ We mistake the ego I for the real I; the former is going every moment, whereas the latter is permanent. When you respectfully approach your mother you are one I; when you go on a honey-moon you are quite a different I. This proves the ego is changing, unreal, whereas the true universal I, the I which is common to all, is an analysis which only India possesses.

@@ The Puranas which describe every step of the soul's progress or life after death, in the next world, are intended for childish minds, being mere words, imaginations, i.e. lies.

@@ All these different Hindu teachings that the Atman is as big as the body, or as big as the head, or as big as the thumb, are mere words imaginations.

@@ So long as you do not know that the ego is a drsyam, you will regard it as the drik, perceiver, witness. Or you may rise to a higher but still erroneous level which says the Atman is reflected in the ego.

@@ When you are very angry you may behave badly. After you calm down, you regret it and wonder how you could have been so. At this time you feel the angry man was like a different person, not your habitual self. What had happened? You had changed your ego for the time being and then threw off the new "angry" ego. This shows from waking proof that the ego can be detached.

@@ Even when we think of the Self we have got self-contradiction. The 'I' is taken as an idea as well as the seer. The body is not the same for two successive moments. European philosophy stops at where reality changes and yet is unchangeable.

@@ All religious doctrines of life after death are without exceptions based on reality of the ego and therefore illusory. True immortality is only in the common universal self.

@@ The I is a compound of a changing factor, ego, and an unchanging factor, consciousness.

---

<sup>171</sup> The original editor inserted "323" by hand.

@@ So long as you say I see an object, it is the ego which is active, but when you examine the totality of all objects, then you have shifted your standpoint to the Drik, for you will have to include all the individual I's among the objects, including your own ego. At this stage there is no question of my knowing, your knowing, his knowing.

@@ Nobody has ever seen the disappearance of Mind. Hence its mortality cannot be proved and since the ego disappears into Mind, we say the I is mental but the Mind which embraces it, is not.

@@ The ego is called a serpent or black serpent because a snake is very cunning. Similarly the ego is very cunning and operates even when it pretends not to. The ego is a complex, as a psychological complex is that which works unconsciously; you do not know it is there.

@@ The Drik must never be confused with the ego.

@@ The fallacy of solipsism is to make the ego real but all else unreal ideas. So if a Hitler says I can kill thousands because they are only ideas, we reply: "you may see thousand persons in dream. What are they but your own mind, hence your own self? Hence he is harming himself.

@@ When you know the difference between drik and drsyam, and include ego with the latter, there is nothing objective you need run after henceforth.

@@ The way to get rid of ego is to note its numerous changes and study its transient illusion. In dream you have one I, in waking you have the differest Is of childhood, youth, manhood, old age; or as husband, pupil, master, traveller. Finally note its disappearance in sleep. Another way is to practice humility all the 24 hours.

@@ There is no such thing as many selves: there is only the appearance of many selves.

@@ “Merging the self” means merging the universe also, for both self and universe go together. If the self is not negated we cannot negate the world, ie. the non-self. They can only be negated together. The self and the world are inseparable.

@@ Happiness means egoism. Who is the person that is happy, It is I.

@@ Until you understand the meaning of Atman, you have to say that Manas is different from it; but when you understand, both are one and same.

@@ Happiness means egoism. Who is the person that is happy? It is the I. The I means what? Ignorance! The term happiness (Sukham or Anandam) in Vedanta does not mean a particular thing, but is negative. It is the absence of burdens, and anxieties and pains.

@@ You know yourself as Mind, you see yourself in the ALL, and this ego dissolves. When the wave merges in the water what is it that enters? Such a question is meaningless for nobody has seen a form apart from the substance. Both water and form entered, both being inseparable as wave, but nobody knows or sees whether the form is still there after mergence. We may only say, universe exists in me, but how it exists there we are unable to say.

@@ That which is permanent in the end is the Atman.

@@ You are always the Seer, having no connection with the Seen, the object, the non-self. You can speak of connection only between one seen object and another, but the Seer never really enters any relation.

@@ The whole thing is in the I. The erasure of the ego is the secret of liberation at death.

@@ We use the word Atman, self, when thinking of it and words have to be used, but as it is non-dual, inexpressible, it is really a misnomer to call it by such a name.

@@ The gnani conquers death because, by identifying himself with all mankind, he continues to live on in them even after he is gone.

---

<sup>172</sup> The original editor inserted “325” by hand.

CHAPTER 14  
THE ILLUSION OF EGO EXPERIENCE



## CHAPTER 15: AVASTATRAYA.

@@ So long as an idea or an imagination is before you, it is real. Such a condition exists equally in waking as in dream, there is no difference between them. This is Gaudapada's teaching. But when people do not enquire fully enough into and correctly define the meaning of reality, they will never grasp this point. The Western thinkers have, of course, given their definitions of reality but not one is uncontradictable! All are incorrect. The real trouble is that they do not begin by marking the goal, i.e. defining the word Truth. After this they would be able to define Reality.

@@ Indian philosophy: Its uniqueness relies on totality of experience by co-ordinating the three states, waking dream and deep sleep—not on waking alone like other philosophies, arts, sciences and religions.

@@ Even when you are seeing the three states, you are still in the Atman; for it is always there. Hence to talk of "shifting the consciousness from ego to Brahman" is wrong, because your consciousness is already in Brahman and therefore does not need shifting.

@@ Ordinarily we may take it for granted that in the waking state it is the ego which perceives the world. But when we enquire, then the ego drops out.

@@ Whatever is perceived by the senses must be illusory, unreal. The logical proof of this lies in the comparison of waking and dream objects. But we rely on reason as being a higher mode of proof than this mere logical trick.

@@ Western psychologists jump to the conclusion that when there is no object, as in deep sleep, the subject, consciousness, also disappears. They could have been more correct to have adopted agnostic position, "we do not know."

@@ The Western idea of consciousness implies an objective relation, whereas Vedantic idea is that it is the unrelated subject alone.

---

<sup>174</sup> The original editor inserted "327" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) It is quite impossible to know that there is a waking state, unless you have a dream and sleep to compare it with (like contrasting colours). Hence knowledge is possible only when you have differentiation. And since the Drik is the undifferentiated it can never be known in the ordinary sense of being distinguished from anything else, as the three states. You cannot talk of the absence of objects when there are no objects for contrast.

@@ If you did not wake up, you would never say you slept because you would have nothing to distinguish it by. But when you do awaken, your sleep is only a memory, i.e. a thought. Memory is an idea just as perception is an idea. Now the idea of a thought implies its distinction from the non-existence of thought. Hence there is an objectless, i.e. thoughtless consciousness.

@@ Soon after you wake up, you first say “I slept well.” When the ‘I’ is constantly changing, you don’t find ‘I’ in Sushupti. Absence of consciousness in Sushupti is not proved. Yet the going and coming of objects is known (since you say there were no objects in deep sleep), and this is proof that Consciousness, beyond the I, has been always there. And it is that which does not get polluted by the tongue. Any word that you can use, in the sense that no word can express this “consciousness.”

@@ Maya is in subject-object—causality, i.e. in the waking state. Viewed from the waking state alone, it is said, its cause must be existent. Had you knowledge of ignorance in sleep? No, since there was no duality. The term remembrance has no meaning in reference to deep sleep. And it is no more than idea in the waking state. In the waking state there must be the thought of an object and we have wrong knowledge or mistaken knowledge;<sup>175</sup>

---

<sup>175</sup> The original editor deleted “and from the” by hand.

(continued from the previous page) and from the waking state alone, it is said that in sleep, there is absence of knowledge.

@@ In sleep you admit you do not know anything, hence you are not deceived, whereas in waking you have the egotism which says the world is real. In sleep your egotism does not assert itself and you say I do not know. On waking you assert "I see this and it is real." So your vanity and delusion arise. Therefore "waking is worse than deep sleep." as Quoran says! "He who is asleep to the sense of reality though in waking state, who thinks he is in a real world when he is not is in a worse condition than one who is in deep sleep. Just as an agnostic who says "I do not know" is better than a religious man who says, "my religion is true, and no other."

@@ Dream state is precisely the same as the function of imagination in waking state, remarks a Upanishad.

@@ "We are such stuff as dreams are made of" said Shakespeare, showing that he was an idealist.

@@ Idealists could ask realists "Before you woke up how can you prove you saw the wall?" How do you know it is the same wall? You can only suppose it. Even if someone tells you he saw the wall during your sleep, it is not proof.

@@ Why did the Sanskrit books speak of a universal pralaya? In sleep your ideas disappear and re-appear on waking. With them goes your world also. This doctrine of universe dissolving into pralaya is intended for the lower order of minds who cannot grasp the higher truth i.e. that whole world dissolves into an idea: the creation and dissolution of universe is a fiction, but it must be taught to those who cannot grasp idealism.

@@ Where is a single thinker in the West who has evaluated the three states? Not one. Yet non-duality cannot be grasped without Avastatraya. In this respect India possesses a higher intellect than the West.

---

<sup>176</sup> The original editor inserted "329" by hand.

@@ When I think of my travels in Europe, I find they are only a dream. The mountains I saw in Switzerland are the same as those I saw in last night's dream. i.e. both are workings of mind only.

@@ The confusion in Europe between idealism, realism, neo-idealism, critical realism, etc. cannot be cleared up unless they go to avastatraya and find that the external world is as much an idea as any other idea.

@@ Critics of idealism who ask why if this wall is an idea, we do not turn it into a horse by merely thinking it, receive our reply thus: this question can never be decided unless we have the aid of avastatraya.

@@ Think of a dream. In it you have both subjective ideas and objective ones. i.e. you see a tiger (objective) and feel fear (subjective). Both tiger and the fear are ideas, but of different character. This will illustrate the two kinds of idealism, i.e. the vijñānavāda of Buddhism and the Kalpana of Vedānta, both of which are different in character. But Advaita is not idealism; it rises above it; it is really Atman-ism! It is the pure mind itself, not taking shape as tiger or fear-ideas. It is the doctrine of the All, not merely of that part of the All called idea. It combines realism with idealism and merges both in the higher reality – Atman. There is nothing corresponding to it in European thought. So do not make error of teaching that Vedāntins are idealists. We are not. Idealism is only the first step in Vedānta. We do not recognize either idealism or realism to be truth. We do not recognize any reconciliation of both, as in Russell's neutralism, to be truth. You will not present Indian philosophy correctly if you describe it as idealistic without carefully defining idealism and plainly saying it is not ultimate reality.

@@ There are three questions which you ought to ask any Indian philosopher of today as a challenge, and even our friends, Y. Subba Rao Sharman or Pundit Vittal Sastri, and none of them can answer the questions unless they draw upon modern scientific knowledge. Of course, they may draw upon scripture or commentators but that is no rational answer. These are the queries: (a) Will you take in dream the money I borrowed from you in waking? (b) How do you know there is such a thing as Brahman? (c) Why is Atman the same as Brahman? Query (a) may be asked even of the people who profess to know Mandukya and they cannot answer it. That is why I say science is essential to prove Advaita, and not merely let it be a dogma.

@@ The God seen in dream is on a par with the God seen in waking vision, both are mere imagination, yet both are actually seen.

@@ Dream is the same as waking state so long as it lasts. Whatever applies to the latter belongs to the former also. Hence when I say intellect is reason confined to waking I include dream in the latter.

@@ Sleep and Samadhi are identical. Samadhi is induced and under the control of one individual, while sleep is not induced and not under control.

@@ There is a distinction between reason applied to waking state and reason applied to all three states. And there is a distinction between applied to waking and dream, and reason in working in them. The former is intellect or intelligence strictly. It is capable of knowing its own incapacity to know everything, as is confessed by scientists. It knows its own defect which arises from confinement to waking data only.

@@ Intellect is that which works in the waking state alone whereas Reason is that which examines the three states; it takes them into account.

---

<sup>177</sup> The original editor inserted "331" by hand.

@@ Turiya the intellectual laying down of the three states to view them from Witness standpoint, is possible only when you, the ego, disappear.

@@ Deep sleep and highest Samadhi (Nirvikalpa) are the same entirely. Self is Witness when there is an idea or object to witness, but there is none such in deep sleep or samadhi – there is nothing to witness. Only in the waking and dream states are there these objects or ideas; they disappear in deep sleep and Samadhi, for both the ordinary man, the yogi and the gnani. The deep sleep state is hence identical for all these three. You call it unconsciousness, but do you not see that consciousness can only exist where there is something to be conscious of? Your friend Pranavananda of Vellore who says he goes to sleep in the consciousness and remains aware of it throughout the night is simply deceiving himself like many yogis and mystics, if he is not deluding others. It is impossible. There is no such thing as Turiya or the fourth state, which is also yogic nonsense. The goal of all yoga is nothing more than deep sleep. Slumber. Yes, nothing more! But you must keep this secret because no one will want to undergo the troubles and disciplines of yoga if you reveal it. The difference between the ordinary man and the attained yogi is that the latter can enter this slumber or Samadhi as he calls it, at will, whereas the ordinary man cannot. Don't reveal this secret because yoga is necessary for the vast majority as a preliminary stage to being fit to study Gnana: it is for those who lack the power of insight and brains; but it will give them peace of mind through elimination of thoughts and all the contents of mind, as well as detachment from worldly desires, both being pre-requisites to study of Jnana which demands absolutely free mind as well as detachment from worldly desires,

(continued from the previous page) both being pre-requisites to study of Jnana which demands absolutely free mind to attend to it.

@@ When we say Turiya is realized or known, we mean only that ignorance is removed. The realisation is not a result of any activity because the Turiya was always there, only an unveiling.

@@ Form of objects and their essence as mind are one and the same. To see this, take the illustration of dream and its objects. But this perception requires a mind as sharp as a razor. If you think of form as something different from mind then the latter has nothing to do with it; and when you regard it as being non-different from Atman, then you find the objects disappear and only the Self is.

@@ There is no such thing as manifold manifestation in the sense of a new creation: just as there is nothing new in the dream world, all its apparently manifold objects being still unchanged Mind. Similarly Brahman is always there as the world, still one, still unchanged.

@@ It is not possible to say that the external changes and forms are either different or non-different from Brahman. This statement is most important. To grasp it look at dream where objects are neither different nor non-different from MIND.

@@ In the waking state you may call it Atman, in the other (dream) state you may call it mind. They are both one and the same entity. (Mandukya 356: "All the entities" refers to this.)

@@ Hunger and thirst are only for the body, for that which has been imagined, but the Atman is beyond both.

@@ In sleep or trance one does not know what Reality or Brahman is.

@@ The unchanging is that which sees the three states. This is how we enquire and prove. Bondage

---

<sup>178</sup> The original editor inserted "333" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) means absence of Knowledge of Truth.

@@ Why should men have sleep? Nature wants to teach you that it is possible to have a state where there will be no imagination, no duality, no fear. In sleep, no questions can be asked, no answers given, there is nothing. Questions can be asked where imaginations are possible, i.e. in the waking state. The secondless state is always present, even now during the waking state. When the mind has learned to enquire properly it finds this non-dual state even during waking, as it is never absent. It is wrong to take sleep as Gnana or Moksha. The case of sleep is given only as an illustration or analogy, it is like the true state of non-duality but nevertheless it is not our goal. It is given as analogy only to show that all ideas disappear in deep sleep. Whereas Moksha is present in this very moment and all can be realised here and now outside of sleep. Only to achieve this the mind must be properly trained to enquire into it.

@@ Waking and sleep are both Atman, but sleep affords a better illustration of its nature. It is not the final state but only a simile for it. This does not mean that sleep alone is Atman.

@@ Turiya must be found in the waking state. The analogy of deep sleep is given by the Upanishads to indicate that sleep is the last gate to be passed before reaching Turiya, that it is like Turiya in the sense of having no second thing for the Atman to be aware of, but sleep is definitely NOT the condition of Gnana. Otherwise the Gnani would have to keep on returning to sleep in order to recover his Gnana or the yogi would have to keep on entering samadhi to see Atman. Sleep and Samadhi give Atman alone, whilst waking state gives both Atman plus thoughts and things. Hence



(continued from the previous page) the non-dual Atman is ever-present even in the midst of waking life. Panchadeshi explains these points.

@@ Sleep gives Atman. That is not enough. It must be known and felt in the waking state which means you must discover it in the midst of thoughts, and things i.e. you must examine the external world and by enquiry-practice eventually trace it back to Atman. Then only have you known Brahman and also known it to be the same as Atman.

@@ Turiya is not split up into thoughts, but is the universal non-dual light whereby thoughts exist. We cannot say there is awareness even in deep sleep. Otherwise how do you know you slept? There is some kind of awareness there, but it is neither personal nor finite. Find this subject by abstracting all objects. It is mysterious and still continues into the waking life. To trace it during the latter and to succeed is to become a gnani.

@@ That which sees the three states coming and going, which knows them, is the Omniscience. Mind is still attached to form, to worldly reality, hence it needs training to get above this attachment before it can perceive both the forms and the essential one reality, simultaneously. This is the real meaning of Omniscience.

@@ Immediately the waking experience comes to you, what happens? You are thinking of body and ego. That is, you think: I am P.B. But the gnani has to see P.B, thus avoiding egoism by negating body and I.

@@ EDDINGTON'S idealism says ideas are pointers, pointing to some unknown thing. Realists attribute the idea to an original object which existed priory and which is the cause of your idea. They thus refute idealism. There is no other reply to this "refutation" except by avastatraya – no other way. And as the West does not

---

<sup>179</sup> The original editor inserted "335" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) know avastatraya the idealism there is not final and secure.

@@ Just as all ideas sink into the mind after dream, so all ideas of the world sink into Atman, and are never really lost.

@@ How are we to know that all this world becomes Atman? The illustration of deep sleep is used, for before you entered it you saw a material world which disappeared. Where did it go? To answer this, ask what all the objects of the world are. They are ideas. Where do ideas go back to? The Mind. Hence world disappeared into the mind. The mind disappears into the Atman. Mind active produces ideas, when in its inactive state it disappears. When everything is Atman there is no one else left.

@@ The Atman which is seen to pass into birth here “seen” really means appears. If your mind had really become a mountain last night in dream it would still have remained a mountain. But the change was an appearance only, not real or permanent.

@@ We appeal to dream and show that there you imaginatively create a multitude of persons out of your own self. They are non-different from you. Why do you think you are different from others, why do you accept duality? Ignorance? You do not enquire into appearances.

@@ In deep sleep there are no prejudices to warp your mind, so you have non-duality. This does not mean that sleep is gnana (otherwise every ass and dog would be a sage!) but only as dream is converted into sleep, so every object of world can be converted into non-duality. That is why we appeal to deep sleep, because it is every one’s own experience and readily available as illustration. But do not carry the analogy too far. When I say “He is like a lion” do not ask where are his four

(continued from the previous page) feet and tail.

@@ Deep sleep has been given you by Nature to show how in Gnan the whole universe goes back into you as idea.

@@ The Atman cannot be realised in deep sleep, but only by calm enquiry whilst awake.

@@ Even when you see mountains in dream they are not different from the mind itself. The essence is the same. Similarly with Atman—all things are not different from it in essence.

@@ You cannot describe Brahman but you can give an illustration of it. This is what Upanishad does, as sleep.

@@ If there is only one self why is one man crying and another laughing? All should have the same emotion? Hence religions believe in millions of individual separate souls. But the objection of differences between separate feelings are answered by illustration. In your dream you think of a tiger who attacks and eats you. Who made the tiger, What is it made of? Answer: the same mind has created both the tiger and yourself. Thus two separate different egos are created by one mind. Latter appears bifurcated through its own imagination.

@@ What do you see in the ordinary waking or dream state? You see each object and person separately, this man, that wall etc. When you say all these are mind, you reduce them to one category, the mind, and then know their oneness in essence. If however your mind is attached to this particular man, that individual woman or thing, you become unable through your liking or desire or passion for the separate object, to see the general oneness of all.

@@ When you kill a tiger in your dream, it is only your own mind appearing as the tiger

---

<sup>180</sup> The original editor inserted "337" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) which you kill. Similarly other creatures and men are your own self appearing as different and what you do to them you are really doing to yourself. They are in your mind, not out of it.

@@ Turiya is not the fourth state: Turiya is that in which all the others are merged; or it may be called the witness sees the other three states.

@@ What we are trying to teach is the non-existence of Matter. The Quoran itself teaches it in a very few phrases. "The world in which we are living here is a dream and men who are living here are a dream." it says. This means that any really deeply thoughtful and concentrated mind sees this truth, but how, it is so, and what it leads to, they need not know. That is provided only by the higher vedanta. Hence Muhammed need not have had the highest realisation to perceive this fully. Shakespeare thoughtfully said: "World is such stuff as dreams are made of." But this alone does not make him a gnani.

@@ When you get Gnana, all acts become ideas as in a dream.

@@ Relativity leads man to idealism. Idealism leads you to mentalism. Mentalism leads you to avastatraya. Avastatraya leads to Brahman.

@@ Critics say a sensation cannot arise unless there is an external object and that a sensation is quite different from a self-created mental image or fancy. Reply: The answer is given by Gaudapada but this cannot be understood without Avastatraya. In your dream you feel injured by a tiger which is an external object. So what is it that tells you in the waking and dream that there is the external object? It is the Mind in both cases.

@@ Advaita begins by using dream as an illustration. Then it proceeds to use it as an analogy, but in the final stage it proceeds to ask what, after all, is the difference between our waking life and dream life? Whatever so-called differences critics may point out we shall refute as non-existent. For example, if you say that waking life is continuous and dream life is discontinuous, we reply: Not so. Even during dream you remember things which happened some months previously and also you have relations with people with whom you were formerly in relation. Moreover when science proves the discontinuity of atomic structure then the whole waking world is shown to be discontinuous also, should you insist that dream life is discontinuous after all. Again if you reply that dream is incoherent whereas waking is coherent we reply: Not so, because even waking life can be shown to be incoherent at times. Therefore we can find no difference whatever between waking and dream. They are both of the same character, that is, they are both mental.

@@ There the Atman is said to be the Witness of sleep and the other two states. This is to prove that even deep sleep is a drsyam.

@@ Gaudapada points out that the dream-objects are obviously mental: he shows too that the waking objects are just like the dream: so he concludes that both are therefore equally mental.

@@ Owing to the impossibility of getting all the facts about the universe, science cannot complete its task as science, and it is impossible to get at truth without Avastatraya.

@@ Avastatraya is the only way to show the non-duality of things seen, for in dream it can be seen that the mountain in dream has nothing in itself, no second external mountain which causes it.

---

<sup>181</sup> The original editor inserted "339" by hand.

@@ Sleep is merely used as an illustration of non-duality. Even in the waking state if mind is sharp we can get the lightning-flashes of sleep: it is then called sahaja samadhi: only we do not notice them. Philosophy will not end if you confine it to the waking state: it will always produce endless Ideas and hence endless schools of thought. But only in the non-duality of sleep do all ideas die, when this is brought into waking state as sahaja samadhi.

@@ The student must pass first through the stage of scientific proof from waking world facts for idealism: he must know that things are ideas. Then only is he ready to pass to the higher stage of studying Avastatraya. Here dreams show what powers the mind possesses to manufacture whole worlds, to create externality and internality, i.e. space. Sleep shows what power the mind possesses to re-absorb, store and later reproduce all the ideas of the world, space etc. Finally having shown all this avastatraya clinches and carries to final culmination the idealistic theory learnt from waking state facts and shows what nature of mind is, what ego is, and that everything is not only ultimately one or non-dual but also not apart from yourself.

@@ In dream you see a tiger, it is a second thing. This arouses fear in you. This fear is an idea. Thus in dream you have an internal world of ideas and an external world of objects, and yet both are mental, non-dual, although seemingly dual. This is our answer to Realists who say there must be a separate external world. We do not deny there is an external world, but as in dream, it too is as mental as, again as in dream, are my thoughts of fear etc. The Realist's difficulty arises because of the body. He thinks there are things outside it whereas ideas are inside it. This prevents seeing truth that both are mental. Hence his need of yoga to break down stubborn attachment to the body.

@@ Critics say that it is impossible for one idea to exist within the spacial limits of a second idea and therefore if the body is an idea how can dream exist within the body as Mandukya asserts? Reply is that Mandukya asserts this only to refute those dualists who say that there is an individual soul existing independently from the body which actually goes out and travels to the Himalayas during dream and then returns to the body. Anyway one idea existing within another is not impossible when we understand that it merely appears to so exist. For instance, in dream we see a man existing inside a house, both the man and the house are ideas. What has actually happened is the idea of the man appears to exist within the idea of the house. Emphasis must be laid on the fact that the waking world, just as the dream world is only a mental appearance.

@@ What is it that appears in dream? What are the characteristics of dream objects? Why is it that externality is experienced during dream? These questions have never been investigated by the west.

@@ Europe may have noticed the similarities between dream and waking since centuries ago; that is not denied; but what it has not done is to enquire thoroughly into the meaning of dream and sleep. Only India has done this.

@@ Why is it in Nature that I should have a dream at all? The importance of this question has not been grasped by the west nor its implications studied. Nature has given us dreams as she has given us eyes, hands, lungs. There is a reason. Let us ascertain it. This will lead us to the discovery of the truth of mentalism.

@@ When people have doubts about the truth of Idealism, there is no other recourse than to refer them to avastatraya. Similarly there is no final escape from the logic of solipsism,

---

<sup>182</sup> The original editor inserted "341" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) which is irrefutable otherwise, than by similar reference to Avastatraya. In both these cases it is the black serpent of ego which prevents understanding.

@@ If people raise the question “What starts the whole process of sensing objects if the latter are only references” we must refer them to dream. We see all sorts of objects in dream, they come and vanish of their own accord. The explanation is that it is the very nature of Mind to be always fabricating thoughts, always active creating one idea after another, just as it does in dream. It is not disproved even by the apparent inactivity of sleep because people often get their difficult problems solved by “sleeping on them” thus proving there is a kind of subconscious mental action going on even then. Moreover Coleridge’s poem composed in sleep, artistic inspirations coming “out of the blue” also show that Mind is continually producing new thoughts even when man is unconscious of its activity. His individual consciousness is not needed for the process.

@@ The definition of real is bound up with knowledge of avastatraya. For a dreamer wall is felt to be as real as a waking wall. This is what Europe does not know.

@@ Whoever talks like Swami Isvarananda of analysing deep sleep does not understand that it is equal to talking of analysis of nothing. We can only analyse experience, i.e. duality.

@@ All the three states are necessary. Sleep only shows disappearance of objects of duality but does not prove into what they have disappeared: but when they emerge in dream and waking then we know they have come out of sleep, not elsewhere. Moreover Turiya is also necessary to note this coming and going out of sleep.

@@ We take sleep only as an illustration of a state where there is no two, but it must not



(continued from the previous page) be taken as an illustration of the whole Brahman, but only of a single point. To stretch the analogy beyond this single point of non-duality, is to commit a fallacy.

@@ If a critic asks why mind cannot know directly what is going on in its own ideas such as in the sensory process without having to make inferences the reply is that this involves the fallacy of thinking the sensory system to exist before and consequently apart or independent of the idea of it. There is no proof that it has a prior existence whether material or mental; that is mere assumption. You can be helped to grasp this point by considering your own body as though it were a dream body. During dream this body may be gushed with knives and blood will pour out, pain will be felt, the nerves will be cut—all just as in waking. Yet all the time the nerves were only ideas! All the time the body was opaque to the mind's gaze and the mind could not observe the sensory vibrational process—as it cannot in waking. Yet the whole body was but idea.

@@ Science teaches that all the universe is inter-woven, one thing affecting another or depending on another or related to another. Now dream must therefore have its part to play in Nature, too. What is this part? If we only reflected deeply on the matter we would realise that the third of every 24 hours given to sleep indicated the great importance Nature attaches to dream and sleep. Vedanta says dream is to open a rift in the mechanism of what is going on behind the scenes as illusion does, and thus give a strong hint that all life is mind-made, that the waking state is as ideated as dream.

@@ We do not take dream-pictures or fanciful ideas as real as our critics say, but our waking pictures as unreal. The two attitudes are totally different.

@@ Science admits that it is its business to

---

<sup>183</sup> The original editor inserted "343" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) study the resemblances and differences between things. Yet it omits to apply this research to the waking compared with the dream states!

@@ Experience of the world is there, that is undeniable, only you will have to know that it is illusory, not what it seems. The illustration is dream. When you wake up and thus when there is no ignorance, you say that the dream-world was illusory. Similarly in waking when you get rid of ignorance you say, yes the wall is there but it is illusory. For every second it is fleeting, just like a cinema picture. The wall appears stable but science knows it is not really so: hence its appearance is illusory.

@@ Misapprehension means taking for reality that which is unreality. The best example is in dream, when dreamer takes imagination for reality.

@@ Even the sense of reality is also mental, i.e. imaginary, and this is proved by (1) dream or (2) rope/snake illustration.

@@ Modern psychology proves that certain ideas can be projected outside and appear to us as real objects. Hence even if Avastatraya does not suffice to vindicate Vedanta science does.

@@ If you assert that an external object must be the cause of the idea of it, we reply look at dream. There you will see the idea of a mountain is created and yet no external object of a mountain was present to cause it! This is one of the reasons why we lay such stress on non-causality and on dream.

@@ Realists who say that objects have a sense of reality not found in mere imaginations, to them we reply the same sense is found in dreams.

@@ Both seer and seen are really the same (as in dream). But the apparent relation between is a product of the Witness.

@@ Did the mind go from here to Himalayas in your dream? No, the idea of space and movement is in the mind. Similarly the Atman does not move, but motion occurs within it.

@@ In the same way you cannot compare side by side a dream-elephant with a waking elephant. All we can get at are abstract creations of the mind.

@@ The rose and smelling which you have in a dream, are only an idea. This helps to understand why similarly the five senses which you have in waking are also ideas.

@@ As in a dream, the table is only a mental construction, science has proved that although it is a table yet it is only an idea simultaneously.

@@ There is no way to discover the world is idea except by modern scientific analysis of matter. Avastatraya cannot be used for this: it is only an illustration in this connection. Hence Y. Subba Rao writes nonsense. Merely muttering “Avasthatraya” as he does is mere punditry. He does not show that it has a rational basis. For the world which he analyses is the dream world; what is the use of that when we want to know what is the real nature of this material external world. Hence he has only half-understood Avastatraya. Avastatraya is not needed to prove idealism: Scientific—such as Russell, Eddington, and even Berkeley up to a point, analyses of sense-perception forms the only real proof. Avastatraya can merely illustrate idealism, although it is the only proof when you step beyond idealism. Scientific analysis of sensation is quite enough to prove idealism. When world is known to be idea, avastatraya is only proof of world being in you, and only way to understand the nature of Atman. Idealists fear solipsism, quite rightly because they make the mistake of putting the world in the ego, not in Atman.

---

<sup>184</sup> The original editor inserted “345” by hand.

(continued from the previous page) They have seen only ego-solipsism, not Atman-solipsism, which is the truth. Proof of idealism can only be got from science. There only can you see the world and yet know it to be nothing more than idea.

@@ In dream you can see a wall outside, you can dash your head against it, you feel the blow, the pain and see blood flowing. Yet all this is only mental. Similarly with waking.

@@ Where was the world before you woke up this morning? It must have been in the mind, similarly when you awake into Gnan you know world is Mind, finally.

@@ It will be a great error to write that the world is a dream. It is not. The correct statement is: "The world is like a dream." This is because both dream and waking worlds are mental constructs.

@@ European realists make the mistake of thinking that ideas can be only inside the mind and not outside it. They do not grasp that ideas can appear externally, as they do in dream.

@@ Ideas are only momentary, although one minute may look like 1000 years in dream.

@@ Dream is something of which you have some knowledge; sleep is a state in which you are not aware of anything; it is known only in the waking state; sleep has a meaning only in reference to the waking state. It cannot be explained without reference to waking. You refer to sleep in waking but not in sleep itself. We can only understand sleep, as a state in which we do not experience any object as in waking state.

@@ The Fourth is that which sees, the witness and it cannot be described. It is not a state, cannot be. The three states merge in the fourth.

@@ Sleep is always present in all the three states

@@ Think of a cocoanut tree idea: next moment a mango tree idea. What happened between these ideas? I do not know. Why do you remember the ideas? There is a discontinuity of thought between the idea of a horse and the idea of an ass. What was there between the two ideas? One idea is not the same as another. The mind distinguishes them; then what is there between them? This shows that 'sleep' or absence of objects intervenes even in waking state.

@@ Deep sleep is said to be causal relation, because every day you go to sleep and wake up and the whole world is before you again. It is also called the seed condition: A mango from a mango seed, and vice versa. Mango tree goes into the seed form and comes out again. In the tree form you do not see the seed: in the seed form you do not see the tree. In the waking you see the whole world, in sleep only the seed, you do not see the world.

@@ The standpoint of Gnan requires taking your standpoint away from the three states. With any identification either in waking state or dream— having objects, no gnanam is possible.

@@ If Turiya were different from Atman, how can there be awareness of the three states at all? So Turiya is always present as that which knows the three states. If you want to know it, it is not enough to negate the three states. The negation of the three states causes the entire phenomena to disappear, because they are unreal. How can they disappear if they are real? If you know that they are all going to go away, it is maya. Maya is a question of fact.

@@ The three states mean the whole of existence.

@@ There is a school which says that take away the three states and then you get Turiya. This is Yoga. It is wrong. How did you know there were the three states?

@@ Even if you see God before you, it is only a thought.

---

<sup>185</sup> The original editor inserted "347" by hand.

@@ Turiya is not a state or condition. We can experience only the three states. Turiya is present always. That which knows all the three states is itself changeless.

@@ The Western psychologists' objection that only primitive savage races regard dreams as real experiences, is answered as follows: Vedanta does not say dream experiences are real. It agrees that they are unreal. It says that waking experiences are unreal (and here it is supported by science) and that therefore the waking state is similar to dream, i.e. both are unreal, despite the feeling of vivid reality they produce at the time.

@@ What is the use of dream? Because Nature wants you to understand the world is idea, she has given dream for your instruction, but men have not got the eyes to see the lesson, that both dream, dream-ego and the dreamer are Mind.

@@ Dream teaches you that all these actions and objects are non-dual.

@@ When critics say your sage does not know Brahman in sleep reply is that they are viewing it from waking standpoint. Can they say this from standpoint of sleep itself?

@@ You can understand that all the world is the same Brahman if you reduce waking world to dream state and that to sleep.

@@ Waking state is valuable to show that your dreams were all in your mind. Similarly Gnan is the waking-state of the Gnani.

@@ Have your ideas in a dream any actual thickness, height or length. No. Yet you feel and see that they have it. Einstein comes near to this in showing measurements are appearances.

@@ We have to go to science for the proof that world is idea, but to get the meaning of this we have to go to dream, which alone explains how the climber, the hill and the climbing are

(continued from the previous page) all idea and all one mind.

@@ In a dream you may become another personality. What happens? The knowing capacity in you, the Atman, associates itself for the time being with the new ego and identifies itself with it. But when the dream ends, you wake up and that ego—say a soldier—disappears. After that you know that you can be separated.

@@ Just as Mind really remains unaffected by changing experiences in dream, (although you think at the time that a murderer is killing you) so Mind in waking is unchanged by its myriad thoughts and experiences. Just as waking after dream shows the murderer as not having been there other than delusion, so in waking up to Gnan all the world show is seen to have been only idea, unreal.

@@ Waking consciousness appears to be external. In dream also consciousness appears to be external. In dream too we see day-time, sun etc. But really, it is not, it is in the Atman.

@@ Externality and internality never exist except in relation to imagined senses. A dream is a dream only, when it is compared to the waking state. In dream it was just like waking state to the dreamer. “That which is subtle” means that which is made up of ideas.

@@ Witnessing too is a function of the mind. In deep sleep all the vasanas go into the mind. Because we are not aware of any other thing in sleep we have to admit that everything has merged into the mind during sleep.

@@ Sleep is due to the absence of duality. It means that there is no positive misery or pleasure. In sleep there is only absence of misery and pleasure. But a gnani must have the knowledge of the absence of duality even in the waking state. Then only there is real bliss.

@@ He who has not identified with the three states is not affected by them.

---

<sup>186</sup> The original editor inserted “349” by hand.

@@ The Atman is he who sees the three states coming and going in succession; and this “witness” unites through experience. I witnessed the three states—what are they? They came out of my mind and disappeared into mind, therefore I am also the sleeper, dreamer and the waker. I am only the witness—the fish does not belong to any particular river-bank, i.e. unaffected by any states is Atman; but Atman gets attached to the banks. In the same way, you can understand the various states, if you think deeply.

@@ When you identify yourself with a particular state, waking or dream, you become indented and individualised. The true nature of prana has no identification. In deep sleep, it does not identify itself and remains unindividualised.

@@ Bliss in sushupti means absence of suffering, which comes only with the existence of duality, of subject-object relationship.

@@ Turiya is not a state. It cannot be indicated by words. It can be understood only as Neti, Neti. It is that on which the ideas stand; it is present in all the three states. If you can say that everything is idea, you must admit that all ideas must have a substratum. Ideas cannot stand in the air. There should be a mind in which ideas stand. Similarly there should be a substratum for the illusory super-imposed snake, which is the rope.

@@ In dream and waking the world is created by the mind.

QUORAN: “The Essence bides, the world’s a passing dream. All else than God is wholly null and void.”

MAHOMED’S HADIS: “Men who are living here are in a dream; when they die then shall they be awake, For all this world is a mere thought— the thought of Him who is the True, whose thought is Truth.”

SUFIS: “He who seems now awake is in deep dream. His wakefulness is false and worse than sleep.”



@@ If you had only the state of pain, could you have had the idea of pain? No. It is impossible. Yogis talk nonsense when they talk of perpetual anandam, for they could form no idea of it unless they also had pain. Is there any anandam in deep sleep? It means that after awaking, you contrast the troubles of waking with their absence in sleep. In latter there is only one state and hence no second thing for comparison is seen, and there is then unconsciousness. When there is no duality, you can say nothing about it either way. Similarly suppose you had only the waking state, could a man then know it was waking? He would have nothing to distinguish it from. Now he who says dream is unreal, automatically states that waking is real and vice versa. Hence waking is real to him who has seen dreams and to none else. (Mand. 291). To objection that all people see waking objects and testify to them, whereas you alone can testify to your dream objects, reply is: In dream you may see a 1000 persons and 10,000 objects, as in waking. At the time all these persons seemed real. Here also in waking you have a 1000 persons and same objects. Where is the difference between the two groups of persons and things? All seemed real at the time. The objection thus falls to the ground. Science helps us here by now saying that for no two seconds do the same things exist as Buddha said. Even the Himalayas are being washed away by Ganges in form of sand, and they are thus ever-changing their form. The most important principle however is that all forms, whether waking or dream, are illusory because they are perceived by the mind. Merely because things and persons appear to you as real, is no justification for taking them as such. We are aware only of a succession of waking states, each comes and passes away; similarly with dream states. To objection that the same waking world re-appears, reply is that the idea of sameness

---

<sup>187</sup> The original editor inserted "351" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) is illusory and must be enquired into. You may think you are in the same buildings which you entered this morning, but if you enquire and examine it scientifically, you will find it has undergone change throughout.

@@ You see the same waking world at two points of time i.e. now and tomorrow. In dream you may have same experience and repeat the same scenes in later dreams. You can pass through 9 or 10 days experience in a short dream. Twelve hours of dream have really passed in one minute of waking. This shows that you have your own ideas of time which vary in parallel between dream and waking. Their character is on the same level, and you cannot distinguish between sleep and dream.

@@ You remember a dream after it has passed. You do not remember it as a waking condition, but only as a dream state. In the dream state if you were expected to remember waking state it should similarly be remembered as a dream and not as a waking condition. In dream you have food, body, hands, table etc. This proves that what was known in waking reappears in dream, where again it seems real. How could you recognise Halwa sweet in your dream, unless you had previously seen it in waking. This is the reply to the objection that we cannot remember waking life in dream, although we remember dreams in waking. Therefore the waking things are seen again in dream later being a repetition of something that has transpired in waking. We can't say how the mind chooses its various waking-material for its dreams, but it does draw on that material for its dream-life. The careful examination of dream shows that memory of waking experiences persists during dream, but if your memory is weak, the links between dream and waking are lost. Philosophy does not treat dream with usual indifference. It studies it with care.

@@ The mind constructs its own picture of the world because it converts sensation into its own images. It is the same as in dream, where mind creates its own dream world that exists within it.

@@ The conscious enquiry into the nature of the objective world during the waking state gradually brings about a “waking up” during the dream state and one begins to realise that one is dreaming. That means that if one sees a tiger during his dream, he will understand quite well that the tiger is only his idea, or dream. But this condition will arise only after the mind has saturated itself with enquiry and discrimination during waking state.

@@ Western psycho-analysts are studying the dream state from a physiological and psychological standpoint, but which of them has begun to study it from the standpoint of the seeker after truth and reality?

@@ How is dreamless sleep known? No ideas and no objects were present then. Hence it is only known by negation; in the same way the pure self is also only known by negation.

@@ The interval between two ideas which pass through the mind is equivalent to the deep sleep state.

@@ Unless the mind is directed to the (philosophical) study of deep sleep, how can truth be ascertained?

@@ The sense of reality impresses itself upon us during the waking state. This sense is transferred to the dream state, but completely collapses during deep sleep.

@@ Just so long as people do not enquire into the nature of a dream, it remains real for them, but so soon as they reflect enquiringly, they realise it is nothing but a dream. Similarly so long as mystics do not enquire critically into the nature of their visions, the latter remain

---

<sup>188</sup> The original editor inserted “353” by hand.

(continued from the previous page) real for them and are not discovered to be what they really are i.e. of the stuff of dreams.

@@ Deep sleep and the dream state are ever present with us, but the idea of time prevents us from apprehending them, for it makes us think that such and such a thing has ended and so on.

@@ The dream state illustrates the basis of both. By proper analysis of the three states, we may ultimately discover the reality which they contain, just as when gold-bearing earth reveals its gold after analysis.

@@ In no other country has the truth been known in all its fullness as in early India. In no other science as that of Gnana has the evidence of the three states been used in order to ascertain truth. Whereas in Zen Buddhism something like this appears, we discover that there has been a borrowing from India.

@@ It is essential to enquire into the presence of objects before we can understand the truth of their reality. The presence of objects is known only in terms of their absence, that is the colour black is known as black only in terms of contrast with the colour white. Hence Reality is to be known only as distinguished from unreality. In deep sleep the entire universe disappears from consciousness, that is, becomes unreal. Therefore, the different states are really relative to each other. In truth when the mind gets the consciousness of Reality there is no distinction between the three states.

@@ To critic who objects "We can learn nothing from deep sleep" I reply "The waves (of thoughts) which sink back into the ocean, still remain the ocean" i.e. personal mind sinks back in sleep into Universal Mind, but does not lose its reality, as Mind for all that.

@@ The three states of man have not been studied metaphysically, but psychologically.

@@ The psychological phenomena of “double personality” is valuable in avastatraya to show how the mind can assume different individual egos. What became of the ‘I’ when Jekyll became Hyde? Science thus shows it is absurd to think of the I as a fact. That is why Vedanta tells you to get rid of the illusion of this reality. Consider this carefully if you want to know the meaning of the waking state; which is too difficult to understand without Avastatraya.

@@ After you see that all thoughts and hence all the world disappears in deep sleep, compare the three states and thus find out the final truth.

@@ The term thought must be used differently from the term idea. A thought is any passing fancy or any feeling or any desire which comes and goes within yourself. An idea is not a thought in the above sense but a sensation of some object which is apparently outside yourself. Thus you will form an idea of a table whereas you will have the thought of removing the table from one room to another.

@@ Although at the beginning of your explanations you may make the study easier for the beginner by saying that objects exist within the mind the statement is not technically correct and should be abandoned when you reach the intermediate stage of explanations. The mind being everywhere, how can you talk of within or without so far as the mind is concerned. The correct statement to make will be (a) “Objects exists as ideas,” and to leave it at that, adding nothing further or (b) all objects are mental or (c) All objects exist mentally.

@@ The illustration of the dream experience when fully grasped will work the first and most important revelation in thinking and outlook of the students. The ignorance of this illustration accounts for the failures to achieve truth of

---

<sup>189</sup> The original editor inserted “355” by hand.

(continued from the previous page) those European philosophers who accepted idealism. Thus Kant, Hegel etc. began correctly but ended wrongly. This illustration of Avastatraya was devised by India and must be accepted by the West. Otherwise they can never grasp the further position that the idea itself will resolve itself into Brahman. The student who has thoroughly understood the implications of dream will also have thoroughly understood the idealistic nature of the waking world for both are identically same in this respect. The point to be noted is that the dreamer may imagine himself to be hunting, ruling or flying when in waking life he never does any of these. Hence his dream ego is entirely a concocted one, fictitious and superimposed on reality. Precisely the same applies to the waking ego.

@@ Matter is tangible, not intangible.

@@ I say that the waking state includes the others because it is only when you are awake that you know dream and sleep exist. During dream itself you take it for the time being as though it were waking, and you are unable to know otherwise. The necessary contrast to enable you to distinguish between the states can only be effected whilst awake, when only you can perceive that waking is only a state that comes and goes; you cannot perceive this during dream or sleep. Hence realisation can only be effected in the waking state. Hence too the need by the West to study Avastatraya.

@@ When in a dream, if you are aware that all the forms, phantasams etc. that you see are of the same stuff as the essence of the mind; it is knowledge; the dream ceases to be a dream (with its reality) and it comes and goes as simply as an idea of the mind.

@@ You are able to judge of the dream in the waking alone which succeeds the dream state

(continued from the previous page) when you are enabled to know through reason that the entire dream is of the same stuff as the mind. So in the state after waking when one knows the waking object or duality as of the same stuff as Atman, it is knowledge.

Note: For the dreamer, the dreaming state is waking state. For one in the waking state, the waking state itself. i.e. there is sense of duality and reality in both the two states.

@@ A gnani, for a moment, may see that there is no such thing as a permanent reality. As soon as (an ignorant) man wakes up from sleep, he sees duality, reality, although in his deep sleep there was no duality for him, because of ignorance. To them a break of the mind when you see a mountain in a dream. No, mind is everywhere. Likewise in the waking state, which part of your idea is not your mind? Everywhere it is there.

@@ Free from sleep and dream—If you know the nature of Atman or Brahman, (its nature is knowing) that all the forms are of the same stuff. Omniscient—Whatever It knows is Itself. Birthless — means It is not to be produced by anything; It is not seeing objects (or duality) as in dream which includes waking.

@@ Sleep and Nirvikalpa samadhi show us the possibility that ideas objects, duality can go. In dream, names and forms appear, but you do not know they are of the mind stuff. Words cannot touch Brahman. Ideas can't reach it. It has got in itself the Light. There is no such thing as manifestation. Production (creation—one thing from another) has no meaning in language.

@@ It is the mind in dream that has itself become the mountain the man, the river; similarly it is the mind that has become all this waking world. Therefore we say it is the mind that has produced them without itself becoming changed

---

<sup>190</sup> The original editor inserted "357" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) for it is only the ideas that appear and disappear in the mind which are changed. This mind, which is unchanged substratum is the Atman.

@@ When we examine the three avastas carefully the 'I' dies and disappears. Jung admits this but says it somehow, somewhere exists, but that is his imagination only. There is something that exists but it is not the ego. I am the Universe not John or Mary. The latter limitations are delusions. You are in complete ignorance so long as you have the sense of 'I' which is finite. Where was the 'I' which changed so many times in dream?

@@ Of what stuff are all the dream-objects made? Only mind, as at no time were they different from mind. Similarly the waking ideas are made of Gnan, knowledge only. Mind implies subject object, whereas Gnan does not. The waking world is as much a construction of mind as dream world; we place them both on the same level.

@@ When my mind is working I see the world; when it ceases to act (as in sleep) the world disappears. Therefore I infer by comparison and agreement that the existence of the world is connected with the duality of the mind.

@@ In deep sleep we do not see any object reduced to unity; we see only non-duality.

@@ The attributes of the mountain you see in dream i.e. its hardness, size, form etc. are in the mind. Similarly in this world the attributes of the various people and objects, are in the mind, the Atman.

@@ We find dream of the greatest value, full of meaning, a treasure to teach and illustrate Vedantic truth, but Europe despises this treasure as being trivial and throws it aside. Why did Nature give it to us if not to help man arrive at truth?

@@ Avastatraya is the analysis of the three states.



@@ When waking dissolves into dream, it is exactly the same as dream: when deep sleep dissolves in Turiya it also is the same, hence it is only Atman, Brahman.

@@ Turiya should never be called the fourth state; it is not a state; it means “the fourth” alone.

@@ When you are in the waking state you have external objects and material objects. Hence your knowledge of them as being other than yourself comes from your being awake then and knowing through your senses.

@@ Unless you know Avastatraya thoroughly you cannot show how the mind is homogeneous, a unity. You can only do what so many do, take it as an assumption.

@@ Mind ceases to work in sleep and death but its basis still continues and must continue.

@@ Mandukya points out that everything exists in sushupti, and from it you got the whole world.

@@ All the phases of the ego’s dualistic thoughts and feelings and sensations have their origin in sushupti; they come from there and somehow they exist there: how, we don’t know. Sushupti as the cause of our individual life is inferred, not seen. However beyond sushupti is the Atman. This sushupti as source is equivalent to “The Unconscious” of the psycho-analysis.

@@ Philosophy in the West is a hypothesis about the ultimate, but in Vedanta we add “Is this hypothesis verifiable?” and reply “yes” and prove it by avastatraya, than which there is no other way.

@@ We do not deny the existence of the object. If you say we deny its externality, we reply that even your body is external – don’t you see it outside you in dream? Dream is the key to all explanation. If you ask where and what is the colour, if the object is an idea, go to dream. You see colours in dream. Then colour too is an idea.

---

<sup>191</sup> The original editor inserted “359” by hand.

@@ Neurotics who see things which are not there, provide a most valuable illustration of Vedanta truth; which if enquired into will reveal one of our highest truths. Similarly the dream is of utmost value for the same purpose. Why should man go to sleep and have dreams? How does it come to occupy such a place in his life? Why has Nature provided for dreams? The answer is of supreme importance.

@@ A  $\frac{1}{4}$  of a rupee is included in a one-rupee piece; a  $\frac{1}{2}$  rupee is already there in one rupee bit. Therefore the  $\frac{1}{4}$  and  $\frac{1}{2}$  rupees are merged in the one rupee bit: when you have a whole rupee you don't enquire, does it contain a  $\frac{1}{4}$  or  $\frac{3}{4}$  rupee in it: you know that both are present therein. You can by enquiry convert, merge or dissolve all the parts of a rupee in the whole one. Similarly you can show that waking dissolves in dream, the dream disappears in deep sleep, and latter merges in Turiya. This is done by converting world of material objects into an idea. Europe is now learning this first quarter, and it has yet to learn what becomes of these ideas, and what becomes of deep sleep—i.e. two more stages or quarters. In this way everything “all this” as Mandukya says in the first sloka becomes Turiya or Brahman.

@@ In dream what is imagined by the mind as outside appears to be real; similarly in waking what is experienced by the mind as outside appears to be real: but in truth, both are unreal.

@@ All occult and yogic experiences of vision, astral travelling, clairvoyance, if genuine, are in dream state but is there then no difference between occultist experiences and ordinary man's? There is. The yogi knows he is dreaming, he knows he is out of body, but ordinary man does not. Pursuing this line

(continued from the previous page) still further we find that when thoughts are transcended in trance the same position arrives, i.e. the man enters deep sleep and knows he is deep sleeping, whereas ordinary man does not know. It is conscious trance. Nature has imposed the three states upon all mankind without exception—none, not even gods and sages can escape from these three: waking, dream and deep sleep.

@@ Conscious sushupti=samadhi. Conscious dream=visions, mind-made by yogis.

@@ The essential difference between deep sleep and Nirvana which is the fourth state, is that the ego is still latent in the former state, whereas there is no latent ego nor latent intellect in the fourth state. Intellect cannot function in Nirvana and therefore cannot tell us anything about it. A further difference between the two states is the presence of consciousness in the fourth state. Nothing can be understood unless it is distinguished or differentiated from something else. For this reason, deep sleep, which offers no contrasts and no differentiations cannot be known in the ordinary sense. The contrast gives one the ability to see reality. Unless we examine the mind and see how it gets exact meanings for words, we cannot see this.

@@ Truth is to be experienced by experience of the three states. We must be conscious that we are dreaming. We must become the witness of all dream movements.

@@ The three states are necessary in order to show that the 'I' has no place at all. In deep sleep the ego disappears. When there is no 'I' when the All is in the One, then there is Gnana.

@@ But before the three states can be tackled the mind must be prepared by study, first of the 'I' to get rid of the false notions about it.

@@ To the objection that we have both matter and mind, that the material object outside and

---

<sup>192</sup> The original editor inserted "361" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) the idea we form of it both exist: If everything were only imagination, why laboratory experiments with things? The reply is that this is from waking state only, that we must co-ordinate its findings with those of dream and sleep states, in order to have sufficient facts. Our immediate reply, however, is "How do you know that your idea corresponds to the external object?"

@@ To realist refutation that the external wall and the idea apart, we reply: You must pass through idealism, it is on our way as a stage. Only Vedanta which is higher than the Idealism can give proper reply. Idealists generally reply, even when you say there is an external wall, whatever statement you make is a statement you make of the mind. (Sensation is of the nerve, mind is thinking).

@@ Realist and idealist position have meaning only from view point of Western thinkers: these are not Sankara's viewpoint: he knew avastatraya which lifts him to a position above both Realism and Idealism. But Idealism is a stepping stone up from Realism.

@@ The same duality of internal and objective experience you find in both waking and dream state. Moreover so long as the dream lasts it is as real as your life in the material world. Did you ever doubt the reality of the dream during its occurrence? So there is no difference between the two.

@@ Of what stuff is the seen made? In the dream it is the same stuff as the seer, mind; hence in the case of dream you can easily see the real unity in apparent duality. So also in waking state for the time being you do not know that the world is of the same stuff as the Atman: although the wall appears different it is nevertheless non-different

(continued from the previous page) when enquired into. Only the knowledge of this non-difference can bring universal brotherhood and eliminate wars. The tiger and the wolf have the strongest sense of separateness and hence prey on other animals. “Maya” really means you do not know that the world is made of the same stuff as the Self.

@@ When dream is compared to waking state, do not made the mistake that Europeans make of thinking we claim that dream is as real as waking state. Only the insane could assert that dream world is as real as waking world. We say that when waking is compared to dream it is as unreal as dream. This is quite different from saying it is as real as dream. Western critics have misunderstood Vedanta on this point. Real is not a good word; here ‘ideal’ is correct. Gnani sees both waking and dream as unreal, child says nightmare, dream and waking are both real. Gnani puts both waking and dream as mental constructions, he never took either as real. Hence the two positions are not the same.

@@ Just as you know of dream only on waking enquiry similarly you know of reality only on making enquiry: and just as duality of dream state disappears on such enquiry so does duality of waking state disappear.

@@ What is the philosophical value of sleep? Has nature given it to you merely for physical utilitarian purposes? No. There is also a higher value. When you think of a meaning, when you get an idea of non-duality, you are still in the world of duality. You begin to imagine. “Brahman must be like this; or Brahman must be like that.” Thus you merely get your own imagination back. You can raise no question in deep sleep. Therefore, to help you to understand Brahman aright, Nature gives you deep sleep. But it is a help only. Sleep is not Brahman, however.

@@ Deep sleep is not the same as Gnan, for the

---

<sup>193</sup> The original editor inserted “363” by hand.

(continued from the previous page) latter exists when you see the world of objects and men; not when you are unaware of it.

@@ Avastatraya: You know that there is a dream state or a sleep state only in the waking state. How do you know the meaning of sleep or dream apart from the waking state? Only by distinguishing it from waking. Imagine a man who is sleeping or dreaming all the 24 hours. Would he ever know that there is a different state in existence, unless he awakens? It is only by taking the whole of man's experience; waking cannot be separated from the other two states: you know waking only by distinguishing it from dream. The West does not know what is meant by sleep, waking and dream. Waking is that which comprehends through understanding the other two states. To shut out dream and sleep from enquiry is to prevent fullness of knowledge being got. It is wakeful state alone which gives you knowledge of the other states. It is impossible to arrive at truth when we reject so much data as sleep and dream, and confine ourselves to waking alone.

@@ It is nonsense to say that there is waking without sleep and dream. Hence waking cannot be understood without taking sleep and dream into consideration for our examination. This is the fatal omission of the West in rejecting examination of dream and sleep data as being worthless. They cannot separate these two states from waking yet they ignore the evidence offered by them!

@@ The fact that you are able to compare both the dream and waking phenomena shows that it is one and the same mind, behind both! Otherwise you could not have made this comparison.

@@ You used your senses in dreams: they produced sense reports. This is proof that sensations are only imagined.

@@ Vedanta takes the whole of experience throughout the universe that you get in the waking state. It asks the question: What is the meaning of dream and sleep? Eventually you come to a certain understanding about the truth of the entire existence, not merely a certain aspect of it. I do not believe in the cock and bull stories that in the next world after I die I shall have my knowledge with me. I die every night but where, in deep sleep all my knowledge, feeling and personality? Suppose you never wake up from deep sleep. You never regain your separate self, nor the world. It is the same in death. The world and myself disappear then as in sleep.

@@ Our position is not that there are no external objects, but that the wall outside and my idea of it are both mind. To understand this, you must go to dream. We say there is nothing external to Mind: which has got everything in itself as in dream. In dream you have external objects, but they are not separate from mind, when you examine them after awakening.

@@ Waking rupees are real so long as waking state lasts: dream rupees are real so long as dream state lasts; but Vedanta does not say that the cause in one state has an effect in another state. It limits the effect to the same state as that in which the cause originated.

@@ The word dream is generally used with reference to the body, for it means “my dream” which occurs within my body. Your body re-appears in dream, you dream a journey, but you do not actually perform it, your body seems to do it.

@@ People are deluded because things in dream appear like things in waking, and so they assert the waking state to be the cause of dream state. They say you saw mango in waking state: hence you have the idea of dream mango. But science cannot prove causality.

---

<sup>194</sup> The original editor inserted “365” by hand.

@@ Whenever anything is seen by the mind, the mind cognises it as real. Only later, when you learn more can you say it is unreal. In dream as in waking you have subject-object relation plus sense of reality, and so mistakenly take waking as cause of dream through the similarity.

@@ People like Dr Sam. Johnson who stamped his foot on the ground to refute Berkeley and to show world is real ignore that in dream they would do exactly the same – stamp their dream foot on the ground and assert it to be real.

@@ Those who declare waking experience to cause dream ones (as psycho-analysts say) are wrong, have imagined it. They take the similarity of the experiences to indicate a causal relation. When do they know that the waking causes dream? After they have come back to waking, when they take latter to be reality and dream as unreality. Suppose you had never dreamt. Could you then say waking is real and dream not? Then you would not be in a position to say one is cause of experiences in the other. For whoever has had a dream had only his own dream. He alone has right to think about it. Others who had not experienced dream would have no right to postulate waking as its cause, hence it could not be a universal truth; only for some persons.

@@ The three states are known in the waking state, not in dream or sleep. Hence you must detach yourself from them whilst awake, if you are to realise Turiya. In the waking world alone can we get Brahman. The mind has to be so sharp in order to catch the meaning of the word state, as applied to waking, for if it sees it thoroughly, it will at once know it is in Turiya.

@@ Dream is given to us for no other purpose than illustrating the unitary stuff of the world. All dream objects being mind illustrates all mental objects are Brahman, including yourself.



@@ The whole world, the whole entity, is only One, but gives the appearance of duality. The mind appears as divided into two—the Subject and Object. The best way to understand this is the case of dream, where one and the same mind produces apparently the seer and the seen, the tiger you fought and you yourself. You must enquire into world and mind and will eventually find that both are only one. Duality means two—(Mandukya P.213)—Seer and seen, nothing else—not God and the soul.

@@ Because deep sleep is followed by dream and waking, it is called the seed or causal state: otherwise if it continued unbroken it would be called Brahman. It is a state, something which comes and goes; the objects of each state are included with it. The gnani detaches himself from them, sees them coming and going, and thus remains in the ever-present non-dual Turiya. Everyone knows these states are transient but everyone does not detach himself from them. It takes time to realise the truth of Avastatraya, as it does to realise non-causality: although you may perceive them intellectually. At the moment you know that the three are only states, you know the Drik, which is Turiya, but you have to know this continually. Turiya is not a state. In deep sleep you have Brahman, for it is always there (it exists in deep sleep, but you do not realise it then), but you wrongly think that when an object is present, as in the waking state, there is no Brahman. You call this Turiya only when you have the three states before you, just as you call it Drik only when you have drsyam before you.

@@ After you come home, what are the countries you have visited, the persons you met during waking state, all experiences of the dream state now? They are only pieces of knowledge, ideas: everything experienced reduces itself a moment

---

<sup>195</sup> The original editor inserted “367” by hand.

(continued from the previous page) later to mere items of knowledge. Everywhere the Gnani finds only such knowledge, gnanam, something known, idea. All those who refuse to accept this truth, have to learn it in the end through death.

@@ Whenever any one says he cannot grasp that Brahman is everywhere and both outside and inside world, give them the best illustration—Dream. The tigers and mountains were not difference from you, yet Mind was in and outside them.

@@ The whole world is of the nature of consciousness; this you can realise by the illustration of dream; and the world-consciousness is not different from your own: they are of the same substance or stuff. The objects rise and fall back in this consciousness like waves in the ocean.

@@ What is sleep? Has it a meaning? Yes. Then it is an idea. What is idea. Something coming and going, something in drsyam world. Hence it is in the mind also when it vanishes. Finally there is therefore no distinction between the three states, between sleep and waking. This sounds insane to un-reflective people.

@@ Which part of the mountain seen in dream was not the mind! All of it. Hence none of it could have been lost, because of all the mountain was your own mind and lapses back into your mind, and as matter is only mind, having been proved to be so, the whole world is in my mind. But it is not my ego, my individual mind, which can create this world. It is the common One Universal Mind.

@@ The mind of the waking and the dream states is one and the same, only it undergoes changes. In waking it may be John; in dream it appears as James, but the same mind is the essence underlying both.

@@ Can you say a man is dead in deep sleep?

@@ Have you got any idea of the world existing when you are asleep? No. It does not then exist. It is only an inference not direct knowledge. Vedanta deals only with what can be known, not inferences and guesses.

@@ An immature undeveloped person believes he has actually made a journey in his soul-body or astral-body to Mount Kailas when he dreams of being there. A man of ripened understanding knows that the whole dream occurred within his own mind and that no journeying was necessary. Just as in waking you can imagine being at Kailas, similarly in dream. But both are purely mental acts.

@@ Ramanuja's argument that the individual soul existed during sleep because you come back from it afterwards and knew you had been asleep, is merely an inference: It is not proof. If the personal self had existed then, it should have been active, but it is not. Did Ramanuja ever see the self during sleep?

@@ Bodily discipline is required to eliminate the I, but intellectual exercise suffices to see the truth of Avastatraya, for then they would perceive that the I appears and disappears daily.

@@ The plain man cannot understand philosophy, the thinking man says I think so; hence there is no common ground because both confine themselves to the waking state and truth can never be found on the waking state data alone, because this yields multiplication of opinions without end only. It never strikes them to ask why we have three states, yet these three alone give all the facts.

@@ 'Unreality' does not mean the absence of the objects, for if you do not see anything the questions about them do not therefore arise. The mind's enquiry into that which is experienced

---

<sup>196</sup> The original editor inserted "369" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) is vichara. Knowing the unreality of objects is called wisdom or Gnana. How are you to know? Nature has given the dream, as illustration, and if you shut your eyes and refuse to inquire, then you cannot achieve wisdom. You cannot understand the nature of anything in this world unless you compare one thing with another. Why is dream state unreal? You have one body here and another in dream. When you awaken you say that dream-body which went to Kailas is obviously unreal as I could not have really gone to Kailas. The fact that all human beings remain ignorant of world's true nature does not justify your following them. They are a flock of sheep, who follow blindly. They do not question "Why have I got dream? What can I learn from dream?"

Waking objects, on account of their being similar to dream objects, are unreal. (M.289 and 103) because they are perceived objects. This is important and must be understood. For what is it that perceives? It is the mind. What is it that the mind has in it when it sees an object? An idea. Suppose anything existed outside or different from the mind. What is it that would have to tell you about it? The mind. As in dream, the mind that informs you of existence of objects, i.e. it is only an act of the mind. Those who say things exist apart from or independent of mind talk like children. Where is the proof? This principle must be thought over, a million times until you thoroughly grasp it. It is only mind that makes a thing perceived. Hence objects are mental states.

@@ In the waking state all people will speak with reference to some common object: in dream you find the same thing among dream persons. Hence the idea of some common standard of reference is not limited to the waking state.

@@ The relativity of the three states: You could not know black as black if white did not exist. If only one colour existed you would never be aware of that fact. Only by existence of another opposite or contrasting colour do you know. Similarly you would not know waking as waking if life were always waking state. You know waking state exists because of existence of dream state by way of contrast, and of deep sleep. Therefore the three states are present together and are always present.

@@ There is no separate fourth state or Turiya state, except when you take up the Witness standpoint. The fourth state seems to exist, from waking standpoint only, but in reality it does not.

@@ From the ordinary man's point of view, deep sleep is best because it frees him from the world (which includes ego) but to Sage sleep, dream and waking have all the same value.

@@ We know absolutely nothing at the time of deep sleep.

@@ In deep sleep mind is free from desire and misery both for philosophers and fools, but in dream these appear because ego is absent in former but present in dream.

@@ Study of three states means "Obtain all the knowledge you can get in waking state and then add the other two.

@@ The three states study is the chief characteristic of Indian philosophers: all else is theology or scholasticism.

@@ Dream is necessary to distinguish from deep sleep, as you cannot know the presence of an object without knowing its absence.

@@ Every man is given the three states, therefore every man can realise Truth.

@@ When you have a dream, what is it? This analysis requires self-elimination, purging of preconceptions. What is the dream now, at this moment, in the waking state? If you concentrate

---

<sup>197</sup> The original editor inserted "371" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) you perceive dream is only a thought, an idea; it is only your own mind. Similarly, all our action and thoughts of to-day, now, will be nothing but thoughts, ideas, tomorrow. Hence all we are doing now is even now nothing but an idea. Yet it falsely appears real because of attachment to the false idea that all this is real.

@@ The aim of yoga is to empty the mind of its contents, but this is successfully achieved by millions of men during the deep sleep state. Yet they never find Truth. That is why something more is needed. Deep sleep is not liberation. It is not Reality. Reality is existence in the external world of matter, as much as in deep sleep, but only the sage can perceive this. We have to tell novices that deep sleep is nearer the overself, merely to induce them to begin and carry on the quest which shall pass into and through and out of yoga. If yoga were enough, why did not Krishna tell Arjuna upon the battlefield to sit down and keep quiet? Instead of that, He told him to go into the thick of the battle of life and to fight, that is, to act.

@@ Sleep is Nature's greatly merciful gift to ordinary men to enable them to contact their divine self nightly. Such is its mercy.

@@ Dreamless sleep offers no revelation of reality. Even if it did, how could anyone possibly know it whilst sleeping?

@@ You may have had a dream, but could not remember it, and then its memory suddenly revives some days later. During that dream you thought that you were a living person. This shows illusoriness of personality, for it exists and disappears and during the period of disappearance the living dream-person is seen to be illusory.

@@ Deep sleep is simply having no ideas.

@@ The dream-state has been given to man as an illustration for the purpose of pointing out to him that the external world is likewise an idea. You see a thing in dream as different from you, but yet it is of the same substance - mental - it is not for nothing that dreams exist. How did the sense of reality during the dream arise? This must be answered. It arises from the Atman, not mind. There is no other illustration but dream which can prove this truth.

@@ Illustrations from waking state, such as the rope/snake, mirage are given for those who do not want the illustration of the dream and can't perceive its value. It is not that the illusion is not seen, that the table is not seen and is not there, it exists, but when examined you find, as after-dream, that it is not real although during dream you can touch and feel a table.

@@ In cases of sudden death of a relative the other relatives will have their mind excited and concentrated on the event. So they will exclaim: "It is like a dream, he has gone for ever." Thus they temporarily perceive the truth that life is a dream as their mind is momentarily sharpened by the loss.

@@ Why do dreams exist? Their value lies in their lessons. They are of highest value when enquired into.

@@ It never strikes anyone to ask why we have three states, yet these three alone give all the facts.

@@ It has not struck anyone in the West to enquire "What is the difference between the reality which I experience during waking and the reality I experience during dream?" Yet the answer offers a clue of vital importance.

@@ We know that the ego disappears in deep sleep. Therefore it cannot be the final truth.

@@ Even European idealistic philosophy does not know that the individual ego also is created by

---

<sup>198</sup> The original editor inserted "373" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) the mind; quite apart from the objects seen.

@@ The external object is in you as it is during a dream.

@@ Avastatraya is something quite new in European philosophy.

@@ In the waking state, when you eat, speak or act you must have a second thing;—duality is there so apparently true that it needs no enquiry, that is why we insist on avastatraya, which alone can lead to non-duality.

@@ The vasanas of the waking state re-appear later in succeeding waking states.

@@ If a man in dream knows the world to be idea, this is a good test that he has reached the higher stage.

@@ Vedanta says that the waking experience is as unreal as the dream. We do not say that the dream-pictures are real and the same as waking, as children say. This is a mistaken view of Vedanta which Western critics take and which leads then to regard us as insane or foolish. What is meant by a dream? It is a construction of the mind. And science is now beginning to see that the world also is such a construction. That is why we parallel it with dream.

@@ You must think constantly that the world is an idea till it gets so firmly fixed in your mind that the proper test of your grasp occurs—when in your dreams you will say to yourself too that even your dreams are but ideas.

@@ Until you become fully aware during the dream state that you ARE dreaming, you are not ready for higher Vedanta teaching which gives Gnana. You must begin to practise to perceive your dream experiences so as to become conscious that it is a dream in dream state itself. This will cause the waking self to grasp the idea that both idea and the object constitute the whole category of existence. All is Mind. If this memory that what you see as well as what you think as well as your individual self are all ideas then that is Gnana.



@@ Those yogis who say that they function mystically in deep sleep, or enjoy consciousness higher than that of ordinary men during that period, are telling lies. It is impossible. Deep sleep is the same experience for all men, whether adepts or ignoramuses.

@@ Dream is called the second state, the sphere of Taijasa, which means light. Why is dream world called the light world? Because there is no sun, moon or stars, yet there is an entire illuminated world visible to the dreamer. The light is still present there. Whose can this light be? It must be that of mind. The mind emanates its own light, suns and moons. How is it that when we shut our eyes, when we enter a state where there is no sun or electric light, we perceive anew scenes, persons, etc. in dream, reverie or imagination. It is because we experience them by the mind's own light. That which is said to be only mental and inside, is thus able to produce the world outside. The old ideas re-appear and produce the external world, impressions, vasanas. This is our scientific basis for the theory of rebirth too.

@@ The three states are only ideas.

@@ If you subtract from your experience everything which is known, then you have the Turiya, objectlessness: to understand this note that sleep is objectless but you get no knowledge of it except in waking state. How do you understand deep sleep? You imagine nothingness. What do you do in such imaginations? You are negating every idea. Hence if the mind can be so concentrated as to thrust all ideas aside, you understand sleep. Hence if you learn the way to negate ideas, which is possible, you may reach reality. But you can see it only for a lightning-flash of a second, it is so quick. You know it has come but cannot catch it. The moment an idea arrives you know that it was preceded by the blank. Hence the interval between two thoughts is Turiya. Therefore you have to examine your own mind with

---

<sup>199</sup> The original editor inserted "375" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) tremendous watchfulness to get it. The three states come of their own accord. But Turiya is seen by intensely sharp vigilance only. Turiya is the absence of the three states. It is always present but must be probed for. It must be always there because it is implied by the presence of the three states. Were it not there you could never think. Turiya only can get the meaning of existence and non-existence. When you can realize within yourself the non-existence of objects, that is Turiya. Everyone knows deep sleep but he does not know how he knows it. When he gets such knowledge, he gets Truth.

@@ It is the want of Buddhi, the incapacity to see sharply that prevents understanding that Turiya, the state in which the other three are now, is here and now. The moment you grasp Turiya the unreal appearances disappear. Nothing that is done can get it, hence yoga cannot reach it. It is exactly the same as when you try to remember that you had deep sleep last night. What do you do to get such remembrance? Do you practice yoga? No, you negate the waking and dream state, you shut your eyes and try to think them away. Similarly the moment you negate objects, external and internal, you grasp the Drik in a single second, in a flash. It cannot be done by Samadhi.

@@ All scriptures imagine a mystic creator for the universe, but Life itself when examined reveals that the true creator (or emanator) is deep sleep, because all your ideas emerge there from and all the objects in the universe are but ideas which come and go and seem real for the time only because your mind makes them so.

@@ What am I during coming and going of the 3 states? Ask yourself this question. Nobody else can give you the answer because they can only give words and words belong to the states (dream and waking); only yourself can supply the true answer by seeing the Turiya although you will be unable to express what you see.

@@ Something that is unknown is the characteristic of Jagrath and Swapna, Sushupti; i.e. sleep, (ignorance) is found in all the three states. In Turiya there is no ignorance. It is not the presence or absence of objects, i.e. ideas that is the test of Gnan, but the knowledge of all the objects including ideas is what is gnan—that everything is Brahman. If you don't see anything that is not Gnan. Then everyone who sleeps becomes a gnani. It is not the absence of duality but the knowledge of the world of objects and ideas as nothing other than Brahman is the point.

Turiya is not said to be the cause at all. Sleep, dream and waking are Drsyam to the Turiya Witness. And cause and effect applies to the Drsyam only, and hence it is said sleep is the cause of dream and waking. Cause just means one precedes another. The seer, Turiya is a ways there in the three states. But in the three states you do not know it is all Turiya. For the Gnani, everything is Turiya, even the three states—i.e. with objects (as in waking or dreaming) or without objects.

@@ Knowledge of Atman is true knowledge, not merely the absence of duality as in Sushupti where you don't know that it is Brahman. Gnan is to see the world and say that it is all Brahman. Even the Himalayas are in you. The control of mind is essential to know the unreality (not the absence) of the phenomenal world. Sushupti can't be equated with Gnan.

@@ Only after you enquire whether it be when you are awake or still asleep, do you discover your dream-universe to be an idea. Similarly in waking state; you are not aware your waking universe is an idea.

@@ Without considering Avastatraya it is impossible to come to understanding that Vedanta is truth.

@@ Use dream as an illustration frequently. This is Avastatraya method. Last night in dream what was the actions, the food eaten etc. All were in

---

<sup>200</sup> The original editor inserted "377" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) mind. All were mind. Similarly all here is Brahman. All is Brahman. What is there to give up? Beginners must renounce world but thinkers find there is nothing to renounce.

@@ Idealism in West has gone as far as seeing dream-likeness of mental constructed world. Sushupti and Turiya are unknown field to West.

@@ Atman is the Witness of the three states. He is the seer or knower. He is real because he is changeless. The very fact that he is aware of the coming and going, of these states shows he himself is unchanging. But if you take away the world, God, the body and the mind, there seems to be nothing left? is the criticism. Through the sharpest intellect (Buddhi) you may perceive that the three states cannot be posited unless there is a knower. Otherwise how can you say they come and go? There must be a seer who notes the coming and going. That seer is Atman, and it is that which does not go. That which is perceived by something else is passing, but when there is no agent to see the Atman, realise it to be unchanging and real.

@@ Truth cannot be found if you confine yourself to the waking state. There will always be differences of opinion, no agreement possible. Only when you take away all individual opinions all personal differences, may you arrive at truth. Therefore the three states are essential. We must put together all the facts, all the three states, weigh and verify them if we are to get truth. Just as in science ignorance goes when professors all over the world can verify the same fact, when it is no longer dependent on one professor's view.

@@ The mountain seen in dream is not lost. It has gone back into the mind and is still there. You cannot say, "I have lost a portion of my mind called "mountain". Similarly all the world idea retires to the mind, and is realised as identical with Atman.

@@ The West will have to take up Avastatraya because it is the only way to learn that the world is in me. Theory of dualism can reduce world to ideas, but still the mystery remains of where these ideas originate. Berkeley says from God, Jeans from Divine Architect, etc., but what are their 'Gods?' Only ideas and therefore within me. Only through dream-analysis can it be shown that the ideas of the world have arisen in me. Hence the theory of idealism is not enough.

@@ People quite wrongly believe that deep sleep is the pure Brahman condition. Sleep is a different kind of non-duality; not the highest. Brahman must be seen when discrimination of the manifold is seen, not when it is absent, as in sleep. You exercise your Buddhi and understand that this wall, table, man are Brahman.

@@ Western philosophy will always be incomplete because it is merely a fight of one set of opinions against another. Such inconclusiveness arises because it limits its data to the waking state. Complete truth can only be got by introducing Avastatraya and thus giving full data.

@@ You have non-duality in sleep but that peace is not Brahman; it is oblivion. The external world should be there but is not regarded as different from Brahman. The disappearance of objects in sleep or samadhi cannot yield Brahman.

@@ You will know that you have understood Vedanta when in your dreams you can say: "This mountain, these cities and people are all mind." This is the test of whether you have advanced from theory to successful practice.

@@ Hundreds of Indian writers mention avastatraya without any more consciousness of its precise meaning than when they use the term God.

@@ You can talk of the three states only during waking. You do not think of the waking world when dreaming, nor of both when in deep sleep.

---

<sup>201</sup> The original editor inserted "379" by hand.

@@ You can have the equivalent of dream right now by shutting your eyes and imagining that you are visiting some place, meeting some person, etc. Moreover you can also have the equivalent of deep sleep if you can succeed in making the mind as sharp and fine-edged as a razor, when you will detect blankness even in the midst of waking state: it can only be momentary, but it must be the thought-less.

@@ How far does mind extend? We do not know. You know only that you have got consciousness, that he has it, etc. You are thus certain it exists. Hence in the language of Gita, “consciousness is” – beyond that we can say nothing provable.

@@ During dream you have got only mind, one and indivisible, yet you do not think it to be mind, but you take it to be mountains, streets sounds and persons. Similarly in waking you take the same things as distinctive whereas they are really one mind.

@@ You have to think for some time before the truth of avastatraya can be grasped, it is so difficult.

@@ The deep sleep state is called blissful only in comparison to the waking state, because the latter has always cares, anxieties and worries. It could not be called blissful otherwise, because we are not conscious. Only on waking the thought of the world comes to you again, with its troubles, and only then do you know (or rather call) the deep sleep as blissful.

@@ The three states are spoken of in order to show you there is that which witnesses their coming and going and is therefore independent of them.

@@ If you want to know the truth of a matter you should not see one side only, but both sides, nay all sides. Hence the three states are necessary for finding whole truth of world.

@@ The ancient Hindu, Ramanujists and modern theosophical teaching that soul travels during dream or sleep is nonsensical, it is impossible.

@@ In the dream world there is no real sun, stars or electric light, yet we see all the dream-objects. By what light do we see them? It is by the light of the Mind. Such is the wonderful power of mind that it creates sun, stars and electric light, in dream.

@@ We know only three states. Nowhere in the Mandukya is it said that Turiya is a state.

@@ Common sense says that we cannot come to any conclusion about the predictive nature of dream: some come true, others do not. There is no general rule applying to all dreams, therefore.

@@ We do not say the dream is as real as waking; we say it is as unreal as the waking. The difference is very important.

@@ Those who talk of seeing the Absolute, talk nonsense, for then where is the seer, and consequently, where the act of seeing?

@@ Where was my I when I slept? Those things which appeared to be so real, have become dreams, or ideas, of the past in old age—persons whom we loved, whom we feared, all have become dreams or ideas. Similarly the world also becomes at the time of death and you yourself will be forgotten and you will also become an idea to others. Your words may be quoted. The only compensation is to get Gnan—the essential knowledge of Brahman—Everything always exists, though the 'I' and you pass and come. The Perceiver and the perceived are one—c.f. dream. The perceiver exists ever unchanged, with or without percepts. The Chidabhasa or Jiva is only a percept. But when you know, that is convinced, that Chidabhasa does not exist, there is no 'I' at all in the enlightened stage.

@@ If you have any realization, it is tested thus: in your dream, if you realize dream objects

---

<sup>202</sup> The original editor inserted "381" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) to be unreal; the same experience of unreality of objects, will duly come upon you even in the waking state.

@@ Dream is so alike to waking that you can study Vedanta during dreams and you can evaluate the three states while dreaming. You say that waking alone is real only because you do not enquire; but after enquiry you discover all waking experience to be idea exactly the same as a dream is an idea.

@@ Yourself is an idea, your I is idea, your body is an idea, your asking questions is an idea; you must become a looker-on, the Witness, keep yourself behind and aloof from all these ideas and examine their characteristics as expressed in the three states. This is avastatraya as proposed in Mandukya. Then you will see all the states coming and going. Ask yourself the question, "Where am I standing? Am I the Witness, the Drik or am I P.B.? If I am P.B. then I can never understand Avastatraya. If I am the Witness, detached, then I see the P.B. of waking as apart, the P.B. of dreams etc."

@@ When a man is strongly attached to the body, he cannot place himself in the position of the dreamer and see that the latter finds his dream-state to be a waking one, with sense of differentiations into external reality and internal illusoriness exactly as it is found in our waking world. Unless you detach the Drik, the Seer, you cannot see this point. (by impersonal analysis)

@@ Confine yourself to each—dream and waking—when studying them by putting yourself back wholly and steadily in one state; carefully note its characteristics; and only after that should you compare both together.

@@ Waking contains the other states in the sense of forming ideas of them.



@@ How is it that objects appear to be real, and yet are really unreal? Answer: we have to observe the dream state to obtain an answer.

@@ Though there is no positive misery in sleep, it is followed by a waking or dream where there is misery. Thus sleep is said to be a state where there is no complete absence of misery.

@@ Waking should be resolved by analysis into dream, then dream into sleep and last sleep into Atman. We must begin with the external world and analysing it, must find out that is only ideas.

@@ In sleep there is no positive misery or pleasure, but only absence of misery and pleasure, i.e. absence of duality. But a gnani must have the knowledge of the absence of duality even in the waking state. Then only there is realization. We must distinguish between absence of duality and the knowledge of absence of duality.

@@ Dream and waking are the same, both being a projection of the mind. In Vedanta there is no hearsay evidence. That the external world and your body itself existed when you were asleep is only hearsay evidence.

@@ What about the three states? Where do they exist? The answer is that they exist in you (witness). There is no other explanation possible. The Atman is that which witnesses all the three states. If you say that you are not the sleeper nor the dreamer nor the waking man but only the witness, that is the first stage.

@@ It is only in the waking state that we can think of the dream state and sleep state. In deep sleep there is neither memory nor perception: there is only mind. In dream there is no perception as well as memory. But both perception and memory are functions of the mind alone. When you identify yourself with anything, with body or mind or any other object, you are either in waking or dream. When you do not identify yourself with any object, you are in sleep. That the mind is everywhere and everything is also a thought in

---

<sup>203</sup> The original editor inserted "383" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) the waking state of the mind. When you realise that you are the witness alone there is the Atman.

@@ In Veda it is said that before the creation, there was only the unmanifested form. How are we to understand this? Only by comparing it with our experience of sleep. There is no need for interpretations unless you refer them to universal experience.

@@ But Turya is that which sees all the three states; the states do not merge into it and come out of it again. It always sees the states coming and going. This is the difference between sleep and Turiya.

@@ Even “sleep” is only an idea in the waking state. Thus we are having sleep even in waking.

@@ What do you know of deep sleep? To know it we have to negate all things, the whole of the Drsyam. When you do not understand a thing you call it Maya. That is all. The paradox dies with the ego.

@@ Western psychologists will object that in dream you never know there is a waking state whereas in waking you know that you dreamt. Hence they will not accept dream-illustration as proof. They are right to the extent that is insufficient. So we must give them proof from science, in addition to this dream reference.

@@ What is it that is climbing, waking, eating in dream? It is Mind itself. You, yet in dream think you are awake, just as here also you think you are awake. This is the meaning of the statement that the Atman does not perform any actions really, because it remains what it was, does not change and only appears to act, as in dream-acts.

@@ Remembrance implies always a duality. Hence if you say you remember the bliss of sleep it means the bliss was an object for you. And if you say the remembrance is after waking, how is that possible when there is no subject-object

(continued from the previous page) relation in sleep, hence no possibility of anything that could be remembered. All you can say is that the duality of this world was not there. It is only when viewed from waking experience that sleep may be considered as blissful but there was no actual experience of bliss.

@@ In that ultimate state of understanding non-duality as truth, you cannot even think about it, hence cannot express it in words. The best illustration of this is deep sleep in which you can say nothing, think nothing, of which you can only think afterwards. This is the sense in which sleep may be called “nearest to Brahman” but it is purely analogical and not to be taken literally. Actually it is not “nearer” because waking is also Brahman.

@@ You cannot prove positively that consciousness has vanished in sleep. You can only show it negatively. For you cannot know the limits of consciousness: you cannot posit where it starts, stops, vanishes etc. This is what Europeans do not understand. We use the word consciousness to include non-dual states like sleep, whereas West uses it only for duality—states. Westerners do not grasp that consciousness can remain without objects, as in sleep, and yet be conscious still. This is “contentless consciousness.”

@@ A dreamer fully believes he is awake. He may even fall asleep in his dream! Thus the two states are identical.

@@ Just like the impression produced by a hill in your mind is in three dimensions, so also in dream an idea is perceived as of three dimensions.

@@ Suppose in a dream you thought you saw a friend coming and you were joyous. Later you discover he is an enemy and are fearful. Where was the error? It was in your mind, and it was only your mind. Both friend and enemy were nothing but your Mind.

@@ Dream shows that a second object can be present

---

<sup>204</sup> The original editor inserted “385” by hand.

(continued from the previous page) (duality) and yet you know later it was not really so. Similarly in waking our sense of duality is a delusion.

@@ They object that there is nothing in deep sleep. I reply that the term no-thing indicates the existence of a thing to start with, therefore non-existence implies existence. Nothing must have a meaning, i.e. a thought and if you had not seen there was a waking world you could not negate it in sleep. Waking and sleep go together, one is not possible without the other. You get deep sleep even in the waking state. It comes during interval between two ideas, when one goes and the other appears. Hence non-existence or Brahman in sleep is wrong. It is like the waves disappearing but their substance, or essence water, remains.

@@ Memory implies a duality, a something known, hence it is absent from sleep.

@@ The ultimate consciousness can be realised only if you study the three states.

@@ Just as the impression produced by the figure of a bull in your eyes perceived is in three dimensions, so also in dream a picture is perceived as of three dimensions. How can we prove that mind is internal? i.e. within the body? It is not possible. Externality and internality never exist in relation to the mind; but they are only in relation to the imagined senses. A dream is a dream only when it is compared to the waking, but it is just like waking state to the dreamer. That which is seen is made up of ideas.

@@ Because we are not aware of any other things in sleep, we have to admit that every idea both internal and external has merged into the mind during sleep as undifferentiated consciousness.

@@ The sound is heard by the ear and the object is seen by the eye. But there is no meaning for the sound if it does not signify an object. Therefore

(continued from the previous page) the sound and the object are one and the same. That the name and the object signified by the name are one. Take a dream. You see an elephant. You call it an elephant. One is seen by the dream eye and the other is heard by the dream ear. That is all the difference. Both are in the dreams.

@@ Turiya is always here as Drik – it is in the waking as in sleep.

@@ When you talk of dream state, you are then in waking state; the former to you now is only a memory, i.e. an idea, no matter how real it seemed then! What difference is there between dream and waking, after you learn the latter is also idea.

@@ Is waking experience the cause of dream experience? Modern psychologists and medieval Ramanujists say: Yes. Moreover they object that dream is a private experience whereas some waking object may be seen by 1000 people. This is their argument for reality of waking and worthless unreality of dream: Reply: Why does Gaudapada compare both states? Because everyone has them in experience; so he seeks to prove that dream is not different from waking.

@@ We do not question that dream objects are similar to those familiar to us in the waking state, but this does not mean we are to accept latter as cause of former. How did the mind get the idea of reality of waking world unless it has had the dream world for comparison? It would never have used the word “real” if it had never started with this contrast of the “unreal” dream world. If there had been waking state alone, the thoughts of reality and unreality would not have arisen. He who has not experienced dream would never have thought of waking state as real. You draw the inference from the contrast of dream and waking that latter is real; Vedanta however draws the inference from the resemblance

---

<sup>205</sup> The original editor inserted “387” by hand.

(continued from the previous page) of their objects that this contrast shows waking to be unreal. This we do, because we do not admit causality.

@@ Dream also is a waking state to the dreamer. When we get up we have another waking state. Strictly speaking, we have a succession of “waking states.”

@@ Critics start with the notion that dream is unreal (by contrast) but a little reflection changes their view and they regard it as real, because caused by waking experiences which are already assumed as real. Thus he finally thinks both states are real. However this is only a mental construction of his. Vedanta however uses this enquiry to show both as unreal because it knows cause to be illusory.

@@ The illusions of dream disappear on waking when they are seen to be unreal. Similarly the illusions of waking also disappear when Gnan dawns and it is seen as equally un-real. The objects, persons, and talks of both states are all ideas. The next step is to know the nature of all these ideas are only the Mind. All names and forms are imagined, but I am always there, whether I see them or not.

@@ In the waking state itself your experience is being sublated every minute. This can be seen only after analysis.

@@ Objection is made that water serves a useful purpose in assuaging thirst, and must therefore be real. But we reply that dream-water may have the same effect, yet it is still unreal.

@@ The idea that waking experience cause similar dream experience is due to the sense of reality which you ascribe to waking. But actually the objects of latter state are unreal. However you are so deeply impressed by the reality of waking objects, that this deludes you into seeing them again in dream; this is not because waking caused

(continued from the previous page) the dream experience, but that the strength, the vividness of waking impressions was such that they re-appeared as dream-ideas. When you awaken, you never think that dream objects produced the waking objects. Why? Because you do not take so much interest in dream as you believe it to be unreal in comparison with waking. You are not so strongly impressed by dream as by waking. The sense of reality is much feebler when you regard dream-ideas than when you regard waking ideas, yet both are the same. Hence the illusion that 'real' waking life caused (produced) dream experiences and persons is due solely to the strength of waking images with you, whereas dream images are regarded as unreal, or at least very feebly real. (see Mandukya 293).

@@ We imagine the waking world and then imagine the dream world and then proceed to find the former as the cause of the latter. This is our delusion. Dream experience is entirely the result of our imagination, not of our waking experience.

@@ In dream you see certain objects, say a mango, and you never see the same mango in the waking state nor in the next dream. You appear to see the same one, but really it is your own imagination.

@@ Many things seen in waking are not seen again in dream, and vice versa. This also shows that Advaita doctrine that one is not the cause of the other, is correct.

@@ Those few who never dream cannot apply the Vedantic analogous to it, nor the Gnani-test of feeling himself the All in dream! However this does not matter, for they can still apply the latter test to waking only but they are unfortunate in missing the former illustration; this will not prevent realization though.

@@ The three states come and go, impermanent

---

<sup>206</sup> The original editor inserted "389" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) and therefore have no value from Truth standpoint. All yogic visions likewise come and go, and are valueless. They are but projections of the mind, as the Jyoti-light seen by yogis and mystics, quite genuine but of no value to the Truth-seeker.

@@ Nature has mercifully given man a nightly demonstration of the goal and the truth of life, in the experience of deep sleep. There you have the comparative bliss of dropping all objects, whether dream or waking, and later the lesson of seeing them arise again from the same state of apparent nothingness. Everything is found in consciousness or mind, both objectless and objective. But Europeans know only the latter, not the former. They must learn the lesson given by Nature through deep sleep. No yoga can give a greater lesson, and even in waking state the same lesson can be learnt by use of buddhi: through which an object may go but pure consciousness remains. A room in darkness does not mean that the objects therein have vanished or disappeared. Similarly these external objects, sounds, persons, go back into the mind in deep sleep and re-appear on waking. When the external world subsides in deep sleep the truth is that it is only an emanation of the mind, a form of thought, it was the mind and remains the mind. This is to help understanding everything as Brahman. Nothing is lost or disappears: it is and always was Brahman.

@@ Turiya is that which sees the Witness, whereas the three states are the seen, the known.

@@ All things seen in dream must ultimately proceed from deep sleep state. At the time dream appears, it is as real as this external world. Therefore it is said that this real dream world is 'created' by deep sleep, because it is its source.



@@ Einstein's theory of relativity is applicable to dream experience. Four persons viewing a table will have four different pictures of it in their mind, says Einstein. Each sees his own mental structure, what his mind tells him, i.e. his own imagination. Similarly the dream-world seen by a dreamer is entirely relative to his own mind. Each dreamer will have an individual world of objects of his own presented by his mind; relativity reveals that no two persons see the same thing in the same way, consequently the whole world appearance is idea.

@@ Those who talk of dream being internal only, mental, illusory and unreal, talk nonsense. Dreamer has sense of world as external to him and of mental ideas being internal to him. This duplicates waking experience. Hence if they call dream illusion they must call waking likewise.

@@ Those who object that the means and ends of waking are different from those of dreams, and therefore they are not on the same level, ignore that you have time, space and casual relation in both states. These three things make the waking world real to you: and are its chief characteristics; similarly they give the same sense of reality to dream. They say waking is real and dream is illusory. We say both are illusory.

@@ Study your dreams carefully, observe them, and you will find that all the senses are operating there. All the experiences which you have in waking state, therefore, can be duplicated in the dream state. You have sun, moon and stars in dream as in waking, and since it is by the sun that years are counted, years can pass in dream as in waking. From the standpoint and experience of dream, it is itself the waking state and our present waking is the dream state.

@@ Where is the need of a divine creator when your own dream experience offers proof that you yourself bring into being a whole world of objects

---

<sup>207</sup> The original editor inserted "391" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) and persons, and if you can create a dream-world, why not also a waking world? Only do not forget that 'you' does not refer to the ego which is itself a produced thing.

@@ The early teachers gave the idea of a "fourth" state to students whose minds were not sufficiently advanced to understand that Turiya is not a state. The latter could grasp the notion that there was a higher state than the three they already knew, so this notion was given them but it is not ultimately true.

@@ Those who say you were non-existent in deep sleep, cannot prove it. To do so, they would have had to be consciously present in the sleep. No. At no time can the Atman be absent.

@@ Advanced state of this path, resulting from the constant practice of inquiry and "awareness" is that the attitude thus developed during waking will repeat itself during dream. Even in dreams the Gnana-yogi will thus separate himself from his dream body, know all his dream objects to be mind, etc.

@@ When we say your ego may be reborn in dream as a different personality as a king or hunter, we admit "this" may be a rare event. However, many people have experienced themselves flying in dream. At that time, you are a flying man, here in waking you are a walking man. The "flying man" is surely a great change of personality, otherwise try and fly now!

@@ The objection that dream cannot sublate waking experience, whereas waking experience can sublate dreams because waking is so universal and coherent, i.e. day after day, whereas dream is private and incoherent is replied: In dream also you may have thousands of men, dealings all over the world, amid long periods of time, just as in waking; this gives it at times a universal character. Einstein has showed that all ideas of time are relative to

(continued from the previous page) the observer. We must examine dream-experience from the dream-observer standpoint and not from that of the waking observer. We shall then find that a minute of waking may be equal to a life time of dream.

@@ We do not say that the three states do not exist; that is not our point: we say that what is felt as real in each of the three states is one and the same thing.

@@ What is the mind doing in a dream? It imagines and then finds various objects and persons. In the waking it does exactly the same. Why do you see the same objects again each day? Because they all pre-exist as vasanas in the sub-consciousness. The ego begins by imagining some objects. Then there arises a memory of those objects in its mind. This memory becomes a vasana and tends to re-appear. But originally the objects were concocted by the ego in the mind. This is the basis of the Karma doctrine and of the transmigration doctrine. This explains why they are facts. These objects are there in the mind as latent ideas unseen as objects. When they emerge, we call them objects. When they remain subconscious we call them vasanas. The objection is made that I see my house again every day in waking, whereas it does not re-appear as continuity in my dreams. Therefore the house exists independently and dream is not satisfactory proof of imagined characters of waking world. Reply: Time is also a piece of your imagination and the two points in time (to-day and to-morrow) in your waking experience, are also imagined. Einstein has proved that time varies with observers. Why? Vedanta answers that each individual has his own imagined time, hence the variations. You do not see time outside; today and yesterday – the two points in time – are only imaginations of your mind. The objection will next be made that the waking house is there even during your

---

<sup>208</sup> The original editor inserted “393” by hand.

(continued from the previous page) sleep: Other persons tell you. That is no proof for you. Only hearsay. What you have not personally experienced is therefore imagined. Similarly you say that J.B. is your grand-father. How do you know? Were you present consciously at his birth? No, it is a belief told you by your parents, i.e. by others. Hence it is an imagination. Hence this objection will not stand. Vedanta does not admit beliefs and imaginations, only personally known facts and experiences. We start with the attachment to and presumption of the reality of waking state, or of its relative superiority to dream in reliability. This is not the way to get at truth. We must judge both impartially, laying them side by side before our mental eye for avastatrayic examination: then only do we find that there is really no difference between the two states – both are equally imagined.

@@ Why do we have dreams? Why should Nature give us dreams? Vedanta alone replies. It is to illustrate for man the highest truth, that from non-dualistic standpoint everything is only dream. This truth is so difficult to discern that dream-experience is given as a clue or hint to man; it is a light in darkness.

@@ When in the waking state you inquire fully into the nature of the waking state, you get Gnan.

@@ Why is waking not known in dream? Reply: It is known. You think you are awake during dream.

@@ The avastas are valuable to show that ego disappears in sleep nightly: hence it is illusory or idea. (Avasta - state)

@@ Without avastatraya how will West know that ideas disappear and re-appear, that the ego itself is such an idea?

@@ What you see in the waking world is the same as what you see in the dream world – this is proved by Mandukya.

@@ The mountain which you see in dream seems to be different from you or your mind, but when you enquire you ascertain that it is both the same and also not the same as the mind. If you look concentrate your mind on it, if you look at the Atman in each thing or person, you will see one and the same Atman. But when you think only of the differences, you see variety. Your standpoint makes the difference. It depends on what the mind is thinking of.

@@ Deep sleep is used as the best illustration of Gnana, but is not gnana.

@@ The best illustration that everything is within you, is dream. Therein all things scenes and persons are in your mind, are your mind. In the same way the external world is yourself and in yourself.

@@ Many thoughts appear within the mind and are limited by time space, but you do not know any limits to the mind itself.

@@ Relativity proves that no two persons can see the same things in the same way. Each man, in his own mind, has his idea of same table. For the mind is the thing which is acting. The mind creates both the table and the idea of it, just as in dream it creates both your ego and the tiger which attacks you.

@@ The diamonds you wore in your dream were only mind at the time and disappeared into mind. Thus they are not lost really.

@@ Turiya is not avasta. We are only aware of the three states. Who is aware of any other state? We do not know anything more than the three states. We deal only with experiences to which everyone can refer. viz. sleep, dream and waking.

@@ If you consult only prejudices and say "I don't care for proof from dream and sleep, I must have waking because it is real" then you will never get at truth. You do not want all the facts.

@@ We Vedantins wish to show that the waking state is as ideal as the dream; it is not our purpose

---

<sup>209</sup> The original editor inserted "395" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) that the dream is as real as the waking.

@@ Waking and dream belong to the same class of duality; both characterised by misapprehension; and in sleep, though there is no duality, it is characterised by non-apprehension. Yesterday becomes to-day's dream. But the knower, everything is Brahman whether with duality or non-duality. Sleep here means ignorance. The three states constitute sleep or ignorance from the point of view of non-apprehension of Reality. But in dream including waking, there is no misapprehension of Reality as well. Whatever is born is only Brahman, if you take your stand in Turiya.

@@ Dreams are largely, but not wholly made up of materials drawn from waking experience.

@@ It would be impossible to recognise waking state as such if you did not have dream to compare it to, and if a man objects that he may not experience more than two states, we ask, "How do you know that there is a waking state?" If, by the opposite experience of dream, then deep sleep is pre-supposed; if by sleep, then dream is pre-supposed. By examining waking experience, we see day-dreams and blankness even there. The meaning of this world existence cannot be separated from non-existence. Hence when there is only unity, differencelessness, what meaning can there be in manifold variety?

@@ When you use word "waking" what do you do? You think of the objective world, you imagine you are seeing it. Where are you then? You are lost in the objects yourself. Similarly when you use word "dream state" when you imagine it, then for the time being you are in it.

@@ You know that there are three states only when in the waking world.

@@ That which appears as the three states plus That into which the three states disappear, these two together form the Supreme Brahman.

@@ Just as in a dream our ideas appear to be external, so in the waking state the objects appear to be outside. Yet analysis shows them to be ideas. We have to learn this great lesson – that the mind operates in the same way during dream as in waking.

@@ Just as in the external world all ornaments can be converted back into a single mass of gold so in the dream world all are converted back on waking to the single mass of mind.

@@ Where do ideas come from? Only from Sushupti – where else could they come from? Sushupti is unindividuated mind.

@@ In deep sleep you do not know whether you, this individual or that body, i.e. you do not identify yourself with any separate entity.

@@ Those that speak of Turiya as a state talk nonsense. It is THAT in which the three states are: it is the negation of the states. Those who say that the Turiya is Sunya, i.e. nothing or non-existence, I ask What is Sunya? It is a word. A word is an idea. An idea must exist. Then even your sunya has existence! The mind cannot think of anything unless it exists as an idea in the mind. You cannot have a thought, without implying a mind that exists. The mind cannot think except by differentiating. When you say anything does not exist you imply the fact of existence. If you are going to make any statement about Turiya or about Sunya denouncing it as a void, then you overlook an implication of your statement, i.e. that you have got something in your mind, unconsciously, when you speak, a rope beneath the snake. A substratum beneath the supposedly false imagination of Sunya or Turiya.

Turiya cannot be indicated as you would a table or book, because it has no characteristic marks.

@@ Vedanta does not regard Turiya as the fourth state, in a numerical line, but as that which is present and subsists in the three states. The former

---

<sup>210</sup> The original editor inserted “397” by hand.

(continued from the previous page) is an error because Turiya is not a state. Turiya is the witness of the three and is that which knows of their existence. But how is it to be known in deep sleep apart from the sleep? You have to do what is done in algebra, you separate or drop out the three, take away the differentiating factors and whatever remains is the Drik, Turiya. It is the only thing of which you can be certain that it is not transient but always there, whereas waking, dream and sleep come and go.

@@ Everyone without exception has the triple experience of waking dream and sleep and this data suffices for the knowledge of truth here to a keen mind, says Mandukya.

@@ The difference between sleep and death is that you know when you go to sleep that you will awake and get back everything that you have given up on falling asleep—wife, house, money, etc.—whereas when you die you know that it will all be lost. Beyond this we know nothing about death (Keno Upanishad 13. Here if you know it, it is truth.”) And therefore all statements about what occurs after death are imagination, because we cannot say what other minds experience after death because we cannot see into them.

@@ How to know that all entities are one? Think of the dream. There mind is in all dream-entities thus making them one. Similarly with Brahman and mankind.

@@ Turiya is not the same as Sushupti because latter changes, comes and goes, whereas former is ever-present throughout all the other states.

@@ To those dualists who say the individual soul exists in seed form in Turiya or even in deep sleep, we reply: Did you ever see the seed? No. Then you are telling lies, not sticking to facts.



@@ To those like Steiner who say one idea cannot act upon another, that we ought not to be able to eat cake if it is only idea, we reply that Nature has wasted time in giving them dream wherein these very things occur and are proved possible.

@@ There is non-duality in deep sleep and also in Gnan. Hence people get confused and say deep sleep is the key to knowledge of reality and is the realization of Brahman. They are quite wrong. Brahman is equally present in dream and waking. So how could deep sleep have the monopoly of it We use sleep only to help those who are unable to grasp even the idea of Brahman or imagine what it could be like; it helps them believe in its existence. We use sleep, therefore as a preliminary aid to the understanding of philosophy just as we use yoga for same purpose. Its analysis is to help novices get over the hurdle of understanding non-duality of Brahman but not to get Brahman.

@@ When you were dreaming you thought these perceptions real, just as now you are awake you think waking perceptions real.

@@ The three states are themselves mere ideas and time in them is also an idea. You have to be careful when writing about them to distinguish clearly between the objects seen in the states and the experiences of the states. What is past time? Imagination! What is the future? Something imagined; but if you take away these two states, your present becomes meaningless. How can it exist independently of the other two? Hence the whole of time is idea and the three states, being dependent on time, are also reduced to idea, to being merely imagined: So taking away the three states as illusory, unreal, what is left? The Atman.

@@ Even the illusion of the universe is, as shown by dream where all illusory ideas are mind, ultimately none other than Brahman in

---

<sup>211</sup> The original editor inserted "399" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) substance although not in form.

@@ At the point of passing from wakefulness to sleep see what it is; that is Atman.

@@ Even in sleep when you see nothing and know nothing, still it is as much Brahman as in waking when activity and knowledge abound. For Brahman never changes, is not mutable, does not increase or decrease; hence talk of gaining moksha is nonsense.

@@ When you think of a dream you can reduce all its sights to Mind, to your mind. So when you get Gnana, you reduce all to Atman and no longer rejoice or sorrow over differences of experience because you now know them all to be One.

@@ When the mountain is in your dream, you ignore the fact that it is only your mind. Similarly when you see waking world, you forget it is only Mind. This is what ignorance means.

@@ Knowledge implies a knower and a known. Such distinctions do not apply to Gnan. Yogis misinterpret this to mean Nirvikalpa samadhi. The correct understanding is that even though there are different objects yet at the same moment, you will realize they are non-different. The best way to grasp this is to look at dream, wherein the object known, the process of knowing and the knower are simultaneously only Mind.

@@ It is absurd to say, as yogis do, that Brahman is found only in Nirvikalpa samadhi, in the absence of world. This is the same as sleep. If that were so, why did the Upanishads speak of a "fourth?" This truth is that waking is Brahman, dream is Brahman, sleep is Brahman.

@@ You must have a keen mental eye, a hawk's eye to see truth in a moment. He who thinks of the three states becomes the perceiver of the three states and is the Atman.

@@ We cannot really establish any relation between the real and the unreal. Even 'witness' implies duality. Only when a second thing is witnessed, do we say that there is a seer, that which witnesses. Only to the ignorant man who sees objects, do we say Atman is that which witnesses the objects or ideas.

@@ When you see the mountain and when you do not see it, the substratum is there. The substratum is only the mind. It is only the Gnani that knows this. Just as all sounds have for their substratum the sound Aum, so the mind without ideas and forms exists even while there are ideas and forms.

@@ If the Turiya were not there, you would not be aware of anything. Turiya subsists in all the three states; otherwise we would not be aware of them. If anything is real, we cannot get rid of it; it cannot appear and disappear. But because the three states appear and disappear, they are said to be unreal.

@@ When your mind or thought is on anything else it is not in Turiya.

@@ Turiya is not something we get after removing the three states. Turiya exists always. Removal of the states does not mean, the production of a new entity. When you get at Atman as the witness of the three states you cannot become aware of the Atman; it is the Atman that is aware of the three states. Remove the darkness and you see the object. The two are simultaneous. They are not really two. When you remove ignorance you realise the highest truth. If I believe that the absence of the three states gives realisation when the mind is still in an elementary state, i.e. the mind merely imagines that which becomes aware of the three states. What is between the disappearance of one idea and the appearance of another idea in the mind? It is just like sleep, though it is momentary. If there is no interval between the two ideas how can I distinguish between the two? Between the two ideas,

---

<sup>212</sup> The original editor inserted "401" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) there is only the mind. It is known to him to whom it is unknown; it is unknown to him whom it is known.

@@ Prajna is only a state which comes and goes whereas Turiya is ever-present. It is because the three states come and go, that we can know the three or Atman as separate from them.

@@ Non-cognition of duality is common to both sleep and Turiya, but in Turiya there is the knowledge that everything is Brahman alone. This is the only difference. Moreover it is only afterwards, i.e. in the waking state that we know that there was no knowledge of Reality in deep sleep.

@@ Sleep is something of which we have knowledge only in the waking state. It is a state in which there is no awareness of any kind in terms of waking state and which we understand nevertheless by reference to the waking state. It is known as the absence of the waking and dreaming state. You can have no direct experience of sleep itself. The waking state and the dream state apparently are not present in deep sleep. But where is the proof that the mind itself was absent in deep sleep? All we can say is that there is no awareness of mind. If you say that the waking state was absent, there must be someone to have seen the absence of the state, which is impossible. The objective world was not there in sleep. Therefore the waking state must have been there in deep sleep, otherwise how could it be known that there was no objective world?

@@ What is between two states, say between sleep and waking? There is only Turiya there; because Turiya is that which sees the going of sleep and coming of waking.

@@ There is a school which says that take away the 3 states and you get Turiya. This is Yoga. It is wrong. How did you know there were the three states?

@@ All that is unreal is tested by and disappears in sleep, even God and mystic experience goes then.

@@ There is no meaning in talking of external objects and internal ones. In dream you see “externals” which are also “internals.”

@@ To those Pundits who babble that everyone, even beasts, is happy in sleep, I reply, How do you know? Did you look into every man’s and every bird’s mind when he is sleeping? No. Moreover I am not aware of anything in sleep (deep sleep) hence I know not if it was happiness, Brahman or what not.

@@ That there are three states can be known only in waking first.

@@ As there is nothing beyond the three states when you know what they are, you will know everything. But they are not to be regarded as permanent things, only as appearance of a reality.

@@ Turiya is not different from the other states but if you want to distinguish it as something to be attained, then you may call it a fourth and treat it as different. It is like taking away all the forms of the waves in thought in order to know water alone. But Turiya itself is really one.

@@ We know only one Mind. We never know but only assume there exist other individual minds; all you get is the thought of them. Even when I am thinking of the minds of the dream state, it is still the same Mind that is operating; they were only thoughts of this Mind.

@@ If you stand on the waking state, then all other things are ideas. If you combine all the three states, then they are Mind.

@@ If a man says he has never had dreams, it is impossible to use the Avastatraya argument with him. This shows the need of science, which quite apart from avastatraya is able to prove the ideality of the world.

---

<sup>213</sup> The original editor inserted “403” by hand.

@@ There are three states, all of which must be studied, analysed and weighed – not one may be omitted if truth of the whole is to be attained. We must get the thorough conviction that the waking world is the same as dream, but it can be got only by scientific analysis on modern lines.

@@ Whatever is in the mind can appear outside as objective existence.

@@ When you know that this world is exactly like the dream world, that is, an idea that the object does not exist as a separate entity, and that the ego disappears, you are ready for truth.

@@ Those who think because I am not conscious of the creation of the world by my mind, therefore I did not create it, are wrong. Look at dreams. You are not conscious of creating them, nevertheless they came out of your mind, whether you were aware of them or not. They are not mental. This proves that the world of waking can also come from the mind without your knowing. This non-knowing is called ajnana ignorance; you have to see that, as Avastatraya says, the whole world is created by mind.

@@ How meet the objection that a loan made in waking state may be repaid in dream if, as Vedanta says, both are the same? It can be met only by the scientific analysis of seeking as productive of illusion. What is meant by illusions? What is meant by seeing mirages, snake-rope etc. A portion of physical science is devoted to the study of illusion. What is meant by illusion Vedantically? If your mind has previously been thinking of something, you can have it before you, you can see it actually.

@@ All three states are individually Brahman, are never apart from it.

@@ To the objection that same waking world reappears whereas dreamworld is irregular, we say that in dream you may see several times 20000 persons as in waking, a whole house full of people as in waking. But we reply: Are you really seeing, the same waking world which you saw yesterday? Here Bergson has done the greatest service to Vedanta by showing it is incessantly changing. Every day you get a new world. There is no such thing as permanence in the world of the seen. Hence the waking world seen by you yesterday is definitely not the same as that seen today. Hence your objection falls to the ground.

@@ Many scientists say the waking experiences and things are the cause of dream experiences thoughts and feelings. It is however a fact, that you sometimes have experiences which never occurred to you in waking, as flying in air. So how can they say that waking world always reproduces in dream state?

@@ Why is waking state omitted in the sloka? (Mandukya 331, V.81) You cannot understand without a Guru. Dream consists of duality. Deep sleep is non-duality. Waking is felt to be waking even in dream. Hence reality is free from both duality and non-duality. Whilst dreaming you believe yourself to be awake. Hence waking is left out. It is no use talking of non-duality unless you know that the external world is an idea. Hegel, the greatest European scholar and philosopher, had the idea of non-duality but he did not prove it. Without proof, you can't grasp its meaning; you have only an intuitive assumption or a mystic dogma.

@@ Sri Ramanuja says the 'I' is there in deep sleep. Sri Sankara says that the I is not there in deep sleep. To Ramanuja the ego is a reality, to Vedantins it does not exist because it only appears and disappears, and because there is that consciousness which knows the I to be

---

<sup>214</sup> The original editor inserted "405" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) transitory, and therefore it is different from the I. Hence Ramanuja immortalizes the separate ego; advaitins immortalise That consciousness which knows the ego. Ramanuja says the ego continues its existence in deep sleep: we say That alone continues which sees the individual because we do not know of ego then, and we did not see it go. Ramanuja fails to see that we are talking of this in the waking state, when I dominates again. His statement that I must have existed in sleep is only an inference, i.e. an imagination. Had he made the statement during deep sleep he would have had to right to do so, had he been then aware of I. We can only stick to what we know, i.e. truth. The truth remains that we did not see the presence of the I, nor its absence.

@@ The waking state is both the state of knowledge and of ignorance. If you think every object therein is real, you are ignorant, if you know that the waking is only a state of which everyone in Europe is unaware, you are knowing the truth, similarly if during dream you know that it is only a state, again you are knowing the truth. This is the most difficult part of Avastatraya.

@@ None but the Indians have properly evaluated avastatraya. All other nations have treated it with indifference. Yet it is the mind which created waking objects as well as dream objects. When you know the three—waking, dream, sleep—as states, then you are Atman, but when you regard them as real, then you are ignorant, and when you identify yourself with any particular state, you miss the Atman.

@@ You cannot say nothing exists in deep sleep. You can only say, in waking state, this world was not there. Hence those that say they experience Brahman in Nirvikalpa are self-deluded, for if they saw nothing then how do they know it was Brahman?



@@ We do not deny the millions of egos, we say that we do see them, but that they are all Brahman, Mind. Those who deny the existence of these differentiations are mystics, not philosophers.

@@ Advaita says, so long as there are two things you will always have doubt. Even if the two are only yourself and God, you will never have the certainty that God may not send you away, show disfavour or change in some way, etc. Hence doubt will be there. Doubt can dis-appear only in non-duality.

@@ Whoever bestows attributes of quality to gnan to the Real, is turning it into a duality.

@@ Any thought you have of Atman or Brahman is nonsense, because no thought has the capacity to reveal the Drik: Thought is the known, Atman is the Knower: This is from the point of view of Gnan. But from the point of view of students books and thoughts are of the greatest use. Whenever a thought comes know that it is not Atman, not permanent, not real.

@@ All dualistic religions or philosophies are based on notion that God and the individual are two separate entities. Hence you are outside God. He is outside you. Hence both are limited; hence even God has no absolute freedom. How then, can such a God give liberation to anyone, if He Himself is not liberated?

@@ He who thinks God is one and I am another can never understand truth.

@@ If you give a definition somebody else will give his own too. Thus wrangling will never cease. Only in non-duality is there uncontradictability.

@@ Misery is due to duality. When you know that everything is in you, not elsewhere and when you know there is nothing other than yourself, duality disappears and misery vanishes as a consequence.

@@ So long as a man thinks that there is a second

---

<sup>215</sup> The original editor inserted "407" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) thing, he is under Maya and in bondage; so soon as he sees oneness only, he is wise and free. Nothing could be easier than this.

@@ “Pairs of opposites” means those things which come and go; sorrows will not be permanent nor will joys. All interpretations of texts are also ‘pairs’ of opposites because of their contradiction. Only the Atman is permanent. The rest is duality, hence *drsyam*, imagination, transient.

@@ The doctrine of the “Lightning-flash” of glimpsing Reality mentioned in Upanishad must not be misunderstood. It has two meanings. The first is merely for beginners to encourage them to go on. It is the teaching that they have to get beyond thought and between thought, to stop thinking for a fraction of a second as it were. The higher meaning is that the students suddenly grasp the idea that all the world is only a thought, and that he himself is also a thought, and that he himself is also a thought, and that all this thought-world is inside himself, is Atma, Brahma. With that he recognises that the thought itself is Brahman with all its ideas it includes Brahman too, including the idea of himself. This sudden understanding may last only a fraction of a second at first. Hence it is called “Lightning-flash.” It is not *samadhi* in yogic sense. He has to repeat this glimpse of true understanding more and more times until it becomes a stable grasp of the truth.

@@ The more you think these ideas out clearly the quicker will you grasp them. This is the practice – yoga – indeed.

@@ There can be no “experience of liberation” for experience=subject-object relation, whilst liberation=negation of subject-object duality.

@@ If you say there is One God, One Reality, it implies that you are there to see that One. Hence Monism of any kind implies duality.

@@ Multiplicity of Atmans is not perceived by us; to assert duality is therefore a lie. We can make this statement and prove it; hence we say Atman is non-dual which being negative is not a positive statement nor proof. When you have two things you can offer proof. Hence proof belongs to the world of duality. For any thought, any word, any assertion, any proof implies duality—the one making it and it itself. Understanding truth implies having an understander and a thing understood. But this is duality. Hence we cannot even talk of understanding truth. Hence we can only express truth by silence.

@@ You avoid, check or control vasanas because they are imaginations, hence drsyam. For if you do not check you will never know the drik. Hence knowing truth requires greatest discipline.

@@ We have to attain a position where it is not possible for anyone to differ. That is Truth. But that is never attainable when there are two entities to argue, dispute or differ. Hence it must be position of non-duality. Here there is nobody else with whom to dispute. Here there is no drsyam, only drik.

@@ Whatever definition you give to the Absolute it will remain a drsyam, unreal, a thought. But thoughts may come and go, impermanent, so your definition will not represent the Unchanging Absolute. If however you take the Absolute, as Drik, then it is alright, there is non-difference.

@@ All the obstacles to realization are duality. The path is therefore to remove them, to unify. But it must be done correctly, not a pseudo-removal. The differences of variety in this world are of great value to the thinker, for they cause him to enquire and then pursue his enquiry to the end and thus eventually rise above all difference of duality into

---

<sup>216</sup> The original editor inserted “409” by hand.

(continued from the previous page) non-duality. But in the inferior minds these same differences will cause only strife, war, dispute and bloodshed, in fact all the world's troubles are caused by the sense of duality.

@@ The figure one cannot be understood unless it is distinguished from two, three, etc. Hence it implies duality.

@@ We use the word "knowing" the truth or reality only for beginners. Know implies duality. But we have to use it for convenience of instruction until the pupil is able to perceive himself that he is, was and ever will be Brahman.

@@ Everything is only your imagination. There fore everything is a lie. That is why advaita is established by dissolving all distinctions, by removing all standpoints. Hence you reject everything, neti, neti, and rest quietly in non-duality.

@@ If you say you are an Advaitin, then you have got a meaning for the word which means you still think Advaita is duality. Hence we say it is more correct to reject the label "advaita" as well as all other labels; saying instead "Search for truth."

@@ Whether duality is there or not, it still remains Mind.

@@ To be established in non-duality means that wherever the mind goes, whatever you see, it always reminds you of Brahman; whereas novices may get a flashing glimpse of Brahman but it passes away as soon as the vasanas of this world rise again.

@@ It is only when gnana yoga is practised all the 24 hours, that the mind becomes steady, i.e. attains sahaja-samadhi in truth.

@@ Every new birth of a form is still only Mind, so it is nothing new, no second thing.

@@ Thinking about the unthinkable, you get only a thought.

@@ The three states when placed before you, the Drik, will then appear as three ideas only. No state will have more value than another. At this advanced viewpoint avastatraya becomes a proof. But at an elementary stage, avastatraya is only an illustration. Here if a man says from the waking state he is hungry, it is useless to tell him take his food from dream. He has not dissociated himself from the three states, and known that he alone exists.

@@ You are only aware of your ignorance in the waking state. Hence you can get rid of it only whilst awake.

@@ Do not be carried away to over-value Avastatraya in the wrong place. Thus there are different interpretations of Mandukya's avastatraya by Ramanuja and Madhva. An opponent can say "My interpretation of avastatraya is correct." Yours is not. What are you going to do then? So science must be brought in because it alone can settle matters irrespective of opinion through appeal to fact. Avastatraya combined with and based on science will have great value; but apart from science it degenerates into opinion and punditry.

@@ Real Gnan, when it sees the waking state, thinks everything it sees there to be only an idea; just as the man who has awakened from dream similarly regards his dream-world. This is to be achieved by constant practice in right thinking until it becomes natural.

@@ All the pundits reproach me for teaching avastatraya. They say there is an avasta (state) higher, which is Turiya. Hence they say there are four states. They are wrong, merely imagining. Turiya is not a state.

@@ You can detach yourself from the ego when you see the three states before you, detached from you. This is the standpoint whence you can regard your own ego as apart, idea.

@@ The endlessness of possible controversy

---

<sup>217</sup> The original editor inserted "411" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) belongs only to waking state and not to sleep.

@@ When you know that Brahman is equally in waking as in sleep, where is the truth in saying that the latter is more spiritually enjoyable because superior in status? To the Gnani both are the same. To those pundits who argue that sleep is more preferred by men I reply, look at the Europeans who gladly sacrifice sleep in order to dance for hours.

@@ All the three states are “the known”, they are drsyam, and not to be confounded with drik.

@@ Advaita first gives its proof from the waking experience and only after that do they give the dream-proof. This is the stronger proof. Pundits who ignore science merely quote dreams.

@@ In dream you may be travelling to Bombay and yet your mind has not really moved. Hence mind is motionless and yet paradoxically in motion at the same time.

@@ You know that deep sleep is undifferentiated consciousness only because it is accompanied (i.e. preceded or followed) by differentiated consciousness of dream or waking: the two states go together.

@@ We do not say that the dream state is real and waking is unreal. We put both on same level.

@@ We know of no other thing having produced our dreams, although we may imagine or speculate, other than mind itself. The dream is Mind; its objects are mind, its results are mind: it is but one substance Mind: And yet it appears as a duality or multiplicity! Similarly waking world of objects, i.e. ideas are also non-dual but appears differently.

@@ The individual mind, the dream, the dream objects and the dreamer are all one and the same. It is all the Mind appearing as such.

@@ It is only the I that dreams.

@@ The gnani is he who knows in the waking state that the world's reality is illusory: thus he is as though asleep whilst yet awake.

@@ Think of all the beautiful women you had in dreams, realise they were only ideas; and apply the same conclusion to the women you see in the waking state. Do this to all other sensual pleasures. This is the practice which leads to enlightenment. Dream is the key to understanding the world rightly.

@@ Avastatraya is not enough nowadays, to prove world is mind. Scientific modern proof must also be introduced. For science has now proved all things to be idea.

@@ Perfect knowledge comes only when you see the world in yourself, just as he who awakes from dream then knows he saw his dream-world with its suns and stars in himself. It comes after you analyse the world and find everything to be in your mind, is derived from consciousness.

@@ Science proves Vedantic truths from the waking state standpoint only: Vedanta goes further by proving them from the totality of states viewpoint. Modern and best way is to combine both methods of proof. Thus science proves indestructibility of matter: Vedanta says, Nothing can be lost, and proves this by dream. All dream objects have gone back into mind i.e. you.

@@ It is difficult to understand the saying that the whole world is in you, but the same truth can be grasped if you say the world is in your mind. This is proved both by avastatraya and science. If in dreams you can keep out the I, you will have understood this advaitic truth.

@@ There is no attainment of Turiya. It is always there. It is that which is aware of all the three states.

---

<sup>218</sup> The original editor inserted "413" by hand.

@@ The Self appears only in the waking and dream. In sleep we do not experience it as appearing and disappearing. Where did the self disappear during sleep? That into which it disappeared and from which it appeared at waking, we call the self. We do not know whether it disappeared into God or Overself etc. for we do not see it come and go into a second entity. Strictly speaking we cannot even say that the self appears and disappears into the Self; for we do not see it. But the nearest approach is that individual ego entered the universal ego, just as all the sounds come and go into soundlessness.

@@ In the waking, objects appear to be real. In dream everything is produced by mind and is therefore ideas. By studying dream phenomena we come to the conclusion that everything are ideas and nothing but that. In sleep everything goes back into the mind and therefore we say that ideas are also mind. Deep sleep is, as it were, the container of dream and waking.

@@ The dreamer creates his own world out of himself. In the waking also we have no proof that the external world which we see is different from our own mind, it has no separate existence apart from the mind. Hence we say that non-duality alone really exists.

@@ The individual self exists only in waking and dream where there is non-self also. There is the ego as long as the non-ego is also there. The 'I' appears and disappears and is always changing. The ego and the non-ego appears and disappears together. Both are changing at every moment.

@@ We call that form which you again come back to in the waking and dream states. We find non-apprehension of form in sleep—that condition which I did not see anything.



@@ Consciousness can never disappear but when it combines with the ego, which appears and vanishes constantly, it seems to vanish with it in sleep. That is error. This is what a Buddhist does not understand. Unless you distinguish between “my” consciousness and consciousness “itself” you cannot grasp this. The ego must not be confused with the Atman. All religionists talk of consciousness being an attribute of the soul, for they are thinking only of ego and cannot rise above it. If any speak of disappearance of consciousness in sleep, there must be the knowing that it has gone, i.e. there must still be consciousness.

@@ Avastatraya reveals that independently of your personal thinking a world can spring up around you and yet be nothing but your ideas. This is the final reply to those critics who say: “I did not think this world consciously into existence. I am not aware of having ideated it. How then can it be my idea?”

@@ Those who quote sleep as an example of the nature of Brahman are wrong. It is an avasta, a state of consciousness, therefore it is a drsyam that comes and vanishes. The correct example is Turiya, that which sees the sleep come and go.

@@ All the three states are Brahman. To think that waking is not Brahman whereas sleep is Brahman is an error: similarly to say that Turiya is Brahman and not the three states, is error. All is Brahman without exception. If you take Mind to be Brahman, then just think: when you pick up this book science tells you it is idea, hence Mind is then present. When a dream-mountain is seen is not Mind present? When in sleep even though no objects are seen, is not Mind present? So mind, Brahman, is everywhere, in all three states and even beyond them.

@@ Waking is on equal level with sleep, for both are Mind. It is absurd to hold sleep superior.

---

<sup>219</sup> The original editor inserted “415” by hand.

@@ Turiya means “fourth”. It therefore has no meaning except in relation to the other three states. They must be present for comparison. Hence Turiya is never realized by negating the other states; it is always present with them. The door, the window frame and the book case are all made of wood. You do not have to burn them to ash to realise this. You can see each object separately and yet know that all are of one material. Similarly you may see all the manifold of waking and dream objects and yet know them as one Brahman. The wood (Turiya) is always present.

@@ What are the three avastas and the three gunas? They are manufactured by the mind.

@@ Science shows that the whole world is a creation of the mind, just as the dream world is the same.

@@ The fact that sleep is a drsyam is proved because we know it as being sleep only after we are awake, i.e. when it is past and gone, i.e. when it has vanished. And is it not the characteristic of drsyam to vanish, to change. It is only a temporary state whereas Brahman is permanent and not a state. Moreover it is the activity of buddhi which brings the understanding of Brahman and buddhi is inactive in sleep. Finally the sleeper sees nothing whereas the gnani sees the world, sees Brahman even in waking.

@@ Super-imposition can best be understood by dream, where any form, mountain, serpent, etc. is super-imposed upon the mind. The form is really the mind but when you think of, speak of it separately, you say it is super-imposed.

@@ So long as a dream lasts you will find an external world of objects there and an internal world of ideas, just as you find here in waking.

@@ You know that dreams have come from sleep. If you want to know what is common to both their essence, you have to take away from dreams the names and forms, then you will have the Mind left. This Mind is the common feature of dream, sleep and even waking. This Mind has undergone no change amid all these appearances. Therefore the idea of causality is inapplicable to it, and have no meaning.

---

<sup>220</sup> The original editor inserted "417" by hand.

---

<sup>221</sup> Blank page

CHAPTER 16. THE ULTIMATE AS TRUTH.

@@ “Is the I permanent? Am I Keeping the I in the background?” This self examination must proceed every minute on the path of gnana yoga.

@@ Why is Brahman beyond speech? Because whenever you use a word, it implies a meaning, a thought. When you get a thought, there must be a witness of the thought apart from it. The thought is not, cannot know and does not grasp its witness.

@@ The final stage of Vedanta Path is called realization because it involves making real to oneself the ideas already studied, i.e. to experience them as such.

@@ Ask any professor of philosophy what is the meaning of ONE or whether ONE exists, and invariably he will give the wrong answer. He does not know that one cannot exist, it will always be two (the person who thinks of it and the idea of it, both thinker and thought, seer and seen; and that therefore the ultimate is not Monism but not-two i.e. non-duality. ONE is not monism but duality!

@@ Ignorance manifests itself as imaginations, ideas.

@@ The notion that it is true that intuition is used by the highest men but it is really insight, matured after constant reasoning, is incorrect. There is no insight needed because the Brahman is always there. When the clouds pass the moon is seen. No insight will reveal the moon of truth, only the passing of the clouds of ignorance. Hence there is no intuition or insight to be gained or matured, only a removal of something which obstructs. Were there something is to be ‘seen’ by insight, then it would be a false Brahman which is “without a second.”

---

<sup>222</sup> The original editor inserted “419” by hand.

@@ To critic who objects of what use is a characterless abstract Brahman, we reply: "You start with presumption that there must be a use; you are a worshipper of God 'use'; we however are primarily concerned only with whether it is true, and we want truth, whether it is going to be useful to us or not."

@@ The practical method which leads to realization is the incessant inquiry into reality, and the continual reminder that all, including yourself, is Mind, not body, pursued in and through the daily experience of life. This practice must go on for a long period until it becomes second nature, ingrained. Then it matures into realisation.

@@ If you say One there is always Two, because the person who says it is one and the thing is a second; hence non-duality is alone correct.

@@ The individual does not exist in Advaita. Hence we do not assert that our own system is true and others false: such a statement is the expression of egoism. We say that at such a stage A is true, at another stage B is true, etc. Thus we do not cling to any particular opinion, we are neither attached nor repelled by any system of opinion.

@@ The Vedantic use of term omniscient differs from the thologic. For us it means "knowing everything to be Brahman"; for them it means that God knows what is happening everywhere or that he knows how to make U-boats and every thing else in the world.

@@ We do not even say Advaita is true and Dvaita is false. Such a statement implies that you think so and thus you introduce the ego which vitiates the spirit of Advaita. Never say "I believe Vedanta, I hold to Advaita—because this egoism proves you do not know Vedanta!

@@ The opposition of practical and philosophic viewpoints is irreconcilable only at the beginning, when we have to effect a tentative separation of Drik from Drsyam. But later on in our study both are reconciled when the drsyam on deeper enquiry turns out to be nothing other than the Drik. Again so long as the drsyam is considered only as such, causality must be held as true of it, but when it is eventually merged into the Drik, then causality is seen to be inapplicable to it, because then it is seen to be the Drik. At this last stage, which is the Gnani's, there is no such thing as two viewpoints to be held simultaneously because they are opposed to each other; both are united in him because he has united all things as Brahman.

@@ The continued and unremitting practice of regarding the world as an idea must go on until it becomes your very nature. They only does theory become realization.

@@ You may talk of destroying the veil of ignorance, if there were a veil, but when you inquire you find the veil also is Brahman. So long as you do not discover truth, you will say there is a veil, I cannot know the truth etc.

@@ The Tibetan definition of non-dual as meaning neither of the two alternatives, such as "existence" nor "non-existence," is correct only so far as your intellectual conceptions go but not as an actuality or reality.

@@ If you say idea may vanish and the imaginer remains, then who sees that one remains? Again there are two entities. That is not what is meant. We mean non-duality, unthinkable, unspeakable. Who knows there is imagination? There must be someone. Hence duality; both are ideas, however. If they vanish, it is into the One, but that is not the same as monism.

@@ The word 'One' is ambiguous and misleading. There are two words used in Vedanta to clear

---

<sup>223</sup> The original editor inserted "421" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) up this ambiguity: one and “not-two” or “non-dual.”

@@ Truth is completely unified knowledge.

@@ Any written description or verbal reference to Supreme Reality can only be your imagination about it: hence the great Bhava kept silent when asked to tell of the Brahman. Silent is the only correct way of speaking of It!

@@ When nothing exists for you as in sleep or trance, and you have no doubt, you do not see Brahman; as yogis say; but only when everything exists as in waking, and you have no doubts, then only do you see Brahman. For then you know everything to be Brahman, and hence have no ignorance, i.e. no questions. Only when you have doubts, do you ask “What is this” What is that?” etc.

@@ Thing of Brahman as often as you think of your body. This is the best yoga, the yoga of eating, what you eat becomes Brahman. Page 263 verse 31 of Panchadesi says: Have indirect cognition through teacher and Sruti and then through a course of reason and enquiry one comes to know that he is Kutashtha directly. Knowledge is not established through mere study of scriptures but unintermittent inquiry is needed. Practice constant enquiry. Why are you slaves for the past 2000 years. Enquiry consists in getting the firm conviction that Jiva and Brahman are identical.

@@ Be ever interested in the enquiry into the nature of Atman, the Sakshin—this is the best Sadhana. c.f. Guru, Sishya etc. all engaged in ‘enquiring’ ceaselessly, to the good of both and all. One should differentiate the Self from the Non-self. Wisdom increases with a sharpened Buddhi, purified Mind.

@@ Western philosophy has not taught non-duality, but it has taught unity, which is not



(continued from the previous page) the same. This is a unique contribution of India. Non-duality means there is absolutely no second. If you have even an idea of non-duality it will not be non-duality. The idea is one and the thing another.

@@ The highest is to feel that the universe is myself, this is Gnana. To say the universe is in myself is not the highest. A man enjoys natural samadhi when he attains truth, not the sleep samadhi of the yogi.

@@ The real secret of Gnana yoga is that it is a continuous practice of enquiry whereby you try to eliminate all those ideas and objects which constitute the field of awareness, from the awareness itself. That is why it is called Gnana Yoga. That element of awareness which is contained in all ideas etc. is what you should seek. It is the unlimited element, not that which is limited to a particular thought or thing. Therefore we do not use the term consciousness because that implies being conscious of something, of a second. Even then, awareness is not quite the precise term, but there is no fit word available. Hence Upanishads describe this state as indefinable, unseparable and indescribable.

@@ This constant enquiry whereby you try to “sense” the awareness behind your within life, is Gnana yoga.

@@ Vedantic realization is quite different from Vedantic gossip, lecturing or writting.

@@ If you get Nirvikalpa by discrimination and enquiry, it is called Gnana. But if you get it by Patanjali yoga practice, it is not Gnana.

@@ By constantly enquiring all the 24 hours into the nature of Brahman, you will also automatically get the control of all ideas, imaginations emotions, etc. without practising yoga.

---

<sup>224</sup> The original editor inserted “423” by hand.

@@ Acts of the mind will only give you an idea, not Brahman: acts of the body will only give bodily or mental results, not Brahman. Therefore no action yields Brahman: the way to get it is only by dismissing ignorance of its ever-presence.

@@ If Brahman is beyond thought and speech, why study books or listen to lectures on Advaita? Reply: On the principle of using one thorn to prick another out of the flesh and then throwing both away, we use these books and lectures to remove wrong thoughts, misleading words, to get rid of erroneous assumptions about Brahman, thus removing our ignorance.

@@ When do you ask such a question as what is the cause of my illusion? It is when you are in the ignorance of duality. When mind rises to the truth of unity, it cannot ask any such question. Let the mind be rivetted to the truth of ultimate unity, and as soon as any doubt comes, it solves itself.

@@ Keno Upanishad page 69/70 verses 29 and 30 gives the illustration of the lightning-flash of Gnan vanishing from view instantly. However this flash has to be repeated many times perhaps hundreds, until it becomes stable and a steady fixed light. Zen Satori is not the same, because based on intuition, and hence not proved by reason and therefore open to each man's misinterpretations. This illumination comes only after constant and frequent reflection, thinking; hence the futility of Yoga to achieve it. Even the first single flash of understanding is true Gnana, but it has passed away, and you must seek its repetition constantly by such reflection until the light stays fixed and does not depart. However even after the first illumination, you will never be mistaken again for you will understand the

(continued from the previous page) true nature of things; although the permanent conviction may have to be established when you imagine a Brahman, there is both imagination and you—a duality. Thus you only get a thought in return—no more. You must keep aline the insight no matter what you are doing. This demands constant concentration throughout the day—not merely sitting to meditate for half hour. This flash is an absence of thought, like conscious sleep, where duality disappears. The first flash is the beginning of realisation and gradually ripens into full realisation. The process is to associate the insight gained by the first flash with everything that you do—eating, working talking, —with Brahman until it becomes settled realization. You repeat what you saw in the first flash by associating it at every moment henceforth—“This is Brahman, That is Brahman, this is Brahman etc.”

@@ Ramakrishna taught us to take one thorn and pick out the painful one, and then throw both in the river. This is how to use intellect in Vichara. Distinctions exist in this intellectual explanation of truth, in discussion and speaking of it, but not in the truth—realisation itself. So our method is elimination of what is not true, step by step, until all false ideas are removed.

@@ Nonduality ascertained by reason or after enquiry is alone Truth; and not the non-duality which you get through sleep, chloroform, yoga etc. The non-duality must be perceived in the waking state, by a sharpness of reason, of thinking—that moment in the waking state in which you know that the three states, waking, dream and deep sleep are only states (coming and going), it is knowledge. By non-duality we mean, even when there is duality, to know that there is only one thing,

---

<sup>225</sup> The original editor inserted “425” by hand.

(continued from the previous page) mind (or as in dream) or Atman, in waking state, after enquiry.

@@ In Asparsa yoga there is no second thing to be in touch with. If you realise Brahman you will know that there is no other to be in contact with. —If you know Brahman, you know it is Brahman. All other systems deal with duality.

@@ You must go on eliminating until all duality goes. Seeking yoga is the practice of Neti, Neti, not seeking the positive Brahman.

@@ The flashes of Gnan are only the first stage: afterwards your mind will see the whole truth.

@@ To those who say the ultimate things of truth cannot be known, the reply is, Who is it that says so? It is the 'I', therefore it is known as ultimate!

@@ Liberation (Moksha) is not something to be got after death, it means liberation from ignorance whilst alive.

@@ If you use the word Monism, that there is one God, the word one must have a meaning, be an idea, and cannot be final. Hence we reject term Monism and use instead "Non-duality."

@@ Truth is where no human mind can ever think of contradicting not merely my mind alone; where there is no thought, no other being, no thinking, no second; that is non-duality. There is nothing to be said about it; not even that we exist there, not even that happiness and peace are there.

@@ How can there be any discussion, any difference of view in a state where there is nobody else to argue with you or to oppose you. That is non-duality. How can any question arise?

CHAPTER 16  
THE ULTIMATE AS TRUTH

@@ When you use the words Ultimate Truth, Vedanta, you try to imagine what it is, and thus still remain in the world of duality.

@@ If you accept anything else than Non-duality, you must find contradictions, do what you like.

@@ When your mind is not thinking, as in dreamless sleep or samadhi, there is no duality; but this is not the same as the true non-duality of Gnana.

@@ We must get at the truth without imagination. All the philosophies of the world are based on imaginations and hence they contradict each other. Let a thousand persons imagine in a thousand different ways, but where is the proof? Each one hugs what he imagines to be true. Even the Void being a mental idea is also an imagination. You do not get truth because you are attached to particular peculiar ideas. Attachment is the root of all evil.

@@ To say that a thing exists, there must be a second to say so or a mind to know it, or a witness. This is objection made to making verbal statements about nonduality. Why you say "My ideas are gone", "My memory of youth is gone", "My childhood is passed" how could you know this unless there were something to say so. You must have been aware of a thing's or thought's non-existence, otherwise you could not say that it has come. On the same principle pleasure must co-exist with pain and you could form no understanding of one without the other. You must have white to know the meaning of black. The mind cannot think except by differentiation. Hence mystic says "I have achieved Ananda". It merely means that you have got something different from what you have already got. Hence when we say that no second thing exists we are positing that a knower existed and then there is no non-duality, as when we awake from sleep.

---

<sup>226</sup> The original editor inserted "427" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) When we talk whether in affirmation or negation, to make a statement about nonduality we imply the existence of one who says so. Only when nothing is said, (silence) is there, non-duality.

@@ Gnana could be realised suddenly (like Zen Satori) in the case of a fully ripe person, as Sir Isaac Newton could grasp mathematics fifty times quicker than most other men, whereas it may take ten to fifty years, or be impossible in case of a dull intellect.

@@ Gnana yoga is the same as Asparsa yoga<sup>1/2</sup> latter is not higher.

@@ Truth will eventually conquer, as mind evolves, because all its substitutes will break down through their defects, but it will take a long time.

@@ Are you imagining the seer, or are you yourself seeing everything in you and really knowing yourself as the seer? You may say, Yes, Brahman is everywhere, but you must distinguish between the imagined Brahman and the real self. You can think of something spread out in all space but that is not Brahman.

@@ It is called Gnana yoga because the practice of discriminating between thought and reality must be kept up for many years until it becomes habitual. This must even be pursued until the sense of the ideality of the world persists even amid earthly and personal sufferings.

@@ We are not pursuing non-duality. We are pursuing truth. We use non-duality only to cure the disease of duality.

@@ It is absurd to characterise Advaita as a negative philosophy because of its non-dualism, for it posits by negating, and declares all this to be Brahman hence it is not nihilism. "Everything is Brahman" is

(continued from the previous page) only one aspect of Vedanta: there are two aspects, the other being Neti, Neti: the latter is negative because we cannot reduce Brahman to words, but the former is surely positive.

@@ When the gnani sees the outer forms of a book like others he does not and cannot reject the form; for he knows immediately it is mind and Brahman. He has trained his mind to couple both together instantaneously. There is thus no conflict in his mind.

@@ The Gita makes the distinction: Knowing that a thing is true is not enough; it is a stage on the way to absolute conviction which is realisation. You may know and accept Mandukya, but without complete conviction as well as knowledge of its truth, you do not realise it. By constantly repeating it you will gradually get the full conviction of the truth of the unreality of the world.

@@ The Gnani thinks of both the individual personality he sees and of the Brahman that is in him: this is non-duality. He does not stop seeing John Smith, his nose ears etc. but with all that he knows the Brahman from which John Smith is inseparable. This is difficult to grasp, it is done by repeated practice over years; as Gnana yoga; had it been easy we need only to read a text book of Vedanta and millions would now have been gnanis.

@@ "I am looking at my own eyes, at my own body," — this is the practice, the attitude you should cultivate continuously and daily to enable you to realise truth. This is better than yoga.

@@ When a man is convinced of truth, which is above religion he will never change his position, or be converted to other concepts or systems.

---

<sup>227</sup> The original editor inserted "429" by hand.

@@ Vedanta is a study which takes many years. It is not merely a conceptual system and that it must be reached by effort. There is a difference between forming a concept and attaining it.

@@ For one second or one minute you may attain glimpse of Gnana, but only he who has disciplined and practised can make it a permanent part of this nature.

@@ Men may know Vedanta intellectually but they may still have their weaknesses, they still need to become fully convinced to the utmost: therefore realisation of its truth comes gradually.

@@ It is not enough to grasp the intellectual truth of non-duality; you must next fix your mind continually in it. i.e. you will get in glimpses at first but you must not rest there; you should stabilise them through constant reminder that the world is not separate from yourself, in order to become a gnani. Knowing the Atman to be non-dual is first stage, realizing it as such is second stage.

@@ The higher meditation comes at the stage after meditation at fixed hours has been practised and mastered. Then this is given up for self-recollectedness to be done throughout the day wherever one is and with out fixed times. That is the secret. It is Gnana-Gnosis.

@@ The reason why we say truth is non-duality is because where is two there is always opening for a doubt.

@@ If a man makes a positive or affirmative statement that he is a gnani or about ultimate truth, it is our duty to refute or criticise him. But if he does not make a statement we should keep quiet.



@@ When you fully understand that all this universe of ideas is Mind, and hence yourself, this means that it is all One. This understanding requires great sharpness and is itself realisation and one can go no farther.

@@ The less contradiction there is, the nearer-we get to truth, because latter is pure non-contradiction. This is the whole use of Vedantic argument.

@@ Those who have no conception of the Seer (drik) ignorantly apply logic to this non-objective world. But here it can have no reference at all because there is no duality here. Argument requires two or more things. So long as there is talk, so long as there is thinking even, there is objectivity (drsyam).

@@ Those who teach that the individual eventually merges in Brahman, as a river flows into the ocean are not teaching our true doctrine.

@@ For Reason shows that everything that is objective, whether it be physical thing or internal thought, is unreal. Hence it is Reason that can tell you what is the Truth and what is the Real but of course it cannot realize It. But nor can anything else. For everything can only give you an idea, i.e. something objective, something not the Drik. Mysticism may claim that it can step in at this point by bringing about the cessation of ideas and thinking but we reply, how can you show that this state is therefore the Realisation? A dog in deep sleep is not thinking.

@@ The truth is beyond all dualities, hence it is beyond both realism and idealism as they are opposed to each other.

@@ The definition of truth according to Vedanta is non-duality.

@@ Every philosopher may say he is using reason and thus arrives at truth. Yet, you object, their conclusions are contradictory. So their reasoning must somewhere be tainted by ego. However what is it that will be free from contradictions?

---

<sup>228</sup> The original editor inserted "431" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) Where there are no two, i.e. Only unity! How do we attain to this unity? This is the Advaitic method.

@@ The advaitin does not set up any position of his own because he knows non-duality to be truth and hence cannot differ from others whom he regards as himself, but shows the inconsistencies of all other positions. He sees the whole universe in himself, as in a dream with the same mind existing in all, so how could he quarrel with anyone.

@@ What is the difference between Atman and Brahman? When you dissolve all the world into ideas and then the ideas into yourself, knowing they are ultimately in you, that is Atman. When you actually see the universe before you and know that it is the same as yourself, that is Brahman. When you are dreaming and know that the dream pictures of cities friends etc. are yourself, that is Brahman. We have first to pass through the stage of discovering Atman and then only can we attain the stage of discovering Brahman. Nevertheless it must not be thought that the two are different both Atman and Brahman are one and the same thing but viewed from two different angles.

@@ The last service of Advaita philosophy is to tell you that the truth is non-duality. That knowledge when grasped, is the realisation of it also: there are no two separate things, viz. the rational knowledge and the realized knowledge and the realized knowledge of Brahman. But the rational knowledge ought not to be confounded with the intellectual knowledge, the latter is manasik and merely logical book-learning whereas the former is buddhick and is when the judging faculty perceives the truth for itself.

@@ When the mind tires of all the different philosophic views of the universe, it can finally seek, as Sankara points out, that where there is no contradiction possible.

@@ The nature of truth is to be free from contradictions. We approach nearer and nearer truth as we find less and less contradictions. The only thing which is so free is non-duality.

@@ Wherever there is impermanence and transiency, there is necessarily duality. But that which knows these things are passing away, that is the pure non-dual consciousness.

@@ So long as one thing or theory or idea can be contradicted by another, there cannot be truth. Only when there is no possibility of such contradiction, can say there is truth.

@@ Truth means advaita, non-duality only. It is impossible for it to be anything else.

@@ Truth can be communicated but that to which it points to—i.e. Reality—is incommunicable.

@@ If you know truth, then only will you know Brahman, because truth points to reality. That is why we have to learn truth first before we can realize Brahman.

@@ The lightning-flash actually eliminates the ego but it lasts for the minutest fraction of a second only; it is a kind of deep sleep in the midst of waking state, a return to the Unconscious. For the rest of the day it is of course impossible to eliminate ego, for we have to attend to personal affairs. Hence what we have to eliminate then is the attachment to ego.

@@ Philosophical thinking leads ultimately to the understanding that there IS something behind thought, the Witness itself. That is, there are two factors in thinking, the idea or object and the awareness or consciousness which is the thinker of the idea. Philosophy leads us to discover this latter factor and in this sense leads us to Truth. Even Reason itself has to go in non-duality.

@@ The yogi is one who is disciplining himself. The Gnana-yogi is one who is seeking gnan

---

<sup>229</sup> The original editor inserted “433” by hand.

(continued from the previous page) through his discipline. The latter is the last stage and therefore his discipline is different from that of all other yogis.

@@ The process of elimination can be applied to physics, metaphysics, religion, science, etc. and in the end you find that only Atman-Brahman is left. But they must first be gone through and evaluated – not dismissed with a word as mysticism does.

@@ Any doubts you have are only ideas, drsyam, and will pass like all ideas.

@@ Maya depends on Avidya, and avidya depends on individual ignorance which makes your mind imagine so many things.

@@ All that men believe in the realms of religion or mysticism are only ideas, after all.

@@ When the mind is thinking it can only think in terms of duality.

@@ The stages of teaching Advaita are (1) to reduce multiplicity to unity by reducing everything to mind. This is Idealistic Monism. (2) To ask what is this One, and to proceed to Non-duality, Brahman.

@@ You can never show that there is any object corresponding to your thought of it: how much less can you do so in the case of God? Hence you may think for a thousand years, as Ashtavakra says, of God but you will get only another thought. Similarly Drik Drsyā Viveka shows that all visualization of God, all meaning assigned to Him, is only a drsyam and never touches the Drik.

@@ Nearly all the ideal goals set up for human attainment by all the schools of philosophy, (except advaita), mysticism, religion and worldly outlooks, are nothing but ideas, transient drsyams, hence unreal!

@@ When Reason achieves perfection it realizes Brahman. Therefore if you have an intellectual

(continued from the previous page) knowledge of truth, you have still to realize it through constant study and practice.

@@ You cannot make a statement that the goal is this or that, that Reality is this or that, because that would imply it is a second thing.

@@ Those who teach that there is an eternal, never-ending progression, do not understand that this progression, itself is only an idea, hence a transient goal, not permanent reality. What is the use of finding happiness in such an endless progression? It is idea only.

@@ Unity can have no meaning without plurality, hence monism is nonsense.

@@ Whoever uses the word experience, such as a yogi talking of God-experience or a pseudo-Vedantin talking of Brahman-experience does not understand that the word implies the separate existence of something experienced, i.e. duality.

@@ The only thing that will allay doubts for ever is non-duality. When there are two, then doubts are sure to arise.

@@ Brahman should not be defined as Sat (existing) or Asat (non-existing) for neither of these two terms apply to it.

@@ Once a critic objected "Suppose I oppose your Advaita? Where is your non-duality then?" I replied: "What is it that you are opposing?" He said "Advaita." I said "You mean unity?" He agreed. "Do you understand it? If you did, you would then see that you were regarding yourself as one and Advaita as a separate entity. You were not regarding it as Oneness, otherwise there would be no opposed and no opposer. You were thinking of duality. Hence your criticism was not against Advaita but against duality. Your objection did not even touch Advaitic Non-duality. It was against an imagined advaita."

@@ Non-duality is the only standpoint from which nobody could ever swerve you: it is quite impossible to be shaken whereas nothing else

---

<sup>230</sup> The original editor inserted "435" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) can remain unshaken.

@@ Everything is Brahman and so even Maya is also Brahman. It does not ultimately go for it remains as Brahman.

@@ When you want to know what wood is, you have mentally to negate the names and forms of table, chair or door. This negation is an abstract affair, for the table, chair and door still remain, they do not physically disappear. In the same way if you want to know Atman you have mentally to negate all names and forms of objects but the objects do not actually disappear.

@@ Every thought as thought is known only by distinguishing it from its opposite. Pleasure (Ananda) implies pain. This is what Gita means by saying we must rise above the pairs of opposites, i.e. we must rise above the dualities inherent in thinking into non-duality. This is the real meaning of Advaita.

@@ If there are two entities there will be differences between them. If there are two persons, or even individual and God, there will be difference of opinion. Hence truth can only exist in non-duality. Hence the work of philosophy is to remove wrong ideas about truth from the mind and to remove duality from the outlook.

@@ All such terms as change, non-existence eternal etc. imply each other. Hence they are only ideas, mental constructions. Any word used will only be an idea that covers the Atman and does not reveal it. They will only keep people in the realm of discussion although it is quite necessary for practical truths which can never grasp reality; for it yields only thoughts, i.e. drsyam and is necessarily devoid of reality. All discussions of the nature of the Highest are mere imagination.

@@ Brahman cannot be known means that the word “known” can be used with reference to objects only.

@@ “Duality ceases to exist” — means duality as two separate realities ceases to exist. Duality still exists but the knower knows that they have not got separate existence in Reality, i.e. the duality has not got existence separate from the only ultimate reality. Unless you get at truth by enquiry, you have to take it for granted that there is duality (e.g. distinction between teacher and taught).

@@ Non-duality is not something taking for granted or a mere theory of the imagination. It is only a statement of the facts of experience.

@@ Brahma-gnan cannot be prevented from coming to any man by anything else because there is no duality really in him.

@@ We cannot say that it is One; we can only say that it is not two. This is where words fail etc. Buddha never said that it was Sunya.

@@ Vedanta is not Monism; it is non-duality.

@@ Nothing else should be thought of because it is not possible to think of anything else than all ideas exist only when there is duality. When you have a thought you are one and the thought is another. When is there a desire? You take food when it is assimilated by the system i.e. when it becomes one with it, i.e. when it is not something different from you, then only your desire is fully satisfied.

@@ The destruction of the world and Jiva does not mean that they should become imperceptible to the sense but there should arise a determination of its unreal nature. There should be a realisation of Brahman as real and not mere absence of cognition of the world.

@@ When you are something different from the other—i.e. when there is duality, there is no liberation.

---

<sup>231</sup> The original editor inserted “437” by hand.

@@ The suffering of life can be treated in two ways: either they are all Brahman or they are merely Maya (Idea); hence they can be treated with indifference, but they are both the same ways in the end.

@@ The fallacy in the argument that God punishes to purify us is that God made us and must have foreseen that we would have gone wrong. Why did He makes us like that? It is excusable in a father to punish his child because he could not foresee how the child would turn out, but it is inexcusable in God's case.

@@ Where is the visible connecting link between the present characteristics and past incarnation? This is a right criticism which may be made against rebirth theory. And where did the characteristics of the former births come from? To answer to this question is impossible for it brings you up against the problem of time and its beginning. It may be answered by "root-matter" or "beginninglessness" or "maya" but these are mere words, not ascertained facts. So that rebirth becomes a matter of belief really, unless you approach it scientifically.

@@ Karma doctrine is irrefutable for those who believe in causality, i.e. for ordinary people and scientists. We see in this world that every action brings results, that even if you escape now from the consequences of telling a lie the time will come either in this birth or another when you must suffer for it. But those who have given up belief in causal law because they rise to ultimate karma can also be given up.

@@ It is extremely difficult to define freedom or freewill, because every man has his own meaning for it. He is carried away by his feelings for what he likes and defines accordingly. Men have different standpoints and each thinks he is right.



## CHAPTER 16

### THE ULTIMATE AS TRUTH

@@ Those who talk of Brahman as the realization of unity, show erroneous understanding of both English and Vedanta. For unity implies duality as being correlated and therefore co-present. The correct word is “non-duality.”

@@ Duality means not the non-existence of a second thing but its non-existence as other than yourself. Mind must know it is of the same substance as the objects.

@@ All forms are of the nature of one Mind. All matter is of the same kind; even here you cannot find a second.

@@ Truth is possible only in duality, when there is both a knower and a known. Hence truth is your idea of a thing. Reality is the fact, the thing itself. Truth is used for communication about the reality. Ultimate truth, beyond all doubt and contradiction, can only be not your idea but the Reality itself. Hence Ultimate truth and ultimate reality are one and the same.

@@ Non-duality means the absence of concepts, when there are no thoughts, for all ideas of advaita are drsyam. The object is gone in non-duality.

@@ Being comes before knowing, an object must exist before it can be known. But in non-duality this distinction disappears.

@@ The Sankhya and Ramanujists say that even ultimately there is duality, that Spirit or Brahman is co-eval with Prakriti. I reply: Show them as being together, prove it. They cannot.

@@ It would be quite impossible to know the meaning of the figure one unless you had the many to discriminate it from. You cannot think even without having to discriminate one idea from another.

@@ If there were only non-existence or if there were only existence, you could never know it, owing to the lack of a second thing to discriminate it from. One of them cannot be thought of without the other.

---

<sup>232</sup> The original editor inserted “439” by hand.

@@ The questions of “existence” or “non-existence” can be applied only to drsyam, not to drik. And a drsyam is something that dies, whereas drik alone is permanent. Hence if you say Brahman exists, it is a drsyam which is doomed to perish, not the true Brahman.

@@ Prof. Reid said: “I distinguish between Truth as it is and Truth that the thinker can conceive and grasp.” But still even the idea of “Truth as it is” is an idea in our mind. We cannot say anything about a thing, which the mind cannot grasp and conceive. It is impossible and absurd to tell anything about something which the mind cannot grasp.

@@ How can we know that God is everywhere? It is not possible. Now what is God? It has no meaning for me. It is a mere sound to me. This Atman is the seer. We cannot prove the existence of any God which is everywhere apart from Atman.

@@ Knowledge of Atma only is true knowledge and not the absence of duality. Knowledge cannot destroy the world.

@@ Until you know the knower you do not know truth, for you will always be liable to change, to think perhaps this is truth or that is truth, to imagine different things at different times as truth. Hence only the realization of Drik, the knower which is changeless, is the true realisation for then you understand this will be final and permanent.

@@ Gnan requires constant looking into one’s own mind, examining one’s own thoughts, testing if they lead to truth, widening one’s sympathies, identifying with whole world, and all this must be done for a long time, for it grows slowly.

@@ When you get convinced, certain, of the truth that the world is nothing but Brahman, that there is no second thing, no ego, that very moment you become Brahman.

@@ Those who talk of Brahman as being Satchit-Ananda reduce it to a compound in which 2 ounces of consciousness, 3 ounces of bliss and 4 ounces of existence are mixed together in a test-tube, thus producing Brahman.

@@ It is one thing to glimpse the truth, but one may easily fall back into error at any moment. Therefore the further task is to hold permanently to that glimpse, to make it steady, part of your nature; unless it becomes firm, there is no gnan.

@@ If you think of individual things separately, you are ignorant. If you think of them as unity, you have knowledge. In the first case you will regard them as real and get attached by desire to this multiplicity. So to detach the minds of seekers from it, we first teach them idealism, pointing out that each object is an idea, therefore ephemeral and unreal. But this idealism is only a stage, a step, to dissolve the crude materialism. But advaitins are not idealists; they rise beyond it to Brahman, all ideas are then merged in Brahman which is not fleeting like ideas, not unreal. We are Brahmanists, not idealists.

@@ Every school that deals with the existence or non-existence of the Absolute merely imagines different things about it.

@@ Light: The Zoroastrian notion of Light and Darkness co-existing is a dualistic one. It is not true non-duality.

@@ You can never know a thing. For knowing implies a duality and the object can never be known. But if knowing means being then there is no difficulty of duality.

@@ How can you have “non-dualistic experience” as P.N. Srinivasacharia says? For that implies that you are one thing and the experienced is another, hence it is dualistic.

@@

---

<sup>233</sup> The original editor inserted “441” by hand.

@@ Fear implies duality; if there is only non-duality, there is no fear.

@@ See what is between two ideas. When you catch the mind between the two ideas “horse – ox” then you catch the non-dual, but the mind should be sharp enough to do it.

@@ If Advaitic position could be grasped by its critics, they could never controvert it. For it sees nothing as different, but maintains it is all one, not two.

@@ If you enquire into the kshetra, the prakriti, it will dissolve and vanish in non-duality.

@@ All religions imply duality, in some form or another, saying, if you do this you will get that. There is no truth of oneness there. Hence all are erroneous.

@@ The chief thing to be learnt is we do not know a second thing.

@@ Duality= One thing different from another.

@@ You have to practice thinking that you are neither the doer nor the enjoyer, and thus you will gradually realise a state where whatever is seen is only Atman.

@@ The occasional “lightning-flash” glimpses are not enough. They must be stabilised. The yogi may get such glimpses but only in the gnani are they stable.

@@ Truth can come only from the non-existence of duality.

@@ When does desire appear in the ego? When there is thirst for a second thing, i.e. when duality is believed in. So ultimately all human bondage is to be traced to wrong (dualistic) philosophy. Desire cannot go whilst duality is accepted. Ego means duality. Body means that you regard the second thing as real. We do not say there is no second thing, but that its individuality is not real.

## CHAPTER 17. PRACTICAL PHILOSOPHY

@@ What is the common feature between my idea of beauty and yours? For I think the figure of Eali beautiful, with its large mouth, grotesque expression, fierce teeth, but you think it ugly. This is the enquiry into the meaning of the word "beauty" and not merely to say it.

@@ Nowhere on earth is complete harmony or perfect adjustment surroundings with one's environment to be found.

@@ In all matters emotional, such as art and religion, there will always be a variety of standards, tastes and judgments.

@@ The mystical theories of Beauty taught by Plato are childish. Schopenhauer and Croce rise higher as they come to see it is more mental. Kant admits beauty is mental but, being an objective idealist, he says it is caused by a separate outside thing.

@@ It is not correct to say music is a universal language, because Western music does not generally appeal to Eastern ears and vice versa. We can only say it is wider than words. It is not a question of evolution of taste but of what children are trained to appreciate.

@@ What is meant by "successful?" It is a word which is most ambiguous. What is success from one standpoint, may be failure from another.

@@ The Nazi ideal is merely an animal one. It does not rise higher than that. For what is it exclusively concerned with?

@@ Indian philosophy goes to the very root of human action for it asks why has the thought of ethics come at all to man.

@@ The problem of evil pain and suffering exists whilst we do not perceive that everything is Mind, unity, and particularly whilst we regard the body as real. It is insoluble so long as the body is taken to be real. But when you see the body is only an idea and that the reality is Kind, then the suffering merges into this mind. Like all ideas the idea of body disappears

---

<sup>234</sup> The original editor inserted "443" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) back into the mind and really was the mind all the time. Constant practice is needed to instil the outlook that everything is one, Mind, none other than it, not a separate thing thought of as being different from Mind and so its pain is regarded as you would regard the pain of a dream-body after you awaken. The reply to Joad's criticism that science reveals the existence of animal suffering long before human race appeared on the planet, is that he over-looks that it is all Mind, and therefore in relation to oneself; we think this; they are ideas relative to us and inseparable from us. To think of suffering is to think of separate entities as being real and to forget that there is only One, Brahman, pure Mind.

@@ Science acknowledges continuity of the past into the present; thus it acknowledges unconsciously the mental and moral continuity of man, i.e. Karma.

@@ We find room for poetry and art in the philosophic life, only we go deeper also and enquire. Why does man appreciate art and write poetry?

@@ KARMA: The Karma theory applies to the human kingdom alone so far as we known. It breaks down if we attempt to apply it to the animal kingdom. All we can say is that throughout Nature one thing lives on another, thus unconsciously seeking to establish unity with it. Only in man does the effort to unify achieve its higher level and succeed truly, because in him reason has consciously arisen. The final position is that when you know that the whole theory is Mind, then the questions of pain and suffering and preying among animals collapse.

@@ In the artistic stage, people want what pleases their imagination, not what is true.

CHAPTER 17.

@@ We cannot correctly say that all mankind have progressed. We can only rightly say that some have progressed and others have not.

@@ Why is Karma yoga really based on Gnana yoga? Because it is work without expecting return. If you do expect, then it means you have not separated yourself from the thing expected, i.e. duality. Also it teaches elimination of ego.

@@ Man ever seeks his happiness: this is quite natural. None—not even myself—is the exception to this rule. All must seek it in some form or other.

@@ The value of philosophical study must show itself in what good you do in the world. Of what earthly use is it to humanity, if philosophers argue on the top of Mount Kailas or squabble in schools on the interpretation of books? Unless it has a bearing on practical life, it is useless. Unless it includes men to work for benefit of all it is useless. This is the only worth-while test of philosophy.

@@ He who has to go to Kailas to find peace, knows nothing of Vedanta. Any man in any place, if he has got the knowledge of truth can enjoy peace. Whether in place or cave, he knows both to be illusions (ideas) and does not depend on such.

@@ All the grand places you have visited, what are they now? Only ideas in your mind, i.e. imaginations! The sage contents himself by reflecting that he too can imagine these places even if he does not go there. So he is not filled with craving for the pleasures of travel.

@@ The best way to do good to humanity is to educate and enlighten them in gnan. All other ways are inferior. For the ramifications of the influence and changes resulting are enormous in comparison.

@@ What is meant by value? The word has no meaning. For the values that appeal to me will not

---

<sup>235</sup> The original editor inserted “445” by hand.

(continued from the previous page) appeal to another man. Where is the standard?

@@ Advaita is finally to be judged from the point of view of the life we lead and not mere words, the practical good it can do rather than abstract discussions, the reasoned ethical guidance it can give rather than dogmatic injunction.

@@ “If thou art ignorant perform action to purify the self. If thou art wise and knowest truth do thou perform action for the protection of the masses.” —Sankara. It is because this attitude is lost that India has been ruined.

@@ Renounce means to look upon the whole world as an idea.

@@ Even if you have known Brahman you have to work for the masses.

@@ Shedding of all prejudices is necessary to knowledge.

@@ Writers who refer to humanity’s social or economic progress or retrogression usually and unconsciously refer only to the particular country where they live: similarly Western writers ignore the East.

@@ The Gnani is undislodged inside no matter whether he is outwardly enjoying woman or doing business.



CHAPTER 17.

@@ Results are the best test. The results of truth are its test. But the good results of truth may not be apparent in a short time. Truth takes its own time. In the long run Truth will endure and triumph, when religion and faulty teachings will crumble and disappear. Though 2,000 years have passed since Christianity started, unchristian war exists still.

@@ Intellectuality can be used for perverse destructive purposes equally as for higher beneficent ones.

@@ Sex gratification requires a certain amount of cruelty in its physical expression; this is the sadism of it; and therefore the psychologists who say that cruelty is often repressed sexuality are correct.

@@ The difference between religions, science, art, etc. and philosophy is that the former study only one aspect of life whereas philosophy studies the whole of life. The truth and test of this is the results we witness all around us to-day. Religion has failed to improve man's conduct towards his fellows of another religion. Science has turned warfare into massacre and so on. Philosophy however wants all the aspects of life, and is comprehensive, and is everywhere, and wants all aspects to be considered costed and weighed. It says let us put all these aspects together, use scientific methods of proof, gain a synoptic view, and know what life really is. Bacon said "Philosophy takes all knowledge for its province."

@@ Do not make the mistake of prescribing mere religion as a cure for the world grief, but point out that the only remedy is TRUTH and that the world is yet to find truth, and that only by honest enquiry can truth be found.

@@ Attachment means taking an object as real. When the mind thinks enjoyments are real, it needs knowledge and discipline. Europeans are in this state and seek enjoyments whereas Indians

---

<sup>236</sup> The original editor inserted "447" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) think less of world-enjoyments. Both need to be brought back to a middle point.

@@ If you want to know the higher philosophy you must give up both love and hatred, attraction and repulsion. But in the practical world and from the lower standpoint both are essential, for you must hate vice and love virtue. From the ultimate standpoint, however, love is not possible without an implication of hatred, and vice versa. Both are logical opposites within a whole.

@@ Science has not ruined the West. The improper use of the science has hurt it. Make a proper use of science.

@@ Even eating vegetables is killing life, but it is one degree higher than meat-eating and hence preferable for seeker.

@@ When you see a beautiful woman, you may acknowledge and recognise her beauty, without desiring to embrace her. This is called purifying the senses. It is different from asceticism. For you know her to be also Brahman, not merely body. It is difficult however and that is why Sanyas is prescribed for the early stages, when the seeker must keep aloof from contact with women, until he is properly self-disciplined.

@@ "Balance" is the essential teaching of Vedanta. Thought must be balanced by action, solitude by service in society, Nature by cities.

@@ The test of truth is not satisfaction of human individuals, races or nations, but happiness of all beings.

@@ Spiritualism is true from the standpoint of ordinary man and material world, but false from the Vedanta standpoint. Waking world and dream world, material world and spirit world rise and fall together.

@@ Ordinary morality does not exist for Vedanta, neither virtue nor morality. Its test is the wide one of the benefit of the ALL, all life

(continued from the previous page) whether animal or human, of compassion to all.

@@ Truth rights negation, and implies absence of harmfulness, of contradiction and conflicts. Where it is present there alone is harmony, whether between husband and wife, Government and people, and nation and nation. This is the practical application of truth.

@@ REBIRTH: A man must be born a large number of times before he reaches satiety with worldly births.

@@ REBIRTH: Samskaras of the mind can lie buried deep for many years and then re-appear suddenly into conscious life. Thus a man who met Swami Vivekananda for a few minutes and was apparently unaffected by it, had a vision of the Swami 20 years later and as a result gave up immoral life and donated much money to the Ramakrishna Ashram at Bombay. Explanation is that Vivekananda's more powerful mind did deeply plant some samskaras in the other man's but they lay in the subconscious for 20 years. It is really the same thing as samskaras appearing out of former births and manifesting in the present one.

@@ Transmigration means identification with one object at one time, with another at another time. Disappearing is an impossibility. Because it is always real, it never disappears. It is always Brahman and it cannot disappear, i.e. objects and ideas, the whole universe, how can they cease to be Mind (as dream objects) or Brahman. It cannot disappear, whether you see the dream mountain or if you do not see it, everything is mind. There is no such thing as going and coming.

@@ Highest ideal in Vedanta is to feel that the whole world is one, that if a man in England is harmed you feel with him.

@@ To learn by erring and suffering is the surest path to truth.

---

<sup>237</sup> The original editor inserted "449" by hand.

@@ Objection is made that if all activity is idea, why do not advaitins sit quiet and refrain from action? This criticism is based on false notion that the body is real, but world is only idea. It is only half a truth, and misleads Western critics.

@@ If the yogis can send spiritual thought-waves as effective service to mankind, why did not Vivekananda sit quiet in India instead of going to America? He could have sent his thoughts to U.S.A. if they could have sufficed. But the man with brains knows that such procedure produces zero results. Therefore the Swami had to go to America and he wanted to help the American people. Look at every part of India and see what futile practical results these yogis' mystic powers have led to.

@@ Gandhi's doctrine of Ahimsa is applicable only to those who have renounced the world, such as Sanyassins and yogis. When he attempts to prescribe it as a universal rule for all classes of people he is making a great mistake. One should deal with people according to the level of their understanding, their character, and their degree of evolution. There is a passage in the Mahabharata which points out that when dealing with brutal men you should use if necessary brutal methods and that men who behave like wild beasts should be checked firmly or even destroyed in exactly the same way as we deal with wild animals. This is in order to protect humanity. However in view of the fact that Indians are an unarmed nation Ahimsa is the only doctrine that they can practice and from that standpoint Gandhi is a clever politician in trying to give a religious sanction for what is merely a matter of policy.

@@ Philosophy is all-comprehensive and deals with the totality of life. It rejects nothing

(continued from the previous page) but asks, “What is the profound meaning and value of this dancing, this aesthetics, this religion, this science, this yoga, etc.? Why does this flower, music, sculpture give me pleasure? Each of them has their value, also its limitations, so philosophy will not limit itself to any one of them but views the whole.

@@ The doctrines of “God-chosen race” for spiritual purposes belong to religion: philosophy stands aside from them because there is no proof. It does not however deny them but it will not accept them.

@@ The Yogi shut their eyes, cut themselves off from the world and thus imagine they have destroyed misery. It is like getting rid of pain by taking chloroform. The yogi takes chloroform and is thus not aware of misery, but it is a temporary process. Gnana alone faces the misery, penetrates, understands and conquers it by knowledge.

@@ One must be sure that what one is doing is right which is done by knowing Truth.

@@ All the branches of higher human culture – whether religion, science, philosophy or psychology or art – should stand upon a single foundation of Truth, because it is the ultimate basis and inspiration of them all.

@@ The wider a man’s sympathies the nearer he is truth, the narrower his prejudices the farther from truth.

@@ Do not condemn anything but try to see to what particular stage it belongs. It is according to the stage; all is relative in ethics and custom. It varies. The man who rises into Absolute Good is alone the truly good man.

@@ Whatever spiritual profit the yogi gains by his practice, it is for himself, for the individual alone and not for the benefit of society. That is why India has been so little improved by the yogis, that is why impoverished India has degenerated despite the presence of

---

<sup>238</sup> The original editor inserted “307” by hand.

(continued from the previous page) its yogis.

@@ KARMA Whoever says “It is God’s will” does not know what he is talking about. It implies that he could see into God’s mind.

@@ Peace is possible only when there is no two. c.f. Panchama himself protesting to get near a Brahmin. Such is his slave mentality. Likewise with regard to ignorant in regard to God or Brahman. Note that equality is the modern spirit. Samathwam as of old. Samadhi is used in Vedanta as Samathwam.

@@ The man who makes enquiry, questions everything. “What is pain, what is pleasure?” etc. He asks and finally sees that everything is Brahman, including both pleasure and pain. The Yogi however thinks that by making himself insensible to pain he avoids it. He gets into a kind of sleep which he calls Samadhi and thus removes pain temporarily. He shuts himself away from pain, whereas Gnani deliberately examines it.

@@ The yogi ignores the sufferings of people near him because he has not reached true Gnan. For he does not see them in himself as one with him.

@@ The idea of brotherhood of religion is very good, but it has nothing to do with truth.

@@ There have been so many religions, philosophies and mystics. How is the world better for it all? None.

@@ When I know all is Brahman I can help others who are suffering, because I consider him as myself, and consider that I am suffering in him. I see a second person, duality, but I know as a gnani that he is the same person as myself. If everyone sympathised with everyone else then gnana would have been universal. Gnani knows truth and always acts to help others whereas ordinary man may or may not help others. The Gnani knows all life is One, ignorant man does not, that is

(continued from the previous page) the difference between them.

@@ Ceylon land scheme is excellent. I myself proposed it to the Dewan of Mysore for waste coast areas jungle of our state, to settle unemployed, but he refused.

@@ There is no opportunity to develop your character if you run away to a cave. The opportunity can come only when you have to deal with others, i.e. in society. Most of those who run away are seeking personal satisfaction and fall deeper into the ego by this absence of opportunity to uplift or unselfishly help someone; there must be a second person present i.e. in society, to permit you to unfold character.

@@ Is this enjoyment of body with women a reality or a fleeting idea? After it is over you do not want her or get disgusted. If it is a reality I want it for ever. But it is not. The same objection applies to poetry and art. Value these emotional things. You cannot eliminate them, but do not over-value them. Express them in their secondary place and pursue reality.

@@ "If suffering goes, happiness too goes." says Sankara. Does not enjoyment even in Heaven tire you? Sometimes happiness too becomes suffering. Happiness and misery, a pair of indispensables in life. There is no energy without opposites. Complete liberation is complete death.

@@ The man who learns that world sense-objects are unreal, loses his taste for them and thus gradually becomes detached.

@@ Misery cannot disappear so long as you have the sense of reality of this duality (Mand.332)

@@ If once you know what Atman is, you are no more in bondage; there is no necessity for you to do any particular thing or avoid any other since he has nothing to gain or

---

<sup>239</sup> The original editor inserted "453" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) lose. It is not the doing or non-doing, i.e. action and actionlessness refers only to the body.

@@ Happiness is not a characteristic of Atman for it is merely an idea, an imagination that comes and goes. It is only for beginners that we sugar-coat the pill of truth by saying that if you get Brahman you will be blissful. Later they will learn to seek truth for its own sake, irrespective of bliss or happiness.

@@ The reality is called “beyond suffering” because when you attain it, you have nothing more to be sorry for as everything will be known to be there in the Real, and cannot be lost.

@@ The existence of desire in man is a confession that he is seeking something outside himself. This proves he does not know the truth of his self, because there all is satisfied. The Atman-knowledge gives contentment.

@@ Non-duality alone is fearlessness and bliss. For even if there is God, there is a second, and you may fear that God will get angry with you. When all imaginations are taken away, there is only non-duality left. The best illustration is deep sleep, where there is no fear. So, if you attain a state where there is no second, you attain bliss and fearlessness.

@@ When the world is enquired into and then known to be Brahman, the mind becomes tranquil of its own accord without ordinary yoga practice, for example, if we are attracted by woman, we analyse, enquire, into her body, find it to be mere blood, flesh, bone, feces, unpleasant things, etc. and thus the attraction to her dies down of itself through the use of reason.

@@ God goes together with truth and cannot be separated from it. For when you see the



(continued from the previous page) real nature of human beings there is then real harmony with them. Even conflicts between them all will disappear when truth is reached.

@@ If you think that eating and working are realities, separate from the Supreme Reality, then you are dualistic, and will shrink from Brahman. We do not deny them but say they too are Brahman.

@@ The Gnani's idea of service will comprehend that whilst he tries to relieve physical suffering, to remove ignorance is still higher and more necessary service.

@@ The Gnani may indeed be a householder, but he will take whole world as his family, for he has given up the ego.

@@ Duty means an act to be done for the good of others.

@@ All activity is Brahman when done rightly. Even sexual intercourse may be right when it is done not for one's selfish pleasure but for the good of others, and when the mind is controlled to regard it as Brahman. When however the man feels he must go and have a woman, otherwise he will not be happy, then he is caught in egoistic attachment, and is unable to see her as Brahman.

@@ When you realise that the I does not exist, then you cease to want anything for yourself, but you may passionately, like Vivekananda, want it for the help of others.

@@ There is a difference between universal brotherhood and universal unity. The former is only a preliminary stage of the latter. Brothers fight each other in law courts, christians fight their brother-christians, etc.

@@ Wherever there is dualistic outlooks there will be hatreds and contradictions.

@@ The real meaning of doctrine of non-violence is that if you harm others it is equivalent to harming yourself.

---

<sup>240</sup> The original editor inserted "455" by hand.

@@ Vedanta says that what is truth must be truth everywhere in life, even in social and practical realms. If you know truth of unity, you will bring it into practical world also.

@@ The Gnani's aim is to bring others to realise Brahman and thus bring them to highest happiness. This is vedantic happiness or peace, his material services are but steps on the way to this.

@@ The test of truth is how far it has benefitted humanity; its verification is: Does it do any practical good to the world? (See Mandukya P.247). Religion may seek the well-being of some, yoga of the individual, but vedanta seeks the well-being of ALL

@@ Hitler will have to pay for his brutal murder of the poles. He thinks this will make him happy, but the contrary will make him happy, but the contrary will happen.

@@ Hitler thought that he could help his people by hating others—the Jews. Lenin thought he could build a new society on a similar basis—class-hatred. Both will prove wrong and their work a failure because hatred offers no enduring basis.

@@ Unless Vedanta promotes the well-being of All, it should be thrown away: this is the difference between it and all other philosophies. They may teach universal brotherhood, but this is quite different from the feeling of Oneness in Vedanta. There are separate individuals in brotherhood but none apart in oneness, or identity.

@@ To learn by erring and suffering is the surest path to Truth.

@@ Germany has studied Sanskrit more deeply than most Indians, yet look at the futility of their word-knowledge. For today the Germans are the greatest egoists and murderers! It is not enough to repeat Sanskrit wisdom

(continued from the previous page) like parrots, but it must be lived. And the highest test of it is the universal sympathy which it produces. The greater the true knowledge, the wider the sympathy, and as we rise higher, the less the distinctions which we make.

@@ Everything is included in Vedanta, for it is universal knowledge; therefore politics is also within its sphere. It is rubbish to say that sages must not meddle with politics.

@@ If you think of all dream experiences as being pure mind, all waking experiences as being pure Brahman, it will be alright.

@@ Truth will prevail one day throughout the whole world, because untruth will ultimately prove insufficient and must fail, let it be a thousand years hence, but it will surely prevail.

@@ KARMA: When I previously said that the man who eats goat-meat will be reborn as a goat this needs to be qualified. The real factor governing rebirth is not what he actually eats but the strongest and most dominant thought in his mind. If therefore he is always thinking strongly about goat, but if he is thinking more strongly of God or other things then he will not be reborn as an animal.

@@ The Gnani can kill a snake to save a threatened child and not incur any karmic sin, because he will be acting without ego: it is being done for another, not for himself.

@@ Science acknowledges continuity of the past into the present; thus it acknowledges unconsciously the mental and moral continuity of man, i.e. Karma.

---

<sup>241</sup> The original editor inserted "457" by hand.

ETHICS.

@@ Do not think when I say the world is a dream or man but an idea, therefore both are to be ignored as empty. For must as a dream person seems to be real and you also seem real, both being on the same level i.e. you think others and yourself are real or unreal together. Therefore do not think your own body to be real, demanding food for it, and yet think that other's bodies are unreal, and their sufferings are not worth believing. This is error. A further point is that in dream all the friends you see and yourself are made of one stuff—Mind. Therefore the moment you make a distinction between yourself and another man, there is no Vedanta. The goal of Vedanta is to see the other man's sufferings as your own. Because in dream all the scenes and all the people are made of the same essence as yourself, they are of the same essence as yourself, they are as real as you are. Whatever I am, you are. I cannot be dissociated from you, the whole world is one. Do not treat other people as mere ideas but your own self as real. If they are ideas, so are you. If you are real so are they. Hence you must feel for them all just what you feel for yourself.

@@ Although working selflessly for the welfare of others it is the natural fruition of attaining Gnan, still even the aspirant on lower stages must also strive to emulate this ideal because nobody jumps into selfless service in a single day, but he must keep on trying to practice it even whilst he is yet imperfect. Thus he is learning how to be a gnani.

@@ The more a man talks about his I or pushes it forward, the more others will arise and pull him down or kick him. It is an inevitable reaction.

ETHICS.

@@ It is your duty to help another person who is being harmed. How much more so with the Gnani who feels the other person to be himself, that there is no difference between him and himself. In the first case the 'I' is present, because duality exists, in the gnani's it is absent because of non-duality. Hence the gnani having identified himself with the rest of humanity, feels their pains as his own when he sees them suffering.

@@ Non-dualistic Gnani does not give up anything, for all is Brahman.

@@ The Gnani does not look at everyone as of no consequence, because he looks upon them as a dream. He cares for them as much as for himself. Knowing his own ultimate reality, he knows they too are ultimately real as Atman into which their forms are melted as a jewel is melted into the same gold.

@@ Even the Gnani must use his ego to fight ordeal with wicked people who themselves manifest ego; thus he will use his own ego to remove another's ego, as one uses a second thorn to pick out the first which is stuck in your flesh. But with harmless people he will not show ego.

@@ The gnani is neither elated nor depressed by the vicissitudes of fortune because he knows that everything is Atman, that in Reality he has neither experienced loss or gain, that everything is as it is, unchanged Brahman.

@@ In the earlier stage of Gnana Yoga, whenever the thought rush to relieve his suffering in order to overcome this feeling of duality by identifying yourself with the other person. In the advanced stage or ultimate realisation of Gnana however, you do not see the suffering person as different from yourself, and therefore help is given as a part of

---

<sup>242</sup> The original editor inserted "459" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) yourself. He is Brahman, you are Brahman, and there is neither he nor you at this stage, although you see him still. It is like relieving pain of one finger when gnani relieves another's pain.

@@ Pragmatism does not apply to gnani, for whom everything is Brahman. Gnanam is much more than ethics. e.g. Nasik Sadhu. A dog steals his roti (bread), the Sadhu runs after him with the ghee to give it to the dog.

@ When everything is Brahman there is no action or inaction for him. Both are Brahman to him. To the extent to which one is able to sympathise with and help another, to that extent he has got Brahman, and that is Brahman, Truth. The less you identify yourself with your ego and body, the more is your chance of identifying yourself with others, with the "sarvam" or "whole"; that is to say the more is your possibility to realise the Truth, here and now.

@@ What is the use of actionlessness to the Gnani when he is merely a looker-on in action or in inaction? If there is a desire for True knowledge, good action means making others happy. Such action may hasten your realisation of Truth.

@@ You have reached Truth when you regard pleasure and pain of all creatures equally as your own.

@@ Morals are inseparably allied to religion. When the latter is decaying in character and influence, then morality decays with it. World crisis reveals this and thus forces the people to seek for new religion or improvement of the old religion or in fewer cases to rise above religion altogether to mysticism or philosophy.

@@ Unless you practically realize your oneness with your fellow men, in their suffering, there is no gnan.

POLITICS.

@@ The failure of the League of Nations is primarily due to the fact that the United States deserted it so early in its career when it was too young and immature to have developed into strength. This was due to America's selfishness.

@@ Although it is impossible to teach philosophic truth to all mankind, nevertheless, some step forward in this direction are certainly practicable. The most important and most urgent of these is to give ethical instruction in every school either as a part of the lessons in religion or as a part of moral instruction. And this teaching should be that all humanity is one family and therefore all should be treated with goodwill. For without such education people will merely drift into narrow selfish ways whereas with it the young impressionable minds of children will be gradually guided towards unity. Education is the most important instrument for effecting such improvements.

@@ I agree with you that one of the most important post war reconstruction problems will be how to deal with the younger generations of Germans whose minds have been poisoned by the Nazi Educational system. How are they to be mentally disinfected? The way to solve this problem is to institute compulsory adult evening or Sunday classes where they will have to learn the ideas of internationalism and the oneness of the human family. This will gradually influence them towards truer views.

@@ Although I advocate constitutional gradualism as path for India's journey to freedom, still the Congress should keep up agitating as thus they move the selfish interest of Britain to make necessary advances, which would otherwise not be made voluntarily.

---

<sup>243</sup> The original editor inserted "461" by hand.

WOODROW WILSON: “A man who thinks himself as belonging to a particular national group in America has not yet become an American. The man who goes among you to trade upon his nationality is no worthy son to live under the stars and stripes.”

MAHABHARATA (SANTI PARVA) “Only such as advance the interests of all the people alike (equally) deserve to be citizens in the state.”

PROTAGORAS. “Man is really measured, not by what he says, not by what he appears to be, nay, not even by what he does, but by what he thinks in his mind.”

BHAGAVAD GITA: (How Gnani behaves): P.92. “Without<sup>244</sup> abandoning action, with a view to set an example to the world. P.93. Having regard also to the purpose of preventing the masses from resorting to a wrong path, you ought to perform action. P.94 V.22,23,24: He has achieved his ends and realised the Self. P.95: Even he should work for the welfare of others, though for himself he may nothing do. Who knowing the Self, thus seeks the welfare of the world, there is nothing to do except to be with a view to the welfare of the world at large. P.273: He regards all beings as himself. He is friendly and compassionate. He is full of compassion for the distressed, i.e. he has offered security of life to all beings; he is a sannyasin. P.216: He regards the pleasure and pain of all creatures equally with his own (i.e. that they should affect them just as they affect himself.”<sup>245</sup>

---

<sup>244</sup> The original editor added open double codes by hand.

<sup>245</sup> The original editor added closed double codes by hand.



CHAPTER 17 KARMA:

@@ Mind is creative. Gita says if at the last moment of death you think of certain things you take rebirth in a certain form accordingly. Thus mind creates the body; the new mind is the outcome of the old thought. Similarly the wars in the outer world are materializations, appearances, of the mental hates, greeds and enmities in the thoughts of men.

@@ Karma has nothing to do with God or religion. He does not arbitrarily manipulate its working. It is a necessary teaching for the West to follow rationally. Otherwise those who give up religion will go to the dogs morally. Europe needs this teaching most urgently. Karma doctrine has kept India moral much more than God-belief. Buddha taught it as a central feature. You must emphasise it for the benefit of Europeans with natural tendencies. It can be scientifically explained. Karma is as real in the empiric world as the law of causality.

@@ The Gnani's motto will be to accept good fortune calmly if it comes but to remain equally calm if bad fortune comes. He will not jump for joy if favours are shown to him, nor be discontented if abuse is hurled at him.

@@ Whoever believes in duality, is certain to lose or to suffer in the other part of duality. Death must come and take his world away. Whoever believes in non-duality, however, finds all things are within himself still.

@@ Life is really a perpetual effort to get rid of sorrows, troubles, wants and desires. Hence each bliss is really their removal, but it is a never-ending process if philosophy is not practised.

@@ It is impossible to have the thought of happiness without having the thought of misery from which to discriminate it. Hence world-happiness without world-misery being also present, is impossible.

---

<sup>246</sup> The original editor inserted "463" by hand.

@@ As knowledge at once gives emancipation, it is quite optional on a gnani's part to meditate or not. Scriptures loudly proclaim that final release is due only to knowledge.

CHAPTER 17; KARMA:

@@ Can we read the future? It is a characteristic of primitive beliefs to accept blindly and wholly such doctrines as palmistry and astrology. The spread of science however will check these beliefs. Science should investigate and test them and anything in them found to be true will be retained and the rest rejected. But no scientist will begin by believing them. The average palmist who is supposed to interpret the palm-lines is usually interpreting his own imaginations about the client.

@@ Wherever possible use science as the basis for all teachings for illustrations and proof, particularly making use of the Theory of Evolution in its application to the idea of Rebirth with the ideal of ultimate perfection at the end, using Huxley's favourable statement on the Theory of Rebirth.

@@ Make use of scientific laws of (a) Conservation of Energy, (b) Equal Return and (c) Heredity. Point out that the Theory of Rebirth was not digested by the early Christians and hence its rejection.

@@ Evidence of Rebirth: Consciousness is a stream of continuity. It must have come from somewhere before birth of body: body-heredity, true, but what if consciousness heredity? We can't say where consciousness came from, but rebirth is logical. We can't say when mind begins or at which point a being begins to reason for even animals show an ambryonic thinking power. Reason declares there must have been a cause for this, and the cause can only have been pre-existence, past experience, reincarnation.

@@ The sufferings of mankind are Nature teaching man to seek truth. The strife of mankind, i.e. the truth is not known.

@@ Suffering leads to doubts only when it becomes acute enough.

---

<sup>247</sup> The original editor inserted "465" by hand.

@@ It is quite erroneous to believe that we alternately reincarnate as male and female, or that we reincarnate for a few births as male and then for a corresponding number of births as female. Those who are weak intellectually or very emotional are born as women and continue to be born as women until their brains develop when they are reborn as men. On the other hand men whose brains degenerate and become emotional are reborn as women.

@@ There is no doubt that thought creates environment even though it may not succeed in doing so till a later birth.

@@ Both fate and freewill are seen in life because the human mind thinks in dualities; by getting rid of this contradiction as being a condition of human thought, we rise above causality and its failure.

@@ Both elements are in the world; fate and freewill; causality and non-causality – such as chance or accident.

@@ People will not listen to philosophy. Therefore the only teacher who really impresses lessons upon them is suffering.

@@ Freedom and necessity are relative terms; both go together. You cannot have a meaning for one without having a meaning for the other. The two sides must be presented together.

@@ Why should you have this particular thought and not another? This is a question which nobody can answer. Therefore if anybody says there is perfect freedom, he is talking non-sense. For freedom has no meaning apart from necessity, and the latter has no meaning in the absence of the former. The two come together.

CHAPTER 17: POLITICS:

@@ There are two views of Hitler, lower or mystic is to say he is unethical and immoral; higher or philosophic is to say he is ignorant of oneness.

@@ History cannot be relied on, because historians write according to their personal bias.

@@ The business of philosophy is to be concerned with sociology as “How to make everyone happy?” and “What are the best ways to cause progress of the world?” whereas religio-mysticism is concerned with “I am happy, I don’t care what happens to the world.” i.e. personal satisfaction.

@@ The fundamental test of philosophy is “Has it improved social life? What good can it do to humanity?”

@@ Those religionists who write on the divine meaning of war, of God sending it ect. are merely imagining.

@@ Instead of telling his countrymen not to copy the mistakes of Europeans, Indian leaders like Gandhi tell them not to copy Europeans altogether.

@@ The process of identification with others proceeds slowly in an ever-widening circle from family to tribe to nation to race and finally to all humanity in the case of a gnani.

@@ No religion has yet succeeded since earliest antiquity until now in giving peace to the world. The Muslims split into Sunnis and Shias, have often fought with each other. The Christians are killing each other to-day in Europe. Hence mere religion won’t suffice to bring peace on earth. Something more is needed: that is Gnan.

@@ What lessons are the soldiers learning from the War? They are inculcated with notion of non-duality; they become ready to give up enjoying wife and family and home at its call; even to give them up for ever in violent death. This means they are learning to give up their enjoyment;

---

<sup>248</sup> The original editor inserted “467” by hand.

(continued from the previous page) i.e. the ego. It is a step forward in egolessness.

@@ The nearer the nations approach to oneness, the more will they attain prosperity and happiness. This is also true for individuals; the more they achieve harmony with other individuals the greater their worldly well-being. This is the practical proof and illustration of Advaita.

@@ If Hitler could get rid of his sense of ego he would not attack other countries. How many more births he must have, with how much consequent suffering he must endure, before his egoism will pass away.

@@ So long as you have the sense of duality, there will be strife, war and hatred. Hence the application of Vedanta is thoroughly practical.

@@ The more ego is asserted, the more conflict results, and hence world is full of strife because of this.

@@ Rulers and responsible influential men should learn Vedanta in order to learn whether they are leading their people aright or not.

@@ There was unemployment and poverty in England before the spread of scientific industrialism. There is unemployment and poverty in India now before the rise of scientific industrialism. Therefore those who attribute the former to the latter are wrong.

@@ 'Freedom' is a philosophically meaningless word as it is generally used because it is so vague. What is freedom for an invalid, say to walk ten yards is a restriction for a healthy man. Therefore it is a relative term, useful in the practical world however. Only in Advaita does it get full clear meaning for here it means the total and permanent removal of all restrictions.

@@

@@ Everybody writes glibly about democracy as though it were a paradise. This is because they have a complex about it through constantly thinking of one side of it. They do not see that, like other things, democracy also has its weak side and its defects. Similarly Andrew Smith, has a similar complex in favour of Communism, and he had to go to Russia, spend four years there, and then leave to be cured of his illusion (c.f. his "I was a Soviet Worker.") The trouble is that people will only look at one side of a theory, either the favourable or the unfavourable, and think only about that creating a psychological complex which prevents their knowing the truth of the matter. This is because they lack the scientific attitude, which collects data from both sides impartially, and then weighs them, and which refuses to "rationalise" its wishes or dislikes.

@@ The practice of Suttee was instituted because some women go wrong after their husband's death. Therefore the pundits wrongly reasoned that all women would become immoral when they become widows. Hence they burnt them incanting religious fables to justify it. It is quite erroneous logic to assume a universal law from a few instances, yet this is a mistake which often happens.

@@ The agitation among Telugus for a separate Andhra province is a social retrogression and a foolish one. After the British have held up the idea of united India these unwise Andhras wish to go back and keep India split up into fractions, thus engendering strife, hatred and conflict.

@@ It is mere mysticism to say that people turn to religion in obedience to an unconscious instinct that it symbolizes reality. There is no proof of this. And it is equally fallacious to say that the mystic's attempt to abolish thought

---

<sup>249</sup> The original editor inserted "469" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) is an unconscious effort to establish that beyond-thinking reality at which the philosopher arrives by reasoning. All this is your imagination. People really turn to religion because they discover that everything good is passing and vanishing and they need consolation at the loss, or because they are suffering positively and need relief. It is ease from pain or loss or unsatisfied desire that drives them to seek way of escape in religion.

@@ ANGKOR: The notion that Brahmins were forbidden to go overseas in ancient times, is being disproved as false. It was concocted later by the Puranic writers for social purposes. On the contrary, Greater India in Bali. etc. owes its culture to the ancient Brahmins who migrated there.

@@ Society is constantly changing whether it likes it or not; this selfish interests are being taught by nature. The Truth of non-attachment, non-desire, the greeds of capitalism breeds communism, the greeds of monarchy brings republicanism.

@@ Idiotic people want to get rid of science because of the horror of modern war. Yet they want to travel in trains which are the fruits of science. It has both advantages and disadvantages like other things.

@@ I cannot help thinking that England will somehow pull through (July 1940) this war; when will not go under although she may have to come to terms with the enemy.

@@ The right ethical attitude under present war sufferings is to help the suffering; those who are impoverished must not be allowed to die of starvation for they must live, but one should not work for restoration of luxurious prosperous conditions if they need the lesson of impoverishment. One should know how far to help in every case. But always explain to the sufferer why it is he suffers (giving karmic or ethical cause).



@@ The Upanishad teach you that you should take care of your body and make it strong so that you should be able to think.

@@ Before condemning caste-system the philosopher first inquires into it. He asks if it has done good to humanity and does not merely look at the harm it has done. He examines both the sides.

@@ Those that do not understand oneness will have endless strife, quarrel, bloodshed. Why are the non-Brahmin classes in conflict with the Brahmins today? Because the latter had the ego-complex.

@@ All smaller movements towards unity, whether in Nature or society, are the heralds of the large universality of Brahman unity. Where the opposite tendency appears, such as hatred and separation, how long can it endure? It will evoke opposition and be destroyed by conflict.

@@ It is only when society wants something for the common good, that it tends to unifications, but as it is often seeking bad you find also divisions and strife. For it is only when thinking of the common good that we think of truth. Therefore when I say society is tending towards oneness it must be understood in this light.

@@ All the trouble and strife in politics and the bloodshed in war is due to the non-realisation of truth of non-difference, that we are One. Unity is not only strength, but also peace and prosperity in this world. Disturbances arise only when there are two views, duality.

@@ The differences among mankind may only be overcome in the far-off future but nevertheless it is the duty of a Government to govern, to tell those people now and as often as possible what the ideal is—i.e. unity—and to compel them to make a beginning in that direction, even though it is only to be attained by protracted stages. That is the duty of those in power and those who know.

---

<sup>250</sup> The original editor inserted “471” by hand.

@@ The way to cure unemployment in India is to create new work by creating new industries, etc. That requires a man at the head who possesses great intelligence.

@@ The immense practicality of Vedanta is hinted at in the Upanishads which assert that prosperity and peace can come to the mankind only after it accepts the idea of its oneness. All other ways are illusory and will fail.

@@ The citizen who volunteers in war to become a soldier in order to defend his country, is forgetting his ego, giving up the I. Thus he is unconsciously raising himself to the high ideal which is set before us by truth.

@@ Gandhi's new Wardha scheme of Education omits science. This is a grave defect for it means the omission of the method of verifying for truth.

@@ Hitler may be very clever but he is also crassly ignorant. He does not know that the millions of people he kills are only himself, Mind.

@@ The future education must be based on science for it deals directly with the world and we cannot escape the fact of the world.

@@ The fundamental thing which drove the French Revolutionists to set up the ideals "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity" is the unconscious quest of Brahman's non-differential Oneness.

@@ Why do we want Gnan? It is because it is of immense use to humanity. If Hitler knew that in persecuting others he was persecuting his own self, would he continue doing so? No, on the contrary, he would do good to others. Hence this one teaching of oneness with its valuable bearing on life.

@@ So long as social reformers omit philosophic study and discipline, so long will they be unable to know (in contradistinction to guess) how to bring about human unity and welfare.

@@ The value of history is to take profit by the study of the mistakes of other individuals, nations and races. The teaching of history is wrong. To say that the Battle of Plassy was fought in 1757, that the warring generals were Clive and Suraj Dowlah, that 50,000 soldiers were engaged on one side and 80,000 on the other is not enough. Students should be taught the cause of the war, the consequences, what led up to it, etc. the errors or crimes committed and then results. That is why the leaders and rulers of the people should be taught wisdom, philosophy, and the patience to refrain from action until either (a) he is wise enough to act correctly alone or (b) he is able to secure the guidance of a wise man. This is the entire lesson of the Bhagavad Gita and is summed up in the 18th chapter where Krishna says to Arjuna: “Now that your doubts are dispelled, act.” Krishna wanted Arjuna to wait until he was fit to act, to fight, until he had been instructed in truth. But until the 18th chapter, which means whilst Arjuna was still not a mature sage, Krishna tells him to obey him only, i.e. take the advice of others who know the truth. Here on the battle field, you have no time to consult others. Therefore obey me. In the earlier chapters of the Gita Krishna teaches religion, mysticism and yoga largely, hence he does not permit Arjuna to act on his own responsibility then.

@@ Do not regret the sufferings which have come upon mankind to-day. It is the only way to make most people think, to show them they have been wrong and mistaken, to teach them the beginnings of truth.

@@ The effects of the war are so widespread, that people in every country of the world are somehow affected. This is good because it teaches them their interdependence – oneness.

@@ The problem of widespread poverty and the

---

<sup>251</sup> The original editor inserted “473” by hand.

(continued from the previous page) consequent suffering is mostly in my mind as I get older. The only enduring solution seems to be some kind of socialism, only it should be brought about in a humane and peaceful way, not by the brutal methods of Bolshevism.

@@ India should not separate herself from England. It would be a crime to do this. It would put both England and India in danger. Full Dominion status with Hindu superiority might be permitted.

@@ Chamberlain appealed for right relations between civilised states; but why should he omit the uncivilised? Hindus regard Westerners as uncivilised, and vice versa. All mankind should be included.

@@ Analyse the war patiently and impartially. If the antagonists were really honest, they would sit down at a round table conference and the issues would clearly emerge: Your English have got more: We Germans have got less English should then say, you have a right to live as we have, and there would be a mutual unselfish settlement. But there is dishonesty on both sides. Hitler brutally wants to dominate other races: English selfishly wants to cling to her past conquests.

@@ Why does Jinnah call his party The Muslim League when Congress does not call itself the Hindu Congress? Because he is thinking of religion, not the nation. Hence he is a trouble-maker.

@@ I advocate more generous treatment of India by British, but the connection with them must be kept up. They have helped India culturally very greatly. I do not agree with communal representation. It is a mistake. It divides the nation when we need to unite it.

@@ The basis of most moralities is satisfaction, not truth.

@@ Those who assault the caste system have misunderstood it. The original plan and intention was excellent. Everyone had to do the duty for which birth and consequent training fitted him for. Servants should be kept in their places and not get too big for themselves. The objection that caste system was invented by Brahmins to exploit others is absurd. What has happened is degeneration and exploitation subsequently by some individuals, as well as hardening into unalterably fixed forms by time. But it is the duty of the State, the Government, to remove or check such abuses: it is not necessary to destroy the whole system to remove the faults in it.

@@ When catastrophes like the war and revolution appear, they force the more thoughtful people to reflect; they strike the attention and arouse the notion that the old society is imperfect, the old religion decadent, their painful struggles of this crisis, the fight for economic survival, force people to revise their conventional ideas and accept new and better, more fitting ones.

@@ Nobody ought to be allowed to die of starvation, that is the duty of a government; otherwise what is it for? No beggar should be found in a well-ruled country.

@@ The new religious faith after the war will be a more universal one, more wide-embracing, just as the new Society after the war will be a super-national one. Peoples will realize that their own welfare and prosperity is bound up with those of other countries, and so they will be forced to think largely rather than on narrow nationalistic lines.

@@ It is not enough to study man individually. We have to study man collectively also, that is, society. Hence the birth of the science of sociology. Philosophy does not deal with the individual alone. That dubious activity is left to mysticism or religion.

---

<sup>252</sup> The original editor inserted "475" by hand.

@@ Truth and peace and prosperity go together, are inseparable. This is what West does not realize. They seek vainly to bring earthly happiness by disregarding truth.

@@ Perfect freedom is demanded by democratic dreamers. This means really perfect animal life, freedom to steal, etc. There must be control, restriction in the interest of society, of man's desire for freedom.

@@ The universal desire on the part of subject peoples (like the Indians, for instance) to gain independence is an unconscious expression of the fact that by nature they (as Brahman) are free.

@@ Even politics has to come and beg of truth, i.e. philosophy for support as when it says "our cause is just," "our principle true." Everybody indeed to justify an act has to come at last to truth; and say his act is righteous or his words true. Thus philosophy is the hidden basis of all ethical life.

@@ What is the use of using a word like freedom? It is too vague and can apply to the burglar wanting to be free to commit theft, for instance.

@@

CHAPTER 17: ETHICS.

@@ You must not get angry or beat others in your own interests, but you may do it in the interests of others. The ego not being present, such acts are ethical. The elimination of the ego means giving up everything mentally. Don't make yourself the centre.

@@ You may certainly practise violence against somebody who is physically harming another for then it is not for your satisfaction, but for duty. Hence Gandhi's ahimsa is not for universal application.

@@ What is the fundamental reason why we should control the senses? Because their characteristic is to make you think erroneously that the second thing is real, that the objects are real.

@@ The attitude towards action is to act as though your body were another's. You may have your I in your thinking, there is nothing wrong in that (see page 271, Ashtavakra); only you should know that the ego is only a thought, an idea just like the ego you have in dream.

@@ Men want to avoid adversity, peasants want to avoid rain at the wrong time, nations want to avoid war, ambitious men try to become rich as Croesus, but all these fail. Why? Such matters are not quite under our control. There is an element of inescapable fate, of iron necessity, about them. Even Krishna could not stop the Mahabharata war. The moral of this is, do not worry yourself over things you cannot control.

@@ The Gnani's position is some duty presents itself to be done. I will not run away from it. I shall do it, provided it is for the good of all. But all the same I shall hold to the knowledge that I am the Drik, which does nothing.

@@ Vedanta does not say anything is useless: it says everything has its place. Whatever makes people happy has its use for them.

@@ People talk of acting rightly. But which is "right?"

---

<sup>253</sup> The original editor inserted "477" by hand.

@@ The gnani may fight in war or not, according to the circumstances which alone can prescribe his duty in the matter.

@@ Balanced life is a message of philosophy. It is called Samatva; i.e. equipoise.

@@ Action is alright so long as you keep the I out of it. Look upon the age as something which comes and goes like all other objects and activity wont harm you.

@@ Sense-enjoyment will bring pain or re-action and thus bring about indifference eventually. The wise man knowing the objects to be unreal, maya, treats them with indifference in consequence, too.

@@ If you want to free your mind for ever from all desires there is only one way to do it radically – that is, to realise non-duality.

@@ Both the Gnani and the ignorant give in charity to the poor but the latter gives because he believes in duality and regards the poor as another person, whereas the Gnani gives because he regards the poor as himself.

@@ The craving to do good to others on the part of those even who are unphilosophical arises from the unconscious truth which underlies everything. The craving to injure others on the part of the brutal arises from the desire to get rid of trouble or suffering caused or thought to be caused by the enemy, i.e. the desire to get rid of duality: it is at bottom the same craving for non-duality as in the former case.

@@ The ethical problems of Right and Wrong go together with the philosophical problems of Truth and Error. The former are based on the latter. Those who ignore this fact find ethics a sphere of contradictory and conflicting dogmas.

@@ Vedanta seeks not merely human well-being but rather the well-being of all that exists.



## CHAPTER 17

### PRACTICAL PHILOSOPHY

@@ All the social troubles which arise in this world arise from the emphasis men lay on their differences.

@@ The idea of “brotherhood of man” is a step on the way to Vedantic ideal of oneness. But it is still imperfect and not the ideal. Even brothers dispute at law over property: even Muslims who are religious brothers fight each other as Sunnis and Shias; but the non-difference ideal of true sage rises higher than the separateness of brothers.

@@ Every time you take a meal you are seeking to unify the food with yourself, to practise non-difference. This exists even in the practical world.

@@ The world is progressing towards unification, it is unconsciously seeking to bring two entities together as one. Hence arises love in sex, religion, mysticism.

@@ Hatred is the very negation of oneness for it emphasises separateness, hence it must be overcome.

@@ Anybody can fire away the word “morality” but only a philosopher will begin by defining it and thus show in what sense he uses it.

@@ When you realize Brahman all the virtues will come spontaneously because all vices are due to (a) egoism and (b) sense of duality.

@@ The practical test whether Vedanta has been grasped is to ask yourself whether the ego is behind your thoughts, actions or not. Ask this a hundred times daily.

@@ The philosopher does not yield to sense-attraction because he has given up that in order to concentrate on the truth of that attraction, as of all else.

@@ We have to realize it in them, otherwise it is mere theory.

@@ There are unselfish kindly people who feel for the suffering of others, but they feel only for their family, or their own locality, or

---

<sup>254</sup> The original editor inserted at top of the page read: “17E” by hand.

<sup>255</sup> The original editor inserted “479” by hand.

(continued from the previous page) their own race; they are unable to expand this feeling to embrace all mankind.

@@ The seeker after Gnan must analyse what it is that makes him take delight in women. He will then discover its degeneration, for it is associated with the nastiest part of the body: through such analysis he may free himself from lust.

@@ Men do not generally have sex intercourse for procreation but because they cannot control sex. The student must repeatedly analyse this attraction, which makes him no better than a dog. It is related to the dirtiest part of a woman's body, where the excreta passes. Such foulness is seen for what it is by keen analysis only. Those who deny this and say that kisses, caresses, endearment, affection are the chief attractions are wrong; these are only preparations for the physical intercourse.

@@ Do what you are obliged by duty to do, it does not matter so long as you look upon the world as being only thought and within your mind.

@@ Virtue is needed in the world as a thorn to pull out the other thorn of vice. Only the sage, who is exempt from duality has risen above its need, but it is essential for all others.

@@ The test of all ethical problems is "Will it do good to others?" Thus, if a dictator threatened to murder the Swamis unless I ate pork, I would eat it. But if their lives were not at stake, then I would rather he murdered myself than eat it.

@@ All such "duties" as are enjoined always imply duality, whereas Gnana is beyond such restrictions because both action and inaction are mere ideas to the sage.

@@

@@ A lie is sinful if the ego be present, it is free from sin if there be no I in it. This means lying to help others is permissible.

@@ Ethics does not exist in Vedanta, because it means the conduct of one human being toward another. Hence it implies duality. As there is no duality in Vedantic Truth, we do not recognize ethics existence.

@@ The notion that a Gnani should never get angry or never pretend to anger is erroneous. He may do so if it is not in his egoistic interest, if he sees harm is being done or if it is for the benefit of others. Krishna urged Arjuna to fight even to slay.

@@ The notion that a snake should be treated with love, and then it will not hurt is wrong. It belongs to the Ahimsa level of mystics. The sage's duty is to kill it if he sees others are in danger of being attacked by it, but otherwise he will leave it alone.

@@ Should a Gnani attack and kill soldiers of an army like Hitler's who are invading innocent people? Yes, if he is doing it to protect the others, the victims, and no if only he himself is attacked, for then it is left to his personal wish.

@@ There was a philosopher near Nasik. A dog came, stole a piece of his bread and ran away. The man ran after him for a long distance down the road. People stared, thinking that he had gone mad through too much Vedanta. After a long chase, he caught the dog, opened its mouth and look away the piece of bread. Then he produced a pat of ghee he was holding in one hand, smeared the bread and put it back in the dog's mouth, saying: "We are one. What I have is to be shared with others. I always take butter with my bread So you must have some on yours goo. For we are one Atman."

@@ Disciplinary training is required. Anybody

---

<sup>256</sup> The original editor inserted "481" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) may read Ashtavakra, for instance, in less than a day, but will they be able to apply it at once?

@@ Critic objects that Hitler may have read Gita's statement that killing bodies is not really killing! Hence he can justify his actions so. Reply: This is mere pedantry, juggling with words, non-application of the great truth of Vedanta that all Mankind are one.

@@ You say your ethics are the highest. The African cannibals say their cannibalism is the perfect ethics: in India human sacrifices were highest ethics among hill tribes. If you object that these merely illustrate the successive evolutionary stages through which ethics pass, we reply that who fixes the standard, the goal, of this evolution? What you call more refined I may call more gross! It is all personal taste.

@@ One man's notion of good is exactly what another man thinks of as evil.

@@ Compassion should be shown to all creatures, even worms; do them no harm, if possible.

@@ How can we forget our differences and realize unity except by forgetting our self and relieving the sufferings of others and removing their wretchedness because they are our own self? If however you object that it is better to relieve their ignorance I reply that if they are not fit to learn truth, as nearly all are, what else can you do for them?

@@ In the case of men like C.F. Andrews he believes in dualism but practices oneness. His ethical contradiction is explicable by psychiatry, by the doctrine of compartmentalism.

@@ Why does a parent love the child? Why do crows call each other when feed is about? What does this sympathy mean? All this shows there is an actual trend toward oneness.

@@ In our experience so long as the ego desires a thing, it may not come. If however you give up the desire and forget it you are to that extent giving up the ego. And then the Universal mind not infrequently brings you the very thing that was formerly desired. There seems to be a mysterious connection or law behind this. For we see it in the subconscious solving problems later which conscious mind gives up in despair and dismisses.

@@ Why should man be interested in forming an ethical social order? Or in spreading human brotherhood? Neither sociologists nor scientists can explain our possession of such a noble inner feeling. Philosophy alone answers satisfactorily and must supplement these studies. The gnani knows the meaning of life and why he should act in a particular way such as serving mankind, whereas the Karmayogi merely serves but does not know why he should do so.

@@ The Vedantic idea of punishment is to regard the sinner as yourself and his fault as your own fault. That in punishing him to purify him of the sin you are actually punishing yourself.

@@ The I does not exist at all. It is itself false. It is illusory. Therefore a true ethics disregards the ego and defines itself as that which benefits the ALL. This why the false exoteric doctrines are given to the populace, even though they are really lies. The fact that they benefit others, that they do good, justifies their falsehood. However this means permanent good. If hurting his feelings or causing temporary suffering is likely to do permanent good then that may be done. Each case whether to tell true or lie depends on the individual circumstances.

@@ The other persons are yourself; you cannot injure others without injuring yourself, this is philosophically true and works out empirically true also through Karma.

---

<sup>257</sup> The original editor inserted "483" by hand.

@@ Why do we feel sympathy for suffering people? It is because there is unconsciously the hidden sense of unity with others.

@@ How can there be enmity with a man when you know he is your own self?

@@ The greatest error is to think that Vedanta philosophy is of no use to practical life. It is not Vedanta unless it is applied for universal benefit. See Brahman everywhere says Gita.

@@ When you know that other men are yourself, when you feel oneness with them, how can you harm them? Hence advaita will do great ethical good to the world.

@@ Each religion has its own standard of ethics. There is a tribe on the shores of Lake Nyasa where it is deemed a disgrace to have only one wife. Thus religious ethics contradict each other. How is it possible to decide between them?

@@ The man who is still believer in multiplicity, who is still held by the sense of differences, will always condemn or strive with others. But the sage who sees non-difference alone never condemns or strives with others for he sees them as himself.

@@ Truth shows you the need of being useful to the world, otherwise you will care more for what you can get from the world.

@@ Wickedness, sin in Vedanta is to be defined as unethical, i.e. any kind of injury to another person.

@@ There is nothing wrong in the West having so much energy: What it needs is to direct that energy into proper channels.

@@ There is no end in this world to desire. Satisfaction can come only from being satisfied with Brahma-knowledge which puts an end to all desires. All other desires are followed by further ones.

@@ Ethics admonishes men to subordinate the ego from a practical standpoint, but only philosophy explains why man should do so, for it proves that ego is unreal, passing away every moment.

@@ The first step is to subordinate ego to others. The final step is to say "I have no ego. I see myself in all. Their joy and their sorrow is mine. I am identified with the all."

@@ One man does not agree and quarrels with another only in regard to ideas and imaginations. Hence strife arises. So Hindu philosophy wants to drop all ideas and get at truth. Service in philosophy means serving those who suffer. Service in religion is service of the strong, powerful, perhaps of beautiful, but not the weak. It is service to ideas only. If there is unity, how can there be contradiction?

@@ The idea of oneness is that which is going to save us.

@@ All the punitive laws and social checks are aimed at the ego. When man is forbidden to steal, to lie, etc. it is a restraint put on his I. Vedanta however goes to the very root and completely kills the ego.

@@ Sorrow comes only from a second object either because you get it or do not get it.

@@ Duty is what you are compelled to do by circumstances; it should therefore be done without caring for consequences to yourself because I should go.

@@ No Vedanta is of any use unless it shows us how to live in this world. This is the general principle. When a man is free from ego, his acts make no karma. Hence the more you forget the I the nearer to truth you are. Then whatever you utter it will not affect you, even though from point of view of others it may seem to be a lie. For causality can only go when the I goes. The punishment of lies crimes etc. belongs to the world causality (i.e. karma) reigns but not to

---

<sup>258</sup> The original editor inserted "485" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) the world where non-causality (i.e. non-karma) reigns. But entry into the latter world is at the price of taking away the I. If this be criticised, we reply that morality is merely that which enables you to reach Gnan: it does not belong to Gnan itself. In that stage the question of morality, of lie or truth is meaningless, for who is there to ask it? The ego has disappeared and with it all questions.

@@ All the academic theories of ethics are inconsistent with each other. Only the Vedantic can hold good because it alone eliminates ego. Hence it alone gives a science of ethics rather than theories like the others.

@@ The only master-key to ethics is very simple and does not require study of a hundred books. It is to get rid of the black serpent of ego.

@@ How can you say this is the Good for all? Another man may consider it bad.

@@ There is an Indian problem in ethics. A merchant with money is pursued in a forest by a robber. On the way the latter meets a yogi and asks him which way the merchant has gone. If the yogi tells the truth, the merchant will be caught and killed; if he tells a lie he will himself sin. What to do? Reply: he should do that which will benefit others, thus forgetting himself. When you are trying to do this then a lie is not a sin: for then you are giving up ego and are identifying yourself with others. In such a state you are free from any bad karma, absolutely free of any sin.

@@ Vedanta ethics is so to conduct yourself as to ask in all your relations: Will this do good to the other man?—not to act only for your own advantage. In the event of conflict between two duties, weigh their merits trying to leave ego out.



@@ The questions of optimism and pessimism have meaning only from some individual's standpoint. Those who are getting on very well in life will naturally favour optimism.

@@ What does value mean? And to whom? It is a meaningless word because each man has his own idea of it. Tell Hitler that the highest value is to make men happy. Will he believe it?

@@ Materialists are quite unable to reply why society should practise co-operation or social service or self-denial. For ego is then the basis and is opposed to them. Only Vedanta explains this because it shows what an illusion ego really is.

@@ What is it we value? If we say what we desire or what we regard as good, we find that different people have different desires. Each has his own standard of value. What is of real value therefore? Emotion cannot rightly decide it, because it changes. Satisfaction is the usual intention.

@@ There is no real freedom for those who believe in God, for their morality is based on doing what God is supposed to communicate through conscience or otherwise; hence they are not free. Nor is there freedom for those who base their ethics on pleasure for they are compelled by their desires to seek pleasure.

@@ Desire is of two kinds: you may desire for yourself or for all others.

@@ The sage will live as he pleases, above codes, but this does not mean he will do wrong, harm others or cause suffering. For his self-identification with them prevents this.

@@ The gnani feels no difference whether he is approached by an exceedingly beautiful woman or by a dirty ugly old woman; he will be mentally the same, undisturbed, neither attracted in one case nor repelled in the other. This is because his analytical insight has become perfect and because he sees non-duality in all. To

---

<sup>259</sup> The original editor inserted "487" by hand.

ETHICS.

(continued from the previous page) desire sex is to seek a second thing which is ignorance.

@@ The gnani sees woman as Brahman; as much he sees an ass as Brahman. He is the same to both. The seeker however, has to analyse and thus destroy the attractiveness of woman.

@@ What is it you can renounce? Everything is Brahman. You can only give up Brahman! Hence the gnani is above renunciation.

@@ There are no 'oughts' or commands or obligations which bind a gnani, unless it be the study of loving all humanity.

@@ Nothing to do for the object of gaining, yet I act. Ramakrishna wanted even a dog to be fed and be made happy.

ART.

@@ In composing any work of art, you first form internal ideas, thoughts, and then express them, i.e. project them into the world outside.

@@ An artist until he forgets his ego will not be perfect. For it is only by perfect concentration on his work or in his imagination that he works perfectly, i.e. he transforms his ego into that of his subject.

@@ Music and all the arts are on the same plane as religion and mysticism, because both involve the use of imagination, not reason. They are useful to kindle religious belief or mystical ecstasy, not for philosophy.

@@ When a man writes a poem on river Ganges, he is identifying himself with it, attributing human qualities to it such as kindness, helpfulness, purity etc. This is done because Atman is everywhere and the man unconsciously feels his oneness with Ganges.

ARTCHAPTER 17.

@@ Why is it a man feels drawn to art, music, painting, architecture, sculpture, beauty, poetry and drama? Philosophy finds answer.

@@ Philosophy enquires into everything, what is the value of science etc. Even from Plato philosophy has been defined as a knowledge of the whole.

@@ Religion expresses itself in poetry, art, painting, dancing—they are all sisters and brothers of the same family appealing to feeling—all imaginations and emotions. Philosophy is concerned with the reasons for this feeling.

@@ The social aspect of art is a variable. What is the standard of beauty? It is a question of individual taste and pleasure. c.f. Krishna's painting.

@@ There is no philosophy in all this art-theory. Why does man want pleasure through art, drama? Why should they desire? "Because they desire"—is no philosophical explanation. Vitality, urge, inclination, emergence—what is all this? What is beauty, and why are men attracted to it? What is it that attracts as its beauty? These are philosophical questions.

@@ Rational thought is a marvellous power. Imagination is supreme in the work of art. But why does man imagine? Patrick does not explain but only describes art.

@@ What do you mean by a fair face? Krishna's dark face—Gopis are attracted to it. European women may not care for dark faces at all. Croce says "Beauty is subjective."

@@ Beauty is a co-ordination of the two—the internal and the external.

@@ What drives us to attain is value; and beauty is one such. This is the 'all.' Beauty is something which attracts us. But what it is, is unanswered. "Pushing", drive is cosmological sense. "Pulling" is theological cause: This is describing the attraction—not defining it.

---

<sup>260</sup> The original editor inserted "489" by hand.

@@ I look in art for the expression shown by the face, and I look into the eyes portrayed for such expression of feeling. I despise so much modern Hindu Art because of this lack of expression of that emotion or thought which is uppermost in the heart.

@@ After all, the greatest beauty is within your own self. Even the most beautiful woman is your Atman, yourself, only an idea appearing to you, so why should you run after her? Then you remember she is only your mind, yourself, you will lose the urge to lust. Only by this non-duality can the highest morality be obtained. Religion cannot achieve this ethic because it is based on duality; on God and I.

@@ When you enquire profoundly into the nature of Beauty you will find it to be no different from that of Truth.

@@ Poetry, music and aesthetics appeal to the feelings and hence have a wide and popular appeal. When however man begins to introduce reasoned thought into them, they appeal only to the more evolved few.

@@ Why do we feel attracted to trees, hills sky, sea, flowers, and beauties of Nature? It is because you blindly sense the common Soul of Nature is one with your own, and hence you love it. You are thinking of the spirit. Why do you feel repelled by tigers and snakes? Because you fear they will kill your body. You have forgotten your spirit, the common soul of Nature and think only of your body.

@@ Europeans see beauty in jazz music and mere sound in Indian music and vice versa. It is therefore clear that there is something put into hearing by the mind of the listener in addition to the sounds themselves.

@@ Human emotions are not killed by philosophy but brought under check and control, by reason. Thus if you see a beautiful woman there will automatically rise a passion of sex for her. The philosopher immediately after feeling the first touch of this passion will bring his reason to play and consider that the body of this woman is only an idea in the mind after all; considering it as such it is then relatively easy for him to remain unmoved by her beauty which he can henceforth see acknowledge and even appreciate without feeling any sex passion for her.

@@ People in South India have different views as to what constitutes beautiful carvings from those held by people in Bengal. This conflicts of concepts of beauty occurs everywhere. How then are we to distinguish as to which are really beautiful, how set up a true standard? Much of the philosophies of aesthetics are mere spinning out of words, not dealing in facts, as terms are used freely without any discussion of their meaning.

@@ Vedanta teaches that emotion and art are inseparable from life, that philosophy does not, cannot and should not take them away from us. What philosophy does is merely to evaluate both emotion and art and then remove the incorrect values we have placed upon them, substituting proper values in their place. It is thus not the Vedantic teaching that philosopher should become unemotional, inartistic or incapable of enjoying beauty. He may be so, but he should know their value and place.

@@ Man cannot be satisfied with mere science. He wants something also that will give him joy. Hence he needs art, beauty, pleasure and satisfactions. He wants not only to know but also to be happy.

---

<sup>261</sup> The original editor inserted "491" by hand.

@@ That force of attraction which draws you through the pleasure of flowers or the pleasure of travelling to some desired place, is the unconscious recognition of underlying unity.

@@ When you admire the painting of a beautiful landscape you are unconsciously assimilating the external world into your mind, i.e. turning it into idea.

@@ The singer who feels an emotion may communicate it to numerous other persons. Yet only a sound vibration is heard, a sense-effect. Why is a mental effect produced? Because all men have got the same Mind.

@@ In imagination the artist has to forget himself, because he has to feel something or somebody else during the period of creation. So too the hearer has for the moment to identify himself with the subject portrayed. All this is effacement of ego, the search for oneness of existence, but it is temporary. Philosophy alone leads to the permanent goal. Thus one who writes a poem on Late Maharaja has either to overcome that which separates him in time from H.H. or to transform his own ego into that of H.H. for the time being. Thus philosophy deals with art.

@@ Another explanation of art is to evoke in the enjoyer the same feeling which artist had. Thus for the time being he puts himself in the position of the other person, i.e. he seeks non-difference, oneness, with other men. Hence the existence of art in life and its philosophical justification. The greatest artist is he who realizes himself as the All, who identifies himself with all things.

@@ Much of art, in creation or in enjoyment is an attempt to eliminate the difference between poet and flower, enjoyer and the other imagined character of a play. It is effort to show forth non-difference.

## CHAPTER 18: SAGEHOOD AS AN IDEAL.

@@ The Gnani will be all things to all men, playing this double life merely to help others: the I is absent here. On the other hand, the pseudo-sage or hypocrite, is thinking of the I in whatever he does, as when he lets himself appear in the public as a gnani, or when he assumes an attitude of superiority as a teacher. This presence or absence of ego is the only difference between them. But the outside public cannot distinguish between the real sage and the hypocrite, until they learn to distinguish between truth and falsehood. The Vedantic test for a true Gnani are: first see if he is living to do good to others, second if he has got the ego or not. Of course, a false guru may pretend to have both these qualities and therefore some period of time must elapse before he can be thoroughly tested, you must wait and see. You can't know a gnani by his face. Time is needed. On the other hand, the guru will test the novice to see if he is fit for truth. This probationary period has no fixed length. It will vary according to the quality of the novice. Some may pass in a day, others not in thirty years.

@@ No man except a gnani himself, is capable of knowing whether another is a gnani. If anyone were to ask "Are you a gnani?" the reply would be first, "What do you understand by the words you and gnani?" and the second reply "You must discover that for yourself. If I say I am, how can you know whether it is true or not. You can only see my body, but not my mind. Lots of people have said they know the truth. I would only be one more, yet most of them were deluding themselves or others".

@@ The Gnani will not permit ego to overcome him. He will constantly and critically examine his own motives. Whenever he sees that attachment

---

<sup>262</sup> The original editor inserted "493" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) is arising in him to any luxurious object or surroundings, he will see the I behind this attachment and immediately go away. However, if he is sick or weak, he may be excused from this.

@@ Krishna was a charioteer, or car driver, Janaka a ruler, Tuladhara a shopkeeper, Vyadha was a hunter – yet all these were gnanis but lived and worked in the world.

@@ The gnani who happens to be a wandering sanyasin will carry out his ideals of service even when he is moving alone through forests, for there he will try to help whatever animals and other creatures he comes across.

@@ Why did not Krishna stop the Mahabharata war by his yogic power? From the lower theological standpoint he did not want to interfere, as each man must do his duty, and he knew himself as Brahman and similarly all these people, on both sides. Yogis have not the power to do such things, let alone incarnations. It has never been done in history, as the first yogi who had realised himself and obtained this mythical power would have put a stop to all human suffering. Besides, Krishna saw all the world in the one Universal Mind, all the fighters on both sides as being in it, himself as the self of all beings, not identified with any particular individual or group of individuals, so why should he interfere? In the suffering he sees only a form of himself, nothing separate. Objection: then how can a gnani be always acting? Answer: The gnani from his own view point is always in the same mood, but the outside observer sees that a gnani can only be one who works constantly for the common weal, as water must find its own level so the jnani must find himself in all people.



CHAPTER 18  
SAGEHOOD AS AN IDEAL

@@ There is only one test for a gnani, because it is impossible to look into another man's mind. It is to note his practical sympathy with the welfare of all.

@@ The Gnani does not live like a block of stone which is unmoved by the sufferings of others. He leaves that to the yogi.

@@ The sage does good work without any thought or wish to receive any reward or payment in return, just as the sun sheds its warmth and light without consideration of getting something back for its service.

@@ He who has no feeling of sympathy with the suffering that he observes, is no sage. He identifies himself with everything, even a suffering ant, or an injured snake. Poets like Wordsworth have felt or imagined their oneness with the whole universe, but they have not realized the truth of it as a sage.

@@ There is no need of samadhi for a gnani, just as an M.A. does not need to study A,B,C alphabet. Yoga is for novices.

@@ The sage never claims to be able to stop the war, or perform similar miracles. He leaves such claims to those who do not know what Gnan is.

@@ Most people talk of imagined gnanis, for they can never look into the mind of a real Gnani; hence they have to form their own idea of him, i.e. imagination. Yet all the swamis etc. lecture on sages without knowing what real sages are.

@@ The infallible test of a false gnani where there is no other way of testing him is whether he is actively engaged in removing the suffering of others and serving humanity.

@@ The gnani is not opposed to any position, religious or philosophical, for he sees all is One; but the others who are in those positions, will be opposed to him.

@@ Prostration before holy gurus encourages slavishness. Sri Krishna does not encourage

---

<sup>263</sup> The original editor inserted "495" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) this mentality. It is true that we have to get rid of the ego, “the I know” mentality, and hence Sri Krishna advised to go and prostrate before an ass than before a man, because the ass than before a man, because the ass does not bless you; it is not elated by your prostration like holy gurus. We should not try to kill another’s ego at the inflation of our own ego.

@@ You may have the best guru but if your karma, your ripeness is not favourable, then it will not avail you.

@@ Because the Gnani feels for others who are suffering, he has from our limited standpoint neither peace nor happiness but he desires to be born again and again to help the world. The descriptions of such peace and happiness are merely baits to lure people on the path to truth, whose dazzling light they are not able to bear. But since the gnani looks on both misery and happiness alike as Brahman, we must not judge his inner feeling for we cannot. To think that the gnani is inwardly suffering because he feels for others, is to think of an imagined gnani, hence a false one.

@@ It is utterly impossible according to Brihadaranyaka, Vivekachudamani, for anyone to detect who is a gnani. No outward sign will reveal it. The nearest possible but partial possible test given in Gita, Astavakra and Mandukya is: Is he doing good to others without thought of gaining benefit for himself? It is however possible to detect a yogi because he is on a lower plane.

@@ Teaching shows how others differ from one and its need to bring them up to the guru’s level. The teacher can see why men doubt, and he may then see whether he has considered and solved such doubts. Thus teaching may help the teacher as well as the pupil.

@@ When Porphyry attended a single lecture by Ammonius and exclaimed "Here is the man I have been seeking!" and immediately attached himself as a disciple for eleven years, he was acting no better than a man who sees a pretty woman and immediately marries her. For in both cases if it were intuition, the latter should be checked by reason and time, for how were they to know what sort of a guru Ammonius would turn out to be later, or what sort of a wife B. would turn out to be. What happened is that emotional satisfaction was made the test in both cases. How much wiser was Ramakrishna when he told his would-be disciples to wait and test him first.

@@ The question of whether a man is a gnani or not depends on the evidence for it: usually we can only say "So far as the evidence or so far as my knowledge goes, A is not a gnani."

@@ The notion that a sage has no emotion, never cries, never laughs, is wrong. He has it, only he knows its value, has weighed it, and keeps it subordinate to higher things. Only the insane ascetic who has gone to extremes may betray no emotion.

@@ Sat-sangha, association with the realized, helps because it slowly and imperceptibly influences the seeker to give up ego-attachment.

@@ Whereas the mystic seeks to avoid people and to ascetically renounce the world in order to get peace and not be disturbed, the Gnani seeks deliberately to mingle with the world in order to help people. Thus he takes on their pain and trouble, even permits his life to be disturbed, because he regards them as himself.

@@ When there is unity, how can there be argument, with whom are you going to differ? It is those who do not understand that truth is non-causality who equate in controversy.

@@ It is impossible to attain the highest unless one has a Guru to guide.

---

<sup>264</sup> The original editor inserted "497" by hand.

@@ In ancient India the Rishis first tested the candidates and ascertained the stage in which he was, and then gave him religion, mysticism or philosophy according to what he was fit for.

@@ When Faraday says that a philosopher should have no master, it is not meant that he should not seek instructions from a guru. It means that he should not commit the fallacy of authoritarianism by quoting his teacher's word as constituting sufficient proof of their truth. His duty is to be thoroughly convinced of their truth by his own reasoning. Also it does not mean that he can escape from his responsibility to acknowledge publicly his indebtedness to his teacher, otherwise he will be cheating the world and acting dishonestly.

@@ The Gnani is not an ethical anarchist because although he is above morality, he is not above the need of doing nothing that will injure other persons or bring them unnecessary suffering.

@@ I admit that the word peace is better than happiness in connection with the gnani's state but this term is also liable to be misunderstood. The yogi uses it, for instance.

@@ The gnani's first business after he realizes the ALL is to remove the sufferings of others. Therefore he thinks first of identifying himself with people's troubles and only second of their joys. Nevertheless all the time he knows their troubles are only ideas. Moreover he knows too that out of evil cometh good. Therefore his doing good will be based on reason. Emotion will be there but it will be entirely governed by reason. But it is because the others have the idea of misery in them that he has to hold up the idea of bringing them to happiness. But once all have attained this, then there is neither misery nor happiness

(continued from the previous page) for both are dualities, dependent on each other, and when all have attained there is universality and unity and non-duality. There is then no second person to become happy or to be made happy.

@@ To prostrate before an alleged guru or gnani is for unenquiring, but the seeker will refuse to prejudge the issue but will detachedly examine the holy man and study his characteristics scientifically, with a view to ascertain the truth about him. Because he sits in trance, many seekers are swept away by emotions, ignorant of the fact that lunatics do the same.

@@ If a man comes to him with a doubt, then the sage is bound to clear his doubt. But if he does not, and merely seeks confirmation of his beliefs, sage keeps quiet about the truth and agrees with him.

@@ If a new student fails to ask any questions it is a bad sign for it means that he is not thinking about my teachings or is uninterested in it, or it is above his head.

@@ Until a man puts questions showing that he has doubts about his present views or about the contradictory tenets prevailing, he is not fit to be taught philosophy.

@@ It has been always a policy to teach the Advaita to those who are rulers because it will guide them in their dealings with the people. Hence the gurus were content to have few pupils but they tried to get those who were the highest rank.

@@ It is the business of philosophers to lead others on the right track, how to decide the most serious actions in life to show them how we should live in this world. Living in asrams is not an example which the masses can follow, therefore it is useless, to do this if one is concerned with service. The Gita's chief lesson is that the gnani should work, not sit idle,

---

<sup>265</sup> The original editor inserted "499" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) should act and teach others; should act to remove suffering.

@@ It is rightly said that whatever a man's tendencies or work before reaching Gnan is, he will continue the same afterwards. The objection is made that an ascetic who has lived for years in a solitary cave and then reaches Gnan will then continue his solitude. Why then do I criticize such sitting quiet? Reply: In such a case the force of Gnan will make him give up his solitude and move about helping others. If he does not do this and alter his ways, he has not attained Gnan. Thus the very fact that Aurobindo confines himself to one place shows that he is not a gnani. The only excuse is if he is ill or not strong enough to travel.

@@ The Gnani is ever-active but it is not for his own benefit. It is for the benefit of others.

@@ The teacher can only say: There is something, but the chela has to do it.

@@ The sage may have no egoism yet may act outwardly as though he had it. That is why it is so difficult to comprehend him.

@@ Any so-called sage who sits naked, remains silent, always fasts, proves thereby that he is thinking only of the body: hence he is no gnani.

@@ If the pupil is to grasp truth as it is realised by guru, he will have to perceive the ultimate state, that there is no duality, hence no guru!

@@ Those who think they are sages sometimes refer to themselves as "This body is going to have dinner" or "this body is going for a walk". They are mere students disciplining themselves. For the words show pre-occupation with body. No sage talks like that.

@@ The aspirant should first test the man who he wants as guru and only after that follow him.

@@ The gnani does not by forming his own separate cult, separate himself from those that do not agree with him.

@@ It is illusion that the gnani attains the magical capacity to do whatever he likes as though he were a God or to be miraculously free of laws of nature. It is childish error to think that a Gnani should be able to reconstruct the world or change mankind overnight. The only freedom he attains is from the ignorance of ego's reality, for seeing the non-causality of the world he sees everything as non-dual, he sees himself as everywhere present and therefore as not limited to the ego. He sees his real self as not being individual ego.

@@ Any standpoint lower than the highest means duality. Duality means one man differing from another in views. This leads to argument. When he hears such argument the sage does not join but keeps quiet.

@@ Avatars are individuals of a higher order, but still individuals. They have realised the meaning of Moksha, but they come to help others.

@@ How reconcile the antinomies that a Gnani does become outwardly one with those in his environment, even to their faults whilst he must also set them example to rise up to? Reply: if he happens to be born amongst thieves he will steal with them but, as his gnan does not go away all the time, at some point he will pause and suggest to the others that they adopt a slightly better course of action. Thus he will uplift them because they will think he is a simple ignorant man like themselves and will be more agreeable to follow his advice.

@@ Gnani being in world of non-duality, will not fight or quarrel over truth with another person, because he regards that other as himself. So can he quarrel with himself?

---

<sup>266</sup> The original editor inserted "501" by hand.

@@ The elimination of ego is done by Sankara saying he claims nothing for himself although he has written all these books, but he ascribes it all to his guru. He does not want to advertise himself but gives all credit for his knowledge to his guru.

@@ The sage does not regard himself as having attained perfection, because he still identifies himself with others and thus shares their sense of imperfection.

@@ The sage serves mankind to the extent which his circumstances permit.

@@ Sankara knew no science. Nor did the other old philosophers. Therefore they were not omniscient. He does not know all the sciences; but he knows the truth

@@ It is a lie to claim that knowledge of truth is your own. You had to get it from your guru, hence it was his not yours. Hence we should humble the ego and give credit to him.

@@ No fixed abode to Gnani. Even on his death bed Ramakrishna asked people to come in as he was anxious to answer their question. This is realisation, not shutting themselves up in caves like yogis.

@@ Characteristics of a gnani include compassion for all living beings, taking his own self as the standard.

@@ The Gnani must set an example so that the ignorant masses may follow, says the Gita.

@@ To the Gnani all are equal, man woman and even animals etc. but he sees the difference also. A gnani treats and gives according to the capacity of each. But he sees the Atman in all and so tries to help all equally. Nevertheless he is forced to be unequal in practice for even a gnani has got his own limitations of the body, personal circumstances etc.

@@ If you know Atman you move about! You do not stay in one place (like V.S.I.)!



@@ The Gnani must teach, must travel and spread the truth. That is indisputable. Not only do the Upanisads, not only does Sankara say so, but how else are the people to be benefitted? To talk of yogis sitting still and sending out thought-waves to help the world is humbug. There must be ACTION. What good have these yogis done for India during the last 1000 years? On the other hand, Ramakrishna, whom I regard as the only Gnani of modern times, realising he could not travel far through lack of knowing English and education, trained one man – Vivekananda to go in his place. None of the other pupils were fit for the highest Vedanta and were trained for yoga only etc. but Vivekananda was given the full truth and bidden to go out and spread it. What good is Aurobindo Ghose doing by keeping silent and hiding himself? There must be speech, communication through words, Truth must be brought down to the physical plane and expressed in speech or writing so that people may hear and understand and that a record left for posterity. No real gnani needs to keep mouna as Aurobindo is doing. He has not understood the highest truth of Gita. Similarly with Maharishi. No doubt he is very lofty and has been wrongly interpreted by his followers who can't rise to his position: but still, why does he sit still in one place? He ought to move. The Upanishad says a Gnani except if he is a married man should never live in one place but keep on travelling and teaching. That is what Sankara did.

@@ The peace of mind, the inner satisfaction which the yogi and mystic obtain, are also possessed by the Gnani, but in addition he possesses ultimate Truth. He will have the emotionalistic excesses of the mystic nor

---

<sup>267</sup> The original editor inserted "503" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) the visionary delusions of yogi, but he will have the inner peace they have won, and have gone beyond to Truth.

@@ Yes it is possible to arrive at truth without a guru but this is only for the most exceptional persons. All others must sit at a guru's feet. Thus in one of the Upanisads the pupil asks how the first man ever got this knowledge and the reply is made that somehow he got it by intense reflection.

@@ As it is impossible to know the mind of another and hence of a gnani, we are left with the only recourse of inferring from his actions whether he is a gnani or not. If he is devoted to helping others that is the test. Nevertheless all the same we shall only have an inference.

@@ It is not correct for ordinary folk to apply the positive test and declare who is a gnani, but it is correct for anyone to apply the negative test and declare who is not a gnani. Gita gives the test: Service and uplift of others.

@@ The two statements that (a) the sage should behave like the society he finds himself with and (b) he should set an example to others are not really contradictory. For he should practice the first and then only the second, i.e. they are to be successive not simultaneous. First he must be with others and win their confidence by appearing as one of them and only afterwards should he set them a higher ideal.

@@ If the gnani is able to eat, work and attend to practical duties without losing his gnan, why should he not be able to sleep and dream like other men without losing his gnan? And this is the case.

@@ Vivekachudamani verse 54 plainly points out that we have to find out the truth for ourselves, not through the eyes of a guru.

@@ Does a gnani work? Answer: Who asks the question? The question implies that the questioner is in the world of duality. He presupposes that the gnani has got a body and as long as we think that he has got a body, we have to admit that he is to work for the good of the whole.

@@ The yogi tries to get rid of everything by shutting his eyes to them and by controlling the mind etc. Whereas the gnani is one who, though seeing everything sees the one entity as everything.

@@ There is no religion which does not give satisfaction to someone, so a man of highest religion may keep silence, if he likes, but a man of realisation should work for the cosmic good, This is the goal of Gita.

@@ The sage observing the differences of opinion and outlook in his social environment, does not increase them by taking up any position but keeps quiet, remains silent.

---

<sup>268</sup> The original editor inserted "505" by hand.

CHAPTER 18  
SAGEHOOD AS AN IDEAL

---

<sup>269</sup> Blank page

## CHAPTER 19. DOCTRINE OF NON-CAUSALITY.

@@ In practical life we cannot say that there is only determinism or that there is only free-will. Both are there. But in the higher reality of paramartha there is neither fate nor freewill, no causality of any kind. For both are dualities inseparably coupled: you cannot have determinism without having freewill at the same time. For who is it that has either of them. It is ego. Hence the getting rid of ego causes the whole question to collapse and vanish. Hence the gnani is said to be released from karma for he is released from the dilemma of fate versus freewill.

@@ The immemorially-old problem of fate versus free-will can be solved in one way alone, and that is by going into the meaning of cause and effect relation and of the terms used in connection therewith. All the usual arguments are on a religious or scientific basis not philosophic. It will then be discovered that there is personal responsibility and that it is our duty to exercise it. All excuses to escape this responsibility – whether Karma, God, circumstances or heredity are fallacious, wrong and egoistic.

@@ Rebirth is a fact to you only so long as you think of yourself as an ego. So long as your attitude is “Now I am John Smith, last birth I was Signor Malto, next birth I shall be a monk” you are identifying yourself with the I. But when you drop the ‘I’ how can rebirth exist for you?

@@ Karma doctrine is good and true so long as you hold to the ego. But when ego goes, then karma goes, rebirth goes for whole world is then in you, so how can you be reborn?

@@ Can a thing become what it is not? No. Therefore can Brahman become non-Brahmanic Jiva?

@@ Instead of enquiring whether causality exists we start by assuming it. That therefore is a fallacy. And once having assumed it, we begin to look for a cause of the world, i.e. a God.

---

<sup>270</sup> The original editor inserted “507” by hand.

@@ Causality is nonsensical when you consider how no one thing is really separate and independent from other things, but all are connected together and in a sense merge into a composite unit. Thus flower depends on earth, seed, water, heat, sun, manure,—all joining together to produce the flower: hence neither one of these can be said to be the ultimate cause of the flower. And each of these is in its own turn dependent on others. So where are we to stop and say this is the cause? It is impossible to stop.

@@ That the same medicine will always have the same effect is only a probability. Some are cured, others not. Sometimes it is successful, at other times a failure. Men take only the successes, ignore failures and deduce the principle of causation from it. We deny this is any proof that medicine is cause of which cure is effect. It remains unproved, hence there is no certain principle of causality to be observed at work here. Similarly fallacy of astrology is there is no proved connection between fulfilled prediction and positions of stars. We hear of the successes and deduce that they are the consequences of principle of causality. But we don't reckon numerous unfulfilled predictions which should be taken as denying this principle! Vedanta doesn't deny successes of predictive astrology but denies there is proof of the connection between them and aspects of planets. Similarly too with cooking. We can't affirm that same cooked food will always produce precisely the same effects on everyone. Sometimes it gives dysentery; some like it, others reject it. Hence there is indeterminacy, uncertainty about its effects: hence too there can be no proved causal principle always at work in cooking and eating: only probability. Vedanta wants certainty, i.e. truth, hence it is forced to deny causality as sure truth, and accept it only as a practical probability.

@@ “Cause” is what produces an effect; it is that which is followed by something else, or it occasions something. But the idea of cause comes in only in ignorance. Cause is ignorance. It is non-apprehension. Effect equals misapprehension. Both non-misapprehension and misapprehension occur in waking state and dream state. Cause and effect is not possible in the Drik since there is no duality in drik, and since drik is knowledge itself. You think an idea different from the mind. It is not. Ideating when regarded as different is a misunderstanding of the essence of the mind. Cause is the same as effect but you think the effect is different from cause. Herein lies the misapprehension.

@@ Causality is in the world of drsyam only, whereas non-causality is in the drik.

@@ “Attachment” means attachment to the ego. Causality depends on duality. So long as Western scientists see only their ego, they cannot know the true of non-duality. They have seen the contradictions inherent in causality, but they are unable to understand non-causality because the ego deludes them into belief in duality.

@@ When you can point out the time when the cause becomes an effect, you can prove causality, but nobody can point out such a moment. Both are therefore the same.

@@ When you are sleeping, when you are in ignorance, causality seems true; but when ignorance goes, which can happen only when belief in duality goes, the truth of non-causality may then be seen.

@@ What is cause? Pandits give contradictory definitions. It is a most difficult question.

@@ No connection between Drik and Drsyam has been proved. There is no causal relation between them.

@@ Science now shows that even in the practical vivaharika world you cannot establish causality. Kant had said it was only idea but science has experimentally proved it is not valid.

@@ If nothing new has come, why do you call it

---

<sup>271</sup> The original editor inserted “509” by hand.

(continued from the previous page) an effect? This is my objection to those who say cause and effect are the same, as said in Brahma-Sutra. It is not the doctrine of non-causality.

@@ The mind is wedded to cause as Kant has pointed out, and whenever it looks it expects to find a cause because it presupposes things as effects.

@@ Cause and effect are found in the sense-world but God is said to be beyond this sense-world. How then can we ever know or prove that he created this world? It is not possible to do so.

@@ The idea of cause is bound up with religion, art and yoga. In art if you do see a beautiful form you will get a feeling of pleasure. In yoga if you concentrate you will get certain results. In religion if you pray or participate in ritual or believe in God, certain rewards will come. But all these, like all causes, are only ideas, they are for intellectual children; and cause and effect must, like all ideas, disappear in the Mind eventually.

@@ The scientist can only say I had that idea then, I have this idea now, i.e. succession but not causality.

@@ Truth means the absence of causality. Causality is not a fact. This is the hardest thing for anyone to grasp. There is no such thing as production. But this is the great stumbling block which nearly all people—religionists, philosophers, mystics—cannot get over. The under-rate its importance completely.

@@ The causality is not there in the universe, but ultimately man himself takes something to be the cause.

@@ “To will” means “to cause”. To say that mind wills sleep is on a par with saying God wills the world.

@@ You cannot speak of cause and effect when there is only one.



@@ Causality is the basis of religion. God must always be doing something, men must always be in causal relation with Him through prayer etc.

@@ Bradley rightly asks how can you account for the difference if the cause is different from the effect, if the seed is different from the tree, if there is something in the tree which is not in the seed? If there is a change then how did this come about? Such is the dilemma in which believers in causality put themselves.

@@ Where is the proof, how do you know, that God produced the world has manifested his own essence as the world? To make such an assertion without proof is to tell a lie. Moreover who created God?

@@ It is the weakness of men that they postulate a First Cause in order to escape from the riddle of how the causal series began. Aristotle did this and all the theologians had gone this way. But to more thoughtful minds, this problem indicates that there is something wrong with causality itself.

@@ The causal complex works so strongly in even the best authorities that very few ever rise to true philosophy, for so long as the causal idea persists it is utterly impossible to rise to realisation of what is beyond the world to Brahman.

@@ The idea of creation comes in naturally when we admit that there is manifestation. But is there really any manifestation? Vedanta says that really speaking there is no manifestation. Only if we once admit that there is manifestation do we have to account for it.

@@ The conception of representing God to have created the mayayic illusion of this world like the juggler performing an illusion which deceives all is not the highest. "When you reach the top of this house, you will understand that everything, even the steps, are of the same material."

---

<sup>272</sup> The original editor inserted "511" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) said Ramakrishna. The meaning is the mind creates the whole by mere thought, and even in the case of material objects, the thought exists before the object. Before building a house, we have to think about it and thus the idea exists first in our mind.

@@ The object of enquiry is to get rid of all causal preconception and be determined to get at truth at all costs. How can God be tired and rest in Pralaya after a cosmic cycle, if He is the one without a second. All these ideas of creation of God was due to lack of enquiry.

@@ If you start with the idea of creation, it naturally follows that God or someone must have created. Is there creation? After such questions you won't think that God has created.

@@ Only when you are ignorant of a thing, the idea of its cause come to us. Cause and effect are thus said to be due to ignorance. When you know everything, there is no causal thinking, and such thinking presupposed ignorance.

@@ An effect seems different from cause. But really both are the same, both are ideas; and ideas are in the ultimate analysis mind. Thus effect is only a misapprehension that it is something different from cause.

@@ Can we not say that the Atman creates the Jiva out of itself? Answer: We cannot prove this statement. We have not seen the one creating the other. Because the ego appears and disappears into the Atma just like the waves rising from and falling into the ocean, we argue that both are one and the same.

@@ Sankara says that there is no causality from the ultimate standpoint. He does not deny that there is cause and effect and that effect follows cause in the objective world.

@@ Causality cannot operate when there is no two. Cause and effect mean time. At what time did the cause become effect?

@@ If you want to get at truth do not think of God as creator of the world. Nobody has seen him creating. To talk as though you had is to tell lies. Vedanta does not want lies. Say honestly "I do not know." How can you see God creating you before you came into existence?

@@ If you say God created world, why not I ask the question "Who created God?" Theologians want to lop at God and discourage such questions. They do not see the absurdity of their positions.

@@ If God is perfect why should he want to play leela, to sport, to play celestial tennis? We have physical bodies and our desire for sport is understandable but why should perfect divine being who is non-physical, need it?

@@ If God created the world, how could he have created something out of nothing? You must have clay to produce a pot, a seed to produce a tree. If you say He produced it out of Himself then He is subject to change, and is therefore not immortal. That which does not change can never change. Hence we reject creation.

@@ Can you think of what you were in your mother's womb? No. How can you know what happened in God's womb? Impossible! Only religion gives its fairy tale answer. We dismiss it.

@@ If God is a creator then he is a wicked one. For he should have been aware of the future, and knew that the impulses of evil he has put into men materialize.

@@ He who says there is no God is a fool. He who wants to know God as He really is ultimately, is wise. My criticism is against peoples' idea of God, their imagination of God. If you think of God as Creator, it is nonsense. Where is the proof? Did you see God creating? Look for God as He is; he is not a creator. That is imagined. Creation and causality cannot exist. Hence God cannot be creator. See Verse 23 p.128 of Mandukya. "Those who are familiar with a

---

<sup>273</sup> The original editor inserted "513" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) person call God a person.”

@@ There is absolutely no evidence for God having created the world.

@@ There was an epidemic of small-pox in Mysore state this year. Lots of people went as pilgrims to a temple dedicated to the small pox goddess, as a precationary measure and worshipped this deity. However most of them died all the same. There is no proof that God will save people from disasters merely because they apply to Him. The causal connection is wrongly put by the ordinary mind, by people who are unable to think clearly.

@@ Science now says you cannot prove causal relation. Hence we rely on it for our best argument against creation theory.

@@ One school says that God imagines, thinks the world first and thus creates it. Another that he spun it out of his own being like a spider or changed a part of Himself into world, a third that he created it out of nothing, a fourth says he took prakriti as a potter takes clay and made the world. All these are more or less reasonable childish stories of religionists, which are useful just as Arabian Nights stories are useful to give delight to people.

The reply to those who say he made it out of his own substance is: How is it possible for one part of him to be mortal and the other part remain immortal? (Mandukya p.197). Is this possible? Religious people say: Don't blaspheme by asking such questions, but believe. For in this theory, one part of God is dying and being reborn, whilst the other part remains unchanged. But is there any illustration in our experience of the world where such a thing happens?

Take European pantheism with it immortal God in Nature. How can you prove anything is immortal?

(continued from the previous page) How do you know that God will never die? He may have lived for 10,000 years but that does not prove he will continue for a similar period. Experience tells me all things are subject to change. I am a part of experience; therefore I shall die. Hence we cannot prove the eternality of God. Only religionists believe it, but we find satisfaction only by reasoning—not believing. Similarly those who say the Atman undergoes change cannot ever posit it as immortal.

To theory that God ideates the universe, reply is why should He think of creating sorrows, sufferings; why should he imagine that which is painful to others. How wicked such a God is! If he is all-merciful, why all this? How can we depend on him if He is so changeable as to be kind to you one day and brutal the next? When you reason this theory will not stand.

If Atman is changing too, by nature how can there be certainty of Moksha, liberation or satisfaction? All these theories are absurd.

@@ God has created. Where was the material. The potter has to have clay. If out of Himself, it means He has changed. Who has seen the changes and where is the certainty that he will not change again. He cannot be eternal, i.e. unchanging God. There is no evidence for creation.

@@ All creation stories are fables that depend on faith. No man could have seen whatever existed before the race of man started. If any one had seen when a Manvantara started then only could he talk about Manvantaras, Kalpas etc. Hence all such talk is pure speculation. Neither should we use the words “supreme creator” for nobody could have seen God create. It would be more proper to use “Supreme Being.” Man thinks there must be a creation, a beginning, in order to construct a religious system. But it is impossible. Religionists who speak of creation use

---

<sup>274</sup> The original editor inserted at top of the page read: “19G” by hand.

<sup>275</sup> The original editor inserted “515” by hand.

(continued from the previous page) the word without meaning. All that may happen is a change of one form into another.

@@ The theory that this world is a leela or sport of God belongs to religion. Why should Brahma sport with human suffering? That theory will not do.

@@ Astrologic world prediction are rubbish for those who have no brains.

@@ Those who say God has made this world for diversion or for enjoyment overlook the fact that such a God must be imperfect, because he has an unfulfilled desire: and what use is such a God to us when he can't satisfy his own desires, how is he going to satisfy ours?

@@ As God alone was present at creation, as no angel or man had then come into existence, nobody else could have witnessed the initial start of creation. Before creation what must there have been? Obviously Unity, and when all creation has dissolved, what will be left, Again Unity. Hence there was and will be only One, even on a religious basis.

@@ When you identify the world with the One, then all this phenomena is the Atman, and no notion of its being produced is called for.

@@ The more you keep out the idea of causality the nearer you get to non-duality; this must be practised every day until it operates in dream also and thus you will approach realization.

@@ What is freedom? It implies freedom to do something Why should God wish to do anything? The truth is we are only imagining. Intuition: What is it other than imagination? How do you know that Absolute has got glory? If Brahman is freedom, why should he wish to do anything? Who wants creation—God or you? Such a freedom associated with God is no more than a philosophy of Hitlerism.

@@ The dualists ask: If you are God create the world? Answer: How do you know Brahman or God created at all? Is there any proof?

@@ Creation could not help anyone to achieve liberation, because it will always be subject to change and hence there cannot be in it a state of permanent unaltered liberation. Therefore it could serve no useful purpose in this regard. So even if you admit the reality of creation, it is seen to be unnecessary. But we do not admit such reality, it is unreal.

@@ How do you know that you will not change again, even if you are a Brahman now? To this objection we reply: This is fundamentally a question which assumes causality. We however disprove causality and thus the question is meaningless to us.

@@ Why should the world appear, you ask? I reply, Ask consciousness. World is appearance in consciousness. Even when it appears it is still consciousness or mind. All such questions arise only when notion of cause and effect is deep-rooted in you. It is a meaningless question to a Gnani.

@@ The question of duality comes with 'I' (the grandfather of ignorance) and with duality comes the question of causality. Duality means seeing Atman or Brahman in a different way, as one imagines.

@@ People ask why did Brahman imagine Avidya? All such questions miss the fact that there has been no change in Brahman, and it has no avidya at all.

@@ Non-duality means there is nothing else. There is no causality so far as Atman is conceived. Hence it is unborn. But still higher level to which we must rise, as birth is regarded as being distinguished from unborn; hence where nothing is born the use of word unborn is meaningless, has no reference to

---

<sup>276</sup> The original editor inserted "517" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) truth. It is best at this stage to comprehend that you can say nothing true about the question. Hence to say Brahman is eternal, unborn, unchangeable, omniscient is not done by the Advaitin. These words are used only in the earlier stages in contrast with the transient, and to direct your attention to a higher view.

@@ Unless you know that the world is an idea, and latter resolves into Atman, you have to concoct religious or yogic creation-stories for the world, cycles of evolution etc.

@@ Karma is there so long as you believe in cause and effect. But if you rise above cause and effect into highest unity, you enter a higher Karma-less world; when you know that there is no causality, Karma disappears.

@@ Evolution is an hypothesis: The West believes that there is progress; our Indian pundits believe there is regress, that we are descending into Kali yuga. Both are stating opinions. In life we find evolution plus involution and we really do not know which is higher and which is lower.

@@ To those who say a seed is invariably followed by a tree, hence cause is followed by effect, we reply some seeds may be planted but have failed to produce a growth. If further it is said that notice is known which has not been the product (effect) of a seed, we reply that we have never seen the seed from which we ourselves have been born nor has anyone else ever seen it. Therefore we cannot prove but only assume, i.e. imagine, that such a seed-cause ever existed. Vedanta has no use for assumptions.

@@ Causation is only a concept, i.e. an idea: therefore a thousand arguments for it will not alter this fact.



@@ The fallacy of causality is that we have to ask what is the cause for the ascertained given cause, and then again to ask what is the cause of that in turn. This leads us to an infinite regress, as with time. This is why Vedanta says causality does not explain anything in the final analysis.

@@ The question is about 'creation' or the 'causal' view of Brahman and the part played by the 'mind.' The question is asked by one who does not know what causality is but who believes in it and who wishes to know how Brahman is cause. Again, that Brahman created the world is only a fable intended to amuse children, for who has seen the actual creating by Brahman? Where is the proof of its Truth. Causality is itself proved to be a piece of imagination.

@@ When you understand causation thoroughly you will understand why there cannot be two things in this world. As there are really no two things, as everything is only one substance, there can consequently be no such relation as a causal connection. Those who set it up have succeeded in doing so only by imagining it.

@@ No scientist knows what exactly happens when two events follow each other regularly; he cannot say how a seed turns into a tree. The causal connection between them is made in our mind, is made by our thinking, but we do not actually see the connection; we only assume it. Therefore causation is meaningless.

@@ We, like Gaudapada and Sankara, make use of idealism to overthrow the realists. But after this is done, then the idealists themselves are attacked when it is shown that there are really no external objects, i.e. ideas, at all, as it is only the Mind itself which takes all these different forms. The ideas have never really been produced and were only illusory appearances of the Mind alone. When the question of causality is put to the idealists, when they are

---

<sup>277</sup> The original editor inserted "519" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) asked how the mind came into existence, they cannot answer. Here they cannot go farther and here Vedanta steps in to show there are no two things and hence no causality.

@@ Our objection to the Western cosmic evolutionary theory is that it presupposes the primal existence of matter. This is mere imagination.

@@ How can we know that man's ancestor was an ape? Evolution is only a hypothesis? We were not there to witness it. Scientists can only form ideas, that is, mental constructions, about earlier times, prehistoric evolutions, cosmology. But this is not truth, only imagination. Hence we can only speculate, never know. It is and must remain a mystery. There is no absolute certitude of fact. It will for ever be wrapped in mystery. This mystery is what India calls avidya, maya. It can only be understood when we grasp that the world is Mind and that Mind is always constructing. Nobody knows how the world was produced. Avidya, Maya, is the ultimate mystery. It is not a shakti of Brahman except for the primitive mentality.

@@ The critics of non-causality do not realize that during dream they also have the same strong belief in cause and effect as during waking, yet when they awaken they discover that the dream was only an imagination, unreal; hence its beliefs were also unreal.

@@ The difficulty so many scientists find in accepting non-causality is chiefly due to the fact that they fail to make a distinction between the practical unenlightened (vyavaharic) standpoint and the profounder philosophic (paramarthik) standpoint. They confuse the two. What is true in vyavahara need not be true in paramartika.

@@ We cannot say at what stage a cause becomes an effect, we cannot say when one form (cause) has been changed into another form (effect). You can go on searching for a final cause of anything which can be separated from its so-called effect but you will never succeed. Nothing exists in independence and therefore nothing is separable from anything else. Yet those who ask for a particular cause of a particular effect commit this fallacy of believing that there is a line of separation between them. There is not. But if there is not, then their duality disappears and the search for cause, being based on it, becomes nonsensical. The fallacy arises out of your initial taking for granted that they do exist separately. This so-called relation of causality is only your imagination. Hence the great semantic need of not being carried away by mere meaningless words like the terms 'cause' or 'effect.' However they have vyavaharic meaning i.e. unenquired meaning.

@@ The objection that an idea must have a corresponding external object as cause because no man would like the experience of pain, for instance, and were things only his ideas, he would never create ideas of pain-bringing objects nor imagine what is harmful to him, is replied by us thus: The advaitic way of argument is to make the opponent stick to his statement and then to show it leads to a fallacy. You are asking for a cause. This contains a hidden fallacy. You take it for granted that there is such a thing as cause but you have not proved there is a cause. It is equivalent to asking "Have you given up beating your wife?" Try to draw a line between your idea of the wall and the wall itself between the known wall and the existent wall. The first is a fact, the second is a supposition, between the believed cause and the believed effect. The truth is that wall and the thought of

---

<sup>278</sup> The original editor inserted "521" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) of it are one and the same, just as the thread and the cloth are the same; one cannot exist apart from the other.

@@ The search for an explanation why the thought of an object arises in the mind is meaningless and unnecessary, once we know the truth of non-causality, indeterminacy. Mind is and it knows its ideas: that is as far as we can go. Dream is an illustration of the objects arising without cause.

@@ Vyavahara simply means that we stop our thinking at a certain point, that we limit it, that we refuse to think deeply, that we are satisfied with a practical superficial view of things or even with a scientific view, which is better but still not the deepest. In short it is the refusal to think to the ultimate, i.e. philosophically. It does not mean that there are two separate independent realms of Nature, the one Viyavahara and the other paramarthika; that is erroneous. Hence if it be said by scientists that causality does actually reign in the empiric world and if philosophers say it breaks down in the philosophic world, neither is correct. The correct view is that causality never existed at all but if we do not examine and reflect upon the world deeply enough, then we fall into the superficial but illusory view that causality is there, whereas when we think fully upon it we perceive it was never there because there were never two things. However we had to begin with a distinction between practical and the philosophic standpoints theoretically until we have gone deep enough.

@@ If God were visible in the objective world, then the logic of the potter and the pot would hold good. But nobody can find both world and God on same level. Hence the argument that world must have a Maker as pot had a potter is fallacious. This argument is based on logic, not on science.

@@ Why is time a question of such great importance? Because it involves the deeper problem of causality. The cause comes first and the effect subsequently, hence time must pass between them if they do exist. Therefore if time is shown to be illusory then causality will have to be regarded as illusory too. When time collapses, causality collapses with it. That is why Kant put them together. Hence too the study of time should precede the study of causality.

@@ The failure of science to make a distinction between practical life and ultimate truth accounts for its bewilderment, when dealing with Heisenberg's Principle of Uncertainty in the microphysical study of the atom. For the laws which obtain in the practical world gradually disappear and are exploded in the ultimate realm. Thus causality which admittedly rules the practical world becomes less and less as science probes deeper and ultimately vanishes.

@@ Unless you think of it, (the thinking is the cause) you cannot have time and space. Hence Einstein's Relativity is incomplete, it is Time-space-cause.

@@ So long as you think, so long as the mind functions, you have to believe in time space and cause. That is the limitation of the realm of drsyam. But such belief disappears in drik.

@@ The final problem of idealism, how and why the idea or image arises, can only be solved by understanding non-causality. For we start with the assumption of a previous cause and then foolishly search for it. However the law of indeterminacy will gradually but surely establish itself and then this problem will be solved – by giving up the quest of external object as cause of the idea of it or the “how” of idea-births as a meaningless question.

---

<sup>279</sup> The original editor inserted “523” by hand.

@@ The whole question of idealism is bound up with the three questions of time, space and cause, it cannot be settled until they are settled too.

@@ The question which comes first in time is the mind-body series in a question from the standpoint of causality. This is the theme of Panpsychism, or psychical monism.

@@ The basic fallacy of the critics of subjective idealism is their unconscious assumption of causality. It is therefore necessary to deal with the question of Cause along with idealism, otherwise it will not be final.

@@ The search for an explanation why the thought of an object arises in the mind is meaningless and unnecessary, once we know the truth of non-causality, indeterminacy. Mind is and it knows its ideas: that is as far as we can go. Dream is an illustration of the objects arising without cause.

@@ Nobody knows what is the connection between Mind and body. You may raise your arm but you cannot explain how the mind orders this or brings it about. It is nonsense to set up a causal relation between Mind and body as separate entities.

@@ The relation between drik and drsyam is a non-causal one, so say that drik is the cause of drsyam is to turn the former into the latter.

@@ If you say Brahman manifests itself as universe, that brings in idea that it is active, i.e. the idea of cause and effect, the notion of God creating the world. To rise above this error you should get to Ajativada, viz. I am witnessing the world. The world appears and disappears. I remain untouched. There is no causal relation between us.

@@ Causality implies duality. i.e. one as the cause of the other. If there is only one there is no causality. When the mind negates the three states, there is only Brahman and there cannot be any causal relation there.

@@ Causality is also an idea. As long as there is the world and ego there is the idea of causality also. Causality is in the world.

@@ A question as to the cause of creation of all the world means that you are ignorant. When you look for the cause of the object, it is Maya. Everybody describes the theory of creation according to the stage in which he is. All these theories are due to their own ignorance. Idea of creation is the lowest. That every individual is a ray from the divine sun is the next higher stage. But what are these all except non-dual Brahman alone. This is the highest stage.

@@ Why did God create this world? Could he not keep quiet? The wickedness of God, if he created the world, is clear. Why did he create men and women, i.e. lust?

@@ Creation is only an imagination. This is proved by science.

@@ For religion there must be creation and a creator, God. If you do not imagine, then the question of creator falls to the ground. If you imagine it is because of preconceptions or prejudice.

@@ Causation is possible only with the world of creation. Vedanta does not admit it. Causal plane means when you do not enquire with Vedanta. Ego appears and disappears. We cannot say that ego is always there or created by consciousness. When did the seed change and become a tree? We do not know the time when nor the process. We only know the states in which the seed was. Gaudapada says it is its nature (mind's) to exist. Mind creates. Maya creates only with the mind. When your mind is thinking of a thing you ask a question.

---

<sup>280</sup> The original editor inserted "525" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) The causal idea comes to you only when your mind works, when you have object. What is meant by absolute certainty? What will you do with thinking, you will only get a thought. Thought disappears in me and comes out of me. It is only the mind that makes you imagine there is a cause when there is none.

@@ When the mind sees an object then only the mind asks for a cause. The causal idea comes to you only when you are seeing something i.e. in the world of duality, i.e. in waking and dream. It is the mind that makes you imagine that there is a cause. And independent causal relation cannot be established. Bergson says that there is continuous change. But what is it that sees the change. Causation is only in the drsyam world; we should not superimpose this causation idea on Atman. But Gaudapada argues that we cannot exactly say that this is the cause of that. When did the seed change into the sprout? When did the child become adult and the adult become the aged man? The change is continuous process. The scientist only notes how much it grows or changes in an interval of time. He cannot either give the exact time of change or how it changes.

@@ Causality implies duality: and where there is no one of the three states, when there is only one, the Turiya, where then is the room for causality in the absence of duality, when mind negates all the three states?

@@ When we know that non-duality is the truth, then it follows as consequence that causality cannot be true, because there are no two things where all is one, there can be no duality of cause-effect. Deep sleep is an example of this in actual experience.

@@ Scientists themselves say now that they do not know what causal relation is.



@@ When the first cause is not seen, not known, then you can only imagine its nature.

@@ Those who talk of Brahman's "Leala", playfulness as an explanation of the world's creation ignore the question, "Why should God want to play, sport?" Such wants are alright for humans, but God should be above all wants.

@@ The question of production or causation of a second thing cannot arise where there is only one substance – mind – not two.

@@ The stages of philosophic growth arise out of each other. Thus unless you know objects are ideas, you will not be able to understand that all is Mind. And unless you know that all is one Mind you cannot understand causality.

@@ When you understand the non-causality, you will then understand how there cannot be change how there is non-duality and all the highest advaitic teaching. When everything is mind, there is no question of mental constructions. The moment you see that the whole of the world is also Mind, you will see that mind does not really construct as mind—nothing new has come; but viewed from the standpoint of ignorance, there are ideas. Even when you see the world or know the ideas, they are still only Mind. In no other way can oneness be established.

@@ If you get any doubt, difficulty or question about non-causality, go at once to dream and that will solve it.

@@ Cause implies duality. Without two one cannot become the cause of another.

@@ When you imagine there is a cause, then it appears to be there when you do not think so, it does not appear. The Mohamedan and Christian says that he know that God created world because they are imagining so.

@@ It was Max Planck that first proved to the world that there is no strict causality. He affirmed that we cannot prove that there is

---

<sup>281</sup> The original editor inserted "527" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) strict causal relation in the world. For scientific investigations it is assumed that there is causal relation between events but it is only a working hypothesis, that is all. No scientist has proved that there is strict causal relation. This does not mean that there is no cause and effect and that effect does not follow cause. It means only that we cannot say for certain that one event will always be followed by another event. Modern physics recognises it is based only on probability. It says that there is no strict determinism.

@@ There is nothing to show that there is any causal relation between two things, yet we start with the unconscious assumption that the relation is there and hence seek to put it there by imagination.

@@ There is no flawless explanation of how a cause produces an effect, no proof.

@@ Heisenberg's criticism is that scientific prediction of the future depends on knowledge of the present, but the latter is imperfect. We do not know everything fully about the present. Hence we cannot accurately determine the future.

@@ How has the leaf emerged from the seed when both are so different? The proof is not given. To say that seed is the cause of the leaf does not explain anything.

@@ Those who analyse into efficient, material, final, formal, first, accessory etc. causes have viewed it from different standpoints but never paused to enquire if there be a cause!

@@ Who has seen God willing? Who has seen Him creating? It is nonsense to say such things, not truth. They are mere imaginings, suited to religion.

@@ The truth of non-causality is too high for brainless people especially for religious minds, hence it is kept esoteric.

@@ Why did the Maharaja of Mysore die? The best scientific medicine and medical attention was given him, yet without success. There is therefore, if we enquire into the root of the matter and go to the very end, the fact that no certainty, only indeterminacy, hence non-causality, although we are obliged in this world to use it for practical purposes. The unthinking man will however be satisfied to dispose of the question by saying "It is God's will or fate."

@@ There are three religious and mystical theories of universal creation. i. out of nothing. This is Christian—Jewish. ii. out of a second substance. This is Sankhya tenet of prakriti. iii. out of God's own self. This is the Upanishadic tenet of spider spinning a web out of its own body. But all these are not Advaitic.

@@ Science has begun to realise that its law of perfect causation is an imagined one. Sometimes its predictions happen but sometimes they do not. The truth is, as Heisenberg has asserted that things may or may not happen, that there is no certainty in processes or measurements, and that we do not really know anything irrefutably. The litmus paper changing colour in acid is the only cause of this change is uncertain. There may be other but unknown factors at work says Bertrand Russell, and these may totalize into cause. Our reply is we will not tell a lie: we must deal only with the known, not with possibilities. Hindu philosophers have proved, in ajatavada, that Russell's theory will never be proved true.

@@ Determinism means causality. Science has now found it to be an 'illusion' in Jean's own words.

@@ Astrology is rubbish because it is based on causation. Science has proved causality to be a fiction.

@@ The old scientific notion of causality was that there was a fixed and invariable cause for everything; the modern notion of indeterminacy is that there may be other causes for the existence

---

<sup>282</sup> The original editor inserted "529" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) of a thing besides the known one. In short, there may be something which we do not know in operation. The old notion was strict determinism; the modern notion is that a thing may or may not happen, i.e. non-causality. The latter was known in India as ajatavada. Till now scientists said that Nature was causally precise. Now they say there is no certainty. You may plant a seed and a tree may or may not be the effect. For practical purposes i.e. ignorant unenquiry we accept the seed as a cause and a tree will probably result but for philosophic purposes of absolutely certain, not probable knowledge, we must confess that there is no certainty about the causality of the seed/tree.

@@ Cause and effect have no meaning. Production implies them. Creation is production. Hence we reject creation.

@@ There is no certainty about freedom and no certainty about determinism. Ideas come and we do not know why they come.

@@ We do not finally accept vivarta. It implies causality in the end. For it says the world is illusory superimposition, so it implies someone who is manipulating the illusion. If so, what is the relation between him and the illusion? It is causal. Thus even though in vivartha the substance is not changed but only the form or appearance, it is not the last truth. It is overthrown by Ajata.

@@ What is the use of enquiring into the truth of individual causes when you have not enquired into the root belief in causality itself?

@@ The present situation in science is that it cannot give up causality yet its faith in it is shaken.

@@ Determinism is the scientific doctrine of causality which says that the future (as effect) can be predicted from the present (as cause) and that the present is inseparable from the past and the future.

@@ Why has mind got this complex for causality? Because in seeking for cause it has for the moment to drop, forget the effect. Similarly in seeking for the cause of the world eventually it will have to drop, forget, negate, the world and thus it will arrive at Brahman.

@@ The root of the belief in causality is the failure to make a semantic analysis of the meaning of the word "cause." Thus the importance of Semantics is vindicated.

@@ It is quite impossible to draw the line for the particular moment when a seed becomes a plant. Hence we can only say it is a unity, that change is inexplicable, and that the seed is not the cause of the plant nor is the latter produced by it.

@@ The origin of God: the origin of the soul: the origin of the world—these three questions can be discussed ad infinitum but no final conclusion be arrived at. Hence the thoughtful Hindus classed God, Soul, world as Anadi, i.e. beginningless and endless. Philosophically this is valuable because it means that you cannot prove anything conclusive about these matters and therefore it was useless to argue about them. It means that the scientific spirit had begun; but the culmination of this line of thought came with the tenet of non-causality in Mandukya. Beginninglessness still implies causality, only it confesses we do not know primal causes. Karma doctrine is based on it. For when did karma begin?

@@ It is a great illusion to couple freewill with non-causality. Libertarianism is really based on causality. The religious scientists and philosophers who want to prove freedom by non-causality, are talking nonsense.

@@ As the mind can think only by discriminating between dualities, it cannot think of causality, without thinking of its failure on the other

---

<sup>283</sup> The original editor inserted "531" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) side, of luck, accident, chance or other breakdown of causality. Hence causality implies non-duality when you enquire into its meaning.

@@ So long as you think of your personal life and its needs causality remains irrefutable. That is why advaita says give up ego in order to see truth.

@@ The proof that there is no causal relation does not come from samadhi; it comes in the waking state by use of sharpened reason.

@@ Indeterminacy means that we cannot establish a connection between cause and effect. But it is not final. It is the first step only. The next higher step is ajati.

@@ The only connection between so-called causes and so-called effects is that of ultimate unity, oneness. When you find that everything in this world is inextricably linked up with everything else, thus forming only one thing in the end, what room is there to speak of one thing being the cause of another? It all points to ultimate unity and there is no room for multiplicity or duality here.

@@ It is nonsense to say you are perfectly free. Can you fly in the air immediately? No. Then you are not free to do so.

@@ People think that if determinism is demolished, freewill can step in. They are wrong. Both are coupled together. If one goes then the other goes with it.

@@ We cannot say how a particular particle of energy, electron will behave: hence it is called uncertainty.

@@ The word change implies the existence of some pre-existing thing from which the change has come and from which it differs. This Bergson did not see.

@@ Those who say that life suddenly enters the germ are merely imagining. Can they say at what precise moment or in what way it got in?

@@ What is the meaning of free will? It means doing something. Why do we do anything? To produce an effect. Hence it is erroneous to presume that free will rises above causality: the old controversy between determinism and liberty is nonsensical because both are based on belief in cause and effect. Yet they delude themselves about this pseudo-freedom.

@@ We cannot say that anyone thing is the cause of any other thing but the whole world combines to be the cause of the whole world, thus making it a unity. If you sow a seed, it must be watered where does water come from? Clouds. But clouds do not come without wind. How does the wind come? Thus you can go on endlessly, building up a chain of causes in which ultimately the whole world co-operates, thus showing it to be one. For this reason we say you cannot truthfully assert that the seed is the cause of the tree, because everything else in the world is also cause and all these causes being joined together, become as one thing with their so-called effects. Push the causal theory to its logical end and it kills itself.

@@ All the different explanations and controversies about the meaning of Maya in India, is due to the inherent belief which prompts them to seek for a cause of the world; they are under causal complex. There are advaitins who do not know advaita fully and so do not grasp non-causality.

@@ Eddington gets confused between vyavahara and paramartha when he deals with non-causality. We must have causality when we want to walk, eat or work, i.e. in the practical world, but it is quite a different matter when you consider what is ultimate truth. Science has got in a fix, through not grasping this fact. On one side i.e. vyavahara, it cannot give up causality, but on the other it is faced by indeterminacy.

@@ You find causality only in the world of drsyam, thought, imagination, but not in the Drik.

@@ Our position is that even Maya is only Brahman.

---

<sup>284</sup> The original editor inserted "533" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) For those who are still under causal belief and demand explanation of world we teach Maya, but others who have grasped truth of non-causality, Maya is not needed.

@@ To be able to grasp the truth of non-causality it is absolutely necessary first of all to make a semantic enquiry into the meaning of cause.

@@ If there is no end to the causal series, as tree-seed chain, then does this not indicate there is a defect in the notion of causality itself?

@@ Creation is a special kind of cause. All such dogmas as Brahman is the origin of the world, Brahma is the First Cause of the world, Atman is the Creator of the world, belong to the sphere of religion, not philosophy.

@@ If there is no such thing as cause, how is it that world-processes happen? That is quite a different question from that of the meaning of cause.

@@ Mandukya shows by semantic analysis that the word "cause" has no meaning at all, whereas "Brahma Sutra" merely establishes the identity of cause and effect. Continuity of substance identity of cause with effect, does not prove the absence of cause and effect relation. This is the error of the pundits. Kokeleswar Sastry's book makes this same error about non-causality.

@@ Mandukya and modern principle of indeterminacy have both shown that one this is not connected with another, i.e. Ajati, and that cause and effect have no relation.

@@ When our enquiry into the meaning of cause shows it to be quite meaningless, we give up all such questions as "What is the cause of the world" as being equally meaningless. What is the use of considering such questions before you have considered the question whether there is such a thing as causality or not?

@@ Causal relation is only an inference, it cannot be perceived.



@@ Mandukya demolishes causality by enquiring What is meant by cause? What is meant by effect? What is meant by relation? The modern scientific way is to ask Has the word 'cause' a meaning? Scholastic or mystic interpretations of non-causality such as that of Brahma-Sutras do not examine causality here in this world but speculate on a dogmatic Brahman not being the cause of the world: i.e. they start at the wrong end and do not scientifically prove truth of meaninglessness of causal relation. They interpret non-causality as identity in Brahman but this is wrong, for it posits two distinctly separate things. How can two different things be one? The Scholastic method is interpretation: the philosophic method is proof.

@@ The causal idea works in you unconsciously as a hidden complex. Only the Mind is present all the time, even thing seen by it whether objects or ideas is only the Mind still and is not produced or caused by it.

@@ When there are no two substances you cannot speak of causality. Hence it is foolish to look for an explanation of the world-appearance. Yet everyone attacks Hindu philosophy by objecting, If Brahman is immutable how did it change into world? Yet people do this because their minds are rivetted to causality-belief.

@@ Those who ask why the multiple world-forms come to our mind, are suffering from the causal complex. Advaita cures the student of this complex and then they cease asking such a question. But until they grasp this truth of non-causality they are quite right in questioning: it should not be abandoned but pursued to the utmost end, thus truth will be found.

@@ Mind does not create the external world, from the final standpoint. Nobody has seen the process of production: it is only an inference. The world seen in dream is not a creation because

---

<sup>285</sup> The original editor inserted "535" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) it is still only Mind, not a thing second to or different from Mind. There is no causality. We do not tell lies, do not accept inference as fact. Similar to this is the supposition that you know who your mother is. Did you witness your birth? No. Then you can never say you know who your parent is: you only suppose it or believe others.

@@ So long as the belief in causality has not been transcended, we have to say with Western Idealists that Mind has produced, created or constructed the world. But when you rise to the highest level, and perceive there is no causality, then the world is seen as being none other than Mind itself, no production being entailed.

@@ Those who deny that you cannot know what is in the mind of others and point to telepathy: Rely: What do you really read? It is your own mind, not the other man's. For you imagine what the other is thinking and some of your imaginations turn out to be correct. But where are all these imaginations? They are in your own mind, not the other man's. In this sense, mind-reading by telepathy is philosophically untenable, i.e. on a higher level of enquiry than the practical.

@@ Causality does not break down in the practical world through the Heisenberg-Planck quantum mechanics experiments; but it is unable to explain them. So reflection, thinking leads to non-causality but when this reflection occurs the scientist has altered his standpoint and moved up to the philosophical standpoint.

@@ When Bertrand Russell has wrongly said causality will again return to science, he has turned astrologer.

@@ People are deceived by causality because they do not enquire into its meaning.

@@ Things happen in a certain order but this does not prove there is any causal connection between them, for the order is not invariable. We can say only that things happen; there is no such thing as a causal law. This uncertainty is what we mean by Maya. For ideas cannot be grasped: they are gone before you can get hold of one. So it is impossible to bring them into connection causally. Bergson was right in saying there is only a continuous flow. This flow of indeterminate ideas is Maya.

@@ There is no possible connection between drik and drsyam. Relations can exist only between two drsyams, never between drik and drsyam. This is the point which is unknown to the West. Hence when we say that we know of no connection between them, this is the same as doctrine of non-causality. For if we cannot affirm something it is better to keep quiet, not to tell lies. For to say there is a relation when by going to the root of the matter we find we cannot say anything at all about it, is to tell lies.

@@ The Vivartavadins who say because the spider spins the web out of itself therefore they are the same and causality does not exist, are unable to answer the criticism why if they are the same, do we see them as different? This argument for non-causality fails because it does not offer any verification.

@@ All the realistic schools fail to grasp the idealistic position because they fail to enquire into the relation between external object and the idea of it. For this would lead them to the further enquiry as to how the object produces the idea, how it causes the idea to come into existence. This again must lead to inquiry into the meaning of the word cause and whether there is anything in the causal relation or not.

@@ You cannot get at the real cause of anything, nor at the whole series of its causes. You may

---

<sup>286</sup> The original editor inserted "537" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) say that quinine (cause) is the cure (effect) of malaria but you cannot possibly explain all the factors why quinine cures malaria. When we say of a bird which cleverly builds its nest for the first time in its life, that it does so by instinct. We cannot get the whole cause from physical factors alone; there is also its mind and what do we know of that? We explain nothing by instinct. It is only a word; it is something which we imagine. We do not know the totality of conditions which are needed to bring about an event. All that you really know are your own ideas. What is behind or beyond your ideas your ideas you never know.

@@ When the universe is reduced by philosophy to a single entity, then causality must necessarily disappear because it depends on a duality of cause and effect.

@@ All that we can accurately say of Nature is that there are sequences. We cannot correctly say there is cause and effect.

@@ The real is neither the cause nor the effect.

@@ To say that the union of hydrogen and oxygen produces water and therefore they are causes of an effect does not explain why gases should form a liquid but only how. Science says this is example of causality reigning in practical world but it will not stand thought.

@@

## CHAPTER (20) THE MIND.

@@ Even if you know anything about the mental world it is only a picture.

@@ Our position is not true idealism. Berkeley says “World is an idea” Vedanta asks “If that is an idea and what we have in mind is an idea, how do you distinguish one idea from another? Idea of material wall and the idea of the wall in one’s mind,—how are they distinguished?” Berkeley’s saying God has given us ideas of the world is wrong. He regards God as a separate being and that God is doing everything for us. So then Berkeley diverges. Russell is correct idealism up to a certain point. Then he diverges. Russell needs Yoga, he cant rise to intense concentration, his desire for women interferes with truth. New Realists who are against idealism must be studied and answered.

If you look at a map of India do you think you have seen India? It is just a mental impression of India, nothing more.

@@ Hiranyagarbha is God when he is creating the world, God in a creative mood. The thoughts is God’s mind is the entire cosmos. Therefore there is nothing in the whole world outside God’s mind. God thus takes the form of mind, the ultimate existence. Garbha means womb, hence mental womb.

@@ Whatever you see is in the mind, as a part of it, not outside, and is a modification of the mind.

@@ Berkeley believes world is idea but imagines God to be putting these ideas in front of us, taking them out of his box to show us and putting them back again! This is not Vedantic view.

@@ Waking is a state in which you think through custom to expect light only from sun, electric lamp etc. You have a preconception. Your mind is prejudiced that light must come externally, and therefore when you shut your eyes you have no light. The sense-world ought not to be compared

---

<sup>287</sup> The original editor inserted “539” by hand.

(continued from the previous page) with the mental world. You can never see it without sense-sources of light. Hence do not ask for mind to create light with which to view a dark sense-world.

@@ Whilst awake you can think of a large distant city, say Melbourne. Can you say in which part of Melbourne your mind is not present when you think of it? No. Hence we say mind is omnipresent, pervades the whole world.

@@ Your mind cannot be measured by a tape and found to be any particular length. Therefore you can only truly say, the mind is immeasurable. I have not seen any limit to it.

@@ How can you show what gold is? You convert bracelets, jewels and rings by melting them down in plain gold. Similarly how are you to show what worldly objects are? You must convert them into their ultimate basis—Mind. You must look deeply into men beyond their noses and faces, if you want to see the Atman of which they are really made.

@@ The critic who said “The world is an idea; why don’t you think a chair and then go and sit down on it” is making two errors: first he thinks the idealist takes his own body as real and only the rest of the world as an idea: second he does not know that it is not the individual mind which creates the universe and its objects but that mind which itself sees the individual, in short the common mind. The individual has no powers to make the universe, that which makes the universe makes the individual also. This point is very difficult to grasp. Berkeley saw it, but owing to his theological predilection he brought in the conception of God to account for the creation of the ideas of the Universe. That which sees these external objects as ideas is therefore able to see the individual body as an Idea because it is purely a universal view point.

@@ The critic who objects that if the Gnani has realised that universal common mind he should be able to create objects mentally overlooks the following:— The gnani has no desire to demonstrate anything for the satisfaction of others, whilst for himself there is also no desire to create simply because he is desireless, and finally because he regards all as himself. He knows that if he is creating through the All; for him such a question never arises as that raised by the critic. Secondly he does not have to answer it.

@@ School of Realistic Idealism says there is something real outside of which we form copy (ideas) inside. But this ignores the question: “Of what stuff is that outside thing made?” They analyse it to electrons. What are electrons? A hypothesis i.e. which brings it down to an idea. Thus all matter is reduced to mind. Hence this school is partly wrong.

@@ Those who speak of Idealism as teaching that the body is an externalization of the mind, are wrong. They are too much attached to the body to be able to give it up in order to understand truth. For where does the mind stop? Can you measure its ultimate limit? What is outside and what is inside the mind? Neither body nor this wall can possibly be external to the mind.

@@ Think of everything, every object as being nothing but the work of your own mind which gives them shape, and thus you remove the snake superimposition and see the rope.

@@ If you say world is idea, where do these ideas exist? Reply: in the mind. Therefore there must be mind first.

@@ What is it that tells you that you have a body? Think of this and know Mind as primary.

@@ A farther stage of development will face science. It will have to answer the question: “What is mind?” That will take it 10,000 years to answer. For mind is Brahman.

---

<sup>288</sup> The original editor inserted “541” by hand.

@@ The Gnani knows that the world is idea; he knows that idea is only Brahman. He has converted the external objects into ideas and ideas into Brahman, because he has made enquiry into their real nature. I have not yet taught you however the reverse process; how ideas are converted into external world.

@@ What is mind? It is that which can assume any form.

@@ Nirvikalpa Samadhi is only a preparatory stage which gives the discipline for rising higher.

@@ The difference between a yogi emerging from Nirvikalpa samadhi and ordinary man emerging from sleep is that the yogi knows that by controlling the mind he can get rid of the contents of the mind, get rid of all this world voluntarily, but nevertheless temporarily. It does not explain to him what the world is, so he is yet in ignorance, albeit not so gross as others.

@@ Perfect control of mind, i.e. elimination of all thoughts as in Patanjali's first sloka is impossible, says Ashtavakra. Page 217. I completely deny its possibility. Nobody can verify a yogi's statement that he has stilled his mind without thoughts because it is impossible to look into another man's mind. And where verification is impossible, we can have no proof, but only mysticism.

@@ All the Indian systems of philosophy such as yoga, vaiseshika nyaya, tarka and sankhya except ours teach that the Atman has a separate thing called mind. Only Advaita teaches that Atman is mind, none other than it. Nevertheless those systems are useful as steps by which to analyse and then rise upwards.

@@ Patanjali is mere ABC. His goal is deep sleep. The occult powers (siddhis) which yogi develops are powers belonging to a state equivalent



(continued from the previous page) to dream state: hence they have the value of dream faculties. To the jnani they are but mental creations as much as other ideas and not Brahman. He looks upon them as he looks upon ordinary powers.

@@ The power of suggestion in healing is useful and I use it occasionally to treat patients and have healed several cases.

@@ “transcending the mind” is rubbish. We can transcend the thoughts about the world, about the objects only. Yoga is not deadening the mind but only controlling the modifications to make it steady, disciplined and concentrated.

@@ Complete control of mind is not possible by yoga. Mind cannot be controlled just like the senses, by external control, i.e. if you shut your eye you cannot see, but while your mind is working you cannot stop it suddenly by any means.

@@ The mystic imagines a thousand things about God, that he hears you and you see him, etc. History shows how God never answers peoples’ prayers; not surprising because He is an imagined God. To know Drg alone is the unchanging reality, for the other things pass away.

@@ To talk of God’s Ideas, Divine Ideation, means that you not only know God exists but you know what was in his mind. Therefore this doctrine is only your imagination.

@@ If the yogi can stop war by occult powers, why did not Krishna stop the war in Gita by such power?

@@ “New Thought” is partial truth. Body is mental. Therefore ultimately able to control body. If you believe that the world is an idea, that thought does make the body must be believed, as body is an idea. Hence you must believe in Karma. But this involves intense concentrative power plus many rebirths. What “New Thought” followers understand this? They might get great results in the same

---

<sup>289</sup> The original editor inserted “543” by hand.

(continued from the previous page) life-time it is possible, but they may have to wait some births if that power is weak.

@@ The power of suggestion is used by Yoga gurus on pupils on those who believe in them. If you make a slave of your patient in spiritual healing or of your pupil in Yoga then your power over him will produce marvellous results. It is the power of stronger over the weaker mind.

@@ Aurobindo Ghose's claim to have several times prevented European war is nonsense.

@@ There was a boy in Mysore who could charm snakes for years. Then one day he was killed by a snake. Similarly if Yogi Ramiah repeatedly tested his power with more snakes he too might discover he had mistaken his power for a permanent one. Repeated experiment is needed to prove such powers.

@@ How do you reconcile the duality of experience with the non-duality of Truth? This problem seems insoluble to weak minds, and so they turn aside from it and take to religion or Yoga. But Vedanta can explain and solve it; so far as books can do so for books are explanations, not realizations: they are helps to the latter. So Mandukya gives here the illustration of the whirling firebrand which when set in motion appears in various figures such as 8, made by you, straight or crooked. Similarly, Mind undergoes no change in itself because it became a tiger or a mountain in your dream. The appearance of these things makes no change in the substance of the mind. In the waking state Mind still retains one and the same essence, but takes all these forms, just as it does in dream. In the cinema show you see people move and talk as though they were living, but in reality there is only a strip of celluloid, no people at all. This

(continued from the previous page) self-deception of the human mind which takes things as they appear, is called Avidya. Hence we must correct the errors of the mind, which is done by getting knowledge.

Nobody has seen mind move from one place to another: all we can say is that the mind is thinking. But when mind is thinking it is not really changing its own nature. Duality can be explained without bringing anything from outside. If you see a snake, where is it? You see it with your mind. Is it outside the body, then where is the body? Inside your mind? Everything in the world is within the mind, but you see it as outside.

All movements of consciousness are only apparent. Is the dream body really running? Consciousness is immovable, for space itself is an idea within it. You can imagine an object moving from place to place, but with the consciousness itself does not move. Kant could not go so far: could not see that there is no unknown reality outside the mind; his noumena are outside, but that is impossible because there is no space outside mind. The whole world's mind-consciousness, both actions and inaction are therein. But without Avastatraya this cannot be understood. All thoughts of the world are within mind; when there are no thoughts of world it is not seen: This shows that the world is in mind and is mind. Hence there is no real duality of a real world and a real observer. Even Himalayas are only a notion of consciousness, are only imagination. We take world as real and separate because of our previous attachment to it for the sake of satisfying our desires. The ignorant here take the idea to be real. Nothing has gone out elsewhere, nothing has come into the mind from elsewhere, wherein everything happens. Nothing is produced, caused; there is no second outside Atman. Where is the space outside Atman to contain any second thing?

---

<sup>290</sup> The original editor inserted "545" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) The best illustration is dream. People have wrong idea that mind is confined to the skull. Greatest Western thinkers are prejudiced against Avastatraya because they wrongly believe dream is unreal, waking is real, and therefore dream proof not worth enquiry into.

@@ Tat Twam Asi. "Thou art that" is the first stage in Vedanta for children. We drop this because it is purely dogmatic, unproved statement in advanced Vedanta and replace it by the higher proved statement "Neti, Neti, "Not this, Not this" which is the negating of every thought or idea that can possibly arise, whether it be idea of God, or of the I. For the first is monistic, the second statement is non-dualistic. "Neti" means "Don't think." It is not a new thought to be added. All thoughts are useless in truth. "Thinking on the Unthinkable you only get a thought, asys Ashtavakra Gita. You may object the Karikas and Mandukya are only ideas, true, but what do these ideas do? They tell us to give up all ideas. They are like the thorn which is used to extract another thorn from flesh. We show that contradictions are in all teachings and suggest you to drop them all, and find something uncontradictable in Absolute silence where ideas there are none.

@@ If you think that mind is always there, that mind, objectified as Drsyam alone is what is coming or going, that there is no causal relation, then the Drk is seen to be consistent, and the world is seen to be really unborn. The drk was never lost, Moksha is never attained; you are always in liberation, you can never die, never change.

@@ Objects are not separate from the mind; (not the ego-mind, that is an error, but Mind in general); the mind in its turn is not separate from the self. (M.P.318, V.67.). You

(continued from the previous page) speak of “My mind”: When do you do this? When it is distinguished from yourself and thus an object. If the mind had no other entity beside itself, you could not say “my mind.” The word mind would be meaningless. The word mind has a meaning however only in the world of duality. Take away drsyam and there is no mind, no drik. Hence we say Brahman is beyond words i.e. beyond duality. (Mand.318 V.67). We must here fall into silence. If you have no drik you cannot perceive drsyam also. Hence both Drk and drsyam are inter-dependent. For you know of one only through the other. You require both the instrument of knowledge and the object of knowledge. Hence when people say “I do not see anything, because I see only Brahman” they talk nonsense.

@@ Ever-luminous” means whatever is presented to the Atman, it knows: it knows everything is mental, is only mind, it hence knows only itself. (Mand.331). When objects are not presented, its capacity to know is still there. Its capacity is not less, even in sleep. Hence it is ever-knowing.

@@ Until you know the meaning of the all, there is no Brahman. When you know that all these objects are mind only, you understand that there is no such thing as the mind itself changing its own nature. i.e. subject to causality, birth and death.

@@ The word “effulgent” Atman is the light, the knowledge, the awareness by which things become known: hence it is the one thing in Vedanta which is not negated. It is the thorn which is used to negate all other thorns of wrong ideas; when these are all removed, then the word effulgent, the thought of any attribute even immortality, even Ajati belonging to Atman, is thrown away as the instrumental thorn itself is discarded when it has served its purpose.

---

<sup>291</sup> The original editor inserted “547” by hand.

(continued from the previous page) Hence we use the idea of being to refute the idea of non-being and finally reject both. Thus all words, all ideas are ultimately cast off as not being the Drik. Silence alone falls here.

@@ You have seen the birth of a man's body, but you have never seen the birth of his consciousness. Hence we call latter "unborn". From Advaita standpoint the word "substratum" has no meaning. You speak of substratum only when you think of something other than it also, a quality etc. This means a second—hence duality. The mind is not really ever changed; all thoughts and imaginations appear to be changes but the mind itself remains what it was, unchanged, and as mind is not born either, it must also be free from death. One man's body may go to North India, and my body to Mysore; apparently there is separation and difference: but ask the meaning, is it separate? How far does my mind extend and how far does his? There is only one consciousness and we can't limit it to two individuals or speak of them as different: for we are obsessed by the ideas of body alone. Duality is with the body; in the consciousness, the unseen Atman, it disappears. If you are always thinking of variety alone you see duality! If you think of unity, you perceive that. Hence realisation depends upon your state of mind. When Vivekananda asked Sri Ramakrishna to get his ulcerated throat cured, by asking the Mother, so that he could eat again, i.e. Brahman, Ramakrishna did so: She replied: "Why are you thinking of eating in this body alone? Ramakrishna is already eating through millions of mouths." This means that when realising one mind is in all these bodies, we free ourselves from the separate-body limitation.

@@ When you understand what Mind is, then you are a gnani; for it is unlimited, indivisible without beginning or end, without shape or form. By contrast with this, think of any object or idea: it has individual separateness, form dimension. This is the description of Brahman. So you see Brahman is simply a name for Mind. But all the shapes and forms of objects are all transient and unreal.

@@ Before anything is derived from consciousness, what is consciousness? That is the question the most advanced Western thinkers, who have seen truth of idealism that all things are derivative from mind, now need to ask themselves.

@@ Words are only things which are found in the mind! Hence they cannot reach Brahman.

@@ It is impossible for the human mind to think of redness by itself—it must always associate it with some object like a tomato, or blood, etc. Later on you will come to see the vast significance of this in connection with Brahman and Maya. The word Brahman is only used as a sign-post: it can never reveal it: those who imagine they know its meaning, know only their idea—nothing more. This unreachable redness is like Brahman. Try and think of abstract red? You cannot! You can see redness only in the object: when you analyse the latter, you find two things have combined viz. matter and mind, to produce it. Your ability to understand the abstract nature of redness will come only after such analysis. Similarly your ability to analyse names and forms i.e. the object, the material world, and to separate them from Brahman, alone can lead to seeing Brahman as it is.

@@ We must apply to consciousness the same principle that we apply to trees. What is the abstract term ‘tree’? It is the universal characteristics of all trees. Similarly there

---

<sup>292</sup> The original editor inserted “549” by hand.

(continued from the previous page) is a universal characteristic of all minds; i.e. Brahman.

@@ If you had not the power of knowing, of thinking and feeling, of consciousness, i.e. of the Atman, you could never understand Truth; when you are talking of anything you presume that you exist as a talker without consciousness how could you talk? Hence the reality and existence of Atman as goal is implied.

@@ When you realize that all these objects that are known are only ideas, when you get rid of the duality caused by your imagination, what is left? Only non-duality – Brahman.

@@ Statements can only truthfully be made about known objects. The Brahman can never be such. Hence it is inexpressible verbally.

@@ If the world is a series of ideas, then these ideas must stand somewhere else as its basis. That basis must be Mind. When you saw mountain in dream, it was not there really, but you could not have had the idea of mountain without the mind which holds the idea. You must have a mind in which all ideas must exist. This is our reply to the Sunyavadins. If you say there is a nihilistic void, we reply, "there must be a knower of the void who knows that it is void."

@@ World as Idea and world as illusion are only tentative stages which are dropped when idea and illusion are seen as Brahman. Each element of world is only an idea; when ideas pass away, what is left is only Atman.

@@ Although the world-appearance is constantly changing, it is of the same mind-essence as the Atman.

@@ When once you know that ideas are also Brahman, then you know everything.

@@ If you know whole world is only Atman, you will not be troubled by either imagining



(continued from the previous page) it, by whether world is idea or not, by whether it should be renounced or not. For you know that imagination is in essence also Atman.

@@ The first degree of esoteric knowledge is that world is idea, the final degree is that world is Brahman, one and the same everywhere. Idealism alone is not enough, because the ego still remains there, as in case of Jeans etc. The ego must be killed before idealist can rise to higher stage.

@@ You cannot say that ideas are separate from the mind, because they could not exist apart from the mind-substance. Yet you cannot say the opposite that ideas are not separate from Mind because then there would be complete identity and you would see nothing. This position is the same with Brahman and the world of objects. The world is not independent of Brahman nor the same as it. Nothing therefore can be predicted truly of Brahman's relation to world other than to say that it is non-dual.

@@ Why we do not wholly agree with idealism is because we know that the ideas are of the same nature, non-different from the one substance Mind.

@@ There is only one thing called consciousness, mind, self, but people through ignorance think that each individual is separate, each mind separate too. To assist the student to grasp this point we give two illustrations (a) dream, (b) one space in a number of pots.

@@ From the highest standpoint idealism no less than materialism is illusive. For we say ultimately the world is not idea but Brahman. Ideas come and go, hence cant be ultimate reality, but where do they go? They disappear into the Mind. What is it that tells you they come and go? It is the mind. This unchanging mind is the Brahman. There is no way of reducing world to Brahman, however, without first

---

<sup>293</sup> The original editor inserted "551" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) reducing every object to ideas. Hence Idealism is a first and necessary stage, but we must not stop there. We must proceed to the next and last stage of enquiry. We ask, "What is an idea?" The attempt to answer the question, how ideas arise, what causes them, brings us to the second and final step, i.e. the enquiry into causality. This enquiry leads to the discovery that (as shown by dream illustration) all the multitudinous ideas can in their own turn be reduced to the single substance which is their essence, i.e. unindividualised Mind. And as the latter did not undergo real change, only apparent change, when it appeared as these ideas, therefore none of them was produced or caused and hence none of them had an individual existence apart from Mind. Thus the doctrine of non-causality is established and the way is now clear to see that Brahman as non-duality is the true reality.

@@ It is nonsense to say that there is a Higher Consciousness. There is no consciousness higher than that of this world, because this world is in your self. If there is any other consciousness then it can only be that of sleep.

@@ Mind is Brahman and is not a separate element. For there are no-two. Hence when ego-thought and world-thought are resolved back into Mind, that very Mind is none other than Brahman; two names of one and the same thing!

@@ If world and ego are effects of Mind, as dream-things are also its effects, is Mind not a creator like God? Reply: yes, that Mind is God, but we call it Brahman and we do not think of the effects as being different or apart from it. We ask "What is your God?" An individual! Then He is an idea, i.e.

(continued from the previous page) not the unlimited reality. So your God is not the true Brahman-God who is no separate individualised idea.

@@ Turiya = Drik = Sakshin = Seer = Knower. The knower is that which is not any of these states. Hence when you are thinking of Turiya you are negating the states, as Turiya cannot be made an object. Thus you arrive at the reality only through negating the illusory.

@@ Hindus contradict Muslims, Realists contradict Idealists, religions and philosophies contradict each other, because men are thinking. Hence only when all thinking ceases, will contradiction of opinion cease. Only in Non-duality such as sleep, does this occur. Then only attachment to any form of thought or belief-idea disappears. Hence Gnani says, "Your religious and mystic and yogic people go on quarrelling with each other, as you must. I shall keep aloof, indifferent and quiet."

@@ Ultimately even ideas do not exist, only the Atman. Hence Vedanta is not mere subjective Idealism, for the latter says ideas alone exist.

@@ We use the words Brahman or Turiya for the wordless truth only by explaining that it means that which cannot be reached by names or words. Hence these names are unique among all others, corresponding to no known thing. Silence is the most appropriate way of speaking of it, but to help students we use these words in their studies, pointing out their unique character and peculiar use however.

@@ You have to learn that ideation is also Brahman, not separate from it.

@@ If one denies the existence of Brahman or Atman, what is it that is happening? You are only thinking of Brahman as an object. But our idea of Atman is that of Witness. When you deny, the denier is there. That of which I am always conscious is Atman or Brahman.

---

<sup>294</sup> The original editor inserted "553" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) Atma can never become the object of knowledge. Buddha kept quiet when he was asked "What is Atman?" but his followers argued that Buddha meant there was no Atman. "The Nature of Atman is that it cannot be described," it is neither this nor that; but this does not mean Atman does not exist. Atma is that which cannot be negated. Language breaks down in defining it; and yet it remains.

@@ Your speech is lost in the Mind.

@@ The moment you know that everything is Brahman, you have omniscience. You have no right to say God is omniscient. He alone may say so. How can you know that God is so? Then it is taken on trust, and is lapsing into religion. Multiplicity of the world is identical with unity. Till this is understood the question of omniscience cannot be solved. You get omniscience when you see everything is in Brahman, is in Atman. It does not mean reading the future as that entails changing past to future, hence causality. The Gnani, by constant thinking, has arrived at seeing the Many when he sees the ONE.

@@ Why does not the seer, being universal, know all that is going on everywhere? Reply: Suppose you have many different coloured bottles. The same light goes into each only, and is reflected differently. When you are away from them the question of difference cannot arise. The thoughts of difference are associated with the bodies, the mental vehicles. But when you detach bodies, the yourself, you see no difference anywhere. When do you say that you are not conscious of other persons' thoughts? or of other thoughts than that of the self? Only when you know that they have had some thoughts, i.e. after they tell you. Until then there are no thoughts. When thoughts are presented to you whether they be your own

(continued from the previous page) or other peoples, then only you are aware of them; when they are not presented then you are unaware. How do you know from higher enquiry viewpoint, not from practical truths viewpoint another man has any thought in him? How can you see his thoughts? You can only imagine because you will inevitably make a reference to your own self and see what happens when you think. Thoughts can be known only when they are presented to you. Do you see your thoughts in deep sleep? No. For they are then unrepresented. Even in dream a man may come to you: you cant see his mind even then. He may think of stealing from you, yet you cant see his thoughts. Yet his mind is of the same essence or stuff as yours. It is a matter of presentation. A thought is something I can find only in my own mind, never in another's mind. I can only imagine otherwise. This is strict enquiry in ultimates, rest is imagination or belief.

@@ Gnanam = Mind = Knowledge = Consciousness= Awareness. It cannot be said to be an abstraction, a non-entity, because it is that which gives the idea of reality to all, which knows.

@@ "Self-effulgent" means Atman has light in itself, everything in itself, it does not need any other thing to make it aware of objects.

@@ When they say that mind itself is transient because ideas are transient, they go beyond the warrant of evidence. They must have still had a second mind to perceive the coming and vanishing of the first!

@@ Words can tell you what is not Brahman: they cannot tell what is Brahman.

@@ The Yogic Idea that Brahman is the highest state of "consciousness is" false.

@@ The universal mind does not have to evolve into Brahman because it already is Brahman. There is one mind only. As Brahman it is the

---

<sup>295</sup> The original editor inserted "555" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) only reality, and that same mind operates in the waking state. It is universal and common to all. This universal knower is really the only one that exists. The ego itself which prevents us from seeing this unity, the millions of individual lives are really part and parcel of the common mind, which explains why the Gnani cannot help but feel for the rest of the world.

@@ There is something which exists, it is everywhere. The mind cannot ultimately be empty, there must be something behind it, matter cannot be utterly empty. It is absurd to say nothing exists, no supreme reality as Sunyavada Buddhists do. Even if you think of absolute non-existence, the thinker himself exists. There is an ultimate reality therefore whether in man or world. Silent method of teaching means in Sushupti there are no spoken words. Where have they gone? Back into the self! But you cannot say the word self and still remain in the self. Hence it can be indicated only by remaining silent, which is what Buddha did.

@@ To say remove all possibilities of contradiction in order to find truth means to remove all ideation. What can you do by thinking. It will only lead to further ideas. You will only get a thought.

@@ How are we to know that there is nothing, a void? There must be a knower to say this. If you utter any word, and a word means an idea in your mind, i.e. your mind thinks, there is a mind which is thinker.

@@ You cannot say this or that of it without making an object conscious of it, thus falsifying it. Words cannot describe it, but we cannot say it does not exist, for even when denying it there is something there to make the denial. It is that which

(continued from the previous page) knows everything in this world, of which everything is made. Deep sleep is not death and affords the best illustration of Atman, for we can say nothing in or of it; yet there still you exist. Finally we cannot even call it Atman or being and we have to drop these terms and say no word is its equivalent.

@@ When the mind sees that which is common to all material things, it sees their essence-stuff by dropping their forms: this is the real meaning of samadhi (sama-the same) – not the yogic sleep or imagination.

@@ The mind has never been separated from the objects and creatures seen in your dream. Therefore at no time has the mind itself been separate from them. Even in the waking state, no object is ever separated from the mind. Ideas must stand somewhere, be created of something, and this is mind. We use the word mind here instead of Brahman, for it is easier to see that all things being ideas, are made of one stuff – Mind.

@@ Vedanta says all these thoughts and ideas will again go back into you. They will never be lost. Everything is only idea. All your ideas of the whole world goes back in deep sleep into the same mind. Hence there is no real loss and you need not be unhappy at the apparent (but not) real loss. The world has gone into you.

@@ Atman, Brahman, God, are mere words. Words express ideas. They are not reality. They can be rejected. The real is nameless, wordless, beyond words or as Upanishad says, “beyond speech.”

@@ The knowing entity or power is the same unity in all persons. It is Atman.

@@ All the departments of knowledge – mathematics, geology, sociology etc. deal only

---

<sup>296</sup> The original editor inserted “557” by hand.

(continued from the previous page) with the illusory.

@@ Everything that has meaning, is an idea, hence is a drsyam and not reality. Thus “scriptures” and “gurus” are words with meaning only in duality.

When do you talk of non-duality? Only when you have the idea of duality! When you see everything as Brahman, however then the idea—and all thoughts—of nonduality disappears. The latter is merely an idea which you use as a thorn to extract the other thorn of duality.

@@ Name and form, idea, must be eliminated; otherwise you cannot know truth, We use the word man, for instance, but what is a man? Each person has a different idea, i.e. imagination, i.e. nama-rupa.

@@ “Because Brahman is without parts”: There is nothing to distinguish one thing from another, when the whole is mind (Atman) alone with no parts.

@@ Upanishads say the self is nearer and dearer than anything else: this means that the Mind is nearer than anything we know.

@@ We do not get at the true nature of things by thinking about them, because all thinking will only yield one more thought in the end.

@@ Gita 4:35 means that you can see all beings in yourself, you can get faultless knowledge, only by knowing that they are all ideas.

@@ The proof that Manas is Brahman is given by Taittiriya Upanishad, page 747 and 750. Where then is room for Aurobindo’s “Supermind?”

@@ Where is the word which can describe mind? None exists. Hence we are forced to say “Neti, Neti,” “It is not this.”

@@ Realization is nothing else than to know, after analysis, that everything is Mind.



@@ The question of Why these different ideas of multiplicity arises to the mind is unaskable by the Mind and unanswerable except by knowing truth. For where everything is one, as in sleep, which is the truth, there is no duality, hence no duality of questioner and question. Therefore when this is comprehended, the why does not arise: it only arises in the state of ignorance.

@@ How do you get the meaning of a word? Is it with the mind or without it? It is with mind, because you cannot think the meaning without it. Hence even if you discover Spirit or God or Brahman you are using mind and forming an idea only.

@@ Whatever word is used to describe the Self, a man will only be able to imagine in order to understand it, i.e. he will get an imagination but not Self.

@@ The mind in one part may affect another part, because all is Mind; hence telepathy is possible.

@@ Your imaginations kill the capacity to perceive the Drik.

@@ How do you understand mind by itself? You can say: "I have got different thoughts," but how to know what pure mind is? Reply: To melt all the thoughts, as in sleep, to eliminate the names and forms. This pure Mind is Brahman.

@@ Those who talk of a Supreme Mind are merely indulging in imagination.

@@ Swami Krishnanand who keep a young lion and claims it is done by his yogic power is not proving his claim. Just as keepers in the zoo get acquainted with their animals and can enter the cages to feed them so has the swami got acquainted with his lion. The zoo keepers do not claim any yogic power. Let the swami go into a forest under critical witnesses and play with wild beasts he never before met and then only shall I believe him.

---

<sup>297</sup> The original editor inserted "559" by hand.

@@ When we talk of the body-mind problem we necessarily refer to the individual mind, but when we talk of the matter-mind problem we refer to the universal mind. Thus we must be careful to understand the use of the terms mind correctly.

@@ We think of a horse, next we think of a table. What is the gap between both thoughts? It must be the pure Mind wherein as there is then no thought of ego nor of an objective things, non-duality alone is.

@@ The marvellous demonstration of thought-reading given by X...is based on the fact that the person whose mind is read is previously hypnotised by the reader, who puts into his mind the suggestion of what is to be thought of, and merely re-states it. So it is not genuine entry into another mind. Even a group of professors have their thoughts read, they were unconscious that they were being first hypnotised. Even a sceptical mind in the group gets caught up in the mass hypnotic mood and is overcome and hypnotised with them.

Thought reading is also explicable by the withdrawal of mind from ego temporarily, so that the identification with universal mind is possible, hence with other human minds. Both methods combined produce greatest results.

Science well symbolises the universal mind by a tank of water from which numerous pipes are proceeding: some are large, some bent, some straight, but all pipes are different. Similarly human mind gets accustomed to flowing through all pipes if the ego is eliminated, the water returns to vessel and is distributed over all other pipes. How could one mind influence another unless it had some contact with another? Hence hypnotism and thought-reading and mental healing proves the existence of a single mind in all men.

@@ Mind has got different functions but it is one and the same mind all the same. Ancient India names these functions manas, chitta, antakarana, etc. just as Western psychology has named them too.

@@ If you ask why the idea of a thing should arise when no object is really there, we reply: Mind itself is the cause of the idea: it has the desire to give birth to these ideas perpetually. This is the elementary explanation. The more advanced view is that the question should not be asked because why implies causality which is a fiction. By rising to this higher level the Atman is seen to be that which cannot be divided; the Mind is measureless; it remains a unity despite the appearance (illusions) of multiplicity. Knowing the nature of Mind the question does not arise. The differences between things are imagined: all is really one in truth.

@@ The story of Pat Marquis, a 12 year old Los Angeles boy who read and saw even with blindfolded eyes before 150 doctors gathered to expose him, is explained as follows: It is thought-reading. Ordinarily we do not know we are reading other men's minds, we infer or deduce from outward signs what is happening there. But anybody who practises concentration can develop same power of reading thoughts.

@@ The gnani will possess the powers of thought-reading and thought-transference as a natural consequence of having destroyed ego-illusion and realised one Mind in all.

@@ The Drik cannot be described: hence silence is best description.

@@ The origin of thoughts is Mind. The question why thoughts should come into existence is unaskable and therefore unanswerable, for when you think of their cause—mind—you have to drop the thoughts themselves, and with

---

<sup>298</sup> The original editor inserted "561" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) then you are forced to drop your question.

@@ What is meant by thought? Vedanta goes to the very root of thinking. It stops only when thinking is forced to stop. When you think of the seed it demands that the tree is non-existent, and vice versa. Similarly when you think of any thought it demands the non-existence of Mind and when you think of Mind it is possible only by making thoughts non-existent. Hence the last point is to arrive at the giving up of thought.

@@ When analysing Mind, its stuff, substance entity must be separated from its functions. Hence we divide it into Chitta, ahankara, manas. It is only ultimately that mind and its functions are seen as one.

@@ The first epistemological questions which are asked by Indian philosophy are: "What is meant by thinking?" "How do thoughts arise?" Then it is found that each thought has its inseparable co-relative: that the thought of bliss arises by discriminating it from the thought of misery: and that the way in which the mind works in to pose dualities of ideas. You cannot understand a thing except by noting its differences from another thing.

@@ All knowing functions come only from awareness.

@@ Science affirms that ultimate reality is unknowable. Advaita bridges this chasm by throwing the Drg Drsya Viveka doctrine across it. It asks why is it unknowable and replies, "Because it is only imagination, the known, the seen, whereas the real must be the knower, the Seer, the Mind that gives birth to these imaginations." Thus Advaita shows why Drik can never be a "known."

@@ If Sanyasa helps to get rid of ideas, it is of great value. Have as few ideas as possible.

@@ Go to the root of the world, see that it is only an idea, then get rid of all the ideas, and see they are only Atman.

@@ No philosophy can ever pass unchallenged so long as it is expressed in words. The only way out is for it to declare at the end of its system "Truth is beyond words."

@@ There is a higher level—non-duality—which we cannot express in words. For words yield meanings, i.e. duality. Words can only falsify the Real. Mind cannot reach it. Duality must be negated if it is to be known. In that highest state the disciple cannot ask questions and guru cannot answer them without falling into error.

@@ Words will always give you only a picture in the mind, no picture can represent Brahman; for this reason only we say that the Brahman is like a void; not for the reason of the Sunyavadins who say there is no reality there. The Void is an illustrational term.

@@ When thought is transcended, that moment—it may be one-millionth of a second—you have comprehended the Truth about Brahman transcending thoughts. For then the idea becomes the Mind. At that moment the mind negates all thoughts. This is called the "lightning flash" in Upanisads. You must watch vigilantly for it. When between two thoughts you catch this brief flash, you have to understand that the thoughts were still in your mind whether they had appeared or vanished. Hence we are transcending thoughts numerous times daily but unconsciously. In this sense you are right in calling our doctrine "The Hidden Philosophy." The thought-gap is hidden. That gap is the seer of the thoughts i.e. Drik, Mind, Brahman.

@@ When you know the truth about Mind, that all ideas and objects merge in it, are dissolved in it, it is then called Self, Atman. But whilst you do not grasp this, you must call it Mind.

---

<sup>299</sup> The original editor inserted "563" by hand.

@@ Who can describe Brahman? It is impossible.

@@ When you know that everything is only Mind, why worry yourself with anything? You are Mind yourself, it is permanent, and all ideas are impermanent.

@@ We do not know when the essence of Mind ceases to exist. Hence we call it immortal.

@@ The translation of Brahman as Intelligence is likely to be misunderstood, for in that sense the meaning is not cleverness but "that which is capable of knowing."

@@ The question of existence or non-existence does not arise for sage, because he has risen above words, and these are mere words.

@@ When you do not understand it, you call it mind, but when you do then you see everything is in it and you call it Brahman. The first step is to know each object as idea. The next is to know all ideas as Brahman. Why do we have to get from Mind to Brahman? Because when I use the word "mind" you create an idea whereas "Brahman" is unimaginable.

@@ Everybody who makes any statement about Brahman, thereby posits its existence and commits a fallacy, for it is not right either to assert or deny its existence. It is beyond discussion. Words can only apply to Drsyam.

@@ Realisation is so hard to obtain because we are perpetually getting thoughts, each of which carries us away from our practice.

@@ Those who say "Your Brahman is as good as nothing" thereby betray an unconscious complex demanding a "something." The correct attitude is to accept nothing less than truth even if it is a "nothing" and thus unpleasant to ego.

@@ You cannot become conscious of non-existence because that would imply a thought i.e. an existence.

@@ Light is your very nature—as soon as an object comes before you, you are conscious of it. The mind is ever-shining.

@@ Essentially of the nature of consciousness: means the consciousness that we get after rejecting all the forms in which it appears. The essence of all the world is of the same in essence as the real 'I'.

@@ How I should like to have this whole muddle cleared up (of the meaning of 'mind' in the West) And what about "Consciousness?" Sometimes it seems to be used as synonymous with our whole mental life, while at other times it refers only to the present or passing aspect of it.

@@ Mind is both gnanam (knowledge) as well as being its instrument as Westerners think.

@@ Psychology as a science studies and classifies various departments of Mind, emotion and will, but philosophy generalises them all into their single stuff—Mind.

@@ European psychology analyses and divides Mind into various parts, such as consciousness, ego, memory, attention etc. but the real truth is that all these are only one thing, only Mind. There are no separate mental divisions in reality. They have not come to see this yet.

@@ In the beginning when the novice does not understand things, he is taught to make a distinction between the "eternal" (drik) and the 'ephemeral' (drsyam). But at a higher stage he learns that nothing is lost, that all things which passed away passed into Brahman. All ideas dissolve into mind and are therefore Mind, which means Brahman.

@@ Mind may take various forms, as a man or mountain for mind is creative, but what form has the mind in itself? None! It can take every form but it is ultimately formless.

@@ The Mind may have various states, whereas consciousness does not alter.

---

<sup>300</sup> The original editor inserted "565" by hand.

@@ I know only one Mind although I suppose other peoples minds are separate which extends everywhere because it cannot be measured or limited.

@@ The Westerners have given up using the word "Mind" because of its ambiguity and its association with "soul"; instead they use "consciousness."

@@ Europe cannot comprehend "Contentless Consciousness." It is quite incomprehensible. It is a relapse into psychological attitude. How can an Absolute serve as an explanatory of the universe or consciousness, they ask. Absolute can be understood only in terms of the relation. Absolute cannot explain anything, since there is no second thing. They cannot see that consciousness can exist and does exist in Sushupti when mind is not working, when there is no idea and when there were no objects.

I know mind is active when only my mind is active. If it is working there must be the objective. We are not warranted in saying "there was no mind" but we may at best say "We don't know." Advaitic position is, we don't use "mind" where there is no object. Thus, Sushupti has epistemological value.

@@ We call the Mind "unborn" because nobody has seen its birth. This is also the latest view of science. Nobody can refute it. Hence Mind is never subject to birth. The consequence is that it is also never subject to the unseparable corollary from birth, which is death or change.

@@ The dualistic-idealistic notion that God brings the ideas to you, as in dream, and takes them away later, is for children only.

@@ Unless a man has a desire to go to the very root where there is no thinking, he cannot grasp this philosophy.

@@ The words "static" and its co-relative "dynamic" are inapplicable to Brahman.



@@ Psychologists who write lengthy analytic books about various qualities and characteristics of human mind, are really dealing with its lower physical features for true Mind is measureless, unindividuated, attributeless.

@@ If there were no forms, would you get the idea of Mind? No. Therefore the forms suggest the mind's existence to you. The forms alone enable you to know that Mind is there. Otherwise you could not know it. If Maya did not exist, there would be no incentive, no purpose in seeking for reality, Brahman. Hence it may be taken as a meaning of the world that all these forms exist to enable us to reflect on them and find the Mind, the non-dual reality of which they are mere appearances.

@@ "All these become one in the highest spirit, called Mind." says p. 137 Prasnopanishad. Again p.744 Brihad Up. says: "Through the mind alone It is to be realised." Hence Vedanta says therefore let us go into the meaning of Mind and thus we can get at realization. Again Srimad Bhagavatam says, "The gross universe is not different from the Mind, which is Brahman." All these quotations prove that Advaita teaches that Mind is none other than what India calls Self, Atman Universe and Brahman.

@@ The realization that all ideas are nothing but Mind is the realization that everything is Brahman; hence it must be put at the end of the teaching and not earlier.

@@ "Neti, Neti" has a deeper meaning. It implies that we cannot say in the end whether a thing is true or not, existent or not. We cannot say that anything is true but on the other hand we cannot say it is untrue. The question of truth or falsity applies to our ideas, conceptions. We cannot prove either case. We cannot even prove Advaita positively but only negatively. Thus it drives us into

---

<sup>301</sup> The original editor inserted "567" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) non-duality. But although we say there is no-Two, we do not say there is no-One. You cannot say you did not exist at birth and yet you did not know it, become aware of it. So too reality cannot become an object of awareness, knowledge or thought. You cannot think it. It is there as yourself but not as your individually conscious self, as in sleep.

@@ If Brahman had any meaning then it would be a mere concoction of the mind.

@@ “Every word uttered is already a lie” said some Greek philosopher. This is the same as our Indian teaching that words can only falsify Brahman.

@@ Real humility will come when you understand that no word of yours can touch the Drik; that the more words used the more it will be covered. It is aloof. Hence the ego has no place there.

@@ Sound always implies soundlessness, where there is no duality. What can I say of that Atman. From its silence we get ideas.

@@ Atman or Brahman is that on which all ideas stand; or that which produces the ideas.

@@ The conclusion is that the whole thing is within you. If you want to understand a thing it must become your essence.

@@ Silence: A sound is a word, implies duality. That is why Brahman cannot be indicated by a sound, by a word.

@@ Gradually allow each successive thought to go back into the mind, whence it has emerged. Thus all the ideas of objects are “offered as sacrifices” by turning them back to one Mind.

@@ Those dualists who say God takes the Universe and places it in the Mind, overlook that God himself must be in the Mind. Can they measure how far the Mind extends? What it stops? No. God also must be included therein, cannot be separated.

@@ In all verbal expression and human thought dualism must reign. It will be 'this word and not that one,' 'this position and not that one.' Hence silence, keeping quiet, is the only expression of non-duality.

@@ Make no distinction between anything and nothing. For awareness i.e. something, must be present to postulate nothing. Hence yogis who want nothing—samadhi are ignorant.

@@ Truth cannot be established by thinking. All thought is drsyam. All philosophical systems contradict each other.

@@ Because other men are also Brahman, because even Hitler is Brahman, and hence because the same mind is in all men, it is possible to influence them by the power of telepathy. That which hinders the successful transference of thoughts of truth is the fact that each man clings to the belief "I am the body" and this prevents the entry of the truer thoughts radiated by the wise. However although such influence cannot be immediately achieved and must necessarily take a long time to be accomplished nevertheless it does slowly make itself felt. Its success also depends on two other factors: concentration or strength of the thoughts sent out and the number of those who are sending them out. In this way it is possible to make men better in character also.

@@ You need not run away from thoughts as yogis do; let them go on but merely consider them as Brahman, Mind.

@@ If a gnani assigns a meaning, i.e. has an idea of Brahman then he has come down, he is no longer a Gnani. Hence it is said: He who says that he knows does not know. Hence within himself he forms no idea of it but dwells secretly in the world of non-duality, which he knows is inexpressible even in thought. For what you know is a second.

---

<sup>302</sup> The original editor inserted "569" by hand.

@@ The Gnani does not merely regard an object as being an idea, but also as it is in essence, i.e. mind, the awareness which is ever present, not-to-be-originated, even before the object is noticed.

@@ Brahman is silence. Knowing that, you need not enter into discussion if you want to get at truth, for words are only words, ideas; but to refute others we may use words. In the verbal expression of every position that can be taken up including ours, there is contradiction. Whatever is said by me, another man will say no, it is so and so. Thus as soon as he begins to discuss, he falls into the world of duality. Nevertheless his dualistic position will be superior to that of all others because he will try to keep the ego out of it and because it is based on reason. When he has used his thinking to refute the thoughts of others, as one thorn to pull out others, he will then have to give up his own position and merge into non-duality, positionless. The line of thoughts, (this thorn) has used, will then fall away of themselves. In the final stage of argument gnani can only show that both he and the opponent are limited by contradiction in every word and sentence. Give up the misleading and impossible idea that you are going to establish Brahman by means of books, writings, speech and other words. All you can do is to refute other people's arguments about Brahman. He who has realised Brahman has nobody to argue with because there is then only one, no second person than himself.

---

<sup>303</sup> The original editor inserted "568A" by hand.

## CHAPTER 21. THE ULTIMATE AS REALITY.

@@ Seeing nothing is as good as sleep. Sleep means non-apprehension of any ideas or Drsyam. In the knowledge Brahman, there is no non-apprehension or mis-apprehension. Here too there are objects but the essence of them all is Brahman alone.

@@ Yogis imagine that they see Brahman. But they must be tested. They must prove, show, that it is Brahman. Their method cannot possibly give Brahman because they kill the brain and yet without reasoning, thinking, Brahman cannot be understood.

@@ After emerging from Samadhi every yogi finds his state of distinction between things re-emerging and duality re-established. This is proved because yogi demands food, he does not say food is only an idea and I do not want it. He is then like every ordinary man. The Gnani does not trouble to go into Samadhi, but takes his food as others do.

@@ The destruction and disappearance of the world does not mean they should become imperceptible to the senses, but that its real nature should be determined.

@@ The highest yoga is when you see nothing. Yet they call this Brahman. This is Nirvikalpa. The Gnani however sees everything. He alone can see Brahman, because you must see that everything is Brahman.

@@ When you make any statements about God, they are all imaginations. But just as you cannot digest all kinds of food, so you have to find the imagination about God (i.e. religion which your mind can digest. The gnani however is beyond imagination.

@@ God has no meaning. Each man has given his own conception of it. The justification of religion is only in the case of those who cannot grasp and who do not want to know the meaning of God. All concepts of God are

---

<sup>304</sup> The original editor inserted "569A" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) equally false. Neither the Hindu nor the Muhamedan has got a true knowledge of God as He is.

@@ Vedanta alone reconciles Realism and Idealism.

@@ Science now says that you cannot distinguish mind from matter, just as it earlier said you cannot distinguish matter from energy. Therefore when you go to the root of the matter you always find non-duality at the end.

@@ We do not say that duality ceases to exist (as in deep sleep or samadhi) but rather that it is unreal. The two views are radically different, as the first is yogic, the second Advaitic.

@@ Half-Vedanta says "All individuals are only imagined." Whole Vedanta says, "but imagination also is Brahman."

@@ You cannot find anything external to yourself. Do not think sense-objects are separate; they are yourself.

@@ Brahman cannot be affected, cannot be produced by anything you do. It is there, whether you seek or practice yoga or enquire or not

@@ We, advaitins are not insane. We know that all things are separate objects. But what we do say is that when ultimate truth is known, they all merge as they do in sleep even for ignorant men.

@@ Sat Chit Ananda are the highest marks so long as we have to think, but beyond thought even those marks disappear.

@@ The "Qualified Brahman" of some Vedantins is simply Brahman as they imagine it to be, not as it is.

@@ "Unchangeable" we can't imagine. Is it possible to have anything unchangeable? How are we certain that the sun is unchangeable? You are only imagining. That is why we don't speak anything of Brahman.

@@ “Universal Being”: Is it possible to have this conception? How do you know He is everywhere?

@@ When everything is itself, how can it say “I am separate?” It can even from the highest viewpoint, identify itself with the body, for it will also identify itself with other things at the same time.

@@ It is quite correct to use such a term as “The Ultimate” as an abstract noun.

@@ The snake-rope illusion doctrine is the first stage of enquiry: a novice’s preliminary step: but the higher stage reveals that the illusion itself is reality: only beginners talk of world as illusory: the wise make no distinction and find reality in everything. You give up name and form at an earlier stage only to discover later on that they too are Brahman. However the first step of negating the world is necessary to help student. It is equivalent to the melting process, of throwing many gold ornaments into one mass in order to learn what gold is in itself, apart from its forms. Once known we may recast the mass back into original shaped ornaments and ever after know then as gold alone. You eliminate differences tentatively by taking away all forms in order to know eventually that everything is Brahman.

@@ If the universe exists in me, then when the idea of me also goes, then the universal illusion goes with it. This is the most advanced position in Vedanta. In other words a separate universe no longer exists for gnani. Even the super-imposition of the world on my mind is then seen to be illusory: Gnani knows in this higher stage that super-imposition is only the mind: that nothing else is.

@@ If Brahman is Nirguna, how can you conceive it at all, it is a non-existent thing, says the Ramanujist. But the inconceivability of a thing does not prove that it is non-existent.

---

<sup>305</sup> The original editor inserted “571” by hand.

@@ You can know the Brahman only by being it.

@@ How can Vedantin say that the world remains uncaused and unchanged, when it daily appears to him as changing? How can he say it is only One when it appears, as a fact of experience as other than himself, i.e. a second? Philosophy must not contradict fact, what we see, otherwise it becomes religion. How can he say that the world is non-different when experience reveals it as different from himself? Reply: if you know that you are the essence itself, and if you know that the essence does not change, then all the manifold and even all the differences, appear to be yourself. Hence you must take your stand on the essence. As Gita says, you see all these changes within yourself.

@@ We refuse to use the word 'God' for this reality because that is something other than ourselves. We find the word Atman beautifully apt for this purpose.

@@ Critics object "How could there be a being without attributes? Nowhere is one to be seen. So how could Brahman be characterless?" Reply: If God were permanent, he cannot change. But everything you have seen is subject to change: therefore it cannot be God, for the only thing which could not change would be attributeless entity: this is Brahman. Again, God Himself must be one thing, his attributes another. God, as such must be separable from his attributes: therefore God, as such has no attributes, even if you admit the existence of the latter.

@@ To those dualists who say God or Self has qualities or attributes, we reply: Prove by catching hold of one Atman and showing its qualities. If you cannot, there is no proof.

@@ To critics who say we cannot show the attributes or qualities of Brahman for the same



(continued from the previous page) reason that we cannot show the sweetness of sugar apart from the sugar, we reply: But still all this is in the drsyam—What about the Drik?

@@ Atman by itself is undifferentiated, has no characteristics and is the same in all, just as the sun itself is unchanged amid all the changing colours of its reflected light.

@@ Every attribute given to Reality is imagined, and therefore unreal.

@@ For other purposes we have other views, but for ultimate purposes we hold non-duality as the reality.

@@ Mysticism may teach oneness; we go still further and teach that you are ALL.

@@ “All is Brahman” is not correct “All this is Brahman” is correct. Yogis repeat former like parrots.

@@ Even here in the midst of world-imagination, the Brahman is eternal and now; the notion that the world must be shut out in order to see Brahman is therefore false.

@@ Nothing exists distinct from Atman. When you know truth, then the whole universal existence is reality itself.

@@ The Upanishads say that you must so constantly think over the truth, that this must become a part of yourself.

@@ The words “Sat-chit-Ananda” will not do when you speak of Truth: they belong to Vedantic Religion, not to philosophy.

@@ So long as you talk about Brahman being this or that you have only your imagination.

@@ Even the discipline and mental training you have to pass through to acquire truth are after all imagination. You are still Brahman.

@@ Point of view of supreme reality, truth, can use no words for they would imply idea, illusion, ignorance. For there are contradictions inborn in our very thinking.

---

<sup>306</sup> The original editor inserted “573” by hand.

@@ It is insane to say the world of multiplicity is non-existent. It is correct to say

(continued from the previous page) it is there, but unreal, like the snake/rope.

@@ “Becoming one with Brahman” means seeing the whole world in you, for on seeing this you know your universal oneness.

@@ Those who say or think “in the course of time I shall gain knowledge, heaven etc. cannot gain truth. For they are now the inhabitants of truth and have not to gain it. They are ignorant for they expect change in that where there is and can be no change. They think they are going to change because they are attached to body and personality, this is their illusion.

@@ The nearest English equivalent to the word BRAHMAN is ULTIMATE REALITY.

@@ Sat Chit Ananda is not the highest truth, but the step immediately below it. It is Brahman with attributes whereas Brahman is attributeless.

@@ Take a block of wood. It is only one—you can carve a dog or elephant or any other toy out of it, all forms. In terms of the substance (wood) itself the latter has undergone no change. That corresponds to Brahman and to “Ding-An-sich” of Kant. What do you do to create the forms? Simply chip away the part not required and thus reveal the form already latent. A myriad forms therefore exist in the wood. Similarly a myriad names and forms exist in Brahman.

@@ The second thing is only Drsyam, it is only a mental construction. How can you have a second thing, then, where the true non-dual God is known?

@@ The highest truth of non-duality will be beyond the Atman-idea also.

@@ If you say that there is any other thing than Atman, then how does it come into contact with it or be joined to it? This objection cannot be answered for suppose I say there is an attribute of virtue in the Atman. Can you show the attribute of whiteness apart from

(continued from the previous page) the white wall? No. You cannot. Similarly virtue, intelligence etc. cannot be distinguished apart from the Atman, if you say they are attributes of Atman. How could two different things—virtue, a quality, and Atman, a substance, be joined together? The theory is nonsense.

@@ If Brahman is ever the same, how has it changed into the world? Reply: That is the pantheistic position, not ours. Brahman never changes, only appears to as in dream.

@@ Even the changing world of ideas, the illusory phenomena of Maya are nothing but Brahman in the end. Hence the changing is ultimately the unchanging, the illusion proves to be the real on further enquiry. Brahman only appears to have undergone changes, just as mind appears to change in dream but it is really unaffected.

@@ Duality is only the appearance of mind. It is never found in sleep, when mind is not functioning. When the mind is working we see the world. Hence the world is a mental creation, is nothing but mind alone.

@@ At no time can Atman cease to be: that is impossible. It illumines everything and is ever-present in everything and in thought.

@@ Are ideas different from your mind? Can heat be separated from fire? No—the ideas are always there as mind substance itself, i.e. Brahman.

@@ Unless you reach the point where by deeper enquiry you see simultaneously both the world divided into multiplicity, and the world undivided, as not different from each other, you cannot understand Vedanta. This requires a very very concentrated mind. The ordinary mind will see only contradiction between them. If two things exist, one contradicts the other, hence non-duality is the only truth that does not

---

<sup>307</sup> The original editor inserted “575” by hand.

(continued from the previous page) contradict anything.

@@ We call Brahman the "One" because there is no limit to it. You do not see it as many. The One is opposed to many.

@@ When you know there is no second thing, how can you say "This is mine, or not mine?"

@@ After knowing Truth nothing else is to be known or gained or seen. The knowledge of truth may bring feeling, intelligence, satisfaction and everything else with it. Nothing need be left out, but the prime aim was the Truth itself, and not the various satisfactions which may come with or after it.

@@ Your body, your ego, the whole world, exists in That Brahman for they are nothing but Brahman.

@@ If Brahman is one, how is it so many parts of it are seen in world? Reply: You imagine that the parts appear: give up your imagination and you will see only Brahman.

@@ Maya is also Brahman. Really speaking there is no Maya; Brahman alone is.

@@ The word "monism" as used to translate "Advaita" is wrong. The correct word is "non-duality." The reason is that "One" has a meaning only as distinguished from two, three, etc. whereas there exists no "two"; there can be no "one-ism."

@@ When the Dvaitins talk, they do not know the meaning of words. Do they know the meaning of "non-duality?" No! If they knew, whom could they ask? None. They say the self is bound and later liberated. The states of the Self: if bondage formed at any time a part of the self, it would be inseparable. The very fact that it comes and goes shows it is not so. What is it that makes bondage go and liberation come? If they exist, then there must be something causing it. But if there is

(continued from the previous page) no other to create or remove the bondage, it cannot be inherent in the self, and cannot be permanently bound.

@@ The idea that Gnanam means the absence of everything, so as to make One without second, is a false idea. That is mere sleep. Gnanam means that he sees all objects and creatures and yet at the same time sees they are all One. Hence gnanam is not absence of everything, but the presence of everything. When you see many things you must also see oneness. This is the paradox of Gnana. It is difficult. Every fool can see the world, but he cannot see its oneness. It is not Gnanam if you do not see it now and in the waking state. There are then no doubts. Hence after perfection in Samadhi, the yogi must begin enquiry. After a time he may finish his enquiry and reach Gnanam.

@@ Brahman is not a thing to be reached. "Reach" is a word which can be used only in the world of the Seen.

@@ Our philosophical teaching is not that unity exists in multiplicity but that unity alone is. Multiplicity does not exist.

@@ When you can comprehend God or Atman then it is no longer true Atman, as you form a concept of it, when you understand God, you form a picture of Him in your mind and thus it cannot be true. God is merely a transient idea. No effort of the mind can help you to realise Atman. Hence only by negating everything can you ultimately grasp Atman.

@@ You must see your body, all other bodies everything as ideas, which you know as self. This is realisation. It can come only after you know the Seen is not separate from the Seer.

@@ Those who believe things are real, we teach them that creation of world is real.

---

<sup>308</sup> The original editor inserted "577" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) Those who think and know things are ideal, we teach that world is illusory. Those who penetrate into deepest, who ask what is an idea we teach that world is Brahman. This is the highest stage.

@@ The central point to bear in mind is that there is only Reality, whether it appears as the physical world, or as mental ideas, or whether it is perceived in any of the three states. To judge of the truth of Reality, we must enquire into the presence of objects.

@@ Any understanding is based only on a mental picture or idea. God is an idea. The term “everywhere” is an idea. We cannot distinguish between Idea and Reality.

@@ Similarly the world now is Brahman, just as the waves are even now made of water in the ocean—when things appear they are Brahman, when they disappear they are Brahman. There is really nothing new, nothing born, everything ultimately is Brahman and not different from it. Just as in dream, the persons, mountains colours forms, actions were all mind, and nothing else, so all that you see in this world, whether beautiful, or ugly is Atman or Brahman.

@@ Reality is beyond all qualities and attributes.

@@ Having known that all persons and things are ideas, and eliminating all doubts and objections about it, through reasoning about them, then only will you know that the whole world is in you.

@@ Vedanta is not Monism. It does not deal with One. That is a word with a meaning, hence an idea. For the knower and the known are one. One therefore means two. One implies two, does not mean one. The thinker and the thought. Non-duality, we therefore use instead of one. The idea of changelessness cannot come without

(continued from the previous page) the idea of change, hence duality. One implies a second, and so on. Hence we are not monists, as Europeans wrongly say; we are non-dualists.

@@ “Illusion” means that it does not affect the reality. The snake illusion does not affect or change the rope. You have not become a man, you are what you always were, eternal Brahman.

@@ Every time you use the word ONE you use it in the same sense of two. Even if a person sees unity in this world, there is seer and seen, a duality. Hence the doctrine of Monism is not Vedanta. To say One implies Two. No European or Hindu has seen this point. Those who talk of the One are thinking of two. When you say you are One, you cannot ask a question, as there cannot be a question and one to be questioned. Place yourself in this position of a secondless entity. To ask questions is to show you do not understand the meaning of One.

@@ When you think or speak of a doubt there must be a second thing. In a unity no doubt can arise. This is difficult to understand. So we use illustration of deep sleep. You do not say you are dead then, yet you do not have any second thing, nor any doubt in that state. Losing and gaining, fear and hope, depend on having a second thing. But unity abolishes all these changes and gives you freedom: it takes you beyond all grief and delusion because it takes you into a frame of mind where you are beyond all property, relatives, wealth, desires etc. The real object of all scriptures is to take you beyond all grief, therefore, by bringing you into unity. Worry and fear and delusion cannot exist in unity, which is the Atman. Thus Vedanta is for the good of mankind not merely for discussion or word-mongering.

---

<sup>309</sup> The original editor inserted “579” by hand.



@@ You will not find perfection. That is impossible. What you get through emotion, find perfect, will be regarded as defective by someone else. It is a matter of life and dislike. So who is perfect? It is impossible in the world of the Seen, but in the Drik, Yes.

@@ Only those who have the higher idea of the world will be perfectly happy.

@@ Sleeping, Eating, water, rice, teaching, everything is Brahman. So how can you say that philosophy has nothing to do with worldly existence?

@@ Nothing can be lost. There need be no fear or sorrow. All still exists in the Atman. There is no second to be afraid of. Sorrow implies sorrowing for some thing or someone i.e. a duality.

@@ The Gnani sees both variety and unity simultaneously. That is the test of Gnan. Otherwise the world would have been full of sages. He is fully aware of the differences in the world, yet is aware of the underlying unity. The gnani seeing a woman sees her simultaneously as both woman and Atman; as he is already aware that he is really the Atman, he has no impulse of lust towards her because she is already within his mind, although he knows she is only an idea.

@@ We tolerate others because they are not different from ourselves. If you say you are different or separate from others, as all cults, all religions, all schools of thought say, then you are keeping ego uppermost. That is why we will not adopt any label or name – not even Advaita School – but remain unticketed.

@@ There is no separate individual enjoyment of supreme Bliss. That is told only to the common people. Ananda means the perpetual absence of grief.

@@ Nothing that man, during his long history on earth, has done has enabled him to achieve happiness. It has been impossible. There is only one way by which this may be done and that is through Vedanta.

@@ All misery is due to the belief in a second thing which you either wish to get or fear to lose: i.e. to desire and fear. Accept the truth that objects are ephemeral.

@@ Highly important to students: 1st the witness stage. Separate yourself from the world. 2nd. What is the nature of the seen? Enquire into the nature of the world and find it to be idea. 3rd. Find all this to be the same as witness, i.e. stage of unity with the world; all fused as One. There are the above three stages of progress in Vedantic enquiry. The first belongs to the beginner and is Drig Drsya Viveka analysis. The second belongs to the intermediate course; the third is the highest and the Witness is the same as the witnessed, i.e. non-duality. The first and second stages are in the world of duality. Hence the idea of Self as witness is not the highest one. The third lifts you into non-duality.

@@ Vedanta shows that the Lost is also Brahman, hence will come back to you; that which you hold dearest in this world, you need not be afraid of losing. Only there will be a change of appearance. In the Vedantic need for detachment there is no final or real loss of world as with ascetic yoga, but a re-adjustment for the unreal world disappears into real unity. When you know that the second thing is also yourself there is no fear of losing it. When you are swayed by duality, this fear arises. Know that everything and everyone disappears ultimately into Me and hence cannot be lost.

---

<sup>310</sup> The original editor inserted "581" by hand.

@@ The gnani knows that the reality is himself, that the world which is seen is only an appearance.

@@ People think the gnani ought not to perceive the world. Truth is gnani may see it and yet know it does not exist in reality. The illustration is audience which sees magician's illusion-show, and yet they know it is not real.

@@ The gnani makes no distinction between animate and inanimate existence, his sense of universal vedanta teaches just as latest science does, that inanimate matter also has life in it. Gnani arrives at that state where he knows this.

@@ The gnani never thinks any object to be real, but only mental, whether it be of the waking or dream states; and he knows that all ideas, objects are but his mental constructions only. He is always sarva Drik sada!

@@ How can the gnani get rid of anything when everything is Brahman? Really it is Atman that is denoted by Samadhi, because it is Samathwa, homogeneity. In the knowledge of Brahman there is nothing to accept nor anything to be given up.

@@ You may have a mirage, you may know that there is no real water there. Yet it will continue to appear to you. But the difference is that you will not be duped by it, like others.

@@ It is impossible for the mind to free itself from all seen objects. But even though the Gnani must see them, it is as though they were seen in a dream. You are said to be in waking state when you see a second thing, but the Gnani does not take what he sees for reality.

@@ It is impossible not to have the idea of the existence of misery unless you commit intellectual suicide. The religionists and mystics who say that they achieve perfect happiness by union with God, are dualists; (I and God=two). Moreover, how are they certain that God will continue to be kind to them, how do they know that God will not change his mind? There is no certainty for them.

@@ The Gnani knows he is untouched by Drsyam; the agnani feels just the opposite. Duality may be perceived—the table may be seen; even when you consider the world real, it cannot affect Atman. Gnana makes you fearless since it tells you appearances are only imaginary, which is shown through Vichara or science.

@@ Your pace will be disturbed only if you recognise a second. Hence mystic's peace is temporary; the only enduring peace belongs to the sage for it is non-dual.

@@ The teacher who knows reality interprets everything according to its light.

@@ The gnani sees not only the name and form of objects, as others do, but he also thinks of their essence, the substance of which they are made. To both of them the world is still there.

@@ Anyone in sleep or anesthesia can be without duality, but it takes Gnan to be awake, see the world, and yet be without sense of duality and feel oneness.

@@ To see the whole world in me implies duality, a second i.e. the world which is to be seen. The gnani therefore sees the second but understands it, for he sees it as an idea in his mind, i.e. himself.

@@ Those who talk of love which gnani possesses are still in the world of religion, where

---

<sup>311</sup> The original editor inserted "583" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) ego reigns. For love implies a second to be loved: it means that the gnani regards himself as one individual and another person a second. Hence its falsity.

@@ AUM is only a symbol for Brahman.

@@ You can neither affirm anything of Brahman nor negate it; it is beyond both because it is beyond all words, all ideas.

@@ If there were different realities, there would be no meaning in the word “reality” itself. This alone shows that there is some common feature in all these “realities” which is the genuine reality.

@@ We reply to the Pundits: “Prove your Brahman: give evidence from life. If you cannot do so, then it is only your imagination.” This is the scientific method.

@@ If you think of yourself as one and God as another, then there is duality, but if both ego-thought and God-thought are absent, there is non-duality.

@@ We do not condemn Dwaita. It is perfectly right for those in the stage where it appeals to them.

@@ The most advanced aspirants are those who when Guru explains all is One Brahman, grasp at once.

@@ To live out of time is to be immortal, eternal. This is the Overself.

@@ Everything will not become one in realization. You will have everything still there, but you will know all the objects to be only mind.

@@ It is not correct to say that Drsyam is the same as Drik. It only becomes so after enquiry when it dissolves in the same ultimate essence as Drik.

@@ If there is a Brahman or God, there it can only be I. “Aham Brahmasmi.”

## CHAPTER 21

### THE ULTIMATE AS REALITY

@@ If Brahman has got a Shakti (Power, Force), I ask “What is meant by Shakti?” The only way to answer it is to refer to yourself, to show how you manifest energy (as by lifting an arm) Then you explain that Brahman is like you and is able to manifest strength. What is this but the fallacy of anthropomorphism, reducing the unconditioned Brahman to the level of a man. For force, motion, power are only in this phenomenal world, exist only from standpoint of ignorance, not in Brahman, where there is no second.

@@ When we rise to consider all things as Mind, Brahman, the hypothesis of evolution disappears, becomes meaningless, for who is there to evolve, to question?

@@ The Sankhya teaching of spirit and matter is fit only for intellectual children. For nobody knows either spirit or matter but only imagines them.

@@ If the world did not exist we could not talk of it. It has to be seen, just like a city seen in a mirror and it has to be experienced, but it has to be known as being unreal. This is a test of gnan. Similarly the aim of Vedeanta is to show the nature of the world as unreal.

@@ People are under the wrong impression that what changes is not Brahman. This is only a lower stage, tentatively taken up in order to distinguish between drik and drsyam, to show the world of objects is only a world of ideas. But at a higher stage even the changing is known as Brahman, even the multitude of ideas is unified as Mind.

@@ Use the word “subject” and you get only an idea. Unse the word “object” and you get an idea. But that which understands both the ideas is the real Drik.

@@ Since knowledge of the whole of universe or existence is aimed at in Vedanta there is no

---

<sup>312</sup> The original editor inserted “585” by hand.

(continued from the previous page) necessity for mentioning about separate elements matters, objects, etc. to be discussed as in ordinary sciences. For everything is Atman.

@@ It is right to say that if religionists say God is unsearchable and incomprehensible, this also applies to Brahman. But Vedanta looks at it from the Drik. Drsyam analysis which reveals that Drik. Drsyam analysis which reveals that Drik makes us conscious of everything and hence Drik must exist, whereas religion cannot prove that God must exist.

@@ You may put a stick in water a thousand times but it will always be seen as bent, even though you know it to be straight. Similarly you may know that all the individual forms are a unity, Brahman, and yet you will continue to see them as separate entities, even though you are a gnani. This is the higher lesson of the study of illusions.

@@ All activity in this world is ultimately for the realization of Brahman. Such is the Upanishadic teaching. Why do men work and eat? Because they want to keep their bodies alive and in good condition. Why this? Because the body is necessary to live and fulfil life's ultimate object—they have to attain Brahman. Why do we meet here—teacher and pupil? It is to attain Brahman.

@@ Atman is not a thing to be attained, it is always there nearer than your body. No other effort is necessary than the knowledge of it.

@@ Only truth can give you the highest satisfaction: unless you realise that everything is in you, there is no complete satisfaction.

@@ All have false notions regarding Iswara. As long as they know not Brahman, they don't know Iswara.

@@ The Gnani sees and knows the table as a table, but at the same time he knows that it is only Brahman.

@@ If we say that non-existence is truth, then you have got Gnan. It is only purposes of elementary analysis that we take away the individual forms and the two states to get at Brahman. But this is tentative. Nothing need disappear, the world can exist. Maya can remain simultaneous with reality in the ultimate truth, for everything is Brahman. Nothing can be rejected. "All this" (sarvam) is constantly repeated in the books.

@@ The talk of when snake disappears rope is seen, hence when Maya goes reality is seen, is merely an illustration of a particular point, i.e. illusion. Do not push it further. For when the pundits say that Maya is not Brahman they are talking nonsense. Both snake-idea and rope reality are Brahman: Nothing is to be destroyed or lost to gain Brahman.

@@ There is an erroneous impression that a thought is not Brahman; that imagining must be stopped to get at Atman, and thoughts banished or controlled out of existence. But Brihad points out that when there is a thought present, you have got only Brahman: and when there is no thinking, Brahman is there likewise. Whatever happens or does not happen to the mind, you have only Brahman. Thus, anything or any event may come in your dream, but all remains as Mind, your own self. Because a tiger is running in your dream you cannot say it is not Mind. Similarly if thoughts come in waking, you cannot say they are not yourself, Mind.

@@ Just as low intellects anthropomorphise their God, so even higher ones may make an object (a duality) of their own non-dual Atman by forming their own conception of it, for that is only a thought, i.e. an object. The way out is to know that thought is not difference from Yourself: the moment you think it to be different, you turn it into an object.

---

<sup>313</sup> The original editor inserted "587" by hand.



@@ Our reply to those who say that if ignorance and illusion go, then Brahman comes, is that both ignorance and illusion are also Brahman, hence there has never really been any coming or going of them.

@@ Maya is only a thought, hence an idea. Everything including every idea, is Mind, Brahman. Hence Maya is Brahman.

@@ If you think that the universe exists as a reality, as a second entity, other than yourself that is ignorance. You may see a thousand things but if you know they exist as ideas in the mind, i.e. in yourself, that is knowledge. Gnan does not mean things are not to be seen; they will be seen, as the mirage is seen but known to be illusory, as the awakened knows his dream-world to have existed only in his mind. In short, ignorance means taking imaginations of multiplicity for reality. Seeing multiplicity is not wrong, only seeing its contents as realities.

@@ At the higher stage of study Drik and Drsyam become one, and the objects are known as being yourself: the opposition vanishes.

@@ All your God, Brahmas, Vishnus are your thoughts. You created your God, he did not create you. When you know that all those Gods are only Mind, as you are, then you know God as He really is. You should know that all the Gods are only the one single fundamental “substance” – Mind.

@@ Contentment can only come when you think of non-duality.

@@ Drsyam must be there, world must be seen, but it has to be known as Atman, not different from Brahman.

@@ Atman is Brahman means that one’s self is as big as the universe.

CHAPTER 21  
THE ULTIMATE AS REALITY

@@ You may see the mirage as water, you may see it a second time after realization and know that it is not water but even as a gnani you will still see it as water but know it as otherwise. The seeing is not altered, only the knowing. Similarly the world will still be seen by the sage and its appearance will be exactly like its appearance to ordinary men: there will be no difference in the visual sensation: but the gnani will also evaluate it as unreal.

@@ Whoever mentally accepts or rejects anything, is still in the world of duality and thus prevents himself from realizing Oneness. When you rise to the top, you see that all the steps were Brahman but until then you tentatively accept or reject particular steps in order to keep rising.

@@ So long as you are in this world talking, eating and working, so long as you have the idea of the I, then you may think in terms of "I am in all things and all things are in Me." You identify yourself with all beings, in Gnan, by feeling for and with them.

@@ Let thoughts remain. See the world as it is. Don't be afraid to have thoughts. Gnan does not omit them, only let the ego disappear.

@@ In Sanskrit the word know has two stages. 1. forming an idea of Brahman, 2. becoming, realizing Brahman, being yourself Brahman. The first is incomplete, a step. Similarly you can't know God truly unless you become Him. I cannot know you thoroughly because I cannot know everything in your mind. I could only know you fully by being identified with you, becoming one with you. Hence any mystic who says I have seen God is deluded because he is separate from God.

@@ The essence of all objects is idea. The essence of all ideas is mind. The essence of mind is your self. This is called omniscience, in its true meaning. Everything that one is

---

<sup>314</sup> The original editor inserted "589" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) everywhere aware of this, becomes Gnan to one who knows truth. And this must include all worlds, whatever he thinks of is known for what it is – Atman.

@@ It is alright to know objects as separate so long as you also know them as Brahman. If however you see them as separate only, then you are in ignorance. It is like seeing a gold ring and simultaneously knowing it is both ring and gold.

@@ Totality is a term which applies only to the parts, the changing objects, drsyam, the known, but in awareness there are no parts, so how can it be totalled? Advaita is both the Drik and drsyam, which is the true “whole” and not the pseudo-whole of a “totality” of parts.

@@ The desire for eating food is the unconscious desire for the happiness for unity for making the food one with your body. If however you eat indigestible foods, i.e. foods with which you cannot become one, you become unhappy.

@@ What has to be practised always is to look upon everything as Brahman.

@@ If you say Atman has got attributes, you degrade drik into drsyam. The dualists who want to give qualities to Brahman have not understood the difference between Drik and Drsyam.

@@ When you think the thought is different from you, then you do not understand Brahman.

@@ Those who say you cannot see the multiple world, are quite wrong.

@@ First Stage: (lower stage of path) That object gives me its experience. That experience is an illusion.

Second Stage: Higher: The object, the experience of it and myself are all Mind, Brahman.

@@ All bondage is only in the seen, drsyam. The drik is never and has never been in bondage.

@@ Truth is that in which you see all being in yourself. This is what the Mandukya tries to teach. Without complete identity there is no real knowledge. If I want to know you completely, I must become identical with you. If you are completely in my mind, it is only a thought in me, and there is no identity. Hence if you see everything in God, then God is only a thought in your mind, you must become so identified with everything, even with God, that then only there is non-duality.

@@ There is no limitation in you as Brahman, you were always there as It and no production by effort was ever needed. All that is needed is enquiry into what you are, not creation. There is no becoming Brahman. Investigate—and this shows you It. Where dull people say, No, I am imperfect, then to make it easier for them, we say, alright, then use effort to become Brahman. But this is only a concession to illusion.

@@ When like Poet Wordsworth you identify yourself with Nature, you are practising Gnanayoga. when you go out to help suffering humanity, you are practising Gnana-yoga. Thus it is the identifying of yourself with non-ego, the practising of oneness, that is higher yoga.

@@ To give any attribute to Brahman is to falsify it. For an attribute is an idea. An idea is that which hides drik from you so that you see only drsyam.

@@ All Nature is struggling for oneness. Even the inferior peoples try to elevate themselves to this ideal unconsciously. We are atheists in the sense that we teach that even God can only be an idea in your mind i.e. imagination.

@@ Ask yourself the question, “Why am I not satisfied?” Answer is because you are a world of duality, where the second thing, that which is desired, whatever it be, is ever changing or

---

<sup>315</sup> The original editor inserted “591” by hand.

(continued from the previous page) passing. So use your intelligence, give up duality, and thus you attain peace and satisfaction.

@@ The moment you think the world is real, that moment you will have sorrow and suffering through loss etc. For thinking a second thing to be real, you believe in duality. Through loss or pain Nature wants to teach you non-duality.

@@ There is always the feeling of a want for him who believes in duality. If you do not want wealth or women, you will want God. Hence (as Buddha said) there is always sorrow for those believe in duality.

@@ Man thinks that the world is outside himself; hence his desires are for external objects. When he learns the truth that the idea of the world is in mind, in himself, he no longer seeks externals, give up desires. He gets into the habit of realising he is everywhere, just as the dreamer who awakes understands that he was everywhere in his dream; he was in every dream place and thing. Still more, he identifies himself with everyone; practices goodwill.

@@ Even the gnani must have the experience of duality. It is inescapable for all. But he will always see it as Brahman.

@@ It is the drsyam that is restless: the drik is only seeing the restlessness; for it is ever in peace. Hence the sage achieves spontaneous inner peace without practising yoga because he knows he is drik. This is sahaja, i.e. effortless samadhi.

@@ There is no distinction between unreal and real for the Gnani, only for the student. Hence in seeing the table, he knows he sees Brahman. It is not a question of seeing a table first, and then interpreting it as Brahman.

@@ One who knows what gnan is, remains so whatever he is doing, whether thinking or not, whether working or not, whether dancing or not. Those yogis who believe he must be without thoughts, are wrong. Both unity and variety are present at the same time to gnani. The only illustration of this state is dream. Here on waking we see all the thoughts words and deeds are ultimately only mind.

@@ If you think that the Gnani sees the table first and realizes it is Brahman next, then you have got the idea of time. Time is only imagination. The truth is that Gnani sees table and knows it as Brahman in a single simultaneous operation. The eye which sees Brahman and the eye which sees the table work stereoscopically just as the two physical eyes see a single object.

@@ Even if a gnani is bitten by a cobra and dies, he will still regard the snake as Brahman! First stage is to think erroneously that absence of external world yields Brahman; hence quest of Nirvikalpa Samadhi. Higher stage is to discover that the external world must be Brahman. Final stage is Gnani's who lets everything come – thoughts, worlds, etc. – because they are all Brahman.

@@ True knowledge can arise only after the destruction of the objective phenomenal world and not otherwise. Seeing that it is so, how can there be any objective enjoyment for the wise man?

---

<sup>316</sup> The original editor inserted "593" by hand.

CHAPTER 21  
THE ULTIMATE AS REALITY

---

<sup>317</sup> Blank page

## CHAPTER 22: WESTERN THINKERS

BERKELEY does not deny that things exist, but he declares them to be ideas only.

@@ His introduction of God to account for our ideas is due to his search for a cause. Had he known of non-causality he need not have added this fancy.

@@ Vijñānavādīn Buddhists agree with Berkeley in saying everything is vijñāna, idea, but they would criticise him by saying we do not see any God. They themselves however are wrong in saying everything is momentary and passes away, for the Drik which tells them this must itself be unchanging to perceive the changes.

@@ Berkeley belongs to the subjective Idealist school, which is a step higher than the objective idealist school. Kant belongs to the latter, nevertheless he was a far greater philosopher than Berkeley, because Berkeley brought in God unnecessarily, and because Kant's manner of analysing the mind was masterly. He showed that time space and causation control mind.

@@ I agree with Berkeley's phrase "Esse est percipi". This is equivalent to my doctrine that to say anything exists, it is the mind which tells you it is there, for perception is performed by the mind.

@@ Berkeley's reasoning is an excellent introduction to the theory of idealism. However after that he went off the rails and said the "idea" has been planted in man's mind by God. Thus he left philosophy for theology.

@@ The greatest English philosophers were Berkeley and Hume, the greatest German were Hegel and Kant.

@@ Berkeley, Jeans and co. wrongly think that the finite ego-mind will continue existence. They did not reach the stage of Vijñānavādīns who declared all ideas to be momentary.

@@ Berkeley and Ramanuja have some points in common and some in opposition. Both agree that

---

<sup>318</sup> The original editor inserted "595" by hand.



(continued from the previous page) the world is God's presentation to the mind, that God puts and takes it away. But whereas the former says it is an idea, the latter says it is real. Ramanuja does not accept idealism.

@@ Berkeley's book "New Theory of Vision" I have read through twice. His view that outness and distance are in the mind and not seen by the eyes, is correct. Huxley's disagreement with this is due to the error in thinking of "inside" and "outside" the mind, and in thinking of 'my' mind. We begin by talking of 'my' mind only because we cannot know what is going on in other peoples' minds, but enquiry into the myness shows that there is only Mind. But as this was an elementary early effort Berkeley was in error when he said the 'outness' is an inference from the experience of touch. All the experience of the other senses, including touch, are themselves inferences without exception.

@@ Berkeley had not the courage to go to the very end for he would have to reflect that the very God he posits as having created the idea which man sees as objects – this very God is Berkeley's own mental creation, hence an idea in his mind.

@@ BERKELEY's notion of plurality of minds, spirits is a wrong assumption. How can he point out where each mind begins and ends, how it stands by the side of other minds? This theory shows lack of brains and there he fell into confusion.

@@ BERKELEY and JEANS not knowing Avastatraya and dream explanation, were forced to account for the objectivity of things by imagining an eternal Spirit which places the ideas of things outside us. But where is this God? It must be in the mind as much as all the ideas of external objects!

@@ BERKELEY's "esse est percipi" means to be is to be mentally perceived; his "perceived things" means "mentally perceived things."

@@ BERKELEY meant that whatever may exist unperceived in the past was really existing as imagined by you because you have seen it in the present. Suppose you have never seen Iceland. So what do you really do? You imagine it to exist. How? By drawing upon knowledge of the countries you already know, and thus construct your mental picture of Iceland, i.e. you attribute to it some of the quality of sensation derived from the known and the present. This is meaning of Berkeley's "Nothing exists that is not a perceived thing." It is correct philosophically for it makes everything an idea but Berkeley did not grasp that perception itself is also an idea, nor that the God and ego of his scheme are themselves perceived things, i.e. ideas. He did not know Drg Drsya Viveka.

@@ BERKELEY's error was to take the ego as real.

@@ SUBJECTIVISM teaches that there are no two things, only one.

@@ SUBJECTIVE IDEALISM is only a step. It satisfactorily proves things to be ideas, but it has the defect of admitting or rather adding an imagined God.

@@ SUBJECTIVE IDEALISM which includes Vijnanavada Buddhists and Berkeley make the mistake of asserting that ideas are only within the mind, whereas the Objective Idealists say that ideas are external and are the external objects; the latter is nearer the truth. What is internal appears external.

@@ When I cannot touch America, cannot see it, etc. I get no experience of America, so how can I say it exists? To say that anything exists, you must have had experience of it, i.e. you must have tasted, smelt or seen it. This is the meaning of Berkeley's "esse est percipi."

---

<sup>319</sup> The original editor inserted "597" by hand.

@@ LOCKE: The merit of Locke is that he was the first to rise above common sense and be struck by the thought that all the qualities of an object did not reside in it but lay partly in the mind itself.

@@ LOCKE says that our experience of an object is mental, only idea, but that it represents an external real object. If this were so how is it possible to verify the latter? It is impossible. Pull your eyes out, remove all nerves of the skin, cut off your nose and get rid of the ears and tongue. Will you then be able to experience an external world? Obviously not. Therefore all we know for certain is the idea.

@@ HUME. It is the essential principle of idealism that ideas keep on coming; we do not know anything more. We do not know why they keep on coming; we do not know anything more. We do not know why they keep on coming; This continuous appearance is called phenomenalism and was correctly explained by Hume. we cannot find any law to explain why the idea of a shelf and not the idea of a wall arises. It is in the nature of Mind to be giving birth to these different ideas. One idea goes and another idea comes; we cannot say more. If you ask why one idea rather than another appears, we say the question must not be asked. For "why" implies that you are seeking for a cause, and cause itself is only an idea. Even if you find a cause it will give, Ashtavakra says, all thinking will give, only another thought again.

@@ HUME's failure to find a self is answered by Drg Drsya Viveka. All his criticisms are sound but apply only to the drsyam. For what is it that tells him that there is no self? It is the mind itself, i.e. the Atman.

@@ BRADLEY I agree with Bradley that every man has his own point of view and therefore every man's philosophy is merely finding reasons for his instinctive belief. But the question is how to get out of this difficulty: here Bradley does not enter and does not offer a solution.

@@ BERTRAND RUSSELL'S "Neutral" stuff, if it has a meaning, must be something which his mind thinks of, i.e. mental.

@@ I agree with Bertrand Russell's criticisms of the falsity in much of our modern education but the reform of teaching the pure truth about things which he proposes is questionable. For do not believe this to be practicable.

@@ BRADLEY says that philosophic thinking can yet at truth but owing to its very limitation cannot get at reality. We in India refute him and show that it can go farther, it can go to the very end.

@@ BRADLEY does come close to Sankara but does not go so far as non-duality. He has seen the limitations of thinking but he has not seen that there is no necessity to stop there, for when we recognise the Thinker, awareness, objectless consciousness, that is the goal. Moreover he makes a distinction between Truth and Reality, where Sankara points out that they are ultimately the same.

@@ RUSSELL is so attached to the body that although he recognises sensations are mental he looks for an outside object which causes them. He does not see that even if he found such an object it again can only be an idea.

@@ CHRIST would have acted on a Vedantic, i.e. a higher ethic if instead of dying for humanity, he should have sought to live longer for them and thus done much more service.

@@ K.A. KRISHNASWAMI IYER: When there are no two, how can you speak of cause and effect? It is the defect of K.A.K's book that he omits

---

<sup>320</sup> The original editor inserted at top of the page read: "Chap 22" by hand.

<sup>321</sup> The original editor inserted "599" by hand.

(continued from the previous page) the latest scientific results on non-causality and hence is not contemporary.

@@ If RAMANA MAHARISHI is really sending telepathic waves to influence Gandhi, why does he not give a positive demonstration of it by influencing Hitler and thus help all mankind? The evidence is lacking.

@@ KRISHNA: The word “Me” used by Krishna in Gita means the Atman.

@@ SRI AUROBINDO Recluses who appear only at rare intervals are thinking only of the body, for they appear publicly to exhibit the body! Similarly with those who remain quite nude: it is an affair of the body.

@@ BUDDHA. He first thought that yoga practice can lead to gnana but he found afterwards that it is of no value.

## CHAPTER 23 WESTERN SCHOOLS OF THOUGHT.

@@ BEHAVIOURISM is quite incomplete by itself. It cannot give a full account of the Mind. It leaves out Mind, consciousness. It is based on inference which is fallible. Hypocritical acts would defeat it. The weakness of all the Western Scientific schools of psychology is that each thinks it is the highest, instead of regarding itself as a stage. Every theory which has been advanced has got its defects and gets superseded therefore by another theory.

@@ PSYCHO-ANALYSIS: The subconscious is confined to the individual whereas the Unconscious is common to all: there are the two divided schools of Freudian psychology. But they do not answer the question: How do you know that consciousness is confined to the body? The Unconscious Mind of Freudians is not so large a concept as our Vedantic Mind because we make the whole world as Mind so that every thought that strikes us must necessarily come from it.

@@ THE NEW CRITICAL REALISM stands midway between crude realism and subjective idealism. It takes something from both. Its use of the term “logical entities” merely means “inferred entities”. They hold that something arises from mind and conjoins with something that comes from the object, whereas Kant’s objective idealism says that nothing comes from the object and the mind works up the whole thing: both regard the object as existing independently.

@@ AMERICAN MENTALISM. This American new idealistic school which teaches the doctrine it calls “Mentalism” also holds the belief in plurality of minds. Thus this new name is beginning to become as ambiguous as the old name of idealism. However it is better because the old name corresponded to our vijñānavāda

---

<sup>322</sup> The original editor inserted “601” by hand.

(continued from the previous page) Buddhism, giving reality only to single and separate ideas, whereas even those Mentalists have to accept that there is a common feature in all this plurality of individual minds, which feature is that they are all mental. Otherwise there would be no meaning in the name. Everything must have something mental in it, just as every door window and box must have some wood in it. Just as the wood is the common feature of the latter so mind is the common feature of the former and even of all the individual minds. Hence even the pluralistic mentalists are thus refuted and a monistic mentalism is thus revealed to lie hidden within their own pluralism!

@@ THEOSOPHY The stories of Koot Humi living in Tibet for thousands of years in the same body is a mere fable for intellectual children.

@@ RATIONALIST ASSOCIATION "How are you going to deal with those who cannot reason, who cannot rise to your level of understanding?" —this is a question I ask the Rationalist association. They are quite right so long as they restrict their appeal to the educated minority but to spread their ideas among the unintelligent masses is to hurt, not help them. It means that Rationalists are selfish because thinking only of themselves. They will only create a new sect. Man has to consider the fate of others who are not so evolved. The important question is: "How shall we be helpful to the whole world?" The mere teaching of ethics to children without religious basis for it has been tried and is a failure. What substitute for religion as a basis for those millions who cannot rise to reasoning can rationalists offer? None! India tried Rationalism long ago in the forms of Jainism and Buddhism but they failed because

(continued from the previous page) religions like others with God-worship etc. Why? Because rationalism was given to those who could not understand reason. Hence rationalism must keep to its own place, where it is of course, quite good. In the case of the numerous Westerners who have lost faith in religion, the right procedure is to give them a higher religion, a more intellectual one. Rationalisms is too negative to help men live. It is merely a negation and lacks constructiveness. It is not a philosophy. Men need a positive basis for action or morality. Give people what they can digest. Hence Rationalism should not be offered to all.

@@ RATIONALIST ASSOCIATION: I wrote to them: "You are taking religion away from the masses. But what are you offering to replace it? Nothing. Therefore your work is purely destructive. It will be helpful to a few intellectuals doubtless but the masses will be injured by losing their religion and having no new source of morality to replace it.

@@ RATIONALIST ASSOCIATIONS are good if they confine their work among a small number, but if they try to spread their ideal of reason amongst coolies who have not the capacity to grasp it they are wrong. Belief must be the way for such undeveloped masses, and the appeal to reason will only confuse them or rouse their hostility. This is the Vedantic ideal of giving people only what they are ripe for, taking them as they are and slowly leading them up.

@@ CHRISTIAN SCIENCE: Because Idealism is true it is also true that human thought reappears or "materialises" as conditions of bodily health, outer environment and karmic fortunes. It is for this reason that the religious teachers have warned people to be careful what thoughts they think. Thus there is a basis of truth in what Christian Science claims. Thought

---

<sup>323</sup> The original editor inserted "603" by hand.



(continued from the previous page) reproduces itself in the circumstances and surroundings of our personal lives and bodies, either quickly or slowly or in later incarnations. Those who think in terms of fighting and war sooner or later get embroiled in war. And just as a dream happens of its own accord and later the events of the dream happen in the same way physically, as though they were “predicted,” so thoughts may come involuntarily to us and later become materialised. Anyway it may truly be said that our present incarnation has been made by our former thoughts.

@@ CHRISTIAN SCIENCE. It is a step to truth. For just as it is the egoless common mind which creates the ideas so if we can eliminate ego from our thought and then send our peace or healing to someone it will have creative constructive effect. However, if you eliminate ego then the desires collapse with it! Certainly the desire for self-healing or self-improvement of fortune will go with the ego for they belong to it. Anyway right thinking is likely to modify karma, for we must remember that karma is simply the influence of past thoughts, it is itself nothing but thought, whilst the body is itself a thought too. But right thinking implies egoless thinking.

@@ THE PERSONALISTS: They begin by assuming the existence of God and individual souls, then by imagining the kind of God and the kind of souls. The whole thing is therefore based on assumption and imagination.

@@ THEOSOPHY: Universal brotherhood can never be got by Theosophical societies because they are basing it on emotion. Hence the frequent strife and quarrels among them. It can come only by convincing the reason.

@@ LOGICAL POSITIVISM. Sense-experience is that which can be felt, smelt, touched, heard and tasted. The L.P's make each sensation a simple indivisible event and refuse to analyse it into a knowing mind, a mental act and a known object. But this is beyond me. How is it possible for us to be aware of sense-experience without a mind to be aware of it? When your attention is distracted you do not see many sense-objects at all? No, for your mind is away. In refusing to separate sensation from mind and object, in refusing to admit mind and matter as separate entities, and in acknowledging only "logically-constructed" sensations logical positivism is trying to arrive at advaitic non-duality; it is similar to saying *drik* and *drsya* are really the same! But the great omission of logical positivism is to ignore Mind as the fundamental thing. For how they have 'logical constructions?' unless there is a mind present to make the construction. Logic is meaningless without mind. Again logical positivists talk of objects being "permanent possibilities" but who can tell whether anything is going to last for ever without himself being there to there to witness it? It is impossible.

The so-called 'possibilities' into which logical positivists resolve all sensations of objects are meaningless, mere words, blab. Moreover has possibility a meaning? Yes. Then it is only a thought. But a thought implies a thinker, i.e. Mind. Thus they are refuted. Again, they limit everything to sense-experience is also erroneous. I can imagine bombs falling on my house so vividly, that sensations of this event will be aroused in me and cause reactions of horror fear etc. If mind is my logical construction, then who is the 'my?' It refers to an 'I' which must itself be Mind. However L.P. is useful as a reaction against two extremes (a) realism (b) theistic subjective idealism.

---

<sup>324</sup> The original editor inserted "605" by hand.

@@ Logical Positivism: You must ask yourself how the mind works when it uses words: what for instance it includes in the thought of the word “man”. This is what Indian philosophy asks: this is to enquire into “the meaning of meaning.” Logical Positivism has begun to ask this, but only begun. It is useful as a step to those who have not yet seen that the world is mental, that things are drsyam.

@@ SPIRITUALISTS. Theosophists and mystics who report conversations with the dead or experiences with spirit-worlds, need not necessarily be liars. They may be sincere, but deluding themselves.

@@ THEOSOPHISTS: They have taught the existence of Hierarchy of adepts who live hidden away in Tibet but who spend their whole lives for the service of mankind. If these adepts have realised the truth they would not hide themselves in the Tibetan caves but would come out into the world in order to help them directly. It is impossible for them to render any effective help from the cave. If they are really there they are merely yogis and mystics but not Gnani. The teaching of the theosophists has got a basis of truth because there are always some sages present in the world voluntarily reborn to help mankind but they do not form themselves into a secret Tibetan society nor do they keep on living in the same physical bodies for thousands of years. Theosophy has thus taken and distorted the great truth.

@@ EMERGENCE THEORY: What is necessary before seeing the emergence of mind from body? What is it that could alone tell you of its emergence? Answer: Mind itself: Yet the advocates of this theory are blind to it. Why? Because they can- not enquire deeply enough.

@@ REALISTS talk of experience, thinking only of the body, and also regarding the body as different from the mind. This is why they fall into confusion and fallacy.

@@ GREECE. Early history of Greek philosophy shows an evolution of ideas and it was much the same in the early history of Indian philosophy.

@@ MANDUKYA: The ultimate lesson of Mandukya is that all human knowledge, all scientific theory, is nothing but imagination, idea in the end.

---

<sup>325</sup> The original editor inserted at top of the page read: "Chap 23" by hand.

<sup>326</sup> The original editor inserted "607" by hand.



## CHAPTER 24 THE NEED OF ULTRA-MYSTICISM

@@ There is no such thing as mystical “truth.” You should say and write only of mystical “experience.”

@@ Let us not despise those who turn to yoga for peace rather than be burdened by intellectual enquiry. Let them also be happy.

@@ Even the yogis are after some object of desire for they are after some kind of mental peace and satisfaction. If everything is Atman, you do not have any desire for anything else, because that is also Atman. It is an impossibility to have any desire then.

@@ Yoga is the moral and mental discipline which must be practised in order to realise the truth. Hence yoga is not to be despised.

@@ Drik cannot be investigated: only drsyam can be inquired into. Hence the futility of mystic endeavour.

@@ Yoga gets rid of the ego in nirvikalpa, but when the yogi returns to normal, his ego re-appears.

@@ The difficulty is to see both the One and the Many at the same time. Because of this difficulty people have recourse to yoga in which is an escape from it, not a solution of it.

@@ Yogic Nirvikalpa samadhi does not even realize its supposed Brahman for it is unconscious, it is not different from deep sleep whilst if it is conscious it must be aware of some object of thought, because the thought movement cannot be stopped, hence the samadhi is not objectless, nirvana.

@@ There can be no argument, no difference of view, no doubt, in truth and in philosophy if it means ultimate truth. Hence those who indulge in discussions about ultimate reality are babbling children.

@@ We are under the illusion that the knowledge

---

<sup>328</sup> The original editor inserted “609” by hand.

(continued from the previous page) of Brahman can be realized only when the perceptual world disappears. But the perceptual world is appearing and disappearing every moment!

@@ When I see the world am I not aware of it? The awareness is there. Awareness is Brahman. When I am not seeing the world, my awareness is still there. So the Brahman is not lost by becoming conscious of objective world, as yogis wrongly assert.

@@ Hegel: Few understand the meaning of unity. One implies many. Hegel's Absolute must be distinguished from the relative or it is meaningless. Hence it implies duality, not oneness.

@@ Ascetics who want to give up the world, really want to give up Brahman. The world is as much Brahman as anything. "Everything is Brahman" says the texts. Hence their disdain for science, comforts, modern inventions, etc. is disdain for Brahman! What they ought to give up is the false knowledge of the world the false belief in its reality, the ignorance that it is idea. Maya also is Brahman. Get rid not of world but of the ignorance which prevents you seeing the world as Maya.

@@ The fallacy of the yogis is to think because they do not see the world in samadhi, they have realized Brahman. What about the world? Is it not Brahman too?

@@ Omniscient=knowing the all as Brahman. Yet mystics seek to know the Nothing!

@@ "Undifferentiated" as descriptive of Brahman must not only be realized inside as yogis claim, but also when seeing the outside world, which mystics are unable to claim.

@@ We do not condemn yoga & asceticism: they are good for beginners and the ignorant: what we condemn is the mistaking of these things for gnan, for the knowledge of Brahman.

@@ Mystics seek union with that (god) which unites the whole universe; thus they unconsciously pay tribute to the inner need of oneness. But the defect is that the mystic wants union with another being, a second being. Therefore the word "love" occurs in both religion and mysticism, as well as sex, because it implies another entity. The two can become one only through truth.

@@ Mystic seeks Anandam which means the highest satisfaction. But the term highest, being relative to lower, etc. indicates that this satisfaction is an object, a changing drsyam, hence not Brahman. That which knows the satisfaction is the Brahman.

@@ Brahman=that into which all things go.

@@ Meditation is useless to get Brahman, because that implies producing a second thing; but it is useful to get rid of bad thoughts or wrong ones.

FINIS.

---

<sup>329</sup> The original editor inserted "611" by hand.