

Interview to the YoGa Magazine ...contd.

Questions and Answers

And I've not given you any opportunity to question. And I want people to live with questions, not with conclusions, so they can ask any question. This body never repeats anything. It's all flowering at the moment. Each flower appears to be the same but it's not same. Though it may look similar it's a new flowering. So there is no question of repetition of anything. So we're not talking from (the dimension of) intellectual garbage and accumulation... It's always the flow of Intelligence! Why the hell you want to repeat something!

Holy Cross

Question: I saw the video recording of your meeting with Father Seraphim, which happened on Valaam Island. And during the talk you mentioned that the orthodox cross and the symbol of Yoga have actually the same spiritual meaning. Could you, please, explain the symbols and elucidate the spiritual phenomenon behind it.

No, what was told to Father Seraphim is simply this: He was telling that in Christianity the basic concept is that "I am a sinner" and therefore "I need a Saviour"... And he asked: "What is it in the understanding of Yoga?" And the speaker said: "It's not that "I am a sinner" or "I'm not a sinner"... These are again opposites. And the mind and "I" is always in opposites. So it's not that "I am a sinner" or "I am not a sinner"... "I" is sin because it's separation from Divinity, from the whole. It's a fragment. It's separation from Divinity and therefore it's sin. "I" is sin. It's not that "I am a sinner" or "I am not sinner". And therefore the cancellation of "I" – the vertical line is "I" and the horizontal line is "cancellation" – the cancellation of "I" is the Holy Cross, that is why it's most sacred. And that is, of course, the symbol of Yoga. Yoga means – "I" canceled. "Chitta-vritti-nirodhah." "I" is chitta-vritti, and that is gone for Chaitanya to be. The division is gone for Divinity to be. So this is the symbol of Yoga – it's mathematical plus sign in India. And there in the mathematical plus sign the horizontal line and the vertical line both are of the same length intersecting at the center. Here it is a little different and perhaps it's good that it's different! Because it's clearly showing that the vertical line is "I" and it's clearly showing that the horizontal line, the small line, – is the cancellation of "I". In mathematical plus sign this cancellation of "I" is not so evident as it's evident in the cross. That's why the speaker said that the Cross is perhaps a better symbol of Yoga than what is available in India, which is merely a mathematical plus sign.

Samadhi

Question: You're were telling during one of the programs that the freedom from division – Samadhi – can't be perpetual, it comes in flashes, otherwise the body will not be able to take it, to endure it.

Actually Samadhi, the dictionary meaning of the word "Samadhi", – is "established in the Energy of equanimity". And however odd the circumstances, this equanimity is not disturbed. That perpetuity is called "nirvicalpa". And when the Energy is there but it gets disturbed – when the challenge is so much and the situation is so adverse it gets disturbed – that is called occasional. It's called "savicalpa". This is the general thing about Samadhi. But there is another deeper implication of Samadhi. When the stimulus and response become one unitary movement and at that time there is a feeling that I am the whole Universe. There is no dichotomy between me and anything around. That is a very deep implication of Samadhi. It comes in a flash and it's such an ecstasy that it's difficult for a body to take it for a long time! See, it's at that moment Jesus Christ said: "I and Father are One". The Indian sages said: "Aham Brahma asmi". The sufi mystic Al-Hallaj Ali Mansur said: "Haqq Haqq ana Al-Haqq! I'm the god! I'm the Truth!" So these are very rare moments and that is such an ecstasy that it is difficult for the body to take it. Just as the body can't take too much pain – it drops dead, like a cancer

pain. Too much pain – it drops dead. Similarly it can't take too much joy! The limited body and joy is so immense so unlimited that in the limited it may not be possible to withstand. Therefore the body may drop dead. So that is why these are flashes. And it's good that they are flashes. And even if the body doesn't drop dead, people will kill. For example, Jesus was crucified. Al-Hallaj Ali Mansur was cut into pieces, and he was bleeding and he died. Many rishis also, when they said: "I'm the God!" – they were killed. So this is what is happening. That is why I said that. But that is a deeper implication of Samadhi. It's not the ordinary Samadhi, which is the Energy of equanimity. And we have instances when the Energy is so great that even when a man's young son died just in front of him in a road accident, his equanimity was not disturbed. That is one aspect of Samadhi. And this is when stimulus and response become one unitary movement. See, I'm looking at you – suddenly I find that there is no dichotomy between you and me. And actually when I'm looking at you you're already inside me as the image on the retina. But because of certain process in our divisive consciousness there is the distance and diversity. And if these processes are withheld, if they are postponed for some time suddenly there is a feeling that I and you – both are same. That means unitary movement. Your body is stimulating my retina and the response and this stimulus become same. Suddenly there is no dichotomy, no division, no distance between you and me. So that is called "stimulus and response become unitary movement". Usually it's not a unitary movement, it's a dichotomy movement. When I look at you – you are there, I'm here. That is what our separative psyche does. There are some times, when this separative process is held in abeyance and at that time there is suddenly a flash that there is no division, not only between you and me – between me and everything around, all the trees, the mountains, the whole Universe.

Non-doer, Bhakta and Bhagawan

Question: How can I understand that Universal Intelligence is acting, that non-doing is happening? The Intelligence can suddenly come, but I may not recognize it as I can use only my intellect, my mind to comprehend something. Or maybe there is some other organ by which I can cognize it, realize it, isn't there?

The question is wrong. The question is not "how". The question is "when". That's what I'm saying – it's possible when there is a fusion, mutation between the thinker and thought, the observer and observed, when there is no division. As long as division is there, observer is there, "I" is there, there is no question of that Otherness, the Awareness. This is a strange process: that "I" – when it's fed up of its agony, suffering, pain and it somehow understands "this is not all", "there must be something beyond all these things" – it's getting a flash, getting a subtle awareness, a message that there must be something, that this is not all life. Life is not all these mental pollutions and therefore there is a yearning to be available to the Otherness, to the Awareness, to the Divinity, to the Non-doer. Awareness is the Non-doer, although every doing is possible because of the connection with that Awareness in the body, connection of Intelligence, the Chaitanya. Awareness means Chaitanya, Intelligence, that means Life, and that connection of Life is available in the body. And that connection is the real doer. But it's also the non-doer because it's directly not doing anything. It's doing through a separative psyche "I". And that "I" if it remains only as a coordinator, as it's happening in the technical world, without getting into psychological registrations and entanglement, then that "I" in spite of doing will still be available to non-doership because it's not entangling, not getting involved positively or negatively. There is choice-less-ness, withdrawal from psychological registrations, which is actually the separative process – that is not there, and therefore this "I", although a technical coordinator, is still available to non-doership in the sense it understands that the real doer, because of which "I am able to do", is sitting quietly. And whatever it's performing – it's performing through my karma-indriya which are available, through other gyana-indria which are available. By utilizing this the Non-doer is functioning, by utilizing this... And it is functioning through another "I" which is merely coordinating the knowledge. Knowledge creates this "I" and "my knowledge", and this "I" is merely coordinating the knowledge which is stored up in the memory. So this process is happening. But to meet that Non-doer – "I" have the yearning to meet that Non-doer, that Non-doer is Divinity, and "I" has the feeling that this is the Thing and there must be a meeting between "me" and Non-doer – but

that is not possible as long as this separation is there. Awareness is whole, it's Chaitanya, it's not chitta-vrittiti, – as long as chitta-vrittiti is there, there is no meeting. So when the Otherness happens this-ness goes. There is no other way! So all these people who say: "I've experienced God", – they're all shits! They're all conditioned reflexes from the knowledge about God, or expectation about meeting God – the conditioned reflexes. So, this Divinity is not an experience, it's Existence. And therefore there is no way to experience it! It's not in the experience structure, the ego-structure. This is the beauty of the whole thing that there is a yearning created by "I" to meet the Other, the Non-"I", the Non-doer, but when the meeting happens there is no "I" – this separative "I" is gone. So therefore this meeting is not possible and when that is possible there is total mutation and fusion, there is no separative process. So, all the stories that devotee is meeting Divinity – Bhakta and Bhagawan, their meeting, – these are all fanciful stories. There can't be any meeting. Because when Bhagawan is there – Bhakta goes. Ha! Because as long as that Bhakta is here – it's not Bhakta, it's vi-bhakta. And vi-bhakta can never meet the whole, the Bhagawan. So there can't be any meeting between "me" and God. Although "I" am seeking God, "I" am yearning for God, but when this process happens – God means "no-division" – when the process happens the divisive "I" is gone. Which means, if I tell in the ordinary language, that if "I" want to meet God there can never be a meeting, and if the meeting happens there is no "I". Therefore there can't be any meeting. This is a paradox. This is a riddle. But this is so.

Is the "I" something which exists?

You see, the content of consciousness in the outer world, for example. The consciousness of the outer world, the content is this bed. And there is a dichotomy between my body and my bed, and therefore I can use this bed. I'm sitting on the bed. And if I don't want to use the bed, I can go and sleep on the floor. Because the dichotomy is there, between my body and the bed, I can do what I want to do. But then this "I" is just a coordinator which enables me to handle the bed, and to use the bed or not to use the bed. Because there is a dichotomy between "I" – which means this body – and the bed. But in the inner world, let's say, I have some mental pollution, some psychological problem, say fear. "I" and fear. Is there a dichotomy? Here – I have a bed or I have no bed. But in the inner world is it that – "I have fear" or "I have no fear"? Just find out. It's not that "I have fear" or "I have no fear". "I" is fear! It's the fear which is creating another fragment. Fear is full of fragmentation. It's creating another fragmentation, which is "I", and it's imagining that this "I" is outside the fear. And it's imagining that this "I" can use the fear or control the fear, just as this "I" is using the bed, controlling the bed, or not using, not controlling. But this "I" can't do that with fear! If "I" wants to control fear, who is controlling? The fear itself is trying to control. Because fear is "I", "I" is fear. There are no two! This is very difficult to understand that there are no two in the inner consciousness, in the inner being! In the outer being there are two. And the "I" is very useful. But in the inner being this whole "I" is an illusion. It's a false division, false fragmentation. And whatever "I" is doing or not doing, it's only giving continuity to fear. When it tries to control the fear it's only complicating the fear. This we don't understand because of our tremendous heavy conditioning that "I" is something which exists! It does exist as a practical entity – coordinator in the outer world. But in the inner world there is no such thing. It's a total illusion. Can this (be understood)? This is the real message of Swadhyaya, the Sankhya, the beginning of Kriya Yoga.

Does God exist?

So, now... Please, understand that "God" is not truth, but Truth is God. "God" is a lie, created by the "I", that illusion "I" and "God" is another illusion of this "I". And therefore these two illusions are protecting each other. So "God" is a total lie. "God" is not truth but Truth that the "I" is an illusion, which is perpetuating itself by this ultimate greed which is "God", this ultimate garbage which is "God", ultimate craving for permanency which is "God"... So it's not that "God" is truth... "God" is a lie of the "I", but Truth is God, the truth that "I" is an illusion, it is a division, it is a separation from Life. This truth is God, is Life, is Love, is Everything. Similarly, it's not that "God" exists or "God"

does not exist. But Existence is God. The essence of existence is God. “God” exists in the fascination, imagination of that illusion “I”. “God” does not exist. But the whole existence, the whole essence of eternal existence – that is God, that is Divinity. The very fact that experiencing is happening is enough proof that what you’re experiencing is not real. It’s conditioned reflexes because Reality, Divinity, it’s not experience, it’s existence. Experience is alright in technical world when you want to be a carpenter or a tailor or a publisher of a journal – there it’s ok, there the experience is alright. But experience in matters spiritual has no validity whatsoever.

Responsibility

Question: And what about responsibility then? If everything is done by that Doer, does it mean that we’re not responsible for anything at all?

People are talking about responsibility. But are they responsible? The word “responsibility” comes from the word “response” that means to be able to respond adequately. But are we responding adequately in any situation? Or we’re merely reacting? In every situation – we’re only reacting! We’re not responding. We’re only reacting from “what should be”, according to our image that this should be like this and if this is not like this we’re reacting. We’re always reacting from “what should be”. There is never a response from “what is”. And to be able to respond from “what is” – adequate response – that is the beginning of responsibility. And because of the shit mind, the shit “I”, with all its psychological registration and investment, we’re only making ourselves available to reaction. And we think we’re responsible. We’re not responsible. We’re a structure of vulgar reaction. We’re not the veracity of responsibility. This simple thing is not going into the heads of such people. Therefore they’re asking such stupid questions.

I and the Other

Question: Does it mean that we should act listening to our heart, being guided by love?

What we’re saying about “I” is not the real I. It’s merely a network of images that “I” have formed about myself or as imposed by the society, through their talks and their estimations. “I” – quote unquote I – is just a network of images. The real I is not this “I”. It’s the Chaitanya, it’s the Awareness. And when “I” am talking about my heart, it’s again my image about the heart, that “I” am having a heart, “I” am having a love! “I” am having a conception, according to some books, or according to some film which “I” have seen, and according to the emotional behavior that “I” have run into “I” think that “this is coming from my heart”. It’s all lie! All images, all activities of the “I”! When this is understood, then there is something, which is Life, which is Heart, which is Love, which is Divinity, which is Unnameable, Immeasurable. “I” can never know anything about Life. It’s Unknowable, because Life is Unlimited, it has no beginning, no end. It’s never born. It never dies. And Life is not interested in any after-life, because it does not die at all. It’s the shoddy little “I”, in order to give itself continuity it imagines things about life, about life after death and all the belief systems. All such things are that protective mechanism of that illusion that doesn’t exist. And that illusion is talking about Life and Heart. There is no way this “I” can know this. “I” must cease for the Other to be!