

Questioner. Gururaj, this is a question about laughter.

Questioner(Cont'd). It's a serious question about laughter. (General laughter)

Gururaj. (Gururaj laughs)

Questioner. There seems to be two kinds of laughter - jokes, and in one kind, the jokes actually attack something which people fear. For example, racist jokes in some all white clubs for example, against blacks or visa-versa. But also banana skin jokes, if someone trips over a banana skin people laugh ... (inaudible) picking it up. In the other kind of joke, it's as though the laughter is drawn from the air, without any target for the joke. Now, the jokes and laughter here always seem to be of the second kind. For example, the laugh we've just had was .. (Inaudible) there was no target. And I'm asking first of all, what is the nature of laughter, and also why is laughter so often very close also to tears?

Gururaj. You've forgotten the third kind of laughter, that wells up spontaneously from inside. That is the most important kind of laughter. To really, to be able to laugh, does not require an external stimulus. That is one kind of laughter, where the external stimulus, or stimuli which is afforded due to some circumstances, as throwing pies, or slipping on a banana skin. That is the external stimuli which is producing laughter in us. So that is a very low form of laughter. Good. A person slips over a banana skin and gets hurt, and that causes laughter in us. Right, does it not show us that we are exhibiting a sadistic tendency, in laughing at that person's suffering? When the person fell, slipping on a banana skin, the person got hurt. Good, and we laugh at the person's hurt. Should it not rather produce tears in us? Or, does it remind us; should it not remind us that if I was in that person's shoes on that banana skin, how would I feel? Would it, should it not also produce the thought in us, that if I was in that person's boots, how embarrassed I would feel. And by me laughing at that person, I'm making that person feel more embarrassed.

The kind of laughter we love best, the true laughter is the laugh of the flower, where it spontaneously sends forth its fragrance, or the laughter of the wind amongst the leaves, or the laughter of the waves roaring away, laughing away in the ocean. So, real laughter is that which comes from within, and which is absolutely natural to us, where we just burst out laughing. Good, have you ever seen a person drunk with hash? Hash, hash?

Aide. Hashish.

Gururaj. Hash, - uh, Cannabis. Now I've been told, and I've seen this as well, that a person with Cannabis just starts laughing for no apparent reason whatsoever. What causes that laughter? Good, is it the laughter of the awake mind, or is the laughter of a deadened and dull mind? So here we can see that two kinds of minds can laugh, a deadened dulled mind, and an awakened, enlightened mind. One kind of laughter of the deadened and dulled mind is tamasic. It is inspired by deadness, or lethargy, which is Tamas, while the Sattvic laughter is that which comes from entire alertness, and not necessary the alertness of the environment, but the alertness that is within itself, for how else can man's spirit express itself? Remember we always talk about the three 'L's'. We had quite a nice talk about this in Spain really, I remember rightly. Life, Love and Laughter.

Now, the finest way to express life and love is through laughter, because in laughter, there is joyous inter-change. There is this joyous communication, which is really the meaning of life, because without communication there is no life, it is death. We know the saying 'No man is an island unto himself', and this saying is very true, that man can not fully live life without communicating, and communications can take place on so many different levels. Looking at the flower, you are communicating with the flower through the sense of sight. Listening to me, you are communicating with me through the sense of hearing. There are other kinds of communications that well up without even saying a word, or without even opening the eyes. The communication of the heart. So all this goes together to make life, and laughter is the easiest way, and the most enjoyable means of communication. In laughter, it's a sharing, but let the sharing be that of joy, that is within us, and not a kind of sharing that is produced by the suffering of others. So, you have laughter, and laughter, and laughter. Good.

Although the basis of laughter, the essence of laughter could be the same, but the motivations differ. And what is important in every action is the motivation. The motivation. You slap your child, the motivation in slapping the child would be good, to correct the child. Slapping the child might be hurting you more than it would hurt the child, as we have said so many times before. Good. The motivation in the action is the most important thing. Now when laughter wells up within ourselves spontaneously, what are the mechanics of that spontaneity? The answer is very complex, and yet very, very simple, because it is only the truly integrated person that can laugh. And when a person is truly integrated, he develops the ability also to laugh at himself. When man can really and truly laugh at himself, then he will have some idea what laughter is, because in that laughter, in that laughter at oneself, when one laughs at oneself, one can separate one's higher nature from one's lower nature. One learns the art of discrimination.

Good, I do a certain act, and I find it to be wrong perhaps, and I laugh at myself because I recognise the silliness of it. Right, now, recognising the silliness or the foolishness of my own actions, and laughing at myself is also a form of sadism, but that sadism is directed towards myself, and not because of an external stimuli, or external stimulus. Good. Here, I am punishing myself through laughter, at how silly I have been, and not only punishing myself in the recognition of my folly, but recognising the folly, I keep on laughing saying that I can do better. So, the ability to be able to laugh at oneself, comes through these various reasons. Firstly, the recognition dawns that I have been silly, and recognising or gaining the recognition of the silliness, I can find the ways and means not to be silly again. So I laugh at myself. Yet that laughter constitutes the element of punishment of oneself. And whenever one tries to correct oneself, it is a kind of punishment. Anything, anything which we do contrary to what is necessary, is a subtle punishing of oneself.

So what we are doing, is that instead of focusing our mental energies, or the mind, and laughing at the suffering of others, we can start laughing at our own suffering. And by being able to have the ability to laugh at our own suffering, do we become stronger. That is why laughter and tears are so allied. You can cry with joy, tears well up because of joy, and laughter also wells up because of joy. So, even in laughter, the element of suffering is there. Good, so they are allied. It is a matter of expression, because within intense joy, when you go into deep ecstasy, I do that very often, I know, the tears would just well up, and I don't know where they come from. Good eye-cleanser. Yes, yes, right. So, so, it is because of the suffering that is inherent in laughter.

Now, in everything for that matter, the law of opposites exist. And when tears can be found in laughter, and laughter can be found in tears, we start mastering the law of opposites. When one, when black is found in the white, and the white is found in the black, then we start mastering the law of opposites, and that is progress, its progress. Now this, laughter and tears is a simple example, because you have asked a question based on laughter, but the same principle can be extended to the various situations of life. Various situations of life, where you would find, if we are aware enough, we would find that there are opposing factors, all the time, all the time, all the time, because we are still within the realms of relativity. So in every joy, there is sorrow. In every sorrow, there is joy, in every parting, there is a meeting. In every parting, there's a meeting. You will leave here Sunday afternoon, Saturday afternoon, so we part. But even in that parting, when you leave here, there is a meeting - what have you met? Ask that question, what have you met? You have met your inner-self, real inner-self, because in the Satsangs, the primary aim has been not only to impart some little knowledge, or some little wisdom, but to impart the meeting of hearts, the real communication. So even in the parting, the bodies separate, but the hearts have come closer together. Is that not a meeting, even in the parting?

So, like that, in every sphere, in every situation of life, the law of opposites always remain. So therefore in your laughter, there are tears. Good. Science might explain the physiological mechanisms of the thing. Psychologists would explain the emotional mechanism that takes place, but in the realm of the spiritual mechanism, in reality there's no laughter and no tears, because in spiritual reality, the law of opposites cease. But that is the way, that is the process we all have to pass through, and recognise, and cognise, and re-cognise the law of opposites. If I did not know rain, I would not know sunshine. If I did not know pain, I would not know pleasure. If I did not know the colour white, I would know the colour black.

So in the path of evolution, we are constantly being faced with the law of opposites. And that is why, living in the relative world, we have to become integrated, so when we are faced with the laws of opposites of tears and laughter, we can take them equably. We can take them equally, we can take them tranquilly. The Gita says something to this effect, 'That he is the man that is not disturbed by disturbances or elated by praises'. This is a very loose translation, - I mean any copy of the Gita would give this to you - where we can preserve this tranquillity, where nothing can disturb us, and nothing can elate us. For remember, the more you can cry, the more you can laugh, and the more you can laugh, the more you can cry, because the greater the sensitivity we develop in us, the greater are we prone to the law of opposites in each direction. Oh yes, the more we are prone, the more are we conditioned to suffer to the extreme, and also suffer to the extreme in the other direction. Take the example of a poet, he can reach the highest heights of heaven and ecstasy, and the same poet can go down to the deepest level of pain. If he was not able to do that, his poetry would not be so profound. We're talking of good poets. His poetry would not be so profound. Yet that poet is in a transitory stage, and when he passes both the extremes, and reaches a state of tranquillity, then he does not want to write poetry anymore. And if he still would want to write poetry, it would be an expression of the joy and love that he feels, not the extreme joys, or the extreme pains, but something beyond those qualities, which is termed bliss. Then his poetry would contain bliss, and bliss is the unification of the laughter and the tears. Have you ever tried to drown laughter in the ocean of tears? Have you ever tried to dry up tears in the beautiful winds of laughter? That is the secret, that is the secret, and all this becomes one.

So, we progress from a sadistic kind of laughter where the, the, the the banana slipping, and the banana peel, the pie throwing is gone beyond. There we laugh, seeing suffering of others because of that sadism. From there we start learning to laugh at ourselves, and inflict that very sadism upon ourselves, to experience what the hurt is, of another person. And when we pass that stage, we start discriminating between your hurt, and my hurt, between your tears and my laughter. Your tears must cause me laughter, what a shame. Absolute shame. Your tears must bring tears in me.

Your laughter must bring laughter in me, and not the other way around. Are we not human? If we cannot do that, we are not even animals really, because animals too have such a wonderful empathy, yes. So these are the things we have to go through, and we have to learn, where your suffering becomes my suffering. Gandhi loved a hymn, it was his favourite hymn, and one of the first lines was '... (Gururaj speaks in Hindi) ' - 'He that can suffer the sufferings of others' - I must sing that for you sometime. I love singing too.

I don't remember the words. (General laughter) I sing, will you play the instruments? Good. Its all right, fine, some other time. (General laughter)

Gururaj. Good, nevertheless, so I've given you a little idea, Erik, of what tears and laughter is all about. They both could be two sides of the same coin, but do we want heads or do we want tails? The choice is yours, always. The heads is always the winner, because it gets us to our senses. That is why the heads must always be the winner. The tails is always for spanking. (General laughter) You see we're laughing, aren't we? (General laughter) Good, it's a lovely question. (Gururaj laughs). It's rough; it has to be polished up before we release it. Now this happens to me all the time, sometimes sharing that love, and I burst out into laughter, and tears and joy, and that's fine. Madness. (General laughter) But what kind of madness? Madness of love.

Questioner. (Inaudible).....more tears.... (Inaudible)..... (General laughter) I'd like you to teach us now guru, on the future of future knowledge, and the nature of God's participation in future knowledge. Many people believe that God is privy for future knowledge.

Gururaj. He's what?

Questioner. Privy, he knows about, he is, he's been.....

Gururaj. Is that English?

Questioner(Cont'd). Yes, (General laughter)

Questioner. Robin says it is - (General laughter) - thank you, Robin.

Gururaj. Privy, privy, privy, perhaps how do you spell it?

Voice. P-R-I-V-Y

Gururaj. P-R...? P R-I-V-Y. Ohhhhhh, I must be very careful now (General laughter) because sometimes I say, 'Please excuse me, I want to go to the privvy'. (General laughter) Did I confuse your question? Sorry, we were talking about laughter, weren't we?

Questioner. I'm, I'm, - many people believe since God has details of future knowledge that he has ... (inaudible)..... he is able to describe already future events. Others, for example Professor Sir Karl Hopper believe that this would make life exceedingly boring to be God, and that life is in fact just as great an adventure of discovery for the Almighty as it is for us, and that we all unfold the pattern of events together. And in other words, if we and God together cut the inter-face between the present and the future, then we all bear the moral responsibility for all the universes tomorrow.

Gururaj. What was the question? (Gururaj laughs)

Questioner. (Cont'd). Those are promising views, or perhaps extreme views, and somewhere I would like you to locate truth for us.

Gururaj. I didn't get your question too well.... (Inaudible).... and I haven't got much there. Nevertheless, the interim period between present and future, and to locate the truth between the interim period of present and future, such a thing does not exist. The future does not exist. Who says there is a future? There is an assumed future, there is an assumed future and a past, past. Past does not exist. Future does not exist. Present exists, that's all, that's all. That's the answer, yes. Do you want me to go on with this? (General laughter) The future does not exist, because although man proposes, God disposes. That's a very well known saying, it's a very well known saying.

Now the future is always based upon man's assumption. Man analyses his past, never thinks of the present, and on the analysis of the past, he bases the future. Good. You, after having analysed the past, do assume that two and two makes four, and four and four will make eight, and eight and eight will make sixteen, but in the land of the living, all those figures might not total up to sixteen, it will total up to sixteen and three-quarters.

So, what is the purpose, what is the purpose of getting a detailed future, when those details are just assumed, and an assumption might just not work out. Good. Now when an assumption does not work out, then we feel very disappointed. We feel dejected, we feel depressed, because with all assumptions there are expectations. Good. And the main cause for suffering is expectation. Boy meets girl, they get married. Now in the marriage there is a business bargain involved, good that the girl expects this, that and the other from the boy, and the boy expects this, that and the other from the girl, and accordingly certain promises are made. Good. There are certain marriages where promises are on the mundane level, and those promises are based on the laws of morality and ethics, and for the sake of stability in society, which should be as it should be and which is a must. Fine. Now, if those promises are not fulfilled, good, and all promises are based very much so on expectations, for them to be fulfilled, then unhappiness starts, because what we had expected, does not come true. Same thing applies in our work that we start working for a firm, and we expect that in two years time we are going to get five hundred percent rise in salary. Good. In ten year's time we will become the General Manager of the company, twenty years time the Managing Director of the company. Expectations, expectations, expectations.

Now, when expectations do not mature, or come, when expectations don't reach our expectations, then we feel disappointment, and that disappointment is suffering. But now, if we had started off without expecting anything, if we had started off in our work or in our marriage, without expecting anything, expecting no results whatsoever, but I, to get married to a woman, to marry her just because I love her, and not expecting anything in return. Then even if she does not treat me well, I will not be disappointed because in the first place, I had no expectations'. Good.

In our work-a-day life, if we do work for the sake of work, we have a certain job to do, and we do it, without expecting the results of the rewards thereof, then no disappointment can result. So all disappointments and dejections and depressions, and the basis of most of schizophrenia, has come about in this way, where expectations were not fulfilled, and caused so many splits within us, that those splits become unbearable. So if we start life, or anything whatsoever, any expectation, then only are we living according to the pattern of creation. Then only are we living according to the pattern of creation, and according to that which we call Divine will. Good. You plant a rose, does the rose know how it is going to blossom out, in what shape and size, or in how many petals? The rose does not know. It just grows. It just grows, and gives its fragrance. But the planter, man, ah, he's the troublemaker. Yes, he plants a certain kind of rose, and he expects it to grow in a certain way. And if it does not mature according to his assumption, his expectation, his idea of how that rose should be, then what happens is this, that the rose does not feel the disappointment, but man feels the disappointment.

So who feels disappointment, and who is the one to fit himself in with the laws of nature, or to expect the laws of nature to do this and that for him? So, this man's idea - good, idea, I-D-E-A, idea. So even in the idea, what is involved but the 'I', with big capital letters. Big capital letter IDEA, I-DEA, as if I'm such a dear. I wish I could be, but every man say that. Right, so having the idea based upon the 'I' within myself, I am expecting this, and I'm expecting that, and I'm expecting every thing, which is not even to be expected. And every idea is an assumption, based upon what the mind could work out according to its capacity, and according to the logic it is capable of.

Fine, but now, as I've said before, that in the living of life, you don't need logic. You don't need logic. Life does not proceed mathematically. Life is an art. Life is an art, and not a precise mechanical science. Good. So now any artist will tell you, that he does not plan his strokes, he has a general idea of the landscape, but as he starts painting, he goes spontaneously applying his brush. We have some artists here? There you are, I've got a job for you, please see me. This is very true. This is besides the point, but seeing that we're talking about it, I want some good artist to do a picture for me, of the representation of the chakric system of the human being. There you have seen pictures in many, many books, and most of them are unfortunately very, very inaccurate. Right, so, we, I would like the assistance, I mean from the Americans, or the English, or South Africans, whatever, us, us, our family, the assistance from some members of our family, to portray those idea in picture form. Because I'd be guiding it? Right, that's beside the point. Good. So as an artist goes, doing his painting, he has no idea, no 'I', no idea how that painting is going to turn out. He has a vague outline in his mind, and as he proceeds, painting the picture, so the picture develops. That is art.

Now life should be lived in a similar way, not artfully, but as art, because artfulness implies scheming, planning. I do not say that man must not plan, but plan in a general form. Forget the precise details, because then you can't not laugh, if the details go wrong. Have a general plan. Fine, man plans to become a doctor of medicine, so he proceeds, he proceeds in his studies, but he's not going to plan every detail. As he proceeds, he learns. As he learns, he adds on more and more to his knowledge. And that must become a spontaneous process, so that the whole pattern is fulfilled, like the painting we spoke about. You see. So when we do that, then will we be the living according to the laws of nature. Now this does not mean irresponsibility and the hippydom and things we find is because of the same idea, but absolutely misinterpreted. People say nature supports. Just do this, and do that, and you have so many movements in the world that talk about this, 'You just carry on, nature supports'. Fine. Nature supports very, very few, but what have you done to allow nature to support you? So the difference is, between responsibility and irresponsibility.

Now we can live in a very, very responsible way, we can be fooled with responsibility. And the main responsibility is to ourselves which would include living a good life. Now, within the framework of living a good life, life should proceed like a painting. Life should proceed like a poem, where the poem is bound by certain metrical standards, yet the expression within it is free. That is a true poem, where you adhere to certain metrical standards, but yet the expression within is free. Now that is art, so life should be art, and not a mechanical science, whereby man tries to interfere with the whole scheme, and pattern of things, which we call God's pattern, for want of a better expression. Because all of us, are so part and parcel of the pattern, that man can say, that he is not only a part of creation, but a part of the ability of the Creator to create. Is that clear? That's what you wanted? You've got it boy!

Was that the bell? You see how mechanical life is? Bell for lunch they tell me. You must really talk to the man in charge. I'll go and speak to him.

Questioner. (Inaudible)

Gururaj. Let's get together again, you know two Satsangs a day are too little. Can't we have three or something like that? They're too short too, yes. Yeah, we will try to see what we can do this evening.

. I've got how many meetings tonight? Two meetings tonight? I suppose we can start a bit early, but I like to give Amrit a chance with these things you know. (Gururaj laughs) No, no you have your things to discuss with B.M.S and I always like you to get finished with that before I come in and talk about things. Okay. So let's have some more interesting questions for this evening. Okay.

END