

Gururaj. There were some Initiations in progress, so it's twelve. We've got an hour. Shall we start off with questions? I know someone who had a stack of questions that were to be read out.

Questioner Guruji, I would like to ask a question on Ahimsa, non-violence. I told that Norman if he did not let me ask this question, I would do him in. (General laughter).

Gururaj. That is a practical demonstration of non-violence.

Questioner. (Cont'd) Gururaj, Gandhi, he drew the scorn of the West when he was asked how he would apply his non-violent leverage of truth, 'Satia gravalas' he called it, in the event, for example, of a nuclear war. He said, 'I would stand and meditate and look up at the pilot of the bomber. In the West they laughed their heads off'.

Gururaj. And get bombed to pieces.

Questioner. (Cont'd) In particular the West's reply was the manner in which he was killed in nineteen eighty four, when he was greeting a man with a Namaste and he shot him.

Gururaj. Latulam.

Questioner.(Cont'd) For many people that was Gandhi's answer to the effectiveness of non-violence. Myself, I do not believe it's got any limits. I would like to ask you,

Gururaj. What if any is the validity of non-violence,

Questioner. (Cont'd) and what are the effective limits if any, of the philosophy of non-violence?

Gururaj. Good, fine. Beautiful, beautiful, beautiful. Now non-violence is definitely an ideal, and as an ideal it is a very good ideal. Good. But how far is it practical in day to day living; that is the question. Good. Non-violence does not only mean being violent with another person, but non-violence would really start off with oneself, how violent you are with yourself. Good. Now every day, every human being that goes through any form of conflict within himself is naturally being violent within himself. There are opposing force within man. There are opposing thoughts. There are

contradictions within man. There are things that require resolving. Good. Part of the mind will pull in one direction, while the other part will pull in another direction. So whatever there is that is conflicting or that is creating a conflict in the mind of man is violence. Good. How can this be avoided and has it ever been avoided? Good.

There has always been some form of violence or the other all the time, and as I said in one of the talks, that even when we breathe, we are killing millions of microbes which is living matter. Even when we eat a cabbage and there has been a scientist that has proven the heartbeat in a cabbage. Whatever we see around is life. Good. This very table standing there is not dead matter as many would assume, there are millions of molecules swirling around in it. There is life. In the very words I speak to you now, in that very force that comes from my lungs, there is life that is breathed out and in. So whatever we see whatever we observe through all the various senses, the physical senses and also the inner senses, there is always the matter of life and death. Good. The whole human organism is built around the factor of creating and destroying all the time. Good. Within seventeen days I was told or was it seven months, where the whole body cells regenerate themselves where the cells get broken down in its old form of violence and new cells are created. So whatever we observe is violent all the time. In other words what violence means at its subtlest level, is the flux taking place. The whole universe is not standing still and there is motion. If you could apart from the universe, you would watch it pulsating all the time. And in the pulsation there is motion and motion can never be created without anti forces, without two forces that propel the motion. Good.

So idealism, violence, the violence that Gandhi preached, was idealistic. Good. But non-violence can never be practised in its totality. Man could never become entirely non-violent. Good. Now this does not only refer to the food we consume, be it in a very subtle form of life as in vegetation or be it in a grosser form of life which people consume. The idea of violence should rather be based upon degree of violence, because as violence as an ideal can not be followed to its completeness. Good. Now the violence that was preached by Gandhi and other teachers was taught at a certain time and for a certain need. Good. Now, to be non-violent does not mean not to be able to defend oneself, because in the very defence, one exercises a form of violence in the form of defence. When someone gives you a blow and you feel that the second blow is going to kill you, so you react in a violent manner. So violence can breed greater violence, good, even if it is in a defensive manner. But here, when you find that life is being unnecessarily taken out of you, you with your natural reflexes would defend yourself and you have to defend yourself in like means. So within certain limitations, violence is according to the laws of nature. Good.

Now there has been made a great hullabaloo as far as India was concerned, that it was one of the only countries in the world that achieved Independence through non-violent means. Yet if we study the inner history of India, there has been a lot of strife. A lot of life has been taken and these things I have witnessed with my own eye. So in putting forward an ideal, Gandhi thought that even if a part of the ideal could be put into practical use, at least something thing would be achieved. Now non-violence, the counter part of non-violence is love, because without having the love that is necessary, one could never become non-violent. And to have that love within man he requires total self integration which we are trying to achieve through our meditational practices. So it is only the totally integrated man that could express love in its fullest form and that could become the least violent. Violence is everywhere as I said, even in mechanics, even in a machine where certain forces are put into motion, there is violence created. Even in the beliefs, even in the religion which Gandhi came from, there was always the Trinity of the Creator, the Preserver and the Destroyer - Brahma, Vishnu, Shiva. Many of you have read this.

So to become totally non-violent is against the principles of nature. But Gandhi had good intentions when he talked of non-violence, when he talked of 'Satiagra' - Sati means truth and Agra to pursue the truth. But even in pursuance of truth was there any violence involved? Even in defying various laws of the rulers of that time in the passive resistance, was there no such violence at all. There was violence. Good. Even in creating marches, there were conflicts created and that too can be termed a form of violence. So here the principle of non-violence might have failed collectively, but it could succeed on an individual basis where a person leads himself to practise non-violence is a proposition. It starts you in the middle of things. Good.

It's an injunction being non-violent but was it ever shown how to non-violent? So it is like a child starting off at school and instead of going through the sub A, sub B, standard one, standard two, he was pushed right into standard six and he to become non-violent requires the necessary preparation to be in standard ten. And that preparation would be to find the integration within man, self integration of mind, body and spirit through our practices which we do, that could produce in us a greater sense of non-violence, that could produce in us what Christ has said 'If you get slapped on one cheek you can turn the other cheek' and that can only come about if we know and if we live the principles of love until finally we become love. And then the ideal of non-violence could become practical, otherwise it would remain in the air. In the name of non-violence, in the name of non-violence, how much violence was there, where due to certain political and religious factors thousands of people have been killed? But at that time in India in order to stave off greater bloodshed, these principles had to be put forward, and it served a purpose, it served a purpose.

So Gandhi was an idealist but in his idealism there was a certain amount of practicality, never mind where he started from or how he started. He was a strategist, he was a strategist and he knew how to capture public imagination. And that did help, that did help in many, many ways where their goals which they had in mind, was achieved. Good. Now these goals were based on nationalism. Good, and many people believe in nationalism. Now nationalism are artificial barriers created by man and all artificial barriers that are created by man, divide man. Now is that not violence? Good. All these wars in the histories of the world were because of artificial barriers. You have the German, you have the Japanese, the Italian, the British, the Indian, the Spanish. They all want to preserve their national identity. Good. Now in order to preserve the national identity, they have to guard their boundaries and not only guard their boundaries, but expand their boundaries. The very act of guarding the boundaries is an act of possession and possession is opposed to non-violence. Non-violence makes a person totally non-possessive. So in the fight of non-violence, in the fight for nationalism or national independence, there was violence because it automatically implies possession. There are many people that would agree with Gandhi-ism, and you would find just as many that might disagree with the principles and policies of Gandhi. Of course, this is a matter for one's own personal opinions, but to practise non-violence in its totality is an impossibility in modern living. Good.

Now these barriers that have been created, once barriers are created, they have to be preserved. Good. And preservation of barriers requires a form violence. And human nature is such that the boundaries must be extended and that is how Empires were built. You can study right back from the Grecian times, from Roman times, and even further back, Moorish times, where the Empire needed to be expanded. Even today, today we find many cold wars we are having, and the wars could very easily become hot wars. Yes. Yes. So as far as we are concerned, I am personally never a Nationalist. I do not believe in Nationalism, although Nationalism has its value, that value is not denied. I do believe in an Internationalism, where the whole world becomes one family, where you won't need a passport to cross one border to the other. That is Inter-nationalism and that is also an ideal where we have not one country or two countries or one hundred and fifty six countries, where we have one world. And if that condition could be created, there would less international non-violence because it is one international family.

So ideals are good. It is good to be idealistic but practically speaking the whole basis of non-violence must come from the individual himself, whereby with the integration we spoke about, he himself becomes a non-violent person and a non-violent person is a loving person. A loving person is a forgiving person. A forgiving person is a non-attacking person. So it goes on and on and on that way. Fine. Now I know Roger is a great follower of Gandhi-ism. Good. Now there are many pros and cons as far as the argument of non-violence is concerned. There's a lot to be said for it, and there is a lot

to be said against it. You mentioned that Gandhi died violently, fine, and the greatest preacher, one of the greatest preachers in the world in the name of Christ that taught love, also died violently. So what has happened here, that certain forces that were created were counter-balanced. You create an atmosphere of non-violence at one place and at another place violence would start up. So as long as we live in the relative world there will always remain these opposing forces, in relativity. Relativity could not exist without opposing forces. As we said before, sun and rain, night and day, pain and pleasure, these opposing forces in the world of the relative would forever and ever remain. Good.

Now how to bring a one-sidedness in a world of opposing forces would become an impossibility. Good. So the realm of real non-violence would start only when we can transcend the opposing forces of relativity. Then only could we feel and experience the factor which is non-violent. The factor which is still, for as long as there is motion, there is opposing forces, you'd have violence and non-violence co-existing, existing side by side. And the only way to become really non-violent is to transcend the opposing forces, to transcend relativity and live in the realms of the Absolute where there are no opposing forces, where there is no motion, where there is changelessness, and where there is absolute stillness. And it is only in the realms of the stillness that true non-violence can be experienced and known. That is non-violence. That is Ahimsa. That is Love and that is God. Okay.

Questioner. (Inaudible)

Gururaj. Beautiful, beautiful. What can I tell you about the mind and what can you do with the mind? It would be such a simple answer, and it would be so beautiful if we could take that cunning animal called the mind and put it away somewhere. But that's impossible. Good. Now the only thing what we can do with the mind is to refine the mind. Refining the mind means leading the mind from a grosser level to a more refined level, leading the mind from a grosser thinking level to a more refined thinking level. Now the mind, if you take it in its totality, would comprise of many factors. And I think we spoke about this before where you have the factor of the intellect, the factor of analysis. Good. Within the mind is also contained the carrier of all impressions that are gained by the senses, and that is gained by inner experience. Good. Then the mind would also contain a judge that would be presented with the analysis of the intellect. The intellect analyses and the carrier carries the analysis to the judge who weighs the pros and cons of the analytical part of the mind. And after weighing that it goes to the higher judge, that which constitutes the entire human personality, the ego self. And the ego self is the one that transmits its message through the same channel again, so that the mind could manifest itself into its practical tangible reality. Good.

Now the most important part of the mind is the factor that could determine how refined the ego level is. For the more refined the ego level is, the more could the light of Divinity shine through. And the more the light of Divinity, which is beyond ego, which is beyond the sense of 'I' that constitutes the human personality, the more that is refined, the more could light, pure light filter through, which in turn helps the judge in making its judgement, and evaluating the analytical part of the mind in determining what is true and what is not true - what is real, and what is false. It helps one to determine the value of reality and the value of non-reality. So the most important factor that governs the mind is the factor which is beyond the mind. Good. And that is what we are trying to achieve. That is what we are trying to achieve to go beyond the level of the mind. For as long as we are whirling in the mind itself, we are as if in a whirlpool where the mind functions by whirling thoughts all the time, where the mind functions with association of ideas all the time. And the association of ideas and the whirling swirling thoughts in the mind are because of conditioning. So, the extent of the mind goes far, far back, millions and millions, and millions years back. It goes back to where even time had not begun, because time was also the creation of the mind and yet the mind can go further back than the concept of time. In other words the mind is a super-imposition upon that which is real.

Now all super impositions upon reality may be termed to be unreality. Good. But in the relative sense, in the relative sense of the existence of the mind, we cannot deny it. We got to give it credence. We got to acknowledge that the mind exists. Now who acknowledges the existence of the mind? The mind itself. So here it could be said that the unreal is confirming to itself the existence of unreality. So all these waves of the mind that swirl up and down gains recognition not by anything else, but by itself. Now what the mind is trying to do is to refine itself to such a level whereby it will deny itself. It will say not this, not this, not this, and it can only say not this, not this, not this only when it reaches a level of such refinement that it merges away into that which is this, where 'that-ness' and 'this-ness' finds no separation. Good. Yet we have a mind, and we cannot deny the mind for the very expression of reality. We cannot deny the heat that comes from the fire although the heat might be non-existent as far as the fire itself is concerned. The fire does not create heat. It is the nature of fire to have heat. Good. So superimposed upon the Real Me, the Real I is this relative 'I'. And when the relative 'I' finds itself or leads itself to a greater refinement, it comes to the stage where it denies itself in saying "Netti, Netti. Not this, Not this, Not this", because in that refinement, it has merged away into the reality which man is. So therefore we say man is Divine. Therefore Christ has said after having reached that refinement, after Christ had found the meaning of his mind, found the meaning of his ego self, and found the ego self to be the trouble maker. And when he found the ego self to be non-existent because it cannot be self luminous. Therefore it is non-existent. And when he found that, he said 'I and my Father are one'. Now this affirmation you would find in all Scriptures where in Sanskrit they would say 'Brahmas me. I am Brahman'. It is the same as saying "I and my Father are one".

So that is the position the mind, the superimposed factor that causes the feeling of this 'I-ness' and the separation, which exists between me and Divinity. So what do we do, what do we do? We have to use the instruments we have in our hands. And the instrument we have is the mind itself. So here the mind itself must be used to subdue itself. The mind itself must be used to refine itself and when it refines itself to its non-existent value then the real definition would be asserted, that "I and my Father are one". And that is when man will recognise that he is Divine. It is like this little story which Vivekananda quotes, and most of you have been recommended to read some of Vivekananda's books, where this lion cub grew up amongst sheep, and learned to bleat like sheep. And when a lion came along there and saw this cub now fully grown, he said "Why are you behaving like a sheep? You are a lion". But, of course, this bleating lion-sheep could not be convinced, could be convinced because it was conditioned, like our minds being conditioned by environment, by our own thoughts, by past existences etc. etc. Good. So this lion took the sheep-lion to the river and showed him his reflection and said "Look, you are just like me." And at that moment illumination dawned, the realisation dawned that "I am not a sheep. I am a lion". And that sheep-lion started roaring like a lion. That is what we need, that is what we need is to recognise the Divinity within us, that I am Divine.

Now here is a psychological factor, and everyone knows this, elementary psychology, that if you keep on saying "I am weak, I am weak", you will become weaker and weaker. Good. But if you assert to yourself affirm to your very mind that causing all the problem, if you affirm to your very mind that I am strong, I am strong I am strong, you will become strong. It does not make any sense in calling yourself "I'm a sinner, I'm a sinner, I'm sinner". No, it would only make you become a greater sinner. We are talking on the relevance of the mind now, not on devotion, because that very thought that I am a sinner can be interpreted in a different way, but we are talking now of the mind. Fine. So by affirming to ourselves that I am not a sinner, my outward self might have been doing things that are wrong, but my inner self is Divine. And my job is to find that Divinity within me so that I will not call myself a sinner anymore. And then I will start roaring like the lion. And that is the purpose and that is the goal of all human life. Good. God plus mind makes man. Man minus mind makes God. Let me repeat that. God plus mind makes man. Man minus mind makes God. So our purpose is to lose the mind. Now this does not mean going to the asylum, but it is to use the mind in its own ability, to use the steam of the mind to propel the mind ever onward until it floats away like the steam into a mist and reality is seen because it is the veils of the mind, created by ourselves, thicker and thicker and thicker veils created by ourselves that separates us or gives us the sense of separation between the Divine and that which is not Divine. And this sense of separation that has created the mind is the illusion which is created by the mind.

So we have to get rid of the illusion, and how to get rid of the illusion is to find total meditation and spiritual practices where the mind and the body and the spirit functions as a totality. And then we will recognise one factor that this world is real from the relative angle, but having reached the Absolute this world is unreal from the Absolute angle. So it depends where we stand, where we stand. And it is always better to stand and view from the Absolute angle rather than from the relative angle, because the relative angle is governed by the laws that oppose each other, the law of opposites all the time, where the Absolute angle knows no opposition. There are no laws of opposites there. That is why the Absolute is regarded to be omnipresent and when it is present everywhere, where is the place for the opposite to stand? The opposite has no standing room. Good.

So through these various layers of the mind, whose extent is the entire Universe, the mind too is beginless and endless. So we cannot destroy, we cannot bring the mind to an end. We cannot bring it to an end because it had no beginning. So as Divinity is timeless and endless, so is the mind also timeless and endless, but the mind is a superimposition. Good. And with the various combinations of various factors involved in man's evolution, the veils have become so thicker, thicker, thicker, and thicker that the superimposition thinks it is real, forgetting the underlying have come from. The fire is forgotten, and the heat only is remembered. So it a question of using the instrument of the mind and the various faculties of the mind to go beyond the mind. And going beyond the mind then we are in the realm of the Absolute, where everything to us becomes one, where the whole of existence is viewed not in time and space but in a flash of the moment, in a flash of the moment where the realisation dawns that in the cross, the horizontal and the vertical meets and it is at this meeting place where the entirety of existence, where the whole of eternity merges in a moment. So eternity is this moment, where the realisation dawns that the relative function on the horizontal level can meet with the Absolute that functions on the vertical level. And at the meeting point, we experience eternity in a moment and that moment is eternity. Okay. Next.

Questioner. Guruji, could you tell us the difference between the sound that the guru selects for his disciple's spiritual name and the mantra?

Gururaj. That would be a question, it's a very good question really but it would mean a lot of repetition, and I think Amrit has made a lovely tape on this, why a spiritual name is given, what the origin of a spiritual name is. So, Keith could you arrange for our brother there to listen to that tape, the tape which Amrit sent to England, to America, to Rishi and I have a copy of that. Can't that section be played to him because we could perhaps tackle a very important question than this? Otherwise everyone will start asking me for their spiritual names. We'll arrange that, don't worry.

Questioner. Gururaj, the Bible tells us to love our enemies. When I ask myself who are my enemies, I find that the people who are most difficult to love are those who make me feel not less than I am, but less than I would like to be but I realise that I should really welcome

Gururaj. Beautiful. Beautiful. Beautiful.

Questioner.(Cont'd) The discomfort that these people give me.

Gururaj. Beautiful, beautiful. I am enjoying it because you answered your own question. (General laughter)

Questioner.(Cont'd) I realise that I should welcome the discomfort that these people give me, because it brings an opportunity for growth, to see in myself feeling hurt and angry. I find I cannot objectify my reactions for some hours after they happen. How can one find a way of objectifying the immediate moment as now?

Gururaj. Beautiful, beautiful, beautiful. Good. It is good to have enemies. It is good to have enemies and like a business man would say "It is good to have competition" because he regards his competitor as an enemy in a certain sense. He might be taking his business away. Good. Man can reflect himself or look at himself in the mirror, but to be able to look at oneself in the mirror squarely, one needs strength. Good. Now it is not given to all of us to have that strength to face ourselves squarely in the mirror. So the forces of nature creates conditions for us which will bring to our attention our weaknesses. Good. Now the one that brings to us to our attention our weaknesses, we call an enemy. Good. Someone says a word to you which you don't like. Then you develop a hatred for that person for having said that to you, but really speaking, really speaking, as Sybil has said, that person must be thanked. That person must be thanked for saying that to you because in there, if it is properly analysed, it would contain a message. And the first message is this that I have become angry and I ask myself why have I become angry? Why have I allowed myself to become angry by something which is external to me? Right, and that is the method of objectification of the external environment.

Now as I, as I start probing my anger, as I probe my anger, why have I become angry, I will find many, many reasons why I have become angry, and the final reason would be this that it has hurt my pride. And the basis of all pride is the ego sense we have in us that I am Mr. Jones, that I am Mr. Brown, that I am Mr. Black. Good. Fine. The ego sense through which we attach so much importance to us. So the insult that was inflicted upon me is a blessing in

disguise to make me realise that my hurt is caused because of the ego I have in me, and because of the ego I have in me, I think that the whole world revolves round me. Good. And because if I think that the whole world revolves round me, how can I be hurt? The whole world is dependent upon me. Yes, that's the sense we have. We might not say it in so many words, or in these words but inside ourselves there is that feeling that the whole world revolves round me, and that is the ego sense that which we are trying to subdue. Good. You find this practically in every home, in every home where a quarrel takes place between husband and wife. Why does the quarrel take place? Because the husband thinks that this home, this whole home revolves round me, and the wife thinks the home revolves round her. Right. So how can you create two homes in one home? That is where the quarrel and the conflict starts. Instead of submission, we are practising the opposite of it in creating greater conflicts.

So everything can be boiled down to the ego which we have in us, and it is because of the ego that we feel these hurts. Good. Now if I can subdue my ego and find myself, the entity, which I am, to be non-existent or of no importance, then where can the hurt take place? Now the process of analysing this, the process of analysing this is the process of objectifying this. So here again we are using the mind as a tool to subdue itself. We are using the mind to subdue the mind. Good. And when we become successful in that, then we can offer the other cheek. And that is called objectification of things happening around us.

There is a little story. There was a Yogi living on the outskirts of this village, one road town, one road village, fine, and people used to say all kinds of terrible things about him. And some said this, and some said that, and some said that. He never was affected by that. Now this Yogi used to wear a kind of turban around his head, and this turban - he never used to care about his appearance or about himself - and this turban was always full of holes. Good. Now he had to go as he did every day, from the one end of the village to the other end, and as he walked past, as he walked past, some would say "Oh, there goes that madman." Another would say "There goes this, there goes that", and every time someone made a criticism one of the holes in the turban would be mended. Right. So by the time he reached the other end of the village road his whole turban was mended and in good shape. This parable means that the criticisms of others should be welcomed because they are blessings in disguise. They are blessings in disguise. Good. And it is only by this, the acceptance of this blessing in disguise that we could view the criticism objectively. You can do whatever you like. Someone gives a donation of five thousand pounds for example, or twenty thousand pounds. You'd have some people saying that "Ah, good man has given twenty thousand pounds", but you will have just as many people saying that "Ah, what is this twenty thousand pounds he has given, when he is worth ten million?" Criticism. So there will always be criticism, always, never mind what act we do, we are still bound in the law of opposites. So for every praise, there will be

a blame, always and it is this realisation that could make one ward off all the negativities, all the criticisms that is inflicted upon us. And that can come about by developing the inner strength that would not make us see the criticisms, but use the criticisms as an instrument to strengthen ourselves more and more.

So there is an opportunity in every adversity. There is always an opportunity in every adversity. So every adversity we come across, if you examine the adversity to its real value, there is some opportunity within it, because the very adversity has inherent in it an opportunity, but it is for us to recognise it and the way of recognition would be to objectify the thought, and objectification necessarily involves analysis. Good. Now that analysis, now that analysis should not be biased. Good. Now by that we mean it should not be biased means we should not become emotionally involved. If someone says an angry word to us and we take the word not to the mind but through the mind also to the feeling level where we stir up the emotions then it would hurt. But if we just take it to the mind level only without letting it penetrate deeper, and analyse it at that level, we will find that the sting is taken out of the criticism and that is objectification. In other words, objectification means to observe a happening or a circumstance as if we are observing a cinema screen, sitting in a cinema and watching the screen. And we are, by observing it, we are unable to encourage or discourage the happenings on the screen. And that is objectification.

Now this does only apply to external circumstances that is inflicted upon us but it also applies to the internal things that we are afflicted with, and that we upon ourselves too. Every happening in life has an objective value. Even the subjectiveness can be brought out in its real objectivity, and when even the subjectivity is externalised or objectified then its sting is gone. It does not hurt, and not only does not hurt but the important thing that would happen there, is what we do not allow itself to become more impressed or embossed in our subconscious mind because that very experience of anger, for example, if it is impressed deeply upon the subconscious mind, because of the emotions that were attached to it, then that anger will come up again like the buried weed we spoke about and manifest itself, perhaps even tenfold. So every instance, every day, every happening if we just become aware, aware of the happenings around us aware of the happenings within us then all this would seem valueless and non effective as far as we are concerned. Good.

And this is what our meditational practices do for us where our minds become expanded in its awareness. And that is the true practical value of expanding awareness whereby we look at things very spontaneously in its real value, in its real form. And when any of the worldly mundane happenings are looked at in its real form, then you know that it has no value whatsoever. The man that criticises you today, will tomorrow come and praise you. The man that hates you today, will come tomorrow to love you, because you have now created within yourself the non-effective quality of the person's

hate. And by creating that sheath around you of not being affected, you can only radiate love which will inspire love in that person. So you are not only benefiting yourself by not being affected, but you are also at the same time emitting vibrations from yourself that will rebound back to the person that started hating you or tried to criticise you or tried blaspheme you or tried to do wrong to you. And that is the real meaning of turning the other cheek. Okay. Did the bell ring? It's like as if we're in school, the bell rings!

END