
SEXUALITY AND SINGLE PEOPLE

AMRIT: Guruji, I'm going to paraphrase this question because a number of people have asked it. I'll paraphrase it from one that's fairly well written. In today's society, there are more and more people in the role of singles, as opposed to householders. About fifty percent of those here on the course are in that category. In a previous talk, you beautifully described an ideal vision of a wife and a family. Could you give a vision of other roles for the many persons who do not choose to be married, or who are not currently married and incidentally, some of those who would probably like to be married, but who aren't? And secondly, can you give us some guidelines for the role of sex for people who are in this category? And finally, he says, how about a Guru dating service for AMS members. [Laughter] I think there already is such a thing?

VOICE: Where is the paraphrase, Walter?

GURURAJ: You see, that's wonderful. First you want to put me in a hamburger. Now you want to put me in a pickle. [Laughter and applause] Now, this half put me in a pickle. All the scriptures in the world do not condone any form of sexual relationship which is not sanctified. All religions teach that. But, you would say, those religions were ancient religions. That might have been good thousands of years ago, because of sociological necessity. Today those sociological necessities have changed, so are we entitled to change those injunctions?

Now, if I tell you that illicit sex or unsanctified sex is okay, a lot of people's going to like that. And if I say that follow the scriptures, follow the injunctions of the scriptures, there will be some that will like that also. So you see, I am put in a pickle. Hum? Good. According to today's sociological conditions, what should one do? That is the question. Today's society is becoming more and more permissive. We know that. Whatever is happening, whatever standards are set in today's society, have not happened overnight. It has taken many many years to build up. Hum? Good. The aim of our movement is to open up the heart. The heart chakra. Hm? And I'm not referring to the muladara chakra. [Laughter] I cannot condone any form of licentiousness. I cannot condone any form of promiscuity. I

cannot condone any form of adultery. If a carpenter is busy building something and his tools are not sharp enough, should he lay down his tools and forget building the house? Should he lay down his tools and forget building up the structure of society?

Now, there are many of us here that if we should take the scriptural injunctions to heart, then most of us will feel a sense of guilt. This sense of guilt is not necessary, this sense of guilty is not necessary. Now we will have to go into

explanations about this. What was regarded as sexual propriety in those ages has become sexual liberty today. Now, this has taken so much time to build up, because man has become more and more a sensual being. There were times in history where polygamy was allowed. Polygamy was allowed because there were more women than men. If you read the Mahabharata, you would find that polyandry was allowed. Where Draupadi married five husbands. It's quite an amusing story. I don't know how the days were divided. But Kunti was the mother, and I think our Kathy wrote a beautiful play on the Mahabharata.

VOICE: Did you read it? [Kathy?]

GURURAJ: I didn't read it in detail, but I went through it and captured the gist of it. You must submit that play. It has many, many good things. Good.

Now, the five brothers, the Pandavas always shared everything. Now there was this princess Draupadi, and in those times they had a competition which was called [Syamvara?] that's the Sanskrit term for it where the best prince who had the best skills would win the hand of the princess. In this competition, there was a fish hung up very high on a swirling pillar. At the bottom was a pond. Now we know Arjuna of the Gita, was a great archer. Now the idea here was to look into the pond, see the reflection of the fish, and aim the arrow upwards while looking down at the reflection, and shoot out the eye of the fish. Now you have to be a very good archer to do that. Good. It might sound a fishy business, but it was so, according to story. So, Arjuna being the greatest archer of those times, won the hand of Draupaadi, and the brothers, the five brothers, came home smiling, and everything they shared. But they always got the permission from the mother, and the mother's name was Kunti. So the mother was busy in the kitchen in the back, and while they were coming from the front door, one of the brothers shouted to the mother, they said, "Hi, Mom, we've brought home something lovely."

"Is it good, my children? Share it." So here the five brothers, and at those times the custom was this, that whatever the father said, was law; whatever the mother said, was law. If you read The Ramayana, just to keep the father's promise (Dasaratha), just to keep the father's promise, Rama went into the forest for fourteen years. He was banished just to keep his father's word to his stepmother. So during that age (it was a different age), it was incumbent and imperative for the son or daughter to obey the parents. So when the mother said whatever you've brought, share it, so Draupadi had five husbands: polyandry. What I'm trying to point out to you is this, that as times change, during different cultures, different times, different structures of society, people's minds change accordingly, and principles are adhered to.

Now, in today's society, it is quite a common practice for a man and woman to live together without being married. They love each other very much, they love one another very sincerely, very deeply, and living together means living a family life. The only thing that is missing there is a little piece of paper called a marriage certificate. Otherwise, their lives are lived in totality. Now, here in the modern age, can we say that the piece of paper is all that important? The piece of paper is a piece of paper. The most important thing that matters is the love that flows between two people. The love that flows between two people and being together physically is just an expression of that love, that inner love, that cannot be contained within itself anymore finds its physiological expression.

Now, all moral laws, including the injunctions in various scriptures, were made by man. They were made by man according to the sociological conditions of that time. They could also be called revelations. A revelation means "to reveal." Those people, those brilliant people of those times, found "revealed" to themselves that these laws would be the greatest factor in stabilizing society. Let us take the example of Islam. Islam says no image should be built, so therefore, you never find a picture of Mohammed. At that time in the Middle East, there were various tribes existing, and each tribe had its own tribal god. So, in order to unite all the tribes together, in order to avoid the friction, in order to avoid the wars that took place between these various tribes, Mohammed did his best to break down those little, small, petty gods. And he became an example of it himself, by never ever having a portrait made of himself, because he knew that if a portrait is made of me, time will go by, and people will start worshipping me. Some will worship me, some will not worship me, and the friction will start all over again, because there would be a million symbols created. And that is why in the Islam religion you do not have the picture of Mohammed.

That was the sociological need of that time, and that is how he united all the various tribes of the Middle East. And they become so powerful that a great kingdom of Islam was established, where even countries like Spain was ruled for about eleven hundred years. And that is how the teachings spread. The point is this, that man has to act according to present day needs. But even while acting according to present day needs, he must not forget the essence of Biblical injunctions. He must not forget the essence of Biblical injunctions.

It might not be necessary in certain circumstances to take those injunctions literally, for everything has its figurative meaning too. Today's society is so composed that, a man and woman want to marry each other. But they find that if we get married, our marriage might fail, and then what? We would be getting into trouble. Rather, let us live together. We love each other sincerely, deeply. The only thing that is missing is the piece of paper. And so, they live with each other. Now, there is nothing wrong in living with each other. If we study history, there have been societies in the past, and even in the present.... For example, in Tibet the children belong to the state, and every man who passes a home is entitled to enter that home and have his needs fulfilled before he goes into the mountains, into the snows from where he might never

return again. So, that is their system there. Now, how can we say that system is wrong? How can we say that system is wrong when that is the need, the sociological necessity of that time and clime and place.

Coming back to our modern society, if people live together and truly feel in their hearts that we belong to each other, that we belong to each other, then the sharing of minds and bodies and spirit could be in terms of all religions injunctions, because a purity is involved. It would be wrong for a man to have a dozen homes, perhaps, in our society today. A dozen might be too much seven. They're only seven days a week, unless, of course, they think of three times on Sunday. Three wives on Sunday, and six days, that still makes nine, it's not a dozen. Nevertheless, now that would be wrong. If the man is floating or the woman from place to place to place, that would be wrong, because he would be expressing lust. He would be expressing an inadequacy within himself which he is trying to bolster by having so much different connections in his life. But if it comes to one woman to which you are devoted, Ramakrishna was totally devoted to that statue of Kali, and Kali became alive to him. The woman, one of his teachers who came to visit him, taught him tantra yoga. Tantra yoga, although this is not mentioned in The Gospel of Ramakrishana, but we know that the practice of tantra yoga requires physical contact, because there was the theory of Shiva and Shakti male, female, and a combination of Shiva to the Shakti.

Now, living together with this idea of finding a divine union, then there's nothing wrong with it and nothing to feel guilty about. But it would be good if a man is good enough to live with, or a woman is good enough to live with, then she's good enough to marry. Okay. That will further stabilize society. Therefore, society has invented a word called common law wife. Do you have an expression in America?

VOICES: Common law marriage.

GURURAJ: When two people are not legally married in court, but she is called common law wife. So here, living together, even without having the ceremony in court or whatever, she is still his wife. And he is responsible for her as the protector, provider. And in today's circumstances, modern society, with the cost of living that we have created, the woman might be required to go to work. So here, even in work, even in home, even in sharing each other, a wonderful partnership is formed. For what is marriage, actually? It is a partnership. What is love, really? It is an understanding. When an understanding develops between mind, body, and spirit between two people, but it must only be the two people and not the buzzing bee that flits from flower to flower.

I wonder why the males are blamed all the time? I'd like to hear of the flower flitting from bee to bee. Chauvinistic, huh?
[Laughter]

In ancient times, in ancient times in India, there were seven forms of marriages, and if you would like to read one play, seeing as we discussed Kathy's play earlier, if you would like to read one play called, [Shakuntala?], it was written by one of the worlds greatest poets, called [Kalidasa?] And of course, you would only be able to read it in its translated form. But there are some very beautiful translations of ["Shakuntala?"]. At that time, [Kalidas?] any playwright or any writer, really speaking, portrays the times he lives in. And, you'd find in ["Shakuntala?"] and various other writings where seven types of marriages are described. The first type of marriage is where a man and a woman get together in all sincerity and says, "I thee wed." And she says in turn, "I wed thee too." That promise is a marriage, and it was recognized. Then, as times grew on, and different times to keep that society together, they required the marriage to be performed in front of witnesses. So in ancient times, a lot of friends and relatives were called. Today they are called and they come to join in the party. The champagne and all that business. But in those days they were called to witness the coming together of two people, and the vows that were taken was that "Before man and God I thee wed." That was a different kind of marriage.

Like that, there are seven forms of marriage. What I see in the Western world, and I've spent about twenty years in the Western world, that "I thee wed" without ceremony has become somewhat quite in vogue. Now, how can this present sociological circumstances be reconciled to scriptural teachings? It can only be reconciled in one way, and that is by total purity. The ideal, of course, is to take those vows in front of witnesses. And why do they take those vows in front of witnesses? It was a different kind of society. Ancient times never had those large cities. In ancient times there were just small villages and everyone knew everyone. So if the vows were taken in front of the people, then those people had some pressure on the couple that if something goes wrong, they would say, "Oh, what would so and so think?" Or else an aunt or an uncle would say, "Don't be naughty, now." So those were certain sociological needs of that time.

Today, those needs do not remain. Yet of course, the ideal is to have a proper form of marriage and, as I said, if a woman is good enough to live with, she's good enough to marry, and vice versa. But, if there are circumstances where this is just not possible and there could be many, many circumstances why this could not be possible then men and women can still live together as man and wife, but in total purity. Total purity means one pointedness, that I am thine, and thou art mine. And that constitutes purity. So, when a person reaches the height of that purity and that one pointedness, you can take all man made laws and throw them to the winds. Because pieces of paper could never be compared to the purity that resides in a person's heart.

Now, we have been talking about the ideal situation. We have been talking of the middle situation. And we have also been talking of the sociological need of today's society. We have to treat the problem from where the problem is. The

advice, of course, is given, "Get married, my children, and be happy." That is the ideal. But if circumstances prevent that and the two people are deeply in love with each other, they cannot do without each other, and their hearts are pure and flowing to each other in total oneness and total purity, then I would see nothing wrong, if she's already called a common law wife, that she is his wife in the truest sense of the word. So therefore, if anyone is in such a position, I would say, do not feel guilty about it, because the very sense of guilt is going to produce friction within yourself. The very sense of guilt, which is unnecessary, is going to create problems in the household, which is totally unnecessary. We want lives to be a frictionless. We want lives to be pure; and purity does not recognize friction. Purity is always frictionless, and if there is friction, remember that friction is on the surface level. There has to be friction. There has to be. The three gunas work that way, where friction is caused. And without friction, where would you and I be? That's a bit too subtle. [Laughter]

Now remember this, remember this, that we do not condone promiscuity. We follow scriptural injunctions. But when circumstances puts one into the same kind of purity that the scriptures talk about, then the important thing is the purity, is the one pointedness, is the togetherness, where two people can function as one person. I always say that before two people get together, it is a four legged run. And after they get together, it becomes a three legged run. There's a wonderful Sanskrit term, I don't know if I spoke of this in America, for one's woman, it's called [ardangana?]. [Arda?] means half [angana?] means self half of one's self. That is the ideal one has to reach for spiritual perfection. Two people can be married according to the laws of the land, or whatever, and the house is just filled with friction and friction and fights. And even children are brought into the world whose lives are made totally unhappy. And then there's another household in which two people are living together in such beautiful harmony and togetherness and purity, where he sees none else but her, and she sees none else but him. Huh? Which of the two is better? The latter one. For that is following true religion. Religion does not demand you to follow it literally. Religion is a pointer, religion is a guide that one uses to fit in with our circumstances, with our society, with our lives. Now when I say "fit in," I do not mean manipulation, because that is very easily done too, where you can take a teaching and manipulate it in such a way so it would fit in with your ideals. No, no. But where it could fit in, in the purest sense of the word.

So those (after my talk) during this week that has some sense of guilt about something, do not worry about it, do not feel guilty. If your hearts are not pure, then try and remedy that. Bring purity into that sphere of life which might seem impure. Take the "im" away, leave the pure alone. It works beautifully, it does. It does work beautifully. Yes. It does, yes. Marriage was an invention by man. He invented this because of sociological need. He invented marriage because to bring a stability in society. He invented marriage so that the children that are born do not become fatherless and motherless. And, it was not a communistic state in those times. That's a modern thing which is detrimental.

So the poor child could not fend for himself. It needed the protection. And today, too, the child needs protection. But what happens if a child is born of two people who are not married according to the laws of the land? That child can still be brought up as a beautiful human being, with all the caring and all the love that is required. The word "common law wife" describes itself. It has become very common. In other words, it means I don't know if it makes any sense in Americanese but it means it's become an everyday thing. Good, good. It has become an everyday thing.

But live in purity. It's fine. And, as I said, if two people are good enough for each other to live with each other, then marry each other. And marriage is definitely not a rope around your neck. That is the joke they always crack. We can't blame them for cracking such jokes. Cracked people always crack cracked jokes. [Laughter] Isn't that true? Cracked people crack cracked jokes. Yes, yes. It is something beautiful, to be together. Man requires the companionship, and so does a woman require the companionship. We said the other day that the sex urge is emotionally the most powerful, but what is more powerful than that is the need for that togetherness, that companionship that is required. And circumstances might be such where the person cannot get legally married and yet enjoy that companionship, that togetherness, in its totalest, fullest, divinest, greatest purity... purest purity. How's that? New word. Okay, next question. [END SIDE ONE]

AMRIT: I wanted a shorter one, though.

GURURAJ: Did I talk so long?

AMRIT: No. Lovely. [inaudible] Do you want me to read it for you? It's very short.

GURURAJ: No, we would like to hear the English accent [VOICES: Yes!]

ENGLISH VOICE: Did you say something?

GURURAJ: You know, Keith, while he's getting ready to read his question, I want to tell you about Keith. He has done such great service to the British Meditation Society. Many of the tapes that you are hearing here... well, England started much before America, and many of the tapes that you are hearing here is due to all the effort, hours and hours and hours that Keith has put in [applause]. And not only that, let me tell you something more, how this beautiful family life can work. Huh? How it spills over. That Keith's wife, [Yvonne?], does all the catering for the one day events that's held in England

for 150, 200, 250 people. Hm? That's Keith's wife, Yvonne. [applause] Is Yvonne here? [Voices: Yes, stand up.] Ah, there you are, yes [applause].

Now, I tell you what she did, huh, to be here tonight, to be in this satsang. I know. Nothing misses my attention, not even a flicker of your eyelid escapes me. Remember that [laughs and oh oh's from audience]. She and her helpers, Beth and all, slaved the whole afternoon over a stove to prepare supper for me so that she could have free time to sit in a satsang. How beautiful, how beautiful. You see. And not only that, you should meet the children, hm? That when we had a concert in England, about two concerts, I think, she put on such a beautiful dance. The movement of her body was a song, a song divine. And created by herself. See the creative ability that comes out? You see the beauty of the family life, hm? It's beautiful. Shoot!

KEITH: Guruji, could you explain the difference between a yogic trance and meditation? You mentioned a practice where yogic trance is involved, and meditation. Could you tell us the differences, please?

GURURAJ: There is a difference between a yogic trance and meditation. Now, you all know what meditation is, so we don't need to speak about that. A yogic trance is something totally different. Now, in order for me to explain you what a yogic trance is, I will have to explain to you the mechanics of a yogic trance. But my fear is this, that knowing of the mechanics of the yogic trance, you might start trying it. And if you are not ready for it, it could be harmful. I know exactly what Keith is referring to. To some of the teachers in England that have been teaching for a few years, that were ready for a particular kind of meditation, I said to them, "You just sit, do nothing, sit with open eyes, and just bring your attention to me and I will go into a trance. You just sit still and do nothing. If you feel like laughing, laugh. If you feel like screaming, scream. Hm? Feel like singing, sing. Do whatever you want to do. Hm? But just sit still, and bring your attention."

In that yogic trance I transferred a power. To some that could see, I transferred a vision. To those that could hear, I transferred to them a sound. And I think we have it all on tape [Amrit: Yes] of the experiences the people had in that practice. And next time when I'm here again there will be many, many of you, I'm sure, that will be ready to experience the power of a yogic trance. How a yogi can transcend his own body and become so one with you, within you, to make you see through his eyes; to make you hear through his ears; to make you speak through his tongue. So this is not a matter for explanation. This is a matter for experience. And I do promise you this, that when I'm here next summer summer you call it summer [Voices: Yes] next summer, those that are ready will be partaking in this practice. Hm? Unfortunately, Keith, I'd be doing much harm in explaining the mechanics of a yogic trance because it would be so tempting to try it. And it could unguidedly it could cause harm, rather than good.

So spiritual practices should always be guided, hm? Always be guided, supervised, and the proper practices to be given to those that deserve them, and not only deserve them, but that are ready for specific kinds of practices. That is the whole secret. I haven't told the secret [laughter]. But a yogic trance is somewhere you take yourself, the yogi takes himself, to a certain state in the relative not the absolute, just a certain finer state of relativity and with that state he can merge himself into 5000 people instantly. And all those present will experience what he is experiencing. Hm? By sight, sound, touch, smell, in every way. It is very interesting. Very interesting. It's worth experiencing. We'll do that next time. O.K.

**** END ****