

Aptavani 13

(Uttardha) Part Two

Dedication.....	4
Editorial	6
Introduction	10
[1] Pragnya – The Direct Liberating Light of the Soul.....	10
APTAVANI 13.....	17
PART II	17
[1]	17
Pragnya.....	17
To Understand Pragnya in its Exact Form.....	17
The Manifestation of Agnya?	18
Pragnya, Jada or Chetan?.....	19
That is not Right Intellect!.....	20
The State of Agnya Shakti after Self-realization!.....	21
That Which Always Keeps the Separation is Pragnya!	22
That Which Cautions Within is Indeed the Experience of the Self!	23
Who Makes one go Against What Pragnya Shows?.....	24
Pragnya and the Divine Vision!.....	24
Who Cautions the Ignorant One?	25
Who Feels Remorse?.....	25
Thoughts and Pragnya are Completely Separate!.....	26
How can the Seer get Tired?.....	27
The Separated Pure Chit is Indeed Pragnya!	27
The Difference Between the Two is like Sky and Earth!	28
Beware Against Listening to the Intellect!	29
Pragnya is Independent From the Intellect!.....	30
Pragnya Only has the Activity of Knowing!.....	30
Pragnya is Above Buddhi; Above Both is Vignan!.....	31
The Support of the Intellect in Spirituality!.....	31
That Which Runs Worldly Life is the Intellect!	32
Are Samyak Buddhi and Pragnya One and the Same?	33
There is a Sense of Ownership in Samyak Buddhi!	34
Sthitpragny State and Manifest Pragnya!	35
The State of Akram is Indeed Very Elevated!	36
The One That Does Not Eat-Drink-Speak is the Self!.....	37
Upto Ninety-nine it is Sthitpragny, and at Hundred it is Pragnya!	38
The Moment Moha is Destroyed, One Becomes Still in the Unchanging!.....	38
Sthitagny as Long as There is Doubt!.....	39
Beyond the Sthitpragny State!	39
Is the Ego Situated in Sthitpragny?.....	40
The Difference Between Sthitpragny and Vitaraag!.....	40
Are These Discoveries Through Pragnya or Buddhi?	41
Pragnya Cautions the Ego!	41
Pragnya Helps One do the Nididhyasan of Dada!	42
Pure Chit is Indeed the Pure Soul!.....	43
The Unique Energy of Dada's Pragnya!.....	45
The Role of Pragnya in Settling a File With Equanimity!	46
The Firm Resolves of Agnya-Pragnya!	47
How to Remain One With Pragnya?.....	48

**Draft version to be used for Paryushan 2017 purpose only.
For personal use only. Please do not circulate.**

What Part Does Pragnya Caution?.....	49
Who Opposes the Mistake?	49
Who Suffers the Results of Pragnya?	50
Both are Separate, the Sufferer and the Continuous Knower!	50
Pragnya Parishaha.....	51
The Subtle Understanding of Shraddha-Pragnya!	52
The Relation Between Sooj and Pragnya!	52
That is Darshan, not Sooj!	53
Is Agnya itself Ignorance?	54
Pragnya is Neither Real, nor Relative!	54
The Difference between the Knowledge of Separation and Pragnya!	55
The Intellect Will Die if You do ‘That’!.....	56
Shuddhatma, Pratisthit Atma and Pragnya!	56
Who is it that Continuously Knows and Sees?	57
A Perfect Couple: Jagruti and Pragnya!	57
The Origin of Agnyashakti!.....	58
That Cannot be Pragnya!	58
Dada’s Meddlesome Pragnya!	58
The Ego is an Evidentiary Doer in World Salvation and Pragnya Makes it do it!	61
Till Then, Only Pragnya is the Knower-Seer!	61
Who is the Meditator and What is to be Meditated Upon?	63
Gnan, Vignan and Pragnya!.....	63
Separation Through the Intellect, Oneness through Pragnya!	64
What Does ‘Attaining Oneness’ Mean?	64
[2.1]	66
Attachment-Abhorrence	66
Root Cause of Worldly Life, Ignorance!	66
Only the Ones with a Body Become Vitaraag!.....	66
A State Without Attachment-Abhorrence in Akram!	67
Attachment, Attraction – the Science of Subatomic Particles!	68
The Pure Soul Does not Have Attachment-Abhorrence!.....	69
Only Then can the Path of Liberation be Attained!	70
[By Applying] ‘Not Mine’, You Become Free!.....	71
Facing the Opposition of the Mind... ..	71
Attachment-Abhorrence no Longer Remains for Mahatmas!.....	72
Thereafter, it is the Filled Karmic Stock!	73
Where the Tuber of Sexuality is Destroyed, There is Clear Experience of the Self!.....	73
Attachment-Abhorrence has Gone a Hundred Percent!.....	75
Mahatmas are Vitaraag, Even if They Quarrel-Fight!	76
Attachment-Abhorrence is an Extraneous Property!	76
To Have no Attachment-Abhorrence Towards Pudgal is Knowledge of the Self!	77
The Light of Knowledge has no Unawareness Arising from Illusory Attachment!	77
The One Without Attachment-Abhorrence is Non-violent!	78
However Much the Disease, That Much is the Attachment!	79
That Which is Without Attachment-Abhorrence is Pure Knowledge!	80
[2.2]	81
Like-Dislike	81
It is Attachment-Abhorrence Only if the Ego Gets Involved!	81
There is no Attachment-Abhorrence After Attaining Akram Gnan!	81
Dada’s Likes and Dislikes!	82
The Path to Vitaragaata Begins From Upeksha!	83
Udaseenta is Higher Than Upeksha!.....	85
Wherever There is Attachment-Abhorrence, There is Recollection!.....	87
The Difference between Affection and Attachment!	88

[2.3]	90
Vitadwesh	90
The Definition of Raag-Dwesh!	90
Would Attachment Arise for Jail?	90
It is Primarily Abhorrence that Makes One Wander!	91
Abhorrence is Indeed the Mother of Attachment!	91
There is Abhorrence First, at the Subtle Level!	92
And In Attachment, The Preference is One's Own!	93
The Four Kashays are Abhorrence Indeed!	94
Main Cause of Hunger is Abhorrence!	96
All These are Sensations of Pain!	98
Abhorrence is First Indeed, Then Comes Attachment!	98
Children, a Resultant Effect of Abhorrence Done in the Past Life!	99
Abhorrence from Attachment, and Attachment from Abhorrence!	99
Akram Vignan has made One Vitadwesh!	101
Why not Vitaraag?	102
Upon Attaining Gnan, One Becomes Vitadwesh!	103
After Becoming Vitadwesh, Discharge Attachment Remains!	103
The Moment Attacking Stops, One Becomes God!	105
The Unique Karmic Account of the Suffering due to Attachment-Abhorrence!	105
This is the Absolute Science!	105
[2.4]	107
Prashasta Raag	107
That Which Can Never be Forgotten is Prashasta Raag!	107
Craze For The Gnani!	107
Prashasta Raag is a Stepping-Stone!	109
Prashasta Raag and Prashasta Moha!	109
Devotion for the Gnani is Greed That is Pure!	109
Even God Has Praised Prashasta Raag!	111
Heading Towards the Vitaraag [State]!	112
The Gnani Himself is Your Atma!	112
Attachment Towards Dada Arises Instantly Upon Attaining Gnan!	113
Prashasta Raag is Itself Moksha for This Era of the Time Cycle!	113
Through Attachment Only for the Self, One can Meet a Gnani!	114

Dedication

Aho aho Dada, termi Aptavani!
Wow Dada, the thirteenth Aptavani!

Gajabni footi, aa to moksha sarvani!
It's a wondrous revelation, one that will lead to liberation!

Be ghadima j Akrame, (muj) Pragnya pragatani!
On the Akram path, within 2 hours, *Pragnya* manifests within (me)!

Raag-dwesh bhagade, tuj vitaraag vani!
Your absolutely detached speech, makes the attachment and abhorrence flee!

Kare melu ne chokkhkhu, e j pudgalani!
(Upon stating,) 'That which spoils and cleans up, is all part of the *pudgal*!'

Gnan-agnan tani, bhedrekha taani!
The line of demarcation between the Knowledge of the Self and ignorance of the Self has been drawn!

Gnan-Darshan-Charitra ma, thothne aani!
The one who was slow to understand the Knowledge-Vision-Conduct of the Self!
Ahin Gnan-Darshan ni, vyakhya samajani!
Here, He understood the definition of Knowledge-Vision of the Self!

Akramni siddhi, Tirthankaroe vakhani!
The Tirthankars have praised the extraordinary powers of the Akram path!
Gnata-Drashta mathi Gnayakata vartani!
From the Knower-Seer state, One prevails as the continuous Knower!

Ek pudgal jota, vir dashani lhani!
Upon Seeing 'one *pudgal*', one gets a feel for the state of Mahavir!
Gajab niralumbta anubhavani!
One experiences extraordinary independence!

Hu, bavo, mangaldas thi muda drashti pakdani!
The real vision is identified through *Hu, bavo* and *mangaldas*!

Gajab kari te to arpi Dada vani!
Dada, how wondrous are You, having offered this unprecedented speech!

Tamam dukho, tuj prem ma doobani!
All the miseries have drowned in Your pure love!

Yugo yugoni taras, Dade chheepani!

**Draft version to be used for Paryushan 2017 purpose only.
For personal use only. Please do not circulate.**

The thirst from time immemorial, Dada has quenched!

Dukhma sabadtane, Akramni ujaani!
For those rotting in misery, Akram is a feast!

Tari karuna, darek par dhodani!
Your compassion overflows over everyone!

Na hale parmanu, dasa vartani!
A state where subatomic particles are not unsteady prevails!

Shu arpu kshatriyane kadi kai n levani!
What can I offer to the Kshatriya who never needs anything!

Aavo Dado malyo mane, aashcharya sarjani!
I have found such a Dada, what a miracle!

Anant bhavo kapaya, e j moksha kamani!
Infinite lifetimes have been cut away, that itself is the profit for liberation!

Brahmandno Swami, chhata laghu dasa dekhani!
You are the Lord of the universe, yet You show a humble state!

Tethi j tuj chhabi, sahu hrade samani!
That is the very reason why Your portrait is embraced within everyone's heart!

Nathi tane khevana koe, tu jagat kalyani!
You do not need to seek anything, as You are the liberator of the world!

Samarpu charane jage, termi aptavani!
I present to the world, the thirteenth Aptavani!

Editorial

People desirous of attaining only the Self have probably heard and read numerous discourses about the Soul, numerous times. However, the experience of the Self is a very mysterious matter! In order to attain ultimate liberation (*purnahuti*) after the experience of the Self, it is necessary to know many things such as, the science of the *prakruti* (relative self), to See-Know the *pudgal* (non-Self complex of input and output), the science of *karma*, the function of *Pragnya* (direct light of the Soul), attachment-aborrence (*raag-dwesh*), anger-pride-deceit-greed (*kashay*), the absolutely independent (*niralumb*) state of the Soul, the state of absolute Knowledge (*keval Gnan*), as well as the solutions to all the secrets about the Soul and this physical body (*sthul sharira*), subtle body (*sukshma sharira*), and causal body (*karan sharira*). All of which are helpful as milestones to reach the ultimate state. Unless these come into vision (*drashti*) and experience fully (*sampurnapane*) and from all angles (*sarvangpane*), the ultimate completion of the science of the Self is not accomplished. And who besides the completely experienced *Atmavignani* (scientist of the Self) can explain in detail about all these secrets?

Whatever the *Gnanis* (absolutely Self-realized Ones) of the past have said has just remained in words, in scriptures and it has been said in accordance with their place and time, which in the current place and time for the most part, does not fit in understanding and experience. Therefore, in this era of the time cycle, in the form of nature's extraordinary gift, we have all received the benefit of the fully accomplished, experienced speech that has touched the perfectly manifest 'Dada Bhagwan' within *Atmavignani*, *Akram Gnani* (spiritual scientist of the stepless path to Self-realization) absolutely revered Dadashri.

Absolutely revered Dadashri has never taken a pen to paper. According to him, all that flowed from his mouth was speech in the form of *deshna* (liberating speech of the enlightened Ones) that is accepting of all viewpoints and does not hurt any viewpoint (*syadvaad*), and is without ownership. It would come forth through the 'tape recorder' (speech from the *Gnani*) upon encountering an evidentiary instrument (*nimit*)! After it was recorded in audio cassettes and compiled, efforts have been made to deliver it to learned spiritual aspirants. From these compilations, the invaluable collection of Aptavani books has been published. Twelve Aptavani books have already been published and now the thirteenth volume is being published, which has been divided into the first half (*purvardh*) and the second half (*uttarardh*).

Dadashri's speech used to flow naturally depending upon the questioner (*nimit*). In person, everyone would understand it exactly but it becomes difficult to compile it into a volume after the fact, and even more difficult than that is for the learned reader to understand it in exactness! Sometimes, due to misinterpretation, one may get off track or get misguided. For example, in the scriptures one reads, "Go and call your mother." Now here, who is speaking with regard to whose mother; that reference has to be understood by the reader on his own. In this, one could be calling one's own wife or someone else's wife too! What if it was misunderstood?!!!

Likewise, the element that is the Soul (*Atmatattva*), and the other eternal elements of the universe, cannot be described in words (*avarnaniya*), they are inexpressible (*avaktavya*). *Gnani Purush* Dadashri comes down from a very, very high level to bring it into words and explains it to us. The matters of *drashti* (right belief, perspective that 'I am the Self') can be attained from the One who has this *drashti* (*Gnani Purush*); it cannot be accomplished through words. The real vision (*muda drashti*) which is about attaining perception of the Soul (*Atmsanmukhta*), how can it be put in words? However, those great Souls with tremendous merit *karma* who have received *Akram Gnan*

(Knowledge of the Self through the stepless path) from absolutely revered Dadashri would understand it as soon as they read it because their *Pragnya* (direct liberating light of Soul) is awakened (*jagrut*). Yet, certain deep matters are such that they may even go over the heads of Self-realized *mahatmas* or it may appear contradictory at certain points. In reality, not even a single word of the *Gnani* can ever be contradictory. Therefore, do not disregard it. To get a resolution for the contradiction, it is worth getting clarification from an authorized person. Otherwise, keep it pending and when you progress to that level, then it will be understood automatically!

For example, ‘railway station’ or ‘railway platform’; these two words are used in different places. For an unfamiliar person confusion arises, and a familiar person would know that it is one and the same thing! Many a times, when revered Pujiyashri talks about the platform, then the description at the beginning may be different, the middle part different and at the very end, the description is different. Therefore, apparent contradiction may arise. In fact, it is the description of the very same thing, at different stages!

Here, Dadashri’s speech has emanated based on different *nimits* (questioners), in different places at different times and subject to the different inner intents of everyone. That is what has been compiled. Matter on the subject of *prakruti* (relative self) from one to one hundred (percent) has come out. However, due to the change in the *nimit* (questioner), the reader may find it a little difficult to understand. At times, it may seem like questions are asked repeatedly but the questioner is different each time, whereas the one who explains in detail is only one, the absolute *Gnani*, Dadashri. And at each point in time, the reader of the Aptavani is just one person who has to comprehend the entire sacred teaching (*bodha*). And an attempt has been made to compile the matter with subtlety, as though absolutely revered Dadashri’s conversation is with just one person. Yes, in the question and answer format of the speech, the answers given to each individual may appear different but they are such that they take us to much deeper stages! This can be understood by those who study it in depth.

In spite of doing all this, it would appear very very very difficult and rare to grasp the original essence as it is.

In the flow of absolutely revered Dadashri’s speech, different words have come forth for the same thing; for example, *prakruti* (relative self), *pudgal* (non-Self complex of input and output), *ahamkar* (ego) and so on. Whereas in some places, just one word has been used to describe different things; for example, ‘I’ (*hu*) may have been used for ego and ‘I’ may also have been used for *Atma* (the Self in reference to *Hu* in ‘*Hu, bavo and Mangaldas*’). *Mahatmas* ought to take it in the appropriate context. To specially explain in detail the understanding of the incontrovertible principle, editorial notes have been inserted in brackets where necessary in the matter, which will be helpful for the understanding of the reader.

In the first half (*purvardh*) of the volume presented here, all eight types of *dravyakarma* (subtle discharging *karma*) are explained in detail. In the scriptures it has been described at great length, which may confuse the spiritual aspirant. Absolutely revered Dadashri has given special importance to only that which is necessary and useful on the path to final liberation, for those who are desirous of attaining only the Self. He has explained it in very simple language and made it such that it procures results on its own (*kriyakari*).

Dadashri, in certain places, has referred to the Soul (*Atma*) as Knower-Seer whereas in other places, he has referred to *Pragnya* (direct liberating light of the Soul) as the Knower-Seer. In exactness, until absolute Knowledge (*keval Gnan*) is not attained, *Pragnya*, as a representative of

the Soul, is indeed the Knower-Seer. Ultimately, once absolute Knowledge is attained, then the Soul itself becomes the illuminator (*prakashak*) of every object to be known (*gneya*) in the entire universe!

Certain discussions, such as those of *Pragnya* come up over and again, at that time it may seem repetitive but that is not the case. Each time, the explanations are at a more subtle level. Just as anatomy is covered in the sixth grade, tenth grade, twelfth grade, and again in medical college, the subject and its basic understanding are at all levels but the subtlety of each is different.

When the absolute principle comes into experience, then the difference of speech or words for such a person is not a hindrance at all. For a person who has come to the center of the circle, no difference of opinion arises with anyone. Moreover, he sees everything as it is and therefore no difference ever arises there.

Many a times, a *mahatma* or *mumukshu* (one desirous of liberation) may become slightly depressed after reading the immensely deep discourses of revered Dadashri, feeling that, 'This can never be attained!' But that will not happen. Dadashri always used to say, "Whatever I am saying, all you have to do is understand it, you are not to make attempts to bring it into your conduct." For that, a new ego will have to be put up. Just keep on understanding (the essence of) the matter; it will come into conduct on its own. But if you have not understood it, then how will you progress? Just keep on understanding and ask for energies (*shakti*) from Dada Bhagwan, and make the resolution that, 'I do want to fully (*sampurnapane*) and from all angles (*sarvangpane*) understand *Akram Vignan* in exactness!' And just this awareness will render the ultimate state (*purnata*). At present, *mahatmas* are only to remain in the *Purusharth* (spiritual effort that does not require any external evidences) of the uninterrupted awareness (*avirat laksh*) of five *Agnas* and 'I am pure Soul'.

Since time immemorial, spiritual aspirants have been after just one thing, 'I have to attain purification. I have to remove the impurities. I have to purify the *chit* (subtle faculty of vision and knowledge)!' Who is to do this? I, I, I! There, Dadashri's speech of experience flows, "The one that impurifies is the *pudgal* (non-Self complex) and the one that purifies is also the *pudgal*!!!" You are just the Seer of all this!!!! Thus, all the discourses render without contradiction the incontrovertible principle that brings the ultimate result (*siddhantik*).

The original Soul (*muda Atma*) is, was, and will be in the form of absolute Knowledge (*keval Gnan swaroop*). All this entrapment has arisen due to the pressure of circumstances, due to wrong belief. And one wrong belief arose that, 'I am Niruben,' from which infinite wrong beliefs have come into being! Through *Akram Vignan*, within just two hours, Dadashri has destroyed the original wrong belief, and established the constant awareness (*laksh*) and conviction (*pratiti*) that 'I am pure Soul.' However, by getting rid of and retracting from the other wrong beliefs that have arisen out of the original wrong belief [of I am Chandubhai]Ohas to get to the real, original form of absolute Knowledge. And ultimately, the developing 'I' (*potey*) becomes the Self (*Atma*)!!! Through Dadashri's speech, the art of getting rid of these wrong beliefs is revealed in numerous places. It makes the path to attain a strong resolve to acquire the *ekavtari* state (in which just one more life remains before *moksha*) tremendously simple (*sarad*) and easy (*sahaj*).

Thus, in Aptavani thirteen, by disclosing the science of the *prakruti*, Dadashri has crossed all limits and along with that, by giving the ultimate science of 'Hu, bavo and Mangaldas,' he has revealed all the explanations in subtlety. Upon understanding this, it is possible to uninterruptedly prevail in the state of the *Gnani*.

Pujya Dadashri had given the divine directive (*Ajna*) to Niruben and Deepakbhai Desai to publish the series of Aptavanis from one to fourteen. He had said that the fourteen Aptavanis shall become the milestones for those desirous of attaining only the Self; to climb from the first to the fourteenth stage of spiritual development (*gunthana*). Hence, the fundamental Knowledge is all included in ‘I am pure Soul’ and the five *Agnas*. But the Aptavanis explain in subtle detail this fundamental Knowledge. For example, if someone in Delhi asks, “Niruben, where do you live?” then I would say, “Simandhar City, Adalaj.” But if the person wants to reach Niruben, then the person would require the address in detail. Where is Adalaj situated? Where is Simandhar City situated? It is on the Ahmedabad-Kalol Highway, near the Adalaj crossing on the way from Sarkhej to Gandhinagar, behind Bagga petrol pump, Trimandir Sankul. Only if detail is provided in this way can the person reach the actual location. Similarly, to reach the absolute form of the Soul (*Atma*), the Aptavanis, volumes of Dadashri’s speech in the form of great scriptures, supply the necessary detail and help one get to the real Self, the Soul in the form of absolute Knowledge!

-Dr. Niruben Amin

Introduction

- Dr. Niruben Amin

[1] Pragnya – The Direct Liberating Light of the Soul

Which part has the awareness (*khyal*) of ‘I am pure Soul’ and ‘this body is separate’? It is *Pragnya* (the direct liberating light of the Self)!

How does *Pragnya* arise? *Pragnya* manifests the moment one attains the Knowledge of the Self. Up until that point, only *agnya* (the ignorance of the Self) had prevailed.

There are two forms of energies. One is *agnya*, which every living being definitely has. And the other is *Pragnyashakti*, the direct energy of the Self, which arises right after the attainment of Knowledge of the Self! *Pragnyashakti* does not allow one to get out of the state of the Self and *agnyashakti* (energy of the ignorant state) doesn’t allow one to get out of worldly life (*sansaar*). Through *agnya* there is bondage as well as merit-demerit *karma*. Where *agnya* prevails, there is always the presence of egoism. Therefore, one keeps feeling, ‘I did this’, ‘I enjoyed or suffered that’. With *Pragnya*, there is a Knower-state; there is no enjoyer-sufferer state, nor is there a doer state. When no one in the world is seen as a doer, that is the ultimate Knowledge.

Agnya makes decisions about worldly life whereas *Pragnya* makes decisions about final liberation (*moksha*)!

Pragnya is the energy that has arisen through Self-realization. *Agnya* and *Pragnya* are both energies of the Self. *Agnya* was created due to *vishesh parinaam* (an extra result). As long as the Self is entrapped in the extra result [of ‘I am Chandubhai’], it cannot go beyond *agnyashakti*! When One (*potey*, the developing ‘I’) attains the awareness of one’s own Self, then *agnyashakti* moves aside. Then the direct liberating energy of the Self (*Pragnyashakti*) manifests and starts to work. Thereafter, it will not allow one to enter in worldly life; it constantly cautions.

The specific knowledge that arose due to the circumstance of the elements of inanimate matter (*jada*) and the Self (*Chetan*) is *agnyashakti*!

Pragnya is *nirvikalpi* (devoid of the belief of ‘I am Chandubhai’ and all the relative ‘I-ness’ and ‘my-ness’ that stem from it); it is *Chetan* (the Self). It is the original Self (*muda Chetan*) but it has separated from the original Self, just for the purpose of taking one to final liberation; thereafter it becomes one with the original Self again!

Is the right intellect (*samyak buddhi*) the same as *Pragnya*? No. *Pragnya* is higher than the right intellect. It is actually the representative of the original Self! That is why it is also considered as the original Self itself.

It is definitely *agnyashakti* that has made one wander around in this worldly life. *Agnya* is equipped with a great army; the anger-pride-deceit-greed, the ego and all are excessively strong. Whereas, *Pragnya* has no-one, not even the ego. That is why, We (the Self) should remain present there. If We are on *Pragnya*’s side, then *Pragnya* will be able to attain its goal. As soon as the slightest restlessness arises within, close the gates right away!

Where *agnya* prevails, it will cause suffocation; hence, our happiness will be masked. There will be no worries now [that *Pragnya* is at work].

In the ignorant state, desires were cropping up and *agnyashakti* was working to fulfill them. After Self-realization (*Gnan*), as new desires do not arise, so new seeds are not sown from the seeds unfolding from the past life and those seeds that exist just need to be settled with equanimity.

Can one increase the *Pragnyashakti*? *Pragnya* does not increase or decrease. Intellect may increase or decrease. The lesser the intellect, the more the *Pragnya*.

Pragnya is primarily the awareness (*jagriti*). As it appears to be less or more, we refer to it as awareness. If *Pragnya* is fully there, then there is complete awareness.

‘You’ (the awakened Self), are to follow the *Agnas* and it is *Pragnya* that makes You follow them. The *Agnas* is the religion itself and it is also the penance. *Pragnya* exists as long as there is penance.

For *mahatmas*, *Gnankriya* (the activity of Knowing) is done through *Pragnya*.

The one that gets engrossed is *agnya* and the one that prevents one from getting engrossed [in the non-Self complex] is *Pragnya*. The ability to understand and to See is that of *Pragnya*. When the *Gnani* explains, who is it that understands that? *Pragnya* does.

After Self-realization, the inner light is lit. It constantly keeps burning, but what can the light do if You go elsewhere from time to time?

Is *Pragnya* the same as the divine vision (*divyachakshu*)? No. The divine vision has only one function; to see the pure Soul (*Shuddhatma*) in others. Whereas, *Pragnya* does a whole lot more than that!

It is *Pragnya* that makes one repent.

It is *Pragnya* that makes one do *pratikraman*.

Who is the Seer during *samayik* (introspection as the Self) in the *Akram* path? It is *Pragnya*.

Who is the one that reads the letters while reading the *Aptavani* or while reciting the *Trimantra*? It is *Pragnya*!

The thoughts arise in the mind and it is *Pragnya* that keeps Seeing them. Dadashri says, “*Agnya* (the intellect) has taken a ‘pension’ from ‘Us’! Meaning it has ended. That’s why ‘we’ have become *abuddha* (intellect-free)!” The intellect shows profit and loss, it keeps one entrenched in worldly life. It is only when one uses the Knowledge of *Vyavasthit* (Scientific Circumstantial Evidence) that the intellect stops and one can advance towards an intellect-free state!

Do not listen to the intellect. Even when it bothers you, stay in Your own State! The intellect will remain as long as you consider it valuable.

Pragnya is higher than the intellect (*buddhi*) and *Vignan* (spiritual science) is higher than *Pragnya*! The science of the Self (*Atmavignan*)!

How much intellect is required in spirituality (*adhyatma*)? It is useful only in the beginning to understand spirituality, not afterwards. Whatever we understand from Dadashri is not through the intellect. In fact, Dadashri’s speech is so powerful that it can penetrate through the veils (*avarana*) over the Self and touch the Self! That is why the intellect just cannot function in understanding this.

Who is it that repeatedly brings us back to Dadashri? Is it the intellect or is it *Pragnya*? It is neither of the two. One is able to come because of one’s merit *karma* (*punyai*).

Who has the desire [for liberation] (*jignyasa*)? Is it the intellect or *Pragnya*? It is the intellect. The intellect of one desirous of liberation is *samyak* (for the good of the self and the Self); it is an experienced (*ghadayeli*) intellect. What is the difference between *samyak buddhi* (right intellect) and *Pragnya*?

If one listens for an hour to the stories related to the Knowledge of the Self from an Enlightened One (*Atmagnani*), one's intellect becomes right (*samyak*). The more one listens, the more the intellect becomes right. However, *Pragnya* will not manifest. *Pragnya* manifests only if one attains the Knowledge of the One's real form (*Swaroop Gnan*). *Pragnya* is the direct light (*prakash*) of Soul. *Samyak buddhi* (right intellect) is the indirect light of Soul. *Pragnya* is a component of the Self Itself.

As long as *Pragnya* has not manifest, the right intellect is very helpful, but not after that. Yet the right intellect can neither be considered as *pudgalik* (a part of the non-Self complex) nor can it be considered as *Chetan* (a part of the Self). After all, the right intellect is nothing but intellect only, is it not! Intellect means that there is a sense of ownership (*maliki bhaav*). There is indeed no owner when it comes to *Pragnya*.

Right intellect means one that does not attack. The one that attacks is *viparit buddhi* (wrong intellect).

There are two parts in worldly life, good and bad. Whereas for us, here [on the *Akram* path] we go beyond good and bad, we move away from *mithyatva* (illusion; ignorance of the Self) and go towards the eternal element (*sanatan vastu*), the Self. This is how the demarcation is made [in *Akram*].

Avyabhicharini buddhi (virtuous intellect), one that brings about peace in non-peaceful situations, is a state prior to *Pragnya*.

What is *sthit-Pragny* and what is *Pragnya*? To stabilize oneself in the accurate understanding (*samaj*) of One's true identity as the Self is known as *sthit pragny*! The *sthit pragny* state is the state close to the manifestation of *Pragnya*. It is the state before Self-realization. Therefore, the worldly interactions are [conducted] with egoism. However, the worldly interactions [of a person in this state] are very beautiful! In the *sthit pragny*, there is the sense as a witness (*sakshibhaav*). *Pragnya* manifests only after Self-realization. There is no egoism in it and there is the sense as the Knower-Seer (*Gnata-Drashta bhaav*). In summary, the intellect has become steady (*sthir*) in the *sthit pragny* state whereas *Pragnya* is a part of the Self Itself!

Sthit pragny (steady intellect) means when one reads volumes of scriptures, serves the saints, becomes pacified through all his experiences after taking a lot of beatings in worldly life, that is when his intellect becomes steady; that is considered as *sthit pragny*. After attaining this state, he doesn't waver, no matter how adverse the circumstances. The *sthit pragny* state is a state of highly awakened awareness towards good discretion (*sadvivek*).

The worldly interactions of a person in the *sthit pragny* state are very beautiful. They are not worthy of criticism by the world (*loknindya*). However, [the person in a] *sthit-pragny* state has a long way to travel before attaining liberation (*moksha*). The state of King Janakvidehi was much higher than that of *sthit pragny*!

As long as the belief that 'I am Chandubhai' prevails, one is considered to be in the *sthit agny* (steady ignorance) state. After attaining *Akram Vignan* (the science of absolutism), the awareness that 'I am pure Soul' prevails, that is when *Pragnya* arises; this state is considered much higher

than the *sthit pragny* state. This is [the state of] *kshayak samyaktva* (permanent right belief of ‘I am pure Soul’). The *mithyatva drashti* (wrong belief of ‘I am Chandubhai’) itself is entirely destroyed.

What does [a person with] *sthit pragny* eat? What does he drink? What language does he speak? Hey! The Soul is not the eater! The eater is separate indeed! Only Dada has talked about this subtle point.

Once *moha* (illusory attachment) is destroyed, that is when one can attain *sthirata* (steadiness). The state where the illusory attachment breaks is in fact even higher than the state of *sthit pragny*. Arjun spoke about this, “*Nashto moha, smrutilabdha sthitosmi* (Upon the destruction of illusory attachment, I have gained my memory (the Knowledge of the Self). I am now steady).”

On the way to *Vaikunth* (the supreme abode), the intellect becomes steady; that is the *sthit pragny* state!

Does the ego really exist in *sthit pragny* state? In the presence of the ego, when the intellect becomes steady having extracted the essence of the advantages and disadvantages of worldly life, that is the *sthit pragny* state. That is considered as *vivek* (discretion) itself. There may not be absence of attachment-aborrence (*raag-dwesh*) in that state but he can resolve every question. After attaining the *sthit pragny* state, one finds the path towards [becoming] *vitaraag* (free from all attachment).

Those in *sthit pragny* state have kindness (*dayaa*); they do not have compassion (*karuna*).

On what basis do scientists make discoveries? Is it through the intellect or *Pragnya*? It is through neither of these two. It is through *darshan* (vision) and that too is a natural phenomenon. Without vision, one can’t be a scientist. Even for the great sages, it is considered as vision. *Pragnya* comes about only after Self-realization.

Pragnya directly warns the ego itself.

It is *Pragnya* that makes one do *nididhyasan* (visual contemplation) of the *Gnani*. Who causes interference in doing the *nididhyasan*? It is the unfolding *karma* that (*udayakarma*) that does so.

Pure Knowledge-Vision (*shuddha chit*) is itself the pure Soul (*Shuddhatma*). When one attains Self-realization (*Gnan*), the *chit* (inner faculty of Knowledge and Vision) becomes completely pure. That is when the direct light energy of Soul (*Pragnya*) manifests. When the impure (*ashuddha*) *chit* and the mind are being very forceful, the strength as the Self (*Nischaybud*) shuts down.

Dadashri says, “I never come out of the den of the pure Soul at all. Only if I come out of it, then would I have to re-enter it, right? And if I were to get out of the den of the pure Soul, then who will go to the houses of these *mahatmas*?” Dada would go to every *mahatmas*’ house every day! That is the tremendous strength of *Pragnya*! The moment you remember Dada, Dada comes before you; what is that? It is the *Pragnya shakti* that readily reaches there!

The moment you remember Dada, Dada comes before you; what is that? It is the function of Dadashri’s *Pragnya*. One gets the result according to his inner intent (*bhaav*). Dadashri has nothing to do with this and he doesn’t even keep an account of this.

It is *Pragnya shakti* that makes one settle the files and it is *Vyavasthit shakti* (the result of scientific circumstantial evidences) that actually settles it!

Who makes the firm resolve (*nischay*) to abide by the *Agnas*? *Pragnya* does.

After attaining Self-realization (*Gnan*), the discharge ego should remain engrossed in *Pragnya*; instead it slips from there.

What does 'remaining engrossed in *Pragnya*' mean? It means to remain sincere to *Pragnya*. When can one remain sincere? When one's resolve is strong. If you want to reach the shore, then the energies should be exerted in the direction towards the shore, shouldn't they!

Whom does *Pragnya* caution? It cautions the egoism part of the relative self (*pratishtit atma*). The very egoism that is trying to become free.

When a mistake occurs, it is *Pragnya* that gives the warning. But who does the oppositional intent of, 'This mistake should not happen'? Here, the light [of Knowledge] (*prakash*) belongs to *Pragnya* and the intent is done by the tendencies of the *chit* that have become purified through that light.

Who enjoys (*bhogve*) the bliss that arises from *Pragnya*? It is the relative ego that enjoys that bliss. The Real is in permanent bliss already, right!

The one that suffers (*vedey*) is the ego and the one that Knows is *Pragnya*! If there is engrossment with the sufferer (*vedak*), there is misery and if One can prevail as the continuous Knower (*Gnyak*), then there is no misery.

After attaining Self-realization, if the speech is about to unfold, and if you are prevented from speaking when that unfolding *karma* has come into fruition, then *Pragnya parishaha* (the affliction or inner suffering of *Pragnya*) arises. Or else, when you explain to another person, and they do not understand, even then *Pragnya parishaha* arises for you. If it is someone's mistake and you want to tell him your knowledge but the opportunity does not arise for you, then also the inner suffering of *Pragnya* arises. 'When can I tell him, when can I tell him,' that is the inner suffering of *Pragnya*.

What is the difference between insight (*sooj*) and *Pragnya*? *Sooj* takes one towards *Pragnya*. In the Self-ignorant state (*agnan*), it is the insight that does all the work. Insight is not the same as *Pragnya*.

What is the medium through which this *Akram Vignan* has been visualized? Through *Pragnya*.

What is the difference between ignorance (*agnan*) and *agnya* (energy of the ignorant state)? *Agnan* is one form of knowledge (*gnan*), whereas *agnya* is not any form of knowledge. *Agnya* only sees profit and loss in every aspect. Ignorant knowledge (*agnan gnan*) means worldly knowledge. *Agnya* (the energy of the ignorant state) has arisen to attain the ignorance of the Self (*agnan*) and *Pragnya* has arisen to attain the Knowledge of the Self (*Gnan*)! Ignorance of the Self (*agnan*) is an additional (*vishesh*) knowledge. It is not wrong but it yields pain.

Who separates the Real and the relative? *Pragnya* does. *Pragnya* is relative-real. Once its' work is done, *Pragnya* rests in the original abode. It then merges with the Soul. If it were real, then it would be considered eternal (*avinashi*).

What is the difference between *bhed Gnan* (the Knowledge that separates the Self from the non-Self), and *Pragnya*? Both are lights. *Bhed Gnan* separates the real from the relative through [the grace of] the *Gnani Purush* whereas the light of *Pragnya* is temporary-permanent. *Pragnya* gives light all the way until one attains liberation.

What increases *Pragnya*'s force? As one follows the five *Agnas*, *Pragnya* arises.

It is the tape record that says, “I am pure Soul” but the inner intent (*bhaav*) behind it belongs to *Pragnya*.

Who Knows the *prakruti* (the relative self) and who follows the dictates of the relative self? The egoism does. Who Knows one’s own Self and who follows according to the Self? *Pragnya* does.

What is the difference between *Pragnya* and *jagruti* (awakened awareness)? *Pragnya* is the pure energy of the Soul and awakened awareness is a mixture of purity and impurity. When awakened awareness becomes one hundred percent pure, one achieves absolute Knowledge (*keval Gnan*). At that time, *Pragnya* comes to an end.

For liberation, what does one require more of? Is it awakened awareness or is it *Pragnya*? Both are required. *Pragnya* keeps turning One towards liberation and the awakened awareness holds on to it!

What is the origin of *agnyashakti* (the energy of the indirect light of the Soul)? When the two, inanimate matter (*jada*) and the Self (*Chetan*) come together, *agnyashakti* arises and upon the separation of these two, it comes to an end.

Is there *Pragnya* in Dadashri as well? Yes, there is. What kind of *Pragnya* is it? Who makes Dadashri intervene constructively (*khatpat*) to take others to *moksha*? Is that *Pragnya*? The constructively intervening *Pragnya*. If *Pragnya* was not there, then the one who constructively intervenes would not even exist, right?

What is the difference between the grace of Dada Bhagwan and the grace of the *Gnani*? Once the grace of Dada Bhagwan is bestowed, then the *Gnani* does not have to bother at all, does he! The grace of Dada Bhagwan’s befalls on a person through *Pragnya*.

The One who makes the work of world salvation happen is *Pragnya*, and the ego becomes the instrumental doer (*nimit*) in this.

Up until absolute Knowledge is attained, it is indeed *Pragnya* that is the Knower-Seer (*Gnata-Drashta*). *Pragnya* is part of the Self Itself.

If you want to look at it minutely, then *Pragnya* is considered the Knower-Seer and if you look at it in broad terms, then the Self is considered the Knower-Seer.

Who is it that meditates on a goal (*dhyata*), what is the meditation (*dhyan*) and what is the goal of the meditation (*dhyeaya*)? After attaining Self-realization, *Pragnya* becomes the meditator (*dhyata*) and the goal of meditation (*dhyeaya*) is ‘I am Pure Soul’. When there is unity between the meditator (*dhyata*) and the goal of meditation (*dhyeaya*), *dhyan* (the meditation) arises.

What is knowledge (*Gnan*), science (*Vignan*) and *Pragnya*? As long as something needs to be done, it is Knowledge (*Gnan*) whereas science (*Vignan*) is what happens by itself! And *Pragnya* is a state between these two!

Knowledge is contained in the scriptures whereas Science is contained in the *Gnani*’s heart! *Pragnya* is in oneness (*abhed*) with the Self, and it is completely separate from the intellect.

The one being cautioned and the one cautioning, are they one and the same? Ultimately, they are one and the same. They are not two different things at all. At the time of cautioning, and at the time of being cautioned, its phases are changing!

The Self has become unnatural (*vibhaavik*) because of the pressure of circumstances, which is why it has separated [from the original Self]. When It comes into Its complete inherent nature as the Self, separation no longer remains, It becomes one [with the original Self]. When absolute Knowledge occurs, *agnya* (the indirect light of the Soul) and the ego (*ahamkar*) come to an end and on the other side, *Pragnya* also comes to an end. Just as the intellect (*agnya*) and the ego arose for the purpose of conducting worldly life; similarly after attaining the Knowledge of the Self from the enlightened One (the *Gnani*), *Pragnya* has arisen for the purpose of taking one to liberation! *Pragnya's* work comes to an end either when worldly life (*sansaar*) comes to an end or when absolute Knowledge (*keval Gnan*) is attained. Therefore, in the end, only Knowledge remains, absolute Knowledge and that is indeed the absolute Self Itself!

What does it mean when we pray, ‘May we attain the state of complete oneness (*sampurna abhedta*)’? Oneness means to become engrossed (*tanmayakar*). We become one [with the pure Soul]. After Self-realization, *mahatmas* are convinced that, ‘I am pure Soul’; this conviction has set in. They have had some experience of being the pure Soul, but they have not become that form yet. There is still some separation. When One becomes the form of the pure Soul completely, then One attains complete oneness.

Who becomes one with the pure Soul? Is it the ego? No. *Pragnya* (the direct liberating light of the Self) becomes one with the pure Soul. The *Pragnya* that had separated from the Self becomes one with It. *Pragnya* had separated from the Self for the purpose of finishing off the worldly interactions (*vyavahar*); upon completion of this work, it becomes one with the Self!

At present, our ‘I-ness’ (*hupanu*) resides in *Pragnya*. Before attaining Self-realization (*Gnan*), it resided in the ego and now it has gone away from the ego. Before (Self-realization), we were prevailing as the ego; now, we are prevailing as the Self. Thus, we have become the interim Self (*antaratma*). The interim Self is in fact *Pragnya*. As long as the interim Self state exists, there is dwelling in the Self (*Swa-ramanta*) as well as dwelling in the non-Self (*par-ramanta*). Ultimately, when there is absolute dwelling in the Self, it is the same as absolute Knowledge (*keval Gnan*)! And that Itself is the absolute Self (*Parmatma*)!!

APTAVANI 13

PART II

[1]

Pragnya

To Understand Pragnya in its Exact Form...

Questioner: The awareness (*khyal*) of, 'This is my form as the Self (*Swaroop*) and this is the other;' what part prevails in this constant awareness? What part is that?

Dadashri: It is *Pragnya* that shows that. *Pragnya* shows everything. It shows everything as separate [from You, the Self].

Questioner: The awareness even remains that the one showing these two as separate is also not me; I am this.

Dadashri: That is correct, *Pragnya* shows that.

Questioner: How does *Pragnya* arise and from where does it arise?

Dadashri: It actually arises the moment 'we' (the *Gnani Purush*) give you the *Gnan* (Knowledge of the Self). It is through this *Gnan* that *Pragnya* has arisen. The work of *Pragnya* begins from then on.

There are two energies within. *Pragnyashakti* (the direct liberating energy of the Self) arises when 'we' give you *Gnan*. Otherwise, every living being always has *agnya shakti* (the energy of ignorance; intellect). Meaning, when the two, 'I' (*hu*; the Self) and '*murti*' (the non-Self complex) come together, it is called *agnya shakti*. *Agnya shakti* gives rise to worldly life (*sansaar*). It does not let one come out of worldly life. *Pragnya shakti* does not let the [awakened] Self to remain in worldly life. It will force the awakened Self, tie 'him' up and drag 'him' to *moksha* (liberation). So this energy that has arisen continues to do the work. 'You' [the Self] should not interfere in it. The work is continuing on its own, the work is happening naturally and spontaneously.

Pragnya arises after the *Gnani Purush* removes one's egoism. Egoism and *mamata* ('my-ness') are under the care of *agnya shakti* (the energy of ignorance; intellect). When *Pragnya* arises, the energy by the name of *agnya* picks up all its things and leaves! Just as, when the Congress Government came to power, all the British left, did they not?

The Lord has said, "The cause for bondage is the ignorance of the Self (*agnya*).'' Worldly life (*sansaar*) is being bound through *agnya*. *Paap-punya* (demerit and merit *karma*) are created through *agnya*. The opposite word to *agnya* is liberation (*mukti*), which occurs through *Pragnya*. That *Pragnya* constantly cautions You [the awakened Self]. It was not there before. Before there was *agnya*. *Agnya* keeps on winding over and over in the wrong direction. This worldly life that has arisen through *agnya*, is destroyed through *Pragnya*. There is ego through *agnya*. *Pragnya* arises after One becomes egoless (*nirahamkar*). *Pragnya shakti* arises after the awareness (*laksha*) of 'I am pure Soul' becomes established.

Now, in ignorance of the Self (*agnya*), there is, 'I did this, I suffered the pain, he did it, he cursed me.' *Pragnya* says, 'I am not the doer (*karta*), I am not the sufferer (*bhokta*), I am the Knower (*Gnata*). The poor man who cursed me is just a *nimit* (an evidentiary doer), he is also not the doer.' That is the ultimate Knowledge (*Gnan*). The ultimate tool (*sadhan*) for *moksha* is just

this much, to not See the other person as the doer and the prevalence of the awareness that You are not the doer.

Questioner: Is it considered as the *upayog* (applied awareness) of *Pragnya* to Know *raag-dwesh* (attachment-abhorrence) as *raag-dwesh*? Is *Pragnya* functioning at that time?

Dadashri: The ‘basement’ of *Pragnya* is different. Even the one who is not Self-realized (*agnani*) understands that this person is having attachment-abhorrence. It is *Pragnya* that Knows, ‘The attachment-abhorrence have gone.’ A person who is not Self-realized will not understand that. Besides, even a small child would understand attachment-abhorrence! If you pull a frown on your face, then the child will run away and not come back.

Pragnya arises when *agnya* goes away. As long as there is wrong belief (*mithyatva*) in every living being in the world, there is *agnya* and when that wrong belief is removed, *Pragnya* arises.

Questioner: Whilst living in worldly life, can *Pragnya* not arise; would only *agnya* remain?

Dadashri: No, *Pragnya* has arisen within You [the *mahatma*; the Self-realized One]. Has *Pragnya* not arisen within you despite you living a worldly life? Hence, wherever you have bondage in worldly life, it will free you from that bondage forever by cautioning you. If You are not aware, then You will receive a caution from within; that is the work of *Pragnya shakti* (the direct liberating energy of the Self). And when you are doing business in worldly life, then *agnya shakti* (the energy of ignorance) will tell you, ‘You can get married if you do this; you are likely to find someone.’ This *agnya shakti* cautions you but it will lead to wandering around in worldly life whereas *Pragnya* cautions You for *moksha*.

Questioner: All the decisions are made by the intellect (*buddhi*), aren’t they?

Dadashri: Yes, the intellect makes the decision, but there are two kinds of decisions. The decisions for going towards *moksha* are made by *Pragnya*, and the worldly decisions are made by *agnya*. *Agnya* means *buddhi* (intellect). All the decisions are of *agnya-Pragnya*.

The Manifestation of Agnya?

Questioner: What is the difference between *Gnan* (Knowledge) and *Pragnya* (direct liberating energy of the Soul)?

Dadashri: *Pragnya* is an energy that has arisen through *Gnan*.

Pragnya is indeed the direct energy, a direct light of the Self, and *agnya* is an indirect light. *Agnya* is considered a top-level intellect or even starting from the smallest level of intellect, but it is all *agnya*. Nevertheless, it is still the energy of the Self. *Agnya shakti* is the [indirect] energy of the Self, and *Pragnya* is also the [direct] energy of the Self.

Questioner: How can it be considered the energy of the Self?

Dadashri: *Agnya shakti* has arisen as an extra result (*vishesh parinaam*).

Questioner: Dada, is it not that the energy is one and the same? It results into *agnya* when it goes out, and when it blends back within Oneself, then...

Dadashri: No, it is not like that. That *agnya shakti* is different, but they are both energies of the Self. Whereas, there is no such energy in the *pudgal* (eternal element of inanimate matter) at all, isn’t it!

Questioner: So does that mean that all the energies there are, they are all of the Self only?

Dadashri: They are all the energies of the Self, but as long as the Self is trapped within *vishesh parinaam* (extra result; the belief of 'I am Chandubhai'), it cannot come out of the *agnya shakti*, can it? When it comes out of *agnya shakti*, when it comes into its awareness as the Self, that is when *agnya shakti* leaves. That is when the results as the Self (*nij parinaam*) arise. Thereafter, *Pragnya shakti* starts to function. Then It will not let you go into the worldly life.

So, both the energies are of the Self indeed. There is no external energy, no energy belonging to anyone else in this at all. *Pragnya shakti* and *agnya shakti* are both things that have been believed; they are a belief.

Questioner: Why did *agnya shakti* begin? What was the reason behind it?

Dadashri: Fundamentally, the circumstance of the Self (*Atma*) and the non-Self (*jada*) coming together came about, the circumstance of the Self (*Chetan*) and the inanimate matter (*jada*) coming together came about, which in turn gave rise to extra knowledge (*vishesh gnan*), and that became *agnya shakti*.

Questioner: Between *agnya* and *Pragnya*, who has the dominance?

Dadashri: They both rule; each in its own location (*kshetra*), each one rules in their respective location.

Questioner: Is there a difference between *Pragnya* and *pratisthit atma* (the relative self)?

Dadashri: A tremendous difference. *Pratisthit atma* is this 'Chandubhai' and *Pragnya* is a part of the Self. (GP5)

Questioner: From where did *Pragnya* begin?

Dadashri: It does not have a place of origin, it is time based. At the time when the wrong belief (*mithyatva*) is fractured, *Pragnya* manifests. As the intellect has taken a blow, it becomes present.

Questioner: Many times, in discussions, we say that *Pragnya* is a part of the Self.

Dadashri: Yes, that is exactly what it is!

Questioner: Is it a part of the Self?

Dadashri: 'A part of the Self,' don't interpret it in this way. You are interpreting all the points in your own language.

That is its nature; when a certain time comes about, *Pragnya* arises automatically and then it ends after it takes one to *moksha*. Even this *agnya* has arisen and comes to an end. *Agnya* comes to end when *Pragnya* arises. Just as daylight follows the darkness of the night.

Pragnya, Jada or Chetan?

Questioner: So is there some part of *vikalp* (the belief of 'I am Chandubhai') in *Pragnya*?

Dadashri: *Vikalp* has no connection here. *Vikalp* is all *agnya*. There is no *vikalp* in it; it is *nirvikalpi* (free from the belief of 'I am Chandubhai'). It is *Chetan* (the Self), not *jada* (inanimate matter).

Questioner: But *Pragnya* is power *chetan* (the energized self) indeed, is it not?

Dadashri: No, it is not power *chetan*, it is *muda Chetan* (the original Self). However, it has separated from the original Self just to do this work [of taking the awakened One to *moksha*]. Thereafter, it will become one with the Self again.

Questioner: *Pragnya* is not *pudgal* (the non-Self complex that fills and empties), is it a part that is in between the Self and the non-Self?

Dadashri: No, it is not the part that is between the Self and the non-Self. It is the part of the Self that becomes separate the day ‘we’ give the *Gnan*. The Self does not do anything in this while it (*Pragnya*) takes one all the way to *moksha*. So, as a part of the Self, it continues to work separately from the Self. It is as if the entire authority of the Self is in the hands of *Pragnya*, just like a power of attorney!

Questioner: So what can God do then? ‘He’ is a Knower-Seer. ‘He’ does not interfere in anything at all; He is *Vitaraag* (absolutely free from attachment and abhorrence).

Dadashri: Nothing remains to meddle in, does it? *Pragnya* is like God’s representative.

That is not Right Intellect!

Questioner: Dada, is *samyak buddhi* (right intellect) itself *Pragnya*?

Dadashri: No *Pragnya* is higher than that. *Pragnya* is a representative of the Self. At present, the Self is not doing any work by Itself to take You (the awakened One) from worldly life to *moksha*. A part of the Self is this *Pragnya*; it is this very *Pragnya* that constantly alerts You in order to take You to *moksha*.

That is *Pragnya*, and that itself is the original Self (*muda Atma*) indeed, but for right now, it is considered as *Pragnya*. The original Self does not have any such activity that can take one to *moksha*.

When the work of *Pragnya* is over, it becomes still (*sthir*) in the Self again; just like it was previously. *Pragnya* cannot be in every living being. *Pragnya* arises only when the *Gnani Purush* makes one aware of one’s own real form as the Self. In every living being, *agnya* is definitely present even if *Pragnya* is not there.

Questioner: *Pragnya* does not allow *agnya* to creep in, that is its only function, is it not?

Dadashri: Forget about not letting *agnya* creep in; it will not only prevent *agnya* from entering but along with that, its function is to take You to *moksha*. If *agnan* (ignorance) arises, it will squash it, it will give one the understanding and take ‘him’ to *moksha*. And the function of *agnya* is that it will turn into darkness whatever little light [of *Pragnya*] has arisen, thus taking one into worldly life (*sansaar*).

So we should not remain on the side of *agnya shakti*. *Agnya shakti* has made one wander around in worldly life. *Agnya shakti* has all the weapons; anger-pride-deceit-greed. It has a very strong ego; that entire army is very strong. And, there is no ego in *Pragnya shakti*, which is why You [awakened Self] should remain present. *Pragnya shakti* cannot lose if You remain on her side. It will continue doing its work. It is an *upsham bhaav* (intent that temporarily prevents the anger-pride-deceit-greed from becoming overt) entirely; therefore when any restlessness arises within, close the gates immediately on it. However, if one intentionally wants to be negative, by saying, “I want to do attachment-abhorrence now,” then that *Pragnya* will move aside.

It is solely for *Pragnya shakti* to not have any problems that, if one serves (*sevan*) the *Gnani Purush* that energy will continue to strengthen. No hindrance should come to that energy. If It has just manifested and some hindrance is faced, then It may extinguish.

The State of Agnya Shakti after Self-realization!

Questioner: So, after attaining Self-realization (*Gnan*) do both *agnya* and *Pragnya* remain together; or is there *agnya* when *Pragnya* is not there, and when *Pragnya* is there, *agnya* is not there?

Dadashri: No, they both remain together. The entanglement between them continues. Even though You have received this *Gnan*, yet they both remain together in the body. So, that *agnya* causes some suffocation. That *agnya shakti* will gradually perish, and *Pragnya* will increase.

Questioner: When entanglement arises, I feel that *agnya shakti* is about to leave.

Dadashri: When entanglement arises, at that time it is *agnya shakti*. And then, because it is not in control, entanglement arises and thereafter it comes to an end. That *agnya shakti* (energy of ignorance) will remain as long as *agnan* (ignorance of the Self) is there. And by however much *agnya shakti* decreases, by that much *Pragnya shakti* becomes liberated. It causes suffocation, confusion and all that. It does not take away anything of Ours, but it causes suffocation, thus preventing the bliss (*sukh*) that was due to come to You, from coming. You are sitting with the Self and so the bliss should arise, you should experience (*vedan*) the bliss of the Self, but it does not allow that. It lets you feel suffocated. It does not make you worry; it just causes you suffocation.

First, all your desires of worldly life arose, and *agnya shakti* is working to fulfill those desires. But now, the force of *agnya shakti* is not going to increase a lot. Other desires are not going to arise from it. So a [new] seed is not going to be sown from the [existing] seed. Whatever you have is what it is, and at the same time *Pragnya shakti* tells you, ‘I want to settle (*nikaal*) all of this. I do not want to leave anything *pending* anymore.’ *Nikaal* means to bring about a settlement!

Who Follows the Five Agnas?

‘Our’ *agnya shakti* has come to an end, ‘our’ *buddhi* (intellect) has come to an end; ‘we’ do not have any intellect. Even the scientists would not believe that the intellect in ‘us’ is finished. No one can even believe that, [they would think], ‘How can the intellect go away?’

Questioner: Would *agnya* be more or less in some people?

Dadashri: *Agnya* can vary, it can be more or less. *Pragnya* works immediately upon the attainment of *Gnan*. Where does One’s *Purusharth* (real spiritual effort to progress as the Self) lie, thereafter? *Purusharth* means to follow the five *Agnas*. If One does not do *Purusharth* after becoming the *Purush* (Self), then it is his own fault, isn’t it? One is said to have become a *Purush* (the Self) after attaining *Gnan*. And if He follows the *Agnas* after becoming the *Purush*, he continues to become *Purshottam* (the absolute state of the Self). The One who becomes *Purshottam*, becomes *Paramatma* (the absolute Self). The path is indeed a systematic highway, is it not?

Questioner: Who follows the *Agnas*? It is the *pratisthit atma* (the relative self) that follows them, isn’t it?

Dadashri: Where is the question for the *pratisthit atma* to follow the *Agnas* in this? Actually, these *Agnas* that You have to follow; it is Your inherent nature as *Pragnya* (*Pragnya swabhaav*) that makes You do all of that. The Self has an energy known as *Pragnya*, so what more does one need there? There is no interference (*dakhal*) of anyone in between at all! ‘You’ just have to follow the *Agnas*. *Pragnya shakti* allows You to do what *agnya shakti* prevented you from doing. When You follow the *Agnas*, it means that, ‘I am pure Soul’ is in Your conviction (*pratiti*) and in your attentive awareness (*laksha*), but only a little in Your experience (*anubhav*). ‘You’ have not become that form (*roop*) yet. ‘You’ become that form when You follow the five *Agnas*. So, nothing else remains to be done.

So, *Agna* is religion (*dharma*) and *Agna* is penance (*tapa*). As long as there is penance, there is *Pragnya*. Until then One has not attained the original form as the Self (*muda swaroop*). The property (*guna*) of penance is not in the Self; it is *Pragnya* that makes One do the penance.

Questioner: After attaining *Gnan*, the constant feeling of ‘I am separate’ from the body that *mahatmas* experience, the awareness of ‘I am pure Soul’ that has been established and thereafter, all the activity of Seeing that continues to happen; all that is happening through *Pragnya*, isn’t it?

Dadashri: All the work is of *Pragnya shakti*.

Questioner: Then it means that Seeing through *Gnankriya* (the activity of Knowing by remaining as the Self) is far beyond that?

Dadashri: That is it, right now the activity of Knowing (*Gnankriya*) is that of *Pragnya shakti* itself. That true *Gnankriya* will occur when all these files have been settled.

Questioner: I read in an *Aptavani* that, that which knows the impure (*ashuddha*), the inauspicious (*ashubha*) and the auspicious (*shubha*) activities (**GP10**) is intellectual activity (*buddhi kriya*), and that which Knows only the pure (*shuddha*) is *Gnankriya*. That is why I thought that *Pragnya* sees everything.

Dadashri: Yes, through *Pragnya*. It is *Pragnya* up to a certain limit; it is there for as long as these files are being settled. Once the files have been settled, the Self itself is the Knower.

Questioner: So, this *Pragnya* is there to help One reach the gates of *moksha*?

Dadashri: Not till the gate, it takes one all the way to dwell in *moksha*. Yes, the one that helps You attain the absolute state (*purmahuti*) is *Pragnya*.

Questioner: Does *Pragnya shakti* come back after One goes to *moksha*?

Dadashri: No, that *shakti* (energy) remains only until it takes One to *moksha* [understand this to be ‘until one attains absolute Knowledge’ (*keval Gnan*)].

That Which Always Keeps the Separation is Pragnya!

Questioner: It is *Pragnya* that ensures that ‘we’ do not become one [with the non-Self complex], isn’t it?

Dadashri: Yes, *Pragnya* maintains the separation in exactness, You have been given the very Knowledge of not becoming one (*ekakar*) with the non-self complex. *Pragnya* cautions You. It cautions You at the time a mistake happens, that is all.

Questioner: How does it tell Us, ‘You have to be careful’?

Dadashri: Remain aware. Do not become one with that one [Chandubhai].

Questioner: Yes, One does not become one with the *vishesh bhaav* (extra intent of ‘I am Chandubhai’). Does that not become the activity of the Self, Dada?

Dadashri: It is not considered the activity of the [absolute] Self at all in anything.

Questioner: Is the activity of cautioning (*chetavani*) an activity of the Self or not?

Dadashri: Cautioning is actually a natural activity.

Questioner: Isn’t it of *Pragnya*? Is it of the Self or of *Pragnya*?

Dadashri: It is of *Pragnya*. It is all one and the same. In fact, there is nothing else in this. Do we not say, ‘be aware’? Maintain *upayog* (applied awareness). *Upayog* means to ‘be aware’.

Questioner: Who is it the one that becomes engrossed (*tanmayakar*)?

Dadashri: Yes, that is in fact *agnya shakti*, and the one that does not allow you to become engrossed is *Pragnya shakti*.

Questioner: Having become the pure Soul (*Shuddhatma*), only Seeing is in Our control, is it not?

Dadashri: All the energy of understanding, of Seeing is of *Pragnya*. The energy of the pure Soul that arises is *Pragnya shakti*. And the energy of the ego is *agnya shakti*, which is in the form of intellect. It shows both, profit-loss wherever it goes. It shows profit-loss even whilst sitting in a bus. It shows profit-loss even when you sit down to eat.

Questioner: When you explain things to us, whom does it reach? Is it the body or the Self?

Dadashri: The Self, of-course! But which Self? Not the Self that is the pure Soul; the *satsang* (spiritual discourse) continues with the energy known as *Pragnya*. It reaches, not the body, but to the energy that lies between the body and the Self. It is only the *Pragnya shakti* that understands this. *Pragnya shakti* catches (comprehends) whatever is being explained here.

That Which Cautions Within is Indeed the Experience of the Self!

That which cautions You all day long, is *Pragnya* indeed. It constantly keeps separating (the Self and the non-Self). So much experience, the experience of the entire day, it keeps Us completely separate, does it not?

Questioner: That is correct.

Dadashri: It does not allow Us to become one.

Questioner: The experience of the Self began from the moment *Pragnya* arose, did it not?

Dadashri: The experience of the Self definitely happens [in the Gnan Vidhi]. Only then can it caution You, otherwise the attentive awareness (*laksha*) of ‘I am pure Soul’ would not remain at all. Whereas here, it constantly remains in Your attentive awareness and the *jagruti* (awakened awareness) also remains constantly. That light continues to shine indeed, but what can it do if You drift off to some other place? And that light is constantly present if You follow the *Agnas*. If One understands such a science [*Akram Vignan*] in its entirety, then it will be worth it! Does it caution You from within? It cautions You the moment You deviate in some way.

Questioner: Yes, it cautions immediately from within. Such is my experience!

Dadashri: Now, in the cautioning that happens, do You not feel that despite no activity on your part, it continues to happen in this way? It cautions You with every mistake that happens, does it not! Wherever the fault (*dosh*) happens, it cautions You, does it not! What is that? It is *Pragnya*. It cautions You in this way the moment a fault happens. Hence, this science is a live science (*Chetan Vignan*; the science of the Self). And where there is scriptural knowledge (*shastragnan*), one has to ‘do’ everything. You have to ‘do’ whatever is written in the scriptures (*shastra*), whereas in this, You do not have to ‘do’ anything. It happens by itself, does it not!

Questioner: Now, this *Pragnya* keeps cautioning, I do experience that for sure, but at the same time my own *Purusharth* (real spiritual effort to progress as the Self) has to be there also, does it not?

Dadashri: What *Purusharth*?

Questioner: With the help of *Pragnya*, I recognize that, ‘This wrong has occurred,’ so then should it not be cleared off by doing *pratikraman*?

Dadashri: The *purusharth* (effort) of *pratikraman* is always there. *Pratikraman* is indeed happening. For the one who does *atikraman* (aggression towards other living beings through thought, speech or action), the effort of *pratikraman* constantly keeps happening. The *Purush* (the Self) indeed continues to perform the function as the Self (*Purusharth dharma*).

Pratikraman does indeed happen automatically. It continues happening naturally and spontaneously, and if it does not happen, then ‘he’ (Chandubhai) should do it. There is nothing to ‘do’ in this, one just has to have the inner intent (*bhaav*). Where there is lack of awareness as the Self (*ajagruti*), there You must remain aware now.

Who Makes one go Against What Pragnya Shows?

Questioner: When *Pragnya* cautions, yet one is not able to follow it; who makes one go against what It shows?

Dadashri: When things do not happen in accordance to what It shows, it’s indeed because you yourself have created such obstacles (*antaray*). So even if it is what You desire, it will not happen.

Questioner: What is the solution to all the obstacles that have been created?

Dadashri: That which has happened [the obstacle that occurred now], is the effect of that obstacle [bound in the past]. You have no choice but to suffer the obstruction; and new ones should not be created.

Pragnya and the Divine Vision!

Questioner: I keep perceiving the results (*parinaam*) of the emerging anger-pride-deceit-greed (*krodh-maan-maya-lobh*) and sexuality (*vishay*) that arises within me through the divine Vision (*divyachakshu*) ‘you’ have bestowed. Is that divine Vision indeed *Pragnya shakti*?

Dadashri: This is Seen only through *Pragnya shakti*. Whereas the divine Vision does only one thing, that of Seeing the pure Soul (*Shuddhatma*) in others. Otherwise, all these other things, all the results of anger-pride-deceit-greed and sexuality that are Seen within, that is all the function of *Pragnya shakti*. *Pragnya shakti* works for as long as the effects of worldly life remain to be settled.

Hence, the divine Vision does only one thing, that is all. These physical eyes show the relative, and the divine eyes (*divyachakshu*) shows the real. The divine Vision does not do any other work at all.

Who Cautions the Ignorant One?

Questioner: Many times, after I have done something wrong, I feel, ‘This should not happen.’ Who feels that way? Does the ego feel that way or does it actually happen to the Self?

Dadashri: The feeling of, ‘This should not happen,’ does not happen to the Self. It happens to the *Pragnya shakti* that is within; therefore the opinion has changed that, ‘this should not happen.’ The ego says, ‘This should happen,’ and *Pragnya* says, ‘This should not happen.’ Both differ in their opinions. One is headed towards the East and the other towards the West.

Questioner: Now, the one who has not attained Self-realization, he also feels that, ‘I should not be doing such work.’ So does he also have some level of his own honesty (*pramanikta*)?

Dadashri: It is the knowledge (*gnan*) he has learnt that informs him, but that knowledge does not produce results, it is not *kriyakari* (such that it procures results on its own from within).

Questioner: Yes. That is why I wanted to know that, how does it work?

Dadashri: That *gnan* (knowledge) does not grow. It is *shushka gnan* (knowledge which does not produce any spiritual results), whereas *Vignan* (Science, absolute Knowledge) grows. This is called *Vignan*.

Who Feels Remorse?

Now that You have realized the Self, what else is left for You to Know? You have Known the Self that, this part is the Self and this is not. It is not the Self at the time of settling with equanimity.

Questioner: Is it the Self or Chandubhai that is settling with equanimity?

Dadashri: It is *Pragnya shakti*. The Self actually does not have to ‘do’ anything. When Chandubhai becomes upset, when he becomes difficult, You do not like it, [You feel], ‘Why is this so?’ This is the Self, and that other is Chandubhai.

Questioner: The one who feels remorse after getting angry, is that a property (*guna*) of *jada* (inanimate matter, the non-Self) or of *Chetan* (the Self)?

Dadashri: It is neither the property of *jada* nor of *Chetan*. It is the inherent nature (*swabhav*) of *Pragnya*. *Jada* or *Chetan* do not have such properties. They do not have such a property of getting angry.

Questioner: This remorse that is felt, who makes it happen?

Dadashri: *Pragnya* makes You do all that.

Questioner: Who makes One do *pratikraman*?

Dadashri: *Pragnya* makes You do all that.

If the mistakes begin to be Seen, then One can become God. How does One start Seeing mistakes? It is actually through Our *Pragnya shakti*. The *Pragnya shakti* that was residing in the

Self; all the mistakes are Seen through it and it shows You the mistakes so You immediately bring about ultimate closure (*nivedo*) to it. ‘You’ say, “Brother, do *pratikraman*.”

When *Pragnya shakti* shows the ‘stains’, You say, “Wash it off. Wash this one off. Wash this stain off.” So he [Chandulal] washes away all the stains. When *pratikraman* is done, it is cleansed.

Questioner: Who is the Seer of all the past mistakes that are Seen in the *samayik* (introspection) that we do on the *Akram* (step-less path to Self-realization) path? Is it the Self or *Pragnya*?

Dadashri: *Pragnya*, the energy of the Self. As long as the Self is doing work in the worldly life, it is called *Pragnya*. The original Self (*muda Atma*) does not do anything Itself.

Questioner: Many times, ‘you’ make us sit in *samayik* and tell us to recite the *Trimantra*. ‘You’ tell us to ‘read’ [visualize in the mind], ‘*Namo Arihantanam*.’ So is it the Self that is reading at that time? And when we read a book in *satsang*, when we read the *Aptavani*, the pure *chit* is doing the reading whereas that other, is read by the Self; so are the two the same?

Dadashri: The Self is the main reader is of a different kind. The significance (*bhaavarth*) for mentioning it to be of the Self is to put You on the [right] path; ‘we’ mean to say that it is not the sense organs (*indriya*) at work here. But this original Self (*muda Atma*) ‘Knows’ what one’s own intellect is doing, what the mind is doing; It Knows all of them. That too, in reality it is not the original Self, it is *Pragnya*. It is considered as the energy of the original Self. Therefore, it Knows everything. It is true that it Knows, but this [point about *Pragnya* being the Knower] cannot be considered wrong. There are no sense organs here. Similarly, that original Self is also not complete either. ‘We’ say this just to get You on the path, therefore this is considered relative-real!

Thoughts and Pragnya are Completely Separate!

Questioner: Now, when a thought comes, how can one distinguish whether it arose from *Pragnya shakti* or whether it came to Chandubhai?

Dadashri: No, not a single thought is of *Pragnya shakti*. Thoughts are discharge, they all come to leave. Thought is a discharge. They are of the *pratisthit atma* (the relative self), and they are of Chandubhai. *Pragnya shakti* just Sees, ‘What thoughts have come!’ It Sees whether good thoughts came or bad thoughts came. It does not delve deeper into them. Hence thoughts become *gneya* (that which is to be known). For *Pragnya shakti*, they are in the form of an object to be known (*gneya swaroop*). *Gneya* means that which is to be known, and *drashya* means that which is to be seen. Thoughts are *gneya* and *drashya*, and You are now the *Gnata* (Knower) and *Drashta* (Seer).

Questioner: ‘You’ have said that even the mind shows us just like a radar. So right now, how can I differentiate whether it is the mind showing or *Pragnya* showing?

Dadashri: Forget about right now! There is only *Pragnya* after ‘we’ give You the *Gnan*. That which frees You from all the thoughts and takes You towards *moksha* is known as *Pragnya*! And the energy known as *agnya* which existed previously, the one that worked through the mind and through the intellect, takes you deeper into worldly life (*sansaar*). So, at present You have the energy known as *Pragnya*, so it takes You towards this side [*moksha*]. The thoughts that are of the mind are not the work of *Pragnya*. Do thoughts come or not?

Questioner: They come. I keep Seeing them with the view as the Knower-Seer.

Dadashri: Keep Seeing them, that is all. The One who Sees the mind has conquered the mind and has conquered the world. This is indeed how Lord Mahavir had conquered the world. So thoughts are actually the work of the mind. They will come, You (the Self) have to keep Seeing them. Thoughts are not of *Pragnya*.

Questioner: Is there any inspiration (*prerna*) from *Pragnya* in this?

Dadashri: No. The mind shows a thought and we understand them in our own 'language'. *Pragnya* cannot have thoughts at all. What is a thought? Thought (*vichaar*) means *vikalp* (the false notion of 'I am Chandubhai') and *nirvichaar* (Seer of thoughts) means *nirvikalp* (free from the belief of 'I am Chandubhai'; with the right belief of 'I am pure Soul'). 'You' actually have the state with the right belief of 'I am pure Soul'. Therefore You have to See whatever thought that comes to mind, that is all. And *Pragnya* shows that.

How can the Seer get Tired?

Questioner: Is *Pragnya* the Seer of the mind-speech-body (*mun-vachan-kaya*)?

Dadashri: Yes.

Questioner: Upon seeing the mind-speech-body all day long, there is a feeling of exhaustion, so who is the one that gets tired?

Dadashri: That exhaustion is the wrong effects that are felt in the mind; that effect verily gets tired, no one else is getting tired. 'He' can never get tired! The Seer cannot get tired. The one who works gets tired.

Questioner: The Seer is the *Pragnya* (the direct liberating light of the Self), isn't it?

Dadashri: It is indeed *Pragnya*; it is indeed *Pragnya* that is working right now! As long as all these interferences exist, *Pragnya* will play a role. Thereafter, when there is no interference, the Self prevails.

Questioner: But Dada, I do feel exhausted. Many times I feel, 'When will all this stop?' So I would feel that way only when there is exhaustion, won't I? If One is natural (*sahaj*) then this would not happen, would it?

Dadashri: You feel exhausted but that too it appears that way. 'You' cannot feel tired at all! The Seer cannot feel tired. The one who works [the doer] may feel the exhaustion. Exhaustion cannot touch the Seer at all. This is because of his previous familiarity of getting tired so he feels, 'I am exhausted.'

Questioner: 'Why does the mind do this?' 'Why did the speech come out like this?' Such opinions may be arising within, maybe that's one reason why one feels exhausted.

Dadashri: Opinions. Yes, all such things do happen.

The Separated Pure Chit is Indeed *Pragnya*!

Agya (the energy that takes one deeper in worldly life) shows within the ways for profit-loss. It gives rise to dualities.

Questioner: You just said, “It gives rise to dualities.” Now the speech, “Gives rise to,” that came out, what part is it that?

Dadashri: That is just the words that are spoken.

Questioner: But is it the gross (*sthool*) mind that says these words?

Dadashri: No, they arise due to the intellect (*buddhi*). ‘To arise’ does not mean like when a man stands up. They arise through the intellect.

Questioner: Yes. But the description ‘you’ just gave is exact, is it not? ‘You’ can See that they are arising and ‘you’ are telling us so.

Dadashri: Yes, even though ‘we’ See and tell, but others cannot see this! Hence, it is for them that ‘we’ have to say, “They are arising” or “This is how they arise.” That [raising dualities, profit-loss] is not the mind; that is not the function of the mind.

Questioner: So, what is the part that is Seeing?

Dadashri: That part is *Pragnya*, it is the main part of the Self. Everything can be Seen [through it]. *Pragnya* has arisen within You, but it will not work fully as long as You do not attain the *niralumb* (absolutely independent) state. It is still wandering within the *karmic* tubers (*ganth*), is it not? In fact when these *karmic* tubers (*granthi*) are destroyed, the work will move ahead. The mind can never show any such thing.

Questioner: Now, do we have to call it *Pragnya* because it is describing this, because it is coming up to the layer of description?

Dadashri: Yes, that itself is *Pragnya*, and that is a part of the Self. Hence, the *chit* (inner faculty comprised of knowledge and vision) that was becoming impure, that which has separated from the Self, that itself works as *Pragnya* after becoming pure. Only then can one speak after Seeing, otherwise it is not possible to speak after Seeing! And when one speaks after Seeing, there is no liability.

Questioner: For the one who speaks after Seeing, even if he wants to hide it, cover it up or twist it, he cannot do so!

Dadashri: No, he cannot speak thus. How can he say this? He has to say it as it is! Otherwise, on the outside, it will create a problem, will it not? Instead of speaking as I See it, if I try to do something else, then the people will understand that this is something else, this is not what it is. They may not know how to say it, but they would know how to understand that, ‘He has spoken after Seeing, whereas this is being said without Seeing.’

The Difference Between the Two is like Sky and Earth!

Questioner: Dada, what is the difference between common intellect (*samanya buddhi*) and *Pragnya*?

Dadashri: Common intellect means commonsense. It always helps you with solutions in worldly life. It opens all the locks of worldly life, but it cannot open a single lock of *moksha*. *Pragnya* does not arise without the attainment of *Atmagnan* (the Knowledge of the Self), or else *Pragnya* begins upon attaining *samkit* (the right belief of ‘I am pure Soul’). How does *Pragnya* begin upon the attainment of *samkit*? It begins like the second day of the moon (*beej na chandra*), and here [during *Akram Gnan Vidhi*] full *Pragnya* arises. Thereafter, this *Pragnya* cautions You

in order to take You to *moksha*. Who keeps cautioning You again and again? *Pragnya* does. King Bharat [Lord Rushabhdev's son] had to employ people to caution him, he had servants who would call out every fifteen minutes, "Bharat beware, beware." They would speak thus four times. Look, You do not have anyone else to caution You and that is why You have *Pragnya* that cautions You from within.

This *agnya shakti* (the energy of ignorance) that constantly keeps clashing within this body, has left 'us' a long time ago after taking a pension [retired]. There is no shouting or screaming [anymore]. There are no complaints from that side at all; there is no insistence from that side at all! It is indeed that *agnya shakti* that has made one wander around in worldly life.

'We' sit here having become *abuddha* (free from intellect). Someone may ask, "Do you have a lot of intellect?" So, 'we' would tell him, "No, 'we' are *abuddha*." He may say, "You call yourself *abuddha*?" So 'we' would say, "Yes, 'we' really are *abuddha*." If the intellect existed, then it would show profit and loss, would it not!

'We' are *abuddha*, there is no problem at all, is there? 'We' consider profit as a loss, and loss as a profit. Moreover *Vyavasthit* is such that it does not change for those with intellect nor does it change for those without intellect. Otherwise, even 'we' would not have let go of the intellect, had 'we' not Known *Vyavasthit* (result of Scientific Circumstantial Evidences). If 'we' did not Know *vyavasthit*, then even 'we' would not have become *abuddha* (free from intellect). But 'we' Know that, 'It is *Vyavasthit*,' so then where is the externally induced suffering (*upadhi*) or complications (*bhanjgad*)? That is why 'we' have also told you, "It is *Vyavasthit*." So, it will be fine if you don't use the intellect as you will become *abuddha*. It was when the intellect (*buddhi*) went away from me, that 'I' understood everything that, 'What kind of falsity (*pol*) is going on.'

Beware Against Listening to the Intellect!

Questioner: When there is interference from the intellect, I am aware that, 'This intellect has interfered.' Who lets me know that? Is it the pure Soul or *Pragnya shakti* that lets me know that?

Dadashri: The pure Soul (*Shuddhatma*) does not do any work at all. It is indeed *Pragnya shakti* that shows You. Instead of the pure Soul, as its representative, it is indeed *Pragnya shakti* that does the work, and it informs You of everything. Moreover, if You are going away from the Self, it (*Pragnya*) brings You back towards the Self. The intellect is called *agnya*. *Agnya's* work is to ensure that You do not go off to *moksha*, so it keeps pulling you back right here. The duel is between *agnya* and *Pragnya*, and if You blend with *agnya*, then that's it; *agnya's* work is done, it will become happy. So, *Pragnya* then gets tired. What can be done when the main 'boss' blends in [on the side of *agnya*]!

Questioner: Dada, for how long will the intellect interfere in this way?

Dadashri: For as long as it is deemed to be valuable. Say there is a crazy man living in the neighborhood who comes around cursing you a few times every day. So, when he comes around to curse you, you know that the crazy man has come. So, you would just continue to drink your tea while he continues to curse. Similarly, let the intellect come and leave; You should remain in Your state [as the Self]. Everything else that exists is in fact *puran-galan* (filling in-emptying out of inanimate matter). It will remain separate even if You do not say anything, and it will not refrain from coming even if You say anything.

Questioner: Are you saying that I should not listen to the intellect when it is interfering?

Dadashri: It is very good if You do not listen to her [the intellect]. But you cannot refrain from listening to her, can you? Even if ‘we’ tell you not to listen to her, yet you will not refrain from doing so, will you? There is no need for the intellect if You want to go to *moksha*. The intellect is necessary if you want to wander around in worldly life. If one has not read all such things and the paper is blank, then for him it will be, ‘This is Chandubhai and this is I,’ that is all, that is good. So all this is discharge.

Questioner: Dada, despite knowing that this intellect (*buddhi*) is interfering, yet we listen to her; what can we consider as having happened in this case?

Dadashri: That is because you still have interest in listening to what the intellect says, but even then *Pragnya shakti* will definitely pull You to that side [of the Self].

Questioner: I recognize that the *buddhi* is interfering yet I continue to listen to it; is that not considered as obstinacy (*aadai*)?

Dadashri: There is nothing wrong if you keep listening to her but you do not put it into practice. Otherwise, You should just keep Seeing what the *buddhi* keeps on doing! There is no problem if You remain in Your inherent nature [as the Self]. You have a lot of *buddhi*, but there will not be any problem because You have attained grace (*krupa*) of Dada.

Questioner: Dada, my *buddhi* is very active but then I pacify it a little. I do not listen to her anymore.

Dadashri: You should not let it affect you. It was only when the *buddhi* went away from ‘us’ that all the problems came to an end! Independent (*swatantra*), no one can interfere at all, thereafter!

Pragnya is Independent From the Intellect!

Pragnya is a property (*guna*) of the original Self, and after the complete division of these two [elements; the Self and inanimate matter], after they become completely separate; it fits back into the Self once again. Until then, it separates from the Self to help take One to *moksha*.

Questioner: Does the unfolding of *Pragnya* occur when total separation happens and then this worldly intellect (*laukik buddhi*) goes away?

Dadashri: After the separation happens, the *buddhi* comes to an end. The experience of *Pragnya* has indeed already begun from the start, even if complete separation has not occurred. And the very meaning of the establishment of *pratiti* (conviction) is that *Pragnya* has already begun on one side. The *buddhi* remains in its place and *Pragnya* manifests.

Pragnya Only has the Activity of Knowing!

Questioner: This state of *Pragnya* that comes about later, is that considered *Gnan*?

Dadashri: No, *Pragnya* is indeed a form of *Gnan*, it is a part of that indeed. But as long as this body exists, it is considered as *Pragnya*, and all the work is also done by *Pragnya*. And when the body is not there, it is considered as the Self.

Questioner: As the Self does not do anything, is that why *Pragnya* does everything as the agent of the Self?

Dadashri: Yes, but not as a doer, it carries out *Gnankriya* (the activity of Knowing by remaining as the Self).

Pragnya is Above Buddhi; Above Both is Vignan!

Questioner: Is *agnya shakti* (the energy of ignorance) the same as *buddhi* (the intellect)?

Dadashri: Yes, that is the intellect itself. But that energy manifests after the intellect and the ego come together. We call it intellect when it is by itself, and *Pragnya* means *Gnan* (Knowledge). When the Self and all other circumstances come together, *Pragnya shakti* (direct liberating energy of the Self) arises.

Questioner: Is *Pragnya* a much higher thing than the intellect?

Dadashri: Yes, it is higher than the intellect, but *Vignan* [Science of spiritual Knowledge] is much higher than *Pragnya*. The science (*vignan*) that you believe in, is intellectual science (*buddhi nu vignan*). So, are you talking about the science that is currently out there? You have understood the meaning of that science in your own language (interpretation). Are you referring to ‘*vignan*’ in the same context as how ‘*vignan*’ is considered in worldly terms? That is the worldly science (*bhautik vignan*) whereas ‘we’ are talking about spiritual Science (*adhyatma Vignan*).

Questioner: Ordinarily, people refer to that [worldly] science as science itself.

Dadashri: But I do not call that [worldly] science as science. The Science (*Vignan*) that I am talking about is a stage much higher than *Pragnya*. It is where there is no need for the intellect at all. *Pragnya* arises when the intellect has begun to come to an end.

The Support of the Intellect in Spirituality!

Questioner: How long is there support from the intellect (*buddhi*)? For how long is the intellect beneficial in spirituality?

Dadashri: The intellect takes you upto a certain point only in spirituality, but it does not let you to go towards liberation (*moksha*).

Questioner: Yes, but upto what spiritual stage does it take one?

Dadashri: Only upto some stage of understanding. Beyond understanding, when the pull is towards liberation, it does not go in that direction. It will immediately pull one towards this side, it pulls one towards worldly life (*sansaar*) again. The moment One feels pulled towards liberation, the intellect will immediately pull Him towards worldly life. Therefore, the intellect is only useful for us to understand spirituality.

Questioner: But is it not helpful in taking one towards *moksha*?

Dadashri: That will not do at all! The intellect will not be useful at all; on the contrary that intellect will lead him astray. On the contrary, it will teach him the wrong things.

Questioner: If any person comes to Dada, he will first have to understand this Knowledge of Dada’s through his intellect, will he not? After attaining Dada’s *Gnan*, does the point about the intellect become history?

Dadashri: After that, the control of intellect just stops. Thereafter, *Pragnya* (liberating energy and the light of the Self) takes the control. It is the inherent nature of *Pragnya* to continuously keep cautioning You, just in order to take You to liberation (*moksha*).

The one who comes here to understand spirituality, does not understand through the intellect. No one can understand through the intellect from ‘me’ (*Gnani Purush*) at all. This is because the speech (*vani*) that comes forth touches the Soul (Self) after breaking the veils of ignorance (*avarana*) and then You yourself understand. Otherwise, the intellect cannot even analyze whatever ‘I’ speak. On the contrary, the intellect gets tired. The intellect ends up harassing You. Do not use that intellect in this at all. There is no need remaining for it at all.

These words that ‘I’ speak are words that pierce through the veils of ignorance. So these words reach the person’s Soul (*Atma*) after piercing through the veils of ignorance, and what ‘I’ say is that, “Accept them only if your Soul accepts them.” And your Soul accepts this. So now the intellect remains far away from this.

Questioner: So after taking Dada’s *Gnan*, when *mahatmas* (those who are Self-realized through the *Gnan Vidhi*) feel like coming to Dada again and again; is that through *Pragnya* or the intellect?

Dadashri: It is not the function of either the intellect or *Pragnya*. The functions of *Pragnya* and the intellect are different. *Pragnya* plays a certain role. Secondly, that which brings one here, all that is a part of his merit *karma* (*punyai*)!

Questioner: Yes, that is correct but again it will happen only if *Pragnya* is functioning, isn’t it?

Dadashri: Meaning that if *Pragnya* is playing that role, then all the *mahatmas* should come here, shouldn’t they? However, not everyone can. Do they not say, “My merit *karma* (*punyai*) is falling a little short these days?” If only *Pragnya* were responsible for this, then everyone ought to be able to come, oughtn’t they?

That Which Runs Worldly Life is the Intellect!

Questioner: Whatever intellect we use to run our worldly life, is all considered as *agnya*, is it not?

Dadashri: That is all *agnya*.

Questioner: Dada, in this tug-of-war that takes place between *agnya* and *Pragnya*, only the *Pragnya* of those who have tremendous merit *karma* (*punyashadi*) will win, isn’t it?

Dadashri: No. Now only *Pragnya* wins because the Knowledge that has been given by Dada breaks the intellect’s ‘legs’ completely. Meaning that it cripples the intellect. And *Pragnya* is strong, it cautions one repeatedly, that point is certain, isn’t it?

And people ask ‘me’, “Dada, will I experience the Self?” ‘I’ tell them, “It is happening every day, what other experience do You want? It happens when ‘we’ give you a little ‘beating’, doesn’t it? Should we ‘beat’ you on the back?”

Questioner: Even with broken legs, the *agnya* keeps working very forcefully.

Dadashri: Yes, that is indeed how the work of a crippled one is. It jumps around a lot more. ‘You’ should tell her, “Be quiet and settle down, now that you have become crippled. You have obliged us for a long time, now sit down. You’ve done enough.”

Questioner: Dada, when these matters that need settling, the thoughts and all that arise, I experience suffocation. At that time, is it *agnya* that is jumping around?

Dadashri: *Agya* definitely jumps around!

Questioner: Is that why suffocation arises?

Dadashri: No, it's not possible for this to happen through *agnya* alone. Even the mind will jump around, if such things happen. For the most part, it is indeed the intellect that makes one jump around.

Questioner: Is *jignyasa* (inquisitiveness; curiosity) considered a part of *Pragnya*, or of *buddhi*?

Dadashri: Of the *buddhi*. It can never be *Pragnya*, can it! One is considered to have become a *Gnani* if *Pragnya* arises. But what is the *buddhi* of a *jignyasa* (seeker) like? It is wise intellect, developed intellect; it is right intellect (*samyak buddhi*)!

Are Samyak Buddhi and Pragnya One and the Same?

However many hours are spent [with the *Gnani*] the intellect (*buddhi*) becomes right (*samyak*); however *Pragnya* cannot arise. It cannot arise without the Knowledge of the Self (*Gnan*). The state that is referred to as *sthitPragnya*, is a state where at a certain time, the level of *gnan* (knowledge) reaches so high that one sees the light. That is on the *Kramic* path (step-by-step path to Self-realization). And here [on the *Akram* path], *Pragnya* arises the moment 'we' give you the Knowledge of the Self. Even if one has not attained the *Gnan*, he attains the right intellect (*samyak buddhi*) by just sitting here with 'us'.

Pragnya is the direct light [of the Self] and *samyak buddhi* is an indirect light. Therefore, *Pragnya* is directly a part of the Self only. That *samyak buddhi* is not like that. Nevertheless, it too will have to be settled ultimately (*nivedo*).

Questioner: But *samyak buddhi* is beneficial, is it not?

Dadashri: It is beneficial as long as one has not reached the 'station' [the Knowledge of the Self]. Once having reached the 'station', it is not helpful for proceeding forward.

Questioner: But after attaining *Gnan*, *samyak buddhi* does not remain or does it?

Dadashri: After attaining *Gnan*, *Pragnya* arises. Thereafter, *Pragnya* helps You to settle it [intellect] with equanimity. Hence, there is a tremendous difference between *samyak buddhi* and *Pragnya*! *Samyak buddhi* is considered as just intellect, whereas *Pragnya* is a part of a permanent element [the Self], of one kind.

Questioner: Can *samyak buddhi* be considered *paudgalik* (of the non-Self complex that fills in and empties out)? That is also one part, is it not?

Dadashri: It cannot be considered a part of the *pudgal* (inanimate matter), because *pudgal* does not have any light (*prakash*). However dim this light is, but it is light after all! But it is neither of *Chetan* (the Self) nor of *pudgal*.

However, the scriptures have called it *Chetan*, but there is no *Chetan* in it. If you call this [intellect] *Chetan*, then that other (real) *Chetan* [*pragnya*; the Self], will not be found. Now, it has been written this way with a relative perspective (*sapeksha bhaav*). People cannot understand the relative perspective. People do not have the capacity to understand to this level. 'I' can understand that it has been written from the relative perspective.

There is a Sense of Ownership in Samyak Buddhi!

Questioner: What is the main difference between *samyak buddhi* and *Pragnya*?

Dadashri: That *buddhi* means *buddhi*. As long as the *buddhi* (intellect) exists, its' owner is there. *Buddhi* comes with a sense of ownership (*malikipana*). *Pragnya* does not have any owner. Even if it is wrong intellect (*viparit buddhi*), it has an owner. Even if it is right intellect (*samyak buddhi*), it has an owner.

Questioner: If one has *samyak buddhi*, that too with an owner, then would that intellect really cause harm or would it show only the right things?

Dadashri: For sure, it will definitely cause harm! There is no telling when the intellect will turn around. There is no telling when the one that is devoted to the right (*samyakta ne bhaje*), will turn and be devoted to the wrong (*viparitata ne bhaje*). And what does *samyak buddhi* mean? *Samyak buddhi* is not present in worldly life. It cannot arise through [reading] books. When one hears the words from the *Gnani Purush*, his *buddhi* becomes right (*samyak*). Yes, thereafter that intellect is not of an attacking nature nor does it do any such thing. No matter what the circumstances, if the intellect does not attack then it is known as right intellect; and the intellect that attacks in every situation is known as wrong intellect.

It is like the attack of the heart, similarly the intellect gets an attack. Would the intellect not get an attack? Chandubhai (File number one) used to be hardheaded, had You not seen that?

Questioner: I have. The attacks used to come, but I could not See them. It wasn't until I came to 'you' and an 'x-ray' was taken that I realized what it is all like within.

Dadashri: Yes, that is true. Only then can one come to Know! Until it is Seen, one would only know the other thing [the non-Self] to be his own [of the Self] and that he is the owner of it. What other difference is there? What's wrong with it? The way it is everywhere, it is the same here. Furthermore, divisions of 'this is bad' and 'this is good' have been made in it. Here [in *Akram*] there is no such thing as right or wrong at all! Here, there are things that take You towards the eternal (*sanatan*). There are things which take You from *mithya* (that which is contrary to One's nature as the Self), towards the eternal; the discussions done here, the worldly interactions (*vyavahar*) done here, all those are things that take You towards the eternal. When You See this, You realize that this is something different; it is not like that other.

Questioner: Doesn't *samyak buddhi* incite one to make mistakes?

Dadashri: It will not incite one to attack.

Questioner: And the awakened awareness (*jagruti*) shows mistakes?

Dadashri: *Jagruti* will actually show everything. It will show anything that comes and goes within, it shows everything. *Jagruti* is actually a part of absolute Knowledge (*keval Gnan*). And as long as *jagruti* has not arisen, the world is sleeping with open eyes.

Questioner: The way *Pragnya* cautions, how does *samyak buddhi* help?

Dadashri: It does similar work, but it is itself destructible (*vinashi*)! Therefore, it cannot give any significant caution.

Questioner: It simply keeps the awareness of that which is beneficial and harmful; that is all.

Dadashri: It is that same intellect, just like how the worldly intellect is. Nevertheless, if you continue to sit with the *Gnani Purush*, that intellect then becomes right (*samyak*). The intellect continues to become right. Otherwise, only *Gnan* (Knowledge) can be *samyak* (right), but this intellect becomes right.

Avyabhicharini buddhi (intellect that binds merit *karma*; intellect that does not take the wrong path) can even make a non-peaceful situation into a peaceful one; it is a stage before *Pragnya* arises.

Sthitpragnya State and Manifest Pragnya!

Questioner: There are the words *Pragnya* and *sthitpragnya*; please explain *sthitpragnya*.

Dadashri: To stabilize oneself in the accurate understanding (*samaj*) of One's true identity is known as *sthit pragnya*.

Questioner: Through the word '*Pragnya*', I am led to the scriptures that, 'If we have acquired the Knowledge that has been given regarding the Self, then *Pragnya* will arise.' However, 'you' just said that *Pragnya* is in fact natural (*swabhaavik*).

Dadashri: That *Pragnya* is natural indeed! This *sthitpragnya* is a different thing.

Questioner: With 'I am Chandubhai,' the ignorant state has happened. And then when I come to 'you' and with 'you' telling me, "You are pure Soul," *sthitpragnya* arises.

Dadashri: Not even *sthitpragnya*; this discussion is beyond [the state of] *sthitpragnya*. *Sthitpragnya* is a state; a state that is close to the manifestation of *Pragnya*. This state comes about when *Pragnya* is almost about to manifest. It is the same state as all the witnessing states (*sakshibhaav*) in the worldly life.

Pragnya arises only after attaining the Self. And the *sthitpragnya* state occurs before becoming the Self; where the worldly interactions [are conducted] with egoism. However, the worldly interactions are very beautiful.

Questioner: On the *Kramic* path, they refer to *Pragnya* as the intellect that has become still (*sthir*) in the Self. So, in our *Akram* path, does *Pragnya* mean the function as the Knower-Seer (*Gnata-Drashtapanu*)?

Dadashri: It is indeed the Self. It is indeed a part of the Self, whereas the one on the outside, that steady intellect is the state of *sthitpragnya*; that is not *Pragnya*. So, it is a state where one's intellect has become still.

When *sthitpragnya* happens, the *agnyashakti* (the energy of intellect and ego) can even take over sometimes. It can also go away with the help of *sthitpragnya*, but in the *sthitpragnya* state, there is also the fear of it [*agnyashakti*] taking over. After *Pragnya shakti* arises, there is no fear.

Questioner: Therefore, does this state of *sthitpragnya* arise when one comes out of the *sthitagnya* (intellect is steady in ignorance) state?

Dadashri: No, it is just the intellect that has become still. *Agnya* (the energy of intellect and ego) is restless (*chanchal*). Hence, those whose intellect has become still, such people are in the *sthitpragnya* state. Otherwise, *Pragnya* is not there at all, it is the *sthitpragnya* state. However, they do refer to it as *Pragnya*, but that is relevant to the *Kramic* path. This *Pragnya* is actually a pure part of the Self that becomes separate.

Questioner: We cannot make divisions of the Self, of *pratishtit atma* (the relative self) and of the original Self (*muda Atma*), can we?

Dadashri: On the contrary, one will get confused. When One has the energy to hold and retain everything, then One can Know everything by its divisions. That much awareness is necessary, is it not! Attentive awareness (*laksha*) should be maintained from all sides. ‘We’ know every fraction of It.

Questioner: Can you please explain this *sthitpragny* in greater detail?

Dadashri: When a human being studies the scriptures a lot, serves the saints, works very hard in his business and yet incurs a loss, he rises through all kinds of experiences, then as he wanders ahead when his intellect becomes still, that is when it is called *sthitpragny*. His intellect becomes still. It does not get affected no matter from which side the wind blows. When the intellect becomes still like that, it is called *sthitpragny*.

The *sthitpragny* state is a state of awakened awareness of extreme right discretion (*sadvivek*). One progresses higher as he goes through various experiences. The state of King Janakvidehi was even higher than that of *sthitpragny*.

Pragnyashakti is much higher than the *sthitpragny* state. In the *sthitpragny* state, the worldly interactions are ideal. Secondly, if there is no such thing that would invoke criticism by others, then such a person can consider his state to be one of *sthitpragny*. But this *Pragnya*, it will indeed take one to *moksha*, whereas the one in a *sthitpragny* state will still need a path ahead to attain *moksha*.

The State of Akram is Indeed Very Elevated!

Questioner: So, is the *sthitpragny* state, a state before *Pragnya*?

Dadashri: It is a state before *Pragnya*, but people have elevated it (*sthitpragny*) to a much higher level. *Sthitpragny* is actually a lower state. *Pragnya* arises thereafter. First, the *sthitpragny* state gradually arises; thereafter *Pragnya* arises.

Questioner: Then a question arises for me that, *sthitpragny* means to become still in *Pragnya* after developing it; so is *sthitpragny* is a state after *Pragnya*?

Dadashri: No, it is not a state after that. It is actually a state before *Pragnya*. When one attains the *sthitpragny* state, it means that one has become still for sure. This *sthitpragny* means that *Pragnya* arises fractionally at a time and one becomes still in it. Whereas when ‘we’ give *Gnan* here, at that time *Pragnya* indeed arises in completeness (*sarvanshe*).

In opposition to the *sthitpragny* state, there is the *sthitagny* state (where the intellect is steady in ignorance). ‘I am Chandubhai, I am his maternal uncle, I am his paternal uncle,’ these are all *sthitagny* states. If *agnya* (energy of ignorance) leaves and *Pragnya* arises, then there is no pain in *Pragnya* because One becomes the sufferer (*bhogi*; enjoyer) of His own eternal bliss (*sanatan sukh*).

Questioner: Is this the same state as the *sthitpragny* state that has been referred in the Gita?

Dadashri: This state (*Pragnya shakti*) is much higher than that of *sthitpragny*.

Questioner: Higher than that?

Dadashri: It is a much higher state in fact. It is a wonderful state! It is the same state that Lord Krishna had. This is actually the state of *kshayak samkit* (permanent conviction of the right belief, 'I am pure Soul'). Lord Krishna had *kshayak samyaktva* (permanent right Vision; permanent right belief of 'I am pure Soul'), meaning that the *mithyatva drashti* (illusory vision; wrong belief of, 'I am Krishna') had entirely gone away.

Samyak drashti (right vision/belief of 'I am pure Soul') means the vision that is entirely that of the Self only, had arisen. Hence, this is a very elevated state. Those with a *sthitpragny* state are in a much lower position than this, but people have not really understood *sthitpragny*.

They have not even attained the *sthitpragny* state. What do people think the *sthitpragny* state is? They feel, 'I am the Soul,' and they are able to remain steady in that for a short while and thereafter they move away from that state, that is *sthitpragny*. One tries to become still in *Pragnya* and then he moves away from that state. He cannot prevail in that state constantly, can he! He cannot grasp the entire science, can he? This is because, even after learning the four *Vedas*, the *Vedas* themselves say, "This is not that, this is not that." If this is not that, then what is it? They will tell you, "Go to a *Gnani*." Because, how can you put in words that which is inexpressible (*avaktavya*) and indescribable (*avarnaniya*)? How can the Self (Soul) be put in words? That is why it is considered inexpressible and indescribable.

The One That Does Not Eat-Drink-Speak is the Self!

Questioner: What is the language of a *sthitpragny*? What does he eat and drink?

Dadashri: This *sthitpragny* is a higher state, it has a higher language; yet just look, one even says wrong things about it! What does he eat? What has eating and drinking got to do with this state? Because the eater (*khanaar*) is completely separate. The eater is completely separate from the one who wants to become free; the eater is completely separate from the one who is bound. The eater is also separate from the one who desires to be free, so then, what does that one have anything to do with the eater? Who would disclose such subtle and profound talks? Would anyone do so? What do you think? Is he separate or not?

Questioner: He is separate.

Dadashri: The eater is indeed separate. That is why 'we' (the *Gnani Purush*) made the separation. So, there is no problem. 'We' do not have a problem with what you eat. Then, one will ask, "Can we wear clothes?" Wear first class clothes if you want. It is the body that wears them, isn't it! "Can we wear earrings?" Wear even earrings. "Can we wear rings?" Then 'we' say, "Wear them." 'We' would disclose this only after Seeing that they are separate, otherwise 'we' would not say so, would 'we'! This is because this body is completely separate from the One who wants to become free. The one eating, drinking, dressing up, drinking tea, drinking water, sipping away tastefully, stroking the moustache; they are all separate. They are all separate also from the one who is bound. The one who is bound would not do all these things, would he? The bound one knows the 'bond' (*bandh*). The one who knows and experiences the 'bond' is known as the bound one. All these people cannot be called 'bound ones', can they? They do not even know that they are bound. They do not even have the awareness that, 'I am bound.'

The word '*sthitpragny*,' is a word for worldly interaction (*vyavaharik*).

One's intellect (*buddhi*) has become still to such a point that he is not fearful in any difficult situation. It is a part of the intellect. The intellect has reached the level of *sthitpragny* and *Pragnya* has not yet arisen. Every living being has this *agny* (absence of Knowledge of the Self) state.

Upto Ninety-nine it is Sthitpragny, and at Hundred it is Pragnya!

Whereas the *sthitpragny* state that Lord Krishna referred to is a state lower than that of *Pragnya*.

Questioner: Is *sthitpragny* a lower state?

Dadashri: It is a state lower than that of *Pragnya*. *Sthitpragny* state means it is gradually attained through the intellect. Now which intellect (*buddhi*) is that? It is *avyabhicharini buddhi* (virtuous, decent intellect). Lord Krishna has referred to two kinds of intellect. *Vyabhicharini* (adulterous, indecent) and *avyabhicharini*. That virtuous intellect (*avyabhicharini buddhi*) begins to become still (*sthir*); presently it is indeed unsteady (*asthir*). *Asthir* means emotional. It starts to become still, day by day. When it becomes still, then it is just like after 97 percent it moves onto 98, 99 percent, and 100 percent is considered the main thing; that is when completion (*purmahuti*) happens. It is called hundred percent. This *sthitpragny* state is a hundred percent (total) stillness of the intellect, whereas *Pragnya* is the absolute thing, the original element (*muda vastu*) indeed.

Questioner: Please explain [the statement], the *sthitpragny* state is not an experiential state of the Self.

Dadashri: When *Pragnya* becomes complete, that is when the experience of the Self happens. For *sthitpragny*, as long as the adjective '*sthit*' (still) is there, the experience cannot be there. But when the adjective goes away and *Pragnya* remains; that is the state of the experience [of the Self].

The one whose intellect becomes still is considered *sthitpragny*. Such a person, is not moved by effects. And when the adjective goes away, it is known as *Pragnya*, and in that final stage there is the experience of the Self. Till ninety-nine percent it is *sthitpragny*, and when it becomes one hundred percent, it is *Pragnya*.

The Moment Moha is Destroyed, One Becomes Still in the Unchanging!

Questioner: Arjun says, "*Nashto moha, smrutilabdha, sthitosmi* ('I' am now steady, because my illusory attachment is destroyed, and the awareness as the Self has been attained)."

Dadashri: Yes. But, he has become still, has he not?

Questioner: Yes, so what I want to know is how?

Dadashri: For the one in whom the following characteristics (*lakshan*) arise; the one whose *moha* (illusory attachment) is destroyed, that is the sign of it (the intellect) becoming still (*sthir*). The other thing that helped from within is, *smrutilabdha* happened (One became aware of the Self); so that is the second thing that helped. It (the intellect) is becoming still due to all these reasons, and it at least remains somewhat still. From that point on, it is called the *sthitpragny* state; if it can remain still like that. However, he says that his illusory attachment has been destroyed. That is considered an elevated state.

Questioner: Here, ordinarily, everyone's situation is like a spinning top, so even Arjun was a human being indeed and he is saying, "*sthitosmi*." It has been said in there that he tells Lord

Krishna, “Oh infallible One (*achyuta*), I have become still through Your grace.” So is this a contradiction for human beings?

Dadashri: He ceased being the spinning top and came into the Real (the Self); in spite of having the *prakruti*, he came into the Real. This is because his belief in *dehadhyas* (false belief of ‘I am this body’) was that, ‘I am this.’ That belief was completely destroyed. It is because the illusory attachment was destroyed and the belief came into, ‘I am This (the Self).’ This *prakruti* (the non-Self complex) is actually movable (*sachar*) and the original Self (*muda Atma*) is *achar* (unchanging). Therefore, the belief that was in the movable (the non-Self) has gone and the belief has arisen in that which is unchanging (the Self), and so He has become still.

Sthitagny as Long as There is Doubt!

How many mistakes of their own can people see?

Questioner: One cannot see his own mistake if *Pragnya* is absent!

Dadashri: Yes. Yet some people even ask, “Is my state that of *sthitpragny*?” I said, “Why did you have to ask? Do you have any doubt in it?” and “If you have a doubt, then know that yours is the *sthitagny* state.” So, is this not a falsehood regarding the other side! He went to the North. Just because he has not reached the North Pole, does that mean that South Pole is gone?

Questioner: Please explain what *sthitagny* is.

Dadashri: One believes and derives happiness and joy in only that which is *agnan* (the ignorance of the Self). He is firm (*sthit*) in only that. If he becomes restless (*asthir*) in *agnan*, then we can say that he has made progress. What has he made progress in, if he becomes restless in ignorance? He is considered to have advanced towards *Pragnya*.

Beyond the Sthitpragny State!

Questioner: There is something that is way beyond the *sthitpragny* state, please explain that.

Dadashri: *Sthitpragny* is such a state that on the way to *Vaikunth* (a state where all wandering chit tendencies end; traditional meaning: heavenly abode of Lord Vishnu) the intellect becomes still. The *Vaikunth* that Lord Krishna has referred to is, as one listens to Lord Krishna’s talk, as one progresses in his study of the Gita, the intellect (*buddhi*) becomes still, and the one whose intellect becomes still, the Lord calls them *sthitpragny*. A lot more remains to be Known beyond that. Here, [as *sthitpragny*] he has become eligible to receive a visa to just one place.

Questioner: Does that mean *shuddha samkit* (pure right vision) and *parmarth samkit* (absolute right vision; permanent conviction of the belief that ‘I am pure Soul’)?

Dadashri: No. It is not *shuddha samkit*. It is a *samkit* (right belief; right vision) that is lower than *shuddha samkit*. One may even do negative if he encounters negative circumstances some day. But, because his intellect has become steady (*sthir*), he does not get swayed.

Yes, so when is it considered *samkit*? It is when the negative does not enter. No circumstance can shake him; that is when it is called *samkit*. Whereas the one in *sthitpragny* state can be shaken up by circumstances. Therefore, he has fear. However, after the intellect becomes still, wisdom arises; wisdom of a very high level arises. At present there are only a few people whose intellect has become still, very few indeed, they are very rare. There may be one or two such people in India, but alas, otherwise not even that.

Questioner: Had the *Pragnya* of the ones with *sthitpragny* not become established?

Dadashri: No. It is not possible to attain the *sthitpragny* state in this current era of the time cycle. It happens in *Satyug* (era of the time cycle characterized by unity of thoughts, speech and action). In the current era of the time cycle, when one's daughter goes to college and does not come home at night, one would think, 'Why has she not come home?' The answer is that she got married! So tell me, how can the intellect remain still? Whereas in those days [in *Satyug*]; they would not get married. It was not like that. One would not face any difficulties at all. How can the intellect remain still nowadays? The daughter may get married any time [without notice]. The young wife may ask for divorce any time. How can a person's intellect remain still in such times? It cannot remain so. Actually, it is with great thanks to *Akram Vignan* because it has eternally blessed (*kalyan*) everyone. Fifty thousand people have been eternally blessed. There may be more or less, but they have been blessed tremendously for sure.

Is the Ego Situated in Sthitpragny?

Questioner: Is *sthitpragny* a characteristic (*lakshan*) of the ego?

Dadashri: The ego can exist and *sthitpragny* can arise; it is possible for both to be present together.

Questioner: Or it may not even be there?

Dadashri: No, it is not like that; it would indeed be there.

Questioner: Please tell us about the line of demarcation between *sthitpragny* and *vitaraag* (one free from all attachment and abhorrence). The line of demarcation between the two...

Dadashri: *Sthitpragny* means, in the presence of the ego, the intellect has become still after extracting the essence and non-essence (*saarasaar*) of worldly life; that is *sthitpragny*. The *sthitpragny* state is considered a part of discretion (*vivek*). It understands the distinction (*vivek*) between the essence and non-essence.

Questioner: And is there no presence of the ego in *vitaraagata* (the state of absolute detachment)?

Dadashri: Yes [the ego is gone in *vitaraagata*]. In the *sthitpragny* state as the essence and non-essence has been realized, One is now on his way towards *vitaraagata*. He has arrived at the conclusion that there is no pleasure in this worldly life, but this was in the presence of the ego. He has now found the path to progress further over here; it has already begun.

Now, here [in *Akram*], we do not have *sthitpragny*; we have *Pragnya*. So *sthitpragny* is with ego, and *Pragnya* is without the ego. Therefore, One attains the Self (*vastu*) a long time after attaining the *sthitpragny* state, whereas *Pragnya* will take One to *moksha*, in a very few lifetimes, in one or two lifetimes.

The Difference Between Sthitpragny and Vitaraag!

Questioner: So then, what is the difference between *sthitpragny* and *vitaraag*?

Dadashri: A tremendous difference. *Sthitpragny* means that one becomes still by thinking everything through his own intellect. And when one becomes still, he can bring about solutions to his own problems. But that is called *sthitpragny*. So *sthitpragny* is nothing but the stillness of the intellect.

Questioner: But in that too, it is said that there is just as much lack of attachment-abhorrence (*raag-dwesh*) as there is in a *vitaraag*.

Dadashri: No, it is not a state without attachment-abhorrence. But one can bring about a solution to every question. So he does not have any attachment-abhorrence towards anyone. If a solution is found, then would anyone do so? It is all through the intellect. The stillness of virtuous intellect (*avyabhicharini buddhi*) is called *sthitpragny*. Those whose intellect has become still; people's intellect is usually emotional (*asthir*). Only the one whose intellect has become still is called *sthitpragny*, because it (the intellect) has specially increased further and further from the state of ignorance of the Self (*agnya*) and will progress forward to reach all the way to *Pragnya*.

He has yet to study *vitaraagata*; he has to study the path of absolute detachment (*vitaraag marg*). Once he attains the path of absolute detachment, his state of absolute detachment (*vitaraagata*) will gradually increase. Hence, after coming to the station of *sthitpragny*, the property (*guna*) of *vitaraagata* keeps increasing.

Questioner: And is *sthitpragny* associated with kindness (*daya*) or compassion (*karuna*)?

Dadashri: Yes, it is associated with kindness. There is no compassion. No one besides the *Vitaraag* Lord (absolutely detached Lord) has compassion. What does compassion mean? It means there is neither attachment, nor abhorrence. There is no attachment towards a mouse to save it, or abhorrence towards the cat; that is known as compassion.

Are These Discoveries Through Pragnya or Buddhi?

Questioner: The discoveries the scientists make, are they done through *Pragnya* or through the intellect (*buddhi*)?

Dadashri: No, they have the vision (*darshan*). There can never be a scientist without vision. That vision is natural. The help from nature is indeed his vision.

Questioner: All the saints from the past like Akha Bhagat, did they have *Pragnya* or not?

Dadashri: No. That is called vision (*darshan*). It is not called *Pragnya*. It can be called *Pragnya* only after one attains the Self. In worldly terms they refer to it as *Pragnya*, but worldly will not do here, will it? What can one do with the worldly? No one will pay for anything worldly there!

Pragnya Cautions the Ego!

Questioner: When certain thoughts come, I respond to them with, "All this is wrong on your part." Now who is the one saying this? There was nothing there before meeting you, so then who is the one guiding like this? Is it *Pragnya* or the intellect?

Dadashri: *Pragnya* warns You, because now the visa to go to *moksha* has been attained. Then if one suppresses that *Pragnya* through the ego, he will act crazy again.

Questioner: When this *Pragnya* warns from within, does it do so through the mind, the intellect, the *chit* or through the ego?

Dadashri: When *Pragnya* cautions, it cautions the [discharge] ego, no one else.

Questioner: But does it warn directly or what?

Dadashri: Directly. Nothing else has the right to do so! There is no one above the ego. Even though the ego does not have a superior over it, yet all day long, it still does what the intellect says.

Questioner: What does the intellect do when *Pragnya* warns the ego? Does the intellect then remain aloof?

Dadashri: What does the intellect have to do with it? The intellect will not arise at all.

Questioner: Is there nothing, thereafter?

Dadashri: There is indeed no work for the intellect, is there!

Questioner: When *Pragnya* arises, the existence of the intellect no longer remains, isn't it?

Dadashri: Therefore the intellect will help Him after that, it will do according to what the ego tells it to.

Questioner: Oh! So it is also the intellect that makes everything right?

Dadashri: Thereafter they all get together and make things right. Not just the intellect; all of them.

Pragnya Helps One do the Nididhyasan of Dada!

Questioner: In *samayik* (introspection as the Self) this morning, 'your' *nididhyasan* (contemplation with visualization) was happening everywhere, what is that? I understand that to be the *shuddha chit* (pure *chit*).

Dadashri: No, that is all the work of *Pragnyashakti*. Pure *chit* is the Self Itself. *Shuddhatma* (the pure Soul) is indeed *shuddha chidroop* (pure Knowledge and pure Vision). This is actually *Pragnya* doing all that.

Questioner: I see Dada sitting everywhere, what is that?

Dadashri: That indeed is the *Pragnya*. *Agyashakti* (energy of ignorance) shows you other things. That which shows you money, women is all *agnyashakti*. *Agyashakti* makes you have *nididhyasan* of women, and *Pragnyashakti* makes you have *nididhyasan* of the *Gnani Purush*. *Gnani Purush* means it makes you have *nididhyasan* of the Self.

Questioner: Now, if a person has already attained the Knowledge of the Self, yet the *nididhyasan* of a woman arises, then is that the *agnya* department?

Dadashri: That is a part of that Chandubhai. What have You got to do with it?

Questioner: No, I mean where is the function of the *chit* in this?

Dadashri: That is a part of Chandubhai; it is impure *chit* (*ashuddha chit*).

Questioner: So this *Pragnya* that makes us have the *nididhyasan* of *Gnani Purush*, where is the function of the *chit* in that?

Dadashri: There is no need for the *chit* in that. *Pragnyashakti* Itself can See.

Questioner: Are we talking about this as exact photography?

Dadashri: Yes, exact. Better than photography. Photography cannot capture it so beautifully. Dreams are better than not only photographs, but they are even better than the meeting directly.

Questioner: There is no need for the *chit* at all.

Dadashri: The pure *chit* that was there, became one with the Self. It merged into the Self.

Pure Chit is Indeed the Pure Soul!

Questioner: Then who is the Seer of the *nididhyasan*?

Dadashri: It is *Pragnyashakti*.

Questioner: Is it indeed the One that Sees, and verily the One that holds (*dharan*) it?

Dadashri: It indeed is everything. All the activities are of *Pragnya*. There is no need for the *chit* there at all. As long as the *chit* is impure (*ashuddha*), it can see everything of worldly life (*sansaar*). The impure *chit* is not able to see anything related to the pure (*shuddha*). Hence, when the *chit* becomes pure, it becomes one with the Self, it merges with the Self. Then who remains? No one remains in the middle. *Pragnyashakti* continues to work, that is all. If there is interference (*dakhal*), then even the pure *chit* will start deteriorating. If there is darkness (ignorance of the Self), then it will continue to deteriorate. So where can we get it repaired again? There are no factories for it. And we will not have to repair *Pragnyashakti*. When that, which is not [eternal], if left alone, spoils, it has to be repaired. If that which is not the Self (*vastu*) spoils, then it will need to be repaired. Therefore, there is no need for anything in the middle. All the activities are carried out by *Pragnya*.

Questioner: Does *Pragnya* arise when the *chit* becomes pure?

Dadashri: When the *chit* becomes pure, it merges with the pure Soul (*Shuddhatma*). Thereafter, *Pragnyashakti* begins. Pure *chit* is itself *shuddha chidroop Atma* (the Self with pure Vision and Knowledge).

Questioner: This *nididhyasan* of the *Gnani Purush* which prevails, ‘you’ have called it *Pragnya*. However ‘you’ also say that the more the *nididhyasan* prevails, that much the *chit* becomes pure, do you not?

Dadashri: *Chitshuddhi* (the purification of *chit*) has already happened, indeed!

Questioner: It has become complete at its core, but what becomes of that impure (*ashuddha*) *chit*?

Dadashri: The impure *chit* will take care of all the worldly activities. Do the mind-intellect-*chit* and ego interfere in the pure *chit* any day? They will interfere if the *chit* is impure, not if it is pure. If there is a third person, then interference would happen. Is there any interference? Go ahead and do the *nididhyasan* some day [and tell me].

Questioner: Whose interference is there in the process of the *nididhyasan*?

Dadashri: That is this unfolding karma (*udaykarma*).

Questioner: Because, if *Pragnya* is its own independent department, then *Pragnya* has arisen within all the *mahatmas*, and yet after *Gnan* for our *mahatmas*, it is not the same...

Dadashri: The *Gnan* does not arise equally in all. It arises in accordance to each one’s capacity. Then he can follow the *Agnas* accordingly.

Questioner: So you say that it expresses according to one’s capacity? Why is that?

Dadashri: But of course. His *Nischaybud* (the strength as the Self) and all that should be there, no! Is it not different for everyone? It is different for everyone. It is different for you, it is different for him; it is different for everyone, is it not?

Questioner: But are ‘you’ saying that all these peoples’ [*mahatmas*] *chit* has become completely pure?

Dadashri: Yes, only then can one attain the Self!

Questioner: So if the pure *chit* becomes completely pure, then that much *Pragnya* will arise?

Dadashri: Hmm. When ‘we’ give *Gnan*, the Self becomes pure, so *Pragnya* will indeed arise. Thereafter, depending on the amount of interference (*bhanjghad*; complication) there is in Its’ energy to follow the five *Agnas*, by that much he will lose benefit!

Questioner: Meaning that, to whatever extent the *Agnas* are followed, by that much the *Pragnyashakti* blossoms?

Dadashri: Yes, that *Nischaybud* (the strength as the Self) and all that, should be there.

Questioner: But whose *Nischaybud* is it in this?

Dadashri: It is all of the Self [awakened Self] indeed.

Questioner: One makes the *nischay* (firm decision) himself, and then he himself becomes strong in it, is it like that? I did not understand that.

Dadashri: When impure *chit* and the mind and such else, exercise dominance, the *Nischaybud* (the strength as the Self) ceases. The lesser the extent one has of the former, the stronger the latter prevails for him. Do they not do all these interference? Otherwise, say you are sitting in *dhyān* (meditation) in solitude, what happens if people create a commotion outside? Similarly, when all this commotion happens on the outside (of the Self), the one for whom there is greater commotion, that one will not succeed.

Questioner: That is very correct. If the external commotion becomes less, then...

Dadashri: ‘We’ do not have any external commotion, so do ‘we’ have any problem? And if there is commotion from just three people, you will become restless. Anything like, ‘They are doing it to me,’ does not touch ‘me’ at all! That is how ‘I’ sit; ‘I’ would not sit on the outside at all! ‘I’ do not have any such desire (*shokh*). If you have the desire, then go ahead and sit outside with three people and join in the commotion. ‘I’ would in fact sit in my own ‘room’ [the Self] and [join dramatically] continue doing the commotion. When would I ever be done with so many people?

Questioner: ‘You’ skillfully slip into ‘your’ own ‘room’; ‘you’ go within [the Self].

Dadashri: ‘I’ indeed remain seated within. ‘I’ do not come out at all. If you feel, ‘I’ might have come out, then that verily is a mistake, perhaps you may have seen a shadow. In reality, it is not ‘I’.

Questioner: That is true. ‘You’ do not come out even when we pull ‘you’.

The Unique Energy of Dada's Pragnya!

Dadashri: If 'I' were to come out [of the Self], then who would go this man's house? Does 'he' [Dada] not come to your house, at five in the morning? So, that is for always, isn't it! Even those in America say, "Dada comes to my house." It is a fact that Dada goes there, isn't it!

Questioner: Yes, but who is it that goes there?

Dadashri: But it is a fact that 'he' goes there, isn't it?

Questioner: People are experiencing that. I don't know whether 'he' goes from here or not, but they feel that 'he' does. What is that?

Dadashri: All of this is in fact the energy; the tremendous energy of *Pragnyashakti*!

Questioner: We remember (*smaran*) Dada, and Dada comes to our home and blesses us, what is that? What is that phenomenon? Is it some kind of a process?

Dadashri: All that goes in the process of *Pragnya*.

Questioner: We think of Dada and Dada comes; so in that is it a small part of 'you' that comes or the whole of 'you' that comes?

Dadashri: It is all the work of *Pragnya*. The Dada that one remembers is of the same inherent nature as the Self. It is indeed your own Self that has become Dada and is doing the work. So that is dependent upon One's own *bhaav* (inner intent; devotion), and what is more, those *bhaavs* should be of *Pragnya*. Someone may say, "Even people who are not Self-realized (*agnani*) can see their *Guru's* (spiritual teacher)." That is the purity of his *chit*!

Questioner: So is it 'your' *Pragnyashakti* that is doing the work? When one experiences that Dada has come to him, is it of 'your' *Pragnyashakti* or is it his *Pragnyashakti*?

Dadashri: It is from this very *Pragnyashakti*. It is the *Pragnyashakti* of the 'One who goes'.

Questioner: What does 'the One who goes' mean?

Dadashri: It is of the 'one' who goes to his house, it is that 'one's' *Pragnyashakti*.

Questioner: The 'one' who goes to his house, whether he is mainly imagining so or whether that is how it appears to him; it is indeed his own, is it not? It was only when you mentioned it that we realized that 'you' had gone there.

Dadashri: He must have such inner intent (*bhaav*; devotion) that is why it all comes together. It does not take long for that energy; if the other person has the inner intent, then the energy will reach; it can even reach all the way to America from here.

Questioner: So this *Pragnyashakti* of Yours, it is in a sense, *vitaraag* (free from attachment and abhorrence). It gets pulled towards the one who does the *bhaav*.

Dadashri: It will get pulled. What else? It will get pulled towards the one whose *bhaav* is strong.

Questioner: Do 'you' realize it when it gets pulled?

Dadashri: Why would 'I' keep a track of it?

Questioner: No, I mean, would 'you' realize it even if you didn't pay attention?

Dadashri: No.

Questioner: Would it not reflect this way? Just like the way it reflects in your *Gnan*?

Dadashri: It would reflect provided 'we' pay attention to it! But why would we pay attention on that side? There are films of so many people, when would 'I' ever [have the time to] pay attention to them and when would it end?

Questioner: There is no need to 'do' that; just keep Seeing.

Dadashri: On the contrary, it will arouse interest in it. It is such that a habit will be formed. There is no need for 'us' to watch that film. If the film has to be seen, then wouldn't we go to the movie theatre and watch it? At least the movie would be over in three hours but this movie would never let us go.

The Role of Pragnya in Settling a File With Equanimity!

Questioner: Does *Pragnyashakti* have any control over file number one?

Dadashri: No, no control.

Questioner: Now, when I say, "Chandubhai, pay a little more attention in this," who says that to Chandubhai? At that time, the worldly activity that occurs, is that of the intellect (*buddhi*), of the ego or of *Pragnya*?

Dadashri: The worldly activity is of both, the ego and the intellect.

Questioner: Is there *Pragnya* in it?

Dadashri: No *Pragnya*. *Pragnya* is the One that says, "I want to settle with equanimity (*sambhaave nikaal*)."

Questioner: But, when both the intellect and the ego play a role, then those activities actually take place in accordance to *Vyavasthit* (result of Scientific Circumstantial Evidences) do they not?

Dadashri: They are indeed subject to *Vyavasthit*, You do not have any liability (*jokhamdari*) at all.

Questioner: When 'I' tell Chandubhai, then here, this 'I' is indeed *Pragnya* that is telling 'Chandubhai', isn't it?

Dadashri: Yes, it is indeed *Pragnya* who says that. The 'I' (*Hu*) is *Pragnya*.

Questioner: Then, does the rest of the activity occur based on *Vyavasthit*?

Dadashri: Yes, based on *Vyavasthit*. However, if you end up hitting another person whilst subject to *Vyavasthit* then You have to say, "Chandubhai, you did this *atikraman* (aggression), so do *pratikraman*, that is all." Therefore, that safe side [of being the Self and not binding *karma*] prevails. If the other person is hurt slightly, there is no problem. But, after *pratikraman* is done, You do not have anything to do with it.

Questioner: Who settles the file with equanimity?

Dadashri: *Pragnyashakti* does that. It is indeed the One that cautions, it does all that. It is the One that settles the files and all that.

Questioner: I asked because there is also the file of ‘Chandubhai’. Otherwise, is it not that ‘Chandubhai’ sees all the files?

Dadashri: That cannot happen, can it? ‘Chandubhai’ does not have anything to do with it. *Pragnyashakti* keeps settling the files with equanimity, and it also cautions. If any mistake happens, it cautions. It is not ‘Chandubhai’ who cautions. ‘Chandubhai’ is the one with mistakes. Even the Self does not caution. The Self does not get into the business of cautioning. Hence, it is indeed *Pragnyashakti* that is doing all this work. Meaning that, it is *Pragnyashakti* that settles the files with equanimity.

The Firm Resolves of Agnya-Pragnya!

Questioner: Who makes the firm resolve (*nischay*)? Does file number one make the firm resolve?

Dadashri: It is indeed You who has to make the firm resolve! ‘You’ (the awakened Self) have to make the firm resolve.

Questioner: Does that mean the pure Soul (*Shuddhatma*) makes the firm resolve?

Dadashri: No, no, not the pure Soul, it is Its *Pragnyashakti*. *Pragnyashakti* (the liberating energy of the Self) cannot refrain from making You make the firm resolve. Actually, One makes the firm resolve at the very time *Gnan* is attained.

Questioner: Dada says that, “There is nothing about following the *Agnas* (special directives) in this. You just make a firm resolve that You want to stay in the *Agnas*, that is all. Leave everything else to me.” This is what You are saying, isn’t it?

Dadashri: You just have to follow the *Agnas*. You do not have to see whether it happened according to the *Agnas* or not. Just make the firm resolve that You want to follow the *Agnas*, that is all.

Questioner: So, with regard to the point about making a firm resolve, You are saying that we are not to ‘do’ anything. Then again, You are saying that we should ‘make’ the firm resolve.

Dadashri: Those are only words; they are simply words in this way. Dramatic words; there is no sense of doership (*kartabhaav*) in that.

Questioner: Yes, it is just for the sake of communication. However, this firm resolve; who makes that firm resolve?

Dadashri: It has indeed happened for the Self, it is indeed this *Pragnyashakti*, which makes the firm resolve. That is it!

Questioner: But when one did not have the Knowledge of the Self (*Gnan*), it was the ego that made the firm resolve; at that time, *Pragnya* was not doing so.

Dadashri: That is correct. It was not the ego, but rather *agnya* (energy of ignorance) that was doing it. Now, *Pragnya* is doing it. *Agnya* makes all the firm resolves for the *agnani* (the one without Self-realization), and *Pragnya* makes the firm resolves for those who have attained Self-realization. *Agnya* and *Pragnya*, they are both energies. *Agnya* is the wrong belief and *Pragnya* is the right belief.

Questioner: Should one say, “It makes the firm resolve” or should one rather say, “One should maintain the firm resolve”?

Dadashri: The words ‘to make’ or ‘to maintain’, whichever is used, You are to do that which accomplishes Your goal. You can use whichever words you want, ‘to make’ or ‘to maintain,’ there is no question about that.

Questioner: Does *Pragnya* make the firm resolve, or does it make One do the firm resolve?

Dadashri: It is the One that makes the firm resolve, It makes You make the firm resolve; all of that is encompassed in It only. Meaning that they are not different entities.

Questioner: So then, we can also say, “It makes One make the firm resolve, It makes One maintain the firm resolve.”

Dadashri: Yes, you can say that. It is all one and the same. By over analyzing one and the same thing, you are doing its postmortem, it will get spoiled unnecessarily. You end up losing the intent behind what ‘we’ are trying to tell you. Do not enter into over analyzing. Simply understand the point. This is done by *Pragnya* and this is done by *agnya*. That is all. [Otherwise] the intellect (*buddhi*) will show you all kinds of disguises.

How to Remain One With Pragnya?

Questioner: Who maintains the awareness of what is trustworthy and what is not?

Dadashri: All this is the work of *Pragnyashakti* (liberating energy of the Self) indeed, but when the *Pragnyashakti* is not active, then that discharge ego continues doing all the work. When it is doing that, You (the awakened Self) have to See what it is absorbed (*tanmayakar*) in! Instead of remaining one with *Pragnya*, it becomes absorbed in that other [the non-Self]; it slips. If *jagruti* (awakened awareness as the Self) is there, then One can remain in *Pragnya*. The moment it enters that other [the non-Self], *ajagruti* (lack of awareness of the Self) prevails.

Questioner: Having received this *Gnan* from You, he indeed wants to remain in *jagruti* (awakened awareness).

Dadashri: He indeed has such a desire, but it [*jagruti*] does not prevail, because of the old habit! Due to that old habit, he tends to slip into that other side [the non-Self]. However, the One who has a strong intent (*bhaav*) will call him back even if he has slipped into that other side by saying, “Hey, don’t you go there.” He [the awakened One] would know that, would he not?

Questioner: You have said that we should remain one with *Pragnya*. Please explain about this in more detail.

Dadashri: You should remain sincere. Who are You sincere to? Now, if You want to attain *moksha* (final liberation), then remain sincere to *Pragnya*. And if you want to stroll around for pleasure-pain then go there [into the non-Self] for a little while. Right now, if the unfolding *karma* takes you there, then it is a different matter. When the force of the unfolding *karma* drags you there, even then You should stay on this side [of the Self]. You should maintain your efforts to reach the shore, even if the current of the river pulls you to the other side. Should You not attempt to reach the shore or should you get pulled in whichever way it pulls you?

Questioner: So it is only if one’s resolve (*nischay*) is firm that he can remain sincere, isn’t it?

Dadashri: One can remain so only if it [the resolve] is firm! Otherwise, for the one who does not have a resolve at all, what will happen to him? He will go in whichever direction the river pulls him; the shore will be left far behind! And You should make an effort to reach the shore. The

river may pull you away, however you should make a strong effort towards [reaching] the shore. Whatever little you move towards the shore is good. That is when you will eventually touch the ground!

So, through this science (*Vignan*), the *Pragnyashakti* that cautions one on the path of *moksha* (final liberation) arises. Thereafter, he should remain positive. He should not harbor any negativity. Positive means that you should be happy with it. Everyone is maintaining positivity and people do not let any worldly difficulties affect them. If He [the awakened One] remains 'proper', then everything within will become arranged in such a way that the worldly difficulties will not affect Him. This is because in the ignorant state, when one had not attained the Self, meaning one had not really attained God, even then worldly life was going on fine, so then would it be ruined after attaining the Self? Of course, it will not be ruined.

What Part Does Pragnya Caution?

Questioner: So then, does this *Pragnya* caution the *pratisthit atma* (relative self)?

Dadashri: Yes, it cautions the part that is the ego in the relative self. It is the part that wants to become free. There is the ego of becoming bound, and the ego of wanting to become free. It cautions the ego that wants to become free.

Questioner: So, that means that it is actually cautioning Chandubhai himself, isn't it?

Dadashri: No, it cautions the ego. The owner of the name 'Chandubhai'; the ego. There are two kinds of egos. One is the ego that gave rise to all this, and that ego is gone. The ego that is trying to become free, that is the very ego...

Questioner: It (*Pragnya*) cautions that one.

Dadashri: Yes. So, the ego that is trying to become free is getting the help. However, everyone indeed has the ego of wanting to become free, but until *Pragnya* arises, who will caution [him]? Therefore, he remains in an entanglement.

Who Opposes the Mistake?

Questioner: The *Pragnya* cautions us within whenever a mistake is made. Now, in this case, the opposing intent of 'this should not happen' that arises within towards the mistake, who shows that? Is that also *Pragnya* doing that? Are *Pragnya* and the one showing the opposing intent present together?

Dadashri: The light (*prakash*) is of *Pragnya*, and the tendencies of the *chit* (*chitvrutti*) that have become pure within that light, it is those tendencies that do that. But, the light is of *Pragnya*, and that is why it can be said that *Pragnya* is doing it. It shows all the mistakes.

Questioner: But when a mistake happens, the gesture or intent of *Pragnya* that arises such that, 'This should not happen'; such an opposing intent that arises, do they both exist together?

Dadashri: That is not considered an opposing intent.

Questioner: Isn't, 'This should not happen', an opposing intent? Doesn't this arise against any negative intent that we may have made?

Dadashri: 'This should not happen', is *Atma bhaav* (the intent of the Self), and 'This is happening' is *dehadhyas bhaav* (the intent of the one who has the belief that 'I am the body'). The

intent of both are indeed different! The former is the *Swabhaav bhaav* (the intent of the Self), and the latter is *vibhaav bhaav* (the intent of the non-Self).

Questioner: So is *Pragnyashakti* itself *vishesh bhaav* (the extra intent of 'I am Chandubhai')?

Dadashri: No. Anger-pride-deceit-greed, they are known as *vishesh bhaav*. I, the ego and all that is known as *vishesh bhaav*.

Questioner: If any real spiritual effort (*Purusharth*) is done to progress towards *Atma dharma* (the inherent function as the Self), then whose activity is that?

Dadashri: That is all *Pragnyashakti*. How long does this *Pragnyashakti* remain? By attaining this *Gnan* (the Knowledge of the Self), You have become the Self, but the Self is still only in belief (*shraddha*), in conviction (*pratiti*) and in Vision (*Darshan*); it has not come into Knowledge (*Gnan*), it has not come into Conduct as the Self (*Charitra*). So, until that happens, *Pragnyashakti* continues doing the work.

Who Suffers the Results of Pragnya?

Questioner: Any work that is done through *Pragnya*; even though *Pragnyashakti* does the work, the results that are attained through that work, who suffers (*bhogavavu*; experiences) those results?

Dadashri: What is there to suffer? There is nothing to suffer in the things done by *Pragnyashakti*. Only bliss (*anand*) arises, and bliss is One's [the Self's] own inherent nature. The one who did not have bliss is the one who suffers [experiences] the bliss.

Questioner: Who experiences that bliss? Does the relative [non-Self] or the Real [the Self] experience that?

Dadashri: No, no. Indeed the relative experiences it! The Real is in fact already blissful! The one who was missing such bliss is the one experiencing it. Tell me yourself, before you used to be this and now it is your ego that is experiencing it. Now that You have become the pure Soul (*Shuddhatma*), You have come into the form as *Pragnya*. The ego is the one experiencing it. Hence, the dejection that it was experiencing, the loss that it was feeling, it all goes away by experiencing this bliss; the plus-minus happens.

Both are Separate, the Sufferer and the Continuous Knower!

Questioner: Who suffers at the time of the unfolding of *vedaniya karma* (pleasure and pain inducing *karma*), and at that very moment, who is the Knower of the *vedana* (sensation of pain-pleasure) that arises?

Dadashri: The ego suffers (*vedey*), and *Pragnya* Knows. *Pragnya* Knows not only the sufferer, but it also Knows that this sufferer is suffering the pain. You can say the sufferer (*vedak*) is the ego. Everything is comprised within the ego.

The ego believes, 'I am indeed the one suffering the pain,' and so the ego suffers it. That is why it is referred to as the sufferer (*vedak*). And *Pragnyashakti* is the Knower in this. Now, for many of our *mahatmas*, *Pragnyashakti* gets left behind, and they come into the intent as the sufferer (*vedak bhaav*). This tends to increase the pain, but they don't incur any loss. If the awakened One (*potey*) becomes engrossed in the non-Self complex (*tanmayakar*) then the pain (*dukh*) increases.

I give *prasad* (blessed offering) [in this case scolding or even slapping the back] to all these youngsters here. If you give it to them with love, then they do not feel any pain; however if you were to do so with the slightest frown on your face, then they would be affected. This is because the ego is involved in it. In the case of the one [*prasad*] given with love, the ego of neither the one taking the beating nor the one giving the beating is involved. There is no existence of the ego at all in that case, that is why it feels good.

So, if You become one with the sufferer (*vedak*) then you will suffer a lot of pain. Therefore, if You can remain as the continuous Knower (*Gnayak*), then the pain will reduce completely. It becomes similar to the case of giving the *prasad* with love, if One prevails as the Knower!

Pragnya Parishaha

Questioner: Would speech really become unveiled when a fraction of *Gnan* (the Knowledge of the Self; experience as the Self) is attained?

Dadashri: Yes, it can. The circumstance for the unfolding of the [liberating] speech arises. And after that circumstance arises, when one is not allowed to speak, then *Pragnya parishaha* (inner burning that arises when One is able to but cannot share enlightened words) arises. That will have to be suffered with equanimity. This unfolding of [liberating] speech indeed arises on its own. That speech will then unfold as the speech of Knowledge (*Gnanvani*). Meaning that, such a speech that will make others understand, will unfold. But when You are explaining to someone and he is not listening, then at that time *Pragnya parishaha* will arise for you.

Questioner: Is it possible that even though there is the desire to speak, the desire to explain [this] to someone, yet I am unable to express it in words?

Dadashri: Yes, it can happen. The expression through words is actually a very great thing. When you keep listening for a long time, then *shrutgnan* (knowledge attained through listening) will be established (*pragamavu*; to set). And then it will transform into *matignan* (experiential knowledge attained through the medium of the senses and the intellect). And then it will express in the form of speech. So you have to keep listening for a long time. Then it's 'yoghurt' continues to gel within, thereafter the 'cream' will express, and then it can turn into 'ghee' (final useful product, clarified butter). That is how it all is, in detail.

And if someone has made a mistake and you want to point it out, even if you want to share your knowledge, and you do not get the opportunity to do so, then *parishaha* (inner burning) will arise within. 'When can I say something? When can I tell him? When can I tell him?' That is *Pragnya parishaha*.

When the Lord spoke about *parishaha* (different forms of internal suffering), He referred to *Pragnya* as a *parishaha* too. On the *Kramic* path (step-by-step path of Self-realization), right Vision (*samkit*) happens after *Pragnya parishaha* arises. There (on the *Kramic* path), the right Vision really only arises after that. Whereas here (on the *Akram* path), after one attains *Gnan*, all this keeps coming out and the '*khichadee*' (rice and lentil mixture dish) continues to cook.

If you were to go to the *upashraya* (Jain monastery) and talk, then no one would listen to you, would they? Even if you were to tell the clear truth, they would not listen. That is why *Pragnya parishaha* would arise for you. The irritation that you feel, 'No one wants to listen to my truth that I am speaking,' has been referred to as *parishaha*. *Pragnya* becomes strong after You settle that *parishaha* with equanimity.

The Subtle Understanding of Shraddha-Pragnya!

Questioner: Tell us something about *shraddha* (faith; belief), *Pragnya* (the liberating light of the Self), *Drashta* (the Seer) and *Chetan* (the Self).

Dadashri: *Drashta* and *Chetan* are the same. There are two kinds of *shraddha* (faith; belief). The beliefs that are kept in worldly life interactions, are all illusory beliefs (*mithyatva shraddha*). And when one comes on this side [of the Self], it is belief with right Vision (*samyaktva shraddha*), which is referred to as conviction (*pratiti*). It is a part of *Chetan* (the Self). Even *Pragnya* is a part of *Chetan*, but *Pragnya* is a separate part, different from *shraddha* which is the conviction part, and later it (*Pragnya*) becomes one [with the Self] once again. Whereas this *shraddha*, the conviction will indeed remain separate forever. They are separate with regard to their properties (*guna*) and one with regard to their inherent nature (*swabhaav*).

Questioner: Three English words have been used for them: faith (*shraddha*), reason (*Pragnya*) and consciousness (*Chetan*).

Dadashri: It's like this. What is considered as 'a meaning'? When it is balanced, it can be considered 'a meaning'. Meaning if there are ten pounds on this side, then there must also be ten pounds on the other side. Whereas here, there is ten pounds of *shraddha*, *Pragnya* and *Chetan* and over there, all three weigh one and a half pounds.

Questioner: So it is imbalanced.

Dadashri: Hence, a pound and a half means it is a gross (*sthoor*) thing. The other is the exact (*yathartha*) thing. So, this weighs a pound and a half and the other weighs ten pounds.

Questioner: But you said that *shraddha* and *Pragnya* are indeed two parts of *Chetan* (the Self).

Dadashri: No. *Shraddha* is fundamentally Its inherent nature indeed. When It comes into *pratiti* (conviction) it is in the form of *shraddha*, and *Pragnya* becomes separate [from the Self]. *Pragnya* completes its own work and then it becomes one [with the Self] again. *Pragnya* is there to destroy the *agnya* (the energy of ignorance). *Pragnya* has the property (*guna*) of destroying *agnya*, however after separating [from the Self], as soon as it destroys *agnya*, it immediately becomes one with the Self (*Atma*). So *Pragnya* is itself the Self indeed, but it has been called *Pragnya* because it separates [from the Self].

Questioner: So, in this case *shraddha* is the base. That which you refer to as *pratiti*.

Dadashri: *Pratiti* is the base, yes. Hence, things go on based on whether the [people of the] world have a right or a wrong conviction (*pratiti*) established. A wrongly established conviction will make one wander in the worldly life, whereas a conviction that is rightly established will take him to *moksha* (final liberation). All that is needed is a *nimit* (an instrumental doer) in establishing that conviction.

The Relation Between Sooj and Pragnya!

Questioner: So this natural *sooj* (insight; intuition) that one has, what relation does it have with *Pragnya*?

Dadashri: That *sooj* itself takes one towards *Pragnya*. Yes, it is indeed that *sooj* that is working. If something is working naturally in this, it is only *sooj*. In the ignorant state (*agnan dasha*), it is only *sooj* that is working.

Questioner: Is it not a part of *Pragnya*?

Dadashri: No, *sooj* is considered as cleared up (uncovered) veils (*khulla avaran*).

Questioner: But does it take one towards *Pragnya*?

Dadashri: It indeed takes one that side, towards the permanent.

Questioner: So where does that *bhaav* (inner intent) come into this?

Dadashri: That *bhaav* that one does, that verily happens from that *sooj* (understanding, inner development). The ego is a different thing. But the understanding that is there, keeps increasing and increasing and goes all the way to *Pragnya*. And when *Pragnya* arises, it will indeed become one with the Self. But *sooj* is a part of understanding; one does *bhaav* (intent) according to the understanding, according to the knowledge.

That is Darshan, not Sooj!

Questioner: Can *sooj* be called *Pragnya*?

Dadashri: No. *Pragnya* is *Gnan* (Knowledge), whereas this *sooj* is *Darshan* (Vision). And *agnya* is considered as *buddhi* (intellect). So ‘we’ can See everything. ‘We’ can See that which is going to happen—that which has happened, ‘we’ can even See what is happening at the back. So that person will say, “I am standing behind [you]. Did I raise my hand or not?” ‘We’ cannot See that; ‘we’ cannot See the gross (*sthool*) and overt. ‘We’ can See the subtle (*sookshma*). The part that is subtle, ‘we’ can See all that. All that can be Seen due to understanding (*samaj*). The gross can be Seen in its entirety when absolute Knowledge (*keval Gnan*) attains completion.

I have Seen it all, from the ‘basement’ to the ‘ceiling’. I have even Seen, ‘What it is like at the bottom? What it is like at the top? What is the perspective?’ Because I Saw from every direction, I managed to discover that, ‘Actually, this is the fact.’ Very few people can See the ‘perspective view’ [from every aspect, overall]. To stand in front of something and to see the ‘perspective view,’ both cannot happen simultaneously. ‘We’ know how to do that.

Questioner: Dada, is that called *sooj*?

Dadashri: No. That is *Darshan* (Vision). Everyone has *sooj*. *Sooj* is based on each individual’s capacity. Vision (*Darshan*) is that which has spread out, that which encompasses vastness. That is something very unique! Yes, even in the midst of so many bitter experiences, it keeps You in bliss; that is something very unique, is it not!

Questioner: This tape record is speaking and I am listening. Then, ‘this is a taped record and I am Seeing it’, so is the part that Sees a part of *Pragnya*?

Dadashri: That part is *Pragnya*.

Questioner: That is why you say, “I am speaking after Seeing.”

Dadashri: I am speaking after Seeing. What previously used to be a state of ignorance (*agnyasthiti*), has now become a state of *Pragnya* (*Pragnyasthiti*). Through what have ‘we’ Seen this *Akram Vignan*? Through *Pragnyashakti*. The knowledge seen (experienced) through the

intellect is helpful in worldly life, but ‘here’ [for liberation], we will actually need pure Knowledge (*nirmal Gnan*).

Is Agnya itself Ignorance?

Questioner: *Agnya* means *agnan* (ignorance), is that not so? That is how we understand the meaning of *agnan*. But who is *agnya*? From where did *agnya* begin? The boundary all the way up to the beginning of *Pragnya* is that of *buddhi* (the intellect). That is all considered as *agnya* indeed. So, is *agnya* a level lower than the intellect, or is it a level the same as the intellect?

Dadashri: It is considered as *agnya* from the time the intellect begins. As the intellect increases, so does the *agnya*.

Questioner: Is *agnan* (ignorance) considered a stage lower than the intellect?

Dadashri: *Agnan* (ignorance) is a different thing and *agnya* is a different thing.

Questioner: Yes, that is indeed what I want to understand. I want to understand the difference between the two, *agnan* and *agnya*.

Dadashri: *Agnan* is a kind of knowledge (*gnan*) whereas *agnya* is not knowledge of any kind. It is simply intellect, so if one says, “This is true,” then the other person will say, “This other is true.” It will not allow an agreement to happen. The profit and loss is from one’s own perspective (*drashti*). Both have different views with regard to profit, with regard to everything. *Agnya* always looks at profit and loss only. That is indeed its business, whereas *agnan* is not like that.

Questioner: ‘There is a kind of knowledge in *agnan*.’ Please explain this.

Dadashri: *Agnan* means to know all the worldly knowledge, and to know within about the Self is known as *Gnan* (real Knowledge). *Agnya* has arisen to attain *agnan*, and *Pragnya* arises to attain *Gnan*.

Questioner: Yes, *agnan* means whether right or wrong, but it is definitely *gnan* (knowledge), right?

Dadashri: No, *agnan* means one kind of knowledge, but it is *vishesh gnan* (extra knowledge). It is not wrong. It is an extra knowledge of the Self (*Atma*). It is knowledge that is in addition to the Knowledge of the Self. It is extra knowledge but it generates pain (*dukhdayi*), it does not generate bliss like the Knowledge of the Self. That is why it has been called *agnan*.

Vishesh means extra knowledge of the Self arises, but because it is relative knowledge, it is destructible (*vinashi*). Therefore it is of no use to ‘us’ [as the Self]. ‘We’ [the Self] are fundamentally the enjoyer (*bhokta*) of permanent bliss; ‘we’ are enjoyer of eternal bliss. The one who abandons the eternal and wanders around like this, there is no telling where he will end up in his next life. Today, he is in the human form. Tomorrow, even after going into the animal lifeform (four legs) he is still being awkward! How can this be considered respectable? But it is good that one is not aware of this. If he were aware of it, then he would stop showing an air of arrogance here; he would become very docile.

Pragnya is Neither Real, nor Relative!

Questioner: Who separates the Real and the relative?

Dadashri: ‘You’ would indeed recognize everything that is destructible (*vinashi*)! All this that can be experienced through the mind-body-speech, seen through the eyes, heard through the ears; is all relative indeed. Whereas the Real means indestructible (*avinashi*). There is *Pragnyashakti* within. It separates the two. It separates not only that which is of the relative [the non-Self] but it also separates that which is of the Real [the Self].

Questioner: So Dada, does that mean that there are three: Real, relative, and *Pragnya*? Is *Pragnya* separate from the Real?

Dadashri: *Pragnya* is actually the energy (*shakti*) of the Real, but it is the energy that has separated from the Self. In the absence of the relative, it becomes one with the Self.

Questioner: Is *Pragnya* relative or Real?

Dadashri: It is ‘relative-Real’. When its work is complete, it goes back to its original location; it merges into the Self once again. *Pragnya* is ‘relative-Real’. If it were Real, then it would be considered indestructible.

Questioner: When that ‘relative-Real’ becomes Real, then the relative is no longer there, is it?

Dadashri: There cannot be the relative in the Real. Everything relative is destructible. So this *Pragnya* is destructible for sure but it is Real. So it merges back into its own inherent nature [as the Self]. It does not get destroyed completely.

Questioner: Does *Pragnya* have any control over the relative part?

Dadashri: No one has any control whatsoever. On the contrary, the relative had control over the Real. So, One used to scream, “I am bound. I am bound. Free me, free me.” So when the *Gnani Purush* liberates him, he experiences relief and says, “Phew! Now I am free!”

The Difference between the Knowledge of Separation and *Pragnya*!

Questioner: What is the relation between *bhed Gnan* (Knowledge that separates the Self from the non-Self) that is constantly keeping the separation within and *Pragnya*?

Dadashri: The *Gnani Purush* makes that separation for You, and thereafter *Pragnya* arises. *Pragnya* will not arise until then. And until that separation is made, *agnya* is there for sure.

Questioner: What is the difference between that *Pragnya* and *bhed Gnan*?

Dadashri: *Pragnya* can arise only after *bhed Gnan* happens. *Pragnya* is a light and this *bhed Gnan* is also a light, but this light is only for separating the two [the Self and the non-Self].

Questioner: And is *Pragnya*’s light permanent?

Dadashri: And the light of *Pragnya* is temporary-permanent. Of its own accord, it gives You full light in every direction, all the way until it takes You to *moksha* (final liberation). It will not leave You, once it arises.

Questioner: What should one do to bring on the force of *Pragnya*?

Dadashri: The moment one follows the five *Agnas*, *Pragnya* will arise. Nothing else. If you ask, “Who causes You to feel the attraction of remaining in the five *Agnas*?” The answer is, *Pragnya* is doing that. That which gives You light (*prakash*), has been named *Pragnya*.

The Intellect Will Die if You do 'That'!

Questioner: Is it also the intellect that says, "I am pure Soul and not the body?"

Dadashri: In this case, it is not the intellect that says that. The intellect will not let you say, "I am pure Soul," at all. If the intellect were to permit you to say, "I am pure Soul," then that would cause its own destruction. Its existence would go away. Hence, it would never take a stance on that side. If it were to say, "I am pure Soul," then the entire existence of the mind-intellect-*chit*-ego would go away. So even the mind is like that, it will not accept this [after attaining *Gnan*]. They all do understand but when the force of discharge comes, they will not accept it. The intellect is always on the side of worldly life; it is never on the side of the pure Soul. It is on the opposing side.

Questioner: Does the *pratisthit atma* (relative self) say, "I am pure Soul?"

Dadashri: It does not say it. The *Pragnya* that has separated from the Self says, "I am pure Soul," and it Sees the *pratisthit atma*, it Sees what that 'top' is doing! It becomes the pure Soul and Sees.

Questioner: Does *Pragnya* See?

Dadashri: At present, it is indeed *Pragnya* that will do all the work. Until we attain final liberation (*moksha*), until this filled *karmic* stock is existing, *Pragnya* will be there. As soon as this filled *karmic* stock comes to an end, *Pragnya* immediately merges with the pure Soul (*Shuddhatma*) within.

Questioner: When one says "I am pure Soul," is that also Seen by *Pragnya*?

Dadashri: The 'taped record' is saying that, but the intent (*bhaav*) is of *Pragnya*.

Questioner: So, is that considered a natural and spontaneous (*sahaj*) activity of *Pragnya*?

Dadashri: All the activities of *Pragnya* are natural and spontaneous indeed; they are inherently natural.

Shuddhatma, Pratisthit Atma and Pragnya!

Questioner: Is there any relation between *Shuddhatma* (the pure Soul) and *pratisthit atma* (the relative self) through *Pragnya*?

Dadashri: A relation between the two? 'You' have a relation with *Pragnya*. Those other people (not Self-realized) do not even have *Pragnya*. They have a relation with *agnya* (the energy of ignorance).

Questioner: Does the Self (*Atma*) have any relationship with ignorance (*agnan*)?

Dadashri: *Agnan* cannot touch the Self, and how can darkness touch the light (*prakash*)? That is considered baseless and without support, whereas this One is standing on its own support (*aadhar*).

Questioner: What do you mean by 'its own'?

Dadashri: Meaning, through its own intrinsic functional properties (*gunadharma*). The non-Self complex (*pudgal*) is [existing] based on its own intrinsic functional properties. *Pratisthit atma*

means power. The one with power comes to an end and nothing happens to the original element [the Self]. That is it; there is nothing else.

Questioner: Did the *pratisthit atma* arise from the original element?

Dadashri: Yes. But it is circumstance dependent.

Questioner: Who is it that knows the *prakruti* and functions according to the *prakruti*?

Dadashri: That is the ego (*ahamkar*); that is all. It knows the *prakruti*. When it sits down to think; it knows everything.

It knows the reason why the mistakes happened, it knows everything. There is only a certain part that it does not know, otherwise it knows everything else. It can know up to ninety-nine, but it does not know hundred. If one trains the intellect (*buddhi*) to that extent, it can know up to ninety-nine. But even then the work [of salvation] cannot be accomplished by the ego. [For that] only the pure (*shuddha*) is needed.

Questioner: Who is the one that Knows the Self and functions on its own support?

Dadashri: That is Your *Pragnyashakti* (the liberating energy of the Self). It verily Knows through its own light (*prakash*). ‘To function’ means not in the language (context) of ‘to function’, it spreads (*vyape*)!

Who is it that Continuously Knows and Sees?

Questioner: Aren’t all things illuminated within the real form as the Self (*Atma swaroop*)? The form (*swaroop*) of the Self is like that of a mirror; the mirror does not come out to see. But all the objects to be seen (*drashyo*; scenes) are reflected [illuminated] in the mirror.

Dadashri: Those that are illuminated, are a separate thing. But this is the *Gnaya* (Knower)! So at present, whose activity is it of continuously Knowing and Seeing (*Gnaya*)? It is of *Pragnyashakti*. Yes, this is because *Pragnyashakti* is ‘active’ (*karyakari*; that which procures results on its own) right now. The original Self cannot be ‘active’. As long as worldly life exists, this active energy, *Pragnya* has arisen. After completing all the work, after winding everything up, this *Pragnya* goes to *moksha* (final liberation).

A Perfect Couple: Jagruti and Pragnya!

Questioner: Is there any difference between *Pragnyashakti* and *jagruti* (awakened awareness)?

Dadashri: *Pragnyashakti*, is the pure energy (*shakti*) of the Self whereas [in] *jagruti*, there is purity as well as impurity. As the *jagruti* gradually and incrementally becomes pure, when it becomes completely pure, it is called absolute Knowledge (*keval Gnan*).

Questioner: Now that we are sitting in the ship bound for *moksha*, will the *Pragnyashakti* go away, later on?

Dadashri: *Pragnyashakti* helps You until You reach *moksha*, and then [after attaining liberation] *Pragnyashakti* comes to an end.

Questioner: Does awakened awareness (*jagruti*) truly do any work after One has attained liberation? Does the *jagruti* become dim?

Dadashri: No, no, nothing, it becomes separated. *Jagruti* is not there at all. There is only light (*prakash*) there, thereafter.

Questioner: So then, is *jagruti* needed till one attains *moksha*; or is *Pragnyashakti* needed?

Dadashri: Yes. *Pragnyashakti* and *jagruti*, both run concurrently. *Pragnyashakti* keeps guiding and turning the *jagruti*, and *the jagruti* grabs on to it.

The Origin of Agnyashakti!

Questioner: *Agnyashakti* primarily arises from the imaginative energy (*kalpshakti*) of the Soul. Is *kalpshakti* the inherent nature (*swabhaav*) of the Soul?

Dadashri: No. *Agnyashakti* arises scientifically. These six eternal elements (*tattva*) are constantly moving. In that, when the Self (*Chetan*) and the non-Self (*pudgal*) come together [in proximity], then *agnyashakti* arises. And when ‘we’ separate the two, *agnyashakti* goes away; ego (*ahamkar*) and my-ness (*mamata*) both go away.

As ignorance (*agnan*) increased due to the pressure from external (not of the Self) circumstances, which in turn, gave rise to the state of ignorance (*agnan pad*); similarly, the state of Knowledge (*Gnan pad*) arose through this other pressure [through the evidence (*nimit*) of the *Gnani Purush*].

That Cannot be Pragnya!

Questioner: However much the inherent nature as the Self (*Swabhaav*) arises, do we refer to that part as *Pragnya*?

Dadashri: That part is not *Pragnya*. The One that even Knows that *Swabhaav-bhaav* (the sense as the Self) has arisen is *Pragnya*. The One that Knows how much the *vishesh bhaav* (identification with the non-Self; the belief of ‘I am Chandubhai’) has decreased and how much the *Swabhaav-bhaav* (the sense as the Self) has arisen, has increased; the One that Knows all of that is *Pragnya*. And at that time, the One that Knows what the Self is; the One that Knows all that is *Pragnya*.

Questioner: Even *Pragnya* increases and decreases, does it not?

Dadashri: Of course, even *Pragnya* increases and decreases. It increases (*guru*) and decreases (*laghu*). This is because eventually when the sense as the Self (*Swabhaav-bhaav*) attains completion and the sense as the ego (*aham-bhaav*) comes to an end, at that time *Pragnya* itself also comes to an end. Up until then, this *Pragnya* keeps functioning.

Dada’s Meddlesome Pragnya!

Questioner: Does Dada have *Pragnya*? Dada, it is about you?

Dadashri: Everyone [has it]; one indeed cannot do without *Pragnya*!

Questioner: The *satsang* that Dada does, all the worldly interaction that goes on, is that all happening through *Pragnya*?

Dadashri: Yes.

Questioner: But *Pragnya* is for us, not for ‘you’, is it?

Dadashri: Of course it is! There is definitely *Pragnya* within ‘me’ too! *Pragnya* comes to an end when *keval Gnan* (absolute Knowledge) happens; it merges back with the Self.

Questioner: It becomes one with the Self.

Dadashri: It becomes one with the Self. Until then it remains completely separate, otherwise how would there be meddling (*khatpat*; constructively intervene) on ‘my’ [Dada’s] part? Saying, “Come here, I will give *Gnan* (the Knowledge of the Self) to you?” Is all that not considered meddling? That meddling is due to *Pragnya*.

Questioner: *Pragnya* makes you meddle.

Dadashri: Yes, and the one who does not have *Pragnya*, will not meddle. If you are going to be harmed, he will not say anything even when you do his *darshan* (make a live connection through eye contact). ‘We’ do not become emotional at that time, because ‘we’ do not have intellect. The intellect does not make ‘us’ emotional. It is *Pragnya* that makes ‘us’ meddle. As ‘we’ speak about that which is beneficial for or harmful to you, ‘we’ are considered meddling (*khatpatia*). What is ‘our’ meddling like? It is so that you all can attain the happiness that ‘we’ have attained. This is ‘our’ meddling. And if you do not come to attain it, then ‘we’ would ask you, “Dear fellow, why did you not come yesterday?” One may ask, “What is your self-interest (*garaj*) in this?” ‘We’ would tell him, “This is ‘our’ meddling, not self-interest.” People tell me, “Dada, why don’t you get rid of this word, ‘meddle’ (*khatpat*)! It sounds bad.” I tell them, “No, no, only this word is befitting. It itself is a beautiful word.” Just you wait, one day it will be appreciated. The word ‘*khatpat*’ (meddle) will be appreciated, one day. People have developed revulsion towards this entire word ‘*khatpat*’, but they will be pleased with this word ‘meddling’. Meddling can also be like this [for the salvation of others], it can be like that other [using tricks to get things done], but it can also be like this.

The Significance of Grace!

Questioner: Dada Bhagwan’s grace (*krupa*) and the *Gnani Purush*’s grace, are they different? What is the difference between them?

Dadashri: ‘I’ can know that Dada Bhagwan’s grace on this person is good whereas for the *Gnani*, He has nothing to do with grace or no grace, at all! He does not have much to do with it!

Questioner: Why does the *Gnani* not have anything to do with grace?

Dadashri: No, when Dada Bhagwan’s grace is bestowed on one, then the *Gnani* does not have to do anything, does he?

Questioner: But generally it is spoken as, “The pleasure (*rajipo*) of the *Gnani Purush*, the grace (*krupa*) of the *Gnani Purush*”?

Dadashri: You have to speak like that in worldly interaction. ‘He’ is God himself, and He is everything. Actually, ‘we’ are making the distinction here, however they would not be making such a distinction everywhere else, would they? The reason ‘we’ make such a distinction is so that people would feel that this is correct, that this is a completely clear and straightforward point! And ‘we’ do not have any such desire to become God.

Questioner: But Dada Bhagwan within is *vitaraag* (free from all attachment), is ‘he’ not?

Dadashri: Yes, absolutely detached!

Questioner: Then where is the question of Him bestowing more or less grace on someone?

Dadashri: No, it's not like that. Apart from Him, we *Gnanis* do not have such a desire that, 'It would be nice if people called us God.' 'We' do not have any need for such fondness and such sweetness. All such hunger has ceased.

Questioner: Yes, that is correct, but our Dada Bhagwan...

Dadashri: 'He' is completely *vitaraag* (free of from all attachment) indeed!

Questioner: The bestowing of grace that happens, it is automatic, is it not? It is spontaneous (*svaym*), isn't it? Or is it Dada Bhagwan's grace (*krupa*)?

Dadashri: Dada Bhagwan, He is in fact a fully enlightened Lord free from all attachment (*vitaraag Prabhu*), but it is through that *Pragnya* that the grace is bestowed.

Questioner: But the *Gnani Purush* is now the Self (*Atma*) Himself, so where does *Pragnya* come in?

Dadashri: No, it means that the grace is bestowed through it. *Pragnya* will prevail everywhere. Up until one attains *moksha*, *Pragnya* will prevail outside [separate from the Self] and continue doing the work.

Questioner: So, the grace flows upon us through *Pragnya*.

Dadashri: Yes, the grace is bestowed through *Pragnya*. That is why 'we' come to know that, 'This man has been graced.'

Questioner: But does *Pragnya* not have a problem with *vitaraagata* (the state of absolute detachment)?

Dadashri: *Pragnya* can never be *vitaraag*.

Questioner: *Pragnya* is not *vitaraag*?

Dadashri: It can never be *vitaraag*. *Pragnya* has come solely for the problem of settling everything. Its function is to settle everything by any means and take one to *moksha*.

Questioner: But 'your' *Pragnya* is much higher.

Dadashri: It is very highly developed, but its function is the very same indeed. 'We' would even say, "Dear man, the Lord's grace upon you has diminished."

Questioner: Meaning that, this talk is of *Pragnya* itself indeed.

Dadashri: Yes, but 'we' even tell him, "The grace has reduced due to some reasons." Then, if he turns [corrects] the causes, the grace can flow again.

Questioner: But all that talk is about *Pragnya*.

Dadashri: That 'Dada Bhagwan' is *vitaraag* indeed! A *Vitaraag* does not have anything to do with it.

Questioner: So, *Pragnya* remains until one attains *keval Gnan* (absolute Knowledge)?

Dadashri: Until then, *Pragnya* is there until the end. It is not there after one attains absolute Knowledge.

Questioner: After attaining absolute Knowledge, One becomes a *Tirthankar* (absolutely enlightened One who can liberate others) or a *kevali* (fully enlightened One); then there is no question about his grace, because *Pragnya* does not exist then.

Dadashri: Everything has been attained! Everything ends. As long as there is *Pragnya*, there is some give and take with the body. Thereafter, there is complete separation from the body! ‘We’ have not attained *keval Gnan*. Nevertheless, yes, ‘we’ have Seen ‘what *keval Gnan* is’.

The Ego is an Evidentiary Doer in World Salvation and Pragnya Makes it do it!

Questioner: Who makes us become instrumental (*nimitroop*) in doing the work of world salvation (*jagat kalyan*)?

Dadashri: All this is the function of the *Pragnyashakti*. *Pragnyashakti* makes one do everything. In this, the Self does not make you do any of it. The Self does not have any energy at all to make you do that. Egoism is a *nimit* (an evidentiary doer).

Questioner: Egoism is a *nimit*. ‘I am doing it,’ is that the *nimit*?

Dadashri: Yes. Who makes it do it? The answer is *Pragnyashakti*. All this is the work of *Pragnyashakti* only.

Questioner: Now, all this that is Seen, is Seen [illuminated] within the Self, but the Seer is another entity, is it not?

Dadashri: It seems as if it is within the Self. What is Seen is separate.

Questioner: Yes, but the one who is describing it, that Seer is separate, is he not?

Dadashri: The describing that is happening is all the work of *Pragnya*. Whatever *agnyashakti* (energy of ignorance) was describing before was through the power of the intellect (*buddhibud*). And *Pragnyashakti* does it through the power (*bud*) of the *Gnan* (Knowledge of the Self); through the natural power of the Self.

Questioner: *Agnya* says it with acquisitiveness (*parigraha*), and *Pragnya* speaks without acquisitiveness.

Dadashri: Not even a trace of acquisitiveness. No acquisitiveness!

Till Then, Only Pragnya is the Knower-Seer!

Questioner: When ‘we’ prevail as the Knower-Seer (*Gnata-Drashta bhaav*), is it *Pragnya* that remains so or is it the Self (*Atma*)?

Dadashri: No, right now *Pragnya* is the Knower-Seer. *Pragnya* is a part of the Self itself. At present, all the work is being done by *Pragnya*. When that *Pragnya* becomes one with the Self, at that time *keval Gnan* (absolute Knowledge) happens, and soon after attaining *keval Gnan*, the Self goes to *moksha*.

Questioner: Right now, You, the Soul of the *Gnani Purush* is the Knower-Seer (*Gnata-Drashta*). For us, *Pragnya* is the Knower-Seer.

Dadashri: For ‘me’ too, the Knower-Seer is *Pragnya*. Until *keval Gnan* happens, it is *Pragnya*.

Questioner: So then, the Self Knows and Sees everything. The Knower-Seer is the Self itself, is it not?

Dadashri: Yes, but it is the part that is named *Pragnya*.

Questioner: So then, after attaining *Gnan*, who is the one that Sees his own *prakruti* (the non-Self complex)?

Dadashri: It is indeed the Self that Sees. Who else? Everything is on the Self. But then, the Self means *Pragnya* [in this case]. Here, you cannot directly consider it to be the Self. The Self (*Atma*) means that primarily it is *Pragnya* that is doing all the work but ‘we’ say *Atma* (the Self). ‘We’ simply say that, that is all!

Questioner: Before, my understanding was that after attaining *Gnan*, for us *mahatmas*, *Pragnya* maintains proper awakened awareness (*jagruti*). The moment any mistake (*dosh*) happens, it cautions me right away, ‘These many mistakes of this... of this... are being made.’

Dadashri: Yes, it keeps cautioning.

Questioner: But I was not quite aware of who remains as the Knower-Seer.

Dadashri: No, *Pragnya* is indeed the Knower-Seer everywhere. The Self can only See *keval Gnan*.

Questioner: Therefore, the Self becomes the Knower-Seer only when *keval Gnan* happens, until then it is only *Pragnya* that does the work.

Dadashri: Even it [*Pragnya*] can be considered the Self. Do not differentiate it. If you try to differentiate them, then you will not understand.

Questioner: Then why are ‘you’ calling it *Pragnya*? Why not just call it the Self.

Dadashri: Yes. ‘We’ do say that about it, but then these people bring it up again. The details have been spoken for the purpose of making people understand. Do not interpret the details to be like this that, ‘In this way...’

Questioner: If one were to look at it minutely, then it is *Pragnya*, and if you want to look at it at the gross level, then it is the Self. So then, does the original Self (*muda Atma*) not caution us?

Dadashri: Yes, the original Self does not caution you. Right now, this *Pragnya* cautions you. It then becomes one [with the Self]. At the time when our entire ‘Ramayan’ (the tale of our *karma*) comes to an end, it [*Pragnya*] too becomes one [with the Self].

The Knowledge (*Gnan*) through which one becomes free from the worldly life is called the Knowledge of the Self (*Atma Gnan*), and when that Knowledge is being used, it is called *Pragnya*.

That which keeps One in the Conduct as the Self (*vartana*) is the Self, and that which keeps One in the conviction based faith (*shraddha*) is *Pragnya*. *Vartan* means Conduct as the Self (*Charitra*).

Questioner: Is the Seer within ‘you’ called *Pragnya* or the Self? In ‘your’ case, can it be called *Pragnya* or not?

Dadashri: It is called *Pragnya* indeed. It cannot be called anything but *Pragnya*. You can definitely not call it the Self. In the state of worldly life, only *Pragnya* keeps working. It cautions, in fact it does everything within.

Who is the Meditator and What is to be Meditated Upon?

Questioner: What can be considered as *dhyata*, *dhyeya* and *dhyana*? Is the *dhyata* (meditator) the pure Soul (*Shuddhatma*) or is it the relative self (*pratishthit atma*)?

Dadashri: After attaining this *Gnan*, *Pragnya* (direct liberating light of the Self) is the *dhyata*, and not *pratishthit atma*. *Pragnya* is the *dhyata* (meditator), and the *dhyeya* (the goal/object of the meditation) is the Self (*potey*); ‘I am pure Soul’ is the *dhyeya*. When the *dhyata* (meditator) and the *dhyeya* (object to be meditated upon) unite, it gives rise to *dhyana* (meditation).

Questioner: Right now, can the pure Soul not be considered the *dhyata* (meditator)?

Dadashri: The pure Soul is our *dhyeya* (goal). To become the pure Soul is our goal. The pure Soul is itself *Parmatma* (the absolute Self); it is whatever you call it. The meditator (*dhyata*) is *Pragnya*, the object to be meditated upon (*dhyeya*) is the pure Soul. This is because, this state as the pure Soul (*Shuddhatmapad*) that ‘we’ have granted you, is a state of conviction (*pratiti pad*). You have not yet become *Shuddhatma* entirely. However, if unacceptable conduct unfolds, then do not have this belief for yourself that, ‘My state is spoiled.’ That is why ‘we’ have referred to it as *Shuddhatma* (pure Soul).

For now, You may consider the pure Soul to be either in the form as *Pragnya*, or the interim state of the Self (*antaratma dasha*). The state is considered to be the interim state of the Self. But this interim state of the Self or the form as *Pragnya* exists only as far as the files have to be settled. Once those files are settled, it is ‘full government’; meaning it is *Parmatma* (absolute Self).

Gnan, Vignan and Pragnya!

Questioner: Then what is the difference between the *Gnan*, *Vignan* and *Pragnya*?

Dadashri: *Gnan* (Knowledge) means that which one has to ‘do’ himself. However much he knows, he has to ‘do’ all that. And *Vignan* (Science) just happens on its own; we do not have to ‘do’ anything. And *Pragnya* is a state between these two. Once you have understood scientifically that, ‘By taking this medicine a person will definitely die,’ then you will never take that medicine ever again; provided you understand that scientifically. However if someone were to tell you just like that [without you understanding it scientifically] that, ‘This medicine is poisonous and a person can die if this medicine is consumed,’ then one may even take that medicine. So, the knowledge that is *kriyakari* (procures results on its own) is considered *Vaignanik Gnan* (scientific knowledge). The knowledge that is *kriyakari*, that itself (spontaneously) procures results on its own is *Vignan* (Science). And the knowledge that is not *kriyakari*, the knowledge that leads one to ‘do’, that is called *gnan* (knowledge). To maintain kindness (*dayaa*), to maintain peace (*shanti*), all that has to be ‘done’. Moreover, that which cannot be ‘done’ by the Self (*potey*) is considered as *gnan* (knowledge).

Therefore, in the scriptures, there is *gnan* (knowledge); there cannot be *Vignan* (Science; that which happens on its own) in scriptures. Scriptures contain scriptural knowledge. And ‘this’ is *Vignan*, so the Knowledge as the Self (*Chetan Gnan*) continues to work within; that *Gnan* itself continues to do the work within. Whereas, no matter how much scriptural knowledge you read or memorize, it does not do the work [on its own]. You have to ‘do’ it. And this *Vignan* actually continues to work by itself. It gives the awakened awareness (*jaग्रuti*) from within, everything continues to happen on its own. It continues to work by itself for You within, does it not? That is called *Vignan*. What is *Vignan*? It is *Chetan Gnan* (the Knowledge as the Self), the Knowledge

that is living (*Chetan*), it has been awakened, that itself is *Vignan*, and that indeed is the *Atma* (the Self). Right now, it is in the form as *Pragnya*. When *Pragnya* will finish doing its work, when these files will have been settled, then *Pragnya* will revert back to its own form as the Self (*Swa-swaroop*), in the form as the absolute Self (*Parmatma swaroop*).

Questioner: When is *Pragnya* one (*abhinn*) with the Self?

Dadashri: Right now, it is not one with the Self, but what does that mean? *Pragnya* is that form (*swaroop*; as the Self). As long as the Self has not [fully] manifested, the immediate cautioning as soon as any fault happens is the work of *Pragnya*. When *vitaraagata* (the state of absolute absence of attachment or abhorrence) is attained, then mistakes do not happen externally, thereafter *Pragnya* itself is the '*Swaroop*' (the absolute Self).

Separation Through the Intellect, Oneness through *Pragnya*!

Questioner: This oneness (*abhedta*) that happens, can it be considered the highest level of intellect or not?

Dadashri: No, that oneness means absence of intellect; it is *Gnanbhaav* (in the sense of Knowledge). Through *Gnan*, we are all one, and through intellect, we are all separate.

Questioner: Does *Pragnya* come into this or not?

Dadashri: It is indeed that itself! We all are indeed one through *Pragnya*, but we are separate through the intellect. 'We' had destroyed the intellect in 'us'. 'We' had removed it in whichever way 'we' could. 'We' had brought closure to it whenever the intellect unfolded. 'We' did not support the unfolding of intellect. 'We' had primarily removed most of it in the past life, which is why 'we' did not have to get rid of much in this life. This is because we had done so previously. Does the intellect not bother you much, now?

What Does 'Attaining Oneness' Mean?

Questioner: What does oneness (*abhedta*) mean? 'May I attain complete oneness.' We ask for this in the *Charanvidhi*, don't we?

Dadashri: Oneness means to become engrossed (*tanmayakar*) [in the Self]. We become one with God. Right now, those that are separate. How much separation do the pure Soul (*Shuddhatma*) and you have? At present, You have become the pure Soul at the conviction level (*pratiti*). The faith has been established in its entirety that, 'I am pure Soul.' You have assurance of this. You have attained some experience (*anubhav*) of that, but You have not become that form [as the absolute Self]. So You are telling the Lord within, "Make me become that form." That is oneness.

Questioner: Meaning, there is no separation whatsoever.

Dadashri: There is separation; there is still separation. 'I' still have to make you become the pure Soul. Afterwards 'I' do not have to do so, afterwards You have to become one (*abhed*) [with the Self].

Questioner: It is the ego that becomes one with the pure Soul, isn't it?

Dadashri: No, not the ego. This *Pragnya*, which has separated [from the Self] for the purpose of settling (*nikaal*) worldly interaction (*vyavahar*), it is this *Pragnya* that becomes one [with the Self], meaning that, the work is complete.

Questioner: Who becomes one with whom?

Dadashri: *Pragnya* and the pure Soul. These two which are separate, they become one. Right now, the I-ness (*hupanu*) is prevailing in *Pragnya*. That in which we are currently prevailing is in *Pragnya*. We no longer prevail in the ego ('I am Chandubhai'). So, when 'I' (*hu*) was prevailing in 'Chandubhai', then it is considered as being in the ego. Now, the 'I' is prevailing as *Pragnya*, meaning it is not the pure Soul, therefore it is what is being called the interim state of the Self (*antaratma*).

'Our' *Pragnya*, for the most part is almost like it has become still (*sthir*) in the Self (*Atma*). Therefore 'we' do not have to say '*Shuddhatma*' nor do 'we' have to think about it. And in that form, it seems almost like oneness (*abhedta*). It is a little short, by four degrees. Whereas You have yet to become *abhed* (one with the Self). Gradually, as these files are slowly being settled, one gradually begins to become *abhed*. The moment the files are completely settled, one becomes *abhed*. All this is just problems of the files. But right now, You (the awakened Self) are in the form of *Pragnya*, and *Pragnya* is a certain part of God [the absolute Self]. When the work will be completed, then *Pragnya* will become one with the Self once again. God and the [absolute] Self (*Atma*) are indeed one. When the self (*atma*) becomes free from the worldly life and prevails only in one's own form [as the Self], then it is called *Paramatma* (the absolute Self). To dwell constantly in the form as the Self (*swaroop ni ramanta*), that indeed is the absolute Self. And when there is dwelling in the form as the Self but also dwelling in the form as the non-Self, it is called *antaratma* (interim state of the Self); that verily is *Pragnya*!

[2.1]

Attachment-Abhorrence

Root Cause of Worldly Life, Ignorance!

Vedanta says *mada* (illusion), *vikshep* (projection due to illusion), and *agnan* (ignorance of the Self). Jains say *raag* (attachment), *dwesh* (abhorrence), and *agnan* (ignorance of the Self). There are these two views with reference to attaining *moksha* (liberation). If these three things were to go away, then a person can attain liberation. What is primarily common between the two [views]? *Agnan* (ignorance of the Self). What is the root cause? Attachment-abhorrence is not the root cause. *Mada-vikshep* is not the root cause. Then what is the root cause? It is ignorance of the Self. Liberation can be attained only once ignorance of the Self leaves.

After attaining this *Gnan* (Knowledge of the Self), we indeed experience *moksha* right here and now; freedom (*mukti*) itself prevails. First comes freedom from ignorance of the Self. Thereafter, very very gradually all the attachment-abhorrence gets settled. Once one starts to settle with equanimity, one can clear (*nikal*) all the attachment and abhorrence. So final freedom, final liberation (*aatyantik moksha*) is attained.

Only the Ones with a Body Become Vitaraag!

Attachment-abhorrence existed as long as there was [the belief of] ‘I am Chandubhai’. But the moment the ignorance of the Self left, attachment-abhorrence went away. Even for a little child, if ignorance of the Self leaves, attachment-abhorrence will go away, one hundred percent. For the *Gnanis* of the *Kramic* path, the ignorance of the Self does not go away, a hundred percent. For us, here [on the *Akram* path], the ignorance of the Self goes away, a hundred percent. So there is no attachment-abhorrence whatsoever.

Questioner: But as long as one has a body (*deha*), until then the attachment-abhorrence will not leave. Now, what you are saying is that the attachment-abhorrence will not leave as long as there is ignorance of the Self (*agnan*).

Dadashri: The moment ignorance of the Self leaves, there cannot be any attachment-abhorrence at all.

Questioner: Thereafter, does the body remain or not?

Dadashri: Let the body be there for a hundred years and remain in bliss.

Questioner: The 99.99 percent is not for everyone; it is for ‘you’.

Dadashri: Right now, there are so many who have become that [free of attachment-abhorrence].

Questioner: Yes, that is fine. However, this is a question of letting go of the attachment-abhorrence. So, what I am trying to say is that as long as the body exists, as long as there is life, the *prakruti* (the non-Self complex) will remain, and until then the attachment-abhorrence will be there.

Dadashri: So then, what remains after the body has gone? It is only when attachment-abhorrence leave in the presence of the body that one can be considered a *vitaraag* (free from

attachment and abhorrence), otherwise attachment-abhorrence are present for sure. In India, there are so many who have become *vitaraag*! It's because you have prejudice from the past that you feel this way. So you should understand that, 'Oh, ho! That prejudice still remains within.'

Let 'me' tell you the consequence (*parinaam*); wherever there is attachment-abhorrence, one will not go without worries arising. Therefore, the *Gnanis* of the *Kramic* path easily have worries, whereas on the *Akram* path, as there is no attachment-abhorrence, worries do not arise.

Questioner: If we do not keep attachment (*raag*) in the worldly life (*sansaar*), then it burns us, and if we have attachment, then it prevents us from attaining liberation.

Dadashri: It's like this, who are you truly? Really speaking, are you 'Chandubhai' or are you pure Soul (*Shuddhatma*)?

Questioner: Pure Soul.

Dadashri: Then for You, there is no attachment-abhorrence at all. If 'I am pure Soul', then there is no attachment-abhorrence, and if you really are 'Chandubhai', then you have attachment-abhorrence.

Suppose you are getting angry at someone, and I were to ask you just this much, "Are you 'Chandubhai' or are you pure Soul?" Then you would say 'I am pure Soul,' so then there is nothing left for me to say to You. When you are getting angry, 'I' know that whatever *karmic* stock that has been filled, is coming out. We do not have the right to prevent it [from coming out]. However, You should definitely tell 'Chandubhai', "This should not be so." There is no harm in telling 'Chandubhai', because he is your neighbor, isn't he? File number one!

Besides, a line of demarcation is in place; this part is Yours and this part is his [file one's]. Say there is a house. Both the wife and the husband divide the property agreeably. After it has been divided, one would immediately understand that, 'This is not mine'. Similarly, after dividing what is Yours and what is his, how can you interfere in that?

A State Without Attachment-Abhorrence in Akram!

Attachment-abhorrence is the cause of worldly life. And those who have become free of attachment-abhorrence (*raag-dwesh*) have attained freedom from worldly life. The world is verily in attachment-abhorrence. As long as one has not attained the Knowledge of the Self (*Gnan*), one has not attained the right Vision (*samkit*), until then there is attachment-abhorrence. And on the *Kramic* path, even after attaining the right Vision, attachment-abhorrence still exists to a certain extent. If one has attained twenty percent right Vision (*samkit*), then eighty percent attachment-abhorrence remains. And here, in *Akram*, the attachment-abhorrence has gone away a hundred-percent.

Questioner: Perhaps 'Chandubhai' has tendencies that are with attachment-abhorrence.

Dadashri: That cannot be called attachment-abhorrence. What does attachment-abhorrence mean? The belief that, 'I myself am Chandubhai' is itself attachment-abhorrence and that belief does not change; [the belief that] 'I am sleeping', 'I am like this', etc. never goes away. It is only when 'we' give the Knowledge of the Self (*Gnan*) that One says, "This is my file. I am separate and this file is separate." The One who has Known that file as a file, that Self is verily pure (*shuddha*). On the *Kramic* path, one will say to this [file], "I am indeed this."

Questioner: So then, does attachment-abhorrence happen to this *pratisthit atma* (relative self)?

Dadashri: It too does not have attachment-abhorrence. It is considered as attachment-abhorrence when there is violent intent (*himsak bhaav*) in it. This is merely a discharge intent. It is considered as attachment-abhorrence when there is both charge and discharge. This is simply discharge intent, which means the filled *karmic* stock (*bharelo maal*) is emptying out (*galan*).

So when anger or anything like that happens, it is not considered as attachment-abhorrence. If ‘Chandubhai’ slaps someone, it is not attachment-abhorrence. Or else, if ‘Chandubhai’ curses someone or slaps him a couple of times, then ‘Chandubhai’ will receive the fruit [effect] of that. ‘You’ [awakened Self] have to keep Seeing how many slaps others have given ‘Chandubhai’. Have You now understood our Science (*Vignan*)?

Attachment, Attraction – the Science of Subatomic Particles!

Questioner: But afterwards *raag* (attachment) turns into *anuraag* (affection) and then into *aasakti* (inner tendency inclined towards attraction that attaches; love with a selfish motive). Then, no matter what the mistake is, it all simply feels good.

Dadashri: It’s like this: *raag* (attachment) is the cause. *Anuraag* and *aasakti* are effects. So the effect is not to be stopped, the causes have to be stopped.

Because, what is this *aasakti* (inner tendency inclined towards attraction that attaches) like? One lady says [to ‘me’], “You have given both, my son and me, the Knowledge of the Self (*Gnan*), yet I still have so much attachment (*raag*) for him. Even though you have given this Knowledge, yet the *raag* does not go away.” I said to her, “That is not *raag* (attachment), it is *aasakti*.” So she said, “But, such *aasakti* should not remain anymore, should it?” I told her, “You [the awakened Self] do not have the *aasakti*.” Say you have a magnet and there are some tacking pins lying around, then if you do this [move the magnet over them], will the pins move about or not?

Questioner: They will.

Dadashri: From where did the *aasakti* (inner tendency inclined towards attraction that attaches) arise in the pins? Similarly, there is a magnet-like property in this body, because this is an electrical body. Due to electricity, a magnet-like property has arisen in the body. But no matter how strong a magnet it is, it will not attract copper. What will it attract? Only iron, that which is similar to itself.

Similarly, the *parmanus* (subatomic particles of matter) that are in our body are magnetized, so they attract those similar to them. That is this *aasakti* (inner tendency inclined towards attraction that attaches). ‘You’ keep Seeing the storm. ‘You’ just keep Seeing ‘how this body jumps around’ and ‘where it goes’ etc., and let go of [the belief that], ‘This is happening to me.’ But in the same token, if you misuse this by saying, “Nothing’s going to touch me any more,” then what would happen? It would be the same as sticking your hand in the fire. You have to maintain the awakened awareness (*jagruti*) of, ‘To whom does ‘me’ refer to?’ If the awakened awareness of ‘I am pure Soul’ prevails for You then there is no need for You to say, “Nothing can happen to me!” There is simply *aasakti* for the son. The *parmanus* have matched with each other; there are three *parmanus* of yours and three of his. If there are four of mine and three of yours, then they have nothing to do with each other. All this is in fact a *Vignan* (Science).

A woman will get along fine with a crazy daughter-in-law, but she will not get along with a wise daughter-in-law even if she reaches out to her. This is because she does not have the *parmanu*; the *parmanus* are not matching.

God only Sees how much attachment-abhorrence is happening. Attachment-abhorrence do not happen! There is nothing to do with the rest. Why do they stop activities on the *Kramic* path? It is because attachment-abhorrence exist due to the existence of activities. Therefore, they reduce the activities, whereas here [in *Akram Vignan*] attachment-abhorrence do not happen at all, then where is the problem? But if 'we' were to say that, then one would go the wrong way. Whatever compliance one would have in following the *Agnas* (five directives that preserve the awareness as the Self in *Akram Vignan*) would stop. Then you cannot tell him anything and everything would become stagnant, would it not? So, 'we' have to let everything carry on as is.

The Pure Soul Does not Have Attachment-Abhorrence!

After attaining this *Gnan*, that which appears as attachment-abhorrence (*raag-dwesh*) happening, is actually attraction (*aakarshan*) and repulsion (*vikarshan*); it is a property of *pudgal* (inanimate matter). However, the moment you say, "This is happening to me," it is attachment.

Moreover, attachment-abhorrence is not One's own inherent nature (*swabhaav*). The inherent nature of the Self is absolutely not that of attachment-abhorrence. The Self (*Atma*), by its very inherent nature is *vitaraag* (free of attachment and abhorrence). Attachment-abhorrence is actually the inherent nature of *pudgal*. Therefore, attraction-repulsion is the inherent nature of *pudgal*. One (*potey*) believes that inherent nature of the *pudgal* to be his own and then he says, "Attachment-abhorrence is happening to me." That is the wrong belief. This predicament (*vesh*) will exist as long as there is the belief 'I am the non-Self complex, I am definitely this, I indeed am Chandubhai.' And when [the belief of] 'I am Chandubhai' goes away and [the belief of] 'I am pure Soul' sets in, then this predicament will leave.

Wherever there is attachment-abhorrence, the Self (*Atma*) does not exist there, and wherever the Self exists, there is no attachment-abhorrence there. The lesser the attachment-abhorrence, that much the Self manifests. The moment all the attachment-abhorrence leaves, the Self becomes fully manifest (*sampurna*; absolute). Therefore, You have been given the state free from attachment-abhorrence (*vitaraag pad*). Is this any ordinary state? This is exact. You don't have to think about it, and if worries start to arise then know that this is not *vitaraagata* (a state free from attachment-abhorrence). So, now that You have turned towards this [the Self], You will encounter causes that nurture it. This is because You yourself are pure Soul (*Shuddhatma*). And everything else that remains, the *gneya* (the object to be known) and *drashya* (the object to be seen) that you bring forth You have nothing to do with them. The object to be known can be of this kind and of that kind too. Actually, the object to be known; what is arising in the mind, 'I will have to commit suicide.' But who does this refer to? To him [the ego], right! What does it have to with You (the awakened Self)? 'You' are the Knower. So this state is of a different kind; it is a state free of attachment and abhorrence.

Questioner: Before [attaining Self-realization], one is not able to remain as the Knower-Seer (*Gnata-Drashta*) and he says, "No, this is not convenient for me."

Dadashri: Yes, that does happen. And now, You can really remain in the Knower-Seer state! You cannot in the former [without Self-realization]. In the former, a little internal pull (*khenchan*) remains, attraction (*aakarshan*) remains. This [state] without any attraction is so wonderful!

Wherever attraction ceases, *vitaraagata* arises. That is the case here, your attraction has ceased. Now *vitaraagata* will arise.

‘We’ too had filled *karmic* stock in the past [life], but ‘we’ do not have attraction. ‘We’ do not have the slightest attraction. Therefore, *vitaraagata* prevails for ‘us’ over there.

The *karmic* stocked has been filled, so the attraction and inner pull that happens right now cannot be considered as attachment (*raag*). Attachment requires a ‘doer’, there has to be a ‘doer’ (*karta*) of the attachment. Without the ‘doer,’ attachment cannot happen. Are You a doer?

Questioner: I tend to become engrossed (*tanmay*) sometimes, meaning I tend to become the doer.

Dadashri: Actually, one becomes engrossed where there is interest (*ruchi*; inclination). When people count money, do they tend to become engrossed in it or not?

Questioner: Yes, they tend to do so.

Dadashri: Yes, that is it. There is nothing wrong with that. The Self does not ask, “Why did you get engrossed in it?” The Self verily is the Self. Moreover, that other state [of being absorbed in the non-Self] gradually starts to decrease. This [state] is going towards *keval Gnan* (absolute Knowledge). When *Gnan* (the Knowledge of the Self) prevails continuously, it is known as *keval Gnan*. Whereas at present, one still has to settle the files, isn’t it?

Only Then can the Path of Liberation be Attained!

If You become ‘Chandubhai’, then the attachment-abhorrence is considered yours, otherwise how can it be called attachment-abhorrence? So one would ask, “Then what is this that is happening?” The answer is, all this that is happening, it is happening to ‘Chandubhai’, and You, the pure Soul, are the Knower of ‘what is happening’, and You are also saying, “This should not happen.”

Questioner: Yes, all that is correct.

Dadashri: Therefore, as Your opinion is different, You are free from attachment and abhorrence (*vitaraag*). That is why ‘we’ said that there is tremendous *Purusharth* (real spiritual effort to progress as the Self) going on Your part. After becoming a *Purush* (Self-realized), *Purusharth* can prevail; otherwise, the attachment-abhorrence cannot stop on its own, even for a moment. On whom does the attachment-abhorrence happen?

Questioner: It does not happen.

Dadashri: In that case, that verily is the Self and It only keeps Seeing everything. If a bad thought has arisen in the mind, if a good thought has arisen, if something else has happened, a third thing has happened; It immediately Sees all that. No matter what speech someone has uttered, whether someone spoke negatively or positively, even then attachment-abhorrence does not happen. When attachment-abhorrence does not happen, that is known as the Self (*Atma*). And when attachment-abhorrence happens, it is known as worldly life (*sansaar*), the belief that ‘I am the body’ (*dehadhyas*).

“*Raag-dwesh, agnan e mukhya karma ni granth, thay nivrutti jeha thi tej moksha no panth.*”

“Attachment-abhorrence, ignorance is the main tuber of *karma*, to become free of it is verily the path of liberation” – *Shrimad Rajchandra*

That which brings about freedom [withdrawal] from this attachment-abhorrence is the path of liberation. In this case, your attachment-abhorrence have retired (*nivrutt*).

Questioner: Yes, that happens through this *Akram* [path]. Therefore, *Akram* is a path to liberation.

Dadashri: Yes, that verily is the path to liberation.

[By Applying] ‘Not Mine’, You Become Free!

For the one who wants to be bound, there is already a path out there! The one who wants to be bound, indeed has the path of the intellect (*buddhi*). For the one who wants to become free, it is open and clear in every way.

It is known as the path of liberation when one does not ‘do’ attachment-abhorrence. One just keeps Seeing all that which happens. Worldly life (*sansaar*) is actually just an instrumental doer (*nimit*) in making the attachment-abhorrence (*raag-dwesh*) arise; it itself is just the *nimit*. What does a *nimit* make one do?

Questioner: It just makes one have attachment-abhorrence.

Dadashri: Yes, so then would one ever get involved with that *nimit*! So, when You say “Not mine,” then You become free of it. The moment You say, “Not mine,” You (*potey*) become separate. The Knowledge of the Self that ‘we’ have given shows You ‘what is Yours’ and ‘what is not Yours’. If You were to say it now, then You would become separate. The moment You fail to apply that Knowledge, and You become one [with the non-Self], then it sticks to you.

Questioner: It is indeed worth keeping such separation within.

Dadashri: ‘You’ have to keep it separate from within as well as on the outside! What do You have to do with that which is external [to the Self]? What does it have to do with You? In fact, if one kept hurling abuses at him [Chandubhai, file number 1] for an hour, then he will start fighting, what have You [the Self] got to do with that?

Facing the Opposition of the Mind...

Even if the mind were to oppose, yet attachment-abhorrence does not happen, then it is more than enough. There is no problem if the mind opposes, but attachment-abhorrence should not happen.

Questioner: How can *vitaraagata* (a state free from attachment-abhorrence) be maintained when the mind is opposing?

Dadashri: It can be maintained. You have to keep Seeing the opposition of the mind. The entire mind has simply got to be Seen! The mind is a *drashya* (an object to be seen).

Questioner: So, wherever the mind opposes, there *vitaraagata* may not remain; but is it possible to prevail as the Knower-Seer (*Gnata-Drashta*)?

Dadashri: [To prevail as] the Knower-Seer is indeed *vitaraagpanu* (the state as the one who is free from attachment and abhorrence). One cannot prevail as the Knower-Seer without becoming free of attachment-abhorrence. For as much time one becomes free from attachment-abhorrence, for that much time one can remain as the Knower-Seer.

Questioner: The opposition of the mind may be going on for a very long time but then the moment it is Seen in exactness that, ‘This mind is an object to be known (*gneya*) and I am the Knower,’ then the opposition of the mind goes away.

Dadashri: It is because the mind found closure (*samadhan*) that the opposition went away, that is all. The mind is looking for closure, in any way it can. And you are saying that, the moment it found closure, it went away; the entire problem vanishes at that time.

Questioner: Many times what happens is that the mind finds closure at that time, but if it is through relative knowledge, then a reaction to it is bound to come, is it not?

Dadashri: There are reactions of the situations (*avastha*) underlying that. One layer goes away, and another comes along. Each and every thing has layers.

Now, people do not know that such states exist! Would people know this? People do not have any such inkling at all!

Attachment-Abhorrence no Longer Remains for Mahatmas!

All activities without attachment-abhorrence are activities of the non-Self complex (*pudgal*). All those activities are not taken into consideration. In the activities that are with attachment-abhorrence, the responsibility lies with the self (*atma*). We cannot say that attachment-abhorrence has happened even though someone’s face may show irritation. Only the owner [the one whose face shows irritation] can tell you that attachment-abhorrence had happened. Even though the face shows irritation, we cannot say that abhorrence (*dwesh*) happened.

Questioner: But the fact that the irritation arose, it would only have happened if one got engrossed, wouldn’t it?

Dadashri: No, there is nothing like that.

Questioner: What causes one to feel irritated?

Dadashri: It would happen even if he did not get engrossed, it is the activity of the non-Self complex. That activity will continue to happen even though he does not like it.

Questioner: Can we say that one is separate because he does not like what is happening?

Dadashri: That is as clear as the light, is it not? Everyone would say that, even a small child would say that. But just because a person became annoyed I would not believe that attachment-abhorrence has happened to him. Even if you (Self-realized person) were to get annoyed I would not believe it, and if someone else (not Self-realized) does not get annoyed, then I would believe that he has attachment-abhorrence. If a person has not attained *Gnan* (the Knowledge of the Self), and though he would be talking calmly, even then ‘we’ would say that he has attachment-abhorrence. The filled stock [within] is ready; the machinery is active, it is with attachment-abhorrence. He is in abhorrence if he gets annoyed, and if he does not get annoyed, then he is in some kind of attachment; but he is definitely in something indeed. And just look at this aura of influence and power (*prataap*) of this *Akram Vignan* (step-less path to Self-realization)! Even though none of the *sadhu-acharyas* (ascetics and worldly religious masters) accept this; nevertheless, our *mahatmas* do accept it. And not just two to four of them, but all of them; all of them raise their hands together [in acceptance]. At that time, what do the former (*sadhu-acharyas*) all say? They say, “Goodness, it seems as if they are all crazy, hmm!” So their world is wise and ours is entirely crazy!

Before [Self-realization], if the boss were doing something wrong, then you would have thoughts about him arising within all day and night, and you would keep feeling in the mind that, 'May something happen so that he gets sorted out.' You have negative thoughts about him; all that is considered abhorrence. And if someone superior to you is helping you out, and you have a lot of good feelings towards him then that is known as attachment. That is all. Whereas here (for *mahatmas*) now, neither does abhorrence happen nor does attachment happen; it only gets settled with equanimity.

All the activities are of the non-Self (*prakrutik*). And the absence of attachment-abhorrence in them is indeed liberation. To have abhorrence towards the bitter and attachment towards the sweet is the inherent nature of ignorance (*agnanta*). If ignorance (*agnan*) goes away, then the bitter and the sweet do not remain.

Thereafter, it is the Filled Karmic Stock!

Questioner: Prior to attaining the Knowledge of the Self, and even now occasionally, this happens. When I have had to go through some difficulty and then someone else faces the same difficulty, then I feel from within that, 'It is good that this happened.' What is that?

Dadashri: The feeling of, 'It is good that this happened' is an effect of abhorrence, and if you feel, 'It is bad that this happened' then it is an effect of attachment. The stock of the effective intents of attachment-abhorrence that one had filled within [in the past], is expressing today. Whereas, there is no such thing as good or bad in God's (the absolute Self) view. Everything is only *gneya* (that which is to be known). It is only worth Knowing it.

Questioner: What should I do when this happens? Should I do *pratikraman* (confess, apologize and resolve not to repeat the fault)?

Dadashri: When that happens, You should See that. 'This happened here and that happened there.' That is all You have to See in that situation. And if perhaps through the effect of abhorrence, excessive injustice is being done to the other person, then there You should tell 'Chandubhai', 'My friend, you had better do *pratikraman*. Why did you do *atikraman* (aggression towards another through thought, speech or action)? Now, do *pratikraman*.' Do that only if it is excessive, otherwise there is no need for that if it is not hurtful to the other person. This is just Your understanding. You should wash it off Yourself; when You See it as an object to be known, it gets washed off. Whereas in the ignorant state, if something bad were to happen to someone, then you would feel, 'It is good that it happened,' and there is indeed abhorrence prevailing towards him. Now (after Self-realization), there is no abhorrence underlying that situation. You may really feel that, 'It is bad that this happened' or 'It is good that this happened'; so, [understand that] it is the filled stock of *karma* that is all coming out.

Where the Tuber of Sexuality is Destroyed, There is Clear Experience of the Self!

Questioner: This abhorrence keeps one in awakened awareness (*jagruti*) and attachment makes one become engrossed (*tanmayakar*). So then what loss does one incur from *kaam-krodh* (sexual desire-anger)? Are they not needed?

Dadashri: Sexual desire-anger, they all continue to give pain (*dukh*). They give a lot of pain. With regard to their necessity, they are needed only as long as one likes worldly life (*sansaar*). However if he is unable to bear the pain, then it is indeed sexual desire-anger that is giving rise to

pain, not one's child. No one out there is giving the pain. It is indeed one's inner enemies that are giving the pain.

It is in fact these *shadaripu* (six inner enemies of the Self: anger-pride-deceit-greed, attachment-aborrence), that give the pain. There is no one on the outside who is the giver of the pain, it is only these wretched ones. If these become separated from the Self, then a final resolution has come about. I [the awakened Self] am Seeing this and no one on the outside is giving me [the awakened Self] the pain. As long as the six inner enemies of the Self existed within, they were causing the pain. Now, they have all closed shop within; they have all gone back to where they came from.

What is the cause of agitation (*akadaman*) at home? One would ask, "Is it because the husband is like that?" No. Then, "Is the wife like that?" No. It is because *raag-dwesh* (attachment-aborrence) is present that one feels the pain. There would not be any conflict at all with anyone if attachment-aborrence were not there. It is one himself who has the attachment-aborrence. Attachment-aborrence means selfishness (*swarth*). To be embroiled in one's own self-interests is known as attachment-aborrence. Do 'we' have any complication of selfishness? As 'we' do not want anything at all from anyone, there is no problem whatsoever. Just imagine the number of complications that arise in going to taste just one *rasaswaad* (enjoyment of the pleasures of worldly life). Moreover after tasting it, if he were to become happy forever, even then it would be good. But after tasting it, there is nothing but grief and sorrow (*rokakadat*). Tell me the truth; is there really grief and sorrow or not, even after tasting them?

Questioner: Yes, that is what happens, that is absolutely true!

Dadashri: All of this is because of attachment-aborrence. It is neither the fault of the wife nor of the husband. There is conflict even amongst the best of people. The reason for this is [the existence of] attachment-aborrence. And if [worldly interactions] are conducted with *vitaraagata* (total absence of attachment-aborrence), then conflicts would not happen. But when would that actually be [possible]? It would be when one has the Knowledge of the Self (*Atma Gnan*). In that case, when the wife says, "You don't have sense." And then he [with Knowledge of the Self] will say, "It is good that you said that today. This 'Chandu' is in fact like that; he has been like this right from the beginning. You said it today, so I've come to know that you have just realized it right now, but I know this 'Chandu' right from the beginning!"

Questioner: When *spashta vedan* (the clear and distinct experience of the Self) happens, then even *vishay-vikaar* (sexuality and sexual impulses) would not remain, would it?

Dadashri: As long as sexuality exists, the clear and distinct experience of the Self cannot happen. The clear and distinct experience of the Self happens when One [the Self] does not have any sense of ownership (*malikipanu*) over the mind, the speech or the body. 'Ours' is a state that Sees the thoughts of the relative self (*nirvichaar dasha*), 'ours' is a *nirvikalp* state (that is free from the belief of 'I am Chandubhai' and all the relative I-ness that stems from it), 'ours' is a desire-free (*nirichchhak*) state, and that is when this state [of clear and distinct experience of the Self] has arisen within. With infinite gratitude 'we' revere and bow down to this state. So, this is the state that is to be attained. Thereafter, if one or so station still remains, then so be it. These many stations have been attained [passed]. Now, how difficult will one more be? And that too, it will be close to God [within His boundary]. Even the 'signal' has arrived, everything has arrived; it has arrived

since long. You too have crossed the ‘signal’. You have not reached the platform yet, but you have crossed the ‘signal’.

Questioner: It will be both, within the boundary of God and in the presence of God.

Dadashri: Yes, the boundary of God and the presence of God! That will indeed do the salvation!

Attachment-Abhorrence has Gone a Hundred Percent!

Look, it is written in this that, “Even if as little as one *parmanu* (smallest, indivisible, indestructible particle of matter) worth of the intent of attachment-abhorrence, anger-pride-deceit-greed is present, then in spite of being the knower of all the scriptures, one does not know the Self (*Atma*). And since he does not know the Self, he does not know the non-Self (*anatma*) either. And therefore, he does not have *samyak drashti* (right belief) too.” Now, what are you going to do? The statement that has been written is absolutely a hundred percent correct and ‘I’ have given the right ‘state’, a hundred percent. So then, who is the one making the mistake?

Questioner: When would a person realize that not even a single *parmanu* of attachment remains anymore? And why does a person not realize this?

Dadashri: But one has to ask about the awareness regarding it. He should ask, “Is this correct, or am I making some mistake here?”

Questioner: How can one know whether even a single *parmanu* of this attachment-abhorrence has remained or not?

Dadashri: ‘I’ Know that no *parmanu* of attachment is remaining, so how is that you do not?

Questioner: Not like that. In worldly interaction?

Dadashri: Call it worldly interaction (*vyavahar*) or call it a holiday (*tehvar*) [whatever you will] but these *parmanu* are not there within You. Is there only one kind of worldly interaction? Do holidays not exist! Diwali holiday, New Year’s holiday, all these holidays do exist! But You do not have any *parmanu* of attachment.

Questioner: There is not even a single *parmanu* of attachment; this is in fact a very important point!

Dadashri: Yes. If there is even a single *parmanu* of that, then how can it be considered as right belief (*samyak drashti*)? Yes, so then! ‘You’ are the One with *samyak Darshan* (right Vision). So then, what is wrong; is it this that is written or is it Your [state]?

Questioner: This that is written is correct.

Dadashri: What ‘I’ have given is one hundred percent correct. ‘I’ have given *samyak Darshan*, that is a hundred percent correct and what is written here, that too is correct; if that is the case, then find out whose mistake is it?

Now, are You ‘Chandubhai’ or are You pure Soul (*Shuddhatma*)?

Questioner: Pure Soul.

Dadashri: So not a single *parmanu* of attachment, of abhorrence remains in the pure Soul. Therefore, the state that ‘we’ have made You is a pure Soul entirely, so why are you doing this? We have established You in that state a hundred percent, a state where there is not the slightest of

attachment-abhorrence, anger-pride-deceit-greed. Have You now understood this puzzle? It is just that you have this old habit that does not leave. It is in your habit that, ‘These [attachment-abhorrence, anger-pride-deceit-greed] are indeed happening to me.’ This [state that has been given] is a guaranteed thing. This is not any ordinary thing. This is a guaranteed *moksha* (liberation) that has been given. ‘We’ have given *moksha* in Your hands. But it is Yours by as much as You know how to enjoy it.

Mahatmas are Vitaraag, Even if They Quarrel-Fight!

Attachment-abhorrence (*raag-dwesh*) verily is worldly life (*sansaar*). After attaining the Knowledge of the Self (*Gnan*), one starts to follow the *Agnas*, and in doing so, the attachment-abhorrence stop completely. Therefore, there is no attachment-abhorrence here [in Akram]. And even if he [Self-realized person] is hitting his son, ‘we’ will still say that he is in *moksha* (liberation). Let’s say all the *mahatmas* come on the bus with you; say there are about 400 – 500 people on the bus. If they were to fight, even then ‘we’ would bless them. ‘We’ would tell them, “Fight if you have to; fight in ‘my’ presence.” Such freedom [from *karma*] cannot happen in ‘my’ absence. If you fight here, in ‘my’ presence, even then a solution can be found. Everything will indeed get cleared. The files will be cleared.

All our *mahatmas* know that they are indeed *vitaraag* (free from attachment and abhorrence). Even if they run a business or fight, yet they are *vitaraag*. They may not realize that, but ‘I’ would indeed know that! Would you not know that? You may think that, ‘How can I be *vitaraag*?’ But ‘I’ actually know that! Just as a patient may have doubts arise in the mind about whether his disease has increased or decreased, but the doctor would know. Similarly, ‘I’ would indeed know what medicine I have given. The moment this man felt it increase and decrease, ‘I’ immediately gave the medicine, didn’t ‘I’? There is nothing but attachment-abhorrence, attachment-abhorrence, attachment-abhorrence everywhere. No matter which religion (*dharma*) you go into, it cannot be without attachment-abhorrence. There is attachment towards the saints and abhorrence towards the unworthy! What else?

One person asked, “I went to the Guru’s *ashram* (spiritual hermitage). I wouldn’t have attachment-abhorrence there, would I?” I said to him, “There too, there is a lot of attachment-abhorrence, just as much as there is here. This is because as long as there is attachment-abhorrence within you, they will continue to happen, no matter where you go. What can the place do? All that you have left within you is attachment-abhorrence only. No matter which place you go to, but your *karmic* stock in hand (*sillak*) will definitely speak out. ‘I’ have not left any *karmic* stock [balance] in hand with you, so then no matter where you go, how are you going to have attachment-abhorrence? ‘I’ (*hu*) and ‘my’ (*maru*) is in fact attachment-abhorrence. ‘I’ and ‘my’ is no longer there, so how can attachment-abhorrence exist? Are there any saints or ascetics (*sadhu-santo*) without ‘I’ and ‘my’? You have ‘I’ and ‘my’ but they are dramatic [superficial as in a drama]. Just as there is no attachment-abhorrence in a drama. No matter how much one [the actor] argues, fights or curses, even then there is no attachment-abhorrence. If you want to see a place without attachment-abhorrence, then see that. Have you not seen a drama?

Attachment-Abhorrence is an Extraneous Property!

Questioner: And really speaking, attachment-abhorrence is considered a *vyatirek guna* (extraneous property), is it not?

Dadashri: Yes, *vyatirek* (extraneous). If the *Gnani Purush* were to give the *Gnan* (Knowledge of the Self), then both [the elements of the Self and inanimate matter] would become free of them. You can see them [attachment-abhorrence] in existence, but they do not belong to the two [the Self and inanimate matter]. These attributes neither exist in *muda Chetan* (the original Self) nor in *muda parmanu* (the original inanimate matter). They are present in *vikrutata* (the unnatural state). Hence, they are not the attributes of either of the two, yet they have arisen. And because of this unnatural state (*vikrutata*) some people say, “They are in my *atma* (self).” Others say, “They are in the *pudgal* (non-Self complex).”

Questioner: Is *pudgal* (the non-Self complex) considered a *vyatirek guna*?

Dadashri: Yes, it is primarily neither an attribute of inanimate matter (*parmanu*) nor of *Chetan* (the Self).

Pudgal means *puran* (influx; filling in) and *galan* (out flux; emptying out). *Puran* stops upon attaining the Knowledge of the Self. Now, only *galan* remains. With incoming faults (*puran dosho*), there is bondage, whereas outgoing faults (*galan dosho*) are known as discharge of *karma* (*nirjara*). Outgoing faults are discharge of *karma* without bondage and incoming faults is bondage that does not prevent the inflow of new *karma* [charging continues].

To Have no Attachment-Abhorrence Towards Pudgal is Knowledge of the Self!

It actually is the *pudgal* (non-Self complex of input and output). There is nothing besides *pudgal*. For attachment-abhorrence to arise towards *pudgal* is known as worldly life (*sansaar*). To have *murchha* (unawareness arising from illusory attachment) is known as worldly life, and to not have attachment-abhorrence towards *pudgal* is known as *Gnan* (Knowledge of the Self). That is called freedom (*mukti*); that is all. That is all there is to it. It verily is the *pudgal*. It is the same *pudgal*; nothing else is changing. Before [attaining the Knowledge of the Self] attachment-abhorrence used to happen, and now [after *Gnan*] attachment-abhorrence do not happen. Eating, drinking, wandering around, speaking, going to *satsang*, etc. is all *pudgal*. But, it's like this, when you wash something with soap, the soap leaves its 'dirt' behind. When we do this *satsang* (spiritual discourse; spiritual company), that too a *satsang* with the *Gnani Purush*, it is known as pure *satsang*. Meaning that the *Gnanis* 'dirt' does not get stuck to you, and your impurities fall away. Whereas out there, the guru's 'dirt' will get stuck to you and so, you have to use 'Tinopol' (brand name whitening detergent). Thereafter that dirt comes off, but then the 'Tinopol' will have left its dirt on you. This is considered a pure *satsang*, and so no dirt will stick to you. You do not have any attachment-abhorrence happening anymore, do you? All's well then!

When you are seeing and knowing through the sense organs (*indriya*) yet attachment-abhorrence do not happen, that is *atindriya Gnan* (Knowledge beyond senses). And where attachment-abhorrence is present, there one is seeing and knowing through *indriya gnan* (knowledge attained through the medium of the sense organs)! The *indriya drashti* (belief derived through the sense organs) causes attachment-abhorrence, *samkit drashti* (right belief) Sees only the pure Soul (*Shuddhatma*).

The Light of Knowledge has no Unawareness Arising from Illusory Attachment!

Questioner: The pure Soul is in the form of Knowledge (*Gnan swaroop*) and in the form of illumination (*prakash swaroop*), is it not?

Dadashri: It is not that kind of light (*prakash*).

Questioner: No. It is a different kind of light, but the pure Self (*shuddha Chetan*) in the form of light...

Dadashri: This is actually *par-prakash* (light of the non-Self), it is not light like this. Light means that it does not allow any *murchha* (unawareness due to illusory attachment) to arise in anything. One may see all the things of the world, but the light (*prakash*) is such that it will not allow any unawareness due to illusory attachment to arise. When you go to the Fort (place in Bombay where enticing things are sold) and see all the things, then does *murchha* arise for some of the things?

Questioner: It happens.

Dadashri: But this light will not let that unawareness due to illusory attachment arise. You will not feel like buying anything even though you have the money.

Questioner: I feel like looking at everything.

Dadashri: No, there is nothing wrong in seeing. 'Seeing' is verily the function (*dharma*) of the Self, but unawareness due to illusory attachment does not arise in it. One can See because of this light, yet the unawareness due to illusory attachment does not arise. And if one saw in the absence of this light, then the unawareness due to illusory attachment will arise immediately for him. Upon seeing a *sari*, as soon as she gets home, she keeps remembering it, 'How beautiful that *sari* was!' She is completely lost in that *sari*. Whereas after attaining this Knowledge of the Self (*Gnan*), as One has attained the light (*prakash*), unawareness due to illusory attachment does not arise for that person. The unawareness due to illusory attachment has reduced, has it not?

Questioner: I may have seen something but I no longer have the desire for it.

Dadashri: Yes, so unawareness due to illusory attachment (*murchha*) does not happen. This light will prevent unawareness due to illusory attachment from arising. One Sees all the things that tend to cause attachment-aborrence; one looks at it this way, that way, and in every which way he can, but unawareness due to illusory attachment does not happen. The Self remains in Its [the Self's] place and it [the thing] remains in its own place. In the other situation, when unawareness due to illusory attachment happens, the entire self becomes engulfed in it.

Questioner: The unawareness due to illusory attachment that arises, is that of the *prakruti* (non-Self complex) by its inherent nature?

Dadashri: Yes, the unawareness due to illusory attachment is of the *prakruti* by its inherent nature. We have referred to it as *charitra moha* (discharge illusory attachment); the *moha* (illusory attachment) that was filled in the past [life] has unfolded today, and we settle that with equanimity through the Knowledge of the Self (*Gnan*). To settle with equanimity (*sambhaave nikaal*) means to bring about settlement by applying the Knowledge of the Self. It may feel attractive to the eyes like this, but at the same time if the Knowledge is present that, 'This should not be so,' then it all gets cleared away. This Knowledge will not refrain from removing the unawareness due to illusory attachment, but the discharge illusory attachment will definitely be present.

Questioner: Is that all really *vyavasthit* (a result of scientific circumstantial evidence)?

Dadashri: Yes, *vyavasthit*!

The One Without Attachment-Abhorrence is Non-violent!

Questioner: At what stage is the attachment that arises considered as *himsa* (violence)?

Dadashri: Both, attachment (*raag*) and abhorrence (*dwesh*) are violence. Abhorrence is violence and so is attachment. It is worth understanding that it is indeed attachment that provokes man into all kinds of violence. It is not something one can understand so easily. Why was the Lord considered *ahimsak* (non-violent)? It is because He had no attachment or abhorrence in Him; absolutely non-violent!

Questioner: Is the One who is in One's own inherent nature (*swabhaav*) [as the Self], considered non-violent?

Dadashri: To be in One's own inherent nature is considered as good as being God. However, the One who becomes separate (*abhaav*) from the attachment-abhorrence is considered non-violent. After separation from attachment-abhorrence arises, then One comes into One's own inherent nature (*swabhaav*).

However Much the Disease, That Much is the Attachment!

Questioner: Gandhiji, in writing about Shrimad Rajchandra (*Gnani Purush* 1867-1901), wrote that, 'However much the disease (*rog*) there was in him, he had that much attachment (*raag*) within.'

Dadashri: That is the rule indeed. As much the disease there is, that much the attachment there is indeed. Today, one may or may not have the disease in the form of attachment. Why is that? The disease that he has right now is actually the resultant effect (*parinaam*) of attachment. But today, he may not even have attachment. If you all [mahatmas] have any disease, then it is now a resultant effect of attachment. 'You' [after Self-realization] do not have attachment-abhorrence, therefore right now You do not have any such resulting attachment (*raag parinaam*) [in the form of causes].

Therefore, in the case of Krupadudev [Shrimad Rajchandra], one cannot say, "It is indeed this way." Because it can be said that this [disease] is a result of attachment [an effect]. But one cannot presume that He has attachment [cause] right now. Now, no one can understand this subtle talk, can they? It is only when the *Gnani Purush* says it, that you understand it. 'He' has actually spoken about it exactly as 'he' has Seen it.

And for the *Tirthankars*, their stage is indeed such that They are *vitaraag* (free from attachment-abhorrence); They have a resultant effect (*parinaam*) that is free of attachment-abhorrence and They are again without attachment-abhorrence [in cause]; both situations co-exist.

Questioner: Can the disease also be there because of abhorrence (*dwesh*), or is it only because of attachment (*raag*)?

Dadashri: The disease is because of both attachment and abhorrence. By calling it attachment, 'I' mean to say, both attachment and abhorrence are there. If one is present, then the other one is bound to be present. For the most part, the disease is due to abhorrence only. For the most part, the abhorrence that gives a lot of pain is the disease of abhorrence, and the abhorrence that does not give a lot of pain is the disease of attachment. That which does not give much pain, where one can find a quick cure; all those are the resultant effects of attachment.

So, all this is a *karmic* account. 'Jump' as much as you want to. You have to 'jump' using your own strength. Therefore, if someone hurls abuses (at you), then bring about a settlement to that. This is because nobody has the independent authority (*satta*) to hurl abuses. And if he hurled abuses (at you), then there is something wrong (on your part). Bring about a settlement to it. Even

if someone causes you some harm, bring about a settlement to it. In case you end up causing harm to others, then make sure you do *pratikraman*. ‘We’ are telling you as many methods as there are. If something wrong has happened for anyone by you, then do *pratikraman*. As a mutually satisfactory solution (*samadhan*) comes about, once that resolution fits within your mind then whenever any such situation arises, this resolution will come forth at that time. As soon as this Knowledge (*Gnan*) comes forth, it will definitely give us its fruit. Therefore, keep listening [to *satsang*] day and night, but don’t stop your business. Continue running your business and continue this too. The one who concentrates on just one side, ends up ruining both. If one concentrates only on worldly life, he ruins not only his worldly life, but he also ruins the Self. Those concentrating on religion (*dharma*), ruin not only the worldly life but also the Self; they ruin both. But the one who maintains the balance between the two, does not ruin anything. That is what ‘we’ are trying to say. Do not become over zealous.

That Which is Without Attachment-Abhorrence is Pure Knowledge!

Now what does it mean to keep the Self in *upayog* (applied awareness)? The Self is not a thing; it is Knowledge-Vision (*Gnan-Darshan*). That Knowledge-Vision has to be kept in applied awareness; pure Knowledge-Vision. What is referred to as pure Knowledge-Vision (*shuddha Gnan-Darshan*)? The Knowledge and Vision that is free from attachment and abhorrence is pure Knowledge-Vision. Whereas the knowledge and vision that the world has, is with attachment-abhorrence. It is impure (*ashuddha*), it is with attachment-abhorrence, and pure Knowledge (*shuddha Gnan*) is considered as that which is without attachment-abhorrence.

[2.2]

Like-Dislike

It is Attachment-Abhorrence Only if the Ego Gets Involved!

Questioner: If like-dislike (*gamo-angamo*) comes in the flow of our *chit*, then is there lack of awareness (*ajagruti*) in the Knower-Seer state or not?

Dadashri: It is through awakened awareness (*jagruti*) that One (the awakened Self) will Know. Things like, ‘One may sit here and not there, and one may not even sit over there too.’ What I am saying is that, say, you have a bench at home, but when you are walking outside and you get tired, you look for a bench to rest. There is a broken bench, which is slightly rotten at the bottom. Now, if you sit on it, that does not mean that there is attachment-abhorrence (*raag-dwesh*) for it, there is like and dislike (*gamo-angamo*)!

Questioner: Does that mean, it is whatever stock of *prakruti* that is filled within?

Dadashri: That is what it is, nothing else. If the ego had become involved in it, then attachment-abhorrence would happen. Today, if his ego had not gone, then there would be attachment-abhorrence for that very thing. The result of the ego going away is that attachment-abhorrence do not happen.

Questioner: Only like-dislike remain.

There is no Attachment-Abhorrence After Attaining Akram Gnan!

Questioner: What is the difference between ‘to like’ and ‘to like very much’? Is ‘liking very much’ considered as attachment (*raag*)?

Dadashri: Whether it is ‘I like it’ or ‘I like it very much’, there is no difference; attachment does not happen. After attaining our *Gnan*, attachment cannot happen at all. If You follow ‘our’ *Agnas*, then attachment does not arise. Neither attachment nor abhorrence arises; and it is due to attachment-abhorrence that worldly life (*sansaar*) persists. After attaining ‘our’ *Gnan*, attachment-abhorrence do not happen, and the anger-pride-deceit-greed that do happen, are happening without any attachment-abhorrence. The ‘extract’ has been removed from it. Just as when the ‘extract’ [essence] has been drawn out of cinnamon, it is still called cinnamon but it does not have the attributes of cinnamon, it is just a piece of wood. Similarly, this ‘extract’ has been removed.

In whatever the ego is involved, it is considered attachment-abhorrence. That which appears as attachment-abhorrence in discharge is known as like-dislike. So, you may like some things and dislike others things; but that is not attachment-abhorrence. Like-dislike are discharge. If there is attachment-abhorrence, then *karma* will definitely be bound. When ego enters into ‘like’, it is considered attachment.

It is not only you who has like and dislike; ‘we’ too have that. If there were no one sitting on this seat then when ‘we’ come here, ‘we’ would indeed go straight there and sit on it. As ‘we’ do not sit down here on the floor, someone may ask, “Do you have attachment towards this seat?” No. He may say, “If you sit down here, then I can sit over there.” ‘We’ do not have abhorrence, yet ‘we’ do have like and dislike. ‘We’ would primarily like (prefer) this [seat] for sure, but if

someone were to make ‘us’ get up from that seat, then abhorrence would not arise in ‘us’, but this is where we would sit for sure. That *karma* does not bind.

Whose Interference is it in ‘I Like This Taste - I Don’t Like This Taste’?

After eating food, if you do not keep remembering it then it is because attachment-abhorrence have gone.

Questioner: But there is like and dislike in food also, isn’t it?

Dadashri: Of course, in everything. There is big difference between not liking the taste of certain food and the dislike that arises. One may feel like eating something sour, but he is not able to, so that too is a different thing. That is an interference (*dakhal*) of the *parmanus* (subatomic particles) within, which do not allow him to eat. Ten years ago, you would have said that you do not like the taste of dessert made from jaggery, and today you say that you do not like the taste of the one made with sugar but like the taste of the one made with jaggery. Why is that? It is scientific circumstantial evidence. The *parmanus* within have changed. The ones [*parmanus*] who are asking for this from within have all changed whereas the worldly people believe that, ‘I am indeed the one doing all this.’

If you ask him, “If you are the one doing it, then why can’t you eat even when you want to?” He will say, “But what can I do? I don’t like its taste?” Hey, but why? You want to eat, but you don’t like its taste; now tell me, whose interference is that? He believes that, ‘To not like its taste has become my inherent nature (*swabhaav*).’ Now, how can he understand all that? He is not aware that there is other interference!

Dada’s Likes and Dislikes!

Questioner: Does the *Akram Gnani* really have likes and dislikes?

Dadashri: The like-dislike is for appearance’s sake only; it does not last, like in a play, in a drama. In a play, one does not actually have abhorrence towards what he [in his role as an actor] does not like, nor does he have attachment towards what he likes.

Questioner: Can you please explain with an example, ‘dramatic’ likes and dislikes.

Dadashri: When the actor Laxmichand [playing the role of King Bhartruhari, who later becomes a Jain monk] recites his lines, “Mother Pingda, give me some alms!” he knows from within that ‘I am actually Laxmichand and if I don’t play my role properly, then they will reduce my pay.’ So he cries, he pretends to cry. Now four people who watched that play and watched the actor cry, ran away from home [overcome with dispassion for worldly life], and have not been seen since. They thought that the poor king truly felt a lot of suffering! Had they asked him, he would have told them, “It is only a play and I, Laxmichand, am merely performing the role of the King.” He would know that, wouldn’t he?

Questioner: Yes, that is correct, he would know that.

Dadashri: Yes. So You Know that, ‘I am pure Soul (*Shuddhatma*),’ and continue playing the role of ‘Chandubhai’. The play has to be acted out indeed, exactly as it is!

This like-dislike, it is all the inherent nature of the body. Of the body means it is of the tangible (*sthool*) part; it is the inherent nature of the *pudgal* (non-Self complex). What happens to you is called *rati* (pleasure)-*arati* (aversion). When ‘we’ enter satsang, does everyone look for a ‘safe-side’ or not? Therefore, when one sits on the ‘safe-side’, it is known as *rati*. And then if

someone asks him, “Hey, you have taken Dada’s *Gnan*, so how come you have *rati*?” The inherent nature of the *pudgal* is indeed like that; it indeed sits only where it is good to begin with. Then, if someone asks “Why are you sitting on the couch? Sit on the floor.” Then I would sit on the floor. In this situation, there would be no change in the inner ‘atmosphere’, not even a drop worth of change. So *rati-arati* (pleasure-aversion) will happen right till the end. It is the inherent nature of the *pudgal* indeed.

Questioner: For the *Gnanis* of the *Kramic* path, would only *rati-arati* (pleasure-aversion) arise for them, if they had only effect [remaining]?

Dadashri: For them, however much the residual ego remains to be purified, there is attachment-abhorrence (*raag-dwesh*) in that part only and in the rest there is only *rati-arati* (pleasure-aversion). People on the outside [not Self-realized] in fact have attachment-abhorrence in everything. There is attachment and abhorrence in even the most trivial of things. The effect of being a *Gnani* is this [no attachment-abhorrence]. If one has half the amount of *Gnan*, then he has half the amount of attachment-abhorrence. However much the ego has reduced, by that much the attachment-abhorrence reduces. As much as the ego is alive and kicking, attachment-abhorrence will arise there. These are all very subtle points! You have to understand only this much. In following ‘my’ five *Agnas*, only that part is your causes, all the rest is effect.

The Path to Vitaragaata Begins From Upeksha!

Questioner: Can you please explain a bit about *upeksha* (a state of indifference) and *dwesh* (abhorrence)!

Dadashri: *Upeksha* means that despite not liking something, there is no abhorrence towards it. And abhorrence means that one does not have *upeksha* (a state of indifference), but there is abhorrence towards what he does not like. [In *upeksha*] He understands that there is no benefit in having abhorrence. It is with the understanding that, ‘This is harmful,’ that he maintains a state of indifference (*upeksha*).

One should have *upeksha* towards any *kusang* (association with that which takes you away from the Self; harmful company). We should maintain a state of indifference here. Someone may be an alcoholic, another may gamble; there you maintain a state of indifference. Don’t have abhorrence there, that is what it is trying to say. Where there is no abhorrence it is known as a state of indifference. And if abhorrence exists, then it cannot be called a state of indifference. Worldly people [those who are not Self-realized] have abhorrence. If they do not like something wrong, they have abhorrence towards it, and they have attachment towards what they like. A state of indifference means that there is neither abhorrence, nor attachment towards anything. The moment he sees it as, ‘I have nothing to do with it,’ he becomes free of it.

Questioner: The state of indifference that comes to unfold, what is it based on?

Dadashri: One maintains a state of indifference based on what he sees as beneficial or harmful to the Self (*potanu*). He feels it is wrong to have abhorrence. There are wrong things, and One is to Know it as wrong; moreover, one should not have abhorrence towards it. Therefore, one has to keep that state of indifference for the benefit of one’s own Self (*Atma*).

Questioner: Is it considered as a state of indifference (*upeksha*) when one conducts himself as per his unfolding *karma* (*udaykarma*)?

Dadashri: Everything is unfolding *karma* indeed! A state of indifference means that although you may continue having negative feelings towards someone due to the unfolding *karma* yet You (awakened Self) remain separate from it with, ‘This should not be so.’

Questioner: Meaning that, many times when you say this, “‘We’ are like a ‘bundle’. ‘We’ go wherever you take ‘us’.” So then, are ‘you’ considered an example of one having the intent [state] of indifference (*upeksha bhaav*)?

Dadashri: No. This [Dada’s state] is indeed considered as the state (*bhaav*) without ownership.

What do we mean by a state of indifference? It means that one acts as if it [the problem-person] is non-existent. Don’t pay attention to that [which tends to affect you] at all.

Questioner: The ego is involved in a state of indifference, isn’t it?

Dadashri: It is verily the work of the ego. A state of indifference can exist only as long as the ego exists.

Questioner: What is the difference between *nispruhi* and *upeksha*?

Dadashri: To be *nispruhi* (disinterested; uninclined) is one’s weakness. *Nispruhi* means it is actually with the belief that ‘I am something’. *Nispruhi* means with egoism. As the egoism increases, it means one is *nispruhi* and *upeksha* (a state of indifference) means that egoism does not increase and gradually from *upeksha*, *udaseenta* (a state of neutrality towards the relative, with decreased attachment-aborrence) will arise and then *vitaraagata* (a state free of attachment and abhorrence) arises. *Vitaraagata* is born out of *upeksha* and *udaseenta*.

Nispruhata (disinterestedness; disinclination) is actually to be found everywhere. In *nispruhata*, one would have decided something; say there is an ascetic sitting here, and if this person also sits next to him, then he too will become *nispruha* (uninclined) by just looking at him. The one who is uninclined (*nispruhi*) has no substance. The ascetic says, “I am *nispruha* (I have no inclinations),” and so the young man sitting next to him also learns, “I am *nispruha*.” If the ascetic says, “No. Don’t bring any food or drink!” Then, the young man says, “No” too. To be uninclined (*nispruha*) is a higher type of abhorrence. Which is why ‘we’ would never become *nispruhi*! ‘We’ are uninclined (*nispruha*) in matters regarding your non-Self complex (*pudgal*), and ‘we’ are inclined (*saspruha*) in matters regarding the Soul (*Atma*). ‘We’ are *nispruha-saspruha*. If one has no inclinations, then abhorrence prevails within.

[‘We’ are] *saspruha* (with inclination) in the matters of the Self, therefore ‘we’ are *nispruha-saspruha* (do not have worldly inclinations-but are inclined towards the Self). Have you ever seen a person with no inclination? They will say, “What has this got to do with me? I do not want anything! Get lost, take it back!” They curse you like that, and do all that!

A person who is with inclination (*saspruhi*) has humility (*vinay*) because he has desire (*ichchha*) whereas a person who has become uninclined (*nispruha*) does not have humility. He is like an animal. He will even talk like an animal. I have seen these ascetics, who are *nispruha*!

If one becomes *nispruha*, he falls on this side, and if he becomes just *saspruha*, then he falls on that side. You need both *nispruha-saspruha*.

Questioner: If there is something that one does not like, but there is no abhorrence in it, then it is considered as a state of indifference (*upeksha*). Then, is it the same in *abhaav* (aversion)

too? Say, we have an aversion for some individual, then there is no abhorrence whatsoever arising for that person, is there?

Dadashri: There is no question about ‘not liking’ is there?

Questioner: No, I mean in *upeksha*?

Dadashri: In *upeksha* it means [one has the understanding that], ‘This thing is not beneficial for me,’ so his interaction towards that is without abhorrence. People of the world [those without Self-realization] will have abhorrence towards those things. They will keep having abhorrence towards onions. They feel disgusted the moment they see it; that is not considered as *upeksha*. Even if one sees the onion, even if it touches his feet, he will not feel disgusted. Yet, it has nothing to do with You (as the Self). For those without Self-realization, they feel the effect.

Questioner: Dada, there is abhorrence when aversion (*abhaav*) arises towards someone, isn’t there? If one feels aversion towards someone, then that means there is some abhorrence in it, isn’t it?

Dadashri: Aversion itself means that there is abhorrence. It is called dislike (*angamo*) if there is no abhorrence. [Dislike] does not reach all the way to the Self, its extent is limited to the senses (*indriya*); therefore, it cannot be considered as abhorrence. It can be considered as abhorrence only if it reaches up to the Self. Therefore, [our state after Self-realization] reaches only up to like and dislike.

Questioner: This *udaseenta* (a state of neutrality towards the relative, with decreased attachment-abhorrence) has gone beyond *upeksha* (the state of indifference), hasn’t it?

Dadashri: *Udaseenta* is different. It is a stage further ahead. There is a slight difference between *udaseenta* and *vitaraagata* (state free of attachment and abhorrence). Even a *Gnani* can do that, the ego is not required to become *udaseen* (neutral towards the relative). Whereas in *upeksha*, the ego is definitely needed.

Udaseenta is Higher Than Upeksha!

Questioner: *Udaseenta* (a state of neutrality towards the relative, with decreased attachment-abhorrence) and laziness; how can the two be differentiated? Say, I feel lazy about wearing jewelry, I have to go get it out of the bank, I have to do this and that; so how can I differentiate between the two?

Dadashri: What would you be teaching your son? How would you make your son realize whether he is lazy or he has become neutral towards the relative (*udaseen*)? It is considered a grave mistake to label a person who is *udaseen* as lazy. To become neutral towards the relative is a stage before One becomes *vitaraag* (free of attachment and abhorrence). It is not a label for ordinary human beings. Therefore, all that is actually laziness (*pramad*; *adas*) indeed. One cannot attain a state of neutrality towards the relative (*udaseenta*). How can *udaseenta* arise? How can *udaseenta* arise in such a big city like Ahmedabad, where one can get whatever he wants? What makes you think it is *udaseenta*?

Questioner: I feel, ‘Why should I make an effort to travel, to wear these things and all things like that,’ so is that my laziness (*pramad*; *adas*) in this? How can I tell whether *udaseenta* has arisen for me or whether it is my laziness?

Dadashri: *Udaseenta* is a higher state after one attains *vairagya* (dispassion towards worldly life), and it is a state preceding the *vitaraag* state. As long as one is experiencing a strong dispassion towards worldly life, but the state of freedom from attachment and abhorrence (*vitaraagata*) has not yet arisen, then for that much time there is the state of neutrality towards the relative (*udaseen dasha*). It is a very high state. Such a state does not exist in people over here!

Questioner: All the desires that one had when he was twenty-five years, such desires do not remain at the age of forty or forty-five. How can one differentiate between all this, whether this is actually *udaseenta* in the true sense, or whether this has all become less intense?

Dadashri: Those [desires] which seem to have become less intense, will actually rekindle and awaken now. Hey, a seventy year old man will remember *jalebi* (crisp fried sweet soaked in sugar syrup), *ladvas* (sweets)! He will remember all kinds of things; even though he cannot chew anything, he will remember such things that he cannot chew. So, it is not only when one is young that these sensual pleasures (*vishay*) arise; they tend to arise a lot more as people grow older. Therefore, no state of neutrality towards the relative (*udaseenta*) is going to arise. Do not worry about that. Do not hold on to that fear.

Questioner: Please give us a true definition of *udaseenta*.

Dadashri: What is *udaseenta*? Whenever one sees anything, he likes it. As long as he does not see it, he will not remember it. And if he remembers it then it does not eat away at him; that is the state of neutrality towards the relative. The state beyond this is known as *vitaraagata*, until then the state of neutrality towards the relative remains. He does not even remember it, and when he ends up seeing such a thing, he just goes ahead and enjoys it right there and then. However, the moment it goes away, he no longer remembers it; he is *udaseen* (neutral towards the relative).

It is not like that *upeksha bhaav* (intent [state] of indifference), that we talk about. This *udaseenta* is a higher state. Hence, it takes a while for the state of neutrality towards the relative to arise. One has not even attained *vairagya* (dispassion towards the worldly life) yet. *Udaseenta* means that all liking (*bhaav*) for the temporary [destructible] things breaks and despite searching for the eternal [indestructible], it is not attained!

Questioner: Is *udaseenta* or *upeksha* the foundation of *vitaraagata*?

Dadashri: *Vitaraagata* is born out of *udaseenta*. Whereas *upeksha* comes before *udaseenta*, it is through the intellect (*buddhi*).

Questioner: Please explain the difference between ordinary *udaseenta* and *bhaav udaseenta*. What is the difference between the two?

Dadashri: What does *bhaav udaseenta* mean? One does not bind *karma*. And ordinary *udaseenta* means it is close to *vitaraag bhaav* (the sense of being free from attachment and abhorrence), it is *upekshapanu* (the state of one who is indifferent). *Upeksha* means there is *udaseen bhaav* (a feeling of neutrality) towards it, meaning that there is no attachment-abhorrence on that side.

Bhaav udaseenta is a very high thing. You do not bind *karma* at all there. The *Gnan* ‘we’ give You, it is of *bhaav udaseenta* (the state that is neutral towards the relative at the belief level). This is the *Vignan* (Science) of *bhaav udaseenta*. One may not eat potatoes, and he may not eat some other things. Dear man, if ‘we’ want to attain liberation in this life, then ‘we’ can do without wearing a garland of flowers. However, here ‘we’ still have one more life or perhaps even two to

live before attaining liberation, so what are ‘we’ going to lose here? Now that the entire universe has come in ‘our’ control, then what are ‘we’ going to lose? ‘We’ do not even have the desire to smell those flowers!

Questioner: What is the difference between *udaseenta* and *vitaraagata*?

Dadashri: The difference is that *udaseenta* is the creator of *vitaraagata*. It is the mother of *vitaraagata*. A son can be born only if there is a mother, right? Hence, *vitaraagata* is the final state, and *udaseenta* is the beginning state. In the beginning, a state of neutrality towards the relative (*udaseenta*) arises. *Udaseenta* means there is no bias towards either attachment or abhorrence. Even where abhorrence is to be done, there is no bias, and there is no bias wherever attachment is to be done. And when one goes beyond that, *vitaraagata* arises. But as long as there is *udaseenta*, there will be kindness (*dayaa*). And the absolute state cannot exist as long as there is kindness. Hence, compassion (*karuna*) is the ultimate thing. The moment unconditional, constant compassion (*kaarunyata*) arises, that means all is accomplished!

If one follows as per what the *Gnani* tells him, then the ‘full stop’ will definitely come. There is no interference whatsoever!

Questioner: The Self prevails in *udaseen bhaav* (the intent of neutrality towards the relative), and on the other hand, the inherent nature (*swabhaav*) of the Self is Knower-Seer and eternal bliss, so then how can the Self remain in *udaseen bhaav*?

Dadashri: *Udaseen* means that the Self does not have any expectation in worldly life. The original Self (*muda Atma*) does not have any worldly expectations and thus it remains in *udaseen bhaav*. People do not understand if you say that ‘the Self is in *vitaraag bhaav*’, but they understand if It is referred to as *udaseen*. The original Self is not bothered about the worldly life at all; It has nothing to do with it. ‘Its’ own inherent nature is different and the nature of worldly life is different. The inherent nature of worldly life is that of the *pudgal* (filling in and emptying out) whereas One’s own inherent nature is that of the Self.

The pure Self (*shuddha Chetan*) in fact prevails in *udaseen bhaav*. It only gives light (*prakash*). You use it in whatever you want to, because the light is not coming to give anything. Just like the sun, it does not come to give light, light is its inherent nature. And when we needlessly become grateful to it, then on the contrary it will get offended. It will say, “What kind of people are these, they have nothing to do!” In fact, that [to give light] is its inherent nature.

Wherever There is Attachment-Abhorrence, There is Recollection!

Preference (*pasandgi*) is an illusory opinion. To remember (*yaad*) something is dependent on one’s preference. However, in whatever one has attachment-abhorrence, it will be remembered.

Questioner: Now, when one has a preference, it is considered as attachment-abhorrence, right?

Dadashri: Preference is fine. In whatever one has attachment; attachment means preference. A whole lot is encompassed in that. If we say it in short, then it is not only preference, but one remembers not only all that one has attachment for but also that which one has abhorrence for.

Questioner: From the beginning to the end, attachment has been accumulated just by having a preference in every thing.

Dadashri: It is like this, preference is actually encompassed in attachment. Attachment is not encompassed in preference.

So, one will keep on remembering that for which he has attachment and abhorrence. That is why a *vitaraag* (person free from attachment and abhorrence) does not remember anything. But that is just a word that has been written based on this, solely for this sentence. However, if we apply the definition of *vitaraag* to be 'One who does not remember anything' then all these ascetics too do not remember anything and they are all encamped there in the Himalayas. That would be the wrong meaning of the word. What does *vitaraag* mean? It is as it is, without any attachment-abhorrence, free of attachment and abhorrence (*vitaraag*)! A *vitaraag* would not have to forget anything at all! As he does not have any attachment whatsoever, so then there is nothing that he remembers. How can attachment be forgotten? A person with attachment-abhorrence will never forget.

Questioner: One is not *vitaraag* if he remembers things.

Dadashri: Yes. Recollection is based on attachment-abhorrence. Not just one word alone, not to forget just one word, the entire dictionary itself is not there.

The Difference between Affection and Attachment!

Questioner: Does *sneha* (affection; love) mean *raag* (attachment)?

Dadashri: *Sneha* means stickiness. When *sneha* (affection; love) arises for a mango, then it latches on to you. The moment *sneha* arises for a friend, it latches on to you. *Sneha* means stickiness. There is a lot of difference between *sneha* and *raag*.

Questioner: What is the difference between the two?

Dadashri: *Sneha* is considered as stickiness.

Questioner: Meaning that, it has gone beyond attachment?

Dadashri: No, not like that. Attachment is very difficult to get rid of, whereas *sneha* can even break.

Questioner: But you called it sticky?

Dadashri: It is sticky yet it can break. *Sneha* means stickiness only, nothing else.

Questioner: Is there no attachment in it?

Dadashri: No. It latches on because of the stickiness. Then it can also become unstuck.

Questioner: So it is like *aakarshan* (attraction), is it attraction?

Dadashri: Attachment arises in attraction. A leaf was blowing about and got stuck to you. Now it got stuck to you because of *sneha*. But as the sun shines on it, all the moisture within it dries up; it unlatches, and falls off on its own. As it is wet, it has latched on here. Whereas what would happen if the sun shone on it?

Questioner: It would fall away.

Dadashri: You will not have to peel it off, whereas attachment is a different thing. Attachment will actually not let things settle until *vitaraagata* is attained. What do You have attachment towards, now?

**Draft version to be used for Paryushan 2017 purpose only.
For personal use only. Please do not circulate.**

Questioner: ‘I’ do not have attachment towards anything.

Dadashri: Yes, then that’s fine! That is considered *vitaraag*. At present, You (awakened Self) cannot be considered *vitaraag*, You can be considered *vitadwesh* (free of abhorrence). There is no abhorrence remaining.

[2.3]

Vitadwesh

The Definition of Raag-Dwesh!

Dadashri: Does *raag-dwesh* (attachment-abhorrence) happen?

Questioner: Of course, attachment-abhorrence is bound to happen!

Dadashri: Then there must be some methods to stop attachment-abhorrence from happening, right?

Questioner: One should gain the right understanding.

Dadashri: Which is better, the cessation of abhorrence or the cessation of attachment?

Questioner: I can understand abhorrence, what does attachment mean? Abhorrence means jealousy (*irsha*), to have enmity towards someone.

Dadashri: All words that are antonyms of *irsha* (jealousy; envy), *tiraskaar* (scornful rejection), *abhaav* (aversion), *angamo* (dislike) etc., come into attachment (*raag*). Attachment means liking (*gamo*), attraction (*aakarshan*).

Now, the entire world is miserable (*dukhi*) because of abhorrence. People are not miserable because of attachment. Attachment gives rise to pleasure (*sukh*) only. However, in that very pleasure resides abhorrence. It is indeed from pleasure itself that the fumes of abhorrence come out. That is why the Lord has said to let go of attachment also later on. First become *vitadwesh* (free from abhorrence). The Lord first became *vitadwesh* and then He became *vitaraag* (free from attachment and abhorrence).

Would Attachment Arise for Jail?

Questioner: It is verily attachment that increases wandering into life after life, isn't it?

Dadashri: Attachment will definitely increase that!

Questioner: Attachment is also fire, isn't it?

Dadashri: Attachment? Attachment is not fire. If it were fire, then attachment would not happen. Desire (*ichchha*) is fire; attachment is not. On the contrary, one would feel good when there is attachment; mental peace or tranquility is felt.

Questioner: Abhorrence is like a wet firecracker. It will misfire and die out. It will not cause much harm, but attachment will cause a lot of damage; is that true?

Dadashri: No, it is not like that. This world is in existence based on abhorrence, on enmity (*ver*). And it is from enmity that attachment has arisen. Hence, the main cause for this existence is enmity. In other words, the world remains in existence based on enmity. This abhorrence, enmity, they are all of the same family. This world is existing due to them. Therefore, become *nirveri* (free from enmity) such that enmity does not remain in any place whatsoever! When one attains the

Knowledge of the Self (*Atma Gnan*), he first becomes *vitadwesh* (free from abhorrence). Then he becomes *vitaraag* (free from attachment and abhorrence).

The attachment that exists in worldly life, what is that like? Just like a prisoner in jail; he would have cried when he was being sent to prison, but after being imprisoned, he would plaster the floor and sleeping area of his cell with clay? Would he not do that if there were holes and rough surfaces? You would think, ‘Wow! He has attachment towards his prison cell.’ So then, if you were to ask him, “Do you have attachment for prison?” He will say, “Not at all. How would anyone have attachment for jail? But how can I sleep at night if it is like this? That is why I am doing this.”

Similarly, one does not have attachment for this worldly life either. But, what can one do? Now that he is trapped in it, he has to take care of it; he has to do everything indeed. Would he not have to plaster it [make it livable]?

Questioner: Yes, one has to do that, Dada.

Dadashri: That is why people on the outside think that he has developed an attachment for the prison. Hey, would anyone have attachment for prison! One has to do everything involuntarily. Does he not have to?

It is Primarily Abhorrence that Makes One Wander!

Questioner: Is *prem* (love, attachment) or *moha* (illusory attachment) as dangerous as abhorrence? Which of the two is more dangerous?

Dadashri: Abhorrence is more dangerous than *prem*. *Prem* carries a lesser liability, because *prem* is born out of abhorrence. Abhorrence is the seed. *Prem* is not the seed of *prem*. The seed of *prem* is actually abhorrence.

You may have *prem* towards everyone at the home, but if abhorrence does not arise within you, then realize that the seed will not be sown again. But if abhorrence arises, then *prem* will arise again and again for them. Then again, after attaining this *Gnan* (Knowledge of the Self), it is not possible for a new ‘contract’ to arise. You should understand about the new ‘contracts’. If you delve deep into all these other things, then you will find that it is a very deep science. And it is a short science. Have you all understood about this ‘new contract’ itself? The new contract arises from the past life’s experiences, due to the push of forces [of circumstances]. Awareness of one’s own pure Soul should prevail; that is all.

Abhorrence is Indeed the Mother of Attachment!

What is considered as *satsang*? To move away from *kusang* (bad company; association with that which takes one away from the Self) is known as *satsang* (association with that which takes you towards the Self). Yes, then no matter where you are sitting, if you move away from *kusang*, then it is *satsang*. Whereas, you may be sitting in a temple, but if you do not move away from *kusang*, then it cannot be considered as *satsang*.

Would the Lord have abhorrence if there is *kusang*? Would the Lord have such abhorrence for you that, ‘This person is not moving away from *kusang*?’ If abhorrence were ever a worthy thing to do, then Lord Mahavir would have said, “Dear man, it’s okay if you do not have attachment on certain things, but definitely have abhorrence for these people! With the alcoholics, with immoral people; definitely have abhorrence for all these people.” This is what the Lord would say, but why didn’t He?

Questioner: When one does not have attachment for those things, then abhorrence does not arise.

Dadashri: All one needs to relinquish is abhorrence. Attachment does not have to be relinquished at all.

Questioner: If we let go of abhorrence, will attachment go?

Dadashri: Do not worry about attachment at all. The Lord has said, “Become *vitadwesh* (free from abhorrence).” Then to become *vitaraag* (free from attachment and abhorrence), that will happen on its own.

Questioner: People say that wherever there is more attachment, that is where more abhorrence arises.

Dadashri: No. It is because one has abhorrence that attachment arises in him. Say, I have abhorrence for someone, then attachment will arise. ‘I’ do not feel any abhorrence, so then how can attachment arise in ‘me’? Hence, attachment has arisen from abhorrence. In this, abhorrence is the cause and attachment is the effect (*parinaam*). Therefore, do not worry about the effect, worry about the cause; that is what the Lord is saying. Such subtle talk cannot be understood, can it? This is very subtle, very subtle talk!

Questioner: How is abhorrence a cause and attachment an effect?

Dadashri: Yes, abhorrence is a cause and attachment is an effect.

Questioner: That is because attachment and abhorrence go together. Wherever there is attachment, there is abhorrence.

Dadashri: No. Abhorrence happens and attachment arises in reaction to that abhorrence. If abhorrence were not to arise in the least, then attachment would definitely not arise.

There is Abhorrence First, at the Subtle Level!

It [the world] is in existence because of abhorrence. Its very foundation is of abhorrence. So, when ‘we’ give *Gnan*, the abhorrence goes away. Thereafter, the pull (*khenchan*) towards things remains, but that too, it is the pull of the relative (*vyavaharik khenchan*). It is not the pull of the Self (*Nischay*, the real). Only after that, One becomes *vitaraag* (free from attachment and abhorrence). A long time later, after becoming *vitadwesh* (free from abhorrence), One becomes *vitaraag*. First, One (awakened Self) has to become *vitadwesh*.

Questioner: It is more difficult to get rid of attachment, than it is to get rid of abhorrence.

Dadashri: No, it is the easiest to get rid of attachment. To get rid of abhorrence is the most difficult. As abhorrence is not going away first, that is indeed why attachment does not go away. This poor attachment, it will go away if abhorrence goes away.

Now, the most intelligent people on the Vedanta path, and even Kabir says, “One cannot think when hunger arises. (*Bhookh lage tab kuch nahi sooje.*)” The knowledge and meditation, it all ends up going towards food. Kabir says, “Listen dear monk, let this stomach catch on fire. (*Kahat Kabir, soono bhai sadhu, aag lago ye pothee mein.*)”

The *vitaraag* Lords, however did not say, “Let this stomach catch on fire.” They inquired about this through the *Gnan* (Knowledge); they analyzed it through *Gnan*. Whereas they [the intellectuals in Vedanta and Kabir] indeed believed that, ‘It is verily my stomach. Hence, set it

alight from here.’ And the *Vitaraags* analyzed that, ‘I’ [the Self] am separate, this [body] is separate, the eater (*aahari*) is eating and ‘I’ am the non-eater (*niraahari*).’ So, after the *vitaraags* made such a discovery, They did not have abhorrence towards the stomach, whereas the others would have abhorrence, wouldn’t they? ‘Let the stomach catch on fire,’ is that considered a small amount of abhorrence? ‘Burn the stomach!’ Has anyone done so, yet? People do speak thus, but have they ever burnt it?

Now, in this world, from where does the first abhorrence arise? Say, a man runs away into the jungle, even there he feels hungry, so he becomes irritated at that time, and in irritation there is only abhorrence, there is no attachment in that. At the time when one is hungry, if you show him gold and all that, will he have any attachment towards it? He will have abhorrence only. Hence, the beginning of the worldly life has been due to abhorrence. And it is based on the commencement of this abhorrence that this foundation [of worldly life] is remaining in existence.

And In Attachment, The Preference is One’s Own!

Questioner: How can one become *vitaraag*?

Dadashri: One becomes *vitaraag* automatically. ‘You’ do not have to ‘do’ anything to become *vitaraag*. The biggest problem is to make Oneself *vitadwesh* (free from abhorrence).

Questioner: That day, you had said that attachment happens through abhorrence.

Dadashri: Yes, all the attachment comes from abhorrence indeed. After eating something bitter, if you eat a little bit of anything else, then attachment will set in towards that item! The moment you eat that, it reduces the bitter taste [in the mouth], does it not? However, if you were to eat the same thing without eating the bitter first, then attachment will not set in towards it. Hence, attachment has arisen because of this abhorrence. That is why, abhorrence goes away first, and thereafter attachment goes away. *Raag* (attachment) means it is something that one has a preference for (*pasandgi*), whereas *dwesh* (abhorrence) arises naturally (*kudarati*).

Say there is a great king, who is very happy and does not have any attachment-abhorrence towards anyone. He does justice with everyone, meaning that he is righteous and does not take anything from others; he has taken the oath of speaking the truth only. He is such that he does not lie. But if he happens to go in a jungle and gets lost there, when he starts to feel hungry, would he have attachment at that time? What happens when one feels hungry? One feels pain and suffering (*vedana*), isn’t it? Now that he is hungry, what will he do in that situation? He will do whatever is needed, even if it means lying or stealing, to eat something. Will he do that or not? And even if a poor man’s child’s mucous is on it, will he eat such food or not?

Questioner: He will eat it, because he is hungry.

Dadashri: This is because the hunger pain that he is experiencing within is actually abhorrence that is happening. So when he puts a little something in the stomach, the abhorrence is pacified. And if you have taken something from someone by lying to him, and if someone else takes it away from you, then will you feel attachment or abhorrence for that person?

Questioner: Abhorrence will arise.

Dadashri: So, all this is the cause of abhorrence. These five senses; their beginning is the cause of abhorrence, and then when does attachment arise? Then even if it is stolen, if there is bread on one side and dessert on the other, he will immediately say, “I will eat the dessert!” That

is attachment, one's choice comes into it, doesn't it? But primarily, abhorrence is happening, isn't it? Primarily, abhorrence is happening and then attachment arises. So attachment is a kind of preference that we fancy. Attachment happens after there is a surplus. But for the main necessities that one has, in those, only abhorrence happens. When one falls short in what is a necessity, then abhorrence arises. So, when someone takes away your bread, then how much abhorrence arises for that person? Therefore, attachment is such that it will go away [on its own]. There is no problem with attachment, thereafter.

Questioner: People say that the entire worldly life is actually based on attachment.

Dadashri: What our *Akram Vignan* says is that, 'This [worldly life] is in existence based on the foundation of abhorrence.' For whoever that foundation is broken, attachment will go away on its own. Say, someone has attachment for tea. What would happen if you make him eat a dessert before drinking the tea?

Questioner: He will find the tea bland.

Dadashri: The attachment for tea will become bland [less intense]. When 'we' give this *Gnan* (Knowledge of the Self), the bliss (*sukh*) that arises from it makes all other pleasures appear bland. And so attachment [for them] goes away.

Questioner: That is a proven experience.

Dadashri: Yes, a proven experience.

The Four Kashays are Abhorrence Indeed!

However much is liked is called *raag* (attachment), and that which is not liked is called *dwesh* (abhorrence). Do you like attachment a lot? What about *artadhyan* (adverse internal meditation that hurts the self) and *raudradhyan* (adverse internal meditation that hurts the self and others)? So then how can you call that attachment? So this abhorrence, do you like it?

Questioner: I do not like it.

Dadashri: Find out who the culprit is, between attachment and abhorrence. It's because the culprits have not been found that this entire world is hanging in limbo.

If you put spices in this (tea) and give to me, then there is no problem if attachment arises in me. There is also no problem if you end up remembering it again later on. However, if abhorrence arises whilst drinking something bitter that is offered, then there is a problem. And there is no problem if attachment happens and you keep remembering it. 'I will drink this juice once again. If it comes a third time, then I will drink it a third time.' But there is a limit (*ant*) to this. With the other [abhorrence], it is endless (*anant*). There is no end to it whereas this one [attachment] is with an end.

Questioner: Even in the scriptures, it is said, "Let go of *mamata* (my-ness)." One has to let go of *mamata*. So if we have to let go of my-ness, then it means that we first have to let go of attachment, isn't it?

Dadashri: Here, there is no talk about *mamata* at all. Here, we do not talk about the word 'my-ness'. What does *vitadwesh* mean? Talk such as, 'Abhorrence leaves after my-ness goes away, otherwise it will not go away,' is not done here at all. Such talk is for those external to the *Akram* path.

Questioner: This talk is indeed for those not following the *Akram* path.

Dadashri: But that talk does not help here at all, does it? Here, people actually become *vitadwesh* (free from abhorrence). These people have become *vitadwesh* first, have they not? They have not been made *vitaraag* (free from attachment and abhorrence). One is not to be made *vitaraag*; he will continue to become *vitaraag* [automatically]. ‘I’ have removed the seed (abhorrence); the seed is gone.

If this is not understood, then this talk is such that people will not understand it even for up to twelve months. Not just for up to twelve months, but it cannot be understood in a hundred thousand years, such is the talk.

Questioner: Dada, now let me ask another question. These two words that you are talking about, attachment and abhorrence. Greed (*lobh*) and deceit (*maya*) are encompassed in attachment whereas pride (*maan*) and anger (*krodh*) are encompassed in abhorrence, then...

Dadashri: All this that you are talking about, is all about what is external [not relevant to the *Akram* path]. That and this have nothing to do with each other.

Questioner: I am talking about what has been written in the scriptures.

Dadashri: The scriptures are correct, but it is talk that is external (to *Akram*). External talk means talk at the gross (*sthool*) level. It is worldly (*laukik*) talk whereas these (*Akram*) talks are of beyond the world (*alaukik*).

Anger-pride-deceit-greed (*krodh-maan-maya-lobh*) are indeed abhorrence themselves; all four of them are abhorrence.

Questioner: In the scriptures, only two are mentioned [as abhorrence].

Dadashri: They will say only the two, but ultimately all four verily are abhorrence, because they hurt the self (*atma*), so they are all considered *kashay*. Therefore, as long as they exist, everything arises. ‘We’ have made You *vitadwesh* here. All You have to See is whether You feel that You have become *vitadwesh*.

Questioner: Yes I do.

Dadashri: Then, [to become] *vitaraag* is an effect, so nothing needs to be done for that. Causes have been removed, have they not? The root cause has been cut off.

Now, this talk is so subtle that one cannot understand it even after many years! This is not talk that can be understood through the intellect (*buddhi gamya*). This is actually *Gnan gamya* (experiential Knowledge arising from the Knowledge of the Self) talk that has come out. See it came out, did it not?

Questioner: But it is a fact; everyone has had the same experience that, at present they do not have abhorrence towards anything at all...

Dadashri: Abhorrence does not happen for anyone at all. Except they definitely like everything that feels good and tastes sweet, like mangos. When there is something bitter, they in fact do eat the bitter, but abhorrence does not happen. They settle it with equanimity; they bring a resolution to it. Therefore, having made You *vitadwesh*, all that remains is [to become] *vitaraag*.

Main Cause of Hunger is Abhorrence!

A *vitaraag* person does not have any sense of doership (*karvapanu*). It indeed happens on its own. Does a person eat because of attachment or abhorrence? When a person goes to eat, does he eat because of attachment or because of abhorrence?

Questioner: Because of attachment.

Dadashri: No, he eats because of abhorrence.

Questioner: Dada, please explain that. I did not quite understand that.

Dadashri: When he is not hungry, the poor man remains seated. When he becomes hungry, he feels pain inside, and when pain arises, he has abhorrence, isn't it? The hunger pangs are itself a cause of abhorrence. To feel thirsty is a cause of abhorrence. Abhorrence arises in him, otherwise if he never feels hungry, then what [would happen] If one would not have any hunger related to sexuality, hunger related to the body or any other kind of hunger, then what [would happen]?

Questioner: Then that person will become *vitaraag*.

Dadashri: He is indeed *vitaraag*! It is just that the hunger pangs arise. How many kinds of hunger arise in him?

Questioner: There are actually endless kinds of hunger!

Dadashri: Say, just like that one day, you do not feel any hunger arise at all, so you decide you do not want to go out to roam. You decide to remain in bed and sleep. Even then, will hunger not arise? Will hunger leave you alone? For a day or two?

Questioner: The hunger will arise.

Dadashri: So then, what happens to him within?

Questioner: He feels uncomfortable.

Dadashri: Meaning that, he feels pain (*dukh*), pain signals (*vedana*) arise. When pain signals arise, it means the resultant effect of abhorrence (*dwesh parinaam*) is considered to have arisen. As the *dwesh parinaam* has arisen, he will curse whoever comes along. Yes, if he is hungry, then he will curse, he will even bite. If you are carrying food and if you do not give him, then he will bite you. This is the case in hunger, in thirst, in sexuality; sexuality is a kind of hunger. Say a person is 'hungry' for a movie, but you do not let him go watch it. What will he do, then? Will he have abhorrence or will he have attachment [for you]?

Questioner: He will have abhorrence.

Dadashri: It is verily this abhorrence that has given rise to this world that is in existence. Attachment, the poor thing actually has no problem at all. Run around with seven women if you want to, provided you feel no abhorrence!

Questioner: Is it true that someone who gets very hungry feels more abhorrence?

Dadashri: Yes, of course. If he feels less hungry, then he will have less abhorrence. The one who has maintained the intent of *brahmacharya* (celibacy through the mind, speech and body) in the past life, meaning that he charged that intent, then he will have *brahmacharya* unfold for him in this life. After that [*brahmacharya* state] unfolds for him, he will not feel hungry for that [sexuality]. Hence, his abhorrence towards that is gone. Meaning that, he has become *vitadwesh*

(free from abhorrence) in that matter. Similarly, whatever he does not have hunger for, he becomes *vitadwesh* in that matter.

Questioner: As long as the body is there, hunger is bound to happen.

Dadashri: No, but for the one who has made the intent of *brahmacharya*, it is possible for him to have at least one less hunger. All other kinds of hunger will inevitably arise.

Questioner: Yes, the other hunger that we all have, to eat food, he will definitely have that; so then the abhorrence will never go away, will it?

Dadashri: So, abhorrence will not go away at all. That is why ‘we’ have given this *vitaraag Vignan* (the Science that leads to the absolute state free of attachment and abhorrence) and made You *vitadwesh*.

Questioner: Hunger still arises every day, so how can one be considered as having become *vitadwesh*?

Dadashri: You have yet to understand this science, when that happens, it [*vitadwesh* state] will be there. This science still remains to be understood, does it not? All those who are seated here have understood, ‘who is the one feeling the hunger and who is not.’ They know all that. ‘Who is the one feeling the hunger,’ you all sit here having understood that, right? And those people [not Self-realized] know only this that, ‘I am feeling hungry.’

If this hunger or thirst were to not arise, then these monks (*sadhus*) would not leave the Jain monasteries (*upashraya*). Attachment has actually arisen later. Attachment is the part that has arisen after ‘This is good and this is bad.’ Everything has primarily arisen from here [abhorrence]. If the root were to be grasped, then one’s work would be done, won’t it?

Therefore, You have been made *vitadwesh*. Now, continue to sit with ‘me’ [in *satsang*] and become *vitaraag*. Sit with ‘me’ as much as you can. Get whatever benefit you can out of this. And one has one more life, two lives, three lives, five lives, or at the most fifteen lives before attaining liberation, but he is not going to incur any other loss, is he? And do You not experience the bliss of that?

People come here every day only because they experience such bliss, isn’t it? Otherwise, who in the city of Mumbai would want to waste up to six or seven hours? Some spend four hours, some three hours, some two hours and some up to eight hours. There may be some people who come here for six hours even, right?

Questioner: Yes.

Dadashri: So abhorrence is such that, all the *vishay* (any worldly thing or subject that one finds pleasure in) that are there in our life, they cause pain. That is why abhorrence arises in him. And it is with this abhorrence that he makes efforts to put out the ‘fire’. He learns later that ‘this is good and this is bad;’ that this is a Ratnagiri mango and this other one is such and such. That attachment he learns after a long time. Attachment was not at all there [before]. When does one need this Ratnagiri mango? What if that other is available and this one is not available at all?

All these necessities that humans have, they all involve abhorrence. Attachment has arisen later. Thereafter started the distinction of, ‘This is better than that one,’ but when he has hunger pangs, does he worry about the good or the bad?

All These are Sensations of Pain!

When you feel hunger pangs, that hunger is considered as *ashata vedaniya* (sensations of pain). Now, no one on the outside is causing the sensation of pain to arise. *Ashata vedaniya* means abhorrence continues to arise within, dislike develops, and so you scold anyone that comes in your way. Now *ashata vedaniya* arises naturally, no one has done it. It is a punishment for having taken on the body. So the abhorrence that arises is of that. It is due to all these *ashata vedaniya* that the sensation of thirst arises. Therefore, wherever the phrase '*laage chhe*' (to feel the sensation) appears, it is all *ashata vedaniya*. The fact that you feel the 'burning' of hunger, of thirst, of sleep, of tiredness. The phrase 'to feel the sensation of' means it is 'burning'; that is all *ashata vedaniya*. Doesn't one also feel the sensation [burning] of being sleepy! That is all *ashata vedaniya*. And that is the reason for the abhorrence to arise. And then, from that abhorrence, one starts looking for food due to the *ashata vedaniya*! Then he ends up eating whatever comes along to 'cool' his hunger pangs. And then he starts choosing what he wants and that is the beginning of attachment. So attachment is our individual choice of this, or that or that in each and everything; whereas abhorrence is in fact mandatory (*farajiyat*). Dear man, just as a person cannot do without eating, isn't it? Similarly, one cannot do without sleeping also! If someone prevents you from sleeping, how would you feel towards him? Would you be overcome with attachment or abhorrence for him?

Questioner: A tremendous amount of abhorrence would arise for him.

Dadashri: What happens when you are hungry and someone stops you from eating? Attachment means one's own desire; it is one's own independent thing. In abhorrence, one is not independent at all. Now, does one read the scriptures or does he think over it in detail?

Questioner: Dada, how can one think over it in such detail?

Dadashri: They read [about it] in the scriptures. The scriptures have been written as a collective remedy for everyone. Take whatever medicine that suits you best. Do not abandon [renounce] your wife unnecessarily and run away. Those for whom it is the unfolding *karma* to do so, may do so, and if it is not in the unfolding *karma*, then so be it. If it is in one's *karma* [to renounce] and he is made to live a family life, then he will run away by the third day.

Abhorrence is First Indeed, Then Comes Attachment!

If one does not feel any abhorrence whatsoever towards his own wife, then attachment will not arise for [other] women at all. Such is the natural law. Hence, the poor man is having attachment towards a woman out of helplessness. Actually, abhorrence is happening for him, and it is this very abhorrence that pushes him into attachment for her. If abhorrence were not arising at all, then attachment for a woman would never arise. Just by thinking a little bit, he would realize that this is not something that is worth having any attachment for. King Bharat had thirteen hundred queens; he may have had attachment arise for them, but would abhorrence not have arisen within him! King Bharat had become *vitadwesh* (free from abhorrence)!

Whereas today, say a man marries a woman and she is dark in complexion, then he will definitely have attachment arise for another woman with fair skin. [When asked] "Hey you! You have a wife don't you?" He will say, "But she does not have a fair complexion!" So if there were no women with fair complexion in existence then would any attachment arise within him?

Questioner: No it will not.

Dadashri: That is it; the cause is primarily of abhorrence. One has a need for a woman; these sense organs (*indriya*) are such that, until one attains *Gnan* (the Knowledge of the Self) he has a need for women, and a need for all other things.

Questioner: Is there no need [for those] after *Gnan*?

Dadashri: There is no need after attaining the *Gnan*; meaning that only sexuality and sexual impulses for the opposite sex (*vishay-vikaar*) stops. The rest, food and all that; he will need that till the end, for as long as the body is living.

Children, a Resultant Effect of Abhorrence Done in the Past Life!

If you do not have abhorrence towards the wife or the children, then attachment will never arise.

Questioner: How is that? If there is something that we like, something that we have attachment towards, then would there be abhorrence for it?

Dadashri: There is abhorrence indeed; only then would attachment happen! Attachment cannot happen without abhorrence.

Questioner: Does that mean, there is abhorrence first?

Dadashri: Attachment can never happen without abhorrence. Abhorrence from attachment, and attachment from abhorrence. When you give medicine to a small child, what would happen if the child spits the medicine out and it goes into your eyes?

Questioner: Then abhorrence will arise.

Dadashri: Then abhorrence will arise. Therefore, if abhorrence goes away first, then attachment will go away. At present, abhorrence has gone away for You. You do not have abhorrence arising towards anyone, but attachment will indeed remain. However, it is a discharge (*nikali*) attachment. Moreover, there is even no discharge abhorrence remaining at all.

Questioner: I still do not quite understand how attachment arises out of abhorrence. The moment we see our child, attachment is the first thing that happens.

Dadashri: Attachment will arise only where abhorrence has happened, otherwise attachment would not arise whatsoever.

Questioner: Would abhorrence have happened due to some *karma* of the past life?

Dadashri: This attachment is arising as a resultant effect (*parinaam*) of that. And if a tremendous amount of abhorrence continues to happen for the child, then he will come to you as your grandchild to play in your laps, and you give him kisses! Hey you! Why are you kissing him when you did not even like him?

Abhorrence from Attachment, and Attachment from Abhorrence!

The cause of conflict is abhorrence. When too much attachment arises, dislike starts to develop. Familiarity up to a certain point will result in attachment, and if it goes beyond the 'ridge point' [normal limit], then it results in abhorrence. When abhorrence is happening, at that very time the causes of attachment are being created. And at the root of all this, attachment-abhorrence is an effect and *agnan* (ignorance of the Self) is the cause!

Questioner: I have read in one section of the *Aptavani* that the seed of abhorrence is sown through attachment, and the seed of attachment is sown through abhorrence. Please explain this a little. How does this happen?

Dadashri: Why? Otherwise, what is your view?

Questioner: I can understand that abhorrence gives rise to attachment, but I do not understand that attachment gives rise to abhorrence.

Dadashri: What do you understand by ‘abhorrence gives rise to attachment’?

Questioner: You had said that, one may have said [in the past life], “I do not want to see his face,” then he is born as a son to him [in this life].

Dadashri: There, he keeps on kissing him.

Questioner: But that means that attachment has arisen due to abhorrence, does it not?

Dadashri: Both are indeed in opposition to the other. This [attachment] gives rise to that [abhorrence] and that [abhorrence] gives rise to this [attachment]. Neither will affect a person who is *vitaraag* (free from attachment and abhorrence).

Questioner: Please explain how abhorrence arises from attachment.

Dadashri: Even though you may have a lot of attachment for someone, yet when it becomes excessive, it turns into abhorrence.

Questioner: When it (attachment) becomes excessive abhorrence arises, is an accomplished principle (*siddhant*); please explain it further with an example.

Dadashri: The cause for the quarrels (*kakadaat*) that happen every day in the home is verily attachment. When it becomes excessive, abhorrence arises. The result of everyday attachment is abhorrence.

Questioner: A woman has a lot of attachment (*raag*) for her husband, is that why quarrels arise between them?

Dadashri: Yes, then when he goes away from home and could not return in time, she becomes increasingly irritated. Nothing happens to a person who is *vitaraag*. The person with a great amount of attachment will continue to have fights.

Questioner: It happens when there is a great amount of attachment; that is true.

Dadashri: Alas, it also happens when there is less attachment.

Questioner: If it is less, then less will happen and with the other, more will happen.

Dadashri: But it keeps on happening for sure. A person had a lot of attachment for his only son, so upon his return from Mumbai after six months, when his son started saying ‘*papaji*’, he immediately picked him up and hugged him so hard, that the toddler bit him! Excessiveness ruins everything. You should learn about all the balance. Upon making everything appropriately balanced, one becomes *vitaraag*. Gradually as one brings everything to balance, one becomes *vitaraag*. Would a toddler bite or not?

Questioner: Yes of course, he would bite.

Dadashri: Was he appropriate or was the child appropriate?

Questioner: The child acted appropriately. Yes, that is correct.

Dadashri: Even then the mortals, they keep on hugging excessively.

Questioner: In displaying too much attachment, abhorrence arose in the child.

Dadashri: No, it's because too much attachment happened, that abhorrence arose. So then, when the child bit him, it gave rise to abhorrence in the father. He put the child down [on the ground] and smacked him. But even then, the father does not understand. He hugged the child even harder. He only knows that, 'Even though I showed him a lot of love, yet the child bit me!'

This is what the world is like; people are blindly walking around in the dark [ignorance]. But what can be done? So, go about leisurely and without haste wearing the 'spectacles' [divine vision] I have given you. The 'spectacles' are good, aren't they? You don't stumble, do you?

I have given you detailed explanations of the subtle most things that the world would never otherwise have discovered.

Akram Vignan has made One Vitadwesh!

Only [the term] *vitaraag* has been used. Therefore, the moment *Gnan* is given, abhorrence is the first to leave for every person. Even when someone curses at him, he will settle with that person with equanimity, but he will not have abhorrence. Do You experience that to some extent? Do You experience that completely?

Questioner: I constantly experience it.

Dadashri: Even though he curses at you! Otherwise [without *Gnan*], what would be the result of someone cursing at you? What would happen if he curses at you? Would you feel abhorrence for him or attachment?

Questioner: It would be abhorrence indeed. After attaining this *Gnan*, we do not experience abhorrence even in places where abhorrence is likely to occur.

Dadashri: If you do not have abhorrence even when you are placed in a home of a person for whom abhorrence is likely to arise, then know that you have become worthy of becoming *vitaraag*!

It is meaningless to have abhorrence in places where abhorrence normally arises. The abhorrence that you used to experience in the past, does not arise anymore in any place, does it?

Questioner: It happens in one place.

Dadashri: There is no problem with having it in one place. If it is happening in only one place, then hand it over to me. But in other places, it does not happen in any other place in this entire world, does it? The one place where it is happening, is actually a mistake in your vision (*drashti*), there is a mistake in your understanding. In reality, it does not happen even over there. And it does not happen anywhere else, does it? Therefore, abhorrence is not arising for you in any place, is it?

Questioner: No, nowhere.

Dadashri: Say four other people are sitting with you in a car, and one of them says, "I will return in five minutes after doing *darshan*." Then, would the four of you seated in the car curse at the one who left? What would you do?

Questioner: We have to See the circumstance that has presented in front of us. So, in that case, abhorrence would not arise in us at all.

Dadashri: No, but what would you do? Would you settle it with equanimity? You would not have abhorrence towards him afterwards, would you? Even if it became fifteen minutes to half-an-hour, would you?

Questioner: Yes, even then abhorrence will not arise.

Dadashri: ‘We’ have made You *vitadwesh*.

So, in what *Gnan* have ‘I’ established You? [One where] Your abhorrence has completely gone away. So ‘I’ have not obstructed your attachment at all. ‘I’ have told you, “Eat alphonso mangos, have mango pulp and chapatti and all that to eat, wear [nice] clothes, go watch movies!” Why have ‘I’ said that? It is because you do not experience enmity towards that. As ‘I’ have stopped your abhorrence, You can remain in *saiyam* (a state in which separation is maintained even in the midst of anger, pride, deceit, greed, attachment and abhorrence) all day long. It is due to abhorrence that all this *asaiyam* (expression of anger, pride, deceit and greed) exists. A person cannot have attachment all day long, he has abhorrence only!

So, it’s like this, if the resultant effect of abhorrence has reduced, then there is no problem if attachment exists. So, right now, even though You have been set free after making you *vitadwesh*, yet no one will call You *vitaraag*. But up to what level have You attained? You have become *vitadwesh*. For You, *artadhyan* (adverse internal state of being that hurts the self) and *raudradhyan* (adverse internal state of being that hurts the self and others) have stopped. This *artadhyan* and *raudradhyan* are abhorrence. Would *artadhyan* and *raudradhyan* be considered as attachment or as abhorrence? They are actually abhorrence. Where there is attachment, would there be *raudradhyan*? When there is attachment, *raudradhyan* cannot happen at that time. *Raudradhyan* exists where there is abhorrence.

Why not Vitaraag?

You have become *vitadwesh*, but you have not yet become *vitaraag*! That is when this attachment leaves. Now how does this attachment go away? It is like this, you will definitely let go of what is bitter, and you will let go of the abhorrence for that which is bitter. But it will take time for you to let go of that which is sweet and it will also take time for the attachment that you have towards it to leave. Everyone knows how to let go of the bitter, but what about the sweet?

Questioner: That is true, it take long to do that.

Dadashri: That is why ‘I’ said that, “You have become free of the bitter. That indeed was the greatest danger, that of abhorrence.”

Questioner: So would it fundamentally have arisen from abhorrence?

Dadashri: All this has fundamentally arisen from abhorrence. And if you go beyond that, then it has arisen from enmity (*ver*). So, your [spiritual] work will be done if you become friends. Otherwise as long as enmity prevails, it will bind you. If the people of the world were to understand just this point of the twenty-four *Tirthankars*, then the world would attain salvation. Just this one point of the twenty-four *Tirthankars* that, “Become *vitadwesh*!”

Questioner: It is a very important point.

Dadashri: Yes, it is a very deep point, only rarely does such talk come about. *Vitadwesh* and *vitaraag*! In fact, the world has not even heard the word ‘*vitadwesh*’!

Questioner: And if it goes, it is abhorrence that goes first, and thereafter attachment leaves.

Dadashri: Yes. Abhorrence goes away first. Abhorrence indeed has to leave first. If abhorrence does not go, then liberation (*moksha*) cannot happen. No matter how much attachment one gets rid off, he will still not get anywhere.

Attachment for ‘I am Chandubhai’ Means Abhorrence for the Real Form as the Self!

‘I am Chandubhai’ is itself attachment in the falsely attributed (*aropit*) place, and there is abhorrence in the other place. Meaning that, there is abhorrence in the *Swaroop* (the real form as the Self). If there is attachment in one place, then there is indeed abhorrence on the opposite side, in the opposite corner. At the instance when ‘we’ make you become aware of your real form as the Self, when ‘we’ establish the awareness of the pure Soul (*Shuddhatma*) within, You come into the *vitadwesh* state. And as You progress forward, You start to become *vitaraag*. *Vitaraag* means the Knowledge (*Gnan*) and Vision (*Darshan*; understanding) of the original place, of the real form as the Self.

Upon Attaining Gnan, One Becomes Vitadwesh!

Questioner: These *vitaraag* Lords, they do not have attachment at all, but we have attachment towards ‘you’.

Dadashri: There is no problem with the attachment that you have for ‘me’.

Questioner: That is why we feel like coming here.

Dadashri: You would definitely have attachment for ‘me’.

Questioner: Then, what does *vitaraag* mean?

Dadashri: *Vitaraag* means, if you want to portray *vitaraag* in the true sense, then one should say ‘*vitaraag-dwesh*’. But why do they refer to them as *vitaraag*? The answer is that when They attained the awakened awareness (*jagruti*) as the Self, They attained the right Vision (*samyak Darshan*). At the time of [attaining] *kshayak samyak Darshan* (the permanent conviction of the right belief, ‘I am pure Soul’), They become *vitadwesh* for sure. When ‘we’ give you *Gnan*, You become *vitadwesh*, meaning the thing called abhorrence moves aside from within You.

Abhorrence goes away. That is why, when anger arises, You do not like it. If contempt (*tiraskaar*) arises towards someone, You do not like it. All that, which is considered as abhorrence, which is considered as contempt, will not be there [within You]. So, You have definitely become *vitadwesh*.

After Becoming Vitadwesh, Discharge Attachment Remains!

Questioner: If there is attachment, then abhorrence will occur. Attachment is a phase (*paryay*) of greed (*lobh*), and it is the last to leave. That is why it is possible for one to have attachment but not abhorrence. But there is no abhorrence where there is no attachment. Attachment is the main thing; with its destruction, One attains the absolute state as the Self, that is to say, liberation is attained. Please explain that.

Dadashri: The inherent nature (*swabhaav*) of abhorrence is bitter, thus one becomes free of the bitter intent, while the other (attachment) being sweet, remains. It is bitter and it is not liked, but now that it has entered within, what can one do? Then later the abhorrence leaves when one attains the Knowledge of the Self or when there is a change in the *drashti* (vision), when it becomes *Atmadrashti* (the vision that Sees the Self). When *Atmadrashti* is attained, abhorrence goes away, because it is bitter. If it were sweet, then this one [file no. 1] will not allow it to go away! Therefore, attachment remains right until the end.

Questioner: Dada, when ‘you’ give us *Gnan*, of the attachment and abhorrence that are present, abhorrence goes away at that very instance. Why does this happen?

Dadashri: Abhorrence goes away first, because the demerit *karma* (*paap*) are destroyed. Then, only attachment remains, which gradually gets worn down and that too, it is in the form of discharge, it is not in the form of charge. It gradually becomes less and ultimately one is called *vitaraag*. One is considered *vitaraag* when even attachment goes away.

Questioner: Dada, if attachment is in the form of discharge only, then would abhorrence also remain in the form of discharge or not?

Dadashri: No, abhorrence definitely goes away. New *karma* would be bound if abhorrence were to be present. As long as abhorrence exists, worries will arise. Here, not even a single worry is arising. The reason for this is that abhorrence is destroyed on the very first day.

Questioner: Not on the first day, it gets destroyed at that very instant.

Dadashri: So, he becomes *jeetendriya jina* (One who has conquered all the senses) at that instant. But as a *jeetendriya jina* has indeed conquered all the sense organs (*indriya*) that is why it happens for him at that instant. So he becomes *vitadwesh*. He conquers all the sense organs.

Questioner: But does abhorrence remain as discharge or not?

Dadashri: No.

Questioner: It does not remain. Experience shows that no enmity remains towards those whom we previously considered to be our enemies.

Dadashri: It will not remain at all. You have become *vitadwesh*.

Questioner: Our abhorrence goes away, but what should one do so that the other person’s abhorrence leaves?

Dadashri: Keep doing *pratikraman*. Attachment has arisen from abhorrence, they both have a cause and effect relationship. Hence, as abhorrence is not happening, the entire cause has stopped; [One has become] *vitadwesh*!

Questioner: Then Dada, attachment still remains. If one has a wife, children, office, business, then attachment would still be remaining, wouldn’t it? Is that attachment considered to be in the form of discharge?

Dadashri: That attachment is in the form of discharge. Attachment is actually in the form of charge when one has the awareness that, ‘I am Chandubhai’. That is when it is really attachment. But when the awareness is of ‘I am pure Soul’, at that time, attachment is really not there. It is in the form of discharge.

The Moment Attacking Stops, One Becomes God!

It is called *dharma* (religion) when attachment-abhorrence does not occur under any circumstance. It's fine if attachment happens, but abhorrence should never occur. Whereas he [not Self-realized] would strike back.

Just make sure that no [feeling of] attacking is arising. And when you feel like attacking, come and tell 'me,' "I keep getting thoughts about attacking." Let those thoughts come, but those attacks are not Yours, are they? If you answer, "No, they are not," then there is no problem.

The scriptures say that if you do not have the intent (*bhaav*) of attacking anyone, then you are indeed *Mahavir* (the victorious One). The moment my attacks stopped, I used to consider myself *Mahavir*; it is just that I would not say so. It must be the same thing the Lord had spoken of; I do not have anything else that remains to be sought. Go find me a man in this world whose attacks have stopped; there can never be one. It just because of this 'I', 'to me' and 'mine' that one is not progressing forward from here. When this 'I' disappears, then everything worldly will disappear. There is no such *upadeshak* (preacher) who has been able to stop his attacks.

The Unique Karmic Account of the Suffering due to Attachment-Abhorrence!

Questioner: In whatever one has attachment, one has to experience (suffer) that through abhorrence later on. And in whatever one has abhorrence, it has to be experienced (suffered) through attachment later on. Please explain this aphorism (*sutra*).

Dadashri: Attachment can never occur without a reason. Attachment occurs when one has experienced a blow of some kind. If one stops talking to his friend due to some disagreement and if the vow not to speak to each other goes on for six months to a year, then tremendous attachment will arise between them. So, when they start talking to each other again, the fools will hug each other. Now, they stopped talking to each other because of abhorrence, and the attachment that arose out of that abhorrence increased to such a point that ultimately when they ended up hugging each other, there was so much concord that had developed in their friendship, that you can't even fathom! This is how the entire world functions.

Attraction occurs only where you have a *karmic* account (*hisaab*). Attachment is known as that which you happily allow attraction to arise. And what is the reason that this is not [considered as] attachment? It is because even though you do not wish for it, yet attraction (*aakarshan*) happens. Does that come to pass or not?

Questioner: Yes it does.

Dadashri: Then it cannot be considered as attachment. In attachment, things happen according to your wishes. Whereas now, it is not Your wish. After 'we' give this *Gnan*, all these people have wives, but it should be against one's wish; only to the extent of attraction!

Abhorrence is repulsion (*vikarshan*) and attachment is attraction. It is the inherent nature of *pudgal* (inanimate matter) to continue attracting-repelling. The inherent nature of the Self is not like that.

This is the Absolute Science!

From the moment you met with the *Gnani Purush*, You have been made *vitadwesh* (free from abhorrence). Thereafter, as the files get settled You start to become *vitaraag* and as soon as one settles all the files, he has become *vitaraag*. The *Gnani Purush* is completely *vitaraag* in this

way. There may be one or two degrees lacking, but otherwise He is completely (*sampurna*) *vitaraag*!

As *vitaraagata* (the state free from attachment and abhorrence) increases, that much freedom from attachment-abhorrence is attained, and that much *moksha* one starts to understand, thereby the complete (*purna*) state begins to arise. [One who has] Absolute *vitaraagata* is known as God.

This is a scientific method, all this of ‘ours’! In fact, this is the absolute science! It is entirely a science (*vignan*). Everything that ‘I’ have been saying for the last twenty-seven years is completely a science. Each and every word of it is science. Science is considered to be an incontrovertible principle (*siddhant*).

[2.4]

Prashasta Raag

That Which Can Never be Forgotten is Prashasta Raag!

First, One becomes *vitadwesh* (free from abhorrence), then One becomes *vitaraag* (free from attachment and abhorrence). After [the state of] *vitadwesh* arises, then *raag* (attachment) itself remains. The inherent nature of *raag* is such that it goes away later only. This is because when *raag* detaches from the *pudgal* (non-Self complex), it gets established upon the *Gnani Purush*. But what is that *raag* like? It is *prashasta raag* (attachment for the real). It is the *raag* for the *Gnani* who has given you the *Gnan* (Knowledge of the Self), or *raag* towards the scriptures that you have been shown. Therefore, the *raag* that remains towards the tools related to [attaining] the Self is called *prashasta raag*. And that *raag* gradually reduces and eventually when it leaves, One becomes *vitaraag*. You will definitely have to get rid of even the *raag* that gets established upon the *Gnani Purush* and all [such tools for attaining liberation] sooner or later, will you not?

Questioner: So, if there is *raag* there is *dwesh* (abhorrence), is that not so?

Dadashri: If it is *paudgalik raag* (worldly attachment), then there is *dwesh*. [Whereas] This is called *prashasta raag*, it does not have *dwesh*. *Prashasta raag* is not such that it is filled with *dwesh*. This *raag* is a remarkable *raag*, and it is this *raag* itself that gives you *moksha* (liberation). One has *prashasta raag* for the *Gnani Purush*.

Questioner: That is not *raag* (attachment), it is *prem* (love).

Dadashri: It is love but it is referred to as *prashasta raag*. If that arises then that is more than enough.

Questioner: Please explain the meaning of the word ‘*prashasta raag*’.

Dadashri: It is a very exalted kind of attachment. It is considered as a kind of attachment that does not cause *karmic* bondage. The effect of this [attachment] does not lead to bondage. All other types of attachment cause bondage, whereas this attachment results in liberation.

When Dada is constantly remembered, that is *prashasta raag*. Does this happen to anyone, where one constantly does not forget Dada? Let’s see, raise your hand if this is the case for you. One, two, three... it happens for everyone! Wow! He is constantly not forgotten. To forget Dada is tantamount to forgetting the Self (*Atma*), because the *Gnani Purush* is verily one’s own Self.

Questioner: If we don’t come here to ‘you’, we feel as if we are missing something.

Dadashri: As long as you do not have the clear and distinct experience of your own Self, until then the *Gnani Purush* himself is your own Self, and if you remain in close proximity with ‘him’, then you attain everything. It is a very simple point, isn’t it! It is not difficult.

Craze For The Gnani!

Questioner: But what does it mean by, ‘One can attain freedom by continuously observing the *Gnani*.’

Dadashri: One can become like the one he observes. As you keep observing ‘him’, you become like ‘him’.

Questioner: When I ordinarily look at others, I am seeing them as a pure Soul (*Shuddhatma bhaav*) within. In ‘your’ case, I do not have such a thought. The mind gets stuck in your body (*sharira*).

Dadashri: It is considered as the Self when it is together with this entire body.

Questioner: We experience a lot of *bhaav* (warm feelings; affection) towards ‘you’. So, if craze (*ghelchha*) arises for ‘you’, then wouldn’t the main thing that we are supposed to acquire be put aside?

Dadashri: No, no. Craze is not arising. Would You not understand the craze! As You are the Self, then would You not understand the craze [lies in Chandubhai]?

Questioner: Why did that happen to Gautam Swami [Lord Mahavir’s primary disciple]?

Dadashri: That did happen, and because of that the *Gnan* may come to a standstill [obstructed], but it will not go away. The *Gnan* comes to a standstill, but that is considered as *prashasta raag*. What is the fruit [effect] of *prashasta raag*? *Vitaraagpanu* (the state as one who is free of attachment and abhorrence). Whereas, the effect of worldly attachment (*sansaarik raag*) is *raag-dwesh*.

So, which *raag* remains after One becomes *vitadwesh*? *Prashasta raag* remains. It is the *raag* that is the direct cause for *moksha*. There is not even a drop of worldly attachment in it.

Questioner: Does *prashasta raag* go away naturally?

Dadashri: There is no problem with it. Even if *prashasta raag* does not go away, there is no problem because it will rest [be satisfied] only after it gives you *moksha*. So there is no need for you to worry about that. *Prashasta raag*, the kind that Gautam Swami had for Lord Mahavir. If not now, then *prashasta raag* will dissolve on its own after a while, it continues to dissolve.

Questioner: That is what stopped Gautam Swami’s *moksha*.

Dadashri: How can that be considered as stopped? It may happen after six or twelve years, it may happen after fifteen years, or it can happen in the next life. There is nothing to fear about *prashasta raag*, the danger is of this worldly attachment. No matter how much *prashasta raag* there is, it is not worth being fearful of it.

Questioner: *KevalGnan* (absolute Knowledge) cannot occur with *prashasta raag*, can it?

Dadashri: What is the hurry for *kevalGnan*? Tell it, “Come if you want to.” It’s like this, we are sitting in the train [of *moksha*]. *KevalGnan* is the final most station. It will come on its own. What is the hurry for it? *KevalGnan* is almost in your hands. It can indeed be referred to as *kevalGnan* from the moment you attain the clear and distinct experience of the Self (*spashta vedan*).

Questioner: If not *kevalGnan*, but the *Gnan* would stop, wouldn’t it?

Dadashri: No. The *Gnan* does not stop at all. On the contrary, the *Gnan* will increase. Who does that happen to? Suppose a person who is very entangled in worldly life gets this *Gnan*, so then his entanglements get cleared and he happens to develop a singular vision. This does not happen for everyone. If one is entrenched too deeply in worldly life, if his *chit* has become stuck

in too many places in worldly life, then when his *chit* gets stuck here [on the *Gnani*], it will detach itself from all the former places where it was stuck. It is not harmful. It has been referred to as *prashasta raag*. Such a *raag* does not arise often, but if it does, then it will do great things.

Questioner: Besides *prashasta raag*, can *paudgalik raag* (worldly attachment, attachment related to the non-Self complex) arise towards the *Gnani*?

Dadashri: *Paudgalik raag* will always detach. That *raag* gets stuck through the *pudgal*, but it will later detach and eventually it remains as *prashasta raag* only. This has happened, this has happened before, hasn't it? This is not something new.

That happens, but eventually one becomes free from everything through it. Wherever else one is entangled in, he becomes free of that, and the attachment converges to one place. That is why people have considered *prashasta raag* as the best tool. All other 'entanglements' tend to detach.

Prashasta Raag is a Stepping-Stone!

Prashasta raag means the attachment that gives *moksha*. In this attachment, it takes one up a step at a time. With the first step, it gets rid of abhorrence (*dwesh*) just like that. Therefore, although everyone has attachment towards 'us', but it is considered as *prashasta raag*. It is not worldly attachment. There is no worldly (*sansaari, bhautik*) intent in it.

Prashasta Raag and Prashasta Moha!

This *prashasta raag* is worth maintaining all the time. *Prashasta* means it is a kind of attachment that is not bad, it is beneficial. It is an attachment that the *Gnanis* have praised. And *aprashasta* means bad, it makes one wander around in worldly life.

Questioner: What is the difference between *raag* and *prashasta raag*?

Dadashri: *Prashasta raag* is the *raag* that takes one to *moksha*, whereas this *raag* makes one drown in worldly life. The attachment that arises for worldly happiness is called *raag*, and the attachment which once established, makes one let go of the worldly is called *prashasta raag*.

Questioner: What is the difference between *prashasta raag* and *prashasta moha*?

Dadashri: *Prashasta raag* can be moved aside; it can be washed off. It takes time to wash off *moha* (illusory attachment). *Raag* is something one has stuck himself, whereas *moha* is something that is already stuck on. Later, this *raag* will detach, there is no stickiness in it. Is there stickiness anywhere in *prashasta raag*? Worldly attachment is with stickiness and *prashasta raag* is without stickiness.

Devotion for the Gnani is Greed That is Pure!

Questioner: If devotion arises for Dada, if my heart over flows, in what should we place that? In which one should we place that; in anger, pride, deceit or greed?

Dadashri: That will go in greed. Only in greed.

Questioner: Is that not *prashasta raag*, Dada? How is it considered to be a part of anger-pride-deceit-greed? The *mahatma* feels *prashasta raag* [for Dada].

Dadashri: That is why it is greed, isn't it?

Questioner: Greed, that's right.

Dadashri: It is not greed with deceit. In the other *raag*, both deceit and greed come together. This *prashasta raag* is greed alone.

Questioner: It is greed for *moksha*.

Dadashri: Greed.

Questioner: These *mahatmas* continue to have inner intent (*bhaavna*) for world salvation (*jagat kalyan*), it constantly goes on within, what is that?

Dadashri: It means that only a person who has attained his own salvation, will have such thoughts, otherwise no one in the world has had such thoughts. How would others [not Self-realized] indeed have such thoughts? The mortal one, he has no end to the interference in his own home! Only Krupadudev had such thoughts, however not even the monks and ascetics (*sadhu-sanyasis*) have had such thoughts because they have become fed up of their disciples themselves, so what can they do?

Questioner: These feelings (*bhaav*) for world salvation, are they also considered as greed?

Dadashri: Yes. That is also greed. *Prashasta raag* is a kind of attachment, isn't it! Those who have attained their own salvation, look for this. These boys, all the *brahmacharis* (young men and women who practice celibacy), they do only this all day long. 'Wow... there are no humans like them.' People become extraordinarily impressed (*aafrin*) upon seeing them because [they are such that] they do not want anything, they do not want any benefit out of anything!

Questioner: So Dada, it is good for the *mahatmas* to have such greed, isn't it? The greed of *prashasta raag*?

Dadashri: In doing this greed, all your tendencies (*vruttio*) towards other worldly things will detach and the tendency will become stuck to only one place. If they get stuck onto Dada, then Dada will help you in your next life; what loss have you incurred in that! Therefore, it is more than enough if those other tendencies leave, if they do not go to the other places anymore.

Questioner: If *prashasta raag* were to arise, then will the other tendencies break completely?

Dadashri: They will break. That is why 'we' tell you, "Do *prashasta raag*. And that is the only *raag* that you may do openly!" So, there is no problem.

If *prashasta raag* were not to arise towards such a benevolent One, then for whom would it arise? Why did Gautam Swami have *prashasta raag* for the Lord Mahavir? It was because Lord Mahavir had obliged him; He had tremendously obliged him. The Lord had called him and gave him the path to *moksha*. He gave Gautam Swami the status of his chief disciple (*gandhar pad*). Then, there was the Lord's benevolence in sending Gautam Swami away from Him [at the time of His *Nirvana*]. That is when He realized within that, 'Oh what a tremendous amount of attachment has entered here.' [He told Gautam Swami] "Let go of your *pramaad* (spiritual apathy), let go!" Then the Lord did a miracle, He attained *nirvana* (final liberation) after sending Gautam Swami away. So, Gautam Swami immediately felt a sudden fear arise within, 'Oh dear! How could the Lord do this?' Then the moment he analyzed it, he realized that, 'The Lord would not make such a mistake. The mistake is my own. Oh! The Lord was *vitaraag*, but it was I who had the *raag*. So

it was to get rid of my *raag* that the Lord had said so before He left.' In that instant he attained *kevalGnan*, absolute Knowledge manifested. It was only because of this *raag* that it had been impeded.

Questioner: Dada, our *prashasta raag* will also go away towards the end moment, won't it? It will eventually go away, won't it?

Dadashri: You will become free of it, over there. Over there, the moment you do *darshan* (devotional viewing) of Lord Simandhar Swami, it will all detach. Actually, if you were to get a chance to do *darshan* of such a progressively higher state over here, then it would even detach right now.

Questioner: But in order to go to Lord Simandhar Swami, we will have to ensure that this *raag* remains stuck, won't we?

Dadashri: It will remain stuck for sure; it will not detach even if you tried to detach it.

Questioner: When we go over there to Lord Simandhar Swami, then it does not matter if it detaches.

Dadashri: It will detach by itself. It has nothing to do with You. That which is external [to the Self] should detach away.

Questioner: If it attaches here [in Dada], then it will detach from everything that is outside [the realm of the Self] for sure.

Dadashri: If anything outside [the realm of the Self] remains stuck, then you will have to come back to complete one more lifetime; You have strayed away!

Even God Has Praised Prashasta Raag!

Questioner: Therefore if *raag* (attachment) towards Dada arises, that *raag* is necessary.

Dadashri: That will happen, of course! That *raag* is actually useful. It is useful till you become independent (*niralumb*). It is the final dependency (*avalumban*), and as this *raag* arises here, the attachment stops in the other places. A person can be only be in one place at a time. If he is here, then he cannot be there, and if he is there then he cannot be here.

Questioner: Dada that is exactly what tends to happen. That is exactly what has happened now. As the *raag* has arisen here, all the other attachments have indeed dissipated.

Dadashri: That is why even God has praised this *prashasta raag*. The other attachments tend to dissipate.

Questioner: Dada, but even then, since we live a worldly life, it feels as if someone is pulling us, we have to be pulled way.

Dadashri: There is no point in being pulled. That is discharge.

Questioner: No. But there indeed was *raag* there before.

Dadashri: It has dissipated. That is why you feel it to be burdensome. Even when someone gives you a lot of respect, it feels burdensome.

Questioner: Yes... that is exactly how it feels.

Dadashri: Even if someone gives you respect, you do not like it anymore. If they tell ‘Chandubhai’, “Chandubhai, sir please come visit my home,” even then you do not like it from within. You say to yourself, ‘Why this unnecessary interference once again?’ That which you previously found ‘sweet’, you no longer like it now.

Heading Towards the Vitaraag [State]!

Questioner: What does *raag* do?

Dadashri: It causes *murchha* (unawareness arising from illusory attachment); *murchha*, *bebhaanpanu* (a state of gross unawareness)! The fruit [effect] of *raag* is a state of gross unawareness, and the fruit of *dwesh* is fear. When these two go away, then One becomes *vitaraag* (free of attachment and abhorrence). One will not become *vitaraag* until then. Our *mahatmas* are making preparations for becoming *vitaraag*. If someone asks, “Have you become a little *vitaraag*?” They will say, “Yes we definitely have. We have become *vitadwesh* (free from abhorrence).”

Now they have to become *vitaraag*. Of the two [freedom from attachment and abhorrence], one has been completed. One would ask, “After becoming *vitadwesh*, where does the *raag* remain?” The answer is, the *raag* would arise for the *Gnani*. The *raag* that used to be towards worldly things has lifted away from there and has now been established for the *Gnani*, for the *mahatmas*. But this *raag* is considered *prashasta raag* (attachment that will lead to liberation).

That *prashasta raag* is the cause for *vitaraagata* (a state of complete absence of attachment and abhorrence). This is the only attachment that makes One *vitaraag*. Has *raag* arisen within you for all these *mahatmas* or not?

Questioner: Yes it has.

Dadashri: The attachment that arises for the *Gnani Purush*, for *mahatmas*, is considered a beneficial attachment. What is the fruit of *prashasta raag*? It is freedom from attachment and abhorrence (*vitaraag*). It will indeed give fruit on its own, you do not have to do anything else. It is verily the fruit of this. You sowed the seed, you sowed a corn seed, you watered it and did everything else, so then does the corn cob sprout on its own or do you have to go in to make it?

The Gnani Himself is Your Atma!

Prashasta raag is the attachment that sets you free from all misery (*dukh*). It is the attachment that makes all the miseries, the worldly miseries to become non-existent. So You have become free of abhorrence but your attachment has not yet left. That attachment which is stuck everywhere, it leaves from there and settles on ‘me’ [*Gnani Purush*]. That other *raag* now feels painful. So one will ask, “What about the attachment that is towards Dada?” That is actually considered as *prashasta raag*, the attachment that is the direct cause for *moksha*! And it is good if the attachment settles on the *Gnani Purush*, isn’t it! Then all other problems will be over!

And Krupadudev helped verify this by stating, “The *Sat Purush* (the *Gnani*, the Self realized One) is indeed your *Atma* (Self).” And so this ‘water’ [*prashasta raag*] runs in that very direction! All the statements are such that they can be verified!

Attachment Towards Dada Arises Instantly Upon Attaining Gnan!

Questioner: Dada, you said that the only thing that prevented Gautam Swami from attaining *keval Gnan* was his *prashasta raag* [for Lord Mahavir]!

Dadashri: Yes. What else would it be? There is no problem if it is prevented due to that *raag*. There is no problem even if due to that *raag*, it is prevented for five lifetimes. There is no *raag* as great as this *raag* in the world. At least no other things of worldly life will possess you! And this *raag* is very beneficial. But such *raag* would never arise [easily], would it? It is difficult for it to arise! It's just that this is *Akram Vignan* (the science of absolutism), and that is why that other becomes pacified completely. That is why *raag* for Dada arises immediately, otherwise it would not do so. No matter how hard you try to make it stick, it will not stick.

Questioner: Dada, after having come here to you, many people have had that experience. Inner peace happens and so the *raag* settles on Dada.

Dadashri: As inner peace happens, *raag* would definitely arise. Even in this worldly life, all the *raag* that arises, it arises due to peace, but that peace is peace that is filled with *aasakti* (infatuation, attraction that leads to attachment); it remains for a while and then goes away. That is why one ends up fighting afterwards. Whereas this [*prashasta*] *raag* that has arisen, there can't be anything else in it, can there? This is the wonder of this *kaal* (era of the time cycle); if one understands this, then he can get his work done. But if one goes astray, then it can also go wrong. *Prashasta raag* has never arisen in any era of time cycle, has it? If it had, then one would definitely not be in the [sorry] state he is in today!

Prashasta Raag is Itself Moksha for This Era of the Time Cycle!

This *prashasta raag* is considered as *vitadwesh*, but it cannot be called *vitaraag*. One becomes *vitaraag* only after this *prashasta raag* also goes away. *Prashasta raag* is actually very beneficial in this era of the time cycle. If this *prashasta raag* remains, then know that you have attained liberation, because it destroys all other attachments. This *raag* destroys all the external worldly pleasures, it destroys all those other attachments. That is why if this *prashasta raag* arises, then consider it as *moksha* for this era of the time cycle.

Questioner: What is the function of *prashasta raag*?

Dadashri: *Prashasta raag* lifts away the attachment in other places, it lifts away the attachment from all the temporary things and when the attachment sets on where the eternal element has manifested, meaning that as the attachment sets on the *Gnani Purush*, everything gets resolved very quickly.

After *prashasta raag* sets in, this other [worldly] *raag* that had established detaches away. One has to remove it after it has been established. [Just like] You have to light the stove and after you have finished cooking, you have to put the fire out. Do you not have to put the fire out after you have finished cooking?

Questioner: It should be put out.

Dadashri: So, one may ask, "If you have to put it out again then why did you light it?" As *prashasta raag* had been established, it had to be removed. Yours is not established; you have to establish it. Once it is established, that external [worldly] attachment will stop; it will come to an

end! Thereafter, once the *prashasta raag* has been established, that too needs to be removed, it has to be pulled away. The solution [final liberation] will come about.

Through Attachment Only for the Self, One can Meet a Gnani!

Questioner: When I asked you if we will meet a *Gnani* even in our next life, you said that we will definitely meet one. But then you say that a *Gnani* comes along only once every million years, so then how is one going to meet a *Gnani* in his next life?

Dadashri: All those who have bound a *karmic* account to do so, will definitely meet ‘one’! Those who have bound a *karmic* account with ‘him’. Wherever one has created an attachment, will that let him off! Even if ‘I’ were to say, “No,” it will not leave, and even if you were to say, “No,” it will not leave. That is indeed why I am saying, “Don’t worry. Don’t be afraid.”

Questioner: Dada, then would we have met somewhere before or not?

Dadashri: Yes, we have come together through the relationship of both, *parmarthik raag* (attachment for the Self only) and *sansaari raag* (worldly attachment). Worldly attachment is indeed everywhere anyway, but the attachment for the Self only is also called *raag*. And it is on the basis of that *raag* that the *parmarth* (absolute meaning; the absolute Self) is attained. What if *raag* were not there? If Dada would have become *vitaraag*, then you would not be able to accomplish any of your work through ‘me’. So ultimately, this *raag* is called *parmarth raag*. It is the *raag* of *Pragnya*. It prevents any *karmic* bondage from arising and grants liberation (*mukti*).
