

Viveka stresses the need for determination. If we do not have a determination, and not prepared to gird up our loins, we are not surely going to have Viveka. This is the point of view with which we ended in the last talk on Viveka. The concept of Vairagya is directly connected to the concept of Viveka. In tradition they are generally called two 'Bhushanam' or two ornaments we should have in the path of spirituality- "Jnana, Vairagya Bhushanam". If we don't have these two, Viveka which is otherwise called 'Jnana' and Vairagya we are not likely to move far in the path of spirituality.

Some abhyasis who have stated that they are not able to develop these virtues or expect them to be granted by some other force rather than generating through their own will are likely to fail in sadhana. The help of the Master comes only when we do our duty.

Some abhyasis have stated that 'I am not able to just satisfy with due attachment', which is also expressed in another way that 'I am yet to develop due attachment'. We should note that there is nothing like developing due attachment. We are as on date unduly attached: if we reduce that undue attachment then it is due attachment. Nobody develops due attachment.

There can be only one attachment and that is the attachment with the Divine and that ensures limiting other attachments to the level that can be called 'due'.

Now what is the Viveka that we should have in spirituality? The Viveka that we have got is, everything here in this world is His, by which we mean it is the Lord's. No one has got any possessive right over any of the items or things or persons whatsoever in this world. Because of the lack of the awareness that divine is everywhere and divine owns everything here the problem of attachment to things develops. Divine owns everything here; we cannot own anything here. Even the land that is there in the Country is that of the Government, any land for that matter, even when we purchase a land it is all of the Government, we have to pay cess, we have got to pay annual rent etc., Nobody owns the land, land is owned by the Government and can be acquired by the Government at any time. I think this concept is very clear to most of us. Similarly it is the Lord who is the owner of everything here. So, when we say we are trying to own something we are usurping what is His. This is what the 'Isa Upanishad' stated "Isa Vasyamidam sarvam, Yatkincha

Jagatyaam Jagat"- whatever that is, is His: therefore "Tena Tyaktena" therefore leave attachment and be happy. The world 'Ka' always refers to God. Therefore the word 'Kasya' in the Upanishad means 'that of God'. God's property is here and we have no right over any of the things or persons here. So it is not exactly undue attachment but it is an unwarranted, unnecessary and irresponsible attachment that we have got, and that is very clear to a person who thinks well and knows everything is God's. The transient nature of things also proves the uselessness of possessiveness. " This too shall pass away" is the knowledge that Viveka gives us. Anything that we own, anything that we have also passes away. "This too shall pass away", if we want to know in one sentence what is Viveka this is what Viveka is. Once we know that we do not own anything and since everything goes or changes we cannot hold any, the state of renunciation is possible.

Renunciation is therefore possible only for a person who is aware of the presence of Divine every where. If we are not aware of divinity any amount of our trying to say 'I am leaving my family, my children, my brothers, my sisters my property' will not grant us Vairagya. The question is, for people who

have faith in God why is it they are not able to get in to the state of Vairagya? It is because that particular knowledge is poor; our awareness of the presence of the Divinity is so poor that we are not feeling the same. It is some intellectual stuff we have and we do not have such a feeling established in our hearts.

Some abhyasis felt that 'Trusteeship is something we should develop.' Trusteeship is not something to be developed; being a 'trustee' is what we are already. The Divine has trusted us and entrusted care of certain things and persons to us. We should be aware of it; we should know that we are only trustees. We don't develop that, our status is only that. We are trustee only; we thought that we are the owners. We have to give up that delusion of ownership. This point has to be understood. If we think we are the owner, we have lost the game already. When some one says he is not able to be a trustee and leave the idea of ownership it means he is not sure about God and the absolute right of His over everything in creation. Let there be no confusion on this subject.

Viveka will grant Vairagya provided our Viveka is right. It is His property therefore we have no business to say it is ours.

By being constantly aware of the Divine we will be in a position to stabilise ourselves in the state of Vairagya. Possessiveness is one thing, enjoyment is another. Not all those who acquire money enjoy it, misers are an example. They collect, they collect enormously and horde it but they don't enjoy. There are two aspects; we must be very clear about. One person who wants to enjoy, another person wants to possess, a third one wants to possess and enjoy. Third category is an interesting category these are the people who want to have the cake and also eat it, that is why there is a perennial demand for acquisition. Possessiveness leads to acquisition: it is a perennial demand because one goes on eating the cake also. So one is constrained to develop acquisitiveness to meet the demand. And so long as we are going to get involved in this drama, of possessiveness, enjoyment and acquisition, the chances of Vairagya developing in us does not arise. But if we are going only to enjoy what is presented to us development of Vairagya is possible. That is what the Upanishad says- it says "Tena Tyaktena Bhunjita", therefore leave this attachment, possessiveness but still enjoy. Whatever is given to us we

can enjoy. Be happy about it. Great father is so kind to give, better have it. It is not ours, it is His, and we are permitted to have a share. Due attachment is what we have been stressing most, but we can take it as due attachment when it is not interfering with our attachment to the Divine. If our attachment to the Divine is not affected to that extent we can say other attachments are acceptable and that is possible only when we live as a trustee. If we have got any other attitude other than that of a trustee we can never have 'Due attachment'.

An abhyasi asked 'How to develop Due attachment?' Due attachment, as a matter of fact is something that comes out of trusteeship. When we go beyond the trustee level and try to possess then we are having undue attachment. This is one of the most important lessons that is taught in Islam. When Great God tells to please sacrifice your son and the pious man was ready to sacrifice it is because he knew he was only a trustee and when the owner wants back his son he is to be given. It is because of the awareness, that son is the son of God he was gave back the son. We will not do that because we think it is our son. It requires a great saint to say,' yes I will

offer'. There are examples in our Hindu culture also towards that. But in the famous Satya Harishchandra, in his earlier life, was yet to learn Satya. He was so possessive of his child, who was granted to him by god that he wanted to dodge giving back the child. Harishchandra prayed to God Kubera to grant him a child. He was granted the child on the condition he would be given back to Kubera. Then he begets a child, Kubera asks him to return the child reminding him of the promise. Harishchandra who he was not willing, went on postponing saying that 'let me see how he plays, let me see his childish pranks, let me see the child educated, let me see that he gets 'Upanayanam'. When it became inevitable he finally tells that son to run away from him so that he will not have the responsibility of handing his son over to the God who gave the son. That is he was trying to be possessive. When we compare him with the Saint Ali, he is nowhere near that standard in spiritual life. And that is the reason why Viswamithra has contested his honesty. What made Viswamithra contest the truthfulness of Satya Harishchandra is that he knew in an earlier life Harishchandra was lying to God and he wanted to know whether he is really a person

who is committed to truth. In that process the tests were put, he goes through that and that is a separate story.

What I am trying to say is the difficulty to practice Vairagya arises when we try to possess. What is His we should give it back; and this can be done only by sharing is another lesson. The same thing is what we find in the tradition when we go to Tirupati; we say instead of offering the child's head, we give the hair. The tonsure ceremony is symbolic of offering of the child back to God. We say to God as it were 'you have given this child to me I am giving back to you'. That it has taken different roots is a separate subject. We still want to possess them is also true, but original message is not that. The original message is, we should know that the child is a gift of the Divine. Once he is a gift of the Divine and is entrusted to our care, how can we say we possess him? Similar is the position of properties, nothing here for that matter is ours.

This state will never dawn unless we also know that between the heart beats there is a silence. Very few people will meditate on that. We are asked to meditate on the heartbeat, why? There is a pause between activity and inactivity; there is a balance that is struck, the natural balance that is there

which grants us peace, which peace is what we are running after all the time. We want to have permanently but we know that we can have it only temporarily. Why we are asked to meditate on the heart beat, if we think well, we know there is a pause between these two and that pause reminds us of peace, neither activity is ours nor inactivity is ours but that peace is what we are. That balance is our nature it is our identity. Everything we do in life is activity or can be brought under inactivity but neither of this is true. If you know that peace it is easy to renounce, if we do not know that peace it is not easy for us to renounce. All that we own up in this world is either activity or inactivity, nobody can own up Balance. Balance is a tantalising position. It is peace. If our nature is peace and if we know that to be the nature of God naturally we will not cling to anybody or any thing.

Looking at Vairagya from a different angle, namely that of the social angle, when some one says that 'I am not able to get detached from all these things' it only shows our extraordinary interest in the mater. The interest is something we know is temporary. Let us take for example a piece of land which is an ancestral property, our great grandfather cultivated it, our

grandfather cultivated it, our father cultivated it, we are cultivating it, our sons will cultivate it, then whose land it is? We come with an abstract concept that it 'belongs to family'. It is not the family that is the owner, it is god that is owner and so long as the men are honest and true it is there with the family, otherwise it will go, it slips in to somebody's hand who is more trustworthy than him. We tend to imagine that certain things are ours because our area of operation is that. This is the table that is given to me for maintenance, I tend to think this is mine. This joke I have seen in my office, my attenders say this table is mine that table is that fellow's I have nothing to do with it, this I will clean that I will not clean. When asked why he should not clean that also as that fellow has not come, his reply was 'no sir, that is not mine, this is mine'. We have absolutely no business to have such possessive thinking but we have, we develop that. In the case of clerks also I found this. With reference to files also I have seen them saying 'this file is mine sir I will not give to others'. When asked 'Who said it, he will show an office order which says that this subject belongs to him and another subject belongs to somebody else.' He grants certain amount of permanency for a

temporary arrangement and our being trustees is only a temporary arrangement, our existence here is transient, we are going to live at best for a quantum of time- may be 80, may be 100, may be 120, surely not eternal. We are a trustee and during that period alone we are responsible for that, still we start thinking that it is ours because of our area of operation is that we feel it ours. So long as we know that we are discharging the duty of our Master here there is no problem, so long we think we are doing something on our own there is a problem. So the Vairagya that we are talking here is a very difficult concept and must be understood in collaboration with the Master's literature on Viveka also. As I told last is a very big subject, it carries in all these things. An aspirant mentioned about his food habits in this context. It is not connected to Vairagya but that connected with Viveka. Vairagya doesn't have anything to with this subject of eating indiscriminately. Whether to have 'Jihvachapalya' or not to have Jihvachapalya is a matter of Viveka and has nothing to do with Vairagya as such.

But these two things always overlap. It is always difficult to understand whether it is Vairagya that you should have or

Viveka, that is why it's a twin concept- 'Jnana Vairagya', that is why the knots related to these two subjects 1 and 1a in our system are close to each other showing the highly inter connected nature of these two essential spiritual conditions.

We can never have Vairagya, real Vairagya until we know that divinity is present everywhere. That awareness is what we are trying to get through in our meditations. Why we meditate again and again and on the heart is mainly because that is the place where we get to know the nature of Divine, God, or Reality namely Balance. The balance that is there, the peace that we have is what enables us to understand the Vairagya. It has nothing to do with other things; it is a question of determination. So far as other aspects of Vairagya are concerned, that are raised by some aspirants they are all matters of determination. We have determination we have it, if we don't have it we don't have it. But as I mentioned while talking about Viveka this varies from one stage of life to another. Viveka of a Brahmacharin is different from Viveka of a Grhastha, which is different from that of a Vanaprastha and that of a Sanyasi. There cannot be one Viveka; similarly there cannot be one Vairagya. If we are trying to say that 'I am

trying to renounce the world', we are talking about something which we cannot do. Renunciation of the world is an impossibility because we are in the world, we can never renounce it. We can renounce certain relations in this world. We can renounce our relationship with our partners, our children, our parents, or our house, all this we can but we can never renounce the world. The word 'renunciation of the world' is I think bordering on stupidity; we can never do that until we die. Nobody renounces the world, there is no such option. As I call it the orbit of God is so big that we can never run away from that. We are always within the orbit, we have got to move within the orbit, we can not do anything, and outside of it there is no existence. So renunciation is renunciation of relationships as I pointed out earlier. While talking about Viveka, I mentioned that relationships arise only when we grant permanency for us. When we grant permanency to us only we can grant permanency to the relationships we have. If we say we are not permanent there can never be any permanent relationships.

So this awareness that we are not permanent itself is in troubles and why does it arise. I know that I am not the same

child I was 64 years back, I was a baby, I know, I changed but why is that this persistence of the feeling that I continue to exist forever? From where does this illusion arise, who grants us this illusion? It is our consciousness that grants us that illusion: that is always permanent. That is the reason why it is said that the consciousness is permanent. Of the mind, chit and Ahankar and Buddhi, these four constituents of Atma, it is the Chit that is always permanent. It is always young, it never becomes old. Our thinking patterns can become mature but consciousness never matures. It is what it was; it is what it is and what it will be. Our feelings can mature, Manas can mature, Buddhi can mature, Ahankar can mature but consciousness per se cannot. That is the reason we always feel we are young, however old we are we always feel young, the reason is consciousness tells us that we pure self. This Buddhi, Ahankar and Manas these are the three constituents of our Psyche, that change. It is because of that we feel permanency and that is true. We are eternal whether we are in the body or outside the body we are eternal. Chit is always there and will always be and that consciousness is what I call Sanatana or Sri Ramchandra Consciousness. The

consciousness that is we have is the same as the consciousness of that, there is no difference. That is the reason why we are able to get in to Him and that is the reason why He is able to get in to us and get out of us, both ways. There must be something common for us to enter in to or to withdraw. That permanent nature of that Chit, which alone is the real self makes us feel that there is a permanency. Only thing is we have granted permanency to these three other factors: even as the smell of the rose is had in the thread in to which it was as a garlanded afterwards. But it is as temporary as anything else. Chit pure and simple is always there that is why none of us whatever may be our age will feel old, our body becomes old. We know it is the body that becomes old, we never think that we are old, nobody thinks even a man on the death bed does not think so, his thinking can be old, his feelings can be old but he is not old. Because of the nature of the Chit itself we grant certain amount of permanency, because we granted permanency we want to grant permanency to other three factors which are purely transient even as the body.

The three constituents of our Psyche which we mentioned earlier, to which we grant permanency can be also called the 'Antahkarana'. So also the 'Indriyas' are also included in the word Antahkarana. Indriyas we know get back to Earth, the moment we are out of the body. People who go on talking about the transiency of the nature of the body and stress permanency of the soul but what I want sadhakas to appreciate is that there are three more factors in which transiency is observed and they are our Buddhi, our Manas and our Ahankar. We can reduce our Ahankar, we can change our Buddhi we can also transform our feelings but we can not change the consciousness which is behind. Consciousness per se doesn't undergo any modulation, because we are confusing the issues we are granting permanency to everything that is attached to the consciousness including the body.

The first understanding is that we painfully understand that this body is not permanent. Regarding the other three factors we do not even at the time of death understand their temporary nature and that is the reason why we are reborn. It is the 'Antahkarana' that moves, it is the mind that moves, it is

the Ahankar that moves, it is the feelings that moves from one life to another. If we cannot develop this particular detachment towards those three aspects of ours we really do not develop real Vairagya. This awareness of the transiency of these factors is the toughest lesson that we need to learn in developing Vairagya.

When we have a feeling of attachment to 'so and so' thing or person and when certain circumstances arise under which we feel forced to change that feeling, may be because the person is dead or the person feels somehow alienated, then we feeling resistance to change and start fighting. We have granted certain amount of permanency to that feeling to that particular thing or person; today it is not there and gone away and we find our roots shaken. In cases of people who give their daughters in marriage to somebody else, there is a feeling of separation, there it is the 'feeling' that is in troubles. They know that they have to part with; they also know that the person will not stay with them but they are not prepared to accept the feeling of separation, because the change in situation is something they are not prepared to accept. They have granted a permanency to that feeling of 'father daughter'

relationship. The father daughter relationship expires the moment she is married is what our tradition has taught but it doesn't happen, it did not happen in the past, perhaps it may not happen in the future. We were born in a particular place, we have moved out of that place, there is an attachment to that place in the beginning, there is a feeling, even when we moved out we would like to keep a relationship that is severed; we would like to retain it as if it is permanent. Fortunately or unfortunately even in the ISRC application forms we ask which our native place is. We do not understand that there is nothing like a native place. The world is our native place. There are many things which are meaningless; in day to day transactions we use those words. 'Which is your native place?' a feeling which is thrust by the society on us, not only we have a feeling, the parents support us, the society also accepts it, but once it is severed then we start questioning, we feel bad about it, we feel for the loss because we have granted a permanency to it which is not there. If we have renounced that attachment in the beginning itself, if we know it is only temporary, we will definitely come out of this problem. We purchase a shirt, which is ours; we have a

feeling that it is ours. We give it to a Dhobi, that fellow burns it. We know that clothes definitely get burnt or torn some day but then we are not prepared to accept that separation because we have granted certain amount of reasonable permanency for that which need not necessarily be true. When we grant permanency the problem of developing Vairagya becomes very difficult to solve; when we know that everything is transient and all relationships are transient this problem is not there.

Another very tough area is our ideas. Nobody gets attached to  $(a+b)^2$ , no body in this world gets attached to it as that is a matter relating to buddhi. But then we do get attached to certain notions about certain gods and places. For us Kasi is a place to go for Liberation, for Muslims it is the Mecca, for somebody else it is Jerusalem and so on. We are attached to certain places and things like this. When some one says we get liberation by going to Mecca and we know that it is only at Kasi we get liberation, we are not going to accept Mecca, because we have accepted that relationship as permanent as if it is something un alterable. This problem arises essentially in Vijnanamaya Kosa. We for example may say that Rev.

Babuji's method is the only way by which we can realise, we may go on arguing about it, but please note that it is because of the attachment to the feeling we have got and there may be many other methods which we are not aware of. And when this awareness develops, then we will feel liberated. When we have that openness, not that alternative opinions are necessarily it is true, but when we have openness then we are liberated. We become closed or attached to our ideas, our feelings and more so with our Ahankar. The feeling that 'I have written yesterday beautifully, therefore I shall write today beautifully', is not necessarily true. The same poet has given different pieces which are not equally beautiful or pleasing. However great the poet may be this is the position, but we tend to attach certain greatness to all that was written by him. Suppose someone says Shakespeare has written something very good and if we don't accept that and say Shakespeare seems to have written some nonsense, the other man is prepared to fight with us on that account. He goes to the extent of having a fistfight; the reason is he has granted a certain amount of permanency to that person's capacity. That he can also err is something which he does not want to

accept. When we don't accept that we can err, it is our Ahankar that is causing the trouble. It is our Ahankar which says 'yesterday I was recognised today I am not recognised', A player who was the best player yesterday, when told today that he is out of form and therefore removed from the team, will not be prepared to accept it. Yesterday some one was a splendid person in painting today even if his painting is rubbish he will not be prepared to accept the same. He would like to argue again and again on his horses rather than accept today he has given some rubbish; he will be adamant and refuse to accept his failure. Once we have granted certain amount of efficiency to a person saying that one can do something very good, he tends to think that he will always do well. That is the problem, which is the essential problem of Ego. If that is cut off then naturally our Ahankar comes to its Balance.

This tendency to think that I cannot err because I was told that I did not err earlier is the main problem whatever is the field. So, when we talk about renunciation, renunciation of our mental concepts, our feelings and our Ahankar, they are really the toughest stumbling blocks. The remaining things

can be easily given up as many people have renounced their houses, they left their wives, their children and gone away but they could not give up these three things. That is why Rev. Babuji says even when they have gone they have not forgotten their places; the reason for that is these are the three things that stay. One thing is no such renunciation is possible, second thing is even if we say I go away to another place we have not renounced. Renunciation is possible for Grhastha only because there is a delegation of responsibility that is possible in a family. We can delegate our responsibility; if I have to a work I will say my brother will do it, my sister will do it, my wife will do it, my children will do it and therefore the task is done, at the same time I am not associated with it. But such delegation we are not prepared to do, we tend to hold on even after retirement, even when we are on the deathbed we would like to hold on to the keys of the house. The keys are something that goes to the next generation because of the death rather than a willing parting away with that. Delegation is something we don't do. Delegation is possible only in Grhastha atmosphere, a Sanyasi has nothing to delegate, we can delegate our

responsibilities, duties, even when the ends do not meet we can ask somebody else to do something, we can take help and thereby our ego is controlled. The feeling that we are the sustainer of the family also is lost when we know that someone else in the family is going to help us, which is possible only for a Grhastha. The advantages of being a Grhastha are very many so far as spirituality is concerned, provided we think, but if we hold to our ideas, our notions we are definitely not going to learn anything in Grhastha life, we will remain as worse fools.

But what makes me feel this is possible is due to the constant meditation that I do. When I meditate on the heart where it beats I always know there is a balance. There is always something of an activity, there is always of something of inactivity. There is a state of torpor and a state of action these are the two things that I know. I can choose to be one. 'Let go'. Let go is a principle we have got to learn as a Grhastha and that is the real renunciation that we are capable of. That is the Vairagya we can have. Vairagya in the real sense is possible only for a Grhastha. Sanyasins from my point of view are not Vairagis' they are people who have abdicated their

responsibility towards themselves, towards their spiritual progress and to others who are dependent upon them and therefore are essentially sinners.

A Grhastha is one who lives according to the verdict of GOD as a trustee and enables the Divinity to express through him and also be in a position to reach back his Homeland with no luggage, 'Travel Light' as Rev.Babuji puts it. Travel light is possible only for a Grhastha; we can handover the responsibility to some one else. A beautiful example Master gives in that article 'Travel light'. He talks about the passengers in the train to give everything to the Guard of the train who will keep it there and we will be in a position to move on without the luggage. How many of us have thought about this as a delegation of responsibility I do not know but I thought it as delegation of responsibilities. I don't have the responsibility to carry my luggage someone else is doing that job. That can be my son, that can be my wife, it can be my son-in-law, that can be my daughter, it does not matter much who, but somebody else can be delegated that responsibility. In that article Master was talking about the Guru/God. If we take that particular article of Master 'Travel light' that is the

end result of the renunciation. End result of renunciation is we should be in a position to travel light and that is possible only and only when we trust a person. Not only we should be a trustee of that person but we should also trust that person and such a trust is possible through Viveka. When we know daily through the influx of the Divine, the nearness of the Divine we will be in a position to understand that 'He is there and I can handover everything to Him'. Then it is not a question of renunciation it is a question of handing over back the luggage to whom it belongs. It belongs to Him, the world belongs to Him, everything here belongs to Him, and we hand it over to Him. Having brought it down to the level to which we are capable of, having protected it in the way we supposed to protect it, not squandering as no one will squander if he is a trustee. If a man behaves as a trustee he will not squander, he will discharge his responsibilities fully, so Vairagya in that sense is what we should develop. Vairagya is not inactivity, Vairagya is not activity it is a balance between these two, that is why if we find in Bhagavad-Gita the Lord talking about going beyond Raga and Dwesha. We should have neither of these- no attachment no aversion. Only a person who can

have, who can have approach to that level, that condition of being neutral in the whole thing and behaves responsibly as a trustee such a person alone is a Virakta, such person alone can be said to have Vairagya.

Some person asked whether he should take responsibility for his son who is two years old or three years old. These are the questions not to be asked in the context of discussion on Vairagya. They are matters of day to day concern which should be addressed keeping in view the guidelines arising out of our understanding on the nature of trusteeship. We should do whatever we can to see that the person entrusted to our care grows to the level which he has to grow. But if we take extraordinary interest in that person to say that the person should become this or that and if he does not become that then we get in to troubles. A rose can never become a tamarind tree; do whatever we want with all the mutations that are possible today it will never become that. It is only our undue attachment or a possessive attitude towards that person who is entrusted to our care that makes us err here. It is only an example that I am trying to give apply it to every field. We will know, we will know on our own where is the

moderation. The mother being attached to the son so much may ask him to eat four times a day because she suffers from undue attachment. If he is properly attached then he will politely say 'no'. As was told the other day to say 'No' when we have got to say 'No' is Viveka and without learning that we are not going to learn Vairagya. Day to day problems are only this, we have to say, 'yes, this is about it' and there not only we have to say 'no' but we should also understand that we are also putting a restriction to that relationship. The other person who is trying to extend the relationship beyond a limit and to him we are trying to tell 'no', 'this is the end of it'; the limit of elasticity ends there. It is the feeling sector where we have got to renounce. Once we know how to say 'no' in the feeling sector I think in any other plane we can easily manage and if we don't know how to manage that situation of the feeling the chances are we will be the first person to be emotionally blackmailed and this happens everyday. Everyday this happens in our lives, somebody blackmails us, the emotional blackmail happens to us because we do not know where to put an end to, we do not know how to renounce the feeling. We must know this is where I cut off,

this is where I severe. If we don't know that we will be in troubles, but these are all the matters of, other than the pure topic of Vairagya.

The workshop on Vairagya about which we are talking about clarifying certain points has a more serious approach. The fomentation from point '1 A' is the place from which the trainer is going to work on this occasion. If a person were to be stabilised in that position and if he were to grant a sitting to you, you are likely to feel to that extent detached. But that detachment is something which you should be craving for yourself. If you are not asking for that, no one can infuse the condition into you. As I always say the pact between you and God is a secret one and perfect too; no one has got any business to interfere with your Karma unless you are prepared for that. No one can be compelled to get transformed; transformation is a volition, is a will. We want to transform therefore we get transformed. This notion must be very clear in your mind. As we have seen there are 'Avasthas', there are 'Ashramas' are there. We cannot ask certain things to the extremes and that arises mainly because of our bad understanding of Vedanta. The question that if

Sankaracharya could renounce in his sixth year, why not me? Is essentially not relevant as you are not Sankaracharya. Secondly nor your priorities are his. Your priorities are different from his priorities; his work was different from your work. We tend to think that every one of us are equally endowed in our Samskaras'. We should note there is a difference. Every one of us have got our own unique Samskaras; it so happens we all seem to have a common Samskara of thinking about the Divine; thinking about something other than our self, understanding our lowliness and trying to appreciate another persons' greatness. Apart from this the way in which we talk, the way in which we move, the way in which dress, the way in which we live, the people with whom we move about, they are all different. Our relationships are different, the intensity of our relationships are different. So to say that what is applicable to Adi Shankara should be applicable to us is not correct because that is not our goal. Our goal is something different, as we have seen in the talk on Viveka, our Goal clarity itself is in troubles. If our goal is realisation of the Ultimate essence of our being; you can see that I qualify Realisation, Realisation

of what? 'Realisation of the Ultimate essence of our being' then we will not be interested in other realisations. Realisation of what; is it to see a T.V. or how T.V. is produced, how networking happens, how a business man does his business all these things are not our concern in this context. If Realisation of the Ultimate essence of our being is what concerns us all the time, our career naturally takes a lesser precedence, our relationship with our parents takes a lesser precedence, and so our relationship with children and therefore we will not bother about them too much. In this connection I would like to recall a statement of Rev. Lalaji Maharaj 'Don't move with children'. It is not clear as to how many of us contemplated over that, how many of us meditated over that. The reason for that is the child is a new manifestation, and we are trying to get back from manifestation. Therefore these two are contradictory forces and are not compatible. The goals of the child and that of us who seek return to the home land are not compatible. In the company of children we get lost in frivolousness, fun, frolic, play. Thus having lost in that and the seriousness with which we are supposed to engage in search of that 'Essence of our

being' is lost. Should we therefore renounce them? Surely not, we attend to them to the extent we are supposed to and don't get attached more than what is necessary. But we tend to get attached there for the only reason the children are helpless beings and we can easily impose our supremacy over them. Wait for another 10 years the child is not prepared to accept what we say, wait for another twenty years it refuses to hear what we say, thirty years it is independent on its own. What has happened to that child whom we have pampered, what has happened to it, what has happened to our feelings? The feelings are all in our heart. If we have unfortunately granted permanency to it we will be the worst sufferer of that as it has happened in the case of King Dasaratha. The attachment for Lord Rama for him meant his death. Right, that is because he retained that feeling even when his son has grown. He should have allowed him to grow, as sage Viswamithra told him. Sage Viswamithra told him " your sons are all Divine people who are meant to destroy evil, and you are not to hold them; please leave them to attend to their divine duty". The king was clinging and arguing, then Sage Vasishta said "Viswamithra knows better,

better hand over". In spite of that lesson he never learnt it. In spite of the lesson that Lord Rama is a God incarnate, the father in Dasaratha was not prepared to leave his feelings, and attachments to the son which was dear to him. That is what an attachment to a child can mean. Please understand the importance of that sentence of Rev. Lalaji Maharaj. He simply made a statement there allowing us to understand and many of us don't even think about it. We tend to think that play is good; play is fine, not good. Play has got limitations. We must know when to end our play. Similarly our office is not good, it is fine. It is fine, it enables us to earn, there its importance ends. If we carry the office to our home it has ruined us. If we carry our attachment for others into our meditation we are lost. If our business were to interfere in our meditations because of the feelings, various feelings or attachments then our meditation doesn't work. So it is a renunciation of these feelings that is a must, if we want a high quality of meditation. Without proper renunciation we will never be in a position to meditate well because they will be coming to us again and again. Ah! Once in a way we can understand but if we are going have everyday this problem it

is not good. We will have this problem so long as we get attached to our children. That is why they say “Putreshana” is something that is to be eschewed, “Dareshana” is to be eschewed, and Dhaneshana’ is to be eschewed. It is because they do not permit us to think in terms of God. But our ways are excellent, we will say that we will come with our ‘Dara’ to the Ultimate, we will come with our ‘Putra’ to the Ultimate. But then Ultimate Essence of being accepts each on merits and not because of associations and relationships. The path to Divinity is narrow as beautifully explained by our temples on the mountain tops. Now a days, journeys to these places of pilgrimage have become easy with better roads and transport facilities. In the past the paths are so narrow that at any time we can slip in to the valley and we are lost. In some places one has to crawl because that is the only way, that is the narrow place in which we have to move, we can’t carry along with us our drums. We can assist those people here in a fraternal obligation, to show them the path, to show them the way we can but we can’t carry them along with us because we never came with another, we will never go with another. So, renunciation of these feelings and these attachments is a

must. We may ask should we therefore renounce the Satsangs. No, we will never renounce the Satsangs, we will keep the Satsangs, we will try to move along with them as far as possible and if necessary, move alone. And that is why we have to appreciate Rev. Lalaji Maharaj's sentence "Satsangh means keeping company with God" and not keeping company with all others. That is where that phrase gains meaning in the real sense of the term. The one thing we can never renounce is God, the one thing that God cannot do is he can never renounce us and that leads us to the second Knot which intimates us of the inviolable and irrevocable interdependency with God. God has no alternative nor have we to be together. He must manage with us and we must manage with Him. Before this state arrives we must know Vairagya has to be firmly established in us. Our eye must be towards Him, and we should have a single pointed orientation towards Him, knowing full well all other attachments whether of beings or things or thoughts or feelings as transient. To arrive at this we must know that " This too shall pass away"- I repeat the sentence- ' This too shall pass away' is one awareness we should have in our hearts, then our reaction to things also

becomes much more moderate. Moderation becomes possible because the extreme position taken by the other person is not acceptable to us. If we can think for a moment 'This too shall pass away' we will have happiness at least. There is no justification what so ever for any attachment due to anything here as a possessive right, but every reason is there for us to get attached to everything that is here as a trustee. So long as we behave as a trustee, we have got every right to get attached. But the moment we cross that border and become possessive we are lost in a problem from where it is very difficult to retrieve.