

Namaskar. Welcome to new session.

Today I intend to take up the questions which have come to us and come to me. I welcome all these questions. It's wonderful thing that you are responding with some questions. This is what is very much required in educative process.

There was one question with regards to no questions. That means while you are shearing me maybe you will not get questions. But in this point in time as being students of philosophy we must not just be examining and inquiring why someone gets questions and why someone doesn't get questions .

In philosophical process we need to understand why someone has questions and why someone doesn't have questions and why someone has questions but doesn't ask the questions. And at times even some doesn't have question and yet they question.

So this aspect of question is very interesting aspect. As a matter one complete Upanishad dedicated to this is called 'Prashnoupanishad' Upanishad on prashna- Upanishad on questions. And Adi Shankaracharya, in his preface, makes a wonderful observation as to why people ask questions. And we must also delve into this as why someone asks a question.

Now usually you think question is a doubt and you have a doubt and therefore there is a question, where somewhere you face a opacity and therefore you get a question. With respect to students, particularly in educative process, when we are considering education, in an educative process, perhaps you might comprehend. If you comprehend everything and you will perhaps say I have no questions but even then a question has to be asked. You cannot ask questions to me but you have to put question to yourself. That's how one has to commence. You must put questions to yourself and find out if you can answer those questions. Now as I said it is not that there must be a question to ask, a question there must be a doubt to ask, a question there should be lack of clarity and therefore you must ask a question. As students, as shishyas, as students, as disciples, as vidhyartis, this is not the case. Of course you must ask questions in such a case but even if you think you have understood, you have comprehended and even if you have grasped yet a question should be asked for a kind of confirmation. What I have construed what I have conceived is it right? Is it proper? And therefore even when you have understood there must be a questioning when it comes to education, when it comes to discipleship, when it comes to fellowship and studentship. So this is an important point to be noted that if you feel that you have understood something, comprehended whatever was taught to you, you will have to still put a question to start with to yourself, and may be meaningless question, so again you must ask the question to your teachers to confirm that what you have understood is right. Many times we think that we have understood it like in case of mathematics, you may solve a problem, the answer is right but the steps are wrong, then in that case that problem doesn't get marks. The answer may have been right but somewhere there are mistakes and by fluke or by chance answer is right. So in mathematics you just can't go by answers that answer is right therefore somebody has solved the problem. We will have to be examiners will have to look into the process if anything has gone wrong. So similarly you might have understood something but yet a question has to be asked because now questions come in different reference as well. So you will get different kind of inputs. So in any case one must be inquisitive in asking a question.

Now as I referred to Shankaracharya's preface, to Prashno Upanishad, he makes a very interesting observation. He says why someone asks a question? There are many reasons why someone would be asking a question. A little amusement here for you that if you are travelling on a train or on a coach or on an airplane and you get a co passenger next to you. Now you just want to kill the time and for the sake of time-pass you just ask some question to that person as to what the person is from where the person is and unnecessary inquiries are there. This is just for time-pass so that's an observation made by him. He says sometimes the questions are asked for no real purpose it is for time killing particularly in traveling that happens. You get bored and therefore you want to ask some question to your co passenger.

Then he makes another interesting observation he wants to put a question to check whether you know what I know. I know certain things I have some knowledge somewhere and I put a question to just check whether you also have some knowledge with regards to that, so to test your knowledge the questioner will put a question. Apart from genuine conditions of asking questions that you have a doubt and you have a question, you have problem lack of clarity therefore you ask a question. That is a genuine way of asking a question otherwise questions can be taken resort to for various reasons and also to check sometimes what I do not know, whether this person also doesn't know and therefore you put a question in the realm where you don't have any knowledge and therefore you want to check whether this person has no knowledge about it. It is an interesting observation he has made.

However in knowledge pursuit the questions must be there. Without having a question it is possible to have questions to increase the input if you have understood to understand better, if you have understood to check whether you have understood properly or not sufficiently or not. You might have understood something but may not be sufficient or may not be proper or it might be an illusion that you might have understood. So unless you put a question you will not be sorting these things out at all. So therefore asking a question on the part of the student is very important. And while you are listening to me maybe you may not get a question but as I said the other day when I am talking to you, you are not merely listening, you are thinking, you are triggering your thought centre, you are triggering your thought mechanism. So a question may not come here and now, right here and now but it will surface after little deliberation on that subject matter. If you deliberate on it maybe you will get a question sooner or later. So whenever you get a question you should not hesitate to ask a question and to put a question. Because you will have your thought process on whatever is heard and whatever is learnt, whatever is taught and therefore the questions will come.

So as I said why someone doesn't ask question? See there are various reasons why somebody will not ask question this also you must take it for inquiry and examination. When you are having implicit faith in someone, belief, faith, dedication, reverence, to someone, naturally the questions will not be triggered. So having implicit faith is one of the reasons why questions are not surfacing. And therefore after a while, when you are away from the direct interaction of the person and , when you have a thought process over it, maybe a question will surface. So I just opened this out for you to have an observation and examination and study and analysis why questions are asked, why questions are not asked. Even when there is a question why question is not asked? Or even when there is no question why question is asked? So again in education this is an important factor to consider. So that's about one question which I got.

Another question, when I was talking with regards to dharma and karma, somebody had a very good question about destiny. Now the person opined that when we are governed by destiny then why dharma karma aspect should be coming up?

Now this philosophy or the karma siddhanta – the law of karma doesn't really have any iota of fatalism in it. There is no fatalism in it but it is deemed to be like that. So, some of the philosophers even criticize the karma- siddhanta, law of karma, saying that it encourages fatalism. But that is not the case. Or some of them have this kind of opinion: you must should just carry out your karmas and never look for fruit and this is the message of the Bhagvad Gita. Just do your karmas and do not expect fruits and do not wait for fruits, do not look for fruits, do not be anticipating the fruits expectantly, waiting for fruits. That is not the message of Bhagvad Gita.

It doesn't say just carry out your karmas. That's a kind of slavery. Just carry out the karmas. That is not at all the precept of Bhagvad Gita. Look into that verse of second chapter, I think in 2:47, it says 'karmanyevadhikaraste ma phalesu kadacana, karmanyevadhikaraste – we have right to action, it is not just a kind of advice, just carry out your actions. Like a house servant, a home servant, someone who is sub-serving, you has no right to activity because he is sub-serving you, he is subservient, he is your servant, house servant, he has no right for karma. He has to do whatever he has to do. That is not the case of the people, of the mortals, this is not a puppet show, we are not puppets that he pulls the strings and gets done everything, makes us do everything. That is not true. We are not in a puppet show. Our life is not in a puppet show, although there is a destiny kind of thing. So Bhagvad Gita says you have a right for action, you have a right for karma. It is our right and it's not merely duty. So this has to be understood that it is a right. Karma Siddhanta is giving us right 'karmanyevadhikaraste'. He nowhere says just go on doing karmas and don't have expectations for fruits. This is a negativistic tone which is not there in that philosophy but the pseudo philosophies churred out this kind of conclusion. So we have right to karma but we have now no right to fruit. See the fruition is not in our hands. Fruition is in the hands of so many agencies, luck, fortune, time, space, situation. When the fructification will take place is not in our hands. You can plant a tree but you can't expect when will you get the flower and fruit from it. That is not in your hands. There are so many factors behind that to fructify, as to when you will get a flower and when you will get the fruit.

However, planting the tree is in your hand. When to plant the tree is in your hand. So the point is dharma and karma, usually dharma is of the nature of vidhinishedha. Vidhinishedha means dos and don'ts. That is how usually the dharma comes up. It tells you about dos and don'ts. Now if we were regulated by destiny there was no point in telling us what to do and what not to do. When to do and when not to do If we were all puppets and if destiny was to pull our strings then there was no need for such advice for mankind. However Dharma gives advices. Dharma tells us what to do, what not to do, how to do, how not to do, what to do when, when not to do what. So this is called vidhinishedha. And because we have right to do, right to act, right to karma, there is a sutra to this in brahma sutras. Why we are given advices? Why Vedas are not there for birds, animals, insects, worms, trees? Why Vedas are not there for them? Why are they meant only for mankind? Because we are in karmayoni, we have right to act and therefore we have some powers. Can't have no powers and have rights. If you are given some rights you are given powers. You cannot be given rights without giving powers. So you are given powers also according to karma siddhanta. So when he says 'karmanyevadhikaraste' that means we are also given power. It's not just right but

power. So therefore in Brahma Sutra there is a sutra called 'karta shastra tattvad' the shastartha. Why the shastras are there? Why there is interpretation of shastras? because we are kartas. So we can be told to do. It is human beings who could be told to do and told not to do while other creatures will go by their tendencies. They go by their propensities. That's called bhogayoni and ours is karmayoni as per karma siddhanta. So we have right to be doing. Now so far as destiny is there we are all bound by destiny no doubt about it.

Now destiny is created by us by our purva karmas not that somebody forms the destiny for us and then we have to just adhere to it. No, we ourselves have created our own destiny. Retrospectively we have created it and now we have to face it. In past karmas and in past lives we have created our destiny. So we are creator of our destiny. It is not that somebody pulls the strings. It is not right to think that God pulls the strings for us and makes us do everything. Our karmas are decided by us.

Now, there is a destiny no doubt that is beyond any doubt but what is destiny? Destiny is a frame and we will be working only in that frame in that life span. So there is a kind of play in destiny. Say there is a minimum level and maximum level. The destiny is given plan is given the scheme of destiny is there. But then you could be at the bottom of it the bottom rung of it or you can be at the top rung of it. So we are given range to function in the destiny frame or destiny range. It's not that the destiny is totally governing us. So whatever you are supposed to be destined to be doing in your life you could be doing it in a worst possible manner to the best possible manner. We are given the range. So our skills, our intelligence, our judgements and perceptions and cognitions, our samskaras, these will give us that play between the minimum line and the maximum line, the bottom line and the top line. So if you are well organised, if you are having a proper development of your conscience, you will tend to be on the higher range of destiny but otherwise you will be in the lower range of destiny, if you decide, if you say anyways it is going to happen, by destiny I will not do anything then it will happen. It will happen but you will be at the lowest level of it. Then understand what is the outcome. So destiny doesn't enslave us it gives us a range to work, so either you must be going towards the best side of it and if you don't make that attempt to go to the better and best side of it then you will be at the worst side of it.

So therefore that is the right. Destiny also gives us right. So again I repeat it is not a puppet show. We are not puppets our destiny, or God, or someone, something does not pull the strings and make us move. So there is no fatalism in karma siddhanta. There is lot of positivism in karma siddhanta, you can be going for highest level in destiny that is given to you. Like in case of economic strata, if somebody is a middle class now it's a range when we say middle class this is upper middle class lower middle class there itself. So somebody is poor, somebody is middle class and somebody is rich. Now, everywhere there is range. For a poor class there is a range, middle class there is a range and then the richer class there is a range. So we are given freedom to be on the upper side of our range. The poor person can be definitely going for the higher, the top line, for the poor strata. The middle class people can be going to the top line, of the middle class strata and the rich people can go to the upper line of the rich man's strata. So like in economic status we are given a range. All middle class people are not middle, they are poor middle, middle, upper middle. Rich people are not rich one and the same class there are lower rich, middle rich and higher rich so also in case of poor-lower poor, middle poor and higher poor. So there is a freedom for us to improve our economic activity and use our acumen prudence etc and even luck factor skill factor education factor etc can definitely help one go to higher line of the range. So karma siddhanta does not really have any slavery aspect of it.

We are given freedom. Anyway we will not be discussing this karma siddhanta this is only to answer the question that there is no fatalism. That's the answer here. There is no need to be negative. If I get I will get it if I don't get I don't get it why try? This is nit at all encouraged by karma siddhanta. karmanyevadhikaraste' therefore with adhikara you are given powers. With right you are given powers. you can use the powers skilfully intelligently with proper time space situation aspect factors and it will suddenly give you the best of the fruits. So that's about the question which had come when we were discussing dharma and karma about the destiny.

Then while we were dealing with meditativity somebody had question about prerana. Where does prerana come? Prerana means motivation. You see prerana is a kick starter for you to be having any activity pursuit or knowledge pursuit. It has to get kick started whether it is in the realm of knowledge or in the realm of activity there must be motivation. And the motivation that is the prerana. The prerana comes as a quick starter or the starter of a car today. I told you during my talks that starter is something that you just use it to get started. Once the car is started you don't again touch the starter you don't dabble with it you don't interfere with it you don't again turn it that will harm the engine. It is only to start. So prerana comes there as a starter or the first gear of the car. We don't drive the car on the first gear. It is just to get the momentum, auto motion. We want to shift to second and third and fourth fifth gear as soon as possible as early as possible as and when we need it then only we come to first gear to get started. Having got started we try to look for changing the gears immediately. So prerana is something like that. It is the first gear. You must look to change that gear as early as possible. However without first gear your car won't start properly. It is not proper to straight away go to second gear. Start the car and straight away go to second gear it will be taxing the engine. You can't take a bypass to first gear. Might take it if there is some problem with the clutch plate etc then perhaps you will take a by- pass but it is not right and good for vehicle it jerks the vehicle and you know vehicle doesn't really pick up well if you suddenly go to second gear taking a by pass to first gear. So similarly the prerana is the motivation. The dynamics which I explained- drive, motive, motion, execution and purpose.

So motive is a facet of prerana is a facet of motivation. That is required to get started and then in the meditativity process coming to thinker, thinking, and the thought aspects. So the prerana, which is kick starter, is left far behind by the time you are in this higher activity. And therefore prerana has been mentioned in my talks when I spoke about dynamics comprised of drive motive motion execution purpose and that motive is a form of prerana that's a form of motivation. If you don't get motivated you don't get started. So it is so important so fundamental however it has been discarded with as early as possible. Like the first gear is done away with as early as possible. You don't stay in first gear too long that is immature driving if you are too long in the first gear when not needed you are driving the car in first gear it is immaturity and it is not good for the vehicle as well. So it's just to get the momentum, get started that's how prerana comes.

Hope I have answered that question satisfactorily.

Then came another question about somebody had that impression that when I was speaking about thought thinking and thinker somebody had this and quiet obvious also that it is something called intellectual gymnastics, that it seems to be a circus of brain, cerebral circus trying to identify thinker, thought and thinking and then to analyse them try to visualize them and try to handle them, mange them, etc., etc., so it seems to be a cerebral circus.

But if you recall the very question that I took of Guruji's mention that his asanic practices were dynamic meditation at his hierarchy his thought process was so refined so evolved so refined that he could get the reflections. And they could reflect the thought could be reflecting thought could be reflected thought was reflector. Now don't venture to do this gymnastics while you are sitting on a garden bench, you have some thought in the mind and you try to go by this, let me try to understand the thinker, thinking and thought, and try to decipher them and then try to analyse and try to understand their profiles their roles and functions. No, no, no, that is not the way. It is only in yoga. Don't be sitting on a sofa in your drawing room or in veranda or in a garden sitting on a bench or sitting on a chair and then trying to understand this. No, it doesn't come there. It only comes in yoga. And then there will be no cerebral circus. If you, now, try to in this empirical state of mind and cerebral state of mind, we are all in cerebral state. Now, in this state of mind if you try to work on this topic and subject matter- the tripartite constitution of thinker thought and thinking then it will be circus whereas in asanas if you recall the preparatories, I mentioned the preparatories, in the very very first session, that we go for associated conditions and kneaded conditions and unified conditions. So these are not cerebral processes because we are well kneaded, well mutually related in body, mind, breath, senses, organs, psyche, consciousness, etc. We are well associated, so it's more kneaded condition, associated condition, unified condition. So this is not cerebral. If you are having this process in say profound sirasana say if you are very proficient in sirasana now the posture becomes insignificant and you can be going for a thought process refined thought process if you are well matured in sirasana. But if sirasana is a posture and you struggle not to fall, etc., etc. you struggle to maintain your alignment etc then this doesn't come in there. So when you are proficient in that particular asana and when you have these kneaded conditions, associated conditions, unifies conditions, it is a whole embodiment process and not a cerebral process.

If you recall I said the back paradigm. Now back is not the cerebral part of the body but you perhaps experience the back was almost a locus for the thought, thinking and thinker. That is, what is, the calibre of the back is, of spine is, or also shoulder blade is, or shoulder is, while you are in an asana, not otherwise when you are sitting on the chair, they will not be able to get that status because they are not really mutually related to each other. There is no amalgamation, there is no kneaded condition, there is no unified condition, whereas in asanas we go for that. Then it won't be cerebral circus.

Then there was also a question in savasana. They say our yoga is all on savasana or meditation of this fashionable world where yoga has become a fashion. We do meditation to relax, just to relax. No, relaxation is not summum bonum of human spiritual endeavour. We want relaxation because we are stressed in this world in the turmoil of the world. And therefore by our mediation we want some kind of stress management. We want to get de stressed conditions that is why we are going for meditation these days. It has become highly fashionable you get on your on line guided meditations. they will just say relax, relax, relax, relax. Yogis were not looking for relaxation. Do you mean to say they were stressed like you and me, who are so mundane people, so temporal people, so cerebral people. So in yoga, meditativity or meditation did not come to just relax, it came for wisdom. If yogis were meditating, it is not that they were stressed like you and me, and they were stressed like CEO of some corporate body, or MNC, or not CEO of MNC, and therefore they were getting stressed, etc. They were not going for Dhyana, for getting destressed. Today we want it because that is our need today. Now I am not being critical about it. Today it is a need therefore we will have to draw out as much as relaxation is possible but in case of yoga and in case of yogis it was

for wisdom process and for wisdom process you need to have dynamic meditation. You must be having this clarity about thought, thinker, thinking, their interactions, their interplays, their role; by rotations they can be playing their role by rotations. Each one can play the role of the other one. So that is wisdom process not knowledge process. So wisdom process you need it. It is not a cerebral circus. It doesn't take place in brain. More over today, when you have this satsanga, many of you might be going for satsanga channels on your television, or on your youtubes, and then you have guided meditations and these are very cerebral processes. They will be triggering thoughts in you. They will be saying think this way, think on this, this is the thought, this is the thinking, think this way, this is the way you should be thinking, etc etc. so all those activities are in the cerebral region, above the throat. They don't have to do anything with the rest of the body. It's only cerebral parts will be working, and all those, that's why, they are cerebral kind of meditative processes. Relax your brain relax your mind and locus of mind is above the shoulders above the throat and everything will be going on there. So they will be talking to you, they will be giving sermons like I am talking to you.

Now this can be teemed that this is the cerebral process. Yes, I am cerebral in my talking because I am using my memory I am using my intelligence whatever the date base the information base about it I have got, I am using it. But when I get to doing it the whole body is involved in that process, body, mind, breath, so it is an integration process, so when I have to explain, I have to explain with cerebral kind of process. But when you are going to do it, see, understand, why the spine is important. But you listen to these satsangas in your television and your youtubes, they do nothing with their spine. Spine is not contributing, only their brains is contributing, and you get all material from their brains. You try to follow those instructions, their only part of the body above the head will be working. Somebody is giving a talk, a discourse, a philosophical talk. The part of the body below the neck has no function, in no direct function in what the person is speaking about, but in yoga your shoulder blades will be involved, your shoulders will be involved, our spine will be involved, pelvic, perineum, abdominal region will be involved, your limbs will be involved, so it is an integral process, not cerebral process.

So all that I spoke about meditativity, meditation, etc., it was not really cerebral circus. It was not cerebral circus actually but for you to explain I had to use the faculty of the brain my memory my perception my information base my knowledge structure whatever I have in my brain. So I am now talking to you from my brain but when you actually get to doing it you are in that position 'sthira sukham asanam', right from your anal mouth everything is involved. When the satsanga is going on, your buttock is almost in dormancy it has no role to play it is totally inert. But if you are going to go for meditation, yogic meditation, understand how much importance you have to give for buttock bone its participation its involvement its addressal its usage. So how much you have to use your spine its participation its addressal its usage its involvement how much you have to use the breath its participation its involvement its usage etc. So it is not proper to construe that that was a cerebral circus or meditation concept or meditativity that I explained or the dynamic meditation, which I explained was a cerebral circus. Because that is only in asanas because in asanas you are connected with each part of your body and mind, gross to subtle so there are connectivities profound connectivities kneaded conditions unified conditions. Therefore it is not cerebral .

In the concept of cellular intelligence you understand, if you are going to sit in swastikasana for your pranayama or meditation, how importance you give to the bottom of the trunk buttock bones, anal mouth, vagina, scrotum, rectum, perineum? Now are they cerebral parts? They are not cerebral but

they have very important participation so it won't be cerebral process, cerebral circus, when it is done in asanas; but if you sit on the garden bench and keep on thinking on the meditation concept that I told you, then it will be cerebral circus. But when you actually get to doing it there, will not be any cerebral circus. So hope that answers that question as well, that there is nothing like cerebral circus, It is in asana, it is in pranayama.

Then the person also had a doubt in Savasana, Guruji says, relax the brain, relax the brain, relax the brain, you know the connotation of the word relaxation also changes. The very connotation changes. If you are stressed and tensed and if we say relax what does it mean? But when you are not stressed and tensed yet we can be telling you there is an advice that you should relax. Now when you are in savasana you are not stressed and tensed and worried person and then you are told to relax. The connotation of relaxation changes while you are in savasana. It is to become sublime it is to become sedate it is to become serene. So quietude, tranquillity, neutrality, virginity, sublimity, purity, piety, sanctity, sanity, equity, equanimity, equilibrium, is the connotation of relaxation in savasana. But suppose you in vrishchikasana and you are in kapotasana and teacher says please relax what are you going to relax? You are going to relax your facial muscles or some tension in your eyes or some tension here and there because relaxation of kapotasana is one thing and relaxation of savasana is another thing. So experience this. So when it comes in savasana and he says relax the brain he doesn't say just relax the brain. Sanity is one of the attributes I gave a long list tranquillity neutrality virginity sublimity purity piety sanctity sanity equity equanimity equilibrium. This is meaning of word relaxation. In different hierarchies that will again change. If you are in lower hierarchy you won't circumscribe so many things if you are in higher hierarchy you will circumscribe all that. So it doesn't mean that there should be no thought thinking etc while in savasana. Savasana has its own thinking. It is a thought process. We are not restraining the vritti in savasana otherwise savasana would be Samadhi. Savasana is not a Samadhi. There is a thought process sublime, thought process ethereal, thought process and reflective thought process. There is a sheen to the surface which is reflecting, there is a sheen which is being reflected, there is a sheen to reflection. So reflection, reflected, reflecting, they all have sheen and therefore they will cast reflection on each other and therefore it is not right to think that in savasana you don't go for that meditativity which I explained. It is very much there. Clarity about thought, thinker, thinking, analysis and then unification, etc.

Then there was a question about somebody wanted to know the difference and non -difference between the mind which we refer to. You know we are all used to mind we say this is mind, that is mind, we know our mind, we know somebody's mind, we say this is mind, that is mind. So the question was, what is the distinction, difference and non- difference in the mind that we refer to in our temporal empirical plane? This is mental, this is psycho mental etc, and chitta?

So what is the difference and non -difference between the mind and chitta? Say I will again take recourse to an example here. If you are at sea shore take a container and fill up the sea water in the container. Now the water in the ocean and water in your container is one and the same. You go for chemical analysis chemical test they will tell you this is ocean water, ok?

So in physical chemistry, substantially, the water in your container and the water of the ocean is one and the same. In physical chemistry, essentially, they are one and the same. Whatever amount of the h₂o there and salt there and other minerals whatever you find in sea water. They will be found even in the container water because you have picked up the water from the sea. So substance wise

to an extent there will be no difference but manifestation wise there is a huge difference. You won't get bubbles foams waves in the container where there ocean water is contained but you look out in the ocean you will see all those things. Waves are there foam is there turbulence is there. The water is unsteady. You will never see the sea water frozen unless it is sub- zero temperature there on polar regions otherwise even in tropical sub- tropical region you will see the water is having movement all the time but the container water will be steadied. In no time container water will be steadied. It won't take long time for the water to steady. Is the water of ocean ever steady like that? Never, although it is same water. It is same water in the container it gets steadied easily. Similarly our mind can get steadied easily. Take a sedative go to sleep it will get steadied. There is no big problem in steadying that mind. Although we say the mind is difficult to steady yes. It is difficult to steady when you are in a wakeful state which is the statement in Bhagvad Gita but that mind can be steadied take a tranquilizer the mind will be steadied. Take a sleeping pill it will be steadied or if you get natural sleep go to sleep it will be steadied. Like ocean water sea water picked up in a container will get steadied without much problem or without taking much of the time but what about the water out in the ocean?

Then if you sit at the sea shore you will say I am seeing the sea and you will say I am knowing the sea. What do you know incoming wave outgoing wave ferocity of the wave low tide high tide some bubbles coming up some foam coming up. What do you see? You see only surface water on the ocean upto the horizon it extends you might sight up to the horizon but what will you see there? It's just surface of the water. There is no comparison between the surface of ocean and what lies at different depths of ocean, to 100 meters, to 500 meters, to 1000 meters, to 5000 meters, to 8000 meters. You can't imagine, you can't even imagine what that ocean is at such a depth or at a distance beyond the horizon. The sea extends beyond the horizon. You can only see up to horizon. You can spend life time by sitting at the sea shore but how much will you know the ocean tell me? Whole life time you can be at the sea shore. Go on watching the ocean day in and day out. How much are you going to know the ocean? Hardly anything. Not even point zero zero zero zero zero percent(.00000%) because ocean is ratnakar. What is inside the ocean cannot be even imagined. So to understand the ocean we must know the ocean up to whatever maximum depth it has. As a G.K I can tell you that Pacific ocean near Philippines has it reaches the greatest depth around 39000 feet and plus, so it is more than about 8000 meters – 9000 meters. Everest is 8000 odd and this depth is much more than that. Now that is the depth. What is at the depth? can you imagine?

Now the water that you picked up will give no clue to you. You give it to any scientist and ask him to explore ocean by the container water it is the sea water ask him to understand the whole ocean from that. It will be not possible. Although in physical chemistry it is one and the same water properties are same but even a scientist will not be able to understand ocean by studying that water picked up in a container. He has to be oceanographer he has to dive into the ocean he has to explore the ocean. So this chitta is like that. Mind is like surface. You see you go to sea shore and watch the sea. Coming wave going wave sometimes high ferocity sometimes no ferocity or low tide etc . that's all you will see by sitting at the sea shore.

The chitta is like ocean. this empirical mind or cerebrally conceived mind is just the surface of it. The chitta has been described as manas buddhi ahamkara are together. Mind itself is an ocean, our mind itself is an ocean. Even the psychologists do not know the depth of the mind. Our intelligence is ocean –buddhi in the sense, so ahamkara is an ocean. So manas buddhi ahamkara put together is

chitta and each one is ocean by itself and these are different oceans not just different names to ocean like Atlantic, Indian and Pacific are one and the same ocean. We have only given different names that's all. But these are different oceans, they are not just nomenclatures difference in names. Mind is an ocean, it has its depth, it has its own characteristics, buddhi as an ocean, it has its own characteristics, and ahamkar as an ocean, has its own characteristics. We contain oceans within us. That's why it is called microcosm. Anyway the chitta is like that.

Therefore yoga deals with chitta it is not mano vritti nirodha it is chitta vritti nirodha. Mano vritti nirodha, swallow a pill you will have mano vritti nirodha, it is not chitta vritti nirodha, so chitta has that much of depth. That is the difference and non-difference. There is non-difference like there is non-difference between ocean water and water tapped in a container. It is non-difference in some respect. So this is also non-difference substance wise it is one and the same but manifestation wise it is totally different. And in metaphysics this manifestation is counted rather than merely substance. See as we are as the metaphysical entity within us the 'I' meta-physical and the same meta-physical entity of divinity is one and the same essence wise one and the same. Purusha purusha-vishesha, but manifestation wise like ocean which is an omnipotent water force and the water in a container has no force. You can turn out electricity from ocean waves you can't turn out by stirring the water in a glass you can't turn out electricity because of volume. So that volume totally changes the manifestation, the way ocean is, is totally different, that will never be, even if you stir the water heavily in a glass it will never become ocean like. You can put a vibrator, or you can put some or stir the water, it will never become ocean like. It's a different manifestation. So in meta-physics, they consider manifestations. We hopefully will consider the chittam in greater depth when we try to understand the whole mind stuff the chitta with reference to shat chakras pancha tattvas and the pancha koshas. Then we will know what enormous depth it is really an ocean. Mind is just a glass of water filled up with water while our chitta is like ocean within us. Three oceans within us and they are not three oceans like Atlantic Indian and Pacific that's only we have given names for our convenience to demarcate them. It's just one ocean on a planet. It's just one ocean not three or five, so that will sometimes tell us about what is this ocean. So that was perhaps the last question.

Before that one more linga sharira. Somebody read on discourses of yoga there are seventeen aspects of linga sharira and somebody read into samkhya karika, so let me tell you Samkhya karika is a very meta-physical text there is no not much of psychology in samkhya karika or even samkhya philosophy. It has relegated to yoga that's why it's a pair, samkhya-yoga is a pair. So samkhya relegated the psychological aspects to yoga, so samkhya karika you will not get much description about the sukshma sharira and linga sharira. If you want to see, understand those with a better depth, you will have to look into vedantic texts and yogic texts. So yogic texts will tell you about linga sharira and there is no point of looking for sukshma sharira description in samkhya karika. It only touches it because of meta physical reality. It doesn't investigate into it. Because it's investigation means chitta investigation and that is in yoga which is a twin system. Samkhya yoga is a twin system and therefore samkhya doesn't do that inquiry so if you want to know much about the linga sharira it is yoga shastra Vedanta shastra which will tell you about it. Samkhya karika will only describe linga sharira that's all.

I can describe a human being that he has two hands and two legs and two arms and two eyes and two nostrils and two ears and a mouth etc. is that description enough for you to understand someone? Not at all. So it is only describing the human being it only describes sukshma sharira it

doesn't go into the depth of it because that job is carried out by its twin system called yoga and even Vedanta. So I think that is enough for the time being let's take a few more questions which already I have received, but in the next session. That's enough for the day. Namaskar.