

TWO TRANSCRIPTS
of Satsang with Ramesh Balsekar

1 January 12, 2001

17 July 25, 2006

Mumbai, 12 January 2001

Satsang with Ramesh Balsekar

We can choose to be here today. It's free will. And we can choose to listen today with free will or not to listen today. In that sense I think that we have free will.

Ramesh: But there, you can only decide, right? What happens [from that point forward] you don't know. Your plane may [be late].

Yea, but it can leave later.

Ramesh: Yes, but then you won't be leaving [at] the time your free will [thought it would].

But it's a matter of time.

Ramesh: Yes. So what exactly do you mean by 'free will'?

I mean the power to decide.

Ramesh: To decide. That's all, isn't it? The power to decide. That's all. Coming from your own experience, what is your experience? You make a decision, but whether it happens or not, you really can't say because other forces come into the picture... What the results will be, that also you're not very sure.

So you're quite right. You have the free will to make a decision. Quite right. You have a free will to make a decision. Was that your only question? Your name is?

Françoise.

Ramesh: Françoise. From France?

From France. I live in New York.

Ramesh: What brought you here, Françoise? Do you know what we are talking about?

Yes.

Ramesh: Somebody told you about what we are talking about here?

Yeah.

Ramesh: Did you read any of my books?

No, not yet. A friend sent me here.

12 January 2001

Ramesh: A friend sent you. I see. Your friend was here?

Yes.

Ramesh: He told you about what we are talking about?

Briefly. Briefly.

Ramesh: So briefly, what do you think we're talking about here, Françoise? What are we talking about?

Yes. I'm here to find out.

Ramesh: Well, I can tell you we don't talk about sports, we don't talk about good food, we don't talk about good wine. [laughter]

I'm sure. I'm sure. [laughs]

Ramesh: Would you consider yourself a spiritual seeker, Françoise?

Yeah, I think so.

Ramesh: Many years?

Not many years. I'm a young spiritual seeker.

Ramesh: A young spiritual seeker.

Yeah.

Ramesh: What started it, do you know, Françoise?

What started it? It started one day I lost my eyesight for three months.

Ramesh: You lost sight for three months?

Yeah.

Ramesh: I see. And that made you think of God? [laughter]

Yes. And light and darkness. Darkness and light.

Ramesh: Yes. Until then you didn't think of God?

12 January 2001

Until then, I didn't really think of God, no.

Ramesh: I see. So now. Is that all you wanted to know? Whether you have free will or not?

No, that's not all. There are plenty of things that I wanted to know, that I try to know... but I'm here mainly to listen to you, not to listen to my voice.

Ramesh: Yes, but to listen to me: I talk. I don't give lectures. You see. I don't give a lecture. I talk to people as when you and I talked this morning. If anyone has any questions, they are free to ask.

OK. OK.

Ramesh: You see?

I see.

Ramesh: So, in life, what do you think you're looking for? In life, what is it you're looking for? Now, you said you were blind for three months...

I think I'm looking for happiness and peace.

Ramesh: Happiness and peace?

Yes.

Ramesh: By happiness, you mean peace? Is that what you mean?

Peace and happiness.

Ramesh: So, supposing you have to choose one. [laughter] What would you choose?

Peace would be the good one.

Ramesh: Peace would be better.

Peace means happiness, right? Also you know? If you feel peace, you feel happy.

Ramesh: Happiness means you want happiness without the unhappiness. In life, our experience is we always have pleasure and pain, happiness, unhappiness, comfort and discomfort.

This is true.

12 January 2001

Ramesh: You see. So when you mean happiness, you mean one - and not the other.

No, I mean to find the peace in both cases. Acceptance.

Ramesh: In other words, what you mean is, you would like to have the ability to bear whatever life brings.

Absolutely.

Ramesh: Sometimes happiness, sometimes unhappiness.

Yes.

Ramesh: And that ability to bear whatever life brings is what you call peace.

Yes.

Ramesh: I agree.

In a peaceful way.

Ramesh: I agree. So how do you think now? Now? What is your understanding, Françoise about how to achieve that peace? What is your understanding now?

Through acceptance. Acceptance.

Ramesh: Can you explain that word: acceptance?

True acceptance of the events or emotions.

Ramesh: To accept whatever happens in life.

Yes.

Ramesh: Are you able to accept it?

Maybe.

Ramesh: How do you think you can achieve that ability to accept whatever life brings? How do you think you can achieve this ability we all want - to be able to accept whatever life brings: sometimes happiness, sometimes unhappiness. How do you think that can happen?

12 January 2001

I think it can happen if you...

Ramesh: What is your understanding now, about how to achieve this peace we are all looking for?

I think it's something... Happiness and unhappiness is something that doesn't last.

Ramesh: Yea. So that is what life brings. Sometimes pain, sometimes pleasure, sometimes happiness and sometimes unhappiness.

Yes.

Ramesh: Now, my concept is that we do have that peace. That peace everybody has. So we don't have to achieve it. But what happens is, that peace is obstructed by something we think or do. That peace which is always there, is obstructed by something we think we do. So we don't have to achieve the peace. My concept is, basically, we don't have to achieve the peace which is already there. What we are concerned with is removing the obstacle to that peace, you see?

Yeah.

Ramesh: Removing the obstruction which prevents that peace from happening. So what is the obstruction? In life, what is your experience, Françoise? What prevents that peace? Now, from my concept: peace is there. What do you think prevents you from reaching that peace during whatever you do in the waking hours? What is your experience?

Too much attachment. Too much ego. Too much emotion.

Ramesh: Now, emotion - you'll find some people with more emotion than others, isn't that right?

Yes.

Ramesh: I have a friend, a German friend who is very emotional. I often see him. Tears come to his eyes. Emotional. And his family history is: he's been in a soldier family of six generations. So he's been a soldier for six generations, but when I talk to him, if something touches him, tears promptly come to his eyes. And yet he has been a soldier. He has been a good soldier. You see?

Yes.

Ramesh: So the arising of emotions has not prevented him from being a good soldier. So my point is if emotion arises, what does it matter? Why are you concerned with emotion not arising? Have you ever wondered if it is the arising of emotions which disturbs you from the peace, which means you don't want the

12 January 2001

emotions to arise. Why do you not like emotions to arise? Fear of what? What people will think?

No. Fear of suffering.

Ramesh: Yes, but emotion arises and emotion can be anything. Fear itself can be an emotion. You see? So the arising of whatever [emotion] does not prevent you from having that peace. Suppose fear arises. You don't accept the fear and you stay around to be a brave woman, and you're unhappy. Therefore, you're away from the peace. Anger arises because it is your nature to be angry - more angry than another person. More afraid than another person. So arising of fear, arising of anger and also arising of compassion, happens because according to my concept, it is the nature of the human object. Each object has its own nature and that nature according to my basic concept, Françoise, is this: according to my concept, every human being is basically... What do you think a human being is basically, essentially, in this manifestation, in life as we know it? Basically, what is a human being? What do you think? What is a human being? You see the manifestation, the universe, the manifestation, what is it made of? What is the universe or the manifestation made of, Françoise? It's made of objects, isn't it? Heavenly objects. Objects in land. Objects in air. Objects in water. Planets, stars.

So whatever exists in phenomenality, whatever exists in the phenomenal universe in an object. Isn't that right? My basic concept [that I suggest you contemplate is]: what is a human object? Everybody wants happiness, peace, whatever. But who is this everybody? Let's first consider that. Who is this everybody? Who wants this peace?

Basically, my point therefore is, Françoise, that a human being can not be anything other than one type of object, which along with thousands of other types of objects constitute the totality of manifestation. Isn't that right?

That's right.

Ramesh: Essentially, basically what I'm saying is that each one of us is an object. We forget that. We forget that we are an object because the Source has created that object with such a design, let us call it nature, that the object considers itself a separate entity with volition. "I have free will. I can do what I like. I'm responsible for my action. Therefore I can either do good action or bad action. I can be brave or I can be timid. I can be kind or I may be unkind. Everything is in my control. I'm in charge of my life."

So, for that person who thinks in terms of "I am in charge of my life," my question is, who is this 'you' that you're talking about? And my point is that all that you are is basically an object. One kind of object. One type of object. One specially designed and programmed object, but nonetheless an object. Basically, the human being cannot be anything more than an object. That has to be accepted, doesn't it?

12 January 2001

Yeah. [laughs]

Ramesh: In other words, we are either the subject, pure subjectivity, potentiality, energy, God, whatever you choose to call it - the Source - the one reality from which the entire manifestation has come. So there is only pure subjectivity, pure reality, the one Source which is the subject, the pure subject, and everybody else is an object. It's very clear, isn't it? And yet, this is the basic, simple truth which everybody forgets. "I want this. I like you. I don't like [such and such]." So therefore, my question always begins with: Who is this who wants something, who does not want something; who likes something, who does not like? Who is this? It is basically an object, you see? So if that object is able to think that it has volition, then that ability to think that it has volition and is in charge of life, that itself must have come from the Source.

So an object who considers himself a separate entity with volition, has that ability to think so only because the Source has created that ability in that object. That is clear, isn't it? So what is a human being? My concept is, a human being is an object, uniquely programmed by the Source. Now, when I say the Source, you can give it any name you like so long as you remember that all those labels refer to only one thing - the Source. Therefore, you can call it the Source. The Hindu Upanishads call it 'Consciousness', 'the impersonal awareness of being'. 'I am'. Not as Françoise or Ramesh, or Krista, or anyone. The awareness that we have is simply of being alive. I am. The impersonal awareness of being is the Source. So the Source has identified itself with each human object and created this impersonal awareness and immediately identified it with an individual entity. So the Source or consciousness itself has done [this]. So this identification, 'ego' you said, has been created by the Source.

And what is this programming? Each human being has been created as a unique individual entity, a unique individual human object so that Source itself, by whatever name you call it, may be able to use each individual, each uniquely programmed human object to bring about whatever the Source wants. That is my basic concept. Each human being is a uniquely programmed instrument, object, or computer created by the Source so that the Source can do whatever it wants, can bring about whatever it wants through each human object, through each uniquely programmed instrument. Therefore, anything that happens through any human object is not something done by an object. An object can do nothing. Therefore my basic concept is: anything that happens through any human object is not something done by an individual, but something brought about by that Source which has created that human object in a special way so that whatever happens to that birth is exactly what the Source wants to bring about.

You think this is strange for you? What I've just told you? I repeat, every human being is a uniquely programmed, designed human object so that the Source can bring up through each uniquely programmed human object whatever the Source wants to produce. Not what the object wants to produce. You see.

12 January 2001

Yes.

Ramesh: It seems strange, doesn't it?

Yes, it is. [laughs]

Ramesh: And yet, what am I saying? What I have said is: 'Thy will be done'. Thy will be done. Is that strange? It's been there in the Lord's prayer ever since you were a child. So what I'm saying is exactly what those four words say. Thy will be done. Thy will is the Source's will, you see.

So what is this programming I'm talking about? The unique programming which enables the Source to bring out whatever the Source wants and not what the objects wants. The programming, according to my concept, is this: you have no choice in being born to particular parents, therefore you have no choice about the genes - the unique DNA in this particular human object. This particular human object has a distinct DNA which not even twins have. Even twins have different DNA and the DNA in the body can identify that body as that particular individual body.

So, Françoise has no choice about the genes in this human object called Françoise. But for the same reason, Françoise had no choice about the environment in which Françoise was born to particular parents. In France, in a particular environment, physical, social, the particular environment in which this human object Françoise was born, Françoise has no control. To which human parents, in which environment, which geographical environment, which social environment, [Françoise] had no control. And what Françoise is, what Françoise really is, the personality, the persona called Françoise is, according to my concept, nothing more than this programming. The genes or DNA plus the environmental conditioning, which includes social conditioning, your education, your social upbringing, everything is part of that conditioning which is changing every moment.

Ever since a baby has been born, this conditioning has been going on. You see? A baby is born, a child, six months, eight months, the child is not concerned with which other child there is; but as Françoise grew up, the environmental conditioning told her she must associate with these children and not with those children. She must go to this school, not to some other school.

So at any moment, Françoise the *persona*, is an individual entity which had no control over either its genes or the environment and social conditioning. What else is Françoise? Therefore, Françoise is a fiction. There is truly no Françoise, except this feeling of being an 'independent' entity, and this feeling of independent entity which has been imposed on the personal awareness of being is called the 'ego'. So the ego, according to my concept, which makes Françoise think she is an individual with volition, to be in control of her life, is really only a fiction created by what the Hindu's call: Maya. I call it 'divine hypnosis', you see?

12 January 2001

So, when the Source created this human object and the parents gave her the name Françoise, then, by 'divine hypnosis' a fiction was also created; a hypnosis that Françoise is an individual entity. By creating an identification; a fictional, conceptual identification with a particular body-mind organism and a name. So what is Françoise? Basically a name given to a human object over the programming of which the so called Françoise had no control. You had no control over your genes. You had no control over your conditioning, and what Françoise is, is nothing but genes plus your conditioning right at this moment.

So you say you make a decision. When you make a decision Françoise, on what is that decision based? That decision which you think is your decision, according to my concept is based essentially on the genes and the environmental up to date condition. Any decision that you make.

Supposing on a particular point you made a decision ten days ago. During these ten days you have met people, you have done some reading, and that reading and talking during the ten day may have changed your existing conditioning so that the decision on the same subject, in the same circumstances ten days ago could have been different from your decision today. You see what I'm getting at?

Yes.

Ramesh: The conditioning keeps on changing. Now what is happening now, Françoise? You and I are having a talk. So the talk that we are having could change the existing conditioning in either of us. You see what I'm getting at? So the conditioning is getting on all the time, and whatever decision you think you are making is based on the genes plus the up to date conditioning.

So you call it your decision. But is it really your decision, Françoise? When, on analyzing, investigating you'll find that what you call your decision is based entirely on something over which you have no control. So even that decision which you think you make is based on something over which you have no control. And the decision that you think you are making is exactly what the source wants you to make.

So, what does the Source do? It uses every human object, uniquely programmed object, as a computer. It uses each human object as an individual, uniquely programmed computer. How do you use your computer? You put in an input and your computer has no choice but to bring out an output strictly according to the programming. Isn't that right? Do you use a computer at all?

Yes I do.

Ramesh: So when you use your computer, what do you do? You put in an input, then you press a button and the output that comes out has nothing to do with the computer's choice. It is strictly according to the programming. Isn't that right? But

12 January 2001

your computer has no ego to say that it is 'my' action. But this computer [the body-mind organism] has an ego. So, the output is strictly according to the programming. The brain reacts to an input over which you have no control, an input being sent by the Source.

So what is the input? Mostly it is a thought. You have a thought which leads to an action which Françoise says is 'my' action. Now, that next thought that you're going to get, you have no control over, you see? And it has been proved in the laboratory that the next thought that you get will happen almost half a second before Françoise reacts to that thought and decides to either do something or not; the thought arises half a second before you can react to it. That means you have absolutely no control over the input. As we have just been saying: we have no control over the programming. So you have no control over the input, you have no control over the programming, and yet you say that the output is 'my' decision. You see what I'm getting at?

Yes.

Ramesh: Therefore, on analysis, what we find is that every decision through a particular body-mind object is exactly the decision that Source wants made. Even the decision is what the Source wants and the subsequent happening to that decision is also God's will or the will of the Source. That is basically why we say: Thy will be done. Because He [Source] has done the programming. He is putting in the input; the output therefore has to be according to his will. You see what I'm getting at?

Yes.

Ramesh: Thy will be done. Why? Because it is according to his will that, first, the object is born. Two, in that object the genes and the conditioning have been created by him. He puts in the input. Therefore, the output has to be according to his will. Every single output through every single human computer, every single moment at every single place, has to be the will of the Source. And it is on this very sound reasoning that the Bible says: Thy will be done. You see?

So, if we are able to accept this, then nothing can happen unless it is the will of God, and when we say God, we mean the Source. Most times the word God is used mistakenly. The word god is used as the chief executive of the multi-national manifestation. [laughter] And this god has various vice-presidents called Avatars [laughter]. That is how the word god is used but that is not the way I use it.

So if you analyze it, investigate it, you come to the conclusion that every decision, therefore every action and its result are all entirely a matter of the will of the Source. And the intellect says: how does God's will function? We can say: according to a cosmic law; according to a natural law or a cosmic law. Then the intellect in this human object says: on what basis does God's will function? On what basis does

12 January 2001

the cosmic law function? And that, the human being can never ever in a million years understand. The human intellect asks the question: on what basis does God's will function? On what basis does God create a healthy child or a handicapped child? On what basis does God create a healthy child in a rich family or a handicapped child in a poor family? And that, the human being can never ever know. Do you know why, Françoise? Because the one who wants to know is a created object. The one who wants to know the basis on which the subject functions is a created object. How can an object ever know the will of the subject?

If you create a statue, a figure of a human being out of rubber, gold, metal, whatever, you'll create a human figure. In that case, you are the subject and that is the object. So the object which this subject has created can never know why you created the object at all. The object which you have created - either in a painting or in an object, can never know why you created it. The human figure created by Françoise can never know the basis on which Françoise's will works. Similarly, the human object can never ever know the basis on which the pure subject, or the Source or God functions. That is why we have to accept 'Thy will be done'. Nothing happens unless it is the will of God. So if something has happened, we have to accept that it could not have happened unless it was the will of God.

Jesus Christ happened, Mohammed happened, Moses happened, Ramana Maharshi happened, Ramakrishna happened. Then it can simply be that they could not have happened unless it was the will of God. So Jesus Christ happened because it was the will of God, but Hitler also happened, Stalin also happened; so they too could not have happened unless it was the will of God. So why the Source or God produces what human beings consider good and bad, good and evil, beautiful and ugly, the human being cannot know. All that the human being can do, as the German mystic Meister Eckhart said is to: "...wonder and marvel at the magnificence and variety of God's creation." We can only accept it; we cannot question it. So if this is accepted, that whatever happens is God's will and is not anybody's doing... In other words, if we are able by the grace of God to accept what the Buddha said: "Events happen, deeds are done, but there is no individual doer thereof." Then...

So, events happen, deeds happen but there is no individual doer doing anything, which means that any action which we think is mine or yours or his or hers is not really anyone's action. Nobody has done anything but it has been created, it has happened because it is the will of God. And if this is acceptable Françoise, what is the result? If Françoise is truly able to accept that no action is her action, no action is Ramesh's action, no action is anyone's action, but a happening which had to happen at that time at that place because it was His [Source's] will, then what happens? Then what happens is, it would be silly for Françoise to blame anybody for any action, wouldn't it? If I'm truly able to accept by the grace of God [even that is God's will]... If I am able to accept by God's will that nothing can happen unless it is God's will, and therefore if anything has happened which the human being, the human, society considers good or evil, if it has happened, it could not

12 January 2001

have happened unless it was the will of God. One. And two, whatever has happened, if it has not been done by anyone, we cannot blame anybody.

So if we accept 'Thy will be done', what have we come to? We do not and cannot blame anybody, neither myself, nor you nor he or she. So the immediate effect of being able to accept that nothing can happen unless it is the will of God means immediately I cease to blame anybody. I cease to blame my self or anyone for whatever happens.

So, actions happen through this body-mind organism, actions happen through every body-mind organism: I can only see them as God's will. So if an action happens through this body-mind organism and the society considers it a good action and honors Ramesh, then the honoring by the society as seen or heard or read, becomes an input in Ramesh's body-mind organism. The brain reacts to it - strictly according to the programming and a sense of pleasure arises; a natural, mechanical, biological reaction. A sense of pleasure. But having the total understanding that it is not my action, that I cannot produce any action, it is therefore not my action that has been appreciated by society. So while there may arise a sense of pleasure, there does not arise a sense of pride.

At the other extreme, an action happens through this body mind organism which is condemned by society for whatever reason. It has been condemned by society. Let us say I have hurt someone's feelings; then the condemnation of society is an input in my body-mind computer. The brain reacts to society's indignation and the biological, mechanical reaction happens to produce a sense of regret - a sense of regret that an action has happened which has hurt somebody's feelings. So in that case a sense of regret arises, just as earlier a sense of pleasure arose. This time a sense of regret arises, but there is also the absolute total certainty that it is not my action which has been condemned by society because I know I can do no action nor can anybody do any action. Therefore, that action which has been condemned by society, happened because it was God's will and it is not my action. Therefore, while in this computer a sense of regret may arise, a sense of guilt cannot arise. A sense of guilt or shame can never arise.

So for the whole range of actions, from honor to condemnation, actions will arise and the natural reactions in the brain will happen. Sense of pleasure, sense of regret, but not pride and arrogance, guilt and shame. For any action which arises through this body, with this understanding that nobody does anything, there will never be any moment at any time of pride and arrogance or guilt and shame. And if some action happens through some other body-mind organism hurts me, it causes a hurt, physical, psychological or financial... With an action which has happened through some other body mind organism, he or she may not have that understanding which I have, so he or she may think that I am his or her enemy and they may be very happy that they have succeeded in hurting me because they think they have done it. But when I know that if I have been hurt it was only because it was God's will and cosmic law that I would be hurt at that time and

12 January 2001

place... If it were not God's will that I be hurt, no power on earth can hurt me. That is the understanding. You see? So the hurt is accepted as God's will, but knowing no one has hurt me, that no one can hurt me, it is not possible for anyone to hurt me, how can I bear malice or hatred toward anybody? You see what I mean? Hurt I have to accept; but I do not bear malice or hatred toward anyone. Nor jealousy and envy for something which God has created.

So what is the total result? All actions through this body or any other body, whatever happens is accepted with a biological reaction: sometime pain, sometimes pleasure, but without that enormous load which every individual bears: the load of pride and arrogance, guilt and shame, hatred and malice, and jealousy and envy. It is this load which obstructs peace from happening. The peace is there. It is this load which is the obstruction which stops the peace from flowing.

So where did we begin: Thy will be done. And where have we ended: nobody is a doer. The Source is the only doer and the result of that is that the peace which is already there shines forth when there is no obstruction. So when this understanding is there and the peace shines forth, we call who has attained this understanding a 'sage'. But basically a sage and an ordinary person still have to carry a body-mind computer which has been programmed by Source. The sage can do nothing about his genes just as an ordinary man can do nothing about his genes. Therefore, the genes in a sage may bring about an action which sometimes the society condemns. How could he do that? He's supposed to be a sage. How could he do that? My point is that if an action is brought about because of the genes, and science today, especially in the last year or two, the amount that is 'blamed' on the genes is fantastic. You're a vegetarian or non-vegetarian: genes. You are a person who is not loyal to his wife or husband: blame it on the genes. That is what I read. All kinds of things these days. The scientists, the biologists have come out with this research which confirms that no-one is doing anything; it is happening.

So an action happens through a sage which, as I say, is condemned. The sage accepts it with a sense of regret but it has happened. So the sage accepts the result of that bad action which may be some kind of a punishment. So the sage accepts an action which has happened through his body-mind organism which has been condemned by society and law as God's will, and also accepts the punishment for it as God's will, knowing that it is truly, as far as he's concerned, not his action.

So, do you have any question now, Françoise?

I don't think so. I'm going to let my neighbor ask some questions. Thank you for your answer.

Ramesh: But wait. Don't you have a question? I would like to get that plain acceptance, firm conviction that God is the doer, no one is the doer. I would like to get that total conviction. [pretending to be Françoise] "At the moment, I like your concept, I like your intellectual concept. It gives me a sense of freedom from this horrible load of pride, guilt and hatred and jealousy, but it is still intellectual."

12 January 2001

Yes it is.

Ramesh: So how do I get that understanding which is total? Is that not a question?

Yes it is really a question. [laughter]

Ramesh: All right. I anticipate that question for you. And the answer is basically, if it is to happen, it has to be God's will. It cannot happen unless it is God's will. But it is God's will that has brought you here. It is God's will that you have heard what I have to say. It is God's will that the concept appeals to you intellectually, and this is what Ramana Maharshi meant when he said to the seeker - a seeker's head is already in the tiger's mouth - there's no escape. So, your question: 'Can I do anything about it?' I say, subject to God's will, there is something you can do. You being the ego. By ego, Françoise, I mean identification with a particular body-mind and a name with a sense of volition, doer-ship. So in the ego, there are two aspects: one is mere identification with a body and a name. But the core of the ego is a sense of volition or doer-ship.

Therefore, a sage, when he is called by name, the sage responds. So the fact that a sage responds to his name being called obviously means there is identification with a particular body-mind organism and a particular name as a separate entity who responds to his or her name being called. So the sage also is identified with a particular body and name as a separate entity. So a sage responds to his name being called. An ordinary man also responds to his name being called. Then where is the difference? The difference is this: while the ordinary man believes everyone is a doer of his or her action and is therefore responsible for it, the sage is equally convinced that no one does anything. All actions are divine happening. That is the only difference. Therefore the sage has that obstruction removed so that peace flows; and the obstruction remains in the case of an ordinary person and peace does not flow.

So what is it that I suggest that you do? At the end of the day, sit for twenty, thirty minutes by yourself [and incidentally this is the only spiritual effort or sadhana I suggest], sit for twenty, thirty minutes. Think of any action during the day which you are convinced is your action. Think of one action. Whichever way you look at it, you think it is your action. Then investigate it thoroughly and honestly. How did that action begin? Did I, from out of the blue, decide to do it or did my doing it depend on happenings over which I had no control? I saw something, or I heard something, or a thought came to me which led to the action. Then, if what led to that action was something over which you had no control, how can you call it your action? And every single action thereafter that you investigate, you will come to the same conclusion. Some happening over which I had no control led to an action. How can I call it my action?

So when this type of investigation happens for some time [how long again is a matter of God's will and your destiny], at some point, Françoise will come to the

12 January 2001

conclusion: I myself have investigated from my own experience and I have come to the conclusion: no action is my action. And therefore, I have to accept that no one action is anyone else's action either. So only from investigation of your personal actions will you come to the conclusion that no one does any action; that all actions are only divine happenings, happenings according to God's will and therefore, no one need be blamed for anything. That is the conclusion you arrive at from your own experience. Then what was once an intellectual concept becomes the personal truth from your investigation.

I can see that we are not the doers of our actions. I can see that, I can understand that. I also see that the Source creates the computer of the body-mind organism and puts it in the world. My question is: how do I know that everything that happens after that - let's say the computer starts functioning, they live, they do actions in every moment in their lives, but why is that the will of God and not just coincidence?

Ramesh: What you are saying is: is there a basis to the functioning of God's will? Is it God's will at all? Is that your question?

Yes.

Ramesh: Supposing it is a coincidence, what is relevant is that it is not my action or your action. Whether it is a coincidence or somebody's will, who cares? What is the relevant point? What is the relevant point? It is not your action or my action. Whether it is an accident or coincidence or a cosmic law, the fact remains that it is not my action or your action.

So when you say it's the will of God, that's just one way of saying it, that's just your choice of naming it...

Ramesh: Yes. Some power is working. Some power is bringing about the coincidence, accident.

That power is the energy, the electricity, that makes the gadget work.

Ramesh: Sure. Yes. Therefore, the physicist will, rather than say the Source, will use the word primal energy. Sure. No problem. You give it whatever label to the Source. If you prefer to say energy, say energy. If you prefer to say God, say God. Or if you prefer to keep using the Source, that's fine. But the relevant point is that the individual is not responsible for the actions. Actions happen in spite of the individual. That is the relevant point.

Your name is?

Teerth.

12 January 2001

Ramesh: Where did you get that name? In Puna? [laughter]. OK Teerth.

When I'm in my daily life, I read your books and I feel peace and then life happens and I get caught up in whatever comes up like envy or dissatisfaction and sometimes I feel I'm very close and then back to...

Ramesh: Yes. Now, Teerth, tell me: who is this who feels whatever he feels? Who is it? Is there a Teerth at all other than a name? All I see is an object to whom the name Teerth is given. A uniquely programmed object with a name. So who is it who likes his feelings and doesn't like his feelings? Who? An object.

A body mind organism.

Ramesh: Yes - which is an object. Therefore, if a feeling happens which is acceptable or not acceptable, if it happens, you accept it. The problem arises because you say it should not happen, 'I should not have had that'. But it is there. So accept whatever happens as something that had to happen according to the destiny of this object. But the main point is that it is not in your control, but if you think that it is in your control, nothing prevents you, according to my teaching, from doing whatever you want to do. You see, the bottom line of the teaching is: at any moment, in any given circumstances, do whatever you think you should do. Can you ever have more freedom than that? At any moment, in any given circumstances, do whatever you think you should do, and doing means merely deciding between the alternatives that are available to you. Select any alternative that you think you should do because your choice is based on the programming over which you have no control.

In that it's God's will.

Ramesh: Therefore, what I'm saying is, God's will need not prevent you from doing anything you think you should do, because what you decide to do will be exactly what God wants you to do because he has done the programming. Let me repeat: whatever you decide to do, whatever the results, whatever the consequences to anyone, is exactly what God wants you to decide because that will be according to the programming which God has created. In other words, the biggest freedom is: to be able to do whatever you like, whatever you think you should do with the total conviction that never ever will you have to ask God's forgiveness. The freedom is not only to do what you'd like; the real freedom is that you can do whatever you like without the danger of ever having to beg God's forgiveness. Not now, not in the future, not on your deathbed. Whatever you decide to do at any moment cannot be against God's will, you see? So your decision is God's will, what happens to the decision as an action is God's will. The results and consequences of that action are God's will, whoever may be affected by those results or consequences. That is why I say you'll never ever have to ask for God's forgiveness for any action, for it is not your action. What more freedom can you want?

Mumbai, 25 July 2006

Satsang with Ramesh Balsekar

Ramesh: So, who is going to start? Your name is? [Suhas Godbole and Kalpana Godbole]

Suhas: I have come here for the first time. I was guided by Vipul.

Ramesh: I see.

Suhas: I wanted to ask a simple thing. Is it necessary, for a human being who wants to lead a happy and disciplined life, to follow a religion?

Ramesh: No! What do you mean by religion?

Suhas: My second question was the same. What is the meaning of religion? Of spirituality and dhamma?

Ramesh: Religion has become, a code of conduct. According to certain concepts. That's what it has become. The original religion, what man has felt, has been lost. It has been lost in the subsequent rituals and what is right and what is wrong.

Therefore, what we are concerned with... That is my focal question. Have you been a spiritual seeker? Ever since you can remember? Or since a particular time? Nine years, twelve years... In your childhood, did you have questions other children did not have? When did it start?

Suhas: Around when I was six years old.

Ramesh: That's what I mean. How did it start? With questions, for which the elders did not have any answers? How long have you been married?

Suhas: Ten years.

Ramesh: Children?

Suhas: One daughter.

Ramesh: One daughter. So how did the spiritual seeking become active? You started reading some books or go to someone.

Suhas : Around twenty-four. My grandmother used to do kirtan, Jnaneshwari and I used to go with her, I would sit in front. And after the kirtan everyone would bow down to her and I would feel great, that my grandmother is being respected, but that's how it started. I wasn't satisfied with all that.

Ramesh: So, what books did you read?

Suhas: I have read Ravi Shankar, Osho. I am not very active as a spiritual seeker.

Ramesh: And what do you do for a living?

Suhas: I am a medical practitioner. I am a homeopath.

Ramesh: I see. And in your case?

Kalpana: Spiritual since ten to twelve years.

Ramesh: Have you read someone or go somewhere?

Kalpana: I am attached with the Art of Living family.

Ramesh: I see. Now, Art of Living. What is the art of living? If I ask you first, is there an art of living?

Suhas: (Laughs) No, everyone has his own art of living.

Ramesh: And, have you read anyone else?

Kalpana: I have read J. Krishnamurthy.

Ramesh: Which books?

Kalpana: **The First and Last Freedom** and...

Ramesh: **The Awakening of Intelligence**?

Kalpana: Yes.

Ramesh: So, what do you think Krishnamurthy is trying to tell you?

Kalpana : It's very difficult to explain.

Ramesh: It's difficult to explain? And difficult to understand also?

Kalpana: Yes, difficult to understand also.

Ramesh: I will tell you what I deal with. The focus question: What does someone like us, reasonably comfortable in life – for which we have to be eternally grateful to God, there are millions under the poverty line – so, for someone like us who are reasonably comfortable in life, my focal question is, in daily living, we have the

common sense to know that nobody knows what the next moment will bring. Sometimes pleasure, sometimes pain. No one can know what the next moment will bring. According to my concept, no one can know the total amount of pleasure I can expect from my life or the total amount of pain I can expect from my life. My concept is that it is predetermined. Whatever the total amount of pleasure in my life, is predetermined. Whatever the total amount of pain in my life is predetermined. This is my concept. So, according to my concept, it is quite useless to go to anyone or pray to any God with the idea that my pleasure be increased or my pain be reduced.

So with this understanding, what does someone like us, who is reasonably comfortable in life, want most in life? I am not concerned with religion. This is what I am most concerned with. Therefore, first I am concerned with being comfortable in life. Second, with daily living. So my question is, what does someone who is reasonably comfortable in life, wants most, in his daily life? That, is my focus question. Nothing religious or spiritual about it, but that is my concern. What do we want most? Or in other words, what are we seeking? That is my point. What do you think?

Suhas: I think neither spirituality is required nor religion, so...

Ramesh: I entirely agree. In fact, I think the human being would be a lot happier if he did not have religion. But, according to God's will, cosmic law, the human beings are not supposed to be happy. That's why, they are loaded with religion. According to God's will, Cosmic law. But, we are free to chose! We can decide, all right, I don't want any religion.

So, what do you want most in life? With the understanding that you cannot know what the next moment will bring, sometimes pleasure, sometimes pain, Or you cannot know the total amount of pleasure you will have in life or the total amount of pain in life.

That is something you have to accept, as the basic. In other words, every human being has to live his life, in circumstances over which he has no control, therefore, while we are being forced to live our lives, in the circumstances in which we have been placed, what does someone like us, reasonably placed in life, want most? That is my focus question. Nothing essentially spiritual about it. What would you say? What is the answer? Let me put it this way, if God came to you and asked what is the one thing you want, what would you say? Think all you want, and I have done a lot of thinking over this and the only answer I came to, was peace of mind. Pleasure in the moment, no questions, I enjoy it. Pain in the moment, I don't like it but there is nothing I can do about it. Daily living means enjoying pleasure or suffering pain. So my question is, what do I want most in life most? I go step by step. Relax. In any given moment, I am either enjoying pleasure or suffering pain. So whatever it is, whether I am enjoying pleasure or suffering pain, what do I want most? I repeat, to begin with, I want more pleasure, less pain. Can't be done,

therefore, throw it out of the window. With that understanding, that no one can increase my pleasure or decrease my pain, what do I want most in life? Think all you like. The only answer I have come to is, while I am enjoying the pleasure, I wouldn't like the pleasure to be shattered. While I am suffering pain, I would not like the pain to intensify. It can't get simpler than that. Agreed?

Suhas: Yes.

Ramesh: Now, what can shatter your pleasure?

Suhas: A thought that it may stop.

Ramesh: A thought, yes. A thought arises. Now I am having pleasure. Tonight, my pleasure will be double. Or, now I am in pain. But it may not last long. Another ten minutes. That is also a thought. I agree. So, what is the thought that can shatter my pleasure. Or intensify my pain. Think all you want. The thought that can shatter my pleasure is a thought that there was something I did, to my father, mother, wife or a dear friend, They have never forgiven me. They may say that they have forgiven me, but they have always held it against me. Obviously, I didn't mean to do it, that I consider my action, but since that day, the memory of that action, shatters my pleasure and intensifies my pain. Or, something someone else did to me. A dear friend of mine. I relied on him and he let me down. Or he hurt me. I never forgave him.

In other words, my point is, daily living, is based on the relationship between me and the other. Morning till night, what is daily living? A relationship between me and the other. The other may be someone close to me, my wife, or son or someone connected to me by business or some profession, or, a total stranger. Who will be during the course of the day, no one knows. You open the door and there is someone standing there with a knife in his hands. So my point is, what destroys my pleasure is, something I did to the other, or, the thought of someone else did something to me. Isn't that right? Think all you want. This is the answer you will come to. And, you cannot stop the arising of that memory. So the next question would be, how to have a harmonious relationship with the other.

In order to have peace of mind, my relationship with the other should be harmonious. At the moment it is not harmonious because of the thought, he may do something to me or I may do something to him. My conclusion is, in order to have peace of mind, I must have a harmonious relationship with the other. Whoever the other is, a close relative, or a total stranger. My next question: Why is my relationship with the other now, not harmonious? Step by step.

Again, I promise you, it's a simple answer. Why is my relationship with the other now, not harmonious? It's a simple answer. Because the other, will not always do what I want him to do. Can there be a simpler answer? Even my wife and son will not always do what I want them to do. And, I also know that it is stupid to expect

them to do what I always want them to do.

So there is the dead end. Does that mean we cannot have peace of mind? That is also not true. We know that there are a few people who are transparently happy. And we can't imagine that there can't be anyone who has peace of mind. That's where the dead end came. I am telling you all this from actual, personal experience. Otherwise, you will find hundreds of books, **Art of Living, Science of Living...**

I am telling you from actual, personal experience. This is where I came to a dead end. So in order to have peace of mind, we have to have a harmonious relationship with the other. Basically, what is the conditioning every child has received? At home, in society, in school, anywhere. For hundreds of years. What is the conditioning that a child has received? In school, you must be on top of your class! If not top, at least in the first three or four. In the playground, you must play to win! Not to enjoy your play, but to win. In school, not to enjoy your study, but to push the other back. For every child, for hundreds of years, the conditioning has been, the other is a potential rival. The other, may be a brother. But there is sibling rivalry all the time. Even among brothers, there is rivalry.

What I am saying is, that the conditioning is such in life that in order to win in life, you must win over the other. That is the conditioning. The other is a potential rival. Take it a little further, the other is a potential enemy. Which means, one will always have fear of the other. With this understanding, can there never be peace of mind? That is also not true. So I cannot have peace of mind because I cannot have harmonious relations with the other. And yet, I know I can have peace of mind.

That's where I was stuck for some time. Then the answer came to me, again by the grace of God, that I can have peace of mind, only, ONLY, if I can accept totally my concept, that everything that happens in the world is a happening according to God's will, cosmic law. Through which person or body-mind organism the action happens, again according to cosmic law. Any action happening in any body-mind organism, how it affects whom, for better or worse, whether a happening happened that hurt someone or helped someone, not in my control. It is according to God's will, the cosmic law, and the destiny of the person concerned.

In other words, no one, no human being, is capable of doing anything. Everything happens according to God's will, cosmic law. So I can have peace of mind only if I can accept totally that everything happens according to the cosmic law.

Then what happens? If I am able to accept this totally, then at that instant, my entire burden of guilt and shame, which I have been carrying, for my actions which hurt the other, even a bigger load, of hatred towards the other for what they have done to me, the entire load disappears.

If no human being can do anything, if they are merely instruments through which

life happens according to God's will, cosmic law, if I can accept totally, then where is the question of my feeling guilty for actions that happened through this body-mind organism?

Before I had this total understanding, what was my reaction to someone when I was hurt? Very simple, he hurt me, I hate him. Now with this understanding, what is my reaction if I am hurt? Again, my reaction is extremely simple. My reaction is - what has hurt me is a happening, what had to happen by God's will and what had to hurt me was according to God's will and my destiny. A happening happens, which helps me. Previously, I used to feel he is a friend of mine!! He has helped me. What has happened that a particular action happened through a body-mind organism, according to God's will. That it has helped me is my destiny.

So now my understanding is a happening has happened. That it has helped me is my destiny. Through which person it has happened is irrelevant. So the question of hating somebody or loving somebody does not arise. In other words, if I am able to accept totally that every person is an instrument through which life happens, according to God's will or Cosmic law, there is no question of me hating myself for what I do or hating anybody else for what they do.

So what do you think of my reaction, when I came to this firm conclusion? What do you think of my reaction? Crying? Happiness? It was anxiety. My reaction was that of anxiety. How is it possible for me to live my life, in a society which insists on punishing me for actions which the society considers my actions? I tell them not my actions, they won't believe me. Valid question, isn't it? I was confused and anxious.

How is it possible for me to live my life with a total understanding that I am not the doer in a society that insists on punishing me for an action they consider my action? And similarly, the society will reward me for an action they consider my action. Is that not a valid question? So that is what bothered me. Lovely concept, beautiful concept. Which even an idiot will accept, intellectually.

It means no more burden of guilt and hatred. But is it a practical concept? My answer was no. Then again, as has always happened, the answer came. That is precisely the concept which the Buddha gave, in his words of course. The Buddha's words I am told, were, " Events happen, deeds are done, consequences happen. There is no individual doer thereof." That was his concept, but the meaning is the same. No individual is capable of doing anything.

So I was greatly relieved. Even the Buddha had this concept, more important lived this concept for a long time. So I knew that it is totally practical for anyone to live this concept without any problem, with the total acceptance, he is not the doer. And since then, it has been my experience that I was right. And the Buddha did live, and I also for the last twenty odd years, I have lived my life with the total acceptance that I am not the doer, with the society punishing me for what the society considers as my action.

You know how? I will tell you. What is daily living? What is the mechanism of daily living? What would you say? Your name is?

Suhas: Suhas.

Ramesh: Suhas. So whether it is Suhas or Kalpana or a caveman five thousand years ago, or anyone in the future.

What is the essence of the mechanism of daily living? I repeat, for anyone five thousand years ago, you and me, or for anyone in the future, the mechanism of daily living has to be the same! And what is the mechanism of daily living? The mechanism of daily living for any person for any time, is that he has to deal with the situation in which he or she finds himself or herself. Every human being at any given time has to deal with the situation. That is the core of daily living. The situation of the cave man, totally different than that of you and me but still, the situation is that the caveman has to deal with whatever the situation he faces, we have to deal with the situation we face.

That is the core of daily living. And what is it to deal with the situation? Dealing with the situation can only mean, in that situation, what do I want? I decide what do I want. And I do whatever I decide to do, in order to get what I want. Isn't that the core of the mechanism of daily living? Which means, everybody has to have total free will, to do whatever he or she wants to do, in the circumstances.

Therefore, the mechanism of daily living, every human has the right to do whatever he or she wants in that situation. Thereafter what is our experience? Everybody's experience is that having done whatever I wanted to do in the circumstance, with all my free will, what happens thereafter?

Thereafter, in the Buddha's words – consequences. "Deeds are done, consequences happen." Consequences of everybody's actions happen. But what those consequences are, nobody ever has had any control over what happens. So what is mechanism of daily living? Nobody has any control over what happens. Fact of life! To put it in another words, daily living cannot happen, unless I have total free will. According to that right, after what I have done whatever I wanted to do, thereafter, only God's will prevails. That's a fact of life. Having done what ever I wanted to do, what happens? One of three things happen. Sometimes I have got what I wanted. Sometimes I have not got what I wanted. Sometimes what I wanted, was beyond expectations: usually for the worse, sometimes for the better. Beyond expectations.

And thereafter the society in which I live, does not know what I did. Society can only accept what has happened, one of the three things, judges my action as good or bad, rewards me or punishes me. And having to continue to live in the society, I have to accept the society's verdict. Reward from the society has meant pleasure in the moment. Punishment from society has meant pain in the moment. And that is the essence of life. Sometimes pleasure, sometimes pain. And what is decided by

the society, functioning under the cosmic law. That is the whole, daily living. About which no one can do anything.

So, I am living for the last twenty odd years, enjoying the rewards conferred upon me by the society, knowing I am not the doer, So I enjoy any pleasure that is come to me, with a certain amusement, knowing that I am being rewarded for something I know I haven't done.

Pain happens, I am forced to accept the suffering. For the last twenty years, I have enjoyed the pleasure and suffered the pain. Like anybody else. Like anybody else. Where is the difference? Where does my peace of mind come from?

I believe I am not the doer. I am forced to enjoy the pleasure or suffer the pain. For someone else, he believes everyone is the doer. For him also, sometimes pleasure, sometimes pain. Where is the big deal? What's the big point? What do you think, Suhas? Whether I believe I am the doer or not, I have to enjoy the pleasure or suffer the pain. Same thing for anybody. So where is the big deal that I have that I am able to accept totally that I am not the doer, which brings me peace of mind?

Simple, honestly. What happens is, I certainly enjoy the pleasure, knowing that it is not my action, there cannot be any pride or arrogance. Not my deal. Pleasure but not pride and arrogance. Similarly, pain I have to accept, knowing that it is not my action. While I suffer the pain, I don't have to feel guilty. Pleasure but not pride. Pain but not guilt.

Similarly when someone else hurts. Pain but not hatred. With the result, for last twenty odd years, I have lived my life, moment to moment. Enjoying the pleasure or suffering the pain over which I have no control, but my ego has been totally free from pride and arrogance and guilt and shame for my actions and hatred for the other. An absence of hatred for my actions and hatred for the other, means a presence of peace of mind. Simple. Which is what we have been looking for. So what have we come to?

First, I have total free will to do whatever I want. After that, God's will prevails. Over which I have no control. That is what it comes to. And would you believe, that whatever I have told you from my personal experience, is precisely what Lord Krishna told Arjuna in the **Bhagavat Gita**. Nothing more. True, lots of other stuff, but basically, what was Arjuna's problem? The Lord took his chariot right in the front (of the army). And what did Arjuna see? Brothers and cousins and friends. And Gurus! As his enemies!

So he said, my friends and relatives even, I am prepared to kill! But I will not kill my Guru. So he put his bow and arrow down. That is the beginning of the **Bhagavat Gita**. So in that situation, what does Lord Krishna tell him?

He says, "You have the total right to act, you have the right to action." Why does

he say that? Because unless everybody has the total free will to do whatever he wants, mechanism of daily living cannot happen. So Lord Krishna tells him, you do have the right to act, but you have no rights to the fruit of your action. And promptly, the management expert says, that is stupid advice! How can a man work without motivation?

How can God expect us to work without any motivation? What is the flaw in this argument? The flaw in this argument is, what did Lord tell Arjuna? You have the total free will to do whatever you want. And what do you want? You want what you want. So how can you say there is no motivation? I am free to do whatever I want, in order to get whatever I want. Total motivation. So I have the right to do whatever I want to get whatever I want.

I have that right. And in the identical situation, the psychopath also has that right. It is the mechanism of daily living. So in a situation, Suhas, say I can now get what I have wanted for a long time. In a situation, I decide I shall not do anything illegal or immoral. In an identical situation, the psychopath says, I have waited long enough for this, now I am not going to let anything interfere with getting it. I am prepared to do anything to get it, including murder.

See what I mean? We have total free will to the extent that even a psychopath can decide to do what he wants. But what actually happens, neither me nor the psychopath has any control. In other words, having committed murder the psychopath may not get what he wanted. Even restricted my actions to legal and moral, I may get it. Or it could be the other way round. See what I mean? What happens is God's will.

And that is precisely what Lord Krishna has told Arjuna. You are free to do whatever you want. But what actually happens, has never been in your control. You do not have the right to the fruits of your action. You have done your best. You cannot demand that you will get what you want. So the core of what Lord Krishna told Arjuna is precisely what I told you in the simplest of terms.

So it's not a great philosophy. Clear, daily living, anything I want to do is my free will. Anything that happens thereafter is God's will. And, the really important point here is, Suhas, that what happens, may not appeal to my sense of logic and reason.

I have done something legal, still not get what I want. The psychopath has committed murder, but he gets what he wants! And talking of murder, what is everybody's experience in the world? A murder is committed. Sometimes, the murderer is caught, detected and executed. That is as far as our logic goes. And sometimes, the murderer is caught, taken to court and the jury decides, not enough evidence the murderer is set free and he commits ten more murders!!

Does not appeal to our sense of logic. That's not fair. That's not just. But it has

happened, and more than that, so many times, an innocent man has been executed for a murder he did not commit. So my point is, we have the right to action, but what happens, has never been in anyone's control. And, it may not appeal to our logic. The innocent man getting executed is part of God's will, Cosmic law.

On what basis? The basis, the cosmic law is so vast, so complex, our reasoning is very simple. We read a book on logic another book on law and you have it. But the cosmic law, concerns the entire universe, for all time. how can something so complex and so vast e intelligent to the human brain? Therefore, all I can accept is that everything that happens is by the will of God, or the cosmic law, the basis of which, no human being can ever understand. But this important fact, society has not accepted it. Religion has not accepted it. They have to understand the cosmic law.

So the theory of *karma*. Why did the innocent man get executed? Because in his previous life, he did something or the other. Mind is satisfied. What is wrong with that? Why is the murderer let go? Because in his last birth... What is wrong with it?

That something gets transferred form one life to other is obvious. Idiots in one hand and geniuses on the other had, would not be born. Fact that the they are handicapped babies, something gets transferred... But what gets transferred, I can never know.

What I can know, one thing I do know is what does not get transferred from one birth to another, and that is the ego. Suhas, Kalpana, Ramesh is concerned with this life only. Why? Because the ego did not come with the body. The body-mind organism was born as a three dimensional object. What does a new born baby do? intuitively, seek its mother's breast for its sustenance. But the baby has not the slightest idea, that she is a separate entity, looking for a separate mother, for the milk she wants.

So the ego, the sense of being a separate entity, comes at the age of one to two. So, the ego does not come with the body, and so it does not get carried forward after the death of the body.

What is the ego? The impersonal consciousness that gets identified with a particular body with a particular name is the ego. Therefore, what is the ego? It is the impersonal consciousness. Ego is God!! But God, not in his total magnificent splendor, but captive splendor. Impersonal consciousness, total magnificent splendor. The moment it becomes Ramesh, Kalpana or Suhas, it becomes captive. So what is the ego? The impersonal consciousness, but in its captive stage, where it has lost its impersonality.

The ego is nothing but the impersonal consciousness that has given up its impersonality and has taken a special, individual personality. So when the body-mind organism breathes its last, the consciousness imprisoned inside it gets released and becomes impersonal consciousness. The impersonal consciousness

which has identified with a particular three dimensional object at the age of two or three, gets released from that bondage and regains its impersonality. That is why the ego is not concerned with what gets transferred from one birth to another.

Therefore, on that basis, the human being can only accept that I am free to do whatever I want, but what happens thereafter has never been in my control, and I have to live with it. And for me, that is the ultimate understanding in daily living.

It is the ultimate understanding in daily living. In any situation, I am free to do whatever I want. In any situation if I want to improve myself, nothing stops me. Physically, mentally, temperamentally, spiritually, I am free to do whatever I want. With the understanding, that I may or may not achieve what I am trying to get!

Therefore, the simplest way of living ones life without any strain or stress, other than what the flow of life brings me over which I have no control. Other than the strain or stress which the flow of life brings me, pleasure and pain in the moment, is there a way of live in which I am totally free? I say yes.

Having the ultimate understanding for the last twenty years, I have lived my life in any given situation, doing whatever I think I should do, having done that, whatever happens, is not under my control. Therefore having done whatever I thought I should do, I need not worry, have I done a mistake? Have I committed a sin? Who cares? Who decides? I have led a beautiful life, for the last twenty odd years, having done whatever I have wanted to do, without bothering "Have I made a mistake? Have I committed a sin?"

Witnessing whatever happens, as something that happens under the cosmic law, without condemning anybody for anything. Can life ever be simpler than that? I repeat. Having done whatever I have wanted to do, without pride or arrogance, guilt or shame, without hating anyone, with the total freedom of doing whatever I want, with the total understanding that I can never make a mistake, or ever commit a sin. Because whatever I have done, is what God expected me to do.

At any moment, whatever I decide to do, whatever the psychopath decides to do, is based only on two factors. My genes and conditioning, the psychopaths genes and conditioning. I did not chose to be born to my parents, so I had nothing to do with the genes I was born with, the psychopath had nothing to do with the genes in his three dimensional object. And as you know, more and more research brings out the fact how powerful this factor is.

Anything I think or do, can be traced to a certain gene. Any disease that happens, can be traced to genes. The latest research, it made me laugh, Am I faithful to my wife? I don't have to take the credit for it. My genes compel me to be faithful to my wife. By the same token, if I am not faithful to my partner, its due to my genes. I don't have to feel guilty. Genes is such a damn powerful factor. The other factor, conditioning. Together, I call it the programming of a body-mind organism.

Just as I had no control over being born to particular parents, I had no control over being born in a particular geographic environment, and the social environment. Upper middle class, middle class, lower middle class or the low class. In which environment this body-mind organism was bombarded with conditioning from day one, this is good, this bad, this is a socially acceptable behavior, this is a sin, God will punish you. So that, at any point, whatever we have thought and done, is strictly limited to these two factors. Genes, and your up to date conditioning, which God made. I say up to date conditioning because I want to make it clear. What is happening now, is fresh conditioning. Which can alter or amend your up to date conditioning, or even transform it. That also has happened.

So my point is, whatever anybody has ever done is based on these two factors. Genes and conditioning. So how can I ever commit a sin? So, I need not fear God at all. In fact, in effect, God has been functioning through me. So I don't have to fear God, nothing stops me from loving God! As my creator, it's between me and my God.

But as far as society is concerned, I am totally responsible. Therefore, whatever the society gives me, I have to accept. Pleasure I enjoy, Pain I suffer. But no mistake, no guilt, no sin! Isn't that the perfect way to live ones life? With peace of mind!

This is what I talk about. No religion... Is this all I am concerned with? Yeah! This life, this body, is all I am concerned with. What about changing the world? I am not concerned with it. God has created it, let him deal with it.

Valid question. I am talking about someone reasonably comfortable in life. Do I not feel anything for the millions of people below the poverty line? For those suffering with disease, and poverty, do I not feel anything? That is also not true. With the average sensitivity, I do feel for those who suffer poverty and disease. But the point is, in that situation, in which I feel for the poor and the diseased, is there something I can do? That is the mechanism of daily living.

So many years ago I said, I do feel for the poor and hungry. In that situation is there something I can do? And I decided, Yes there is. So a certain percentage of my income, I give to charity to those institutions, who deal with this problem. Having done whatever I can to in the situation, after that, I leave the matter to God.

So my point is this, in any given situation, it is so easy to say God created it, let God deal with it. And I keep my money. Or, the second alternative, I give some money to those institutions who deal with the problem and thereafter, I leave the matter to God.

So, any questions? No, total surrender? [laughter] As I told you, for this understanding of non-doership, the acceptance has to be total. Intellectually, even a damn fool will accept it. No more burden of guilt and shame... But the concept cannot work, unless the acceptance is total.

So it's a valid question. What is the question? Suhas, Kalpana, what is the question? It's simple. I have no doubt that I have the total intellectual acceptance that I am not the doer. No one else is the doer.

But the question is, what do I have to do in order to have the total acceptance that I am not the doer? The answer is nothing. If I am not the doer, what can I do? Nothing! Which means, it will happen only if it is my destiny, God's will, cosmic law that is meant to happen. Otherwise it will not happen.

But then another valid question arises. I have been a spiritual seeker for many years. I have always done some thing or the other fasting, meditation, for all these years. And, nothing to do, just waiting for God to make up his mind, I will be lost. So in order to while away my time, is there something I can do as a spiritual practice? Valid question. For that, I do have an answer. Personal investigation. Very simple, because you are not really doing it. Personal investigation. If you have time during the day, any time. But if you find yourself busy throughout the day, then at the end of the day, sit quietly, try to ensure that you are not disturbed, and be comfortable.

You don't have to sit on the floor with your back straight, take the most comfortable chair. And in order to be comfortable if you like some coffee, have it. And do some simple, what I call personal investigation. And that is, from the many events of the day, most of which you will agree, just happened, select one action, which you are sure is my action. Others, I don't know, but this is my action.

And I can challenge anybody to prove to me that it is not my action. This action, I bet is my action. Then, this action, that I call my action, did I decide to do it at a particular time? No, I didn't. Then how did the action happen? And then you remember, a thought had happened, an idea had occurred. And that thought turned into my action. And I had no control over that thought or idea. So how can I call it my action?

Action after action, you investigate. And I assure you, each and every time, you will come to the conclusion, if I had not been at a certain place a certain time, and seen something, my action wouldn't have happened! And I had no control over being at a certain place at a certain time, and seen something, or heard something, or tasted something, or touched something, my action would not have happened.

Every single time without exception. And when you have done this investigation yourself, the acceptance must go deeper and deeper and deeper. Until at a certain time, with God's will and the cosmic law, a flash of understanding is likely to happen. I simply cannot be the doer. And if I cannot be a doer, the other cannot be a doer either. Whether he or she believes it or not, does not matter. I know, from my own experience that I cannot be the doer so the other is also not a doer. After that flash, no more doubts are likely to remain. And, this is my concept.

Suhas: The thought which comes in our mind, is my thought.

Ramesh: No! That is the point. Suhas, do you have any control, over what the next thought is going to be?

Suhas: No.

Ramesh: No one has. Even if God took birth, he wouldn't have any control over the next thought. Because he has become a human. The impersonal consciousness, has become the identified consciousness. No one has any control over what thought may occur. therefore, nobody can ever say That I will never do this or I will never do that. Nobody can ever say that. Any thought can come, and any thought can bring about an action, over which you have no control.

Have you heard of the sage Parashar? Parashar was supposed to be someone so unusually innocent, that if Parashar passed by the bathing place, the woman would not bother to cover themselves. So transparently innocent.

So what happens to Parashar? He wanted to cross a river. So he got into a boat. And who was ferrying him across? A young fisherwoman. And what happens? This emblem of innocence, gets enamored by the young, sixteen year old fisherwoman, Matsyagandha. Smelling of fish. Smelling of fish, but Parashar was enamored by her and the passion was reciprocated. The result was, that they lived together and a child was born. So Parashar tells the fisherwoman that I will return after ten or twelve years, I will take charge of him, he is my son. In the meantime, ask for three boons, I will give you. I have that power. The first thing she asked was, take my fishy smell away. Done. Next, you will be gone, I am only seventeen years old, I would like to marry. So I would like my virginity back! Done.

I forget the third one, but the point of the story is, he did come back to take his son and do you know who the son was? Sage Vyas, who wrote the **Mahabharata**. So what do we say? Parashar did this wrong thing, so sage Vyas was born. No. My point is, because a sage like Vyas had to be born, his parent had to be someone extraordinary, like Parashar.

So my point is, we think only in terms of cause and effect. A had to happen and B happened then C happened. But I say, E had to happen therefore D happened, C happened...Cause and effect, a double pointed arrow. So if something had to happen later, hundred years later, then whatever happened that led to that, had to happen also. therefore cause and effect. Effect brings about the cause and cause brings about the effect also.

Are you from Mumbai?

Suhas: Yes.

Ramesh: If any questions arise, you are most welcome to come again.