

# **Excerpts from Harimedia Forum**

## **Discussions with Hari**

### **Page One**

Click on index to go to that topic's post

Copyright 2005-2024 Harimedia LLC  
All Rights Reserved

Envy	4
Mind	4
Life and living and death	8
Knowledge	11
Being unconscious	13
Why spiritual people suffer...	14
Our goals and objectives	16
Lord Shiva	30
on "interview for former disciples"	33
mind	34
Wath we see in the sky	35
karma	36
Devas in different traditions	41
Divine love	42
Senses	43
Striving for perfection	46
Divine and evil	50
Harmony & modes of nature	52
Prakriti	53
end of modern society	58
I	59
life	62
Ego	63
Purport of the sacrifice	64
What happen at the moment of leaving the body	67
Love and forgivness	72
Re: What kind of lifestyle do you recommend to improve our vibration?	73

Your perspective on the current crisis in Europe	74
Help really powerful mystic at the time of death	75
SPIRITUALITY WITHOUT BELIEVE SYSTEM	76
Deities	77
How to die properly	78
Servant or Son and Dother	80
Bhagavat Gita	81
Godhead and His Supreme Personality	82
Do we need a religion?	87
Spiritual world, Heaven and Hell	91
presence	94
How to overcome anger and other negative feelings	96
Mother Durga and Lord Brahma	98
Good enough FOR smth. smb. or worthy OF smth. smb?	102
Am I daemon?	105

## Envy

by **kamalamala1** » Sun Nov 25, 2018 10:42 am

Hi Harijee!

We see that in this world envy is everywhere.  
People sometime is envious even without real reason, sometime absolutely for nothing.  
Actually i notice that practically all the people has some kind of envy,  
Does envy in some way exist in spiritual world?  
Can one be envious to God?

Re: Envy

by **Hari** » Thu Dec 06, 2018 7:47 pm

Well, as you might have noticed, I avoided answering this question for some time. I entered my standard procrastination mode. But now I rebooted and will dare to reply. I cannot answer this question as it is phrased because I do not know how.

I am totally blocked by the word envy. The word is one of those blockbuster terms that is totally loaded with all kinds of expectations, fundamentalistic ideas, warped and guilt ridden conceptions, and a pile of other stuff too numerous to mention and too heavy to discuss without needing an ibuprofen at the end.

I do not even know of an alternative term to help us understand the underlying question better because this word cuts off at the knees all attempts to use one's intelligence and experience. So I am stuck.

I do know that the idea of doing one's best and using the efforts of another to do better, as in a form of competition, does exist within spiritual energy and it works well. But the idea that one could be with God and be envious of God at the same time is far too paradoxical for me to deal with. I think the concept is impossible, but saying that places me in the path of a machine that will roll over me for daring to question this presumed absolute truth by saying it is anything but the basis of all things "material." Sorry!  
Top

Re: Envy

by **kamalamala1** » Fri Dec 07, 2018 5:09 am

Thank you Harijee!

Actually you answered my question.

I also nowadays could not believe that anybody in spiritual realm can be envious to GOD.It sound too primitive.

Actually as i understand envy is result of passion and ignorance , and if people there in shudha satva how can be there envy

## Mind

by **kamalamala1** » Sun Feb 08, 2015 6:54 pm

Dear Hari

WE often heard that our mind is our enemy .

And that it is just an instrument.

But in fact we all feel that our mind is the part of us.

So the question arising is our mind is part of our soul, or it is just an instrument given to us and after liberation we will not have it?  
And if mind is part of us why it is acting seemingly independent?

Re: mind

by **Hari** » Tue Feb 10, 2015 10:07 pm

Ugh. That is my reaction to this question. 😞

Why bring up the mind? What is to be gained? You can understand the workings of the mind in great detail, but this does nothing to help you deal with it. I spent many years helping people with all things mental and I saw that little was to be gained even after so much endeavor. In those places where there is no life, the mind reigns supreme. I therefore left that pretzel where it belonged. Adios. So when I hear the word, my reaction is to avoid the question. But this is my forum and I said I would reply. So I am stuck. I am not happy with answering, but I will do so anyway. You might think that I am not addressing your question, but I am in another way.

Controlling, recognizing or pacifying the mind are all accomplished in the act of meditation. If we succeed to immerse ourselves in the essence of being, we feel our conscious energy. This energy flows throughout our body and all sensory exchanges. We feel it flowing as ideas, concepts, values, desires, thoughts, exchanges, communications and in every choice we make. When we are centered in consciousness, everything we use is a servant of our energy. Nothing is independent. Nothing is material, meaningless, valueless, or a burden. Even though we might not be happy with our life's situation, acts of living remain equally important. No part of our life is merely an instrument. Everything is an extension of who we are and has value when it serves our interests. We lose interest in separating the mind, intelligence, or ego to examine them and wonder over their functions and relevance in our life. We project our conscious energy into what we focus upon and express ourselves without worry about how it happens.

Consciousness is homogenous. Essence is homogenous, as is our energy. Because we are superior to the tools which we use to express life, our conscious essence dominates our field of activity, All aspects of what we "are" in this world of physicality are subservient to us. From this perspective, analysis of the the mind has little meaning.

Re: mind

by **Drpta** » Wed Feb 11, 2015 7:31 pm

I am sorry for interfere, but these are golden words you are speaking here, dear Hari!

You wrote "Everything is an extension of who we are and has value when it serves our interests" and "Because we are superior to the tools which we use to express life, our conscious essence dominates our field of activity. All aspects of what we "are" in this world of physicality are subservient to us". It is a real holistic approach which is absolutely opposite to accepted by modern society and even Indian sankhya philosophy approach is based on dividing, deriving and analysis of the dry rest. I love it!

But I have a question. Why the more subtle is an aspect of our "body" the more difficult it is to control it? Is it a question of our awareness of our more subtle aspects? For example, even in our gross body we, being in normal state, cannot control functions of vegetative nervous system. But after a slight practice based on the spreading our consciousness upon respective parts of our body we are acquiring control over them. Or in meditation for example, our mind often interfere and hampering the direct vision or perception. And what should we do in this

situation? I, for example, before a meditation simply direct a feeling of gratitude and appreciation to my mind just for what it is and it calms down. It really works, at least for me.

Now I am thinking, is it proper to say “more subtle” aspects? Maybe they are different qualitatively and not vibratory?

Re: mind

by **Hari** » Fri Feb 13, 2015 10:59 pm

*Now I am thinking, is it proper to say “more subtle” aspects? Maybe they are different qualitatively and not vibratory?*

I like your idea of adjusting how one speaks about the mind. I like to see it in a greater context. Mindfulness is focusing the attention on whatever is before you. When this is done, the mind is no longer separate from our consciousness. The mind rebels when it is left out of the experience. The solution is non-stop connection to the experiences we have, focusing with aware perception of the present life.

If you go running with your legs but you do not engage your arms and they flap here and there, it feels silly and highly inefficient. All acts, experiences, awareness, perception, choices, words, or plans must include the full package of what we are. When this is done, all parts that make us what we are belong to the effort of life. Neglect any part, and it becomes a burden.

Re: mind

by **kamalamala1** » Sun Jan 15, 2017 6:11 am

Hi Harijee!

The answers you wrote on this issue is very exciting but some questions arising in this regard also in context of your last lecture about mind.

This your words "The mind rebels when it is left out of the experience." means a lot.

Does mind totally belong to us? Or it is as our body temporary tool given to us by divine.

Why i am writing this since you wrote in your answer to Driptas question that mind can rebel.

Can we say that mind is like a computer with some programs inserted already by divine beings or higher self, in it?

Re: mind

by **Hari** » Mon Jan 16, 2017 8:58 pm

Our energy belongs to us, obviously, and the mind is a gateway through which our energy flows. The gateway is ours, although the specific characteristics of that gateway such as how clear it is, or how effective it is, depends on our present bodily characteristics. Right now it belongs to us! Rebelling is more a function of the reaction that occurs when we are distracted, not focused, or we allow ourselves to be deviated from our tasks by external forces. When our consciousness is scattered or unclear, we are out of control and the mind reflects that and reverberates with unwanted things.

Re: mind

by **kamalamala1** » Wed Jan 18, 2017 11:41 pm

Harijee !

Can we say that mind rebels when the interests of higher self become in conflict with the interests of lower self?

Re: mind

by **Hari** » Sat Jan 21, 2017 10:01 pm

There is only one self. Whenever we accept something that is not "true" to that self (in-tune with that self) dissonance is created. Mind rebels in an atmosphere of dissonance.

Re: mind

by **kamalamala1** » Sat Sep 02, 2017 7:10 am

Hi Harijee!

In regards to this issue arising the following question.

I understand that all feeling we get from senses we feel in our mind.

And all this feelings is not different form the feelings in dream when senses is not active at all.

Can we say that the main function of mind is feeling but not just rejecting and accepting?


Rejecting and accepting is secondary function of mind?

At least i feel like that.

Re: mind

by **Hari** » Fri Mar 30, 2018 3:30 pm

I do not know why the reply to this question I wrote months ago has disappeared! Something

went wrong and my reply was lost. 

I do not believe that the mind feels. Feeling is directly related to consciousness itself as it is the essence of being we all experience as our personal energy, our life, desires, and the main force behind what we do or think. Our minds are affected by what we feel. Naturally there is a two way exchange between what we feel and what we think, but what we feel is far stronger than our thoughts because feeling is the primary energy of consciousness and thinking is subordinate. We see this clearly when we consider that the feelings of love in a loving exchange with God are primary, axiomatic forces and all thoughts are derived from it.

However, if you are referring to "feeling" as the response to a sensual stimulus, such as the feeling of heat when the sun hits our skin, then this is different. I refer to feeling as awareness (the base "sense" of all perception) and the response from us (from the essence, consciousness, spirit we are) arising from that awareness. This is primeval. The other subsequent feelings derived from the interaction of the organs of sense with the world around us are subordinate to this fundamental awareness. These senses are indeed tracked by the mind within the context of the complex bio-chemical framework of cause and effect that is our body-mind-intelligence in this life. This complex is fueled by essence that is often hidden from us.

As far as I know, dreams are a vehicle to facilitate processing the huge amount of data that the senses collect that we did not connect to our feelings or desires directly. Because the data is derived from sensual perception, the mind processes it in a very similar manner as it would when we are awake and presents images and events accordingly. Because this takes place within the subtle realm, the logic of these scenarios reflect the greater freedom within subtle energy.

I suppose one can accept 😊 the concept of accepting and rejecting when one considers the mind within a binary framework (as in 0 and 1 as on off or yes no) which evolves into boolean logical sequences which bring in AND, OR, NOT, and a pile of other logical steps built on this. From this point of view, one can indeed call the mind an acceptance rejection device, but it would be a mistake to define the mind as limited because of this. Perhaps this concept of accept reject was only meant to define the basic functioning of the mind, although all the other movements within the mind can be understood in more complex ways as the language of the mind is better understood.

## Life and living and death

by **kamalalala1** » Mon Nov 14, 2016 7:07 am

Hi Harijee!

Every day in the world people are dying \all who were born here ever will go to another world in another reality after some time).

Every day in the world is born 365000 people and dies approximately 150000 people.

But those who come here are born with different life plans and challenges, some are born to cultivate some quality some desired for achievements, some repair broken relationships, some come here to pay debts,(some on the contrary even more spoil their relationship foolishly and develop negative qualities).

Some people coming here to develop there spirituality.

When a mother gives birth to the child she has plans for life not for death.

And same for children if they properly treated they all have plans and expectations in this life.

When One want to really build a house or factory or mine gold

or something else he don't think this is all for naught since all will die(go to another reality by force) .

Yes, of course everyone knows that they will soon or late leave this world, but it's not dominant in their minds when they make plans for life

If the consciousness of death dominated many will lost enthusiasm and began to depress.And this also happening.

It is obvious that for successful undertakings in life one need just such a positive approach to life and total immersion

and not at all think that all is in vain.

But at the same time to forget about death is silly especially because it always reminds itself and it is also as real as life.

So, should one while living in this world totally forget about death?

Since it seem that remembering about death doesn't at all helping people

but opposite it only make disturbances in there life, anyway it will happen, so wath.

Is always remembering about death is useful and beneficial in any way?

But from another point thinking about death as a big change in one existence in some cases can be positive

Also people should not foolishly that they forever will be here it is also not so.

How to treat all this in balance?

Re: Life and living and death

by **Hari** » Wed Nov 16, 2016 11:21 pm

I do not believe that anyone completely forgets that they will die someday. Obviously, the degree to which we are aware of this fact differs for each of us. Some people assume they will die far in the future and therefore they put it out of their mind till someone they know or love



dies. For some, death is more visible than for others. Some who think they will live long die quicker than they planned. We all deal with our awareness of death in whatever way is appropriate to our life situation.

I personally would avoid saying that there is a proper way to think about death and those who disregard it are somehow deficient. I believe that the purpose of life is to live; so as long as you have that life you should go on living as best you can. One cannot live if one is crushed by the thought of death or continually fearful of its occurrence. We need to be in a relaxed state so we can do what we can in the best way possible. Even when we attempt to do good for others, we focus on the other person and not on ourselves. When I am writing this text, I care about how my words will be of service, not if or when I shall die. Nothing wrong in that!

Regardless of your philosophical inclination or tendency towards existential awareness, we all have moments when we cannot avoid death. Our own demise reigns supreme amongst those moments, but when others die we are reminded. If one is faced with war in one's community, a natural disaster, disease, or any of the hundreds of different ways people meet their end, we are forced to face the subject. When we do not have to deal with death, we do not have to!

But, those who are wise prepare for uncertainty in their lives and make arrangements to best deal with the unknown. Security is very much a part of our planning and execution, and avoiding death or accommodating it when needed remains an important part of life. One of the primary ways we humans prepare for death is to root our consciousness in spirituality so that we can attain a good destination. This spiritual awareness creates the balance we seek as we live our lives to the fullest.

Re: Life and living and death  
by **kamalamala1** » Mon Nov 28, 2016 2:37 pm

Thank you for answer!  
Another question arising in this regard.  
Should one afraid death ,or if should in what degree and why?

Re: Life and living and death  
by **Hari** » Tue Nov 29, 2016 1:35 pm

In Bengal there is a saying, "The worst thing that can happen to you is death, and even death is not so bad. So why worry?" Death is scary till it happens and when it happens it is no longer scary unless you are some really evil character who is going to face all kinds of nasty reactions. But all living creatures are more or less wired to fear the unknown and death is the greatest unknown. Unless you embrace a religious philosophy that gives you courage to die knowing you are going to a good place, it is fearsome. Now whether or not that happens is another question, but at least the idea that it will creates relief.

The sun will come up tomorrow. Should I fear that? And if I did, what would it matter? I cannot do anything about it and being afraid just ruins my time right now. Better to not worry and make good choices and deal with whatever happens as it appears. Regardless, our personal responsibility to ourselves and those around us is to always be the best person we can be in an ideal of service.

Re: Life and living and death  
by **kamalamala1** » Wed Mar 08, 2017 3:38 am

Harijee!

Can people who live here help their departed relatives?

If they need help at all.

Previously there was the ceremony shradha even Lord Caitanya performed it in Gaya

Re: Life and living and death

by **Hari** » Wed Mar 29, 2017 1:17 pm

How much one can assist departed relatives depends on many factors. If they have already taken birth in a new form, the religious ceremonies are meant to give them more good karma to assist them to live a happier life. Any descendant can offer such assistance if they learn how. How effective their assistance is depends on how they do it and the power of those who assist them or their own power if they do it on their own. If they have not yet taken rebirth, relatives can assist them psychologically and spiritually if they know how or are connected to someone who knows how.

Re: Life and living and death

by **kamalamala1** » Mon Jul 24, 2017 1:36 am

You mean any religious ceremonies Or Vedic ones?

Can you explain please more how to help them psychologically and spiritually?

Re: Life and living and death

by **Hari** » Tue Jul 25, 2017 4:41 pm

If the relatives are hovering in our realm as disembodied spirits, we should help them to understand what they need to move on and then assist them to attain it. This requires personal skill and power.

If the relatives have already taken birth and are living their lives elsewhere, it is doubtful that you can do a lot for them. But you can always send good energy to any living being anywhere by focusing your attention on them.

If the relatives are somewhere else, but not yet fully embodied, they can be assisted by sending them good energy. Good energy is created by love, by good intentions, well wishes, charity performed in their name, sacrifices intended for their benefit, or acts of devotion or prayer directed towards them. If a ceremony can create this good energy then go for it. You can also do this on your own or within a smaller group.

Re: Life and living and death

by **kamalamala1** » Thu Aug 31, 2017 6:35 am

Harijee

Does after death exist such a beautiful nature as it is here?

Does there exist countries and nations and cities, Temples and Churches, religions?

Re: Life and living and death

by **Hari** » Fri Mar 30, 2018 2:54 pm

Um, your question spans a wide range of situations. I cannot answer it properly. As far as I have seen in my somewhat limited experience, individuals experience after-lives uniquely, although there are groups of various sizes that participate in a shared experience. I do not wish to go into the details of this more than to say that our capacity to create our future is greatly

expanded when we are no longer anchored to a gross form. In the less gross realms, our consciousness can control our environment far more than we seem to be able to now. If we consider this (or more honestly, if someone believes this concept to be true) then this capacity opens the doors to any and all experiences (within limits that I am not qualified to describe) according to our consciousness at the time we depart from our body.

Those who are highly advanced at the time of death have access to realms that most people can merely imagine, but the process of entering into these places and the activities within them is similar.

## Knowledge

by **kamalamala1** » Wed Aug 30, 2017 10:19 am

Hi Harijee!

Last few about days i was thinking about knowledge.

We all and most of the people wasting such incredible time to get different kinds of knowledge .

We are spending whole our life to learn learn and learn especially our younger ages

So much energy attention and life force is invested.

But most of the knowledge is simply how to adjust ourself to modern life mostly for earning enough money for simple survival

In this regard question is arising.

Does all this endeavors all this knowledge have any value after death?

Since most of it relate to life.

And what is real knowledge?

Re: Knowledge

by **Hari** » Wed Sep 06, 2017 12:51 pm

Three times I have almost completed an answer to this question and three times I was called away to do something else before I hit "Submit" and all was lost, so perhaps it will work this

time! 

All that we do in this life depends to a large extent on what we know. Learning is a major part of life. The act of learning itself assists us to develop our skills of observation, research, learning how to separate what works and what doesn't, along with many other important tools. These tools are essential to our evolution for without them we would remain ignorant. What we learn is not always as important as how we learn it. The art of learning can be seen as more important than what is learned. The better we become at learning the more capacity we have to figure out what we should do and how we should respond to what is happening in our lives.

If we consider the role of karma in developing our future, whatever we learn in this life becomes part of our decision making process. The consequences of these choices unfold as our circumstances in our next lifetime. From this perspective, knowledge has a definite impact on our life after death.

"Real" knowledge is a vague and perhaps useless term. If knowledge is true, has value to us, and helps create a better future for ourselves and others, then it is useful. Is this knowledge real as opposed to illusory ideas? Sure. But is knowledge about space, advanced mathematics, or other concepts that have no immediate personal relevance to us less real? One could say that any knowledge that is true is real. But illusions can sometimes serve us quite well. Magic is an example of this. Magic is also real, but what it appears to us to be is an

illusion. Is life an illusion? In some ways we consider it to be when it creates the idea that we belong in a world of physicality, but even then this illusion helps us understand what we value more. I consider the word "real" to be irrelevant in spiritual discussions. I use the word "value" because all that truly counts is what has value to us!

Re: Knowledge

by **kamalamala1** » Tue Mar 27, 2018 11:05 am

Hi dear Hari!

IN your answer you wrote .

"Is life an illusion? In some ways we consider it to be when it creates the idea that we belong in a world of physicality,"

Since we don't belong to this world then what is the use of most of our endeavors to make our lives here comfortable.

We are spending so much time on it

The whole civilization is crazy on that?

And where is our real home if we have such where is the place where we belong?

And what we should do for life in our real place?

Re: Knowledge

by **Hari** » Thu Mar 29, 2018 12:34 pm

You have just stated the premise for religion by more or less saying, "We do not belong here, we belong in the realm of God; therefore, why bother with production, consumption and enjoyment when we can simply focus on our spirituality?"

If this makes sense to you, then you will act accordingly. The degree to which you embrace renunciation of this world and detachment from it will dictate how close you remain to your ideal. If and when you decide that you need to create a balance between the life you now experience and the life you desire to experience, you will adjust your actions, your ideals, and your expectations appropriately.

Please do not assume that I am reiterating the universal premise of religion because I replied to your question about illusion as I did. I do not often speak using the term illusion, neither do I focus on leaving this world. I present the concept of living in awareness of the energy of existence and finding the divine within it wherever one is. Considering this, I do not wish to engage in the discussion of this life as useless and only a return to the abode of God has value. You may feel like that and this may or may not be "good" for you or bring you to where you wish to go. You will find out later on. I think it makes more sense to act as if the moment has more value than anything else and because of that our choices and our subsequent actions mold the course of our lives and set the stage for our future. Whatever we do in this moment should reflect our divine nature as we try to balance our needs and desires with being of service.

One could say our fundamental energetic existence is one of being of service in connection with the Divine Beings and Energy. I believe this and therefore I do not need to be anywhere else to express the essence I am. Home is where the heart is, and if our heart's are engaged in being of service within the flow of divine energy, we are home. This attitude is the best discipline to refine our consciousness so that we may transfer to the realm of God without requiring a massive dose of mercy that may or may not come regardless of our belief that it will.

## Being unconscious

by **Drpta** » Sat Aug 05, 2017 2:15 pm

Hi Hariji!

I want to ask you, what is happening with me, with my own self, if I am get unconscious? For example if I am fell into a faint or in the deep sleep without dreams. As I can suppose my body and my essence are getting separation in this state. My body is here in the bed for example, but where am I? Why when I woke up I remember nothing? It scares me because it looks like something similar is happening with the man at the time of death. I cannot control my destination, I can control nothing. I even don't know if I am or not. And this state of separation of me and my body means that I leave not only my material body but also my memory and mind, isn't it? And when I wake up all of them bring together again. Is there any means to realize if I still am and alive in such a disassembled state? And does it mean that for our existence we always need to have a body whether "material" or more subtle "spiritual"? Can essence operate without body and how can you define the state of being without the body?

Re: Being unconscious

by **Hari** » Tue Aug 08, 2017 9:26 pm

I cannot comment on the state of unconsciousness because when I am unconscious I, like you, know nothing about it. I am sure the spiritual essence we are is right where we left it because when we awaken from the unconscious state we find our consciousness in the same state it was previously. There may be exceptions when there is severe trauma, but this is mostly what happens to all of us when we sleep.

Death is not similar because death is not unconscious. Except in the extremely rare case when someone dies from within the deepest unconscious state, we are quite aware of what is happening around us and to us when we depart the body. Our memory and mind are within our consciousness. Consciousness is essence in its purest state and essence is life regardless of its being within a body or not. Further, pure consciousness can never be unconscious. The unconscious state you refer to is a feature of the embodied, because unless the linked consciousness-body-mind-memory-and all that jazz has some time when it is completely disconnected in total relaxation, we would go insane and have extremely short durations of life. There is even a statement in the commentaries on the vedanta sutra (because you are into these things) that states the soul goes into brahman during unconscious sleep to recover and restore itself to face the next day.

Re: Being unconscious

by **Drpta** » Wed Aug 09, 2017 2:54 pm

What you are writing is very interesting. You wrote

*essence is life regardless of its being within a body or not.*

Does it mean that life is possible without the action? I mean, do we always need a body to act even in the "spiritual" world and unembodied state is rather exception than rule? And what is that force that makes all these consciousness-mind-memory-body keep together?

Re: Being unconscious

by **Akhila L** » Wed Aug 09, 2017 6:04 pm

HARI: "The unconscious state you refer to is a feature of the embodied, because unless the linked consciousness-body-mind-memory-and all that jazz has some time when it is completely disconnected in total relaxation, we would go insane and have extremely short durations of life".

Yes, sleep deprivation leads to death even on the physical plane. We have to rest (sleep) to survive. Our brain and rest of the body need it.

However, I would like to comment on another important aspect of unconsciousness. Time aspect. I used to monitor patients with unexplained syncopal attacks (fainting attacks) and provoke the attacks through different means, no place here to explain how but it is possible in susceptible individuals.

One thing stroke me throughout all these years - people who lose their consciousness due to a temporary cardiac arrest or a circulatory collapse and regain consciousness after, say, 30-45 seconds (otherwise the brain would suffer a substantial irreversible damage), used to tell us how they experienced movie-like long sequences during their loss of consciousness - it may be a long walk in the park (at least one hour long ...), being at a party etc. And we are talking about max 30-45 seconds in the real time! These dreams are very long and quite comfortable. Moreover, they meet people they do not know but NOT the deceased ones (that I asked about very specifically). So, what is happening in their mind brain is totally dissociated from our (time) reality.

Would you like to comment upon it?

Re: Being unconscious

by **Hari** » Tue Aug 15, 2017 8:22 pm

Drpta, the easiest answer to your question is, "Definitely, but life without action is either a temporary state or a choice by someone who wants to exist within the energy of God without worrying about manifesting personal awareness." As far as bodies go, as soon as you say act, there has to be an actor, and to act one requires a means to fulfill the action. A body fulfills that need quite nicely. An unembodied being thinks of itself as embodied because of their energy holding together a familiar form. A mental form is still a form. An energetic form is still a form. It may not seem to be a "body" in the usual sense of the term, but it appears to be a form to those who are unembodied.

As far as I have seen in my own life, when my consciousness shares something significant with my mind-body-memory (as you call it) this creates a bondage between these agencies that causes it to stick together. This also works anywhere, in any form where there is a significant energy impression. This explains why the disembodied remain in a form familiar to them. This same concept explains energetic thought forms.

Re: Being unconscious

by **Hari** » Tue Aug 15, 2017 8:27 pm

Akhila: I think that this is an example of inter-dimensional energetic bleeding due to the brain trauma these people are undergoing. I see these people as being shaken apart by their condition and the stimulus that causes their symptoms, and as they naturally work to reassemble themselves, they move through another realm on the way back to the usual one.

## **Why spiritual people suffer...**

by **maha** » Mon Jul 17, 2017 8:12 am

Dear Hari!

Thank you for your lectures, for the love you always manifest and expand to the world while sharing your invaluable experience!

I live in a village, and here ordinary people ask, they often ask such questions:

Why do people engaged in spiritual practice, who gave 25-30 years or more of their lives, suffer?

Why do they live in poverty (do not thrive), suffer from poor health? Why does not God help them?

Why God does not give them Their divine energy to overcome all these difficulties?

And they have such an impression that God helps in life even more to the 'ordinary' people, although they do not follow any spiritual practice?

They can not understand this, why such sacrifices are required?

Devotees answer most often that it is the karma to blame.

I would like to hear your personal opinion on this.

If you can please answer in the forum or in your broadcast as you find better.

Thank you,

Sincerely yours,

Atindriya

Re: Why spiritual people suffer...

by **Hari** » Fri Jul 21, 2017 3:02 pm

Remember my lecture, "Why Good Things Happen to Bad People?" I addressed this issue in depth there. [http://harimedia.net/downloads/lectures... People.mp3](http://harimedia.net/downloads/lectures...People.mp3)

When we link spirituality with material prosperity, good health or other seeming symptoms of a successful life, we are making an assumption. After all, I am not sure we can point to a "warranty statement" by God that says, "if you are devoted to me then your entire life will be filled with prosperity." Considering the lack of a written guarantee, have we seen this confirmed in our lives? If we have not perceived this to be true, then we should consider that perhaps the idea is not rooted in reality but is rather a product of our desires or imagination. If this is so, and after all, no one can say for sure, then your question is moot.

If this is not so, then we have to deal with the issue of a whimsical God. If God gives good people troubles, then we either have to rationalize that all these troubles are good for us or we deserve them due to our karma. Both of these ideas may be acceptable because they help us become better. But if these ideas are not acceptable, then we have to face a God that does what God wants when God wants to, and our devotion or service is not a significant factor in God's decisions.

If we say that God gives us challenges because we need to have them or must have them, then again we have to take responsibility for our lives and work through it and not load blame on God. If we think that God is whimsical and unconcerned, then we have to question why we

bother bringing God into the conversation at all since regardless of our opinion of Him, he does what he wants.

## **Our goals and objectives**

by **Drpta** » Thu Nov 27, 2014 4:44 pm

Hi Hari,

I have a question. In ISKCON, as well as in all other religions, they constantly told us that the higher purpose of life is to return to back home back to Godhead and so on. So, now I have a doubt, is it our real purpose? Since we live on this Earth planet, may be it will be better for us to realize our earthy, material desires and needs we have, than mostly neglect them in our aspiration to reach the God or any kind of spirituality or spiritual experience like getting contact with Devine? If, all of the sudden, when we die, we find, that been pursuing these goals we missed the main things, for which we had born on this planet?

Being made by God's plan, this material world is perfect as it is, with all that things exist within it, as I think. Then, why should we look for any spirituality in this material world? May be it meant for another things and spiritual things more easily can be attained in another worlds? Why should we push our evolution? May be it happens of itself?

I am sorry if this sounds somewhat challengeable but I want to clarify this point.

P.S. You know, while I was writing this text, I, all of the sudden, realize that without all this "spiritual things" it will be very bored for me in this world.

Re: Our goals and objectives

by **Drpta** » Thu Nov 27, 2014 5:10 pm

Actually I wrote this question as a private mail, but by Hari's permission I placed his answer here. *"I have a question. In ISKCON, as well as in all other religions, they constantly told us that the higher purpose of life is return to back home back to Godhead and so on. So, now I have a doubt, is it our real purpose?"*

Hari: It is hard to answer a question that requires us to determine our "real" purpose, because the word "real" implies that we have a purpose we are expected to fulfill. This purpose transcends our present existence since it has been given to us by some higher power and our destiny is to find out what it is so that we can do what we are supposed to do. This places the control of our life in the hands of someone else. This is a typical modern religious ideal, also accepted by ISKCON, that tells that we are small and insignificant, but when we can find out our place in the big machine and do what we are supposed to do, we shall be perfect. Such philosophies are good for creating workers who will sacrifice themselves for the sake of the religion and its institutional needs.

Did God make man with the idea to fulfill some goal? This seems to usurp our personal integrity and responsibility. I think God wishes us to be the best we can be as we are. After all, we cannot be anything else.

*Since we live on this Earth planet, may be it will be better for us to realize our earthy, material desires and needs we have,*

Even when someone joins a religious order, for example, they have a need to fulfill that is not always spiritual. They may be afraid, in need of shelter, trying to avoid pain or some social responsibility, or a wide variety of other self absorbed desires. No one can avoid the needs and



desires of this world. Some are better at attaining their desires than others, but everyone has desires and needs and everyone works to fulfill them to some extent.

*“than mostly neglect them in our aspiration to reach the God or any kind of spirituality or spiritual experience like getting contact with Devine? If, all of the sudden, when we die, we find, that been pursuing these goals we missed the main things, for which we had born on this planet?”*

Hari: I think we should use what we have and understand the essence we are within and act according to our essence within this environment. Then we miss nothing. Act within this world in awareness of the life within it.

*“Being made by God’s plan, this material world is perfect as it is, with all that things exist within it, as I think. Then, why should we look for any spirituality in this material world? May be it meant for another things and spiritual things more easily can be attained in another worlds?”*

Hari: Um, if we are spirit and we are essence, then that spiritual essence goes with us wherever we are and can never be destroyed. Since all are essence, we are surrounded by spirit everywhere. So how can we avoid it if we are aware of spirit? This world is called material by those who are ignorant of its actual nature. It is filled with spirit, the matter is a label on that which we do not see spirit.

*“Why should we push our evolution? May be it happens of itself?”*

Hari: It does, but if we desire to grow, become strong, or become all that we can be, we push it to fulfill our desires.

*“I am sorry if this sounds somewhat challengeable but I want to clarify this point. P.S. You know, while I was writing this letter, I, all of the sudden, realize that without all this “spiritual things” it will be very bored for me in this world.”*

Hari: Of course. You like spiritual awareness, so you desire it. Because you are spirit, you desire to expand your awareness and interact with spirit in the form of other living beings. No one needs push you towards this. The more aware you are of spirit, the more you naturally want it.

Re: Our goals and objectives  
by **Drpta** » Fri Nov 28, 2014 10:32 am

Thanks a lot Hari for your answers. It clarified many things for me, but gave rise to new. I have to digest what you wrote.

Re: Our goals and objectives  
by **Drpta** » Fri Nov 28, 2014 10:53 am

*Did God make man with the idea to fulfill some goal?*

I think that for man it is inherent to strive for goals he made in his lifetime. Our senses naturally gravitate to the respective objects. For example the Sun. When we see it we can become desirous to reach it like Icarus. The same is about Radha-Krsna. We have heard that they live in pure spiritual realm, which is very attractive for us, who live here, down in this “awful material

world”, as those religionists instilled to us. It makes us eager to reach Them, isn't it? And, if it is not so, again, the God is so attractive, that it is very difficult to stop ourselves to strive to Him consciously or unconsciously.

Okay, let us suppose that this “localized” aspect of God like Radha-Krsna is far beyond of our perception and understanding. Then why they told us about Them? It looks like lure, isn't it? This unreachable god is only distracts our minds.

Okay, God created man, and being the creature of God man is perfect. Then why this perfect man, being born in this world is so unaware? Why he needs to be more conscious and aware then he is? Why should he be aware that world around him is manifestation of God and spiritual of itself rather than just perceive it like it is? It is like when Krsna has lived on this Earth, someone sees God in Him, but others just a man. What difference? He remains to be God in spite of their views, and they certainly look at God, even being unconscious about that. What difference between being aware or unaware? It is only soothing my mind but do not changes me. Is fear influences soul? If God wanted us be aware of true nature of the world then He will be created us like that, isn't it? But He didn't. Or if He did, then why we don't aware?

Hari, you often use word essence. Is the essence mean soul?

I find interesting quote from don Miguel Ruiz's book in Nandagrama's (rest her soul) topic [viewtopic.php?f=6&t=713](http://viewtopic.php?f=6&t=713)

*She wrote:*

*“When we speak about toltec's path for freedom, we mean that there is a map of liberation from domestication and taming. Toltecs compare Judge, Victim and structure of faith (religion) with parasite, which invaded into human mind. From their point of view all “domesticated” people are sick. They are sick because parasite controls their consciousness and brain. It feeds with their negative emotions caused by fear”.*

Re: Our goals and objectives

by **Hari** » Fri Nov 28, 2014 9:30 pm

7

To answer in the reverse order of these three texts:

If domestication and taming dull our awareness and prevent our seeing the world as it truly is, then indeed they are an obstacle to be overcome. Whether or not that is true depends on the training and ideals of each individual. Any system that dulls our connection to the energy that pervades all creation is not useful.

The words "spirit" or "soul" or the overly-redundant 😊 "spirit soul" imply to certain persons an energy that is beyond our reach in our present condition. There are many connotations to these words that I would rather avoid, so I use a word that, in my mind at least, helps me open the door to higher awareness bypassing previously accepted limitations. Spirit is all pervading, God is everywhere in all things and therefore ultimately all things are divine. We designate some things as better, some as worse and some as terrible. The energy of things is one -- the spiritual energy that exists everywhere. This is the essence of all things, all beings, all existence. Essence is that beyond which you cannot go. It is what makes something what it is. I am essence, as are you, as is the divine. This word, in my opinion, is exactly what I wish to express when I discuss topics surrounding awareness, consciousness, energy, life itself and the force that we know ourselves to be.

You seem to assume in your text about the "idea of God," that the world be are born into is somehow distinct from this energetic essence and it is usually beyond people's capacity to know this divine energy. It seems to me that you are equating the idea of being in illusion as being the reality we are born into and therefore we might find it better to be concerned only with this existence and not try to find out something "beyond" it. Although this is an interesting question, its premise is false.

This world is based in spirit. All life, regardless of where it is found, is the spiritual energy of the essence we are. Most of what is interesting in this world is living. There are some nonliving things that we desire, such as diamonds, oil, or the earth we use in our garden, but many of them are a product of living creatures long ago. Diamonds are carbon, oil decomposed bodies, the earth layers increase regularly by decaying bodies. Life is everywhere within all things, although some of this life is microscopic. Some substances are devoid of life, like lead or gold, and we value them because we can use them to make things. We have given them value, otherwise they are lifeless.

The real nature of this world is essence. God has given us awareness, intelligence, logic, reason, the capacity to feel and think, so that we can live a life of awareness of what is. Spiritual awareness and awareness of our world are not very different and ultimately require the same capacity and training to connect to the energy that pervades all existence.

I think it is safe to say that once again God has shown how perfectly He and She arrange this world for the sake of all. Now we should learn how to not screw it up. But even if we do, the suffering and chaos that ensues educates us to better ourselves later on. Ultimately, it all works out.

Re: Our goals and objectives

by **Drpta** » Sun Nov 30, 2014 1:33 pm

Okay, as I understand (with Maha's help) that there are two obvious truths:

1. This world is not distinct from its energetic essence.
2. People have a capacity to understand this divine energy.

But two questions remain:

1. If we are in illusion then there is a reason to look something for beyond it.
2. If we are in reality then we perceive real world, its energetic essence, divine energy and God everywhere. And this is only question of our awareness.

And why it is so difficult to develop our capacity for such awareness? May be because people don't like it themselves?

And I like to add to my previous post that may be there is a kind of pollution which prevents our awareness and we need to clean it out?

Re: Our goals and objectives

by **Hari** » Thu Dec 04, 2014 12:54 pm

1. *If we are in illusion then there is a reason to look something for beyond it.*

Yes, if you do not like being in illusion. Some people like it.

2. *If we are in reality then we perceive real world, its energetic essence, divine energy and God everywhere. And this is only question of our awareness.*

Ideally, yes, but part of our existence in this life is to face challenges and obstacles. They help us to develop the qualities we require. If we walked around seeing God everywhere we would not be on the same wavelength as everyone else in the world. This would create even more challenges and obstacles.

*And why it is so difficult to develop our capacity for such awareness? May be because people don't like it themselves?*

We are conditioned by our environment and the people around us. We are taught to think and believe in a certain manner, even if we consider ourselves free from outside influences. To understand the true nature of consciousness is difficult and can only be done by a dedicated seeker of the truth. Courage and heart are required.

Re: Our goals and objectives

by **Drpta** » Sat Dec 06, 2014 5:21 pm

*1. If we are in illusion then there is a reason to look something for beyond it.  
Yes, if you do not like being in illusion. Some people like it.*

What is the illusion? May be there are only different levels of awareness of reality? And who is Maya in light of matter, what is her role in this affair?

Re: Our goals and objectives

by **Hari** » Mon Dec 08, 2014 4:13 pm

I do not use the word illusion. You will not find it in my lectures and usually not in my written texts unless I am forced to deal with this concept when replying to a question. I see no value in discussing it because everyone has a different idea of what illusion is, what it is caused by, and its relative importance to us in our lives. Even if you think that multiple people share a common scriptural conception of it, you will see them act differently from each other, sometimes contradictorily, even hypocritically. Indeed, much discussion takes place either justifying these differences or criticizing others for not seeing things the same way we do.

There are different levels of awareness of reality, but whether there are "only" different levels of awareness is not a question I want to address in this brief reply. One could say that awareness is everything (Kind of like Schrodinger's cat in the box) but since there are far more things in existence than we are aware of, moved by forces beyond our control that impress upon our consciousness and mold it, our power to influence the world around us according to our desires is limited to the choices we make in the present.

If we are molded by these forces, are we in illusion? This question is deeper than it might appear. Is our conception that our awareness is all important the "real" illusion? Or is illusion ultimately something we create by our acceptance of it? And if I create something, is it really illusion to me? Is my creation original or is it suggested by someone or something else?

If I want something, it is real to me and what is real to me is not an illusion. If I choose to think something is what someone else thinks it is not, then which of us is in illusion? Are neither of us in illusion because we decide what to believe or not to believe by our own free will, or are both of us in illusion? And if everything is illusion except those things you cannot directly perceive (due to their being in another realm that is free from illusion) does the term have any value? If we call everything "awesome," in reality nothing is awesome. Is our free will the only non-illusion in our lives? But are we truly free to act as we wish? Examine your options at the present moment. How much freedom do you truly have? Can you do anything you want or is your action restricted by your circumstances?

What if I know that I am essence and yet I dive into a good food, get scared when a monster screams out of the TV, enjoy the love of someone I know does not really love me, or vote for a candidate who says they shall do good for the world but never does? Spiritualists can easily call all these things illusion within the realm of maya. Can you know that you are essence yet act within maya? And if you act within maya and embrace it to maximize your experience, are you really in illusion or are you the master of it?



Ja ja, I know! Bad me for even saying this! But I think about this stuff now and then. Not everything is obvious in this existence. As far as I am concerned, nothing is obvious! If we allow ourselves to perceive with our consciousness unimpeded by our behaviorally modified conceptions, we see quite differently. Indeed, the same thing can appear in many different ways according to the time we view it, the place where it is viewed, or the mood we are in at the time, amongst thousands of other factors. So where is the illusion when everything is relative? This is simply the nature of reality — calling it illusion does not change that or protect us from it.

There are things I reject because I do not like them. I shall not drink or smoke, for example, because it is unhealthy and unattractive to me. I do not avoid these acts because I think they are maya and those who do this are in illusion, I avoid them because I do not like them. Someone might say that my petting my dog is illusion because he is a mere beast! I even call him a beast and he likes it! This makes me want to pet him more. If this is illusion, then I like it. Some things I like, some I do not like. Although I am in this world, I am not of this world, and I have to do something. I can take care of my deities on Sunday and then enjoy a dinner with my parents and friends after that, and not one word about the Supreme is mentioned! My God! Maya to the highest degree!

I might, therefore, like to be in states of consciousness that are different, for this makes things interesting. Sure, I would rather be doing something spiritually really exciting with some really cool aware people, but honestly, this is rare. Life goes on and something has to be done at all times. One cannot pay the bills meditating. One cannot live life avoiding it.

Re: Our goals and objectives  
by **Drpta** » Mon Dec 08, 2014 9:23 pm

Cool! I share all you said. 100%. Really.

Re: Our goals and objectives  
by **Drpta** » Wed Dec 10, 2014 2:17 pm

Hari, I have a question. You say that God is both, Radha and Krsna. But many people like to adore only one of Them as their very intimate object. Like a lover for example. And it is naturally based on point that people have two sexes (it is interesting, does soul have sex or sexual preferences?) as well as God. For some women it is unacceptable to see Radha near Krsna since they feel so extreme love to Krsna. Can we say that such kinds of people have a kind of deficiency or misunderstanding?

And if it is natural for woman to see Krsna as her lover, does it natural for man to see Radha as his lover? (In ISKCON, I think, such a thought will be considered as extreme blasphemy).

Re: Our goals and objectives  
by **Hari** » Fri Dec 12, 2014 3:42 pm

I would never say that anyone's inclination to relate with Radha or Krsna is deficient or a misunderstanding! How one relates to either or both of them is entirely up to them. I also do not wish to comment on relationships with them because I do not wish to interfere in the processes that naturally occur as one becomes closer to the divine.

Hmmm, if you saw Radha as your lover then you would be in competition with Krsna. What can you imagine this would mean?

Re: Our goals and objectives

by **Drpta** » Sun Dec 21, 2014 2:33 pm

Hi Hari,  
You wrote:

*I think God wishes us to be the best we can be as we are. After all, we cannot be anything else.*

Does it mean we are the best every and each moment we exist since we are doing what we suppose the best to do in current circumstances, and even if we do something we feel is wrong, it is our choice, especially if we have to choose only between bad or worst? Of course, we can blame ourselves for our deeds in past, but in present moment we are ever the best we can be, isn't it? And here a question arises: if we are the best every moment, then we spontaneously will strive to be more perfect in future. In the light of this mood, can we say that the "perfect" state for one is to reach Goloka Vrindavana for example or any other higher place, where God manifested in such a form, which one can have relationships with easy and naturally? Or we should ever do our best and keep ourselves in tension with the goal to be the best we can? And if the second is true, then is there such a place where there is no future, meaning where one doesn't have to always try to be the best and strive for a better future? But it is interesting to notice, that now we are naturally having contact with God as His manifestation in form of material nature around us. All things around us are divine, (and you say the same) but people can't see it, may be because they got used to it and it is too obvious for them? I think this level of being is properly compatible for people living in this world. And may be only few have desire to know something more. And why we should see any divine at all? I think this question appears only as a result of our frustration and dissatisfaction with our life or us ourselves. The very word "divine" and similar words, I think, create a big gap in our perception of this world. I think this is even harmful word which separates us from reality. Divine reality 😊 . What do you think?

You said:

*We are conditioned by our environment and the people around us. We are taught to think and believe in a certain manner...*

May be Prabhupada was right. He tried to destroy common values and believe structures and re-teach people. Of course he used not the best methods. But society very much needs to change its value structure. It is more than obvious.

Re: Our goals and objectives

by **Drpta** » Mon Dec 22, 2014 4:20 am

It is interesting, that previously, in ISCKON as well as in many other religions the main approach is based on the truths reviled in scriptures. You could not argue with scripture even if

it has contradictions with sanity and personal experience. But now we sift accent to side of importance of practical experience and it is very respond to my personal strive to use empiric approach in exploring spiritual matter. I am speaking about pure experience, which is not polluted with false premises. But sometimes, in our attempts to find answer we might ought to become cynical. It is normal in common science, but spiritual science is more delicate. How can we avoid going too far and committing something wrong? How to avoid offences in our spiritual exploring? I wonder should we set bounds in our spiritual exploring?

You wrote:

*if you saw Radha as your lover then you would be in competition with Krsna. What can you imagine this would mean?*

It is suggesting me an idea that only Krsna is man, and all others are women 😞.  
As I have heard, in Vrindavan Radha had husband and children. And Her husband was not Krsna. Does She love him and Her children? And how Krsna looked at that?

Re: Our goals and objectives

by **Hari** » Tue Dec 23, 2014 8:41 pm

It is hard for me to respond to texts if you write multiple times before I can answer. This makes things confusing and hard to reply to!

When we are the best we can be, we are optimal. We cannot do or be anything more. If we can act optimally, then all possible attainable spiritual goals will be reached sooner or later. Nothing more can make this optimal process go faster. This is obvious because no process is faster than an optimal one. But is speed all that matters? Perhaps depth of experience is more important.

To be the best we can be means to be who we are, because we cannot be better than who we are. We are already perfect as the essence we are. There are many methods to connect to that essence, and I have given one that I feel works very well. Indeed, I think it works the best, otherwise I would not do it since my being the best I can be means that what I say or share must be the best I have. Whether what I think is best is good for everyone, or for anyone, or somewhere in between, can only be determined in the course of time. I do not worry about it because I am doing what I can do!

By doing what we can as best as we can, will eventually bring us to wherever there is to go. Being the best we can be means to embrace our essence. Because this is the essence of spirituality, there is no need to worry if this concept is compatible with scriptures.

If we try to attain a goal that requires us to be something other than what we are, this goal is not the final goal. If one thinks that life is primarily a process to attain residence in Goloka, then one is living for that time when one can attain the place where one belongs. With this in mind, one tries to focus on the future and detach from everything within this world. Nothing else matters.

This idea has an inherent flaw. When we embrace the idea that only the future is reality, we think of the present as an illusion. Attaining a realm far from where we are presently located is all that matters and all that should be desired. All actions, thoughts, words and relations are dedicated to this ideal.

The idea that the present is illusion and only existence in the future is real is backwards. The future does not exist and never shall exist. It is a reference point holding our desires, fears, ideals, dreams, or death. Everything tangible or intangible, living or non-living, exists within the

present. I am essence and I only exist now, nowhere else. I do not now exist in a future time. If I imagine my life in two hours from now and whole heartedly believe that image, I cannot say I validated my image when two hours have passed and I am still here! After all, when that point arrives on the clock, it will be the present and once again, I only exist in the present. Even my dreams exist in the present when I am imagining a pleasant future. All life occurs in the present, exists in the present, and remains in the present at all times, because only the present exists. The idea that reality only exists in the future when some goal is attained is illusion.

The best discipline is to act now, in the present, as best we can so that we can make the next best step forward on our journey of life. Where life leads is part of the mystery. If it leads to Goloka, cool. If it leads elsewhere, we will deal with that place when we are there.

Our value structure cannot be obliterated. It is inherent in who we are and modified by our experiences. We can change our experience, but we cannot change who we are. Therefore, every follower of spiritual disciplines remains to a large extent the same person with the same inherent values reflected in the mirror of their ever changing experiences. A spiritual group can modify this to some extent, but we have seen that people remain very much who they are despite this influence. Otherwise, why is there so much fighting, arguing, posturing, attempts at superiority, domination, exploitation, selfishness, ad nauseum, within spiritual groups? Devotees of any sect tend to express their devotion within the mood and confines of their place of birth and social integration. This is why Indians, for example, never really embrace the Americans, Israelis have a hard time with Germans, and so on.

That society needs a more spiritual value structure is obvious. Enlightened people should have a greater role in developing a win win society, based on mutual respect, appreciation, caring, and the ideal of prosperity for all regardless of the bodily form, gender, race, etc. Broad social change is not usually done within spiritual movements, although there are a few times when a new religion had significant impact on civilization. For example, Christianity transformed society gradually over a long period. Social transformation is a difficult project that requires the cooperation of a large majority of the people.

If you spiritually explore your own values and test them when you respond to events around you, you will rapidly see what works and what does not. How you evolve depends on your perception and honesty.

Radha had children? Are you sure about that?

Re: Our goals and objectives

by **Drpta** » Wed Dec 24, 2014 7:06 pm

*The best discipline is to act now, in the present, as best we can so that we can make the next best step forward on our journey of life. Where life leads is part of the mystery. If it leads to Goloka, cool. If it leads elsewhere, we will deal with that place when we are there.*

What you say is very interesting and new. It makes challenge to common outlooks on life. But I do not quite understand. We should know, were we going to, isn't it? And we should have desire to go there. Could you explain how to find right, optimal, path and do not get lost? How can I come to Goloka for example, if I even do not know where it is, how it looks, and I even do not know what they are doing there? For example, this year I have been in Greece. Before I went there I heard that there is interesting country, I have seen some movies and decided that it will be interesting to visit this country. But what concerns Goloka, I only read some stories and heard that this is highest abode of God, where He herds Surabhi cows. It sounds like a



kind of tale. And having such a knowledge of that place, I am not sure do I want that place or not. It will be very valuable if you describe life on Goloka, could you?

*Radha had children? Are you sure about that?*

It was one common friend of us who told me that Radha has husband named Abhimanyu, and they have children. I also have doubts in it. Could you say something about their marriage?

Re: Our goals and objectives

by **Hari** » Sat Dec 27, 2014 6:36 pm

Is your life a journey from one point to another? Or is your life a process that finds its way to many places, many situations, and many different challenges?

If you wish to go to Greece, you have to move your body to the airport and take the right plane. If you wish to think of Greece, you simply do it. Physical motion and mental motion are different. Indeed, as children we use our imagination to visualize people and places we have never seen.

Do you go to some spiritual destination by determining where you want to go and then moving there? Certainly not! Depending on your process, you engage in disciplines and develop the capacity to evolve faster towards your desired goal. Even if someone tells you what that goal is like and paints nice pictures of it, this knowledge does not get you there faster, although you might feel better having a clearer goal. Your own spiritual evolution brings you to where you should be in due course. This is why I said what I said.

You cannot get lost on your path because you are always on it. You can slow down your evolution or speed it up according to your choices. Even when you are confused and depressed because you think you are going nowhere, your true nature and capacity will eventually get you going again. Sometimes feeling stalled in nowhere is required! Sometimes this is the catalyst for further development. It depends on who you are and what you need.

I do not think Radha had children or even that she was married in any typical sense. Even if someone tells me that she had children, I would not believe it, or if I had to, I would suggest that we are all her children in the philosophical sense of the origin of it all, but I would not extend this role to her being the mother. That role is Durga devi's. Stories are just that -- stories. Whether you believe them or not is up to you. Whether you have faith in who is telling the stories or not is your own decision. I am not suggesting you should disbelieve or believe anything. I am just responding to your question with a definitive, "I don't think so." My answer should not matter to you, however, because you have to determine truth for yourself. After all, it is what we do all the time. We decide what to believe in and when we make that decision we further empower that which we have focused our belief on.

Re: Our goals and objectives

by **Drpta** » Sat Jan 03, 2015 5:12 am

You wrote:

*Essence is that beyond which you cannot go. It is what makes something what it is. Here I have a question about svarupa. Can we say that our svarupa is our essence?*

Re: Our goals and objectives

by **Hari** » Sun Jan 04, 2015 11:47 pm

Again, old days...

Essence is enough. It is sufficient. We do not need to dress it up with a Sanskrit word. If we defined swarupa as essence then these terms would be equal, but I am not sure if those who previously used the word would agree. They might see essence as merely the spiritual energy. They might call it a spiritual dot encased in matter. They might say that essence requires to be developed, to grow, to become this or that. I disagree. Essence is. And it is all that is. When you accept this, you start to see far more than when you think that "your swarupa" is attained after so many austerities and tons of mercy and disciplined concentration on the supreme. This has been the point of all that I have said throughout the last 17 years.

The word swarupa carries with it many implications. It is something to be attained after much work and effort. Before one attains it, one has little or no connection to one's true spiritual identity and remains a student of the art, investigating how to attain the self. One can have a discussion about whether the spiritual identity is immediately attained, as in the case of Narada Muni's lightning illumination, or it is gradually attained and one just flows into it over time. Both might be true, or probably are true depending on who you are, but neither concept interests me. The first carries with it the burden of unattainability and the second makes little sense but sounds reasonable enough if you do not examine it in detail. The second concept carries a bit of an organic mood to it, like a growing flower, so it feels good in some way as it is familiar and easily recognizable. The lightning bolt is easily understood because all we need to do to accommodate the idea in our life is to consider that we have not had this experience and we might have it one day, perhaps at death (who really knows?) or maybe when we get some mercy from someone who really likes what we did! We can relate to someone walking in the door and giving us a million dollars as this image fits within our realm of "possible ideas," although we do not know anyone who got money like this and we do not really believe someone will give it to us.

Essence is such a nice word. So very peaceful, calm, kind and considerate. Without demand, without expectation. Simply awaiting for you to accept it. If I am spirit, then I do not have to become spirit. I will not become more spirit just as I cannot become less spirit. I have to accept myself, fully and totally, as the essence I am. I am pure spiritual energy and I have never been anything else. When I accept this, embrace this, and love this without allowing myself to hold onto any other idea, then I become familiar with myself and know who I am. I stop listening to others who ceaselessly attempt to define me. I think this idea of self identity is superior due to its unencumbered simplicity. Occam's razor kind of thing.

Re: Our goals and objectives

by **Drpta** » Sat Jan 10, 2015 9:14 pm

*You cannot get lost on your path because you are always on it. You can slow down your evolution or speed it up according to your choices. Even when you are confused and depressed because you think you are going nowhere, your true nature and capacity will eventually get you going again.*

Does it mean that the same is attracting the same? By having the inner knowledge of who I am and what is my true nature or let us say inclination or resembling with, I feel and am automatically attracting to an appropriate direction. It is like that when my essence, which has a particular frequency of vibration, is coming in resonance with the respective "place" in existence, and then a vector of force is appearing and gravitate me towards that sphere. So now I ever know where to go. It is attracting me like a magnet. Thanks a lot dear Hari!

Re: Our goals and objectives

by **Akhila L** » Sat Jan 10, 2015 9:52 pm

When I talked to the people about the message of Vedas (or whatever you call it, if you want to get them believe you are an authority worth listening to), which was an absolute and unquestionable reference point for me at that time (= many years ago=old days), now, when I look back, there was one question when I started quoting different "vedic" or Sanskrit texts or terms they frequently used to ask: but what is YOUR opinion on that? "I do not care about the texts you quote, but I want to talk to YOU and hear YOUR voice, not you citing some books or terms". In this context, I sympathize with Hari when people use predefined terms or quote something assuming this must be true per definition. But where is the proof? What do you mean by the word you use? What is YOUR story behind the story you quote? In a wider context, people who fanatically stick to someone else's interpretation are sure to create problems because they blindly follow the path that may not be theirs. I am sorry for this bit of bitterness.

Frankly, I have always hated all these "satya svarupa" - stories discussed by many. It felt somewhat artificial to me, just as other aspects of the "highest and ultimate position", which, not unexpectedly, created unresolved debates among people who claimed to promote the Ultimate Truth, ironically.

I think the most difficult part of it is to find a natural balance between following your own nature and accepting help from others keeping your (spiritual) integrity in the same time. I also like the word "essence" more. Because I can immediately feel its meaning. Please, comment on it, if you can, Hari.

Re: Our goals and objectives

by **Hari** » Sun Jan 18, 2015 12:24 am

Drpta: Your comment is nice. Well said!

Akhila: Essence is the fundamental quality of something that cannot be broken down further. It is what makes a thing what it is. You are spirit. Spirit is essence by its nature, but you are a particular essence just as a pure etheric oil is the essence of a particular plant or flower. The energy you manifest is your essence because your energy and yourself are not different. You are essence. When you allow yourself to simply be what you are, you experience essence and you rightly say, "I Am." You feel your energy as the essence it is without dilution or coloring from anything that is not you. We cannot use the phrase, "your essence," without creating a conflict because you cannot possess essence, you are essence. This is important. There is nothing beyond essence that can possess it. It is you, you are it.

Does this help?

Re: Our goals and objectives

by **Akhila L** » Tue Jan 20, 2015 11:38 pm

Thank you for this explanation. I know you may feel tired by being asked many times about the same issues (you mentioned that in one of your posts). However, just discussing it brings relief and remembrance of who we really are. And it definitely helps, even if your intuition tells you the same thing.

Re: Our goals and objectives

by **Hari** » Tue Jan 20, 2015 11:43 pm

I agree Akhila. Because we think we are not good enough, we are more inclined to reject our intuition even though our first impression of something is often the most significant one.

Perhaps the relief you feel comes from me encouraging you to feel good enough and trust your intuition?

Re: Our goals and objectives

by **Akhila L** » Thu Jan 22, 2015 8:18 am

Yes, that is exactly how it works! We all need support, helping hands, and loving parents and teachers. Or friends. I feel we are very afraid of giving ourselves "too much" because we think we will be cheated. So, we disbelieve our intuition. I find your consoling words very important and encouraging in this context. When I look back into the (spiritual) texts I once studied there is one theme that comes back again and again. "Do not be afraid" (eg BG 18.66 or Bible but not exclusively, of course). I guess many of us share the same experience. The inner feeling of not being good enough is strongly related to the feeling of fear. Strangely, you feel the greatest satisfaction in your life if you are able to overcome that fear. We fear about our health, money, being rejected etc. Then, we fear of death. If you asked me what I dislike most it would be that fear. And now, looking back at the title of this thread, "our goals and objectives" - it looks like an introduction to a scientific paper on our life's agenda 😊.

Re: Our goals and objectives

by **Hari** » Sat Jan 24, 2015 12:10 am

In Conversations with God it is stated that the fundamental and primary motivators in life are love and fear. When you act with love for yourself, you act with love for others. If you are afraid, or fear something about yourself, you act with fear towards others. Fear creates conflict, distrust, anger, resentment, false expectations and all the negative qualities that crush us. Love creates all good in ourselves and in our lives. Love tends to flow to those who are around it. This love is not mushy or sentimental. It is our essence and the polar opposite of fear.

Re: Our goals and objectives

by **Akhila L** » Mon Feb 02, 2015 11:02 pm

Thank you for this commentary. I read Conversations a few years ago and this message was actually one of the most important and inspiring ones in the whole series. I like this universal concept of love (not the mushy one - I laughed a lot reading it) very much. But the real challenge is to live according to the essence and never forget it.

Re: Our goals and objectives

by **Drpta** » Fri Jan 20, 2017 5:53 pm

Hi Hariji!

I have a question. If all creation (spiritual, material—it is no matter) is a space of action and action originates from a desire (and our body is an instrument for realization of our desires) then what qualities and desires should we have and develop to get access to the divine worlds and to act there? I mean that we even do not know clearly what are happening there in the divine world, so how then conscious desire can appear in us to get there?

Re: Our goals and objectives

by **Hari** » Sat Jan 21, 2017 10:06 pm

I have a feeling that your question makes sense, and I am sure it does to you, but I cannot grasp it properly. Please rephrase it better.

Please also avoid making it in the format of "if this then that then what?" as I think your attempt to use this type of questioning makes it harder to understand. This is especially true when I do not, perhaps, accept the first IF! What is your question? Clarify further after a question is stated. OK?

Re: Our goals and objectives

by **Drpta** » Sun Jan 22, 2017 2:48 pm

OK.

What qualities and desires should we have and develop to get access to the divine worlds and to act there? And what does it mean "to act" in spiritual (in common sense) world?

In this regard personality of Narada muni is very interesting. What so special qualities he have that allows him to travel everywhere in any world?

Re: Our goals and objectives

by **Hari** » Tue Jan 24, 2017 11:37 pm

Your questions are vast and broad, fitting comfortably within the "How Can We?" category of inquiry that is best answered with, "You do everything!" kind of flippant answer. But, I shall try to succinctly reply with something that might be of value.

Desire is required in any activity. We do not act unless we want to. We might think that some of our actions are independent of desire, such as how we react to a sudden danger, but these actions are not related to the challenge as much as they are related to our over-riding desire to not get hurt. Because we desire to avoid injury or pain, we defend ourselves as an automatic response when we are attacked. This response is intimately related to our life force because our essence is axiomatically linked to ever-existence. The spiritual quality of non-dying is appears in this realm as our desire to maintain life even under the most challenging circumstances. So we can see a glimpse of our essential consciousness in our everyday existence appearing as the universal desire to continue existence. Set aside for a moment the possibility that we might no longer wish to live because we cannot deal with the impossible situations of this world, as this is an aberration and not the general rule.

We must want to be aware of, or connect to, our internal, spiritual, undeniable essence that makes us who we are that is part of a greater whole where other similar spiritual beings reside under the shelter of the divine beings and divine energy. This desire is first and foremost required to attain a state of existence wherein we can reciprocate with others within the divine realm.

The quality we require to do this is our personal essence, and we already have it. To experience this quality and use it to attain what we desire, we must remove all coverings that we are not. Without desiring a divine life, no one would bother to take the time and effort to filter out unwanted energy within their consciousness.

The personality described as Narada Muni is a spiritualist whose essence includes a jovial nature that desires to share with others throughout existence and so he has developed the means to travel to fulfill that desire. More importantly, his desire to be of service is equalled by his capacity to uplift others and therefore he has been gifted by higher authorities with this incredible facility.

Re: Our goals and objectives

by **Drpta** » Sat Jan 28, 2017 2:32 pm

You wrote “we must remove all coverings that we are not” what do you mean under these “coverings”?

Re: Our goals and objectives

by **Hari** » Thu Feb 02, 2017 8:54 pm

Anything mixed into our consciousness and energy that is not our own. But this does not include things voluntarily accepted into our consciousness. I know that is not a great answer, but it is best to reject, for example, judgements of others, or other person's pain, anxiety, or stress, or the fear and tension they spread around them. Any form of energy that is placed upon us by exterior forces that is not compatible with who we are.

## **Lord Shiva**

by **Vajra** » Fri Dec 09, 2016 9:41 pm

Dear Hari!

I was long time admire one of the most wonderful personality in all creation Lord Shiva . I like Him very much, His benevolent nature, His qualities, His mercy ,and His love to all creatures

But i know so less because of well known reasons about Lord Shiva

I know some contradictory information that Lord Shiva is Father of all living entities and also annihilator of the universe.

But i really don't know his wonderful personality

Can you please explain some information about Lord Shiva ?

Why he considered as a father of the universe and why he is annihilating it?

Can you please tell something more about such a wonderful benevolent and merciful Lord Mahadev?

Thank you !

Re: Lord Shiva

by **Hari** » Sat Dec 17, 2016 11:31 pm

Although your question seems simple enough, in fact it is quite hard to properly answer. Lord Siva has been depicted for more than 10,000 years in a variety of ways. These descriptions fall into categories where cosmically significant qualities are systematically ascribed to this magnificent personality. Despite that, he is perhaps best known as the one who wraps up the universal creation at the end of its cycle when he releases his energy of anger to destroy all things. Thus his anger and his unrivaled capacity to destroy are seen as paramount. To balance this, he is presented as the most peaceful, meditative soul, fully renounced of all worldly attachments or possessions, who is always ready to assist those who come before him. His story becomes one of a great deity who awakens at the right time to do what he is meant to do.

This is all more or less a fair representation, but it leaves out the most important consideration. We can easily embrace him as a deity because all deities are more or less available to us when we come before them in submission and service and ask for blessings or assistance with our problems. But humans cannot connect with him as the person he is and most devas have either a hard time befriending him or they may fear getting too close to him. Some devas sit near him to share the inconceivably dense energetic space he creates. This is an important insight that can help us better understand why he is seemingly aloof.

Lord Siva is sakti. In Vaisnava vocabulary, he and his family are sakti tattva. When the host of living entities in this world who are jiva tattva attempt to truly understand Lord Siva or any sakti personality, they do so through worship, philosophical discussions, celebrations, yoga and renunciation, to mention a few, where they associate together to amplify their sprouting connection with him. But due to the fundamental differences between sakti and jiva, it is almost impossible to understand him in a more personal manner.

Connecting to Radha and Krsna is easier because we all are their nature in essence and they have facilitated connecting to them. Indeed, they invite and encourage this connection. When one attempts it, they nurture it. This is not the case with Lord Siva. He is detached, renounced, unengaged, and almost never participating in the process to connect with him. He will give protection and benedictions, albeit rarely, but true connection is rare.

And yet, we are always connected to him because we swim within his energy. One who is sakti knows this, but those who are not sakti have a very hard time even conceiving of it. His energy is limitless and everywhere, and equally powerful at all locations within this universe. His meditation is far more than a spiritual quest, it is the tower of power from which we all draw -- whether we know it or not. Most beings flow within energy easily but are unaware of its source. Although we are all the same energy as Krsna and Radha, we could not exist within this universe without their divine support. Their support appears in the form of sakti. Lord Siva's energy is Lord Krsna's energy and Goddess Sakti (in all forms) is Radha's energy, and they uniquely empowered to pass on and share their energy within the universe and thus support this creation. Therefore they are the father and mother. They create the playground within which their children play and when it is time to go, they destroy the playground and move on. But again, these words are descriptive and to some extent philosophical.

Although volumes have been written about Lord Siva, sakti cannot be experienced as deeply and personally by one who is not sakti. Words do not carry the meaning of sakti because sakti is not expressed by words. Lord Siva does speak words, but his energy that powers and supports the universe is not made of words. His energy creates the forces that physics strives to understand. He is the one unified field theory of everything that cannot be described by words. One cannot rationally define his energy because it simply is. It is qualitatively different from the essence that I have often spoken about. One can think of sakti as the perfect transformation of essence meant to support a creation that appears to be disconnected from the spiritual realm.

Sakti can only be felt and therefore, Lord Siva and Goddess Parvati are only directly experienced when one is immersed in their energy. A jiva soul can attempt to do this, but due to jivas vibrating at a different frequency they cannot tune to the personal energy of sakti. A boat on a raging sea perceives the energy of the sea differently than the fish that swim peacefully below the surface. When a jiva comes near to the essence of Lord Siva, the raging waves make it impossible to connect. Because of this basic incompatibility, Lord Siva is described by humans as the one who does wonderful things with wonderful qualities. The personality he is may only be known to those who are the same energy as him.

Top

Re: Lord Shiva

by **Drpta** » Sun Dec 18, 2016 1:11 pm

Hariji, what you wrote is amazing. Write a book about this, please. We all need such a book where will be described hierarchy and forces rule in universe and over the universe, in spiritual realm. Who are the devas and how do they work. Who are Radha and Krishna? Who is God

and how it appears? Your message is very fresh and actual, it based on your experience, it is very important. It is not just digested book's knowledge. Really.

It is interesting, is it possible migration thru tattvas thru shifting soul's vibration? For example, if I meditate on Lord Siva, do my vibrations shift into band of his vibrations? There is an example with steel road which accepts qualities of fire being rad-hot. Is it work here?

According vaishnava vocabulary Radha and Krisna are from Vishnu-tattva. Is it true that only Vishnu-tattvis able to realize who They really are? If, for example, in my imagination I see me as a closed friend of Krishna, then I can be His friend. If I can imagine something then it is already exists, isn't it?

Re: Lord Shiva

by **Vajra** » Sun Dec 18, 2016 6:10 pm

Dear Hari!

Thank you very very much for your such amaizing explanation.

Top

Re: Lord Shiva

by **Akhila L** » Sat Dec 24, 2016 7:56 pm

Thank you for this explanation. Do you mean that to be able to understand how Lord Shiva can be both a person and energy at the same time you have to be on the same level?

"Because of this basic incompatibility, Lord Siva is described by humans as the one who does wonderful things with wonderful qualities. The personality he is may only be known to those who are the same energy as him."

First, most of humans do not know him, second, his depiction may seem very awkward, naive, or primitive to the educated people. Third, how could this message reach educated people of our times then?

"Connecting to Radha and Krsna is easier because we all are their nature in essence and they have facilitated connecting to them. Indeed, they invite and encourage this connection. When one attempts it, they nurture it. This is not the case with Lord Siva."

This is definitely much easier to explain for a common man. The connection is bliss and relief. But it seems that the world we are living in is doing all but not facilitating this connection?

Re: Lord Shiva

by **Hari** » Mon Dec 26, 2016 4:31 pm

*First, most of humans do not know him, second, his depiction may seem very awkward, naive, or primitive to the educated people. Third, how could this message reach educated people of our times then?*

I think that the deficiency in descriptions about Lord Siva are directly related to humans not knowing him very well. I am not sure why "this message" (whatever you mean by that 😊) has to reach educated people? I do not see people reaching out to Lord Siva unless they want something and often what they want is somewhat nasty. Why should we attempt to facilitate bothering him with their desires?

If you are of his energy, you are connected and if you are not of his energy, you cannot connect, at least not in the usual sense of the term. Just because someone is educated does not mean they have a greater capacity to make the connection with Lord Siva. I am not actually



sure what you mean by your comments or questions? If you desire, you can further clarify, but if you now better realize what I originally stated, you might not feel the need. Up to you!

Re: Lord Shiva

by **Akhila L** » Tue Dec 27, 2016 11:57 pm

Dear Hari, thank you for your explanation, I am satisfied. I just found your comments very intriguing and elucidating at the same time. It seems that many of us have problem with person-energy duality. We do not really know how to deal with specific persons being one with a specific energy. Thus, the descriptions make us confused. For educated people of our times, to deal with energy is much easier than to deal with a person. I do not know why the original question was asked and I do not find it very relevant to me but your answer was relevant and generalizable. My very naive and emotional approach is that I do not need to know all these details about different persons and energies they govern - I do not think it might offer anything in my specific life circumstances neither I feel such a need. First of all, why should we assume that descriptions given so many years ago are correct? Second, I would rather hear why Radha & Krishna facilitate the connection.

## on "interview for former disciples"

by **Sita** » Thu Dec 01, 2016 4:06 pm

Dear Hari,

Recently

I came across the text in one Vkontakte blog that was announced as An Interview for "Prabhupada Sumedhasam" magazine 2016 with you. The text was given in Russian. So could you please confirm or otherwise if you have given such an interview?

The publication was from some ISKCON VK users. So it seemed somewhat confusing for me personally.

Thank you in advance

Re: on "interview for former disciples"

by **Hari** » Thu Dec 01, 2016 4:39 pm

I have no idea where this came from and I have not had contact with this magazine since 1998! Someone sent me this article about a month ago and I read it with amusement. It seems to have been written by someone with a vivid imagination who somehow wished I had said these things and who decided to put these words in my mouth! But no, I did not give such an interview, neither would I have said or agreed with most of what was written. I am glad you asked me. I wonder how many people actually believed what was written?

I found that my departure from ISKCON was filled with similar experiences. I remember when Bhakti Tirtha Swami came to visit me in Abentheuer and reported to the world that I said this or that when in reality I did not say one word he quoted! Jayapataka Swami also did something similar, although not nearly as fabricated as the Bhakti Tirtha Swami account. It seems that my situation was so weird for them that their minds went **TILT** and created a completely different account of what was said or done by me. Such is life. Even more interesting is that most people simply believed it and did not bother to ask me to confirm or deny what was being said. I had no chance to correct this misinformation because my communication with devotees was blocked by the traumatized authorities at the time 😞

I could have commented on this article sooner, but I wanted to see if anyone would ask me about it. It seems that even almost 20 years later that most people are inclined to believe

anything they read. Once again, thank you for asking! 🙌🙌

Definition: "TILT" = to mess with a game machine by lifting up, or tilting, one side of the machine to affect the movement of the ball, which caused the machine to stop and display an error, "TILT," thus terminating the game.

## mind

by **kamalamala1** » Tue Sep 13, 2016 3:28 am

Dear Hari,  
Just a few days I was thinking about what I know about mind and so many questions arises, so I decided to write it.

Mind is the most mysterious organ( if it is proper to say like that) of us actually it is us itself as I understand since we feel our self through mind.

If it is us itself what is the use to differ it from ourselves, from our soul?

Even as I understand our senses feelings dwelling in the mind and is actually part of mind and also intelligence is just the part of mind

it is not separately existing organ .Since whatever we feel we feel in the mind and whatever calculation and analyses we do we do in our mind.

And when one live this body mind doesn't disappear or replaced by anything else it is forever with us it just change its quality

But this is just my speculations

I don't know what is in reality.

So the questions is.

Is the present mind forever part of our souls and actually us itself?

Is let say subtle senses just a part of the mind?

IS intelligence just a some function of mind or it exist as separate let say organ?

Re: mind

by **Hari** » Thu Sep 22, 2016 6:36 pm

When we speak of the mind, do we refer to something that exists in a form like a container, or as a space within which something moves? Or more generally, are we referring to our capacity to think? And if we only refer to our capacity to think, do we mean conscious thoughts we are aware of -- those loud ones that are at the forefront of our consciousness -- or do we include the thoughts, considerations, or vague ruminations that rumble just under the surface only to appear at odd times? Or do we include the deepest, darkest, subconsciousness that includes trauma and so on?

If we define the mind to be something like a container or a fixed space (like our room at home) then the idea of it perhaps NOT moving with us to some other place in another lifetime makes sense. If we consider the mind to be where our thoughts are, our thoughts are related to what is in our consciousness at that time and since our consciousness always goes where we go, then so does our capacity to think.

Subtle senses are inherent within our consciousness that is the symptom of the always existing essence we are. Our capacity to reason, our fundamental intelligence, is also a symptom of our ever-existing awareness. We power our bodies with the conscious awareness that is natural within essence. Since we are essence, wherever we go, whatever form we take, the power that makes us who we are remains the same.

People think about different things when they are stimulated by their environment or their social interactions and so on. We think about the loud noises in the city when we are in the city, otherwise if we are in nature our thoughts are different. If someone wrongs us, our thoughts dwell on this injustice. None of this is permanent because it appears and disappears according to our situation. Although our bodies influence our thoughts, the capacity to think and plan, feel and will, create and invent or express how we feel or think remains always within the soul.

## **Wath we see in the sky**

by **Vajra** » Thu Jul 07, 2016 1:53 pm

Dear Hari

While looking at night on the sky iwas wandering all this stars( with there planet systems) which is visible to us is only the part of material world where souls existing for the tests for evolution or there are some of them which is just heavenly regions and even spiritual worlds?

I am asking this since i got an impression that spiritual world is just another dimension world so it cannot be visible for us, although 3 dimension objects can be visible for 2 dimension world in there way at least some part of it.

Re: What we see in the sky

by **Hari** » Tue Jul 19, 2016 10:32 pm

Consider a hypothetical person who only sees in 2D. If they saw part of a 3D object, they would not be able to understand the complete image because they could only see a portion of it in 2D. In truth, all objects we perceive are 3D because nothing actually exists in a purely two dimensional plane. We can, however, create representations of three dimensional objects in two dimensions. For example, if we draw on a paper we consider the image as only having width and height. Although we accept this as a 2D representation, it is actually 3D because the pencil or pen ink has width, even if it is miniscule.

Whatever we see in space fits within our dimensional limitations. Were we to fly to some other planet, we would only have access to the dimensional properties there that we have the capacity to perceive. Assuming that all things originate in higher, more subtle realms, what we see in our 3D world is a subset of actual reality just as a 2D image is a subset of a 3D object. The celestial realms are an expanded dimension compared to our realm but are nonetheless a subset of the spiritual realm. Just as a person perceiving in 2D cannot imagine 3D reality, we cannot perceive greater dimensions. However, because our energy is spiritual and our fundamental essence is part of that spiritual dimension, we have the inherent potential to perceive these realms when our consciousness connects to the celestial or spiritual energy.

I never doubted that Rupa Gosvami, for example, could perceive and communicate with the spiritual dimensions while on the earthly plane. I think of the spiritual plane as a higher dimension within one totality of existence and therefore when he spoke to Krsna he did not have to travel somewhere to do it.

People who can connect at will to expanded dimensions are always considered madmen because those whose perception is anchored in limited dimensional space have no capacity to see or experience what an advanced spiritualist perceives. Can you imagine how hard it is for this person to explain to others what they are seeing?

Re: What we see in the sky

by **kamalamala1** » Tue Sep 13, 2016 3:38 am

Thank you for your answer.  
This issue is so interesting.

## **karma**

by **kamalamala1** » Tue Sep 17, 2013 2:16 am

Dear Hari

I just want to ask a question about karma.

We heard and read many information about karma but still this issue is very unclear. Since you are real mystical person and have a huge mystical experience i decided to ask you about this complicated issue.

Most important for me that you are telling not the info which you read somewhere but from your personal experience.

So many times when something happened we are saying that this is Karmic reaction.

Practically all the time.

But there are arising a question all the actions cannot be reactions some should be the reason of reactions.

So how one can recognize which actions is reactions which is there reasons?

And the second question is there are place for such a thing like "by chance"?

Can somebody just suffer without karmic reasons?.

And who is controlling all this karmic processes?

And have animals karmic reactions?

Re: karma

by **Hari** » Mon Sep 30, 2013 6:46 pm

Gee, it is hard to answer a question that starts with 'you are a real mystical person and have a huge mystical experience.' Anything I say now will simply disappoint everyone. Please make these questions less intimidating and more realistic, ok? My personal experience with karma is exactly the same as everyone else's.

Karma means consequence. An act is performed and a consequence arises. Cause and effect. Rather simple, actually. Everything has a cause. Every cause has an effect. If you say that the word effect is synonymous with reaction, then you could say that every cause has a reaction. I do not like to use the word reaction because its usage tends to amplify something negative, as in "bad reactions that are sinful create suffering." Please listen to my lecture, "Why good things happen to bad people," for more about my views on good and bad in this realm of variables.

Every act has a consequence. We do things all the time. We constantly create consequences. Every creature does things to create consequences. A butterfly flaps its wings in the Sahara and we have a hurricane in Florida. This is physics. It the axiomatic law of cause and effect. This law works equally for matter or energy.

If I hurt someone, I create a wave of consequences. My negative energy combines with that person's hurt energy and it creates a consequence that later affects me. Something like a boomerang. I send out energy and it comes back to me.

If something happens to me seemingly without cause or seemingly unrelated to me, it could be a result of a consequence I initiated long before, in this lifetime or some other, that I have forgotten. It could also be caused by someone else who is now creating a consequence by involving me in some action they initiated. I make things happen and others make things happen to me. This also works for groups. A group can make something happen or someone can make it happen to them. This group could be a nationality, a religion, a sexual orientation, a race or color, an economic status, a random bunch of people in a mall, or something else. Either I am entangled in a consequence that I initiated or I am becoming entangled in one that someone else initiates.

All reactions have a cause. Although we sometimes can see the cause, usually the causes are so complex or over such durations of time that we cannot understand them. But all effects have a cause. And yes, there is "chance" in the sense that someone can initiate an action that entangles me. If that entanglement resonates with what I am, it affects me more than if it does not.

The real question is, "Can I suffer some pain without me initiating a cause for that pain?" One might think that one could suffer unjustly. I doubt this. Maybe I did not create the consequence, but I might have to suffer something as part of balancing the energy of cause and effect. Let us say I created some act that has a consequence, but that consequence has not yet appeared. If the consequence requires me to experience a painful entanglement, how that occurs is not as important as it occurring. So if my being a member of a certain group gives an excuse for me to experience this, then this is how it occurs.

From this point of view, there is no chance. Everything finds balance in this world. Yet, from another point of view there is chance. The specific form of suffering or enjoyment, or consequence that I experience could be the result of some random person's actions. I could also experience something that I should not. I must later experience a balance for that. Perhaps more enjoyment, or perhaps more suffering? Who can say...

The only principle that could affect karma, besides cause and effect, is the second law of balance. All things seek a state of balance for when they are out of balance the natural law is to restore balance. One could say karma is the law of cause and effect seeking a state of balance. If this definition makes sense, then it also applies to creatures other than human beings. Perhaps the animals do not have to suffer their karma, but still they suffer and enjoy due to cause and effect and their existence similarly seeks balance.

Who controls this? These are physical laws that govern the universe. These laws govern all matter and energy. This is balanced by whichever higher authorities create balance as "nature."  
Top

Re: karma  
by **kamalamala1** » Sat Nov 23, 2013 5:52 pm

Thank you very much for your answer  
But another question arising in this regard.  
As i understand animals doesn't get the reactions from actions of there previous life, but they get reactions from present life actions  
Is it so?

Does it mean if for example cat eat mouse then he will get reaction for that act in this lifetime? If it is not so that mean that cat can make pain to mouse and doesn't get reaction so the law of balance will not work properly. And also another question arising does animals evolving to human form or they always will be in there animal form in there next lives?

Re: karma

by **Hari** » Tue Nov 26, 2013 4:35 pm

I find it interesting that Christians think that animals have no soul and Vedic people say that animals make no karma. Let's examine this.

The human soul has the capacity to determine what is right and wrong and to restrict his or her activity according to moral, ethical or other higher principles. The human can also distinguish between actions which seem good in the short term but which are harmful over longer periods of time. Animals do not generally act according to long term interests, for example, a dog chasing a car or a squirrel running across a busy road. The joy of the chase supersedes their need to survive. Dogs love to eat horse droppings and always get sick because of it, but due to their inability to understand cause and effect, they cannot put two and two together and understand that eating horse poop makes them sick. This lack of rational capacity is what causes them to be seen as "lower" than humans.

Every living being is affected by the law of cause and effect. Every actions creates a consequence, regardless if you are human or animal. The human has a rational brain to make connections between an action and a long term result, whereas animals do not. Even so, many humans engage in self-destructive behavior. They act to harm themselves through drinking alcohol, drugs, bad foods, toxic waste absorption, dangerous activity and so on. They do this even though they have the capacity to understand this is not in their best interests. Indeed, they can feel a need to gradually kill themselves when they are depressed or unable to deal with their reality, and cover this need by suppressing it out of their conscious awareness. Lemmings aside, animals generally do not share this conscious or subconscious desire for self-destruction.

An animal acts according to instinct and the immediate gratification of their desires. Some species do store food for the winter or prepare for bad situations, but this is instinctual and not rational.

All beings suffer consequences when they do something improper, but the human has the capacity to know better. When someone commits a crime and goes before the court, one of the most important elements in the prosecution is determining if the crime was committed in full knowledge or if it was accidental or done without understanding it was wrong. For example, if I give someone with a peanut allergy peanuts and they die from it, it makes a huge difference if I did it purposely to harm them or it was an accident. The difference is a charge of murder versus a costly mistake done in ignorance.

Animals act according to their nature and instincts and therefore are not held responsible for their acts as humans are. Humans know better and therefore have to act reasonably. Animals have to act within their species according to their nature and follow that which is ordained for them. They have little choice. Humans have to find their way to express themselves within the confines of laws, social demands, and other rationally created limitations.

Because animals are not consciously responsible for “crimes” they are not punished for crimes. Therefore, although the vedic culture accepts that animals are spiritual living beings created by God, they are not held accountable for their acts under the same rules as humans. From this point of view one can say they are not under karma. However, one has to modify one’s understanding of karma to accommodate this. One may say that karma is accrued when one’s premeditated decisions create favorable or unfavorable consequence that manifest in the future.

Since the human being is meant to learn and develop through each lifetime’s experience, it is important for him to deal with each consequence. Each decision represents his mentality and energy, his desires and needs, and resolving this is essential to his evolution. Therefore, his energy field stores the potential for development life after life in the form of meeting and dealing with situations in the present that were created in the past. This potential remains till it is properly dealt with.

Animals do not store consequences as every decision represents their instinct and energy at the moment. They do not require to deal with it life after life. They deal with it in the here and now.

So if a cat eats a mouse the reaction is that the cat is full and the barn has one less mouse. If the mouse had some disease that was harmful to the cat but the cat could not perceive it, then the cat will get sick. Cause and effect are always valid in all cases and at all times. The balance in creation is built into it. One species is food for another. They do not suffer when they eat. Animals cannot throw the balance of creation out of synch. Humans can and do so all the time, and the need for the restoration of balance requires the humans to deal with their accrued consequences.

Since I cannot answer from personal experience about the future lives of animals, you should refer to scriptures for this answer and believe what you feel is right.

Re: karma

by **kamalamala1** » Fri Nov 29, 2013 7:51 am

Thank you for your very interesting answer.

So many questions still arising in this regard.

But one of the main is still the following.

Reaction on each action is suffering or enjoyment or something else.

But as i understand one cannot suffer without reason if we are suffering then there should be a reason and initial action.

So let take a mouse there are no karma for animals so why poor mouse or cows or any other animals completely being innocent should suffer pain?

As i understand that nothing can be without reason and pain without reason also should not be.

I cannot still answer this question for myself.

Re: karma

by **Hari** » Sat Nov 30, 2013 3:07 pm

The overall reason for all action and reaction is that we exist within the realm of action and reaction. Simply being here is reason enough for all forms of suffering and enjoyment and everything in-between. The event of our "entry" into this realm, if that is an appropriate thing to say, is the cause of subsequent involvement in the cycle of cause and effect, regardless of whether you call it karma or not.

I cannot defend or justify why things are the way they are. I can only state the obvious: Things are the way they are because they are. We all know it. We can only think about why they are as they are and come to our own conclusion about it.

Re: karma

by **kamalamala1** » Sun Dec 22, 2013 4:36 am

Dear Hari thank you for your answer.

In this regard as i mentioned arising so many questions.

But one is very important

Since killing animals is an extremely painful act for animals, this should definitely make karmic reaction for people.

Now days people kill so many cows and other animals without real need.

So please tell will people who eat meat get the reaction for the killing animals and even fishes?

And what kind reaction this can be, the reactions in this life time or even reactions in future lives and even life between the lives?

And by the way can the acts make reaction in the life between lives?

Re: karma

by **Hari** » Mon Dec 23, 2013 10:45 pm

Well, I'm not sure.

You are asking me a question about philosophy, not my experiences. You already know the answer from other philosophies, and I have nothing to add or subtract from these answers.

I am a vegan because I do not wish to cause animals pain. Causing anyone pain without cause always creates a reaction somehow. How that reaction comes is unknown. But it shall. For me, the idea of killing an animal or causing them pain (unless they require chastisement, as children do) is repulsive and if I were to do it, I would be devastated within. My emotional and psychological reaction to such acts would be painful for me.

But according to previously learned philosophies, sinful acts that are not considered sinful in the communities within which they are performed are not sins. Interesting no? You will find this stated within one of those books!

Re: karma

by **kamalamala1** » Thu Jan 16, 2014 4:01 pm

Yes i read it in as i remember in Micael Newtons books

But i just consider that it is his personal point of view

Harijee it is arising a question in this regard

If the tradition is a main factor of some act be a sin or not then why the wise Vedic times people made such a tradition that killing animals is a sin why they made by this the life of many addicted to meat eating so sinful?

Re: karma

by **kamalamala1** » Sat Feb 22, 2014 10:32 am

Ok i got some answer at least it can help

In Vedic scriptures it is stated that the laws of karma worked differently in different yugas.



Especially in kali yuga many things which could be considered sins in other yugas is not sin in Kali yuga

But i am not sure about killing animals can we apply this .

Hari is writing that there are definitely should be reaction but if it is not a sin in some tradition then maybe this reaction will not so heavy as it could be in other yugas and in other traditions

Re: karma

by **Hari** » Mon Feb 24, 2014 8:38 pm

The problem with these questions is that you are asking me to gauge how sinful something is and what kind or what quantity of reaction there will be for an act. Now how am I supposed to do that? What practical experience would I have that would qualify me to determine this answer? This is better asked to those who control the universe, than to little ol' me! And if you wanted a philosophical answer, there are plenty of philosophers who will be glad to answer, although they will probably disagree...

Re: karma

by **kamalalama1** » Mon Jul 11, 2016 7:09 am

Harijee!

In your wonderful book Living Energy (Russian edition)it is very nicely explains the concept how thought forms acting in karmic reactions

The thought forms concept It is actually very nicely explaining a lot in this karma issue

But still it is a question is all this karmic processes going on automatically as you explained because of thought forms or some karma controller personalities also engaged in this complicated process?

I wanted to ask this question during your last broadcast which was a week ago but the issue of your broadcast was completely different

Re: karma

by **Hari** » Tue Jul 19, 2016 11:00 pm

The brunt of the burden of delivering karmic justice, in whatever form it appears, lies with material nature. Consequences build up due to the choices we make. At a certain point, the weight of accumulated events results in an apparent reaction. Although most of the reactions come within the arena of the world within which we live, occasionally outside forces impact us when the need arises. People, nature, etheric based beings, energy forms or vibrations, celestial beings, departed souls, angels, or Divine beings all share in manifesting our future. No one can predict which of these elements will contribute to our receiving our karma, and not all of them are involved all the time. According to how events are seeded by our choices in our field of action, the future is cultured. Karma is the sum total of all factors within the entirety of existence. Although all things affect everything, generally only a small portion of existence is directly involved in delivering our results. Periodically, the entire universe moves to accommodate our actions.

## **Devas in different traditions**

by **kamalalama1** » Mon Jul 11, 2016 6:43 am

Dear Hari

As we know in different cultures there are different persons (devas) who controlling the particular elements

Like in vedas one who control all the watery elements is Varuna dev

But in Greek tradition is Poseidon.

Also Indra is the king of devas in Greek tradition the king is Zeus

And so on .There personal histories quite different, characteristics some of them although is quite similar sometime.

Some are completely different

My question is ,are all this divine personalities the same person in different traditions o r they are different persons?

If they are the same person then why the personal histories so different and if they are different personalities then how it is that

different personalities that are in charge of control of the same nature element?

Re: Devas in different traditions

by **Hari** » Tue Jul 19, 2016 10:44 pm

We cannot assume that the descriptions given in different cultures perfectly represent the personalities they attempt to depict. The differing characteristics of Varuna and Poseidon arise from the history, beliefs, and literary capacity of these ancient civilizations. No tradition completely and perfectly explains these devas, for the reality of these celestial beings is far greater than humans can document. Each culture assumes that their description is complete, but none of them are. Although the ancient Indian ideas are clearer than concepts of later cultures, differences in the description of the gods with similar functions do not imply different beings.

## **Divine love**

by **Vajra** » Wed May 25, 2016 8:00 pm

Dear Hari

Looking around what is happening in the world and on the life of people sometime i am asking myself a question.

Does God love us?

I supposed that he does but how it we can see?In what we can see his love?

Can you please say does God really love us?And how we can see and feel that HIs love?

Thank you

Re: Divine love

by **Hari** » Sat May 28, 2016 9:56 pm

Your question reflects to a certain extent a classic religious conundrum, namely, "If God is all love, how can he allow such evil in this world?" During the time of the holocaust, this doubt cracked many who could not tolerate what happened. God gives us the tools to create our own lives according to our choice. God is not a policeman. The laws of nature are governed by cause and effect. We do not see God upending these laws whimsically.

When we chose to believe in God, or serve and love God, we already knew that the laws of nature remained basically unchallenged. We did not see major transformations in the world around us that could only be explained by divine intervention. However, we have seen smaller miracles in the form of protection, healing, sudden gain, and other unexplainable phenomena

that we ascribe to God or to divine beings. Whether these phenomena are indeed mystical remains to be seen, but how strongly we believe in God's total control of all aspects of life determines to a large extent how we interpret the events of this world.

If you are someone who believes that not one blade of grass moves without the sanction and will of God, you may find yourself making adjustments or creating explanations for everything that occurs. But when you are in a situation that smacks you in the face with its "wrongness" you will be challenged to maintain this opinion.

I personally feel that God does love "us" but does not manipulate our lives. Love and manipulation are two separate things. You can love someone and not interfere in their situation. We expect that someone who loves us does not manipulate things for our sake. Free will and love go hand in hand. Without one, the other struggles to meaningfully exist. Someone may manipulate our world without a trace of love. We see this clearly in our political, social and economic systems.

So the only question is, "If God loves us, how can we feel it?" But this question I have answered multiple times. When you let go of all the stress that dominates your life and simply allow the energy of the divine to flow to you, you will feel it immediately! Stand before the divinity and absorb this love, send your love, and let the love meet in a unity of essence. Avoid making demands in this love such as requiring peace or wealth or health or anything.

Re: Divine love

by **Vajra** » Thu Jul 07, 2016 1:46 pm

Thank you very much for your answer.

Actually i am now reading your book Living Energy in Russian and it so helpful in many regards And you really very nicely explained how to overcome all obstacles in evolutionary process

## **Senses**

by **kamalamala1** » Thu Mar 17, 2016 5:17 pm

Hi dear Hari

Just recently i heard a lecture from youtube where was said that we should not satisfy our senses

and should satisfy the senses of Supreme.

And only by such a way we can come closer to Him or become connected with Him.

This statements made a lot of questions in my mind.

First of all senses is the part of ourselves and it is given to us by Supreme and the desire to satisfy them also comes from Him.

And i am really have a BIG doubt that Supreme himself does really want that we just try to satisfy his senses. ,

Why He should want that and why he should force his parts to become in such a troublesome condition to hate their own senses which is given by HIM .

I think this kind of statements leads people to mental hospital since its make an incredible conflict in the heart of each follower of this statement and as a result since nobody can take away his own parts (i mean senses) they will hate the Supreme since they will feel that he is the one who made such a unsolvable task

And if one who follows such a statement will definitely feel forever Guilty because he is always somehow trying to naturally satisfy his own senses and he should not do that.

I think this is the best way to make people real slaves or even zombies.  
At least people will become hypocrites isn't it?



I am sorry but i am really writing what i think.



I personally think that the statement should be not to try to satisfy GODS senses or stop to satisfy our senses but to purify our own senses to try to enjoy much pure sense objects and to become detached for gross enjoyments with gross quality of energy and this will maybe bring us to the level of real detachment from senses and there objects.If it at all needed.

Isn't it better to enjoy a good pure food for a really short time then just meditate on Supreme and even meditate on Supreme with gratitude while enjoying the food since he gave such a nice tasty food isn't it a better way?

The question arising if one hate his senses it mean he hate himself (since senses is his part) how that one can feel that he is Good enough?

And does God or Gods really want that from us?

Does Supreme himself really want that we just try to satisfy his senses?

Re: Senses

by **Hari** » Fri Mar 18, 2016 9:37 pm

I do not want to answer questions that are in the format of, "Someone said this or that. I think what they said is this or that. What do you think?"

I can say with certainty that addiction is not good for it limits our choices. Obsession is not good for the same reason. These qualities cause us to act in ways that are self destructive. Lust, anger, and greed are always troublesome when they cause us to act against our best interests. These qualities also cause us to harm others.

Enjoyment is part of life. To see the sunset and enjoy it is natural. Swimming, soft breezes, good food, good company, beautiful flowers, nice music, art or a cleverly done movie, all inspire us and contribute to the feeling that life has meaning.

Re: Senses

by **kamalamala1** » Sat Mar 19, 2016 5:04 am

I wrote that i" heard from youtube" it is just a form of beginning the question, it is not that this questions didn't arise in me. WE was living a long time under the influence of this concept .

And since it comes from honorable sources it is real made question in me.

And the questions arises is really fundamental that is why i decided to ask you.

I agree with you that addiction is not good .

And you said that enjoyment part of life and it is natural and beneficial.

But does Supreme himself really want that we just try to satisfy his senses?

Does in spiritual realm all associates only trying to satisfy Gods senses?

Initially i wanted to write another question.

The image we have from religions is that in spiritual realm people only engaged to glorifying Gods and trying to satisfy Them. And the real question was how is the ingagments of people there?

Re: Senses

by **kamalamala1** » Sat Mar 19, 2016 11:04 am

Your answer made me think more on the questions which i asked

And actually i just realized that if someone really try to satisfy Gods senses then his own senses will be filled with total bliss which will be not compatable with any sense enjoyment I mean it will be so ecstatic and so deep that one can louse his mind really in that. Since God himself is the source of all total enjoyment and bliss and he is the source of all us. But only if he do that completely really.

Re: Senses

by **Hari** » Sat Mar 19, 2016 3:13 pm

You are nicely answering your own question. This makes sense. If your question is so fundamental, as you say, then the answer should be easily accessed within yourself. If you think that information coming from outside yourself is more important than what you know within, you will miss a lot.

Perhaps a good way to deepen your understanding of the spiritual realm is to consider the associates of Radha and Krsna who are enjoying their lives and at the same time satisfying those they love. In relationships, enjoyment and satisfaction are a two way street. Without this exchange, there cannot be lasting love.

You might think I am avoiding your question, and perhaps you are right. But I think that only you can truly answer this. When you resonate with the essence you are, questions fade away. Experience rules.

Re: Senses

by **kamalamala1** » Sun Mar 20, 2016 5:51 am

My answer is not correct since it is to idealistic and in reality very very rare person on this Earth really can live on that level

And even that one will not be always in the mood of satisfying only Lords senses sometime he will satisfy his own senses. And in sects usually after this statement is said one can satisfy Lords senses only if he satisfy Guru and this is very dangerous ,people can easily replace God by there so called Guru and there are tons of so called completely unqualified appointed or self appointed business Gurus especially in India.

For ordinary people it is misused by religious organization and turn into heaviest exploitation which we already saw. It is the foundation of Guru business.

I am sure exist some really qualified mystically advanced persons who can be called a real Guru for many people but they never will replace Lords by themself .

Your answer is much better

Your wrote

"Perhaps a good way to deepen your understanding of the spiritual realm is to consider the associates of Radha and Krsna who enjoying their lives and at the same time satisfying those they love. In relationships, enjoyment and satisfaction are a two way street. Without this exchange, there cannot be lasting love."

From it it is obvious that even in Goloka (spiritual world) people doesn't engaged only to satisfy Lords senses but they live there own life and it is ok with Lords. This make much more sense.

So from that example it is obvious that the whole concept to only satisfying Lords senses is wrong.

Discussion with you is much more interesting for me and others. Silently getting answer from my own heart is quite boring.



Re: Senses

by **Hari** » Mon Mar 21, 2016 10:00 pm

My role is to inspire you to uncover your own essence. If I can do that, I feel successful. If I engage in telling people things, I gradually get discouraged, even if the act of speaking is fun while I am doing it. After all, the speaking has only one goal, to encourage people to experience their spiritual wisdom and move towards their true existence.

Re: Senses

by **kamalamala1** » Mon Mar 28, 2016 9:19 am

Thank you a lot.

You did such a job all this years.

You took out us from sectarian way of spirituality into real spiritual space.

And you always was guiding us as an angel.

I know you want that we become independent and strong and spiritually evolved.

Very very much thanks to you .

Ps By the way back to the issue i want to add that the best way to satisfy Lords senses is possible in the Temples, anybody can offer something valuable to Lords, also his own energy in any form.'

And this is easy and completely ecstatic. That is why we constructing our non sectarian Temple.

Re: Senses

by **Hari** » Thu Mar 31, 2016 9:57 pm

You are very welcome.

I agree with you that the temple is a marvelous place. Communicating with the deities becomes easier as we become more aware of the conscious energy that flows within the temple room. God is not a distant, unattainable resource. The divine is freely available at all times. We must let go of doubt and fear and reach out to Radha and Krsna and Gaura Nitai.

## **Striving for perfection**

by **Akhila L** » Mon Mar 21, 2016 9:46 am

Dear Hari,

In your lecture from 2007, "Not good enough", you conclude that the reason why we are "here" is our idea that "we are not good enough" and that we are striving for perfection and having the arena for it "here and now". You said that our inner desire is "I wish I could be like that".

Actually, I have been thinking about it for more than one year now and have some questions.

By saying "not good enough" do you mean "not good enough as You" meaning "me" comparing myself with God?

I would like to start from this point before I ask more questions.

Best wishes,

A

Re: Striving for perfection

by **Hari** » Mon Mar 21, 2016 10:12 pm

What an interesting thought! It is not possible to compare ourselves to the Supreme without first separating from the Divine Source. When we think of ourselves as separate, we ask questions like, "Am I good enough for you?" When we compare ourselves to the Supreme, we naturally feel inferior and "not good enough." When we love someone with our heart and soul, we do not see ourselves as separate. The interests of the lover and beloved are one. There is only one of us in the pure, divine union of spiritual harmony. The idea of not being good enough does not exist, As soon as we compare ourselves, we are no longer in a union. There is now a me and a you. Enter duality, complete with the inevitable comparisons of better or worse. If we are honest, we will not think ourselves better, because we know who we really are.

Now why do we step back from our union with God and consider this comparison? Have we entered into a competition? Well, competition is not bad when it is done in friendship or love, but when it is done with a selfish attitude, we get in trouble. Is envy involved? Lust? Which comes first, the feeling that causes us to separate and compare, or the feeling that we cannot compare that causes us to separate? Or does it all happen at the same moment?

Re: Striving for perfection

by **Akhila L** » Mon Mar 21, 2016 11:04 pm

Thank you for this explanation. In the same lecture you stated that you did not like the word "envy" as a designation of our state of mind. You said that this word may have an unnecessary negative implication on us. I liked this statement as I protest when religious leaders and teachers make us feel guilty for being envious of God. Now you used "envy" again. Do you mean the same thing now?

You have also used a word "arena" in the lecture to refer to our place and time. It makes me think that we are making movie but the pain and fear are real. So, the inconsistency I feel is why we should inflict suffering on us if we are co-creating reality (or co-designing) to have an arena for our pursuit after perfection. Of course, the old "karma" concept shows up here but it seems to me even more inconsistent as you actually do not remember what you did previously wrong. Maybe the "real" suffering is needed for us to play for real? And then another paradox - the time when it all started - mentioned by you. If the time does not exist, "when" should not exist

either. A concept that makes me really nervous sometime 😬 is what is the next step "when" this all is "over" meaning you have given up the idea of not being good enough. When means a beginning and an end but there is neither of the two.

What I feel attracted to is the idea that you can't appreciate something that you have but you will appreciate it directly when you lose it. We all know that "when" (again) we get something back, there is no guarantee of appreciating it forever. I see it in my family life. You tend to forget what these people mean to you when they are around, you suffer when you lose them, and again, when everything is normal, you think this is "nothing special". I guess the loving relationship is to always feel "special". So, the concept you discuss of "not being good enough" is it a part of "always remember Me, and never forget about Me" concept? Is this hard training we have to go through a sort of recalling process in case? And why are we so stubborn!

My apologies for this long text inspired by your answer.

Best wishes,

A

Re: Striving for perfection

by **Hari** » Tue Mar 22, 2016 12:35 pm

You are correct about my disliking the usage of the word envy as the primary cause of our residence in this realm. However, you brought up an interesting concept and I want to follow it. As seekers of the truth, we are prepared to fearlessly inquire.

If we feel unity with the divine, why would we step aside to view our relationship from a non-unified perspective? Cause and effect always exists, otherwise there could be no action. We accept spiritual action and it must have some cause. What could possibly cause us to see in this unique manner we never before considered? I can think of a few reasons.

\* What if I were curious? What if I thought it would be a way to expand my love? Or what if I wanted to confirm my love or examine it in a new way? Because I am smart, I might consider a momentary detachment from the Divine a safe way to do this. See with new eyes, hear with new ears, explore a new dimension, and so on. But, I might not be ready for the consequences of this choice.

\* What if envy or lust, two of the traditionally stated reasons for entering this world of physicality, are only experienced when one is not in the state of divine loving union with God? If so, then they are not the cause of the transformation, but are an effect of the choice to examine the relationship in another way. And what if, when feeling these two hitherto unknown emotions, we suddenly saw God in another manner? What if we looked back and said, "Hold on! Have these feelings been hidden from me by my choice or was I forced to not feel this way?" And what if suspicion crept in and trust eroded at that point? So many what if's here, but we are examining a very difficult concept so why should we hold back in our analysis?

\* Now there would appear to be a choice. Shall we reject these thoughts and feelings, consider our experiment as over and without value or further interest to us, or shall we embrace these new experiences in our search for knowledge? After all, we never experienced a "need to know." When one is in divine harmony, one knows. Needing to know is unknown so when faced with this need, a person who has an inquisitive nature might be attracted to examine why this appeared.

\* Choosing to investigate further in an inquisitive manner may not at all be related to lust or envy. We might have simply wanted to know how and why we were in the place we had never been before. This feeling would be unprecedented.

\* A choice appears, shall I neglect what I have stumbled upon, turn my back on my perception, and declare it a waste of energy? Or should I embrace the mood of what I seemed to have created to examine it further? I am unaware of the path I would have to take to find out more as I have no prior experience, no maps, no teacher to guide me.

But what initiated this in the first place? If this description is true then envy or lust are by-products of the initial mood that changed our direction. We still have to deal with why.

What if I became somewhat overwhelmed by the thought that God's all pervading perfection and acceptance of me would allow me to be more than what I presently was? What if I thought I did not feel my connection to God as strongly as I imagined others feel it in their relationship with the Divine? What if I looked at these other seemingly more connected persons and felt the essence of all doubt? "What if I am not good enough?"

Re: Striving for perfection

by **Akhila L** » Fri Mar 25, 2016 6:05 pm



Again, thank you for this analysis and presenting different concepts. No doubt, these are very deep issues that require hard work of mind, intelligence, and the heart. I will focus upon three issues that you touched, and that I feel are crucial for understanding.

#1 \* What if I were curious? What if I thought it would be a way to expand my love? Or what if I wanted to confirm my love or examine it in a new way? Because I am smart, I might consider a momentary detachment from the Divine a safe way to do this. See with new eyes, hear with new ears, explore a new dimension, and so on. But, I might not be ready for the consequences of this choice."

What if the Divine would like to see your struggle for perfection, your progressing toward him again, your feeling of separation for him in an environment that makes him "invisible" or present only when you so wish? So, this could be a mutual enterprise to increase the loving exchange. Maybe all these years of struggle, lifetimes and days spent in the oblivion are worth all these moments when you re-connect and re-discover your best friend again? Would it be possible with out this separation in the first place? On the other hand, the physical suffering you have to endure may be the consequence of your last sentence above? Maybe we are not aware of what awaits us, maybe the situation is very dynamic and the project or screenplay adapts all the time to what is happening and what choices are made by us? I have a deep conviction that the highest point in your life is when you re-connect and re-discover your best friend, there are no greater moments in your life. For some reasons, they do not last very long, however.

#2 \* But what initiated this in the first place? If this description is true then envy or lust are by-products of the initial mood that changed our direction. We still have to deal with why. "

Maybe we are pushed forward by the will to examine this relationship in an extreme condition? However, I do not understand why we have to go through so many life forms (if it is true), so many individual physical embodiments and lifetimes, focusing upon apparently irrelevant for our relationship activities, literally waisting our time on activities that are far from this greatest feelings of all? Is it due to our free will? Or is it a way to test different roles before we know what is that we really want to do? We may have a great time watching sport games, having parties, or intimate exchange, singing and dancing, skiing, being out in the nature, diving, swimming, helping those in need, creating music and poetry but and one point we have to face what we call "reality": aging, diseases, and death. I think that these integrated parts of our existence must make sense in relation to our primary choice to separate. But what if we decide to separate again? I cannot buy this explanation that once you are back you are safe. This would limit our choices.

#3 \*What if I became somewhat overwhelmed by the thought that God's all pervading perfection and acceptance of me would allow me to be more than what I presently was? What if I thought I did not feel my connection to God as strongly as I imagined others feel it in their relationship with the Divine? What if I looked at these other seemingly more connected persons and felt the essence of all doubt? "What if I am not good enough?"

This part was most difficult to analyze. "What if I am not good enough for You"? Now, you may start envying those around you? There should be a model for it in our reality. Do you mean a boy looking at a girl and thinking "oh, I am not worth having relationship with you"? I would like to love her but she would never accept me? Then, there is a place for both feeling of insufficiency and envy of others that are more fit in your mind. Is the cure for it in accepting the illusionary realm of self-indulgence being "disconnected" and forgetting the love you once had?

Re: Striving for perfection

by **Hari** » Thu Mar 31, 2016 9:52 pm

You might want to think about all this and share your realizations as you get them! You now have a forum to do so 😊

And if anyone else wishes to say something about this, please do!

Since everything we are discussing at this point is in the form of "what if," we are free to speculate as we like 🤖

## **Divine and evil**

by **Vajra** » Sat Mar 12, 2016 4:42 pm

Dear Hari

From ancient wisdom we know that this world is the world of duality  
There are evil (negative, egoistic) forces (entities) and divine ones Gods  
Evil ones called demons and they tried to exploit everything on their own benefit  
let say nature and people, and divine ones -Gods taking care for the harmonious development  
of all creatures and taking care of all the harmony in nature

Many years I got information from certain sources about the head of that divine forces Lord  
Indra (king of Gods)

But somehow or other some information which was gotten is mostly presented Lord Indra in  
negative way, and the image from that information of Lord Indra is not at all good looking for  
most of the common people (not for me), but Lord Indra being the king of the Gods definitely  
doing so many incredible activities on behalf of humans and all the creation and He is definitely  
worthy to be really appreciated and praised for his heroic divine activities for maintaining  
divinity in the creation, from my point of view much more than most of so called civilian and  
spiritual authorities in human society.

Although in Vedas I mean in Rig Veda and others it is also many praising hymns to Lord Indra  
And by the way He is greatest devotee of Lord Vishnu as I know. But the main image gotten  
from information is not at all the best.

(It seems that since the whole humanity practically everywhere felt under the incredible strong  
influence of demons because of Kali Yuga factor, so all the information about Lord Indra was  
twisted in all old scriptures in negative way not even in India but in Greece also, since he is the  
main enemy for evil forces (this is just my speculation))

So can you say about Lord Indra (king of gods) from your experience what special activities he  
is doing and how looks his kingdom and He himself.

I don't know maybe my question sounds strange but it is really a question that I have.

Re: Divine and evil

by **Hari** » Tue Mar 15, 2016 8:40 pm

Good and Evil are axiomatic in the universe. When creation takes place, the elements to  
manage it appear. Every endeavor requires a leader. Brahma is an architectural engineer, not a  
manager. Managers are required to make sure things go the way they should. Forces that tend  
to break apart order have to be positively redirected or dissolved. The celestial region is not a  
democracy. It is a kingdom and everyone there accepts this. A King is required.

The problem with being a King was nicely summed up by Abraham Lincoln. "You can please some of the people all of the time, and all of the people some of the time, but you cannot please all of the people all of the time." Indra has the same problem. He engages wholeheartedly in his task and usually does it quite well. The celestial realm is orderly, peaceful most of the time, and just as it should be. Indra works hard and has a lot on his mind. His job is stressful. He deals with it in his own royal manner. Sometimes this gets him in trouble. Someone might not like what he does and chastises him. Such is life.

No one in the universe can do a better job of being the King of Heaven than Indra. Despite whatever was said about him, he is the best at what he does and without him there would be chaos. When you are at the top of the heap, every hiccup or sneeze is big news! Everyone is focused on you. This can be very irritating and uncomfortable. Sometimes you have to do things that you do not want to do for the sake of your subjects. Sometimes you are manipulated by those around you because you are avoiding to act in a lose-lose situation. Indra does what he has to do according to the role he has been given despite it being an occasional can of worms.

He is an easy target. When you want to teach your kids what not to do, you point at this larger than life figure and say, "Look at this one. He was SO lusty that he was cursed." Or, "Just to keep his power he had to do these terrible things to his friends!" And so on. If you were in the same situation, you would have done far worse, but that does not matter because a critic only has to say something, not do something better. No one can do better. This is an unequivocal fact. Indra is the best. And he needs encouragement. Who would do such a tough job without encouragement? What better encouragement can the denizens of heaven give than telling him, "You da man!" in common parlance, or "You are the greatest of the great, the best of the best, and we bow before you as you keep us safe, manage our prosperity, and maintain peace." Nothing wrong with this.

I cannot say what conversations he has with his wife at night while laying in bed lamenting about his day as I am not privy to such information. I also do not want to be. This is his problem, not mine. The boss is the boss because he can be the boss. I do what the boss says because I am not the boss, I do not want to be the boss, and I am fine with me as I am. If the boss gets more perks than me, that's ok! I do not need these perks because the price to get them is far too great.

We have experience that devotees love to criticize others. We have seen they really love to criticize those in power. We also see that when they are in power they are no better than those they replaced. And thus the natural condition of humans in this world is revealed.

Those who are evil are quite straightforward about it. "Indra is in charge and we want to be in charge. So we will kill him and take over." They do not bother with criticizing his morality. Those who are supposedly good have a different slant when they need to. They bring up morality, decency, ethics and so on, as weapons against their King. Sometimes they have a good reason and sometimes not. Regardless, he remains king because no one else can replace him, and if someone were to replace him, they would do a worse job!

My advice is: Get off his case! Worry about yourself.

Re: Divine and evil

by **Vajra** » Wed Mar 16, 2016 12:53 pm

Thank you very much for such a wonderful answer.

I always was thinking that Lord Indra is worthy for real deep thanks for all that he is doing all over universe

In old times people was much more advanced in the cutler also that is why it was recommended to all wise humans to worship Lord Indra ,Agni, Varuna, Vayu,and other Gods who are doing incredible work in the universe

The householders, and not only them, for showing there love and recognition of Gods regularly was making oblations to them and festivals for them, not only for Supreme  
Shouldn't we also somehow do that for real harmony in the world and in our hearts?

Re: Divine and evil

by **Hari** » Thu Mar 17, 2016 12:17 pm

I think the main problem comes from the usage of the word "worship." If a person worships the Supreme, they might feel it to be cheating on God to worship someone who is not Supreme. Of course, they will worship earth people who they consider linked to the Supreme because they are representatives of the Supreme. Why they do not consider devas to be linked representatives of the Supreme is beyond me, but many uncultured persons think in this way.

Despite this misconception, the devas are the governors of the Universe. All government takes taxes from its people. So one can consider offerings to the Devas as taxes. Or one can offer them something out of gratitude for what they offer us. Calling this offering of tribute as "worship" is a misnomer. One should offer to the devas as a reciprocation for what they give us.

When one is no longer taking without paying, one ceases to be a thief. If one takes from the devas without giving anything in return, one is a crook and responsible for the consequences. If you want peace and harmony in your life, follow the guidelines given by those who are more powerful than you and avoid coming in conflict with the authorities. This is what Krsna meant in the Gita.

## **Harmony & modes of nature**

by **Drpta** » Sat Mar 12, 2016 11:07 am

Hi Hari!

I wanted ask you a question: what does mean harmony from point of view of three modes of nature? Does it mean that if I find myself in place full of ignorance it would be in harmony to behave myself ignorantly, for example? Or I should try to develop and maintain the mode of goodness in any situation? And then what means adaptation to circumstances around us and influence the circumstances on us?

And is being in goodness superior to being in passion or ignorance in light of fulfillment our tasks and destination in this world? I mean if one has born in degraded alcoholic family and inclined naturally to make evil deeds, that it is his choice to experience life in ignorance and for him live in goodness is not his task.

Re: Harmony & modes of nature

by **Hari** » Tue Mar 15, 2016 8:09 pm

Your way of looking at things is fascinating. I find your perspective to be unusual and unexpected.

I do not use the term harmony synonymously with going with the flow. For example, if I had only one hour to finish programming an application that prevented a melt down at a nuclear reactor, I would initially need to accept the task, wholeheartedly embrace the urgency of it and set aside anything and everything, including my well-being, to complete it. Going with the flow of moving forward at any cost, I need to resonate with the energy of success as I and my task become one. I thus use passion in the best possible manner. I do not become one with my work; rather, I focus on my task so intently that my mind and the steps I take to resolve the problem become one. When the task is complete, I move on.

Having a need to fulfill and doing what is required to get it does not create harmony. Thousands of frequencies exist simultaneously and we use each of them at different times to fulfill our needs and desires. Everyday tasks are meant to accomplish something. Passion does this well. The existential state of harmony is different.

Harmony is a state of being wherein I, the living consciousness, am aware of myself, my energy, and the energy of divinity around me, be it in nature, in the temple, or in other living beings. Being harmonious with nature or other beings characterizes the natural common spiritual frequency we all share. To be harmonious requires that our frequencies are in tune. This only happens when we are aware of our natural frequency, we remove all dissonant energy, and we perceive the natural energy of others. True harmony only arises in enlightened states.

Yet, two beings in ignorance might live in harmony together for some time when they share the same frequency. The question is, though, are they harmonizing through the energy of ignorance or are they ignorant of how spiritually compatible they really are? I do not believe that the energy of ignorance can create harmony. Because ignorance can only cover spirit, whatever harmony they feel is due to their underlying divine energy.

Divine harmony transcends material considerations. This harmony is eternal and always resonating within the heart. Lesser forms of harmony do exist, but they come and go. We may play football together as one unit to score goals and prevent the opponent from scoring, but this unity dissolves at the end of the game when we go our separate ways. While harmonizing within everyday life, we meet, dance together for a while, and move off in different directions.

Therefore, my answer to you is two-fold. First, I do not believe we perceive true harmony when we are influenced by physicality. And second, the harmonious resonance that does temporarily appear is a distant cousin to real harmony.

Re: Harmony & modes of nature  
by **Drpta** » Wed Mar 16, 2016 7:41 am

Thank you, it seems I have got the point.

## **Prakriti**

by **Drpta** » Sat Feb 06, 2016 2:55 pm

Hi Hari!

I have a few questions concern Prakriti.

1. Is Prakriti a manifestation of Radha?
2. What are the functions of Prakriti in spiritual and material worlds?

3. Is this Prakriti a kind of energy that forms words and facilitate relationships between persons there, starts from spiritual worlds down to grossest material worlds by accepting more and more dense forms in accordance with desires of the selves to get experience of different type?
4. Is Prakriti an energy, by virtue of whom differentiated entities assumed forms and names, including 'bodies' of the God in which He She becomes perceptible for other beings?
5. Is Maya one of Prakriti's sub-energy? And what are Maya's functions?

Re: Prakriti

by **Hari** » Sat Feb 06, 2016 11:20 pm

These are philosophical questions relating to concepts you have read about. I have requested in the past that such questions be posed to people who enjoy answering them. I do not feel that answering these questions would assist you in a way that is compatible with the theme of what I have presented since 1999. There are other audiences and forums relating to the Vedic tradition where many experts are eager to reply.

Because you are not asking me something that lends itself to personal experience and realization, I am not inclined to reply.

Re: Prakriti

by **Drpta** » Sun Feb 07, 2016 12:32 pm

Sure, these are mainly philosophical questions, but I do not agree they do not lend itself to personal experience and realization. These questions expand our awareness of how this world is functioning. You know, someone may be just a consumer, and it is normal, but other want to know how does it works and become able to use all options and facilities of obtained device and repair it easily if it breaks down. Since I live in this world, in this existence, I ought to know how it really works for to be more aware and determined in every particular situation.

Sure, I am reading philosophical books, but what I have read I try to apply in practice. You know, when I read about Prakriti in Ramanuja's commentaries I found many unexpected views that have to be confirmed somehow. And therefore questions appear on which there are no answers in book. For example, when I have bodily contact with other embodied entities around me I have contact with a kind of energy (Prakriti?) which carries conscious spiritual energy of personality. This energy (Prakriti) has some qualities. For example it provides feeling of contact--verbal and not verbal (as I think, I do not read about this). What kinds of interesting and useful qualities it may have else?

You know, in holography, by using different wavelengths you may manifest different objects saved on the same plate, or using few different wavelengths you may reveal one object with new details, hidden before. This holography quality is manifestation of some bit of Prakriti's qualities. We may expand it to deal with other realities. What is the nature of our vibrations we use to tune ourselves to contact with divine? Who emanate them – I as the self or something else that is somehow under my control? Is it an agent that as a laser, reveal holography of world around me?

They say that God is transcendental (I agree) and when He She manifests, His body is also transcendental and not different from Him, as they say. But if His body forms by the same energy as ours, then He becomes closer to us. To establish contact with Him Her becomes much easier now. It changes many.

You sand me to Vedic philosophers forum. Do they able answer these questions correctly? I am not sure. They are the same book readers, not the mystics.

Of course I cannot push you, but it will be very interesting and useful to know your opinion related to this.

Re: Prakriti

by **Hari** » Sun Feb 07, 2016 3:47 pm

*[Sure, I am reading philosophical books, but what I have read I try to apply in practice. You know, when I read about Prakriti in Ramanuja's commentaries I found many unexpected views that have to be confirmed somehow. And therefore questions appear on which there are no answers in book. For example, when I have bodily contact with other embodied entities around me I have contact with a kind of energy (Prakriti?) which carries conscious spiritual energy of personality. This energy (Prakriti) has some qualities. For example it provides feeling of contact--verbal and not verbal (as I think, I do not read about this). What kinds of interesting and useful qualities it may have else?]*

I get this, but the problem is that you phrased the question within the context of Ramanuja. You could have said: "When I have bodily contact with other embodied entities around me I feel a conscious spiritual energy of personality. This energy has some qualities. For example it provides feeling of contact--verbal and not verbal (as I think, I do not read about this). What kinds of interesting and useful qualities it may have else?" It is easy for me to answer a question like this. Using the word "prakriti" can cloud this discussion. I do not agree that there is a universally accepted definition of the term that completely describes the concept you wish to discuss. Your question is fine without it. By leaning on a sampradaya acarya, you place me into a box I do not wish to be in and therefore I will choose to not answer. But your real question is universal and understandable by all people since it is something that we all share because it relates to who we are and how we perceive.

So considering my comment above, can you use my rewording of one of your questions as a basis to rephrase your inquiry into a format that is universal and transcends culture and history?

Re: Prakriti

by **Drpta** » Mon Feb 08, 2016 10:00 am

Ok, rephrased my questions I can ask:

1. What is that energy which facilitates us to perceive objects around us?
2. What is the substance or energy that making God to be perceptible by other entities?
3. What is the energy that creates outward forms or perceptible bodies of beings in 'gross' and in 'spiritual' worlds?
4. What is the nature of this energy? How this energy works and how can I control it and use it for my personal development and evolution?

Re: Prakriti

by **Drpta** » Wed Feb 10, 2016 9:44 am

Can we say that this energy is originating from a primordial polarity, when the pieces of the polarity, being forcibly separated One, are gravitating to each other by desire to become One again? Is this energy a principle of this separation? The separating energy. This energy

designates entities by giving to them forms and names. The nature of this energy is desire. The primary desire of One to become various initiate process of separation known also as creation which characterized by increasing of desires of separative types. Separation means creation since we make many from one. But the tendency of beings to interrelate with each other is manifestation of secondary latent desire to become One again. Therefore this energy, being initially divine, is integral principle of entire existence and relationships among beings of all types. How do we call it changes nothing.

It is interesting, what happens when latent desire to become One grows up to patent desire? Is it individual process of reunion or process of global collapse?

Re: Prakriti

by **Hari** » Wed Feb 17, 2016 11:38 pm

You list four fairly similar questions, and when you add in your next text, you are requesting me to write a book! But I already wrote the book and it is available to purchase via Amazon, and your niece just translated it with Mahashaya! You read it! You might think that I did not discuss these topics, but I did, just not in the most obvious manner.

The energy is living energy -- conscious, spiritual energy. God's energy, the divine energy within the cosmos, and our energy, are all this energy. Perception is conscious awareness. Energy emanates from living beings and thus other living beings who are consciously aware can perceive it. God is a living being, so are we. God's energy supports the creation by supplying the ingredients we need to get bodies, forms and facilities required to fulfill our desires or to act in a way that allows us to evolve to where we ultimately should be.

Question 4 can be answered by any and every one of my lectures and meditations. Truly.

Your next text requires me to be philosophical again. This means me answering according to something I might have thought or heard or considered to be true. Probably somewhere I have experienced the singularity of all things separating into little pieces, but I certainly do not remember this now and it would be pompous and absurd of me to answer this from my personal realization or experience. You are talking about the origin of existence in this universe or within the realm of physical existence, and further, you wonder about the motivations behind it. These metaphysical topics are answered best by philosophers, religionists, and spiritual traditions. They each have their own particular way of resolving these issues.


Why does the One become Many? This is the primordial question. From my experience and realization, I have seen that stasis sooner or later becomes boring or makes me dull. Boredom is far more than an idle inactivity. I need action. Even if that action is not a positive one, something has to break the bondage of immobility. That "One becomes Many" is compatible only if we consider one and many as concepts, not as individuals. But is the One ever an individual? I do not think so. The "Many" are individuals and since we are all always individuals, were we to be within the one, we would want to be individuals again, and thus the motive to separate arises. As I express my individuality, I define myself sometimes as one with others and at other times as separate and distinct from others. My momentary desire within a situational environment motivates me to act.

What if God does the same kind of thing, but on a massive extra universal scale and simultaneously on the smallest of all scales? And what if within this entirety of existence there is a principle which eventually collapses the entire thing into a black hole where all is consumed, digested, and regurgitated out into another creation when boredom strikes? What if the collapse of all things and the creation of all things is the axiomatic principle for living beings



who reside within this realm? If this is the fundamental principle regulating all existence, then all we need examine is why. I think the principle of eventually attaining the status of boredom is far more powerful than we might imagine. We usually consider boredom to be a trivial human thing arising from not having a proper engagement. But what if you have already done it all and have nothing left to achieve, yet you are still within this realm? Would you not be bored? Would you break apart the physical realm to attain a life not bound by it?

If you want to be true to your nature as a seeker of the truth, then find out why you are the way you are. You will uncover why existence is the way it is along the way. Even if you do not accomplish this now, you will in some non-specific future and you will emerge from where you are to where you should have been all along until you decided you did not want to be there

anymore. 

Re: Prakriti

by **Drpta** » Mon Feb 22, 2016 9:17 am

All these sounds good and very attractive, but what to do with fear and lack of confidence if after some evolution I, without my own desire (thru my bad karma for example), find myself again in terrible conditions? Where this fear comes from? Is it from my previous not-successive attempts or from my desire do not repeat difficulties of this life again?

You ask me why I am the way I am? It touched me and I contemplate it for a while. I can compare myself with the sprout breaking thru the asphalt now. This sprout is my awareness what is evolving and developing, discover new and new horizons on its way. It is like a ray of light—wide or narrow. The area illuminated with this ray becomes the realm I find myself in. When I concentrate the ray of my consciousness on something, then my awareness of the object increases.

Sometimes this sprout-ray has to go thru a kind of dense substance. If I have gone thru it then I have accepted it into my sphere of awareness. If do not, then it becomes buried in me and becomes a cause of “digestion problem” of my being until I digest it. It looks that now I am going thru the dense media named the gross matter. Is it wrapped me all around? If I aware the whole sphere around me I can answer it. Was I created in this dense environment or I came in it somehow—it does not matter. I am growing and grow thru this strip too. Do all beings have to go thru such a dense media? It is also does not matter. I have fond it on my way and have to accept it and go thru, like an airplane is going thru clouds. There is nothing special. It is even sometimes funny. But it does not mean that just I gone thru and forget it. I embraced it, it always remains in me, in my sphere of awareness.

I think this picture looks quite natural. If I want to meet the a form God I just have to point the ray of my consciousness on the current direction of divinity. If I have full-wide awareness I become able to perceive all existence.

What is about fear—I can consider it as a sign of warning—be careful, you are on the risky way, your awareness is weak in this territory. And it looks like we quite often lose our awareness, especially in the matter non-specific for our accustomed condition of being. And then we are starting become afraid—if it is something wrong?

But the question arises—where my capacity to aware gets its energy from? Why sometimes it is powerful enough, but sometimes weak? Where and how can I get the power for aware? And how can I keep it on?

Re: Prakriti

by **Hari** » Mon Feb 29, 2016 12:09 am

You have found the most important impediment to awareness: fear. Fear is a sign of intelligence when it protects us from danger or harm. Fear also manifests from ignorance when one does not know the source of a sound, or an event, for example. As important as these forms of fear are to our survival, I do not think these forms of fear affect evolution. I think the fear that blocks us is the inherent fear of not being good enough that characterizes our lives in this physical realm. This brick wall of self-condemnation prevents advancement more than anything other factor.

Think of it this way: What will you lose if you just accept your experiences, accept your perceptions, and flow with them? What could go wrong by allowing yourself to feel what you feel and see what you see. Try to give yourself the benefit of the doubt that if you are indeed a spiritual being that is divine in nature, you certainly, without a doubt, have the right and capacity to directly experience divinity. Ultimately, all that is stopping you is this persistent, primeval idea that you are not good enough.

If you allowed yourself to experience divinity, could you possibly make some horrible, evolutionary destroying mistake that cannot be rectified? I do not think so. I think you have far more to gain than you have to lose. And the quality of your gain is so far beyond whatever little you could lose that not attempting to go beyond your limits is foolish.

## **end of modern society**

by **Vajra** » Sat Jan 30, 2016 3:07 pm

Dear Hari

Just recently i find in you tube very interesting video.

[http: www.youtube.com watch?v=0Z760XNy4VM](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0Z760XNy4VM)

By the example of animals society development we can see what is the end of our society. And all the problems begin when life became very comfortable

So my question is does the comfortable circumstances hindering our development?

Re: end of modern society

by **Hari** » Wed Feb 03, 2016 10:35 pm

Please do not ask me to view a video as part of a question. I do not have time to do that.

Development takes place under all circumstances, but it is much faster when there is some impetus. We naturally want to resolve our discomfort, so whenever that situation arises we do whatever we can to feel better. This process can encourage us to learn, to grow and to experience more than if we felt fine. However, someone might feel fine and comfortable but be very interested in developing knowledge, researching, or uncovering truths that were hidden. This development is not born of discomfort. Curiosity, the desire to know the truth, the wish to expand knowledge, or gain newer experiences are all part of the process of evolution and not directly connected to comfort. In one sense, one who is dissatisfied with their state of knowledge is feeling a form of discomfort, but I do not think that is what you meant.

In the Gita we hear about seekers of the truth. Their journey is not necessarily related to discomfort and sometimes they also live quite comfortably. We also hear about those who are

suffering or in need of money. Such persons try to resolve their discomfort by taking up spiritual life. So the answer depends on the person and their circumstances.

Re: end of modern society

by **Vajra** » Sat Feb 06, 2016 12:39 pm

Thank you for your answer

I agree with you, this video is really boring old and not nice to look.

But it made a question in me that is why i decided to write.

'But all this is not so important actually. Most important the personal evolution.

It is interesting all that you wrote i mean the different ways of evolution is in some way applicable to animals life?

Does they also by there life tasks had an evolution of there soul?

Re: end of modern society

by **Hari** » Mon Feb 08, 2016 4:05 pm

I could rightfully define evolution as a journey towards the restoration of our natural state. All life is spirit, regardless of its form, and therefore the consciousness of all living beings is fundamentally pure. Animals are living beings, so they also have a natural, pure state. All beings eventually return to this state. I believe that no living being is condemned eternally to ignorance.

I doubt an animal has the capacity to consciously evolve towards a pure state because they would not be able to remove the unnatural impositions on their consciousness. They live according to their acquired nature and rarely deviate from this, although they can display surprising awareness and sensitivity. Considering this, their evolution is handled by devas who situate them in future lives according to their destiny. The principle of evolution remains valid even when the animal does not play a conscious role. I presume that each creature takes their birth to fulfill some purpose in their lives. Exactly how or why this occurs I cannot say, but there ultimately seems to be a reason for all things.

You bring up an interesting point, but perhaps not the one you intended. When answering this question, I examined the concept of evolution itself. If evolution is indeed a journey to an original state, then what we call evolution is really the removal of external impositions. In this case, all living beings share the same process, but at a different pace. Within the long term process of removing external encumbrances, we develop skills and capacities we did not have previously. Is this a development of a new ability or are we coming closer to our natural capacity?

**I**

by **kamalamala1** » Tue Jan 12, 2016 8:39 am

Hi dear Hari

I was thinking last week about some issue.

Each of us feel his I.

But I is part of God (Brahman, Bhagavan, Paramatma)

Can we say that when we feel our I then it means we feel God ?

Re: I

by **Hari** » Wed Jan 13, 2016 4:37 pm

Do you feel love within yourself? Are you able to feel love that comes from a source outside of you? If you cannot feel love within you, then feeling it when it is around you is difficult. If your energy does not resonate with the energy of love, feeling it can be troublesome. Many people have this problem and it forms the basis of many emotional and psychological disturbances. If you resonate with the energy of love, you have the potential to feel it when it is around you or directed at you. Even so, whether you want to feel it or not is entirely up to you because if you do not want to feel it, you will block it. For example, if you do not like the person who sends it to you or you do not like what they want in return.

God always wants that we feel the divine love God sends to us. Our capacity to resonate with this love depends on whether we can feel love within ourselves, and are not blocking it, and our desire to accept God's love and reciprocate with it. If you are asking if feeling your essence means you are feeling God, you are certainly feeling the energy of God because you are the same essence. The essence you are is part of God, so feeling you means feeling God. This might sound good, and it is true, but we need to examine if feeling the essence of self is equivalent to feeling God. Since we are energetically non-different, we are feeling God, but since God is so much more than our essence, we are only glimpsing at God. This glimpse gives us a taste that encourages our desire to make a stronger connection. When we feel essence, and do not block it with ideas like not being good enough, we open the potential to tune to God's love and return that love. We can immerse ourselves in this divine loving connection and even lose ourselves in it. When we experience this connection, we do not desire to label it in philosophical terms because doing so dissolves the sublime "us-ness."

Re: I

by **kamalamala1** » Mon Jan 18, 2016 7:35 am

Thank you for your answer.

You actually anticipated my next question.

But still another questions arrises.

If we feel divine energy why most of us don't feel infinity, and opposite we feel that we are quite limited in space in sense perceptions.

We feel a lot of ignorance instead of enlightenment and knowledge.

Why it is so?

Re: I

by **Hari** » Sat Jan 23, 2016 4:56 pm

We are not infinite, we are finite. This is an axiomatic truth. We can expand our and connection with divine energy to encompass more of it in increasing awareness, but there are limits to how far we can go.

Re: I

by **Vajra** » Sat Jan 30, 2016 3:02 pm

Hi dear Hari

But in this regard many other questions arising

let say we all know that we have some supreme I (not paramatma) and the i we are now feeling is located in the box of the body and nothing more

And then what is the Supreme I?

Where it locate?

And why we don't feel it?

Actually in Micael Newtons book Journey of souls it is said that one can have many bodies in the same time and most probably we have, but why we don't feel them, ?

Also in Upanishads it is said that I is as powerful and shining as a sun ?

Is it so and if yes then why we don't feel it?

thank you

Re: I

by **Hari** » Wed Feb 03, 2016 10:53 pm

I am not sure what you mean by the "supreme I." Do you refer to the Supreme Lord or to the highest I that is yourself? If you refer to the Supreme God, then you really do not need me to answer this question. If you refer to the highest form of yourself, then I am not sure what you mean since you are already the highest form of yourself. You must be referring to something else. Please clarify.

If what Newton says is true and our higher self does indeed inhabit multiple bodies, then there certainly would be signs or symptoms of this shared connection in the form of feelings, ideas, dreams, visions, or people we seem to have knowledge of or interactions with, that are outside of the situation of our present lifetime. These perceptions probably would seem indirect and somewhat vague or mysterious, but as we expand our awareness, they would become clearer and more real. However, embracing this idea could encourage a multiple personality disorder or some other derangement.

As far as the shining sun idea, maybe we are all born with really strong sunglasses?

Re: I

by **Drpta** » Sat Feb 06, 2016 8:09 am

Hi!

Let me interfere?

I think the answer of supreme self or I is a Sanskrit interpretation of word paramatma problem only. Since word atma has few different meanings such as soul, maid and body (in sense of ignorant state when one think he is this material body). So the word "supreme self" is addressed to the real self or the essence of us to emphasize its transcendence over of all other descriptions of the self such as mind or the body.

In this concern an interesting interpretation of verse 13.23 of BG I found in Ramanuja's Gita Bhashya:

The embodied Self is called the witness, the sanctioner, supporter, experiencer, the great lord and also the supreme self.

Commentary:

This Self (Puruṣa) existing in the body becomes the one who observes and 'sanctions' — permits the physical activities in accordance with volition and other mind states. Likewise, It is the 'supporter' of the body. It becomes the 'experiencer' of the pleasure and pain resulting from its activities. Thus, by virtue of ruling and supporting the body and by making the body completely subservient to its own needs, the Self becomes 'the great lord' (maheśvara) of the

body, the senses and the mind. (vide Gita 15.8 ). The embodied jivātman is said to be the 'supreme person' in relation to the body, the senses and the mind. The particle 'also' (api) indicates that the Self is the 'supreme lord' in relation to the body in the same way as it is the supreme person. The supremacy of the Self has already been described in the text beginning with 'It is the beginningless Brahman to which I am superior' (Gita 13.12). It is true that the Self [in its emancipated state] has limitless power and knowledge. But it becomes 'the great lord' and the 'supreme person' only in relation to the physical body. The term 'Self' (ātman) hereafter will be applied to both the body and the mind, for example:— 'Some perceive the Self by means of the self through meditation' (13.24).

Re: I

by **Vajra** » Sat Feb 06, 2016 12:27 pm

then appearing the question why we cannot even control any processes in our body or hardly controlling mind.

Obviously for me this processes controlled by other sources or maybe i am wrong maybe by unknown part of ourself?

But then again what is this unknown part and why is that unknown part if it is part of us?

Hari used the term higher self

Dear Hari please explain us what is Higher self what you mean under this wards in your answer, and why we don't feel it and who is really controlling our body and mind ??

Re: I

by **Hari** » Sun Feb 07, 2016 4:08 pm

Most of the processes in the body are controlled by the autonomic nervous system. [http://www.merckmanuals.com home brain, ... ous-system](http://www.merckmanuals.com/home/brain,_nerve_and_muscle_disorders/autonomic_nervous_system)

That we have no control over most of these functions is a good thing! It keeps us alive under most conditions and challenges.

The mind is best controlled by discipline, and discipline is a function of the higher self controlling the lower self. The higher self relates to your capacity to do something or feel something compatible to the essence you are. The lower self refers to anything else. But both of these concepts are misnomers to a person aware of the natural integration of all aspects of life. Higher and lower "selves" do not exist, but we learn to create these distinctions by behavioral modification at an early age. We are born in an integrated state (mostly, but there are exceptions) and systematically de-integrate (do we fall apart? 😊 ) as we grow up and learn the ways of this world.

When we are not integrated, we pass off control of our functioning to other people, external situations, or our own biology. We have to unlearn this to re-integrate as the complete essence we are.

**life**

by **Vajra** » Sat Dec 26, 2015 3:44 pm

Dear Hari

Life is we ourselves and it is said that prana is life ,does this mean that we is Prana itself ,or prana is separate from real us?

And what relation Prana have with Lord Vayu?

We heard many times ,and read a lot that this life in this world is very special.  
Can you tell what is really special in this life, and why it is so special?  
And why in other realms is not so special if it is so?

Re: life

by **Hari** » Mon Dec 28, 2015 8:44 pm

For the most accepted definition of prana, please click this link <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Prana>

Prana is the part of the life force responsible for various bodily functions, of which breathing is probably the one we consider most important. It is not life itself.

Prana is important for any living body that breathes. If one has a body that does not depend on breath, then most likely that body is subtle in nature. The flow of energy in subtle beings depends on that energy alone, not on a secondary energy like prana as we know it. How that energy is defined by those who live as energetic beings can only be truly understood by persons who live on that platform.

Re: life

by **Vajra** » Wed Dec 30, 2015 6:58 pm

Thank you very much, it is very interesting answer.

But the issue really complicated.

## Ego

by **kamalamala1** » Wed Nov 25, 2015 8:38 am

Dear Hari

In many scriptures and other esoteric books often mentioned the concept of Ego  
Eckhardt Tolle also using this concept  
But many off them have different understanding of this concept  
Some tell us that it is soul itself, some others tell that it is false part of soul

So can you say what is the proper meaning of EGO from your point of view?

Re: Ego

•

Post

by **Hari** » Thu Nov 26, 2015 3:56 pm

Why do you think I have the "proper" meaning? I can, as you ask, say something from my point of view, but whether or not it is proper depends on what you think of what I say! If I were to

state that my definition is proper and someone else's is not, it would be egotistical of me!



I do not think it matters if there is a standard definition of ego or not. What matters more is how we integrate our understanding of it in our evolutionary process. After all, language depends on our acceptance of the terms used. This is why language evolves over time. The term "ego" evolved greatly in the last two centuries.

Ego means "I" in latin. Therefore, the simplest way to define it is in relation to who or what we assume ourselves to be before we attain clarity as to who we are. The idea of ego getting in the way of our interactions with others or with the world around us is integral in the process of psychoanalysis. If we consider ego as the ever existing, enduring consciousness that experiences, we see it as the foundation upon which conscious life rests. In short, the aware being who perceives and reacts with everything in its world. When one is self centered and unconcerned with others, we might state that someone is too full of themselves by saying, "He is egoistic." We then refer to their conceit, and link it to their self-image in a negative manner.

Re: Ego

by **Vajra** » Sat Dec 26, 2015 4:24 pm

Dear Hari

As i understand EGO is we ourselves.

Can you say does mind is part of the EGO?

Does the history of this life is part of the ego?

Or Ego is above all that?

Re: Ego

by **Hari** » Sat Dec 26, 2015 4:50 pm

If you use the term "mind" to refer to the thoughts you have, then you have to further clarify if these thoughts are exclusively your creations or they are a product of external influences. When thoughts are your creation alone, then they arise from your conscious awareness and are part of you and thus fit within the self, the "I." If the thoughts are mixed with external elements, then not. The mind, if we were to use the definition of the term as stated by spiritualists influenced by some Indian traditions, is a tool we use to internally organize life, plan actions, make choices and so on. It is the vehicle through which we internally express life, the internal container for that part of our consciousness that directs much of our aware choices. Although we make many involuntary responses, such as when we react to touch or sound, or when we mimic previous responses, these are of a different nature and do not directly correlate with what I consider ego.

Our previous experiences are the foundation upon which we determine our present choices and our future path. These experiences are powerful because they are integrated within our consciousness. However, the history of what happened, when or how it happened, may not be directly related to who we are as much as how we chose to act or were forced to act according to the sum total of previous experiences at that time. This is not ego.

## **Purport of the sacrifice**

by **Drpta** » Tue Nov 17, 2015 8:04 am

Hi Hari,

I have a question. In Bhagavad Gita I am reading 'In the beginning the Lord of all beings, creating men along with the sacrifice, said: 'By this shell you prosper, this shell be the cow of plenty granting all your wants. By this please the gods, and gods will support you. Thus nourishing one another may you obtain the highest good. The gods, pleased by the sacrifice, will bestow on you the enjoyments you desire. He, who enjoys the bounty of the gods without giving them anything in return, is but a thief. Pious men who eat the remnants of sacrifice are freed from all sins. But the sinful ones who cook only for their own sake earn only sin. From food arise all beings, from rain food is produced, from sacrifice comes rain, and sacrifice springs from activity'. (BG 3.10 – 3.14)



So, now, in the reality, we can see that people are having born, rains are going regular, and grains are ripening even in the places where people do not heard what the sacrifice is. And all these indicate that devas are satisfied, but what is the means of their satisfaction? What a sacrifice is performing? What Krishna mean while saying these words about yajna?

And about thieves. The thief is one who has taken, without permission, thing belongs to another and uses it as his own. Are devas idiots? People enjoy the life, getting wealth and prosper without even be thankful to the gods, what to say they do not perform yajna, and gods are giving them more and more pleasures. But according to the Gita these people are thieves and sinners. But world is working properly. What is wrong then? Why gods allow thieves to use stolen things? May be they are not thieves and sacrificial activity is having place on the unconscious level of energetic reciprocation between men and gods? Could you explain the purport of the sacrifice Krsna saying about? And what place the fire yajna has in sacrificial activity?

Re: Purport of the sacrifice

by **Hari** » Sat Nov 21, 2015 9:45 pm

Although I understand the logic in your question, I disagree with your premise and your conclusion. If your premise is that the world is going on properly, or even worse, that things are fine, then we must be reading different news reports. As far as I can see from my limited perspective, humanity has managed to create an environmental disaster unparalleled in the history of the world. Maybe we can do something to revert the coming consequences, but due to greed, ignorance, political intrigue, and a general lack of concern for the future generations, the world in 80-100 years will be so different than it is now that we would consider it unlivable by today's standards. The crisis of misplaced people, the long lasting and deepening effects of downturning economy, the wars, the continual stress that plagues humanity, and the inability to make it better points to a conclusion that nothing is working properly and nothing good will come. The water shortage will increase to the point where drinking water will be the number one valuable resource. I do not need to go on and on, research a little to draw your own conclusions.

Did you think that when we stopped caring about the facility given us by higher authorities that everything would end in a flash of light? The downfall is gradual, accelerating over time, and seemingly inescapable without some serious changes in how people view this world and their place in it.

They say that a rising tide raises all ships. When the tide goes out, all ships fall with it, even the rich, famous, and powerful. Considering this, I conclude that things are going "properly" because this human disregard is causing disaster.

Re: Purport of the sacrifice

by **Drpta** » Sun Nov 22, 2015 9:08 pm

But did you notice that all disasters are falling down on the heads of innocent people who constitute major population on the Earth and pushed to follow certain ideology, often forcedly instilled by different means. And mass media is one of them; I would say it is the main means. Bad news blows up stress, get disturbance and creates polarization in people's minds, people become aggressive. Serials make people stupid and instill them low values or put them into illusion of tale. Alternation of opposite information is amplifying stress. But those who organize all this disorder are only a group of few people who have real power to control. So, all disasters are organized by only few people who want to establish dominance one over another. When

they do it on the level of countries, religions and nationalities we have global disorder. But where these people got their power from to control the entire world? Who and why gave them this power?

But you are right, people are becoming worth, but I think this mainly is a reaction on the policy conducted by governments and values established in society on the base of this policy.

When I said that world is working properly, I mean that global equilibrium between happiness and distress or bad and good is maintained in proper proportion and people are getting desirable results according of their efforts in spite of all “strange” things happening in the world.

Frankly I do not believe in global collapse – environmental or economical or demographical. And the base of this my view is that on the all period of existence of humanity there were regular wars and exploitation of nature, often even more barbarous than nowadays. Existing of the great demons in the past proofs it. In Bhagavatam is described when Narada travelled he saw big mines and quarries where metals were digging out. The Kuruksetra war, when nuclear weapon was used. And bondage was wide spread in that time all over the world. And it was a vedic period when vedic sacrifices were performed regularly! What new we have now? Events have quality to repeat. Was there any even short period of time in the world without war or suffering of the people?

Of course, until recently, people carelessly exploit the nature. But now, after serial big ecological incidents, they become more careful towards the sources they use.

If we take as premise that souls come into this world by their own desire, then all what is happening in the world is for satisfy their desire. Of course if they want to make this world better they have all facilities for doing it too, but they have to be ready to meet a big resistance.

And on this background many wonderful things appear. Child getting birth, people getting married and display great love and care and support of each other. Government tries to take care for citizens by paying pension and other social subsidies, organizes asylums, hospices, clinics. Cities are becoming more clean and comfortable. New technologies appear which make our life more ease and safe. Modern plants are much safer for environment. Development of the science is fascinating. Oil as fuel will lose its importance soon for alternative electric systems appears. And if we accept logarithmical development of civilization then we will meet a big jump soon. But interesting feature I have noticed – time, spent on job is not changing as dramatically as technologies change (but I heard that in EU they want to establish 4-day working week).

The paradox is that even “bad” people have right to be happy and are becoming happy. And the state of happiness is not depends of the means it reached by or the state of the individual. And even means as they are is neutral by its nature. Only our relation to it based on the culture and convictions has meaning and creates our reaction to see or even feel good or bad. Man may be very poor, sick an exhausted but happy if, for example, he heard good news.

And on this background I want to return to the question about the sacrifice mentioned by Krishna in Gita. What kind of sacrifice He means? Did He mean that people, for obtain things, have to sacrifice something what is dear to them, like their time, efforts, energy or desires in form of labor or suffer or penance – physical, mental, emotional etc? And being satisfied, gods in form of phenomena of this world like wealth, power, knowledge, etc. will come to the aspirant? And then, in change, he cares about the source and thus cycle of reciprocation repeats again and again.

*They say that a rising tide raises all ships. When the tide goes out, all ships fall with it, even the rich, famous, and powerful.*

But wise man use tide to rise his ship up from the bank and go to the sea for happy voyage!



Re: Purport of the sacrifice

by **Hari** » Thu Nov 26, 2015 3:42 pm

Ecological degradation falls "down on the heads" of everyone. You try to build your argument on the back of the suffering masses and then you contradict your argument in your 6th paragraph by stating how things are better for everyone. I say that there is good and bad for all people. Some may have more money or power than others, but this does not insure that they are happier, healthier, or live more peacefully. You also acknowledge this. If you want to hear more of what I think about why good things happen to bad people, please listen to the lecture I gave on this topic (which is appropriately named!)

I addressed your question about sacrifice relating to the devas in my last text -- perhaps not obviously enough. The devas regulate nature and the interaction of things and living beings. When one acts within the natural characteristic of this divine energy, making choices that support the existing infrastructure, one is acting in union with the devas. Acting in union with the natural laws creates harmony and good results, whereas acting against these laws creates disharmony and a breakdown of our support systems. "Sacrifice" can be seen as setting aside one's propensity to exploit resources to learn the discipline of living with the awareness to care for the gifts given us.

Re: Purport of the sacrifice

by **Drpta** » Mon Nov 30, 2015 10:53 am

Thank you Hari for the useful explanation. It turns out that "sacrifice" or "sacrificial activity" means we share with devas (or any other beings) care, control and usage of resources we mutually have since we are also responsible for what we use. And in this manner we can reveal our divine nature and become happy. If we do not want to care about what we use we reap fruits of our irresponsibility. So, "care" here is a key word.

Re: Purport of the sacrifice

by **Vajra** » Sat Dec 26, 2015 3:53 pm

Dear Hari

But along with sharing with Devas care control and usage of resources shouldn't we at least recognize them and honor them for their great job?

Re: Purport of the sacrifice

by **Hari** » Sat Dec 26, 2015 3:56 pm

Sure!

## **What happen at the moment of leaving the body**

by **Vajra** » Sun Dec 14, 2014 8:07 am

Dear Hari

The most un-understandable in this life for me and for many others is the moment of departure from this body to another world. Unknown causes fear and anxiety. It seems consciousness is somehow transforming in that moment. You have not only tremendous mystical experience, but also you have direct experience of how death happens.

Could you clarify how disconnection of the material senses is going on in that moment?

And when turning on subtle sight, hearing, taste, and tactile senses?

And whether they exist in such a form as here?

Does he understand where to go and what actually happens at the moment of death?

I thank you in advance for your reply

Re: What happen at the moment of leaving the body

by **Hari** » Wed Dec 17, 2014 5:41 pm

It is impossible to definitively answer this question as it is stated. Every person dies within unique circumstances.

For example, when we are in extreme physical, mental or emotional stress our awareness reduces as we become preoccupied by our pain, confusion, anger, anxiety, frustration and so on. During such times, our capacity to think clearly is severely reduced. Even if someone comes to us to calm us down, we may or may not be able to hear them. Even if the source of stress is removed, it may take hours before we can calm our minds enough to properly deal with the situation.

The physical body dies. The mind continues along with the energy of the person. According to how one dies, the mind can be in a state ranging from absolute terror to extreme peace. Those who die in terror or in any form of unusual stress, remain in that state for some time until it gradually reduces (with or without help). They are afraid of their situation, not eager to contact others, and require assistance to gradually heal. Some are so stressed that they do not even move on to another body and hover in a ghostly state. Those who willingly depart from their body and embrace their future, are aware of their new situation and seek out what to do next. They accept what is offered them -- if someone offers them a helping hand they accept it and go with them -- and are easily able to consider what they should do in a clear state of mind. Sometimes a person might understand they are not moving naturally and reach out to special people to help them move along. Sometimes someone wants to spend time saying goodbye to their friends and relatives who may or may not even know they died.

Consider how the senses are active in the dream state. We see, hear, interact, and feel to some extent while dreaming. How clearly this occurs depends on our consciousness. One who thinks that the senses require to flow through the body will have a harder time to figure out that they can still perceive in the same way. Their confusion keeps them wrapped tightly. Most people can quickly, if not immediately, perceive that the same senses are the gateways of consciousness after the body is dropped. This is natural because the senses are part of our essence, and as our consciousness is always active, so are the senses whether or not one is in a body. Without being in a body, one does not require to sleep and will not become unconscious. OK, maybe one might take a "nap" during a healing period if one is really screwed up, but that is temporarily induced by the post life medical trauma team who are expert at dealing with crazed individuals.

After leaving the body, everything is the same only without the gross form. This means that there is less interference and a clearer consciousness, not limited by one's history within the body. We now have our natural memory of life events that span all lifetimes, unlike our present conscious memory that is restricted in this lifetime to what happens between birth and death.

As far as where one should go, that is obvious, but different for each person. Either you flow towards some light, or through some doorway or into an area, or you are brought there by someone. Only those who die in a really confused state, or who refuse to accept they died, or who have no idea they died, remain bewildered by their situation and therefore cannot go anywhere.

Re: What happen at the moment of leaving the body  
by **Vajra** » Thu Dec 18, 2014 3:45 pm

Thank you very much dear Hari for your so clear answer.  
In this regard i have more questions if you don't mind i would like to ask.

As i understand our present senses is the part of ourself -soul, and they will be with us forever is it correct ?  
In the other realm how is people using the taste sense, does they eat there and if yes what kind of food?  
And last one  
What shall i do here to get to the best places there, from where nobody incarnate again into the gross body?

Re: What happen at the moment of leaving the body  
by **Hari** » Tue Dec 23, 2014 8:56 pm

Consciousness is ever existing. Consciousness is aware and sentient. Awareness and sensory capacity always exists.

There are unlimited "realms" and therefore unlimited foods. The food is different, the process of tasting remains the same.

If your question refers to the "spiritual" world, in the higher realms, and certainly in the highest realms, all the senses work simultaneously in integrated awareness. Experiences are not divided into something that was seen, or something that was heard, and so on. Each experience is perceived with all senses acting in full awareness.

Re: What happen at the moment of leaving the body  
by **kamalamala1** » Wed Dec 24, 2014 9:51 am

Thank you for your answer Hari.  
You know this helped to understand that the other realms is full of real life.  
Not like a shadow.  
But does they need food there as it is here?  
Does they depend on the energy of food as it is here?  
And does there also is so much struggle for food as here people usually have on this planet?

Also here is senses usually acting quite independently they have there needs because of hormones or chemicals and that is why they are pushing people, does in that realms senses similarly pushing living entities to satisfy them independently like here?

Re: What happen at the moment of leaving the body  
by **Hari** » Wed Dec 24, 2014 1:14 pm

There are many "realms." You seem to be speaking about one in particular. Please be specific.

Re: What happen at the moment of leaving the body  
by **kamalamala1** » Wed Dec 24, 2014 3:06 pm

I mean at least 3r ealms  
the realm where common people getting after death.  
Also the realm of Gods.  
And the realm of Vaikuntha.

Re: What happen at the moment of leaving the body  
by **Hari** » Sat Dec 27, 2014 7:38 pm

The transitional place after death requires no food. If one then goes to some other place, one has regular food appropriate to that place, even if the place was created for healing purposes. They need it because all bodies need it, even if the body is a virtual one since the mind of that body is accustomed to eating.

Devas have really good food. They enjoy it. They do not need it as we do here.

In Vaikuntha, they also have really good food. They do not need it at all. They do not need anything.

Re: What happen at the moment of leaving the body  
by **Drpta** » Mon Dec 29, 2014 9:31 am

I wonder who supply food for habitants of deva's worlds and worlds of Vaikuntha? If they are eating, do they wear dress and ornaments? Who make all these stuff? Are there special beings like we have here? And what ingredients they use to make it?

Re: What happen at the moment of leaving the body  
by **Vajra** » Mon Dec 29, 2014 3:06 pm

Dear Hari '

I also want to ad to Drptas question something from me  
What about tactile senses there in that 3 realms, does it like here the same, does people there feel the same feeling of touch, solidity.  
Are there gravity?  
Thank you

Re: What happen at the moment of leaving the body  
by **Hari** » Mon Dec 29, 2014 3:28 pm

Gee, you all think that the realms of the devas are some kind of fantasy! They are as real to them as this world is to us. Why should you doubt this?

Very strange questions!

Re: What happen at the moment of leaving the body  
by **Vajra** » Mon Dec 29, 2014 3:36 pm

Dear Hari

You said exactly very very right thing practically everybody think that devas realms is like a fantasy, that is why we are asking this questions to feel there reality.

Re: What happen at the moment of leaving the body  
by **Hari** » Mon Dec 29, 2014 4:42 pm



Re: What happen at the moment of leaving the body  
by **Vajra** » Thu Jan 08, 2015 11:43 am

Dear Hari!

This realm is based on five elements.

Each element has his quality, let say water is liquid, air is gas and e.t.c

As i know each sense has connection to exact element, let say eye is connected to fire element, ear to ether and e.t.c.

So the question arising do God s let say have the same water and the same air and other elements also as here we have?

Or there water and other elements is different?

Or maybe there realm is made from only ether?

Thank you !

Re: What happen at the moment of leaving the body  
by **Hari** » Sun Jan 18, 2015 1:07 am

I find it hard to speak to a physicist about the elements in other realms because these places are different by definition! We cannot speak with certainty about the nature of these realms. We cannot dissect them and analyze them or create a periodic table of elements for the celestial realm because we have no possibility to do so. Indeed, were we to go there and attempt this, we would be looked at by the residents with amusement.

The celestial realm is solid to those who live there. If a normal resident of earth were to be given a chance to observe the celestial realm, they would see it as a blinding forceful light. That realm exists on another frequency that our bodies cannot handle. The energy there is more powerful, more dense, yet built on different wavelengths. All energy resides within the ether, yet ether is not vaporous as some might imagine. Defining ether as simply the space within which things rest is simplistic and incomplete. Within the ether all energy exists and anyone familiar with energy knows that it can have enormous power, potency and slam us against a wall or dissolve our forms in an instant. How the ingredients within the celestial environment mix and support that realm is beyond our capacity to perceive unless our senses or consciousness was similarly attuned.

Sure they have weather, but not bad weather. Sure they have elements that support their bodies, but these elements are not the same as ours. We cannot analyze them and categorize them because we have no experience of them. Therefore I do not know how you will find answers to your questions before you actual visit that place.

If you are asking a simpler question in an elaborate manner, then I can say that they have a beautiful realm within nature that is harmonically tuned to the residents. Nature supports their sophisticated, cultured, and advanced consciousness by providing the facilities they need and want just as nature provides it to us here. However, there is a qualitative and quantitative difference in nature's vibrational frequency between the celestial realm and our own.

Re: What happen at the moment of leaving the body  
by **Vajra** » Sat Dec 26, 2015 3:33 pm

Dear Hari your answers is so exciting you cannot imagine

I read it again and really enjoyed. after such a long time just reading old scriptures with all religion shapes which is not giving the taste of reality, it is only real answers that i heard  
What you are writing is so alive, so real that i got real desire to go there very much

Thank you very much

## **Love and forgiveness**

by **kamalamala1** » Sat Nov 21, 2015 9:43 pm

Dear Hari

We all know that to get to the space of peace one have to avoid all negative thoughts and negative feelings and emotions and not only towards others but even towards oneself(and it is also important).

And should place in his heart love and forgiveness.

But in life there are sometimes one have to deal with such a rascals and negative persons that it is so hard to forgive them what to speak about love

For small things it is easy to forgive and get out from negative emotions ,but when it serious things it so difficult.

Let say the creatures who are nowadays just making terror to innocent people Or in history let say how one can forgive such a creature like Hitler?

How one can in such situation sent love to rascals and forgive them or should one act in other way to get into the place of peace?

What is that way?

There are the example of Pandavas they was ready to forgive but simultaneously they didn't forgive

Can you say the best way in such a cases to get in the peaceful stage?

Re: Love and forgiveness

by **Hari** » Thu Nov 26, 2015 3:29 pm

Here is the short and simple answer:

If forgiving someone is the key to letting go of the effect they had on you, then by all means forgive them. If you cannot forgive them, or forgiving them is not enough to release the trauma they created, then simply accept what happened and incorporate this acceptance into your life. You may then avoid this person or persons, respond to them with finality, or ignore them entirely and let them drift off into space.

Some things remain with you despite your best efforts. You then have to deal with the lingering lessons or insights these situations continue to cultivate.

## **What kind of lifestyle do you recommend to improve our vibration?**

by **Manojava** » Wed Sep 23, 2015 6:57 pm

Dear Hari, i heard in your lecture that if we want to contact with the divine energy we need to raise our vibration.

I've also heard that the vibrations depend on our lifestyle. What kind of lifestyle do you recommend to improve our vibration?

Re: What kind of lifestyle do you recommend to improve our vibration?

by **Hari** » Mon Sep 28, 2015 5:24 pm



Your question is very general. Please tell me what kind of life style you think would be appropriate? I can comment on your answer.

## **Re: What kind of lifestyle do you recommend to improve our vibration?**

by **Manojava** » Tue Sep 29, 2015 9:37 am

I understand very clearly, that it is individually. In my life, in this period, it seems to me, the following things help me:

1. Reducing the amount of food and relief food, as much as I can do it.
2. Specific activities for the Deities, for example, useful activities for the temple.
3. To fulfill my social responsibilities.
4. Communication with people which vibration is higher than mine.
5. Solitude in nature.
6. Exercise and body care.
7. listening meditative music.

All of this helps me to improve the quality of my contact with the divine energy, when I meditate, communicate with the Deities, chant, sing mantras ...

I am interested in your comments. And also additions.

Also, I'm curious to know your opinion about the four principles (in the tradition of Vaishnavas before Prabhupada) and chanting the mantra a certain number of rounds - what is the importance of certain amount of rounds?

### Re: What kind of lifestyle do you recommend to improve our vibration?

by **Hari** » Tue Sep 29, 2015 5:30 pm

You are a mature adult and an experienced spiritualist. You have already figured out what serves your evolution and what doesn't. You do not need me to comment on your life. Your ideas are fine, but someone else might have come to a different conclusion about what helps them. There are, of course, general principles, but one who is engaged in "our" brand of spiritual life will have already figured this out from listening and reading what "we" have to offer. I quoted the words "our" and "we" because they are defined individually by those who partake in what I present or facilitate.

I do not want to add to your list. If you have listened to my lectures, you might have observed that I have systematically avoided creating "must-do" lists. I do not presume to demand people act or think in a specific manner. Everyone does and thinks what they like in all circumstances anyway. What I do is to assist someone to do what they do better, or to evolve as best they can according to who they are within their sphere of existence.

The famous four regulative principles that you followed previously may or may not have served you well. Only you can say if they were good for you or not. You follow or don't follow them according to your choices. I do not insist that people eat in a particular manner, for example, although I state clearly that I am a vegan and have been for quite some time. I say, "I am a vegan," if someone asks me about eating. If they ask me why, I tell them. If they ask me if they should do that too, I explain the benefits from the health and spiritual point of view as well as the non-violence point of view. If they ask me if they must do it, I reply that it is up to them to choose how to live their lives. I live my life according to my conscience and I do what is best

for me while considering how my actions and choices affect those around me, the environment, or any other factor of significance in each situation. I feel it is far more important for an individual to learn how to make his or her own choices than for me to tell them what choices to make. I can suggest according to a person's particular situation, but telling them what to do is counterproductive and often creates the opposite of what you are trying to achieve.

I have already commented quite extensively about how I feel about certain principles and their consequences and I do not feel like repeating myself here.

Re: What kind of lifestyle do you recommend to improve our vibration?  
by **Manojava** » Wed Sep 30, 2015 11:17 am

Dear Hari, thank you very much for your answer and your mystic support all these years.

## **Your perspective on the current crisis in Europe**

by **Akhila L** » Sun Sep 13, 2015 10:52 am

Dear Hari,

I would like you to comment upon the current situation in Europe. There seems to be a new demographic crisis arising with thousands of people of poorer countries trying desperately to get to Europe using conflicts and tyranny in their own countries as an explanation and the driving force. Most of them come from cultures that will collide with the Western style of life and democratic rules. I see people in my closest vicinity commenting on it, both with some spiritual background and without. What I see is fear behind their opinions. I fear it too. I see people who come to Europe with a very restrictive religious background, with a very restrictive view on women and their role in the society, treating the animals in a horrible way, and not only animals either... I do not like it and I do not like me fearing others. So, I just wanted hear you telling us a few words about it. Best wishes, A

Re: Your perspective on the current crisis in Europe  
by **Hari** » Tue Sep 15, 2015 7:56 pm

The situation is obvious. The fear may or may not be justified; only time will tell. The migration is happening. The result of this will be evident according to the cultural and religious views of the migrants. Considering this, the following is more or less sure to take place:

- 1) The migrants come from cultures where having a large amount of children is normal. This will mean that within a few generations, they will be in the numeric majority in certain areas, and within some time they will be the numeric majority throughout the country.
- 2) The identity of the European countries involved will transform radically. Europe was characterized by the distinctive cultures in each country. These distinctions will blur as a common culture will pervade. Do not expect them to change to fit your European culture. They will find a way to work within your culture, but they will keep their own.
- 3) The religion of the migrants will become the predominating religion of the area.
- 4) Interestingly, Nostradamus predicted that this will happen. People assumed such an "invasion" would mean a military one and dismissed this prediction because such an event

was unlikely. Now we can see that the prediction is true because the "invasion" of migrants will conquer by transforming the population demographic by procreation.

And there is nothing that anyone can do about it except to deny their entry or remove those already there. Considering the moral and ethical bind such actions would create, this is unlikely.

Perhaps the solution can be found by restoring peace in the countries they are leaving?

Re: Your perspective on the current crisis in Europe  
by **Akhila L** » Sat Sep 19, 2015 4:25 pm

Thank you for this analysis.

I did not know that Nostradamus predicted it to happen. I used to read his predictions many years ago but it seemed to me that they could be appropriately interpreted first after the actual events had happened.

I am not sure there is a good possibility to restore peace in these countries. They have a long tradition of either a strong leadership (almost a tyrannic one) without any involvement of religion or almost a fanatical adherence to old religious beliefs with a man-focused dominance and hatred towards other religions. Neither option is optimal although this would end the war. I am spending a few days in Beijing now and remember that everybody was afraid of Chinese some years ago. What I see is a blooming materialistic society, a very modern city, clean, a lot of cars, mostly new ones. And they do not have a democracy. The average people I meet are very nice in the direct contact, modest, always smiling, helpful. This is also very interesting as I expected a country with a strict communistic regime and sad, poor people.

I think people in the Western Europe are paralyzed by the thought of being "bad", "racists", "inhuman" etc. This must be a sort of mass trauma after WWII and feeling guilty for what's happening in these countries.

Thus, a so called religion has become a real problem in the modern world.

## **Help really powerful mystic at the time of death**

by **Manojava** » Thu Sep 10, 2015 4:35 pm

Dear Hari, some gurus promise to his disciples that will be taken they in the spirit world after his death. Could this be true?

And could really powerful spiritual mystic influence on the fate of another person at the time of his death, or after his death?

Re: Help really powerful mystic at the time of death  
by **Hari** » Tue Sep 15, 2015 10:05 pm

Well, when you "some gurus" and you say "really powerful spiritual mystic" I am not sure who you mean. I can answer that yes, "some gurus" or "a really powerful spiritual mystic" can indeed influence the fate of another person at the time of his death or after his death. However, we are speaking here about a VERY select group of EXTREMELY qualified individuals. One or two, or three, I do not know, might exist now. I do not wish to speak about what any one person can or cannot do. But in these rare cases, yes it is possible.

The act of modifying the location of the departed entity requires a full command of the science behind it. The mystic has to be fully aware of the universal realms and the energy that supports them.

The term mystic is general but one who is capable of doing this is someone who can connect energetically to a person regardless of where they are in energetic space and who has the power to gather their energy and send it somewhere they desire. They must have a connection with the place they want to send this person to and be allowed to do this by those who are in that space or manage that space. They also have to have a good reason to do this act for it means modifying the destiny of an individual. Of course, who can say it was not the destiny of that individual to be so favored by this powerful person?

Re: Help really powerful mystic at the time of death  
by **Manojava** » Wed Sep 16, 2015 7:25 pm

Thank you.

*You wrote: "They also have to have a good reason to do this act for it means modifying the destiny of an individual".*

Please, explain - what may be "good reasons"?

Re: Help really powerful mystic at the time of death  
by **Hari** » Thu Sep 17, 2015 11:45 am

Like:

- \* They were friends, or the person cared for them
- \* They are important to the world
- \* They are being inspired by higher authorities to do so

Re: Help really powerful mystic at the time of death  
by **Manojava** » Thu Sep 17, 2015 4:11 pm

- \* They were friends, or the person cared for them

Do You mean "the person cared for them" as a spiritual guide and teacher?

Re: Help really powerful mystic at the time of death  
by **Hari** » Thu Sep 17, 2015 10:52 pm

In any manner.

## **SPIRITUALITY WITHOUT BELIEVE SYSTEM**

by **kalamala1** » Sun Aug 23, 2015 10:44 am

Dear Hari

I have a question.

Whether we have a belief system or not Life itself is spiritual isn't it?  
But we need goals explanations and values.

Is it possible to practice spirituality without belief system?

Re: SPIRITUALITY WITHOUT BELIEVE SYSTEM

by **Hari** » Mon Aug 24, 2015 12:40 pm

**SCREAMING CAPITALS!**

Everyone has beliefs. We make assumptions based on these beliefs and from these assumptions come expectations. No one can avoid this.

Everyone accepts that life exists. Disagreements come when we define "life." On the surface, the idea that life is spiritual seems to be quite opposite to the idea that life arises from a combination of atoms. The new idea that life, or rather, consciousness is a product of a simulation interests us because the chasm between believers in matter or spirit might be bridged by it. When consciousness itself is the focus, the conversation centers on what is consciousness rather than what is life. Scientific minds have a harder time grappling consciousness because it is beyond atomic structure. What better way for a rationalist to embrace a non-material consciousness than to push it into the realm of virtual reality created by a super computer or super artificial intelligence? Although virtual reality is a combination of positively or negatively charged particles that create bits and bytes that are manipulated to create structure, as soon as you add the possibility to manipulate organic elements into molecules, the idea that the computer is organic changes the entire discussion. They are already creating organic storage media and using primitive life forms within computers. In time, organic computers will appear that are far more powerful than what we have now. Even if these organic computers can create viable bodies, the consciousness that we have can enter these bodies in the same way life reproduces now. Maybe newer life forms will appear too?

I think it is good that this development occurs because at one point it will either appear that the consciousness of life can be created by manipulation or that it cannot. No longer will discussions about belief have relevance. Until that time, you have your belief system based on your experiences and a rationalist has their conception based on logic. I think we can live in peace together with those who have a different idea and feed each others development. And when it is shown that the other's idea is correct, accept it. "I am right and you are wrong," may make you feel good about yourself, but it doesn't change someone else. If you are indeed correct, eventually others will see it. And if they do not, you cannot change that anyway.

Although we should not absorb ourselves in spiritual concepts if we do experience spiritual energy, many accept spirituality because it purports to give them an easy way out of their troubles. Such persons have a fragile belief system that can be shattered. If we experience spiritual energy and divine consciousness, we will not be persuaded by opposing concepts or logic.

**Deities**

by **Prisni** » Tue Aug 18, 2015 6:54 am

I have my own deities of Radha-Krishna.

I don't feel them as 'home deities' or like that word implies, but rather they are mine and I am theirs, with a kind of energy connection between me and them. It is not something I need to meditate in any special way about, it is there all the time. Sometimes I feel it stronger, and can feel it energizes my heart (chakra), at other times it is more distant.

When the energy connection grows stronger, I cry or laugh or dance or sing, and feel ecstasy, when it gets weaker my life gets more ordinary.

It makes life kind of crazy.

Do you have anything about what goes on?

Re: Deities

by **Hari** » Fri Aug 21, 2015 3:54 pm

Hey Prsni, nice to hear from you again.

What is happening seems to me to be quite normal. So, "Carry on!"

All is well!

## **How to die properly**

by **Drpta** » Tue Jul 28, 2015 7:22 pm

Hi Hari,

I wanted to ask you a question. How should man die properly? I mean that for example Bhishma was waiting the moment when sun is going to north. Or Krsna in BG is saying "what man is thinking about before death there he goes". But only ones are dying being in sane and clear consciousness. Millions are dying being mad or suffering enormous or too suddenly. Since all of us should leave this body once, I wanted to ask you to clarify this moment. Should we somehow (and how?) prepare ourselves for the death? Or it is not the matter how we die, because whether or no we will get the place where we came from (as Newton writes)?

Re: How to die properly

by **Hari** » Tue Aug 04, 2015 1:21 pm

Bhishma was a very special personality who was lying on a bed of arrows in the middle of a horrific battlefield. No one else can die as he did. Using him as an example of how to die will not assist our passing from this realm.

We are who we are and everything we have experienced in this life creates our aggregate consciousness at any given moment. We do not suddenly become someone or something else. We make gradual shifts and changes according to our experiences. Each of us die in our own way. Those who die traumatically will leave their body differently than those who die in their sleep or those who fade away on their death bed. Regardless, that aggregate of who we are does not radically change in this one moment. We continue on our path when we leave this body according to the momentum we generated in this life.

Some people express great devotion to God at their end. This is not a sudden thing. They had that feeling all along. Maybe those around them never knew it, but devotion does not suddenly appear out of nowhere, especially if there is a sudden trauma. They reach out to the one person they have always counted on throughout their lives. Other people express great fear at death and they scream for mercy from God. I cannot say if they get it or not, but who they are does not change because of their fear.

And yes, we all go where we are supposed to. No one can change that. You can get there kicking and screaming or you can go peacefully. Our options are limited to how we choose to express our last communication and how we accept what is happening to us. Eventually, we end up in the same place.

Re: How to die properly

by **Drpta** » Thu Aug 06, 2015 9:02 pm

*[We continue on our path when we leave this body according to the momentum we generated in this life.]*

Well said! And it seems that shocks, challenges or radical changes in our life are good amplifiers of the momentum. As well as love and continuous thinking.

But still, if I in sane consciousness and death is inevitable (for example if I in the falling airplane), what the best thing I have to do? Or if old man is consciously going away for die, how should he prepare himself for this event? Are, for example, states from Bhagavatam useful in this case (where it says that I should dissolve elements of my body one in another and so on...)? Conscious depart this life... Please do not mean I want to suicide.

By the way, I still cannot understand clear enough, why self-murders are so condemned in all cultures? There are may be many reasons to interrupt this life before the terrible end, isn't it?

Re: How to die properly

by **Hari** » Fri Aug 07, 2015 10:00 pm

I think that you are not phrasing this in the best way. When one is not dying, one sometimes considers death and the best way to face it, but when one is dying, your response to this trauma has nothing to do with your plan or even your desires. It is automatic and flows from your consciousness. For example, if you are totally dedicated to your deities and death seems imminent, you will naturally depend on them, communicate with them, and propel your consciousness to them. This is the organic conclusion of your consciousness that has matured during your life.

If you make a plan on how to die best, you might just do the same thing as you always did in life. If you are devoted to God during your life, you will aim for God at the time of death. If not, then you will find your consciousness mixed with whatever emotions are relevant to your desires throughout life. What you cultivate in life, you continue to grow towards in death. Zucchini seeds make zucchini plants that make zucchinis! If you plant zucchini seeds but plan to get potatoes from them, you will be disappointed. What you sew, you reap later on. There is no mystery about it.

To die best means to live as good as you can. I recommend continuing to cultivate your Godliness, your divinity, and deepen your connection to the divine beings. And when you die, you will turn to them with focused attention because you are well aware that no other personality can assist you.

Re: How to die properly

by **Drpta** » Tue Aug 11, 2015 10:11 am

Yes, you are absolutely correct. We may plan things such and such but when it happens with us in reality we often find that our plan is failed. I have one funny example. Sometimes I think that I can stand any pain or torture. But yesterday I burned my finger. Not too bad but bubble appeared and I was jumping of pain and all my self-confidence disappear in one moment! What a big difference between what we are thinking (even if we already have some experience or knowledge) and what it really is!

*I recommend continuing to cultivate your Godliness, your divinity, and deepen your connection to the divine beings.*

Yes, I feel that I should somehow arrange my life to intensify my spiritual practice...

Re: How to die properly

by **Drpta** » Fri Aug 14, 2015 5:44 pm

*[I recommend continuing to cultivate your Godliness, your divinity, and deepen your connection to the divine beings.]*

How you recommend doing this? I mean what the most effective tools or means should be used for the cultivation? What is the best way to develop devotion to God?

Re: How to die properly

by **Hari** » Sat Aug 15, 2015 7:40 pm

But that is what we do here on this site! Lectures, meditations, advice and so on. If that is not enough for you, add some other things to it!

## **Servant or Son and Dother**

by **kamalamala1** » Tue Jun 16, 2015 6:10 pm

Dear Hari

In many religions it is stated that we spirit souls are the servants of Gods.

But this servant and master relations is not (in our life at least) based on real love ,more it based on fear.

But the idea that God really love us more then any person can imagine is more close to the idea that we are there sons or daughters.

Since anyway we are really His parts.

So the question arising are we the servants or we are there sons and daughters?

For me personally is more dear( applicable) the idea of being there son.

Re: Servant or Son and Dother

by **Hari** » Mon Jun 22, 2015 12:40 am

I do not consider myself a servant in the usual negative sense of the term and neither as a son or daughter of the Supreme. I am always ready to render them service where and when it is needed, as I express love in that way.

But if you wish to think of yourself as a son, then why not? I recommend that you find yourself in relation to their lordships in the most compatible manner. After all, considering yourself in some relation with God is not as powerful as experiencing it. So find out what is and live in that truth. There is no need to create some concept before then. If you experience the relationship, you will feel comfortable in it.

Re: Servant or Son and Dother

by **kamalamala1** » Thu Jul 02, 2015 3:57 pm

From the other side we are so much depend from outside forces

(i mean that all processes in our body doesn't at all controlled by us) that i am inclined to think that we are puppets in the hands of God.

At least in this life.



Re: Servant or Son and Dother

by **Hari** » Tue Jul 07, 2015 12:10 am

A wise person once said to me, "Act as if everything depended entirely on you, but know full well it doesn't." This means that we should act with full consciousness, full mindfulness, and with focused attention to induce the best result we can. However, although we are trying hard to accomplish our goals, we are aware that ultimately everything is in the hands of the higher authorities and forces that permeate this universe.

## **Bhagavat Gita**

by **kamalamala1** » Sun May 17, 2015 4:08 am

Dear Hari

Since in our evolutionary process we get knowledge by different ways, scriptures definitely also is the main part of the source of that knowledge.

So it is natural that what we read in them, we want to correspond with our reality and try to understand the deep meaning.

From the other side as you said nobody knows that this is original scriptures and is not twisted by many rewriters in 1000 years in a way they want.

In this regard a few questions arising in this case with some statements in Bhagavat Gita and i decided to ask it to you since you have great experience and very clear understanding of the issue.

Lord Krishna said that if one eat food not offered to him (to God) he eats sin

The process of eating is one of the main ways to contact the outside energy since practically it is only process where we are taking something from out side and putting it inside our body and seem not only physical body. Of course we also get so many energies from information canals but still

So it is a big question since every time when i eat let say the apple i think that it is not proper that i didn't offer it to Lord but from the other side this making the process of offering wrong.

Can you say what can mean this statement in truth, and it is so that one should not eat anything without offering to God?

Re: Bhagavat Gita

by **Hari** » Tue May 19, 2015 2:23 pm

Perhaps the discussion should center on defining the word "offer"? Your question seems to relate to your understanding from the "good old days." If you think the only way to make an offering is to bring a plate before a deity in a temple and ring a bell and so on, then your eating an un-offered apple will cause you stress. However, if you feel connected to God when you will pick up that apple and wonder at the marvelous gift you have been given to eat, you will feel grateful. I think the real offering is feeling grateful for the gifts you are given and to express that gratitude in your words and actions. After all, if someone mindlessly cooks some food and someone else mindlessly offers it, is it really offered? Is the process of sacrifice simply a formula without mindfulness or is it an act of devotion that comes from the heart with feeling? You know the answer.

"All that you do and all that you eat should be done as an offering to me." And there you have it.

Re: Bhagavat Gita

by **Vajra** » Thu May 28, 2015 10:26 pm

Dear Hari

You so nicely explained what can the word offer mean, and i agree with you totally that it is the best meaning in this case

But what can the word sin mean in this statement in Bhagavad Gita?

Why food which is not offered to God becoming sin?

And what is in general sin?

Re: Bhagavat Gita

by **Hari** » Sat May 30, 2015 9:33 am

Sin is a Christian term. Why bother defining it?

Eastern conceptions of karma consider the effects of actions as bringing negative or positive results. The negative result referred to in this text means that mindless eating will burden one with the weight of the food. Food eaten without consideration of the "offering" defined above, will be without positive benefit and will bring negativity.

Re: Bhagavat Gita

by **kamalamala1** » Tue Jun 16, 2015 11:55 am

Dear Hari

In this regard appearing a general question .

Are there any shlokas in Bhagavad Gita written as spoken by Lord Krishna which is not actually said by Lord Krishna but concocted by Brahmanas when they made there editions?

Could it be that some shlokas just concocted by Brahmanas in later times?

Re: Bhagavat Gita

by **Hari** » Mon Jun 22, 2015 12:35 am

I cannot answer that question. I have no idea.

## **Godhead and His Supreme Personality**

by **Drpta** » Mon Jan 12, 2015 10:49 am

Hi Hari,

if you consider this topic is for good old days, move it down there, please.

In Indian religious traditions there are a huge variety of avatars and expansions of God. And some traditions consider that Krishna is supreme but another convinced that Rama for example is supreme and another is saying that Visnu is supreme. I am just wondering where it have appeared from such an idea of supreme or highest personality of Godhead? If there is highest so it means that there are also lowest and middle ones, isn't it? Or they mean that all creation is God and we are also personalities of God but the essence of God is His supreme personality?

And from said above such a question arises: why are you saying that namely Radha and Krishna are the Supreme but not another Divine couple? You said in your answer here <http://www.harimedia.net/forum/viewtopic.php?f=2&t=967> that it might be mostly a matter of faith we feel best with. Can we expand this statement and say that the personality of God we are choosing as the Supreme is a matter of our faith and tradition? Then whether it means that God depends from what we believe?

Could you clarify these points please?

P.S. There is a language problem appeared when I was trying to name the topic. Godhead is neither he or she nor it. What to do?

Re: Godhead and His Supreme Personality

by **Hari** » Sun Jan 18, 2015 12:10 am

God is God. There is little use in declaring God to be the Supreme. Do we make God the Supreme by our declaration? Or is this statement meant to convince someone else that God is the Supreme? Convincing others is a part of theology, but God being the Supreme has little importance to me in everyday life. What have I gained by saying that the person above all others is the highest? I already knew this and God already knows this. If we see this statement in the context of defining ourselves as lowly and fallen, then God is the great highest force and we are the lowly force. That highest force is over us at all times and we should not forget it. And to make sure we do not forget it, we require to compare our highest force with someone else's highest force so that we can declare boldly and once and for all that our God is the best God. These ideas make religions what they are. The idea that God is the Supreme cannot be wrong, but it does not truly improve our lives. Sometimes it even creates conflict or war.

Philosophies require concepts to discuss and argue about. If you are a philosopher, then it is important for you to list the various forms of God you know about and categorize them. This is what philosophers do. If you are a mystic, you find God wherever God appears and you embrace that appearance whenever you find it. You do not worry that the deities in your temple are somehow less than the real God in the sky (who is up there somewhere). You accept the energy of the deities, their love, care and connection and embrace them. Sakti saktiman abheda (if I can remember the sanskrit after all these years, "Energy and the energetic source are non-different")

You can always discuss with someone if you must and certainly you will present your understanding in a proper manner. If you can find God anywhere, accept that. Do not worry for a second that the God you found is not the supreme highest form of all forms and does not look exactly as some painting says He She should look! Feel God! This is superior to memorizing definitions of God. Experience always trumps knowledge for there is never a better form of knowing a person than feeling their energy. Feeling does not depend on faith and has little concern for tradition. Yet, speaking about God helps focus our attention on the divine and the more personally you speak, the greater your feeling for God grows. This feeling forges a strong connection with God.

Is God a He, or a She, or a He She? Or should we say, God Is? Or at one point do we stop relating to these personalities who we love with our heart and soul by their category and simply see them as they are, feel them as they are, and love them as they are, as they love us as we are?

I have a real hard time with commenting on words such as "The Supreme." This phrase does not speak to me. Neither am I inspired by speaking about the highest, most powerful, or the greatest this and that. Yes, yes, but so what if I cannot be with them?

Re: Godhead and His Supreme Personality  
by **Drpta** » Mon Feb 02, 2015 9:47 am

*[If you are a mystic, you find God wherever God appears and you embrace that appearance whenever you find it.]*

This statement is very consonant with my mood in understanding of God now. But I have a kind of natural gravitation to Indian culture and this is a little confusing me since I want to have something universal, do not limited with traditions.

In this connection I have a question. It is about of the worlds for representatives of different religions.

There are a variety of religions and each one has its own understanding of God with different names, for example Allah, Yahweh, Krishna or any other. Each proclaims its God is supreme. But it is obvious that there is only one God. Then can we suppose that God assumes a certain form according to belief system of certain religion? Besides that each religion supposed that there are special worlds, realms and planets, different for every religion, where the followers of respective beliefs are going to after death of this body. If it is so, who creates that worlds? Are they real? Is there an evolution in those worlds, which are highest for respective religion?

And the main question: is there an absolute world which exists independently from our beliefs, where the personality(s) of God is residing in its independent pure form (if it has such a form)?

Can I say that according to my faith I can create my own spiritual world where God appears in most acceptable for me form? Does it mean that ISCKON for example already has created its own spiritual world according with its values?

Re: Godhead and His Supreme Personality  
by **Hari** » Sat Feb 07, 2015 10:33 pm

This question is asked by many, especially now. Maybe something woke up in people and gave them a glimpse of how spirit works?

I remember once in Mayapur. Prabhupada was napping outside on a rocking chair in the hallway where he stayed. He woke up and said, "I just saw the heavenly planet where pious Muslims go after death!"

Every religion has their own unique conception of God and a theology that includes the other aspects of their religion, including the different places one goes under specific circumstances. Everything makes sense to the believers of that religion. Sometimes they each think their conception is the best and others have no idea. This conviction assists them to deepen their beliefs.

If God is limitless, the ways God can be approached are limitless. If God is personal, then He or She or It or Whatever (again, all according to your belief system) can approach you, you can approach God, and a communication can take place, energy exchanged, and salvation-liberation-rewards can be received.

I do not bother too much with trying to present what I say in a universal manner since I know that I can never please everyone all the time. I too resonate with the culture of the east and find it very comfortable, but I can also easily adjust my language to accommodate other's conceptions. I do not want to do that all the time, though, as it interferes with my personal devotion. When I am in my own temples, I am entirely within my own tradition and never consider others or their vocabulary.

Whenever someone drags the word absolute into a conversation, I internally head for the hills! As soon as that big gun is rolled onto the battlefield, the booming explosions, shouts of valor, and the righteous declarations of devoted followers appear. I am not a fan of the word. I am a fan of God, or as I would speak of them, Radha and Krsna, and all their expansions regardless of where they are in the universe. I do not think in absolute terms. I used to think more in absolute terms when I was younger, but my aging has made it almost impossible to even listen to a conversation based on this word.

God can do whatever, whenever, and however. No limits. And yet God can create self-limitations for pleasure, for a purpose, or to facilitate an individual's development. God can be independent, dependent or work cooperatively. Having said that, I have no problem with dealing with God in the manner to which I have grown accustomed over the years. I just skip thinking about God as absolute and supreme and almighty and so on.

Re: Godhead and His Supreme Personality  
by **Akhila L** » Tue Feb 10, 2015 9:32 pm

This is a very nice explanation and very personal declaration. I think the key word might be "self-limitations". In my experience, you appreciate somebody more when you lose them. Or even things and objects. It is somewhat difficult to appreciate persons and things we have. Maybe Radha and Krishna play that game with us? Just an idea that comes back again and again when I think about it.  
By the way, They are ABSOLUTELY fantastic. And supremely humorous.

Re: Godhead and His Supreme Personality  
by **Drpta** » Sun May 03, 2015 11:30 am

Hi Hari,

Can I say that God has created us for the purpose to experience the moment of suddenness thru the oblivion of the knowledge and for experience the efforts and other difficulties thru being limited? And for this purpose He has manifested Himself as the limited living beings who does not have omnipotence, and who are His form for experience the life in the limited state? And maybe it is better to say that we are neither limited but not-omnipotent since limitations can be removed or overcome but not-omnipotence is the quality. So everyone is able acting limitlessly by using qualities he has.

So, in this way we have us as embodied Brahman, whose embodiment has one set of qualities and other personalities, who are Brahman's embodiment with another set of qualities. The "others" I mean those who are known as Supreme Personality of Godhead and His tattva. Of course there are a huge variety of another species and energies with their respective qualities.

Why I am asking all of these—it is because the conclusion is that we are also Personalities of God with all issuing consequences. And all dividing on lowest and highest, superior and inferior is absolutely useless in this light. In this regard I may say that all is Brahman's manifestation. Is it impersonalism? Nope! It is, I think, highest degree personalism based on natural, free and

pure relationships with others and with so called God too (saying with care), without any artificial definitions.

Please correct me if my considerations are wrong?

Re: Godhead and His Supreme Personality

by **Hari** » Tue May 05, 2015 7:17 pm

Only God can say if you are wrong! It is how you feel now. Later on, if you are inclined, you can modify your statement to fit your updated experience.

Who am I to state that creation is a certain way? I can only give my opinions. You can accept or reject my opinions based on your experience and inclination. Therefore, to ask me to

approve or disapprove your ideas is not really relevant, I think. But maybe I am wrong?



Re: Godhead and His Supreme Personality

by **Drpta** » Wed May 06, 2015 11:00 am

It is coming out that there are nothing absolute in the creation? Everything is very relative and depends on how I fill and experience world around me?

Re: Godhead and His Supreme Personality

by **Hari** » Thu May 07, 2015 6:41 pm

Anything created can be destroyed and before that it can be modified. Therefore, it is not absolute. Laws, principles, structures, and the like always exist and assist us to delineate and define our lives. Anything that affects us will by definition depend on how we feel and experience it. This is common sense.

If you wish to speak about God and creation, your opinions have validity. You can either accept statements from religious literature, if you are so inclined to believe them, or you can try to figure it out on your own. It seemed to me that you were attempting to make sense of a difficult subject that is not adequately addressed in religious traditions. Since you are speculating according to your feelings and experiences, I encouraged your process.

If you wish me to state definitively, "It is so," I shall not do that because I cannot definitively state anything regarding the motive of God. I can only give my opinion and why is my opinion so much more important to you than your own?

As far as why we are here, I spoke about this at length in one of my lectures concerning our feeling not good enough. I consider this the primary reason we are in this world.

Your question started with the words, "Can I say..." and to this I answer definitively, of course you can say it. Whether it is true or not remains to be seen. People will discuss the issue, arguments will take place, and everyone will go home thinking exactly what they thought when the process started despite their expression that they will listen to someone else's answer and accept it, unless, of course, they are surrendered souls who just believe what they hear without questioning it or doubting it. I am not one of them and neither are you. So I answered as I did.

Re: Godhead and His Supreme Personality

by **Drpta** » Fri May 08, 2015 10:21 am

*[It seemed to me that you were attempting to make sense of a difficult subject that is not adequately addressed in religious traditions.]*

Yes, you are absolutely right. And one of the issues is if we are divine by nature then why must popular religions are making accent on that we are always somehow less divine than God? If one of the reasons we are here is that we once felt we are not good enough, so how we may return to the God (if we must) if we are going on to cultivate this state? This is religiously absurd.

And therefore recently I attempted to explore my divinity and have found that it is really a wonderful state to experience your divine nature. In this state I saw things, world and people in absolutely different light and find that in this state more ease to have contact with divine beings. And besides I felt and saw Krishna at an absolutely new view—deeper and closer. I think the cause of this phenomenon is that the nature I started to perceive myself becomes more close to the nature of divine beings and God. In other words I find a new frequency to have contact with them.

*Since you are speculating according to your feelings and experiences, I encouraged your process.*

You know, the reason I am looking for your “approval” is what I am doing now is very opposite to what is accepted in religious teachings and what is instilled to us in ISKCON especially (this is for another special topic). And sometimes I am even becoming afraid when “blasphemous” ideas are coming to my mind. But the experience I am having is, as a rule, ever worthwhile. So in these my investigations I sometimes need some support from people who I consider as authority. And your opinion, as a more experienced and authoritative person, is very important to me. But it does not mean that I am just blindly accepting all what you are saying. And it is not that I wish you say “It is so”, I just need a beacon for be sure I don’t get lost and did not go to the wrong side.

Actually I want to say that you helped me very much to make a very great advance. I am very much obligated to you.

## **Do we need a religion?**

by **Drpta** » Wed Mar 04, 2015 11:37 am

Hi Hari!

I am thinking now, many common people around us are followers of any kind of religion and all of us are victims of traditions. Many of people want to have any place for the sole rest. And they are not very desirous to perform any complex practices to achieve it. So his existing religion and traditions is in much degree respond his desires.

Of course, we can criticize the religions as long as we want, but it looks like we need them? Even you, in spite of your “out of religion” teaching, are saying that you like the eastern tradition. So, what should a man do if from the one hand he likes the religion and tradition he belongs, but from the other hand he wants become more aware than bounds of religion and tradition allow him?

When Buddha starts his teaching, his ideas were very new, pure and attractive but in course of time it appears as Buddhism. Do not you afraid that your teaching someday also becomes a religion with Hinduism’s incline?

But I think the religion, if it is not conservative but is ever evolving according of time, needs and degree of awareness of people, might be quite useful and helpful for people. What do you think? If word "religion" is derived from Latin "religare" which means "to reconnect", so it is very close to word "yoga".

Re: Do we need a religion?

by **Hari** » Wed Mar 04, 2015 11:59 pm

The most significant problems with religions are their institutionalization. Religion is best tasted near or at the time when their prophets shared their sublime realizations with the people around them. Before distortions appear, before politics, exploitation, or structures appear, religion has the most power. Institutions require money, management, priorities, self-preservation, and many other layers to justify their existence. Before these institutions appear, people are concerned with the ideals and energy of the teachings and are most connected to the goal of the religion.

And yet, without structure religion tends to fade away. For example, I highly doubt that anything I teach will become a religion because I have not created a structure within which a religion can take birth. Since there are very few young people involved in what I do, most likely after I die and the rest of us die, what we are doing will merge into history. For me to "save" what I am doing I have to create temples and proselytize so younger people can join and continue the process. I would require to create structures that are managed and financed. Wherever there is management and finance, all the bad things surrounding religion appear. This is catch 22. Damned if you do, damned if you don't.

Essence, however, transcends all this. Essence is universal, eternal, and always relevant to all people at all times and places. Ideas tend to last, so if I can present ideas that are good enough to last the ravages of time, I could consider myself a success. But I will not know it because I will be long gone.

I take great risk by avoiding the standard formula of institutionalized theology. I get periodically depressed thinking that few have understood the depths of what I have presented. Despite the universality of what I speak about, its subtle nature and simplicity require an audience free from the complex knots of behavioral modification.

What Buddha, or any other great prophet, said is only as significant as how it was recorded in history and how it was interpreted by his followers. The main problem is faithfully recording the main teachings in their original context and insuring these gifts are preserved by subsequent followers. This is rarely done because institutions tend to be an elephant's foot on the flower of a prophet's inspirational energy.

Re: Do we need a religion?

by **Drpta** » Sun Mar 22, 2015 2:25 pm

See, there is yoga or teaching of connection with Divine and a religion which uses this yoga as a kind of instrument. I think it is quite enough to have the yoga. Until and if this yoga works it will be alive. So the purpose is to make teaching popular by presenting it to people in form they can accept. For this purpose, as I think, we do not need to mold any religion or institution.

You wrote:

*I get periodically depressed thinking that few have understood the depths of what I have presented.*



Maybe it is a sign that your teaching is too exalted and acceptable for very narrow circle of people who are already trained and ready enough to deal with it? Maybe we need to develop any methods for beginners for prepare and involve them gradually?

*For me to "save" what I am doing I have to create temples and proselytize so younger people can join and continue the process. I would require to create structures that are managed and financed.*

Temples or places for getting together. For example, if I will build my own private temple with Deities and invite people and make meditations and lectures what you do in Saint-Petersburg temple, in manner how I understand it, do I need to be belonged to or be a part of your religious structure? I am sure that I do not. So, I do not see any problem at all, if people, who understand you, will preach and open private temples out of any structure. The problem is how to urge them to do it.

Re: Do we need a religion?

by **Hari** » Mon Mar 23, 2015 2:12 pm

I can easily develop a method that goes from the start to a very high level, however, I am not the best person to teach a beginning method. Teaching the beginning is something that others can do and must do. I could, hypothetically, teach those who had the capacity to go from the beginning to a high level within a reasonably short period of time. I can also teach those who will teach others. I am fairly good at that!

I am good at teaching teachers. I am also good at developing a curriculum. I have already done this to a large degree, including the discipline required to attain a high level of spiritual awareness. I can advise and design structures and communities. But none of these contributions mean anything unless they are supported by people or groups who find my assets useful. I cannot initiate this but I can participate in an organization created and maintained by committed individuals.

How one defines my contribution depends on many factors. It does not have to be labelled religion or yoga. How it appears depends to a large extent on who will receive what is given and how they share with those who teach. No effort can continue without some form of compensation for efforts. Arrangements need to be made to accommodate reciprocation. Support must come economically, so the structures created can continue, but money is a small part of the equation. Interested, enthusiastic people are worth far more, for where such people congregate, everything else follows.

Religion, per se, is not required. However, a shared, mutually beneficial identity is required for people to assemble in a coherent, sustainable, dynamic group. This includes a teaching, a culture, and a social interaction within an economically sustainable structure.

Re: Do we need a religion?

by **Drpta** » Mon Mar 23, 2015 7:35 pm

*I can easily develop a method that goes from the start to a very high level*

Certainly, it will be super if you develop such a method with curriculum which people can use to teach others. I think that many people dream about to have such a course even for their own practice and if you compose it then they appreciate it very much. I think that right now we have a good time to prepare to our main future activity!

Re: Do we need a religion?

by **Akhila L** » Sun Mar 29, 2015 3:35 pm

"Religion, per se, is not required. However, a shared, mutually beneficial identity is required for people to assemble in a coherent, sustainable, dynamic group. This includes a teaching, a culture, and a social interaction within an economically sustainable structure."

How relevant in this context is master-student relationship? The word "master" is one of the most favorite words ever used in religion. It makes the student accept the leadership in an almost blind manner. It can be seen in all the great religions, Indian traditions included. I read somewhere that the real "spiritual" masters are more like guardians not authorities or absolute reference point, they do not own their students but rather offer them help and assistance when the student needs it. I guess that the "quality" of the master (or guardian) depends very much on how close to the essence he is himself.

Institutions are good for prestige and practical aspects but usurping the role of absolute source of truth they are at high risk of being hated if they fail to keep the high standard (as the Catholic church, ISKCON, you name it ...). From absolute love to absolute hate there is only a narrow step.

I hope you do not mind these few words of comments. Please, share your thoughts on it.  
Best wishes,  
A

Re: Do we need a religion?

by **Hari** » Fri Apr 24, 2015 10:47 pm

Hmmm. The word "master" has so many connotations associated with it that discussing this in depth requires far more energy than I can muster right now.

Master-student? Yikes! How about teacher-student? Sounds better, is more realistic, less demanding, and it reflects an open interaction where someone who knows something can share it with someone else without complications.

Maybe a better phrase to represent someone who guides you through your life is a mentor? Mentors are nice people.

Please do not throw religion into this stew as it will ruin its flavor. Sure, we need something to encourage our evolution, but I am not sure what it is we need or why we need it. Spiritual people getting together and sharing their love and devotion for the Supreme is nice. But when one seen as better than the other, or worse, if one is categorized as better when they are actually not so, the association goes sour.

Imagine a spiritual group that does not have a structure that creates better and worse or needs a lot of money? Imagine a group that is not dedicated to its own survival and growth? Just people getting together and doing something spiritual and enjoying the atmosphere! Is it possible?

Re: Do we need a religion?

by **Akhila L** » Sat May 02, 2015 9:13 am

Thank you for this commentary.

I just watched a few Harry Potter's films with my daughter (who loves them) and realized that the school portrayed in the film has "teachers" and "students", although not all the teachers are very nice. Interestingly, the bad guy in the film, Voldemort, calls himself a master. Even more interestingly, in science, when you meet older and more experienced peers you used to call them "mentors". At an advanced level in science, there are no masters, not even teachers, people exchange their thoughts and ideas in a more or less free way. I always wonder why we do not have the same situation in the spiritual circles? Maybe we ourselves tend to create this idolatry to feel safe?

I do not like institutions, especially the religious ones. I do not feel comfortable with religious ceremonies of any kind. But this is me.

I prefer meeting people who share the same interests in life but they are not so many.

"Imagine a spiritual group that does not have a structure that creates better and worse or needs a lot of money? Imagine a group that is not dedicated to its own survival and growth? Just people getting together and doing something spiritual and enjoying the atmosphere! Is it possible?"

I understand exactly what you mean. Is it possible? You said yourself that we are creators of our lives and the world we live in. Maybe this is what we are doing now? I've noticed (monitoring Facebook activities and other media) that the global consciousness among especially younger people is changing. I am amazed how some of them are determined to change the fate of animals, how they respond to different atrocities that we experience nowadays. Interestingly, the well-established and organized religious organizations are not the ones who care most. Sometimes quite the opposite, actually. They are more interested in promoting their idols and the way of life they think is the only one that counts. Once again, I strongly sympathize with your words and can only agree.

Re: Do we need a religion?

by **kamalamala1** » Mon May 04, 2015 8:54 am

While I was reading Hari's answer the question arises.

What is real spirituality?

But I got in youtube this very detailed lecture about it.

It is so nicely presented this issue in that video that I decided to share it.

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LmvE3eQJORI>

Re: Do we need a religion?

by **Hari** » Thu May 07, 2015 6:44 pm

Thank you for finding out where I discussed this in a lecture. It saves me a lot of trouble. Most of the time, I have discussed things in lectures. After all, that is why I gave them! I appreciate it when you forum readers find out where and post it. Thanks!

## **Spiritual world, Heaven and Hell**

by **Drpta** » Sun Mar 22, 2015 12:51 pm

Hi Hari,

According to scriptures there are three realms: spiritual, heaven and hell. For me it is clear enough with first two, but what about the hell? Is it real place for special suffering, a place of expiation for sins earlier made? Who directs souls into that place? Do they make it by their own will because of having the sense of guilt or something else, or there is spatial structure like a judgment which decides your destination?

And I have a question concerns to how soul comes into different realms: into spiritual world, into heaven and into hell. Do soul have birth there like at Earth as child who has two parents or in any another manner?

Re: Spiritual world, Heaven and Hell

By **Hari** » Mon Mar 23, 2015 2:31 pm

We create our own destination according to our choices. We create heaven or hell by our actions as we cultivate our consciousness and our environment. Our lives on earth reflect that reality within the structure of the facilities we are offered at birth. How we use what we are given determines how we experience life.

After death, the heavy weight of our bodily situation is lifted and all that remains is our consciousness that was cultivated in our physical lives. After death, our conscious energy defines who we are. Thus, we reap the result of our cultivation of our consciousness.

If we are living in hell, we have created this environment. If we are in a hellish consciousness at death, healers assist us to overcome the intolerable consciousness we are entangled in. After this time of healing, when we are clearer in heart and mind, we are placed within a new life that forces us to change our choices and our selfish, exploitive mood. We voluntarily place ourselves in the optimal life situation encouraged by beings who facilitate our gradual, systematic, evolution towards essence.

Birth depends on physical bodies. Where there are no physical bodies, there is no birth.

Re: Spiritual world, Heaven and Hell

by **Drpta** » Sun Mar 29, 2015 4:06 pm

*We voluntarily place ourselves in the optimal life situation encouraged by beings who facilitate our gradual, systematic, evolution towards essence.*

Being the essence by nature why do I need to somehow evolve to "reunion" with essence? Does it mean that I just experience life, which is manifestation of essence too, and that I having birth again and again means that I, as personal manifestation of essence, steel unsatisfied and can solve my main set of desires by having birth in material body in this world? And then, became fine, I go to another reality to experience another life? But it is looks bored, useless and silly. Zillions are doing the same things again, again and again and forever to the end of time!

Being co-creators of God we ought to do something special, we should coordinate our deeds with Him or Her to have real fun! But now it appears that we are living here like rats in the ship. Everyone lives in his own small world, care about himself and his offspring and seeing at others as at enemies. Absolutely useless life!

Re: Spiritual world, Heaven and Hell

by **Akhila L** » Sun Mar 29, 2015 11:09 pm

This is a very interesting topic (heaven and hell) as it is instrumental in making people follow representatives of "God's will" or "God's rules". It is instrumental in fooling people that someone can give them a passport to heaven here or, even worse, give them a ticket to hell. Unfortunately, this virtual bifurcation of soul's destiny has infected also many of "spiritual societies", some of them well-known 😊 I like the invocation "according to scriptures" as it implies that this an absolute version of truth. Life has taught me that when you stop

questioning what is given to you as a "final solution" or unquestionable set of rules, you place yourself in a very risky situation. It may be impossible to see from within but is perfectly seen from the outer perspective, if you get there in time. It refers not only to religious organisation but also to politics, science, love affair, everything. Of course, it is not about questioning all the positive that these different spheres of human activity can offer but rather about questioning blind following.

I share many of your sentiments, Drpta, and has been haunted by most of your ghosts through my life. What I learned myself too is that in the moment of great despair, frustration, when I am really getting broken down, I just pray to Him Her and admit that I am a hopeless case but one thing I can, that is I love Him Her and want Him Her to help me never forget about it. Absolutely useless life? Maybe not. Maybe this is your Oscar scene.

I am really thrilled to read how Hari responds to your emotional credo. This is really exciting. Thank you for this input.

Re: Spiritual world, Heaven and Hell  
by **Drpta** » Mon Mar 30, 2015 8:19 am

Thank you Akhilaji for a kind and supportive words!

Re: Spiritual world, Heaven and Hell  
by **Hari** » Fri Apr 24, 2015 10:36 pm

*Being co-creators of God we ought to do something special, we should coordinate our deeds with Him or Her to have real fun! But now it appears that we are living here like rats in the ship. Everyone lives in his own small world, care about himself and his offspring and seeing at others as at enemies. Absolutely useless life!*

I agree. This is why I so much liked the saying, "There is only one of us" because it opens the door to positive social interaction, cooperative effort, caring for each other, better family connections, and a win win world where people care about the environment and how we manage the resources of the planet.

We create heaven when we see how we are all connected to each other and how we affect everything in our environment. We ultimately control what our planet becomes. My statement is not a plea for us to create a nice place; rather, by creating a sustainable, flourishing world we demonstrate we are developed as we should be. Our planet reflects our internal and external harmony and blossoms.

We create hell by doing the opposite. We humans seem hell-bent to create a terrible place by our actions, by how we entertain ourselves, and how we carelessly flaunt our resources, along with the hundreds of other things we do mindlessly.

Re: Spiritual world, Heaven and Hell  
by **Drpta** » Sun May 03, 2015 7:12 pm

Acting cooperatively is an art as like as caring for each other. But people easily get used to it and try to exploit you. Do you know, how practically avoid such exploitation? How to protect ourselves from exploitation and at the same time be in service for others?

Re: Spiritual world, Heaven and Hell  
by **Hari** » Tue May 05, 2015 7:09 pm

You could always avoid people who exploit and be of service to those who do not.

You could try to be of service to the exploiters by assisting them to become better people, yet not getting entangled with them. This is an art and I am not sure it can be taught. Unfortunately, even if you know the art it doesn't always work!

Re: Spiritual world, Heaven and Hell

by **Drpta** » Wed May 06, 2015 11:11 am

Thank you!

**presence**

by **kamalamala1** » Thu Nov 27, 2014 2:43 pm

Dear Hari

I was just thinking how to manage to live in present moment ,and find out several problems. First of all since i am responsible for many things i have to plan for future and for planning i have to analyse the experience of past.

So it s mean that past have value and future also should be planed, but usually i read in some books many times that one should not care about future and past for living in present moment,i think that like that only can live either really renounced person or completely irresponsible one. Can you say your opinion how one should live in presence simultaneously taking care for future and not neglecting past?

Re: presence

by **Hari** » Fri Nov 28, 2014 10:05 pm

I disagree that one should not care about the future. To not care about the future means to live without making a plan, without any consideration of one's economy, or what one eats, what one does, who one hurts and so on. Even animals are better than a person who has no plan or concern for the future.

When I truly live in the present, the past resides within each successive moment. I am continuously the sum total of all my experiences. My experiences reside within the present and thus my stock of building blocks with which I can take my next step, make my next act, or discover my next experience, ever increases. If I were to neglect my past experiences, I would be foolish. A person who previously felt pain when touching fire yet touches it again anyway, will probably suffer again and again in life because they cannot learn from their experiences.

When I am aware of the world around me and strive to find the best way through life's complexities, I will continuously endeavor to make the best choices I can. These choices determine the course of my life. I choose to act according to the ideals I hold dear and thus I create an increasingly superior version of myself and my world. Whether or not the future turns out to be what I think it should is not totally up to me. Even though I may act as if I am in control of what I create, I should know full well I am not. Regardless, I strive to do what is right and aim for the best result. Whether I am attached to the course of events or not depends on my consciousness. If I get what I thought I should, fine, and if not, I shall deal with that.

This is superior to not caring, both for myself and for those I care about.

Re: presence

by **Vajra** » Sat Nov 29, 2014 6:18 am

Dear Hari but in this regard  
far more questions arising .

One should care about future as you said and i agree, but future is not only this life, this life only 100 year, future is also after so called death .

WE really don't know much about after death period although we read many books. Should we care for us and our dependents about that period of existence and how we can do that in the best way?

Re: presence

by **Hari** » Thu Dec 04, 2014 1:21 pm

Awareness comprises both the experience of the moment and the possible future consequences of our choices and acts.

A person living in ever present existence is not bound by death. His or her consideration of the future is not limited to one lifetime. Considering this, if you love and care for someone, you will love and care for them continually. True love is not lost simply because the body looks different in your subsequent lives. You do not cut all ties to people when you change your body. These connections always remain. How they manifest in the future depends on our fate and plan.

The best way to care for those you love is to always do what you think is best. Act with care and make choices considering all the factors you can. More than this you cannot do. Give your loved ones the tools for them to build their own lives while living in their awareness of the moment and their own future.

Re: presence

by **kamalamala1** » Thu Apr 09, 2015 7:20 pm

Thank you dear Hari  
for your answer

Continuing this issue i want to note that actually as i understand all modern "jazz" about living in present moment is just to not continuously lament for mistakes and faults and not live in the future dreams forgetting about beauty of present moment. Otherwise one should plan his life and make goals as everybody does. If i properly understand.

But still a question arise should we make goals for after death period i mean let say the goal to go to spiritual world or heaven?or it is better to find the spiritual world or heaven just now in present moment and that all without any goals to go there in future?

Re: presence

by **Hari** » Fri Apr 24, 2015 10:26 pm

Oh am I replying late! So sorry. Big work here, no time, exhausted and no brain power to reply, but your question is easy!

*or it is better*

*to find the spiritual world or heaven just now in present moment and that all without any goals to go there in future?*

Yup! Because if you do not get it together right now, you are not going to get anything better later on!

Re: presence

by **kamalamala1** » Mon May 04, 2015 5:47 am

Great explanation of this topic

[http: www.youtube.com watch?v=HuzaAaFIMN0#t=117](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HuzaAaFIMN0#t=117)

## **How to overcome anger and other negative feelings**

by **Vajra** » Fri Feb 20, 2015 5:32 pm

Dear Hari

It is said that the worst contamination is anger .

And indeed it is so.

If one contaminated with anger he fell himself so bad after .

And it can make people actually mad.

So many bad things happening because of anger

So naturally arising a question.

How one can control anger?

Some people and so called authorities in psychology advising to not control it but to reveal it in some way,

In some organizations and companies was even a room where there was a statue of a person on whom one is angry let say on office manager and one who is fall in anger because of that manager comes and beginning to beat his statue.

But latter on the same psychologists came to conclusion that it is making situation worst.

Actually i think if somebody allows anger to come out then he is contaminated.

And to make it a habit it is not wise.

But some or other anger is very important to calm or transform.

Can you tell from your experience a best way to deal with anger, to calm it down?

Also practically all people during there life getting so many negative feelings like resentment, grievance, hurt, injury, bitterness, petty grievances, and most of them living with us sometime whole life and even more people carrying it to other lives.

Can you also tell what one should do to overcome all this feelings?

Thank you

Re: How to overcome anger and other negative feelings

by **Hari** » Wed Feb 25, 2015 11:44 pm

This question contains many words and phrases that one can discuss. It is too big a topic to be covered in this forum. Thousands of books discuss anger from every point of view. What more can I add to the discussion?

However, I disagree with the premise as it is phrased in the title of the topic. Why should I overcome anger and why should anger be a negative feeling? What makes a feeling negative? If I have reason to be angry and I feel anger, what is wrong? Anger is a natural feeling that arises when we feel that something is wrong. Anger itself is not a problem. None of our feelings are a problem. Our feelings are a result of our situation, conditioning, behavioral modification, stress, how we are dealt with, and thousands of other causes. Our feelings are a natural result of the stimuli that create them and are indicators of how we react to circumstances.

If I am angry at someone who is exploiting another person, this anger is justified for me because the act of exploitation is wrong according to my world view. Even though the exploiter has a good reason to justify it, my value structure does not accommodate it. What I do after I feel angry defines who I am. I can walk away mumbling about how bad this is, I could run into



the situation and beat the exploiter, I could teach him, or try to change him somehow, or I could bribe him to stop, give him something else to do, or even though I might be burning inside, I could try to ignore it because I am busy in something else. How I react depends on who I am at that present moment.

If my anger were to turn to a rage that propels me into actions seemingly beyond my control, then we have a serious problem. Here in Florida, we have a phenomena called road rage. Everyone gets angry on the highway because sometimes we are stuck behind slow, stinky trucks, careless drivers, drunk people, or even sometimes someone cuts in front of us so closely that it could have caused a serious accident. If I had a really bad day because my boss gave me a hard time, I lost money, my girlfriend insulted me, my cell phone broke and my neighbor's dog pooped on my doorstep, amongst other issues that can turn a fertile consciousness into a hotbed of emotion, I can say, "You lousy no-good (\*&^%\$! You cannot do that to me! I am going to show you something you will never forget!" And subsequently my nice Lexus becomes a deadly weapon roaring down the road after the unsuspecting offender who might not have been aware that the person he cut off was even there because that car was in his mirror's blind spot. [No, I do not have a Lexus and I am a typical old driver whose number one principle is avoidance of all danger] Now we have a road rage incident with the offender getting knocked by the raging driver, speeding up to get out of the way while the rager chases him down the road. People sometimes see this happening in their rear view mirrors and get out of the way and call the police who come out with blaring sirens to control the rage affected driver who has entered into the state of being a dangerous madman. Anger is not terrible until it becomes rage. When rage appears, control is lost and one falls into all kinds of really bad situations.

You cannot calm your own rage. You can only work like mad to avoid getting there. You cannot stop feeling anger, but you can attempt to let it fizzle out. There are ways to do this, some better, some worse, but none of them are universally effective for all people at all times. We might sometimes simply leave a situation where we are very angry and let it cook within us till it burns out (hopefully) or it appears later on as bad words against others that we later regret. We can express our anger right away as clearly and rationally as we can so that others are aware that something has really ticked us off and created this reaction. This is a good method because most anger is caused by misunderstanding. We might think that someone just said something horrible about us when in reality they meant to compliment us, or we assumed something that was not true, or we expected another outcome when it was never to be. False expectations are a real problem. Not being aware of others and what they really mean creates all kinds of difficulty in relationships. Another problem is not caring enough about others to ask if what you heard was what they said and if so, why would they say such a thing?

Sometimes we just explode in anger. This displays our deficient investigation of previous events or being faced by issues we can no longer avoid, or when we realize we have been cheated. Most rage comes within situations where someone you love cheats you or some form of familial treachery. Most murders occur as crimes of passion.

We cannot overcome feelings. We can only deal with them once they appear by making modifications in our life by changing our choices. We can change our external circumstances or work with the catalyst of our feelings to channel that energy into a positive direction.

Re: How to overcome anger and other negative feelings  
by **Vajra** » Thu Mar 05, 2015 4:46 pm

Thank you for your answer.  
It is interesting .

In many scriptures anger is considered as contamination and a feeling that should be avoided. But your answer is much practical and acceptable. In this regard appearing other question what is contamination? We heard many times that heart should be cleaned up from contaminations, but what is that contamination?

Greed, lust, egoism, feeling always guilty, feeling offended, and so on. Is all this contamination which is hindering us for clear viewing the reality of Divine?

And also can you tell how one can overcome the useless feeling of being offended when this happens?

Why I am asking this since I see that it is the biggest fear in the heart of people and maybe there is a reason.

Thank you

Re: How to overcome anger and other negative feelings  
by **Hari** » Mon Mar 09, 2015 9:32 pm

A contamination is anything that is not naturally occurring in our pure spiritual essence. Removing contamination means removing anything that is unnatural to essence.

If spiritual realization depended entirely on removing all contamination, no one would realize anything. The practical task of optimizing the realization of our potential is supported best when we remove anything that blocks our awareness or distorts our consciousness. When this is done, we can best feel essence. By feeling essence, contamination dissolves. This experience powerfully cleanses the consciousness. If you wait to remove all contamination before attempting to feel essence, you will wait forever.

If you are aware of how you react to what others say or do to you, you will understand how others will react to what you say or do. If you understand how you are sometimes moody, angry, upset or frustrated for little or no discernible reason, you will understand better how others are dealing with you when they seem irrational. Better wait a bit before reacting and investigate why someone is doing what they are doing. Perhaps they are seeking help in an awkward manner because they are unable to simply ask? Or perhaps we should simply give them space and retreat from their association till they calm down? In most cases, reacting with anger to an angry person is not advantageous.

## **Mother Durga and Lord Brahma**

by **kamalamala1** » Thu Oct 16, 2014 2:21 am

Hi Harijee

We got information from Vedic literature about different Super Beings, Gods who are controlling and managing this universe.

But sometime personally I cannot really understand their roles properly.

For example I want to ask you about Mother Durga.

Can you say what is the role of Mother Durga in universe? And also Parvati Ma.

Since it is said that they are the source of the Universe. Can we say that universe appeared because of them?

And also we know about Lord Brahma who is in charge of Universe so what is his role?

Re: Mother Durga and Lord Brahma  
by **Hari** » Wed Oct 22, 2014 2:49 pm

This question is a bit difficult to answer, so I will make some comments and perhaps expand an answer later (or not!).

They are not the source of the universe and the universe does not appear because of them.

Speaking about their roles in this forum seems strange to me. If you need "vedic" information, you have your sources and you also know the answers. If you want more information than that, I am not sure I can assist you.

For example, what is your role? And how does that question make you feel? If you were to summarize the role of your mother as, "She gave me birth, she fed and clothed me, and cared for me and loves me," does this give valuable information about your mother and do you like to think of her in that manner?

If someone were to ask "What is the role of Hari in this world?," I think I would be somewhat perturbed by this question. Why do I have to have a role? Is my life determined by some role? Can't I be me, doing what I can do to be of service? Boiling me down to a role is not nice, at least from my point of view. And therefore I do not wish to be involved in doing that for the personalities you asked about.

I am not putting off your question, my answer might give more information than you might imagine!

Re: Mother Durga and Lord Brahma  
by **kamalamala1** » Wed Oct 22, 2014 4:47 pm

Maybe the ward role i use was improper.  
The real question is to trying understand there personalities not only from image we have but from there activities there responsibilities there sphere if we can use this wards for them.  
Like you said that we can feel Vayu deva from air and Varuna from water  
From scriptures one can have different conclusions

Re: Mother Durga and Lord Brahma  
by **kamalamala1** » Wed Oct 22, 2014 6:12 pm

We don't have any real information about Them only some stories which hardly one can really understand .My question is just a try to understand There Great personalities more deeply To make our awareness more large and deep nothing else. Since i am ( and not only I) worshiping Them long time and naturally want to know more about Them They are is centre of our activities.

I understand and know that they cannot have a role  
this word i used only because of lack of my English sorry.

Re: Mother Durga and Lord Brahma  
by **Hari** » Fri Oct 24, 2014 2:29 pm

I understand that you did not mean role, but your question is still not easy to answer. Here is a basic reply that might help, but more than that you have to uncover yourself using the hints I give here.

Goddess Parvati is the wife of Lord Siva and as such she supports him in all that he does. She does not have a role, a task, or some dominion over some aspect of the universe. She is the mother to her children, and she will support whoever approaches her in that mood to some extent, if she so desires to do so. She is a private person and is not eager to engage outside of her family.

As we know, however, she is far more than that and has enormous potency that is rarely seen except to her family. Because she does not wish to directly engage outside of her family, her primary expansion, Goddess Durga, reaches into this universe for the sake of all beings. Durga devi further expands into many forms. She is accessible and available to everyone who tunes to her energy and desires her help and assistance. She is the most powerful warrior when she wishes to be, able to wreck destruction on those she decides to destroy, yet she is kind and loving to those who reciprocate with her in a loving manner. She can bless, offer benedictions, increase the potency and opulence of one who satisfies her and she is generally a shelter for anyone who desires it. Many take advantage of her nature for their own gain and some amongst them care little for her as a person. It is difficult for her to see such selfishness for she desires the greatest benefit to all. Thankfully, there are many who love her for who she is and are grateful for her presence in their lives. She projects the love and service that is the nature of Goddess Parvati throughout this universe.

Re: Mother Durga and Lord Brahma  
by **Hari** » Fri Oct 24, 2014 2:30 pm

Oh, and Brahma! I forgot.

I do not have much access to him so I cannot really say much. Sorry...

Re: Mother Durga and Lord Brahma  
by **harsi** » Sun Oct 26, 2014 11:12 am

I must voice my surprise in this regard too, if I am allowed to intervene a little in this discussion. My perplexity goes in the direction of how can I know anything about those gods, if I want at the same time to stand also above, or not involve myself too much with those revealed scriptures who seemingly contain some informations about those divine beings. If I want to see and be able to look at these things more objectively so called? Of course there might be certain people one could praise and hold in high esteem for their ability to be recipients of certain divine revelations. That I don't want to negate. I am a rational individual who believes in God but one who made also his experiences with God in various situations of his life. But access to demigods I don't have nor did I experience anything about their activities in my life. What I know, but that also just from hearsay, is that they would be somehow involved in certain parts and functions of my physical body and the greater body of the universe.

Re: Mother Durga and Lord Brahma  
by **kamalamala1** » Wed Dec 31, 2014 12:49 pm

Durga Ma is mother of Universe?  
Can we consider Srimati Radharani, Mother Sarasvati and Mother Lakshmi as our mothers also?

Re: Mother Durga and Lord Brahma  
by **Hari** » Mon Jan 05, 2015 12:12 am

This question really agitated my mind. Days ago, when I first read it, I ripped off a sarcastic reply. Being a wishy wash, and also trying to be cultured, I deleted it. It is not your fault and your question is neither bad nor deserving of my harsh reaction.

But your question brings up problems in perception and definition that I need to address even though I would rather avoid it. But you asked, so I should. Ah life...

Why do you wish to equate Goddess Parvati and Goddess Durga? Why do you want to add Ma after their names? They are not the same person, although certainly, energetically speaking, they are similar considering their sources and the hierarchy of expansions descending from Sri Radha. No human can truly understand what an expansion is. We hold onto a philosophical idea that allows us to neatly define the concept without having a clue what it entails in practical reality. Therefore, we tend to make things equal as we seek simple solutions. But no, they are not equal, not the same, and do different things in their different lives.

Ugh, when I hear you ask to consider Radha as mother I cringe. Saraswati and Laksmi are someone's mother, but not mine. Why do you need to consider them as mother? Aren't they fine as they are? You have a really nice mother. You love her. How many mothers can one have? Ok, sure, Hindu's love to have tons of mothers. They see mother everywhere. All women are mother! But they are also trying to contain their lust by calling some women as mother. Oedipus anyone?

Indians will be upset with my words here. Western hindus of any nationality will feel offended. But I cannot change how I feel and I have no interest in telling you why I feel how I feel. I cannot understand why we need so many mothers. I cannot imagine how some of the devas feel when being addressed in this way, but then again, considering how people use the devas to fulfill their desires, calling some of them mother seems to be a great way to get what they want. After all, isn't the mother supposed to supply us things?

Are you your mother's servant or do you do things for her out of love alone? Do you have to learn how to relate to your mother? The word, "mother," carries with it many connotations and I have a hard time with most of them. Maybe I have mother issues? 🤔 Who knows? Or maybe I am fine with my own mother and have issues with having to see these other wonderful personalities as mother when they are perhaps something else to me?

And here is the point. If someone is your mother, you know it. You do not need to ask someone if it is ok to think of them as mother, unless of course you were abandoned at birth and had no idea who your mother was and now you wish to reconnect. But in this case bitter feelings might accompany your endeavor and confuse you more. This is not the case here because none of the personalities you mentioned abandoned you. So you will know who they are naturally, without asking me.

If your question is merely, "Is it ok to do so?" my answer is, "Depends on you!" You now know how I see this issue.

Re: Mother Durga and Lord Brahma  
by **kalamala1** » Sat Jan 31, 2015 6:34 pm

Thank you very much for your such a very interesting and completely unexpected answer. You know we was taught 20-30 years in well known organization in standard formulas without real experience.

So it is very good that we have at least a chance to really know now what is what.  
Thanks a lot

But still there are tons of questions in this regard.

All the ways we address God, as we was taught is in different rasas.

So in this regard arising question.

Does this theory of rasas really practical and a way to relate with God?

Or maybe one should not at all think about all rasas and theory but just approach God as his heart tell?

Thank you

Re: Mother Durga and Lord Brahma

by **Hari** » Sat Feb 07, 2015 10:42 pm

The categories of rasa represent basic ways in which people interact. We could just as well say that we can relate with God as a person in whatever way our relationship exists or as it develops. For example, the relationship of a mother to her child is naturally arising from the child having taken birth from her womb. One can redefine how good or bad a mother might be, how much she might care about her offspring, or how important she is to the child, for example, but the basic relationship is inherent in the physical act of giving birth. Friends are friends because they want to be and lovers are lovers because they want to be. Although they might worry about intensifying their relationship, who they are to each other depends on chemistry, desire, and experience.

To answer: I recommend that you just be yourself and relate with Radha and Krsna as you can and as you desire. Just open communication, share energy, do things for them, and see what happens. They are very communicative, they share powerfully, and they are well aware of your relationship with them. Just perceive it; that is all that is required. Don't worry about making it fit into some category.

## **Good enough FOR smth. smb. or worthy OF smth. smb?**

by **maha** » Sat Jan 24, 2015 9:27 am

Dear Hari,

Thank you again and again for your lectures records! In these challenging times they give peace and shelter to my lost soul, and your miraculous meditations when practiced awaken and activate portals of divine energy growing in its presence inside as quite vivid and blissful

feelings and sensations which continue to live and interact if you let them so.. 

While discussing with Drpta our understanding of the 'being good enough' concept and trying to understand his struggle with 'being good', I realized that possibly it is also a matter of the nuances of translation. If we translate 'good enough' literally then it makes 'dostatochno horoshiy'. Now if we compare English adjective 'good' it seems to be much wider than the Russian analog of it 'horoshiy'. 'Good' seems to have a broader and more sublime facets to it – take for example its derivative Goodness (like 'the mode of Goodness' or when you exclaim 'Oh, my Goodness!'). Russian adjective 'horoshiy' doesn't carry any sublime connotation with it and rather has quite average meaning like in 'to be a good boy' or to have 'Good' mark in the school which is one step down from the 'excellent'.

On the other hand there is adjective 'dostoy' in Russian which usually is translated to English as 'worthy'. By the way, Dharmabhavana is very much into this word and the notion it carries. He explains that 'dostoy' means that which is 'do' (before) 'stoimosti' (cost or value) – in other words that which is before cost or measurable value, or that unconditional worthiness which is primary and all other virtues are secondary value. Or, perhaps, that value or worthiness which is always there and you cannot measure it. It has very sublime meaning and is used in such phrases like 'to be worthy of one's fathers' and so forth. In Russian from the adjective 'dostoy' there is derivative noun 'dostoinstvo' (dignity, worthiness, integrity). It is also used in a narrow meaning like 'value of a coin', but in general in relation to a person it means a very sublime quality which one already has as a human from birth and which folk's wisdom in many sayings strongly warns one not to forget or not to 'lose', and if you 'lose' it - it is as catastrophic as to 'lose one's soul'.

Hence, I wonder, if it is better instead of translating 'good enough' as 'dostatochno horoshiy' may be better we should translate it as 'dostoiniy' and then it will have this facet of 'being worthy' or rather 'being unconditionally worthy' and definitely removes all possible resistance to the word 'good' because every mentally healthy human wants to be unconditionally worthy of everything but not everybody wants to be just a 'good boy' or a 'good girl'? 'Good' (at least in Russian) seems to be something more behavioral or a value which is imposed or evaluated by the judgment of others; whereas 'worthy' (again as 'dostoiniy' in Russian) can be more unconditional, or on the basis of some natural original properties, or of the essence of something. Is it so that in English it is vice versa and 'good' sounds more unconditional and 'worthy' is more evaluated?

Funny that in Lingvo dictionary we found only one meaning of 'good enough' as a phrase, meaning 'be so kind' or 'be so courteous' when you ask somebody a favor and you say 'Be good enough to do smth...' But that is of course out of the context and is not relevant here..



Please share your comments and bring some clarity here...

Sincerely yours,

maha

Re: Good enough FOR smth. smb. or worthy OF smth. smb?  
by **Hari** » Mon Jan 26, 2015 10:46 pm

Oh my! I cannot bring clarity to a discussion of how to best translate "good enough" into Russian! But I quite appreciate the effort being made to make sense of the term. One of the most disturbing elements of inter-personal communication is how we understand what another person says. Aside from the general difficulty we all have to mean the same thing when we speak, even when we agree we do so from our own unique perspective. We sometimes become confused when we discover later on that we did not actually agree! We all see things from our own point of view and considering quantum mechanics, that point of view must always, by definition, be unique. All agreement is to some extent a compromise. I am not referring to the agreement that  $1 + 1 = 2$  on paper, I am referring to interpersonal communication.

To be "good" is indeterminate. How good do you have to be to be good? How much good makes you good? When you mix good and bad, what is the threshold ratio that places you

within the good category? What is good today is bad tomorrow. Times change, people change, everything evolves for better or worse. We have notions of what is good or bad from religions but these ideals also change over time because they are absorbed into the context of modern life. The word good does not represent at all what I mean by "good enough." The word good represents an ideal that is modified by the expectations of family, teachers, government, sport coaches, or friends who place demands and standards upon us. When we are what is expected of us, we are good, when we do not act as expected, we are not so good. "Good" is a changeable ideal placed upon us. To be kind, loving and so on, surely is good and always a desired quality, but it has little to do with being good enough.

To be good enough means you are fine as you are. Who you are does not change in different social, political, familial or educational situations. You are who you are and that is ok. You are fundamentally good enough as a person, as spirit, as essence. You do not need to prove yourself by jumping through fiery hoops until some judge stamps approval. We engage in proving ourselves because we feel that we are somehow, somewhere, fundamentally wrong, and that we have acted, thought or felt improperly. Ultimately, we feel we acted in ways that disappointed God, disgusted God, or challenged the position of God by daring to desire something we were not supposed to. This feeling causes us to constantly strive to prove our worth, value, and essence by cleansing away all this bad stuff so that we can present ourselves before the highest judge who will proclaim that we are now worthy to enter the kingdom of God.

We do not need to prove anything, do anything, or please anyone. We simply need to be what we are. We are pure spirit, pure essence, that is the same energy as the divine God, as all spirit. We are already, by definition, good enough, for we are fundamentally the same energy as God, the same quality, if you require to use a word that does not really say as much as some think it does 😊. Because we are always that essence, we are always good enough. We cannot be anything less. Thinking that we are somehow less is an illusion.

Do I therefore think that we are good? Depends on the criteria you bring into the discussion. Sure, we have problems, act strangely sometimes, hurt people, hurt ourselves, and cause difficulty to other people in a wide variety of ways. Should we change this behavior? Certainly. Do we have to remain in this realm of physicality to punish ourselves for not being good enough to return to God? Absolutely not.

We are unconditionally worthy under any and all circumstances. When we change our deepest conception of ourselves, our lives transform and our evolution blossoms.

Re: Good enough FOR smth. smb. or worthy OF smth. smb?  
by **maha** » Tue Jan 27, 2015 8:54 am

Wow! That is so cool!!! 😄 God, please make me to realise this fully!

Thank you!

Re: Good enough FOR smth. smb. or worthy OF smth. smb?  
by **Hari** » Tue Jan 27, 2015 1:08 pm

By the way, I doubt that most people I know would know what smth. or smb. means. We do not abbreviate something or somebody like that. We do not abbreviate it at all!

Re: Good enough FOR smth. smb. or worthy OF smth. smb?



by **maha** » Tue Jan 27, 2015 1:35 pm

Oh, sorry! 😞 I thought it to be so obvious and now I understand that perhaps you can meet such abbreviations ONLY in dictionaries and ONLY in English-Russian dictionaries 😊

## Am I daemon?

by **Drpta** » Wed Jan 14, 2015 10:59 am

In one of your answer to Harshi (<http://www.harimedia.net/forum/viewtopic.php?f=2&t=864>) you said: “See how we are manipulated by our beliefs and observe who benefits from it”. This phrase awaked in me something. All of a sudden I realize that all structures I am creating in my mind or adhere to in my life is just a kind of means to make my life more comfortable and ease. I am limiting me by myself. But the interesting thing is that when I letting me to be free, I see that nothing wrong happens. Even my scariest ideas and thoughts are turning up quite acceptable. And namely these “allowings” gave me the most valuable experience in my spiritual exploring.

But some things are still pressing and limiting me as I think on very subtle level. This is limitations created by religions. First is concept of God. I am not atheist and my spiritual experience proof that, but definitions made by religions strongly rooted in me and I think it is not good since they limit me. For example the idea of great God and little tiny atomic me. I not agree! Or almighty God and limited me. Who limited me? I am always worse than God! Why? I do not want to talk about I am always pushed to feel having a flaw or deficiency but God is ever sinless and perfect since now I am not feel like these, but it might be... So, I want to say that we always look like two opposites – He and i. Also I should ever be humble and respectful with God and His energies. And in scriptures God describes such and such, but if He appear before me in another form? The doubt arises – is it God?

But was Lord Chaitanya teaching us to feel like mentioned above? I sure not! So, how can we kick out all these awful religious concepts from our heads? Sometimes they are very subtle. How to learn quickly seeing things as they are?

You know, I think that daemons who challenge God were not just pride arrogant men. Hey were well-educated ones and well-known who they are. I think they were known their spiritual essence well too. Did they disagree that God is? I am not sure. Did they disagree with religion of God? I think yes. You know, often I feel sympathy with demons when I am reading stories or seeing movies with them. May be I am daemon too?

Re: Am I daemon?

by **Hari** » Sat Jan 17, 2015 11:22 pm

In computer talk, a daemon is a type of program or routine that allows a particular task to be executed. So for me to answer this question, I would have to understand how you are assisting others to accomplish a task! 😊

Comment on your first paragraph: CORRECT! You are a good person and allowing yourself to be who you are is not a dangerous act, it is the start of something good!

Ah, you are getting the point! Is it not interesting how organized religions tend to limit us and place us within specific confines while telling us what we should do, think, or be to better ourselves?

But you have brought Lord Chaitanya into this discussion and something he taught gives the answer. We are one and different with God. Religions usually emphasize the difference. I suggest that you emphasize the oneness. What is that oneness? That you are essence, filled with spiritual light, love, good qualities, empathy, awareness, capacity, understanding, and many other wonderful qualities all packaged in that unique personality you are. This uniqueness is your difference from God and all other beings. Embrace that difference and be yourself without having to mirror the lives, thoughts, actions, goals, or desires of anyone else. You are fine as you are. Get rid of external qualities and ideals you have embraced. Do not allow anything to cloak your real self. When you as you are without covering, you will see that you are wonderful. Indeed, you cannot be anything else for you are one with God in quality! Getting rid of the impediments placed upon us by outside forces is an important task. We must be disciplined to accomplish this.

Here is something to consider about demons. If you meet a person and they are nice to you, you like them. If they are nasty to you and nasty to others, you dislike them. If they are nasty to someone you love, you really dislike them. If you are God and someone does something nasty to you, do you ultimately care? They cannot harm you, cannot change ruin your life or happiness. But if you sought more action in your life when you were visiting some other place for a while, these nasty people offer you an opportunity to have some fun.

The definition of a demon is interesting. Some say someone is a demon if they are against God. Devotees are for God and demons are against God. There are two teams, God's and the Demons. Each team's members think their team is the best. Without this conflict, there can be no tension. Tension creates growth as it exercises muscles. Members of one team may empathize with the plight of a member of the other team without changing sides. Empathy is a natural quality amongst living beings.

If you ever met a real demon, you would probably want to head for the hills as fast as you could as soon as you figured out who he or she was. You would not stand around and examine the demon in various ways. There are very few real demons in the world. One could say there are many unintelligent, insensitive, exploiters of others who are selfish to the max. But true demons are rare. You are most certainly not one of them and you shall never be one of them.

Re: Am I daemon?

by **Drpta** » Sun Jan 18, 2015 4:33 pm

Oh my poor English! 😞 But it sounds like a kind of to be of service 😊

Re: Am I daemon?

by **Drpta** » Wed Jan 21, 2015 5:46 pm

*I suggest that you emphasize the oneness.*

Yes, now I emphasize the oneness since I am trying to restore the equilibrium in my relationship with God for so long time I was undergoing the emphasizing the difference. And I am feeling it yielded some good results.

*...you are essence, filled with spiritual light, love...*

Ok, I am a good person, but where from in my mind appearing so many bad thoughts and desires? If good light qualities belong to my essence, then who is possessor of bad dark qualities such as ignorance, laziness, selfishness, envy, anger, rudeness, malice, hatred and so

on? By these I do not want to say that if one has bad qualities—he is not good enough and guilty of having such bad qualities. But if we as essence have also some “bad” qualities, can we consider our being in this world as means of getting rid of these qualities? And namely because we have such qualities we are still here in this “material” world? I have got the point of your idea to emphasize good (that you described here [viewtopic.php?f=2&t=1009](http://viewtopic.php?f=2&t=1009)), but sometimes it is also good, as we say to know enemy by sight.

And interesting point is that qualities, good or bad, appear only in attitude to another object. It seems that they do not exist of themselves.

Re: Am I daemon?

by **Hari** » Sat Jan 24, 2015 12:04 am

Maybe you should read my book? 😊

Obviously you have accepted qualities and characteristics that are not great, some of which you might even hate! These are not you, they are what you have accepted into your life for various reasons you thought were correct when you did it, or you didn't think at all and just accepted mindlessly. Your task is to rid yourself of all these external things that are not you and live within your own natural energy.

That you are a good person who is good enough does not mean that you shall not have troubles. It means that you do not need to hold on to these less desirable qualities to punish yourself or to fulfill a role you have accepted as someone who is bad. This allows you to move into a better place by empowering you to give up unwanted aspects of your present self or burdens in your life that are not serving your best interests.

How you can do this is a big subject and ALL of my lectures and my recent book are dedicated to assisting you to do this by giving you the tools to remove the unwanted ideas and concepts you have embraced in an attitude of mindful awareness, deep perception of what is real, and the discipline required to accept yourself and not interfere with your natural energy. Although it might sound dismissive, I recommend that you listen to the lectures with this idea in mind. I systematically went through the hundreds of obstacles we all face, the struggles and stress that dominate our lives, the behavior modifications we have undergone, and the unlimited trauma that has defined us over an unknown number of years. Your questions seem to be based on your not having heard my lectures and reading my book. I spent years presenting these materials just so that you can find what you seek.

Knowing the enemy is fine, but if the enemy is yourself, then knowing yourself is the goal. Knowing yourself also means becoming more and more aware of how you act in certain situations and how you create your choices when challenged by life. For example, if someone is in your way for some reason, are you rude to them to move them? If so, you have chosen to act in that way. Why did you do that? What do you intend to gain? You thought that was the right thing to do at that time. Probably because you felt that what you wanted was the highest priority and this other person did not matter. However, using the tool of awareness and the discipline of there is only one of us, you might be able to see how your own mind and emotions become colored and burdened by this choice, and further, how the thought forms created by the person who you hurt by your rudeness remain with you and attach to your energy, creating one more burden on your already stressed life. All of these topics are discussed in great depth in my lectures and book.

Re: Am I daemon?

by **Drpta** » Sat Jan 24, 2015 7:45 pm

Oh! I have understood! If I have some bad qualities that I aware are bad for me because they cause troubles for my evolution, than I certainly will try to get rid of them. It is normal. But if I have some qualities which any other is thinking as bad, but I think they are good, so this is a very different situation. For me I am deciding what is bad or good. If I feel that this particular quality, which can be considered as "bad" by others, helps me to become more aware and gives me good opportunity to evolve and connect with divine and discover the essence of me, then I embrace it in spite of any opinion of others.

Re: Am I daemon?

by **Hari** » Mon Jan 26, 2015 9:52 pm

Yes, you are who you are! You cannot be anyone or anything else. You can only move forward from the place where you are presently situated. When you are aware of who you are and where you are, you can make a plan to move to a better situation if you so desire. This is always good.