

# **Excerpts from Harimedia Forum**

## **Discussions with Hari**

### **Page Two**

Click on index to go to that topic's post

Copyright 2005-2024 Harimedia LLC  
All Rights Reserved

Dharma and the meaning of surrender...	4
Help from Divine	8
Our limitations help us	8
Practices and techniques	10
Faith	11
varnashrama	15
Dismantling of 3D Reality?	26
Spiritual individuality vs. being lost in Brahman	32
who is helping us	34
Devas	35
Are we so good in our essence that we can't even accept ourselves as such or are we just stupid?	40
Understanding the term 'energy'	41
Dimensions and Gods space	45
Modern and Vedic cosmology	46
time	47
It's all God	50
About the Suprim Origine	54
Becoming independent	55
My Presentations of the Divine	58
Human Life and Action with a Higher Purpose in Mind	72
sravanam kirtanam	74
Grounding	75
Indigo Children	77
Varnashrama Manifesto for Social Sanity	80
Inductive or Deductive - A Logical Approach to God and Truth	82
is it possible to stop love someone?	89

Will something live on after our physical death and where?	91
We as humans are offsprings of Gods?	103
Energy overload in forehead?	106
Midnight Coffee	107
The Teacher and the Thought together Produce the Teaching	111
I'm and Being	112
Grasping the mystery of ultimate reality	113
Question about the Future ...	119
Voluntary Euthanasia - the right to die at will.	134
Meaning of Radha-Krishna and fully surrendering unto Them	137

## Dharma and the meaning of surrender...

by maha » Wed Dec 31, 2014 3:46 am

Dear Hari,

Somehow lately this notion of surrender has popped-up in my life again and perhaps as well in the lives of others who read or will read this forum amidst uneasy transformational times.

Ekhart Tolle, for example, is advising to surrender to the ever present Now and is suggesting two stages of surrender - to surrender to the current moment of Now and the situation of Now, and if that doesn't work or is not possible - to surrender to our current inner feelings of Now or our feelings about the unacceptable situation. Ok, this helps to find peace in the moment and perhaps even leads to the four stages of Conscious Evolution described by you - Relaxation, Purification, Awareness and Awakening..

Though when we wish to come deeper in contact with the Divine... Or when others wish to support or help us they suggest us to surrender to God, or Radha-Krishna completely and give ourselves up to Their Divine Will. This was in a sense easy to do in the context of religious organization when we would do it in a simple manner - just do what the guru or authorities say and often in it give up responsibility for ourselves and our lives at the same time which later showed itself to be counterproductive.

On the other hand now we understand that the term 'surrender' in the doctrinal concept was most likely misunderstood or misinterpreted or simplified. Around 5 years ago you expressed it in this forum like this:

*"I have dedicated the past years to redefining the meaning of "surrender," as the word does not seem to efficiently express what it intends. I see it important to accept the irrevocable connection to the divine couple as our essence. When one has accepted oneself and this natural connection, one's life is in harmony with Radha and Krsna (as well as all divinity in existence) and unfolds as it should, when it should."*

Indeed this description is very beautiful, specific and clear.

Yet, what is actually the meaning of surrender? Or what should be the other term or notion to be used instead? Are our endeavors to surrender meant to be endeavors to come and be in contact with the Divine and then everything else unfolds on itself?

We can see that the word translated into English and into Russian does not even sound good. In English it has the second or even the first meaning of a defeated soldier surrendering to the victorious enemy. In Russian the root itself resembles the other word meaning 'to betray'. If we look the Sanskrit notion of 'sharanam' - it means more like 'to take shelter', right?

In general, the idea seems to be related to a part of an organism reviving its full connection in being integrated to the Complete Whole of a bigger organism, isn't it?

Giving up our own will until we see, or feel, or understand the will of the Divine doesn't make sense, or does it? Or is it better to just pray to Radha-Krishna - May Your Will Be and not mine! Or - May I accept Your Will as mine!

We can see that Bhagavad-Gita for example is all about surrender. Beside the ultimate 18.66 prescription to give up all dharmas and surrender to the Supreme, which if we try to

understand in essence seems closer to your theme of coming in full connection with the Divine, with Radha and Krishna, right?

Still when we think of our daily practical life we cannot avoid notion of dharma - when we endeavor to be of service according to our natural capacities, characteristics and the necessity of the current moment. And then according to Bhagavad-Gita our surrender or yoga can be according to our abilities or various kinds of yoga that we can do - to do our things but dedicate results to the Supreme, and so on, and in any case to dedicate any challenges or austerities we undergo through willingly or unwillingly to the Supreme as the ultimate enjoyer of all sacrifice and austerities?

All in all, please help us to properly define this notion or 'surrender'? Or how to do it properly? What is the algorithm of it, if we can say so? Can it be the permanent policy or strategy or the mood or the mode of our life?

Thank you!

Sincerely yours,

maha

Re: Dharma and the meaning of surrender...

by **Drpta** » Wed Dec 31, 2014 10:47 am

I am sorry, I couldn't help, but Russian word "предаться" which can be translated in English as "surrender" means "пере-дать-себя" or "give oneself up to" the root is "дать" or "give". It is not correct to compare it with the word "to betray" in this case for it has different connotation. Russian word "предать" which can be translated as "to betray" also means "commit to" or "commend to". So one can say "I commend myself onto God". But it is interesting that word "surrender" etymologically absolutely identical to Russian "предать" since "sur-" means "over" or "пере-" and "render" means "to give" or "давать". Sorry again for this comparative etymology exercise. 😊

Re: Dharma and the meaning of surrender...

by **Hari** » Mon Jan 05, 2015 12:56 am

Well, etymology aside, how you define the concept of surrender is not dependent on what that word means or implies in your native language. Surrender is more a feeling than an action. Words can induce feelings, but they can rarely describe them fully. When we express our feelings in words, we express something dear to us. Let us consider surrender as a bad word attempting to describe a great concept.

Maha's struggle to make sense of this concept is admirable and I really enjoyed how he massaged meaning in his essay. I imagined a baker kneading a pile of dough, anticipating the time when the final product will be baked into its delectable form! Nicely done!

I would ruin your endeavor, Maha, by trying to comment on all your points, so I shall not. But I can attempt to jam a little with this word so we can spread it on the bread!

I hate this word, surrender. It is as misused as the word servant. Whenever someone tells me that they are my humble servant, I roll my eyes. They know as well as I know that they are no such thing and they are just saying something that seems to be expected as a social convention. Similarly, when someone says, "just surrender to the supreme," what they are

really saying, or at least what I hear them say, is, "I have no idea how to solve your problem, so just give it all up and do whatever you are supposed to do and stop babbling and lamenting." Now this approach certainly is direct and might make the speaker feel good about their dedication to their cause, but it surely does nothing to assist the poor soul who came for advice in the first place. I mean, I have a problem, so I come for advice and am told to surrender. What does that actually mean? In the context of someone needing help, it means little.

What are we all seeking? We seek connection to Radha and Krsna, those divine beings filled with divine, loving energy within which we all knowingly or unknowingly reside. Those who know where they are and who they wish to embrace, do nothing to prevent that connection from happening. Those who do not know where they are and within whose energy they live, are continuously preventing the connection by defining their existence as something other than what it truly is. Consider this: One way to look at the word surrender is to see it as the act of stopping fighting. This meaning has a very sublime quality to it. Stop fighting your nature and simply accept who you are and the energy of all those around you who are essence like you. Stop standing before the deity and blocking the wonderful energy of God, just accept it. Do not fight. Do not fight with yourself!

Oh, this is a really nice point. Surrender means to stop fighting with yourself! Here is an image: I am a really good guy, but I have been told all my life that I am not a good guy and that I deserve nothing in this life but trouble and pain. So when anything other than trouble and pain come or someone mysteriously sees me as a really good guy, I reject this because it does not fit the pattern I have always accepted. I fight it. This fight should be given up as it is counterproductive to my spiritual attainment. Better to surrender by stopping fighting against myself and just accept that I am fine as I am -- I do not need to be what others say or think I am. But that feels real hard. If I have accepted a bad image as my self, changing that idea is very difficult because it bucks against the entire pattern of my life! Therefore, I try to maintain the status quo by fighting this concept as best I can.

Give up this fight and let go of all these strange ideas. It is not harder than you think to do this; rather, it is easier than you think. You need to let go of all these things you hold onto that do not help you. You need to free yourself of the burden of defending illusions.

This is surrender at its ultimate! When we are who we are and no longer as we are not, connecting to the divine is natural and the flow between ourselves and the divine beings is normal. We do not need to surrender to the supreme because we are not fighting against God. We are fighting ourselves as we insist on being someone other than who we are. When we let that useless idea go, our connection to God is guaranteed because it is our nature and this nature cannot be changed by anyone or anything. It is the essence we are and all other ideas are self-defeating.

My answer is intended to supplement your essay! I hope it has done so!

Re: Dharma and the meaning of surrender...  
by **Drpta** » Sun Jan 11, 2015 1:04 pm

What about that powerful daemons and atheists who are sending challenges to God? For hum they should surrender?

Re: Dharma and the meaning of surrender...  
by **maha** » Wed Jan 14, 2015 2:10 pm

Dear Hari,

Your answer is not only a cool supplement but is the missing link which binds all my questions together and gives the image of a whole where it all falls into its place.

Yet what amazes me even more now is that factually you've been giving this whole concept or even better to say methodology from all possible angles theoretically and practically all these years when I've been interpreting your lectures and still it sounds to me as something far out and yet to be achieved!!! I could try to justify myself that while interpreting I couldn't really put or implement it on myself at the same time as I was busy following the logical threads and channeling your energy, but i feel that that really is not a reason. I now suddenly also understand your somewhat disappointment which you were expressing after your lectures in Russia that from the questions the listeners had asked you realize that they (or at least some of them) after all these years still do not catch the essence of what you are trying to deliver. Maybe that was also a reason why you stopped lecturing and broadcasting? Because you felt strongly that everything is said and now is the time for actions or implementing the methodology?

I truly see it now in myself that one can seemingly understand the concept and even feel strongly the effects of your meditations and then go back to the 'normal' life only to 'happily' continue fighting with oneself, or with the demons in oneself, or with imperfections in oneself or whatever is more attractive to call it.

Those years I didn't feel much this contradictions as regularly acting as your interpreter would allow me to be absorbed in your moods and energies over long times, but now I feel it very sharply. What a wonder that such a seemingly simple act of fully accepting myself in my essence which I already am, always was and ever will be is so inconceivably hard to implement. It must be similar to a monkey trying to let go its hand out from inside the hole in a tree but not being able to do so because of not letting go of that thing which its hand is holding inside the hole.

That is so pity! We can of course find the whole range of reasons for us not accepting ourselves: self-criticism inherited and reinforced into us from our parents, teachers and society, always finding the reasons for our non-luck or unsuccessful endeavors in our own badness or not-worthiness, the general poor state of modern society in the matter of personal integrity of its individuals and so on and so forth.

Unfortunately these reasons do not give the salvation from them but at most provide even more justification for us not accepting ourselves.

Oh, Goodness! What how can I accept myself?

Yet I must admit that listening to your lectures again and again always helps and gives a hope!

Re: Dharma and the meaning of surrender...  
by **Hari** » Sat Jan 17, 2015 10:55 pm

My continuing to speak would require me to simply repeat over and over again basic concepts and points. You might have noticed in these forums how I shy away from repetition. I do not feel that repeating subject matters makes them easier to understand or accept. There are limits to how much one person can feed another person information. At one point we all require to find our own way by researching the various options available to us using the tools we have been given. My attitude, for better or worse is, "Here. I gave as much as I could. I felt that with

these tools a serious person can find their way to themselves. If you cannot work with this now, then my continuing to present the same thing in slightly different packages is not going to make it easier for you. The commitment required must come from within. You have to want it. You have to seek it out. I can assist in some way, but please do not ask me to repeat myself. I know it might be easier for you to just ask me about this or that, but it is harder for me. The lectures are available. Please listen."

Or not. It is up to you. None of you are children. None of you are neophytes. You have brains. Do some work. Find the material. Share it with others.

And accept yourself. You are fine as you are. Embrace this and uncover essence. Have fun.

Re: Dharma and the meaning of surrender...

by **maha** » Mon Jan 19, 2015 11:44 am



Thank you very much!!!



## Help from Dlvine

by **Vajra** » Thu Jan 08, 2015 11:31 am

Dear Hari!

As i know so many divine forces angels and other beeings want to help us.

But as i know it is not easy for them to do that ?

So hard that many of them( even gods) have to take birth on this planet for helping us.

Can you please tell why it is so?

Thank you!

Re: Help from Dlvine

by **Hari** » Sun Jan 18, 2015 1:19 am

Some sound frequencies go through glass without difficulty while other frequencies shatter that glass. Divine energy is very different from our physical energy. Due to this, we often do not perceive it. A divine being, for example, can speak to us and even though we might feel that something extraordinary is occurring, we do not hear the words. Our ears have the capacity to capture specific frequencies. This is the way they are designed. Celestial beings work on other frequencies that we cannot not hear. Even in this world, dogs and cats hear far more than we do, over far greater distances. For a divine being to be recognized by us, he or she has to vibrate according to our capacity to perceive. Some people have developed the capacity to link to their thoughts or energy. But this is rare. If they wish to be of service to a wider range of people, they will accept a life in our realm to deliver a message or be of assistance. This is not fun for them as they are uncomfortable here and never feel like they belong. The experience is never as they thought it would be for they cannot imagine what we go through "down here" in our world. This creates unusual situations for them. Everyone who comes here pays the price somehow or other.

## Our limitations help us

by **Drpta** » Sat Jan 10, 2015 11:11 am



Interesting idea came to my head. If the limitations we have in this world are helping us? The premise is the God created this world with love. Then why it (this world) limits our capacity to reveal our essence?

I think one reason is to help us to concentrate on solving the tasks with which we came in this world for this world is the best place to solve these tasks. This world gives us the great opportunities in this concern. For example we can easily realize here our "bad" or demoniac features (if one has demoniac desire then one has it, what wring?) for no one can read our thoughts and hamper us. Or we can develop many good qualities if we are lack of and have desire to develop them. For example if one is lack of responsibility he feels a challenge when faces a situation where he should manifest the responsibility and by solving and getting over the situation one develops a certain quality. For the challenges arise from our limitation to act. In this world we cannot act what we would like all the time. Solving tasks and adaptability are also good qualities developing in restricted space for they improve our flexibility and capacity to accept.

So, the point is that one is placing in the restricted space where he is able to solve only a specific kind of tasks with the purpose do not be distracted with a huge variety of other things. What do you think?

But one can object: what is a benefit we are getting from all these development and improvement? All these things seem to be useful only in this "material" conditioned and limited reality, isn't it? Do we really need to improve ourselves if we are already the best what we can be in every particular time of our being?

Re: Our limitations help us

by **Hari** » Sun Jan 18, 2015 12:47 am

You are right in the sense that too many options creates confusion. This confusion is not conducive to resolving our problems.

Of all the points you raise, this one is the most important:

*Do we really need to improve ourselves if we are already the best what we can be in every particular time of our being?*

I do not think that we are always being the best we can be. Sometimes we are lazy, inconsiderate to others, neglectful, or insensitive, to name a few things we can be. Neither do we always act according to our capacity or potential at any given moment. One can say that we always do what we think is right at any given moment. When we do something, we do it because we think it is right. Doing what we think is right is not equivalent to doing what is best! There is a difference and sometimes we lament because we did not do what was best. We can always improve. We can always become more aware of how our actions or words will impact others or affect ourselves.

I have repeatedly stated my opinion that we are here in this world to overcome our deep idea that we are not good enough. Overcoming challenges, learning from experience, discovering our qualities, and all the rest of what we could conceivably acquire in this world are part of our fundamental task to reach the conclusion that we are indeed good enough and we do not need to remain in this realm to prove anything more to ourselves.

Emphasizing how bad we are along with a whole plethora of negative thoughts about ourselves sounds like a person who is overweight walking around saying and thinking, "I am fat." This resembles the catholic idea of "mea culpa." I am responsible, I created this situation, I am therefore bad. I need forgiveness, mercy, compassion, and assistance to break free from my

negative qualities because I am not good enough to do it on my own. Assistance from others might not be a bad thing, but negativity always breeds trouble. I do not find these thoughts constructive.

Rather, emphasize the good and work on dismantling this age old idea that we are not good enough. See that there is little use in holding onto this concept. Let it go and be the good person you are. You are a good person and that person is good enough for you are perfect and complete in yourself as a complete whole. The more you act with awareness of self, the more you learn about yourself so that you can gradually conclude that you are most certainly good enough!

## **Practices and techniques**

by **Drpta** » Sat Jan 03, 2015 5:41 am

One of important practices for us for today is meditation. And this is very consonant with what Brahma did to realize who is he and who is God. By doing that he showed us personal example. But it is also said that yuga dharma for age of Kali is not meditation but chanting holy names of God. Whether isn't this contradiction?

Re: Practices and techniques

by **Hari** » Sun Jan 04, 2015 11:24 pm

First off, this question is more suited to the good old days forum because it is based in something you learned in those good old days that now seems to be in contradiction to what you feel presently.

I live nowadays. Meditation has value because it connects me to the divine energy and personalities. I will not stop doing it because someone says it is not the best or not important. I doubt this time span called "yuga" has the power to determine how I shall evolve and I doubt that if I only chanted, everything will gloriously appear. I have not seen it in practical reality. I think much more is required and therefore I have shared my ideas with you all.

But please do not consider anything I say as restricting you. You must do what you feel is best for you.

This may not be the answer you wanted, neither might it be in the format you desired. There has been a recent tendency in this forum to slant the questions or discussions towards the good old days. I do not write or speak relative to those days. I will only include ideas or concepts from those days when they are presently part of me because I only wish to share ideas I now consider valuable. There are many old days people around who thrive when asked about these "contradictions." I am not one of them.

Re: Practices and techniques

by **Drpta** » Tue Jan 13, 2015 3:56 pm

Since time immemorial there exists tradition to perform pilgrimages to holy places. Different scriptures describe a big benefit for people performed pilgrimage. All existed religions have such places. Also there are a lot of so called "places of force" on the Earth. All these places I think is very interesting places because of the presence of special energies or highest beings appeared there more intensive then in other places. What do you think about this practice of visiting holy places? Can you suggest any places for visit and why?

Re: Practices and techniques

by **Hari** » Sat Jan 17, 2015 11:39 pm

According to my experience, some places have great power associated with them, others amplify our own power or the power of nature when we visit them, and some places fill us with moods of love, or peace, or awe and wonder. Most holy places I have visited have wonderful qualities, but the more commercialized they become, the less their original quality manifests. When I first went to Vrindavan in 1972, I found the spiritual atmosphere to be mystical, enticing, and embracing. When it became discovered as a place for tourism or retirement and more and more houses, shops, roads, hotels and the like were built, the atmosphere suffered. I cannot say if the potency of Vrindavan changed, but I can definitely say that my experience there changed for the worse. Mayapur became very different from when I first went there in 1973, but I knew how to avoid the crowds and troubles when I wanted to. I sought out Mayapur's natural spiritual energy and it always allowed me to find it easily.

There are hundreds of holy places in India and nearby countries. Some people like some places better than others. You have to experiment as a tourist.

Here is something that might be controversial: I was walking in Seattle around an area where Kamala had a course one day. Suddenly I found myself in a spot that filled me with images, feelings, and clear thoughts about the American Indians who resided there long before. The power there could easily be felt. I stood there and absorbed it as long as I could. I felt blessed.

I have felt amazing vibrations and energy in various forests all over the world. I loved these energies. I do not think any one country can claim exclusive rights to having amazing places! I shall never forget the amazing experience I had on the beach in Stavanger, Norway, during a mid winter storm. And who can forget that wonderful forest in Germany? Not !! But these places had power that spoke to me. I cannot say they would speak to you, but you never know till you try...

## **Faith**

by **kalamala1** » Mon Nov 10, 2014 8:41 am

Dear Hari

All the so called knowledge and point of view on all existence and especially spiritual activates in our life mainly founded on faith.

In spirituality it is 100% for common people (not for real mystics)

But even science is based on faith let say astronomy they have theories about other galactic and so on

but it is so far how can one really trust that the laws of nature which they are using in there calculation is same on such a distances, so they have only faith that it is same.

My question is does faith have real value especially in spirituality.

What if one have faith to some wrong ideas which is not corresponding with reality?

Or faith itself creates the special reality?

Are there any other way to move on the spiritual road except faith?

Re: Faith

by **Hari** » Wed Nov 12, 2014 11:24 am

A scientist might have an opinion that he strongly believes. Whether or not he uses the term, he has some faith in the accepted standard of knowledge, his training in his field, his capacity to understand the data he observes and the conclusions he reaches, as well as the wisdom in the community of his peers and, ultimately, his own opinions. When the theories and opinions of

scientists are challenged by new evidence or research, they often change their opinion because they are more concerned with a truth that works than an idea that doesn't.

A religionist often embraces a faith because it feels right to them. They accept it and its authority. Their personal experiences amplify their faith as they fit everything in their life into their religious ideal. They find their faith carries them through problems and painful situations. If the system they embrace requires surrendering to scriptures and authorities, they reject external challenges or alternative ideas. A true believer remains faithful to the original ideal, even when that ideal is tested by circumstances. They generally accept any fault in their life to be a result of their inability to properly act.

A spiritualist aware of divine essence is not bound by faith in a belief system because their spirituality flows from within to interact with their world. Because they are continually challenged by momentary circumstances, experiences and ideas, they transform their consciousness to accommodate their changing world. Going with the flow of life is a natural course for one who experiences things as they are rather than what a belief system says they should be. This kind of spiritualist is somewhat of a hybrid between a scientist and a religionist. They observe the world around them, experience how their interactions with others change their world, and adjust their actions to insure compatibility with their energy. They have faith that they can deal with any situation without losing their spiritual integrity. They remain true to themselves and their connection to the divine.

Re: Faith

by **Vajra** » Sun Dec 14, 2014 8:53 am

Dear Hari  
you wrote

*A spiritualist aware of divine essence is not bound by faith in a belief system because their spirituality flows from within to interact with their world. Because they are continually challenged by momentary circumstances, experiences and ideas, they transform their consciousness to accommodate their changing world. Going with the flow of life is a natural course for one who experiences things as they are rather than what a belief system says they should be. This kind of spiritualist is somewhat of a hybrid between a scientist and a religionist. They observe the world around them, experience how their interactions with others change their world, and adjust their actions to insure compatibility with their energy. They have faith that they can deal with any situation without losing their spiritual integrity. They remain true to themselves and their connection to the divine.*

I like very much the way as spiritualists is described by you since for us and most of educated modern people to have a blind faith of religionists is hardly acceptable, especially since spiritualists based not on the fear but on the investigation of nature of all .

Re: Faith

by **Akhila L** » Sun Dec 14, 2014 12:14 pm

Dear Hari,

Thank you for this very accurate depiction of the "spiritual scenario". The science works exactly the way you described it. For some reason, we have a tendency to either reject our inner feelings and intuition to only rely on the "objective facts" = tertium non datur, or we become fanatically attached to the closed religion systems, and we buy "the whole package" of the given system with beliefs and rules that may not refer to us as we are today. Either way, faith is needed, either you believe your experiment or your religious leaders.

I do not like strong leaders as they have a tendency to stop your own growth. Either in physical world science or spiritual science. Probably, their intentions are originally good but the effects may be deleterious.

Just as you treat somebody for a disease, and you over treat him.

Anyway, very inspiring and encouraging comment by you.

One question: to preserve "the spiritual integrity" in any situation. What is in your opinion and experience the best strategy? To pray? To meditate? To give and serve at any cost? Or to withdraw from the situations that are too challenging?

Re: Faith

by **Hari** » Wed Dec 17, 2014 4:59 pm

You preserve your spiritual integrity by not allowing others to drown you in their own problems, by not doing something you know is not the best thing to do, by always being true to yourself, and by sharing yourself with others according to your desire to express what you are. There are other things too, but this is the gist of it. Prayer is not part of this. No one should give and serve at any cost! We have to consider all the factors involved in action, including the price to pay for fulfilling our needs and the circumstances we are in. We are not slaves who must act as we are told or according to some archaic ideal. If we see that a situation is too challenging, then certainly withdraw from it!

Re: Faith

by **Akhila L** » Thu Dec 18, 2014 8:24 am

Thank you.

I find the topic very important and practical as well. I refer to the first sentence of your comment. For me, it has been maybe the greatest challenge in life. This is what I meant by to endure vs. to withdraw. I think the greatest part of this challenge is a fear of not being accepted or to be rejected by others. Or to be brave enough to live the way to be true to yourself. But I would like to explore it even more.

An example: I hate see animals suffer and the vision of their suffering has been plaguing me for a very long time. However, I have to live with and interact with people for whom eating meat is an obvious part of their existence. These people are otherwise a valuable part of my life, both on a professional and private plan. I like them, I like to talk to them, I like discussing different topics with them, I like meeting them and having a good time. In the back of my mind, I am sometimes frustrated why they cannot get it that this part of their existence creates suffering ? But I never discuss it with them. How do you deal with such inner conflicts? I am sure it is a part of your life's experience too.

Re: Faith

by **Hari** » Tue Dec 23, 2014 9:06 pm

Either you sit in a room alone all the time, or you accept people who they are despite them doing some things you do not like. After all, if I ignored people who did something I did not like, I would ignore everyone, all the time. I try to relate to everyone as they are and not as I wish them to be, although included within my interaction are my best wishes. I always reserve the option to accept or reject any association. Why I accept or reject interacting with others is complex. There are thousands of factors in every relationship. Just do the best you can. There is no reason to lose yourself within other person's faults. You are who you are, they are who they are. They are not you and you are not them. You can try to be of service when your service is desired, or you can just be a friend who shares his consciousness and awareness. How much you take from others depends on you. It is your choice.

Re: Faith

by **Akhila L** » Wed Dec 24, 2014 11:18 am

Thank you of sharing this comment. I hope you do not mind if I come back to the first line of your former answer:

*"You preserve your spiritual integrity by not allowing others to drown you in their own problems"*

Do you mean "to assist" but not "to engage yourself"? To be observer and not the part of the scenario? Instinctively, I understand very well what you mean. However, whatever you do and whatever choices you make will make you a part of the interactions sooner or later. If you see a beggar on the street, you have to make a choice, to give him money or not, to ignore him or to interact with him. This is his life but your paths cross at this moment. Could you add some explanation to this specific line?

Re: Faith

by **Hari** » Sat Dec 27, 2014 7:42 pm

We have to engage ourselves to assist others. But if you are stopping the bleeding of someone in an accident, are you bleeding? No! Do you feel badly that they are bleeding, maybe, but it is more important to stop their bleeding. How can you help someone as a doctor if you become bewildered by the pain of your patients? The correct attitude is to listen and observe and do what is best for the patient. To listen and observe you require detachment. If you are involved in their suffering, you can no longer properly listen or observe because you are now as important as they are and also require help.

If I see a beggar and feel that I should help, I do. If I feel I should not, I do not. I make that choice. In neither case am I absorbed in the life of the beggar. I am simply determining how to properly respond.

Re: Faith

by **Akhila L** » Fri Jan 02, 2015 7:27 pm

Yes, I see what you are trying to say. I think the word "properly" is the crucial one. We make choices all the time. I read at many places that the first thing you feel when interacting with others is the the reflection of your real nature. You can literally hear the voice saying what is good for you at the moment. But we used to rationalize and calculate, to filter out what is threatening us in our imagination. Is it really good for me to engage or to sacrifice a bit of my time energy money for the other one in need? Then we "adjust" our spontaneous response to the result of our calculation, and, often, we retreat from the battle. Walsch has written that a person who sees that realizes and convinces himself (has faith) that this is good for him (whatever happens in the end) but the master knows that. I am definitely not a master but I am dreaming of being one. It must be a great experience to know instead of having faith and to act accordingly.

Re: Faith

by **Hari** » Sun Jan 04, 2015 11:48 pm

Nicely said!

Re: Faith

by **Akhila L** » Sat Jan 10, 2015 9:54 pm

Thank for your kind words. Happy to discuss it with you.

## **varnashrama**

by **kamalalama1** » Thu Sep 11, 2014 2:35 pm

Dear Hari

I want to ask another question about Varnashrama.

Can you say what real benefit will get people as individual s and society as whole, from this system?

And why do the society need that system? What is the real meaning of this system?

Why i am asking since we have an example of India where Varnashrama system was the way of a huge country many years

but as a result it doesn't at all look as attractive system more then that it became at present the hinderance in many ways for evolution of millions.

And another question in this regard how and why one should figure out his varna what is a need for it to make another label?

And who will be the Ones who taking risk and responsibility to label others?

And why one should trust them, ,?

What place have the concept of independence in this system?

Since independence as i understand is one of main platform from ones evolution isn't it?

Re: varnashrama

by **Hari** » Sat Sep 13, 2014 9:29 pm

I wrote a book about this a long time ago...

Krsna spoke of the most important aspect of this system in the Gita: everyone has an inclination to work and the qualities that support that work. Your varna (the manner of work that fits your potential best) falls within some very basic guidelines. We are all born with this basic quality and it forms the basis of how we might best earn our livelihood or serve within society. Knowing that we are born with a specific quality helps us understand why we succeed at some things and fail at others. But then again, there is nature and then there is nurture wherein a conflict arises when we are naturally a business person but were raised to be a leader. In this case the individual is unhappy or unfulfilled as a leader, and more comfortable with figuring out ways to produce, sell and make money. One can safely conclude that it is more advantageous for an individual to be trained and encouraged to act according to their nature.

The real benefit of varna is a social psychological one, where individuals are given the best opportunity to fulfill their potential. This creates strong, stable and healthy people who can support a complex society. Since varna is linked to the basic nature of human beings and therefore cannot be erased, working with it can only benefit society.

Understanding the propensity and quality of children is traditionally the realm of parents and teachers. Ultimately, the individual will understand their own nature even without this initial guidance.

Re: varnashrama

by **kamalalama1** » Tue Sep 16, 2014 6:02 pm

Dear Harijee

Thank you for answer

But still I don't understand how in society and especially in the sects can be introduced Varnashrama

By the way there so many astrologers and psychologists helping people to figure out there professional proper duties, is it not enough?

What is a need to make the social system ?

I am sincerely thinking that it can become as labeling people and be very much misused by some group.

Maybe I am wrong but I don't have answers on it, sincerely.

As I understand, the whole essence of proper society is the satisfaction which people in it as individuals have to have and as a result the whole society will be satisfied entity

One of the main problems in finding satisfaction is proper engagement of each individual

According to his real desires and capacities.

The problem is what is real desires since during the lifetime one can get hundreds of artificial desires

which is not at all his really own ones for example when one associate with smokers can get the desire to smoke and under the havvy advertisement can get other desires also due to envy and competition and other reasons

So until one not engaged in the field of activities which is corresponding with his real desires he will be not satisfied not full and will feel some kind of constant worrying.

The real satisfaction is coming when one executing his dharma his duties towards all dependents

Towards Gods and ones who helped him and himself as well

So two things is really important for satisfaction

Activities which he should perform and duties which he have to perform towards dependents Varnashrama system initially was made exactly for getting maximum as it possible satisfaction in life stream for individuals and for society since without satisfaction will not be a peace and without peace will not be good spiritual contact.

Varna means the specific group of activities which one can perform according to ones nature and real desires which is also coming from his nature. And this group of activities of course will be in service

ultimately, to whole society in direct or indirect ways .

Ashrama is the status in which one have very specific duties towards dependents and society also

This is my understanding of varnaashrama in very short

But for activities based on real desires one should have his own free will no others

And actually for proper society, people should act on the level of freewill and should be independent Since the practice showed that the society or union of independent peoples is more active more bright and more attractive than an army like society based on fear.

That is why in vedic literature the main principal to defining own varna was not base om birth but

was based on ones qualification and personal desire later own it was changed.

Of course we all depend on each other on some level but here is not about that dependence.

So when arising the question how in sects can be established varnashrama I really don't see any real way since people there don't have the basic platform of independence in all means the most important platform for revealing ones on soul desires.

And practically in same situation many people in society most of them in some kind of sects

Re: varnashrama

by **Hari** » Tue Sep 16, 2014 7:46 pm

Perhaps you did not understand my reply completely? I chose not to reply with the negative aspects of varnasrama and the obvious conclusion that it is impossible to implement in any



form that existed in the past. I emphasized those aspects of it that had the most value by focusing on the essence of varna and how the system highlighted the need for people to understand how everyone interacted in a properly working society. I do not care who figures out who is who. Whatever works! Labels are only as bad as they are incorrect. We label everything, all the time. If people know who they are and how to best live their lives, this cannot be bad. If they further know the optimal way to interact with others, this can only help.

But how that is done and who is to do it is another issue entirely. But if you do not think the system has value, why ask about it? And if it does not have true value at present, who cares who will determine what?

Perhaps what I am asking you is, what is the point of the inquiry? What do you really want to know?

Re: varnashrama

by **kamalamala1** » Wed Sep 17, 2014 3:33 am

My whole point in this question was to figure out the real value of this system. Although i understand it values in the way as i understand ( as explained in my previous text) but i don't see what will come really from it and how. And the issue how that can be done and who is to do is also a big question isn't it? Yes you are right i didn't understand why you didn't answer the negative aspects of varnashrama but this not the point.

Re: varnashrama

by **Hari** » Wed Sep 17, 2014 1:13 pm

OK, then what I answered first is the real value of the system! It is a very valuable thing! Know who you are as an individual and what basic social type is best for you. Recognize this in others. Learn to relate with the least friction and with the greatest group benefit.

Implementing this is far easier than trying to implement an entire social system. Understanding the structure of optimal interaction in society is a good thing that benefits every society regardless of belief systems. I personally see no benefit for modern people beyond this one aspect of varna understanding. But this one thing is the essence of it all, so one does not need anything else.

All social templates require a deeper understanding of the varna archetypes described. When these fundamental social types are understood better, how they relate to each other will become more obvious. The major hindrance to the acceptable implementation of these relations is the lack of ethic in the people and the degraded self-interest that is rampant in the world today. At present, society is faced with an almost insurmountable task of restoring the human condition, meaning, to restore goodness in society. This begins by culturing good people who create good families. It is a major task, but one that must be undertaken.

Re: varnashrama

by **kamalamala1** » Tue Sep 23, 2014 6:22 pm

Dear Hari

Your answers somehow made me think more and more and I suddenly figured out how many deep meanings in every sentence you wrote  
Especially I really began to realize how important the meaning of the following your sentence

“The major hindrance to the acceptable implementation of these relations is the lack of ethic in the people and the degraded self-interest that is rampant in the world today”

I never thought about this very important aspect of Varnaashrama.

Actually in any society will not be real evolution and happiness if people doesn't really honor the really ones who carrying the moral and spiritual values.(not bogus ones I mean the bogus brahmanas and gurus)

Now days the most value is to get money by hook or crook and the ones who without any values becoming successful in that they becoming the heroes the most adorable ones nobody cares how and what they did for it and what characters they are( just see on this so called stars).

It was also for me a complete new interesting issue the other sentence that you wrote

“Understanding the structure of optimal interaction in society is a good thing that benefits every society regardless of belief systems. “

As I understand that varnashrama system is not the possession of Hinduism and can be implemented

In any society regardless there believe system it very interesting

Actually, for me it is obvious that in every society there are varnas but still.

Can you please explain in more details what you mean?

Also your sentence is really really true. . At present, society is faced with an almost insurmountable task of restoring the human condition, meaning, to restore goodness in society. This begins by culturing good people who create good families. It is a major task, but one that must be undertaken.

People lost their orienteers families lost their deep meaning

Homosexuality, hypocrisy cheating valueless movements and valueless businessmen's and all kind

of craziness became usual in present society.

There are no any more traditions which was the meaning for carrying values.

Yes families I agree is real foundation in any society since if families is not good children's will have

so may hindrances in there evolution and education in proper meaning of this ward.

In this regard also appearing another question it coming from my past which nowadays

At all not important for me but still I am sometime worrying about them.

I mean how in such antisocial antifamily societies (sects)can be implemented

Varnashrama?

Although they also have so much goodness.

By the way

You was totally right every single word is a label actually everything is labeled in our life.

Let say we are trying to explain what is a table by this word we are labeling the whole category of

things which look as same but actually they are all different.

Same all other words ,people, stars, gods ,pens, mans ,woman's and e.t.c

It is actually the whole very interesting

issue.

Re: varnashrama

by **Hari** » Wed Sep 24, 2014 7:59 pm

Varna is a label in the sanskrit language. Every language has a label to denote similar concepts. In English one could say occupational categories or divisions of labor or all kinds of things, but sociologists throughout the world have similar terms in their own language. Every culture has a conception of division of labor within their society and an existing "code" or set of expectations for those within each kind of work. These expectations are manifest in the interactions that exist in the workplace. Teachers are supposed to act as teachers, for example. When they do not act with the intelligence, respect, sensitivity or awareness of the needs of those they teach, we get upset. Military personnel have their standard roles. Government leaders are supposed to organize, protect, and increase prosperity. Farmers produce food, businessmen create and distribute goods, and workers build and so on. We are all, throughout the world, aware of social divisions.

There are a few things we are unaware of. The most important is the four basic divisions and the manner in which they ideally interact. Another is that we all naturally tend towards a particular kind of work when we are allowed to. Cultivating these two things will assist every society.

How to do this requires educating people and their leaders of the importance of these principles as well as educating families, supporting compatible cultures and traditions, and assisting people to find themselves. This is not something you or I can do on a large scale. What you or I can do is to help each individual we meet to understand themselves and to find out the best way to interact with others in the world. More than this we cannot do without far more facility and support.

That people in ISKCON cannot figure this out is nothing new. Although ISKCON people proclaim to be Prabhupada followers, in truth they are not. If one were to analyze his lectures, one would find the topic he spoke of most was the institutionalization of varnas. Yet, it is ignored in ISKCON as material. I find it slightly interesting, although it makes perfect sense considering that people pick and choose what they want to know and follow according to what they think they need or what they might get out of it. Since most are eager for liberation and getting free from the pains of this world, worrying about properly organizing society is not seen as essential. Besides, they are mainly not educated and have no skill to do this. But that is another issue entirely.

Re: varnashrama

by **kamalamala1** » Tue Oct 21, 2014 8:28 am

Harijee in this regard arising more questions

From your answers I understood that your vision of varnashrama is not based only on scriptures

I totally agree with you but I cannot understand what will be the new understanding of varnas and ashramas in modern world?

In Sanskrit texts there was a very elaborate explanations of the duty's of one who is in such and such ashrama and varna.

How this stages of live (ashramas) will be applied for modern people what should be duties for certain ashrama and varna for modern people ,?

I am asking this since the societies nowadays and in old ages when was written the duties for varnas and ashramas are completely different.

There are much more questions appearing when we examine varnas.

Varnas can be recognized by activities or maybe more by motivations?

Let examine ashramas, first one had to become brahmachari according to sastras, a student for many years should live under the total control of teachers (gurus) he should totally control his senses (especially sexual desire) and should not mix with opposite sex. And this was only for mens and women's didn't have any such duties. More then that it is written in the Sanskrit texts that ladies even when they are 11 years old should be given to marriage and that all with them.

But in modern world it is not like that and cannot anymore be like that all the ladies also getting education and they are free for there life and never one of them will want to be marry in such a young age. They have equal rights with mens and it is very good but in vedic times it wasn't in this way

Although they was very much appreciated and loved but still they didn't have same rights.

The next ashrama is householder he should earn money according to his varna and maintain his family

and help people this is more or less is ok nowadays if we don't consider so many divorces .

But what about vanaprastha and sanyasa this cannot be applied to modern people in a way as it was described in vedic literature .Sanyasa is hardly possible for most of the people

How this stages of live will be for modern people let say for us,?

There are much more questions appearing when we examine varnas.

Varnas can be recognized by activities or maybe more by motivations?

I am asking this because since there are examples of monks but there motivation can be more economical then spiritual so many so called brahmanas who think only about money which is not the characteristic of a brahmana.

And what about scientist thay supposed to be brahmanas but actually many of them are shudras from my point of view or vaishyas?

And also so many politicians who just vayshyas but not Kshatriyas since they don't care about people at all.

Most artists in vedic culture was considered as shudras aho are they now?

Actually in very short what will be the definition of Brhmana Kshatria and Vaishya for modern society

For modern people?

And should we base our understanding of Varnashrama on vedic scriptures?

Re: varnashrama

by **Hari** » Tue Oct 21, 2014 6:05 pm

I am somewhat uncertain how to answer your question. You seem to be writing from the point of view that somehow I want to restore varnashrama or that it should be restored by us or someone. I do not wish to restore varnashrama and I seriously doubt anyone else can restore it. The way it has been used in the past seems incompatible with the modern world. The only aspect of it with academic value for the modern world is the relation between the varnas, which is particularly relevant to social scientists or social engineers. They might incorporate some of these principles in the planning or designing they do, even though they most probably will not label what they are saying as varnashrama.

Considering this, perhaps you want to rephrase your question? Otherwise, I don't see the point in me struggling to defend something I see little point in defending.

Re: varnashrama

by **kamalamala1** » Tue Nov 04, 2014 10:11 am

My intention is really to try understand the importance of this social institution for modern world ,and nothing else.

Since we are using the word varnashrama and it came from old vedic scriptures with its definition i am trying to figure out what will it be for modern time and why it is so important.

Re: varnashrama

by **Hari** » Tue Nov 04, 2014 3:06 pm

Ok, so I answered your question in my last text, right?

*The only aspect of it with academic value for the modern world is the relation between the varnas, which is particularly relevant to social scientists or social engineers. They might incorporate some of these principles in the planning or designing they do, even though they most probably will not label what they are saying as varnashrama.*

Re: varnashrama

by **Hari** » Sat Nov 08, 2014 8:40 pm

Here is something interesting, I think



I saw a movie called "Divergent" and it dealt with a post modern twist with implementing varnashrama! There were "factions" as they were called, and two of them represented brahmanas (who are erudite and truthful) and the other three corresponded to the other three varnas. I do not want to give away the plot, but I think if you can see it, you might have fun with it!

Re: varnashrama

by **kamalamala1** » Mon Nov 10, 2014 7:13 am

I saw that movie long ago and yesterday had a look again and it was one of the reasons that i began to make questions ,since i understood that people interested on this issues. From that movie looks that the motivation is the first point for deffention then the activity itself is second

And the idea that someone can have the qualification of all 3 Varnas it is interesting i know someone like that.But do you believe that it is possible?

Personally i understand that when one really engaged in his field of activities the one which he really like

not because money and so on, then he can be really happy and satisfied and then more then that his children's have a big and good chance to get into that profession easily without extra endeavor without difficulties and become happy ,so like that family traditions will come out and whole society

will be very simple to manage.

More then that one can have the best possibility to associate with others who have the same goals in the life and this is even more important since we all social beings isn't it?

But there can of course come many negative things as we saw in the movie and it i believe happened

Can you say who should rule the society brahmanas or Kshatryas?

Re: varnashrama

by **Hari** » Wed Nov 12, 2014 10:25 am

*Can you say who should rule the society brahmanas or Kshatryas?*

What is your opinion on this?

Re: varnashrama

by **kamalamala1** » Thu Nov 13, 2014 7:40 am

It is difficult to say exactly.

From Vedic tradition King's ruling society but again the brahmanas consul was overseeing sometime what kings doing

but this wasn't a system just in some bad cases they came out from there ashramas and using there Brahminical power

made proper decision.(also this brahmanas usually was maharishis not just ordinary Brahmanas)

So we can say that kings was ruling the society.

But from that movie intellectual class and enunciates (Brahmanas) was rulers

That is why the question arises what is the best.

Re: varnashrama

by **Hari** » Fri Nov 14, 2014 9:24 pm

Without referring to history or some tradition, government works best when there are selfless leaders who desire to do what is best for the greatest number of people in the society. Such a leader has to be a good manager who can determine where to find the best advice and information and use it properly.

When you strip away all the names and categories from scripture, things boil down to common sense methodologies universally recognized as maximizing social development and maintenance.

Re: varnashrama

by **kamalamala1** » Wed Nov 19, 2014 12:05 pm

You mean leaders like Pandavas they was really super selfless?

But most of the kings very rare was really selfless.

And leaders nowadays also.

Although some maybe trying there best.

Re: varnashrama

by **Hari** » Fri Nov 21, 2014 6:00 pm

No leader is super selfless. Selfless is complete in itself!

There will always be conflict and unrest in the world. This is the nature of life.

Here is food for thought: Yudhishthira was a great leader, far beyond anyone we have ever known, surrounded by the greatest personalities we could ever imagine. Look how he was exiled and how millions of people had to die to restore him to power.

If you seek utopia, expect to be disappointed...

Joined: Tue Dec 09, 2008 5:46 pm

Re: varnashrama

by **kamalamala1** » Wed Nov 26, 2014 10:29 am

Yes all the heroes of that time was so great one even cannot imagine.

Mahabharat is the greatest epos of all times.

I just read one episode when Dritarashtra was lamenting after the war because of his sons death, with him was lamenting Yudhisthira and his brothers there was always nearby Dritarashtra and was serving him as a real king ,what great hearth they had what a kindness, i bow down with my mind and hearth before them really.

Yes varnashrama should not be some utopia it should be something practical.

Just yesterday was interesting news Catholic Pope was invited to the euro parliament and what he said was really interesting.

He said that the biggest problem of Europe is not economy not political situation with Ukraine but loneliness of European citizens.

And he is right since because ashrama institution is completely destroyed in west, families lost there role

all people live apart and don't care much, varnashrama is the way to make real community real families where people will not feel loneliness. .

In India people don't have that problem since in India and Asia the idea of ashrama is in value and people respect ashrama institutions.

That is why although people in India generally more poor then Europeans but they are happy . Since happiness coming not from machines and tecnology but from people and people is the best value in the world.

When i was in Europe i find no people in the streets it was so quite like in cemetery i thought that it is just my feeling but when Pop told about loneliness problem i find out that it is it.

And how make it practical nowadays is a big question.

I also want to add that from the example of Yudhisthir and Vidura we can understand what a great personality Yamaraj is, we can understand real divine qualities of Gods. Since Yudhisthir and Vidura were incarnation of Yamaraj.

Re: varnashrama

by **harsi** » Wed Nov 26, 2014 9:39 pm

Hari wrote:

*The real benefit of varna is a social psychological one, where individuals are given the best opportunity to fulfill their potential. This creates strong, stable and healthy people who can support a complex society.*

That is definitely so. I made the same experience. You said also ones something which elucidates very good how a good manager of people would have to act in order to get things done: "You have to get the right people in the right places. That is the whole point of Varnashrama." From a [video on Youtube](#).

Re: varnashrama

by **kamalamala1** » Fri Dec 26, 2014 1:56 pm

About varnas it is more or less something is clear.  
But there are a huge questions about ashramas.

I am trying to analyze and figure out how should be proper ashrams and the rules in it .

In this regard arising several questions.

What is the best for spiritual development.

For example in the west tradition there are some rules and customs for families which is completely different from the rules and customs of the western traditions

Let say in the east householder usually live with there parents in the same house and generally it is tradition and they feel comfortable with them and take care for them and it is a rule there that all decisions for ones own life should be made by elder members of family .

More then that there are a rule younger brothers or sisters should respect and obey to eldest one, and it was like that not only in Mahabharat time.In the west it is not at all so and in many cases completely opposite, some parents doing all to get there child's to live separate from them and be completely independent and they doing it for there point of view and from there love to them.And what to speak about eldest brothers in the west nobody so much considering the age.

I remember one story in this regard there was one worker from Tajikistan here .

And as soon he was getting his salary he Immediately sending it to his father and then father was

distributing it amongst family members to ones who need it more.

He was forcibly married and he had to obey all his 8 eldest brothers and it was quite uncomfortable situation ,from the other side it was beautiful tradition. There idea of family is more waste then in west.

So since if one is bound or controlled by many others and cannot display his real desires and identity in eastern tradition, especially woman's, it look that this kind of traditions hindering spiritual growth of a person but from other side they are more save to not make karmic mistakes and be more save in the life and be pure.

But the western tradition allows one to be himself totally free and get the experiences for independent actions and even mistakes ,but there also one can become heartless and careless and insane and lose his purity.

Especially teenagers can fall under the influence of bad company and end up in total loneliness and frustration which is so usual in west.

So considering all this what do you think is the best for spiritual evolution to live like in east tradition or like in the west tradition?

P.S

Harijee you know while writing this I suddenly understood why it was so important to push in vedic literature, in vedic time , the idea of renunciation and detachment, and how useless to push this ideas nowadays in the west, since in the west ,people became insanely detached they detached so much that it is becoming dangerous for future of society and they need to recover, to become at least in some level attached ,so that family's don't fall apart and children's don't suffer.

Re: varnashrama

by **Hari** » Sat Dec 27, 2014 6:57 pm



You know, you should figure this out for yourself and answer your own questions. The reason I am saying this is because I have no interest in this subject and it is hard for me to be placed in the role of explaining it. Even the term "householder," is fairly absurd in the modern context. All the sannyasis I know in a certain movement have what can easily be called a household, even down to those who care for them. Functionally, to survive in modern society you have to have a place to live that is a home. I am therefore not interested in the term. I am not really interested in any term regarding "ashram" since I fail to see the relevance.

I cannot comment on whether it is best to live in the east or west. As far as I can see, one lives where one lives and according to their family and community culture one is stuck with the values and ideals. This changes over time and every individual will rebel in their own way. Spiritual evolution can take place in either environment and I do not see one as better than the other.

There is no such thing as vedic, so I am not sure what you mean. If you mean previously in India, then maybe detachment was valuable to counterbalance extreme attachment, but I am not sure if one can state with confidence that this worked beneficially within the last few centuries or that it is working now, so why bother with this discussion?

None of these points matter, in my humble opinion. Just as the value of varna is mainly psycho-social to help define the relationships between different qualities of work, the value of "ashram" is today mainly only important in as much as it assists families to be stable and children to be protected and given the best possible circumstances to evolve and grow.

Am I radical? Nah! This is normal stuff. What is radical is attempting to insert historical Indian cultural ideals into those who are not naturally inclined to them. Look at the wonderful results of the movement in the middle east where radical religion is being forced upon everyone regardless if they want it or not. And I am being sarcastic.

This topic has run its course. I do not see much value in continuing it. Sorry if this is rude, but you would find it more advantageous to research it yourself and discuss with others who are interested in it.

Re: varnashrama  
by **kamalamala1** » Mon Dec 29, 2014 8:30 am

Thank you for your answer  
it is so good that you wrote it.

Since previously you wrote a book about Varnashram and it was illusion that this issue including all so called vedic terms has value in this regard  
And also in your answers in the post in your forum Varnashrama Manifesto, was not so clear does your supporting that  
Ideas in your book or not .  
So by your this answer it became clear to me that all this doesn't have any value nowadays and all this terms like brahmana and ksatriya ashrams and others is useless.  
And actually you are right.

And also it once more it became obvious that all this categories made in ISKCON like householder sannyasis, brahmacharis and ....is just a theater and we were playing in that theater the best years of our life's taking it so seriously that some even sacrifice their life's. Very pity story.

Re: varnashrama

by **Hari** » Mon Dec 29, 2014 3:17 pm

I do not think that the major elements of this concept are useless! On the contrary, they are still important because these four major categories always exist in human society. These categories relate to the fundamental nature of the human being, so awareness of them is good at all times.

To recreate this concept in the modern world is impossible and I do not see why one should bother with discussing practical implementation. That does not mean the concepts have no value. Even though modern social structures look very different than older one's, people are similar. These ideals of the psychology and physical qualities of work are equally relevant now as they were previously.

I wrote that book because if one examines Prabhupada's lectures and talks, you will see that he spoke about these ideas more than 50% of the time, or at least he mentioned them in some form or other that often. I saw that practically no one was interested in these concepts and simply listened and let the words fly through their heads without considering them. People used these concepts for personal gain as the occasion fit, and discarded the various austerities and responsibilities associated with these occupational categories. I do not wish to discuss the failings of those who heard what he said but were not moved by these words because it is not interesting to me any longer. Many claim to be followers, yet they do not actually follow. They pick and choose according to what suits them. Hypocrisy aside, I am simply explaining that I felt a book needed to be written to attempt to present a viable solution to the total lack of a universal social structure within ISKCON and the world. The book failed to fulfill that need and therefore it also has little value at present.

All that has value is awareness of the qualities that naturally appear when people gather together and perform work. Understanding this helps us to optimize education, seek out the best people for the right positions, encourage leaders to feel responsible and generally for everyone to live a life that is ethical and compatible with others in their surroundings, as well as to live in a manner that is true to themselves. This is the main message of the system and this message will shine throughout all time whether we accept it or not. It is better to accept our qualities and work with them than to reject this valuable information due to the manner in which it was presented or how it has been perverted for self interest throughout the ages.

And that is certainly my humble opinion.

## **Dismantling of 3D Reality?**

by **maha** » Thu Dec 18, 2014 5:40 am

Dear Hari,

I have been listening to your latest broadcast lectures of the Spring 2011 which one would roughly call apocalyptic series. Even they were related to Fukushima event there somehow I wasn't feeling that much apocalyptic that time, anyway much more so in compare to nowadays. Nowadays we don't even have to mention numerous threats and madness happening around the world as it is very vivid and all over news. Besides also many spiritualists at least whom I know even among our community undergo very serious challenges related to health, economy or relationships.

Back there in 2011 you have referred to the Hathors' message by Tom Kenyon where they advised a meditation of feeling an unconditional gratitude as often as possible as a way to

safely go through the difficult transformation times. Also similar kind of meditation was advised few times by Jasmuheen and this feeling of unconditional gratitude seems to be exactly the opposite to the downward spiral state of feeling not good enough – be it either feeling the self as not good enough or always perceiving one's situation or the world around as not good enough.

Now when I looked up to the latest Hathors' message through Tom Kenyon it is called 'Dismantling of 3D Reality' and advises strongly to be in contact with our body and our inner spirit essence to survive during the what they call 'more difficult passage of planetary transformation'.

Hence my question is what do you feel about it from your unique perception point? Is it really what is happening now – Dismantling of 3D reality? If you could kindly share with us your comments and advice on the latest critical time developments? And since I know that you always see far ahead, perhaps what we should be ready for or even prepare ourselves to?

Thank you!

Sincerely yours,  
maha

Re: Dismantling of 3D Reality?

by **Hari** » Tue Dec 23, 2014 9:30 pm

Yes, my problem is being ahead of my time. I have not figured out how far ahead, but anywhere between 5-15 years makes sense.

Fukushima is an interesting example. Ebola is another. No one talks about the nuclear reactor, now yet the radiation poured into the ocean at an alarming rate. As I said then, no one will tell you the truth of the situation. It is now reaching the Pacific coast of the USA and has affected marine life in the Pacific area. We tend to forget because the ocean is deep and wide, and seemingly forgiving. Even though the sea bed of Gulf of Mexico is coated with a thick layer of oil residue that has impacted the environment on a level that cannot be calculated, we do not worry about it. Ebola! Remember those headlines? Came and went with a flourish. More are dying now from it than ever before, but it is old news so who cares?

The world economy is really in tatters and things are shaking left and right, yet people are focused on their game boxes, TV and streaming media, social networks where selfies dominate and where people rarely meet anymore physically. Phones, texting, and so on have replaced human face to face interaction. Steve Jobs was a hero? Not in my book.

Can I change this? Nope. Can I change me? Yup!

3D reality is long gone. This is why I did those meditations where we sought out the limit of consciousness by following our energy and seeing that it has no limit. This is why we looked just to the side of what we were looking at with a relaxed gaze that allowed us to see that the images in front of us were just the surface of what was there. This is why we entered dimensions and felt what was there.

Listen to the lectures and meditations we did in the past. Maybe there is something relevant to the present situation?

Me? I am already living within my world of plants and birds, now and then with the horses (although they use me only for carrots), as I continue to figure out how to survive in the coming days. I tried my very best to encourage the development of communities of like minded folks who could together create an environment where the most important things in life could be shared. After three years of this endeavor, I gave up and just did it for myself. I cannot wait forever for others to figure out what to do.

Most interesting for me was that while I was speaking about us all getting together for our mutual benefit, the people listening were drifting apart. One becomes quite discouraged seeing this. More so when one realizes that this is still the only hope.

Re: Dismantling of 3D Reality?

by **Drpta** » Sat Dec 27, 2014 9:02 am

Hi guys, I am sorry for interfere, but since you have brought up the question of community, I like to say, that self actualized people do not have tendency to live together (this is psychological fact). All of them are very strong, self sufficient and independent persons who like to act independently. For example, let us see, did ancient sages live together? As I know they lived separately and get together now and then for some prominent events. Of course, they had their ashrams in secluded place, where their family and students live. For today we have the same. All great spiritualists live and act separately. And this is good since like this they can involve much more people. So, about what a community can we say if you, Hari, are trying to train namely the self actualized people? Or am I wrong? But if you open ashram, please sign me in as number one! In ashram (school) interested people can get together for some time for train and evolve. Later on some of these people open their own schools and train other ones and so on...

Survive? Live!

Re: Dismantling of 3D Reality?

by **Hari** » Sat Dec 27, 2014 1:34 pm

Community does NOT mean:

- Living in Seclusion
- Living in an ashram
- Economic dependence
- Philosophical dependence
- Giving up freedom
- Doing something you do not want to do

Community does mean:

- Sharing resources to make life easier
- Living wherever you want and are able to
- Having friends with physical bodies nearby
- Not depending on Facebook and Forums to communicate
- Greater ability to protect what is important in life
- Better chance for children and families

Village structure has existed for thousands of years for a very good reason. Each individual is born within a family. This family nurtures and protects itself. The village nurtures and protects families and individuals.

If you want to live alone in a city, surrounded by pollution, noise, and stress, that is your choice. If you want to live alone in the forest like a sage, that is also your choice. If you want to live anywhere, you can do so.

I think community is a win win situation if it is done without being encumbered by conceptions that are not useful. I have spoken about this frequently in my lectures. I do not agree that smart, actualized people have to live alone somewhere without association. Please do not redefine words that I have taken great pains to properly define.

I like to live in the country and I do not like to live in the city. My "country" environment is a 7 minute car ride to the largest mall in North Central Florida, 12 minutes to the largest hospital in Florida and 15 minutes to the largest University in Florida. I doubt that it can be considered remote. Yet, it is in the country, I am surrounded by birds, horses, small animals, plants, trees, fresh air and good water. I grow most of our vegetables and I am working on the fruits.

I am living fine here. Do I miss having others around in the area? Sure! Would I rather have my friends nearby so we can share life together? Sure. Do I lament it is not so? No. I am well aware that it is not going to happen. I am also well aware that without it, everyone will be challenged in ways that are not nice. Am I an oracle? Definitely not. Does everything I say happen? No thank God! Does that bother me? Nope. Should it bother you? Nope.

Are there problems in the world? Yup! Can we fix them? Maybe, but we sure can fix ourselves and doing it with others is a fine way to do that.

Re: Dismantling of 3D Reality?

by **Drpta** » Sat Dec 27, 2014 4:55 pm

Yes! What you describe here I actually saw and lived in our Belarus village. Word for word! People lived there generation to generation, growing children, plow and plant together, help each other. They were spontaneously visiting each other without prior call. Share ups and downs. They herd cows and sheep in turn and gathering together for celebrations. It was absolutely ideal place. And all Belarus is like that. Even those who live in towns are always connected with their kin in village and regularly visit them to help. Of course one can argue that they drink and eat meat. And what? They are good, careful and kind people anyway. So, now I am also having house in country. There also are big hospital, supermarkets, few schools, railway station and many cultural and historical places nearby in few minutes' access. I have some friends there and we get together for some holidays, Janmashtamy for example and visit each other. We are helping each other to do some hard work and share our experience in agriculture. And yet we are absolutely independent from each other. So, can we call this as a community?

And can I ask you, how people will earn money while living in a community? I, for instance, am earning money in town, even if I do it remotely. Some of my friends lease their flats in Moscow and live on this money.

What concerns "self actualized" word, I used definition given by A.H. Maslow in his book Motivation and personality. I remember that you also use this word in your earlier lectures and I thought that your definition is quite the same. I am sorry if I made mistake.

Re: Dismantling of 3D Reality?

by **Drpta** » Sat Dec 27, 2014 5:03 pm

Harshi, as I heard you made a comment here and then remove it. Could you please bring it back since it is not clear what question Hari is answering.

Re: Dismantling of 3D Reality?

by **Hari** » Sat Dec 27, 2014 6:41 pm

There is no need for Harsi to repeat his comment. I removed it. I also answered some part of it according to what I felt was important to state regarding community.

A community is not necessarily a physical location. It is more an attitude of the people who live there. Some people where I live insist we are a community and perhaps they have some association with each other that makes them believe it to be so. I do not, therefore I do not see this as a community, rather just a bunch of people living together in the same area. I also think they have no idea what a community is because if they did they would not use that word. And yet, I cooperate with everyone here as needed and am ready to offer my service.

If you feel like you are in a community then you are. This explains why the word is used here by a couple of residents.

Just because someone is actualized according to anyone's definition does not imply that they wish to live alone.

Re: Dismantling of 3D Reality?

by **Drpta** » Sat Dec 27, 2014 9:33 pm

Okay, suppose we like to organize community for spiritualists, let us say. I think it would be an association of people or persons who able to cooperate with each other with one mood and emotions which resonate with each other. They are ones who can operate like a cohesive organism, being in harmony with each other, nature and divine. Is it so?

But do community means that people should, by all means, live in one physical place? Can they live separately, in different countries, but be united into community via their common interests? Like they do it in social networks (not good example, but why not?). And from time to time they can get together for sharing experience, education and so on in more natural manner.

Or you suppose to create community as a means of protection for people when "evil days" come?

Just because someone is actualized according to anyone's definition does not imply that they wish to live alone.

Sure. But is it easy for them to find proper association?

Re: Dismantling of 3D Reality?

by **Hari** » Sun Dec 28, 2014 7:26 pm

A community can be many things to many people. Some people think Facebook is a community. I do not. Maybe I am just an old dinosaur, but I find it boring and uninteresting. I do not find meaningful relationships on Facebook. I have had enough cat videos, amazing things that amazing people did videos, selfies, discussions about how bad this or that is, and having to accept people as friends who I have never seen or have no idea who they are! I like to be with real, physical people. But not all the time. Sometimes I like to avoid physical and virtual people. Having my own place allows me to shut the door and hide.

A community should facilitate being together with others when it is desired or required. Going for a walk with friends who live nearby is an easy task and on that walk we can joke, lament, be quiet or whatever. If I want to go for a walk with you, I have to make all kinds of arrangements at great expense and trouble and subject myself to a lot of physical hardships just to be near enough to you to say, "let's go!"

A community is very good when it facilitates life. Assisting each other with resources, energy, food, transportation, child care, education, and all the needs and requirements of life, helps everyone. Being together with a community of vegetarians, for example, insures that when you are invited to eat you do not have to worry very much about where it was cooked, what was in it, or whatever. Being in a community of people who are more or less spiritual means there are certain values that make life a little less stressful. You do not have to share everything or anything, but when you want to share, you can. When many have a need, there are many available to help fill that need. If someone needs help, there is usually someone to offer assistance. This is the nature of living in a social environment. You do not have to believe in the same thing in the same way as the others in your community to live like this!

But a community based on a philosophical ideal is not sustainable because people's ideas change. Today I may like an ideal, tomorrow not. A community based on practicality will remain relevant. I will always like to eat and anyone who likes to eat will always prefer home grown food to food shipped 5000kms while still green so that it can ripen enough to be sellable. People will appreciate speaking with other smart people who think about things, even if they disagree on points. At least if they are cultured and know how to relate with others, the conversation will be interesting. Families usually share the need for children to play, for mothers to hang out together, for the security, health and well being of their members. Regardless of your philosophy, these requirements can bind all kinds of divergent cultures.

When we are narrow minded, we require to be around people who share external similarities. When we are smarter, the internal similarities are more important. An actualized person is well aware of the internal and therefore finds more to relate to in others than one who is not actualized.

Re: Dismantling of 3D Reality?  
by **Drpta** » Mon Dec 29, 2014 7:45 am

Thank you very much! It is really the best explanation I ever heard! For me it clarified all things about community. Satisfied absolutely!

Re: Dismantling of 3D Reality?  
by **maha** » Mon Dec 29, 2014 8:02 am

Dear Hari!

I'm listening to you lecture 20110101\_Allowing\_2011 where you share your feelings and understanding for the year 2011 which was coming. Your advise was so much specific and helpful that when I look back I see how it unfolded later in a great and powerful way. If and when you feel like it could you please share your feelings and visions and advice for the year 2015 coming?  
Even if it won't be so nice and optimistic, still I believe it can be quite valuable..

Perhaps you could even record a New Year video-appeal to your audience which even country presidents do?

Thank you!

Sincerely yours,

maha

## Spiritual individuality vs. being lost in Brahman

by **maha** » Thu Dec 25, 2014 10:13 am

Dear Hari!

At the end of your wonderful lecture 20110108\_First\_Impression I asked a question about how one can hold on to his limiting beliefs and imposed roles in this world with the fear of losing one's individuality. You mentioned that the question is very good but very vast and still you responded quite deliberately how our essence cannot be destroyed and thus you cannot even imagine how we could possibly lose our individuality.

I feel that I am still not satisfied with the answer as it has more dimensions to it in the light of my recent life experience.

It is well known that when one experiences deep frustrations in relationships blaming oneself for it which happens quite often in this world even within one lifetime one wishes to cease existing. And since we know that a physical death does not help it much, I suspect it can make deeper imprints on the soul level to not exist as a person. On the other hand this can be the deepest fear within - a fear not of a physical death but of a spiritual death. Even though you have answered in the lecture that it is not possible, then how about a doctrinal knowledge of our on default spiritual identity as an impersonal spark of a Brahman and that a more advanced spiritual identity we still have to develop by spiritual practice?

I wouldn't have asked such a question if I had a direct and definite experience of my spiritual essence as a person in relations with the Divine, when instead there is a fear for personal relationships in this world and at the same time a fear of losing my identity, what to speak of if

I still haven't developed it - a fear of never being able to develop it due to the other fears... 🙄

Thank you,

sincerely yours,

maha

Re: Spiritual individuality vs. being lost in Brahman

by **Hari** » Sat Dec 27, 2014 7:30 pm

If you will forgive me for paraphrasing your question, I hear:

"I screwed up, royally. I thought I was something, but crisis forced me to understand I was not that. I did not listen to good advice before (Oye, so why should I listen to it now?) and therefore the wonderful, merciful universe has punched me right on the nose and now I am bleeding. Therefore, I am going to sit in the corner and feel sorry for myself. But I am going to get bored with this rapidly, so I have to justify everything by making it into an existential crisis! I cannot really be spiritual and have a non-destructible essence if I can ruin myself totally and utterly by being an idiot! I know I am an idiot because what I wanted I cannot have because I ruined it. Therefore, all that I have heard recently here in these lectures is not working (I am the proof of that) and I will now fall back into the idea that I am nothing but a spiritual spark in some vast impersonal brahman without personality or qualities since I have proven that I do not have the right personality or qualities and I am worthless. I am a little nothing who is not good enough and who does not have the capacity to do anything right! And so, I am filled with fear since this concept means I shall lose myself totally! I need this and do not want this! I want this and



cannot stand this! I embrace it and fear it. Aaargh, I cannot stop living! I am stuck with me!  
HEEEELLLLLLPPPP!"

Yah, yah. The question really should be, why does it take a disaster to make us understand ourselves? What stops us from accepting who we are and acting appropriately? You know, you are a really good person. Why not just act like that? Why not be helpful to others in a manner relevant to them, and truly love and care about other people?

NOT GOOD ENOUGH! Once again. That nasty, persistent conviction that we just cannot give up. That deep resonating fear causing us to always be off balance. This resonance reflects towards others as we demonstrate our deep faults even against our conscious will. Defense rules. Fear not love dominates as we think "I am not good enough, so you are also not good enough because I cannot be good enough alone." Misery loves company. "And I shall continue to make it clear that I am not good enough through my choices and acts. And so you shall see it. And when you do I shall understand that it is really so and that I am the one exception in the universe (or maybe there are more of us, where can I find them? They are my real soul mates!!!!) and then I shall lament and punish myself, mea culpa, because I am indeed worthy of pain and suffering. After all, this cycle of elation and depression is a wonderful way for me to avoid embracing who I am!"

I am well aware that my text here is nasty, impolite, improper, inconsiderate, rude as all hell, and presumptuous, and definitely not good enough. Ah, tough beans! Sooner or later we have to face reality. How we deal with it defines our future.

Re: Spiritual individuality vs. being lost in Brahman  
by **maha** » Sun Dec 28, 2014 6:12 am

Dear Hari, thank you for the answer it is perfectly fine, after all it just describes how I screw up and that is true, I admit it. I do not like when people feel pity for me and your feedback instead it quite spiritually enlivening and uplifting as it reanimates the truth.


Definitely the philosophical justification seems inappropriate here. After all philosophy is meant not just to let us feel smart but to help us find real answers for practical issues in life. Perhaps it is good when it is pacifying to justify situations which we cannot do anything about but accept them as they are, and when we reap the fruits of our faulty understanding and are the ones who have to fix it then justification is counterproductive. I realized that my belief system is faulty and useless already 17 years ago and since then have been trying to change it and still my head is tricking me all the time, and in a big way.. What is really pity is how we tend to blame those who are but trying to help us and we refuse to see obvious ways to fix ourselves. Sorry for that..

Re: Spiritual individuality vs. being lost in Brahman  
by **Hari** » Sun Dec 28, 2014 7:31 pm



See? I told you! You are a good person. Imagine that!

Do not worry if you are slower to understand some things than someone else. Just accept it. Your life is unique and what you have to resolve is unique to you. Figuring it all out will be the

great success of your life. 

## who is helping us

by **kamalalama1** » Fri Dec 19, 2014 9:27 pm

Dear Hari

Sometime in the critical situations people begging God to help them.

And usually help is coming in some way.

As i know and you said many times and as it is written in different kind of literature

here are thousand not visible for us beings around us and in the every space.

Some are friendly and godly some is demoniac.

So the question is when we are praying God for help is it God who helping us or usually the godly beings (nature spirits or angels or even Devas) are helping us and supporting us.?

P.S AS in the any country when you ask president usually other officers from government helping, very rare president himself interfere.\Or maybe it is wrong example,?

Re: who is helping us

by **Hari** » Tue Dec 23, 2014 8:50 pm

The help you get when you need it is unique to that situation. Does it really matter where it comes from? After all, you asked for help, received it, and are better for it. Is all not well? If God creates the environment within which you can be helped, isn't that help coming from God? With this in mind, be thankful to whoever helps you whenever that help comes.

If you are lucky, perceptive, and aware of the hidden features of life, you will be able to understand who helped you. When you know specifically who offered assistance, you can offer your thanks more directly.

Re: who is helping us

by **kamalalama1** » Wed Dec 24, 2014 7:23 am

Maybe it is useless what i am writing below since it is impossible to figure out who helped us. But still

We are personalists.

So isn't it strange when one person Ivan helping us we are thanking the other one Nikolay 😊 .

Let say we need help and some Gods ( let say Lord Ganesh or Hanumanjee or Mother Durga or Lord Shiva or there assistants or Jesus or even spirits) help us but we instead of be thankful to them we are thanking Krsna and Radha.

I understand that we should always be thankful to Radha and Krsna but i think even for them it will sound strange.

And more then that whole creation in this case will look completely impersonal.

Isn't it important in the relationship between us and Gods to be thankful exactly to that person who helped us?

Actually you answered this question

I understand that it is very difficult to figure out who helped us since very rare person have that capacity to see the ones

who helped us but still.

Can you please tell some methods how we can be aware of the hidden features of life, to figure out what personality helped us?

Can it be that because of to be thankful to every Divine person in Vedic times people every day was doing offerings to Gods and even spirits 3 time a day?  
Maybe this is solution.

Re: who is helping us

by **Hari** » Sat Dec 27, 2014 7:47 pm

Obviously, as I stated in my reply, it is better to know who is helping you and to thank them directly. If you cannot, then it is acceptable to thank many persons in hope that you get the right one. Some thanks are better than no thanks. If you state, "I do not know who specifically is helping here, but I am offering my thanks to the devas or to God with the intention that the specific person receives my thanks," you will eventually learn how to offer your gratitude.

The act of gratitude is very magnificent and it acts like a magnet to bring us to the right places in our life and therefore the right persons.

You can always ask, "Who has helped me?" And be sensitive. You can gradually develop a relationship with someone by interacting with them. In the beginning you will not know so much, but as your interaction increases, your knowledge of who you are relating to will also increase. Just start relating and opening conversations in an attitude of gratitude and you will find out all that you want to know. There is no other way to do this.

## **Devas**

by **Drpta** » Wed Oct 08, 2014 12:30 pm

Hi Hari,

As we know, in Universe there are limited quantity (about 33mln.) of devas, then a question arises – how they do control over whole unlimited processes which are happening in the Universe? Do they have all-providing capacity to do this?

And also, for example, Surya is the Sun god, and then, is he only god of our Sun star or he is the god of all sun-like objects in Universe?

Re: Devas

by **Hari** » Tue Oct 14, 2014 6:18 pm

I do not think that you should start this question by saying, "As we know..." Rather, we can say, "We have heard..." With this in mind, I will try to give some feedback according to my capacity.

Devas do not necessarily look like the paintings we have seen. How they "look" or how they act is related to the second part of your question about how they control. They do not act as beings in "control," they facilitate, they coordinate, and they cooperate to maintain the universal order.

The human model of a physical being with arms and legs making things happen is not necessarily applicable in all respects here. For example, the Sun God, who you speak of, must by nature have a form compatible with the sun and all its enormous power for him to exist. That is obvious, but less obvious is how his consciousness, his intent and intelligent application of that intent facilitate supplying heat and light. Keeping the sun going is one task, yet another is knowing where the rays of the sun go and how they react with what they meet and to do this, his consciousness and awareness are linked to these rays, or rather, they ride on these waves. Vayu's consciousness is pervading the air and Varuna's the seas. They know their domain through the element or planet they represent, as well as the characteristic energy

related to their task. Within that element they are fully empowered and competent to provide their service.

Surya, the deva of the Sun Planet, is a position, yet the specific personality of the Surya who we know through his work in our universe is different from the others who do a similar task in other locations throughout existence. Other solar systems have other Suryas.

Difficulties arise when the cooperative efforts of these devas seem to be at odds with the desires and requirements of the living beings within their domains. There are times when energetic churning is required as a natural consequence of time or a chain of events and we might blame the devas for ruining our lives. The devas generally do not engage in punishment out of their own rage, although they might rarely express rage and anger when they are really upset or have to deal with universal opposing forces. What happens on our level follows a routine schedule or after our input into the energy of our world.

The idea of “satisfying” the devas means to tune to the energy of the world and universe and compatibly engage in acts that bring about positive consequences. For example, a person who is in tune with Vayu will not pollute the air, one in tune with Varuna will not pollute the water, and so on. When in tune with “nature” in this way, everything becomes quite heavenly. Being out of tune with nature creates problems on all levels. The devas respond to the frequency of the energy projected by the residents of the universe and respond accordingly. Thus the devas, the living entities, and the elements, interact.

Re: Devas

by **kamalamala1** » Thu Oct 16, 2014 2:05 am

I am sorry that i am interfering.

But your answer is so interesting that i cannot stop me to ask more question in this regard. I hope that Drpta don't mind.

In this regard I have a question about devas does it mean that Devas who mentioned In vedic scriptures Indra, Vayu, Varuna, Agni are devas for all universe and dealing with all kind substances like let say Varuna is controlling not only water (H2O) substance but is in charge of all liquid substances like let say liquid mean oceans on other planets( same about Vayu) and especially about Agni

And also Lord Chandra is the Lord only of our moon?

Since there are thousands moons there in the universe

Can we say that same what you said about Surya can be applied to Chandra and other Gods?

Re: Devas

by **Drpta** » Thu Oct 16, 2014 10:00 am

Thank you Hari for your answer. But some more questions arise.

1. Can we say that “controlled” substances are the parts of god's bodies? And what is the principal difference between human being and deva?
2. Are the laws of nature, I mean physical laws, for example law of gravitation, laws of electricity or magnetism, laws of thermodynamic, product of the will of gods, or they are work independently, just because of the properties of interacting objects? For example a magnet attracts an iron – is it because of will of Magnet god, who responsible for magnetic field or because of that magnet has magnetic field which appears because of the specific molecular structure...
3. Do all stars and galaxies in Universe have their respective gods? And who is the god of our Galaxy? Do our solar system has respective god?

4. What the hierarchy of devas is? Obviously there are some main devas, who care about basic processes and forces and many subordinate devas, who influenced by and using forces controlled by superior ones. This question has some intersection with Kamalamala's one.

Re: Devas

by **Hari** » Mon Oct 20, 2014 1:53 pm

We are limited in our capacity to understand the role and power of the devas. Here is an example to help clarify this. How does thought happen? Can you explain it? What is a thought process, where does it take place, and how is it created, sustained, and remembered later on? We know thought happens in the brain, but we do not know how it happens or why. Thought is a function of consciousness that simply happens. We do not feel how we think and would have a difficult time explaining the mechanisms of thought to others. Our best answer is simple -- we think. This has been stated as, "I think, therefore I am." Knowing this limitation helps us to better understand devas and their power.

Let me give a mystical example. A yogi with the capacity to fly can explain how he does it in a way that makes perfect sense to him but has little connection to us who cannot fly. If he tells us, "I step on the air and flow with the wind," we might be able to imagine this action and visualize like a scene in a movie, but we would not be able to connect to this concept in a meaningful manner. Hearing that the yogi perceives air as something solid that supports him, expands our understanding further. Someone might object, "How is the air solid? It is by nature gaseous." This is correct from our point of view, but if we stop trying to imagine air as dense the air and focus on the possibility that the yogi makes himself lighter than a feather through a mystic process, we better understand what is happening for the air does not become denser, the yogi becomes lighter. By changing his nature, the yogi defies the generally understood laws of physics. A flesh and blood 70 kg human cannot be lighter than air, but a yogi who transforms into a form lighter than a feather, can float on air. Naturally our next question is, "But how did that yogi become lighter than a feather? This is not normal." It is not normal. He does it through his highly developed mystic capacity. Although it theoretically makes sense, exactly how to use this understanding to duplicate this feat is beyond us. His power simply is extraordinary by virtue of who he is as the manifestation of his energetic consciousness

In certain circumstances and within specifically empowered individuals, their capacity to act is simply part of their nature and has no other cause than "this is who they are."

It might be easier to understand the controlling power of devas by adjusting our understanding of them. When we call them gods with a small "g" to distinguish them from the top God, we create an image of some awesome powerful person who is somehow far beyond us in the celestial realm. Although this image is correct in many respects, considering them as the CEO of a powerful service company allows us to grasp their function and consciousness better.

For example, let us call Varuna, the god of waters, as the CEO of the Universal Water Company. As CEO, he has secretaries, assistants, vice-presidents, foremen, labor managers, and many levels of workers. Above him is the board of directors. He has millions of subordinate workers who arrange things and do labor to supply his service. It is a corporate hierarchy dedicated to facilitating the requirements of life in the universe. The materials they utilize to supply this service are given them and are part of the nature of who they are. The water service personnel are watery, the air service personnel airy, and so on.

Exactly how it is done is analogous to how the yogi walks on air. To walk on air the yogi transforms into a state that allows him to float or fly. Therefore, the sun CEO or the moon CEO or the air CEO and so on, all exist within states that allow them to perform their services and

like all good CEO's, to know everything that is happening within their corporation so they can regulate it and transform it as needed. We are not privy to how they exist within that state as this is not something we have seen or experienced. But we can know that they do it.

Just as our thoughts simply "are" within our minds, the devas consciousness flows within their area of service. Thought is the nature of our life, and for the deva, his awareness within his area of control is natural. It is inherent to their roles as facilitators within the universe. Regarding the dominion of Varuna: metal is metal regardless of it being in a fluid or solid state. Water is water regardless of it being frozen in ice or boiled into gas. The same CEO is in charge of that element despite its transformation. And according to literature, that CEO is in charge of that element throughout the solar system.

I cannot answer if Chandra, the moon CEO, is in charge of each moon on each planet within the vast galaxy or solar system we inhabit. I do not know.

Re: Devas

by **Hari** » Mon Oct 20, 2014 2:17 pm

To answer Drpta's questions:

1) Not every deva controls a substance, so to answer that question properly one needs to discuss each deva. We cannot do that. The devas and their assistants have bodies which are perfectly suited to perform their service. So the deva of the Sun needs a body that is suited to such fiery heat and light, which implies a body of fire or light. The same principle can be applied to other devas who are in charge of some element or substance. Devas who are not associated with a substance like that will have a body perfectly suited to dealing with whatever it is they do. The nature of their form is less significant than their powerful consciousness running throughout all aspects of their area of service, as I previously answered. Although this is not actually very different from what we do, for we also manage larger projects and project our consciousness within them, the scale of what the devas do is greater than what we do and their power and capacity is greater. Their life span is far greater. In general, they are far greater than humans in all respects.

2) All the physical laws that fundamentally support and hold together this universe are inherent in the creation and are essential to it. The devas use the forces described by these principles to facilitate. They are not known as creators, unless we are speaking of Brahma, because they render service by using the facilities given them to perform their services. However, they are so powerful that they can bend these laws when they wish to. The laws of nature are provided by nature to create the arena within which we all live. Nature is independent of the need to be created by or supported by the devas.

3) The problem of trying to translate the scriptural description of the universe and the location of the devas is related to defining the limits of a universe as given in these scriptures. I presume they call a galaxy a universe and thus the group of devas relevant to us exist within our galaxy. It is also possible that our group of devas is related to only our solar system, but I cannot say for sure. I usually only answer from experience, but I thought your questions interesting (you are an astronomer of sorts) and I am enjoying thinking about this.

4) I think I addressed the hierarchy in my previous answer.

Re: Devas

by **Drpta** » Tue Oct 21, 2014 7:04 am

You wrote that “satisfying” the devas means to tune to the energy of the world and universe and compatibly engage in acts that bring about positive consequences. Does it mean that this is enough to leave in harmony with nature (like, for example, animals do, and as we can see, getting everything what they need) and by this satisfy devas, and then they supply all what is necessary to our good life? So what for we need the knowledge about devas and warship them then? Aren’t all things happening even without our knowledge about devas? What a favor can be derived from this knowledge by people who live in harmony with nature and the modern urban ones, who live absolutely disharmoniously?

Re: Devas

by **Hari** » Wed Oct 22, 2014 3:00 pm

Living in harmony with nature, with the nature spirits, with the creatures of this world, and with yourself, certainly "satisfies" the devas who facilitate our existence as it means that you are not longer working against them (!!!), you are respecting them, you are respecting what they have given you, and you are working with it in the best possible fashion. That you give thanks for what you have been given and are ready to render service to others in this world as a grateful reciprocation for all that you have received, is certainly the best attitude to have. You do not need to worship the devas in some separated artificial context to get more than what you have already been given naturally, but knowing about them is extremely valuable. When you get a gift from the devas, you should naturally be curious and finding out more about them not only acknowledges their presence but it expands your capacity to connect to them and thus the energy of existence that is all around you. This is the yoga of awareness of the present that is so essential to spiritual consciousness and development. If you are aware of the present, you are aware of all the personalities and energies that are part of that present, support and maintain the environment within which we exist, and to whom we owe a great debt.

Obviously, living like this is vastly superior to living in ignorance for such awareness is goodness itself and the source of all positive evolution in life. Can one think of a greater favor than this?

Re: Devas

by **Drpta** » Sun Oct 26, 2014 9:51 am

You said “The laws of nature are provided by nature to create the arena within which we all live. Nature is independent of the need to be created by or supported by the devas”. A question arises – what is the nature? Is it just a set of dull material elements (gross energy) that are interacting with each other by the universal laws, which exist as part and parcel of it, or is it living, spiritualized, substance? I do not know how it is in English, but in Russian we often say Mother Nature, and nature in Russian is “she”.

Re: Devas

by **Drpta** » Sun Oct 26, 2014 9:51 am

Could you, please, explain more elaborately about that yoga of awareness of the present which you have mentioned above. As we live in social environment we usually have to plan our future deeds and analyze our past. So, in common life we more live in future and past then in present. How can I plan my future and be in the state of awareness of present simultaneously? And does one really need such planning if one attained the awareness of present? It looks like to live in modern society, being in state of this yoga, is impossible or very difficult. Does it mean that practitioners of such highest yoga should live outside of society?

Re: Devas

by **Drpta** » Mon Oct 27, 2014 3:29 pm

It looks like to live in modern society, being in state of this yoga of awareness of the present, is impossible or very difficult. Does it mean that practitioners of such yoga should live outside of society?

Re: Devas

by **Hari** » Thu Oct 30, 2014 7:37 pm

When I said that nature is independent I was speaking of nature as the arrangement of the divine. If you speak of Brahma as the creator of the structure within the universe, you still have to account for all the materials and laws that are the basis of what he creates, the raw materials. These are supplied by the supreme. This structure of materials and the laws affecting these materials are what I referred to as nature and the devas task is to work within that nature. Nature is not dull, it is alive and vibrant.

As I have given hundreds of lectures specifically relating to the yoga of the present and my book discusses it as well, I will not discuss this point again here. But we do not need to divorce ourselves from society to live in the present. The most effective and most aware people are those who live entirely in the present and see therefore the real nature of reality and all those who live within it. They are best able to relate to individuals around them and can interact on an extremely aware and empathetic level. Indeed, the practice of this yoga is difficult specifically because it is done in this world with all its distractions and challenges!

Top

## **Are we so good in our essence that we can't even accept ourselves as such or are we just stupid?**

by **maha** » Wed Dec 03, 2014 11:48 am

Dear Hari,

Today I listened to your lecture 2011.02.12\_Instruments\_of\_Expression and it hit me to the core of my current challenges in life. Amazingly so it described the essence of what would unfold just in half year later from the time of that lecture being broadcast.

At that time I kind of got used to miraculous things happen in association with you but this is really a miracle for me much more personal than many others. Even in that lecture I asked question at the end about my way of being curious in life as a way of expressing myself, even though I rarely would ask questions. And just in half year I met the person whom I find most compatible with and we would help each other to express ourselves in many good ways, including translation of your book.

Now I have to learn the lesson which you addressed at the end of that lecture – when we feel that we can only express ourselves in the association of one particular person and otherwise we would rather not live and would want to abandon life. You revealed that it's not at all the fault of that person but it is our inner desire to abandon life since we cannot live with ourselves when we can't stand ourselves because we don't like ourselves and we only use other person as an excuse.

Now I see it clearly about me and when I ask myself why can't I live with me, then it struck me with paradoxical phenomena that it seems we can't live with ourselves exactly due to good side of us which we would otherwise respect in ourselves very much but in complexity of



circumstance unfolding in this world it often looks as our weakness and then we start to judge and blame ourselves for it and behave in unnatural ways to negate our very good essence itself and thus basically destroying our fortunate life situations in a self-destructive ways.

When at the same time we are idealists, then it reinforces such conflict of ourselves with this world or rather with our manifestation in it even stronger when we hope that if we quit from this world then we will find another one where our essence will be much more welcome and compatible.

Even though intellectually I understand that this world is not a problem as it only reflects our self-expressions, then why even in circumstances most favorable for our natural expression of good in ourselves, of our essence we do not value it so much and still throw ourselves into such situations when we no more want to express ourselves or feel that we can't do it anymore even though obviously we have no other choice than to be? Perhaps the cause of it were our even deeper non-acceptance of our essence or its manifestations in this world?

Re: Are we so good in our essence that we can't even accept ourselves as such or are we just stupid?

by **Hari** » Thu Dec 04, 2014 1:07 pm

Sutra answer:

Deep within, we know who we are and this creates a standard we should live up to.

We can never live up to this standard.

We therefore think we are not good enough.

When we are younger, we strive to correct this. We rarely do.

At one point we lose hope. This often leads to self-destructive acts meant to punish us for not being good enough.

After a while, we desire to stop this, but we seem to lose track of how to.

So we get some help somewhere. This changes life for a short while. We feel good about ourselves to some extent, until we don't.

We again deteriorate. In some cases, we spiral down to the bottom. We then look up and ask why. At that point we make a choice. Where we go from there depends on us.

Consider the cycle. Consider the root.

"Not Good Enough."

## **Understanding the term 'energy'**

by **harsi** » Sat Nov 01, 2014 9:26 am

Dear Hari,

I am a person who not only wants to know things but one who also wants to understand them and logically follow respectively reconstruct them according to ones experience and ones - I don't want to call it intellectual capacity since I don't have much of it, I am a more simple-

mindful person - but I want to comprehend and understand things in my own individual and personal way so to speak, regardless of who might say something or from whatever source that information or teaching might come from.

In this regard I have a question regarding your usage of the word energy. In what way should that term be understood when it comes to God respectively whomever or whoever the divine of my heart is? What I want to say by this is, that when I experienced or experience God, the Supreme, I experienced and experience that Divine Being as having also a personality of his/her own, fully able to reciprocate with me in a very personal manner.

Now if we say that the Divine, God, would be (just) "this infinite ocean of energy", as some use to call it, the One with no beginning and no end, that divine neutral 'energy' that is just all-encompassing and all-embracing, than in my understanding and personal experience of things there is something missing in such an explanation. An energy has for me no personality of its own which would be able to reciprocate with me in a personal and individual manner, it just functions according to how it is determined and predestined to function respectively to physically flow. Let us take for example electric current, an energy, it just flows and works according to its nature. There is no way whatsoever to alter its functioning and make it more personal and individual. Okay, you can use it to power a heater or a refrigerator, two seemingly opposite functions of that energy, from heat to cold, but the inner functions or the physical flow, the characteristics, of the electric current remains the same.

So what is your understanding in this regard Hari, or how should one understand your usage of the term energy when it comes to describe our non-physical being and that of God, the Supreme?

For example the term "energy" is used by Aristotle as per <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/energy?s=t> with a sense of "force of expression." That would make sense to me as it would indirectly define me, the soul, or God, the Supersoul, as that "force of expression", or that power inherent in my physical body and that physical world.

Re: Understanding the term 'energy'  
by **Hari** » Tue Nov 04, 2014 12:26 am

Why do I often get the feeling after reading your texts that you insist on misunderstanding my descriptions of God or you maintain some conception of how I think about Radha and Krsna that usually includes an impersonal slant? Either you are stating this because this is what you truly believe, or you are not very good at expressing what you think. But because you spend a lot of time and effort to express yourself, I can only conclude that you really believe this of me. That troubles me.

This troubles me because I do not think, feel, or speak in an impersonal manner. I certainly have a very personal relationship with the deities, the devas, and with anyone I meet. I feel all living energy as personal, all the time.

Considering this, I have no interest in answering yet another one of your questions filled with false assumptions and insinuations. Indeed, the only question you asked is how should one understand your usage of the term energy when it comes to describe our non-physical being and that of God, the Supreme?

And this is also troubling because I have discussed hundreds, or perhaps thousands of times this very topic. I might even go so far as to say this is all I discuss in various forms.

It might be helpful for you to look a little deeper within your consciousness to see if perhaps you are so afraid of something in your psyche that it mirrors in the world around you?

Re: Understanding the term 'energy'  
by **harsi** » Tue Nov 04, 2014 3:45 am

No Hari, it is not so that I would intentionally try to misunderstand your descriptions of God. Instead of thinking that way Hari you should try to understand the feedback which I am trying to give you regarding the usage of your language terms. My question was a an honest one therefore I am very surprised of your reaction to my honest enquiry. When you insist to view my being, me the the soul, as just a living energy than what I conclude by this I answered above. So again what is your understanding of an energy? An energy cannot be personal nor individual since it just is at is, in my opinion. What is yours, Hari, and why you consider an energy to be also or have also personal characteristics. In my experience and understanding - and like I wrote above that in truth just that really counts for me - it is not that way. Please do not think that I would be in any way against that what you try to make people understand, I am not. I just try to understand it in my own way - like everyone does.

When you write " I have no interest in answering yet another one of your questions" than that I can respect, but that leaves me also with an open question of what your understanding in this regard may be. And your usage of certain language terms involves many issues. Therefore I am asking for your clarification. And I may not be the only one in this regard. 😊

Re: Understanding the term 'energy'  
by **Hari** » Tue Nov 04, 2014 3:52 pm

If you think I insist that the soul is "just" a living energy, I must assume that you do not understand the concepts that I have discussed. The concepts are quite clear. The fact that I must use terms that have multiple meanings is not an issue for I define these terms clearly. Perhaps you are somewhat insulted or disturbed that I have rejected your inquiry? I thought you would be when I wrote it.

Perhaps you should stop trying to define energy and simply experience your own energy? There are very specific limits to how much of this can be understood through discussing terms. Therefore I present my experience under the label of spiritual mysticism. I am not happy of what I perceive to be your desire to reduce the most important spiritual essence to an academic definition of energy. This means you have missed my point. I cannot get you to see the point in this short discussion in an open forum if you have not understood this very, very basic experience through my years of speaking about it, writing about it, leading guided mediations about it and so on. Perhaps you have a fundamental misunderstanding about mysticism that you need to correct? Might it help to go back to square one and feel who you are, what you are, and how it you relate with the world around you?

The love your express to others is an energy they feel very strongly. Is that energy impersonal or not individual, to use your terms? When you speak, your words create wave forms in the air that are heard by others. This is an energy, and it has a frequency. Is it impersonal or is it intimately connected to only you? Are these wave forms received impersonally? If you think this, I feel sad that I have failed so utterly to help you evolve.

Those who didn't get this left these forums long ago. I concluded long ago that either you get it or you don't. Either you can feel it or you cannot. I spent years helping people feel it. At one point I stopped because those who could and wanted to feel it already did and those who could not or did not want to, decided they had better things to do.

You are very concerned about my language, but your writing clearly expresses exactly what I said it did. I have indeed understood your feedback and I have replied to it appropriately. Now you have to deal with this if you want to. I am not at all worried that you are "against" what I have said. I am discussing your lack of understanding of it with the desire to agitate you enough to make a change. But if you are truly against it, then fine, so be it. You are free to be for or against anything you want. I cannot make you understand anything and neither am I obliged to engage in a sparring match with you until one of us is defeated. When I get to the point where discussion is futile, I say it. I am not happy with it, but acceptance is essential in a life lived in the present.

Obviously, if other people have something to say or to discuss about this, they are welcome to do so!

Re: Understanding the term 'energy'  
by **kamalamala1** » Tue Nov 04, 2014 7:44 pm

if you don't mind i can say a few words from my side.  
Most of the words are the labels put by people to explain some subjects of reality we see or feel, but no word can exactly explain the object we see or feel.  
Let say we are using the word stone but there are thousand of different stones and they are all different from different chemical consistence and frame but we all understand what it mean when one use this word.  
Same with the energy it is something that have potential and vibration but it is different in different fields  
Technical use of this word have one meaning but still the characteristic of it is some potential, some vibration, some force. When Hari use this term this doesn't mean the same is technical meaning of this word but it used to show us the essence of this word the force the potential the vibration that individuals is ( the soul by the way have visible vibration)  
Since the soul issues and spiritual issues is something out of people experience there are no always proper words to explain the issues so that people can feel and understand it so it is used the most understandable for modern people word  
And please don't cite the oxford dictionary or other one  
WE are mostly understand each other more by feeling not by definitions of words  
Let say you using the word Germany  
I understand it by my feeling  
But what is Germany is it the land or it is people and what kind of people, turks also live in Germany and Romans also and Russians also  
Does water is also Germany?  
and ants and animals also and insects also ?  
The clouds and air is also?  
So what is Germany can you say?  
Nobody Harshi can really say what is Germany but when you use it we understand what you mean so the same with word energy.  
When Hari saying the word energy everybody understand what he mean and by the way it is much more easier to understand then for example what mean Germany ,at least all i know all the people don't have problem with understanding what Hari means by this word.

Re: Understanding the term 'energy'  
by **Hari** » Wed Nov 12, 2014 11:47 am

Maybe it might help to clarify the term, "feeling?" Feeling is the same act whether you feel physically, emotionally, or spiritually. Feeling is intimately related to spiritual consciousness.

What you feel, on the other hand, can be labelled (if you want) as spiritual, material, or a mixture of the two. The same feeling process that allows you to love another person is the same process that allows you to love to divine. Who you love is what counts, not how you love. Love is a natural feeling that can be expressed in a variety of ways. So discussing the term "feeling" is not really the issue. What counts more is what that feeling relates to! "Awareness" is a similar term. How you are aware is less important than what you are aware of, for awareness is our natural state.

What I just understood when reading your last comment Harsi, was that you are using words in a different context than Kamalamala, but your intention is quite the same. You seem to categorize feeling and awareness according to your capacity to calm your consciousness when it is agitated by interactions with the world around you. Feelings are not as spiritually significant when they are a product of "the material existence," whereas feelings associated with spiritual experiences are good. This makes sense and I doubt anyone is arguing this point.

I have been attempting to teach a system of yogic discipline that uses awareness of feeling to skip the dissonant noise of this world and directly connect to essence. If you can feel your self, your own living energy, and you are aware that this energy is not different than the energy of the divine, then you can become aware of the ever existent connection between you and the divine beings, Radha and Krsna. The yoga depends on being able to feel. It does not require you to do anything else than relax totally, as we did in the meditations. By relaxing totally, one is able to feel the self. But this you know from my book and everything else said around here.

## **Dimensions and Gods space**

by **kamalamala1** » Tue Nov 04, 2014 9:42 am

Hi Harijee

After reading the texts about Devas arising a question, do they exist in our space with 3 dimensions or they exist in other dimensional space which is including our space also?

Re: Dimensions and Gods space

by **Hari** » Tue Nov 04, 2014 3:25 pm

Our space has far more than three dimensions. Our capacity to understand the space we live within is extremely limited. We all live within the same space, but some are far more aware of what that space actually is. These more aware personalities know there are more dimensions than humans can generally see. They also act within this expanded awareness. The devas act with a far greater awareness of dimensional reality. When we develop a heightened awareness, we can also perceive the expanded dimensionality that naturally exists within this creation.

Re: Dimensions and Gods space

by **kamalamala1** » Tue Nov 18, 2014 2:04 pm

So if we live within same space with Gods (I mean that although we only feel and see 3 dimension space but unknowingly we also live in more dimensions spaces)

So does it mean that all the feelings (energies) which let say we emanate from our being exist in the space of Gods?.

And this can influence there space too.

Re: Dimensions and Gods space

by **Hari** » Fri Nov 21, 2014 6:03 pm

If we could not influence their space, then we would have no connection to them, could not offer them anything, and whatever we did would have no effect whatsoever on the situation of earth. But this is not so, therefore reciprocation exists at all times.

## Modern and Vedic cosmology

by **Drpta** » Mon Nov 03, 2014 6:45 pm

Hi Hari,

Now it is well known in modern cosmology, that 85% of mass of our Universe constitute dark matter. And I am thinking now, may be that dark matter is the Garbhodaka Ocean? If this ocean fills a half of Universe, its weight, related to planetary systems, which are mentioned in Vedic cosmology, may be quite equal to the ratio, discovered by scientists. What do you think about this?

It is also very interesting for me to know your opinion about Vedic cosmology. For example, it is said that all planetary systems are rested in the steam of lotus, sprouted from Visnu's navel. So, those planetary systems are physically arranged one over another: bhur, bhuvah, svah and so on, until Brahmaloaka. The questions arise – if those systems are material and exist in our Universe, then we should be able see them. Then, may be the galaxies and clusters of galaxies, we can see in telescope are namely that other planetary systems mentioned in the Vedas? And our Milky Way Galaxy with its satellites is Bhur system? But then, how to be with some things like, for example, polar star which belongs to our galaxy, but also known as Dhruvaloka and spiritual Vaikuntha? Or Big Dipper, which stars are also belong to our galaxy, but according of the Vedas, each stars of it is abode of one of the Sapta risis. Are these risis still live in this Bhur level?

Re: Modern and Vedic cosmology

by **Hari** » Tue Nov 04, 2014 12:13 am

Oh my! You don't really expect me to defend the vedic version, right? I also do not like to use the term "vedic" since it does not mean anything. Defending the Bhagavatam version is not something I like to do, but it is something I play with now and then in private for fun. The idea that some parts of the modern conception might correlate with the Bhagavatam description does not feel good to me. This approach starts from the premise that the modern version is the "true" version and the Bhagavatam version is validated when it is somehow analogous to or near enough to the modern version. I never got too involved in this approach, but Sadaputa (rest his soul) did this in great detail. If you find this technique useful for yourself, go for it! But I do not wish to be too involved with it. I mean, sure, it is fun to think of black holes as the lotus from Brahma's navel, and it is cool to consider the lost matter as the Garbhodaka ocean, and there are tons of things that make sense in the ancient texts and science comes up with more and more interesting analogous concepts as time goes by.

My personal opinion is that there were space travelers who gave information to the humans on this planet about the universe, but since the information was far over the heads of these people, they incorporated this information into the forms presented in the Bhagavatam. Probably, over time this has also been adjusted or changed.

Re: Modern and Vedic cosmology

by **Drpta** » Fri Nov 07, 2014 6:13 am

You know, I also don't like this term "vedic", but I have used it just for it is popular to indicate ancient Indian knowledge. Of course, better term will be "Puranic". And of course I don't expect you to defend the vedic version.

You answered that there were space travelers, and these words have many common with my vision of importance of knowledge, obtained through direct perception. And in this regard I asked my question.

I have few more questions, tied with direct perception, I want to ask you. First, can we consider that the higher (where, for example, devas live), middle and lower worlds (Bhur, Bhuvah, Svah an so on) exist simultaneously in one point of space and distinguishes each other only by frequency of their vibrations, and may be by quantity of dimensions (something like a kind of parallel worlds), or they are scattered in different places of space and separated physically and spacey?

And another question is if we, in meditation, do something, then do we do it really or only in our mind? I mean, for example, if we in meditation have contact with somebody or some energy, or travel to some place, or do something, is it real contact, travelling and deed (even if in subtle body) or we just concoct it in our mind and imagine that it is real? How to distinguish real deeds and mind concoction or dreams in our meditation? Especially concerns the practice of visualization.

Re: Modern and Vedic cosmology

by **Hari** » Sat Nov 08, 2014 8:55 pm

In my experience, or my conception if you will, higher and lower entities exist inter dimensionally and also at the same time in distinct spaces and planets. This is why we see rocks or gasses somewhere and they see a nice place. But I cannot prove it.

The contacts we experience in meditation or dreams are as real as we make them. When others feel their dreams and mediations as real and connect to us, then the experience we share is as real as we make it. The distinction between thought and action is one of quantity. The more power there is in it, the more real it is. I have seen that some physical activities are not as real as my meditations! I also feel visualized energy can be more solid than the physical realm.

This is a complex subject that depends entirely on the person who is experiencing it. The more powerful one is, the more real the experiences.

## **time**

by **kamalamala1** » Sat Sep 27, 2014 1:15 am

Dear Hari

We know that there are no past and future, and only present exist.

And time is also only present.

But how flow of time can exist being only present, since for the flow its need to be beginning ( past) and destination (future)?

And what is flow of time ?

And also present should be static but life and time is dynamic?

Is time objective or it is totally subjective?

I myself don't have answers on this and just trying to understand.

Re: time

by **Hari** » Thu Oct 02, 2014 5:26 pm

If only present exists, then only existence is present. The word, "time," makes sense in a realm where living beings yearn for a future and remember the past and therefore situate their desires and memories on a time line to organize life better. One who lives in the ever present existence

(sat) does not hanker for a future or lament about a past as they are fully absorbed in the present moment. Time as the concept we know it does not exist to them. One cannot even say they live in the moment as there is no concept of moment. They live. That is everything.

Because our past haunts us either positively or negatively and our plan making and preparation for the future is most important, time has great significance in our realm. Due to our lack of focus and not being in contact with the essence we are, our lives exist more in the past and in the future than in the present moment. While acting in the present, we are preoccupied with the future result and absorbed in the acts of the past or some other actions or thoughts related to other places or people. Living totally in the present is a mystic art signifying the greatest achievement for it is the energy of spirit expressing fully without consideration of external, non-existence.

Time does not flow because it is not an energy. The movement of time is an illusion supported by our measuring devices. Therefore, time is totally subjective. Each of us measure it in our own manner. Our consciousness and how we accept or reject life determines how important actions within the linear measurements of time are. One might say that the universe has its own time independent of us and our paltry considerations, but do planets hanker and lament or care about time? Even if at some point in the future the sun stops shining, does the sun care? Is the sun influenced by that limitation? Or do we worry about it because if it happens when we are alive it will cause our death and we care about death?

Time is important in a realm where the existence of things is limited. If my carrot rots within a week, eating it within that time period is important to me. If I will die within a month, then I feel I have to finish things before then. My limited existence makes time the most important force to reckon with and therefore carefully delineating its passing is of the highest priority. But in a realm where decay is non-existent, time has no power. As being, essence, spirit, consciousness, love, and energy are ever existing, they are not limited and time as we know it has no importance.

I could speak more about the concept of time and flowing, but since time is not an energy it has no flow. We create devices that have a beat that measure off segments that we have labelled as seconds, minutes, years and so on. Time has none of these things, but we find it reassuring to have this facility to measure as it allows us to compartmentalize and organize life into useful sections. Because time has a beat, we are able to make music, and by manipulating that beat by changing the signature, the tempo, or the rhythms, we use time to create mood and enjoyment. Time is a facility needed only in this realm of physicality.

Re: time  
by **kamalamala1** » Mon Oct 06, 2014 4:56 am

Thank you very much for very interesting answer.  
I need some time to digest and understand the issue.

As i understand time is concocted by people category  
in reality it doesn't exist

Re: time  
by **aradhya** » Mon Oct 27, 2014 1:00 pm

Dear Hari, to be absorbed in present experience it seems we may have only one experience at a time (if that 's not truth, please correct me), so there 's opinion that if one could be fully (forever) satisfied with some experience (for instance, within some pastime of one 's own



relationship with Krishna), then one wouldn't experience any changing of time (as a means for changing of one's experience) anymore. But from the Goethe's point of view this concept might seem demoniac: Faust couldn't „lost his soul,, (Mefisto couldn't take him) until he finally (after many dissatisfying experiences) exclaimed: „Oh Time, stop now, now you are too beautiful!,, (Listening to your composition "Knock About Time" provokes that kind of experience, I must confess!). So, my question is: both of these concepts might make sense: the seemingly static one (that's shared amongst the devotees), and the kind of evolutionary one (that we mustn't stick to any particular preference, otherwise we prevent Time from doing its evolutionary work on us), so which one of them you prefer (recommend) and why?  
Thankfully yours, A.d.

Re: time

by **Hari** » Thu Oct 30, 2014 7:38 pm

Being fully absorbed in the present means that we are fully aware of our experience each moment. It does not mean that one experiences only one thing. One can experience multiple things at the same time in each moment, and when one catches the import of awareness of the present, one learns that one's senses can work together at the same time to enrich our experiences. As our awareness expands, our experience expands accordingly.

Life within ever presence is not static and stuck in one moment. When we speak of time, we generally refer to some clock or calendar, or our feeling about how long something takes. For example, when we watch a pot of water coming to boil. As they say, a watched pot never boils. What they mean is that the pot boils just as fast whether we watch it or not, but when we watch it expecting it to boil, our consciousness becomes dominated by that expectation and we are absorbed in the act of waiting for a result. Thus our pain of waiting and our subsequent frustration create a time period of suffering that connects us to time. If one was not bound to the result, one would have a different experience.

Our evolution is not a product of time, but it happens step by step. Each moment we live is as valuable as any other moment, and the journey of life is as important than the moment the goal is reached. If all we care about is the goal, then time can be a challenge. If we care about the moment, time ceases to be a challenge.

Re: time

by **kamalamala1** » Tue Nov 04, 2014 9:58 am

Harijee

Arising the other question in regard of time issue.

We see that in world everything each moment is changing (nothing stays static), what is the source of this process?

in Sanskrit if i am not wrong it called Kala, have this force anything with the idea of time?

Re: time

by **Hari** » Tue Nov 04, 2014 3:18 pm

Time is a unit of measurement similar to other quantifiers such as weight, height, and so on. All things change in this world and so their quantifiers change as well. Our description of things changes as the things themselves decay, or grow, or modify. If it takes 5 years for something to grow, we describe its transformation as having taken so many units of our clock measurements. That our clock is a relative thing is obvious, for it is based on a convenient division of our year and day, all related to the movement of the sun and earth. Clocks on other

planets or solar systems will look and act differently, although the process of measurement is basically the same.

Kala, as the force of time spoken of in the Gita, is a great destroyer because all things material decay. Things change by the design of the creator. This world was designed to be filled with things that are created or take birth, that grow or evolve, that last for some time, and then eventually decay. Time is used to describe that process. When you see the world as a product of matter, then this process from creation to destruction is of paramount importance as it describes all things and time becomes the great destroyer as all things eventually get destroyed.

If you see existence as life itself, filled with living energy and consciousness, you have a better chance to understand the ever present existence beyond time, beyond space, and beyond the process of creation and destruction. Since time is known by this process, it does not exist in ever present essence.

## It`s all God

by **harsi** » Mon Sep 08, 2014 10:04 pm

Dear Hari,

One of the common understanding between the spiritualists of today is that, as they say: "It's all God." Do you agree to this premises or is there something more to it?

Re: It`s all God

by **Hari** » Tue Sep 09, 2014 8:08 pm

What is "it's"? I mean, what a vague question 🙄

If this is supposed to mean everything is God, well, that sounds like vasudeva sarvam iti. How you deal with that depends on how your philosophy works. I might say everything is the energy of God and the energy and the energetic source are one and the same. But, since the energy of the Supreme is diverse and multifarious, one can also say that everything is spirit, yet everything has its own nature and quality. Each living being has a unique personality. Considering this, saying everything is God sounds good, but lacks the depth of meaning that the speaker might have intended. If you say that everything is awesome, then everything is the same, and what is the use of a life where everything is the same? So if someone says "it's all God" with the idea of negating the individuated aspects of God then they are cheating themselves out of the wonderful variety that exists in the universe.

But if someone says it's all God referring to the underlying motivation or force behind a particular act, such as the loss of money or a family member and so on, they are saying that it is the will of God. Even if we could argue the point, why would we do that when someone is suffering?

Re: It`s all God

by **harsi** » Sat Sep 13, 2014 2:36 pm

Yes Hari, it's also my personal experience that, as you say: "Each living being has a unique personality." Now you may have noticed that I edited my comment here a few times not knowing exactly how to put that which preoccupies me in the right words. The great majority of people who give spiritual guidance nowadays seem to have the understanding that the dissolution of this "unique personality" would be the goal of ones spiritual practice.

A well known person says for instance: "It's so simple to know who you are beyond the surface self. And that doesn't mean you can't remember your history anymore, of course you can remember your personal history, that's fine. But you are no longer trapped in that exclusively personalized sense of me. It's such a frustrating thing to live just with this little me. Always feels threatened by things and needs to identify with other things, and never feeling complete; never feeling satisfied for very long; always a sense of not enough. An awful way to live.

So, we are transcending that. And that's the shift in consciousness. And then as you bring in into your daily life that spacious awareness, the awareness of yourself as spacious consciousness, which you could also call stillness - there is a stillness - even as you speak you can still feel the underlying presence. In the foreground you speak, you listen, you do things, in the background is spacious awareness. In other words you sense your own presence - which is not your own - because your own presence is one with the universal presence. You might have mentioned I don't use the word god."

Now if I am in my spiritual essence an "individuated aspect of God", as you put it, do I dissolve myself and fuse again with God when I am aware or sense again my spiritual essence? I know that with the thinking mind and intellect all this is hard to fathom, but maybe you can give me some hints which could help me to better understand and experience this issue.

Re: It's all God

by **Hari** » Sat Sep 13, 2014 8:53 pm

Dissolution of an acquired personality that has been accepted within this realm of physicality is not a bad thing. Most spiritual practices ask you to drop off coverings.

When I speak of the essence of being, personality is the energy that is unique to you as the individuated being you are. It cannot be dissolved, only covered.

To uncover that essence, one has to drop off the acquired aspects that are not essence. When that is done, one may with ease naturally feel the connection that we all have to the divine and each other.

If those you quote are saying that the personal essence you are is also to be dropped, I would disagree. First of all, it is not possible. Second, I am sure they have not experienced self. But I am not sure this is what they meant to imply. I have little interest to defend or criticize others who you present here. Not my thing...

Re: It's all God

by **harsi** » Mon Sep 15, 2014 2:01 pm

Thank you Hari. It is always a great pleasure and honor for me to read your explanations which make so much sense to me, and exchange my spiritual experiences with you. It is very true that, as you say: "most spiritual practices ask you to drop off coverings." The question is just whose coverings are they really?

Yesterday I was watching somebody speaking online from London. A person was asking the question: "I want to be a better me. I want to be before I am, how do I reach there, without always judging myself and not thinking that I'm not good enough? For many years since I've been born I always feel that I am not good enough, and I'm tired of that. I want to be myself, how do I get there and be a better person?" The answer of this man was: "Don't be a better person. Being a better person is fine, but it's not the same as being your true self. Because

sometimes being a better person is linked with how people perceive you and all of this things. But your self is something quite beyond that. And it is easier than being a better person. You see, because it is already here..."

"We believe that you must grow through our conditioning and become a better person, and technique and practice, and grow and so on, and this has its place. But that is not what I am pointing to here. I say that all those stages there are still illusory, they are not true. Your true self is the only true thing that's here. It's the only true thing that's here. Nobody can do anything for it; nobody can perfect it; or help it; it is the ever pure; it is your god-self. It is not somewhere else in another dimension waiting for you, it's right here in the core of your being."

"Than you may say but how can I, how can I reach it, you see. And this voice, I want to say to everybody about it, the voice which we so trust in ourselves that says: "yes I really want to find, I really want to come home to myself" is universal, it's a universal voice. "I want to come back to myself." And it is part of the play, the great play of life, that consciousness will adopt a human garment and say you know, and go through this life of seeking and finding, and leaving and going all this ..."

Is it also your experience and reached understanding, Hari, that our true self cannot or is not really meant to be perfected in some way, as it is already the ever pure "god-self", or akin or similar to god, godlike self, to say it in another way, at the core of our being? We would just have to become aware of that, cognize it and integrate that cognition, that awareness, knowledge and realization into our being and our life.

Re: It's all God

by **Hari** » Tue Sep 16, 2014 2:55 pm

Yup, but I do not use terms like "core of being." Being is the core. It does not have a core.

A covering is anything that makes one feel that one is different than what one is. When one no longer has that misconception, one's body, mind, and all things connected to the physical and emotional self are permeated by one's essence.

Re: It's all God

by **harsi** » Tue Sep 16, 2014 5:56 pm

It's really remarkable, Hari, to discuss this spiritual topics with you. You are so clearly and promptly able to put your finger on the weak spots - also a question of attitude and interpretation - of somebodies presentations on spiritual truth. It makes sense to me that being does not have any 'other' core, it rather "is the core" of my spiritual existence. I hope I understood you correctly in this regard. That's a slightly different viewpoint than what the man I mentioned above tried to make the questioner understand.

It was interesting for me in this regard, what I found online when I googled the expression "core of being".

I find this to be highly appropriate to what we discuss here. Is our own individual, personal, existence just an illusion we have to overcome in order to get and find the One and Only who which is at the core of our individual being? Some spiritualists see it like this. Others say our own individual, personal, existence exists and thus makes up, forms, that of the One. We would thus be the components of the One or the individual "parts of the nature" to say it with the expression used in the description of the above mentioned movie. Others say our own spiritual existence exists at the same time as that of the One. What is your understanding and

perception on all this, Hari? Of course more easier would it be to say: does it really matter in some way. 😊

Hari wrote:

*So if someone says "it's all God" with the idea of negating the individuated aspects of God then they are cheating themselves out of the wonderful variety that exists in the universe.*

I personally, if I can say it like that, made the experience that people who argue that all is God that is, that exists, do not really negate the "variety that exists in the universe". What they rather say as I was reading ones is, that a very intriguing aspect of God is that God is existing (is immanent, is indwelling, etc.) in both the aspects the good and the bad, the beautiful and the ugly, the right and the wrong, the positive and the negative, the high and the low, the conceivable and the inconceivable, mortality and immortality, existence and nonexistence. As discussed in this [video for example](#).

So if you say that by uncovering the essence, the spiritual consciousness that we are, we may with ease naturally feel the connection that we all have to the divine and each other, could one not also say that actually it's all the play of God in his "individuated aspects", the one pure, "divine", consciousness in its variegatedness, that is, might be, busy with themselves, itself, since it permeates, is immanent, in all that is?

Re: It's all God

by **Hari** » Wed Sep 24, 2014 3:03 pm

I see that you are playing with thought experiments to see if they relate to your own experiences. That is fine and your conclusions will be interesting. Me commenting on the twists and turns within your experiments is not required. You last conclusion is interesting and you should play with it more.

You do not need me at this point. Continue to research and see where it leads you!

Re: It's all God

by **harsi** » Sat Sep 27, 2014 4:11 pm

Fine I will do that. You complained ones in a [broadcast in 2010](#) about people who would continue to insist that you remain some kind of guru figure that they were familiar with from former times. Now I don't do that anymore, but I do value your insight and I do appreciate it when something you say. or write, makes sense to me. Unlike as it was in the "old days" where you were urged to accept what people like you were saying, and teaching, just because you were considered to be an authority in the field, whose advise one would have to follow without delay if one would be sincere in reaching ones envisaged spiritual goal.

That is one of the main reasons of my enquires from you on this or other topics discussed in this forum. Your style of teaching seems to me to correlate with the teaching of a Zen master who was ones asked by one of his disciples: "What happens after death?" The master replied to his pupil: "I don't know, let's wait and we shall see." With a certain degree of astonishment the disciple replied: "But you are the master, who should know it than if not you?" The Zen master replied: "Yes, you're right, but I am not a dead master." In other words "the proof of the pudding is in the eating." as the proverb goes. Ones own wealth of experience is been considered to be equal to or above those acquired just in ones mind from various sources, or from the teachings of others.

Could you identify yourself with this style of teaching, Hari? Is it that kind of self inquiry, to enhance the process of self-exploration in this field, you would like to foster in the people searching for spiritual advice from you? On the other hand those searching for advice often appraise their own competences at a very low level. So what to do, how to find or where is the right balance on this matter?

Also worth mentioning is what you were saying in that broadcast I mentioned above: "I have been trying to see things from the point of view of the divine. Instead of telling you what to do, I am trying to facilitate your realization of who you are, so that you may yourself know what to do, how to do it, when to do it, why to do it."

Re: It's all God

by **Hari** » Thu Oct 02, 2014 4:43 pm

Well, you have heard enough of my lectures to know how I do things. So remember what I did and then apply your experience to the various techniques you are familiar with and see if there is a match! And yes, the last statement of mine you quote does indeed reveal a lot!

I am not happy with you appraising yourself at a lower level than you are, and therefore I am always interested in helping you act according to your potential. In your case, giving you answers has little value. My task is to help you see how your own investigative capacity and your ability to come to your own perfectly valid and useful conclusions is far greater than you might think.

## **About the Suprim Origine**

by **kamalamala1** » Thu Sep 11, 2014 2:55 am

Hi Harijee

I have a question about the Origin  
About the Supreme Origin

Cause of all causes

There are several versions of the origin of Supreme Origin.

Some texts said that the origin is without quality Brahman.

Some texts said that the origin is Purusha.

In Bhagavad gita Lord Krishna said that he is the cause of Brahman.

In Narada purana it is said that Sri Radha is cause of all including Lord Krishna.

In some puranas it is said that Lord Shiva is the Origin and in others is written that Goddess Durga is Origin.

In some lectures you said that Krishna is the Supreme male and Radha is Supreme female. But others said that Krishna is Supreme in all ways as male and female also.(Govindam adi purusham)

Others said that same is Radha. Since it is definition of God .

The others said that Lord Chaitanya is the Origin since he is Radha and Krishna.

Also there a good example of God as Shiva and Parvati as one person.

So please can you say what is your own understanding of the Supreme Origin.

Re: About the Suprim Origine

by **Drpta** » Sat Sep 13, 2014 7:48 pm

Hi Kamalamala,

You know, I also have thought about that and now I think that it does not correct to ask who is the primordial origin - Brahman or Bhagavan? The Brahman and Bhagavan exists simultaneously and I have found that Jiva Goswami wrote about this in his comments on Brahma Samhita (text 40) "Lord Govinda and the impersonal Brahman are the same Godhead, when He manifests His qualities He is Govinda, and when He does not manifest His qualities He is the impersonal Brahman".

P.S. Also I found curious passage in the Mahanarayana Upanishad (23.1). It is said that Purusha, which is the Supreme Brahman, is an androgynous person so both male and female are present in Him.

Re: About the Suprim Origine

by **Hari** » Sat Sep 13, 2014 9:08 pm

The wide variety of ideas as to who or what is the supreme origin reveals that it is either impossible or very difficult to pinpoint. After all, only the origin knows the origin. If the origin is not saying, we do not know. And if the origin claims to be the origin, how can we be sure when anyone can claim this? We either believe it or disbelieve it. Besides, how do we know that someone claimed to be the origin when we did not hear it directly? The best source we have is the scriptures of the tradition we believe in. As there are multiple traditions and therefore a variety of origin ideas -- even within the Indian tradition there are numerous statements that contradict each other -- a believer of a tradition naturally accepts his or her spiritual authority's version. We cannot know if that opinion is the "real" truth as there is no way to confirm it. We believe what we feel best with.

If existence is ever existing and at no time not existing, there is no concept of origin. The idea of an origin is something discussed in a world where things have a beginning. If there is no beginning in the world of spirit, only ever existing present, then there is no origin.

It seems to me therefore, that the many ideas of origin are presented to massage the minds of people within this world of beginning and end. When the residents of earth have fewer questions nagging them, they sleep better, wake up more refreshed, and move on with their daily activities.

## **Becoming independent**

by **maha** » Fri Mar 28, 2014 7:56 am

\*\*\* question from Dmitriy Osipov from Ukraine \*\*\*

Dear Hari!

When we left ISCKON as much as I remember you gave us an advise us to learn to become independent, which we have been working on since then. But now I'm struggling with this question of independence in the circumstance of my family about to fall apart.

The question is what is independence, what is its meaning? Isn't it we always depend on so many people and so many other living entities?

Sincerely yours,

Dmitriy Osipov

(Charanambhoja)

Re: Becoming independent

by **Hari** » Sat Mar 29, 2014 3:06 pm

No one can be completely independent of others. There are many forms of dependency, some are physical or practical and some are emotional or psychological. If someone is dependent on intoxication to get through the day, then it is better for them to become independent of this addiction. If for some reason someone is dependent on a bad relationship that is crushing them internally, it is better they address the issues that are placing them in this unfavorable situation and resolve them, or leave that relationship if they cannot.

Being dependent on someone else spiritually is not healthy. Being independent requires that we are strong as individuals and aware of who we are and why we do what we do. We must have our own vision of life and the direction we wish to take. We might take advice or assistance from others as needed, but that is only to strengthen our position. The stronger we are, the more we can stand on our own two feet. Being stable and well situated is required in spiritual life for only we can advance and only we can connection to the supreme or divine energy. Others can help us do this, but the actual relationship with the divine depends on us more than anyone else.

Therefore, being addicted to crutches to enable our advancement is not advisable and we must get free from these external structures that are holding us up. We have full capacity to stand on our own two feet. This form of spiritual independence is required and without it we cannot reach our full potential. Besides, when you are strong and stable, you can best relate to others, assist others, and be of service to them. Weak, dependent people are useless to themselves and others.

Being independent of your family is not advantageous or desired in most circumstances. Trying to make family relationships work may be trying and difficult, but it is your first responsibility. We cannot declare ourselves independent from our family for in truth we are connected to them biologically and emotionally and nurturing this basic social unit is extremely important.

When we engage in business, we are dependent on others. We work together with others to complete tasks and we are dependent on consumers or those who pay us to keep the finances flowing.

When we go to school, we are dependent on the ability of the teacher to help us learn. When we are in the hospital we depend on the doctors and the staff to cure our ills. We depend on the government to keep us safe and to facilitate our lives. We are interrelated to hundreds of people in thousands of ways all the time and without this interaction our lives would be so much less.

This is obvious. So recognize your dependency and do whatever you have to do to nurture your family relationship. Apologize, rectify, adjust, compromise, do whatever you must to make it work. If it becomes impossible, do what you have to.

Good luck!

Re: Becoming independent

by **harsi** » Sat Apr 12, 2014 9:36 am



You write: "When we go to school, we are dependent on the ability of the teacher to help us learn." People you or I would call devotees - and by the way I still feel to be one since I still believe in Krishna as god and that for almost 30 years now, and the way I experienced some of your lectures, especially those you gave ones in St. Petersburg, you do the same - worship that teacher they call guru exactly for that reason. Would you say that such a thing is conducive for ones spiritual evolution and understanding? And when the point has been reached where all this worship, appreciation and "dependance" as you call it has been reversed so much that without it one would feel to not be able to stay on ones own feet so to speak and feel somehow unprotected spiritually and without a proper connection to the spiritual realm and truth? I like it and can well relate to what a spiritual teacher says in a video that once we "align to our true natures," or as some of us would say become aware of our true essence of being, or soul if you will, we can all step into the perfect future we desire.

Re: Becoming independent

by **Hari** » Sat Apr 12, 2014 11:25 am

Teachers who assist us to spiritually evolve are important, their message is important and the service they render us is often incalculable. Without spiritual teachers this world would be in far worse shape than it already is. Learning from these evolved individuals is a good thing, but if the teacher becomes the focus of your life and you are dependent on them more than you should be, this can become counter-productive. Although we depend on the wisdom and experience of others, when we complicate the relationship by worshiping them, we run the risk of distorting the teacher-student relationship and turning it into something unhealthy. Maintaining the capacity to change one's mind when it is right to do so is an essential part of spiritual development. Worshiping someone tends to restrict such change. Those who worship a guru within a tradition, accept a deeper and more dependent relationship with their teacher than those who are not in the tradition.

After we learn something, we need to practice it. A teacher can assist in this or a teacher can hold us back. It depends on how good the teacher is and how aware the student is. One could say we always remain students of sorts because we are always seeking answers to questions and researching how to solve our problems. Even a teacher remains a student in this way.

What makes us independent is that we decide the direction of life, have our own vision about what it should look like, and choose who to listen to and who to avoid. We make our choices and act according to our best interests. When one becomes dependent on another to such an extent that they lose confidence in their capacity to decide what is right and wrong without some "higher" direction, we become weak. Often this dependency is over-compensated by a fundamentalist attitude or fanatical behavior.

In conclusion, you accept what you want to accept. You do what you think is best for you. If you feel good doing what you are doing and it truly is helping you, why change? If you do not feel good and it is not helping you, then why stick to it? Independence maintains the capacity to choose what is best for yourself.

Re: Becoming independent

by **maha** » Wed Apr 23, 2014 3:46 am

Continued from Charanambhoja:

Dear Hari, thank you for your thorough answer!

I have contemplated upon it and have some more questions:

If we are so dependent in the material realm and considering that any two persons understand everything each in their own way, then what at all we can experience as more or less real without being mistaken from the spiritual realm as it is more multiform and not so obvious? How not to get confused? How to understand who am I and what a heck am I doing here???

Thank you again!

Sincerely yours,

Charanambhoja

Re: Becoming independent

by **Hari** » Wed Apr 30, 2014 12:42 pm

I do not worry all that much about making mistakes. Radha and Krsna know that we are trying our best and as they are our greatest supporters they allow us to find our way.

Because everything is so deep and rich in the spiritual realm, I simply explore it to increase my understanding and experience. I do not fear the diversity, I embrace it.

I find that confusion usually causes me to research deeper, endeavor more, and tune to the spiritual energy for the solution. I also wait for a resolution, or at least a sign, an answer, or an indication of how I can proceed. Something always comes. I may not resolve every issue or situation, and I do not expect to. But what can be resolved usually is in due course. I have confidence in this.

Who I am is resolved by accepting myself and acting as I am without trying to be anything else. Please see my book "Living Energy" for a deeper discussion of this. Why I am here is not important to me because my being here is more important than why. I have already dealt with the why and have given a lecture on this. I am experiencing and becoming a better version of myself through all these experiences. I do not need to always consider the why or lament about not knowing why. There is little value in always banging my head against the wall in frustration. Acceptance of what is will usually resolve what is not.

Re: Becoming independent

by **maha** » Wed Apr 30, 2014 1:06 pm



Thank you very much!



## **My Presentations of the Divine**

by **Hari** » Thu Jun 23, 2011 3:58 pm

There is a discussion going on in Good Old Days about my "opinion" or presentation of Radha and Krsna. A question was raised because it seems I do not discuss the "lila" or "philosophy" surrounding the "worship" or Radha and Krsna. The quoted words in the previous sentence highlight the problems that exist in the perceivable differences between what I do and what is done by others. The question seems to revolve around the idea that I simply ask people to feel the deities and do not supply the required standard philosophical information of their position and identity. This is a large subject that relates to the way I see things and how I present methods of realization. I shall first address my presentation of Radha and Krsna.

First of all, I do not limit my presentation to "The Supreme." I am concerned with facilitating people's connection to the divine energies, wherever they are found. Simply put, I give people the means to connect to, or tune to, any deity they wish. This technique works equally well in any religion or any spiritual place of worship. I avoid creating a gap between the divine and the individual being. I avoid creating a mood of awe and reverence and do not encourage someone to see the unlimited greatness of the divine in relation to their unlimited smallness. I avoid these concepts and create the mood of personal relationship in an attainable manner, not encumbered by issues of power or worth.

I mainly teach the advanced techniques of tuning to the divine in the St. Petersburg temple. If you look in Hari's Corner, you will see a text where I speak about the deities in that temple. This appears on the website of the temple and it includes a good introduction to who the deities are. While I speak to people about the deities and tuning, I am standing in front of the deities, gesturing backwards and turning towards them, including them in the discussion. In short, the deities are the main focus, so it would be very hard for an audience member to miss my point or to confuse who I am speaking about. As I discuss the process of tuning, it always focuses on connecting to the deities who are in the room with us. I do not speak of them as representations of anything, I do not infer that they represent energies, and I do not use them to accomplish something not related to them. All I am doing is facilitating the people in the room to increase their awareness of the deities, feel their energy as it pours from them, absorb that energy into their consciousness, and accept it totally. I ask them to send their energy to the deities and ultimately to create an Us'ness where we feel a deep and intimate connection to these wonderful personalities. I imply and suggest that the deities are people, are living energy, and are thus perceivable to our aware senses.

Since this experience is real and there is no doubt in anyone's mind what is going on, they are all deeply impressed. They feel a deep and tangible connection to God. In many cases, it is the first such realization, in some cases, it is the experience they have longed for their entire spiritual life. Many former devotees have later thanked me from the bottom of their hearts. Some have said that I have supplied the missing ingredient in their spiritual life.

I do not need to burden the audience with philosophy or lila as they do not need it. What they need is this experience of connection and entering into the energy of relationship. This brings us to the next point.

Stories about Radha and Krsna are nice. They are fun, make us sometimes feel good, and grant us hope that one day we will realize more. So long as these stories are experienced as stories, in other words, we hear them and feel happy to hear them yet we are not experiencing these lilas directly, they remain as stories (although they are spiritual and special). Those who are engaged in the lilas directly, in other words, the "characters" in the stories, do not think of them as stories, neither as lilas, neither as part of a scripture. They experience life in full. They feel it as they experience it. They live within that atmosphere.

More advanced pastime participants on this plane "enter" into these lilas through the process of visualization. They have gone through a focused process to visualize themselves in the lilas, gradually feel their form that is compatible with this environment, and learn to perceive through that form what is happening there, and through long practice of meditating they gradually glimpse their goals. As they become more and more aware, sensitive and experienced, they expand their energy to embrace the spiritual atmosphere.

I am creating that atmosphere directly. I share it with the audience. Those who are practiced in the art of spiritual life through their years in ISKCON, know the lilas and know the identity of the personalities on the altar and their "position" within the hierarchy of existence. And yet, they are sharing, side by side with "non-devotees", the same experience of the deities' spiritual

loving energy. Indeed, sometimes the "non-devotees" enter into this atmosphere more easily than the former devotees since they do not have a mountain of misconceptions to climb over. Some so-called experienced devotees are bound tightly by their conceptions of not being good enough, of being fallen, sinful and so on. This restricts their experience. Those who are not so restricted are much easier able to feel and enter into the atmosphere.

The atmosphere of the spiritual realm is not a mental conception, not a philosophical conception, and not simply related to doing the right service while following the right rules to induce mercy. It is an experience. I start from the "end-point" of the experience and create the structure within which the living being can fill in the details.

There are already enough descriptions in the Indian literatures and I am fine with them. If someone wishes to research it is easy to uncover these materials. If they ask me, I can also tell them, but there are many who have dedicated themselves to sharing lila who I am not eager to recommend as these individuals also share other ideals that I feel hinder spiritual progress. They might also ascribe to notions of spiritual elitism, sexism, social ignorance, and fundamentalistic thought, none of which are acceptable to me. Despite the problems surrounding many of these spiritual leaders, I remain naturally connected to these literatures as they are part of me after the 28+ years of study and practice and those parts that increase my awareness and inspire my life remain the basis of all that I do. Yet, I reach for more. Of all the writings, I consider those of Rupa Gosvami and Raghunath das Gosvami to be most relevant to my personal connections.

As far as teachings, I am most close to Ramanujacarya.

In short, I have learned much in my life and now I am sharing the ripened fruit of my personal experience and realization. I do not share it completely as very few, if any, could understand the depth of what I am. Yet each of us can say the same thing about ourselves. We share what we feel is best for others when we wish to do so. I like more than anything in the world to share my capacity to connect to the deities at will, to communicate with them, and to allow them to modify my awareness when they see fit.

Re: My Presentations of the Divine  
by **harsi** » Sun Jun 26, 2011 9:18 am

Hari wrote:

*As far as teachings, I am most close to Ramanujacarya.*

I very much appreciate your comment, Hari. It was high time to also explain more in regard to your presentation and application of spiritual knowledge. Although I don't yet understand everything yet fully I try hard. An interesting point to reflect on I was reading recently online also in regard to Ramanujacarya's Visishtadvaita Philosophy.

"According to Ramanuja, Moksha means the soul's passing from the troubles of mundane life into Vaikuntha where it will remain forever in undisturbed personal bliss in the presence of God. The liberated soul attains to the nature of God. It never becomes identical with Him. It lives in fellowship with the Lord, either serving Him or meditating on Him. It never loses its individuality. There is no such thing as Jivanmukti, according to Ramanuja. Salvation comes when the soul leaves the body. "

What I don't understand fully is the explanation that all souls form the body of God, the Supreme Self. "God alone exists. All else that is seen are His manifestations or attributes. God or Lord Narayana of Sri Ramanuja is a complex organic whole – Visishta – though it is one."

In regard to Ramanuja I like and can very much relate to one of his often told life stories: "The Guru refused to initiate the learned disciple six times, but the disciple was not discouraged and came back for the seventh time! The gracious Guru, seeing the sincerity and earnest of Ramanuja, now gave him the Mantra, warning -

"Do not disclose the Mantra to anyone, else you shall suffer the agonies of Hell."

"And what will happen to those who hear the Mantra, Sir," asked Ramanuja innocently.

"Why, my son, the power of the Mantra would lead all those to salvation!"

"What is more desirable than thousands of people attaining to heaven even if I alone be damned," thus thought the kind hearted Ramanuja, and climbing up the platform in a temple shouted -

"Come, O my brothers, come! Listen to this Mantra that will open floodgates of liberation for you."

And in front of all, he repeated the Mantra aloud."

One can also read on the Internet that: "Initially, Ramanuja studied the Scriptures and the Vedanta under the guidance of a great scholar Yadava Prakasha. However, soon they parted their ways, as differences cropped up in their interpretation of the Scriptures. Ramanuja, though young and still a student, showed unusual insight and grasp of the subtleties and nuances of Vedanta, and as if scored over Yadava Prakasha. It is said that the matter took such a turn that the teacher began to hate his pupil and in fact even attempted to assassinate him! Many years later, however, Yadava recognized Ramanuja's greatness, repented, and became his loyal follower." (...)

I just wonder why there is no mentioning of Parabrahman in Ramanujas explanation of the divine reality. That which supposed to be also beyond Brahman according to Sri Caitanya's teachings?

#### Re: My Presentations of the Divine

•

Post

by **Hari** » Sun Jun 26, 2011 3:53 pm

First of all, simply searching for someone's description of what Ramanuja said or believed is not very useful. Most people do not understand it in depth. It is a highly sophisticated understanding that cannot be summarized in one paragraph, unless of course, someone is really good at it, which your quoted source is not.

Secondly, you are mainly interested in placing me within a context familiar to you that fits nicely into previously stated schools of thought. This will not work and it will not expand your understanding of me. Therefore, for these two reasons, there is absolutely no reason for me to reply to your question.

There are two ways to understand a person or a situation. The inferior way is to start with a preconceived notion and seek out evidence that supports this notion. The superior way is to research with an open mind to seek the truth of what a person or a situation is. When one seeks to first understand, the questions one asks and the conclusions one reaches will have greater value.

The questions you ask demonstrate you have not used the latter method, but are fixed in the former. To this, I object. I do not wish to be examined under the gaze of someone's preconceptions for any response I make, were it to be true to what I am, would have to include

wasting enormous amounts of time to dissolve the preconceptions so the person can start to hear the truth. I have spent years speaking about this very point. My numerous lectures and writings are dedicated to removing misconceptions that appear when we simply accept something without awareness of what it is we are accepting and how it relates to us. As Nanda so rightly put it, I have made a systematic presentation of how one removes the less than ideal preconceptions that one is spoon fed and replaces them with personal wisdom and experience. You feel that this process requires a negation of the tradition, but I say now and have always said it does not. It accepts the essence of that tradition and presents the most important and valuable elements in a manner that is more congenial to us as modern humans. By continuously requiring that I reference what I say or do to these traditions is evidence that you do not understand what I say or do, for if you did, you would see how my presentation makes far more sense than you could imagine and that it will inspire you to become a far greater version of what you are, in whatever tradition you choose to be.

I am sure that most of the usual readers of these texts are wondering why you have not gotten this point. But I have seen that it takes courage to listen to what I say and allow oneself to accept it deeply. After all, I am not telling anyone anything. I discuss topics in a way that will expand your capacity to think, to increase your awareness, and to demonstrate how you too can experience all those things you dream of.

I could go on with this text, but in truth, I have said it all.

Re: My Presentations of the Divine  
by **harsi** » Sun Jun 26, 2011 8:56 pm

Dear Hari, you might think that you have said it all and that's your right to think like that which I accept. Although I must say that your continued attempt to put me in a position where I suppose would not know what I say or would like to know from you shows to me that you too doesn't seem to understand what I am at to understand and realize. In some way you are so much just focused to oppose that what you understand to be some preconceived notions people might have from the good old days that you miss the wood for the trees in my case to say it with a German common saying.

Like I said when one speaks or teaches something from a completely neutral point of view like many are doing these days it is one thing but when one speaks and acts also in relation with something which exists already in a long established spiritual tradition and understanding in society than one should not wander when such questions might arise how that what you might say or do might fit also in the understanding one might already have. After all the way intelligence works is that one dearly accepts something in addition to that one might know already if it makes also more sense to oneself.

Ok you might say that those people you might speak in Russia might understand you better but my personal experience in regard to this is that this is far from being the case. But maybe it evolves over time like my understanding also. I hope so.

Re: My Presentations of the Divine  
by **Hari** » Mon Jun 27, 2011 2:22 pm

Everything everyone says is in relation to their experiences. There is nothing new under the Sun, as it is said. But does that mean one can only understand what someone is saying or sharing in reference to something specific in the past? I do not think so and thus I reply as I do.

Listen, I do not mean to insult you or to make you feel bad. I am not trying to put you down or criticize you. I am endeavoring to create an understanding of what it is I do! Nothing else. When you define me, I have to clarify as I do not accept your definition. Now if your definition of me works for you for some reason, then why bother to have me clarify it? Is it important for you that I see the error of my ways?

FYI, if you can get a hold of Ramanuja's commentary on the Vedanta Sutra and if you check out the incredible first sloka commentary he does, you will understand far more than reading a summary on the internet. I think you will appreciate it very much. I know I did when I first read it in 1982. That was when I said, "Oh, this resonates with me so deeply!"

I am a spiritual mystic and as such, I am concerned with the experience of life. I train people on all levels to prepare them to find their own mystical experiences in whatever way they desire. I do not have a burning need to bring them somewhere or have them practice a certain discipline. This does not mean I am against them doing it, it only means I am not into pushing them towards anything. There are plenty of others ready, willing and eager to do so. I bring people to the deities as this is my personal inclination. They are free to come to the temple or not as they like. I personally do not require to place the deities within a philosophical context more than I normally do as what I do works just fine. I am not trying to avoid my past and have said multiple times that it is the foundation of what I am today. I am happy for my experiences. I am grateful for the opportunities given me.

Yet, at this moment I do not want to reference what I am doing to the past or to a school of philosophy. I have seen that this form of philosophical discussion deviates one from a mystical methodology and discipline. It creates polemics, not unlike the one you seem to want to engage me in now. I do not appreciate polemics. I do not like philosophical conflicts, although intellectually I am more than capable of presenting what I do and think in rational and convincing terms. It is a matter of taste and of my desire to maintain consistency in my presentations. It also works better in my own mind. So when you push me, I react. How you feel about that is something you have to examine and respond appropriately, however, I do not wish to engage in discussions that are not relevant to me.

Normally, I would respond to people according to what they need or want. After all, I like being of service. But your discussion is about me and how I think about the fundamental concepts that drive my presentations and perhaps my experiences. Being so, I decline to participate in this discussion on your terms alone as your questions or your considerations of what I am do not relate to me. I am not trying to shut you out. I do not mind that you do not write in a way that expresses what I am. I have been dealing with this for a long time and I am familiar with it. What I do and what I am are not philosophically obvious. Due to this, I give a lot of ammunition to critics to find fault with what I say or do. As I do not follow within a particular system familiar to them, they find many things to object to and to "reveal" to others as faults. This is not very interesting to me neither is it original. It follows the pattern long established amongst "brahmanas" who are only so good as their capacity to prove themselves intellectually superior to other brahmanas. I am not interested in this.

This does not mean that I have no "school of thought." I do and it is easily apparent in my books, writings and presentations. How you receive it is entirely up to you and there is no right or wrong way for you to think. And yes, that last statement was definitely my opinion and not absolute.

I am primarily concerned with stating (when I have to or want to) the truth as I see it and as I feel it can benefit others. There are thousands of discussions and presentations available on the internet or in books where such discussions occur. They do not interest me. Must they interest me? Is there some fault in my having no interest in them or is it my allowable

inclination? When I follow my inclination, my energy flows towards that which inspires me and brings me to where I want to go. When I am aware of this flow, I am not inclined towards leaving it just because someone says I should. I do not feel I have to do anything, that I have to follow anything or anyone. If and when I do that, it is according to my own choice at that moment. Am I therefore whimsical? Again, it depends on your definition. Is following one's heart whimsical, and if so, why would it be? Or is it the basis of one's existence? At this point I do not see any other choice. How you see it depends on you.

I appreciate a lot of the philosophy of the ancients and respect certain personalities enormously. There are things I disagree with. I do not feel such awe or reverence for anyone that I am unable to look at their words from my own point of view and accept or reject or not be interested or find it interesting sometimes or any combination of any ingredient as I like! When someone attempts to restrict me, bind me, limit me, place expectations and demands on me, or somehow box me into some conception that does not reflect what I am, I object and decline that attempt.

Re: My Presentations of the Divine  
by Hari » Mon Jun 27, 2011 3:15 pm

*Dear Hari, you might think that you have said it all and that's your right to think like that which I accept.*

Not sure what you mean by "said it all." I have stated so much in my lectures I cannot imagine needing to state more. I am kind of tired of saying things. I am not sure it means much at this point.

*Although I must say that your continued attempt to put me in a position where you suppose I would not know what I say or would like to know from you shows to me that you too don't seem to understand where I am at, or what I understand and realize.*

I firmly believe that you know very, very well what you say. I am totally convinced that you have a very clear conception of who and what you are and what you think. My conviction of this is what drives my urge to continue responding.

When it comes to Ramanuja, I feel (and again, this is my opinion based on reading his books, not accepting someone's summary on the internet) that you have presented a part of him that does not properly represent him. If you wish to have an answer to your question, read his vedanta sutra commentary, or at least the 32 (+ -) page commentary on the first sutra.

If you want me to understand what you are and what you realize, then state it. But this thread was not about you. Despite that, I will reply if you do.

*In some way you are so much just focused to oppose that what you understand to be some preconceived notions people might have from the good old days that you miss the wood for the trees in my case to say it with a German common saying.*

I am opposed to your definition of me. I realize that your posts are concerned with what I do not understand. I appreciate your courage to express it but I simply do not agree. I have no preconceived notion of you from any old days as I did not know you then as I know you now. My responses to you are directly in the present moment.

Please list my preconceived notions that I am opposing that are unique to this conversation.



*Like I said when one speaks or teaches something from a completely neutral point of view like many are doing this days it is one thing*

So are you defining me as like all the others in the New Age market? Define New Age. And no, I will not engage in this thread in a discussion about New Age. I think the term is as meaningless as "Hindu."

I have never, ever stated that I present from a neutral point of view. I present from a very specific point of view. I am entirely within the mystical realm of presentation and this is in no way neutral. However, someone might misunderstand this because I do not demand any individual to think, believe, feel or act in any way other than their own individual experience that this is neutral. I am not neutral, I am totally on the side of the individual! I have very definite ideas and when someone presents something opposed to these ideas, as you seem to do often, I object and state once again that I am not neutral, I have a very specific idea of what I am doing. I see things that are beneficial for someone and things that can harm them. I try to avoid condemning them when they do harm to themselves and endeavor to assist them to change their choices by modifying the rationale that drives their acts. Therefore I do not say, this is good, this is bad, in the sense of some absolute. I say, this works for you, this does not. This is not neutral, this is considerate and extremely personal. Indeed, I am an extreme personalist.

Considering that I disagree entirely with your statement, I see no reason to engage in the discussion you are initiating afterwards. You say, if A then B. I say, not A: B therefore not relevant.

*but when one speaks and acts also in relation with something which exists already in a long established spiritual tradition and understanding in society than one should not wonder when such questions might arise how that what you might say or do might fit also in the understanding one might already have. After all the way intelligence works is that one dearly accepts something in addition to that one might know already if it makes also more sense to oneself.*

I get the questions, I get the concepts, and I get why you ask them! This is not the issue. The issue seems to be, and correct me as you like, that your texts come in the context of defining me and I do not accept these definitions. I do not accept them because I am allergic to being defined. I do not accept them because the definitions are incorrect. I therefore reply with correct definitions. Again, you can define me as you like. But if you are interested in how I define me, you might find it more advantageous to accept my stated definitions.

I never really liked comparative religious studies. I find it boring. Just because I say something that is similar to what someone else said does not mean I have to discuss the other person. Seems like a waste of time. After all, everything we say has already been said or shared with thousands of others, perhaps millions, throughout historical time.

There are many fundamental and important points within the concepts of the past that I entirely and categorically reject as irrelevant, damaging, incorrect and sometimes downright dangerous. There are some extremely essential things that I consider to be the foundation of my entire existence. For me to engage in a discussion of each and every one of these points in the format that you sometimes use, would be very confusing. I have lectured extensively on points I feel are not advantageous for spiritual development. Considering that most spiritual organizations following a culturally based spiritual tradition demand compliance with concepts they consider axiomatic and allegiance to their authorities in their school or organization, they feel I am "not qualified" to engage in such discussions. Indeed, they are correct! I do not

accept what they accept. I do not accept the infallibility of sadhu, sastra or guru. Sometimes I think they are as wrong as one can get. I maintain the freedom to feel what I feel, to choose as I do, and to decide what is acceptable and what not. Now why would you want someone who believes this to expand your awareness of those traditions? When you do it, either you have somehow missed what I presented (I understand that too as there are tons of lectures and after all, who has time or desire to listen to them all?) or you are trying to adjust my presentation to conform with what you feel is right. Neither of these reasons work for me and therefore I reply as I do. It is not because I think you do not know what you are speaking about, it is because you most certainly do know what you are speaking about and I most certainly do not agree with it!


So no need to be insulted. Honestly! And maybe you are not insulted. Perhaps this is a sport? Or maybe you are intensely interested in being understood for what and who you are and you refuse to allow me to define you in a manner that is not acceptable? Bravo!

*Ok you might say that those people you might speak in Russia might understand you better but my personal experience in regard to this is that this is far from being the case. But maybe it evolves over time like my understanding also. I hope so.*

When I broadcast, the audience is from around the world. Naturally, when I go to St Petersburg they have more experience with me and the deities and their own direct and deeply spiritual experiences that have impacted them enormously. This is something unique and I am very happy for them. When I go to Moscow, I cannot reproduce that experience for people who have not had it before because there are no deities. So I am not sure who you mean when you write this.

I am not placing you at odds with others. But I am saying that when one has the mystical experiences I endeavor to facilitate, one is much more equipped to enter into other mystical experiences than those who have not (unless they already did it in some other way.) Now, when you question as you do, I consistently state that I am not a philosopher, not a New Age Guru, not a guru at all in any traditional sense of the term, not a grand discussor of sadhu, sastra and all that jazz, not a believer neither a follower of any tradition and so on. I am a mystic and I share that with all my capacity.

It is interesting that you quote Russians. During my last trip to Russia I had an existential crisis as I saw that I could no longer handle dealing with the minds of others. I could only relate to the mystical side of individuals or group energies (see lecture, What Is Mysticism?) and minds got in the way. I felt that those who were mystically aware could deal with it and those who were familiar with me yet were not mystically aware never would be (unless they were new at it and not ruined by traditional burdens.) residence on the mental platform and the mystical platform at the same time is impossible. So even in Russia we have dichotomy. Alas, it exists

everywhere. What to do? 

Re: My Presentations of the Divine  
by **harsi** » Wed Jun 29, 2011 10:36 pm

Dear Hari, I was reading a few days ago your first response and allowed myself to reflect on it, for some time before responding. Today I see that you added another comment where you elaborate more on what I wrote. What I wanted to write first after reflecting today for some time about your first comment is, that I was until now somehow not aware that while giving the lectures your main intentions were not to introduce someone or make someone better aware of the Supreme, Krishna but something else what I would try to place also in some kind

psychological category, helping to increase ones self-confidence and so on. Since the time the deities were placed in the temple in St. Petersburg I was always wondering why you were speaking so less in your lectures about this divine personalities. Now I understand that as you say: "I bring people to the deities as this is my personal inclination", you make a distinction while speaking to the public about your personal preferences and that what you want to present on Harimedia as a kind of spiritual healing or something like that.

On the other hand as I can experience here on Harimedia from the writings of others it is also so that some people seem to think that you moved away completely from the philosophical level into a kind of mystical energetic one. But as I can see in your comment related to Ramanujacarya that you still value philosophical discussions and interpretations. And I am happy about that because I say to you frankly that all this speaking and writing about this energetic stuff or even the so called "mystical experiences" are not my world, it wasn't for me. I want, like Socrates, to understand things mainly from a so called philosophical or intellectual point of view. Although I would say I am not really against mystical experiences it is just so that I have no clue yet what those experiences really are, and where they should lead, or guide one in a spiritual sense, if you understand what I want to say.

Re: My Presentations of the Divine

by **Hari** » Thu Jun 30, 2011 11:13 am

I thought I was discussing philosophically! I might not discuss scriptural philosophy, if that is what you meant, but I certainly do speak philosophically.

What I say is in the context of preparing the ground for an individual's entrance into spiritual mysticism. It is what I do. One cannot come to the point of willfully creating mystical experiences unless one is fully prepared to do so. Most of the themes I discuss, are meant to assist someone to develop the capacity to focus their energetic awareness consciously and thus enter at will into spiritual dimensions. It is not psychology alone, although the psychological factor is significant within the context of communion between psyche and feeling. This communion balances the left and right, male and female, aspects of the brain and human energy and increases power. When we are fully aware of our energy, we awaken to spiritual dimensions.

I think we do not share this ideal. Your idea of philosophy must have as its goal realization of the self and divine. My goal is the same. I do not like to simply speak about this goal, I open the doors for people to enter it. Your comment that you have not had a mystical experience has made me sad. I cannot satisfy your intellectual thirst as I am not that kind of person. I think you would be more fulfilled by associating with others who share your requirement. I will not engage in intellectual discussions as such talks do not resonate with me.

Re: My Presentations of the Divine

by **harsi** » Thu Jun 30, 2011 9:01 pm

I am glad to hear that your goal is the same, namely the realization of the self and divine. It seems that you just put the focus more on that what you call mystical experiences, which according to my understanding seem to be a kind of autonomous spiritual awareness or realization of the individual, a kind of aha effect for which people following traditional ways of self realization think that they might become aware only after a long struggle and great deprivations of different kinds, also called tapasya. It is interesting how Wikipedia describes this one: "The Aha! Effect refers to the common human experience of suddenly understanding a previously incomprehensible problem or concept."

So all is fine I am on your site. It is also so that the reason I am always so eager to listen to your lectures or read what you have written is that it also satisfies very much mine, that what you call "intellectual thirst," it also opens new ways of insight into things or philosophical aspects clouded often by the old ways of understanding, dictated by the former association and the understanding in the society one may have being involved before. I am not a traditionalist, or fundamentalist although it may seem so at times from that what I am writing. It is rather so that somehow by my nature I am born with the irresistible urge and insatiable desire to question things, in order to get at the root of things. In this way I am more a progressive. But I would say in conclusion, a true progressive needs a vision of a better "philosophy", spiritual insight and society as a precondition for personal action or involvement. And for me there is no doubt that you have that vision and ability to properly deliver that vision also to others.  
Last edited by [harsi](#) on Thu Jun 30, 2011 9:13 pm, edited 1 time in total.

Re: My Presentations of the Divine  
by **pamu** » Sat Aug 20, 2011 9:14 am

*I am kind of tired of saying things. I am not sure it means much at this point.*

Discussion, no matter if it happens by writing or by talking of this, that and the other point can become very tedious. Life and direct experience of it very seldom does. Writing and talking about direct experiences of life is not that tedious either. Life is like playing improvised music, jamming. Notes can be good, but what the heck, who needs them if you have good jamming partners?

So I, for one, do appreciate your nonsectarian approach.

I remember that in the days of yore while doing my time in camp Iskcon what really bore me out was the endless discussions of various philosophical points type "how inconceivable is actually, in a sense, conceivable, if you just wrap your mind around it the following way blah blah and the other theoretical approaches and intellectual gymnastics we were supposed to sport with. Being intellectual. 💡 In the meanwhile, in another part of the universe, there was a whole lotta life to live and interesting experiences to experience, plenty of time to keep an open mind and make it even more open. Instead our time and energy was being boxed into a corner.

Just a reflexion here, not really meant for anybody. Not for Harsi either. Just a bit rambling.

Gotta go, races to race, pies to eat. 🤗🤗

Re: My Presentations of the Divine  
by **harsi** » Sat Aug 20, 2011 10:56 pm

For my liking in what you have written here Pamu I see a kind of contradiction or rather a way to over simplify things related to our spiritual experiences. I for one long for the time when we would no longer compare all our spiritual understandings with those practiced by this or the other society of people. Rather from the point of view of what would be more advantageous for each of everyone of us individual persons. As I see it there is or it could be not really advantageous spiritually for the individual to neither over complicate or mystify things, like perhaps experienced in traditionally lead societies like ISKCON or overly simplify them like you may try to propose in what you have written.

There must be found a right balance between this two extremes, the golden middle so called. In music both things are needed and also helpful to become a good musician. The ability to

play by notes as well as to play by ear if it is needed and also requested from you. In a symphony orchestra without the ability to play by notes may get you in trouble. The same is true for a dance band, here your improvisation and creativity are what counts.

In a society of people there are also different approaches to what you may want to get or achieve by your endeavors. A simple man may be more satisfied with his services to god and his prayers whereas people who may not be so simple-minded by nature may want more. To understand god and his position or his relation to the supreme and the universe, may want to have more background information before doing some service to god or meditate or pray to the supreme. This are just some reflections by me regarding this interesting issue you opened up here in this discussion.

Re: My Presentations of the Divine  
by **Hari** » Mon Aug 29, 2011 12:34 pm

Perhaps it would assist if I stated my realization of late?

I have shared my experiences with people as far as they could be shared in words and concepts. I know that experiences only have value when they are experienced; hearing about someone else's experiences is not as valuable as having your own. I thought that if I could set the stage for others to share what I have gone through in this life, they would share my experiences and thus my methodology. This is not what has happened and for some time I have had an existential crisis about it. My crisis revolves around seeing a future in all of this.

A good friend of mine explained to me what has actually occurred and with this help I understood more and no longer am in crisis. Let me share this with you.

I have given the means by which people can find themselves on their own, in their own manner and in their own time. They have been given all the tools to do this. I have not given them goals or a mission, neither have I required any quantity of advancement. I have simply facilitated their process to find themselves. I have made it acceptable to find oneself. I think I have been successful at this.

One of the problems that follows this is that everyone becomes quite strong as an individual and more capable to live their own life on their own terms. This is a problem because while it is great for the individual, it is not so great for a group. A group requires something that binds it together that all share and contribute to for its growth. I have tried to place what I do in a group context but it does not work. Whatever "we" do is mainly for our individual selves and does not transfer over to the group context. This forum is a great example of this. Each person speaks from their own realization as there is no "group think" or expected philosophy or required methodology. We express ourselves as individuals and are respected as such. However, when we try to do something together this strength turns into a weakness. Too much individuality creates distance and separation between people. We also sometimes think we do not really need each other. I do not think this illusion will continue long considering the rapidly deteriorating situation in the world (most of which is not reported in the news). Therefore, we need to learn about "unity in diversity." It is easier said than done.

We have no group, and I find that interesting. Sometimes I have heard the phrase, "Harimedia People," as if this was a cohesive group that had similar ideas and followed some line of thought. As we all know, this is most certainly not true.

The question is, "Is this good or bad?" One might say that it is neither, it just is. Another might say that why bother putting a value on it? My thought is that I am 100% convinced that the

only future in this world is to be found in localized, self-sufficient, energy independent, people aware and family friendly communities. Community is, by definition, a group thing and it requires that we grant our energy to the group as an offering of sharing and support. So far, even discussing this issue is troublesome as we all have our ideas of what we want and who we want it with. I am designing community in such a manner that we are all protected in our living even though we cooperate. But that, as you know, is another issue.

Re: My Presentations of the Divine  
by **Sati** » Sat Sep 03, 2011 6:58 pm

*One of the problems that follows this is that everyone becomes quite strong as an individual and more capable to live their own life on their own terms. This is a problem because while it is great for the individual, it is not so great for a group. A group requires something that binds it together that all share and contribute to for its growth. I have tried to place what I do in a group context but it does not work. Whatever "we" do is mainly for our individual selves and does not transfer over to the group context. This forum is a great example of this. Each person speaks from their own realization as there is no "group think" or expected philosophy or required methodology. We express ourselves as individuals and are respected as such. However, when we try to do something together this strength turns into a weakness. Too much individuality creates distance and separation between people. We also sometimes think we do not really need each other. I do not think this illusion will continue long considering the rapidly deteriorating situation in the world (most of which is not reported in the news). Therefore, we need to learn about "unity in diversity."*

*My thought is that I am 100% convinced that the only future in this world is to be found in localized, self-sufficient, energy independent, people aware and family friendly communities. Community is, by definition, a group thing and it requires that we grant our energy to the group as an offering of sharing and support. So far, even discussing this issue is troublesome as we all have our ideas of what we want and who we want it with. I am designing community in such a manner that we are all protected in our living even though we cooperate.*

I want to share one story that has a direct relation to this. Also as this story has started just a week ago - I am still under the impression of the change that has happened in me and it is very inspiring.

I am living in a cottage in a forest zone and most of the time I am at home alone with my son ( sometimes father and his wife come but they have their own home here and we don't spend much time together) I usually do videos, play music and meditate, sometimes work in the garden and much time I am spending (as all of us ) just in maintaining life (cooking cleaning, shops and s.o). I consciously have moved from Moscow to the country because I wanted to live in a peaceful place and meditate and relax more and not to be so social and to see people less as I thought that people distract me from my spiritual efforts. When I came to Moscow to play music it was good for me because I can be of service by this BUT when guests came to me, although I love to receive guests I was always thinking that Although I love this or that person - the day is lost because I have to talk and associate with them and it means its "not so spiritual" as doing music meditation and videos. So when the guests came some part of me was always suffering and wanting them to leave.

Last week a couple of my friends came to meet me and they saw a big pile of wood that needed to be chopped for the wood burning stove. I told them that I have a plan to call workers and pay them so that they chop all this wood and put nicely to dry up. And they said "why would you do this - lets better call our friends and spend money for the food and nice tea and we do it all ourselves" So 5 people came to my house that evening. They were very different and very independent people - few buddhists and few yoga practitioners and

followers of some other spiritual systems ... All this people know each other from the "Empty Hills" festival. They have worked together there, cleaning the forest after the festival was over. They all love nature and earth and are very expert in ecology and gardening and s.o So they came and we have stayed together for about a week (some left earlier). This week transformed me in a great way. First I had crises - after 2 days I've got tired and felt that I need to be alone... but what to do? they are in my house and there are a lot of work still left and they are all nice people whom I like very much. Then I have honestly explained to them my problem ( as they are all very sensitive people they could also see it) and we have shared responsibility in such a way that I've got a lot of space for me and everyone was doing what he can and we all were happy. We all could wake up and go to sleep when we wanted and do whatever exercises we needed and when anyone felt ready to do some work - he just went to chop wood or cook or cleaned the kitchen and the house. We eat together and in the evening we had concerts (there was one more musician there). In the evening neighbors came to drink tea with us and to listen to the music. People came and brought milk and vegetables and fruits... They were attracted by this energy of love and support that was here. And there was no division between us - they were accepted in a friendly way without any judgment or fear that they could break our "spiritual atmosphere".

During our talks while drinking tea we discussed the situations that had happened during the day and things that were very closely connected to our evolution and to the things we want to do together. And this situation was very enlightening for all of us as we all could see each other's weakness or problems and could openly talk and discuss it all with love and acceptance to each other and desire to be of service. This was a real family of people who shared the same values and ideas in life. And when I have changed and started to learn how to live and work together with them - It had opened so much potential in me, in my capacity to express love and to be of service, that now, when I am finally alone, I don't feel that its better for me. When you are quite strong yourself and you can declare your own space and live as you want to live and do what you consider right - then the society of spiritualists, who share the same spirit can be VERY helpful to your evolution. This type of communication helps to see your motivations, fears and desires, faults and misunderstandings and work with it with the help of loving people who don't blame or condemn you but kindly hold you and support you. And there is so much co-creation and jokes and warmth and love... So the wood chopping is mostly done, but now we have many more ideas what we want to do together and we are going to meet again soon and to live together for some more days.

There is definitely a question of money there. I can tell you frankly - its not cheeper then calling workers to chop the wood, and it is not much more expensive. Perhaps also little longer, because our intention was to work without stress. But when you are doing things like this - you change the energy of it all. Instead of business type of relations, when you just pay people for their work, you get a loving exchange where you offer what you can and people offer what they can. And this is a great opportunity to express your trust and your generosity and freedom from expectation or fear and allowance and acceptance and desire to be of service without trying to exploit others. I can't say I am completely successful in all this tasks:))) More or less in some, and have a long way to evolve:)))

So - living in such a family friendly community can be great for the spiritual growth and very pleasant at the same time. BUT it can be harmonious only if most of the members are quite strong themselves and do not want to prove that they are good by making others feel bad and are completely honest and opened towards each other. I am very happy to have such people near me and I am extremely grateful for that.

Just wanted to share it... It is already happening, we started to live together (sometimes) and we all are planning to build the big community ... and I believe we can do it soon:))) And we invite all others, who want and can cooperate together on the basis of love, acceptance and being of service.

Much Love

Re: My Presentations of the Divine

by **kamalamala1** » Sat Feb 22, 2014 6:08 am

Dear Harsi

I am wandering with whom you spoke in Russia that got such a negative opinion?  
I know many of them who was present on Haris lectures they are quite intelligent people.  
Much more intelligent that many Iscon people there in Germany i saw when i was there.

More then that frankly saying i got my feeling that most of the people understood much better what Hari was saying then you.

And i know many of them there are far more intellectual then you can imagine.  
Your elitism that coming that you are living in the west is completely over

## **Human Life and Action with a Higher Purpose in Mind**

by **harsi** » Wed Dec 11, 2013 7:46 pm

Dear Hari,

the man who contributed to the end of apartheid in South Africa is an issue that many are talking about this days. His motto was a human life and action with a higher purpose in mind. It was surprising for me to learn, as told by one of his closest friends on BBC News that this man had accumulated inside himself quite a lot of hatred and distrust against those who caused him so much inner pain. But he intellectually understood that in order to reach the higher societal and educational goals he had in mind, he could never ever show this kind of feelings and emotions to anyone in his immediate entourage or the general public.

In public he would instead present himself always as an example of decency, fairness, integrity, and forgiveness. Can such a human life and action with a higher purpose in mind influence and be an example in spiritual life? "He was not afraid to compromise for the sake of a larger goal," one can listen the US President speaking. Could that serve also as an incentive for us to follow, and when does the risk of drifting into something negative or unwanted arises? What actually constitutes an unwanted understanding such as "the end justifies the means?" Of course the motto "all's well that ends well" is more positive, but both understandings carry with them the necessity or ability to pursue a larger goal or a higher purpose in life..

Without wanting to anticipate your answer on my questions, Hari, I would like to let you know a very thoughtful perspective on this of a man from Nigeria, Africa. On his Facebook site, I have subscribed to, he mentions that he studied at the Enugu State University.

He writes: "Education in the coming age will not be a form of "indoctrination" as presently practiced but a systematic approach towards awakening the innate voice of reason in each man, his intuitive perception and cognition. Increasingly, education will entail mental exercise and training. Mental training as the cornerstone of modern education is that systematic method of opening up the child, exposing him her from the tender age towards acquiring the mentality of rationality objectivity intuition in thought processes. It is the ability to think independently and therefore reach a personal conclusion.

This is the "vista" of modern education. It will no longer be a "monotonous indoctrination" of the contents of the text-books and notes by the tutors. It will become akin to all inclusive "debating" process encompassing all views and opinions. The rapidity of new knowledge is fast making the knowledge of last decade obsolete.

The educated man of the new age will be an inquirer. A walking question mark. Not an intelligent "memorizer" of the outputs of thinking men. Each will become a thinking man in his own right. It will become a true art. Each man will be able to assemble and deduct from a perspective peculiar to his "innate" nature. Classrooms will be "interactive" in nature not a one



way monologue. There will no longer be constants but only variables as opposed to today's method of teaching constants without any variables. Thus, garbage in, garbage out.

The building blocks of learning will only be the common factor; common factor being what you can "attest" to personally such that need for proof disappears with respect to you alone. On such basis will common grounds be founded. The pupil will become the "researcher" right from the onset, and then knowledge becomes an independent form of personal output. No man in the true sense of the word is a "better" teacher of any man except the man himself. The most another can do is point to the way. Even with that, there is no "one or right" way, there are as many one and right ways as there are people on earth.

This will be the dawn of the era of the "mental" man (spiritually evolved man, added by me). The horizon is unlimited and its "inherent" wisdom is immeasurable. The present monotonous system of learning education will give way. Knowledge will present itself in its true form; simple which is in sharp contrast to the garb of "complexities" that men have built around knowledge."

---

A former university teacher from South Africa replied: "I have always viewed education as a process of enticing - not as enforcement. I always thought it was my job to create that inquisitiveness and excitement in learners about what I was about to teach."

Another woman wrote: "I'm in complete agreement with this piece! This is what I wish my children's education to be. For now, I can only be brave enough to live by intuition as silly and different Mommy can seem. This is about restoring and acknowledging the divinity of every single individual on the face of the planet. Every one can shine with their creations, ideas, affection, movements, strengths...and as my husband just complimented me of my 'gift' of cleaning house 😊 "

Re: Human Life and Action with a Higher Purpose in Mind  
by **Hari** » Sun Dec 29, 2013 8:57 pm

The case of Nelson Mandela hiding his hatred of those who caused him pain, allows us to speak about both his quality as a human being and our misconceptions about leaders and great men. Because he is a great personality who was an example for his countrymen, he understood that expressing hatred would create a long term conflict and many deaths. He wanted independence, but he wanted one that was sustainable and based on principles that would endure. Revolutions made out of hatred, where one party kills or crushes the other, eventually stumble back into a system that resembles the previous regime or deteriorate into a chaotic rivalry amongst historically opposing factions. To demonstrate his conviction, he avoided proposing a violent revolution and embraced inclusiveness. This was not only successful, it was a great example for the entire world.

He set aside his personal emotion for the sake of his cause and only expressed qualities that were favorable to all citizens of his state. He was indeed a great man.

A common misconception amongst spiritualists is that their leaders have to be perfect, otherwise they cannot be leaders. This creates a somewhat sterile atmosphere as leaders repress their emotions or true feelings to maintain the expectations of their followers. It is not sustainable. Everyone should have the freedom to express their energy as it is without being forced into a common mold. Nelson Mandela's inner hatred might surprise those who wished to see him as a saint without fault. Those who appreciated him as a great human being, as Mr

Clinton did, saw his setting aside his deepest feeling of personal revenge for the sake of his people as an act of valor and selflessness.

Is this selflessness and austerity, indeed this incredible discipline under severe hardship and trauma, spiritual? Do these acts display spiritual strength and fortitude? In my opinion, yes, of course! His spiritual essence as a godly man caused him to set aside his perceived tormentors and seek the long term goal of freedom for those who suffered. Most certainly it is a good example for leaders of state.

Now as far as your Facebook group comments go, gee, they sure seem like a direct in-your-face challenge to those folks, so naturally they will get upset and dump you from the group. Maybe a better question to them is, "Are you certain it is best for me to follow what you teach rather than to find my way through the life that appears before me moment by moment?" You were not interested in their reply since you already knew they did not have an answer you liked; you were acting to wake them up or change them. Since they obviously are not interested to do that, any "challenge" meant to change their minds is best given in subtle ways.

Rudolf Steiner created a system of education in the first half of the previous century wherein he saw the student in a similar way as your quoted personality. Socrates used dialogue as a method of education long before. So long education is a means to churn out slaves to production and consumption, it will remain bound to controlling the development of individuals. And without individuals buying into the dream of prosperity in a technological wonderland, no one would accept such a restrictive environment,

Education should be a process that teaches one how to learn anything one requires to know. This is vastly superior to a system that creates highly specialized workers and thinkers. But I think that technology has also allowed each individual to find what they seek in life even as they get their degrees and learn to be whatever their employers want. Search engines, free exchange of information and knowledge, and freely available online university courses found on the internet have created an atmosphere where anyone desiring to expand their horizons can. Even in the present system, the inherent desire within each of us to find our own truth causes many to break free from the limitations of modern education.

However, not even a highly evolved educational system can ensure that a person will desire "correctly." It can only assist society to accommodate and facilitate everyone's desires in the best possible way and for the greatest common good. Balancing what is good for the individual with what is good for the group remains the major struggle for all societies in the world.

## **sravanam kirtanam**

by **kamalamala1** » Tue Sep 17, 2013 3:18 am

In context of your teaching or your approach to spirituality  
 I would like to know what real meaning have the process of sravanam and kirtanam  
 Previously this two activities was the foundation of the whole movement  
 And the point was just chant and hear and serve and nothing else  
 Feeling wasn't at all important.  
 In that time i was already wandering what is more important feeling or  
 chanting (sound even without feeling in the most times)  
 And if we have feeling what is the need of chanting?  
 And is there any use in such a process without feeling?  
 In this regard can you also clarify

what does really mean shraavanam and kirtanam proses?

(As i understand real sravanam is when one chanting or saying with deep feeling and kirtanam is the same with feeling)?

And what is more important feeling or chanting even without feeling?

In feeling i mean bhakti

And in bhakti i mean feeling

I also want to add that personally i love very much chanting even without deep feeling

<

But i also like more deep meditations and if some feeling is there then it is the most

It will be very nice to know what means really shraavanam kirtanam

Re: sravanam kirtanam

by **Hari** » Fri Sep 20, 2013 1:28 pm

If hearing and chanting give you a good feeling, and you like it, then there is great use to it. You say you like it and you have a deep feeling when you do it. Therefore, you are harmonizing with the spiritual energy as you should and all is well.

Sensitive people like to use their sensitive awareness to experience spiritual energy in a variety of ways. Aware people do not say, I am already aware so what is the need of processes that increase awareness. No sensitive person would agree that because they can feel they do not need to do anything that expands their capacity or uses it. After all, life is a continuous feeling experience and anything that expands this is welcome.

Hearing and chanting ultimately are not processes exclusively intended to accomplish some goal. They are not a means to an end, they are an end in themselves. They are a spiritual experience that is a feeling, a love, and a harmonic resonance with the energy of the Divine Beings. Therefore sravanam-kirtanam are relevant at all stages of life.

If a person has no feeling while hearing and chanting, then they are doing something wrong or they are so blocked or energetically distorted that they cannot resonate with the spiritual vibrations. In that case, they need to correct this deficiency to receive benefit from the spiritual practice. This is usually the case for extreme beginners after they pass the "honeymoon" period of initial bliss.

I think the best course of action for blocked people is to find out the sources of their energetic distortions and work on them. This will improve their spiritual practices so they can experience the deep love and devotion that is bhakti.

## **Grounding**

by **maha** » Thu Aug 15, 2013 3:03 pm

Dear Hari,

I have the question about grounding. It has been rising in me gradually, and now most likely due to my enduring dwelling on board of the sailing ship in an open sea the desire to grasp what grounding actually means has ripened in me.

In one sense it is clear, that technically or energetically grounding means to connect (to tap) to the energy of the earth, better standing on the ground barefoot, and to feel how the dense and warming energy of the earth is entering through the middles of the feet and through the

perineum upward to breath it in, to fill with it the whole body so that while meeting with the other vertical flow of the cooling Cosmos energy which flows downwards the feed and empower all the chakras and organs of the body as well as our corresponding interactions with the world and spheres of life.

But what means grounding in a broader sense? That seems to be especially relevant and important for those of us who feel as if they've landed on this planet from other worlds or stars, and still wish to become fulfilled in earthly life, to fulfill the potential of this incarnation and to get maximal benefit of for the further and more enduring evolution. I understand that the more I'm grounded the deeper is my earthly experience on earth. But still what it actually means to be grounded. Does it mean only or necessarily to have family and children, to own a house or a piece of land, to have 'earthly' job and steady income and be fully integrated into earthly human society? Does it mean in essence to love mother Earth and nature and to develop strong connection and interaction with them?

We find that some strange groups or people like my parents for example even consider eating meat and drinking alcohol to be the best and easiest way for grounding, but I don't agree, since I find it more burdening and clogging for health. At the same time I have big difficulties with it since grounding is related to the base (root) chakra Muladhara which is also very much related to parents and especially to the mother. Does it mean that we can only be properly grounded through the connection to our parents and our earthly kin?

Other problems which I have are that due to my nature I am not much capable to 'sit at one place' and often inclined to travel, to search for new experiences, and to cope with it I even find partner in life who would also have such 'unearthly' disposition and in thus we are both not enough grounded, but we still are aware of the necessity to have our own home or base where we can always return from travels and experiences.

On the other hand the Earth itself seem to undergo lately various transformative processes and is so to speak lacking stability than what would grounding mean in even broader sense? The connection to Cosmic nature and to the mother of the Universe Goddess Durga?

Re: Grounding

by **Hari** » Sat Aug 24, 2013 9:25 pm

Being on the sea certainly makes you appreciate the value of the earth under your feet. Now you are physically experiencing how constant shifting in an unstable situation can make you feel queasy. You might feel an urgency to ground your energetic body to the earth to avoid floating away. Just as a ship must anchor to remain at its dock, we must anchor to the planet to remain here during our life.

Whether we feel we belong on this planet or not, our energetic body requires a connection to the physical body. The physical body is a product of this world and since we reside in it, we cannot avoid it. Not all physical bodies require the exact same things and we have to supply our body whatever it needs to function optimally. Some people eat meat, others are repulsed by the thought. But we all eat. Some people feel that a family and home are the foundation of their lives, others feel it is a prison. There is no formula that works for all.

We all need to feel comfortable in our body and we all need to express who we are. Grounding can be seen as connecting to the earth as a tree connects, growing roots to gain nourishment from the earth and the water within it. The concept of grounding may be defined as gaining nourishment in a compatible manner. Therefore, the question arises, "What nourishes you?" Are you nourished by family and houses, or are you nourished by the love and security these

things might provide? Are you nourished when others support you or are you happier when you support yourself? You should answer this question for yourself.

When you figure out the list of what nourishes you, make another list of how you will attain that nourishment. The facility that provides this nourishment will ground you the best. Find out what this is. You might find you require many different kinds of facility since no one thing can provide everything you need. The next question is, "How shall I get the facilities that provide me nourishment?" Answer it.

If someone tells you that you require to do what they do to be grounded and connected, you now have a very good answer.

The meditation on the tree that assists us to connect the heaven and earth within our hearts in the perfect balance of a grounded body and a free spirit is just as applicable to you as anyone else, regardless of your personal nuances. You will benefit by meditating in this way. You might still act differently than others even when you are grounded in the manner appropriate to your unique situation. That is fine.

You may have to defend yourself by discovering out how your energy can interact with other people without being distorted by them. Another question is "How can I feel like I belong in a world I do not belong to?" The quick answer is that you can't unless you accept the illusions that make most people feel this is their place. Grounding and belonging are two different concepts.

If you like what you are doing and where you are doing it, you will feel connected to it. If you like the people around you, you will feel connected to them. If you like the energy around you, you connect to it. But what if you do not like the situation you are in or the people around you? What will you connect to? This is the challenge you face when you make plans.

Re: Grounding

by **maha** » Sun Aug 25, 2013 5:20 pm

Your answer is very clarifying and helpful! Thank you very much!

## **Indigo Children**

by **sri** » Tue Mar 24, 2009 2:22 pm

Dear Hari!

I am at the moment reading a book called "Indigo Celebration". There is a book written before this one that I have not read. (I sometimes just read books as they come to my life.) This is a book full of comments by parents, teachers and sometimes even children on what in first book was categorized as "Indigo Children", referring to children that are different, spiritually open, "system busters"...

Nevertheless, while reading it I could see much of myself, my friends and children I know, and have a good laugh. While my husband and me had a serious questioning about whether it really is that this children are different and unusual or are they just children and it is parents that are starting to be more aware of children, it was something else that caught my attention and that I wondered about.

Namely, many of them, Indigo Children, are talking about coming from another world, rather often also stating that they have been rulers of those worlds. Again, whether this is normal for all children, or these children are different, I do not know, but I personally know of many people (from time they were children) and many children of present time that actually feel the same, they feel connection to some other, previous world in which they often had some "position".

Most of them will not admit that after the age of ten 😊, but I am good at listening.

Obviously, I have no problems with reincarnation. What intrigued me was this feeling of "royalty", feeling of being important, special, having access to knowledge (again not so surprising part). The thing I wondered about was the number of such persons. Could there be so many other worlds (well, obvious answer would be -why not?) that so many "rulers" and important people could drop from by? Is it anyhow possible that in some other reality everybody is royalty of some kind and that these souls just have a better memory due to, for example, Kali yuga nearing its end?

I am aware of that you had not stated any of the above and therefore do not have to have an answer but given your many years of spiritual experience and quite a few books read combined with your keen intellect I believe that if anyone could think about it and give me some answer, it would be you. So, I hope you don't mind me asking.

Re: Indigo Children

by **Hari** » Thu Mar 26, 2009 4:31 pm

Mahashaya has a lot of experience dealing with Indigo children, so you might want to connect with him for his feedback. Or else Maha can write here as a comment to your text too!

To preface my reply, let me say that it is natural that newer generations of children are more evolved in some ways than their elders. Simply being born later gives one the facility to build on the assets of the previous generations. It also gives one license to express oneself in a new and somewhat different manner than those before them. In a similar manner, parents are constantly evolving as they build on the structures of their parents as well as they themselves having been more evolved as children. In other words, society is always evolving in some respects, but more so now than ever before.

At the same time, there is a dullness in society due to toxins, energy contamination, food contamination, reducing oxygen, and the overall stress that characterizes all aspects of life. This makes an interesting combination.

By the way, my generation was filled with system busters. We were very proud of that. 🏆

So yes, parents are more evolved and thus more aware of their children, and yes, children are more evolved. And yes, the idea of superiority is characteristic of ignorance and yes, even the so called evolved are somewhat ignorant when they think of themselves as superior and thus deal with others as inferior. One could conclude that some (not all) Indigo children who are a bit contaminated by the idea of their "higher" capacities are somewhat ignorant of social skills, empathy, or even culture, and thus need education. One has to also question if one becomes known for what one is by one's description of oneself or by how one acts and how one is of service. If one is royalty, one should act regally and do something significant for the world.

This is just a comment based on my discussions with Maha. Perhaps it is the challenge they face and their struggle to overcome it will be their success as a generational force? Time will tell.

I have a lot of fun dealing with psychic or powerful children. I have seen this generation struggle with the same things I struggled with my entire life. The idea of not fitting in, of needing to find those similar to yourself, of looking around and seeing a waste of human existence are concepts familiar to me. But in my day (sorry, this is the grand old man speaking) we were quiet about it and rarely, if ever, spoke about it. Now it is expressed, not only openly, but within a community of like-minded souls. Alas, there was no internet in my day and the only way to meet people was to physically connect to them. Since we all went to public schools and then large universities, our possibility to commune with similar people was limited to the enforced similarity of age, neighborhood, economic or academic status and so on. When we went out into the world after leaving school we felt somewhat lost and disconnected. The internet has allowed social awareness of the potential in special children to blossom and given them a chance to nourish each other. It is now a movement and they have a name and a color. Good for them. I wonder if I shall have a color name when I come back again?



Re: Indigo Children

by **sri** » Thu Mar 26, 2009 5:46 pm

Thanks for the comments. I do not know about the movement, color I guess comes from the crown chakra, but according to them you already have a name and a color, you would be an Indigo Child, slightly before they discovered it or named it, but nevertheless an Indigo 😊, judging from what you are saying. And from what you are saying, you were probably not the only one.

If Mahashaya (or anyone else) has something more to share on the matter, I will be happy to hear it. Thanks all.

Re: Indigo Children

by **maha** » Tue Aug 03, 2010 8:02 am

Dear Hari, thank you for your compliments. 😊

Unfortunately yet I don't have as much experience with them as I would like to.

Maybe this open admission of it will open and expand it further...

There are more and more of aware kids, not only indigo.

Obviously they belong to all kinds of dimensions and levels of awareness.

It's almost useless and counterproductive to label them and mostly they don't like it.

I find it difficult to associate with them on the level of information, as they seem to mostly value direct personal experience and direct personal perception, although some of them devote themselves to develop and reveal to people some important evolutionary information, which in its highest essence seems to me very much like what Hari is sharing with us.

Many of them devote themselves to sometimes plain and simple, and at the same time quite specific and practical help to others who need it, especially to other children.

It seems that most aware of them know exactly why they are here and they are doing what they want - which is exactly what they've come here to do 😊, not really publishing or advertising it. Quite possible that one of their major work is related exactly to the matrix of change, which the latest broadcast was about.

Obviously some of them need our help, (as absurd as it sounds!) primarily in not interfering and not trying to push them into "boxes" and frames, but simply accepting them as they are, trying to actually listen and understand them, tune to their hearts, relax and stretch ourselves to their dimensions, to their wavelength.

I find it inspiring and enlivening to try to tune to them on the level of heart and love, or sometimes just through the eye contact. Their most wonderful quality for me is that they often attain their task and make enormous change simply by their presence among us.

Yet, natural and inevitable truth is that some of the "new children" have much power and abilities and not yet enough developed ethics or even plane "earthly" wisdom, and then those of us who already have it can help them by sharing.

Finally I've found someone who is reflecting quite clearly and essentially what I have been feeling as Indigo presence here on Earth. His name is Matías De Stefano. As he says before incarnating here he had been working with what we call Akashic Records. He is presenting very wisely and concisely all the important points about incarnation, evolution, other dimensions, transition to Aquarius Age, indigo and so on..

Personally I find his presentations interestingly complementary to what Hari has been doing and sharing with us. But you can see it for yourselves, please... 😊

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jepolpObRBM>

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Dh2NkhunEJ0>

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=h64CJI54j8M>

## **Varnashrama Manifesto for Social Sanity**

by **auferstanden** » Tue Dec 11, 2012 11:40 am

Haribol!

I have a question to Hari.

Do you still agree with all the ideas that you've represented in this book?

It was published at first a long time ago, in 1981.

Thank you in advance for the answer.

Re: Varnashrama Manifesto for Social Sanity

by **Hari** » Wed Dec 12, 2012 11:20 am

You are from the Ukraine, so you are reading the Russian version. The Russian version is very badly translated and has little connection to the original, so you are not getting it properly.

I think Varnashrama is a fine system and had ISKCON taken it seriously, it could have helped create a society that was useful for all members. My presentation might have had faults, but the basic idea was useful.

Today, I am not interested in presenting anything in relation to ISKCON or to its philosophy and therefore am not interested in discussions that are restricted to the varnashrama system.

However, I feel that the basic principles of varnashrama are very useful. These principles can revolutionize interaction between people. The implementation of these principles is difficult and if this system is not accepted or useable within ISKCON, an organization that professes to follow the Indian systems, then there is little hope it can be implemented outside of ISKCON.

So there is little use of the entire idea, IMHO.

Re: Varnashrama Manifesto for Social Sanity

by **auferstanden** » Thu Dec 13, 2012 8:50 am



Why do you think it's badly translated? For my opinion it's adequate.

Re: Varnashrama Manifesto for Social Sanity

by **Hari** » Thu Dec 13, 2012 10:45 am

Did you compare it with the original english version line by line? Others compared it and found it lacking.

Re: Varnashrama Manifesto for Social Sanity

by **Hari** » Thu Dec 13, 2012 2:37 pm

What I like about Varnasrama:

\* It openly clarifies the fact that people are different and feel most comfortable in a work that suits their nature. I feel that a lot of anxiety is created in modern society when we all struggle with being something we are not. This system allows everyone to understand the inherent relationships between individuals who share some basic qualities and differ in others. There is nothing hidden about it, nothing behind the scenes. Modern societies speak about equality, yet under the surface there is a raging current of class distinction, elitism and differentiation. At least Varnasrama is honest and open about it. Makes it easier to accept, easier to deal with, and to more openly resolve differences.

\* It professes to give appreciation, acknowledgement, acceptance and gratitude to everyone in the society regardless of their position. It gives the means for this to occur, although it does not always do so. Indeed, how this functions is related to the quality of the individuals within the society. No ideal can change human nature and since a lot of humans are not evolved enough to see that there is only one of us performing functions within one society meant for the benefit of all, we have individual exploitation. This leads to disrespect, abuse, and all forms of unwanted social interactions.

\* It is also flexible and allows for individuation within the four broad social classifications.

\* It is open to discussion, debate, and clarification.

I cannot say there is much I do not like about the system in its pure form. However, we see that it has existed in a somewhat "pure" form, or at least a form where people were happy and prosperous, only when a Rajarsi ran the society. A successful society depends on a good leader. Nowadays this is rare, not only because the political system does not encourage idealism and breeds servants of the entities that place the elected in power, but also because many of those who should guide the development of society, the educated and influential intellectuals, are themselves motivated in ways that are not always beneficial to others. Sure, this is due mainly to the all pervasiveness of money and power that influences education, research and social directions, but without clear minds and strong independent thought, one cannot implement social egalitarianism. In short, while the system is good, the implementers of it are not so good. And as there are many groups and individuals dedicated to blocking anything that reduces their power and influence, it is highly unlikely any substantial social change can take place that does not benefit those who make things happen behind the scenes in this world.

I suppose I wrote that book hoping that it would spark interest within ISKCON to be the leaders of the social transformation according to the system and wisdom of the vedic times. Perhaps I was trying to create a rallying call for transformative change? Perhaps I looked into the future

of ISKCON and saw that without this direction, there would be no attainment of the vision of assisting the world to find peace and prosperity in a God Centered society?

## Inductive or Deductive - A Logical Approach to God and Truth

by harsi » Thu Jan 05, 2012 7:31 pm

Dear Hari,

Philosophical beliefs were the springboard for contemporary methodology with Plato supporting the experiential and abstract and Aristotle embracing the concrete and systematic. Woven from two differently cultured cloths, these defining elements served to establish the grand variances for drawing conclusions with deductive and inductive methods.

The deductive approach - beginning with a concept and its consequences which is then illustrated by means of applications - must give way to the inductive approach based on first awakening natural curiosity. Applying this deductive approach those involved very easily and effectively accumulate a lot of knowledge through "learning by doing", at least that was and is the opinion in certain circles of society. Prabhupada was also teaching the Vedic approach to Krishna or Vishnu and the Supreme Absolute Truth, which is a deductive one. Thus for him and those alike who base their knowledge on the revealed scriptures it is much more easy to demonstrate and execute a deductive argument with the required certainty, but is it therefore also more appropriate or true?!

The empirical nature of science has allowed for its success in solving great human problems and in understanding the world around us. It is based on observed scientific truth. Real life data and observations lead to such findings, which only then can be translated into theory. A scientific theory without such data is merely a hypothesis waiting to be shown true through human observation. If you start with a theory like for example the essence of life is that of servitude (servant of god) and then try to prove it, you are taking a biased position and setting out to complete an impossible task. Nothing can be proven in science only accepted until shown otherwise.

Thus if one tries to establish a theory based on his understanding of humanness, even if it is taken of some revealed scriptures or trusted advisor (guru) and from this sets to prove his moral theory struggles to fit human morals into an idealistic model that he perceives. Of course assuming you believe in a divinity to begin with you may be inclined to believe that your life purpose is that of servitude to that God and Supreme Being. But than you are living a religious life and not one based on observable evidence and data collected during an assessment.

Of course one may say whether a major premise is true depends completely on whether this person's authority, who is setting up a certain assumption is infallible. If it is, then everything follows as a natural sequence, as when the major premise is rooted in the revealed scripture (sastra) and its goal is Vishnu the source of everything. If instead ones approach is based on the premise (assumption) of an ordinary man's fallible speculation or contemplation and conclusion reached by observation and evidence gotten through his fallible senses, deduction becomes a caricature. Whereas Vedic deduction relies upon knowledge that is authoritative and indubitable. Brahma, the first Vedic sage of the universe, received that knowledge from the Supreme Godhead at the dawn of creation. And after that, whenever the Vedic teachings were misinterpreted or lost, the Lord appeared again and again to objectively re-establish the correct understanding.

Thus the questions arise, whether and to what extent one can get close and come to know God and the truth about one's own 'spiritual' existence with a purely inductive approach (experiential learning)?

As for me I can fully identify myself with this statement I found recently online that says: "Not ancient gods, but principles and backgrounds discovered and questioned by one's own efforts are to determine the rules of the world, of being, of politics and of communication." On the other hand there are people who say that conclusions reached just by virtue of one's own intellect and endeavor can never be sufficient to rise above the ordinary to the level of transcendence. Which might also be a valid argument.

Re: Inductive or Deductive - A Logical Approach to God and T  
by **Hari** » Fri Jan 06, 2012 4:39 pm

According to the Bhagavatam, the original knowledge was a collection of teachings by hundreds of different sages and rishis, each with their own schools, students, and disciplines. This knowledge was compiled by Vyasadeva and organized into the literature that presently exists. This literature was hand copied, sometimes modified and had more or less parts deleted or added.

So if one bases one's belief in the infallibility of one's source of knowledge on the assumption that it came from God, one might be mistaken. One might object that nothing important was modified, but one would have to have access to the original to make that judgement. Not only does one have to accept that this infallible knowledge came from God, one has to also assume that all the iterations of that literature were perfectly transmitted without any change through thousands or, even worse, millions of years. One also has to account for the mysterious blackout of history between the recent descendants of Janamejaya and the appearance of Buddha. One has to have faith that during this 2000 year unknown period that the same infallible transmission was faithfully reproduced and that the literatures were not lost in some cataclysm and reproduced by some brave souls by memory.

That God appears periodically to restore the pure knowledge is an inspiring idea. But then one has to question how Krsna restored the entirety of this pure knowledge during His appearance. Was it through the Gita? The Gita is great, but is it the restoration of all "lost" knowledge or was it the restoration of dharma as it applied to the time and some time afterwards? Lord Caitanya and His followers did not restore the entirety of knowledge, but they did give a wonderful look into intimate relationship with Radha and Krsna.

Considering this, one might be safer to assume that the ideal of spirituality as it is given in the modern understanding of ancient Indian wisdom is quite nice and accepting its basic concepts is quite useful. There are also teachers of various aspects of the tradition that can assist us to advance in our spiritual awareness and capability. We accept this and benefit from it to the degree that it resonates with us. Some find it useful to resonate with certain teachings.

Beyond this, it seems to be a matter of opinion. I have found that my evolution is a combination of accepting teaching from others and experientially attaining practical realization. I started off learning from my parents, then my friends and teachers in school, and then I later on uncovered my own truth. I gratefully accepted Indian wisdom and teachers for many years and learned as much as I could. During that time I also engaged in testing this knowledge in my everyday life and learned to adapt it as required. And later on, I engaged in deeply absorbing myself in direct experience by embracing the mystical energy of the divine.

It seems obvious that both aspects of the "educative" experience are required. Sometimes we accept established wisdom and knowledge that is gleaned from analytical research or from the anecdotal experiences of others, and sometimes we seek our own truth by acting and adjusting.

I know no one who is purely inductive or purely deductive. The idea that either of these states exists in a pure and unique form in any individual seems to be illusory. The idea that one has to choose one or the other seems irrational.

It is my personal experience and it seems logical and reasonable, that coming in contact with God is an ongoing and continuous process that includes learning from others and personal experience.

Re: Inductive or Deductive - A Logical Approach to God and T  
by **harsi** » Thu Feb 09, 2012 12:12 am

Dear Hari,

I have another question for you, which is related in some way to the same line of reasoning addressed in this thread. And I must admit that I got inspired to start thinking about this by listening to the answer given by Eckhart Tolle in response to a question asked by Neale Donald Walsch: as one can watch in this video on [Youtube](#).

Walsch asks therein Tolle in a public conversation: "How do I take what I think that I am; how do I take what I experience myself to be and wash the canvass of my life with it, especially when it matters to me the most, (Walsch refers to the relationship between him and his wife) why can I sum (not bear this in mind, I suppose - added by me) in this - then?"

Its quite interesting how Tolle answers the question by referring to real imageries, Jesus would have used parables I guess, or one can say to use a new expression - 'Presence' or 'Awareness' in or of the 'Now'. "In a certain situation the 'Presence' moves through you and it is sometimes there, I would assume and sometimes not..." "In certain situations I have lost the "Present Moment", I'm not present in the "Now", So, in other words, you are trapped in the mind," replies Tolle to Walsch among other things.

Is there also a way to answer this question in a more clear and comprehensible way, a clearly understandable manner? if you allow me I would like to reformulate this important question as follows: How to overcome your "weaker self" (or how to vanquish the inner temptation) and making thus a radical change in perspective in your life? Of course the whole topic could be extended also to the psychological level or has implicitly also some psychological connotations when in asking how to overcome something like this or 'your inner fears. It is well known that many people have a blind spot, "one's weaker self". Supposing that the required understanding is there of who I really am, if one can even formulate it in this way, and not purport to be something one is not...

This words like 'Presence', Awareness' or 'Now' used by Tolle seem to denote a Being, a spiritual or out of this world Something, or a State of Being which is, or seems to be, above, or transcendental, to that which we may experience, or perceive in some way, in our observable, visible, world we live in. As I read somewhere: "He wants to fully appreciate the ineffability of the Absolute, but still wants there to be some sort of transcendental something that can act as a referent or Ultimate." At the same time this "Something" seems to be also somehow intertwined with this world and can be made visible through us in some way, here in the 'Now', the present moment. Its also interesting how Eckhart Tolle is referring to the mind ("It comes

sometimes that you realize that your mind has taken over and at that moment you can relinquish that and invite "Presence" back into your life ...) and the 'false' (limited) ego as being sometimes something obstructive for "being in the Now". It sounds good but what should we understand by it? What would you envisage under this?

Now of course there are also those who say that the whole thing is also a matter of purification of the heart and that the most sublime and powerful means of purification is to always think of Krishna and always do the will of Krishna. Jesus also said: "Only those can see God who are pure in heart". Interestingly Muslims have a similar understanding as one can read online under the title: "[Means of purification](#)"

Re: Inductive or Deductive - A Logical Approach to God and T  
by **Hari** » Thu Feb 09, 2012 12:24 pm

I watched the video. Tolle says it all and the way he says it is quite fine. There is no need for me to try to make it better.

Perhaps you are having trouble due to his usage of words. He is speaking of presence as that divine presence, that divine energy of spirit, that pervades all things and is the fundamental energy of all existence. Sometimes we are aware of it and thus live and act within it consciously, and sometimes not. When we are not aware of it, we act or get entangled in things that are unpleasant or agitate us. Other people might give us feedback that shakes us. At this point we should consider that we have lost connection to the divine and we need to reestablish it. When things go wrong, this is an alarm bell that sounds to remind us of what we are. We should use negative events in that manner.

When Tolle speaks of being trapped by the mind, he indicates a state of mental disconnection wherein the full conscious awareness is inhibited by thought that revolves around our protecting what we think is our identity but which is actually a product of aspects of our lives that are not divine. When our conscious awareness is focused in thought, we have minimized our greatness. This is not a true expression of self. To truly express self, one must allow the full depth of our conscious awareness to be active. Therefore, the false conception of self derived from thoughts that are bound in the network of defense of the illusions we hold dear are the main obstacle to living a life of conscious spirituality.

Re: Inductive or Deductive - A Logical Approach to God and T  
by **harsi** » Tue Feb 28, 2012 2:32 pm

Dear Hari,

Behind everything there is a logic, a reasonable understanding consistent with a set of rules or whatever one personally finds to be in accordance with ones own definition and understanding of things or that of a particular school, institution or understanding in society. Medical practitioners follow the "logic of healing", in politics we find sometimes the rule or logic of the divide and rule strategy, in Iskcon we had the logic of renunciation, becoming completely free from the karmic bondage, free from samsara, the cycle of birth and death and so on in order to reach one day the supreme abode of godhead. There are a wide range of physical experiences, ranging from mystic experiences of leaving the body and near-death experiences to yoga, which people in society describe as "spiritual".

What would you say is the logic a spiritual mystic aspires to follow?

In this connection I read recently an interesting statement:

"Our community is not trying to manifest some kind of utopian ideal - rather we work genuinely with who and what we are."

Sounds logical enough, but implementing that which brings a spiritual dimension to it is often quite difficult. Normally you associate with spiritual something which improves or purifies one.

Re: Inductive or Deductive - A Logical Approach to God and T  
by **Hari** » Tue Feb 28, 2012 11:36 pm

Behind everything there is a logic, a reasonable understanding consistent with a set of rules or whatever one personally finds to be in accordance with ones own definition and understanding of things

You have already answered you own question. As you accept that mystics are rational, as opposed to being irrational in which case we could not speak with them, you accept there is a logic to their way of being.

Everyone rationally constructs their lives on a foundation of something they accept or believe. From that foundation, they logically infer the entire system of their lives. Mystics are no exception, as they will also be rational, will have their own form of logic, and will build their lives accordingly.

Perhaps you are also asking about the "slogan" of the mystic, that which makes them unique in this world or that separates them from standard religionists who (sometimes) follow what they are taught and who do not try to explore new territory. Here is one way to describe that:

A mystic is someone who considers their experiences to be the basis of life, who believes in his or her ever expanding awareness and defines life according to their perception. In short, the foundation of a spiritual mystic is experience that can only be perceived and defined in an extremely personal manner. Thus the foundation is self and all that is built on that foundation follows from that ideal. This experience is unique to the mystic. All decisions in life are based on this personal experience. The rationality of it, and thus the logic of it, is clear; if it means something to them, it has value, and if it has no meaning, it will not have value.

I am not sure why you start your second comment in this line with "in this connection," as I do not see the connection. As the question is unclear, I shall not comment on it.

Re: Inductive or Deductive - A Logical Approach to God and T  
by **harsi** » Sat Mar 03, 2012 12:48 pm

What you write, although remarkable and very revealing, is for me often so deep and unfathomable that it takes days to learn, digest and internalize, understand the content. I read today a statement related to industrial production which says: "Automated procedures are preferred to purely manual procedures as they can be standardized and validated." It seems this applies in some way also to the way religions are structured. As giving a standardized (for the masses) and seemingly validated (by scriptural authority) means to come in contact with the divine. It seems the individual (manual) way of the spiritual mystics is or was always one representing only a small minority in society. Of course that does not have to mean that their way and spiritual discipline is or would be less spiritual potent. But the question still remains how to validate or standardize (making it applicable for the majority of people in society) the path or way of the spiritual mystic? How is it possible? Is it at all necessary?

In this regard there exists a known community of spiritualists here in Nuremberg, who offer every now and then interesting public lectures which they advertise with big posters they pose

in crowded places throughout the city. I attended also ones one of them and was surprised what great amount of followers and sympathizers they have, mostly in the upper class of society among intellectuals, people with good qualifications in high-level positions, artists, doctors and people at similar levels. They consider themselves spiritual mystics of the Christian way of life influenced also by theosophy ("divine wisdom").

On the internet one can read "Rosicrucianism is a secret society of mystics, allegedly formed in late medieval Germany, devoted to the study of ancient mystical, philosophical and religious doctrines and concerned with the application of these doctrines to modern life. (...) See also [Britannica.com](http://Britannica.com)

On their [American website](#) it is stated: "Who am I? What is my purpose? What can I accomplish in life? How do I chart my own course in life? Is there more to this wonderful universe than I see around me? What is self? These are the great questions the brave and insightful have always sought answers to." They claim to walk "along the path of the mystic" and that it would be a "path travelled by a relative few at any one time." Yet they claim that some of the "greatest minds" who were "enriching the world with their physical inventions, scientific discoveries, beautiful works of art, music and books, but most importantly, their personal approach to life" were following on that path "reaching their ultimate personal evolution."

On their website one can further read:

"Just what is meant when we use the word 'mysticism'. A proper definition has always been elusive or vague. For the record, mysticism can be defined as an experience where one personally knows, through direct knowledge, the source of all being. Many call this source God; others, the cosmic. The point is, the experience is noetic. We know, not believe through faith or know only through scientific observation, but we simply and truly know.

"The art of mysticism can be learned. The work of the Rosicrucian Order is to initiate the student to the techniques where mystical knowledge can be readily attained. This knowledge when properly accessed is ultimately rational."

"In the end mysticism isn't a belief. It is simply an art of knowing. The mystical experience transcends nature. Often the person will receive a feeling that far surpasses anything which could be conveyed by words. Furthermore, this insight, devoid of ego, is thoroughly comprehended as truthful."

At "[Frequently Asked Questions](#)" one can read "The Rosicrucian path incorporates both metaphysics and mysticism. Metaphysics is that which falls beyond the five physical senses; for example, intuition, visualization, and healing techniques. Mysticism is simply the process by which you may eventually experience direct, conscious union with the Absolute, Divine Mind, Universal Intelligence, or what some Rosicrucian students call the God of their Hearts."

At "[The Path of the Mystic](#)" they say their community "is not a religion and does not require a specific code of belief or conduct. Rosicrucian students come from a variety of cultural and religious backgrounds. Becoming a Rosicrucian student does not in any way require you to leave your church, join a church, or change your religious beliefs. Some Rosicrucian members do not subscribe to any specific religious beliefs at all. For students who do, we encourage them to participate in the religion of their choice. As a result, Rosicrucian students come from every religious denomination, and through our teachings, many find a greater appreciation of the mystical principles underlying their individual religious and philosophical beliefs. Those who do not belong to any particular religion often discover a sense of connection with a higher intelligence that was missing in their lives before."

Now you might ask why do I make references to all this passages here. It is because somehow it gets close also to what you write and the logic and reasoning you apply on this subject sometimes. "The art of mysticism can be learned," write this people I mentioned above. What would be or is necessary to achieve this? I know you were leading ones a spiritual retreat in Russia about this.

---

The reason I mentioned the statement by the Shambala community "Our community is not trying to manifest some kind of utopian ideal - rather we work genuinely with who and what we are." is that the logic they apply doesn't seem to have something to do with a system that elevates them to some higher plane of consciousness, they seemed perfectly happy to be who and what they are. A logic which only provokes the shaking of heads in some spiritual circles.

Re: Inductive or Deductive - A Logical Approach to God and T  
by **Hari** » Sat Mar 03, 2012 1:28 pm

Standardization rarely works uniformly. Probably the best example of standardization is the legal system. Laws are meant to regulate and standardize activity and provide codes for the benefit of most. However, as time progresses, people and circumstances change and laws must be updated accordingly. What was illegal 75 years ago is considered normal now. Standards that work are those that are updated according to the requirements of those whom the standards are meant to serve. Unless this is done, the standards become obstacles and are removed either by revolution or by the gradual atrophy and deterioration of the structure.

Religion is somewhat unique. Although most religions adjust to some extent to keep pace with the changes in society, there are certain regulations that cannot be changed for fear of diluting core values. Acceptance of a religion means, more or less, acceptance of its core values. Even if you change, you cannot change the core values for doing so would change the religion. Therefore, the follower has two choices; either they leave the religion when it no longer is relevant or they forcibly change their personal mentality if they can. I suppose there is a third choice which is to declare you are a follower while holding your own interpretation of core values that fits your situation. Indeed, most people embrace the third option, more or less, although they rarely speak about it.

Someone who lives the life of a spiritual mystic would find it unacceptable to repress their feelings to fit into a mold or to outwardly present themselves as following the standards while internally living another life. For this reason alone, mystics avoid structured religion as it places them into an antithetical position.

I think the mystic ideal of being true to yourself is an ideal fit for all people, at all times and all places. One might ask why is it not accepted if it is universal? I feel that the structures created by religion are more based in the economic and political requirements of spiritual service and due to the convenience of the social grouping, a structured theology has evolved that includes loyalty to the organization.

If you examine the early days of all religions, you will find that the basis of the religion is rooted in the life and teachings of their prophet. The individuals surrounding the prophet were attracted to his personality and teaching. There was no organization and no structure. Structure and organization came much later on. The prophets did not ask for or want organization. They asked for spirituality. Christ, Mohammed, or even Lord Caitanya, wanted people to connect to God and serve according to their capacity. None requested organized structures. Indeed, Lord Caitanya, for example, had nothing to do with Kings, governments, structures or the like.



Were the teachings of these great souls less potent because they had no structure? Obviously not. Did these teachings become diluted when placed within a structure? You decide. By the way, most prophets are more or less hidden while alive; the power and beauty of their teachings manifests long after their departure from this world.

Those who are great become great in their own manner through their personal experience. I do not accept that their format of evolution is only relevant to prophets and no one else. I think, IMHO, that their example is relevant to all and is indeed the cornerstone of their teaching. The creation of institutions is an add-on. It seems to me that spiritual mysticism is the foundation and everything else is a container for the expression of the divine in everyday life.

To standardize, as you say, the mystic mentality is as simple as standardizing the structures of religion that exist today. One simply teaches it and creates the educational system by which that teaching is given to subsequent generations. As easily as one could say that one simply follows the theology of the past, one could teach "here is the divine, find it through your life." It is a different perspective of the same goal; a different way to reach it.

I think that my hundreds of lectures and numerous writings all lead to that point. Many have written to me with appreciation of these lectures when they are in need of hearing something that validates their human experience and personal connection to the divine. They express gratitude that the points are presented in a manner that brings them to a state of consciousness that serves them well. I see structure throughout what I do. However, if I were to write it down in a list as a theology, it would effectively nullify the principle of growth through self-discovery. Indeed, I think this is why you find my texts heavy to digest. I point you to yourself where I am sure you will find all your answers. I indicate where you might look, but I never tell you what you will find. How could I? Only you can see and feel what you feel. My telling you what you are is a disservice to you. I tell you how to find it, not what it is. Sure, I might say it is essence and it is you and so on, but this is not what you will experience as you will taste the you and thus the divine as you learn to resonate with the wonderful spiritual energy of God.

## **is it possible to stop love someone?**

by **Aicha** » Wed Jan 18, 2012 6:41 pm

Dear Hari! I have just one question? Is it possible to stop love someone???? I had never such experience, all men that i laved i love them now, but i don't want to have a future with them. So i have a question - is it possible to stop love someone????

Re: is it possible to stop love someone?

by **Hari** » Fri Jan 20, 2012 2:58 pm

Your question, although seemingly simple and straightforward, is truly complex.

What is love? It is a feeling. It is an emotion. It is an energy. It is the primal force that sustains existence. It is far more than we can define in words although that will not stop us from trying.

God is love. We are of the same energy as God and therefore we are love. Our essence is love. Yet that description confuses more than clarifies. By defining love in such a broad manner, I have effectively diluted it for the practical reality of my life can often be anything but loving. If I am love, why do I sometimes feel hate? One could say that hate is the other side of love, and that is sometimes true, but I may neither feel hate nor love, I may simply be unconcerned. I

may walk past a homeless person and do nothing to benefit them. I may even see a family member who needs me, and ignore them although I would state, if asked, that I love them.

Our love seems to be layered and exist in degrees of intensity over time. I may feel intense love for a person, may go into the “honeymoon” period of head-over-heels love, and find that this initial infatuation fades within the next few years. I may find that in some cases this loss of infatuation causes me to separate myself from the one I loved. In other cases, this deteriorating infatuation is replaced by a long term, deep and meaningful loving friendship that becomes fundamental to life itself.

So what is love anyway? I think that a condemnation of infatuation as merely lust with no relation to love is incomplete. Besides, we might be infatuated with other things not related to sexual partners. Perhaps we are infatuated with video games or with a political candidate? The on-line free dictionary offers these two meanings:

- foolish or all-absorbing passion or an instance of this: a mere infatuation that will not last.
- the object of a person's infatuation: When I was a kid, my infatuation was stamp collecting.

Consider infatuation with a newly discovered boy or girlfriend. That infatuation has many elements within it, all of which amplify our desire for the other. Physical attraction, mental compatibility, the voice, the looks, the sharing of activity, and perhaps even sexual enjoyment. Whether these ingredients are compatible with us or not is not an issue; as long as we think or feel them to be, they are. We become totally absorbed in the other party. We call it love because it does indeed include all the elements of love. The question then arises, “But if it does not last, was it actually love?”

Do we, as spiritual beings who are all inherently divine, have a universal love for all spirit? If we were to be aware of the spiritual nature of all beings, would we love them all equally or would we still love some more than others? As I am a personalist, I would tend to say that even in our most elevated consciousness, we would have preferences that would amplify love for certain individuals more than others. If that amplification is caused by our conscious preference for things we like, then our consciousness becomes a major factor in love.

My consciousness is characterized by my choice. As I choose, I display my consciousness. I follow my desires, regardless of what is behind those desires. I may love ice cream, but choose not to eat it because my desire is to not become fat. I allow myself to be infatuated with another because I like the way they look, feel, or whatever. All systems are go and my conscious choice flows in their direction. There may be many factors in that flow that are subconscious, but I include that within the realm of consciousness as the subconscious surfaces as my desire and I act on the basis of conscious desires. I choose to allow myself to fall in love.

Consciousness is not overwhelmed by desire for long, as reality includes self-preservation. When I see that the other party was hiding something from me, or that I was blinded by the filter of infatuation, I find myself adjusting my perception, even against my will. Give enough occasions of being subtly insulted, stepped on or grossed out, my rational mind creates a case file called, “Things I don’t like about you,” that remains dormant until the amount of pleasure derived from the relationship is less than the amount of pain. As we like pleasure and not pain, this is a significant factor. At one point we say, “Enough!” And that is that. We walk away. Perhaps we feel relief mixed with lamentation and frustration at having wasted time or resources, or perhaps we simply don’t look back.

We have rational reasons for our separation. Separation does not occur without reason and it is our conscious choice. But where is love in all this? If our love was mainly based in infatuation it might be lost after separation. If our love was to some extent based in mutual respect, admiration, appreciation and friendship, then that part of it will remain even when we realize the impracticality of relationship.

I find it hard to use the term, “real love,” as love is love and who am I to qualify the term with the redundant “real?” If I say, “I really love that,” what I am really saying is “Well, my previous ‘love’ was not really, but now it is!” Love is love. But how do we get it? Hmmm.

How do you “get” love? Can you create it? Is it a conscious act? I do not think so. I think it is something that just happens. I do not believe that we can cause it to happen; indeed, it is more or less causeless. Ok, there are factors that influence it, certainly, but the conclusion that we reach at one point is that we are in love. Sometimes that realization is shocking and wonderful at the same time. Sometimes it bewilders us. Other times it happens so gradually that we flow into it without hesitation.

How can it exist if it is not created? Well, anything that exists that is not created is already there. One might object by saying it is created, only by factors we cannot perceive. That is fine too. But I think that these factors are far beyond the visible realm and relate to energetic exchanges. When there is an energetic compatibility between people, this creates a comfort zone between them — a place where they relax into each other and allow each other to be who they are and where they relish each other as they are, accept each other, and enjoy being together. Seems to me that this is the place where the natural love we all are can manifest safely in this world.

In other words, we protect our essence from insult. I have discussed this in my book. When we love someone, we still protect essence, but in another fashion that does not inhibit the relationship.

Love exists and always will exist, for it is the core of being. But love will not manifest unless the conditions for its safety are met. Considering this, we never “stop” loving as we are love. We rather choose when and where to manifest it.

Previous lovers have shared a piece of our heart. They have been offered our most precious gift and we have accepted their most precious gift. This incomparable sharing makes a deep and lasting impression upon us. This energetic impact remains, even if we have filed it away and forgotten it. When we focus our attention on that person, perhaps when a memory surfaces due to some catalyst, or if we see or meet them again, that impression of energetic sharing may arise for some moments. We then wonder if we still love them or not?

We loved them once and that remains with us always. They had managed to inspire our loving inclination and therefore they are special. That can never be lost, although it can be covered.

Some rare individuals can offer their love to others as a gift from their essence. These individuals do not fear being damaged or insulted. They simply love because they are love. We usually crucify them.

## **Will something live on after our physical death and where?**

by **harsi** » Wed Oct 05, 2011 5:09 am

Dear Hari,

A few days ago I went out and when passing along the road in front of a shop I saw a magazine lying on the street. It was a Christian magazine of a group of people who interpret the content of the Christian scripture in their own way, and it attracted my attention because of the title of the printed article on the opened page of the paper while lying there on the ground. "Will we live on after death?", was the title, "Lebt man nach dem Tod weiter?" in German. The author develops in the article the idea that after death everything is finished and underpins his personal conclusion with a quote from the Bible where God himself allegedly would have said: "For you were made from dust, and to dust you will return..."

The writer goes on by writing that God created angels to live in heaven and the human beings and animals to live here on earth. Adding again a quote from the Bible to give support to his statements. He develops further the idea that the human beings were meant by God to live on eternally here on earth but because the original human beings did not surrender to the will of God by tasting a certain fruit they were forbidden by God to taste they brought about the death upon themselves and into this world. He writes further by quoting from the Bible that only those who surrender to the will of God will have the privilege to live on after death, as he puts it "in the mind and memory of God" and sometime in the future again eternally in their physical presence here on earth. "All those who will live than may hope to unite again with their loved ones" the author writes.

Now what I find interesting here is that one can find support for ones ideas and ones various spiritual concepts in everything, if you want it to, if in the Bible or like other people in the Bhagavad-gita or some other scriptures, but I ask myself if one can somehow really differentiate what can be a credible information in this regard and what not and how? Of course some may say that you can have faith in what is written there in this or that religious scripture because its content was directly revealed by the Supreme, by God personally or through those he empowered to listen to his will and voice. But I often ask myself if we really need at all a scriptural support for our ideas and for understanding something spiritual about our existence and if and what will live on after our physical death and where? Is it beneficial for someone to live ones life with a particular expectation which may or may not become fulfilled in the future or is it better to keep in this regard also a natural curiosity by knowing well that who knows or what scripture can tell us for hundred percent what is there to be expected after death and what not? Of course than the question may arise what is there to be known and to be realized or become aware of spiritually anyway and what a religious belief or spiritual concept and understanding is really there to give an answer for? In the past some of us developed the concept that just by chanting so and so long and by doing this and that devotional service the answer and realization to our various questions will somehow automatically become revealed to us if we just go on with our spiritual practice.

It seems that a perfect and timeless answer regarding ones various questions about life and death science as it is understood and practiced today can also not provide us with. As I was reading recently in an article written by a professor. "Science is a socio-discursive method and has nothing to do with timeless truths." Thus science can also only tell us what the knowledge on a particular issue is at present which may well change also in the future. It seems that however perfect or whatever perfect knowledge we would like to possess somehow we will have to live with the fact that in this regard we will always lack something however perfect or full of knowledge one may want to be, if at all.

Its also interesting what Prabhupada said in this regard: "Our Krsna consciousness movement is very scientific, factual, authorized. Simply intelligent persons can understand it." If what he meant really meets the science preconditions of being "logical irrefutable, contradictory free and empirically adequate" is I think doubtful.

Re: Will something live on after our physical death and wher

by **Hari** » Wed Oct 12, 2011 1:49 pm

Perhaps the real question is, "What do we believe to be true and can we ever really be sure it is so?" Philosophers have dealt with this question often and I think it is important that each of us understand why we think and feel as we do.

The key to all understanding is awareness. The more we are aware of the circumstances we are in, the emotional and psychological factors that influence us, how our thoughts and behavior are modified by external influences, and how our own conscious and subconscious desires rule our vision, the more we are capable of understanding who we are, why we accept what we do, and where we plan on going.

The Japanese have a unique vision regarding predicting the future. Unlike other cultures that periodically check the accuracy of their previous predictions to better their predictive capacity, the Japanese do not care if their predictions are realized. According to them, the act of predicting the future is an exercise to expand awareness of the present. They see their vision of the future as simply an extension of their vision of the present and accordingly they modify their present to accommodate where they think it is heading. Quite smart! After all, it has been verified again and again that no one can accurately predict the future as it is always something other than we thought.

Religion gives us a vision of the future and a method to attain it. It is a standard characteristic of all theologies. They define their version of the final goal, their heaven, and how this goal is attained. It is not so important that their ideas of heaven are different; what is more important is that the goal includes full peace, bliss, happiness, freedom from pain, old age, disease, death and similar problems found in this realm. In short, a very nice place without problems in association with God and other Godly personalities who do not fight or cause each other difficulty.

This is attractive since it includes all the things we do not like about our present situation. The methods to attain this state include acting good in one's own life and towards others, doing service, worship, discipline, self-control, abstinence, and many other good qualities that are beneficial to the self and society.

So we are given a complete package: here is the final reality and the way to get there. No one disagrees that ending up in a nice place is good and no one disagrees that the way to get there is to be good.

Is it true? We cannot say for sure until we experience it. Yet, if one dies and does not experience it, one could carry the mind set after death that lack of attainment is linked to personal failings. Even if one attains it, one cannot come back and "testify" that everything is true. This means that the goal cannot be verified and therefore the method to attain the goal is also not verifiable.

Set aside for this discussion the rare situation where someone has visualized themselves into the spiritual realm they desire while still in this world. This unique and very personal attainment is also impossible to verify as one can only accept the statements of the one who claims to have the attainment. Yet, we can share to some extent the energy of another's attainment to the extent they project it and we can receive it. But again, this is subjective.

Subjective reality is the norm in this world, not the exception. Science is not absolute -- simply look at the profound difficulty arising when photons were measured to travel faster than the speed of light, thus breaking a seemingly irrefutable axiom proposed by Einstein. Sure, this is a

headlining contradiction of the laws of nature, but there are thousands of accepted facts that were overturned when new information was gained. I am comfortable with the idea that science is a combination of facts that can be verified and reproduced, and supposition, presumption, and theory. The scientific method includes the creation of working theoretical models that help guide further research and development and that are continuously updated and modified to fit data and practicality. There are axiomatic facts and there are theories meant to assist the increase of knowledge and capacity.

Spirituality uses the same method in its own way. I do not think there is value in trying to justify spirituality as a purely verifiable fact while denying its theoretical component as this does not demonstrate its scientific quality. Such attempts seem to me to be based in the idea that "we are as good as you and better," and have little value to the spiritualists themselves who generally dismiss the scientific method as either useless or disrespectful of God. I do not see any loss to spiritualists who admit there are elements of both experience and theory in what they do and believe.

No one remains on some spiritual path without personal experience. Without having experience of the spiritual energy, one would not engage in the oftentimes intense disciplines expected. One engages in spirituality because it gives something tangible that can be felt and has value. This is the "factual" aspect of spirituality and it also includes the idea that were we to engage in certain sinful activities it would cause us harm -- a concept that can be verified through experience. We consciously and subconsciously experiment by deviating from the expected norm and observing the subsequent results. This is a scientific method in as much as it uses experiment to test hypothesis to reach conclusions that are built upon to uncover previously hidden truths.

And yet, there is the element of theory that is also shared with science. A spiritualist believes their literature and theology to be true. After some time, they develop faith in it and may even feel this faith to be unshakable. Some feel that what the previous authorities have stated is irrefutable and undeniable. They accept authority and follow it, sometimes even when it counters their personal experience. This mentality of following is born of the theory they have accepted as a working paradigm. The theory is something like this:

"I do not know what is true or false as I am small and imperfect. The scripture comes from God or people who are as good as God. The scripture is true and beyond the failings of humans. If I simply believe in it and follow it, I too shall attain the promised land after death. All I want is to attain that state, so I shall deny myself thoughts or acts that are forbidden and thus qualify myself for heaven."

Why does one believe this? Does one have any evidence that this is so outside of what one has read or heard? Yes, there is some experience involved, such as the honeymoon period when one first enters a spiritual group and feels great love and connection to the divine energy or when one later has moments that are simply wonderful! There is inspiration, a feeling of unity with others, the conviction that one is doing something great for the world, and one is the representative of God. Yet, despite this experience of our modified actions bringing tangible results, the complete package of the belief system remains a theory to be later proved or disproved. The idea that the scripture is correct is also a theory for any individual. We accept it is correct and have faith in it. This is our working theory. So long as there are no blatantly contradictory events or occurrences to deviate us from this conviction, we remain convinced. We state, "I will continue to believe this to be true and this belief will get me to heaven." In short, we accept and continue in a spiritual process because we want to, we like it, and it gives us something we think we could not have without it.

Although Sheldon disagrees, an important aspect of science is psychology. The process of the mind is analyzed and attempts are made to modify it for the sake of the individual. Modifying how people think is a very developed science utilized by the media, politicians, businesses and anyone who wants to earn money or gain power. The theories we accept as fact after being influenced by a public relations or sales campaign may not at all be true, but this is of little importance to those who are concerned with the goal of modifying your behavior for their benefit. Science plays a major role in creating fantasy, as can be seen in the movie Avatar, the presentation of the prophetic quality of a presidential candidate, or the insane need of people to buy little devices that do all kinds of things that one had no idea needed to be done till someone told them to do them! This is all science, carefully researched, developed, implemented and experientially monitored to produce verifiable results. Yet, it is mainly fantasy in one form or another. Because of this, I do not think science can justify criticizing religion when science is used to create other forms of religion with the same ideals of giving people the goal of heaven (on earth) and a means to get there.

What is true to you and has value to you is based on your own belief system. My desire is to assist you to become super-aware so that you can expand your capacity to see the energy of any person or event and thus understand its value to you. Decisions made in awareness are superior to those made without it.

Will any of us, even those who are super-aware, make perfect choices and decisions and always live within the highest forms of energy? I doubt it. Does it matter? That depends on your demands and expectations.

Some questions we should all examine regularly:

- \* Why do we believe what we believe? What caused us to come to the conclusions we did?
- \* What do we expect out of life and what are we expecting to attain in the future?
- \* How do we feel about our-self and thus others in this world? What has caused us to feel this way?
- \* How much of our life's experience is a product of external energy that integrates within our own without our awareness and how much of what we experience comes from within?
- \* Do these ideas of the future have value only in the future or are they really indicators of what we are now?

Continue to ask questions, observe, increase awareness, and see how fact and theory are always related. See how we are manipulated by our beliefs and observe who benefits from it. As they say, "Follow the money," as it will always lead to underlying causes. You can substitute "fame," "profit" or "distinction" or any other form of enjoyment for the word "money" to expand your awareness of this world.

Re: Will something live on after our physical death and wher  
by **harsi** » Sun Nov 06, 2011 9:29 pm

One thing I'm still not able to understand, although I'm trying hard at times. Are you really suggesting that one is not able to "realize" or become aware of the self (the spirit soul) as something being apart from the body since one cannot become aware of something one already - is. At least one could have that impression when reading what you wrote. It would indeed also be funny to suggest to realize something one may already - be (which just waits to be recognized by oneself one day). As that would mean that there is something you - are - and something distant from you, you would - posses or would be something separate from you, the conscious person, and I am not speaking here about the body. I think there is no doubt that in this world one is - also - the body, at least for some time and all other groups of people who

would suggest a different view are doing that also with the body and mind, something they try hard to deny although that is not possible. Since when you are not the body you seem to be nothing at all in this world by which one can express oneself and ones views, or maybe a ghost expressing oneself by clattering with tables and chairs. Can one realize at all something one already - is?

Have you realized and appreciated "your" self or "your" spirit soul on your long and unique spiritual journey in life? Have you thus reached full control of all your bodily senses and mind, of course I am joking here... I just wonder why Prabhupada was stressing this point so much in his teachings as something indispensable for reaching ones "goal", again another one of this irresolute and dogmatic concepts, in ones spiritual life. It must have had also something to do with the time of the hippy generation, the youth of the late 60ies and beginning of the 70ies was committed and following, with their motto of free love and free drug use like LSD, marijuana, hashish and other hallucinogenic drugs in order to "get high" and "experience" oneself in ways never done before, he was also recruiting young man and woman from, mostly in America. Of course to say there is material life and spiritual life is also strange since life is life, it is ones conscious state of being, it cannot be really categorized in one way or the other distinct from the state of being.

In all other issues your wrote I can fully agree. I just wonder what is there really to be realized or become fully conscious of, if it is even necessary, in addition to that what one may be and feel at present anyway?

Thank you for your precious time and energy!

Re: Will something live on after our physical death and wher  
by **Hari** » Mon Nov 07, 2011 10:35 am

Life is characterized by acts, events, struggle, stress and a variety of demands and impositions placed upon us, that divert our attention away from self. We become entangled in life, so much so that we lose connection with who we are as our minds and bodies are overwhelmed.

Spiritual practices counteract this influence. When we make the conscious choice to place ourselves in a spiritual environment -- a place of worship, a meeting of spiritual people, a discussion on spiritual topics, a peaceful meditation -- we focus our awareness on spiritual energy. This grants us relief from external impositions and stabilizes our energy.

The topics I have spoken about do not question the importance of spiritual life; I simply question the method. I propose that instead of spiritual life being mainly a group endeavor with now and then concentration on the self, it should mainly focus on establishing the self that may then engage in group endeavors as it sees fit.

As the most fundamental characteristic of self is awareness, I endeavor to focus awareness on the essence we are, on the energy we are and that we manifest. I point out that the we are mainly concerned with dealing with the energy of others in our daily life and that we need to learn to distinguish between that energy and our own. I recommend to be fixed in the self, strong as the self, and take responsibility for the direction of our own life through the choices we make.

I do not like to give too much prominence to a concept like "realization." If one is aware of one's energy and how one expresses it, one gains insight into the energy of others. This creates a new level of interaction and this increases ones awareness. I do not think one can be "fully conscious," as a final state as awareness always grows. Awareness is not limited to a few dimensions and it can enter as it likes and as one develops the capacity. As one feels more and



more comfortable with oneself and secure in oneself, one allows his or her awareness to expand far beyond the limitations imposed by external forces. As one's awareness expands, one sees more, experiences more, and develops greater capacity. I suppose you could call this realization, but as it is a continuous, on-going process, the word "realization" no longer describes anything significant. Realization is a moment in time, whereas awareness is the energy within which we understand or realize. This continual increase of awareness is what powers conscious energetic expansion. It is the essence of spiritual life and evolutionary growth.

Since I am already aware, as awareness is the nature of life itself, I should allow that awareness of self, of being, and of essence to deepen more and more. There is no end to this expansion of awareness. Considering this, one can simply go from where one is now to a state of increased awareness. All the tools are within.

This is a discipline, but not the kind that is meant to get you some goal or some "attainment." It is meant to make life, wherever it is lived, a deeply meaningful process. When seen like this, life is no longer a series of events leading to some ultimate goal; rather, it is an ever-existing process.

Re: Will something live on after our physical death and wher  
by **harsi** » Sat Nov 12, 2011 11:12 pm

I found today on the Web a very interesting quote I would like to let you know. There it is said: "Indeed, although it is true to say that in recent years there has been an increased interest and a greater sensitivity on the part of public opinion, international organizations and governments with regard to schooling and education, there has also been a noticeable tendency to reduce education to its purely technical and practical aspects. Pedagogy and the sciences of education themselves have appeared to devote greater attention to the study of phenomenology and didactics than to the essence of education as such, centered on deeply meaningful values and vision."

With the above description of your new "philosophy" in regard to spiritual awareness and ones ever-existing identity you opened a new chapter or a new way of spiritual understanding I would like to further expand or deepen if you don't mind. What I found especially a meaningful message in the quote above is that "the essence of education as such is centered on deeply meaningful values and vision." Something which in my opinion appears to be highly appropriate to the way you explain spiritual topics.

Now what I would like to know is what is or should be the usefulness, benefit or gain (I am not sure what term I should use here in English) of ones expanded spiritual understanding and awareness? Is there a "goal" one should try to reach with ones expanded understanding and awareness or rather should that be a starting point for a more meaningful way of living ones life wherever that may be in the present and the future? You know what our understanding was in the past. In the past one was also joining or tried to come in contact with spiritual minded people or a spiritual community with a certain goal in mind, at least I had one, to find out who I am, spiritually, who or what is the Supreme Godhead, what is my connection and relationship with that superior divine being? Than I tried out all the various disciplines offered by that society by which, at least I had that promise, I could come closer to my spiritual goal in life.

Which "spiritual" disciplines, if any, would you propose to be meaningful and helpful in this regard? When I was in St. Petersburg last year I was surprised to see people chanting japa in the temple. I am also doing it every now and than but not anymore in the way I did it until a few years ago where I was thinking that I would have to do so and so much rounds of japa on my

beats in order to become purified of my bad ego or control the flow of my thoughts in my mind or whatever. Now I am chanting Hare Krishna every now and then when I feel like because I like the sound vibration and am feeling well when chanting the "holly name of Krishna" My focus has changed somehow as also in other things related to spiritual understanding and practice. Somehow I can very much relate and understand very well that what you wrote above: "As one feels more and more comfortable with oneself and secure in oneself, one allows his or her awareness to expand far beyond the limitations imposed by external forces."

Still one may ask maybe what is expanded spiritual awareness or awareness of self really? Is there a prescribed or a feasible method in practice by which to expand or further ones understanding and awareness some say realization of the Supreme or Krishna? Or is it something which each individual person must or should decide.

Re: Will something live on after our physical death and wher  
by **Hari** » Thu Nov 17, 2011 4:17 pm

*Now what I would like to know is what is or should be the usefulness, benefit or gain (I am not sure what term I should use here in English) of ones expanded spiritual understanding and awareness? Is there a "goal" one should try to reach with ones expanded understanding and awareness or rather should that be a starting point for a more meaningful way of living ones life wherever that may be in the present and the future?*

This is a very good question. I personally do not have any goals and expanded awareness is not a starting point. Awareness (without adjectives) is the natural consciousness of life. If you think back on the various topics we have discussed, you will see a recurrent theme; namely, "Our natural state is energetic essence and conscious awareness. All the external impositions we have accepted and embraced as our own, dull, distort, and transform that awareness. To restore the natural condition, one has to remove the grip of these external forces. Once that is done, or at least significantly so, awareness is restored to its natural state and life is lived as it was meant to be." I do not recall insisting that the life that is lived has to be in some form as opposed to some other form. I do not give goals or directions. I avoid interfering with an individual's will or right to make their own choices. I advise how to attain clarity and how to make connections to the divine and other beings. I sometimes share with others how I do it or how they can do it.

I like the statement that, "the purpose of life is to live." If you add more conditions to the purpose of life, you start interfering with life itself. One naturally requires social, political, and economic directions, laws and structure, but these things are meant to regulate how life is lived within a social context. None of them are a purpose. There are various things we want to do and like to do or need to do, but none of them are the fundamental purpose of life. For example, it is not the purpose of life to be of service, it is rather the characteristic of essence to see that there is only one of us; service is an expression of this vision.

In short, life is to be lived. Being alive is simply another way of saying that the living, conscious and aware energy is expressing itself. One can also be alive and express oneself by doing nothing, as in a deep meditative, relaxed state.

We sometimes become confused by instructions that we should do this or we should be that. These instructions in and of themselves may or may not be correct and valuable, but it is important to understand that these ideas are only as important to us as we make them. When we embrace or reject something, we choose to do so. Why we make the choices we make is the real issue. A goal in life could be to insure that all the choices we make follow our conscious awareness of what is best. If we are making choices based merely on what we are

told or what we have accepted without complete awareness, we are not really living our own lives but are living the lives of others. To truly embrace one's own life and live it requires that one is very aware of why one does what one does. The more aware one is, the more able one is to adjust, modify, or transform one's choices when there is a reason to do so.

Sometimes this is seen by someone as simplistic. Those who are addicted to being told what is right and wrong and what they should or must do, as well as the demand that they embrace some mission or goal as the ticket to their salvation, find my statements to be without much substance, boring, or a waste of time. I understand their reasoning, but I think they are not yet at the level where they can comprehend the spiritual depth of the discipline I suggest. Indeed, the very fact that they have surrendered their awareness and intelligence to some other force means they are not aware enough to understand me.

What is most interesting to me is that someone who embraces a spiritual culture or tradition, or at least some parts of it, after having removed those forces that cloud one's conscious self-awareness are far more powerful in all respects than those who accept something because they believe it to be so! Again, this is a simple reflection of the often spoken idea that realization is superior to theoretical knowledge. However, the realization I speak of as prerequisite to living one's own life as an expression of the essence they are, is truly deep and wide and will manifest in all aspects of life.

When life is seen as an expression of essence, one approaches it differently. However, there are many things one must do simply to manage day to day affairs in this world. Although one's activity is at times restricted or directed, one still has the freedom to perform that activity with awareness (called "mindfulness" by some teachers) or not. As all action is more or less ruled by consciousness, one always has the opportunity to manifest one's aware choice.

Difficulty arises when a person does not see the depth of what I have been presenting and thinks there is "more" to it. They might think they need to have some spiritual activity to expand their awareness or develop their spiritual power and strength. As long as they think they need this, they do. After all, we are what we decide we are and if we decide we need to do more to be more, then we shall endeavor to do more. Being is, and it is fine as it is. I do not believe that removing external influences is done by simply following some process, as each influence has hooked itself to our consciousness in different ways, at different times, and for different reasons. Regardless of whether one follows a spiritual discipline or not, one still has to do the same exact spiritual work of developing true awareness of how and why we have embraced a certain idea and then endeavor to dissolve that imposition.

Now, you might ask, does this mean I am suggesting that one does not need to do anything? Well, yes, I am. However, I may choose to do something because I want to. I like to chant, sometimes, and I sometimes like kirtan, depending on who is doing it and what kind of effect is created. I like the deities and relating with them. I like speaking about spiritual themes. I like associating with spiritual people, but my definition of who is a spiritual person might not be yours. In short, I do what I want to do because I want to do it. I also do things I may not like, and there are plenty of them, because I am doing them for others who I do like. I do not like being everyone's tech support (which is the burden tech savvy people all over the world carry) but if it is for my parents or my wife, or I can assist someone who really needs it, I like it. In other words, I may not like the act, but I might like who the act will benefit. Therefore, I come out ahead and do not lament about it.

*Still one may ask maybe what is expanded spiritual awareness or awareness of self really? Is there a prescribed or a feasible method in practice by which to expand or further ones*

*understanding and awareness some say realization of the Supreme or Krishna? Or is it something which each individual person must or should decide?*

Prescribed method? Not from me, although you can find others who will gladly share their prescriptions with you. Feasible method of practice? Well, living life as a discipline wherein one always maintains one's conscious awareness and chooses to act as if there was only one of us is definitely feasible and favorable for spiritual evolution. And yes, that is something each individual has to decide on their own if they are true to themselves.

It all boils down to each individual. We are the controllers of our acts. We are the one's who make choices. We are responsible for the choices we make. So embrace this reality and do not try to pass the responsibility to someone else. This in itself is a great spiritual achievement.

Some guru in Russia has complained that I took credit for what I did in the past. He thought that was wrong since all the glory and credit goes to one's guru and not to oneself. I find it amusing. If we do something wrong, it is all our fault, and if we do something right it is all the guru. Hmmmm, how do we win here? If you believe that everything comes to us from mercy, then sure, you are investing in the guru bank account and you will withdraw mercy from that account in due course. I give to you and you give to me. Is it so that when you do something that is bad that your bank account gets less? In other words, are we fined or penalized for improper actions? What kind of bank is that? Is there no way it is safe and secure? Kind of sounds like the modern banking system to me. But joking aside, if I am responsible for my acts when they are not right (and what is right and wrong is such a complex issue that religionists argue all the time amongst themselves, so much so that they often take each other to courts or mediation to resolve their disputes) then it will naturally follow, I suppose this is simple spiritual physics, that I am also responsible when my acts are good. I mean, either we are responsible or we are not. If one says we are responsible sometimes and not at other times, we open the door to a chaos of having to investigate and judge the factors, laws, regulations and interpretations of action to determine what is in the good side (when one is not responsible) and what is on the bad side (when one is responsible).

Therefore I stick to my idea that we are responsible for our acts and the choices we make. I have no problem with saying I did this or I did that. I would have a problem were I to use that statement to gain glory or admiration as this would be unnatural for me. However, I do like being appreciated for what I am by those who understand me. Ah yes, that is for another discussion!

Re: Will something live on after our physical death and wher  
by **harsi** » Sat Nov 19, 2011 11:31 am

Dear Hari I appreciate your voluntary intellectual attitude of openness and transparency. Indeed You demonstrate openness to us by giving an insight into your specific point of view in regard to spiritual and human topics. What I found most remarkable in your comment is the following passage: You write: "Regardless of whether one follows a spiritual discipline or not, one still has to do the same exact spiritual work of developing true awareness of how and why we have embraced a certain idea and then endeavor to dissolve that imposition."

I must say frankly I do not really understand what you mean by writing this. I will explain. I started my spiritual journey by reading from the books translated and commented by Prabhupada. He translates for example in the Bhagavad-gita the verse told by Krishna to Arjuna:

janma karma ca me divyam

evaṁ yo vetti tattvataḥ  
 tyaktvā dehaṁ punar janma  
 naiti mām eti so 'rjuna

"One who knows the transcendental nature of My appearance and activities does not, upon leaving the body, take his birth again in this material world, but attains My eternal abode, O Arjuna."

Or: "A person who is fully absorbed in Kṛṣṇa consciousness is sure to attain the spiritual kingdom because of his full contribution to spiritual activities, in which the consummation is absolute and that which is offered is of the same spiritual nature."

Now if I understood you correctly the certain "idea" I may have embraced to try to "attain" the eternal abode of Krishna I would have to give up or at least try to understand what led me to embrace that certain idea. Perhaps trying to escape the difficulties in life. But than one may ask oneself perhaps why should one engage oneself at all with spiritual topics and disciplines, Why should one not just "eat, drink, and be merry, for tomorrow you may die" as the expression coined by Imhotep goes seeking more the things of the world through the effect of rampant materialism and not those of spirituality or heaven? In other words what do you mean to say by writing that one would have to do an "exact spiritual work of developing true awareness"? I had already before some difficulty to understand what it means to "become fully Krishna conscious."

I think what I would like to know why should one give up ones goal oriented ("How activities in Kṛṣṇa consciousness can lead one ultimately to the spiritual goal is described here, writes Prabhupad in the Bg) interest and engagement in spirituality for something which seems to be less aimless, or at least it seems to be so? It could also be so that my ability to understand you fully is hindered by the fact that I am not an English speaking reader.

You write also: "When life is seen as an expression of essence, one approaches it differently." In my opinion when I think back a few years ago it was indeed so that the way we lived our life "in Krishna consciousness" was more or less an external imposition of "vedic" laws and behavior which had in fact not much to do with the reality of life within this world. And all that experience we accepted as our own was intensified by the society of people we lived together in order to be accepted and appreciated therein. Therefore to live ones own life it is in my opinion much better to live independently of any "ashram" or society in order to live ones life as an "an expression of essence", whatever that may mean, which is not yet fully clear to me.

Re: Will something live on after our physical death and wher  
 by **Hari** » Sat Nov 19, 2011 3:09 pm

Either my presentation was ambiguous or you have understood it differently than it was intended. I shall attempt to clarify.

*[Hari writes]: "Regardless of whether one follows a spiritual discipline or not, one still has to do the same exact spiritual work of developing true awareness of how and why we have embraced a certain idea and then endeavor to dissolve that imposition."*

*I must say frankly I do not really understand what you mean by writing this.*

When I said, "Regardless of whether..." I was saying that it does not matter if one performs or does not perform any particular kind of spiritual discipline as spiritual discipline itself is not the issue. The discipline followed, whatever it may be, is not the key to awareness.

The “ideas” I speak of are those all of us have embraced that relate to who we think or feel we are in the here and now. Some examples of these ideas:

- \* Traumas at birth
- \* Being abused as a child
- \* Being neglected or not seen for who you were as a child
- \* Growing up in a prejudiced environment
- \* Being ridiculed for not being good enough
- \* Being weaker than other kids
- \* Absorbing the values of your country
- \* the list could go on forever

These ideas impact us very deeply at the core of our consciousness. Traumas, feelings of insufficiency, yearning for recognition, desire to be acknowledged, wanting to be loved for who one is, needing to fit into the group, seeking respect, and other factors can influence the choices and decisions we make. This influence is apparent not only in our longer term decision making process, but at every moment in time. Why is interpersonal relationship so hard in this modern age and why is it getting worse, day by day?

Even if you believe, as you do, that Krsna is God and our duty is to serve and follow everything we have learned in the scriptures, when we are faced with a situation that agitates hidden cracks in our psyche, how we react and how we express ourselves are to a large extent a product of our past, even if attempt to control our reactions rationally. Even if we manage to not say what we really think, which is after all not that hard as most of us never say what we really think about something even if we knew what it was that we really think as most of the time we hide from ourselves, our energy expresses itself in truth. To be able to control that expression of energy is a skill and part of the discipline I have discussed. Recognizing that energy for what it is when it manifests is part of the detective work, the inner research, that reveals to us the rumbling undercurrents in our psyche that causes us to react as we do. The more we recognize and deal with these things, the more clear we become. As we cleanse away these forces, we come closer to the pure essence of self.

You can chant, read, serve and so on, and that is fine if this is what you really want to do. But unless and until you deal with your own energy in truth, in practice, in experiential environments where you are tested and pushed to the limits of your conscious awareness, you will not be able to cleanse the coverings that are glued to the self. Spiritual disciplines might make one more sensitive to the coloration of our consciousness, but without developing the (meditative) capacity of heightened awareness, one cannot take full advantage of these disciplines.

This is not some theory I cooked up. I have seen it practically, not only amongst modern day members of various religions, but amongst the leaders of those religions. No one, and I repeat, no one becomes free from their own baggage till they address it directly. You cannot hide behind a discipline and hope, wish, pray, and believe that everything will work out so long as you continue doing what you are doing. Real connection to the Supreme does not come from doing, it comes from being who you are and tuning to the divine energy. To be what you already are is not a question of doing, it is a process of letting go of everything you are not. To let go of what you are not requires that you know what you are not, to see all things for what they are and decide how to relate to them. To go through the process of accepting what you are and rejecting impositions on what you are, regardless if you have voluntarily accepted that idea (because it seemed at the time to correct) or you were programmed to think you should, is the prerequisite to enlightenment.

And if you deeply research the same sastra you like to quote 😊 you will see that this is the more advanced methodology expressed in the Bhagavatam. I find it amusing that devotees simply skim over the parts of the sastra they “accept and follow without question” that describe the meditative methods of detachment from this world. They assume that since Lord Caitanya said chanting is the only way, this is all they have to do. They assume their 16 rounds and their periodic following of their principles and programs are all they need to do and they are guaranteed entrance in the spiritual sky. However, this is not so. Whether one believes that or not depends on one’s own choice. However, I do not wish to leave my life in the hands of a statement that is not in tune with the entire tradition. But that is just my way of seeing it. I have explained this over and over again in my lectures.

If one were to examine what I have been saying in the context of the most profound elements of the religious tradition, one would find not only similarity, but often a continuation of these concepts. I do not wish to do that point by point comparison for various reasons. I leave it up to you, if you so desire, to make the comparison. If you feel the need to make comparisons, it is better to uncover the deeper resonance rather than seek out the differences. Once the deeper resonance is found, one can ride on this and embrace the deity one desires. The differences then become inconsequential.

Re: Will something live on after our physical death and wher  
by **Akhila L** » Fri Nov 25, 2011 10:22 pm

Thank you for this very interesting discussion.

I assume that people who follow certain religious traditions do it but their own choice. We can only see a particle of time, and cannot see beyond the boundaries of birth and death, but there must be a good reason for that too.

What I "realized" and learned from you over the last years, and what resonates well with me (so it must be good for me: a simple rule) is that:

- we are co-designers of our own life; so we decided to meet Hare Krishna people in this life; we thought it would be important for us to see the world from that perspective; when we were done with this our awareness expanded and we could move forward;
  - there is no ultimate resort for souls; we cannot buy heaven with our "spiritual" or "religious" deeds but it helps us in de-conditioning (I mean Hari's list of this life's conditioning) from traumas and in directing our attention to the inner life;
  - whether one likes it or not, there is only one of us (although we are different), and all religions (Bhagavad-gita or Bible included) are continuation of the same concept;
- So, inclusiveness is always a move in the right direction; "you are not one of us" means always problem in the process; it seems to be a simple rule but can be devastating if applied for "religions" and "spiritual movements". Very, very rarely you will meet people who accept, not reject. Unfortunately, it happens also among those who admire this fantastic dialogue between Arjuna and Krishna.

I really enjoyed this discussion.

## **We as humans are offsprings of Gods?**

by **maha** » Mon Mar 31, 2008 1:19 pm

Dear Hari,

Please help me to clarify the question, which resonates in my heart already for quite some time.

From Vedic scriptures - Indian, Russian and others, as well as from historical legends and narrations of various nations it is known, that humanity originates from Gods. Even in prayers to Gods we call them our Mother and Father. I wonder why this point is not so much stressed when we try to (re)establish our relationships or connections to Them? Would it not be helpful for the connections and proper attitude?

On the other hand, some popular channels and channelers describe humanity as some genetic experiment of all kinds of extraterrestrial civilizations, thus giving us a feeling of being a laboratory experimental creatures of some kind..

This subject seems to be very important to me, because it is related to our identity and self-perception, which on itself is the basis and the ground for developing and acquiring correspondent beliefs, values, orienting and defining our goals and even life missions!

First part of it relates to our own self-identification - of an infinitesimal and thus almost insignificant particles (already sounds impersonal) versus offsprings of Gods, which are created already perfect by their image!

Second part relates to our perception of Them. When we try to make connections imagining Them to be somewhere far away, not only in a physical or metaphysical proximity, but in emotional sense as well, it seems to me rather hard, and often doesn't show much reason to do so. Whereas the very understanding of Them as our sublime relatives and (original) ancestors creates a feeling of intimacy in relationships. Are such feelings bonafide or not? or maybe they are offensive and overweening? If not than it would be amazing, as it would mean that in spite of humans being so many, each of them (or may be not everybody???) can awaken their intimate relationship and connection to Gods as his her relatives!.. Is it a matter of genes, or awakening some special genes or some parts of genetic structures, or has it no connection to physical human bodies what-so-ever and is only a matter of subtle energetic bodies and thus is exclusively the matter of consciousness?

And more-over does it have any significance at all, or we are to know Them as if brand-new, acquaintance and familiarize ourselves with Them from very beginning, trying to establish relationships... of what KIND? Since They are our ancestors - it seems that can only be that kind of relationships. On the other hand, from the notion of rasa we understand that spiritually it can be all kinds of relationship or those that are already there, and considering spirit and matter to be relative terms, it becomes even more complicated.. Specifically, my question is not so much about discovering specific rasas or spiritual body forms (as they were called), but rather about the intimacy of kindred relationships as such.. It is that loving intimacy of kindred relationships that many people often seem to lack, forget, or even not know in this life with their physical relatives, and are to discover it with Gods...

It is as well about awareness of relationships.. Seems that it was not for nothing that some century ago people were very carefully recording and handing over to their children the detailed descriptions of their lineage...

Re: We as humans are offsprings of Gods?

by **Hari** » Sat May 10, 2008 4:47 pm

I do not know if we are the products of extra-terrestrial genetic manipulation. It makes sense that humans were first seeded on this planet from other planets and therefore we humans today have a slight genetic connection to those persons. But realistically speaking, how valuable is this genetic connection?



We all are in the same family since we all have a common ancestry, yet that does not make us feel an affinity for everyone on the planet. We feel no practical connection to most of the other earthlings. We do not even have much of a connection, emotionally or otherwise, with relatives in our present family! It is not so important that we share some DNA or familial characteristics. I see similar characteristics in all people yet this simply tells me that we are all human.

The idea of worshipping the ancestors is a good one as it focuses our consciousness on the irrevocable fact that we are a product of all that has come before us. Our bodies and families are a product of our ancestors and we should honor and respect that. More importantly, we should not try to diminish the past or neglect it, rather we should integrate it into our present. This integration is most effective when we accept our past, accept our ancestry, and work with it rather than against it.

The channelled ideas you speak of have no value to me.

But let us see it from another point of view. What has value to me is relationship. If I have a relationship with someone, then I am connected to them. Sometimes these relationships are familial, sometimes economic, sometimes emotional, or sometimes just because they work. The physical location of those with whom I relate is not as important as the energy of the connection. For example, I can call you on the phone and feel intensely connected to you for having some form of contact is enough to rekindle the relationship.

There are people who have the capacity to communicate with devas or other non-earthly beings. Since they communicate, they have a relationship. That relationship follows the same basic principles as all relationships on Earth, although naturally there are differences due to the power of the devas. It does not really matter if we are related to them or not, or if they are my direct ancestors since ultimately we are all related to the original people. What matters is the experience we share.

And yet, we may share very intimate relations according to who we are. We can share with the devas in very deep and meaningful ways. As in any relationship, we are influenced by those we relate to and they are in turn influenced by us. Such exchanges mold us and assist our evolution.

We can initiate a relationship when a person reciprocates with us. Not all devas will be fitting candidates for reciprocation. We might be more inclined to one deva than another and a deva may be more inclined to us. In general, we may be friendly with those we meet, but not their intimate friend.

Anyone can attempt to create relations with devas. How successful that attempt is depends on our awareness and sensitivity. It also depends on which deva we contact. When a deva is ready to reciprocate with us, a connection is consciously made. Yet they may already be connected with us even if we do not know it! Our increased awareness will reveal that connection and turn it into a marvelous experience. This connection has nothing to do with our sharing some genes or our cells having some minute similarity with them, it has to do with our consciousness.

Re: We as humans are offsprings of Gods?  
by **maha** » Sat Oct 22, 2011 10:03 pm

Dear Hari,

I am not sure why, but at that time when I got this answer from you it somehow did not resonate with me as much as it does now..

Thank you very much!!!

## **Energy overload in forehead?**

by **maha** » Fri Sep 23, 2011 6:29 pm

Dear Hari,

this question is from Irina Katkova (Krasnodar) who has recently started to listen to and practice on records of your lectures and meditations, and whose daughter is a long time follower of yours:

After I started to follow basically the raw food diet and excluded from it meat and synthetic products, and also started to practice exercises complex "Eye of revelations" (aka Five Tibetan Rites, described by Peter Kelder) and some other energetic exercises, I've got some pretty strong sensations in the area of the forehead chakra. They would intensify when I pray or imagine energetic flows. This lasts already for more than half year. These sensations are something like spreading, or pressure, or like some electrical discharges inside forehead.

Sometimes they spread all over my body, and then I feel like an electrical cord. 😊 And sometimes they become almost painful in the area of eyebrows, eyes, forehead. Please, could you advise on what it can be, and what to do with it?

Sincerely yours,

Irina Katkova.

Re: Energy overload in forehead?

by **Hari** » Sat Sep 24, 2011 4:38 pm

Hi.

It is hard to pinpoint exactly why something is occurring in the body of someone else, but I can give you some hints. I hope they work!

If your feeling is due to a problem in your ajna chakra, the chakra in the forehead, a way to help reduce the pressure there is to do chakra breathing. Chakra breathing is done by "breathing" energy in and out of the chakra. We are familiar with breathing air, and the flow in and out of our lungs through our nose and mouth is natural and second nature. If you relax and develop a meditative state similar to the one where you experience energy flowing in your body, you will be able to reproduce the same kind of breath flow energetically. Focus on the ajna chakra, and from within "exhale" energy out of that chakra. It might take some time to catch this idea, but it will come. Feel it flow out and if you need to, visualize it as well. Once you feel it occur, you can easily reproduce it. After exhaling in this way, try "inhaling" or absorbing energy through the ajna chakra. Once you feel this, breathe in and out of the chakra again and again. As you exhale, cause all negative energy to flow out from that chakra. You do this through visualization, intention, and focused conscious concentration. When you inhale, intend that positive, healthy energy will flow in. Continue to do this as long as you feel comfortable. After a while, examine the feeling in that chakra. You might feel a lot better there!

If not, then the problem is either elsewhere or in connection with another part of your energetic body. If this is so, another technique will help. Again in the relaxed state, cause energy to flow from the universe through the top of your head and down through your body to the floor. Feel it flow as a cleansing liquid that pulls out all negativity. When you feel that you have done that enough, bring energy into your body and start to move it around from one side of your body to the other, from the top to the bottom, from one part to another. Feel it roll around as a force or as a ball that you control with your intention. Roll this all over your energetic body and when you have caught this feeling you can also feel it within your physical body to the degree that you have integrated your physical form and your living energy.

These tips can help you resolve this problem. Good luck! Hari

Re: Energy overload in forehead?

by **maha** » Sun Oct 02, 2011 10:18 pm

Dear Hari,

Just today Irina has reported through her daughter that the Ajna chakra breathing helps her a lot.. 😊

Thank you very much!

## **Midnight Coffee**

by **Hari** » Mon Mar 14, 2011 2:52 pm

Dear People

There has been a lot of feedback from the last lecture, Midnight Coffee. I want to respond to this feedback in this forum and I welcome discussion on this topic.

One person stated that I was wrong to say that things have "started" and that we have to prepare for them. Their idea is that we are all good and powerful people that have the capacity to overwhelm the "bad" energy with our "good" energy. They stated that we can change everything and that my lecture simply bred negativity.

I did not breed negativity, but I reported on reality. I did not imply that we cannot change things in a positive way for we certainly can change things for the better over longer periods of time. We can imagine that we have the power to stop earthquakes, for example, but experience might demonstrate that we cannot. One might be inclined to conclude that we are not trying hard enough or that something is wrong with us and therefore statements such as those I made are counterproductive and should not be spoken. However, I feel this conclusion would be erroneous for it begins from the premise that we can change global physical events with our personal power. Those who feel they have that capacity will certainly continue to feel this way, but I doubt that we can do so to the degree assumed. As I stated in the lecture, events have already been initiated and what is happening now is the reaction to these events. If one is to practically change physicality, it is usually done best if initiated before physical manifestations occur. In the case of tectonic plates, we are far too late to make much of a difference. The general rule of prevention is better than cure is always relevant.

I feel that the best course of action is to be prepared for changes as best as we can. Although it is impossible to fully prepare, we should do the best we can. More than this we cannot do.

This was the main message of the discussion regarding the physical consequences of the ongoing sequence of events.

There is another platform on which we are uniquely qualified and where we can do extreme good -- the energetic vibrational. The thrust of my message was that we can do positive things and continue to commune on that platform under all circumstances. For example, I see the ether at present to be broken up into disconnected fragments. I see the glue that tied together the etheric matrix to be weakened and splitting apart. I see people are confused and disconnection is the rule, rather than the exception. Those who can see this should observe what is happening and then volunteer to restore connectivity according to their capacity. This service is important. However, do not expect that this shall restore the previously existing peace in the world as there was no peace before. What is happening now is an uncovering of the fragile state of existence as the house of cards crumbles. The illusion we lived within is being revealed on all fronts. No aspect of life is being spared.

Some people do not care so much. I have been told that there are people who are used to chaos and think it will not affect them more than it already has and is. They think it is business as usual and when something more happens they will deal with it. As cold as this might sound, I find it somehow a useful mentality. Those with the confidence that they can deal with whatever existence throws at them have a far better chance at success than those who worry about destruction.

I just got a text where someone suggests that there should be a mass evacuation to the etheric plane. This is decidedly extreme and not at all what I spoke about. I am concerned with maintaining the balance between the physical and energetic planes and any such "evacuation" even if possible (hey you, it is far harder than you think!) would not resolve the problem but would accelerate it! I would rather be part of the solution than accelerate the problem. There most likely is a lot of karma connected with such acceleration.

Just to clarify: There are problems now, these will get worse, and we should be as prepared as we can. There is something we can do both as individuals and as a group, so let's do it. Keep together, stay safe, and good luck. It is actually simple.

Running does not work. Ignoring the situation is foolish. Proclaiming yourself to be far stronger than you are is egoism. Realism is a virtue.

Re: Midnight Coffee

by **Nanda-grama** » Mon Mar 14, 2011 8:33 pm

Dear Hari, may I dispute with you a little? 😊

I understand how it is importantly to be conscious of real situation and real danger, and, of course, we can't stop earthquakes. But I'm sure that we can choose own destiny in limits of the global events. For example, if a airplane falls and only one survives I don't think that it is simply a chance. I think we have capacity to tune on definite version of the future and to pull it to ourselves. I have personal experience of it, but I don't know it is possible to do in a group or not, I simply have not such experience. If it is possible it should be cool!

I remember that when you did the meditations on matrix at the last summer and all we participated in this in some degree, the terrible torridity in Russia suddenly stoped. It could be coincidence but in that time it seemed to me that it was the result of this meditation 😊

Re: Midnight Coffee

by **kamalamala1** » Wed Mar 16, 2011 5:11 am

I completely agree with Hari

One should be in real illusion to not see what is going on in this two years.

Especially now.

I had a relative he was thinking that sun is rising because of him.

He died and now i think he have less opinion about himself. 😬

Of course we are in clear stage is powerful being but not now and not on this stage of our development.

We are totally dependent on resources and it is proper to accept it as it is.

It depend of course on each person maybe somebody is really powerful and maybe some even doesn't know it ,but i am saying in general.

But most probably many of such people is in illusion about their present power.

Sometime people think that they can fly or hold 200 kg but as soon they try they notice that they cannot at all do even the half

Illusion is saying don't worry you are great you will do fine but i think the same was thinking people in Japan and Chernobyl also

Re: Midnight Coffee

by **Nanda-grama** » Wed Mar 16, 2011 9:23 am

what happens now in Japan is , of course, terrible, and we can only to send this people good energy, love and pray about them.

I think the capacity to influence on own future and in some degree on future of loved people and to choose a version of our future is not sign of some special power, it is the capacity of all people, all do it constantly, even little children, but less people do it consciously. If we think that we are potential victims of future catastrophes, likely, it will be exactly so. If we tune on such future in which we will be defended and nature around us will be harmonious, we can attract such reality in our life or ,at least, attract best version of possible events. I think such work is more important than some external actions and preparations.

It is also importantly to have connection with inner guidance and with Divine personalities in terrible moments, and thank Hari that he reminded of it.

Re: Midnight Coffee

by **kamalamala1** » Thu Mar 17, 2011 4:28 am

Divine personalities helping us by saying that it is the time to take care if we don't want to listen them then what else they will do, they are not our servants ,if we doesn't want to move our finger and our mind what they can do.?

We are not alone and if we think about peace let say in Libya it will not happen since millions think other way,

God help ones who making efforts

Re: Midnight Coffee

by **harsi** » Fri Mar 18, 2011 9:09 pm

It looks like we are all too much engaged in our minds to cosset our various dreams and spiritual concepts. Things and loving care for each other look different in reality. I think that to nurture this different look was the issue of Hari's speech last Saturday. I appreciated very much his view on the reality of things as they seem to unfold right now in this world.

I remember a few years ago on a weekend I was visiting the Prahlad-Nrsimha farm community here in Germany in the Bavarian Forest, some 260 km from where I am living. And it so

happened that someone to whom I always had a friendly relationship from the time I was living also there in the temple community, was also present at the farm. It was so that many of his disciples from Germany and the Czech Republic came to be with him, participating to his lectures. Knowing him personally since many years I visited him in the guest room of the building he was housed there.

It so happened that in the middle of our discussion a woman, a disciple from Czechia, knocked on the door of his apartment. She came in and started to speak to him, recounting a very sad story. It was namely so that just a short while before, she received an e-mail from Vrindavan from someone she knew wherein the person told her about the sudden death by accident of a woman she also knew from Czechia who was visiting Vrindavan. She heated the room she stayed in Vrindavan with a gas bottle which leaked gas during the night while she was sleeping there. It was in February or the beginning of March, I don't remember well the time this happened. In Vrindavan during this time it is still cold in the night. Gas can be mortal if inhaled in big quantities which seemed has happened while this woman was sleeping.

This lady disciple wanted to know what she should do next, she would have to inform the family of this woman who died in India. She wanted also to share her feelings of sadness to someone. I was very astounded by the reaction of this guru. He seemed to be as much speechless or dumbfounded about this sad story which befall one of his female disciples from Czechia as the woman who came and asked for his advice or help in this regard.

For a few seconds I had the inspiration to offer my help to this woman and thought maybe I should drive her with my car to Czechia so that she would not be alone when she would inform the parents and family of the deceased woman, but than I thought why should I do that. An hour later I met that guru again in the temple room, he was deeply absorbed in chanting Hare Krishna on his beads.

Re: Midnight Coffee

by **Nanda-grama** » Sat Mar 19, 2011 9:34 am



yes, sometimes simply commiseration and emotional aid may be best help.

In the case with earthquake and with the probability that same can happen in our places, we can't defend ourselves by some physical ways. Only by spiritual.

My husband and me were very inspired yesterday when did the meditation by Tom Kenyon which Hari placed here.

It is interestingly, now in mail.ru the message goes where somebody writes about what reasons of the cataclysms is in negative energy which people accumulated and he offers to send love to Earth

and to ask grace, and to send love to other people. The message goes from person to person

and people ask to send it to somebody else. Some absolutely unknown man sent it to me. 😊

Re: Midnight Coffee

by **Hari** » Sat Mar 19, 2011 7:38 pm

Although I appreciate the discussion, I am worried when our comments single out individuals in a somewhat negative manner. I know that your intentions are good, Harsi, as you are a good person, but was it required to bring up the example you did? I would have simply said, "some guru," or whatever, if I had wanted to mention someone at all. If you don't mind, I would like to remove his name from your post as you can no longer edit it....

Everyone is dealing with life in whatever way they can, for better or worse. I am making this comment publicly in the forum as many have already read it...

Re: Midnight Coffee

by **Adhi** » Mon Mar 28, 2011 12:30 am

In our region already throughout 30 years destructive earthquake in the strongest magnitude is expected. The thought that it can occur any minute, constantly is present at subconsciousness. Those who live here, do not perceive it as something negative. On the contrary, the feeling that all habitual world can be transformed in any second beyond recognition moves to that to live, without dismissing idea, action, desire on «then».

Also it seems silly to accumulate these possibilities for the future. Or you can make it now or not. And everyone hurry up to live: to make acts, to build relations, to express feelings, to support etc. who as is able. It seems unimaginable, if the person knows how to realize itself, but tells: time has not come, I will wait for more favorable conditions. On Kamchatka even the nature hurries up to live, the spring comes in the end of May and the maximum lasts two weeks, the nature blows up when heat approach.

So in our opinion there is nothing negative in realizing danger of destruction and to be in a ready to realize crisis strategy. It is not original to tell it, that in such position there are everything, and not just inhabitants of seismically dangerous regions.

To develop our own strategy on a crisis case now it is actual for everybody, Hari gives to us a lot of helpful information In this aspect.

We do not have power to overcome evidence of physical death. And if we operate with such understanding, it only will add to us abilities to make correct decisions, to co-operate with others, to act effectively, instead of illusion multiplication that everything will be good and that "friendship" with demigods or a mystic force will make "eternal" our comfortable existence.

## **The Teacher and the Tought together Produce the Teaching**

by **harsi** » Thu Jan 27, 2011 1:02 pm

Dear Hari,

I just came about to know a statement I found on a video I posted also to my [youtube channel](#), where a contemporary person said an interesting saying. "A teacher and the taught together produce the teaching." Would you agree to that?

Re: The Teacher and the Tought together Produce the Teaching

by **Hari** » Mon Jan 31, 2011 4:20 pm

Certainly! After all, without the student, who can be a teacher?

Besides this obvious fact, a good teacher is one who offers the student something useful, something that resonates with their energy, and something that the student wishes to have. When these motivations are active, an attentive and engaged student will draw out from the teacher more and more information. The student is as important as the teacher. They depend on each other...

## I'm and Being

by **Gaura** » Sun Jan 09, 2011 7:17 am

I a little bit edit first my post till there isn't comment, 😊

Before I wanted to know who the God is. Well I do know who he is but I think it's thought to me knowledge, I called it books knowledge. Some people search for several Gods according to their books and religion.... But I'm out the path...

I thought I should go there with no luggage as a free researcher. So I thought first as a basis I should know who am I without books, then will go on farther. And today's lecture touched a lot that subject.

You said that I'm and Being is different. But deeply inside I can't agree.

Who am I? My subtle body, which one can feel? If yes then I feel only two hands in my subtle body. Does my hands are 4, or maybe 6 or maybe – 5.

Definitely I feel even the subtle body is not I'm. I'm something even subtler. It might be desire? But desire for what? Liberation or... ? Again "books". This thoughts and desires I feel artificial – outside "knowledge". Then who am I really?

You said (in the answer to the question that man afraid to loose his self) that you don't know how person can dissolve. That means there are the person and the thing people afraid to merge to. And my wonder is who the person is in the first place. And as it obvious from above to say just person (we) is just - I am, will not be enough for me for it seems to me not deep enough. When I'm go very deep in my meditation I can't catch myself, I can feel only awareness, energy.

It sounds like "mayavada". But I honestly decided to be free of any designations and dry books knowledge and words, and terminologies. I try to understand it all myself without any fear. And any help would be great 😊

Re: I AM and Being

by **Hari** » Sun Jan 09, 2011 12:25 pm

Thank you for your comments.

If I said that "I AM" and Being are different, then I expressed myself incorrectly. Although they are in essence the same energy, the awareness each concept creates is different. I was attempting to increase awareness by demonstrating through experience how these concepts can be contrasted.

Self is not dependent on concepts, but to assist us in feeling self and using that feeling to enter into advanced states of awareness, I chose to create this subtle distinction between I AM and Being. My purpose was to demonstrate that when we focus our awareness on our energy through the key phrase, I AM, we experience Self as the essence we are, with Self as the center of consciousness. It is Self that is conscious and Self that powers experience. When we focus our awareness on Being, Self is seen in the expanded context of all existence, everywhere, and thus we integrate Self with existence. This amplifies the conception of Self. This exercise was meant to rapidly increase our awareness of ourselves.



You question who you are. I am not sure you really want an answer to that question from me. You are experiencing Self in your own way and are increasing your perception day by day. You do not need me to answer your question as your question is your process. As you say, you are a free researcher.

As long as you feel that your thoughts and desires are artificial or are derived from external sources of knowledge, then these thoughts and desires are not of your essence. Deepen your meditation to find that place where you simply are. This is the meaning of I AM. When you are there, your thoughts and desires will flow from being and will be unconcerned with the external world.

When you say that you think that the state of awareness in I AM is not "deep enough," or that you can only feel awareness (energy) and cannot "catch" yourself, I smile. Since you feel awareness and energy, you seem to have caught yourself fine! Perhaps you are still bound by expectations? Could it be that even though you say you have freed yourself from conceptions taught in books, you still embrace externally derived ideals of what you will find when you "catch" yourself? This could be possible and it seems worth the effort to examine this possibility further.

I suggest that you are the one who is aware of your awareness. I suggest you are the energy that is aware of energy. As it is you who is aware, do not expect to find yourself somewhere. You are not something that is hidden that will be uncovered when you look in the right place. You are I AM. This is awareness, this is energy, and this is the spiritual essence of being. Embrace your consciousness in this state. Play with your awareness to explore outside of the expected. Do not be satisfied with your awareness of awareness itself but use this awareness you feel to do something, perhaps even to connect to the divine. Once you use it, you shall see it is under your control. You are the controller of this. I AM is more than a passive state. It is you in all your energy, desire, capacity, potential, and love.

I suggest you need to do more. I do not think this is a conceptual problem or one that can be resolved with words. You need to do more work within to understand where you are when you find yourself somewhere and then move one step more to the center of awareness.

I hope this helps clear up any misconception I might have created due to an incorrect expression.

Re: I'm and Being

by **Gaura** » Sun Jan 09, 2011 3:41 pm

Thank you for deep analyzes. I appreciate the deepness of it.

Definitely I'm still under the "books" but trying to free myself and freely research. One of the "books" print on me the understanding of the person. When I feel awareness I can't feel me as person. For me one of the main definitions of the person is desires. But when I'm aware there is no desire, only awareness and sometimes love. So I'm happy where I am and will go deeper.

## **Grasping the mystery of ultimate reality**

by **harsi** » Fri Mar 19, 2010 4:44 pm

Dear Hari,

I called the title of this discussion and question to you "Grasping the mystery of ultimate reality". First I wanted to name it "Defining mysticism" or a mystic but then I thought maybe that would sound too exclusionary or that what could be called or seen as (religious) exclusivism.

In my nature I am an eternal seeker and whenever I read or come about something I don't understand I become curious to search for its deeper meaning or a better way of expressing what it could really mean. Unfortunately I am somehow limited in my mind when it comes to formulate and give some better meaning to something I want to know or search for, therefore I like it to read what other people are writing in relation to certain subjects I am interested in. In this way I came across on the Internet on the article called "Western Theology and Indian Mysticism" where one can read:

"Western theology has always been opposed to the mystical traditions of the world. That is why foremost mystics of the Western world including Jesus of Nazareth himself were misunderstood, persecuted, or crucified in their lifetime.

Theology is dualistic and doctrinaire; mysticism is non-dualistic and experiential. Theology is dogmatic and creedal mysticism aims at the unfathomable mystery beyond all dogmas and creeds. Theology is the rational articulation of absolute faith; mysticism encourages transition from faith to personal realization. Theology interposes an organized administrative hierarchy to mediate between the layman and God; mysticism affirms the spiritual equality of all men and their potential for direct union with the Divine. Since mysticism is recognized in India as the very quintessence of religious consciousness and the ultimate goal of man's spiritual aspiration, it has been the target of criticism of even some of the most universally minded and sincere Western theologians"

Then there one can read a book online related to the "Sacrificial Mysticism of the Vedic times" where it is stated that:

"The assumption of the mysterious omnipotence of sacrifices, performed by following the authoritative injunctions of the Vedas independently of reason or logical and discursive thought, forms the chief trait of the mysticism of the Vedic type. There is nothing here of feeling or even of intellect, but a blind submission, not to a person but to an impersonal authority which holds within it an unalterable and inscrutable law, the secret of all powers which we may want to wield in our favor. The next step in the development of this type of mysticism consists in the growth of a school of thought which sought to intellectualize the material sacrifices. It encouraged the belief that it was quite unnecessary actually to perform the sacrifices requiring the expenditure of enormous sums of money for the collection of materials and for labor. The same results might be as well obtained through certain kinds of meditation or reflection"

As you may know the chanting of the Hare Krishna mantra was also understood as a kind of "mystical" experience which would give rise to a certain realization. I guess what I would like to know is what your understanding related to all this is and if one can say that there is a certain goal or reason to be engaged in or experience spiritual mysticism? Is it a way of grasping the mystery of ultimate reality or God?

You said also in the lecture you gave in St. Petersburg entitled "Desire to Experience" that: "As far as I see it the soul is experience. It is not that the soul has experience. And if you understand this distinction, you understand spiritual mysticism." What do you mean by saying that I, the spiritual being, would be experience? I know that I may gain or gather in the due course of time some experience, after all "one learns by experience" or speaks from experience? But to be the experience itself I never thought about it in this way or do you mean

that I may enter or create any experience I want out of my free will without having to act in a certain (prescribed or defined) way in order to get to know and feel something?

Re: Grasping the mystery of ultimate reality

by **Hari** » Sun Mar 21, 2010 7:31 pm

Hmmm, I would have rather that you called the text "Defining Mysticism," as this is closer to the theme of your post as I read it. "Grasping the mystery," hmmm, can you grasp mystery? And if you do grasp it, it is a mystery? Is mysticism synonymous or intimately related to mystery? Does it even matter?

You also wrote, "...of ultimate reality." Ultimate reality? Does such a thing exist, or is it just reality? It seems to me that your choice of a title reflects the remnants of the exclusive theology you wished to avoid! That is not bad. I am just having fun here...

I am curious why you felt that the words mysticism and mystic imply religious exclusivism? After all, why would you think these words fall into this category when you accept the ideals of the article about theology and mysticism you quoted? The red text you highlighted declares that the two are quite different.

I am not personally concerned with your word choice. I leave you to ponder it.

The issue that seems to be significant here is defining mysticism and thus the mystic. Your questions are directed towards this definition.

I do not contemplate ultimate reality. I am concerned with what is. I cannot use words like "ultimate," because I see reality as ever shifting and molding according to the consciousness of those perceiving it. I realize this sounds very quantum physics like, but to me reality is a word we use to describe what we believe to be true. We throw this word around in a variety of ways. Religionists use it to describe their view that God and God's Kingdom are the only reality and all else is illusion. Thus, the words, "ultimate reality," have great meaning and import to them. This ultimate is their goal, their mission, their life's destination and all that has meaning in their world.

I disagree. I see ultimate reality as an abstract. It is a concept that we choose to believe because we have heard it and trust our source of knowledge, we find it suits our situation, or simply because it offers us a way out of what we think are the difficulties of our existence. I do not write this as a denial of the spiritual realm or its power! I mean it as a description of an ideal that does not exist for us in our present experience.

Since this discussion is about mysticism, I shall confine my discussion of experience to the individual. I am aware that there is a greater existence beyond me, yet whether or not it exists separate from me is a state of mind more than an absolute principle. After all, I can choose to experience the oneness of being or not as I wish.

Existence is what is. What is, is all that is experienced by me. This is a timeless and placeless perception of existence as I, the being, am aware of it. Since my awareness is a constant, I do not need to say, "as I am aware of it right now or in the present moment." As far as I can experience it, all that exists, exists right now in the present moment. This is not a limitation. Rather, I am placing existence right back where it belongs, in the present and centered in me. I am the perceiver of existence. My perception is a constant as is my existence. Even though something may exist now that existed in the past, it is not the same now as it was in the past for all things change over time. That which might exist in the future does not exist now. An idea

of its existence in the future does exist now in my mind. When I speak of experience, it is of the present. And experience can only be had by the experiencer.

According to my understanding, I, the conscious essence, am experiencing. Or, put in other words to assist understanding, I am aware, I experience, I perceive, I feel, I am. That which is within my consciousness forms my experience. This continual experience is ever present and ever existing. The sum of my experiences formulates my perception and suggests how the state of consciousness experiences in this moment. This summation also plays a significant role in the choices I make and the plans I create.

To directly address your question: at a certain point in one's development, one no longer needs goals or reasons. One is. That is enough. One then goes through life moment by moment, choosing to express oneself in the best way one can in the continuous process of upgrading what one is.

When one is aware of what is, one also feels or directly experiences oneself and that within which one exists. Thus one feels the presence and energy of the divine and reciprocates with the divine in that communion. At this point there is no need to have goals. One does not need to grasp anything for such awareness is our nature. You cannot grasp your nature, you can only be it, or more properly put, it is you.

That which is called mysticism is that which is of the essence of being. It is the essence of all that is. It is the conscious perception and experience of existence. One could speak about mysticism quantitatively, as in, one is deeper into it than another. The mystic has a goal or destination, and that is to be absorbed in what is. When one is so absorbed, one is in one's essence and thus has no need to go anywhere or do anything, yet one acts to experience in the moment. One who lives in this way is a mystic. How deeply one allows oneself to get into this mystical state depends on how one feels at the time. Even a great mystic may go in and out of such states at will and according to his or her desire. Only the mystic knows why. But since mysticism is experienced, the mystic may desire to shake up circumstances to brew a better batch of experiences.

Not everyone is living like this. Indeed, perhaps few do. Those who do not live this way live by rules or disciplines that assist the development of their spiritual awareness. When one is a mystic, one does not need anyone to agree or to confirm it. The very concept that one's existence requires others to agree or confirm is contradictory to the consciousness of a mystic. Real mystics, or rather, those who are experienced at their art, are not obvious according to how they look or manifest themselves. Since they have no need to act in a particular manner, they may find it advantageous to simply live amongst others unobtrusively. Perhaps mystics like their privacy?

A mystic may or may not act, speak, or care in the manner of others in society. Yet, the mystic, according to my definition, generally does not create situations wherein others may feel pain, discomfort, or anxiety for the pain of others is his or her pain. A mystic may, out of compassion, rattle the cage of one who he or she sees as stuck, even at the risk of causing them anxiety, but even though this is done idealistically, the mystic will still feel the reaction to this act. A mystic is an empath, meaning, he or she feels what others feel. This is in part due to naturally arising mystical sensitivity, and in part to the fact that there is indeed only one of us. Heightened awareness brings increased sensitivity, often at the price of not being able to have peace in this world. Those who are experienced in this heightened state learn to let things slide off their backs, not because they do not care, but because they care too much and need to survive the cruelty or wrong in this world.

How does one differentiate between the experience and the experiencer when one is in heightened awareness? This state of awareness is so highly attuned that the difference between the two dissolve proportionate to the degree one accepts the experience. When one is extremely capable, one feels and experiences on a degree that is vibrantly intense. It is for this reason I stated that the soul is experience, for the soul is most capable.

How you attain that state or how you choose to live your life is a question of great importance. There is no easy answer for each of us is unique and how we express as beings is only knowable to ourselves.

I am not sure if this answer will satisfy you. You are no doubt a great philosopher and your research is of such a caliber that I have given you your own forums to express in. Yet, I think you will need to stretch your boundary of what is acceptable to you to find the mystic in you. I think you need to do things that are not in your usual world. You might need to see things less in a straight line and more in curved space. Mystical experiences are not found in black and white, or the straight and square, they are found in the nuances of existence, the colors and flavors of the unexpected where life is ever fresh and new. But you will find this one day. And when you do, you will look back on these times and smile.

Re: Grasping the mystery of ultimate reality

•

Post

by **harsi** » Thu Apr 01, 2010 1:07 pm

*Hari wrote:*

*I am curious why you felt that the words mysticism and mystic imply religious exclusivism? After all, why would you think these words fall into this category when you accept the ideals of the article about theology and mysticism you quoted? The red text you highlighted declares that the two are quite different.*

I come up with this definition under the impression of some discussions I had with various members of this forum. Hereby one could get the impression that there is a clear tendency by some followers and admirers of you from Russia to make oneself stand out or to contrast with those people who were choosing another path as that of the mystic and to make oneself a kind of unique and exclusive. Now I understand from what you wrote that this is not also your view and way of thinking.

In this regard I would like to quote Mikhail Gorbachev whose book "Memoirs" published in German in 1995 I am reading right now, and who writes in regard to his work of restructuring the former Soviet Union and its economic and political system as it was at the time of his presidency:

"It's in my nature, my predisposition that, I cannot judge or write about something as long as I didn't grasped the inner logic of the subject. My thinking is clearly coined methodically. Thus when I set myself to work I felled the need to begin at the beginning; I recur-ed conceptually to the first years of the Soviet power in order to penetrate (understand) deeper the developments (evolutions) of those days."

I could not have said it any better I am of the same nature and predisposition when it comes to understand a mystic or any other subject, and his way of thinking, writing and doing things.

Please bear with me and please tell me more. You write: "A mystic is an empath, meaning, he or she feels what others feel. This is in part due to naturally arising mystical sensitivity, and in

part to the fact that there is indeed only one of us." Do you mean to say: the only one of its kind in the world? As saying you my one and only or what is the deeper meaning of your understanding of the world "Us"? We as being of the same spiritual, material or rather substantial nature? Or would you like to call into question ones inherent individuality altogether as being somehow illusionary?

Re: Grasping the mystery of ultimate reality  
by **Hari** » Thu Apr 01, 2010 1:37 pm

*Please bear with me and please tell me more. You write: "A mystic is an empath, meaning, he or she feels what others feel. This is in part due to naturally arising mystical sensitivity, and in part to the fact that there is indeed only one of us." Do you mean to say: the only one of its kind in the world? As saying you my one and only or what is the deeper meaning of your understanding of the world "Us"? We as being of the same spiritual, material or rather substantial nature?*

I am unsure of why you are asking this question. First off, I have no followers. We are all individuals who make our own choices and do what we think is best. What would one follow anyway? I have not given any instructions to follow. I am not sure if you mean the word the way it sounds, but the way you use it sounds strange to me and makes me uneasy. To continue this point, if you have a problem with the way others in this forum have expressed themselves, why not just ask me directly, if this is your intention, "Hari, someone said you think like this or that this is the way it is. What do you think about that?" This would make my life easier and my answer would be directed towards your specific inquiry rather than a long winded treatise that might have little meaning to you. After all, it takes time to write these answers and time is not something I have tons of.

Is your problem the "There is only one of us," statement that is often used? Do I perceive a fear of the oneness hiding here in the background? If so, say it directly so we can address the primary issue instead of dancing around it.

I cannot imagine saying "the only one of its kind in the world." This statement is foreign to me. I am not into elitism or exclusivity; to the contrary, my idea is that what I say is accessible to all people as we all share the same fundamental essence that is Being.

When I quote the phrase from Donald Walsh that there is only one of us, the us refers to exactly what the word usually refers to, a group of individuals. Us, as it is used in english and all languages, refers to an arbitrary group of individuals placed together into that group due to desire or circumstances, such as when five people are going to the theater together and they say, "We are going to have a good time. Good for us!" In the larger sense, the divine sense, we are all Beings. We are the sum total collective of all living energy. When we say there is only one of us, there are various implications. To start, it implies that we do not stand alone or separate. What we do or feel affects others. What we send out, returns to us. Our pain is others pain, there pain is our pain. We are in it together and we are all affected by what we create together. As an example, I suggest that the bad weather and multiple problematic events that seem to be increasing in a short time are connected with the mentality of fear and doom that is growing. Financial ruin is around the corner and people are buying into the idea that 2012 will create disaster. The latest movie is cementing this in their minds and any news broadcast amplifies this fear. Therefore, their incredible power of the billions of living minds and hearts that are filled with fear, anger and gloom is wrecking havoc with the weather and filling the Earth with dissonance. We are creating the weather and the future and unconsciously fulfilling the so called prophecy. It is a self fulfilling prophecy. Although we may not believe there is only one of us, we are being forced to see how this is so. At present, only those who

are aware can see this, but it is increasingly becoming obvious to more and more people. Those who are aware have a responsibility to counter this direction if they can by permeating the atmosphere around them as wide and far as they can with positive and constructive energy.

This is the vision and work of the mystic. To see the enormous power in Being and to unleash it consciously for the good of all, for what is good for all is good for the individual. And therefore there is only one of Us.

## Question about the Future ...

by **Devendra** » Tue Jul 06, 2010 9:55 pm

...could be considered like question about the Present.

Dear Hari, your way is very similar to the way of some close and open ancient mystics societies. I don't know do you have some kinds of example in your head, but it's very similar. The main difference is internal organization of your movement and my question is following. One day, when you leave this planet, who will continue your mission? If you don't think about it, this movement will be your self expression only. Please think about your relief. Thank you for the nice music on radio. One of your compositions was in the spirit of Van der Graaf Generator, that I like very much too. You have always very important place in my heart. With love.

Re: Question about the Future ...

by **Hari** » Mon Jul 12, 2010 4:26 pm

Hmmm. I am not sure if the analogy you make is as similar as you think.

Certainly there are similarities between what I do, what I am, and mystics or mystical groups of the past as I am a spiritual mystic engaging in similar practices, but expressing them in ways that make them more accessible and less elitist. I do not think that because I do things similar to what groups did before this implies that I have a movement that needs to be organized! I also do not find it relevant to worry about how this will go on when I am no longer here. I shall explain.

If you look at the contributions of those spiritualists who most influenced the world, it was their writings, teachings, examples and life that were the influencing factors and not their immediate followers or their movements or churches. All of the major religions of the world were initiated by persons and only long after their death was someone inspired to take their teachings and create some structure. We are not aware of nor are we influenced by some organization that directly carried their teachings forward. This is a simple fact. All we know is how people today have accepted some organization that was created sometime in the past with some kind of twist on the original teachings to accommodate the society within which the structure needed to be built. The relation between the subsequently created structure and the originator of the spiritual teachings is tenuous and in some cases even somewhat illusory. Much has been written on this.

No one can represent me but me. And part of what I am is that all I am concerned with is that you have the facility to develop to your maximal potential. I am concerned that you shall stand confidently as an individual with the power and conviction of your being manifested in the world of your own creation. If you want to go out and create some structure, be my guest! But

please do not label it later on, "The Structure of Hari As the Keeper of His Faith," as this would be 100% contradictory to what I have shared.

I see structure and facility, along with missions and movements, to be the primary means to destroy the essence of what is mystical spiritualism. This is my personal experience and my conviction. I would love to be proven wrong.

Wherever there are buildings or physical facilities, money, and people involved there will be politics, conflicts, intrigue, cheating, violence against someone somewhere, all within the context of stress, amongst other things. I would rather see individuals understand how to experience mystical energy and grow in their own way. I would be happy if these individuals created their own structures or expressions that were not captured by the previous defects of societies past, but I am not convinced yet this is possible.

I am not sure how simply hosting a web site and giving lectures creates a movement, as you have described it. Even in this forum, which I host, there are hundreds of different opinions and expressions. This particular forum is mainly me and those who ask me something - hence the name, Discussions with Hari - but the other forums are mainly everyone else. As there is no established theology in the usual sense of the term, no fixed philosophy that cannot or will not be changed, no specific reference points that we can point to as our authority since we reserve the right to do what we think is best, we cannot say this is a movement in any traditional sense of the word. Since I have nothing to gain other than to assist you all to become empowered and enlivened to stand on your own and do wonderful things in this world and have fun at the same time, I do not have a mission as such. Or at least I do not have a mission that someone can take over. Surely, you all can inspire others, but that is what we all do all the time, or at least we should! Nothing missiony about that!

I welcome feedback and comments about this, not only from you, Devendra, but anyone else. I thought these points were clear from my lectures and so on, so I am kind of surprised at this question! Am I in illusion?

Having said all this, well, if I were to be honest there would be benefits for me to create a movement with members as opposed to me being what I am now, a spiritual head of a smaller group of people who like how I assist them. I would love to have as a member someone who was super rich who would allow me to get a great facility in Moscow to offer some really super spirituality, culture, art, music, literature, speakers, teachers, feasts, fun and mystical experiences. I yearn for a potent and powerful healing center. I want to create communities as villages that are self-sufficient, energy producing havens that are not dependent on the outside world. I want to work with people for their sake.

Yet, I would feel very untrue to myself if I allowed myself to create a movement just so I could have fun creating all these nifty things. I would be exploiting others. So I do not do this.

Yes, I see the contradiction here, but I would not be happy being a hypocrite. I know that unless I either figure out how to earn all this wealth myself, and I somehow doubt this is going to happen since my economic modus operandi is whatever comes in goes out each year, or I convince someone else to support me, that nothing is going to come of my (actually really nice) ideas. (By the way, I am also very learned and experienced too, O God, I am advertising myself, someone pull the microphone plug off this soap box, fast!)

Without structure, management and organization, nothing tangible occurs that can impact larger groups. With structure, management and organization, there will be other problems. Sigh...

Thoughts?



Re: Question about the Future ...

by **Devendra** » Sat Jul 24, 2010 4:08 pm

I perfectly know that you explain this point many times from the beginning, but if it comes back to you time to time, from different sources, may be it can give you some new ideas. From my side, I wouldn't be someone who give you suggestions how you should drive your car, but if you ask about my "thoughts", here they are.

If you build your house and by some reasons you couldn't finish to construct it, any other person, looking upon your creation, could think that it is actually finished work. If there is not leading after you, it means that any other person will start from the same place that you started. It will be not that one will continue another, but one will move it in parallel. May be some one active the same level that you, or but may be not. So, could appear hundred houses after your departure, but they probably will not communicate between them.

Of course, if you have pleasure to speak with your friends only, you will not need any structure, but if you want to develop some projects you will need it. Here is important question, who will be in the head of your different departments, because it will be not easy to make all of them by you, and here is the question about quality of personalities. That to be sure about quality of personality for developing some external project of your movement, or club or I don't know who to name it, it will be necessary to create internal structure first. You have lot of experience in this area, so you can put forward the priority which will be more important for you, spiritual or professional.

Any structure that you will chose permit to develop better your projects, at least you can say I plant a tree.

Re: Question about the Future ...

by **Hari** » Mon Jul 26, 2010 10:27 pm

I think we are speaking about two totally different concepts here. There is what I do personally, including what I share or facilitate, and then there is anything that required a capital investment like a building or a center.

When I share myself personally by speaking, I desire to facilitate an individual to become the best he or she can be in connection with the divine. If I can do this, then this will live on in the individual who will develop more and more and share with others. I have no particular point that needs to remain and if there is something that deserves to remain it will do so in the books that I will manage to write. When I am gone, someone else will do something better and life will continue to evolve. I will be happy to know that I have played some part in this evolutionary process.

But when it comes to a structure, for example the center where the deities reside in St Petersburg, this is something quite different. There is the organization VODR which controls the center and I pray and hope that any and everyone that associates with the center and the VODR society will make it their number one priority to insure that the deities are taken care of, are safe, and that there is always the facility for others to connect to them. More than this I cannot do. Even if I create a marvelous structure and organization, when I am gone it will go its own way anyway. I have done what I can. More than this will be ineffective regardless.

I suppose it boils down to my requiring to assist others to develop their awareness so they feel that devotion to the deities...

Re: Question about the Future ...

by **Devendra** » Mon Aug 02, 2010 12:55 pm

I see that we speak about different subjects. I try to explain you what I mean, but before I would like to put forward one small introduction. You created wonderful spiritual-virtual system of international communication, but, as it seems to me, you have much bigger potential for your Club that you didn't explore yet. So, I decided to write you some observation of mine for only reason that I appreciate a lot your spiritual investigations and also I appreciate you as personality. The problem is that I haven't enough diplomatic qualities that to express my point view gently and generally it takes opposite effect. Looking back through the years I think that my role in different situations in past could be compared with the mission of "grater". If you need to make one salad from carrot you take a carrot and chop it by the "grater". It happened many times with me, without any of my intention to take part in this, and I sincerely hope that it is not my original spiritual pastime. Anyway, I will try to explain my point of view by more delicate manner as possible and I ask you excuse me in advance in the case of my deep deviation.

I think that if absolute truth existed on the Earth in its entire form, few thousands years ago, so today this knowledge is dispersed in different nations and religions like beads of the same necklace and may be some of them didn't find yet. So anyway, there is not lack of spiritual knowledge on the Earth, the question is, who will be this "gardener" who bring them together? Which will be the criterions to find out them? I think that the answer on this question could be find in proper internal organization of spiritual organization for the sake of progressive purification. There is not lack of the knowledge how to organize the process of spiritual elevation inside of one particular group. More of this, most of spiritual traditions use very similar scheme to organize their internal structure. It starts from the level of debutant and progress gradually from level to level and every of such level should have their proper priority. It is not always reasonable to give the same task for different levels in the same time. I give you example of gardener. Someone can have good seeds and fertile earth. He throw them around, they give good shoots and little bit after they became a nice vegetables. It remained a little, pick them up and use them accordingly. If he doesn't do it, in this case usually, somebody else comes and take them or they will rot on the bed. What he is doing after? He takes once again the seeds and throw them again around.

During your lectures you speak about basic things of spiritual life, thinking probably about persons who joined you recently, but there are many others persons who follow you for the years. From another hand, any person who stay on the level of debutant for the years, has not really interested in spiritual life and in his personal development. Me personally, I am interested by subject that you develop in yours lectures, but after 5 minutes I clearly understand what you want to say. You explain very detailed every point without possibility to apply my intelligence on and it continue during 1 or 2 hours. I remember one lecture of you, few years ago or may be more, which you did in the tradition of Yoga-Sutra of Patanjali and it was remarkable. Unfortunately I can not give you any precision about the year when it was. It doesn't means that you should give your lectures only for me or for any another person, but in different classes. So may be it will be more practical for you to have a few or three or may be more baskets to sort your followers accordingly. It seems to me that such communication with different levels, could be very interesting for you too. But of course all this have the sens if you have intention to create some kinds of spiritual school, because if you want only to share your personal experience you don't really need it. Me, I didn't find answer on this question, because I know that one of your project is a creation of some kinds of community, it means-organization. I agree with you that it is nice possibility of development of your spiritual club.

More of this, I believe that this community could start working even today, on virtual level, because any real spiritual organization it's also the ... Brotherhood.

I had many hesitations to write you about this subject, but I very hope that all of these critics didn't make a harm for you personally.

Re: Question about the Future ...

by **Nanda-grama** » Mon Aug 02, 2010 5:12 pm

*As Hari wrote: "I welcome feedback and comments about this, not only from you, Devendra, but anyone else"*

, I will try to add my comments.

Dear Devendra, if to speak about levels of information which Hari gives in his lectures, I would say that Hari does not give some concrete information, rather his lectures are simultaneous with his listeners experience, which should be perceived not only by intelligence. However, if you will give a task yourself to understand about what Hari speaks and will listen to his lectures for many-many years, you will find absolutely clear lines and topics which connect lectures of different yeas, and also will find distinct steps which group of Hari's listeners did together with him.( recently I did such work and I had many detections) And if you did this steps also and got same experience you will very interest ulterior motion, but if you didn't some step you will not interest it, because there is not some information in usual sense of this word. And speciality of his lectures is in what although they are very simple they are multidimensional, and great part of "information" in them influences on subconscious level. My friends and me found many

times that we heard several different lectures when listened to one and same lecture 😊 , because everybody heard it on own "level".

And what you offer is very good in ISKCON . If you are in ISCKON more long time than somebody another you automatically become " old devotee", get the badge "very-very high level devotee" and all begin to worship you, you have association of special level, special prasad and so on. You can worry about nothing, you should only quote words of great acharya in due time.

I'm sorry, Hari, for my comment 😊

Re: Question about the Future ...

•

Post

by **Hari** » Mon Aug 02, 2010 8:35 pm

Thank you Nanda, for revealing the multi-dimensionality of what I do. You are correct. I speak to the listeners and for them.

I have a question to Devendra:

"If I assist someone to develop to a higher level of consciousness and they later choose to associate with, serve together with, or work for some other person or group, have I lost in some way?"

Re: Question about the Future ...

by **harsi** » Wed Aug 04, 2010 10:09 am

I think what Devendra would like to understand, and I must say that I somehow think the same is: What is the goal of all this? What is the goal of all this knowledge you may reveal in your lectures.

Ok Nanda-grama may write: "My friends and me found many times that we heard several different lectures when listened to one and same lecture, because everybody heard it on own "level". That may be so but nevertheless a teacher or a lecturer has a certain message or goal he may want to express or reveal in his lecture.

The way I see it is that Hari would like to let us know or conscientize us for the way how the Supreme (One of Us) operates or governs this cosmic manifestation leading us towards his or hers desired goal. He often speaks of the Spiritual Matrix although I must admit that I not always understand what he means by this. At least this term is a somehow modern one not used in some scriptures or books of the past.

As I see it the traditional understanding of religion which Iskcon is also a part of tries to put the individual somehow in the position of the Supreme and of someone you may call servant of god who may do gods work here on earth as if the Supreme (the spiritual matrix) would be somehow amputated of his limbs or energies to not be able to do it on his own. Of course I could be mistaken in this regard.

---

If God Was One of Us Lyrics  
Joan Osbourne

If God had a name, what would it be  
And would you call it to his face  
If you were faced with him in all his glory  
What would you ask if you had just one question.

What if God was one of us  
Just a slob like one of us  
Just a stranger on the bus  
Trying to make his way home

If God had a face what would it look like  
And would you want to see  
If seeing meant that you would have to believe  
In things like heaven and in jesus and the saints and all the prophets

What if god was one of us  
Just a slob like one of us  
Just a stranger on the bus  
Trying to make his way home  
Just trying to make his way home  
Like a holy rolling stone  
Back up to heaven all alone  
Just trying to make his way home  
Nobody calling on the phone  
Except for the pope maybe in Rome.

Re: Question about the Future ...  
by **aradhya** » Thu Aug 05, 2010 8:40 am

Dear Harsi, I think the inter-dimensional network brought down to us these days by Hari's regular broadcast shows up some suppressed anartas in order to be rided of by His admirers

(at least the Non Russians). For examples, Devendra, as an advanced spiritualist, offers himself to explain the meaning of Hari's teachings to beginners (otherwise Hari would have to continue spending His time doing so?!) as if the meaning of something must be different from the thing itself?!; you are asking Hari to strictly define His goals simultaneously illustrating poetically the idea that any concretization of The One of Us couldn't look decently enough even for any of us particularly?!; as for myself I must confess too, I feel internally proud as if being „between His chosen ones,, while fearfully acting towards „the others,, as if ashamed to be so (my colleague Sati could find a proper diagnose about all of this, it has to do with complexity of the parental relationships in this world). So let's simply enjoy whatever happenings the uncertainty arranges for (as well as between) us!

Re: Question about the Future ...

by **Devendra** » Thu Aug 05, 2010 9:12 am

First of all I would to answer to Hari:

"If I assist someone to develop to a higher level of consciousness and they later choose to associate with, serve together with, or work for some other person or group, have I lost in some way?"

I think that it depends are you doing this consciously or by chance. In first case you have some spiritual group which cooperate with you, where you can make a visit time to time to observe which kinds of wonderful plates were prepared from the vegetables that you grew in your garden. It will be nice possibility also to check that your fruits were not smashed against the wall. For this purpose, you can say during your lectures that if somebody wish to know more about certain subject, he can visit this or that group. If it will be different in another case, because every event has 3 stages of its existence: start, development and the end, and you will operate always with one of them. Actually, you will never know whats going on in your camp, because you will never have real feedback.

Here we mix two kinds of terms: "level" and "inquiry". I agree that during the lecture different people could understand it differently, because only, that they have different inquiries which could be on the same level. Its question of priority of personal research of everybody and they could be completely different. I think that "level" it something more complex. Its like an alloy between quality of inquiries, sincerity and sincerity about yourself, and personal purification. Moreover, the personal purification its also a freedom from some common illusions...!

I if could only know, where from all of these coming from ...

Re: Question about the Future ...

by **harsi** » Thu Aug 05, 2010 6:14 pm

Dear Aradhya you are using a lot of flowery language in your post to me. For example "inter-dimensional network" which Hari would have "brought down" to us in his broadcast. Than you are meantioning the term "suppressed anartas". In regard to Devendra you are using the term "advanced spiritualist" and what to say to this "as if the meaning of something must be different from the thing itself?!" or "I feel internally proud as if being „between His chosen ones,, while fearfully acting towards „the others,, as if ashamed to be so."

In the dictionary one can find the terms: infinite-dimensional or finite-dimensional or even multidimensional but what is a "inter-dimensional network"?

I don't know what to do with all of that. I somehow don't really want to get rid of something ("suppressed anartas" or whatever) in my life. Why should I? Please explain!

Re: Question about the Future ...

by **Nanda-grama** » Thu Aug 05, 2010 7:06 pm

In Russia there is such proverb: " Better is an enemy of good". Hari does what he does by such only way how he already does it and it is fine as it is. If you, Devendra, feel that it is not enough for you, nobody prevents you to search some knowledge somewhere else or to practice something additionally. You write : "For this purpose, you can say during your lectures that if somebody wish to know more about certain subject, he can visit this or that group. " Why should Hari say you that you should go to there or to somewhere? For example, we have in Moscow something as a club ( which is premised on principle of friendship, not on principle of " same levels" 😊 ), where we practice different things how and when we want it, we use any knowledge and any new ways which are interesting for us. Nevertheless Hari continues to be a leader for every of us on more deep level regardless from esoteric skills and practices by which we are fascinated in present moment. Indeed when we did the meditation for look us between lives( by Newton), many of us sow that we were one group of soul and Hari was our guide. And Hari acts now in this life same as a guide should act between lives- to give full freedom, but to support us by his love. It is rare event among spiritual leaders and in it there is most value. But you offer: Let do as all other do! Let create some structure! You, Devendra, write: "If it will be different in another case, because every event has 3 stages of its existence: start, development and the end, and you will operate always with one of them. Actually, you will never know whats going on in your camp, because you will never have real feedback." Every of us can come and go out when he likes it, but real bindings don't depend on it.

Indeed, this discussion already broke the tether of discussion with Hari. 😊

Re: Question about the Future ...

by **aradhya** » Fri Aug 06, 2010 9:16 am

Nanda-grama is right, we went too far, so let's be as short as possible: Harsi, I've thought you (as everyone of us, unsatisfied with the boundaries of ISKCON's internationality) would feel comfortably enough with interdimensionality (Hari explains It as clearly as possible, what could I add to it), while network refers not to something we are to be unwillingly caught by (for example this Internet can't catch us until we chose to join it), but offers Itself to connect beings situated in different dimensions. As for anarthas, as soon as they are exposed to one's awareness (unsuppressed) one can chose to keep them or not, for they aren't anarthas anymore. So you (or anyone else) can't possibly want to get rid of something you (or anyone) aren't (or don't want to be) aware of. So my intention was to join this club in an optimistically liberal way, but although aspiring for interdimensionality, sometimes we have hard time to sharply tune to our international network, that's all.

Re: Question about the Future ...

by **harsi** » Fri Aug 06, 2010 9:01 pm

Yes Aradhya let us "die Kirche im Dorf lassen" as the German proverb goes. "To let the church in the village" or this global village of the internet age, which means in colloquial German to not necessarily make things intricately or complicate things unnecessarily.

Your explanation regarding the anarthas makes sense to me. This freedom one can call it also autonomy one really has in ones life or the right for self-determined actions was something I

was always "fighting" for, even during the old days in the association of devotees. I had always problems to just accept a subordinate role to somebody (guru, some authority or whatever) or to just bow to the discipline of the temple or association. Of course I did it when I understood what it meant and when I considered it helpful to the spiritual purpose in life as I understood it. This obedient role of a so called das- or dasi of God I considered always a kind of unnecessary enslavement, Enslaved by the system of the particular society you were in. Is it really necessary to consider oneself such a "slave" of God.

I remember while reading during the late 1980ies or even today some offerings of the devotees to their spiritual master in the Vyasa puja books. One could have the impression that here people are competing for a championship for being seen by their spiritual master or the others as who considers himself more lower than the other. Dog or whatever of imagined subordinate roles before the so much venerated or imagined superior role of the master.



### "Radio To God" Reported Destroyed By American Scientist

A most interesting FSB report that is circulating in the Kremlin regarding an "interdimensional communication device", which Russian scientists are (jokingly?) calling a "Radio to God".

Re: Question about the Future ...

by **Nanda-grama** » Sun Aug 08, 2010 10:35 am

Yesterday Hari said in his lecture : "*I got a challenge. People offer me to create some elite group and to REVEAL most occult secrets to them . But it is what I do all time- reveal secrets!*"

Look, how it is interesting!

Great mystics always created some filters in order to defend their knowledge from unprincipled people. People should go through some tests, examinations and so on, and only few of them could get access to main secrets.

Hari gives "most occult secrets" free in his broadcasting, but look- filters are still there! Some people JUST DON'T HEAR it to listen to his lectures. I think, one of this filters is simplicity and easiness of his manner to speak. Indeed, it is most strong filters. I will not write which people and why they can't go through this filter. And another is fearlessness to get own experience, to not be simply follower. If somebody isn't getting it, he generally can't understand about what Hari speaks.

Today it struck me very much. Indeed, in order to hide something it is better to put it in most opened, crowded place, and nobody will dawn upon to search there!

Of course, I don't think that Hari has special intention to shut away something. But nevertheless all it is jocously.

Re: Question about the Future ...

by **Hari** » Sun Aug 08, 2010 2:57 pm

This point needs expanding.

It is not that I am expertly hiding something in the open. It is that to understand what I express with the depth and comprehension required to get the maximum benefit from it, one should have gone through the previous evolutionary steps with me. In other words, I have spent years preparing the ground for people to accept these points and one could theoretically listen to all the lectures and gain this prerequisite knowledge and apply it to what we are presently discussing. I say theoretically because while I am speaking live I am also assembling and

sharing energy intended to push the limits of consciousness. This energetic sharing is much more significant than the actual words. I cannot say if listening to a recording carries the same energetic effect, as I am not neutral enough to see it from the point of view of a person who would favorably be influenced by that energy if they were at the point in their evolution where this would benefit them. Maybe it works, maybe not. I know that it works when I do it live.

If one has gone through the previous steps and grown in their own way sufficiently to have the capacity of awareness and fearlessness to grasp what I am saying now, they will understand the words and concepts and energy of what I say in a completely different manner than one who did not go through the prerequisite steps. One might also have attained sufficient growth through other teachers, in other groups, or in other ways, but unless one has gotten to the required point, my words and concepts will be heard and seen in a manner that is quite different. Remember that I speak on many levels at once, so even though what I say will be equally understandable to people on all levels, some will comprehend it in far greater depth. The important difference is the way each individual can use this information and what they will attain from it. In the latest series of lectures, if one is not ready to understand one will hear only words but not be given entrance into the expanded multidimensionality that inter-dimensional processes bring. One will simply not feel it, will not see it, and will not even know it exists. Therefore it is not me hiding anything, it is simply a function of who listens.

As a really simplistic example, if I give \$100 to two people, one could turn it into a million dollars and another could turn it into \$110. It depends on who receives the money and their capacity to use it. Both may think they have used it to the maximum capacity intended by the one who gave it.

So yes, I reveal a lot, perhaps too much, but I know well that unless one has gotten to the point where they can use it, I have revealed nothing special. For those who are at the point, it is the key to the future. Why should I fear if one knows how and where to use the key? Why should I attempt to please those who do not or be concerned if they do not respect what I do? I have already given hundreds of lectures that are freely available for anyone to hear and accept. Others charge subscriptions and earn from this. I do not. How can I charge for that which is given to me freely? Yet, some take it cheaply. It is they who lose, not me.

I do what I do and share what I share because I can do nothing less. I also do this now because the time is right and many are eager and ready. Accept what I give in the spirit it is given. Be happy that it does not cost you. Embrace it. Share it. Run with it. Flow with it, grow with it, and hold together the matrix during this increasingly troublesome time. Know well that your service is appreciated.

Re: Question about the Future ...

by **harsi** » Mon Aug 16, 2010 9:51 pm

"We're always perfect, always beautiful, and ever-changing. We're doing the best we can with the understanding, knowledge, and awareness we have. As we grow and change more and more, our 'best' will only get better and better." —Louise L. Hay, from *Experience Your Good Now!*

This quote by Louise Hay I find very revealing or enlightening. Especially if her sentence "We're doing the 'best' we can with the understanding, knowledge, and awareness we have," is true than we have nothing to fear if at one point in time our consciousness may not have all the answers needed for a given situation or to comprehend something in all its details or in all its particulars in order to not consider oneself or be seen by others as clueless, ignorant or even inimical to someones attempt of an explanation.



Dear Hari, you may think maybe "what's he driving at?" or "what is he on about?" Well, I must admit overtly that I have no clue what you are talking about lately in your lectures. I will explain. My whole life I was always anxious to find out who I really am, where do I come from, what is my destination after that temporarily life. Who or what controls this visible and invisible world we live in, or what is the sense and meaning of life?. I always tried to expand my knowledge and awareness in this direction. Now what you are talking about lately confuses me a little bit.

You are talking about experiencing dimensionality in all its fullness, about conscious individuals who would uphold a matrix, about this or that energy or people who would be in some way inimical towards the manifestation of this divine or whatever energy here in this realm. You are mentioning in your lectures Durga devi, Radha and Krishna, you have offered even their Lordships a "temple of divine energy" in St. Petersburg but at the same time one does not have the impression from what you are saying that you are thinking highly of the way the divinity is worshiped and understood in the traditional religions. You are speaking about living in the Now although I must admit that according to my understanding only idiots and millionaires can afford to really live in the now. The idiot because of the lack of knowledge he may have to make or dream of a better future for himself and the millionaire because he has made it already and can live thus carefree. At least this is the common understanding in society.

I think what I am at to understand is how or what is the right way to go through all this seemingly confusing things and still remain true to oneself? To give you a hint what I mean I would like to provide you with a link I discovered recently on the Internet. On this site someone offers also some recordings online for listening, but one has there a very hard time to follow what he is actually talking about. One can hear there speaking also about "[multidimensional awakening](#) of all aspects of our existence". Listen for example to: [The True Purpose of Human Existence](#) or to [Meeting of Consciousness and Energy](#).

Re: Question about the Future ...  
by **Hari** » Mon Aug 16, 2010 10:13 pm

Sorry for losing you there...

What had to be done was done last Saturday so I shall return from "way out there" to a somewhat more normal situation.

In our global audience our viewers all have their unique characteristics and experiences. I usually try to cater to everyone, but sometimes people complain about this by stating it is too simplistic. Although anyone who can read between the lines of what I say, so to speak, has a deeper experience than those who take things as they appear to be, I usually present concepts in a manner that appeals to a variety of listeners. However, something had to be done that was important and now that it is done I might return to my usual methodology although I will sometimes refer to these "newer" topics in various ways.

If one were to categorize what I say, one could divide topics into those I feel are useful for others and those that I feel are fun for me as there is quite a difference.

I do not have time to listen to the links you have discovered as I am doing the work of four men here and I am having a hard time continuing in this way. I need four employees, minimum, to keep it all together and expand. I am working on creating this facility for myself and thus all of you. But I get your point, there are topics that make no sense to some people.

Or are you supplying these links because you secretly want others to expand their knowledge of the topics of recent weeks? In that case, clever you! 🤔

Re: Question about the Future ...  
by **harsi** » Wed Aug 25, 2010 3:09 pm

Another thing,..but as I find quite to the point.

"We cover our deep ignorance with words, but we are ashamed to wonder, we are afraid to whisper 'mystery'."  
~ A.W. Tozer

*"Mysticism is not a religion.*

*If anything it is a philosophy, but more to the point, it is a process in which to understand the world we live in. A religion is an explanation of the world we live in, it is also an organized system of what one should believe and also what one should not believe. The basis of religion is a spiritual explanation for the world and consequently a set of guidelines that one must follow as a result of that spiritual explanation.*

*Now the line gets fuzzy, because there are religious components to mysticism. Mysticism can have spiritual explanations and can have guidelines to live by. However the important distinction is that mysticism is not subscribing to a set of beliefs, but rather exploring beliefs in order to find an answer. Religion is a passive approach to understanding wherein teachings or guidance advise a follower on what to do, whereas Mysticism is an active approach wherein one discovers what to do by finding knowledge. In plainer words, the religious worship, but the mystic learns. A ... will worship ..., but a Mystic will learn from .... The religious pray for results, but a mystic searches for results. The religious leave their fate to a higher power and the Mystic creates their own fate. The religious seek help from the divine and the Mystic seeks to reach the divine.*

*So what is Mysticism?*

*There can be complicated definitions on the true meaning of the word, but to wrap this discourse up, it is blanket term to describe various organizations who throughout history attempted to discover the true nature of the universe using all tools available to them including the five senses and more. Western Mysticism generally follows the external quest for knowledge through study, ritual and experimentation whereas Eastern Mysticism generally follows the internal quest for knowledge through meditation and reflection. Both work to obtain the truth of existence and express this intent in a variety of ways. > [Waythingsare.com](http://Waythingsare.com)*

Would you agree to this attempt at an explanation? To say it more clear I have no problems whatsoever with what you say and how you say it, my doubts concern more myself as the recipient of this information and spiritual or mystical realizations. One could say also I have my doubts if the conclusions and realizations I make or have are in line with the way the Supreme would see it. In other words exists there something like an "absolute" way of seeing and describing spiritual matters and realizations? Is there a need of or what is the need of supporting ones spiritual realizations, with quotes from scriptures or of other spiritual "authorities" like Sri Caitanya?

"I love Krishna, you can love him too. We can all love Krishna its the thing to eternally do..."  
one can hear you singing at this moment on Harimedia radio.

Re: Question about the Future ...

by **Hari** » Wed Aug 25, 2010 7:23 pm

Nice text!

I like mystery because when we are in it we tend to look for answers. While looking we find all kinds of things, even things we did not think needed finding. Mystery brings discovery and discover brings growth.

Universally accepted definitions of mysticism are hard to come by. The person you quoted has a good one. My definition is rather simple. First, I think that mysticism and spiritual mysticism are synonymous. Whatever difference one might find between these two concepts seems to be more related to an incomplete knowledge of the art, prejudice, or a lack of awareness on the part of the definer. IMHO (or shall I more honestly say IMNSHO), those who are true mystics are aware that all mysticism is spiritual. Yet, we all know that there are mystics who use that power in what we consider to be a less than nice way. They know mystical arts (sometimes called black arts) and know it is based on something spiritual, but they choose to use that energy negatively. Even though we consider it negative, they consider it positive as they feel it is right that they do what they do even if it turns out to be negative for someone else. Is this not, by the way, somewhat similar to those angry brahmanas of the older times who cursed people when they thought they did not do the right thing? One becomes a judge and jury and punishes another for what one considers their wrongs. Interesting... Someone might object and say that those olden days brahmanas were qualified to do what they did and the present day doers of evil not qualified, but that is not necessarily so. I often found myself reading ancient literatures and thinking, "Now why did that brahmana have to do that? What is wrong with him?" But that is just me...

Anyway, I like mysticism, or at least I can more honestly say, I like my flavor of it because it is all about my experience. I seek out experiences in the energetic realms to heighten my awareness, increase my energy, make connections I wish to make, feel the divine in my presence to share my consciousness with them and with others. I like sharing this experience with others in a way that brings them into it from their own point of view. I like to assist people learn the art to feel what I feel within their own personal context and consciousness. This is why I supply tools. "Here is a tool, use it and experience. As you grow, I shall grow. Gain experience, get more tools, use them, get more experiences and so on." This is to me spiritual mysticism. It is interdependent, interactive, and a sharing that is based on love.

I would not personally bother to get involved with a comparison of this or that school of mysticism or try to analyze it in relation to religion. I feel that energy is common but differences in manifestation arise due to the transmitters and receivers of that energy. There are certain fundamental elements that every mystic shares such as the energy itself, the ether within which it flows, the frequencies and vibrations of it, and the shared experiences. How one perceives and understands this will always be unique to the individual even if one is within a group that purports to have a system for doing it. As we are all uniquely individual and our energies are a manifestation of what we are, we will transmit and receive uniquely. Any discipline that is accepted can only assist us to be more aware of what we are and amplify our capacity to utilize vibrational energy. Mysticism is what we are, how we express what we are, and how we receive what others are expressing. Sometimes this is directly in relation to the divine and sometimes related to other people, plants, devas and so on. At all times it is within the divine as all energy is divine in its various forms and flavors. Therefore, there is no need for me to

speak about religion as I see religion as a structure, not an experience. Naturally, any structure structures experience, by definition, but I consider the mystical experience as what is important and not the container within which I find it.

Considering this, there is no right or wrong as is commonly defined by human beings who are fixed within structures that claim exclusive right to what is truth and declare their definition to be directly descended from the absolute in one form or another. The idea that the divine insists that things be his or her way or the highway is not characteristic of a loving and kind omniscience. Naturally religions throughout time have boldly stated what the divine wants, what we should do and not do, and set the lines in cement as to what is acceptable and what is not. However, a cursory examination of the principles and formulas given in these religions will show that most of these directives coming from ancient times are obsolete, irrelevant, or not in tune with modern people. To adjust this, religions modify these troublesome things while claiming to keep the essence. This is fine, but why bother with the religion in the first place if what you are doing is keeping the essence? Spiritual mysticism in my book is the art of working with the essence without requiring a reference to religions, scriptures, demands, requirements, structure and so on. I do like to refer to traditions now and then as it is fun to do so, interesting, gives insight into why and how they did and do what they do, amongst other reasons, but I am writing in this manner to expand the points you brought up.

Yet, how shall those who are not yet capable enough to enter into mystical experiences move forward if they are not given assistance? For most, some sort of education, discipline and direction will help them to get to the point where they can stand on their own feet. I have been trying to establish this through what I say and write, but I am unsure of the result as I have not heard about someone growing rapidly due to what I do or say. I have people all the time write to me and thank me, but I do not know them well enough to know what they were before hearing me and how they have moved from that place to where they are feeling gratitude now.

The Divine, The Supreme, continually shares with us in multiple ways. There is never, at any moment, a separation between us and the divine. We simply choose to forget our connection when we want or when we are ridden with guilt, shame or self-condemnation. The divine wishes us to experience our essence. Attaining the capacity to do this at will and to the depth that reveals intense experiences requires that we stretch our muscles by exercise and discipline, act when the energy is there, learn from mistakes, experience those mistakes fully and embrace them, then later realize there are no mistakes and rejoice in the completeness of essence. When all is compact within an all perfect existence, how can there be anything other than experiences that deepen our awareness?

One might say that there are bad people doing bad things and that this somewhat negates what I just wrote. Although I am not promoting that anyone should do bad things, I think this idea of bad should be examined further. Even though someone may be acting against the best interests of themselves and others by harming others and creating win-lose or lose-lose situations, after some time, even if it takes lifetimes, that spirit will emerge from their personal darkness when they have gained enough experience of how these negative acts are not in their best self-interest. At one point they will say "This does not work! Enough!" They will then change and move towards a more beneficial way of acting. Considering this, and considering the divine's marvelous capacity to stand by the principle of free choice as the only viable method of evolution, we can see how everything, everywhere and at all times fits within the consciousness of the divine.

Yet, I would not wish to do something I have defined as wrong. I feel there are things I do that are wrong and things that are really right. Even if later on I see that the wrong things turned out to be good in some way, that does not deter me from challenging myself and demanding a higher standard of values. This demand and challenge keeps me going in a direction I like. One

aspect of mysticism is that we take responsibility for our choices, our actions, our planning and arrangements, and our responses to events that impact us. A mystic continues to experience the moment as it is the only reality that exists. He or she will not stop experiencing because of what someone says is to be done and not done or their declaration of what is right and what is wrong. We shall listen, digest, and act according to our own conviction at all times, taking into consideration all information at our disposal. It is our life to live, not someone else's. And the purpose of life is to live. As we go through life we develop through experience our own understanding of what is right or wrong and this guides us in the choices we make. Regardless of what one might have been promised, no one else will take responsibility for the choices we make as the consequences of our acts are our own to experience. There is no easy way out of personal responsibility, no way to avoid the challenge of making the right choice at every moment. It is the discipline of life and the more we are aware of our spiritual consciousness, the more we are prepared to maximize every moment.

Can you imagine what it is like to have faith in the infallibility of someone else's words only to find out later on that you have to experience the consequences of following them regardless if they were right or wrong or if they really understood what they were doing? Faith is a dangerous thing. It cannot protect us in the face of direct experience. When our consciousness awareness is in tune with the energy of our lives, we are best prepared to deal with anything that comes before us.

Regardless of who we are or what we have learned or believe, we think what we think, say what we say and do what we do because we feel this is what is right. Everyone does what they think is right at every moment. When all is said and done, all that counts for us are the experiences we have in our lives, even if we are following exactly what we are supposed to. A life lived as another's life, complete with the other's earned values, ideals and goals, is vicarious. If our experiences are simply derivations of other's experiences, we are living vicariously. Direct experience is always superior and as far as I can see it is the "religion" of the future. It is also what Lord Caitanya gave to everyone he met and what he experienced himself in his latter years.

I do not like the word "absolute," and I wonder if even the people who use it know what it really means. Sure, I get that the usual definition is that truth to whom all relative truths are related, but what if the related truths are contributing to that absolute in as meaningful a way as the absolute contributes to them? This would remove the stigma of the entire burden of responsibility of all existence on the absolute and distribute it amongst all those who are related to it. Life becomes more of a interactive and flexible experience, based on spontaneity and desire, kind of like what it is supposed to be. But that is another discussion.

I do not think that we need to find approval of our realizations. We realize what we realize and we experience what we experience. Acceptance of this is one of the preliminary steps towards immersing oneself in spiritual mysticism. However, finding confirmation of the nature of our experiences is useful. This helps us discern which experiences are illusory in the sense they do not serve us and which are useful and can lead us to greater awareness. Both experiences have value, but the endeavor to find confirmation outside of ourselves and to see how our experience links to further experiences and connections is the discipline of the mystic. Forward movement is valued when it brings us to more interesting or relevant places. Once one is consciously aware of the value of this process, one sees the universe (the divine) directly reciprocating with our desires and endeavors. This attracts the synchronicity that characterizes the natural flow of living energy. This is vibrant mysticism.

Re: Question about the Future ...

by **Akhila L** » Thu Oct 28, 2010 6:28 am

>>>I have been trying to establish this through what I say and write, but I am unsure of the result as I have not heard about someone growing rapidly due to what I do or say. I have people all the time write to me and thank me, but I do not know them well enough to know what they were before hearing me and how they have moved from that place to where they are feeling gratitude now.

I have to admit I made a real progress due to what you say or write. I am not a "frequent follower" of this forum but I come here when I need it and always find what I am looking for, in one or another way.

Just to give you a feedback ("gratitude")

What attracts me most is your open mind and "not rejecting" attitude. Except for your profound analysis.

Best,  
AkhilaL

## **Voluntary Euthanasia - the right to die at will.**

by **Sati** » Mon Jun 21, 2010 9:49 pm

Dear Hari!

For already 6 months at least, I am studying this site - <http://www.exitinternational.com>  
It is about voluntary euthanasia - assisted suicide. Most of the people there have serious reasons to quit their lives at will - they have much physical pain or they know that soon they would be completely unconscious, or would loose the ability to take care of themselves and don't want to make problems for their families. This people, (I ve seen a lot of videos with interviews), are very strong people - not just those who are afraid of life... They are not hysterical - they are calm, peaceful and happy and they want to leave peacefully AT THEIR WILL, with a good mood, listening, (perhaps), to their favorite music, eating the favorite dish, with the friends or relatives, who sit with them in love till their last moment and say goodbye ... some receive a psychological help before, (to get read of fear of death), and at some point they just drink special medicine, and go. It's not so easy, (quite difficult in some countries) ,to get permission to do it and sometimes people have to cross half of the world to be able to do what they want. And even in the countries where it's permitted - there is a quite long process to reach the goal.

As we know - the idea of leaving "this world" at will is not new in spirituality - great yogis did it and spiritual teachers of the past, (they didn't need a medicine of course - they could just leave the body ...if it's true)

If we believe that our evolution is the product of our will and the challenges we get is also chosen by us, I think, its natural, if at ANY point of our life, (doesn't matter how sick or what we are ), we can choose to top it, (I develop the euthanasia idea and take it from the medical context to the more existential field) ... without fear, without sorrow and grief - I decide - I don't want more experience like this - and I quit. Of course we can change our lives to some extent and to build different situations around ourselves... but its not always possible and even if it is – its just one of the options we have – isn't the right to exit at will the same kind of option (but not popular due to the traditions and beliefs of the past ?

You often point the acceptance of life and circumstances of life, as one of the primary tools in spirituality... but isn't the expression of the free will the same important tool ?

I wish to be of service, for example, and I see my life as an opportunity to do good things, but what if at some point I loose the desire to do good things and to evolve at all, or I can see any other reasons, (doesn't matter what kind of reasons, as its my life and my choice), and decide

to finish this lifetime and start the next one. Reload, restart... I chant mantras or connect to the Divine ... and peacefully fade away... Isn't it a NORMAL situation for a soul in this world - when we can express our desires to leave at will?

Isn't it better to prepare to die and to make good arrangements - small meditative exit party with close friends...and concentrate on the Divine and go in the best and peaceful mood?

Instead of some stupid dying in the car crash, screaming out of fear, or in a hospital... crazy and unconscious from pain or during the teeth brushing in the bathroom ?

Isn't the overly increased value of our own lives born out of religious fear and lack of mystic experiences when people don't have the experiences outside of the body and see the bodily life as the only experienced type of existence?

What is your attitude to this point?

Of course it's selfish towards the people who love us just to quit without consideration of what they would feel and leaving them without our help and care, and also, of course, I value much the lives of those I love and want them to live forever and not to leave me.

I ask about the situations where this type of exit would not cause much harm to others.

I also know that circumstances of life can change and what is seen as black today can be pink tomorrow - but isn't it also a free will - to wait or not to wait till this tomorrow and to accept the present moment or just to say - that's enough for this time - I better go ?

Re: Voluntary Euthanasia - the right to die at will.

by **Hari** » Sun Jul 11, 2010 4:58 pm

I shall answer in an extremely simple manner.

I decide what to do, when to do it, how to do it, according to what I think is best at the time I do it.

Along with this I accept the consequences of what I do. I try to live in the principle of there is only one of us and do things which fit within that principle.

I also am aware of the laws of the state and am aware of the consequences of not following those laws.

And so I act.

I see no reason to make this answer longer as all the elements of my answer are contained in these three sentences.

Re: Voluntary Euthanasia - the right to die at will.

by **Hari** » Mon Jul 12, 2010 3:51 pm

OK, previous reply was not very good. Here is more:

Do people have a right to do this? Who am I to give or take away, confirm or deny anyone's right to do anything? I value that every individual is responsible for whatever decisions they make. They have to do what they think is best. There are many factors to be considered. What is best for us may not be best for those around us. There are consequences to all actions. Suicide, whether assisted or not, has consequences. Obviously, the consequences are different. One who kills themselves out of intense desperation and the inability to see any other solution in life is treated as a patient needing healing after death. There is compassion there, but there is also a long period of rehabilitation as the soul must recover from the deep trauma that brought this intense act on. But killing oneself more or less whimsically, or even after some consideration that includes elements like, there is nothing for me in this world, I am bored, I am

stuck, I wish to go somewhere else, or whatever, will create a more difficult situation in between lives.

We are given the opportunity to find a situation in this life that reflects our evolutionary journey. This opportunity takes into consideration the consequences of our previous actions and the mentality with which we performed them. As we need to have experiences that balance out what we have done, we are placed in situations that accomplish this. We agree to this in between lives and we might even know how hard it will be. To decide to trash the life is to interrupt the process we initiated and thus derail our development. This life is an opportunity. Whatever we might think is bad about it could be related to how we see our life and not the life itself. By adjusting our perception and by adjusting our consciousness, we can move beyond difficulty and accept it as a catalyst for advancement. Opting out of life when there is absence of intense trauma is to disrespect the process and the personalities that assisted in the creation of the life scenario. This will not be seen with the same compassion as the ending of life of one who has gone far beyond their limits of tolerance. But we will not know until we are in that situation between lives. And we cannot predict what will happen.

As far as those who are clinically confirmed to have a limited duration of life and are sure to face a painful end, this is quite different. Now one could say that the pain one has to face is part of the process of experience. Others may say it is their karma to suffer. These points may or may not be true. I cannot say. I feel that this situation is not obvious and I will not approve or condemn it as I simply do not know. If I were in the same situation, what would I do? I cannot say, as I am not and it is only real when one is living the situation. Even if I were to say now that it should not be done as one has to embrace the pain and suffering, if I were in such pain I might think differently, or I might not. Because I cannot predict how I will feel when in the same position, I hesitate to pass judgement on those who are.

As far as allowing others to do it, we are then in the legal realm. If it is against the law, regardless of whether we feel the law is correct or not, and if we facilitate it and are caught we shall suffer the consequences according to the law. If one goes somewhere where they allow it legally, then this factor is not there. So long the law is so, one should know it is illegal, rightfully or wrongfully. If one feels the law is wrong, the only option is to lobby to change the law.

If one has the option of ending life by some legal or illegal means and decides to do it, then this fits within the concept of everyone having free will. We have the capacity to do what we think is right, but we also must embrace the consequences. By declaring one's power to make a choice one also declares one's acceptance of the consequences of that choice. If one has a desire to end one's life, no one can stop them. Where there is a will there is always a way. Yet, what comes next? That remains to be seen.

I do not think the idea that no one would be harmed by such assisted suicide is specifically relevant to my previous comment. One should not think that there will be no consequences to it. As one does not know the consequences, one has to consider what they might be and how one might react. Then again, the consequences might not be as bad as we think.

After all, keeping people artificially alive on machines that financially ruin the lives of the family with hospital bills that run into the hundreds of thousands of dollars is also not natural, not necessarily included in our life's plan, or at least needed, and is as contrived as ending life. I see little difference between these, except for one being cheaper and thus less of a burden on the family. I thought I would bring up this point as it is interesting, at least to me!

Krishna and the monopoly on the legitimate use of force  
by **harsi** » Thu Dec 10, 2009 3:28 pm



Dear Hari,

I was thinking the other day if the conclusions and knowledge revealed by Krishna to Arjuna in the Bhagavad-gita were not actually meant more or exclusively for him as a member of the legitimate governing and administrative society of people? Because his advice or order given to Arjuna on the battlefield of Kurukshetra to fight is something which belongs actually only to the state (and by extension the government) that holds a monopoly on the legitimate use of force in the enforcement of its laws and orders within a territory and society of people.

Thus there might well be the case that the content of the so called revealed scriptures of the past might have to be viewed also according to whom this knowledge might have been spoken in the first place. To say, that following the advise and order of the Supreme is meant equally for all members of society might be for some people also a source of great confusion if, like in this case, one might not have also the nature and be rightly situated in the required position in society where one would be allowed to use force in order to maintain the ideals of righteousness, justice and law in society. Isn't it that such a principle is as valid today as it might have been in the society at the time of Arjuna?

Re: Krishna and the monopoly on the legitimate use of force  
by **Hari** » Wed Dec 23, 2009 1:40 pm

You already knew the answer when you posted the question! I agree with your understanding. Anything that is said, any instructions given by anyone must be taken in context. Taking things out of context or generalizing can be dangerous. Sometimes it works, sometimes not. And worse, sometimes it can cause havoc. Many strange things have been done in the name of scriptures. Therefore, those who are wise always take into account the context of a statement and adjust the statements relevance to them accordingly!

## **Meaning of Radha-Krishna and fully surrendering unto Them**

by **harsi** » Fri Sep 04, 2009 11:09 pm

Dear Hari,

I was reading recently on Hindu-blog.com the following explanation regarding Radha Krishna: "To understand the relationship between Radha and Krishna, first we have to clear the worldly impurities from our mind, which is clogging our vision. Once these impurities are removed we will understand the true meaning of Raslila – the individual soul realizing that it is part of the universal soul, which is a continuity. It is always Radha and Krishna together or simply Radhakrishna. Radha exists with Krishna; not without Krishna. Radha represents the individual soul and Krishna the universal soul. On a lower level, we say the individual soul merges with the universal soul. In fact, Radha on seeing Krishna realizes that there is nothing called the individual soul and that she is Krishna..." It seems to me that this is how many so called Hindus view or explain their faith and understanding of Radha and Krishna. But could it really be that simple?

On the same website one can find a quote by Bhaktisiddhanta Saraswati which supposed should have said or written ones: "On perusal of the first chapter of Bhagavad Gita one may think that they are advised to engage in warfare. When the second chapter has been read it can be clearly understood that knowledge and the soul is the ultimate goal to be attained. On studying the third chapter it is apparent that acts of righteousness are also of high priority. If we continue and patiently take the time to complete the Bhagavad Gita and try to ascertain the truth of its closing chapter we can see that the ultimate conclusion is to relinquish all the

conceptualized ideas of religion which we possess and fully surrender directly unto the Supreme Lord."

But what does it really mean to "surrender" so called "directly unto the Supreme Lord"? In the past some of us may have understood this as a request to engage in spreading and facilitating a certain society of people and its understanding of life and the Supreme Godhead. But could that really be the right meaning of fully surrendering "directly" unto the Supreme? Why should there be a need to "fully surrender unto the Supreme Lord", if we are supposed to be anyway also a part of Him or Them in some way or another?

Re: Meaning of Radha-Krishna and fully surrendering unto Them  
by **Hari** » Tue Sep 15, 2009 4:28 pm

I find the hindu blog description uninteresting and not useful.

I have dedicated the past years to redefining the meaning of "surrender," as the word does not seem to efficiently express what it intends. I see it important to accept the irrevocable connection to the divine couple as our essence. When one has accepted oneself and this natural connection, one's life is in harmony with Radha and Krsna (as well as all divinity in existence) and unfolds as it should, when it should.

I see no reason to complicate this very straightforward essential truth. I have explained this in detail in my short book segment.

What you do after you have accepted this connection will most likely be a natural extension of your being. And if it is not, you will have a good reason why.