

Excerpts from Harimedia Forum

Discussions with Hari

Page Three

Click on index to go to that topic's post

Copyright 2005-2024 Harimedia LLC
All Rights Reserved

Individuality of a soul	4
How looks the afterlife space	8
Neglecting nature= neglecting God	8
Being enough and complete	9
dharma artha kama moksha or artha kama dharma moksha	11
About love and relationships	13
Dying	15
The purpose and meaning in life	24
Opening the eyes of soul	31
The positive and negative of religion	31
God and man's limitations on HIM	32
Energies origin	33
again the reality	34
"Inside out versus Outside in" lecture	35
Personality	36
Humanity and Gods	38
children and spirituality	40
feeling safe	43
Lord Buddhas thoughts	47
Looking to balance material and spiritual life	48
Origins of life and the concept of the soul	50
Love, love not	57
Ether, Love, Sensuality, Energy, and a big headache	60
I already have bothered myself	62
Emotions	66
Making Choices	69
too many questions	72

how to relate to Scriptures	76
How to know: to use powerful technics or not to use (v.2)	78
"Triggers" in life	85
Chanting Gayatri	86
Unity between male and female energies - divine in nature?	88
Abortions... When the soul comes?	93
unfulfillment and rejection	98

Individuality of a soul

by Nanda-grama » Fri Oct 31, 2008 11:57 pm

Dear Hari!

I have a question.

There is a knowledge about chakra's system, and owing to it people have a possibility to change themselves and their lives. If all chakras would be free from blocks and all subtle bodies would be harmonious, people would be happy and perfect. But even he who is the expert in vision and control of energy does not hurry to change something in his chakras radically because these imperfections and divergences from a standard allow to feel the definite experience. Likely a soul chooses the limited convictions and conceptions before the birth in order to receive these blocks and imperfections in its own energetic system. And the difference in flow of energy reflects an individuality of soul with its desires.

My question is: If would souls not take this chakra's system and these embodiments, would there be some differences in their pure energy? (and what it would express in?) Or before the display are the energies of souls identical (it is the one energy) and only possibility to display it by different ways creates the individuality of a soul? What can you say about it?

I know the theoretical answer from books that a soul always has the individuality, but how can I feel it practically? Because now I feel only different condition of chakras with their blocks and so on. And generally, is it possible to perceive the original energy of a soul here and now?

Thank you.

14.11.08

Dear Hari!

I continued my investigation and I tried many times. And it seems to me, something began to come of it.

At first I look how an energy flows. I take the information which is in chakras. (about peculiarities and character of a person, his desires and problems). And all it is constantly in motion. Then I look what is under it and more immovable. Thus I get to something that is very light, almost elusive, isn't connected with an action, but very quick, and similar on a mood. Usually this is something delightful and it doesn't coincide with that how a person displays himself in life.

Am I on correct way?

Last edited by Nanda-grama on Fri Dec 05, 2008 3:05 pm

, edited 1 time in total.

Re: individuality of a soul

by Hari » Thu Nov 27, 2008 12:12 am

May I give a simple answer?

I do not worry about all the ins and outs of chakras and how I might be affected by them and why. I do not see a difference between my energy in its pure state and my energy as it flows from that state to the external environment within which I exist. Naturally there is a difference between what we might conceive as our fundamental and basic pure spiritual energy and the quality of our consciousness in this world, but this is not the sum total of what I am. Regardless of how my spiritual energy manifests internally or externally, it is the same energy whether it is resting as Being or transformed by the world.

If I am this pure energy and this energy is the basis of consciousness, then my task is simply to feel what I am. The more I feel what I am, the more I am consciously aware of what I am; more

aware of my particular, unique Being. As spiritual seekers become clearer about what they are, they naturally will live in accordance with this knowledge. As we find ourselves flowing in our own energy rather than accepting energy as our own that is imposed on us from the exterior realm, we become lighter, clearer, more aware, more conscious, and thus more spiritual.

It does not matter what state the cakras are in or how they cause my energy to manifest externally. If I am aware of my being, I am also aware of how my cakras are perfectly suited to my energy. As they are "mine" they are part of me and are in reality my creation. As they are energy and work with my energy as the gateway to my world, they represent a part of my being. If I do not choose to use them in a manner that does not represent my being the cakras do not act as impediments. If I choose to express what I am, my cakras act as tools of this expression.

If you try to understand Being through the cakras, you are going to have trouble as the cakras carry some debris from previous traumas. If you concentrate your efforts on your energetic essence, you will feel your way past the trauma. You can then see this debris from the inside out and clear it faster.

But this is just my way of seeing it. I know others will say, "OK, but how do you get to the being if you are contaminated?" But it seems to me this question is an illusion as the being can not be contaminated. Rest within the being and feel it without worrying about the quality of it.

In other words, instead of trying to become something (better, purer, wiser, more skilled, more anything) just feel what you are and be present in that. It is a different way of seeing the same thing, but a way that is in tune with what we are instead of trying to be in tune with what we want to become.

Re: individuality of a soul
by Sati » Fri Nov 28, 2008 10:33 pm

in other words, instead of trying to become something (better, purer, wiser, more skilled, more anything) just feel what you are and be present in that. It is a different way of seeing the same thing, but a way that is in tune with what we are instead of trying to be in tune with what we want to become.

But what if we cant manifest who we really are due to the past traumas and s.o. We know who we are, we remember how it feels - to be what we are, but -... Where is this harmony between trying to be a higher version of ourselves and relaxing in acceptance of who we are just here and now?

Re: individuality of a soul
by Hari » Mon Dec 22, 2008 9:53 pm

Obviously you have to work on the effects of your traumas to be able to accept yourself. However, while this is going on, and it will always go on more or less, you can still connect with your being and be it. How much harmony you feel within depends on you.

Individuality of a soul

by Nanda-grama » Sat Jul 25, 2009 7:31 pm

Hari wrote:

I do not worry about all the ins and outs of cakras and how I might be affected by them and why. I do not see a difference between my energy in its pure state and my energy as it flows from that state to the external environment within which I exist. Naturally there is a difference between what we might conceive as our fundamental and basic pure spiritual energy and the quality of our consciousness in this world, but this is not the sum total of what I am. Regardless of how my spiritual energy manifests internally or externally, it is the same energy whether it is resting as Being or transformed by the world.

Dear Hari

I feel a difference in my perception of an energy of chakras and of an energy of essence of a person. When I tune myself on chakras of a person I get an information about what how this person expresses himself in the world, how acts, has what problems and so on. This information is more mental, and it is connected more with a condition of this person now, how it seems to me. I interested very much how I could perceive an original energy of soul, it was some problem for me, the abundance of information confused me. But then I found that there was some constant shade which did the energy of a person recognizable in any his condition. I tried to catch this subtle shade. Now I feel it more as music, I hear it. There is some constant melody(it is even not a melody, but I don't know how to express it differently) of a person. It also is connected with definite kind of radiation, dynamics of it. It seems to me, it is connected also with main intention of a person. When I feel this kind of my own energy, hear my own melody I find myself in very pacific condition, I feel my power and truth. And if I connect with Divine in such condition it is very breath-taking experience

letter

by Nanda-grama » Mon Jun 29, 2009 7:46 am

In this letter Hari answered my questions. His answer seems to me valuable. May be, it will be interestingly for somebody some more.

Dear Hari!

I want to ask you to explain me one thing. I stucked in this question. You give us so many ways for connection with Divine, and you teach us how to love and accept ourselves completely, with all our peculiarities and deficiencies and together with them to be in this connection with Divine. But why does Prabhupada insist that a person can contact God only through spiritual master or only when he will get rid of material desires? It creates a snare for his followers. Can you explain me ,how do you think, why he did so? He should know that it is not truth. He gave so many good things, but why did not he tell a main thing- how any man could easily connect with Divine?

He was a dedicated follower of a system of traditional culturally based religiosity that taught dedication to the guru and austerity in activity as a means to reach God. Therefore, he did not "cheat" anyone, neither did he do something he thought was wrong. He did what he thought was best at the time he did it. That it is not the best thing now for us is a value judgment we make due to our differing experiences and tastes. Because we have a different experience and we no longer feel bound by a tradition, we have chosen to see things differently. That it works well for us and for others is our good fortune.

Therefore, there is no need to start making comparisons to other traditions (including the one that Prabhupada represented) as it would be comparing apples and oranges. These traditions were in different times and they acted appropriately to their time and situation. We are in

another time and situation, and we are people who have lived through certain traditions and have moved on from them.

Many things in a simpler society were extremely different than modern times. For example, the social interactions and lifestyles of the people in the Mahabharata were very different than those of Indians in the last millennium. Whether it is better or worse is something each of us will decide according to our own experiences.

I hope this helps.

I am trying to demonstrate the manner in which Lord Caitanya embraced people and made them spiritually conscious. By tapping into that energy, everyone is sharing the same experience He wished them to have. From this viewpoint, what I am doing is an extension of the tradition of Gaudiya spirituality as it concentrates as its essence the act of Lord Caitanya's mercy. All I am asking people is to accept His love, embrace His love, and experience His love. Everything I teach is meant to bring us to the point where we let go of all those things that prevent us from getting to this point. In other words, I am (more or less successfully) preparing the ground for someone to accept the embrace (and thus be embraced) by Lord Caitanya. This is causeless and does not depend on prior acts, acceptance of a guru, austerities, or anything else.

Very few people can understand this or what I am doing. It is rather subtle, I do not advertise it as such, neither have I ever explained this in public. I wanted that people would figure it out for themselves. ISKCON devotees have little desire to understand what I am doing. My situation would create too many questions were it examined neutrally. Devotees have a hard enough life and they need to remain in a peaceful ignorance due to their limited capacity to see beyond that which they are supposed to see according to their conceptions of what is their own tradition. I have to live with this. Such is life.

Thank you for your answer. It soothed me a little. But I don't understand why did this tradition, which Prabhupada presented, do connection with Divine such difficult cause , after all , this was also the tradition of Lord Chaitanya? It seems to me that any good thing when it becomes approached for masses of people gets some protected device which does most attractive part of it hardly accessed. Therefore some person should be who gives most essence.

Every spiritual tradition goes through revisions and evolves as do all things over time. Sometimes jumping to a "final" conclusion (if that is even possible to state) is not the optimal way in which a tradition can grow or assist people. Sometimes it has to go through its natural growing pains and process. Further, it is obvious that not everyone will understand or want to participate in this growth and amongst then many will declare this is not growth but a tumor. Each person has to deal with this situation according to their own understanding.

I can only think that this growth that we have shared is a natural extension of the original tradition, a required modification for us according to what we are as people. From this point of view there is no need to wonder about why Prabhupada did or did not do anything. He did

what he did as that was the best he could do at the time. And this was better than anyone else at that time, believe me!

How looks the afterlife space

by kamalamala1 » Fri May 01, 2009 7:16 am

Dear Hari

Also appeared another question.

There must be nature in afterlife space .

I understand that there millions of different spaces of existence and it is so vast and different, but still.....

Are there spring ,summer and winter kind seasons?

Is there growing older process?

Rains and snow.and so on in some way.?

Can you give at least some hints how does it look ?

Re: How looks the afterlife space

by Hari » Sun May 10, 2009 1:31 pm

It depends on the space you find yourself!

I am not sure what you mean by afterlife. If you mean between lives then that space would not have seasons and so on. If you mean a place you created after death to deal with something you did not fully process in life, or as a result of being too attached to a particular person or situation, then I imagine you would create the appropriate nature. If you mean some spiritual realm as in Vaikuntha then I suppose the weather is always perfect. If you mean some heavenly planet in this universe then again the weather in heaven is perfect. And if you mean the next life then the weather is whatever it is in that life or in that place.

Is rain less than perfect? Are clouds less than perfect? Are cool nights, or sunny days, or normal weather patterns less than perfect? They all have their place within the context of moods and ambience. Extremes of temperature, wind, drought or flood, and so on are not nice and therefore would not be found in heavenly atmospheres. This does not mean they are not there in some other afterlife scenario that is less than heavenly.

I am not sure what you mean. Are there more possibilities than I mentioned here?

Neglecting nature= neglecting God

by kamalamala1 » Fri May 01, 2009 7:06 am

Dear Hari

When we are observing the nature we find it is so beautiful so attractive amazing and encouraging it is the real stimuli of life.

And if we observe it we can really feel the presence of divine without scriptures without temples and even without real trainings and so on, as the aborigines do that.

I think that definitely the Divine much present in the nature

then in any place in any book, only we should have eyes to see it.

And even in Scriptures there are a way [usually ignored by some sects] to see divine as Vishvarupa

Many groups considering the nature as maya- illusion, so they ignoring it as a tool of spiritual progress.[Although i really cannot understand how one can ignore the core of the existence and hope that he can get the benefit from it]

They are definitely must be nature in other dimension in other world and it must be really beautiful and attractive isn't it.

And my question is if one doesn't appreciate the nature here, where is the chance to appreciate the nature there ,and if one doesn't appreciate the space where he exist then how he will exist there peacefully and comfortably .?

Re: neglecting nature= neglecting God
by Hari » Sun May 10, 2009 1:22 pm

Your question is your answer as your question is rhetorical. Therefore it does not require a reply from me. Yet...

Nature is filled with life. There are living beings of all sizes, shapes and species in nature. Appreciating nature is appreciating life. If you love life, you love nature. Those who see life for what it is can see spirit everywhere in nature. Perhaps some of those who we consider primitive are more in touch with spirit than some of us who are modern. Yet, in all societies there are out of balance people who are cruel, insensitive and exploitative.

Those who are sensitive to the wonder of life and its all pervasive manifestation as nature will find spirit everywhere they look. And in this they will see the divine everywhere. Is this not a superb way to see?

Being enough and complete

by Sati » Sun Apr 26, 2009 10:19 pm

Dear Hari!

In your broadcasts and seminars you very often say about feeling ourselves complete and enough because we are already complete and enough as spiritual beings of Divine nature. In your lecture called "The concept of completeness" you say that all we need - is to change our perception on ourselves and the world. I was exploring my past and doing psychotherapy but it seems to me that although everyone has his own experience and traumas of the past that lead to this feeling of lack of love or money or whatever - its quite useless and impossible to find all causes that are deep in the past or even in our past lives experiences. Do we really need to heal all this enormous traumas and s.o or can we just accept that yes we have all it baggage but it doesn't matter any more because "everybody has problems so I am fine with all of them"(c)?

So as you also like to say that the spiritual process is the easy way - so it must be some easy way of changing the perception. So what is this way? Can there be some special meditation on being enough and complete and feeling so or just the relaxing and feeling our being (in "I am" meditation for example" is already enough? Or it is just an everyday practice that comes as a habit? I mean the mental knowledge that I am enough and complete and the feeling of completeness are different things - I want this knowledge to become a constant feeling that can be a basis of my inner peace and the capacity to be of service to others
Otherwise every practice turns into trying to become enough and complete (and if I already am enough and complete then I don't need any practice - just to relax and connect to the divine or anyone I want and to express the love that I am by being of service).

Re: Being enough and complete
by Hari » Thu Apr 30, 2009 10:07 pm

It is a bit simplistic to make a statement that begins with, "all you need is," and if I have done that, I apologize. Life is a complex combination of factors such as our past experiences, our genes, our stress, our traumas, our ever-changing states of consciousness, our biochemistry and so on. Each of us has to deal with the ever-changing state of our existence at each and every moment, and doing this properly in the context of what is relevant and useful is a major task. Therefore, one should avoid saying, "all you need is!" Rather, one can easily say, "This thing is essential and can help you enormously in your effort."

I am very confident that all the tools you require are available to you. You have also stated the essence when you said:

(and if I already am enough and complete then I don't need any practice - just to relax and connect to the divine or anyone I want and to express the love that I am by being of service). I am not a fan of repressing emotions, fears or desires, yet at the same time one should avoid expressing anything and everything that appears in one's consciousness as this would be counterproductive to our interests and the interests of those around us.

We have to deal with our situations step by step, day by day, in a manner that we can accept. There is no quick fix for life.

Re: Being enough and complete
by Sati » Thu Apr 30, 2009 11:51 pm

Thank you, Hari, for your answer!

I also apologize that I must have understood your words in a too simplistic way and thus made you apologizing for what you didn't mean

Hari wrote:

We have to deal with our situations step by step, day by day, in a manner that we can accept. There is no quick fix for life.

But what do you mean by fixing life? Is it same way of changing the perception?
How would I understand that this is a "spot on my way" where I don't have to try to "fix" life any more and just accept what is and what I am, doesn't matter what happens and what I think about myself. Where is the difference between my negative judgement about myself (when I just need self acceptance) and faults that need to be cured?
What is the difference between trying to fix the insufficiency that is a cause of trauma and simple greed - never getting enough, wanting more and more?
The trauma can and should be cured but the greed cant be cured - it can be only stopped by will.

I am also sure I have all tools. You give more then enough tools and million thanks to you for that. I am not sure I have a proper understanding of how to use them and I want to be sure that I am fixing that needs to be fixed instead of trying to become somebody and good enough to get some " spiritual goods" instead of being of service with what I am. Am I "broken tool" or just "lazy hands"?

Where is a difference between normal emotion that comes and is expressed (like a sadness, for example, that is natural in some situation and the sadness that better should not be expressed

and can be harmful for others? If we always express only joy and happiness it looks like idiotism sometimes also ...

Re: Being enough and complete
by Hari » Fri May 01, 2009 7:33 pm

A "quick-fix" is an idiom that refers to something that will magically cure all things at once. It is not that we have to fix life. I meant there is no quick way or one method for evolution.

dharma artha kama moksha or artha kama dharma moksha

by kamalamala1 » Mon Feb 09, 2009 5:30 pm

Dear Hariji

Few weeks ago i just was wandering about dharma artha kama moksha this different stages, or times of life.

I figured out that the way it was presented in ISCON time, that first is coming Dharma then Artha then Kama then Moksha doesn't resonate with my understanding, and i find out that many commentators of vedic literature have another opinion. I myself also figured out that more natural and proper that first coming Artha the education the skills of becoming economically strong and then Kama and then responsibility- Dharma and then Moksha, and Dharma at all doesn't mean religion or even spiritual practices but responsibility in general it can be responsibility in sake of family in sake of country and in sake of Gods and Supreme also. But not only responsibility in in sake of Gods and Supreme. I think that it is natural that children's just learning different skills then getting enjoyment then taking care for dependents and Gods and then Moksha.

Since when they are passing the first stages artha and kama and they are mature persons they really able to take responsibility in sake others, otherwise how could little children's take care of others. And if they under the control of elders they are forced to chant mantras or pray or any kind of different activities it is not Dharma in real meaning of this ward since children's because of there dependence not able to really take responsibility.

Although i am not saying it is bad to teach them all that things. But it is not Dharma.

It is mainly Artha skills even in spiritual activities. And in general even in English the ward art is scils also.

And also if we analyze the different stages of life then educational time is more artha the household life is more kama and dharma and vanaprastha and sanyasa is Moksha .

And also since most of population doing things not because they think what is proper but doing things more because of natural forces {mainly the desire for enjoyment} ,let say it is much natural that parents thinking how to teach there children's so that they will be able to become economically strong for be ready for hard life struggle and children's also want to become strong and be capable to enjoy which means Kama and then when they enjoy they getting children's and becoming more mature and detached and ready to take responsibility which means Dharma.

All this seems very natural no need to even preach about it.

So it is my understanding.

Please tell your opinion about this issue it is very interesting for me to hear what do you think about this issue.

Much love

Re: dharma artha kama moksha or artha kama dharma moksha

by Hari » Wed Mar 18, 2009 3:51 pm

For the sake of those who don't understand the meanings of the words you've used, let us define them. Dharma is usually defined as religiosity, however I would modify this to mean "the duties that are natural to one in life," or in other words, one's capacity and inclination to work. Artha refers to the act of economic development, or stated simply, earning money for one's livelihood. Kama is often thought of as sense gratification, but I would modify this to mean "attaining pleasurable experiences including those normally connected to interpersonal relations, the attainment of goals, and other activities related to feeling good." Moksha refers to liberating oneself from ignorance and the attainment of awareness of spirit including the goal of ascension into a spiritual realm.

Considering this, educating oneself in the duties specific to one's physical and mental capacities, including comprehending the available set of opportunities, seems to be the very first priority. Without knowing who you are and what you can accomplish in life, or even more importantly without recognizing your desires, capabilities, and capacities, one will not be able to engage efficiently in the process of maintaining one's family or any kind of economic development. I understand that many people engage in work without really being aware of their potential, but I don't think the advice given through the varnasrama system would tolerate allowing people to go through their lives in ignorance. The enlightened ideal of work is to engage in a work compatible with you as a person.

Therefore I would say the order in which these stages of life were presented makes sense. Obviously any proper educational system would attempt to understand the needs of the students and adapt the curriculum accordingly, but unfortunately this is not often the case and therefore stating that it must be done seems to be correct.

Re: dharma artha kama moksha or artha kama dharma moksha
by kamalamala1 » Thu Mar 19, 2009 7:12 am

Your point about ,that in vedic culture the education in spiritual topics is the first priority made me think more.

I agree with that .

So trying to understand all that i wrote to you and your answer i came to the conclusion that Dharma is first in the line in the meaning of priorities and it doesn't depend on ashramas ,or stages of life,in other wards in any stage of life the priority is Dharma,and the most important part of Dharma is spiritual education, so it is the priority.

But then appearing more questions one can get really spiritual education in Kama also since life educating more then anything.

What is real spiritual education anyway,?

I am asking it since one can all life learn in his home or office books and religions but the other can live life full of extreme experiences and without theoretically knowing more then the first one really become more educated.

And also if dharma artha kama moksa placed in the line of priorities then why artha should be more important then moksa and kama and why moksha should be last.

Please tell your opinion

Re: dharma artha kama moksha or artha kama dharma moksha
by Hari » Thu Mar 19, 2009 1:18 pm

First of all, I do not think these four items are prioritized in a list that goes from less important to more important. They are all important in life. Therefore these are stages that people deal

with. Understanding one's role or duty within society is always important. And all of it is an education. You learn how to live according to your particular qualities in the context of the ethic of being a responsible human being, you use that knowledge to become prosperous, you use that prosperity to enjoy, and when you become aware of your essence, you evolve further spiritually and embrace your spiritual being.

Neither did I say that an education in spiritual topics is first. I said that educating children according to their nature is the initial step. We have qualities and desires, capacities and potential. Education is meant to bring out these natural qualities and facilitate our using them in life by giving us the tools to accomplish those tasks or works that characterize us. In a society that is based in religiosity, this will naturally be done in a spiritual context to strengthen the morals and character of the individuals. It is a practical education centered in a spiritual ethic. If you strip away the cultural cloak within which all religion rests, you have a universal spiritual ethic that guides work.

Your questions are based on your understanding of the topic from scriptural sources and you are answering your own questions based on your conclusions attained through your having digested these topics. My comments are addressing the definitions of the words and the relevance of these concepts for all people at all times regardless of their spiritual beliefs.

Re: dharma artha kama moksha or artha kama dharma moksha
by kamalamala1 » Thu Mar 19, 2009 6:49 pm

Thanks

Today I also realized that there no question of priorities.

Artha dharma kama moksa going through our whole life.Sometime more some time less/
The question arrises when i read some comments to scriptures where this terms was put in the priorities line it bewildered me since i also tried to refer to this terms in there real meaning. In that comments i couldn't just figure out why childhood period of time should be more dharma. {maybe there are less artha and kama in that period.}Then again when one is in educational process for gaining wealth is it artha or dharma,i can try to answer myself maybe it is both. Anyway the point became much clearer.

Thank you

Re: dharma artha kama moksha or artha kama dharma moksha
by kamalamala1 » Fri Mar 20, 2009 7:02 am

Your comments helped me a lot to really figure out the subject
i also realized that that for people with different inclinations they are different priorities.
For yogis and advanced spiritualists Moksa the priority and then Dharma then artha then Kama
For Intellectuals [Braminical people} and administrators{Ksatriyas} Dharma is priority then artha then Kama then Moksa ,or dhrama moksa artha kama
For business people Artha priority then Kama then dharma then Moksa,or artha
dhrma kama moksa
Anyway Dharma is main priority since everyone choosing his priorities according to his nature it means dharma

That is why in different scriptures it is written in different lines.Since they address to different people.

Thanks again

About love and relationships

by Nanda-grama » Thu Feb 26, 2009 9:11 pm

Dear Hari!

My girlfriend and I discussed about the nature of love and relationships, and she asked me to ask you her question (she doesn't know English and doesn't want to call her name).

So, she came to a conclusion that it is very simply to fall in love with somebody because every person when he naturally and free displays himself becomes very attractive as his spiritual energy comes to light by this way and it is attractively. And, most likely, so called compatible people are who creates one for another such natural and safe atmosphere in which they can free display themselves and by such way they continue to be attractive one for another constantly.

But there is so called related souls and strong attraction between them exists independently on what they are compatible or not. And such relationships bring too much pain, but at the same time it helps person to grow very much. In some relationships a man decides to open or close his heart, to love independently on circumstances or shrink into oneself. Most likely, all had such experience of relationships in their life, and my girlfriend also passed across it.

She asks is it possible that every person can have related and simultaneously suitable for him soul somewhere or it is a rarity? And what can person do in order to attract such soul in his life?

I want to add my question. When I associated with my angels they told me that the condition of love is natural condition of soul. But usually man in his life doesn't be in such spiritual condition, and when other person evokes this feeling by some qualities which intensify it as a lens, this natural condition of soul becomes intensified and concentrated because it is focused on one object, and man feels inspiration, dizziness and happiness. He is in spiritual condition. But usually man loves by all his being and sexual desire, desire to associate and be together - adds itself to feeling of love, and then if circumstances are unfavorable for it - misfortune comes. My question is: in such case is it better to clean this feeling from other feelings and desires and to love only by heart's chakra without participation of other chakras? And is it real not stipulated, spiritual love? Or is some sense in existence of other chakras and desires and is this problem in incorrect choice of the partner?

Re: about love and relationships
by Hari » Wed Mar 18, 2009 4:04 pm

It seems to me that your question has been translated through an online translation system. Therefore it is very confusing.

It is not that I'm trying to avoid answering your question but I find it very hard to even understand it. According to what I did understand, I think the answer to your question is something quite simple. I do not think it makes sense to consider having a relationship with someone that you can not have a relationship with. Psychologists might analyze the desire to have a relationship that can never be fulfilled as being a manifestation of a fear of relationships or a manifestation of one's low self-esteem. I would ask someone who insisted on attempting to have a relationship with another person who was either not interested or incapable of reciprocating why they are insisting on doing something they must well know is impossible?

Why would your friend place herself in such a contradictory situation unless she felt that she did not deserve loving relationships or even that she was worthy of being loved? Trying to attain an impossible relationship is an obvious indicator that something is extremely wrong. Therefore I would suggest that she examines her motivation carefully and tries to understand what she wants in life. Without such deep introspection she will continue to suffer. It does not matter if blame can be placed upon the non-reciprocating party, for even though it may give

some mental relief, it does not address the real issue. The real issue is the lack of capacity to accept the relationships that are available and have the potential to be attained.

I feel this is the answer to the mood of this question.

!

by Nanda-grama » Wed Mar 18, 2009 4:29 pm

Thank you.

Dying

by Akhila L » Fri Jun 24, 2005 11:11 pm

Warm greetings for You, Hari!

Now, to the question.

In my work I have to deal almost daily with people who are dying, out of older or cancer or other tragedies.

I wonder what is their real destination, what are they going to experience when they come across the border, do they meet their relatives? is it a positive experience for them to die although all the others lament?

Then, why do we have to die ? Why is it a part of our existence? What is the meaning behind? Personally, I hate dying and I suffer when I see people dying.

I have, of course, some background from the old ISKCON-times, but I think that this basic question for me was never discussed in a non-dogmatic and open way in its structures.

In other words, what is it that has some persistent value for us when we die, what is not dying?

Regards,
Akhila L

by Hari » Wed Jun 29, 2005 4:35 pm

Dear Akhilaji

I recommend that you read two books by Michael Newton, Journey of Souls and Destiny of Souls, for these books give you some detailed glimpses into the scenario that can be experienced at death. What is written there does not seem to be the complete and total understanding of what happens after death for there are other descriptions from other sources which amplify our knowledge of what happens.

It would be dishonest of me to say I have no personal experience of this realm. As I am dedicated to sharing my experiences, I shall relate some of the more essential elements of these experiences with you. These same experiences are available to you under special circumstances that you can self-induce or be led into by those who are qualified to assist you. When you meditate for longer periods of time and intend to have your questions answered, different revelations come to you which give you some pieces of the puzzle. Hypnotherapy can be very useful to opening up your locked up awareness and clearing up the remaining pieces. In some cases this is shocking; in others it is relieving.

Dying is a very individual process. How one departs from the body plays an important role in what comes next. As there are unlimited scenarios, I shall try to describe the most common as briefly as I can.

Those who leave their bodies in full consciousness without any baggage, attachments, pride or inimical feelings towards others in this world can directly attain whatever destination they aim for. Let me use the example of Sridhar Swami, my old friend and companion. His example is the best I know of at present, not because he had the right destination in mind (I am not bringing that into question here), but because he executed his departure in an almost flawless fashion and thus this example can help others who wish to gain any particular destination they wish. In his life, he was an honest seeker, a person who questioned deeply and was not afraid of public opinion. He had his grip on truth and what he believed and had openly declared his desire for his ultimate destination. In other words, he was very clear about what he wanted and how he was to get it. His intention was not born of some ideal and he was not clinging to faith. He knew what he wanted so deeply that nothing and no one could shake him from it.

He knew he was going to die for a long time. He had many forays into near death and many close calls. Although he did his very best to get healed, he knew it was hopeless. Let us leave out of this discussion the deep-rooted death wish that haunted him as he felt there was no place for him in this world of misery, as he put it, for although this unnecessary death wish could have been the cause for his early departure from this world, he accepted it and therefore we should not consider it -- as the question was about leaving this world, not staying in it. Staying in this world was not his strong point and his example was not always exemplary (but he did really damn good anyway!), as he would be the first to point out. Yet his honesty in pointing this out and his fearlessness in discussing himself was his strength. Here we see a contradiction: a person who lived to die, yet died in a really fine manner. So let us examine the fine manner of his death and leave aside the difficulty he faced in life.

However he felt about his own life or the world within which he lived, he was a fine man who loved very, very deeply. I miss him so much that it is hard to write this, but I feel inspired to do so.

In his last years he endeavored to go everywhere in the world and see every single last person with whom he might have had some entanglement or some bad feelings. He resolved each and every one of these potential stumbling blocks with his openness, his honesty and his huge heart. He never avoided the pain that naturally comes when you have to retrace your past and right the things you felt you did wrong. By so doing he voided the slate of karma that could have held him back in this world and became free from the negative elementals that others could have placed on him out of their own twisted understanding of life. Remember, he was aiming at complete and total liberation from this world. Simultaneously, he shared with all he met his love and they grew from that. Together he and those he met grew and learned to appreciate the love that we can share which is all there really is in this world of value.

I will never forget his visits to our house. He did not avoid poking fun at himself since he did not take himself seriously. However, this was not done in a self-effacing manner; rather, he saw the humor in his situation and was not afraid of diminishing his position by pointing it out to others. He was a dedicated person, convinced of what he felt was the truth, yet ready to embrace you despite differences of opinion.

When he felt it was time to die, he went to that place where he felt most comfortable and safe and absorbed himself in the energy of Lord Caitanya. Yet he never lost his sense of humor, never took himself all that seriously, and never tried to claim any position in the future either historically or socially. He truly severed all relations with this world for his goal in life was to return to the place he called home.

I was meditating on him as he died and I requested Radha to give me a vision of what happened to him. Out of love for him I will share this with you. When he left his body, he let out a scream Hari Hari Bol and raced back to the spiritual world with a power that left me breathless. And he never returned [update: seems like he wanted to do more service here]. Simply marvelous.

Others leave a long trail of entanglement when they die. They leave their body and are immediately struck by all the things they should do before they can move on. They visit their relatives, one after another, and try to console them and give them strength by telling them they are alright. Some feel their presence and some not. They go to those who they now see were victimized by them in some way or other and unsuccessfully try to make amends. They clearly see how they did many things wrong, yet they can do nothing to change it. This period lasts for some time, more or less depending on the circumstances of the person. It can either be a few seconds or much longer. Some remain until they can be disengaged from their situation by powers of good.

It is here, in this in-between stage, that a few persons become confused by their desire. Some create a world of their own making that appeals to them. It can include persons who have died previously who they still wished to live with, or be in places where they have warm and comforting memories. They create their own reality and live within it for as long as they wish. This is a static situation that requires higher intervention to transform.

Those who have no attraction to creating an alternate reality are called upwards when they have finished visiting those they needed to see one last time and they move towards the light. It is called the light because it is a very bright place that blinds one to its features. When they get there they are usually greeted by a person or a group. When they have undergone a great trauma, they are usually met by one person who takes them to a healing place. When the trauma is exceptionally great, they may find themselves surrounded by a group of healers who transmit healing energy to them until they are brought out of that circle when they are ready.

Those who did not die within such a traumatic state and those who have calmed down after a traumatic death are met by persons who are within their group of loved ones. They greet them warmly, embrace them and explain to them their present situation. As the mind clears of the previous life, they feel comfortable in their familiar surroundings and bond again with those they love and who love them.

They usually go through a period of reviewing their previous lives. They see their faults and the consequences of their choices. They are commended on the good they do, and are often surprised at how little things they did not consider important were of such great value. They understand what they needed to learn in their last life and how well they went through their task of growth.

We are not forced to accept the situations of our present lives as a result of our previous actions. We choose to accept these situations when we see the necessity to do so. The pain and struggle we face are part of our tasks that assist us to leave off unwanted habits and actions that do us no good and harm others. We voluntarily accept these situations because we know they will help us grow. We have the choice to either go through a tough series of events in our next lives or to take it more or less easier till we gain the strength to go through the tougher experiences we need to evolve. We share in designing our fate with our guides who suggest paths we could accept and the consequences of accepting these paths.

When we are ready we take birth again in that place and time best suited to our accomplishing our tasks in our next chapter of our evolutionary journey.

What does not die is our fully conscious essence which carries with it our ideal of what we can be and what we wish to be.

by Akhila L » Wed Jun 29, 2005 8:15 pm

Dear Hari!

Thank you for this extensive and detailed reply.

I have actually read these two books and found them very inspiring, not only because of author's dedication and scrupulosity. They've changed a lot in my understanding of the process of dying.

In your reply I found a very interesting, if not revolutionizing passage:

"We are not forced to accept the situations of our present lives as a result of our previous actions. We choose to accept these situations when we see the necessity to do so. The pain and struggle we face are part of our tasks that assist us to leave off unwanted habits and actions that do us no good and harm others. We voluntarily accept these situations because we know they will help us grow. "

So far when I heard someone talking of or explaining the law of karma the obvious point was that we are forced to suffer/enjoy due to our past deeds without possibility of changing it. "You have to suffer to burn out your karma". You cannot change your karma, this is forced upon you etc.

In this "new" perspective our world is more an educational institution than a prison with a differentiated grade of suffering for "our sins". How come that this concept is almost absent in the traditional religions?

Another important point in what you said is that our fathers, mothers, wives, husbands etc are not only a temporary karmic product of one life but rather close and almost eternal (?) associates that we should not ignore and neglect but respect knowing that we are really a close family.

When I think about it now I feel we missed an essential point some years ago in Old Good Times...

Now I will touch another problem connected with dying.

The immortal or endless nature of one's existence seems to me (as I try to imagine this) as petrifying as the perspective of terminating the present life. Is it this feeling that lies behind the will to stop existence by becoming void or one? Is it a universal phenomenon or individual? Is the cure for it universal or individual?

Thank you for Sridhar Swami's story, very inspiring one.

by Hari » Wed Jul 06, 2005 1:23 pm

Now I will touch another problem connected with dying.

The immortal or endless nature of one's existence seems to me (as I try to imagine this) as petrifying as the perspective of terminating the present life. Is it this feeling that lies behind the will to stop existence by becoming void or one? Is it a universal phenomenon or individual? Is the cure for it universal or individual?

I cannot speak for all who have such feelings, but if I had horrible problems in a life which was mainly characterized by suffering I would certainly be relieved if all the suffering were to totally cease after my death. At least I could look forward to that day with eagerness. I might create a philosophy where cessation of pain was linked with ending all existence.

However, it is also possible that after death the pain stops but life goes on in another way. Therefore there is no need to annihilate all life to get peace.

If your experience with life is a good one, or generally not so bad, then you would be more encouraged to think that life shall continue.

I think these principles are universal but are individually applied according to the circumstances of a particular lifetime. As far as a cure goes I would suggest that the best cure for a troublesome life is a life that is not so troublesome, or even better, a life filled with love.

Love in life and love of life are intimately connected.

Eternal life - what to do?

by Akhila L » Sun Jul 31, 2005 12:52 am

Hari wrote:

If your experience with life is a good one, or generally not so bad, then you would be more encouraged to think that life shall continue.

I think these principles are universal but are individually applied according to the circumstances of a particular lifetime. As far as a cure goes I would suggest that the best cure for a troublesome life is a life that is not so troublesome, or even better, a life filled with love.

Love in life and love of life are intimately connected.

Thank you.

The problem that I wanted to discuss deals with the fact that we often try to imagine an eternal alternative of the life we are experiencing now.

"What am I going to do when I (hopefully) regain my eternal status ?"

"Shall I dance with angels all the time, shall I pray or shall I watch TV without being disrupted? Shall I have family (eternal?) or what? Shall I play with God (Krishna) or shall I be a tree on Goloka (frankly, terrible alternative in my eyes, maybe I should place my bet somewhere else?"

What is the eternal or real existence beyond death in fact? Is it so differentiated that you (any kind of an established teacher, generally) cannot describe it or you don't know and try to cover it with complicated terms? Why should someone use terms from old scriptures to illustrate this (e.g. vedic scriptures) and not from our closest reality? And do the scriptures encompass the whole truth?

by Hari » Wed Aug 03, 2005 10:22 pm

Your question goes to the heart of the belief system that many hold. I have addressed this question extensively in a lecture, but I cannot remember which one. If anyone out there remembers which one, please tell us in this forum since I do not wish to repeat something that was already dealt with in lecture format as my time is limited.

Your question is a good one, but it is answered in another place.

by Jiva » Mon May 29, 2006 1:39 pm

Hari wrote:

In his life, he was an honest seeker, a person who questioned deeply and was not afraid of public opinion. He had his grip on truth and what he believed and had openly declared his desire for his ultimate destination. In other words, he was very clear about what he wanted and how he was to get it. His intention was not born of some ideal and he was not clinging to faith. He knew what he wanted so deeply that nothing and no one could shake him from it.

Dear Hari!

I have got something for me after reading this topic. I have understood that if I die now it will not be the same as Shridhara Swami did. I have no clear idea about the truth, about the final destination. I have no clear idea about something at all, I can not define the percentage of my confidence in something, except one thing, I really want to live forever (not to die, not to disappear). I want to live in a society of beautiful people, associate with them on unselfish base, constantly extending our relationships. I think it is Sat Chit Ananda of the spiritual world. When I have looked inside myself I realized that I need only it, I could not to wish something specific to me. If I imagine that I already have all of it, I feel myself very happy. What do You think, is it a goal for me? And what could I expect in the future? How can I to get closer to my dream?

by Hari » Thu Jun 01, 2006 8:20 pm

You can either say you want something called THIS or you can say you want something that describes what THIS is without calling it that. They are the same. You can say you want the spiritual world, vaikuntha, sat-cit-ananda, or any other terminology that refers to a goal, or you could say you want to live in a place where there is love, peace, beauty, harmony and so on. You would be saying the same thing in either case. From this point of view, you are clear about what you want and where you wish to find it.

If you reach out for your dream, you have a better chance of attaining it than if you did not reach out. Seen from another point of view, however, it is not certain that transforming your consciousness in this life into some ideal for the next will get you there or that it even exists in the form you imagined. One can say with certainty that transforming your consciousness into the ideal required to attain such an elevated destination is the best way of spending your time in this life, for you will already taste the results of your efforts. When you do that successfully, you will see that the there you are looking for is also here, for you have transformed your consciousness to resonate according to that divine harmony. At that time, the here and the there of it all cease to be important. In fact, there is a good chance that the there one thinks to attain might not at all be what one thought when one gets there.

Yes, I have esoteric perception of this and also have been told of this phenomenon by those who after departing their body in a blaze of pure glory had to adjust to the initial shock of the transition and rapidly adjust their conceptions, their perception and their expectations. One guru even wanted this told to his disciples so they would not be shaken by what they found,

but I would not do so as I did not wish to be part of that person's life in any way. I am not so keen to get involved in such controversial issues, especially when I am speaking with those who are convinced of what they read or hear from persons they accept as authorities.

I do not wish to discourage you or anyone from attaining the situation of your dreams, but I wish to modify those dreams to avoid disappointment. Let's look at it another way: if we have a clearer conception of what we are heading for, we will better prepare ourselves to optimize the situation when we get there. If we are somewhat dreamy about the destination (dare we say, overly romanticizing it) we tend to be a bit unprepared for the circumstances that manifest after our transition.

In your case, I feel you would be better off to continue to skip suggestive terminology and work towards transforming your consciousness to the ideal you have. This will probably assist you towards a smooth transition to the other side and empower you to rapidly take more effective steps towards your attainable goal in that realm. You will also be more satisfied with what you get, for you do not have expectations that exceed your capacity. Expectations are all right -- after all they are an essential part of our motivation -- but expectations in this life that exceed our evolutionary capacity lead to disappointment.

The focused development towards our goal should manifest throughout life. I know that it seems to be really focused when we are gradually nearing death and excluding all activity other than our preparation for it, but in many cases this later or last stage of evolution seems far more significant to us (or those around us) than it is when seen from a higher perspective. I don't mean this last sentence to be a critique against utilizing your remaining time to optimize your transition; rather, I mean it as an encouragement to not wait till that late stage, for the power of that stage is not as significant as we might think. I know there are those who were at the bedside of great personalities as they were dying, but no one can declare with certainty that they knew of the inner development or the post-transition situation of anyone. Therefore I suppose I am simply warning those who are overly confident of their destinations, and encouraging the generic development of spirituality and divinely harmonious consciousness throughout all stages of life.

Re:
by harsi » Mon Oct 20, 2008 8:48 pm

Hari wrote:

The focused development towards our goal should manifest throughout life...

I know there are those who were at the bedside of great personalities as they were dying, but no one can declare with certainty that they knew of the inner development or the post-transition situation of anyone. Therefore I suppose I am simply warning those who are overly confident of their destinations, and encouraging the generic development of spirituality and divinely harmonious consciousness throughout all stages of life.

One week ago on a sunny Sunday afternoon I was together with my wife Marina at the bedside of her dear mother, Margareta, as she lay dying. It was in the hospital in Iasi in Romania. One week before, in the middle of the night, we moved her there with an ambulance. Since a few month my wife and her father took care of her in their home. Due to an advanced stage of diabetes and liver disease, her body was almost immobile and in a very unhealthy condition. In this night she almost fell unconscious and we called the ambulance which came together with an emergency doctor. They immediately tested the blood and found out that the level of glycemic in her blood reached a life threatening level. After an injection with that substance she indeed within one minute or so reached her consciousness again and was communicating with

us as if nothing happened. I travelled from Germany by bus two days before to visit her, my wife and her family.

The female physician of the emergency ambulance told us that the nourishment for the cells in the brain is this glycemia. If the level of this chemical substance reaches a critical level in the blood the brain starts to stop its functions. That reminded me of Krishna's words in the Bhagavad-gita (18.61), who states that the living entity is seated as on a machine made of material energy.

The last wish of mother Margareta was to die at her home in her accustomed surroundings and we arranged already with the doctors of the hospital to take her home the next day. I remember the last words she spoke to me while being moved from the hospital room, she was staying since a few days, to the emergency room of the clinic, since her situation became over night very critical, I was holding her hands and she told me whispering "I am going home..." My father-in-law, Constantin, became this morning very restless, as if feeling the call of his beloved wife, and went accompanied by me, without being called by phone by anyone from the hospital, very early in the morning to the clinic.

Mother Margareta was a very pious woman. At the time she was more healthy I could often, at my visits to their home in Iasi, in the early morning listen to her praying to the Lord in her room, with folded hands staying on her knees before beautiful icons of Holy Mary and Jesus Christ. In the tradition of the Orthodox Christian faith she was devoted to, there are certain spiritual beliefs and practices mother Margareta was always very eager to follow. In the night after she died my father-in-law complained to the Lord with tears in his eyes, before this icons in their room, lamenting why she had to die now in this way although she followed so many religious duties in her life. They knew each other since 60 years and were married since 54 years. A very long time. To loose ones loved one 'better half', ones soul mate, after such a long time must be indeed a very traumatic experience.

The apparatus in the hospital connected to her body continued to show, although very slow, as if her heart would still beat. The female doctor said this were the electrical impulses of the medical device, regulating the beating of the heart, she had since a few years in her body. The cardiac pacemaker continued to function due to the power of its battery sending electrical impulses delivered by electrodes contacting the heart muscles. But her heart had stopped beating...

Why am I writing all this? It is because I would like to ask you, dear Hari, if there might be a difference for the journey of the soul to depart from life at a place considered home, in the presence of loved ones, or to die in a place like a hospital where there might be also persons around, like doctors and nurses who seem to be, at least one could have that impression perhaps, not so much emotionally involved or affectionately connected with the dying person - who with a kind of helplessness may consider in the situation of simply doing their job to the best of their abilities and knowledge?

You wrote above in regard to Sridhar Swami: "When he felt it was time to die, he went to that place where he felt most comfortable and safe and absorbed himself in the energy of Lord Caitanya."

Re: Dying
by Hari » Mon Nov 03, 2008 10:21 pm

Although there is no doubt a dying person will feel relatively greater comfort surrounded by familiar faces and places, I cannot say that dying in a hospital would seriously hinder a person from attaining the destination they have earned. After all, the divine beings that assist the

transition from one life to the next are more aware than we of the circumstances within which we depart this world. Everything is always adjusted in the end.

However, when death takes place in a way that is extremely unpleasant, agitated, against our will or even our comprehension, the possibility of our consciousness being overly disoriented or distorted increases radically. This can create a period of confusion for the departed soul. But considering your specific question about your mother-in-law, I do not think that such conditions occur under normal circumstances for those who are aware that they are sick and dying in a hospital.

Since each person is unique and the circumstances of their death similarly unique, I cannot answer your question with a blanket statement.

Re: Dying
by harsi » Fri Nov 07, 2008 11:53 pm

Hari wrote:

Although there is no doubt a dying person will feel relatively greater comfort surrounded by familiar faces and places, I cannot say that dying in a hospital would seriously hinder a person from attaining the destination they have earned. After all, the divine beings that assist the transition from one life to the next are more aware than we of the circumstances within which we depart this world. Everything is always adjusted in the end.

Dear Hari!

I thank you and appreciate your honest and sincere reply. You are mentioning "divine beings that assist the transition from one life to the next," who are they and is it possible for the soul to become aware of their presence after departing from the body?

I was reading today on the Internet about your longtime friend and path companion Jayapataka Swami who is since a few days in the hospital in Mumbai in a very critical health situation. Let us focus our good wishes, our inner healing energy and prayers to the Supreme for his recovery and personal well-being. Info website: www.victoryflag.org

I remember well the time at Gaura Purnima in 1985 I was visiting India, filming with my Super8 movie camera the Parikrama followed by thousands of people, you were leading together around Mayapur and Navadvip, telling us many interesting stories about the places where Sri Caitanya Mahaprabhu performed his pastimes of boyhood and youth and started his sankirtana movement.

The scenes I was filming with my movie camera tend to resemble one in many ways at the descriptions, one can find nowadays published on the Web, about Sri Caitanya and his followers where one can read: "Following Lord Caitanya's chanting, all the devotees reproduced the same sound he chanted. In this way the Lord proceeded, leading the entire party on the strand roads by the bank of the Ganges. When the Lord came to his own ghata, or bathing place, he danced more and more. Then he proceeded to Madhai's ghata. In this way Sri Caitanya Mahaprabhu, the Supreme Lord, who was known as Visvambhara, danced all over the banks of the Ganges. Then he proceeded to Barakona-ghata, then Nagariya-ghata, and, traveling through Ganganagara, reached Simuliya, a quarter at one end of the town. All these places surround Sri Mayapur."

Re: Dying
by Hari » Thu Nov 27, 2008 12:20 am

The beings who assist one to depart from this life are either related to you, or are guides who assist you, or can be angels or others who are concerned about you. They care about you and help you make the transition. Definitely you are aware of them.

The purpose and meaning in life

by harsi » Tue Jul 01, 2008 10:09 pm

Someone wrote on health.yahoo.com "What I care about is sustainable happiness, which comes from having purpose and meaning in life" and Sara wrote recently on Chakra.org, "Krishna gave us life for a reason and He will give help if we try to find our purpose and find a way to live in happiness, using our God given gifts in service to others."

I was thinking and meditating for quite some time about the meaning of this words and find there is a lot of wisdom inside. A life of love and service to others, including the Supreme, can be in my opinion indeed in many ways rewarding to oneself. I think when there is a meaningful way to describe and translate the sanskrit word bhakti, here one could find a hint towards a good understanding of it. The definition as "devotional service" used by some is in my opinion a misnomer which is not really directing one towards an integrating, all-embracing understanding of it. Certainly bhakti connotes devotion, or love, which implies service, an act of assistance or benefit, or that activity which is intended to please the beloved, but should or can regarding this the beloved be just the Supreme?
Dear Hari what is your understanding about it?

What I would like to say is, (I am editing my text again...) if the reason for your life can be understood also in a divine sense, the way you act can also serve a divine purpose. It can be an act of devotion to the Supreme that motivates your service to others.

A certain amount of self-care is also required, being aware that your first duties are to keep your own physical well-being and to keep yourself healthy so that you can be of service. And from that self-care, one can build oneself to the point where one is serving others and especially those whom you are close to, whom you are already obligated to; those whom you have accepted or into whom you have found yourself related to in such a way as to be part of your lives.

Re: The purpose and meaning in life
by Hari » Sat Jul 05, 2008 4:58 pm

Your question contains within it your answer.

I have discussed this topic in depth in two lectures:

Bhakti and Divine Harmony -- 28 January 2006

Devotion -- 11 February 2006

There is one more element to service that supersedes all others and I may of may not have spoken of this in these lectures. We may be eager to serve, to render service, to be of service, or however one phrases the desire to do something good for others, but unless the object of our service truly desires the service we render it is done more to make us feel as if we are doing something meaningful than it is significant to others. I do not refer to service rendered in a business relationship, I mean service offered freely by one person to another in the spirit of being of assistance. When one examines people's motivations it is often apparent that they do

not really want to be served, helped, or assisted. What they really want is strength, self-confidence, approval, appreciation, empathy, and empowerment. Sometimes they become resentful of things we do for them; even worse, they become dependent. Therefore, I feel the only real service one can offer to anyone is to empower them with the tools they need to be what they want in their lives. And it seems this is the desire of God.

The aspects to devotion usually defined in bhakti (hearing, chanting, remembering and so on) do not fit within my idea of being of service but seem to be disciplines or exercises performed to increase one's spiritual awareness and capacity. Ultimately, being a friend to the supreme is not a service for it is an exchange of love. You can call an exchange of love a service, but it is not the best usage of the word and creates more confusion as to what service actually is. Friends certainly do things for each other in the mood of being of service, but simply being a friend is not a service in and of itself unless you are with someone who desperately needs a friend for some reason.

I see many older devotees who are confused as to what is "their service" or how they deal with engagement in a spiritual manner. This becomes worse when they have to engage in money-making activities.

You have opened a vast topic and one that touches upon the essence of life. What am I in relation to the world around me? What am I in relation to the Supreme? What am I? All the lectures I have given are attempts to deal with these critical questions.

Re: The purpose and meaning in life
by harsi » Sun Jul 06, 2008 11:18 pm

Harimedia radio just started playing the song "Bolo Ram". It is such a beautiful song and while reading your reply to my questions to you, my heart became filled with joy while meditating on the deep wisdom of your words.

Hari wrote:

When one examines people's motivations it is often apparent that they do not really want to be served, helped, or assisted. What they really want is strength, self-confidence, approval, appreciation, empathy, and empowerment. Sometimes they become resentful of things we do for them; even worse, they become dependent. Therefore, I feel the only real service one can offer to anyone is to empower them with the tools they need to be what they want in their lives. And it seems this is the desire of God.

I understand now also that in many situations in life one does not really want only to be taught to or be assisted but rather also be understood, feel some empathy and participation regarding ones feelings or emotional situation one is going through. This can in many ways empower one also more to go through life. There is so much wisdom in your statement "Therefore, I feel the only real service one can offer to anyone is to empower them with the tools they need to be what they want in their lives" I can also fully agree with.

Hari wrote:

The aspects to devotion usually defined in bhakti (hearing, chanting, remembering and so on) do not fit within my idea of being of service but seem to be disciplines or exercises performed to increase one's spiritual awareness and capacity.

I know from the past I was so often hearing and reading and also engaging with full confidence in this so called "process of hearing and chanting" and that of "devotional service," always with

the expectation of gaining one day the expected described results... Nowadays I feel so much more happy and fulfilled in my life by just following my inner impulse, (some say intuition, although I don't know if the same is meant) when I feel of doing something for or meditating about the Supreme. Somehow I feel that I am already somewhere and does not really have to prepare and engage myself to reach some eternal destination sometimes in the future. That makes life so much more easier to go through and brings you so much more in harmony with the world around you. And that although I feel pleasure sometimes in reading or hearing about the pastimes related to Radha and Krishna and many other aspects of the Supreme.

But I would not call this service, or a process for making spiritual advancement rather as you wrote so suitable: "Ultimately, being a friend to the supreme is not a service for it is an exchange of love. You can call an exchange of love a service, but it is not the best usage of the word and creates more confusion as to what service actually is."

As if spirituality and spiritual engagement could really be understood in this what I would call a mechanistic approach toward something described in such terms as self realization and spiritual advancement or purification. Its somehow like saying to just press the button of this machine and if you do everything else right you will reach your destination or what you expect to gain out of it without a doubt. It seems that such an approach should give someone the impression that one would follow a kind of scientific method (The Science of Self-realization).

Its interesting also what I found regarding this written on the internet: "There can be no scientific answer to the question why but there can be many scientific answers to the question how. Richard Feynman in The Character of Physical Law relates that when Newton was asked about his theory--"But it doesn't mean anything--it doesn't tell us anything," Newton responded: "it tells you how it moves. That should be enough. I have told you how it moves, not why." It was just this type of cold mechanistic approach that the early Enlightenment skeptics were afraid of. Science had to destroy teleology--the philosophy of purposefulness. In order to do its business, science had to assume that existence has no purpose. Existence just "Is." The proper question for a scientist to ask is not why (a value laden question) but how (a valueless question). " More...

Hari wrote:

I see many older devotees who are confused as to what is "their service" or how they deal with engagement in a spiritual manner. This becomes worse when they have to engage in money-making activities.

I can very well understand this, I went a few years ago through the same situation and confusion. Somehow there comes a time in your life where you are growing out of the stereotyped understanding you were following before and just want to live 'your life' in the society of people in general. Although I would say I like the association of like-minded people.

The question may still be what can help one to increase one's spiritual awareness in life? Although I find you answered this question already by writing:

Hari wrote:

All the lectures I have given are attempts to deal with these critical questions.

Re: The purpose and meaning in life
by harsi » Tue Jul 08, 2008 10:28 pm

I have to admit that I was not fully aware or have forgotten somehow that you have spoken already in depth about this topic so I was listening again to your very interesting lectures and I will try to transcribe them for others to read.

Hari wrote:

I have discussed this topic in depth in two lectures:

Bhakti and Divine Harmony -- 28 January 2006

Devotion -- 11 February 2006

"Today I want to discuss about Bhakti. Its part of what I was speaking of before, or part of my clarification, or definition as it were, of what I am, or what I do. I left ISKCON and all those transformations took place. I tried to make for myself and for others spiritual life very relevant to every individual. Now spiritual life is always been relevant to every individual, spiritual life has always been relevant to me, but there were this other situations which was creating a formidable obstacle to maintaining a rather fluid and open heart to heart connection between people. And as you know we talked about it over the years quite a lot, there has been a lot of shall we say a development, personal development, development of how things are seen, development of how philosophy relate with experience.

And this development, this transformation has addressed issues of organization, of hierarchical organization, of charismatically lead organization, of ways in which people were less important than a group. So a lot of energy in this past years, a lot of the discussions that we have had, a lot of the development we have done has been towards reestablishing the central point of our life which is ourselves. And from that platform of being secure and comfortable with our spiritual essence to reach out in a loving connection to that which is around us. We reached out towards other persons, we reached out towards our family, we have reached out towards our environment, nature of the living entities, and we have reached out towards the higher forces, or the more powerful forces in the universe, towards the realm of the demigods as it were, the realm of the beings who have great power and potency to regulate and administrate within this universe.

We have reached even further beyond towards the supreme source of all power, the supreme source of all energy, the supreme source of all love, the omnipotent, omnipresent Supreme. And I continued to maintain the idea of us being individuals who are individually in our own endeavor, in our own life's, making that effort to connect to the Supreme. Now that's fine and that's good, I don't regret any bid of it, however I feel that it doesn't really represent me totally. And over the last week, various circumstances which quite surprisingly appeared from extremely external sources, have forced me to define myself in a very clear way that anybody can understand. Legal authorities, friends, acquaintances, people who are close to me.

This led me to even create a name for what I think we are doing. To give us a name, something that can be related to by a name, that name being "Divine Harmony". Divine Harmony - I have no idea how you would translate that into Russian. Divine as in divinity and Harmony. So the name, I know that a name is simple a way in which you can relate to something, but as soon as something has a name that implies it exists. So how does it exist? Well we have already defined how we exist - we are in an association. We are in an association of like-minded persons who are interested enough in what we do to do it together, at least every Saturday and amongst you and your own private sessions you do it more often.

So one of the most interesting things about what we do is that we are an organization without organization and I was struggling to try to find out a way to describe that. Now obviously we are organized, what we are doing right now is practically unique in the world, even in this modern extremely advanced Internet age we are doing real time interactive translation that is

broadcast throughout the world to anybody who wishes to be part of it, without using 800 dollars a month conferencing service. And what is extremely interesting about this, is that we have the capacity in our meditations, in our communications as in questions or in comments, to connect with each other in a very real way. We feel the connection, we feel our presence together on our Saturday congregations. So in essence we are a congregation that is organized around this particular broadcasting technology and our capacity to connect to each other in this way.

We are a worldwide congregation of people. And our organization is not an organization of a physical facility, in the sense that there is a centralized organization of that facility, we are not an organization that has a hierarchy, we are an organism. As an organism we are a group of people who formed a body of this organism with Lord Caitanya, Radha and Krishna as the head of this organism. Now the most interesting thing is, that I had a very hard time clarifying this in words, as silly it sounds. There were many reasons why, until I started doing research on the Internet about, what is it called - unincorporated churches. And I ran into the Baptists. This is a group of Christians in America, generally in the southern part but they can be anywhere, who believe amongst, I suppose they have a wide variety of opinions, that it is the individual and not the church which is important. That Christ is the head and that the members are the body, and then I realized its exactly what we are doing that Lord Caitanya and Radha and Krishna, God as it were is the head, and we are the body of this organism.

You see sometimes we think that we are doing something very unique. Well, what we are doing in the broadcasting is very unique, but in reality what we are doing as people, as an organism, is not unique. And it was really refreshing to see somebody else already define it. The refreshing thing was to take help of this other persons, who are already gone through this same kind of struggle, and to adapt it to what I am doing, what we are doing, was a great relief for me. I don't know if you can appreciate how much of a relief it was, it was an enormous relief to finely have a definition that actually fits what we are. I really appreciated the struggle they have gone through in their own history as a religion.

And then I started realizing that you can be a group that have a name, that has an identity, it has a forum, it has a function without falling into the same difficulty of an organization, by being an organism. A living spiritual organism rather than a dead, in the sense of structured organization. So now I have created this, shall we say name Divine Harmony. I was thinking of Temple of Divine Harmony, or Church of Divine Harmony but again we are taking divine harmony and trying to place it within something. So I thought "Divine Harmony," that's fine. And I have registered the domain divineharmony.eu and soon I will put up there texts which are of a different nature than what is of Harimedia.net

On [Harimedia](http://Harimedia.net) what we are doing basically is answering questions, working it out our difficulties, our internal, our personal difficulties. Trying to understand more about our life's and giving a place for downloading this lectures, meditations, music and so on. And I never really felt it appropriate on that site, I'm not sure why, to just simply state my innermost heartfelt feelings as, or even define myself, or therefore define basically what we do here on Saturday. I felt it was just a place to share and to communicate some tools. But on this new series of websites divineharmony.eu, we are going to, I am going to at least, and I'm asking for your help and assistance in doing this, I'm going to state very clearly, not in such details that there is no room to move, but to state really clearly the fundamental principles which I accept and which I assume most of us who are continually congregating on Saturday would accept too.

And the reason I ask for your help is that its pretty presumptuous of me to be representing this organization Divine Harmony, this organism, Divine Harmony, so therefore I would like you to if you could, if you would, if you want to give feedback, give suggestions, give ways to change it and so on, before we make it kind of public. So I'm going to be posting this texts on those new

domains and we can discuss this in the forums of Harimedia.net. I think its important, I think its really relevant to be clear about what one is doing. Now you know I talked about it for years now, what we are not doing. We are not doing a charismatic organization, hierarchically based upon some central figure, whom everything must relate to and be set to and pledged allegiance to. We are directly trying to connect to the Supreme.

We put the interests of you, the individual, as topmost. There is really no group interest, we are not trying to build anything. We are not trying to pay for anything, we are not trying to do any big project to the group, we don't have any particular thing we have to protect or create. Ok, so we know what were not. But specifically what are we as a group, because we are a congregation, because we do congregate? We congregate regularly and associate in this way so what are we? So I would define myself first because its very important for you to know and if you don't like it, to object. I define myself as a person who is sharing his experience through many years of engagement in spiritual life in various ways, who is sharing his learning in many different disciplines and many different countries, cultures and lands. And who is sharing his realizations according to a very honest and individualistic manner without leaning on, depending on, or quoting somebody else, simply presenting things as I see it.

The point is that I'm trying to do my best not in a way to influence you to do anything else than to simply be the best person you can be, with the greatest connection you can get to the Supreme. In other words my whole motivation, my whole goal here, besides having something to do every week which I love to do, is to be of service to you. I like to do this, because it makes me feel good, makes me feel good about me, makes me feel good about you. So my role is to be your - is to serve you, to be of service to you, by offering to you everything I know. Yet that which I offer to you fits within I think, the category of things that you find helpful.

In other words you like to be respected as individuals, you appreciate to be respected as individuals, you like being given tools which empower you as individuals. A lot of what I do is based on your inspiration. Its based on what you are telling me through your communication you want to know about. And yet there is another factor here which I really feel needs to be very clearly declared and openly defined. That factor is the factor of bhakti. Now bhakti is a connective process by which your love, by which your actions, interact on a very spiritual platform in a divine way. And yet, when we say divine that word can be misinterpreted. So lets be even more clear, I specifically mean connection to Radha and Krishna, or Lord Caitanya, who is the combination of Radha and Krishna. This is how I live my life. Every morning before I come to this program, I sit before Radha and Krishna, going into deep meditation, I ask Them to inspire me, I ask Them to tell me, what do they wish me to speak about. I live my personal life totally in relationship with my Deities.

Now I don't say that all the time, I don't push that all the time, I don't feel that its required to do so. I don't feel like waving the flag of Radha and Krishna, I don't feel like waving the flag of Lord Caitanya. I'll explain that. I don't like elitism, I don't like the idea of being in an elitist group which thinks they have the answer and no one else does. I don't belief in such kinds of absolutism, absolutistic ideas that there is an answer and anything that's not that answer is false. I like it if anybody has some connection to the higher energies, especially if they have higher connections to God. But if somebody would insist that God is this male dominating figure, I would have to object because I would rather speak in terms of the mail female connected God. I don't care if you call that male female connection Radha and Krishna. The name doesn't matter to me. What we are speaking here - of course it matters to me personally - but in as far as the group goes, we are speaking here about the Supreme who is complete in this way.

People have been there in the temple in Sankt-Petersburg who knew nothing about the Vedic so called, quote on quote, very bad term, but the Indian ancient cultures, and yet still who

loved to be with Lord Caitanya and Lord Nityananda. To further clarify I feel the whole fundamental inspiration in my life since 1998 has been those deities, and continues to be those deities in Sankt-Petersburg. Of course I have my own deities, they have their and they are on equal level to me, but the fundamental inspiration, the fundamental source are those deities Gaura Nitai in Sankt-Petersburg. I think deities, especially deities you can connect to, deities that have this beautiful energy of love that comes from them, this connection from them is so important in spiritual life.

If you ask me the two most important, or any group of important things in spiritual life, I would put number one and number two, it doesn't matter which position which, the Deities and this transcendental sound vibration, and that transcendental inner vibration and love that's bhakti. This fundamental connection between my self and the Supreme is what makes my life what it is. And I see my service to others as a fundamental part of that bhakti. To take what I get to share it with others this is a fundamental interaction that defines me as a person. I have no problem as an individual to state that, declare that very clearly, that I find any meaning in my life to be my relationship with the Supreme and my sharing of that relationship, or sharing of what I know for the benefit of others.

Yet if I were to have been in Sankt-Petersburg, and during the times when we were doing this connection meditations with the deities, and I were to in an, shall we say very restricted manner present the deities, the people would not have been able to connect to them. Would not have been able, they would have felt restricted. Can you imagine, here you are a person, you're walking in literally of the street, because you have heard there is a program going on and you are put in this room where this two statues stand in the front of the room, everything is facing them and somebody says that's God and you have to believe it. And literally I feel that just that act, even if I think it, even if I feel it, I will create an energy to block the connection between those people and Gaur-Nitai.

I chose to do it in a different way. I said this are divine beings, I explained about them. I didn't care whether they accept it or not. I said just try to feel without any prejudice in your mind the love that comes from them. Just try to accept that love, just accept it that's all, what have you got to loose. You don't have to know who they are, you don't have to accept them in any particular way, just feel what they are giving you, as an offering, as a gift. Now at that time I realized, you don't have to define god in any particular way for people to connect to God on the most important fundamental level. And for those of you who were there at that time, you know perfectly well this people were feeling the love from Gaur-Nitai, they were connected in that love, they were relishing it. They were experiencing a very highly, evolved level of bhakti.

I was very satisfied. I didn't feel, I don't feel they have to accept the way I think, they don't have to accept the way I speak, they don't have to use the words I use, they don't have to accept any culture I may accept. My whole intention was simply, they should accept the love of Lord Caitanya and Lord Nityananda, which is all Lord Caitanya and Lord Nityananda want anyway. They accept the love, they reciprocate with that love and that love is unconditional. It doesn't demand they think, or act, or follow, or accept any person, or any group, in any way.

And is that not the way it was during Lord Caitanya's time? Was that not the way he went throughout India and just gave love to everybody? If I were to create some cult around Lord Caitanya which would imply structure, structure of culture, structure of social interaction, structure of behavior, it would create an obstacle between Lord Caitanya and people who just couldn't relate to that. Non of this things are important anyway. The most important thing is the bhakti, it's the connection, it's the flow of love, the reciprocation. It is not because of me this took place, its because of them and the deities it took place. Yet that statement contains misinformation, or shall we say incomplete information, and it needs to be qualified. And the

qualification is: that yes I do play a part, yes each of us do play a part whenever we assist people to make that connection.

How could I have done that if I didn't learn that from somewhere. Obviously I learned it from somewhere, obviously I practiced this in my life. This is important. Before this people could connect to the deities like that, I had to spend time to explain it in such a way that they just were drawn to the deities energy. And when that connection was going on I just got out of the way. Here we come I feel to an extremely important point, and one that I have to state clearly, about what I am actually doing. Now I could say I'm not trying to be a guru here. And that would be correct in one sense and would be false in another sense. And it would be true or false according to the definition I would use, or I would apply to the word guru. Now you already know all of the things I already have said a million times about the negative aspects of guru, the negative exploitive aspects than all of the things that swirl around this word which is been so misused and misunderstood.

So I would speak specifically about the way in which I would allow that definition to apply to me and to apply to anyone of you at any time. (Continued in Audio)

Opening the eyes of soul

by kamalamala » Sun May 11, 2008 5:27 pm

Dear Hari

Once just looking on stars.

Raised an interesting question.

What is really valuable for the development of soul to just observe the life in all aspect, to spent a lot of time to analyzing and trying to understand and first of all to try to see a beautiful world around us in all there amazing variety and to try really oneself feel and see the magic of creation or to just spent the whole life energy on trying to understand the scriptures the books.?

And try to see everything from there point of view.?

Re: Opening the eyes of soul

by Hari » Fri Jul 04, 2008 12:40 am

Every individual will discover meaning through experience. Experience accumulates and at each moment in time our perception of existence is to a product of our past experience stimulated by the unique quality of the moment. Considering this, all experiences have value.

According to our situation, we place value on the moment. Our judgment as to the quality of the moment is a product of the situation of our consciousness and not dependent on some absolute standard. In such relativity, anything and everything can have more or less value.

So to reply to your question, all of the things you mentioned are important. In fact, all things are important. We will find out how they are important when their significance surfaces in our lives.

The positive and negative of religion

by kamalamala » Mon Mar 31, 2008 12:07 pm

Dear Hari

From one point of view the religion is obviously can prevent the evolutionary process of the soul.

And organized religions from my point of view giving more harm than benefit/
But from the other hand if people sincerely just begin together think about God even in their religious way
or maybe pray doesn't they get any benefit just simply because of this attempt.
I personally do feel that they get real benefit. But still I cannot be so sure in all cases
Please help to clear this issue, please tell what do you think?

Re: The positive and negative of religion
by Hari » Sat May 10, 2008 4:05 pm

It is impossible for me to state definitively if organized religion does more harm than good. I can say in some instances it harms and in some instances it helps. There are and always have been good things and not so good things in religion. As in all aspects of life, there is good and bad.

Although we cannot always control how this good and bad influences us, we can control how we respond to it. There are people who have lifetime after lifetime practiced in various religions and gradually increased their awareness and spiritual capacity. There are some who have had terrible experiences that have traumatized them deeply. Both of these have learned what to do and what not to do. The positive or negative energy associated with these learning experiences is not directly connected to the religion but is a product of the people interacting in these religions or in the society.

Usually people come to a religion because they want to connect to God, find forgiveness from God, find a solution to their problems or are looking for shelter. The religion is seen as successful or not to the degree it accommodates their desires. Even if someone is not directly interested in God but has ulterior motives, they still are connected to God through the religion in some form or another.

Those who were traumatized by nasty people in a religion will have many questions in their life. Finding the answer to why they had to experience what they did might be the reason for their birth. I do not wish to justify abuse of people by this statement, but how can I say for sure what circumstances led to the development of their unfortunate situation?

The world is a complex mixture of intelligence, foolishness, sensitivity, dullness, love and fear and so on. This complexity enters into all aspects of life be it religious or secular.

I have no opinion as to whether or not religions are ultimately beneficial. It depends on the individual and how he or she relates to the situation they are in. Prayer is always good, yet it becomes better when an aware person does it. Yet if a person is not aware, how shall they become aware? Experiences such as religion assist one to become more aware. Regardless of the quality of the experience itself, our awareness increases. One could say this about any experience, and therefore my statement is not so significant. But not all experiences are the same and in some cases the religious experience is required to stimulate spiritual awareness. From this point of view, religion is to some extent beneficial for the evolution of people. This does NOT mean it should forever remain as it is now or as it was in the ancient past. It means that it is valuable, nothing more and nothing less.

God and man's limitations on HIM

by kamalamala » Tue Apr 01, 2008 8:03 pm

Dear Hari
Before coming to Hare Krishna movement

i had an understanding that GOD- Krsna is nor man nor female.
Since he is the original Being and he doesn't need to be man or female for any reason.
And the same For Radha she also nor female nor a man she is GOD.
But in that movement the Image of God was mixed a lot with human life so i became bewildered on this issue?
I am still believe that God doesn't need to be male or female, and to consider God female or male is something like putting some limitations on Him .
So please clarify this issue tell what do you think about this ?

by kamalamala » Mon Apr 07, 2008 4:23 pm

After all we as a spirit in our pure state of atman have no sex identification Why should God have that?

Re: God and mans limitations on HIM
by Hari » Sat May 10, 2008 5:29 pm

God does not need anything so God does not need to be male or female. However, considering the holistic nature of the Supreme and the divine harmony that exists everywhere, it makes sense that God would also manifest the divine balance between the archetypical male and female energies. Archetypes are not limitations for they are the origin and therefore that God would be the source of all archetypes is perfectly compatible with God's position.

As far as the soul having no gender, I assume that the soul is also a complete unit balanced between the male and female energy, as is God. This state of balance between the male and female energy is neither male nor female for it is the union of both and a complete individual that transcends gender! Considering this, the soul has no gender. Similarly, the perfect God is perfectly balanced in the archetypical male and female energy and has no gender, which makes your previously held ideas still valid.

Yet, for the sake of enjoyment and for the sake of enabling a life filled with experiences, pleasure, and challenges, the Supreme divides eternally as the Supreme Male and Supreme Female. So the one complete balance is also existing simultaneously as two in complete balance. And thus there is perfection in the world for we now have a prototype we may follow to live life to its fullest extent.

Energies origin

by kamalamala » Thu Apr 03, 2008 5:59 pm

Dear Hari

We all know that there are positive and negative energy's in the universe.
And here are arising the question's all this energy's coming out from persons or they exist by themselves and originated themselves?

In Srimad Bhagavatam it was stated that first appeared the persons then the energy's
i mean that first appeared personified fear for example then the energy of fear.

And so on.

Are there negative energy's anyway in universe or they are created only by people?

Re: energys origin
by Hari » Sat May 10, 2008 5:17 pm

There are archetypes of all things. An archetype is an original that has been imitated. Any time something is designed, a model is first created to insure the design works. A prototype follows and when all is well, production starts. This is part of the evolutionary process.

Let us assume that there is an intelligent energy in existence that initiates and formulates all creation. That intelligence creates archetypes of all aspects of existence. These archetypes are the building blocks of the complete and capable units of life and matter. In the course of the formulation of creation, a model is constructed, followed by a working prototype.

Once prototype beings appeared, it was easy for them to propagate their lineage.

A prototype person must include, for example, the full range of appropriate emotions. As part of this design, archetypical fear was modeled previous to the creation of the prototype so the unit would be complete. This fear was required for the preservation of the species (an evolutionary concept) for without it one would fall off a cliff, get eaten by a tiger, or some other catastrophe. In a similar way, all useful emotions, psychological processes, and physical existence was developed.

Even if one thinks all things developed by chance, there seems to be a set of laws which direct the manner in which evolutionary chance could conceivably proceed. This set of laws represents the overriding intelligence to which I refer.

From the point of view of intelligent design, there is first a reason for existence, a desire, and then a plan is made. The tools to accomplish the plan develop along with energy and power to work. When intelligent plan meets compatible tools, models are made and prototypes develop. When all tests well, production begins and each self-sufficient unit supports itself using the available energies. This is the plan of Intelligence.

None of the energies created were negative in and of themselves for they were neutral tools. We have subsequently used them to create negativity.

Even death is required to restore a living being's physical vehicle at rebirth. This is not negative, it is part of the holistic design. When we relate to each other in anger, hatred, and so on, we create negativity.

again the reality

by kamalamala » Mon Mar 31, 2008 7:17 am

Dear Hari

In our life we have to accept quite a lot things that doesn't really depend on us. When we are coming to this world we have to accept the nature : the forests, the lakes, the mountains the climate and so on as it is .Although there are so many things depend on our inside world, on our point of view, but as much even more things doesn't at all depend on us.

So there are obviously in this world objective reality.

In so called spiritual realm i mean in the other realm, which connected a lot with our inside world must be reality that also exist without our expectation which is existing itself which doesn't depend on expectations and imaginations of believers.

So my question is does such an objective reality exist in the spiritual or i don't know how it call properly realm?

Love

P.S At least there are persons individuals whose existence doesn't depend on our believes, why they should change themselves for us why shouldn't we accept them as they are Although i have no idea how they can look objectively as they are among themselves.

Re: again the reality
by Hari » Sat May 10, 2008 3:40 pm

When we take birth, we enter into a world that already exists. This is an obvious truth. Therefore, we can assume that if we are not now in that other world, we have to enter it and when we do we shall perceive the people and nature already there. This previously existing reality is not dependent on us. Once we are there, we become part of that reality.

As this is obvious, I think the problem in your mind might be connected to the word, "objective." Perhaps you are using it to refer to some fixed and absolute reality that is independent of our or any external influence?

What exists now is a product of all that was before. We create and mold our world by our choices, by our consciousness and ultimately by our desire. We cannot change the nature of reality but we can influence the way in which we relate to it. For example, we cannot change the nature of water to be wet, but we can influence where the water goes and how it is used. We can pollute the water, or we can purify it.

To some degree, we influence reality and by influencing it we are creating it. This influence is mainly a function of our consciousness. We influence existence in proportion to our awareness.

Those in the 'other world' have more awareness and therefore influence their realms in a spiritually compatible manner. Certainly they influence their realms! If they had no influence and simply had to accept what was there it would be a dictatorship and not a sharing of love.

"Inside out versus Outside in" lecture

by harsi » Sun Dec 16, 2007 2:08 am

I would like to express my deep gratitude to Hari for taking the time and the great endeavor of explaining this topic in great detail in this Saturday's video broadcast. All the questions I had in this regard were fully answered by his detailed and elaborate explanations. It became also evident for me the fact that the spiritual power and the right application of the spiritual knowledge I may develop lies within my own reach thus I can take myself the lead for my spiritual endeavor in life than having to make myself dependent in this regard from anyone else whoever that may be. Although I must say I like the valuable spiritual assistance Hari is offering since I have the impression that the knowledge he is sharing with us lies somewhere inherent also in my own being which is just becoming more comprehensible and applicable by his elaborate explanations, rather than having to adopt and align my life accordingly in a somehow artificial way.

Re: "Inside out versus Outside in" lecture
by Olesya » Sun Mar 16, 2008 11:55 am

Dear Hari,

I have a question in regards to the Inside Out lecture, or maybe, I just need an additional explanation.

Comparing the Outside-in process with the Inside-out one, you say that the goal is the same, just the process of 'getting there' is different.

But after thinking this over, I see another way of interpreting this: it seems to me that, at least sometimes, the goal of all the Outside-in discipline and routine is to become an Inside-out person and THAN to be able to connect to the Supreme.

Basically, what I mean to say, is this, I suppose: the Outside-in process says that if you do this and follow that, you eventually might become a kind of person who can connect with the Supreme. So, this is a kind of two-step ladder.

The Inside-out process says that you've already got it inside you, you need to make only one step to connect, you don't need to 'become' someone else to do it, you need to 'become you', so to say.

So, can we really say that the goal is the same? Or can we say that in some cases the Outside-in process leads one to develop into an Inside-out person and this way become capable of connecting to oneself and to the Absolute?

Or am I misinterpreting this?

Re: "Inside out versus Outside in" lecture
by Hari » Sun Mar 30, 2008 11:21 pm

Your interpretation of what is going on is correct.

If the goal is stated to gain a connection with the Supreme, then the goal is the same. I do not see the extra steps in the outside in process as changing the goal. The real problem comes when an outside in person cannot see that unless they develop the capacity to perceive from the inside out they can never attain that goal.

However, there is quite some difference in other ways. Those who see from the outside in miss the point that you do not have to go anywhere to get that perfection. Ultimately, you can find it right here as opposed to having to go to some other realm.

I am not sure if what is attained is the same either.

Personality

by maha » Thu Mar 20, 2008 4:17 pm

"The process of Inside-out is obviously dependent on the self: one's perception, one's awareness, one's consciousness is the center of the process. And that personality is to be respected, that personality has integrity, and that personality is the source of all evolution for that soul." (Hari, 'Outside-in vs. Inside-out' lecture)

person - from Latin 'personā' - "human being", originally "character in a drama, mask," possibly borrowed from Etruscan phersu "mask."

self - from Proto-Indo-European *selbho-, from base *s(w)e- "separate, apart". Compare Sanskrit svah, Old Church Slavonic svoji = same in Russian.

"Personality is the supreme realization of the innate idiosyncrasy of a living being. It is an act of courage flung in the face of life, the absolute affirmation of all that constitutes the individual, the most successful adaptation to the universal conditions of existence, coupled with the greatest possible freedom of self-determination." (C.G. Jung)

(English etymological dictionary www.etymonline.com)

Dear Hari, what is actually personality, which is the source of all evolution for the soul?

Is it anyhow related with the structure of human, that we heard before (Soul, Ego, Intelligence, Mind, Senses, Physical body)?

Or may be it is related with the structure, described in NLP: Essence, Identity, Beliefs, Abilities, Actions, Surroundings?

Is it possible to build (rebuild), or at least revise, examine or verify one's personality? To make sure everything is in order and on its place there, that all elements of it are pure and healthy and properly functioning, without dissecting it?

In Hare Krsna philosophy human personality had been more related to as ego and especially false ego, thus considering it to be unnecessary and even deleterious. And we see that Etruscan origins of the word person mean it exactly as a mask. That means something is behind the mask, or the masks... Nowadays ego seems to me meaning more as to whom or what we identify ourselves. And we can see that we have different roles in life that we play for different contexts or associations, and even for our relatives. Does it mean that the more our ego or personality, or our roles, or the masks reflect the individuality or the Self behind it the more valuable it is for the evolution of our soul?

If we really are created by the image and likeness of God/Goddess (Gods), what are the real attributes of the Personality of God that we have similarity to? We heard that the attributes are His/Her name, form and qualities. We just had discussion about it with Kamalamala, and he wonders if the name and form are really so crucially important and absolute as we were taught before, or Their essence is really what is important for our connection with Them? After all, on other planets, in other universes, where reside sometimes even more intelligent entities than humans, they may not appreciate those God forms, which we consider as Absolute.. We witnessed that very often even the Deities installed in different parts of the world somehow tend to look similar to local residents. We came to conclusion that different forms and names of God and Gods are probably more like communicative keys or codes for living entities to clearly be able to approach and connect exactly to the Divine Personality they wish to connect to, by connecting to the appropriate portal or connection grid. On the other hand these forms, names and attributes are supposed to be Their images to facilitate and allow living beings most successfully to imagine and become aware of Them, of Their Personalities, are they not? Please correct if something wrong here and clarify this question, which maybe not even one!

Re: Personality
by Hari » Tue Mar 25, 2008 5:36 pm

Interesting!

Is person most important or is personality? Is there a difference? Well, sure! A person is someone, somewhere, not a specific identifiable someone. When you know a specific someone, you know their personality. How they relate to the world (meaning their body, their environment, their acts, others around them and so on) is more or less a manifestation of their personality. This can and will adapt to surroundings and will more often than not be clouded by stress. Neither of these terms refer to the living being. One is generic and the other is a manifestation. That I have a personality or that I am a person is also a generic understanding. When we get specific, we no longer speak about personality, we speak about specific quality.

We are essence and being and this is energy. Our particular energy is our unique being and this is the sum total of the manner we express our energy known as our personality. This personality manifests more clearly when we are more aware of our personal integrity. This integrity is somewhat similar to our identity, yet one can assume identities to fulfill roles. One's

integrity is beyond identity. One's essence dictates one's integrity. To maintain integrity is to be true to oneself -- one's essence.

Everything else is a by-product of this essence.

Jung's poetic definition of personality is great. Yet it presupposes personality as an archetypical quality unique to each of us. Perhaps it is, yet is it still unique when we attempt to fit into our world as we are expected? What becomes of his definition when we act in an influenced manner? Obviously he had much more to say about personality than what you have quoted, I just took advantage of the quote's limited scope to make a point.

My point is that our essence energizes our mood. As we feel, so we create. Our creations therefore spring from our energy. One who sees the pervasive nature of this flow of energy from our essence into the world around us, learns to express their personal essence in an undiluted manner and thus appears in this world as a super personality.

More comments require a book. No time for that now! Sorry...

Humanity and Gods

by maha » Wed Feb 13, 2008 12:45 pm

Question from Jana Grigorjeva:

Dear Hari!

If God (Gods) is Energy and the Constant (beyond time), and paganism, Judaism, Buddhism, Taoism, Krishnaism, Mohammedanism, Christianity e.t.c. are the humanity's endeavor to comprehend life and time in different times of history, to put God (Gods) into a shape or form, then my questions are the following:

1. Does it mean, that the humanity has been always remembering and aware of God, primordially (since the beginning of time)?
2. Does it mean, that the humanity was thrown out "like a kitten on a street" (survive, if it does)?
3. Why God (Gods) required such variety of the forms of worship primordially?
4. Have God (Gods) decided Themselves to "slave", meaning to follow the forms of perception of Gods, offered by the humanity, originating from their domestic cultures, conditions and ways of life, ways of thinking, kinds of perception? Or is it a series of chances, chaos, mutual quest and assertions (who is who)?
5. What is the ultimate form of perception of God (Gods)? Is it "Conversations with God", New-Age, or just meditation under the starry sky, or something else, or is it a continuation of the game: "from Spiritual World to Material World; from Material World to Spiritual World"?
6. If God has launched this game and we are required to God, why there is so much pain on Earth?

Thank you for everything!
yours faithfully,
Jana Grigorjeva

Re: Humanity and Gods
by Hari » Wed Feb 20, 2008 7:51 pm

If God (Gods) is Energy and the Constant (beyond time), and paganism, Judaism, Buddhism, Taoism, Krishnaism, Mohammedanism, Christianity e.t.c. are the humanity's endeavor to

comprehend life and time in different times of history, to put God (Gods) into a shape or form, then my questions are the following

1. Does it mean, that the humanity has been always remembering and aware of God, primordially (since the beginning of time)? :

I cannot answer this question as it presupposes I have either personal experience about the start of time or that I am in communication with someone who does. I can guess that people have always wanted to know more about their world and have always felt some greater presence and power beyond themselves. From the time people had enough awareness to try to understand the divine, they have been doing so.

2. Does it mean, that the humanity was thrown out like a kitten on a street (survive, if it does)?

I do not see how question 2 follows your initial premise or question 1. I do not think we were thrown out like kittens in the street. I would not throw a kitten into the street, so why would God?

3. Why God (Gods) required such variety of the forms of worship primordially?

I cannot say if they required it or if we pushed it on them. That man worships the supreme is natural. How man does that depends on how man feels, what facility man has or can create, and how man's thought has been molded by a belief system created by other men.

4. Have God (Gods) decided Themselves to slave, meaning to follow the forms of perception of Gods, offered by the humanity, originating from their domestic cultures, conditions and ways of life, ways of thinking, kinds of perception? Or is it a series of chances, chaos, mutual quest and assertions (who is who)?

Is the form and personality (or lack of it) of God a creation of man according to man's culture or did it evolve through time by chance? Perhaps it is a combination of both. What if man had some experiences of the divine and translated these experiences into descriptions relevant to his fellow man? Would these descriptions not correspond to the environment within which man lived? I think so.

Considering this, can we say that such conceptions are relevant? They only have value when they are reflections of actual spiritual realizations. When religious ideas facilitate sincere seekers of the truth to understand themselves and the Supreme, they fulfill their purpose.

However, even though some of these religions and realizations served me well in my previous lives, I do not presently wish to follow the dictates of such created systems. Having said that, my experiences in the eastern paths were very valuable to me in this life.

5. What is the ultimate form of perception of God (Gods)? Is it 'Conversations with God', New-Age, or just meditation under the starry sky, or something else, or is it a continuation of the game: from Spiritual World to Material World; from Material World to Spiritual World?

My method of perceiving God is to tune to the divine by being deeply aware of my essence and then tuning to energies around me. I stand before the Deities or the Divinity and tune to them by allowing their energy to wash over me as I absorb it. By floating within their space I feel them and their love. I then reciprocate that loving feeling by sending my love and entering into a divine embrace. Thus we become one of us. In such a state, communication becomes easy.

6. If God has launched this game and we are required to God, why there is so much pain on Earth?

I cannot confirm or deny that God launched this game, or that it is a game at all. I am here to experience. Being that I am what I am, I always endeavor to be a loving participant in my experiences and I am not happy with me when I fail to be so. I feel pain when I cannot be all that I can be or when I act beneath my standards.

We all know about the sources of pain in our worlds, but we are not so aware of how we are partly responsible for creating this pain in others and ourselves.

God has facilitated our experiences. We have used the facility as we thought best. We share the responsibility for our creation.

A few of my lectures address this point in much greater detail.

children and spirituality

by sri » Sat Nov 17, 2007 9:37 am

The other day I was going through some song books with my sons (Lucia festivities in nursery are nearing) and we got to Damodarastaka. There was a picture of Krsna, tied, and my older son (who is going to be five in a few weeks) wanted to know why was Krsna tied. He insisted that tying children is not correct under any circumstances.

As a teenager I read a book "Free children of Summerhill" by A.S. Neil and was taken by the ideas he presented. It boils down to parents not imposing their beliefs and structure on their children (of course certain human rules are not to be neglected). So, even if my children are having sikha, have friends in ISKON children and help sometimes offering food, they are actually not aware or pushed into that system of belief. In my and my husband's background there is a number of different religions (including both Catholic and Protestant faith, atheism and different Eastern faith) and society itself has a lot of values they are being presented with (one of the most prominent insisting on differences between boys and girls, such as boys don't wear pink). Obviously, I am not able to completely free my child from structures and influences of the past but I would like to be able to give them some tools with which they can cope with all the information and make their own conclusions.

So, how do I explain why Krsna was tied without demanding from my son a total faith or supporting a total rejection of faith? How do I explain a concept of God in the light of circumstances that are presenting him with different Gods (well actually religions) that all claim absolute knowledge, power and right?

As a digression. When I was some eight years old I was told (in discussing God and death) that after we die there is nothing any more. That just did not sound right, feel right and even if I wasn't a perfect believer in everything that has to do with God I believed that He exists and that we don't stop existing after death. So, I believe that children have deep inside a knowledge of things and what is right and wrong, but many stop listening. That probably happens when we start believing that we are not good, good enough.

thanks for all inspiring words

Sri

by Hari » Sat Nov 24, 2007 8:00 pm

Your questions are interesting because they address universal parental responsibility. Essentially, the problem is: how does a parent instill values and educate their children without stifling their development? This becomes more complex when the parent feels it is their responsibility to introduce their child to religion. Those parents who deeply believe their family religion must be accepted by their child present it without hesitation, whereas a parent who feels the child has a right to discover religion on their own, facilitates the child's inquisitive nature.

It is safer for a person in your position to act as a facilitator of your children's search for spiritual meaning. How you do this depends on how good a facilitator you are. To properly facilitate, you have to consider the needs of your child as primary and more important than your own needs. For example, if you feel it essential to prevent your child from misunderstanding the situation between Krishna and Yasoda, you could offer explanations such as, "This was an exchange of love. Krishna was being naughty and his mother was stressed. She was not thinking clearly due to her stress and therefore tried to restrict Krishna from being naughty. But this was not an appropriate response to Krishna since he is powerful. He taught her how her response was not appropriate and his action has been discussed by millions of people as an example of his power and position within the context of his loving exchange with his dear mother. Therefore, although I certainly agree that tying up your own child is not at all a good thing to do in most circumstances, there are times when this is needed. For example, some mothers have placed a rope around their small children when they are forced to walk in large crowds and carry things to prevent their children from getting lost. After all, if the child were to get lost, this would cause him or her great anxiety and pain. So sometimes we parents have to do things out of the ordinary to protect our children, but tying them is rarely good for them. However, I understand your point and agree that we should not tie up our children. Mother Yasoda finally agreed with you and gave up on the effort!" ... or something like that. In other words, try to explain as clearly and completely as possible. If your child continues to insist it is wrong in all circumstances, simply say, "OK, I see your point." Why argue or insist? We all have the right to think what we want, even if we are children. Children anyway think what they want, even if they are quiet about what they think.

It might not be required to insist this event really happened or that your son must believe it. It is a story and he is listening. Why must his faith or lack of it enter into the equation? I think we often place too much emphasis on issues that are personal or distinctly adult and forget that children think and feel differently than adults and will anyway come to their own conclusions later on. I would rather assist a child in developing their own method of coming to conclusions rather than insisting on them accepting other people's conclusions.

If there are things in the literature of a religion that are strange, we should admit this. A devoted follower might say to their children, "This is strange, but there is some reason for it even if we do not see the reason." I would say, "This is the way they see things from their point of view. They have a specific system they like and this system depends on their own particular assumptions and beliefs." I would explain this more only if asked to.

I have seen cases where forcing children to accept something backfires and causes them to reject that very thing simply because they were pushed to accept it. Do not underestimate the power of youthful rebellion. I have seen cases where children have blindly accepted so many things in their lives it has limited their capacity to question and limited the development of their own method for coming to conclusions that make sense to them! I have also seen children who were spoon fed a philosophy, who continue to believe it in essence, yet make adjustments to it in a healthy fashion as they grow older for they had teachers, parents, or at least some kind of

good fortune to balance ideas and the analytical capacity within their environment. I think our responsibility as adults lies more in balancing information with experiences in an environment of acceptance which allows questioning, honesty and respects everyone's need to come to their own conclusions without being forced.

But you know all this, and your question was different. I was just on my corner soap box for a while! Sorry about that...

How do I explain a concept of God in the light of circumstances that are presenting him with different Gods (well actually religions) that all claim absolute knowledge, power and right?

This is a very important question. Let me rephrase it for you: How does one derive one's own understanding of God considering there are so many religions claiming to have the absolute truth and all the rights and power derived from this understanding? After all, the problem is your understanding the situation and then explaining it to your child in a way that helps, not hinders him. This is not his problem, it is yours. Even if you said nothing, he would most likely do just fine without anyone teaching him about God, just as you did fine in a family that totally denied God. We sometimes think our children will become lost atheists without our help, but we forget that no one helped us and we were not lost. When we wanted to know more, we did, and there were enough resources available in the world for us to learn what we needed to learn! Perhaps we lack faith in our children? Maybe this is because we lack faith in ourselves? Maybe this would change if we had some faith in these little people and allowed them to see for themselves with our help?

Considering this, we could just explain it as it is. What this 'is' would be different for each parent as each would see the 'truth' in their own way. I would say something similar to, "I believe there are beings who are much greater than I who are assisting in the arrangement of this universe and beyond. I believe there are divine beings who are at the core of all existence, who are the energetic source of all that exists, who are pure spirit, pure love, and connected with all things through their divine consciousness. I believe they have personality, as I do, manifesting according to their extraordinary greatness, and because I am of the same energy as they I have experience of a loving and caring connection with them and therefore I know what I believe is true."

It is easier to explain about religion when you speak from the basis of essential truth rather than specific flavors of culturally or historically based ideas. One can continue to explain that there are different religions manifesting in different geographical locations and cultures. They all have their own ideas about the divine and all have some discipline through which their followers can come in contact with these divine beings. They have different rules and regulations, philosophical ideals, and value structures appropriate to their concepts. One of the interesting things about these different religions is they all are quite convinced their way is the only way, the best way, the absolute truth of it all, and that their God is the real God and all the other gods of the others are somehow borne of human illusion. Sometimes they fight with each other to prove their way is superior. Sometimes they change their ideas to facilitate their managerial organization and growth of power. Many people feel good about their religions because it gives them answers to why they are suffering or how to correct what they are doing wrong. People feel that when they can act better, they can gain entrance into that final destination which is free from material troubles. Obviously one can expand on this method of explanation as one sees fit.

Is there something wrong with not declaring any one religion the best? Is there a problem for a child to understand there are many people in the world with many different ideas of life? I feel the real difficulty lies in the inability of the parent to explain it in a manner that makes sense to the child. When one presents options and possibilities to a child, it respects their capacity to find his or her own way and thus nurtures it. When the child has questions later on, he or she will know where to go for answers. And you, as that first facilitator concerned with the child's

welfare, will rank number one as a trusted source of information. You will also protect your child from falling victim to exploitation offered in the name of religion. You will do the greatest service for your child and the greatest ultimate good for all people. You will also encourage spiritual thinking, free thinking and coming to one's own conclusions. Since we all have to accept the consequences of our actions, we should understand that the responsibility for what we do, what we think or accept, and all that follows, is our own and no one else's. We can and should accept assistance on our path of life. Children should understand they are on a path created by their choices in the context of their present situation. Considering this, we can learn and hear from anyone we choose, but the ultimate responsibility for the events we initiate (the choices we make) is our own.

by sri » Sun Nov 25, 2007 11:37 am

This was a many great thoughts and useful advices. Great lecture too. You "felt" the questions better then I could explain them. Thanks a lot.

As far as if children have difficulties understanding existence of different religions, I don't think they do. On the contrary, they have it easy to understand that and that is were the problem is. They see that they are different from mum and dad, their brothers and sisters and they all live and love together (even if there may sometimes be disagreements and adjustments). Then they see the same picture in the big world, only here they are told that the God (that is One, all agree about that) actually asks them to kill and eliminate the others, for He only loves them and it is only them that are right and chosen. That is, in the children's eyes at least, like their mother or father telling them that they should kill their brother or sister for he/she only loves them. Hardly unlikely. Very distorted and confusing. Not very easy to explain how come that all these "smart" grown ups have gotten it very wrong. I guess a point here would be to encourage them, children, not to continue in that line. To make their own choices that actually do make sense to them and feel right for them.

Wow, this was actually more helpful then I first realized. Thanks again.

feeling safe

by sri » Sat Nov 17, 2007 9:50 am

Again, my older son inspires for this question. I wander about any ideas you may know or have heard about installing feeling of safety and peace in children.

Reasons for not feeling safe are:

1. feeling and even seeing beings that are not of material nature (mostly in the night)
2. becoming aware of the bad things that do happen in the world (violent and unexpected death, war, jealousy, someone wanting you to feel bad and worst then them...)

Both of my children present as their solution to this problems (before or after situation arises but not in the moment fear is present) that they are powerful and can perform miracles (possibly they could if they knew how to use their latent powers) or that they are going to call upon some of their powerful imaginary or established heroes that are their friends (here falls Superman as well as Hanuman who with his club and holding a whole mountain rates high on the hero list)

I still remember my own childhood, fear I experienced from seeing or feeling beings that everybody around me just decided to proclaim nonexistent and that was suppose to eliminate fear (it did not) and fear from hearing about wars in which innocent children, children like me where being killed. Not even now have I really a good answer to that fear.

I would be very thankful for any words on this issue.

Thanks

Sri

by Hari » Sat Nov 24, 2007 10:26 pm

Hmmmm. I doubt I can shed much light on this dark issue, but I shall try.

Feeling and seeing subtle entities is a gift that should be encouraged, not programmed out of children. If children can be trained to see these beings for what they are they will lose their fear of them. However, even adults are afraid when someone unexpectedly suddenly appears even though they are regular people. Fear of sudden change in our local space is normal and is part of the primeval fight or flight syndrome that propels us to defensive action. When we understand this sudden change was the appearance of someone we knew we lose our fear and say, "You scared me!" Explain to the children that their fear of unknown entities entering their room at night is a normal reaction, it will help them understand this fear in context. I do not want to go into a long explanation of non-physical entities; besides, you already know it. However, these entities usually appear either because they need to be near us or we need them for some reason. If an entity needs to be near us, if we are sensitive we can try to assist them in some manner, and if we need them, we can gratefully receive what they have to offer us. Rarely do entities come to simply create trouble, yet this does occasionally happen. Children have a very hard time with this kind of energy and the only solution is for the parent to step in and remove the unwanted entities.

That your children have ways to deal with fear after it has appeared or can deal with the idea of fear in general is very good and it indicates that they are very healthy.

No one can really 'deal' with the suffering of the world and the potential dangers that can suddenly confront us. Children have a very hard time dealing with the things that can happen to them or are happening to other children, and this is made worse by their fertile imaginations visualizing all sorts of demons in their closet. When they see horrors actually happening to children in other locations, they naturally assume it can happen to them! Parents must address this fear and somehow neutralize it. If the children actually live in dangerous and unavoidable situations, all efforts must be made for their safety. But even if the children feel safe, they know other children are not so fortunate as they are. Here are some methods your child can use to assist these children -- to pray for them and ask the Supreme to remove them from danger; to ask angels to help specific children; to be empathetic to them and send them love; to feel the desire to do something to change the world for these children when one is older, or aspire to develop other altruistic ideals.

If anyone else can add to this discussion, I would be grateful!

the "third option"

by kami » Sun Sep 30, 2007 1:13 pm

Dear Hari,

I have a question and didn't find good topic to answer.. Is it possible to stop exist at all? Has jiva only this choice - love to Krsna or samsara? Is there the third option? Must the soul be eternal and immortal? Could you explain me this, please?

by Hari » Sun Sep 30, 2007 7:38 pm

I do not have any personal experience of not existing. I do not have any idea how to achieve this state, neither would I want to even if I could achieve it. Therefore I would not experiment with methods to attain the non-existent state.

Some may write about it and others might believe it, but how you think about these ideas is a matter of your own personal belief.

Therefore I do not think I can answer or even elaborate on the possibility of a soul becoming non-existent.

I also would not want to be stuck with the idea that one has only the choice, as you put it, to love Krishna or samsara. I think there is another option and this option is what I speak about in my lectures. The spiritual atmosphere is available in all states of being. But since your question is specifically about the state of non-existence, I do not wish to write further.

Good luck with your search to find this state. Let me know what you find out -- if you still exist and can explain it when you attain non-existence.

by kami » Mon Oct 01, 2007 9:22 am
yes, I will try

Thank you anyway I will listen your lectures then..

Sastras say that the soul is immortal and eternal, so maybe it is not fair???
Navigare necesse est, vivere non est necesse. [Pompeius]

by Hari » Mon Oct 01, 2007 6:29 pm

As for me, I am quite sure that spirit is ever existing. What is not fair?

by kami » Mon Oct 01, 2007 6:35 pm

For me also (I believe in it) but I'm thinking about 'the choice' - if we can choose 'only' existent state, what about freedom - free choice....
Navigare necesse est, vivere non est necesse. [Pompeius]

by Hari » Mon Oct 01, 2007 7:49 pm

Maybe the problem lies in trying to think of our essential being as a changeable state? Our being is an axiomatic truth. It is. I AM.

Due to the absolute nature of this essence, one either accepts it as it is, or one denies its existence and declares life as nothing more than a temporary chance combination of matter. The idea that one can be and then not be at will is anti-axiomatic in its nature.

If there was the option to not-be then being would not be the axiomatic fundamental principle of existence. We could then ask if existence or non-existence is the foundation? If existence is the foundation, then non-existence would have to be a temporary state, if it would exist at all. If non-existence were the foundation, then existence would be the temporary manifestation and we all return to non-existence after a while. How does the non-existent suddenly exist? If the fundamental principle were that there was a choice to exist or not, then you would have to assume that you start off as existent and have the choice to be non-existent. However, once you make that choice you are forever in that state for the non-existent cannot suddenly exist again. Who or what would decide to exist again? There is nothing. That is the meaning of non-existence. Again you are faced with the 'unfair' prospect of lack of choice.

If you speak of choice, you must speak of a chooser. The chooser is always superior to the choice, even as a principle. The chooser must exist before the choice is made. How, therefore, can the chooser choose to not be a chooser? It is axiomatic that the chooser is the basis, otherwise there can be no existence.

Even those who feel they are nothing but matter think of matter as the fundamental principle. The spiritualists think of spirit as the fundamental principle. A fundamental principle is that upon which all other principles are derived. Without the foundation, there can be no manifestation.

But this is word play. Fairness does not enter into this discussion. I AM, and that is all.

by kami » Mon Oct 01, 2007 8:19 pm

Hari wrote:

Maybe the problem lies in trying to think of our essential being as a changeable state? Our being is an axiomatic truth. It is. I AM.

Yes.. I catch it..

Hari wrote:

If you speak of choice, you must speak of a chooser. The chooser is always superior to the choice, even as a principle. The chooser must exist before the choice is made. How, therefore, can the chooser choose to not be a chooser? It is axiomatic that the chooser is the basis, otherwise there can be no existence.

Oh, that's the point for me! Thank you!! I must contemplate this for a some time

Hari wrote:

I AM, and that is all.

It is like in The Bible - "Great I Am" - about God, of course

I was wondering and wondering about this topic. Your answer clear up my 'stuck state' The rest of your answer I must translate better and think it deeply.... Thank you

Lord Buddhas thoughts

by sri » Fri Sep 28, 2007 11:19 am

Dear Hari,

I have just been looking at some of the numerous posts by Harsi and amongst the thoughtful quotes found one that I really liked. It says what I always taught and I guess it proves that I must have been a buddhist in some of my previous lives .

Putting the jokes aside, I wonder how would this quote marry with the philosophy of some other religions that seem to insist on acceptance without observation and analysis? Buddha is after all represented as incarnation of God and I assume that he wouldn't advice people to do something that is actually not beneficial for them, or something that they are not capable of doing (as it seems to me that many religions insist on humans not questioning things since (that) they are not capable of understanding).

Also, I would say that the last sentence in the quote is slightly tricky. There are some things that don't agree with my reason and I don't see them as conducive to the good of all, but there is somebody else that does. So, are they then indeed for the good of all or not? According to Buddha I should have a right and power to make that decision for myself, even if not for others.

I would be thankful to hear some of your thoughts on the following quote, if you have time and find it interesting, of course.

Thanks, and all the best

Sri

"Do not believe in anything (simply) because you have heard it.
Do not believe in traditional ideas (simply) because they have been handed down for many generations.
Do not believe in anything because it is spoken or rumored by many.
Do not believe in anything (simply) because it is found written in your religious books.
Do not believe in anything merely on the authority of your teachers and elders.
But after observation and analysis, when you find that a thing agrees with reason and is conducive to the good and benefit of one and all, then accept it and live by it." - Lord Buddha, Kalama Suta

ps. I am right now engaged in analyzing the religions, finding similarities and differences. Tracing the history of humans connection to God has been interesting so far. Therefore the interest in above questions.

by Hari » Sun Sep 30, 2007 7:57 pm

The idea that an individual should decide to accept something that is personally acceptable and reject that which is not, is very good, but something that will certainly be objected to by organized religion which is more concerned with telling you what is best for you.

I would not accept any statement of Buddha on the basis that he would only say what is best for people. I would still examine it and see if it had relevance to me. It seems to me he would agree with this idea.

Also, I would say that the last sentence in the quote is slightly tricky. There are some things that don't agree with my reason and I don't see them as conducive to the good of all, but there is somebody else that does. So, are they then indeed for the good of all or not?

According to Buddha I should have a right and power to make that decision for myself, even if not for others.

If someone says that a thing is good for all people and you do not think it is good for you, then either it is not really good for all people or you are wrong in thinking it is not good for you. If you do not have enough faith in yourself to determine what is good for you or not, then you can experiment with doing what you were told is good for you. If after a longer period of time and enough experience with acting in this manner you see it is indeed good for you, then you will develop more faith in the concept that others know better what is good for you. If, however, you find acting according to other's ideas is not good for you, you will develop more confidence in yourself.

Either way, it is you who has decided what to believe and how to act. Ultimately, you have enough faith in your decisions to guide your actions. We always are in charge of what we believe and what we do. It is impossible to avoid this. Even those who enter into religions or other restrictive social or spiritual associations are doing so of their own free will and choice. When they later claim they are now simply following what they are told, they are actually continuing to do what they think is right when they follow. Therefore never forget that you are always in power and can choose as you like.

The problem is that it often takes far more courage to admit one's course of action is no longer relevant and make the appropriate changes. We often feel it would be against our other interests to do so.

Therefore it is essential that we understand our personal responsibility for our beliefs and our choices. It is most dangerous when one becomes convinced that one is powerless to make changes when one feels one should. It is even worse when one avoids change by nullifying the capacity to feel due to being unable to deal with the conflict between one's faith and one's experience.

Looking to balance material and spiritual life

by adikurma » Sat Jul 21, 2007 5:19 pm

Dear Hari,

I would like to get some advice from you. Your advice always help me to take the right direction in my life. At this point of my life I am little bit confused. I have a job (this is my tenth year with the bank). I find that it is getting to my nerves and I just find it very difficult to keep up with the stress and sales etc. At the same time I know i have to maintain my family and I find through my current profession I have the stability financially to keep up with the basic needs of the family. Now the other part of me is looking for devotee association and better spiritual life. I just cant find the balance. Sometimes i feel that I should leave the big city and move to a smaller place but i do not know how that will impact my family. Am I thinking very selfishly?

by Hari » Mon Jul 23, 2007 8:40 pm

I am glad to hear that my advice has helped you. I appreciate the feedback. At times I wonder if what I write is of use. I spend much time to perfect my replies and were they to be less than useful, I want to know it.

You are not the only person who is confused, unsure, or doubtful at this moment. It is a common phenomena and relates to the shifting that is forcibly redirecting existence. How we relate to this shift is up to us. Each of us will be encouraged to examine our ideals and adjust them accordingly. Our consciousness is being stretched and our limits tested.

I think our sensitivity to stress has recently greatly multiplied. As the cloud covering the future becomes denser, deep seated fears globally awaken stress as our consciousness of the inherent instability of our situation increases. This awareness challenges our conceptions and our plans. Although this challenge is difficult to deal with, it is impossible to ignore! Perhaps the wisest thing to do is to ignore the urge to jump into change and observe with detachment what is important, what is valuable, and what aspects of our lives are worth keeping. After a significant time of consciously observing the structure and elements of our life, we can create a prioritized list that will form the basis of cool headed premeditated change.

Doubting your present course of action is not a symptom of selfishness. Examining life is a symptom of intelligence. Intelligent people periodically check to see if their environment is in need of rebalancing. While we are generally secure with the status quo, existence tends to draw fashionable energies into our lives which can insidiously replace important values and structures with less significant elements. The status quo we work so eagerly to maintain is often a product of forces that transform our lives into something we do not wish to keep when we are aware of their negative affect on our spirit. The broad effect of such hidden transformations are often protected against counteraction by our ignorant desires to avoid honestly examining the reality of our lives. It is wise to step out of our everyday wrangling with nature and look holistically at our present status. When we consider the potentially impending future in the context of our present situation born from our past desires and plans, we may or may not be pleased. Yet, just as we had the freedom to influence our lives with our decisions in the past, we can similarly do so today.

Inevitably, as we grow older, transformation of our living situation becomes less attractive. Instability is something we fear more than stagnation. Rare indeed is the person who takes a chance to change the basis of life, and rarer still is one who does it fearlessly, intelligently, and successfully. Seeing the odds against us discourages radical change; indeed, radical change is generally considered madness by our associates. In some cases it is indeed so, in some cases it is not. Only time will tell. Despite this, there are occasions when radical transformation is valuable simply because it has created movement within a dying environment.

Knowing you, I seriously doubt radical transformation would be beneficial. You are not the usual type of radical minded person who can throw caution to the winds for the sake of an idea. This is not the way of your DNA, not the way of your education, and certainly not characteristic of your personal history. Yet, you want more than you have now. You need to make a change. The shift has come upon you and you need to deal with it. This is not selfish.

What shall you do? I cannot answer that, but I can suggest that many people regularly change their jobs or living place. You are an educated and qualified person. If you are dissatisfied with your job and not specifically your occupation, you could maintain that job while looking for a similar one. Perhaps you might find work in another physical location which is more suitable for you?

I know I cannot live in a city, so I seek out the suburbs. My work is not bound to a physical location so it facilitates my desire to live in a peaceful place and not travel. One of my cousins

works as a consultant, another works as a salesperson for mutual funds, and many other people work in similar fields from their own homes using the telephone and internet. Sometimes their company's link them to their networked computers or redirect a company phone extension to a special line in their homes. Nowadays your work does not have to be limited to the one bank and one town you are in. Then again, maybe a smaller town needs a highly qualified and responsible person like you?

You want to associate with others who think like you. I do too. But sometimes such association lures us into the inevitable politics that swirl amongst idealistically minded persons. Currents of frustrated expressions can eat away at the benefits of being in physical proximity of people who live their lives with stricter ideals; under some circumstances this can create more pain than living without their association.

Consider finding a job that is fulfilling and properly compensates you for your capacity and responsibility. Then consider a move to a physical location with a good ambience in proximity to the devotional personalities you wish to be near. With such a facility, you can come and go as you like within the context of the peace and stability you need.

It is not required that you find a solution instantly. Indeed, a rapid change to fulfill some idea would fall within the selfsame category of selfishness you wish to avoid. Research your options and move slowly. Discuss with those you love and come to a mutual conclusion. When the next step is sure and all concerned wish to take it, do so with confidence.

To conclude: Just because change is required does not mean it has to be made carelessly. One lesson of this shift is to do it with full awareness for the benefit of all concerned.

I hope this text is useful.

Origins of life and the concept of the soul

by harsi » Wed Jun 13, 2007 11:07 pm

Dear Hari,

I just came upon this article on the internet "Scientists propose the kind of chemistry that led to life," and wonder how should one deal with such inquiries into the mystery of life and the spirit soul, if not from the knowledge found in some religious literature like the Bhagavad-gita. I know this is revealed knowledge, thought to be revealed from a higher source which at least in the beginning on ones spiritual journey has to be accepted on basis of pure faith. Is there or should there be any alternative to this view or to the process of becoming aware of this spiritual energy, the soul, other than what it is revealed in some religious literature and that was taught sometimes in the past?

I feel that what was taught and revealed by some persons in the past in this regard, may well require also some interpretation and adaptation to put it into perspective to the understanding and requirements of today's life. But, than again who am I to say such a thing some would say. Anyhow I think that anyone in whatever time period one may be living has to face and solve the same challenges of life in this regard individually although one may take from here and there some references to enlighten oneself more on ones journey of spiritual awakening.

by Hari » Wed Jun 20, 2007 5:05 pm

Am I correct in assuming that your question indicates your discomfort with feeling you must believe something you do not really believe? If so, I think such discomfort is good. Regardless of the right or wrong of any point of view, human beings feel most natural when they are allowed to believe what they want. Therefore, governments, businesses, and even religions, work hard to present data and ideas in a form that is consciously or sub-consciously digestible to encourage people to think these things are good for them or, optimally, it is their own idea developed by their own free will. When you think it is for your benefit to believe something, you will do so, and when you think you created the idea or you embraced another's idea as your own, you truly will own it. Sometimes people find themselves in a state where they desire to have someone tell them what to do to attain liberation from the unhappy existence within which they live. In such cases, even if they were to follow a philosophy that demands faith and acceptance of ideas that are normally difficult to believe, it is ultimately their free will which allows them to believe anything. Although we can be forced to act in ways against our will by greater powers, no one can force you to believe what you do not wish to believe unless they convince you to believe it.

Considering that we all have the power to believe or not believe whatever we want, when such belief no longer fits within the scope of our intelligence we can change our belief to one more compatible with our present understanding or experience. Although this is a right we can exercise anytime, it is often not so easy to do or it is an unthinkable option! Some feel that once they have accepted something on faith, it would be blasphemy to think otherwise; contrary ideas would ultimately lead them to some kind of darker region and punishment. This fear of reprisal hinders transformation. Others do not wish to change, for although they know as well as anyone that some eccentric ideas come with the package of their belief system, there is enough good there to justify any strange position. For example, very few firmly believe that a King had hundreds of millions of wives who were all barren, or that the universe really is a bunch of flat concentric masses surrounded by tasty oceans, so they just let these topics flow by them, do not discuss them much, and rarely try to justify them. Some speak about the universe when they must, but the discussion is often either a fanatical demand that the statements are accepted as they are, or the scriptural descriptions are allegorically similar to modern observations. Difficult passages are generally read by most people in a neutral manner to avoid dealing with the subject.

There are statements by authorities within the Hindu tradition that demonstrate the complexity of the belief system and the lengths scholars go through to deal with them. Bhaktivinode, one of the most respected scholars, stated that the hells described in the 5th Canto of the Bhagavat are allegorical. If you believe him, you now have the problem of maintaining the opposing ideas that the scripture is absolute and literal, yet allegorical and obtuse at the same time. Faced with such a choice, how does one decide which model to apply when one is within the confines of a belief system? If one were to follow previous authorities and accept whatever they said, one would also have to believe they had some superior connection to the absolute source of knowledge which gave them the right to declare what was literal and what was allegorical. Troubles arise when these authorities disagree with each other on meaningful details, as one saw in the discussion on namabhasa where authorities had different opinions, or even in the major disagreements between sects within the tradition.

I bring up these points as an attempt to assist you in your struggle to decide what you believe or could/should believe considering your present intellectual development. The question then becomes: Do I want to move down this path of doubtful questioning and expose myself to the potential of perhaps having to disagree with scriptural ideals?

You have the right to do this, obviously, but do you have the will? It depends entirely on how you feel about it. If you do not feel the gain you might make by stepping out into the wide world of making up your own mind is worth the risk you have to take, then do not do it. But if

you feel it makes sense to you, or that you really have no other choice since you know too much, then when and if you find the courage to do what you know is right, go for it. No one but yourself can make that decision for you for no one can change your mind but you.

The article quoted in your text refers to a mechanism whereby random events could selectively create chemical reactions that build molecules that could potentially build bodies. This is Darwinism from the molecular point of view and is nothing new. If you have dealt with Darwinism before, you can deal with this now.

Although I have personally undergone an intellectual transformation in the past years and I have no qualms whatsoever to accept any idea if it is what I feel is correct, I cannot accept the idea that life is founded on chemical combination. I have personal experience of my life being beyond the chemical body and I have experience of others' lives beyond their physical bodies. Considering my experience and my understanding of life, I am unimpressed by the attempts of scientists to prove that life arose from matter. I am also not interested in their speculative ideas or their speculative experiments that are extremely primitive, even if on the molecular level. The idea that random chemical reactions can create within a physical body the alchemical capacity to create non-physical reality might be plausible from the science fiction point of view (as in robots gaining life symptoms and taking over the world a.s.o.) but it contradicts Occom's razor for it adds layer upon layer of assumption to explain something that is easily understood once one accepts the spiritual nature of life force and living energy.

When a plausible mechanism appears that demonstrates how living bodies came to populate this earth, we will feel better about the origin of human life on earth. Until that time, a religionist can either believe Brahma created our forefathers and put them on earth, or that our human ancestors arrived here from the stars, or our original parents were placed here in the garden of eden. And a scientist will believe life developed through a random chemical event that created something useful and the process of evolution took over from there. It is all a process of belief and we each decide how we answer our questions.

by harsi » Tue Jun 26, 2007 6:01 pm

Although we can be forced to act in ways against our will by greater powers, no one can force you to believe what you do not wish to believe unless they convince you to believe it. You are completely right with what you wrote, at least in my case I got convinced about the existence of Krishna and my existence as a spirit soul by reading and hearing such somehow convincing arguments like this spoken ones by Prabhupada "God is great, I am small. From me a small quantity of earth is coming, water is coming. Why not from the gigantic body of Krsna, so huge, I mean to say, volume of water, gas, and everything as we see it is coming?"

Please don't understand me wrong I am not the kind of person who is hiding his own beliefs behind some words spoken by someone else or quoting something in order to be viewed as authorized or something like that, you may know what I mean, what is in my mind this days is if such ways of convincing someone of the existence of a higher source of existence or the existence of a Supreme being, Radha Krishna if you will is not relevant or up to date anymore, I mean Caitanya Mahaprabhu was also trying to convince people in his own incomparable way. How should one follow his example in a way which may please him and also benefit oneself? The question then becomes: Do I want to move down this path of doubtful questioning and expose myself to the potential of perhaps having to disagree with scriptural ideals? You have the right to do this, obviously, but do you have the will? It depends entirely on how you feel about it.

My question in this regard is if I assume to have the right to question certain scriptural references than how should I proceed further, I am limited, how to understand the unlimited

from my own limited view and understanding if not by accepting and interpreting if you will what was revealed to us, I will not say through someones mercy, this words are to much used nowadays to proof so called all kind of things? As far as I understand you, you are saying that one should become more individualistic in the sense that one should first convince oneself intellectually in a certain way, but like I said before aren't we doomed to fail in this regard since we are so small and somehow limited in trying to understand us and the Supreme by our own intellectual endeavor. I also am listening to your lectures on Saturday since I feel that I have my own limits in this regard and want to get some help in order to know more. So how to overcome this dilemma of becoming again dependent on someones superior intellectual or spiritual if you will capacities?

No one but yourself can make that decision for you for no one can change your mind but you.

All that you write and say sounds so logical and yet what you teach if I may be allowed to use this word, is a complete shift in the spiritual understanding I had before about how to view spirituality and my place in the methodology of understanding me and the Supreme God. Although I have personally undergone an intellectual transformation in the past years and I have no qualms whatsoever to accept any idea if it is what I feel is correct, I cannot accept the idea that life is founded on chemical combination.

That I can understand, its interesting what is said here "Scientists explain that water is a combination of hydrogen and oxygen, but when asked where such a large quantity of hydrogen and oxygen came from and how they combined to manufacture the great oceans and seas, they cannot answer because they are atheists who will not accept that everything comes from life. Their thesis is that life comes from matter." On the other hand I would disagree with the author and his way of generalization that all scientists are somehow atheistic, because they have another approach to find answers to the mystery of life.

I also ask myself if the way I was viewing in the past many people, devotees if you will, as being somehow spiritually more advanced was really based on the truth in the sense that this persons made really some transformation in their consciousness by following a certain way of spiritual practice or was it more due to having due to their nature a certain more advanced capacity to memorize and interpret certain heard or read information from some books? Or in the case of certain so called gurus are they really in the position of freeing someone from the so called nescience of material existence due to their being so called spiritually so advanced or is it more that they themselves are more in the position that they belief or are somehow convinced that the certain methodology they use which they got from their predecessor guru or spiritual adviser will work in the end and deliver them and their follower at the desired spiritual destination?

So many questions are nowadays in my mind, some would consider me therefore on the mental platform, a state which was viewed by some not so long ago to be not really beneficial for ones spiritual progress or like you say evolution. I thank you very much for you taking the time to read and answer my questions in a very comprehensible way which I very much appreciate.

Until that time, a religionist can either believe Brahma created our forefathers and put them on earth, or that our human ancestors arrived here from the stars, or our original parents were placed here in the garden of eden.

And yet although you write in this somehow let us say neutral way, you also speak so nicely about worshipping deities, knowledge which may be also found in a certain religion. You also installed yourself Radha Krishna and other deities in St. Petersburg which certain methodology you use or advise to worship and please them on their altar? Is it somehow different from the understanding one may know in the vaishnava religion and what is the background knowledge behind that worship which may be different from the known understanding of worshipping the deity?

by Hari » Sat Jul 07, 2007 3:33 am

I have distilled from your last text the essential points you have made and I will repeat them here for clarity and then address them one after another:

- a) You want to convince others of the spiritual truth you believe, you want to please Lord Caitanya by doing this, you want to follow his example, and you want to get some benefit from doing this.
- b) You feel limited in your knowledge and intellectual capacity to understand that which is beyond your experience and comprehension. You therefore depend on others who have a seemingly greater capacity but worry that you will simply transfer your dependence from one teacher to another.
- c) What I speak about is logical, but it represents a shift from your previous training.
- d) Are so-called advanced souls those who are just better at memorizing philosophy or are they souls who have convinced themselves of the ultimate attainment of following a discipline? Is your doubt about this on the mental platform and therefore bad?
- e) I try to be neutral in my presentations, yet I install deities in the temple in St. Petersburg and have them in my own home. What is my method of worship and what is behind this method?

Here are my answers:

- a) I question your need to convince others of what you believe. I question whether this is the best way to please Lord Caitanya. I question whether this is the best way to benefit yourself.

These ideas are ideas given to you by others. Are you 100% sure they are true without any doubt? There are other Gaudiya "authorities" who do not preach and who feel pushing their ideas on others is counter-productive. They wait for people to inquire and then they share what they know. I do not think the concept of convincing people in the manner you might consider is accepted by all.

I can understand that a person who has a good idea wants to share it with others. I do it myself all the time. But if people are not interested in it, or find it boring in some way, I back off since sharing requires mutual consent and interest. If someone wants to hear me share, I share, and when they don't, I don't. It makes life simple. And I insist they understand that what they hear from me is my understanding and not a representation of the "truth." I insist they find their own truth by seeking it out. If I can facilitate their search, fine, if not, then I do not wish to mold their minds according to my desire. And thus we get to

- b) since I would feel like a total failure if you were to become dependent on me. I feel the goal of what I do is to awaken your own consciousness so you can have your own experiences and realizations specifically relevant to you. Indeed, everything I am saying depends on this taking place. If you were to replace your previous authorities and your dependence on them with me I would have failed utterly since all the principles I am presenting depend on your accepting your own power to discriminate, investigate, perceive what is within you, and grow to your greatest potential.

Considering this, why would you want to become dependent? I suspect it is a strong conditioning left over from your previous indoctrination. Be aware of this and let these ideas go for they are holding you back from expanding your awareness and experiencing all you desire. And therefore

- c) this is definitely a departure from your previous training. I encourage you to depart from your previous training. I encourage you to question each and every aspect of it down to the last teeny detail and reassemble your belief system in a personalized manner which makes sense

to you, which is compatible with your intelligence and your life's experiences, and which encourages you to develop further with enthusiasm.

I do not request you to reject everything and then rebuild it. Although I did that (I admit it), I have been trying to make your entrance into this world of questioning softer and less traumatic than it was for me. I also have that kind of mind which allows me to enter into new and uncharted territory without fearing the total loss of what I left behind. Not everyone can handle that. Therefore I am sharing with you the methods by which I came to my conclusions and I supply comprehensive commentaries on how this impacts belief systems and the creation of our evolutionary journeys. This is one of my services to people.

Such ideas have never been encouraged by organized hierarchical religions for they oppose the structural principles which bind their followers to their organizations. Since I have no structure, I have no structural principles, neither could I think of a way to bind people to me, neither do I want followers but rather want people to lead themselves, I represent a radical departure from the established tradition of the world religions. I do not apologize for this. I state it clearly. If you like this methodology, fine, if not, fine. Do what you feel is best for yourself. If what I say assists you, great, but if not, do something else! Just be aware of how you feel, what you might gain, what you might lose, where you are headed with all this, and whether you could lie on your deathbed and look back at your life with a satisfied smile.

d) I cannot comment on the advancement of others. I have my personal opinion of others but this is subject to change when I become more aware. One jazz singer once said, "You know you are creating God in your own image when God hates the same people you do." Perhaps this sums up the difficulty I am having with many religionists for I feel they are creating God in their own image. I know many persons who have mastered the art of memorization, who have become eloquent speakers, who have so convinced themselves of the truth of what they are saying that they can inspire vast crowds of people, yet their depth of evolution is not impressive. I know that some people gain power by being totally convinced they will attain the kingdom of God when they die. There are many TV preachers in the US who know their books perfectly, who are incredibly eloquent, and who are totally convinced. Can I vouch for their evolutionary state because of this? No. I do not know who they are simply by examining their presentation to me. I cannot say they are great or they are not great. I can listen to what they say, I can feel what they are sending to me, and I can decide for myself if I like it or not. I can take from it what I can and gain from it. I can also walk away and leave it as irrelevant for me. I can also respect their intelligence, their genius, their innovative capacity, and their power of presentation. I still would not be able to know for sure their level of advancement. The most important factor to me would be how relevant they are to me in my struggle to evolve.

The worst thing would be to have to accept someone and all they say or do simply because they held a position. Perhaps it is even worse to believe someone to be great because they are good at what they do. One really never knows truthfully about another. Therefore, my method is to accept everyone for what they are without insisting they be something I want. It is more fun that way for me. I am interested in people as people. As much as they wish to share with me personally, I more or less accept and if it benefits me, all the better!

Is this mental? No, why would it be? I think it is mental to simply accept others without questioning. Such acceptance would be a mental adjustment to fit some expectation. Questioning is intelligence. Are you intelligent? If so, what could be wrong with questioning? What is the fault in asking? And when an answer comes, is it wrong to consider it?

e) I try to be neutral in my presentations and to a large extent I am neutral in my consciousness. Regardless, there are things I like, things I believe, things I know, things I wish to be, and so on. I am a personality with likes and dislikes, inclinations, desires, and above all,

my own nature. These aspects to my life have come from my birth and my experience. My behavior has been modified by the responses of the world around me. I have been affected by all that I have previously experienced and my present situation is a product of my past. I do not live in a time vacuum.

Considering this and considering my experiences with deities and specifically those deities whom I have experienced a personal contact, communication and connection, I will always be of service to them in whatever way they desire according to my capacity. I know they only desire of me that which is compatible with me, so I do not worry when I say that. Further, I also know they do not want me to do something I do not want to do. I know they care about me and want my life to be a positive experience that brings me to where I want to go and where they want me to be.

Therefore, I like it when they are in my home and in the temple in St Petersburg. But how do I worship them and what is behind it?

I worship them by bathing and dressing them weekly and sometimes offering food. I come before them every morning and evening. I discuss my life with them. I meditate in front of them and do healing work on others with their assistance. Because of them, I better understand the world around me. In other words, they are the most important personalities in my life and they shall remain so. I worship them with my heart.

It is my experience that when we feel connected to the deities we can understand what to do with them. Following rituals and rites handed down through time does not necessarily create a connection to the deities. I feel the most powerful method is to create the connection first and then the details follow as they would in any intense personal relationship. I cannot get into further details in this text as it is a very big subject I have addressed in various lectures.

Here are some other comments which may be useful to you:

Either you trust someone else fully and surrender to them, or you have to decide for yourself what is right. The first method demands that you accept everything you have heard. You must seek out someone to fully accept, and then decide to accept them fully. Ultimately, it was your decision to simply accept. Do you really accept everything without any question from then on or do you sometimes have doubts you have to cover over to avoid questioning since you have already decided to stop questioning?

Those who accept authority like this say you can question, but when you get the answers you must accept them. In other words, questioning is only meant for clarification of the information given to you, not that it can be used to reject or deny that information.

Is it even possible to decide to accept something and never question it again? I doubt it. This would mean you either had to park your awareness at the door when you entered an institution, or that you were continuously convincing yourself that it is the best thing for you to do to accept.

Why must one understand the unlimited nature of the supreme? By definition, one cannot. Why not understand according to your capacity, according to the manner in which your relationship with the supreme has manifested and share that? What do you feel is better, to tell someone something you do not personally understand or to tell someone something you understand? Does it really help to repeat something you have little realization of to someone who has less realization? Is this a transmission of knowledge or is this a transmission of words?

You might say that although you do not have realization of what you have heard, you like the concepts. In that case, you could share these concepts with others by saying, "I have heard these concepts and like them. What do you think about it?" Share with others what you know and be honest about what you know. There can be no fault in admitting your limitations and most people will respect you more for it.

Find out what you don't know with whatever means available. You can hear from others as you like, you can experiment, you can experience, you can do whatever you need to do. But if you are restricted in what you should realize and how you should realize it, you run the danger of the discipline being incompatible with yourself or perhaps insufficient in some way. You may have wasted a lot of time before you realized this.

Therefore it is good to make a good plan. Planning is 90% of an endeavor, some great soul once said!

Love, love not

by sri » Sun Jun 24, 2007 11:39 am

Dear Hari,

I have a question (or two) that arouse from my work. My job is to listen to people and offer them some comfort and possible guidance in their respective situations. Possibly it is the loneliness during the Midsummer days that causes a big amount of certain type of clients calling to me. These are ladies that found themselves in love triangle, being the second women there.

Now, having to comfort a person in such a situation has often, in my job, two possible ways. One has a background in doctrine that says breaking a marriage is bad. Then the advisor will suggest that the person leaves the man (and his family) alone and does not have any relationship with such a man (for her own good). The other suggestion stems from the New Age doctrine that says breaking marriage is OK, if love is over one should not stay in a relationship. Even this line may suggest that woman should keep a distance but this time while waiting and sometimes insisting that man makes a swift decision to divorce.

In reality, this situation is very complicated and both of the doctrines are used by all involved to protect themselves, to justify their own needs and action, convince themselves and others that it is not them that are the bad guys in the situation. Unfortunately, to make things even more difficult, there are often children involved which makes a triangle a square or a pentagram.

Now, to my first problem. As a woman and a child of the divorced parents I am really not a advocate of divorces. As a human being I am not for people hanging in the situations that are harmful or unproductive to them. As a consultant I am supposed to be objective (as much as that is possible as I am conditioned by above) and see to the best of my client. Sometimes I have difficulties supporting a woman that insist that it is her right to overturn somebodys life (children's in particular) for her love. Supporting it makes me feel directly responsible for it, involved in somebodys else's hard hit while standing on the wrong side. I am not in a position where I can do much for that other woman and those children and I am fully aware how difficult it is going to be for them. It is just part of my nature to want to be there where the blow hits. I am not sure how to deal with the feelings of reluctance that this situation causes me. Any words of wisdom by you on that subject would be highly appreciated.

Then comes my question number two. I wonder if it really is so easy to stop loving someone and just give up on them? Many men and women do just that nowadays to their partners and

their children, other relatives or friends. No matter how hard I try to think myself I cannot find one person that I wanted to cross from my list if I once felt some love for them, be it relatives, friends or whatever. Although I may have given that impression to some of them some time and could have probably kept a better contact with them. Can love die, or was it love in the first place? You love someone that says he or she loves you and then one day they come and say they don't feel like it any more and you stand there with your love and go "what?". Dad comes and says he loves you but he isn't going to be around for he doesn't love mom anymore. That there with love is a huge puzzle for me so if you ever feel like saying something more on the subject I will sure be listening.

Thanks and hope you have a nice Midsummer time.

by Hari » Sat Jul 07, 2007 12:48 am

At first glance, your questions seem complex and deserving of answers in the form of books, seminars, and conferences. As this has been done by many extremely qualified people before me, I do not feel I can add to this body of knowledge. Yet, there might be something I can propose to assist you in your incredibly difficult and important task.

As a therapist and counselor, your task is to bring resolution to controversial situations. As you have mentioned, there is no right and wrong. Part of you sympathizes with those forced to live without love and part of you sympathizes with children forced to live in a divided family. No one can definitively answer these questions in a manner that works in all situations for every situation is different and all people are different.

Your job dictates that you are neutral. You have to work for the best interests of all people involved. You have to care about husbands, wives, children and the law. You have to follow the principles of the psychological disciplines in which you are trained. Most of all, in each situation you have to do what you feel is right and best for all. If you come to the session with a preconceived notion borne of your religious background or your acquired alternative ideals, you will block the progress of the talks as you push the direction of what takes place according to what you think should be done rather than what the family members think should be done. This would erode your effectiveness as a therapist.

Is it always in all situations correct for people to remain married? Are there any reasons why they should not? If you think there can never be divorce for any reason, then you should not be a counselor but rather you should put a sign in your office stating, "Forget how you feel. No matter what you say I will decide you should stay married regardless of your pain." How many customers will you have? Better to just let them work it out amongst themselves for this is why you are there -- to give them the forum within which this can be achieved.

Thus the therapist or counselor has to become a mediator. As a mediator, your task is to insure that all parties involved express themselves to their complete satisfaction and are heard by all the other parties involved. This is often done by asking the right questions to the right person at the right time. The most important part of the mediation is getting everyone involved to understand the position of the other. You do not need to have them agree, for complete agreement is difficult, but you should endeavor to get them to understand the positions of the others, for when they are aware of the entire picture solutions tend to manifest as the passionate members of the conflict become more reasonable. Sometimes you have to induce one party to place themselves in the position of the other and suggest alternative modes of resolution. The hardest part of mediation is awakening in each member of the conflict awareness of the other party's pain and difficulty.

When this is done, and as you know this is no easy task, the next stage is to negotiate an acceptable resolution. Naturally, no one will be happy when they walk out of the room for no one is happy with life shattering conflict, but if at least they have together grafted an agreement they can move on with their lives.

But what if one party wishes to remain in a marriage and the other does not? What if the one who wishes to remain will not budge and will never accept divorce? What if they do so to maintain external appearances or to have some semblance of a family and refuse to change this?

At that point, the negotiation could be centered on how to maintain that shaky alliance for the sake of accomplishing the goals. This is also a negotiation and it also can only occur if there was such awareness of the other's needs that both understood the requirement to negotiate peace.

Violent divorce or hostile divorces are handled by courts and would not be something you would ever deal with. There are laws to determine how such disputes are handled and judges who interpret the laws by passing down judgement that all have to accept by force. This is the least desirable form of separation, yet nowadays sometimes the only form possible.

Your one and only task has to be to facilitate the conflicting parties finding an acceptable means to continue with life. While these people are working out their problems they will feel pain, hardship, suffering, and one of the greatest traumas in their lives. Your skill as a mediator has to be melded with your compassionate heart as a therapist. You can always be there to support them and offer them whatever you can to assist them. It would be wrong of you to say, "Yes, dear, I understand that husband of yours is a real brute and I am so sorry you have to live with this." Rather you should simply be there for them and offer them a response according to what they require in the mood of, "I cannot understand the pain you are going through, but I am here to assist you lessen that pain in whatever way I can." Taking sides is not empathy, it increases the friction. Being supportive is welcome by all.

As far as your second question goes, "Is it possible to stop loving someone you once loved?" This is a good question. I have deeply loved in my life and due to circumstances have been distanced from those I love. Sometimes I have initiated that distance and at other times they have initiated that distance. I feel love goes on regardless, but I may not wish to have close contact with those people who I did not want to be around any longer. I also may wish to be around those who decided they did not want to be around me, but I have to accept that it cannot be. In a nutshell, love is complex. Once you love someone, even hating them later on does not change the love that was once there and which lingers somewhere deep inside and under the proper conditions can surface again. This is one of life's greatest challenges.

Can love die? Well, yes and no. If it was really there in the first place, it can be shocked out of existence, covered over by time, transferred in its intensity to others who are more relevant to our lives at present, or any of a myriad of possibilities. Does this mean the love died or that we transferred our love elsewhere? What does this say about the nature of love? I suppose it is everyone's task to decide for themselves the answer to this question.

I think the only way in which love matters is when we feel it. As it is a feeling, it can only be experienced when we feel it. Simply being loved by others is not enough. Only the love we feel is real to us. It is great when those we love, love us too, but it is not their love that is most significant to us, it is our love for them. Therefore when we stop feeling love for someone, love for that person has died for us. Sometimes that is sad.

Ether, Love, Sensuality, Energy, and a big headache

by Hari » Fri Jul 06, 2007 11:45 pm

I was sent a long and detailed question by someone and I felt my reply would be useful to others. I have rephrased the question to save space -- Hari

I want to love and be loved, as all people do. I have been struggling to feel enough trust in myself and others to accept a deep relationship. I thought I had attained someone's love and was reciprocating with them on the subtle platform, but when I tried to verify if this was really happening and they were also aware of it, it turned out to be something other than what I thought. Now I feel distraught, depressed, cheated and I cannot find peace.

It seemed that this love was real, but perhaps it was not so. Or maybe, it was real, but there was an illusion attached to it. Or worse, maybe it was just a fulfillment of my own desires as I am not satisfied in my life?

This situation has so disturbed me that I have become crazy and started to do things that are neither good for myself nor anyone around me. I do not know what to do and I consider life as too great a burden to bear at present. Please help!

The pain I feel now makes me lifeless. Is it possible this pain is due to being raped by an unwanted connection or worse, is it due to my accepting an unwanted connection because of thinking I am connected to someone I am not thus leaving myself open for any energy that finds its way to me? How is it possible that anyone can just come and connect to me in this way? I don't know how to defend myself from it.

Note by Hari: Obviously I cannot capture the mood or nuances of the original text in this short summary, so please be aware my answer below might address these missing elements

by Hari » Fri Jul 06, 2007 11:46 pm

I feel a desperation in you. I do not think it is necessary and it is destructive. Why are you so desperate? What is it that you think you will attain? Love is not something that is grabbed, especially not when one is desperate. It is, as you know, something that comes to us as a gift. Like all gifts, the best way to receive it is to be thankful and say so. One does not receive a gift by grabbing for it. That is the way of a small child. I do not know adults who seriously respond to being grabbed at.

I know that you cannot see yourself right now and I know that you are very upset with yourself and life, but this shall pass. Your motto right now should be, "This too shall pass." If you were to compare your situation with the sufferings of others who do not even have the essential things in life, you will see that your life is fine. You seem to lack a real connection to a real person on multiple levels. I think you have woken up to what a real relationship is, and that is good. It seems you never had one before. I see the taste of it has inspired you greatly and that is also good. What is not good is your thinking the 'connection' experienced in a subtle manner relates specifically to this or that person. This created within you an idea that this or that person was interested in you - as a person - and thus this illusion has created attachments in you for people who are not reciprocating the energy you are projecting towards them. It became worse when your initial loving energy transformed into desperation.

On the subtle level there will always be someone, somewhere, on some platform or another, who is ready, willing and able to reciprocate with your sensual desires. One of the ways they

inspire you to continue this is to bring you to the point of wondering who it is that is the source of this energy, and then allowing you to conclude it is that person who you wish it to be. From that point on, as long as it works, they will continue to do this and enjoy with you. While this is going on, you are happy and enjoying the connection. But when you try to verify that connection through physically existing people, you discover there was something wrong with it.

The something wrong is not in these ethereally felt people, neither is it in you and the way you deal with these people. These 'people' are simply surrogate visualizations, solidified thought forms suggested by your desire to connect to the visualized person and confirmed by whoever's energy it was which inspired your sensuality. There is nothing 'wrong' with those who do this *with* you, in other words, those who allow you to think they are those you want them to be, for you have been a more than willing partner and have accepted the experience without much questioning. As long as you are consenting, there is no wrong. You might say you consented due to a misunderstanding, but is this not one of the greatest problems everyone faces in life? How often do we think someone is one way only to find out later on they are quite different? No one is so observant and perfect that they can instantly know everything about anyone. It takes time to find out what others are like; therefore, in the real world we gradually get to know others and reciprocate with them safely and surely, or at least this is the way it is optimally done in a world without passion. The problem with the ethereal energy is it defies most person's direct sensual perception and therefore although the energy felt cannot be other than what it is, the specific personality behind it may not be who you think.

It is not 'wrong' that you allowed yourself to think these connections were real. The experiences you had were real. They brought you to another place which gave you something. Perhaps it was the booster shot your life needed -- a kind of kick in the pants! What might have been wrong is your insistence that the sources of these experiences are those you visualized. It is like the snake and the rope example from the veda. Neither the snake nor the rope is false; rather, it is your misunderstanding of what they really are.

Instead of grabbing and being desperate, why not just relax and see clearly what is happening and then decide if your 'relationship' with these energies is acceptable. In other words, you liked it, so why stop it? If you only liked it because you thought it was this or that specific person, then stop it if you cannot tolerate it is not that person. Are you sure that you were cheated? Or were you allowing it to continue because it was an experience you could not resist? If so, then admit it. There is nothing wrong with such an admission for it is a statement of the truth of your life. If you negatively judge yourself for enjoying, then this means you think you should not enjoy, or that if you do enjoy it has to be with this or that special person for when you do it with them your enjoyment is somehow acceptable whereas if it were done with anyone else it would not be acceptable. Just be honest with yourself about what is happening. When you are honest and clear about what is happening, you will be able to continue living in a manner that gives you peace. And don't worry about being cheated. You learned many skills that are valuable in your life by these experiences. You are now wiser and more mature than ever before, and certainly much less prone to illusion.

There is another aspect which should be mentioned. People leave behind elementals -- energetic thought forms. One can connect to these elementals and experience the specific energy of a person that was created during an intense state of energetic thought which gave birth to the specific thought form. As we cannot tell the difference between a 'parked' elemental that is forever the same with forever the same quality of energy and a living person's energy that is constantly changing, we can become bewildered and confuse a person's separated energy from their living conscious energy.

To be quite frank, you are married. I assume you wish to continue being married. If there is not enough stimulation for you in your marriage, then find some somewhere where it will not harm

you or your family. You seem to know the art of having fun and if this is acceptable to you stop worrying about it. Otherwise, be honest and say, "I cannot tolerate the situation I am in now. I will change it!" But this in-between state where you are unable to deal with yourself and have become self-destructive is not good, is not helpful, and is the best hell a person can create if they wanted to punish themselves for their sins.

I have seen that those who have this problem are not sensually satisfied at home. They need to do something about this and put more zing in their lives!

I already have bothered myself

by Aicha » Wed May 30, 2007 5:44 pm

Dear Hari, for a long time I was trying to ignore my feelings, because I determined them as frivolous.

I feel myself very melancholy, since my childhood. I always explained it such reasons, as character and psychology. I have many aspirations and desires to make something global, but at the same time I see senselessness of it. Very rare people are interesting for me, and in general I prefer loneliness. In connection with it, I had a certain dual personality, for others and for me. And the most awful, during the moments of a life when I would like to share myself someone, I find it impossible.

In the past, i felt comfortable in a such situation, but not now. My current condition is like I want to To fall asleep.

My daily timetable is full, i tried to sink in affairs, but it did not help.

What is Your suggestions in my situations, might it be something simple or normal, or I should change something in my life or mind?

by sri » Tue Jun 05, 2007 9:29 am

Hi

Aichas question to Hari is obviously meant for him to answer, but I hope you don?t mind me sharing a few thoughts on it. I am a "newbie", and we can apparently mess things up sometimes , trust me I've been one a couple of times. Please don?t judge me to harsh.

Aicha, what you are writing about is an interesting situation. Interesting because we have all at some time in life (and probably more then once) experienced something similar. However, it is but few that talk about it. And why? Because most of us experienced that when we tried to do so previously, we found that when we most need and want to get a contact with others, it doesn't?t work.

What is your first reaction when someone comes and says - I am tired and my life doesn't?t work for me? Usually there are two responses - one: you feel compassion and try to comfort a person or -two: you've heard it too many times from the same person (or others) and you think that she or he should get grip of their life and go on with it instead of lamenting and being week.

Longer we live, more times we have heard people complain, especially if we find ourselves in a difficult situation, more we choose (this is not a conscious choosing I am talking about) to respond in the manner that second alternative suggests.

It becomes a evil circle. We are tired, need help or inspiration and people come to us asking for the same and we just feel, "Come on, get yourself together, be a man, get up and fight or go and die". Then we don't dare to go and ask for the help because we expect that others will react the same. And most of the time they will. Then we end up feeling even worst.

So we all depend on those souls that are in the life phase where they can choose the response alternative one. And it isn't always easy to stay there. Indeed, it can be very difficult. I have pondered over this particular issue already as a pre-teen.

It was in my early teens that I wrote a story In search of love (parts of which I dared post on Members Writings for I felt that people here may be able to relate to it). It was in the middle of one of my own personal crisis about ten years ago that I found the manuscript in my garage.

And what did I discover? The girl that was so devoted to be a flower and not a thorn, to be a light even in the deepest of the darkness, to do something good, global or less global, but something that would add to the goodness in the world, yeah, I was very, very far from that.

I too, Aicha, felt that there is no meaning, that nothing really can be done. And the taught strikes me every now and then again. Then, it was that girl that I once was that helped me find the light inside me. Some other times it was the kind souls that had the light and shared it with me.

I have been unfortunate to loose some of those people I found to be friends and inspiration to me, and when I finally found them I found that I was but a stranger to them, not very wanted in their life right now. Then again, I too had a times when I could not share the light with others, as you can guess.

Ultimately, what I am trying to say as a add into the discussion is: How do we get the help we need, without draining ourselves and those we want a help from? How do we keep giving the help without getting drained and without hurting others in the times we aren't able to give help?

And to you personally Aicha I would like to say - do go and sleep. A good sleep is worth gold. Don't try to hide in overworking. Take a rest. Take a long walk and enjoy the beauty of the nature. Recharge your batteries. Life will get the lighter colours again. Good luck.

Sri

by Hari » Fri Jun 08, 2007 11:29 pm

Ultimately, what I am trying to add to the discussion is: How do we get the help we need without draining ourselves and those we want help from? How do we keep giving help to others without getting drained and when we cannot help them, how can we avoid hurting them?

Generally it is true that in this particular forum only I reply to the main question being asked and anyone can comment on this. However, no rule is set in stone, especially here on harimedia, and we shall forgive Sri's adding her two ore to the conversation (ore are Swedish cents, if she was Russian it would be her two kopecks) for I think Sri has added something significant to the essence of Aicha's text. By the way, to make fancy fonts and so on, you need to use only the commands that are available in the edit box of the text.

But to address the original question first:

Usually, the first line of a significant text contains an important expression that indicates the writer's intent. Sometimes a first line is simply an introduction to a more meaningful point, but in your text I see the first line as a clue to what is going on in you.

How long have you been ignoring your feelings and for how long have you felt feeling to be frivolous? I do not need your written answer, but rather you should answer this for yourself. What act or event caused you to start ignoring your feelings? What process was used to determine your feelings were frivolous? On what basis did you make that judgment? Did you find your conclusion to have a basis in the facts of your life and was this conclusion verified by your experiences afterwards?

When you investigate the answers to these questions, you will come closer to discovering what makes you tick, what motivates you, which can lead you to a deeper understanding of what it was you were trying to avoid, or achieve, when you decided that feeling was not relevant.

Feelings are the essence of what we are. Our consciousness is our awareness and the essence of the spirit is its sensitivity and feeling. That feeling is not an irrational, emotional, and therefore frivolous thing, it is the basis of our existence. Although you might say your statement was only meant to relate to how you felt about other people, I see that statement as having significance for yourself as well.

You state you like to be alone and that you presented one side of you to the outside world while you kept yourself, who you really were and what you really felt, to yourself. Many of us feel during childhood that the people around us are not interesting. Some people feel that for the rest of their lives as well. It is not an easy task to find people who are interesting since most people are doing things that relate to their everyday needs. If I look around those who live in my neighborhood, for example, I see mothers and fathers who work to support their homes and families, work to maintain their houses, drive their children here and there, do this and that social obligation, take care of elderly parents, and a myriad of other tasks. Everyone is busy all the time and very few have any time to devote to cultivating relationships with others, especially if some effort is involved. Therefore, by default, most people are uninteresting to other people because they are either not motivated to be interesting or they are simply too busy.

I am sure there are billions of interesting people in this world. One has to relate with them in a manner they find interesting which inspires them to display that which makes them unique. It is that uniqueness in each person that is interesting and discovering it is a real joy.

There are many who are hermits. I cannot say for sure and anyway generalizations are worthless, but it seems to me that most hermit types I know are that way because they are either not equipped with social skills for some reason, they feel that others exploit them or demand something from them, or they feel others have nothing to offer them in return. Some are hurt so badly by previous experiences that relationships seem to be the last thing they want in their lives. Some are traumatized by the loss of loved ones and fear letting anyone come close to them as they cannot tolerate further loss. Some are themselves traumatized by extremely intolerable events in childhood which scarred them for life and which convinced them relationships lead to pain. There are other cases too.

The idea that since relationships cause pain, avoiding relationships avoids pain is interesting. Is it really so that the only source of pain is relationships? What about loss of money, loss of position, loss of physical health, loss of bodily motion, disability, hurricanes, storms, floods, drought, and so on? Surely these are sources of pain. Relationships are merely one form of pain, so why would we conclude that avoiding them avoids pain?

The answer is equally interesting, for relationships are near to the most important thing we have in this world. As man is a social animal, and society means relationships, we have no choice but to throw our lot in with all others and cooperate to make our shared living area comfortable and compatible. Avoiding such relationships weaken our capacity to do this and therefore we must drop off our reluctance and work cooperatively or we suffer. Some may conclude that either way we suffer for in many cases suffering at the hands of others due to their harsh words, duplicity, cheating, selfishness and carelessness is worse than anything the forces of nature can hurl at us.

I find in this point the key to resolving this dilemma. The reason relationships wield so much power over us is due to their being at the basis of all that we need in this world and all that we can be in this world. Even just manifesting the primal urge to reproduce means there must be a mate, friendly relations with our own and other families, relations with one's own children and their friends, as well with all those who assist us in maintaining these relationships. Therefore, it is almost impossible to avoid relationships.

If one manages to avoid them to a large extent, one can also manage oneself into a depression of sorts. One might end up in the situation you describe, namely, you cannot live with yourself under these conditions. Perhaps you feel to some extent hopeless in life? How can you go on? How will you live in such situations? What will save you from this dichotomy that does not seem to have a natural resolution?

What makes a person interesting to you? Is someone interesting because they know some art or have some capacity, or are they interesting because they know how to listen to you and relate to what you feel? I think the former is a type of entertainment that is surface and temporal. How many interesting movie stars marry another interesting movie star and after a while lose interest? I think someone who can listen to us, relate to how we feel and respond to us appropriately is worth more than money can ever buy, but then again, this might be a reflection of what I am and what I want. Perhaps it is what we all really want for I have heard it said again and again, "I need to find someone who understands me."

I have heard people speak about opulence by stating that the more you act as if your life was a constant flow of opulence the more it will really be that way. Some speak about these positive affirmations as being the root re-programming of the destructive routines that have placed us in a repetitive, unresponsive rut. In this mood I would suggest you to start learning how to reach out to others by being a good listener and offering your service to them in this way. You might be amazed at what they say when they finish complaining about those things which disturb them. When they are allowed to vent and you have been so kind as to listen, they trust you and feel free to speak about things which mean something significant to them. This exchange of confidentiality is not only interesting, it is where the essential life force is shared between souls. If you want to get, give, if you want to be loved, love. If you want kindness in your life, show it to others, under all conditions, without expectation of return, without demands or judgments, and your life will change.

And so we come to Sri. Those who have been there for others when they needed it are usually those who have plenty of people ready to assist them when they need it. I know this is not business, but it seems that when you invest in people, they return to you more than you put in. Only ask for what you really need to go on and do not think that the solution to your problems is to drain energy from others to replenish your waning supply. Only Count Dracula would find that solution compatible (is it possible the original Dracula was just someone who drained the life out of others through his demands and expectations?)

Now if you wanted to really help others, the best way to do so is to listen to them. Everyone becomes interesting to us when they listen to us. During a discussion with another person, do

not feel the need to speak, but feel the need to hear. Simply the act of hearing another person is often enough to cure them. Many are frustrated on the deepest levels simply because no one cares enough to listen. They feel misunderstood, not appreciated, and therefore useless. Try the art of compassionate hearing. Listen to what is not being stated verbally by taking in all their communications on all levels. By doing so you are a real friend.

If you are in need, having such kinds of friends is what you would value most. Certainly if someone was in pain and you just listened to them but did nothing to relieve their pain, you would be useless to them. I suggest that when you do know the answer to their problems, if only a few of them, you share this without expectation of reward, but when you do not know the answer you admit that but continue to listen empathetically since it is a very valuable service that often solves problems we did not even know we had. And sometimes these problems are the root of that which we presently are experiencing.

What more can we do and what more could we expect from others? We can only give what we have and we should only take what we need. I suppose this is a kind of social manifesto, "From each according to what they have, to each according to their need." Hmmm, it works. To implement this properly you have to know what you have to offer and limit yourself to offering this only. You also have to know what you need and not take more than this.

If you are in the company of an energy vampire, separate yourself as fast as you can. Luckily for us, most people are not like that.

by Aicha » Sun Jun 10, 2007 4:42 pm

I didn't expect that you would replay), because some time later I realized that your work on this site: lectures, forum are already the answer.

THANK YOU!

Emotions

by alexey » Thu Jun 16, 2005 12:45 pm

Dear Hari!

Sometimes I (like anybody else) feel negative emotions. How can I deal with them? I mean, I understand why I feel it - because of bad mood, because of behaviour of the people (when they act against my expectation) etc. I understand that I am not right, and I try to control my words and actions. But emotions are already there... I understand that such emotions are wrong reactions and I do not want to feel them, but I feel.

Thank You for helping

by Hari » Mon Jun 20, 2005 4:06 pm

I used to think that some emotions were bad. Now I think that they are simply what they are, nothing more, and nothing less. Labeling emotions as bad is self-judgment, and self-judgment has to be used cautiously. One does benefit from viewing one's actions with some detachment for not all actions are the best actions for us to choose. Therefore we use our intelligence to choose what the best course of action for us is. When we reflect on our thought process and emotional responses, we understand ourselves better and can therefore better adjust our

consciousness in a manner conducive to our evolution. However, this does not imply that what we think or feel is bad; rather, it simply means it is not the best thing for us to think or feel at the present moment. We make that decision according to what is best for our overall evolution. Learning to see what we are and adjusting that to optimize our progress is an art well worth learning.

For example, when people act opposite to your expectations you can consider a few different courses of action. First, you could examine why this unexpected reaction has occurred. Perhaps you did not have all the information you thought you had when you created the expectation and now you waking up to reality. Second, you could wonder if having expectations is the best thing to do. Perhaps being detached is more appropriate for you. Third, perhaps there are conditions within yourself which are creating the reaction to the event or the energy impacting you which is opening up a door within. When that door opens, opportunities arise for self-discovery and the increase of self-awareness which is an essential ingredient in self-actualization.

Whatever the situation, use these so-called negative emotions as an opportunity rather than seeing them as a problem. If you see them as something bad and lament their existence, you will miss what these emotions are telling you and the wonderful possibilities they might lead you to. After all, these emotions are your own personal and specific energetic responses to other's energy. They are the best communication you can possibly have to you own inner world that is often locked up and sealed off from outside influences. Listen to what your inner world is expressing to your outer world.

You cannot go wrong by listening to yourself. Do something about it. Dig deeper to find the source. Do whatever is required to get to the bottom of what makes you tick and what turns your emotional energy response on. You will never regret it. After all, it is you. Don't be afraid of yourself. You are a good person and you are a fully spiritual being. Avoiding what you are will simply put off the time when you have to face yourself, accept yourself, and discover your beauty.

by kami » Fri May 18, 2007 10:24 am

Hariji, could you give me advice how to manage with anger? when we do something we like and someone comes and disturb more and more.. how to change that situation without frustration, fight and resign from this activity we like? what is the mental (?) way? what is the optimal thinking to be free form disturbing people?

Thank you,
Kami

by Hari » Tue May 22, 2007 6:49 pm

Everyone gets angry at one point or another. One who cannot get angry has no life or perhaps is lobotomized. Although the optimal way to be free from disturbing people is to avoid them completely, it is not always possible when they are your relatives, neighbors, compatriots, or partners in business. Therefore, one needs a viable method to deal with situations that evoke anger.

To effectively deal with agitating situations, one requires to be evolved and mature. There are various types of evolved people. Some foresee complicated situations and avoid the potentially upsetting scene, but even those gifted with this marvelous vision are now and then forcibly entangled in unwanted embraces. Those who recognize that people's acts are a product of

their nature and level of advancement compounded by a myriad of known and unknown factors that create stress, are therefore not angry at others by default. Their first inclination is to investigate if they could be of assistance rather than lash out at others. This requires internal peace, for one who is agitated within will erupt rapidly in agitating situations.

I have experienced that most times when I either erupt instantly, or want to do so, is due to the agitating situation striking a resonant chord within me. Perhaps I was seeing something in others that I disliked in myself, or perhaps I felt insulted or hurt by someone who should not have done what they did? I have learned (and am still attempting to practice) the concept of looking for the factors within people that motivate them, or even force them, to act the way they do. This usually sufficiently cools me off to function reasonably well. One who observes how anger arises can deal with it with detached curiosity. When family is involved, it becomes harder to do this. However, one who has been pushed over their limit of tolerance may blow up in a somewhat calculated manner to put an end to a time wasting disturbance or action that harms others or the world.

Anger within ourselves usually indicates something needs to be done -- either we must change ourselves or we should assist others to change. Of course, one can just be angry, frustrated, filled with wrath and rage, and trash everything around one in the vain hope of gaining satisfaction, but this very destructive force does no one good. Therefore, to properly deal with anger we have to accept it, feel it, and then decide what to do about it. The alternatives are that one can vent; one can see a reason to change something inside oneself; or one can understand that some form of change is required in other people, or the world, and take steps to implement it.

Venting means to express to those who make you angry, or to anyone else who takes the time to listen, why you are angry. Venting blows off steam and reduces the heat of our anger. Repressing anger is never good as it creates volcanic-like effects that either spew out everywhere like a geyser or create underground pathways of super-heated lava within our psyche. Venting is good when other options are either not possible or are too difficult, such as when you are angry at your child or are angry at unknown universal forces or fate.

Being angry with oneself for being stupid, for making mistakes, or for any other form of perceived internal defect, encourages a healthy search to discover what went wrong. Finding such causes helps us to avoid similar situations in the future or to rectify existing reactions to our errors.

Being angry at others actions and feeling an impetus to assist them could either be due to seeing how others are ruining themselves or a desire to have them stop causing us and others difficulty. It then becomes our responsibility to analyze the situation and find an appropriate means to educate, transform, or redirect this improper energy.

At the heart of these three methods is the desire to not hurt ourselves or others. This desire must be cultivated in our hearts, for when the passionate madness of uncontrolled anger strikes, the desire to destroy the "aggressor," regardless of the cost to ourselves, tears at our intelligence. Those who truly love the world and those within it are able to respond evenly by relating to the facts involved and not by attacking individuals for their faults or motives. It is one thing to say, "You did this to me and I don't like it." It is quite another to say, "You did this to me because you are a rotten stinker who hates me and doesn't care for anyone but himself." The former states the case and the effect of the act, the latter judges the performer of the act and presumes to know the actor's motives and inner being. One who is forced to deal with facts is more inclined to cooperate than one who hears judgmental condemnation of themselves. Naturally, determining what are the facts in any case is very difficult but when passion is involved it is almost impossible. If one recognizes the goal (again, either to change

oneself or to change others or a situation) one can catch one's breath and cool off enough to express care and concern for all involved. This is also the course of action healthiest for our bodies.

I suppose one who lives the motto, "There is only one of us," knows the pain they offer to others through anger is pain thrown upon themselves and therefore expresses with respect. Certainly, we should not allow others to walk over us, neither should we avoid changing what is wrong on the plea that there is only one of us, but acting within the proper context is more effective than acting as if we were a victim of some aggressor.

by kami » Thu May 24, 2007 8:14 am
Thank You, Hariji!

It is very helpful for me in my situation..

Greetings

Making Choices

by Guess » Fri Apr 06, 2007 1:54 pm

Dear Hari!

People in general including myself do not always know all consequences of their's actions or choices, at least consciously. Moreover people often or even most time stay under the pressure of external circumstances as they make theirs decisions, such as different kinds necessities of life in relation to body, association etc.

Considering all this I would suppose, that people do not really have a free will. But I definitive know, that they have.
Where I've made a mistake in my conclusions?

If we do not know the consequences, why should we take the responsibilities?

It seems, that the free will directly depends of our awareness about the possible consequences.

by Hari » Thu Apr 12, 2007 12:37 am

We know for certain that no one can be absolutely sure about the consequences of their actions. Considering this, the best course of action is to do the absolute best you can for the greatest good of all concerned. If you do the best you can, no one can accuse you of fault, if there is any, since any fault that occurred would be beyond your capacity to prevent. However, one should not attempt to do something one lacks the capacity to do when one does not have to do it and there is significant risk involved. In this case, even doing the best one can is not enough since one should not have acted in the first place.

That we are under pressure to make a decision infers that others assume we are qualified to decide. If we see that avoiding to decide would be contrary to the best interests of ourselves, our family, or others, then we have to act and do the best we can.

I would not conclude that being forced to make a decision negates free will. I would conclude that being in the position where a decision has to be made proves the existence of free will. After all, "to decide" means there are choices. How you decide depends on you. Even if there are factors to consider that are beyond your control or against your desire (after all, if you had the possibility to change these circumstances you would) it is clear that being in the position to decide one way or the other means you have choice and this is free will.

There are many factors and conditions arising prior to the event requiring a decision, and how all the actors arrived together in this scenario is often extraordinarily complex. We all know that life often throws together people and circumstances in a manner that cooks us! How such situations play out is often a complex combination of multiple persons' free will and desire. When we are in a group, our singular free will and desire has to conform according to our desire and requirement to cooperate with other's decisions. Perhaps our free will manifested at the moment we decided to join a group? Perhaps we made the choice to be a member of a particular family?

Long ago we might have made the choice to smoke cigarettes and are now faced with the unpalatable options of choosing either chemotherapy or radical surgery. We might consider both these choices as terrible alternatives, but we might see death as even worse. We might say this means there really is no free choice, but that is not true. Some time ago we made a choice out of our free will and desire and now the consequences are upon us. You might argue that you lived in a home where your parents and family smoked, you played or grew up with friends who all smoked, smoking was considered the thing to do, or other situations forced you to do it and therefore you did not have the free choice to say no to the original offer to smoke. Perhaps it was like that; however, you still made the choice. You had the option to not do it.

Some choices seem to be created for us either by the devil or a saint. We might think the devil created the situation where we had to rob a bank, get captured on tape by the surveillance cameras, and subsequently get arrested when he arranged for you to be born in a poor family and have bad association. I do not know if you believe you were born into a particular circumstance accidentally or by choice, but depending on this belief you can understand the different ways in which you would look at all subsequent events. If you think you were born into a family and circumstances accidentally; there is no overriding intelligence or choice in these events; we are all thrown into the chaos of this world and battered around while fending for ourselves, you might think all events are the product of chaotic force. But then you would not have asked this question!

If you believe our present life is primarily a continuation from our last; meaning, we carry into this life our etheric bodies with memory, desire, and characteristic personality, then you would consider it quite possible that your previous situation, created by your free will and choice, has created the potential into which you are born in this life.

One might complain that it is quite hard to find the root of all of this. You would certainly be correct. Which event at which point in time created the original cause that created the character of all events to come? What was that significant thing that colored the path I was to take from then on? This is an interesting question that I cannot answer. If I had to find out my root cause, I would look within for my most powerful characteristic desire and try to extrapolate this to the start of my time. I could not depend on the answer, but it would assist me to better understand myself.

Your question mainly seeks to find out why we should be responsible for the consequences of our actions when we cannot predict what they shall be when we initiate such acts. But do we know the full consequences of any act? When I pour water on the floor, do I know how it will fall or exactly what it will wet when it splashes? All I can be sure of is that water will be on the

floor. If I am mopping the floor, that is good enough for me for all I care about is moving the wet mop here and there to clean the floor. Spilling water is a simple act ordinarily done for a simple purpose. We have done it many times and we are sufficiently aware of what we are doing. We have decided that a complete knowledge of the random waves of the splash is not required and therefore we do not worry about it.

As acts increase in complexity, the possibilities of what can occur increase proportionately. Complex acts create complex consequences. In the real world, those who have a greater awareness of these consequences can predict what will take place and use it to their advantage, whereas those who are less aware will have a reduced capacity to exploit future events.

Let us, for fun, take the example of a government that decides to create an event they feel will transform their country and therefore the world. Great minds will sit together and create a plan, consider each and every situation that can arise, and plug all the holes that may exist. They create feasibility studies to determine if it will work and then update the plan until success is highly probable or certain. The event is then set into action and initially it seems to create the predicted pattern of results. This makes them happy and causes them to nourish these patterns with appropriate responses and legislation.

But is it always so? One can see that although for some time or in some way manipulation does indeed create situations that others can exploit to further their wealth, power, or gains, at one point these gains may be reversed, wiped out by severe, unforeseen reactions, crushed by disloyalty amongst the initial plan-makers, or any of a hundred other reasons why the best made plans of mice and men are often laid to waste. After all, who but God can predict events? Humans are prone to error and one of their most glaring errors is miscalculation. If even the best amongst us, the most intelligent amongst us, or even those within the celestial realm can miscalculate, why should one think we have the option of foresight?

I would conclude that we are therefore limited in what we can see and our challenge is to find our way with the perception we have. Considering this, we are naturally bound to accept consequences of decisions made without complete knowledge. This seems to simply be the way it is. And further, it seems only God has the perfect capacity to understand all consequences of all acts everywhere at all times as this is one of the reasons God is God and no one else is. Again, this understanding would only apply to you if you believed in God and God's capacity, otherwise you would think that all things are random events ruled by physical laws and a human's responsibility is to know these laws the best he can and work with them to make life as best as it can be. Even so, you would agree with the analysis that no one in this world can know everything and our task is to make the best of what we have.

None of these points negate free will. Free will is active in all circumstances, although our choices may be severely limited due to past forgotten actions that created the fertile ground for our present situations.

But why do we have to suffer the consequences of acts when we could not have predicted what will occur? After all, we did what we did with good intentions. Regardless, it seems to me that without acts creating consequences there would be no world. That an act creates a consequence is the basic factor of all existence and is the real definition of karma.

Consider a world where you could do anything you wanted and there would be no consequence? This is like saying, my acts will bring no results. So my eating would not fill my belly, drinking would not quench my thirst, or sex would not satisfy my desire or even feel good! When we separate an act from its result, we strip the world of all potential and create a realm ruled by the void. Naturally you would not accept this, neither could it ever happen.

Therefore consequences follow acts. Responsibility for these consequences must be linked to the performer of acts otherwise no one could eat or drink. You are aware of the consequence of eating ice cream. You like how it tastes and feels and therefore you eat it. Such pleasure often rules the decision making process which stops further questioning about future consequences because one considers them irrelevant to the enjoyment at hand. Ice cream is mainly fat and fat is not very good for you. Sometime down the road, you can develop problems that can severely curtail your health. In other words, there is good and bad in all things and how we decide to own these possibilities before we embark on an action will demonstrate our character and intelligence.

Learning to do things better for our own sake and for the sake of others is a challenge that fosters the evolution of our intelligence, strength, character, fortitude, determination, and a host of other good qualities. It is the means by which we grow. Without such a challenge, there would be no growth. Here is a brief answer your question as to why we have to receive the reactions to the consequences of our acts even though we cannot predict them: without this, there would be no evolution.

by Guess » Thu Apr 12, 2007 10:12 pm

Sometimes we have to choose only from very few possibilities and most time we "eat ice cream" only because we like how it tastes and feels. You might argue that you lived in a home where your parents and family smoked, you played or grew up with friends who all smoked, smoking was considered the thing to do, or other situations forced you to do it and therefore you did not have the free choice to say no to the original offer to smoke. It was alike as you wrote. I've started to smoke three times because of association with smokers.

I want to thank you for your detailed answer.

too many questions

by Aicha » Thu Mar 29, 2007 5:54 pm

dear Hari!

I have weak understanding of the reason why the souls had transformed from spiritual world of happiness to the material world. I found several answers for them, and might be all of them are right. However, one of them, that is the most logic on my opinion, has a concrete contradictions with vedic sayings about the soul.

In more detail, I think that our mind is not developed enough to understand God, his personality. So, as our mind is the derivative of our soul, it reflects all characteristics of the soul. Thus, we loose the qualitative characteristics, which limit our perceptions on the level of soul, as the mind cannot exist as independent variable. And this contradicts with sayings, which I heard from vedic resources, that the soul is the pure and perfect part of the God.

I would be very appreciated, if you would express your opinion upon it. Till I have some order in my mind, every question brings a root of other questions like a snowball.

by Hari » Tue Apr 03, 2007 8:35 pm

If souls come from a spiritual world where all is perfect and only less than perfect souls leave, there seems to be a contradiction. After all, if the place is perfect, why leave it? If we leave it because we are imperfect, then there is imperfection in the spiritual world. On the other hand, if it is part of the perfection of the spiritual world that some are allowed to leave, then one should not define the spiritual world as a place where no one leaves.

It is possible that only the spiritual world is perfect but not all the souls within it. It is also possible to consider that leaving the spiritual world may not be an imperfect act; rather, it fits within the overall scheme of things and thus the souls who do leave are not less perfect. The possibility to relocate to the 'material world' may even be encouraged when it is for the benefit of the individual. This would mean our present definition of 'perfection' is imperfect and the debate about the issue unnecessary. One could say that at any particular moment some souls are properly suited in the spiritual world and others require to be in the material world.

A second opinion states that the souls here in this world do not come from the spiritual world, but have always been outside of the spiritual world. One wonders why some souls were allowed to eternally reside in the spiritual world and some were condemned to the material? The God of this spiritual world seems to be whimsical, putting some souls here and some souls there. Why must the souls who are outside have to now work so hard to get inside while the ones already there enjoy? And can those who were shunted off to the place of suffering count on that same God to allow them into the spiritual clubhouse? After all, it was that God who shut them out in the first place. Was there a reason they were shut out or was it arbitrary? And once they are in, are they assured of their security regardless of any future happenstance in the spiritual world? After all, since they were once arbitrarily designated as material residents, what would keep the same unstoppable whimsical force from doing it again after they entered the spiritual realm?

If matter and its world is temporary and not eternal, then where were these souls before the material world existed? They had to be somewhere, so where was that place? Was it the spiritual world or do we have to come up with a third alternative, perhaps the non-manifest cosmic egg, but then where did that come from? Those who give this argument will not disagree that the spiritual energy is the source of all existence including matter. If the material energy is eternal, then it was never created and those within it are always there. If one says the material energy came from God at one point, then so did those souls who were within it and therefore ultimately all souls were once with God. Did they emanate from God? Was it then they entered into the material realm? Was there any choice in this? They were merely atomic particles within God whereas the eternally liberated were within their eternal abode in the spiritual world. If the emanated were atoms, they had little choice where they were headed when they streamed forth from this massive source of all energy, and thus it is not their choice to be here in this world. This means ultimately, they were put here by God. If the material world is not eternal, then they either fell at one point somewhere in time from the spiritual world or they emanated from the body of God. Both ideas negate the idea that one is eternally in the material realm.

If the material world is eternal and the souls who are there were not put there by a whimsical God, then it must be the nature of the souls within it to be eternally in the material realm. If it is their nature, then what is it about these souls that differentiates them from the other souls whose nature it is to be in the spiritual realm? They could not have attained that nature if they always had it. This means there really are two types of souls and this makes one wonder how one transforms from one type to the other, or, how despite their being two types the main differentiation between the types -- residency in a particular realm -- can be negated by practice. Considering this, in essence there are not two general groups of souls, but only one group that has the choice to transform their basic character, and thus their places of residence, at will.

The idea that there are essentially two types of souls does not explain how this fundamental difference exists. Since they are eternal and these categories of differentiation are also existing timelessly (until they seemingly change forever), they were not created that way, they always were that way.

Can we reasonably accept this or is there another way to look at it? Considering the all-encompassing perfection of the Supreme and the matrix within which we all exist, it makes more sense that each and every soul, regardless of their situation, is perfect and complete exactly where they are. How they move through their lives is up to them and their attaining alternate realms depends on their tuning to that dimension's frequency when they intensely want to. Due to the fundamental and massive frequency shift required to relocate to the other dimension, such an act requires an enormous effort of will.

One could describe the dimensions in two general categories, one as a place where there are challenges and one as a place without challenges. Within each category there is a wide variety of options and lifestyles. One realm is harder, one is easy. When groups of individuals unite in an extremely compatible spiritual manner within the world of challenges, the hard realm can become easy. Uniting in this way is one of the challenges we can choose to face.

There are problems with other models of the spiritual realm. Those who profess we 'fell' from a perfect spiritual world filled with pure, unalloyed spiritual beings, are also accepting that imperfection can either exist or suddenly appear in the spiritual realm. Is it that a perfect person who is properly situated within the spiritual wholeness of pure being suddenly gets the idea to do something impure and falls? Consider the difficulty in understanding the development of these imperfect and impure thoughts that catalyzed the fall. At what point does the idea of rebellion crystalize enough to provoke the purity thought police to terminate your spiritual world passport and deport you? Does it come when you wake up one morning and say, "That's it, I'm through!", or is it when you have the first thought of doing the unthinkable as in "Gee, am I really meant to be here with all these perfect beings?" Could it be that 16 bad thoughts are the limit and when that limit is reached you are sent packing? Or is it understood by all that we no longer belong there and thus we move on?

There are problems with the concept that one in the spiritual realm is forced to leave due to unexpectedly becoming incompatible with the place. If I am in the spiritual realm and have no proper conception of the 'material realm,' how can I make a fully informed choice to leave the spiritual world? Would I know there was such a choice available? And if I knew it, would the choice hover in my consciousness somehow, or even, would it be revived when someone I knew left the spiritual world? Would I speak with or have contact with those who were in the process of leaving or was the departure so rapid that there was no way to communicate or reason with the person? Was it a mass departure that happened so long ago that it is now forgotten, if forgetfulness is possible for the perfect beings? Am I informed of the options available to me in the spiritual world? Would I be informed of the consequences of my leaving that realm and 'entangling' in the arms of the 'material beast' or does it all happen so fast that there is no time to consider the results of my desire flare?

In the scriptural idea, we leave the kingdom of God due to lusty desire. How such nasty desire can arise when one is situated in the realm of perfection is not discussed. It might be said that some are always perfect and never become imperfect whereas some are capable of being imperfect. However, are those with such 'imperfect' capacity aware of it; are they told about it and taught to watch out for those evil thoughts? Are they warned that after four such thoughts (or whatever) they will be deported? If not, then the eviction is without cause, and if so, what causes such perfect persons to disregard such warnings? If lust within the perfect soul arises suddenly, its potential is inherent within the nature of the soul. Or are there some souls who

have a different potential than others? If all have similar potential, what guarantees that it will never manifest in those who have never left and what guarantees it will not manifest again in those who have returned? If they are reluctant to allow the desire to manifest, this means they are in a constant state of control due to their memory of the consequences of allowing their potential to even slightly manifest. Does this constant vigilance not cause them a disturbance? If they have such vigilance they are superior to those who have never fallen! There are now individuals who have the potential for lust but who never use it due to superior knowledge and experience. Those who have never fallen and who have the potential to do so do not have the upgraded features of those who have learned their lessons. My goodness! They are at risk! If they are not at risk then their potential is indeed different and there are indeed different kinds of souls. If there are different kinds of souls then those who leave are simply following their natures. Following their potential cannot be considered a fault.

In other scenarios, some wish to attain another position, such as a competitor to the Supreme. They must be dissatisfied in a world where all are always satisfied. If the fall of others is caused by their curiosity to discover something new and therefore expand themselves, then the spiritual realm is a rigid place where one cannot question. It is interesting how our own human conceptions color our understanding of the spiritual realm.

These are not easy questions to answer; therefore one finds shelter in ideas such as the mind's incapacity to understand inconceivable things that should not be debated. Thus the subject is swept under the rug, along with other problematic discussions, as one attempts to continue the process of advancement within the confines of culturally based, hierarchical religious traditions. Nagging doubts have to be put aside as questions such as these can only be definitively answered at liberation.

A wise person said that living beings enter into challenging environments to reinvent themselves to expand their energy, power, and capacity as part of an eternal evolutionary process of growth. Although I am a spiritual being who can remain within my spiritual essence and commune with others in the spiritual environment, I yearn to expand and stretch my spiritual wings. As this is hard to do in a spiritual realm where everything works smoothly and my desires always manifest, I decide to enter into a challenging realm to develop my capacities. There I can conquer challenges and grow through these experiences. When I am satisfied with my level of evolution, I will again rest in my spiritual essence in that spiritual realm I have created together with my beloved Deities. I may repeat this process as I choose.

In this explanation there is a choice; the choice leads to expansion; growth ensues, and there is a happy ending. At no point are we left without support, love, or the chance to do the right thing and ultimately attain all we desire. We chose to enter the state of being challenged and we choose to return to the state of satisfaction with our being. All doors are always open.

When I am immersed in my spiritual essence with the greatest possible spiritual awareness and I visualize my deepest desires to connect to my Lords and my Lords reciprocate, then our mutual desire creates a perfect union. Souls so connected may wander as they like to wherever they like in whatever realm they like. This is the flow of spiritual energy.

Now let us imagine the scenario where two persons have a relationship. The first is extremely powerful and capable while the second does not feel equal to the relationship and desires to expand for the sake of the other. [A mundane example would be where the woman would be intelligent and poetic and the man would be gross and illiterate. The man could desire to go to school to become qualified enough to give poetic pleasure to the woman.] If the soul wishes to evolve to a level more compatible with the beloved Lord and their spiritual group, the soul will be highly motivated to expand its personal spiritual power. Thus the entrance into the arena where growth takes place is a choice made with the mutual consent of all concerned. We are

never left alone as our spiritual group always maintains watch over us as we traverse our developmental path. Indeed, that realm is always with us as another dimension to our lives. We may tap into that dimension at will, if we know the art. Our understanding of when we have completed our task of expansion will precipitate our return to that spiritual dimension fully immersed in our re-established spiritual relationships. When we thus return, our relationships deepen proportionately to our growth. In this manner, our spiritual realm evolves.

To summarize: There is a spiritual realm [defined according to our inclinations] where there are beings who have found their perfect communion with God and wish to maintain this relationship. If and when the living being, God, and all associates feel it would be in the best interests of the soul to evolve further, the soul relocates to this world of challenging experiences. When ready, the soul returns.

This is an alternative way to help us understand scriptural ideals better.

how to relate to Scriptures

by kamalamala » Thu Mar 22, 2007 6:19 pm

Dear Hari

In Caitanya Bhagavata recently I found one text that made me really shocked and I didn't know how to properly relate to not only that text but to the commentators on it.

In 15 chapter 8 text it is written about the importance of tilak . In the comments, Bhaktisidhata Sarasvati quotes several puranas wherein it is said that one not putting and maintaining tilak on his head definitely is a demon and will go definitely into the hell. Padma purana utara khanda.

And this is not the only statement. In other puranas it is written that those who do not fast on ekadasi will go to hell, and in another one, one who puts Lord Shiva's mark on his head will be punished. As I remember also one who does not wear tulasi around his neck will go to hell, and so on.

The question is, how can the scriptures and their authors be considered unalloyed and purely spiritual if they are sending millions of people into the hell just because they didn't put some sign on the head and how they represent God who obviously will not send people to hell just because they are not wearing tilak. And how such a honored spiritualist as Bhaktisidhanta Sarasvati who is famous as pure representative of God can support such an idea?

Reading scriptures is very enlightening as there so many very enlightening spiritual stories and practices, but when one reads such strange verses, an independent seeker can lose his faith and will ask if these books are really totally written by saints or maybe by politicians and sects which definitely existed at all times which used these literatures and edited them as they wanted as it is done by many modern sects.

In scriptures there are verses which say that simply by doing something you can go to the Spiritual world even if you are big sinner, for example if one gives water to tulasi or chants the Lord's names or fasts one day on ekadasi. But even if it is so, then again it is totally unfair to the millions sent to hell who didn't know about these 'loopholes,' who don't chant and who never knew about existence of tulasi. Can it be that the authors of scriptures mean hell as synonym for something bad but not exactly hell?

Sorry that this question maybe not in tune with our present understanding, but it is a question for me.

by Hari » Thu Mar 29, 2007 4:13 pm

Here are various ways one could see this issue.

Do scriptures come from God or are they created by man? If they come from God then there can be no mistakes in them and all mistakes we see are due to our lack of understanding or our being unaware of the hidden motivations behind these statements. If scriptures come from man, then mistakes are to be expected since men make mistakes and therefore scriptures cannot be absolute.

If scriptures come from God and there are mistakes in them, they are due to the imperfect transmission of the text while it is being copied by man. If this is so, one cannot know what has been changed. If something has been altered for some reason (either by accident, by a systematic misunderstanding of the words used, or by design) one cannot state absolutely that anything within the scripture is 100% as it was in the original, which is discomfoting.

Since men copied the literatures we can safely assume they must have influenced them in some manner. Considering the historical 'black-out' from a few generations after Janemejaya till Buddha, one can rightly wonder what happened to literatures during that time.

All in all, it seems that regardless of the actual events, at present one can either believe the scriptures to be totally true, one can believe them to be mainly true with some exceptions determined by oneself or others, or one cannot take them as absolute and see them as reference materials. One's acceptance of any of these three courses depends on one thing only, one's belief.

If you believe something, it attains great importance in your mind. If you are an acharya in a religious group, you have no choice but to believe everything related to the religion is absolutely correct and to present it to others as it is. In your activity as acharya, you defend the faith against intruders and disbelievers although sometimes you may personally wonder about some statements in scripture. The more you doubt, the more powerfully you present the doubtful statements to hide your doubt and demonstrate your loyalty to all that your religion embodies.

Arguments can be given by the faithful to 'prove' the veracity of scriptures. I have heard the argument that the Bhagavatam is free from human changes since it was commented on by Sridhar Swami. However, this commentary was made thousands of years later. That vaisnavas believe the other puranas or other literatures are not to be depended on due to the sectarian influenced changes does not encourage confidence in any scripture.

Those who are wise know the essence of their belief resides within their spiritual experiences. These experiences are often couched within a spiritual tradition that gives form and structure to spirituality. One who has spiritual experiences is not concerned with statements in books, arguments and debates, or things they are told they must believe. Spirituality resides within oneself, within the heart, and is inspired by anything which stimulates our essence. Some are stimulated by scriptures, some by prayer, meditation, chants or dances, or some simply by seeing the wonder of the world. Seek out that which works for you. Obviously, scriptures are not going to be your exclusive stimulation!

How to know: to use powerful technics or not to use (v.2)

by Mihail » Sat Mar 10, 2007 7:32 pm

How to know: to use powerful technics or not to use

- 1) I need some hints how to find such "do-s and don't-s" by myself.
- 2) If you have your "do-s and don't-s", it is also interesting.
- 3) What about others people "do-s and don't-s"?

What are powerful technics? That means:

- to force anybody to make something by ajna-chakra
- to induce an intention into somebody by means of my energy and interception of his intentions and desires
- to induce a desire into somebody by means of my energy and interception of his intentions and desires

... and like this. It's something like hacking a system. System means etheric body, intentions, desires... and so on.

One may say that the system is already hacked by egregors (just like many computer systems are already hacked by viruses, and system owner do not know about this fact). And (just to follow the analogy) when I hack into such system, cure it from viruses, and install my own program instead of viruses into it, I do not make a harm to the system owner.

One may also say that the way to achieve my goal is of no meaning, and my goal is the only thing I have to concern.

Your opinion?

UPDATE:

In a few hours after I asked you this question, someone probably scanned me and said "this question is not important for you". I do know that it is not important for me for now, because I can not do such a things now. But I shall master all the technics. Why?

- it's interesting
- it's MY power
- it will increase the field where I can combine parts together to make something

I have a vision of my life and my position in it, position in regard to other persons... I feel that my vision, or my life philosophy, is too shallow for this abilities. I plan to improve my life philosophy before I master all this. How to do this? That's the real question.

by Hari » Wed Mar 14, 2007 12:36 am

Your question interests me because many people use techniques to coerce others to do things they do not want to do. Although I know your question is aimed towards the mystical use of power attained through techniques and practice, my answer relates to all forms of coercion. By understanding the universal principles underlying all forms of involuntarily modifying the behavior of others, one can easier find answers to your questions.

Let me clarify this. We are addressing the fundamental right of an individual to pursue his life within the context of other individuals who live within the group, be it a family, club, society, country, the planet or even the universe. At what point does my endeavor to get what I want interfere with your endeavor to get what you want? Who shall get preference in this conflict, if anyone? How will such problems be avoided before they occur and when they occur what shall we do about them?

All groups deal with this issue in very similar ways. The differences between them lie in how much power the group has, who controls the group, and what it is they wish to attain.

It usually works like this. The members of the group have inherited principles handed down to them. Those who have power and a desire to do so, modify these principles as needed. Upon these principles rest the mission statements of the group; that is, what it is they are as a group. From this their goals and methods are derived. To create order they create codes to negate unfavorable situations and create favorable ones. These codes are written as laws and regulations or infused within the individuals as moral codes and social expectations. When one breaks the code, there is some system of correction.

Living with a group demands constant attention. People often conflict as we are all different and want to fulfill our own interests in our own ways. Therefore, people live within groups where everyone basically accepts the same culture. This creates an immediate camaraderie and a platform on which all can function in agreement. Within the usual elaborate social codes is a system which facilitates everyone getting what they want without having to come in conflict with others. As everyone buys into this system either from birth or by choice, there is a relative peace that all enjoy.

Conflicts come when there are opposing elements that fall outside the allowable arena of interaction. For example, I wish to earn money and live happily and you wish to take my money and live happily. When you take my money by causing me to buy something you sell out of my free will, this is acceptable, but when you steal money from me this is unacceptable and laws are there to punish you.

You are asking about a more subtle aspect of social interaction, one where you induce me to do something I would not ordinarily want to do if left on my own. Here is where it gets interesting. I normally have no interest in driving a huge pickup truck with 550 hp, but you create commercials I watch on TV which seduce me with professional race drivers doing impossible maneuvers while they cavort with scantily clad gorgeous ladies! I might see this commercial 50 times in one week and gradually I start to think I need this truck with all its glitz and glamour and I buy it although all I do with my existing car is drive to the shopping mall! This is called advertising and it was one of the first forms of subtle marketing coercion in modern times. It was meant to convince me I needed something I did not need or to do something I did not need to do.

Here we have a situation where a merchant desiring wealth markets to me through commercials played by a broadcaster desiring wealth. The seller's advertising comes along with the programming I pay the broadcaster to see and is an intrinsic, albeit annoying, aspect of the media service. Because we have all bought into the system of the media, we all share the effects of watching. When I agree to pay for my cable TV license, I understand I shall be bombarded with offers to buy all kinds of useless things. Indeed, we all assume that without allowing ourselves to be accosted in this way, the broadcaster could not continue to supply our entertainment. Even the person selling that big truck goes out and buys an iPod when he is influenced by the nifty commercials he sees on TV. No one avoids the insidious pitch to consume. Yet it is acceptable since we all agree to it. If you do not like it, do not use a TV.

Capitalistic society is based on the unstated right of facilitating the means by which people can influence people. Socialistic society is based on the governments doing it. The most successful governments or businesses do it through the principle of win-win. We all win when we buy into certain transactions which benefit us. Because the end is to provide something everyone wants, influencing people is not considered a negative thing. Indeed, all business runs on this principle. Religion also runs on this principle, but with different mission statements, different goals, and different products. This is just the way it is.

It is important to note that people have not advanced beyond Machiavelli's principles. Might still makes right and the end still justifies the means. Indeed, entire countries are so ruled by these ideals they do not hesitate to enforce their will on other countries. Add to this the universal principle that everyone thinks they are doing the right thing at the time they do it. Even 'good' people engage in some form of coercion when they think it is the right thing to do. After all, parents do it to children to insure their children's safety and growth, businesses do it to their employees to insure their companies' safety and growth, governments do it to their citizens to insure their countries' safety and growth, and even religions do it for self-preservation and to make you pure and qualified to go to heaven. The stronger manipulate the weaker to facilitate the stronger who can work for sake of the weaker and therefore the whole. At least that is what the stronger think. Because they are the stronger and therefore the better, their goals are right and their acts justifiable.

Any group whose leaders are convinced that the group's ideals are good for the individuals within it will to some extent coerce its members in the name of benefitting all. Whenever there is a conflict of interests between such groups, the mightier prevail. If victory includes using methods which challenge the rights or independence of others, so be it, for the ends attained justify bending the usual rules.

Considering this, it makes sense that there are some who use subtle means to coerce others. It is, after all, human nature to do so and esoteric knowledge is a fundamental part of human existence. When esoteric groups are created (it does not matter how you label them, they can be religions, sects, secret societies, schools of thought, disciplines or whatever) they follow the same basic steps as any other group in human society and are led by individuals who must create a standard of interaction and a method to deal with those who oppose that standard in some unacceptable way.

Here is what a hypothetical follower of some empowered discipline might say:

"I have mystic capacity. I know how to protect myself and center myself with power. I know how to project my power on others and therefore know how to defend myself from them. I can defend myself by deflecting their energetic attack on me and I can bewilder them in some manner to dissolve their desire to do something to me. I know what is good for the world. I know what is good for others. I shall use my power to induce others to do what is right according to what I know to be right. If others are bad people, I will change them by getting them to do what I know to be right. I can also use people by manipulating them to get what is right for me as I am of the elite due to my evolution. Increasing my power and influence enables me to do more good for the world since I know what is good for the world and they do not. I am sure of this because I am in contact with authoritative sources of knowledge. When others are selfish and do not agree with my way of seeing things I shall induce them to do what I know to be right and thus transform their self-centered actions to correct ones."

In other words: "I am stronger than you. I am more evolved. I know what is best for the world and therefore for you. You simply harm yourself and others due to your ignorance. I shall stop this and transform you. Since my goal is good, I can do it in any manner possible. It does not

matter to me if you want something else. Your will is not important to me as you do not know what is best for you or the world."

And then there is a second person who says, "I want this. I can get it by stepping on you and I do not care what it takes to get it. I do not care about you, only about me."

There is not that much difference between these two.

I know those who manipulate others do so with good intentions but the path to hell is paved with good intentions. It is one thing to do this in a situation where everyone participates -- for example, when we all buy into a system which provides us sense enjoyment -- but it is quite another when it is forced upon people unaware that their choices are being made by others.

I know the weakness of my argument. People are often mindless and vote for governments simply because they are fooled into doing so, they buy things they do not need because they are convinced into thinking they should, or they simply want to keep up appearances. I know that people have habits that kill them. I know that if people did things differently it would be better for themselves and for others. Therefore the idea of influencing people to do better things and create a better world is attractive. But who will decide what is better and who appoints those who shall influence people against their conscious will? Who will officiate this manipulation of society or of individuals? And if you knew they were doing so, would you allow them to?

Let's assume that evolution means the individual moves through the constant present by making choices. Each of these choices brings experiences and these experiences behaviorally modify our understanding of what we could or should do in this world. Thus, my advancement towards being the next best version of the greatest vision of myself depends on my being allowed to make choices and reap the results. As my choices modify my world, I move towards my evolving image of my ultimate situation.

When a person induces me to make choices by modifying my power of perception, by planting thoughts within my mind, by seducing me with illusory possibilities, or by a promise of heaven either on earth or beyond earth, they interfere with my evolutionary growth. Whenever another disregards my will, has no interest in my desires, sees no point in facilitating my path, or disrespects my soul by coercing me to act by overriding my inherent potential to choose, they are an aggressor.

If you induce me to buy something that is not what you promised, you either have to give me back my money or face legal action or disrepute. If a government acts directly against their stated platform in the election, they are voted out in the next election. Sometimes aggression goes unchallenged and this encourages further aggressors. Although no one sells snake oil anymore, they put fluoride in the water and tell us it is good for our teeth. Why no one questions why they cannot just provide plain old water and let people get some additive for their water if they wish to have it is beyond me. In this case an industry that needs to dispose of this toxic by-product sees a great opportunity to sell this useless waste for a profit and have everyone think it is good for them. Sooner or later, people wake up to such foolishness and demand change. In the meantime, we suffer. Enlightening people to the burden aggression puts on all of us, and the earth, is an important mission.

Let's talk about what happens to aggressors in the esoteric realm. Aggressive usage of etheric energy creates anxiety as it is a dissonance in the universal harmonic vibrations. The universe works in a finely tuned harmony which is demonstrated by the cosmic balance maintained amongst the practically infinite numbers of planets and objects in space. Despite the incredible

power within the universe it is always in balance. Even cosmic acts of destruction are within the natural laws of harmony. All forms of physics are based on such law.

What happens when you step outside these boundaries? Well, you can get burned. When the most powerful country in the world thinks it can overwhelm another country easily, it often forgets to consider the situation that develops when social balance is usurped. The consequent instability hurts everyone connected to it. Similarly, when a powerful mystic interferes with the natural balance of another person or situation there are residual effects germinated by their disharmonious (aggressive) usage of energy. One may say such energy projections are for good and therefore not disharmonious, but as soon as one disrespects another, there are reactions. [Please refer to my lecture entitled, "Ethics and Morality" on harimedia.net's lecture page for an elaboration of this point.]

Why does a healer refuse to heal someone who does not give them permission to do so? Simple. If healing energy is sent to someone who does not want to receive it, it not only has no effect, but it creates a ripple in the energy communication which echoes back to the sender as negative energy. Further, a residual deposit within the sender is created by his or her disrespecting the recipient by not getting permission and 'hacking' into their sacred energy system. Think about what happens to one trying to build a house without building permission from the local government. There are reactions. Even if you idealistically desire to create a school for orphans, the planning board cannot encourage the creation of exceptional precedents by allowing you to do so without a permit.

Similarly, when a person uses esoteric power to coerce another against their will for whatever motivation or whatever reason, there are reactions. There are forces and powers within the universe that balance energy. These powers do not cooperate with aggressors. Being out of harmony with such power insures the aggressor will suffer the effects that distorted frequencies create within any sensitive being. If they do this enough (how much is enough varies as the threshold is different for each person), they can become mentally imbalanced, psychologically disturbed, depressed, fanatical, out of control, caricatures of themselves, unpleasant for others to be around, and so on. This does not happen instantly for it builds up gradually over time. Sometimes the victim of their aggression discovers what happened to them and lashes out at the aggressor either by going to a similar course in a similar school, or employing other aggressors who professionally attack and thus a war begins.

As for me, I follow principles and ethics. I do not act as an aggressor. I do act as a defender of myself and those I love, and those who specifically ask for my help against others who are harming them. If someone asks me to help them deal with an aggressor and I see the aggressor is reacting against former aggression by my 'clients', I do not use force against them but negotiate as best I can an understanding between the conflicting parties to encourage them to resolve their problems.

I once made the mistake of believing someone's answer to my question of whether they wanted a particular person removed from their energy field. Since they asked for my healing and I felt capable of giving it, after I encountered someone's influence within their field I felt it was my responsibility to report it and suggest that I could remove this. Although the 'client' stated that removal was acceptable, I later found out that this response was given because they thought it had to be given and not because it was really wanted. That person became very upset, being in love with the person in the field, and this created a chain reaction of negativity I had to deal with.

So powerful is the effect of disrupting the free will and desire of others that entire countries have been overturned by the unstoppable frustration of those who were victimized. Therefore, I suggest the ethic of those who deal with esoteric energy be based in non-aggression and

respect for the will and desires of all entities. By allowing others to find their own evolution in their own way, we are part of the enlightened process of facilitation. By manipulating others to accept what we feel is right opens the door for our own personal conflict with the light which can dangerously slide us into darkness.

This principle of non-aggression can be utilized when educating children, in families, in marriages, in what we eat, or in any form of personal creation. We still need to follow principles upon which we all agree to facilitate the functioning of a society like obeying traffic lights, food and drug codes, maintaining acceptable public conduct, and so on, but manipulating the energy of others to transform them against their will creates unpredictable situations.

by Mihail » Wed Mar 14, 2007 4:56 am

1) I shall listen Ethics and Morality. Also, if I uphold something, this does not necessarily mean I think it is true. It may be that I am testing if it is fit me. So I shall not use "one", I shall use "I".

2) Could you address a specific issues (A-D):

Instead of:

Increasing my power and influence enables me to do more good for the world since I know what is good for the world and they do not. I am sure of this because I am in contact with authoritative sources of knowledge.

Something like this:

Increasing my power and influence enables me to do more good for the world since I know what is good for the world and they do not. I am sure of this because:

A. Due to my power and technics I am in contact with much deeper layers of me, than others

B. Due to my power and technics my desires are not influenced by such things as social and political advertisement, and not influenced even with more subtle effects of ideas

C. Due to my power and technics I do understand the future effect of others actions, but others do not understand such effect

D. And like "I cured a system from one virus and infected by my own virus -- so it is of no harm for the system owner."

I do not ask you what of ABCD is applicable to me -- it is mostly planning. But sometimes something may be true -- for example, a child want to play with matches and do not understand that he may cause a conflagration.

Probably this may not be resolved by understanding only. So I am interested (again!) in technics... but one of the technics is to discuss.

I suppose that when somebody really is in contact with the deepest level of self (see "A") one do not need such a technics.

3) BTW: I fight advertising. I do not tolerate it on TV. I do not see TV if it can be interrupted by ads. I do not like a book if it presents something by an circuitous way. I learn and I shall learn to quickly detect such attempts. Now is the time to make such a defense in an energetic way.

4) And the most interesting -- concerning marriage... I shall ask later.

by Hari » Mon Mar 19, 2007 10:08 pm

I understand you are exploring. It is a good thing to explore. I personally find not being able to explore intolerable. For example, formerly when I had to initiate and manage multiple large projects, I would use thought games as the generals used war games to test feasibility. In these games, talking and planning would go on passionately as all concepts were explored using 'think tank' or 'brainstorming' methodology. Some people had a hard time with such passion for they assumed the exploration ended with inalterable conclusions that dictated courses of action just because the meeting ended. Those who love the creative passion of mind/speech churning sometimes temporarily follow a line of reasoning only to discard it later. Coming to a final conclusion is often difficult due to the various opportunities or possible modes of action, but when enough research is done there are often only one or two real options to choose from. When the path is clear, one can move down it with conviction. Yet, if one finds the path is not the best, the courageous must say so and make a change despite the inability of others to understand it.

I embrace your methodology of exploration and I know you will find what you seek because you are not afraid to look for it.

I agree with your supposition that a person in contact with very deep levels within them already has the capacity to do what they wish energetically. It is also possible that the deeply sensitive would not want to learn or use techniques designed to control or coerce others.

Considering this, we could conclude that these techniques might be useful for those who seek their essence within the depths of their consciousness or who feel a calling to intervene in the lives of others. Through learning how to gain and use power, they might find a way to be of service. I believe that increasing the power of others goes hand in hand with increasing their knowledge of how that power affects themselves and those on whom it will be used.

I am not sure if you meant the virus switching example in the way it read to me. I do not want a virus in me, or on my computer, and therefore someone who replaces one virus with another is equally an aggressor as no virus is good. If you wish to heal, cure all viruses. I cannot understand the mentality of someone who wishes to coerce others in this way. It is like a mother who justifies her domination of her child's words, friends, time and eventually thoughts, by declaring she knows what is best for her child, even more than the child herself! Such a mother succeeds only in stifling the child's growth until the now crippled offspring rebels and reaches out for freedom through contradiction. This is sad, for the child's life becomes characterized by a strong need to counter anything the mother said, good or bad. When I come in contact with those who declare they know better than me what is best for me, I become suspicious for my experiences contradict this notion. That does not mean helpful knowledge or suggestions should be discouraged!

"We Know What Is Best For You!" Governments say this, doctors say this, teachers say this, gurus say this, your friends or parents say this, your wife or husband says this, the TV says this, your financial or tax advisor says this, and so on. It is a common mentality in this world. There is no lack of people who are convinced they know what is best for you and want you to simply listen to them. Thank God there is still a choice! I can walk the other way if I want. I can research options or alternatives. I can examine the qualifications of the person presenting me their 'product,' and I can judge if this is something I wish to be involved in.

I find unacceptable that someone will use esoteric mystic energy to program me according to their conception of what is best for me. Whether that matters to the person interested in learning or practicing such arts of coercion depends on the quality of the person. If they care, they are cultured, but if they do not care, they are aggressors.

It depends on your value structure. If your value structure includes the concept that you know better how others should be due to your power or knowledge, then you will engage in learning how to influence others. If your value structure includes the acceptance of the organic reality that all must go through their own evolutionary life experiences and usurping this would be against the natural course of events, you will not use esoteric mystic power on people unless they ask for your help.

Even if one is a great healer, one will not attempt to work on someone without their desiring such help. Healers are an interesting combination of people who care, who have the sensitive capacity to feel the pain and problems of others, and who have the power to change others' situation to something better, all within the context of facilitating the growth and freedom of the 'patient' rather than directing it. Part of the healing process is the realization of the deep emotional trauma that often precipitates illness and the individual's correcting their (often) involuntary response to the trauma. This can do wonders. No healer can heal well if they dictate to the energetic body or mind of another, for the response one makes to inner trauma is personal and cannot be programmed by others.

Even the Gita advises those who are wise to not disrupt the patterns of the ignorant. One can only encourage others to stop doing self-destructive things. One cannot command them to do so -- at least not successfully!

It is not within my power to direct anyone to stop trying to control others, for such a realization comes in one's own time and in one's own manner. I periodically discover people attempting to influence me against my will and I deal with them as aggressors. Do not forget: one can get burned while attempting to coerce or dictate to others, especially when trying it on those with power.

Learning powerful techniques is useful to carry one into other dimensions where useful and valuable things about ourselves and others are discovered and therefore it would be wrong of me to stop you from learning and practicing power expanding techniques. Just be warned of my concerns and use your energy to develop in the most advantageous way. After all, nothing ventured, nothing gained -- just be careful -- fools rush in where Angels dare to tread.

"Triggers" in life

by Mahabhuta » Sat Mar 10, 2007 4:49 pm

Dear Hari,

is it possible, that for some persons some sort of expression or activity is connected with some sort of a "trigger", which brings to life the negative or positive reactions from previous lives? I've seen sometimes, that when people have a fear to do things that are actually quite normal for others, there may be good reasons for that in the sense that they somehow know about such "triggers". For example someone don't want to drive a car or fly. And especially with such people occur nasty things which are actually quite rare in reality such as car accidents.

by Hari » Tue Mar 13, 2007 6:40 pm

It is definitely possible. I am aware of such triggers, or at least one of them, in me! Whenever I encounter one specific situation, I am thrown into a state of unexplainable emotion and I shudder involuntarily. Since I personally experience it, I am not only sure it is possible, but see it as a very real factor in my life and in the lives of others.

Our minds operate within our personal energetic environment and carry memories of events or feelings from previous lives. These memories can be stimulated by altered states of consciousness such as meditation, hypnosis, or chemically induced. Some of these memories are surcharged with negativity. Sudden trauma, fatal situations, shocking emotions, or any highly charged event create memories that are burned into our consciousness. Considering the power of these events and the emotions that arise when they are recalled, people bury them internally to seek relief. Since burying memories does not cleanse them away, they can be unexpectedly accessed when we are stimulated by a similar situation.

For example, someone who was forcibly drowned at night while the wind was blowing and the moon was full, will be unexplainably terrified simply by being on a dock during the night of the full moon while the wind blows, even when they are with someone they love and all is peaceful around them. Since the responses they make are not connected with the present moment they cannot understand why they should feel this way. This confuses them. Those who are aware how buried memories can powerfully affect the present learn the art of dealing with these feelings in a more appropriate manner. Thus this awareness is a very positive capacity.

Sometimes we are stimulated by particular objects, rather than a situation. One who, in a former life, was cut by an axe can feel terror when someone comes near them with an axe even if only to show it to them!

Chanting Gayatri

by adikurma » Tue Jul 11, 2006 3:18 am
Good Evening Hari,

My deep respect and humble obeisances to you.

I got my gayatri mantra from you in Boston in 1997. I was wondering if you will advice on the benefits of chanting gayatri, significance of Gayatri mantra and the importance of Gayatri. I love to chant Gayatri and I think it is one the best gift that i have received from you.

Thank you,

your servant,

Adi-Kurma

by Hari » Mon Aug 07, 2006 4:56 pm

Dear Adi,

I know you want me to say something significant in reply to your question, but I think you have answered your own question in the most significant way possible.

I love to chant Gayatri and I think it is one the best gift that i have received from you.

First off, I do not feel like I gave you the gift; rather, I passed it on to you from the source of all mantras and spirituality.

But more importantly, you say you love it. You love it because it gives you an experience you love. The effect of these mantras is great and you continue to chant and expand your experiences. These experiences give you benefits and this makes it important to you. In other words, this is something of great significance in your life.

So you answered your question. One might ask, "But why does it do so?" I think it does so because you allow it to do so. Another person can chant the same mantra and feel nothing. Indeed, most chant it as a chore -- something they should do three times a day. They are not immersed within the spirituality of the mantras. They do not have the same feeling as you have. This means you have connected to the mantras and the point of the mantras. Your connection with these subtle vibrations is the most significant part of your experience. Of course, it helps that the mantras you meditate on have power and are factually connected to spiritual energies.

I am not avoiding your question, but I do not feel comfortable answering it in the expected manner...

Chanting Gayatri

by Maha2 » Fri Feb 23, 2007 3:03 pm

Dear Hari,

I love it too, like anything. But I missed to receive it. And I feel very sorry for that.. What shall I do?

by Hari » Sun Mar 04, 2007 6:48 pm

Well, you could just get the text and chant it as you like. After all, the most important lines of gayatri are public having been printed in various places. Someone may say it will have no potency unless you get it from a 'proper source,' but if you take it from a book written by a 'proper source' then it should be proper, no? Of course, they will say it has to be given at the time of initiation and it has no potency unless given in this way. I suppose you could just chant it and see for yourself. There could be no harm either way.

by Maha2 » Thu Mar 08, 2007 6:38 pm

Thank you for the answer.

I think the similar way. (Although, my personal feeling is that probably there is still some potency in receiving the "energetic frequency" from the person who is already on that wavelength, I see it as a connection to a large, universal cloud of energy.. and maybe I am emotionally attached to that, but anyway,

I found the description of Gayatri mantra(s) on many web sites, but they are all written differently, with all kinds of different pronounciation, so now I wonder, which one is correct. I tried to find the description of the mantras used by the Vaisnavas, but the problem is, they don't want to write them down.

From the same reason you've mentioned above. I have no problem to chant them, whatever way, silently or loudly. I can experiment, that's OK, as far as I am concerned. (Of course, now some more orthodox people may object, that I shouldn't, but personally I think that spirituality is a private thing, and no organisation has the right to tell me what I should or shouldn't do.

This is my life, and I have the right to chant whatever I like. Isn't it so?)

Can you please write them down?

Thanks.

<= this is me

Unity between male and female energies - divine in nature?

by harsi » Wed Nov 22, 2006 9:03 pm

Dear Hari, by viewing the images of the Radha Krishna Deities you installed in the temple in Saint Petersburg who are looking so gorgeous and happy one question came into my mind I would like to ask you. You may also know the understanding someone like me raised up in regard to this, although I always remained open and still am to any supplementary understanding. What is in our opinion the deeper meaning of worshipping Radha Krishna as the Supreme? For a Vaishnava and someone who is used to view and worship Radha Krishna in the traditional way and understanding described in the revealed scriptures, or for someone who may come from another spiritual or religious background this questions may well search for a satisfactory answer and in your weekly lectures you are speaking very little about.

by Hari » Tue Nov 28, 2006 5:49 pm

Perhaps if I put my understanding in orthodox terms it will be clearer. Sometimes people have a hard time understanding unfamiliar subjects due to being unable to process the conceptual elements integrated within the overall context. When the scenario is labeled in a familiar manner they suddenly develop clarity.

This infers, of course, that they do not really understand the situation; rather, they merely understand the term used as a label. The label may have little relevance to the situation it attempts to clarify, but often this does not matter to those who are comfortable with finding meaning in this way.

For the sake of those who thirst for labels, I suggest the following understanding.

In the raga form of worship of the Deity, the Deity is seen as a living personality related to in a flowing and loving manner rather than an arca-vigraha regularly worshiped in a formal context. Such personal loving relationships are based on feelings and the actions manifesting from these feeling display love in all its intensity and variety and are not concerned with regulatory considerations.

Now those who are into labels will undoubtedly submit the standard and expected objection and reject this explanation as relevant to our Deities. In their minds, it is not possible to be on that platform unless you are near to being, or are, a "liberated soul" who is _____ [fill in the blanks with your favorite requirements for being liberated.] I have nothing to say to such persons as I do not see any need to reply to this. This is their idea borne of their education and they will not change. This is fine.

I do not see it the same way they see it. I do not see love as unattainable for all but the most rare and fortunate souls. And I do not see developing a personal, loving, feeling communication with the Deities as a complex development after many lifetimes of penance, austerity, and the attainment of mercy. I see it as a conscious choice made by one who is aware of their personal energy, and the qualitative context which their personal energy interacts within existence. This has been the subject of many discussions and texts recorded on this site.

I do not think my feeling or manner of relating to the Deity is contrary to the principles of the sastra. I think it is the essence.

Does this assist you in understanding my point of view?

by harsi » Fri Dec 01, 2006 1:28 am

I have to admit that I read many times your answer to my question, in order to understand it completely. I guess it has also something to do with my limited understanding of the English language. Your answer reminded me of the discussions that I had sometimes with my wife, a few years ago. She was a teacher in Romania by that time and she expressed to me her wonder about why I and others were always speaking in this preconceived stereotyped notions while speaking about spiritual themes and why we didn't use more our own words and understanding.

To your feeling and manner of relating to the Deities with love and devotion I agree, it sounds reasonable to me. In order to develop the loving relationship with the Deities, one may want to know also more about the divine personalities one is worshiping in this manner and with this understanding, his or her pastimes or lilas, qualities etc. That may lead one to the next question: where to find or get that knowledge if not in the already known sources?

by Hari » Mon Dec 04, 2006 4:09 pm

I replied to your question in my lecture on Saturday December 2, 2006, entitled "Knowing Someone."

by harsi » Wed Dec 13, 2006 7:08 am

It was a great pleasure for me to listen to your lecture explaining how one can relate to the Supreme and view spirituality in a way one was not used to think before. It opened up a whole new way to look at this issue and ones own responsibilities and possibilities one has. Indeed very interesting and rewarding to take into consideration in life.

by papula » Thu Mar 01, 2007 10:24 am

Sorry to hijack this thread,
but I didn't want to start a new one as my questions are related to the OT.

I've been studying quite a bit Tibetan Buddhism (among other things) in recent years and I've come to conclusion that male and female in their iconography and meditative practices are symbolical representations of some universal underlying principle. Usually paired as Wisdom-Method, Emptiness-Form, Male-Female. And they are non-separate and non-dual in essence. (Little bit like achintya-abheda-bheda philosophy, but with a twist.) Example, they reject the four philosophical extremes ie. monism, dualism, nihilism and eternalism and "Tetralemma".
-eternalism, which maintains that all circumstance unfolds according to an unchangeable plan or design. Eternalism is thus a distorted view in which form reigns supreme, denying the emptiness of the possibility of change or chance.

-nihilism, which distorts non-dual reality by maintaining that all actions are empty of meaningful value.

-monism, which distorts non-duality by asserting that "everything is one" in denial of apparent distinctions and compassionate connections.

-dualism, which denies non-duality by declaring that emptiness and form are divided.
"Tetralemma" or catuskoti is generally understood to be a POV where two logical statements have four possible "dimensions".

So my question is basically this: (to Hari)

Has there been any equivalent to TB idea of this non-dual "union" of emptiness and form (as a meditation or visualization practice especially) in connection with deities or Radha-Krishna pair?

Has there been a practice where R-K pair (or similar male-female pair) have been visualization methods of realization the ultimate, outside the theistic idea of God? (Especially in Vaishnavism?) In other words, has there been at any time a tradition that "used" R-K pair as inner tool for unlocking the inherent potential for greater awareness of things as they are, without considering them to be really existing, separate God-entities in some "spiritual dimension"

Or is this anything you like to discuss at all?

Thanks for your time,
Sebastian

by Hari » Sun Mar 04, 2007 5:30 pm

You did not hijack the thread so all is well in forum-land.

But you asked me a whopper of a question. It is a great point to discuss but I do not feel qualified to give an authoritative answer. I do not know all the religious traditions that have ever existed. Naturally, all of us are more or less familiar with the common world religions and some eastern esoteria, but there are many spiritual practices or thoughts which have not been documented. Within these undocumented spiritual forms one may find an awareness and recognition of the holistic view of existence to which you refer.

The yin-yang symbol is a very universal indication of the natural balance within existence. Before this symbol was created, there were tribal people who created forms of spirituality which are today called pagan. I am fairly sure that India prior to the 'vedic' era (the time of the prominence of the four vedas) was a place where the tribal people were in tune with the goddess potency. Anyone who lives in connection with nature and who is not overwhelmed by the self-interested or motivated manner in which a 'sophisticated' society pushes its members to act for survival, can see the symbiotic relationship between male and female in all things. The propagation of all species, the manner in which nature moves in cycles and fertilizes the earth along with the day to day experiences of humans, points towards an interdependent existence that rests upon the interaction between male and female. Perhaps one might not specify these forces as belonging to a gender, but one certainly perceives the push and pull of the natural polarities.

The act of balancing the archetypical male and female energies is different from adjusting life as a response to the forces of polarity. Restoring the primordial balance between feminine and masculine becomes a spiritual quest for the original state of perfect divine harmony. Well before one is ready to tackle this effort, one is forced by nature to deal with the very real and pressing demands of a world in flux and respond in a manner which insures survival and comfort. In such a struggle, there are opposites, or things which seem to be quite different in their nature like good and bad and so on, but there are also forces which work together to paint the complex picture of our earthly ambience. It is hard to place good and bad within the categories of male and female. However, we can see how the interaction of the male and female create situations within which people will see things as good or bad and possibly create

conflicts accordingly. Thus defining the elements of nature in the context of balancing nature's powerful forces and urges, became the primary concern for all tribal peoples.

In their endeavor to maintain and grow, they dealt with nature closely and adapted to nature's changes. This sensitivity to their environment allowed them an intimate view of the inner workings of life. They could speak about it in symbols, words or forms, which represented their feelings and indicate the latest directions to their children how to best evolve.

The earliest people could see how their day to day lives depended on their parents when they were young or how their children similarly depended on them. They could see the cycles of birth to death and the growing seasons as indicators of powerful forces beyond their control. They saw the male qualities of logic, reason, power, defense, hunting, order and organization and so on as the partner to the female qualities of nurturing, nourishing, cultivating, gathering, the creation of compatible spaces and ambience and so on. They saw that all endeavors to deal with those forces that are beyond their control requires this male-female partnership. When in tune with these energies, they may have seen the earth as female due to its motherly character, and all that above the earth as male. As they categorized things according to the way they felt they represented the male or female quality, perhaps even with emphasis on these qualities as representing the father or mother, they might create deities accordingly. Their language might also start to place gender on words according to how they feel about the words.

Systematically recognizing these qualities and learning to work within them is a research process whereas balancing them to create a better existence is an act of discipline. In this way they are different. The more advanced might come to see the balance within these two archetypal energies as the essence of life. They might conclude that in the sublime state of balance they are equally joined in a perfect reciprocity. Anyone who concludes so will automatically assume that the divine state includes this balance. If one wishes to have deity, one would naturally presume the deity is the personification of this balance or, if it is a minor deity, works perfectly within the balance or is integral to the maintenance of the balance within the universe.

One could speak about the need of deity philosophically. One could ask, "Is the creation of an eternally existing perfect divine being an integral and essential part of divine balance or could such balance exist independent of a deity as a naturally existing state that appears when all disturbing elements are removed?" How would the ancient tribal handle this question? It is likely each tribe would address the issue differently according to their bio-physical natures and their existing cultures.

All the pairs of dual concepts which join into a sublime union of awareness (such as those you stated at the start of your comment) are certainly the essence of the philosophical effort to regain and retain the natural balance of being. What I find interesting is although they are a type of duality, their union brings balance. Duality in union is balance. Balance is the state of oneness where one does not consider the duality but lives in the state of divine harmony.

One can therefore say that the state of perfection is divine harmony where all dualities of existence find their balance within the being of a person who does not waver in the unsteady winds of desire. Stated in this manner, we sound very Tibetan, but word it slightly differently and throw in the deity as the personification of that divine balance and you have theism and God. Once one is in balance, it matters little to that person if the balance is within them alone, or they are merged within the totality of balance, or that the balance depends on and is within the deity for they are experiencing the state as oneness with existence and they are happy with it.

I find it interesting that in many stories about Radha and Krsna the balance is always being thrown off by pranks or games in which anger is aroused or conflict must be overcome. In this ideal, balance is the foundation upon which the individuals play but periodic disturbance of this balance and the consequent struggle to restore it creates spice in life.

Some look at that and wonder. Some look at the pain gopis go through or Radha must suffer and think this is very human and not characteristic of deity. Some wish to remain in balance and see no need to ruin what they took so long to attain. Again, it depends on who you are and how you wish to interact. I see this conflict between the divine couple as very characteristic of the interplay of the female and male energies. It seems to me that some form of tension, real or created, is essential for life to exist. I think it is here that Vaishnavism and other traditions part ways.

That certain practices require the visualization of personality as a tool to attaining balance proves in the minds of the theists that God is required even for Buddhists. Yet Buddhists might not care about this as they have reached their being and are one with their essence. As all desire and need connected with the illusory forms of life are dissolved, they feel fine as they are and see no need to manipulate this state further.

I do not worry about this personally as I respect their attainments and their state of being. Although I also occasionally immerse myself in these illuminating states, I confess to an inclination to interaction with Radha and Krsna.

How one sees deity depends on how one is inclined and educated. It also depends on what one is. Some personalities are inclined towards a more solitary life whereas others are more social. These inclinations can be borne of present or past life trauma, or they can be a manifestation of their essence.

Getting back to your question, it does not seem to make much difference whether or not one includes deity in one's meditation on the male-female nature within all things, as the attempt to balance the feminine and masculine is the discipline which brings one to essence. When one is there, one responds within this state according to what one is.

I would suppose that tribals all over the world in pre-history times (I avoid prehistoric as it sounds like dinosaurs, cavemen and so on) were in tune with nature and the energy of life. This led them to naturally want to create balance. The more spiritual amongst them categorized this by creating meditations, hymns, music that moved the heart or soul, and active practices of worship, with or without iconography or forms, to point towards the energetically perceived deities. These rites included male forms and female forms, but also combined or hermaphroditic forms to represent the state of balance naturally ascribed to those within the higher realms.

One could look within the Cabbala and other hidden or mystical practices tangentially related to main-stream religion for indications of a structured attempt to find cosmic balance. It exists in tantra, but it is sometimes twisted to create opportunities for unnatural powers. Do not forget, the mystical traditions which are in the category of 'secret societies' insured their survival by not documenting what they did and by demanding difficult tests of membership along with severe punishments for betrayal of trust. These traditions were not handed down unless secrecy was guaranteed and therefore we neither know about them nor have access to them today. Look at how women were burned in the middle ages simply because they worked with nature to balance the forces which shape the world? Due to the dominance of hierarchic conceptions of God and the world, anyone who they thought challenged their power by attempting to bring the goddess back into prominence, or worse, to make her existence a necessary partner in the balance of all things, was a heretic and a danger to be burned.

I realize my answer was not exactly what you asked for, but perhaps there are more scholarly members of the forum who might want to share with us a documented practice that directly invoked balancing male-female deities?

by papula » Sun Mar 04, 2007 8:27 pm

Hari wrote:

You did not hijack the thread so all is well in forum-land.

I'm quite satisfied with your answers so far, and feel no further elaboration on the subject. (It was nice to make a contact with you this way. Thanks for it.)

Hari wrote:

I realize my answer was not exactly what you asked for, but perhaps there are more scholarly members of the forum who might want to share with us a documented practice that directly invoked balancing male-female deities?

Well understood. Thnx.

Abortions... When the soul comes?

by Dhana-da » Mon Sep 12, 2005 3:51 pm

Analyzing different sources of the information on this theme, I have drawn a conclusion, that the soul can come to parents during conception, after it in some days or months, and also is not excluded, that the soul comes earlier and for this reason two persons suddenly decide to give a life to other essence. How business actually are?

And in this connection it would be desirable to learn your attitude to abortions at once... The Philosophical point of view is known, the position of a nonviolence karma, etc. In a context of our most perfect vision of and ideas about that that victims does not exist how to define the choice and how to help people to make more successful choice, if nevertheless abortion not the most favourable karmic act? What know about it more developed essences?

Thanks.

Excuse for my English, I could not place the Russian version of a question at the Russian forum, the system does not accept my password and I cannot write to the manager

by Hari » Fri Sep 30, 2005 2:14 pm

As you say, there are many different accounts as to when the soul, or the energy of life, enters the developing fetus. It would be presumptuous of me to declare that one is right and one is wrong. Therefore I cannot answer your question of what is the "real" situation.

There are different issues here. The most obvious, and the one that is stated by all religionists, is the right to life of the child. For the opponents of this stance, the right of the mother, or other's involved, is at least an equally important, if not more important, right. Without repeating the entire polemic I shall simply say that there is validity in both points.

However, the most interesting question to answer is, "When is the spiritual personality entering the body of the child?" If it comes after a certain point in time, is an abortion performed prior to this point considered killing? If this question could be answered, the debate may somewhat cool off.

There are many problems to finding the answer. The most obvious is that no one can do research on when the personality enters the body. It is scientifically impossible to determine this as science lacks sufficient understanding of consciousness and it would be safe to conclude there is no conclusive scientific answer at present. This leaves us with religious literature (which almost always points to life at the moment of conception), alternative literature of the theosophical or psychic viewpoint, or the newer forms of spiritual literature, such as "Conversations with God," or "Journey of Souls," which point towards the consciousness of personality appearing at a later date.

There are some who feel that although the living body is manifesting and displaying signs of movement, capacity to respond to stimuli and so on, the specific bonding of the personality spirit and the physical body takes place later on. This has been discussed by Michael Newton and others. The exact moment when this occurs is more a function of higher arrangement and the desire of the soul than of the capacity of the body to sustain conscious life.

I feel that the latter ideas make more sense to me than the former. I do not find it acceptable that the soul will be placed in a state of total unconsciousness for so many months till the body develops and then be forced to remain within a restricted and compromised state till birth. The explanation is simplistic and does not resonate with me. I prefer the idea that the conscious personality bonds with the body over a period of time and makes an acceptable arrangement with it for cohabitation of the etheric and physical space chosen for the manifestation of its life. This implies the entrance of the spiritual consciousness (the individuated personality) at a later date.

This opens the door to relax the intense pressure on rape victims, forced pregnancies, diseased and damaged personalities and so on, who might look towards a terminated pregnancy as their only chance to continue to live their lives in any meaningful manner. But perhaps more important, if this idea is accepted it would help remove the intense internal guilt that mother's have when they abort children, a guilt that remains with them throughout their lives and eats away at their self-esteem and capacity for attaining happiness. Like all religious inflicted guilt, it is not required and has adverse affects on the world.

I make no comprehensive declaration here and I do not claim to have answered this topic according to some higher principle. I have tried to express all sides of the story and have given a limited response based on my feelings. This does not mean I will never transform these feelings in some way and thus I do not expect that anyone will take what I answered as anything other than my present opinion. I cannot speak for the more developed essences, but I suppose they have influenced those who have already written about the topic and it was done in a manner which I find reasonable.

Top

julie108

Posts: 2

Joined: Tue Oct 10, 2006 5:30 am

by julie108 » Tue Oct 10, 2006 5:50 am

Hari

your reply seems a bit wishy washy. Why can't the soul be unconscious during the period that it is in the womb? Most people sleep eight or nine hours a day, a third of their life if not more, and they are for all practical purposes unconscious. Granted that many times on a subtle level they journey into other realms -just like sleep walking- but they are still not conscious...

Abortion is a violent, fear based act. It is not harmonious with the laws of the divine mother. I have read Journey of Souls, Conversations with God and similar texts which try to justify the violence by stating that the soul is not in the physical body. I wasn't very impressed with Journey of Souls, although I do think that some of the authors research is valid. Conversations with God was even worse. I would prefer to read the realizations of a genuine saint. Nothing wrong with inspirational work, but don't claim that the inspiration is directly coming from God.

Does this mean that if we destroy the body of someone who is sleeping or in a coma due to an accident that it is ok? If I astrally travel while I am asleep does this mean that you can smash my head? The soul does not die but does this justify destroying my body?

This same sort of nonsense is used by Christians and others to justify the killing of animals for food, sport and scientific experimentation.

The physical body cannot grow without the soul being present. This is a fact.

Abortion is not an act of kindness and most certainly not based on higher consciousness.

by Hari » Tue Oct 10, 2006 11:52 pm

As I stated in my reply, I did not try to answer definitively. I did not try because I cannot answer with conviction as I do not have the personal experience within my conscious mind of how the consciousness within the womb manifests. I have seen children in the womb respond to light, but on what level this response takes place is hard to determine. Considering my lack of expertise, I do not feel it wrong to speak about what others say or feel about this issue. Your response represents the point of view of those who feel strongly about the need to protect unborn children. Although I would certainly agree with the nobility of such a value, I would not have expressed myself as you have. If my lack of conviction qualifies my answer as wishy washy, then so be it. As I have said many times, my replies will be based on my experience, and if they cannot be, I will say so.

I did not say the soul "cannot be unconscious" during the long time in the womb -- I said this was a simplistic idea that did not resonate well with me. Your objection also does not resonate with me. "Why can't it?" is not an argument I would wish to reply to, for anything is possible in the realm of the unknown. Your comparison between an embryo and a sleeping person is also not illuminating and I doubt that the books you critically mention have discussed this issue with the idea to justify violence. They seem to be suggesting that we have understood pregnancy and the consciousness of the embryo incompletely. Logically this implies people have defined abortion improperly.

Abortion can be defined as violent when one considers it the murder of a living soul within a body. But some do not define the life within the body that way and how one feels about abortion depends on how the embryo is defined. One may believe religious literature or one may consider modern spiritual literature, or one may make the decision based on what is best for oneself. Some religionists say it is self-evident that it is violent murder while others say this idea is primitive. I think discussing it is good and therefore I took the trouble to answer the question in the first place and am now taking the time to reply to you. I feel open discussion is a means to assist those who have to make such weighty decisions to make them with greater awareness. I do not like to partake in mandating what is right or wrong for everyone does what they think is right at the time they do it. Giving one all the options available and explaining each is valuable. There are professional counselors, loving relatives (who often never hear about the pregnancy), friends, or literature available to enable the seeker of help to find it. I tried to assist in one small and rather insignificant way to expand slightly the spiritualist point of view by quoting some of the available ideas.

To state that abortion is fear based does not negate the requirement of some to accept it. Do you mean to say that anything done out of fear should be rejected? This means one should only act out of love. This sounds like Conversations with God to me. Yet some women or young girls feel this fear so strongly they consider abortion their only option.

If you were to act out of love and work in a clinic or a center to assist those thinking of abortion to overcome their fear and make the right choice out of love, you might find it quite rewarding. There are also some who work in centers to help those who wish to abort to accept their situations better. After all, many girls who have had abortions regret it and carry this pain with them their whole lives. Others are convinced it was the right choice for them.

You say some of the research done by Newton was valid. This means you invalidate the rest. On what grounds do you invalidate his research? Were some aspects of the research improperly conducted? Were the results tainted? Or was it that you disagree with it? Perhaps you chose your words improperly to express your ideas?

Does this mean that if we destroy the body of someone who is sleeping or in a coma due to an accident that it is ok? If I astrally travel while I am asleep does this mean that you can smash my head? The soul does not die but does this justify destroying my body?

Your state the soul is sleeping in the womb. If you remember, I did not like this idea very much. If what certain persons say about the "soul" bonding to a personality later on within the womb is true, then the "someone" you speak about is not sleeping; rather, it is the body that is sleeping and the "someone" has not yet appeared. This is quite a different situation than when a living active soul goes to sleep and is murdered.

I am personally against causing animals harm. I am also against causing people harm, but sometimes harming one person to protect another is required.

What if a young girl is violently raped against her will in a manner that scars her for life and which fills her with hatred towards the rapist and the world? This unwanted baby who was violently thrust into her womb against her will represents to her the horror. Is allowing her to end her pregnancy not "harmonious with the laws of the divine mother?" I do not know. Do you? You may be convinced you do know and I have nothing to say to that. I am convinced I do not know, yet I would feel comfortable with assisting that young girl and supporting her choice, whatever it is. I know I cannot really answer your challenge as I am a wishy wash, but I do think there is much more to consider, especially if you are the potential mother and your life threatens to be torn apart by something beyond your control. I have only mentioned one hypothetical situation and my not mentioning others does not negate the possibility that other situations might be equally valid to pregnant women.

The point of my original text was not to definitively address the issue of whether abortion is right or wrong. I was trying to offer some balanced insight into the complexities of this difficult subject as there are people I know who have struggled enormously with their past actions. I do not like to condemn such persons.

It would be very hard for me handle having to personally make such a decision, and I pray I never have to, but I would avoid trying to dictate to others how they must decide as I would want to give a broader picture and multiple options as an assistance to women in stress. But then again, this is just me. I can conceive of how forcing a woman to not abort could later turn out to be disastrous both for her and the child and create consequences as entangling as one might believe the abortion to be. Contrarily, I can also conceive of a happy future. You might feel strongly and demand women to have their children regardless of the cost based on what you believe to be philosophically correct. I will not argue against your belief. I have tried to clarify somewhat the issue in the light of your strong expression of it.

Top

julie108

Posts: 2

Joined: Tue Oct 10, 2006 5:30 am

by julie108 » Tue Oct 17, 2006 3:19 am

As feminist and lesbian woman of color who has worked in the professional counseling field as well as been involved in social activism since the 70's, I feel that the soul most certainly is present within the developing physical body and that abortion is not a good thing. Your response with its logic and word usage is so typical of males who feel that they know what is best for women. I have counseled many, many of my sisters who have been emotionally torn apart by their abortion experience. While having their daughter ripped from their wounds may have seemingly solved their problems, in reality the seeds sown only led to to more pain and suffering.

My father was in Hitler youth and experienced the hell of the Second World War. He spent two and a half years doing slave labor in a concentration camp in Siberia. He was in Germany when the invading Soviet troops gang raped girls as young as seven or eight and elderly women in their 80's.

I see no difference between rape and violence against women in general and the abortion of our daughters in the womb. Life comes from life and while we have the power to create the conditions for life it is the Divine Mother who bestows it upon us. In the 80's I marched in protest with my sisters against the madness of nuclear arms as well as insanity of the murderous abortion industry. It is the same madness caused by the same greed and desire to lord it over others. Playboy loves abortion and both exploit women.

I understand that you do not want to take positions on things that you are unsure about, but I feel that this is wishy washy.

I DO VALUE and deeply respect your views but to say that there is no life within the womb is just not factually correct>

Before you decide that abortion is good for victims of rape and violence talk to women who have been there and listen to their stories> did you know that in India and China most of the children murdered are female?

I believe that homosexuality has in most cases is caused by genetic factors> how many parents would chose to abort their daughters if they knew that the unborn baby was going to be a lesbian???

many times the mentally and physically challenged are aborted>>> the excuses and justifications are the same as what you state about how abortion is helping the mother etc> your teacher Prabhupada rightly compared abortion to animal slaughterhouse and from what I have read he could actually see the divine within everyone equally>

I pray that the Divine Mothers blesses you and helps you to see the sacred< seamless garment that connects all life in whatever form it may be present in> Divine Mother loves her children and wishes us to live peacefully and walk in harmony with the Earth>

by Hari » Mon Oct 30, 2006 4:01 pm

I do not claim to know what is best for women and neither have I stated there is no life within the womb. I do not think you understood my response. I doubt that my response is typical as I do not think many have expressed themselves as I have.

I agree with you totally about assisting women and girls who have been abused or harmed. If I were to consider your points without considering the manner in which they were expressed, I could see them as proper and demonstrative of your compassion. I can see you feel very intensely about these subjects and I encourage you to continue offering support to all traumatized women.

It pains me to read that I fall within the category of those who exploit and harm others, for this is not how I feel, neither how I act. I do not see, however, how my wishing to allow females the option of dealing with their problems as they see fit as qualifying me as ignorant and therefore needing to see the divine within everyone equally. Although I do wish to see in such a manner, I do not understand your need to express yourself so vehemently to me in public as if I were an enemy, but you have a right to express yourself so and I understand you have many personal reasons for doing so. We seem to disagree, although I am not sure if you understand the very limited way in which we see differently for had you not chosen to be so acrid in your expression I would have found little to disagree with. Sometimes one can do more good by seeing the points of agreement and understanding the areas of disagreement than by magnifying the disagreement and thereby nullifying any agreement.

You have certainly turned me off in this exchange and because of that I see no reason to continue it. You did not succeed in transforming me to your cause and you succeeded in pushing me away. I know you deeply believe in what you express, but perhaps the energy of your texts is borne of other unexpressed personal reasons. I also believe in life and wish to support it as best I can, but consider this: when one is fanatical in any issue, the fanaticism tends to alienate others and push them into opposing the fanatic, even if they would not ordinarily do so. Calm down and relax for it will make you a better representative of those you wish to help.

Perhaps you would utilize your energy better by writing in forums where such topics are encouraged rather than in this small forum where we are dealing mainly with other types of issues? I think you could assist those you wish to protect better by focusing your insights at those who encourage and assist in actions which are obviously harmful.

by harsi » Mon Oct 30, 2006 11:00 pm

The Germans have a proverb "Der Ton macht die Music" which means the sound makes the music... What I would like to say I guess is that although we may have originated from the Supreme, I am sure it is not in his interest that he may domineer over us rather patronize or encourage us to discover us new. For me, Hari's thoughtful answer points in the same direction, very enlivening to read.

unfulfillment and rejection

by Sati » Sun Oct 15, 2006 12:52 am

Dear Hari!

In "Conversations with God" I've read this :

"Hell is the opposite of joy. It is unfulfillment. It is knowing Who and What You Are, and failing to experience that. It is being less. That is hell, and there is none greater for your soul." (p.â„–26)

I was thinking and read this part again and again, but still did not understand it. What kind of awareness is it ? What prevents, for example, me, knowing who I am and who I am not to experience that joy? What is this impervious zone between knowing and experiencing in this case ? Who and why could get stuck there?

And just in the same place it is stated that the sole rejects this knowing:

"You, yourself, create the experience, whenever and however you separate your Self from your own highest thought about you. You, yourself, create the experience, whenever you deny your Self; whenever you reject Who and What You Really Are."

That i also cant understand - what could be the motivation? Isn't it impossible to see yourself in the mirror and to say seriously to yourself- thats not me and to believe that? madness...

I understand that it is different from the original forgetfulness out of the desire to experience what we are not for the purpose of the experience of who we are a.s.o.

by Hari » Mon Oct 30, 2006 5:48 pm

Try comparing that definition of Hell to being a multi-billionaire miser who doesn't spend a penny on herself or anyone else. In other words, you are filled with enormous quality, yet you do not experience it. 'God' is trying to encourage you to manifest what you are by experiencing what you are. If you are not experiencing it, you are in hell, according to this definition of the word.

I knew many people in Calcutta who were extremely wealthy but lived like common people. I am sure they had their reasons. We always have reasons. We are very good at coming up with creative rationale.

We are all filled with the greatest qualities and capacities, yet we do not manifest them. We think we good reasons why, but in the larger picture these reasons appear so warped that 'God' decided to call those who do not manifest what they are as being in hell. Why should you be less than what you are? Why should you refuse to experience yourself in your fullness?

Naturally, people do this all the time in this world. It seems to be a characteristic of our situation. Unfortunately, it is not in our best interests to avoid experiencing our spiritual opulence.

Why do we do this? The answer is the subject of five volumes of books in the the conversation's series. Here is a quick summary in my own words.

We have forgotten who we are. We did this on purpose to allow ourselves the opportunity to expand our experiences and thus expand our consciousness. Unfortunately, we forgot that we forgot and we now assume that we never knew or that some other agency or entity put us in this illusion. We further assume that without some external help from higher or supernatural forces we will never get freed from the prison of ignorance this agency or entity put us in when we sinned. Considering these assumptions, it is logical, in a perverse sort of way, that we deny our spiritual glory and therefore deny ourselves the experiences that would manifest that glory. This is hell and we put us here.

by Sati » Mon Oct 30, 2006 7:24 pm

Thank you for your answer.

I thought that this situation of hell is not about most of the soles who have forgotten that they forgot, but about those who are already completely aware of their real self but consciously reject it for some reasons in full understanding of who they are and what they are doing...

