

# **Excerpts from Harimedia Forum**

## **Discussions with Hari**

### **Page Four**

Click on index to go to that topic's post

Copyright 2005-2024 Harimedia LLC  
All Rights Reserved

Childhood	4
2 or 1?	5
Barrier	7
Self-made/self-build persons	8
What is the best way to stop make troubles to 1)me 2)others?	12
God from another point of view	17
It seems that God appears to us in the form we want to see him.	18
What is the goal You have now?	23
About following some system of regulation	24
Gracious Goddess, protect me from all harm seen and unseen	28
How to think about ourselves?	29
Why do souls choose to have birth in the bodies of animals..	31
Blooming	33
Any advice on balancing life?	35
Living entity capacity	37
To be "the great vision of yourself"	39
Hearing the Higher Self	43
Absolute and relative reality	45
If God is male and female, is God more than One?	48
Mythology	50
Monastery :)	55
What about the future?	55
Avaranatmika and praksipatmika	56
Woman to political power	59
Communication	62
The meaning of life	63
New Age	65

Understanding the basic thing	68
Symbol	70
Basic human condition of life	70
Bhagavad-gita	74
Some topics	74
Inside burning thoughts	76
Healing. What does it mean?	80
Power protection of children.	81
How to combine advanced sensitivity with real life?	81
Faith and Religion	82
To be offended by everybody	87
Feedback you want, feedback you get	89
Angels at lecture 16 jul 2005	91

## Childhood

by Damodar » Wed Oct 11, 2006 7:42 am

Thank You for your lecture!

Your answer is satisfying me, of course, and more questions are coming up.

In life one requires courage to go against the stream of concepts one was living in. Therefore fear has to be overcome. It seems like fear separates us from "being". I wonder about period of our childhood. That's the period when we have not much "ability to respond". So much damage happens that time and often we have to struggle the whole lifetime to overcome burden from the past not being able to really express ourself in sense you mentioned. Maybe it is naive question but what is a sense of such order of things?

Thank you!

by Hari » Mon Oct 30, 2006 5:19 pm

I think the answer to your question is within the question itself. It seems to me that everyone's childhood contains elements that appear to be unfavorable. Everyone is challenged in childhood although the quality, detail, magnitude and duration of the residual effect is different for each of us. I conclude two things from this: childhood challenge is a required evolutionary stimulus, and our unique personality makes us susceptible to compatible influences and suggestions. In other words, we are borne with and within specific patterns that nourish appropriate challenges.

I have seen as a general rule that unless there is some struggle, we tend to be lazy and neglect our evolution. When all is fine, idyllic and peaceful, we tend to take life for granted and not move forward. For example, those who are happy do not feel a need to seek out happiness. As evolutionary stagnation is not an acceptable option in this world, challenges take birth with us to stimulate our movement and encourage us to activate those experiences we seek, we require, and for which we yearn. That adults later feel the pangs of some form of childhood trauma seems to be universal principle meant to encourage and stimulate us, not torture us.

We all have a very specific and unique nature that manifests from our energetic essence. As our essence is eternal and is characterized by a specific personality that does not change (although it expands), the only non-permanent energetic feature in our world is the manner in which our essence interacts with our physical being. The change of body life after life creates the opportunity for us to gain a wider variety of experiences. As we cannot absorb too divergent a panorama of experiences within one lifetime without becoming energetically incapable of digesting them, we are given a limited range of experiences according to the corresponding physiological and emotional capacity of the union of our energetic and physical bodies. To fulfill our requirement for fresher beneficial challenges, we move sequentially in the next lifetime into newer experiences and opportunities meant to stimulate the expansion of our consciousness.

When we are in childhood, our "buttons" -- those sensitive points which always create strong reactions within us -- are regularly pushed by our family members. They know everything about us; they know how we act, react, feel and desire, and this makes them uniquely qualified to manipulate us, or even agitate us, at will. Often it seems as if they are playing our personality like an instrument. They may not be aware of how they affect us but the impact of these significant persons stimulating our most significant energy receptors sets into motion the revelation of the script of our lives by negatively or positively agitating our potential. As a reaction to their insensitivity or their encouragement, we seek out experiences to exonerate us from our childhood insufficiencies and prove our worth and goodness.

I suggest we see our early traumas differently. What if we saw them as a necessary stimulation to encourage or force our seeking out and accepting experiences appropriate to our present birth, rather than simply seeing our early days as burdens to be overcome? This point of view is similar to seeing the glass as half full instead of half empty. Adjusting our thoughts about our childhood can empower us to more enthusiastically accept ourselves and those experiences we have had or could/should have for the sake of our evolution. This seems better than lamenting and being depressed.

Obviously I am focusing my reply to the subject of your question and therefore neglecting other factors which significantly affect all people.

## 2 or 1?

by Sati » Thu Oct 05, 2006 11:40 pm

Dear Hari!

I was thinking about Radha and Krishna and got some questions.

God has this form - male and female, loving each other. One without another is incomplete. We are created in the image of God. And we are the same quality. So, according to this (2 persons that are one) form of God, the idea of divine union of 2 soles seem to be very attractive.

In Moscow in one of the lectures (about love between people) You've mentioned the theory of twin soles, but didn't manifest Your attitude to it.

Actually the question is "Is it possible that in order to be complete and fully aware of ourselves we need another particular or not particular sole in a male or female body"? If yes, then how does it fit with our individual relations with God?

Also If yes, then this attachment of almost all religions to the idea of different monasteries (that prevent relations between male and female for those who want spiritual realization) seems to be strange. But if we look inside this monastery's (at list here, in Russia) often we find the relations between people there even worse then outside...Then it only proves the idea of this union...

Also as i understand, the spiritual body depends on the relationships with Radha and Krishna. There are friends and lovers and s.o. Also in some scriptures it was said that the sole has female nature, then how does it relate to the male spiritual body, for example?

by Hari » Sun Oct 08, 2006 7:56 pm

The concept that the soul is feminine by nature is borne of the idea that females are subordinate to males due to their inherent inferiority. This idea is derived from the females supposed lesser intelligence and power, their tendency towards materialism, their dependency and so on. If you accept this, then the idea of souls being feminine in relation to the Supreme Male (God) makes sense. People in the past viewed the world this way and integrated their

view into their conception of their relation to God. Therefore, God, who is usually defined in human terms due to man's inability to conceive of a God beyond himself, became a male who as the supreme power enjoyed all other souls as subordinate females. The idea that the male is the enjoyer and the female is the enjoyed fits within the historical ideal of men.

If you do not believe this version of subordinate and subordinator, you can simply discard such terminology and stop struggling with all souls being female. It then becomes much easier to deal with the soul's inclination to be male or female as is desired or as is apparent from the inherent nature of their energy. It also becomes easier to understand how spiritual energies inclined towards the male or female gender are attracted to their gender opposites. Twin souls can then be male/female combinations without disrupting the basic principles of spirituality.

The idea that residents of monasteries or spiritual ashramas are unbalanced has been documented by history and expressed within literature. We have also seen this lack of balance manifested within the last century as the disturbing manner in which the devoted lost their capacity to love and relate to one another in a healthy manner due to their being programmed to think such healthy relations are somehow illusory or evil. The problems male spiritual aspirants have with women translates into their philosophy as rules and regulations meant to prevent the disturbing connection between men and women. In the rare moments when women are accepted within the spiritual context as theoretically equal, they must still remain separate, protected, and sheltered, as the female is socially encouraged to accept roles which fit within the historical norm even though that norm is not verbalized. They may rarely be given independence to organize or act but it usually implies separation from men. In all cases, intimacy is feared. Alternatively, if the males see the females are good at earning money, all philosophical ideals are set aside long enough to reap the profits of their labor while keeping the feminine capacities and qualities at arm's length.

Lord Caitanya has been called the yuga avatara, or the personality who displayed the mood and method of the age we live in. He has been seen as Krsna appearing as Radha to taste the love of Radha for Krsna while secondarily spreading love of God to all people. This seems incomplete to me for I see Lord Caitanya as the combination of Radha and Krsna and not as Krsna covered with the mood and complexion of Radha. This was demonstrated by Lord Caitanya to Ramananda Raya and was considered to be the most complete manifestation of the Lord. That Radha and Krsna become one is natural since they are originally one but have separated for pleasure. Svarupa Damodara confirmed this.

I see this sublime re-unification as the primary spiritual goal in this age for Lord Caitanya is the perfect example of the twin soul and acted as such. Radha and Krsna are one, but they separated for pleasure. In Lord Caitanya, they reunited for even greater pleasure. Thus the spiritual history and literature of this age documents the perfect balance of the Supreme Male and Supreme Female as the guiding beacon of hope and direction for all souls who are evolved enough to share this vision and reunite with their twins. I see this as the most powerful evolutionary goal in this age.

A soul mate is one who is a loving friend within our spiritual family who remains connected to us through time. We may or may not have a more intimate connection as conjugal partners with these persons for the basis of our connection to them does not depend on it. A twin soul is our other half. This person is the separated part of us that has somewhat independently evolved with the goal to reunite when the time is right. The time being right is dependent on both halves having evolved enough to have a solid and powerful balance between their male and female energies as this balance in both souls is required to empower the resultant union with the capacity of potent expression. So above, so below; so with God, so with man. Thus Lord Caitanya becomes the forerunner for the re-unification of all separated souls.

One may raise the point that individual souls feeling some lacking separate to become recreated as whole after the parts evolve and grow to the point that the unification becomes much greater than the sum of the parts, but Lord Caitanya did not have that problem. Yet we see commentators on Lord Caitanya's life stating that Krsna did not understand fully the love Radha had for him and therefore desired to accept the combined form to increase his appreciation and understanding. The principle of so above, so below remains valid.

Did Lord Caitanya have a difficulty in relating with 'God?' Not at all. Was this relation strained, artificial, distorted or substantially different than that which is acceptable to us? No. Therefore when we re-unify we have no difficulty in our relation with the supreme; indeed, as the relationship matures and deepens it manifests increasing power and intensity.

by Sati » Sun Oct 08, 2006 8:47 pm

Thank you very much for your answer! It is very easy to understand and to accept. It makes me really happy because for a long time I had the inner hope that things could be like that

## Barrier

by alexey » Tue Jul 18, 2006 5:15 pm

Dear Hari, here is a question from russian forum:

Hello, dear Hari!

I will try to state my problem.

Relations with others is a very big part of our life, of our development. Sharing spiritual information we help each other to develop. I am lucky to live with interesting and evolved people. But I have a problem. I can not to formulate a question. I have very simple answers on very important questions. They lead to developing of acceptance, love and self-discipline. It is stupid to ask stupid question, and it is meaningless. There are unique people around me, I have a desire for association and I have a possibility, but I can not to take advantage of it. I learn a lot from them, and I want to be interesting and useful too. But I can not create a topic for talk. It is like I am a burden to them. It is a barrier!

It is useful on some stage, and I am very grateful for patience. But now the passive position is not for me. I know that the keys are hard-working, patience and joyous life. "If you want to change situation change yourself!" I think it is common problem. What do You think about it?

And thank You very much for Your lectures, music, answers, and association. Due to this I could formulate my thoughts in this letter. It is a break-through for me.

With respect,  
Julianna.

by Hari » Mon Aug 07, 2006 6:19 pm

I suggest you find for some part of your day other association where you feel comfortable and are able to communicate without fear. Relate with these people and develop your confidence in your capacity to speak. This could be either some club or association where people gather to do something you like to do. When you have similar interests, you will have something to speak about.

I feel your present association is too intellectual for you and therefore you feel stifled by them. I doubt it is your incapacity to speak or relate to others; rather, it seems you need to find friends and associates who are interested in the same things as you. If you can spend some part of the day with similar minded people, you can return for the rest of the day to your present company and be passive and not feel bad about it. Let me know if you do this, or want to do this, and what the results are! Good luck to you.

## **Self-made/self-build persons**

by maha » Wed Jun 28, 2006 10:12 am

Dear Hari,

I've heard notion like self-made or self-build person. Somehow it resonates within me with attraction and challenge. Can there be something important behind it? Isn't it that beside moving with a flow, fulfilling our destiny and missions that are already there we still build our future and present experiences, build our life, make ourselves what we meant to be, what we choose to be to fulfill our potential and growth? Perhaps it is related a lot to the process of awareness of our selves, of our essence, of our plans and decisions for this life that we made in between lives stage? Perhaps it is also about building new structures of ourselves, making new choices for us to be, revising and reconsidering what we are and how we change?

If to approach this issue systemically on the grounds of scientific metaphysical knowledge, what are the key elements and processes related to building ourselves? If one would start to build oneself or to revise oneself from the deepest origins of oneself out into the present and future reality, what would one start with? What stages one would go and would better go? Forming a value structure, choosing one's roles and identities for various contexts? Choosing beliefs to accept, abilities to develop, actions to undertake, surrounding to support? Where would there be a creation, a maintenance and some logical completion of it, stepping into a next cycle?

After all, isn't it that we grow and build even our spiritual bodies, and not only lives on this planet, in this world?

Thank you,

maha

by Hari » Thu Jun 29, 2006 8:03 pm

Your two paragraphs refer to two distinct situations. The first rightly assumes that our future development rests upon our present state which is a product of our past experiences. The second seems to raise the hypothetical challenge of creating from scratch a better person.

I think both of these concepts rest on who we are. Since we are all individuated parts of the complete whole (our individuation being practically proved each day as we struggle with differences of opinion or taste), we have to accept our unique fundamental energy as unavoidable. To what extent we are capable of transforming this energy remains to be seen. Obviously, we can transform many things in our lives or the way we respond to events, yet there seems to be a basic format to our consciousness that is unalterable. Does it relate to our tastes, inclinations, and ultimately our basic desires? It is something powerful, something essential, yet at the same time so much a part of what we are it is hard to capture and quantify. This very quality of who we are runs with the flow of our energy through all time, in all places,



and in all circumstances. Indeed, it is this unique quality that makes us who we are and gives us the rationale for describing ourselves as individuated.

Considering this, it seems logical to conclude that any development within us will be within the framework of our characteristic essence. To make a long answer short -- all development might be the spirit's attempt to manifest itself clearly, purely, powerfully, and in its full vibrance! Think of life as an attempt to display ourselves -- our essence -- to our fullest capacity by expanding that capacity with our greatest power. Seen in this way, we are all meant to be self-made persons, for we yearn to manifest ourselves in our full glory. The process of doing this can be likened to a construction site where a monumental structure is erected according to the mental and emotional creation of the designer. When we strive to 'make' or 'build' ourselves, we are seeking to manifest and display our inner essence, that unique us that demonstrates our brand of individuation to the spirit whole that glorifies the whole when it is revealed. This process will continue from life to life and within each life. Due to the complex challenges of working within the parameters of different physical bodies and the circumstances within which they manifest, the task remains fresh each lifetime. This demonstrates the rationale for seeking out newer experiences for they encourage us in our never ending endeavor towards the ultimate revelation of our glory where we shine for all to share.

Would we do it any differently were we to be in the position of starting from scratch? Although in reality it is impossible to do, if we were to create the thought model where we wipe our slates clean and start our evolution all over again from zero, could we attain something different than we have now? And even if we could do this in the present lifetime, is there any guarantee that the coming lifetimes would be significantly different than the lifetimes we will anyway face from our present evolutionary position? I think it unlikely. After all, the same forces that are operating now in our lives will operate in all our lives regardless of the mental or energetic history stored within us. Ultimately, we will generally react the same, move in generally the same directions, and create an energetically similar future although in an externally different world, for the basic energy active when we make choices -- our essence -- determines our tastes and inclinations.

The past gives us a stock of experience that modifies our approach to the future. If the past restricts our attempt to better define and display ourselves in the future, then certainly recreating ourselves from scratch would have a beneficial effect. But for how long would there be benefit and would this actually be beneficial to us? What if the past serves an essential purpose of being the catalyst for the very transformation we seek? What if avoiding the past is the worst thing we could do? What if we would lack the power to attain our goals without the encouragement of our failures?

If we were to start over again from a pristine state, would our new endeavor be perfect? If we assume that all actions in the pristine state must be perfect, how do we explain why we are now here? Either we have to accept as perfect our decision to enter into the arena where essence is challenged to evolve, or deny the existence of an original pristine state. If we were never in such a pristine state, why do we assume we can recreate it or that it even exists? We might believe that such a state will exist when we get there, but then we will not be able to accept a thought model in which such a state is the starting point, for in our view it is the end point. If we assume there was a pristine original state, then we have to deal with why we opted for entering into the realm of experiences and growth with all the inevitable pain and hardship such a choice implies. Does this mean our essence demands this experience knowing this is the only way to attain its full glory?

If one assumes we start off in a pristine state, one would expect that one in this state would make all the right choices and thus remain in that state, and would wonder why we are not now in that state? To deal with this, one might think our present existence in a less than pristine

realm is therefore nothing but illusion because philosophically it cannot exist, or that there is no superior realm of ultimate origin. If we were not satisfied with these ideas, we could redefine the original state as the eternal, ever existing facility wherein we always have the freedom to initiate experiences, and the non-pure state is within this perfect arrangement and plays an essential role in existence. Those making an endeavor leading them outside the state of pristine essence are usually drawn further into the realm of error, for these mistakes are a required inspiration to guide us towards our goals and are therefore compatible with the universal arrangement. After all, if you were to create a thought model where one starts anew but with our present realization of what not to do and a better idea how to proceed properly, you are practically re-creating the present situation for this knowledge comes from past experiences. The only difference between the ideal state and the present state would be your freedom from the negative effects of the past which hinder your advancement.

Either way, it is better to expand your capacity to accept, respect, and resolve the past, for this enables full access to all our past experiences with the freedom to maximize the future course of action.

by maha » Tue Jul 04, 2006 4:02 pm

Dear Hari, thank you very much for this elaborate answer.  
Please let me develop it further and deepen my quest.

Hari wrote:

Either way, it is better to expand your capacity to accept, respect, and resolve the past, for this enables full access to all our past experiences with the freedom to maximize the future course of action.

That is part of my question too, when I ask about where is creation, maintenance and logical completion of phases of our manifesting and displaying our essence. Isn't it that our capacity to accept, respect and resolve the past in some cases mean exactly our capability to understand when there is no more use to maintain and hold to our past state and when it is time to resolve, or complete it and initiate construction of a new part of the monumental structure which might require us concentrate on other parts of our characteristic essence, i.e. accept other roles, values, beliefs, abilities, actions and surroundings than those we had in the previous phase? I mean, when we face a dead end it may become obvious that we need to change or switch to other parts of ourselves, but what if we wish to have some flash light to see dead ends in advance, or just to know when enough is enough? And how to distinguish the dead ends that are signals of providence from the limits imposed on ourselves by ourselves?

When we erect our monumental structures should we design them? And how to do it properly not just from the point of view of architecture or technical science, but from spirit's point of view? What is important for our spirit in our designs of ourselves and in the way we start, maintain and complete or resolve our constructions, wipe our slates clean or try to revive them, search for new instruments, not knowing what to do with those we have already?

Hari wrote:

The only difference between the ideal state and the present state would be your freedom from the negative effects of the past which hinder your advancement.

In relation to this what are proper and harmonious ways to resolve negative effects, and even to understand which layers of our past are resolved and which are not and where are they holding us, or where are we holding them, which may be the same, may it not?

by Hari » Mon Aug 07, 2006 6:02 pm

I agree with your analysis and the need for transformation. It seems to me that seeing the end of a road is one of the hardest things to do in life; especially if you have been on that road for a long time. I prefer to end up at a dead-end or a brick wall for the finality of it removes all future doubt about the correctness of your conclusion that continuing the path was futile. When there is no other option you never look back and wonder if you made the right choice. I really dislike such looking back for it seems impossible to come to definite conclusions. When you do not see the end of your road but predict it is coming and therefore change your path, you are taking a risk on the basis of your assumption. We always have the possibility to look back and lament while fantasizing about how things could have been different if we had just hung in there a little longer with more faith and self-confidence. Making mid-stream changes when there is no certainty of failure or loss is the hardest thing to do and requires the most courage and self-confidence. Changing when you have no other option is to a large extent easy and painless, despite the devastation. But again, this is my personal opinion.

Those who have the greatest success in politics, finances, adventure, war, love and so on, are usually those who have taken a great risk by committing themselves to an uncertain course of action or change of direction. Usually those who take great risk have the potential for the greatest gain; however, conversely there can be the greatest loss and long-term lamentation and pain. This is life and we have to deal with it.

Then again, simply waiting for brick walls to manifest can be an excruciatingly slow process; so much so that one would rather do anything else than continue in the same rut. In that case, change is welcome despite the result which we can live with by virtue of our memory of being unable to continue. This is another type of relieving dead-end.

Now, you ask about seeing in advance and you link that with self-created restriction versus fate. Interesting. I think no one can definitely see in advance and no one has a flash light into the future. We feel potential, we have previous experience of similar situations, we hear from divine beings, we hear our own hearts, and we follow our thoughts and desires. Sometimes this works well and we pride ourselves in being seers, and sometimes this fails and we condemn ourselves as fools. Ultimately we have to live with whatever we decide and grow from the place where our step landed. In either case it is what it is and we see it as good or bad according to the way our mind and spirit have moved with the event. We cannot finalize our conclusion about an event until we see it within the context of time. Since we do not know how large a context is required to properly determine the goodness or badness of any action, the wise refrain from self-judgment and simply state, 'It was.' This is the only sane conclusion and it is often expressed as, 'I did what I thought was best at the time I did it.'

But where is that sane person who avoids self-condemnation? We all have our own form of madness and it is this madness which moves our spirit to take chances and leave the pack with which we now run. The pack taught us restrictions and we accepted them. Is this not also our fate? What is really the point in trying to distinguish the source of our limitations? What is the point of trying to ascertain if we are reaching a 'real' dead end or a 'mental' dead end? Are we separate from all that we are? If it is a mental creation, with what agency of analysis would we determine this, the mind? Slippery slopes, methinks. Anyway, my point is that although there is little use in trying to find the source of our troubles, we will always attempt it anyway. That is what makes us human and such endeavors are noble in a certain way. When we erect our monumental structures should we design them? And how to do it properly not just from the point of view of architecture or technical science, but from spirit's point of view? What is important for our spirit in our designs of ourselves and in the way we start, maintain and complete or resolve our constructions, wipe our slates clean or try to revive them, search for new instruments, not knowing what to do with those we have already?

Our designs should be ruled by the principle to become the next greatest version of the grandest vision of ourselves we have ever had. I think this answers your question perfectly. You cannot wipe your slate clean for you can only move from where you are. Therefore, attempt to become the next greatest version of that greatest vision. There is enormous wisdom in this saying.

Hari wrote:

The only difference between the ideal state and the present state would be your freedom from the negative effects of the past which hinder your advancement.[end of quote from Hari]

In relation to this what are proper and harmonious ways to resolve negative effects, and even to understand which layers of our past are resolved and which are not and where are they holding us, or where are we holding them, which may be the same, may it not?

Acch, you are asking me to repeat all the different techniques created that are in their own way effective for different individuals at different times in their evolutionary journey. I cannot do that, neither is it required. Each of us has to seek out compatible methods of healing and continue with them as long as there is a good effect. We then either find another method and repeat the process or we seek out other experiences until we need to continue our therapeutic journey within.

## **What is the best way to stop make troubles to 1)me 2)others?**

by Mihail » Sun Jun 25, 2006 10:33 am

What is the best way to stop make troubles to 1)me 2)others?

by Hari » Thu Jun 29, 2006 4:27 pm

As your question is ambiguous, I will assume that you are asking me what is the best way for you to stop causing yourself trouble and to stop causing trouble to others.

Why do we make trouble for ourselves? No one wants to do this, yet we often do. Here is a short list of reasons:

\* We consciously or subconsciously feel that we should be punished for some offensive act we have done in the past.

\* We are simply ignorant of how to act and end up suffering the consequences of not knowing what works and what doesn't.

\* We do not feel we should be punished, we know what to do and how to do it, but circumstances work against us and we end up causing ourselves trouble despite our sincere efforts to avoid it.

There may be more reasons, but I shall restrict this discussion to these.

If we feel we should be punished for something we have done, not done, said or not said, we have to deal with the cause of this feeling by fostering a reconciliation with the past. There are a variety of ways to do this. One can revisit the person, place or thing which was involved in the act which gives us heartache and attempting to rectify the situation by apologizing, getting forgiveness, righting a wrong with an act of goodness, doing some penance or austerity, or in any other heart-felt manner we find appropriate. This might not be possible, for example, in the case of someone who has died; in this case, we have to learn to live with ourselves. One can either X out the event (see the techniques in Hari's Corner) or one can forgive oneself. What happened, happened and there is often little we can do to change this. Acceptance of our

imperfection is often an important factor in self-healing. It gives us the strength to go on when we are discouraged with our inabilities.

If we are simply ignorant, the solution is to gain knowledge. There are systems of knowledge that provide us with the capacity to act properly in important situations. The socially inept can learn to communicate with others, the financially inadequate can get a grip on their economy through courses in money management, the emotionally handicapped can find assistance to become aware of their own feelings and thus gain insight into the feelings of others, and there are courses of learning to assist one in respecting one's body and mind. By approaching those who have knowledge, one can get training in areas of weakness.

If the consequences of our previous decisions have captured us in a web of responses, there is little we can do but surrender to the power of our co-creation and ride out the storm. When we respond to each situation with integrity, always doing the best we can, always seeking to do what is right, and appropriately responding with a desire to work things out rather than resisting that which comes to us, we will have an easier time dealing with these difficult periods. The more we fight against the net, the tighter it can become. What you resist, persists. By respecting the power we are facing, our awareness of how the universe responds to us can deepen our understanding of what we value, what we want, and to what extent we will go to get it.

You have asked how we stop causing trouble to others. If our troubles are related to the complex network of our previous choices that have captured us, the paragraph above will also help us to better formulate our responses to other persons. If we are lacking in the basic skills required to properly interact with others, then the response related to a lack of knowledge will assist us to better relate with others. If the trouble we give to others is related to our inner frustration or fears, then the reply to how we deal with the feeling we should be punished would be relevant. Those who are frustrated often feel a need to be a cause of frustration for those around them. They might see this is a way to bring balance into their lives.

Sometimes we cause trouble to others just so we can gain their attention. For those who are not ordinarily 'visible' in the world, a way to gain attention and perhaps ultimately be recognized and appreciated, is to create some situation where other people are forced to relate with them. It is a situation not unlike the little boy in school who pulls the hair of the cute little girl. The girl thinks he is a complete annoyance and 'hates' him, but he really only wants to relate with her and gain her attention. Due to his lack of experience, he uses this primitive technique. Some adults use a variance on this schoolyard practice and cause troubles to others hoping they will understand and interact sympathetically. More often than not, this does not work and thus their frustration increases. Being aware of this possibility will limit one's utilization of pulling hair as a means to gain attention.

To properly answer this question, one would have to reproduce already written psychological treatises. I have merely touched upon this deep question with my remarks.

As a general rule, if we accept the ideal of being of service to others, we will be better able to avoid causing trouble to others. However, we have to avoid the pitfalls that will derail our good intentions! Being of service does not mean:

- \* You know better than the person or persons to whom you wish to be of service.
- \* Your service has to be accepted, appreciated, or rewarded.
- \* Your service is needed and without it being rendered things cannot be right.

If your service is desired and you desire to give it, always consider the situation of those you assist and do not force yourself on them in any manner. Be sensitive to their energy and you shall have an easier time finding a compatible balance in your life.

Astrology from the spiritual point of view

by sveta » Tue Jun 06, 2006 4:36 pm

Dear Hari.

Could you please tell about astrology from the spiritual point of view?

I mean when an astrologer does his prognosis and, for example, it is not so favourable, but there is a mercy of God and everything is very good against the astrologer prognosis. Does it mean that the astrologer was not professional enough? Or there is a spiritual influence takes place which astrology, as a material science, is not able to count?

Thanks.

All the best.

Sveta.

by Hari » Mon Jun 12, 2006 4:32 pm

Hi there Sveta, thank you for your question.

An astrologer should be able to tell you the planetary trends and influences that are affecting you at a particular time or in a particular place. Depending on the accuracy of the birth data you supplied to the astrologer, charts are cast which can precisely determine these influences. If the astrologer is good, they will tell you about these influences in relation to your personal qualities and situation and will be able to suggest how these influences will affect you and how you might best react to them. They would also be able to say roughly when this will happen, even within a day or so of accuracy. If they are really good, the accuracy can be very precise.

When an astrologer or someone else attempts to predict the future with certainty, I become skeptical. There are many factors that affect the future. The planetary influences indicate the forces active in the future, but although they indicate generally how you might feel and to some extent how you will be influenced to react, they do not force you to react in any manner and therefore are not specific enough to determine precisely how you will react as you have free will, you are intelligent and can therefore challenge the forces around you. Most significantly, there are other forces in the world and in the universe that are beyond your control which make accurate predictions a risky business.

Good astrologers suggest patterns and make you aware of influences. They also clarify the trends in your life and make you aware of hidden weaknesses or situations so you can properly decide what to do when you must choose a course of action. If someone states with certainty that something will happen it often means they are not very expert at their art and are left with mud on their faces and one less client.

If you feel their prediction is coming from the book of fate and the predicted events are therefore inevitable, you may go out of our way to insure that events happen in the predicted manner since "it was supposed to be like that." Do not underestimate your own power to create the future. This is a significant reason why suggesting a certain future to someone is tricky business which has more than once created confusion in the lives of susceptible people.

But then again, perhaps the astrologer told you one thing and you heard another? Sometimes we hear what we want to hear and later blame the person who we thought said it. This is also a factor to consider when questioning the efficacy of any advice we receive.

Influence of other forces

by sveta » Sat Jun 24, 2006 10:49 am

[quote="Hari"]

*Most significantly, there are other forces in the world and in the universe that are beyond your control which make accurate predictions a risky business.*

Dear Hari.

Thank you for the answer. Most of all I am interesting in these other forces. What could you tell about them except what was told in the books of M.Newton.

by Hari » Thu Jun 29, 2006 3:17 pm

"Other forces" refers to the free will of other people, governments, social factors, economic forces and changes, deaths, diseases, or accidents affecting others around us, climactic changes, aging, political crisis, and so on, all of which affect us directly and indirectly and which are unpredictable, as well as changes in the environment, atmosphere, cosmic balance or any other physical power from beyond the earth, along with the most unpredictable intervention of beings who are far more powerful in their capacity to influence people than we realize.

Relevance or significance of Scriptures

by harsi » Fri Jun 17, 2005 6:18 pm

Dear Hari

I would like to ask you what relevance or significance (I hope I chose the right words), do you mean has the knowledge of the various revealed Scriptures of the past, if one can say it like this, for the time we are living in now. We are living in a changing world and changing circumstances, I guess that's the nature of things here also, would this not mean also that knowledge which was spoken or revealed in the past to those living at that particular time and place should be also adapted for the time, place and circumstances we are living in now? I would say that truth as well as art lies in the eyes of the beholder or in other words the angle of vision one may be locking at it according the personal background one may be in or come from.

I guess what I want to know by saying this, is what could be the best possible way, to understand or to define the absolute nature, if there is any, in the statements or evidence one may find in the revealed scriptures, from whatever background they may come from. Which could be the best way to handle their statements in other words, for our entire good. (again if I expressed myself correctly in the english language)

I hope you understand what I mean by saying this.

by Hari » Mon Jun 20, 2005 5:20 pm

I shall assume that all who read these texts are smart people who do not need long-winded replies to form their own conclusions, and in this spirit I shall concisely address your points. If you want any point expanded, let me know.

The wisdom of the past is certainly a product of those who lived then. God certainly wishes that people receive wisdom they can understand and accept. God certainly wants to make it easy for people to advance if they want to. Just consider -- if people lived in a society where the most important resources were the land, cows and bulls, their scriptures would compatibly refer to their milieu. If God were to present to such people statements which related to international communications networks where people all over the world could contact each other at the speed of light, or in terms compatible with the mentality and resources required to utilize such systems, the people would have been lost and confused. Perhaps this is why the secrets of the pyramids were rapidly lost? Perhaps that which we consider to be the ultimate expression of spiritual wisdom is actually a version modified to the requirements of the people living in non-modern times? I think this kind of modification was required and necessary. I think it is required now. Much is being revealed through advanced souls who are similar in many ways to the wise souls of the past. Sure there are differences, but the times are also extremely different. Those who respect and cherish the experiences of yogis go to places where they can meet such persons. Most do not. Spirituality is for everyone so I see no benefit in limiting the manner in which it is experienced.

There are other places in the universe, including the celestial realms, where people live in situations which are far more advanced than our very advanced technological society. Even though there are incredibly smart people in the world today and the number of spiritually, philosophically, and intellectually evolved people is astounding, still, we are far behind the power, capacity, and speed of those in the celestial dimensions. Their spiritual understanding and the words, concepts and culture that is derived from it is quite different from what we are aware of on Earth. Those who are teachers there will speak from their own realizations and experiences that are born of their highly developed environment. The body of recorded wisdom will naturally reflect this. Spiritual teachings and practices find their homes within the hearts and minds of the people of the time. Even those who live today yet follow ancient teachings adapt those disciplines to fit them within their everyday reality.

Why shouldn't those who have the capacity to extract the essence from the wealth of spiritual wisdom present their realizations and experiences in ways which flow with the times within which they live? Whether it is approved by the traditional religions or not, the reality is that this is now happening. Those who are in this flow are touching the hearts of those who contact them.

I do not like to live in the past. I like to live in the present. If this means adapting those aspects of my life that I formerly considered as timeless and unchangeable, then I shall.

by harsi » Wed Jul 06, 2005 12:08 am

"The wisdom of the past is certainly a product of those who lived then. God certainly wishes that people receive wisdom they can understand and accept. God certainly wants to make it easy for people to advance if they want to".

Thank you Hari for this very instructive and progressive explanation, which I appreciate very much. It clarified my understanding of this indeed complex issue. To the way you are approaching and explaining things, Bhaktivinoda Thakur would have said, I am shure:

"Thought is progressive. The author's thought must have progress in the reader in the shape of correction or development.

He is the best critic, who can show the further development of an old thought; but a mere denouncer is the enemy of progress and consequently of nature.

Progress is certainly the law of nature and there must be correction and developments with the progress of time. But progress means going further or rising higher... The true critic advises us



to preserve what we have already obtained, and to adjust our race from that point where we have arrived in the heat of our progress."

From his speech "The Bhagavat"

Open up your mind and heart to new experiences of consciousness.

by Hari » Wed Jul 06, 2005 1:30 pm

Certainly I agree with what was quoted but sometimes making an adjustment means to leave aside something which is the cause of a problem. I do not agree with the idea that a complete change is improper simply because it rejects that which came before it. For example, medical science made a complete change when it discovered bacteria.

I do like to build upon those principles of the past which have value and which encourage growth. I do not like to build upon principles which stifle individuals. Therefore, adjustment could be seen as an attempt to maintain the essential principles of spiritual evolution while leaving aside those aspects which create conditions not advantageous at present.

If this is what the Thakur meant then I can certainly agree. Building upon a previous thought can also mean going back to the origin of the thought and restoring its essence instead of being bound to progressing on a distortion of a once good concept.

## God from another point of view

by Gaura » Mon May 23, 2005 8:21 pm

I have a question from not ordinary point of view. I hope God will excuse me for I want to know the truth more deeper.

They say that God is like a human(body). Is it because we are humans? What if we were dolphins and sufficiently intelligent, would we consider Him like dolphin? Or more likely if we were from other planets and have "strange" kind of bodies, would He have the same "strange" body?

Of course I have read that He has a lot of bodies. But people worship Him in human like form and think that is all to it. Is it not that by worshiping Him in this only way all the world around us become very simple, very chip? It's seems to me that in this way we forget about His inconceivable depths.

Sorry if I have said something to bold, but I have just read interesting pages which illuminated in me this point.

by Hari » Thu Jun 02, 2005 6:28 pm

As you know, your asking this question created many other thought processes in me and one of them was the lecture last Saturday, Polarity, Spin, and Attraction. Originally, this answer was going to be very long, but since the lecture already gave me a chance to express these ideas to some extent, I will simply answer your question directly and briefly as best I can. Thank you again for inspiring my thought process. I am grateful.

I do not think that God will have a problem with your asking this question. Since God has no fear, God does not discourage you from asking any question you wish. As God wants you to

continuously develop to become the greatest you can possibly be, it would be against God's interest to place a restriction on what you can question. To prohibit questioning is to suppress intelligence, something that is usually done by those who have something to hide, such as hidden flaws, fundamental weaknesses, or unstated motivations, amongst other possible reasons. Since God has none of these defects and is eager for you to uncover the truth, questions such as these declare boldly your right as an intelligent portion of divinity to express what you already know within, but were formerly afraid to manifest externally. Congratulations for your courage. Asking those questions which seem to be quite taboo makes for interesting discussions and stimulates more growth than hiding your doubts in the closet of darkness.

I have heard this question asked in private only a few times. An intelligent person who is a freethinker must address this at one point. The problem of a fixed and absolute form of God spoken about in India (even if there are many different forms they do not change once they have appeared) makes one question whether human beings have given themselves an elite position within the universe with Indians having an elite position on Earth. Considering that at present there is much information about beings from other planets (whether you believe it or not, there is much consistent information available), an intelligent person must wonder why God must have an eternally non-changing form ultimate form of a human being? Consider the plight of beings in the universe that are not human. They must now accept a God who might just look impossibly ugly to them according to their own standards of beauty. Since God shall be all-attractive by definition, how would they relate to a form that is alien to them?

Obviously we cannot answer this definitively. Unless one has contacts with alien beings and trusts their information about God or one has God's direct answer to the question, one can never really be certain of the true situation. But then again, would you believe a person who claimed to have such direct information? I would find it hard to believe it unless I also had some personal experience.

Let us look at this from another point of view. God can have as many forms as God wants. God can also choose to not manifest any particular form to contact or connect with those who do not wish to tune to a form. All that counts to God is that the person making the connection finds the connection real, relevant, significant, and deep, for God is interested in the evolutionary benefit of all. For beings of non-human forms, God can communicate with them in forms familiar to them which capture their hearts and minds.

by Gaura » Thu Jun 02, 2005 8:36 pm

Thank you for your answer.

I also think that this forms of Gods came from the ancient times, when people think that humans are the kings of all creates, and our planet, or where we live, is the most important place in the universe (maybe because we are also so important).

An interesting thing: It seems Christians never see Krishna and Krishnaitis never see Christ or Maria.( Of course Christ is not God, but people think so in one way or another)

**It seems that God appears to us in the form we want to see him.**

by Dhana-da » Thu Jun 23, 2005 9:10 am

Funny. On the eve I just talked to one person whom I have inspired to read Walsh, about the God. I tried to prove that the God has impersonal aspect and personal, but personal above as, many followers vaishnava's cultures saw Krishna in the meditation. God has come to them in such form, according to their belief in such form?

And remember, there is a statement, what Krishna has subdued the appearance of all essences in the Universe-it exaggeration? And how see itself those showers which enter into eternal games and are borrowed there by the certain actions? It too result of their belief or so occurs really in a spiritual empire?

My problem in that conversation, probably that I have no such deep experience to learn as actually. But now there is a question, whether there will be my experience absolute truth or again it is fruits of my belief? The last "terrible" opinion on followers of an impersonal way, I have certainly changed, especially after book Svami Yogananda, but questions as you can see remain.

by Hari » Wed Jun 29, 2005 3:36 pm

I understand your dilemma. How can you discuss topics of which you have not got a clear understanding of when you are not simply repeating something you have heard or read? If you engage in a discussion with someone and they propose something that you 'know' is not complete or is incorrect, on what basis do you continue the discussion? Certainly the easiest way to discuss is from the platform of your own personal experience, but what if you do not have an experience that relates to the topic? Certainly you have some experience and that is a good point to start from. In time, your experience will grow and your capacity to discuss that experience will grow with it. Seek out these experiences without fear and they will come to you. If you honestly call out to the Their Lordships, the universe, or your guides or angels, certainly they will respond.

This leads us to the more important question: What is it you wish to share with others?

Formerly, some of us [who were Hare Krishnas] had the idea that we knew the absolute truth and it was our God-given responsibility to give that to others as it was without change. It was not important to us whether they wanted it or not and therefore we would chant anywhere and everywhere, even if they found it obnoxious, troublesome, or silly. We would give them a book by hook or by crook since all that counted was they had it whether they threw it away in the next five minutes and hated us forever or not. After all, we were the messengers of God and we were on a mission that had to be fulfilled regardless of the cost. You get the point. This ideal is a comforting one in that it makes life simple and answers all the questions one might have about how to relate with the world.

Now you, and many others, have changed. You no longer see things like that. Yet you still engage in talks with people where you try to 'prove' something to them but now you feel uncomfortable about declaring something as true simply because someone told you it was. You yearn for your own experience so you can share on a level that cannot be contradicted by mere words or philosophical edicts yet you lack the experience to answer all questions. My question is, "Why must there be an answer to all questions? Is there something wrong with allowing questions to answer themselves over time?" Growing together into an answer is organic and healthy.

There is no harm in saying, "I feel it to be so or I think it might be so." An absolutist would deny your right to say so for to them it is a declaration of ignorance. Since you are not an absolutist, you should not worry about this. Your honesty in your discussion with others fuels the sharing between you and is the basis of love. If you care about others, then you should share with them that which you know to be valid. As much as you know, you can share, for what you

know to be true is all you can truly offer to others. Certainly you can just talk without any connection to your heart, but you are no longer satisfied with such an impersonal idea. You want to connect with those you speak by sharing your essence and your ever-increasing awareness of life. Yet, try to avoid stating that what you now know as true is unchanging for as you see things from newer perspectives you find nuances and surprises that you would never expect were there. Give yourself room to grow and to find new and better ways of seeing life. As your awareness grows, so shall your experience of reality. If you think that you must experience reality in one particular kind of way, you are limiting your growth and cutting off your chances to be aware of things you could not now imagine. Let your growth be organic and you shall experience all that is available to you.

As your experience expands share it with others openly and without pride. State simply: This is what I know now. I shall know more later on and when I do I shall share that with you as a loving exchange. I do not state that this is all that is to be known or that it is an absolute that can never transform; rather, it is what I know now. I am sharing this with you in our loving exchange and I am sure what you share with me will also give me impetus to increase my awareness of life.

There is nothing to prove right and nothing to prove wrong. After all, who would you prove it to? Mainly you are convincing yourself. If you need to prove something is right to someone else, it speaks more about your lack of belief in what you are saying than the other person's need to know it is correct. Further, sometimes we try to convince others of what we are saying either because we are bored and need some sport or we need to conquer someone else to prove ourselves great orators or scholars (the disease of some brahmanas). I suppose the only really valid time to prove and conquer in this way is when you are selling something. As you not selling yourself (are you?) then you have no need to prove or convince anyone of anything.

Why not just talk with others and share with them? If they find your experiences useful to them, they will take them, otherwise not. If they do not accept your experience and therefore have no interest in you as a person, then they are not the kind of person with whom you can have a longer term relationship. If they appreciate the exchange with you and are not concerned about the substance of it, there is a potential to continue the exchange. If they appreciate what you say and gain from it, even up to the point of having a similar experience to what you related to them, then you have found a friend and also given that friend something of value.

The idea that we speak at someone or give something to someone by convincing them they had a wrong idea is not conducive to our own or other's growth. I know that others think it is, but if you examine it carefully, being a kind and loving friend who shares with others as they need, or as they value, is worth so much it cannot be described. Sometimes doing this at the right time saves someone from having to spend years getting entangled in an ideal that does not serve them over the long term.

As for me, I have concluded it is better to continue to be a seeker of the truth forever. Those who share in my journey for some time might find some solace or companionship on their spiritual journey.

Those you impact by sharing the means to experience something significant will remember you fondly for all time.

by Guest » Tue May 30, 2006 6:33 pm

Dear Hari!

I have read Your post, and for some period of time I have changed my point of view. When somebody (You) say something that coincides with my internal feeling, I loose my feeling of loneliness, and I open myself for surrounding. It happens very rare to me. I have looked around me, I have seen the same things, but I felt them something important. Now I am not very experienced man, I had not some mystical experiences connected with the traveling to other planets. But inside me I feel some power and mystery, something that close to me, something I can connect with. It is all my experience. Sometimes I can see these things outside. But it disappears very quickly (why?).

The question about absolute and relative forms of God, about His form of relationship with us, about our absolute form is very important for me. Any contact (for us) is a contact of forms (mental, physical). No form, no limit, no contact. What do You think about it? If everything changes: God can take any form, we change forms, and maybe any form is not essential? Does the form limit relationship?

I have noticed that when I try to go deeply to some question, I hit on duality: good-evil, good-bad, form-content and I stop here, I understand that I went nowhere, the passageway is closed. There is a childish question: Name two things, equal and different at the same time. The child as distinct from adult say: an original and a copy. They are equal and different. The usual logic does not work here. Let's say A does not equal to B, and B does not equal to C, then A does not equal to C. But they can be equal for children. I think the logic is a math instrument, and the heart is sentiments. What should we follow?

Sorry for such long question. In brief: what do You think about form and essence? And what should we follow trying to live with our inner nature?

I also would like to say You Great thanks for ability to read You and to write to You. I also thankful to the people maintaining this forum.

by Hari » Thu Jun 01, 2006 10:47 pm

It is important to examine why you feel connected after you hear something I, or someone else you might find significant to you, say something you believed to be true. This indicates to me that you have a very low self-esteem that causes you not to have faith in your intuition and your realization. This is not the best attitude, for it weakens your capacity and integrity during your day-to-day life when you doubt yourself because you do not have the possibility to confirm what you feel. Have faith in your inner self and realization for they are the only things that will guide you through life. After all, the main reason you found what I said to be interesting is its similarity to what you already knew. The most important factor is that you already knew it. Believe in this. You will realize you know more than you think.

You say that form, or some kind of limitation, is essential for contact. I am not sure what kind of contact you mean, but the deepest contacts are those we establish through feeling. It is hard to even speak about the form or limits of feelings. After all, love is love; hate is hate, where do we set the boundaries or limits on these emotions? I suppose one could try to speak about the forms of love or hate, but one might have to speak in terms of the manifestation or effect of these emotions more than the direct experience of them. This is why poets create allegories to describe their love rather than using quantitatively limited phrases. Something about the sentence, "I love you as much as three buckets of tomatoes," doesn't seem very accurate or pleasing; whereas, "I love you as much as the sky is blue and the sun is bright," strikes our emotional strings in a more fitting manner. Now how does one quantify "as much as the sky is blue?" What is the limit of that blue?

Can you even speak of the independent form of blue? It is a color and in that sense a form, but it is a dependent form; one that needs to be applied to another physically existing object such as a wall or a car. After all, in the allegory above the blue sky is not even blue. It appears to be so due to the interaction of light on the atmosphere filtering through from outer space and therefore as a subjective reality it defies quantification. Although it has a perceivable form, it is not really what it appears to be, but do we care? Not really, we are mainly concerned with the essence of the sky as the basis of our atmosphere within which cycle the constant changes from sunny day to dark night, or a clear day to a rainy and cloudy one. The sky is in one sense, formless, yet forms manifest within it and from it according to the atmosphere around our planet. I do not think form limits contact; rather, I think it is a vehicle through which connection takes place. It is a means through which the interactions of connection occur and a means by which connection transforms.

Now when we speak of God, we run into various problems. God defies quantification and when we attempt to quantify God we say, "God is great," or "God is all-powerful," but these terms are abstract and do not specifically quantify God or limit God with a specified amount of greatness or power. Even the term, all-powerful, is abstract as we have no way to understand it other than to say the all-powerful can do anything at any time and no force can stop it. The thought of that makes me shudder. But when we speak of God as all-powerful we do not worry as we trust God, or at least some of us do, and therefore we don't fear the potential abuse of such power due to the divine love that tempers and guides it. For those who do not accept the power or existence of a God, there is no discussing these points, but for those who accept the divine, the essential point is love, for it is divine love only to which we can connect. How do you connect to the great or to the power? I suppose those who live in awe of that greatness and power can feel secure as the dominated servant, but that is not an acceptable connection for all. Others feel connected through the unconditional, all-pervading love. This is not a form, is without limit, and cannot be quantified, but can be experienced in specific ways which confirm the existence of the divine love and which encourage us to expand our connections to the loving source of all balance and support.

Form is not essence. Essence requires no form. If essence finds it advantageous to assume form, it can do so, but essence is without form by definition. The essence of spirituality is spiritual energy and we are that. Our being is that energy and that energy is essence. Since we are conscious and our consciousness is active, we manifest our essence energetically. According to the situation we are in, this manifestation will be in different forms. When essence interacts with environment, form is the basis within which the interaction takes place. We are essence, yet we manifest it within form.

Some people insist that this essence has an eternal form and that the form and the essence in that eternal, liberated, state are non-different, but this concept is not contradictory to what I said. Essence assembles form according to its consciousness, for it is the nature of essence to create form according to desire. Essence desires to manifest according to what it is. Our consciousness has inclinations and preferences, and according to the situations we are in, we assume a situation appropriate to the manifestation of our energy. It is the nature of our energy to flow and by flowing to create manifestations and forms. In most cases, this energy requires a vehicle, or a form, through which to flow according to our specific and unique consciousness and the manner in which we desire to manifest it. This seems to be the way all spiritual beings manifest themselves.

As essence, we are what we are by definition. When we are fully aware of the essence we are, we will correspondingly manifest that in our appearance, in our words, in our acts, and in consideration of everything to which our energy connects. This is how we "assemble" the forms that represent what we are when there are no other external impositions upon us. This is the spiritual body.

## What is the goal You have now?

by I am » Mon Jan 16, 2006 2:22 pm

Hello, dear Hari!

I wonder what the main goal do You have now in Your life? Something that rules Your activity? Thank You for answer and for the facility to associate with You. Good luck!!!

by Hari » Thu Jan 19, 2006 2:07 am

After I leave this physical realm, I wish to be met by those I love the most who will embrace me and say, "Thank you very much. You have done very well." And then I will cry in love.

by Jiva » Tue May 30, 2006 6:26 pm

Hari wrote:

and say, "Thank you very much. You have done very well." And then I will cry in love.

Dear Hari!

Recently I have been criticized by a person, who is very close to me, his opinion is very important to me. This person have criticized me completely saying that I am not very good man. Since that person is close to me, and I think hi is fine and dear to me, I can not to ignore him or say: "you are fool yourself". At the same time I can not to agree with him. I do not care who is right. The other point is very interesting for me.

When people who are very important to me criticize me, I feel badly. When they praise me I feel good. Why? Is it because a person (soul) is a social being and he/she lives only reflecting in eyes of other people? Or maybe because I am afraid to find out, that I am bad. And for whom am I good or bad? I came to a conclusion that the policy of threats and bribery is a natural way of society and relationship building. We now what bad things sre. But it constantly changes. It is important that there are always good and bad there. Could it be so, that there is no obligation for me to coincide constantly with some external image? The principal concepts "good, positive, clever, happy" are like labels. The people appreciate me by these labels. Could it be, that I am like I am, but the other people accept and love me? Or should I break myself to fit to some expectations? The world does not accept me, I have constantly something to do with myself. Why is it so?

by Hari » Thu Jun 01, 2006 9:09 pm

Ah yes, the ancient dilemma! Shall I be what I am, whatever that is as I gradually discover it or uncover it, or shall I be what I must be according to the powerful influence of the world around me? What is more important, my internal world or my external world?

Naturally, both are important. You have to be yourself and you have to be true to yourself. You have to be the best you can be at whatever you can be, and at the same time you have to consider you are not alone, you are not the center of the universe, you are not independent of others, and you need to interact with others to fulfill your social being.

This is easily said, but difficult to manifest; indeed, it is the primary work of everyone.

Here are some hints:

\* You can only aspire to do what you feel is right at the time you do it.

- \* You can only be the best you can be at all times.
- \* You can aspire to compassionately understand others.
- \* You can try to be honest yet at the same time considerate of how your words or actions affect others.
- \* You can attempt to insure that you are not neglected while supplying others what they need.
- \* You can trust your feelings and follow your heart when you have the opportunity to do so.
- \* You can compromise anything if you see the need to without having to accept the compromise as your ultimate desire.
- \* You can accept you did something that was not the best for yourself or others around you and attempt to rectify it as best you can while learning from the experience.

If you do this you can never be a bad person. Anyway, if someone calls you a bad person, they are really stating, "You do things or think things that I think are bad and I do not like it and I want to tell you so," and nothing more. It does not mean you are bad if they call you bad or that you are good if they call you good. All it means is they think like that.

If people need you to be something other than what you are before they will accept you, then they are not accepting you but are molding you for their usage. You might accept this compromise for some time, but when you realize it is counter-productive you should allow yourself to change the situation. Since people have a hard time understanding others, most likely you will find yourself in this situation again and again. Deal with it according to what is best for you at the time.

If people insist you be a certain way otherwise they will no longer accept you, they are indeed blackmailing you and you can decide if you want to accept this or not. After all, circumstances can force us to do what we do not want. For example, if we are working in a job and we are forced to do something we do not like out of fear of being fired, it is something we accept only because we need the money. Friends or relatives may occasionally demand we meet their expectations or face reprisals, but if they do this consistently you should decide if they are worth the trouble.

Some people are eccentric. They do not fit into the mold of what is considered a model citizen or friend. They are what they are for many reasons and only they can know why they feel comfortable doing what they do. This is neither good nor bad, it simply is.

Nevertheless, some of the most significant advancement made in life comes through circumstances that were unpleasant, restrictive, frustrating, bewildering, or when we had to deal with things that would not go away or resolve easily. Sometimes people appear in our lives to demand our acceptance of a situation similar to the one we put others, either in this life or previous lives, and do us the favor of forcing us to experience the frustration and pain we caused them due to our lack of concern, insensitivity, or gross ignorance. Evolutionary possibilities have a habit of manifesting in interesting ways.

It is a balancing act. Practicing it is good. There is no absolute standard of success. Even if the crowd applauds, the actor might be miserable. One has to simply try one's best. There is nothing else to do!

## **About following some system of regulation**

by Hari » Fri Jul 29, 2005 7:53 pm

I received the following question via email and thought it might be useful for others.



Thank you for keeping in touch with everyone who wishes to be in touch with you. I would like to ask you some questions regarding sadhana-bhakti and how you see it now.

You know that for many years we've been following sadhana process, certain rules and regulations: rising early, worshiping, chanting, etc. Some were more rigorous in this process than others. But we've been doing this because we believed that it will bring us to a certain unknown point of our spiritual journey to Sri Krishna, or God. And there were moments we were happy in that process too. We had even a faith that if you do it for all your life, eventually you get to the point of perfection or self & God realization. The belief to follow this process at the beginning was based on theory alone but later on the practice as well because it had some 'juice' in it, although sometimes it was uneasy, especially to rise early in the morning . But it was part of agreement, contract so to speak, with the guru because he took responsibility to bring us to a certain point of self & God realization if we do certain things and refrain from the others.

At this point I would like to ask you how do you see the situation now? For me it is sort of hanging situation. The belief in the process (I mean, for example, sadhana process) at some point have been amputated if we could use a medical term here. We had that belief and we are dealing with it now. Some may be are continuing the process to this day fully in the temple or at home after decision that it is good for them, some don't do it at all because of a sudden change in belief or lack of it, and others do it partially just because have been used to it for many years (as myself) and still have some faith in it but at the same time are doubtful in their minds - will I get in my spiritual journey to that destination now, to that point were the process suppose to bring, should I make more endeavours from my part to follow it? I know that we are trying to resolve those questions ourselves. It is a bit like a baby left without parents trying to do things. And sometimes making a lot of mess (like my daughter lately painted all floor, cupboards and walls in the kitchen ).

I would like to know what are your thoughts about sadhana process now, is it still relevant to you (yet I feel that it has some importance to me)? Does the God or Angels, or any higher forces reciprocate according to our endeavours which we put in following certain rules and regulations or it is more like growing bank account which we are not allowed to use till some time in the future (to buy lovely things) although we are glad that account is increasing each day? Or may be it was created by some smart people who wanted to manipulate followers of those rules and regulations?

From your previous postings I have the picture of your present understanding related to belief and religion but would appreciate to hear more of your thoughts and feelings on the mentioned subject.

by Hari » Fri Jul 29, 2005 8:53 pm

As you well know, all things in life depend on how you see them as much as on what they are in reality. If you wish to do something and you like to do it, there is no need to ask anyone if you should. But sometimes we do research to examine if what we are doing is the best for us at the time. I assume that is what you are doing now. In the spirit of trying to be of service to you to assist your research, I can answer according to what I think.

I understand your example of your daughter painting everything. I can see how you fear being left on your own and having to make all these grown up decisions in your life as this is a challenge and demands accepting personal responsibility for consequences you fear. It might be advantageous to see your daughter's action as her discovering her world and her capacities. She expressed herself artistically and made her mark and statement on her world. Sure this is a mess for you since normally you would not paint your cabinets like that, but from her point of view she took a chance. How you respond to her will become an important part of her development into adulthood. By being steady and non-aggressive you can explain to her what she has done and how that is not an acceptable family behavior, and thus stimulate her growth as a social being sensitive to the world of others. In this case your presence in her life assists her as you give her the feedback she needs to understand what not to do in the future. She has learned from her own experience. Later she will look back on that and love you more because you accepted her as she is without condemning her for it. Thus you will grow in her eyes.

Not all questions can be easily answered. Neither does simply following something someone else gave you give you full protection. Sometimes it can be counter-productive. It is certain that when you make the effort required to determine what is right or wrong in your life, you will grow enormously and develop strength and confidence. If you simply follow some system your growth may be stunted by your atrophied internal capacity and/or the limits of what you are following. I like the method of your daughter better. Fear not, you are not a child and you have a better developed sense of what is right and wrong. Trust it.

If you were someone who had little or no conception of spiritual culture, I might suggest some principles to help you along. I would suggest that being a vegetarian or close to one is helpful to some extent, but if you were not or will not be one I would leave it be. When one develops in their capacity to act from the platform of love, all the little details fall into place. I wonder if following some principles really strengthens your capacity to act from love or if it tends to harden you and create an elitism that separates people? One can only answer that by examining a large sample of people who have attempted to advance using the disciplined approach and another sample of those who do not.

A good education and training in the early years can go a long way towards creating strength and spiritual awareness later on in life. Thus the varnashrama ideal arises again! Yet a superior quality educative system, talented teachers, well adjusted family members, and a safe and supportive environment are essential to the manifestation of that ideal, for without them varnashrama education is nothing more than an excuse to experiment with children. Again, it boils down to the personal responsibility of every parent.

As far as restricting some essential bodily functions, it is clear that lack of sleep dulls the intelligence and initiative. But that is another issue.

Many have followed different paths. Some have done everything perfectly and others have not. There are reasons why a person does not follow something and these reasons are important. One of the deficiencies in the understanding of fundamentalists is the idea that if one does not follow what one is supposed to, according to the fundamentalist's understanding, one is simply incapable of following and therefore not very qualified or spiritual. Because of this blindness, they miss good opportunities to adjust their behavioral patterns to make their mission more successful. To do that requires, perhaps, more courage than the usual follower can muster. Let the scholarly research the reasons why things happen the way they do instead of trying to prove that those who did them are deviants. They may be astonished at the result of their investigation.

One should similarly examine why a person will follow something even when it no longer serves their own interest. Such an examination will assist the followers to better understand what it is they are doing and why. If they are doing it because of the faith that they will get a great destination by doing so, then they are gambling that their belief is exactly what they think it is. Such people will also follow their belief even when practically they can see it has no real purpose or value for them.

Those who follow because they actually like doing whatever it is they are told to do and are having good experiences with it, feel little impetus to question until some circumstance arises to challenge their experiences. How they adjust to the new situation depends on their character, courage and honesty.

Those who do not feel like following and struggle against themselves to do so often end up with internal conflicts which tend to tear at their internal psyche. They follow, but do not have much faith it will bring them success. They inevitably lose faith in themselves because they know they don't have enough desire to follow which leads them to condemn themselves and their "rebellion." They feel unqualified because they do not follow, yet they restrict their capacity to change as they restrict transformative experiences out of fear. In such persons, evolution comes slowly and usually through traumatic experiences.

All of them should understand one thing: they are doing what they do because they want to do it and no other reason. Since they are in control of their actions, they can also change their direction when they desire. Understanding this empowers them to consciously create a significant transformation in their evolutionary program.

Whether you should follow or not is entirely up to you. I do what I feel is best for me without considering overly seriously what someone else has said is right for me. Certainly I want to receive input from learned and helpful people around me, but ultimately I have to choose what to do and take responsibility for it. If I do what someone tells me to do and the result is not what it should have been, it is I who must live with the reactions. Others might be somewhat affected, but it is my life that is most deeply affected when I follow something not right for me.

I hope you understand the liberating import of this. Do not naively think that someone else shall take the responsibility for you and your evolution. In all cases it is fully dependent on you. Others may assist, but it is you who makes it happen or not. Yes, you can share that with others and others can give you great support as well, but you are the pilot of your destiny. Blinding yourself with faith does not guarantee you will not run into a tree!

If following something serves your interests, fine, but if not, then it is up to you to have the courage to change it. It seems you already know what is best for you, so why not just do that with confidence in yourself and your intelligence? You are a good person and have a good brain and you can determine what is ultimately best for you. You may surely take advice from others, but you are responsible for what you accept.

It seems to me that you wish to follow some things and not others. This becomes a problem when you live in the temple or your life is dependent on maintaining some position. Otherwise it is not a problem unless you make it one.

About following some system of regulation

by Nanda » Wed Aug 03, 2005 7:47 pm

Hari wrote:

*... I hope you understand the liberating import of this. Do not naively think that someone else shall take the responsibility for you and your evolution. In all cases it is fully dependent on you. Others may assist, but it is you who makes it happen or not. Yes, you can share that with others and others can give you great support as well, but you are the pilot of your destiny. Blinding yourself with faith does not guarantee you will not run into a tree!*

*If following something serves your interests, fine, but if not, then it is up to you to have the courage to change it. It seems you already know what is best for you, so why not just do that with confidence in yourself and your intelligence? You are a good person and have a good brain and you can determine what is ultimately best for you. You may surely take advice from others, but you are responsible for what you accept.*

Thank you, dear Hari, for this wonderful answer. It is very important to have on mind this very good advice: You may surely take advice from others, but you are responsible for what you accept. ... Fortunately, we have this forum when we can pick up good advices. Thank you again.

## **Gracious Goddess, protect me from all harm seen and unseen**

by Mihail » Fri Aug 12, 2005 3:32 am

Some regulations is useful.

Did you try to MEASURE EXPERIMENTALLY amount of different modes at different times of day?

I tried something. When I typed text in natural language, I noted, that after 18 or 19 hours number of errors (found by spell checker) increased around 1.5 ... 2.0 times. This was the case even when I stood up at 14 or 15 hours! So mode of ignorance is real for me.

Also there are many things that can be experienced but not calculated so clearly. They can depends on person, however.

by Hari » Mon Aug 15, 2005 8:27 pm

Actually, yes, I have done my own kind of experiments. There is another factor present. I have heard from astrologers that if you were born in the morning, then you are a morning person who works best at that time of the day. According to the time of day you are born, your energy is strong during that period. I see it is true with me. And I see that ignorance can attack anyone at the times which are far from their times of strength.

Passion can arise at any time, and also is connected to the movements of other modes. But it depends on the constitution of each person.

I agree with you that regulations that are consistent with your modes of action according to the times of day, the times of the month (as the full moon and dark moon create different moods in people) or even of the year (the summer creates different energy than winter) and for that matter in life itself (youth creates quite different energy than old age) indicates that regulation has to be tempered by the time and circumstances. Regulation itself is important to maximize energy, increase efficiency and develop personal capacity.

Regulation in some ways is good for sanity, for we like to have stability in certain predictable parts of our lives.

by Damodara » Mon May 29, 2006 1:42 pm

Following some system of regulation (including sadhana) is an austerity. We get the power from austerity.

Sorry I could not restrain myself. I was a confirmed sadhana man. It partly saved me.

by Hari » Thu Jun 01, 2006 8:23 pm

Nothing to be sorry about. I respect your experience.

## How to think about ourselves?

by alexey » Thu May 18, 2006 8:32 am

Dear Hari,  
question from russian forum. Author - Dhana.

Earlier we have thought about ourselves like disciples of some Guru, and we were proud of it. We have related ourselves to certain society and line of teachers, to certain school. Can we think about ourselves as man of the world of free soul? When the old paradigm breaks down one wish to get rid of past common existence with somebody or something quasi one wish to wash away something sticky that embrace him for a long period of time. In time such a rejection accept healthy forms based on real realization and understanding oneself. You have said You are not Guru, but helping people is Your vocation. For me the man who helps me is a teacher. Is it correct to say to myself: if You are a teacher, then I am Your disciple? It happens that somebody through the books or practice helps me, I also could call him a teacher. But the question is: Do I need some new label, new name? Does the attitude of the Universe and angels towards me depend on my opinion about myself? On whose follower I am. Or I can confess to myself that I just go and use everything that helps me to grow and thanks to all? Maybe on the level of full self-realization there is no need to be privy to some group or a person? Some persons and groups resonate with me, and I can use their experience and practice. How much is it important to devote oneself to some school? Earlier the hearing or impersonals was considered as a great offense and the beginning of a falling. But I can read that kind of book and find there something useful.

What will the Higher authority say about my "deviations"? Do the elevated souls see us like the disciple of disciple, the servant or the servant or grand and powerful essences, co-creator with God?

by Hari » Sat May 20, 2006 12:15 am

When your teachers in school taught you your ABC's, were you their disciple? Learning from someone does not make one a disciple. Considering this, you choose to be a disciple when it makes sense for you to think of yourself in that manner. Part of the making sense is having the appropriate forum to express your discipleship. This usually requires the presence of a person who acts as your teacher/authority.

One does not have to define oneself as a disciple. There are other healthy, natural and rewarding relationships with teachers which can be beneficial and require no 'contracts' or formality. When we accept a teacher (or teaching ) to assist us, we are seeking to evolve

through spiritual experiences and we are expected to take what we can and develop. We do not need to re-define ourselves according to the demands of a culture of guru-disciple or master-apprentice for we can feel quite comfortable with being seekers of the truth. Angels, demigods, sages, saintly persons, or other seekers of the truth accept us as their compatriot and assist us on occasion. This philosophical definition of what we are as a seeker is not only sufficient, it frees us from needless burdens when you do not wish to have them, allows us to always seek truth and not simply accept it even when our experience contradicts what we are told, and empowers our progress under any and all circumstances.

If someone demands you become their disciple before they will share with you their knowledge or experience, you can examine whether this is something you want to do or not. You might find this demand stifling, archaic, or bordering on potential exploitation, or you might find it comforting to have finally found shelter on a clearly defined island in a sea of uncertainty. Your decision depends on how you feel at the time. I do not see any absolute requirement either way; sometimes one way works better than the other, for our evolutionary needs lead us to what we must experience.

If I find something that resonates well with me, I accept it. If I find something that does not resonate well with me I try to understand it better. If I need to change and I see it is right to do so, I will consider it, but when I see no reason to integrate this understanding into my life I will not do so. I maintain my freedom to seek out the truth by doing what I feel is best for me at all times. This does not mean that I always do the 'best' or 'right' thing for there are often circumstances which force me to accept associations, actions, or even partnerships I might not wish to accept were I independent of all needs. As we are social beings with internal needs that must be addressed within an external environment, how we deal with the world around us has to accommodate the reality of our world.

Are you asking me to set up some rule or guideline for you? I don't wish to fulfill this request. I do not think there is an absolute or 'higher' requirement that a master-apprentice relationship is the sole or optimal means to attain realization, yet I have also stated that sometimes a person needs to be in such an environment for a variety of reasons of which we may or may not be aware. I was also in such an environment and evolved within it despite its limitations.

If someone were to judge your 'deviations' there would have to exist a standard that all must follow. If you believe that, then you naturally would want to follow that standard and not deviate and therefore there is no need to ask the questions you are asking. If you do not believe this idea then there is also no need to ask the question since the divine would not label your attempts to develop as deviations when there is no such standard. However, do not forget we have our own standards that we apply in our lives and often we do not tolerate our own deviations from them.

I will avoid dealing with your last sentence as it is filled with tar. There can be nothing wrong with a person wishing to be of service. This is our great gift to ourselves and the universe. While we are engaged in all sincerity in service, we are in harmony with the divine. When in harmony with the divine, we do extraordinary things while broadcasting spiritual love.

by Siva-Ratri » Sat May 20, 2006 9:32 am

Hari wrote:

There can be nothing wrong with a person wishing to be of service.  
This idea greater warm responds in my heart.

by harsi » Wed May 24, 2006 7:27 pm

Hari wrote:

I maintain my freedom to seek out the truth by doing what I feel is best for me at all times. This does not mean that I always do the 'best' or 'right' thing for there are often circumstances which force me to accept associations, actions, or even partnerships I might not wish to accept were I independent of all needs. As we are social beings with internal needs that must be addressed within an external environment, how we deal with the world around us has to accommodate the reality of our world.

There is so much wisdom in what you wrote. Would you say that there is some deficiency, if I chose the right world, in the way many understood in the past, me too, spiritual awareness and progress or elevation as something which would contradict somehow the way the society of people at large would live their lives in this world, declaring them as living a life in `maya`, if something like this would indeed exist or is rather something we are not so consciously aware of like some higher beings surely are? I guess what I would like to say is the following. Is it not so that everything one may experience in this world and the society of people one may find oneself in temporarily is something one may have to go through in order to elevate oneself spiritually more and thus everything what happens to oneself, or the situations one may find oneself in temporarily, could have also a deeper and somehow beneficial meaning for every individual person of us, although one may not always be consciously aware of this?

by Hari » Thu Jun 01, 2006 7:40 pm

Absolutely!

## **Why do souls choose to have birth in the bodies of animals..**

by zulfiya » Mon May 29, 2006 1:36 pm

Good day, dear Hari!

The question I would like to ask You is about world of animals and plants. Yet I can not find a clear understanding: What kinds of souls do aspire to take birth in the bodies of plants and animals? Saying animals, I mean all representatives of Fauna: bacterium, insects, inhabitants of water, birds, mammals! I wonder because the quantity of all beings I mentioned above is more than people in several times. Do those souls also plan their future lifetimes between lives? What kind of spiritual way they have? Why do they choose to have birth in the bodies of animals and plants? Of course I remember from Bhagavat-Gita about evolution through 8400000 forms of life. Is it so?

I wonder especially domestic animals. People live with them, love them, and care about them. A person often has pet, which like his only friend, his part of life. There is an opinion that pets take a part of karma of its masters. You could say the same about plants: plants react on people's contact, on concerning, on good attitude. Such souls live in a close contact with a person. Could they be in one spiritual group? Do we plan between lifetimes our meeting with them in the next life? Will we meet them after life?

The other example people kill and eat the animals. Do the souls of these animals know before birth about their destination? If they know, what is a stimulus for them to take such a birth? The same about the plants we eat. Could You explain it to me? Thank You in advance.

by Hari » Thu Jun 01, 2006 7:38 pm

As I have said before, there are two effective means to answer a question: a) by quoting some external source of knowledge, or b) by speaking from your own realization, experience, and understanding. There are many sources of knowledge outside of ourselves and we use them all the time, but I am not aware of many that could answer this question from experience. As far

as I am aware, the only people who attempt to definitively answer questions such as these are religionists who reach into their scripture to reply.

You are already aware of the scriptural points of view, so I will not attempt to use such sources; neither would I be comfortable doing so. I may or may not agree with them, but that is beside the point. That leaves me with the option of speaking from my experience. Admittedly this experience is limited when it comes to my direct perception of the motivations of and decisions made by plants and animals before this life. This limits my capacity to answer this question.

Most animals respond very well to love. If someone cares for them and provides them with their essentials, they reciprocate. But this applies mainly to the more domesticated variety like household pets, horses, cows or whatever. Wild animals might also fall into this category were there to be someone like St Francis of Assisi to love them. Considering this, we could understand these creatures are comfortable in the role of supporting humans and receiving support from humans and perhaps this is a reason for them to be what they are. But then again, there are animals that will never feel such support. What would motivate them? I cannot say.

My experience is that pets absorb your pain and give you love. They enjoy your pleasure and wish to be a part of it. When I see my dog, for example, I see a creature that is very comfortable being a dog. I also see that I would love to see and be with him in the afterlife and in the next life. Such a nice doggie he is! Some say they wait for us. Some say they take birth again quickly and one should go out and find another that looks in our eyes the same way. I have no direct experience of this.

I do know that the creation of a body is directly connected to the consciousness of the soul that shall inhabit the body. As that consciousness evolves, the body will follow. We see this in our own lives and in the lives of others. This lends credence to the concept of spiritually based evolution through the species. However, one wonders how a single celled creature's consciousness evolves sufficiently to allow it to graduate to a higher form of life? This makes the idea of the evolution of consciousness difficult to apply universally, but not impossible if one allows for forces to be acting to which we presently have no connection, perhaps something similar to Carlos Casteneda's fascination with the consciousness of crystalline forms.

To deal with this difficulty, scriptures usually indicate the automatic evolution of souls to higher forms until they come to the human form when they can be more in charge of their evolution and the bodies they accept. Although this handles the complexity surrounding single celled organisms evolving (or others -- use your imagination), it is not a concept that is logically satisfying for it creates these incredibly long periods of time for all souls to move from the lowest to the human forms. I sometimes like the idea that souls are just happy being what they are, some in a manner I cannot understand, and only move when they wish to, again, using a mechanism I do not understand. But this idea of mine is not meant to be a contradictory philosophical creation within a radical school of thought; it is just an idea.

Then again, here is an interesting thought: What if the evolution takes place in-between lives by the spiritually aware soul? What if the experiences as a single celled organism are not in themselves sufficient to create changes in consciousness (for after all, there is practically none) but rather it is the soul's conscious capacity after the death of that cell that propels it into a higher form? But which soul could tolerate making the single step into a two celled creature and not insist on a more developed form? Not me!

Therefore my answer is useless for you. I am sorry about that, but this is all I can honestly say with confidence.



## Blooming

by alexey » Thu May 18, 2006 8:29 am

Dear Hari,  
question from russian forum. Author - Vlad.

Dear Hari!  
Buddha have achieved blooming under the bodhi tree; masters of Zen use some situation that demolish commonness and so on. Is Blooming a question of training or the game of God? If God wants He will give, if not then maybe you should not try?

by Hari » Fri May 19, 2006 11:13 pm

Let me try to rephrase your question so those who speak english can make sense of it.

"Buddha achieved enlightenment under the bodhi tree; masters of Zen use specific techniques. Is enlightenment a question of training or is it an act of mercy; perhaps an act of whimsy of God? In other words, if God wishes to grant it, you will get it, otherwise if He will not give it, why try to get it at all?"

This is a standard question: Do we become enlightened through mercy or through our disciplined endeavors? I have discussed this in detail in one of my lectures (I have no idea which one, but if someone knows, please add it as a comment to this text.) There are even groups in South India who have been fighting over this point for centuries.

One could say that enlightenment is a gift, and naturally one would assume that such a gift could only come from those who are already enlightened. God is a good candidate for giving such a gift. But why would God give this gift to some and not to others? By what criteria would God determine one is worthy and another is not? Would there be any criteria other than the whim of God to determine who attains enlightenment and who not?

Obviously, those who we usually celebrate as enlightened are persons who have worked hard to increase their spirituality through [lifetimes of] practice. This immediately gives credence to the idea that enlightenment follows disciplined action. But some might bring up the example of people who received causeless mercy from Lord Caitanya as examples contrary to this 'rule,' if we were to turn our observation that enlightenment follows from appropriate activity into a rule. But then again, we do not have sufficient data on all people who took birth at the time of Lord Caitanya to ascertain if they had or had not accumulated credits in their previous lives which were the cause of their getting the mercy.

Some say that even if you work very hard, ultimately it is God who grants the final step and lights the final 'aha' bulb in your soul. As enlightenment usually accompanies a strong connection to the spiritual source and since that connection is a two way affair, naturally God's desire to connect to the soul is required. This resolves the difficulty of a whimsical God for in this model God reaches out to those who reach out to God. When a person is sufficiently close, God bridges the gap.

Based on this idea, enlightenment is a combination of endeavor and the final desire of God. However, this idea only works for those who accept the idea of God as the 'Supreme Being.' After all, there are many who do not believe in a God the same way a personalist does, specifically those who are within the Buddhistic or other presumably impersonal disciplines.

They would emphasize the individual spirit's complete union with the totality of spirit as enlightenment. This removes the idea of mercy and places the onus on the individual's development. They might comfortably speak of mercy in terms of the blessings of the ancients, the forefathers, or other previously enlightened souls who decided to benedict a person for some reason or other.

Therefore one would be safer to state that according to one's way of seeing spirit and one's definition of the self, one's definition of enlightenment and the means to attain it would be uniquely defined. This definition would then be active when answering the question as to whether the enlightened state is attained solely through personal endeavor or is a combination of personal endeavor and the desire of God. In many cases we find the idea that one works hard and gets called to connect with the divine. But those who firmly believe enlightenment rests solely on the desire of God will must come up with some reasonable explanation of the motives of God when God chooses one and not the other.

by Siva-Ratri » Sat May 20, 2006 9:50 am

*Hari wrote:*

*I have discussed this in detail in one of my lectures (I have no idea which one, but if someone knows, please add it as a comment to this text.)*

If I am not mistaken, last time you in detail touched this theme in lecture "Spiritual mysticism" (By the way, after that lecture I had a lot of strange, but very much inspired discussions on this theme )

*I have completely ceased understanding people*

by alexey » Thu May 18, 2006 8:26 am

Dear Hari,  
question from russian forum. Author - OLEG ua.

Hello, Hari!

I am former ISCCON member. I have left ISCCON at the same time as you. I lived with the spirit I have received in ISCCON, I have read a lot of spiritual literature, and the spiritual searching has become my life basing. But there is a problem. I have completely ceased understanding people. I oppress by their morals and acts, ideals and aspirations. I feel myself defective, small and defenseless. I have to contact people due my activity, and it introduces a great confusion in my soul and heart. Now I do not see the meaning in my earthy existence! Please, help me understand. What did I wrong and how to manage it?

Thank You! Your (uninitiated) disciple, Oleg.

by Hari » Fri May 19, 2006 10:31 pm

You have expressed your problems as:

- \* You cannot understand people.
- \* You feel oppressed by their morality, deeds, ideals and aspirations.
- \* You feel that you are small, defective and defenseless.
- \* You are confused and see no meaning in life.

This is quite a package for me to deal with in a forum like this!

Do you try to understand people or do you base your perception of them on some idea of what they should be? If you have a generalized preconceived notion of how people should be then everyone you meet will either have to fit within your ideal or be considered by you as somehow not good enough to relate to you in a meaningful way.

Do you find that your idea about yourself is also colored by this ideal into which you wish to fit others? In other words, do you find that you also lack the qualities and characteristics of an acceptable person? I suspect this could be the case, and if so, it would seem that this is the basis of your difficulty.

It might be advantageous for you to examine the basis upon which you judge others. I suggest you make a list of all the assumptions you have accepted as the standard by which everyone is measured. Get out paper and write down each and every thing you can think of that defines how you think people should be. Don't try to organize it, don't explain or analyze it, simply write down as fast as you can in a stream of consciousness list format the qualities and characteristics of a person who you would accept as good. Don't filter your thoughts in any way. Do not even filter out those qualities you feel you also do not have. Simply write down the complete definition of a proper person according to your present understanding.

Examine this list. Make a star next to those qualities or characteristics you feel personally deficient in. Study the list.

Then deeply consider the following point -- is this list coming from your own realization or have you accepted these qualities and characteristics as essential because you read them somewhere, heard them from others, or were taught to accept them as the basis of a proper life?

Go back to the list. Be meditative for a moment to contact your own thoughts and feelings. Consider how you really feel about the listed items and if they resonate well with you. Consider how you are not up to your own standards (if you are not) and consider the possibility that others who are also not up to the standard could still be honestly trying to become better in their own way, as you are.

The most important point is the realization of what items come from you and what items were accepted by you because you thought you should accept them. Obviously you have accepted what you wished to accept, but sometimes we accept something because we feel it should be accepted and not because we really do accept it in our hearts.

If and when you find that your list is not a very good one, rewrite it from your own heart considering how you are, how you feel, and how others might feel. When you go out into the world, try to understand people on a deeper level, for when you scratch the surface of others you might see they are not much different than you in most respects. Some are more advanced and some are less advanced, but we are all quite similar in most ways. The secret to good relations is to first understand people as deeply as you can for when you do so you will find their goodness. When you see their goodness struggling to manifest through their doubts, fears, anxieties, stress, and the desire to be loved, you will also contact all that is good within yourself. When you contact that goodness you will find meaning in your life.

## **Any advice on balancing life?**

by adikurma » Sat Apr 22, 2006 11:50 am

Dear Hari,

I would like to humbly ask for your advice on how I can balance life where I can give quality time to both my spirit and to my body. Maybe you can give me some advice from your daily routine or life. As I can see you are much healthy physically and u look very energetic too. I need some inspiration from you. Please guide me.

I have been reading the excellent health advise that you have posted. I do take Omega 3 and i know the great effect on me. I also heard that Vitamin B complex is great for relieving stress. Any comment on that?

Thanks

Adikurma

by Hari » Wed Apr 26, 2006 11:29 pm

Hey Adi, Nice to hear from you!

Without going into a detailed explanation, one can boil down good advice to:

- \* avoid stress
- \* stay connected with your own essence and the divine essence
- \* eat properly and not too much and when you are hungry
- \* find out what you are sensitive to and avoid it or desensitize yourself
- \* always do exercise, at least 30 minutes 3x a week or much more
- \* go for a walk and be in contact with nature or the outdoors every day
- \* start each day with a meditation or some mantras
- \* do good things for other people
- \* avoid stress

The best way to relieve stress is to avoid stress. Once you are in it, everything becomes harder to do. But if it has caught you in its horns, go into deep meditation and find out how it did that and let it go.

Yoga is also exercise as is ballroom dancing or working in the garden. Just keep moving!

Like I said, this is a concise answer without details. I think it captures the essence.

by adikurma » Thu Apr 27, 2006 2:46 am

thank you so much

by Patri » Sat May 13, 2006 6:54 pm

*Hari wrote:*

- \* *find out what you are sensitive to and avoid it or desensitize yourself*
- \*

Dear Hari, would you kindly elaborate on the above point shortly, please?  
My best regards to you.

by Hari » Wed May 17, 2006 5:47 pm

I suppose that sounded a bit cryptic! I meant, discover what foods or substances you are sensitive to as such things can create a lot of stress for the body when contacted. I personally use two wonderful techniques through a great practitioner in our area, NAET and NET. You can look them up on the web, but they deal with our allergies or sensitivities and work to remove them. The more you remove these problems, the easier it is for your body to recover through its natural process.

## Living entity capacity

by Kostya » Sat May 06, 2006 12:23 am

Dear Hari !

Living entity can get answer to any question by sincere desire. Why sometimes I cannot find out the reason of difficulty without external help despite eager desire and have no proper vision ?

I can understand: when there is no desire to know the reason - external help is useless. When there is desire, why not always there is my own vision and external help helps ?

Do have real independence from people and self sufficiency only those souls who feel that they associate with Krishna ?

I know how to start relationship with human being, I can feel those relationship, but never felt relationships with God. Maybe all people have them and I also feel but do not recognize ?

Are those relationships that what everybody craves ?

by Hari » Fri May 12, 2006 4:47 pm

I am not sure if I agree with your supposition that anyone can get an answer to anything if they are simply sincere to know it. I assume you mean that answers can be found from esoteric sources if one is sincere enough to want them, but it also seems you are saying that one should not, for some reason, have to turn to sources outside oneself to find answers. If this is so, I cannot agree with this. From my own experience, and it seems from your question it is your experience too, we need help many times. Learning from others who have already figured out the answers shortens the time we spend trying to figure everything out ourselves and gives us a good foundation upon which to build.

This is not to say there is no room for self-discovery, personal experience or growth by figuring things out on your own; rather, I am saying that without some kind of help, no one can figure things out. Being in a state where you must learn everything by yourself means to go back to pre-historic times and "re-invent the wheel" All of us build upon the knowledge of those who came before us and we contribute to the pool of knowledge when we expand it, even in a small way.

I think your worry is needless and you should embrace the assistance others give you as an important and necessary part of life. Self-sufficiency does not mean you do everything yourself, learn everything from personal experience, or that you stand alone in this world. From your birth you were dependent and if we were to examine the various aspects of your life today we will find you remain dependent on others. You write to me using a computer, electricity, an internet connection, a desk, chair and lights in a heated flat while eating and drinking products

provided at a store, all of which are provided by others. You also had help learning how to use these things.

Regardless of one's spiritual capacity, one requires the assistance of others throughout life. No one stands alone. This is the nature of people as we are social animals who are dependent on hundreds of thousands of people, agencies, and services to maintain our lives normally. Unless you are in the forest living alone and unencumbered by any need whatsoever -- a naked monk spending time meditating and living on berries and stream water -- it is highly unlikely you will ever be in a situation where you can avoid dependencies. At best, all you can do is to modify these dependencies to reduce their power over you or to optimize the way you utilize what they offer you.

When you recognize your dependency on others in this world, you can start to understand the relevancy of our necessary dependence on the divine beings, the support of all that is within this existence. At that time, you can choose to constantly recognize this in all things and at all times, thus integrating God within your life as the support of all you strive to be. Realization of the supreme usually begins with an awareness of how things are around us. When we see how independence is a myth, we can accept our dependency on others and thus move into the spiritual consciousness of dependency on God. When we develop closeness to the divine through such understanding, we then start to act in harmony with the divine. Naturally this includes the missed spiritual experiences and relationships we crave as they are part of our being.

New self-determination.

by Dhana-da » Wed Apr 12, 2006 7:36 am

Hello, dear, Hari! Kind time of day all!

I am Literally yesterday has suddenly realized that already by what part of the consciousness is not connected with society ISKCON. (If certainly to not consider memoirs) I another and I go absolutely not similar on any, by. As it is strange... 3-5 years of intensive submission of to this school... And it is so much years of healing from numerous forms of dependence and suppression... Freedom to be itself where is more pleasant though to realize it and to estimate probably would be not possible without ISKCON.

How much important for a spiritual life to identify itself with any group or the spiritual leader? For certain some of visitors of this forum too somehow define themselves. Rank itself as your listeners or to group of free selectors. Whether it is necessary to name somehow in general myself if it anything the general with our internal I probably have no? What purest identification, will reflect an essence of our soul?

And can and to ask it is necessary nobody, when the person has found itself?

by Hari » Sat Apr 15, 2006 12:47 am

Hey Dhana! It is very difficult to understand your english. You must be using an on-line translation program.

Identification with a spiritual group or leader is usually useful when one is new to spirituality and has to find some way to capture the spiritual feelings and experiences one seeks. As one immerses oneself in the tradition or discipline, one structures oneself in a manner which assists the development of understanding and experience. Even more advanced persons find it encouraging to be with spiritually similar persons.

On the other hand, there are those who find their own way. Some of them start their own spiritual paths or groups.

Your question addresses identifying oneself with a group or leader. Identification with something means one feels comfortable with what is being said as it resonates well with what one thinks. This means that it is a part of you and not something presented to you which you must accept when you accept a group or tradition.

If you have a certain idea of yourself and you find this to be in harmony with others in some significant way, you will want to associate and communicate with those persons. Even if one is highly advanced, being in the association with those who are similar in their ideals or understanding is a desirable thing. We are social beings and want to relate with those who are enough like us to enable easy communication and different enough to inspire us with the new experiences they contribute to our lives.

If one is submissive or stuck on something that one does not feel comfortable with, this could be a difficult situation. From this point of view your feeling of being inspired by your freedom would make sense. But if you now find yourself agreeing with another kind of association, you have to examine if you have entered into this association out of your own free will and with a feeling of harmonious satisfaction. If so, then you are the initiator of your entrance into that relationship and any identification you feel with others is a product of your own feeling of personal identity and therefore is a healthy thing. This seems better than attempting to identify with those who are not very similar to you and with whom you are not harmonious.

## **To be "the great vision of yourself"**

by alexey » Wed Jul 27, 2005 9:55 am

Dear Hari!

There is an interesting point in "Friendship with God". God said that there are two important questions: "Is it a great vision of myself?" and "How would Love do in this case?" If one asks himself these questions in every moment of choice it will be very beneficial for him, his spiritual realization will increase very fast.

But I find a big difficulty in it. It is very hard to answer these questions. And what is more: I begin to speculate on "how would the great vision of myself do in this situation?". And very often I imagine the actions of "the great vision" that do not relevant to me now. But because I think that it is "the great vision" either I put on me obligations and I feel bad about it after some period of time or I act not like "the great vision would do" and also feel bad about me. May be I am not on the level where one can ask himself such questions?

by Hari » Fri Jul 29, 2005 2:47 pm

There is no need for me to further define or explain the concepts of becoming the greatest version of yourself or what would love do for these have been far better explained in Conversations With God.

But your question does not really ask me to do this anyway. What you really want to deal with is how to answer these incredibly deep and complex issues in your own life?

And the answer is sublimely simple: All you have to do is continue to try. This may sound like my excuse to write a short answer, but as you know, I find it hard to write short answers. This issue, unlike most of the others, lends itself quite well to brevity since the discipline lies in finding the answers yourself. The act of struggle to achieve clarity in these topics is the discipline required to eventually powerfully do them.

Yet, here are some tips. When it speaks about becoming the next greatest version of the greatest vision you have had of yourself, consider that you only have to take one more step towards that vision you now have, or have had before you lost confidence in yourself, not a vision you think you should have or will have in the future. This clarifies the task. First you must be clear on what is your vision for yourself and your future evolved state. If you do not have one, you should get one. When you get it, take one step toward it. When you are secure in that one step you have taken, take another step.

When it speaks of "What would love do?" find the answer by thinking of how you would want others to caringly act towards you or towards someone you loved were they to be in the same situation you are in now. This is similar to the golden rule (Do unto others as you would have them do to you.) and is a very practical guideline for all people at all times. You want others to deal with you in love and do for you the very best thing. You know how it feels when they do not do that. You therefore can simply switch it around and see how it feels from their point of view if you were to act towards them in a way you would not want them to act towards you. This usually rapidly clarifies the situation and gives a good indication of how love would act.

This technique of role reversal would be very healthy for all in religious movements. Most of them have something against women or others. They should reverse the roles and see how it feels. For example, Men are less intelligent. Husbands should be beaten like a drum. The men should stand in the back of the room and follow their wives. Men should be under control at all times. Men are lustier. Men are materialistic. Every man enjoys a good rape. And so on. You get the point. Now most will say that is ridiculous since women are different than men and really do need to be controlled. But this is their assumption, not necessarily a fact, or perhaps not a fact at this time in the history of the world. Scriptures aside, it helps enormously to uncover the double standards we hold when we do the simple task of reversing the roles and seeing the situation from the other point of view.

by Mahabhuta » Mon Aug 01, 2005 2:34 pm

Dear Hari, I have found in B.G. the following statement: "ž ...the mode of goodness, being purer than the others, is illuminating ... " (14.6), and I have thought, that maybe when I feel the influence of the mode of goodness ("žThe manifestation of the mode of goodness can be experienced when all the gates of the body are illuminated by knowledge." (14.11)), my vision what would be a next better version of myself have a good chance to be correct. And when I feel "ž ... great attachment, intense endeavor, uncontrollable desire and hankering develop."(14.12) or "ž ... darkness, inertia, madness ... are manifest " (14.13), that means that it is not a right time to make conclusions on spiritual subjects. Or it should be better not to mix this things?

by Hari » Wed Aug 03, 2005 10:39 pm

*I have found in B.G. the following statement: "ž ...the mode of goodness, being purer than the others, is illuminating ... (14.6), and I have thought, that maybe when I feel the influence of the mode of goodness (The manifestation of the mode of goodness can be experienced when all the gates of the body are illuminated by knowledge. (14.11)), my vision what would be a next better version of myself have a good chance to be correct.*

Let me rephrase your statement, if you don't mind. When your awareness is illuminated with goodness, your perception of what is and what to do next is clearer. Since the concept being discussed by you is your idea of what is the next better version of yourself, whatever your idea at any point in time is would be correct since it is your idea and thus your next version. The difficulty would be if your idea was based on some misconception or illusion of some kind. In



this case your version might not be better or even connected with your essence but a product of some misunderstanding you have of yourself. This does not help you as much as having a clear understanding borne of the mode of goodness. But any understanding of yourself is valid in as much as it is your understanding of yourself. All understandings are to be modified in time and when you gradually increase your awareness through the development of your consciousness the modifications you make will become more powerful and capable of fulfilling your innermost desires. Goodness, as it is defined in the Gita, certainly assists this development and speeds up evolution enormously. Clear awareness is a true gift for it creates a platform from which all things become revealed as required or desired.

And when I feel ... great attachment, intense endeavor, uncontrollable desire and hankering develop.(14.12) or ... darkness, inertia, madness ... are manifest (14.13), that means that it is not a right time to make conclusions on spiritual subjects.

Or it should be better not to mix these things?

If one is in darkness it means one cannot see clearly. Any decisions or endeavors made are a hit or miss type of guess. Certainly making definite conclusions about your life is risky when you make them during a time when you are clouded by darkness. Yet, sometimes we see that out of the darkness comes light, and taking a risk can be advantageous under very infrequent and specific favorable circumstances. However, I understand the mood of your statement and agree with how you have drawn your conclusion, for clarity comes from light and distorted vision occurs in darkness. If one can avoid doing it (and that is not always possible due to the pressures we face in life) one should not create any fixed ideas in darkness but should research and investigate until some clarity develops and then dare to make conclusions about existence. At that time one is more confident of what one is doing and therefore the risk factor is far less. However, there is always risk. The world is never under our control and the higher authorities reserve the right to sometimes play with us to either bring us to a better place or bring the place to a better situation. I suppose Arjuna would agree with that.

by Mahabhuta » Sun Mar 12, 2006 12:23 pm

*Hari wrote:*

*The difficulty would be if your idea was based on some misconception or illusion of some kind. I suppose, that everyone wants to be oneself.*

What can then lead one to a situation of being something else but oneself?

1. When someone finds (or thinks he has found) a quick fix for his problems (an easy way to solve his problems), such as financial situation, live conditions, communication problems.

2. When other people are trying to define us.

Otherwise, if we always have a choice whom to be, why than we should choose (or even want to choose) to be something we are not?

Or what could be the reason for such an "illusion"?

by Hari » Thu Mar 16, 2006 8:47 pm

When a person is unaware of what they are energetically, their conception of self is distorted according to how they concentrate their awareness. A person who does not understand the energetic nature of the source of their consciousness or even that their consciousness is their energy, may start to define themselves according to other factors that are indirectly connected to their inner selves. I am replying using a split definition of the self; namely, that which is external to the energetic essence of our being and that which is of the energetic essence of our being. The problem then becomes to accept this definition and act on it.

It does not seem that simply thinking you are not the body and accepting your spiritual nature are enough to define what you are. I know many people who think like this, yet are unable to connect to their spiritual essence and energy. It seems to be an impossibility that someone cannot connect to themselves, and indeed, it is impossible. Yet, we find that our desires to be something else than what we are drive our attempt to assume different roles, costumes, and attempts to expand the ways in which we relate to a variety of life experiences. Therefore, the question becomes how we define connection to our inner essence; how that connection is valued at every moment; and how this affects the decisions which guide us.

Some value the way in which their lives revolve around their bodies and their bodily achievements, their intellects and their intellectual achievements, or even according to the degree of pleasure they experience. The athlete, the model, the racer, the researcher, the author, and so on, might find their concept of self to be intimately linked with what they do with their strength, intelligence, prowess, beauty, and so on. There are others who are linked to the pleasures of their everyday existence and do not see beyond it. All of the personalities mentioned in this paragraph have limited their definition of self to that directly perceivable by the senses of their bodies and therefore they find it advantageous to relate to these bodies as their essential being, or that which makes their sense of being or identity a tangible reality. Sometimes, persons who accept this are also religious and accept they are essentially soul, and their physical actions are modified by religious work, the avoidance of particular actions, or the performance of specific types of activities. In most of these cases, their sense of identity is tempered with a religious fervor which transforms the mundane into a platform to reach the godly. Sometimes this is truly an expression of their evolution and is compatible with what they are; yet sometimes not. When it is not a natural expression of themselves, their actions can be seen to come from a platform from which they are not. Even though we might think these actions are still good for them, they may or may not understand that or receive the full benefits of these acts. Indeed, they may even be incompatibly altered by accepting such religious influences, but this has to be seen on a case by case basis.

When I say that someone is acting as other than themselves, I mean they may either have a conception of themselves that comes from an external source; a willful distortion of their reality that is accepted due to its attractive nature; a misunderstanding of how they feel, if they can understand how they feel at all; a product of trauma or confusion in their lives (as in the cases of those who were abused as children, were exploited for some reason, feel unloved, uncared for, or those who were deprived of essential elements of life); to living life in a dream due to an intense desire to be someone or something else (which may or may not be connected with something they wish to forget in this life); or any other reason that manifests when we reach out for a sense of what we are and find something else that seems more appealing or reassuring.

Obviously, no one thinks they are trying to be something they are not and most will object if one would suggest they were, but often we find that we need to be shaken out of our slumber and accept our reality as it is to avoid inadvertently breeding uncertainty, confusion and ultimately pain. Even though we all are convinced we are acting exactly as we are, often it is not so. When we are following something that someone else tells us is good, we are not acting directly according to our own realization. Yet one could object that it is good to try out new suggestions as new experiences enrich our lives and are thus relevant and proper. Although this is true, there are often times when the experience is contrary to our nature, or so we see later on after discovering the long term ill effects of the choice.

For example, no one has it in their nature to get a disease from unprotected sex or to become an alcoholic, drug addict, or whatever. We are introduced to these acts by others and even if we agree to them and embrace them as being not only compatible but enlivening, we may later seriously regret how we 'lost ourselves to this scourge.' When we are doing it, we think it is

right. It naturally follows that part of this thinking is that these acts, feelings, thoughts, decisions, and choices are also right as they are a product of what we are and are therefore intrinsically connected with our inner selves. Those specific acts which we later on regretfully understand to have been in reality divorced from our selves, are those acts which come from acting not as the self but as a distortion of the self, a distortion which is created by our acceptance of energy external to ourselves. Any action or decision taken from the platform of our internal energy is by definition taken by the self and is an important evolutionary experience, whereas those actions influenced by external energy is not necessarily related to the self and therefore can have mixed results.

Due to our being intelligent spiritual essence, we are able to use these mixed experiences to our advantage and turn something negative into something positive by using the opportunity of having acted in error as the catalyst for positive transformation. Therefore, even improper action can be seen as good when it leads to evolutionary development, although it takes a longer time to get the same results that could be had by directly engaging in acts that are personally beneficial.

Now, you also ask why we choose to be something we are not. This is a good question, yet the answer is also related to the statements previously given in this reply. We do not consciously choose to be something we are not! Rather, we accept actions we feel best express ourselves at the moment we do them. Even when we choose to 'lose' ourselves in the sheer pleasure of the moment, we feel a strong urge from within to do so. The fact that we are confused as to what best represents ourselves or our long-term interests is not the issue to be focused upon. We always act in ways we feel are best at the time. That we are mistaken in these choices only manifests later on when we evolve and see the errors of our ways, if we do later see these acts as errors at all, for sometimes, when revisiting our choices, we see that situations were beyond our control, beyond the control of anyone, pushed forcibly onto us, or we simply had to go through them. Not doing something can be as damaging as doing it, as we have all experienced the intense pain of judging ourselves with: "Why didn't I do that when I had the chance?"

To conclude, we never act from a platform which is not connected to us and we never act as someone else than ourselves. We always do what we think is right at the time we do it, even though our decisions may not satisfy all our conditions for rightness and may be mixed with doubt, fear, confusion, and even dread. Yet we still act in this way since we are convinced that when all factors are taken into consideration, this is still the best course of action. Putting aside those doubts created by guilt borne of social convention, there are times when we receive messages from our higher selves which warn us of impending disastrous choices, but only one who has solid self-confidence and faith in their capacity to hear their higher self can transform their pending decisions based on these messages.

So again, when one is clear about oneself and can hear and see from the undistorted perspective of a spiritually aware consciousness, the choices one makes are usually superior to those made without full knowledge of all the factors that make up action. Therefore, it is usually better to act from the platform of the real self rather than acting from the platform of an assumed self.

I hope this answer assists you?

## **Hearing the Higher Self**

by Maha2 » Thu Mar 16, 2006 10:30 pm

Hello Hari!

First of all I wish to say, this is a great site, and thank you for this way of communication, it really inspires me!

Although I've been reading many texts for a while, this is the first time that I write anything. (somehow the general mood here is very grave and philosophical, and, although I like it, I must admit that it made me feel a little embarrassed to write .. Who knows, maybe I write something stupid... But, anyway, this is just how I felt..)

This topic is very interesting:

there are times when we receive messages from our higher selves which warn us of impending disastrous choices, but only one who has solid self-confidence and faith in their capacity to hear their higher self can transform their pending decisions based on these messages.

So, my question is, how does one feel, or know if something is really coming from the higher self? Because, in my case, I rather feel things than simply hear. I mean, I don't hear "with the ears", but it is a kind of an intuitive feeling, or something like that.

I always wanted to know what is the indicator that something is coming from the higher self, what is the feeling associated to it, because if I know, then it will make me easier to make the difference, and not make the mistake of not paying attention to it.

Because, many times I like to ask my higher self, or divine powers, or angels, to give me answers to things, and usually I get the answer by one way or another, but it never comes through simply hearing. When I try to hear, I get all kinds of confusing answers..And then I really get in trouble deciding which is the right one.

by Mahabhuta » Fri Mar 17, 2006 10:53 pm

*Hari wrote:*

*I hope this answer assists you?*

Sure, but I am thinking very slowly.

by Hari » Sat Mar 18, 2006 1:55 am

Sorry Maha2, it was a bad choice of words when I said, "hear the higher self" as this is not what we really do most of the time. You are perfectly right when you say it is a function of feeling the higher self and to some smaller extent of those faint words in the back of the head (mind) that make us wonder..

I am glad that you pointed this out for the sake of all.

It wasn't so bad for you writing in this forum after all, was it?

by Maha2 » Mon Mar 20, 2006 2:31 pm

Thanks Hari,

(Especially for this encouraging Smiley!)

Surely I will write more things here, but first I want to download all the meditations and lectures and hear them. I wasn't able to do that by now, because I'm using a public computer, but yesterday a friend downloaded some lectures for me, so I hope you'll hear again from me soon!

Best wishes:

<---- Melinda

## Absolute and relative reality

by kamalamala » Wed Mar 15, 2006 5:44 am

Dear Hari

I have a question regarding relative reality?

As you told several times the reality is relative it depends on the believes of people of different group.

In this regard rising a lot of questions few of them i decided to ask.

We know that there are laws of creation for example such as reincarnation. And this laws is universal and seemed to me that they doesnt depend on the belief of people.

The question is if some group of people have a belief system which is objecting reincarnation or demigods does it mean that in there reality there will not be reincarnation anymore or there will not be demigods? More then that there are group of people who objecting God what about them.

P.S In reality i mean the stage between lives including

by Hari » Thu Mar 16, 2006 9:50 pm

To start, I need to clarify the wording of your question. Although reality is relative in the sense each of us have our own perception of what is real, I am not sure one could conclude that a group of people claiming to believe the same thing have the same exact relative reality. Even if two people claim to see things the same way, after a detailed and exhaustive examination they uncover previously unknown differences arising from the meaning they gave to the words they used, their differing expectations from the agreement, or what they see as the implications of that which they assumed naturally followed from their agreeing. Considering this, I am not sure I can answer your question from the point of view of a group.

I think your question is coming from a different angle than my presentation. Naturally, you will find there are people who have different belief systems, some of them totally contradictory. I do not equate a belief system with the creation of reality; rather, it creates a system within which they choose to live. One may also believe that one will live in a body forever and so long as one is alive one may be considered as living within that relative reality. Ultimately that person shall die thus disproving their belief. The point is: just because you believe something does not make it an absolute reality. If someone does not believe in reincarnation or the demigods it does not make these things less real to another who believes in them. The same goes for a belief in God. For the person who believes, this is their reality until some circumstance arises which forces them to reconsider their understanding.

Let us consider the point of a Christian who truly believes that after death they will go to hell for their sins. They may truly go to such a place they either find, having been already created by others who shared their belief, or which they create themselves in their own unique manner where they burn for some time. Others may similarly go to heaven and remain there convinced this is their rightful place. Since the length of time they spend can be considerable, from this point of view they have gone to a destination where there is no reincarnation.

Those with particular belief systems will find the divine energy arrange itself according to their expectations. Christians will be met by angels at death and will meet various Saints and so on, leading them towards their next destinations in a manner they can easily accept. Hindus or Muslims can be greeted according to their customs and beliefs. After all, the divine beings do not need to wear the same uniforms for each person and can at will be whatever is best for those they care for. This is the way they manifest their love.

People absorbed in their own version of reality in life can enter into circumstances mirroring their conception at death and be unaware of this as a self-created illusion. We have heard of a friend of Daskalos who, after his death, was living in such a self-created situation with his mother and family by the sea and who could not understand he was dead and this was not real. Here is an example of a reality that defies the usual understanding of both the materialists and the spiritualists. It does make sense that a highly motivated person can create a situation for themselves after death which is unique and not according to the usual mode of existence.

Such examples do not prove one can create alternative principles which will defy, negate, or transform universal principles. These examples demonstrate the power of the self to create and live within a reality of one's own. These relative realities are sub-sets of the larger reality which is ruled by principles of order and possibility. Without these over-arching structures, the universe as we physical beings see it and as those who are not bound by physical bodies see it would be ruled by chaos instead of order. One is allowed to redefine, restructure and reorder reality according to one's mentality, emotion, physical form, or desire, but this can only be done within the constraints of universal principles, not in defiance of them.

The relative changes we are allowed to make are not bound to any particular location and are valid on earth, in space, on other planets, in the ether or other energetic realms, and even between lives. However, all such relative transformations are constrained by the universal laws. Just as two people can see the same thing in two different ways, we can focus on aspects of reality according to our own way of seeing, thus creating our own particular sub-set of reality which I called relative or subjective reality. We all live within our own subjective reality that is a product of our perception and awareness. How we decide to bend the laws of nature to accommodate our reality is up to us, but bending these constraints and breaking them are two different things. No one can break universal laws. Even if a mystic were to do something seemingly defiant of the laws of nature, it is really not so. It is only that we were unaware that we were living within a sub-set of those laws where we could not conceive of such things and the act of the mystic did indeed fit within the universal principles.

by Guest » Fri Feb 10, 2006 5:45 am

Why are there such absolutely unlike and mutually exclusive religions like Islam and Vaishnavism in the world, if we consider that the God is author of them? The Puranas prohibit eating the flesh of a cow, and Islam allows.

by Hari » Sun Feb 19, 2006 8:07 pm

You make the assumption that God is the creator of all religions in the world. If God is the creator, why do They (see "If God is Male or Female...") create religions that contradict each other?

Well, how shall we deal with this? We could say that the idea that God creates all religions is not true. We could say that man creates religion. An alternative to this could be that God does indeed create the religions, but does so in a way man requires due to man's hang-ups,

demands, and cultures. If one were to accept this, the important factor to examine is man as the dynamic force behind the creation of religion. This idea is strengthened by man's constant playing with the basic religious tenets, sorry, I should have said clarification and renewal of these basic religious tenets, to make them more compatible with man's desires.

Then again, we could state that the religions do not actually contradict each other for they all purport to bring man closer to that one supreme God and that is, after all, the point. We would liberally state that the details of the religion are not important. But then we would run into the problem of some religions not accepting a monotheistic version of god and worse, some of them do not accept god as a personality but rather as a force. Since the force can be with you when you want it to be, religion is a creation of that part of the force that wished to have connection with it. Some say there are many gods, some say we are all god.

Those who believe in one god and demand that others follow this, are certain they are right and everyone else is wrong. They say god did not create these paths and these paths are not religion at all. They resolve this conflict in a neat and tidy fashion.

Those who believe in a force kind of god, using whatever words or phrases they use to describe this force to focus discussions, are not overly concerned about religion, neither are they militant against other ideas. They find words limiting and fundamentalist religious armies similar to the plague. They would not be interested in the question at all.

For me to answer you in a manner relevant to you, I would need to know where you stand in all this? Considering that your question included the puranas, Vaisnavism and Islam, I assume you are of the vaisnava belief system. Many vaisnavas believe strongly that Islam was created by Lord Siva as a punishment against the brahmanas. They say that he created this just to kill cows and contradict the brahminical culture. Others say that Islam is not a religion at all, and thus neatly avoid this question of who started it. Both of these ideas are often heard in India and avoid the question of why God started such religions by either saying it is not a religion or that Lord Siva started it.

This brings us back to the point that perhaps religion is really more of a function of the interaction between man and god than we would want to admit? After all, there is a reason for everything, and all creation fits within the overarching desire of God that everyone find a place in the evolutionary process and develop accordingly. Different religions are useful for different people at different times. Sometimes it is useful for someone to believe that only they have the truth and no one else, for this idea supports their weak self-esteem and allows their faith and devotion to grow in a totally uncontested environment. In future lifetimes, when they are more self-secure, they are able to accommodate all people in whatever way they attempt to find themselves and the Supreme. Why should God not facilitate all people to evolve? And if Lord Siva really did create a religion, do you think he could do that independently of Visnu? Think again.

Of course, if you wish to think so, an easy answer is there is no religion except the religion of the Bhagavata. This is the standard solution accepted by 'vaisnavas in the know.' By saying there are no other religions, you avoid having to deal with the question of God's involvement in the creation of these various traditions. If you wish to go that route, you need to qualify your statement and define what you meant for there is a distinct possibility you might be missing something.

I feel that the creation of religion is always tied to the human psyche and desire. Spirituality is independent of all that. Religion insists on creating a system of acceptable and unacceptable actions and then defends itself against others through the establishment of its superiority. We have historical examples of what this leads to. Spirituality accepts the essence of all and allows

that essence to find its way through the mire of external demands placed on it until it finds peace in itself in communion with the divine.

by harsi » Mon Feb 20, 2006 9:18 pm

Dear Hari since some time I wanted to ask you this question, but I somehow always hesitated. I personally became attracted to the way Prabhupada presented spirituality as a `science or a evolving `scientific process` of the spiritual consciousness. But in due course of time in the movement he started, more and more it became evident that the goal was somehow more, to convince people to become "vaisnavas", thus change somehow one religion with another. My question to you, since you were for some period of time in a somehow close connection with Prabhupada. What do you think was really his intention in this regard and how or what do you think could be the best approach to this subject? I am just asking to come somehow closer to the truth of things myself, I hope you don't mind asking you this question.

by Hari » Thu Mar 16, 2006 3:36 pm

"The truth of things" is not so easy to grasp, especially after much time has passed. I can guarantee you that I cannot "know" what was his real intention. I can only guess at his real intention. I can say what I thought it was at the time and what I might speculate it was if I were to think about it now. However, I do not consider what I thought then to be any more authoritative than my speculation now, and therefore I will decline to comment on this question.

You could, of course, ask me to simply give my opinion. I would also decline as I do not see the relevance of it.

When one uses the word science in a definition of spirituality that has many, if not all, the characteristics of a religion, one blurs the present usage of these two terms in a confusing manner. However, if one includes in one's definition of science observable reality verifiable by experiment, one could include spiritual experiences reproducible under specific circumstances to fall within the category of experiential science. For example, a consistently achieved meditative state that creates a specific capacity not explained through normal scientific channels would classify as a "scientifically" verifiable phenomena under this definition. I am not sure if this is what Prabhupada meant.

Having an elaborate philosophy is not necessarily the qualification of being a science as philosophy is not a science in that sense of the term; yet, the experiences of a spiritualist within the realm of observable phenomena do fit within the scientific realm. If we consider that various aspects of reality are caused by unseen forces fundamental to all existence, string theory would be one of them, an understanding of these forces expands the basis upon which science rests. From that point of view, any aspect of human emotion, human psyche, or organic energy that influences the external circumstances of the world (as in the weather, health, politics, economics, other social sciences, physical sciences, or even quantum physics) would benefit from understanding how the spiritual energy of life creates the vibratory fields within which matter rests. From this point of view, science would do well to understand living energy in full.

## **If God is male and female, is God more than One?**

by Adhishthitam » Fri Feb 10, 2006 5:43 am

I offer to discuss the next topic here:



In modern society, where the rationalism dominates, it is natural that the only God is a man, rough God, the father. The worship him is considered high-culture sign, monotheism, in contrast to so-called heathenism. Modern people orphaned, they have no mother. The feminine energy have been deprived the Divine status. When I faced ancient mythology, I was impressed that there was a big cult of Goddesses, they have esteemed feminine energy, feminine beauty, the sexual experience was like high spiritual experience.

But I have noted: although I understand that God combines the male and female origins, when I refer to him I continue to identify Him with male origin. If there is only one God, one has to choose male or female image. It is impossible to refer to one always thinking that He "consists" of two contrary origins. On the other hand, I have tried to refer only to one, female entry of Divine and have felt that some unintelligible fear stops me, as if I break some prohibition.

by Hari » Sun Feb 19, 2006 7:29 pm

Very interesting point. I often run into the same problem. I feel it is more a product of the limitation of the languages we use than a conceptual problem. It becomes very complex in the English language to refer to a person without using the personal pronoun. One has to create convoluted sentences and juggle phrases just to avoid having to come right out and state 'he' or 'she.' Sometimes it maddens me! So I deal with it by saying, 'They,' although I am well aware that it sounds strange. How bound we are by language and the way it sounds in our ears! We are born that way. We learn language mainly by hearing the cadence, rhythm and feelings which are placed into it, and then later we start to piece together the proper manner in which concepts are structured. We never forget the ideal we learned that it has to sound right. When new words are coined, or new ways of saying things are developed, we initially rebel against them unless we find them fitting to the way we expect things should sound.

For example, my wife, Kamala, said something to me long ago which I will never forget. We were watching some movie and when things got more intense she said, "The thick plottens!" Now this is not English yet any English speaker immediately understands it and thinks it sounds great. This is because it has a sound that is acceptable, not because the usage is correct.

When we say 'They' to refer to God, we cannot accept the sound. This has nothing to do with whether it is right or wrong, it is a product of prejudice. For so long we have insisted that God is a He (do not forget the capital H!) and Krsna, Allah, Jehovah, Yaweh, and so on, is God and is He. We grew up with this, we believed it, we accepted it, we embraced it, and now some weirdo comes along and says that we have to stop using that word and use another. Totally unacceptable to the mind and worse, it does not sound good at all. So we reject it and start to lament about how to express this existential truth that we know to be true.

I sometimes say 'He' in public because everyone understands this. I like to speak in ways that people understand and go the route of least resistance when explaining complex concepts. Yet, I find it annoying to say 'He.' I cannot say 'She' for the same reason. Neither of these words express what I want to say. Since I feel that God is They, I experience that God is They, and I am happy with God being They, I want to call God They. Instead, most likely because I lack self-confidence in my capacity to transform the languages of the world (I wonder why?) I say God. This is the easy way out since using the word God allows me to avoid the he and she dilemma.

Unfortunately, this shortcut also feels lousy as I feel like a traitor to Them. So I try to deal with it with multiple sentences which clog up my lectures and writings and give the listeners and

readers brain fag. I am truly sorry for this. I wish we could just say "They" and not be disturbed by it. We are so brainwashed, is it not?

I like Lord Caitanya because when I speak about him I avoid all of this. He is They. Yet, he appeared as a He just to resolve me of this constant struggle to express myself. I can say He and refer to They at the same time! So nice of him.

by pamu » Mon Feb 20, 2006 8:31 pm

This is easy. You should start speaking in Finnish. We do not use he/she but "hän" which refers to both sexes.

## Mythology

by Adhishthitam » Fri Jan 27, 2006 9:31 am

I am first time on this forum, and very glad that such forum exists. I offer to discuss mythology, by the term "mythology" I mean collective conception about things, that are out of usual, conceptions about holly reality. Maybe I idealize, but in the time of heathenism the myths helped one to feel himself like a part of spiritual reality. There were no ordinary things for ancient man. The myth was the only reality, it was a habitat for him. Many scientists have come to such conclusions, and I think this attitude to the time of heathenism is correct. Now the people of the west culture do not have the mythology to unite them. The common things and the mystic things are on the different poles. What happens? Maybe now the new mythology arises. The mythology that corresponds with science. There is a term "neo heathenism" in fantastic literature. How to educate children not having uniting mythology? How to give them ideas about spiritual reality and not damage their social adaptation. I do not wait the finished solution, but I very eager to know what do You think about it. At ancient time the myth helped people to understand the nature deeper, to receive the power from it. For example, for ancient man the bear was not only an animal, but it was personification of wisdom and strength. Can we use the ancient mythology now?

by Hari » Mon Jan 30, 2006 10:47 pm

This is an interesting question. I find it interesting since I have often though about the different myths we lived with when we were previously engaged in spirituality and how these myths formulated our values and modus operandi.

Let us examine, for a moment, how some classes of ancient people functioned. In the literature connected with early pre-Christian people, we see that many of them were, what we sometimes call in a demeaning way, "Pagans." If you know something about them, you will see that many of them were in close touch with their environment and directly perceived and interacted with the mystical nature of the elements, nature, life in all its forms, and the etheric energy which was the home to nature spirits and other living beings. These were forces they could feel, tap into, and gain benefit from when they were in harmony with them, or who would destroy them when they were in disharmony with them.

Putting aside for a second our prejudices with these 'primitive' people and accepting the good in this, we can see that there is something to be learned here. I see a direct parallel between the ideal of living in harmony with nature, one's own energy and the extended energy of all life around us, and my own suggestion that we accept all that is connected to us as an expression of our spiritual energy. I see the harmonic resonance of our physical energy as a direct manifestation of our internal spiritual resonance. I see our creations and the consequences of

them as a direct manifestation of our spirit. I see that there are multiple sources of spiritual energy and these can and do manifest in manners we cannot directly perceive with our eyes unless we are trained to do so through opening our spiritual awareness and sensitivity. Therefore, there are many parallels between the pagan ideals and my own. I love the plethora of personality within all existence as it gives so many opportunities for connection to others. Nothing in this ideal prevents one from connecting to the Divine Sources of all things and seems to point towards such a power by implication.

I do not consider my perceptions as mythology just because someone else labels them as such and neither would I consider offering people a mythology as a central point in their lives. Even though I am well aware that having a centralized belief system and an awesome beyond visible reality as the glue that holds society together, it would be counter-productive to base societal ease on a myth. In the case of the pagan peoples, their view of life and the philosophy they lived by was not a product of a myth but of their direct perception; in other words, they did not have to be told to believe it for they considered it as largely self-evident. Certainly they were taught things and accepted them, but the power of this kind of naturist life style is in the direct perception of the validity of it, not in a faith in it.

I could consider modern forms of religion, shall we call them post-pagan religious idealists?, as based on a myth to the extent they depend on leaps of faith and belief more than direct experience. That which depends on belief to be accepted is more of a myth than that which one can perceive. If you can perceive or feel it it becomes an experience that is almost always labeled as reality, indeed, it is an observable reality that can be shared by other witnesses and reproduced with the proper methodology. That which you do not directly perceive is something you believe because you should or you want to, or you strongly wish it be true. Many people believe something because it gives them strength to get beyond a problematic situation in their lives and gives them hope for a better future. In many respects, this search for utopia is myth.

I think one can be very mystical and very connected with something 'other-worldly' and not be caught up within the label of myth and not blackballed as irrational. If one feels comforted by a centralized mythical belief, then consider that an awareness of and connection to the personalized and individuated etheric energy around us is similar to what we now label as mythology, namely the gods and so on that have been recognized in Greek, Roman, Nordic, Celtic, Hindu or other religious traditions. After all, as you said, the people who lived in these cultures did not think what they did was part of a myth, they really believed it. Their true belief led them to have many experiences in their daily lives. The modern people who accept such beliefs on the basis of faith do not have the same connection as their ancient predecessors.

The word myth really only applies to people who are outside a particular culture looking in and judging the way the natives of that culture lived. Therefore present day adherence to any mythological belief system can never be useful to anyone.

My conclusion is that you can have all the benefits you want to have without reference to a mythological structure by having a real experiential connection to those energies of life that do exist eternally and that grant enormous social, psychological and emotional benefit through seeing the universal spirituality that connects all of them.

Now to answer your question more specifically: yes, I do think the presently glorified left brain rationality has basically ruined the more elegant aspects of the human being and that children are suffering because of this. Therefore I am trying to replace the mythological structures with something that relates well with logic, reason and a good sense of the here and now. In other words, I wish to facilitate the balancing of the left and right brains and the balancing of the male and female archetypical energy and force within life. It is only through such balancing that

the mystical and rational meet in a divine union. If I have not answered you completely or you want to explore this further, please feel free to continue this thread!

by Adhishthitam » Fri Feb 10, 2006 5:42 am

Hari wrote:

*I could consider modern forms of religion, shall we call them post-pagan religious idealists?, as based on a myth to the extent they depend on leaps of faith and belief more than direct experience. That which depends on belief to be accepted is more of a myth than that which one can perceive. If you can perceive or feel it it becomes an experience that is almost always labeled as reality, indeed, it is an observable reality that can be shared by other witnesses and reproduced with the proper methodology. That which you do not directly perceive is something you believe because you should or you want to, or you strongly wish it be true. Many people believe something because it gives them strength to get beyond a problematic situation in their lives and gives them hope for a better future. In many respects, this search for utopia is myth.*

Can we base only on the experience of direct perception? We can lose our way or stick in the details, the modern science is an example. Must there be some direction in our researches? The mythology have been giving such direction. The truths, the same in all mythologies, have been expressed through the myth. There is no of ancient mythologies in modern religions. May be it is a cause of their problems?

*Hari wrote:*

*The modern people who accept such beliefs on the basis of faith do not have the same connection as their ancient predecessors.*

Why can't they have the same faith? Is the cause that they trained out of tradition or it is not enough have only the faith to receive direct perception? It have not been always so?

Hari wrote:

The word myth really only applies to people who are outside a particular culture looking in and judging the way the natives of that culture lived. Therefore present day adherence to any mythological belief system can never be useful to anyone.

Dear Hari, please clarify it. This statement puts me in confusion. What about Radha-Krishna, Sita-Rama, Nrisimha etc? I remain devoted to Vedic beliefs, and it is not indifferently to me all that attached with these sacred images. Is it possible that the connection with mythology can not give me the benefit? Is it useless to utilize something not accepting the belief system wholly?

*Hari wrote:*

*Now to answer your question more specifically: yes, I do think the presently glorified left brain rationality has basically ruined the more elegant aspects of the human being and that children are suffering because of this. Therefore I am trying to replace the mythological structures with something that relates well with logic, reason and a good sense of the here and now.*

How great that You do such things and share with us Your discoveries. I also want to take part in it.

*Hari wrote:*

*In other words, I wish to facilitate the balancing of the left and right brains and the balancing of the male and female archetypal energy and force within life. It is only through such balancing that the mystical and rational meet in a divine union.*

Dear Hari, if You have something to add to all You have said in this quotation, please share it, because it is very interesting.

Your answer is very interesting. Thank You.

by Hari » Sun Feb 19, 2006 7:01 pm

I split off your last post from this topic and created a new one. If you write after a text it makes it impossible for me to easily quote and reply to you. Therefore, either wait to continue a discussion or create a new one. Or else just let me do some administration and fix it! Either way...

*Adhishtitam wrote:*

*Can we base only on the experience of direct perception? We can lose our way or stick in the details, the modern science is an example. Must there be some direction in our researches? The mythology have been giving such direction. The ?????????????? truths, the same in all mythologies, have been expressed through the myth. There is no ?????????? of ancient mythologies in modern religions. May be it is a cause of their problems?*

I am not sure what the Russian words mean and my word processor cannot maintain the Russian letters, sorry. When I spoke about experience, I did not mean to imply the ideal of observable reality which is often stated as direct perception by the scientific community. I meant the very subjective and individual spiritual and esoteric experiences of divine energy and relationship which cannot be quantified. I do not consider experiences as details, I consider them the substance of what we are and the foundation of our belief system borne of these experiences. When you speak of mythology, I assume you are speaking about an esoteric belief system. Yet such a system without personal experience is nothing but a belief to one who believes but has not verified their beliefs in a significant manner. When I speak about experience, I refer to that which we perceive within us to be the truth which rules and determines what we value spiritually. This is contrasted by what we have accepted, often on what is more or less blind faith although one is reluctant to admit it, because someone has told us it is the truth.

Surely we need direction in life, but why must it be a direction given in terms that are overly specific and demandingly limiting? If you are allowed to find out the particular means by which you can connect with your own esoteric experience and simultaneously provided the tools to discover your unique connection with the divine, this seems more relevant than imprinting upon you that which a mythology or tradition has formulated over time. Again, I do not mean to say the traditions are in any way defective; rather, I am pointing out the need to spiritually evolve in ways which provide modern people a compatible environment for growth.

I accept that the histories of most religious traditions hold truths that are eternal, relevant to all people at all times, and which facilitate spiritual experiences. However, due to the manner in which they are written, they often cannot convey this important information to modern people in an optimal way. When I say the languages, concepts and analogies used to present the histories are based on a culture and time essentially foreign to the modern mind, it does not imply that the traditions are useless, wrong, foolish or whatever, . Even eternal truth has to be phrased in a way that people can understand it. Those who lived in an ancient agrarian society

understood things in a different way than those whose lives are ruled by wires and chips. If you could transplant an evolved ancient and ask them to instruct modern people, they would enter into a severe culture shock. When they adjusted enough to attempt to function in this society, they would have an intolerably difficult time to relate their spiritual understanding to the modern world. They would be essentially aliens. The ancient texts are products of ancient minds and thus are in many ways alien to us. When we wish to, we can adjust to many aspects of ancient cultures, but most of the deeply mystical and esoteric experiences integral to the people of those times, would be hidden by virtue of our inability to capture that which was obvious to them. The only way to recover the essence of what they experienced is to discover it again through our own experiences using the facilities and circumstances of our society.

This does not mean we accept the modern society as good or even that we have to judge it in any manner. It means that we go on with our lives in however they are presented to us and find our own essence and energy and re-claim our power. As this is usually done within some preexisting spiritual framework, we can be affiliated with some 'mythology' (to use your word) or some tradition, yet not bound by any aspect of it. As most traditions demand total acceptance of all that has been stated, this is a difficult thing to do. Therefore I am doing what I do.

In conclusion, modern people lack a similar cultural or experiential context to the historical statements of sacred texts which makes it harder for them to benefit from the historical descriptions and concepts in the same manner as the ancients. We moderns can have similar experiences, develop the same kinds of capacities and have the same kind of connections to the Supreme and divine beings, but ultimately we must develop this through the context of our world. Having the freedom to find the same things the ancients found without having to go through the ancients or be stuck to them and what they wrote or said, is not a luxury, it is required. Intelligent people build on past learning and experience, but when one is bound to the past ways as the fundamental means for spiritual advancement without integrating our own experience and cultural context, ancient belief systems and value structures can act as chains. I do not think the ancients would have wanted this.

What about Radha-Krishna, Sita-Rama, Nrisimha etc? I remain devoted to Vedic beliefs, and it is not indifferently to me all that attached with these sacred images. Is it possible that the connection with mythology can not give me the benefit? Is it useless to utilize something not accepting the belief system wholly?

Hold on there! You are reading into my words something I did not intend. Please do not forget the limitations of the written word. I remain devoted to all the personalities you state. I do not remain devoted to beliefs. There is a big difference. These personalities are the essence and they are the reason for all devotion and love. Connecting to them (or others, according to the tradition) is the essence of the ancient's documented belief system. However, their words, statements, rules, disciplines, social customs, legal customs, accepted norms of behavior, unstated values and so on, underlying their presentations do not necessarily relate to me in my present situation. Therefore, I was attempting to explain that adherence to something which may not be useful to your development is not required and if you bind yourself to a system which is not optimally designed to your present state of consciousness in the here and now, you have effectively limited your evolution. Again, I do not believe the ancients wished to limit us.

By careful examination of all the available literatures in various traditions, including the Indian ones, we observe a continuous development of conception through time. The original culture was one of the mother, of the nature and of the innate connection between all things. Over time, this was transformed by scholars (sages) who developed an alternative presentation of the prevalent thoughts that ruled the intelligentsia. Then came other literatures which pointed in other directions and this constant updating and clarification of particular schools of thought continues even today. People have always influenced traditions with their motives, their

limitations, and their desires for what they feel is best. The appearance of Lord Caitanya established the unique and primordial connection between the male and female divinity which was lost when the mother was set aside as a dangerous obstacle to certain groups. The discussions in the Caitanya era were in many ways different from the past. A good example of how a cultural context can influence the presentation of ideas is seen in the writings of Bhaktivinode. The fact that you are writing in this forum is a departure from the traditions of the past. Yet, the point of it all is to connect with the divine in pure love. It is that point I wish to amplify, not the tradition within which the statement was first learned.

## **Monastery :)**

by LvU » Sun Feb 05, 2006 6:45 pm

I want to be a monk, but in my country there isn't such monasteries like in Asia i mean that in my country there is only very low level Christian monasteries. I would like to know were i could find such a spiritual development place like a monastery or at least were should i start searching Created by Love and powered By God the one who speaks, doesn't know...the one who knows, doesn't speak

by Hari » Sun Feb 19, 2006 5:20 pm

I am not sure I have enough information about what you wish to do with your life to properly answer this question. Why do you specifically wish to be a monk? What do you wish to achieve?

Do you have any experience with monastic life? If so, where and what happened? If not, which aspects of monastic life have you heard about that attract you most?

Some people like to live with others who share their beliefs and goals. Some monasteries discourage all speaking. Most encourage austerity and hard work. There are other types of detached religious or spiritual lifestyles for those who do not find Christian monasteries acceptable. There are Buddhist (and all types of similar derivatives) monasteries in India, Nepal, Thailand, and other Southeast Asian countries, or Japan, Korea, or anywhere else in the world where these organizations have spiritual centers. There are many Hindu type monasteries, called ashramas, in India. All of these places offer a similar kind of austere and detached life style, devoid of any material facility outside of a roof over one's head and some basic food, with spiritual practices in the flavor of their spiritual tradition. There are even communities in Europe, America, and South America (I am sure also in Australia, Fiji and so on) which facilitate spiritual devotion in a dedicated environment, but you would have to research them and even try some out before committing yourself to a long term residency.

You also have to consider the visa situation in any country you wish to reside for a longer period of time. Some countries do allow monastic visas, but you would need to be sponsored by the community you wish to join.

## **What about the future?**

by Sambhu das » Thu Jan 05, 2006 11:31 pm

Dear Hari,  
I have asked you this before, but can you tell about the future?

by Hari » Thu Jan 19, 2006 2:05 am

I prefer to work with the present and how it manifested. For example, I am interested in how a person's present situation has been created by their previous choices and circumstances. Awareness of these events and choices encourages understanding of the mechanism which created them, and as we become more aware we develop a heightened capacity to direct our lives in a more favorable manner. This creates our future. I am therefore concerned with how the future is created, not as much with what it will be.

Sometimes I can see what will happen and often it does. But as it is so uncertain and I am not confident of what I see, I do not speak about it.

by Sambhu das » Thu Jan 19, 2006 3:40 pm

Thank you.

I don't want to brag but I see that I can more and more understand how my desires create my future.

by Hari » Sun Feb 19, 2006 5:03 pm

It is not bragging. You are simply stating how you see things. You are not saying, "Look at me! I can do this wonderful thing and I am really great!" You are stating simply, "I have learned to see how what I do and the choices I make affect my life. I can see the relation between my choices and the consequences or results that manifest from these choices. I have therefore understood how the future can manifest by examining the situations I am creating now that are a part of a continuous stream of experiences I am an integral part of. I therefore can honestly state I have become aware."

Good! All love to you.

## **Avaranatmika and praksipatmika**

by maha » Fri Jan 27, 2006 6:53 pm

Dear Hari,

trying to understand what is behind the two maya-shaktis - avaranatmika and praksipatmika I have some guess.

It seems that the maya force that drags us down is based on the principle that the form of relationship which is the highest in spiritual world (madhurya rasa) can drag one all the way down in the material world (as extramarital relationship), at least that is how it was explained to us previously according to sastra. Is it so, or that is not the point of it?

And the second part: is it so that the covering potency of illusion starts from the fact that in this world external appearance of a person is usually the opposite to what is inside of him? And here I mean that our psyche seems to be very balanced in that way. For example, it seems that for this reason women in general are perceived as soft, fragile and irrational and practice shows that it is perfectly balanced by their inside being pretty practical and rational. May be that's why they live longer? Whereas men in general are perceived as strong, hard and rational, which is balanced by their inside being soft, vulnerable and impractical. This is of course in one sense specific and in the other sense very generalized example. But the idea is that due to the material world being balanced and complete in itself and our spiritual individuality being in a sense of a different nature, it seems that all external manifestations of people are balanced by



the opposite energies inside of them, like there is Yang in the Ing and there is Ing in the Yang. Is it what covers and bewilders our perception?

Thank you

Avaranatmika and praksipatmika

by maha » Sat Jan 28, 2006 9:22 am

I'm sorry, but I already have a continuation of it from another angle of perception.

What is the role of our passions and desires in it and of the law of entropy always trying to increase? Is it so, that due to one being overwhelmed with his/her passions, needs and charms by external manifestation as described in my previous letter, one's perception is covered?

And then because of that one forgets the very necessity or simply has not enough time and strength to counteract the law of entropy which demands from one constant endeavors not only to keep things in order, but to keep them going and develop, otherwise one is dragged down into a havoc?

by Hari » Thu Feb 02, 2006 3:44 pm

The concept of maya is a difficult one. Let's discuss it from a conceptual point of view rather than being constricted by Sanskrit terminology.

You have asked me to consider two factors; being 'dragged down' and being 'covered over.' Let's start with dragging down. The term 'drag' (when used in connection with people, or animals) implies that an external force is pulling you against your will. Alternatively, one can define drag as a weight or a friction, as in an airplane when there are weights on it or when there is some aerodynamically improper structure that creates air friction. This concept of drag is closer to what we experience. We are meant to fly, yet the dragging weight or friction slows us down and keeps us earth-bound. It is a weight that prevents us from approaching our potential. Anyone living in this world carries weights and therefore has to deal with their effect.

Why do we have such a burden? How did it get there and what purpose is it fulfilling? What is the result of dropping this weight? These are important questions. Obviously, we are living in a world of earthly elements which, in a quantitative sense, all have weight as opposed to ethereal elements which do not have such weight. I will skip discussing how ethereal elements have weight and are more dense than earthly elements since it is not pertinent.

To live on earth means to carry weight. It is a function of gravity and our desire to integrate within an environment where there are anchors and roots. Without it, we could not properly contact or interact on the physical plane. We might have thought of this realm as a field of tangible objects we can grasp that can be counted on to produce specific reactions under distinct and predictable circumstances most of the time. There is a certain attraction in this conception and it creates an arena in which everyone can find a place, from the single celled organisms to the most intelligent humans. Indeed, this idea of concrete reality is so attractive we chose to bear the weight and be bound by gravity! Astronauts can appreciate the trauma of living without gravity for longer periods of time. We welcome the weight as we are attuned to it. We tune to it because it resonates well with us. It resonates well with us because we are on that level of evolution and not only require a gravity bound environment but thirst for it. So long we thirst for it, we will accept certain restrictions to live within it, much as exclusive club members agree to a dress code when entering their playground in the mood of, "If you want this facility you accept these terms and conditions."

From this point of view, the drag is a part of the design and not an obstacle. "It is a feature, not a bug," the older programmers used to say. This viewpoint gives us perspective on what we consider to be a predicament and thus indicates how we might transform it were we inclined to do so. As they say in the health field, a correct diagnosis is 90% of the cure. Once you understand the problem, solving it is much easier. Even if there is no resolution or cure for a disease, it makes life easier when one accepts reality instead of living in a dream world of false hopes. Those who consciously accept 'gravity' in full awareness of the required terms and conditions may, when finding they are not getting what they wanted, seek out another environment to better fulfill their needs. Thus, a consciousness of the contract is more important than a judgment of those who have accepted it unconsciously.

Instead of lamenting how some super-powerful force drags us down, accept this force as an elemental reality of life that defines the parameters of our playing field. The question becomes easier; do I accept the terms and conditions of the supplier of this facility? If so, then I am responsible for the consequences, either good or bad, and if not, then I shall find another provider. Those who choose the latter become spiritual seekers. Seen from this point of view, the drag of extra relationships is the effect of the entanglement it creates rather than being a product of an inverted reflection of a spiritual realm.

Covering implies that this power has thrown a dense sheet over you against your will and holds it there (or vacuum packs you to maintain 'freshness' ) whereas one can also see it as the product of our perception of our circumstances. Since we have accepted gravity to live in a gravity filled world with others, we rarely think of ourselves being in a state free from gravity since that would be not only be unnatural but we would perceive it as a state dissociated from reality. Drug induced states allow one to be a gravity resident and tour the weightless regions with little effort, yet there are problems associated with re-entry that make the experience less optimal. Sometimes the word cover is replaced with the word 'veil;' a curtain which separates us from the 'other' reality. Continuing the theater analogy, it seems that it is more a costume than a cover, a uniform we wear to designate us as part of the forces of earthbound reality defending ourselves from the infiltration of awareness which will destroy our palace of pleasure. Quite a drama!

I am not sure you can generalize that all people are one way on the outside and another way on the inside for in some the internal and external characteristics blur together while others are what they seem to be. One can also say that people perceive you as one way whereas in reality, were they to be more perceptive, they would see how your words, values and actions do indeed demonstrate your inner being. Don't forget that prejudice and sensual coloration distort perception. In many cases, we see others as reflections of how we would think of ourselves if we were to be in the same situation we rightly or wrongly perceive them in. We like to find ourselves in others and in so doing forget to see them as they are.

Not all women are soft, fragile and irrational on the outside and practical and rational on the inside, but I get your point and it is a very astute observation. I see what you are saying and it does make sense. Similarly I understand your idea about the inner and outer difference in men and it also makes sense. I suppose one can say that these points relate to nature's inherent balancing system which causes polar opposites to tend towards each other as opposites attract in a magnetic or energetic sense. Strong men yearn for sensitivity and soft women yearn for rationality. Left brain yearns for connection to right brain. Men seek out women, and so on. You even see it in same sex couples; there is usually a stronger one and a softer one.

I think this conception does not directly relate to this discussion of a covering potency, but it is interesting in itself. Awareness of the workings of polarity is complex, difficult to directly perceive, and requires a greater awareness to understand, but I do not see it as a cover or

something to bewilder any more than not knowing something could be seen as a covering of ignorance"" but that seems more a term of speech rather than a philosophical concept. The attractive force of polarity within all of us is the unstoppable force of spiritual energy yearning to be balanced. It does not matter in which realm we have chosen to reside, this force will act. Perhaps you could seek out a better example of covering, if you still felt inclined to pursue this thought process?

Now in your second text you attempt to show how passion, that great creative energy of continual expression of life, enlivens experience and is the inspiration for our acceptance of the costume that facilitates the fulfillment of our desire. I would agree with this.

And in the second part of your second text you are basically saying, if I have it correct, that unless you keep the motor on the airplane going the plane will crash to earth by the force of gravity. Certainly. As soon as you accept a world based on these physical laws (that also affect the etheric realm in a very powerful way) you have to pay the energetic price. This indicates something about the nature of our contract. We are the one's maintaining it, not some external force. We keep it up and we keep it going. Nature supplies the facility.

Havoc is not necessarily the result of not keeping our world going. For example, a person who has given up trying to fulfil any passion in life simply sits in one place and accepts whatever comes to him. There are many homeless people like that. They have lost the desire to chase after dreams. This is not havoc, rather, it can be peaceful for those who have accepted homelessness voluntarily to avoid the pain of being at home. Yogis or babajis find such a state as refreshing for they feel their seclusion is a better way to live. For those homeless lacking the spiritual insight of the benefits of such a state, there is the burden of being cold and hungry and this is a terrible state of affairs, but that is to a small extent offset by community and connection they may not have had when they were living within the world of increasing endeavor. (No, I am not saying that we should be homeless or that the homeless are enjoying their lives.) Neil Donald Walsch was once living as a homeless person and has experienced this.

I do not pretend to have a complete answer neither do I think I have dealt with this topic to my own satisfaction, but I have made some indication and you can elaborate on this if you want according to the practical manifestation of your life and its unique form of struggle.

## Woman to political power

by harsi » Wed Nov 23, 2005 1:02 am

"Mister President of the Parliament, I do accept the election," said Dr. Angela Merkel, the new elected woman Chancellor, today in the German Parliament. "That is a strong signal for all woman and for many man certainly, also." With this words introduced the President of the German Parliament a new era in this country. <http://www.bundeskanzlerin.bundesregierung.de> ... <http://www.bundesregierung.de/en>

The President of State, who has here more a function of supervision according to the constitution, ( <http://www.tatsachen-ueber-deutschland.de/389.html> ) introduced her in her new office, wishing her good luck, strength and the blessings of God. Thus 87 years after the introduction of the democratic woman election right in Germany, in this country's newest history, the first woman is entrusted with political power and leadership of the state.

What I would like to ask you, dear Hari, is the following: The fact that more and more woman, come also in leading political power positions in this world, can this not be seen as a sign, that

the male and female energies, come also more and more in harmony. What could that mean for us and the world and time we are living in?  
Open up your mind and heart to new experiences of consciousness.

by Hari » Thu Nov 24, 2005 8:37 pm

One would have to examine if the British foreign policy and political actions were better when Margaret Thatcher was Prime Minister, or for that matter, during the Victorian Era. One might conclude it has little to do with a leader being male or female for the main consideration is their personal qualification and the ways in which they manifest their power.

Politics is such a stinky arena that one wonders if a woman or two could effectively change it. One wonders how one could be elected in the present climate without having some aroma on oneself.

Certainly the feminine energy is needed and required. We need more nurturing and nourishing for the poor, the sick, and the victims of disasters. We need less male dominated ideals of conquer and victimize through any and all exploitation possible for personal and group gain. This change in direction is not directly correlated to the gender of the leader, but to their evolutionary state. Thus a woman or a man could be a good leader if they were sufficiently evolved.

So, no, I do not think that women being elected necessarily signifies a new day in politics, but it does signify the breakdown of prejudice amongst the voters and that is certainly a sign of evolution.

by Marina » Sat Nov 26, 2005 12:54 pm

*Hari wrote:*

*So, no, I do not think that women being elected necessarily signifies a new day in politics, but it does signify the breakdown of prejudice amongst the voters and that is certainly a sign of evolution.*

I very often can read here this term evolution, what is the specific understanding behind the usage of it in this forum?

by Hari » Sat Nov 26, 2005 10:44 pm

I use the word 'evolution' to describe the forward motion of the spiritual energy towards greater awareness, greater self-actualization, or any form of advancement that benefits one in the long run and awakens one to one's essence.

The use of the term according to the biological understanding is not what I mean here.

Evolution can also be used in relation to groups when the group is made of evolving individuals. A society can also evolve as a group. Men can evolve as a group, as can women. Actors can evolve as a group, as can writers. But fundamentally, individuals evolve and seek out others who are similar to them or who share their evolutionary ideals and characteristic means to express these ideals.

It seems that everyone is always evolving. Some do it faster, some do it slower than others. We have to move forward for we are always learning and transforming according to the stimulus that we contact at every moment.

Conscious evolution is that form of action that is done with the awareness that it is an evolutionary step. Those who are more aware of these steps possess a greater degree of such consciousness.

This is how I, at least, use this term. There is more that can be said, but that would fill a book.

by harsi » Mon Nov 28, 2005 10:50 pm

*Hari wrote:*

*Certainly the feminine energy is needed and required. We need more nurturing and nourishing for the poor, the sick, and the victims of disasters. We need less male dominated ideals of conquer and victimize through any and all exploitation possible for personal and group gain. This change in direction is not directly correlated to the gender of the leader, but to their evolutionary state. Thus a woman or a man could be a good leader if they were sufficiently evolved.*

What you wrote is certainly true, it should indeed not be disadvantageous to be a woman, in order to gain a leading position in the society. But the history was such, that even in the 60's in Germany I heard it was for example impossible for a woman to get a credit from the bank without the signature of the husband or the father. What to speak of the so called vedic time in India, or what one may have understood in this regard, of the so-called vedic time. Would you say that this 'discriminations' of the woman in the society were only due to the dominance of the male energy in this societies or was it also meant somehow for their protection?

by Marina » Tue Nov 29, 2005 6:27 pm

*Hari wrote:*

*Conscious evolution is that form of action that is done with the awareness that it is an evolutionary step. Those who are more aware of these steps possess a greater degree of such consciousness.*

This is how I, at least, use this term. There is more that can be said, but that would fill a book. A interesting way of interpreting this term.

Apropos books, what author would you recommend to read in order to understand this matter more profoundly. Here appeared a lot of books nowadays written by Paul Ferrini, Jasmuheen, Rene de Lassus, Deepak Chopra, Dianne Lancaster, Bruce Davis, Sri Vasudeva and the author whose books I personally find quite interesting, Neale Donald Walsch and his conversations with God.

by Marina » Wed Nov 30, 2005 10:09 pm

*harsi wrote:*

*What you wrote is certainly true, it should indeed not be disadvantageous to be a woman, in order to gain a leading position in the society.*

From my point of view, which is a liberal one, I can say that also where I am living women occupy an important role in the government of the country, which were not always so. The ministry of health, that of justice and of culture is under the leadership of a woman. The woman in my country can also be seen as power woman because they engage also in the social and political life and successfully, proving their high qualities of leadership, organizational talents in the active life of the country combining femininity with persistence.

by Hari » Wed Nov 30, 2005 10:44 pm

I am happy to hear that "Power Women" (yes, this name is becoming more and more recognized in the world) are entering into these arenas and mixing them with their nurturing energy. I am also glad that they are entering into these forums too! Thank you.

by Marina » Sun Dec 11, 2005 2:08 pm

I sometimes wonder why some of the man have a sort of mentality so different from ours, woman, concerning attitudes towards life, every day life and especially the couple life. In due course of time I have spoken, commented with some of my woman-friends about this matter, and I am astonished, really surprised sometimes from the great differences of opinions, gestures, attitudes and reactions, sometimes words or expressions, of our life partners. Sometimes we think that we know very well the person we are living with, or our friend or mate, but things happened and demonstrates us that we are wrong and I wonder why? If anyone of you have an opinion about this matter, please discuss.

by Hari » Fri Dec 23, 2005 9:08 pm

Of course you are well aware that men and women are different. The only way to really know someone is to communicate with them and see their actions in different situations. But women are more comfortable about speaking about how they feel than men, and men say a lot less than women. Women are more into details whereas men are more into events, facts, and short descriptions.

There is a lot of literature about this in the world today and it describes this a lot better than I can in a few words.

One thing: If you see that someone you thought you knew and love react or act in ways which are quite contrary to your expectations, this indicates that you were not connecting on a deep level and that certain aspects of your relationship were not favorable to your partner. When this is seen, it is time to suspend all further actions until a deep understanding of the underlying forces that created the dissatisfaction are uncovered and comprehensively discussed.

## **Communication**

by Marina » Tue Jan 24, 2006 9:08 pm

I also agree that communication is a good way to know - or to know better someone. But what 's to be done when the other person is not so open, is not communicating with you? I must say that I have sometimes certain difficulties with friends of mine concerning communication between us. Is there a so call 'best strategy' to apply, or a certain way to act?

by Hari » Mon Jan 30, 2006 9:21 pm

You have hit upon the essential point. One of the greatest arts in communication is to make people feel secure and comfortable enough with you that they enjoy the communication. This is best done by being a good listener. One who can listen well with great attention and an empathetic desire to understand the other person has a very good chance at creating an open channel of communication. One who simply wishes others to understand them without first trying to understand the other has a harder time.

This works well when the other wishes to be understood, but what do you do when the other has no interest in communicating with you? In this case, you first have to create the environment within which a desire for communication can arise, then you can empathetically hear and understand them. When they see that you care about them so much that you are listening carefully without judging them, they will be able to hear you. This is the secret to effective and meaningful communication.

## The meaning of life

by ? » Mon Jan 16, 2006 2:50 pm

Respect to You. What the meaning of life do You see now? Evolution, self-perfection! And after this? These are the games of Lord? If the only explanation - games, then these games are cruel, I think.

I have read the books of Walsh! There is no final in it, the eternal circulation between material and spiritual. Brahman if I am right. To speak the truth, the thoughts about it make me depressed. Speaking about the meaning of life it is hard to avoid the old topic about fall of the soul, about exit from the state where you are not thinking: Where is the exit? Due to Walsh one can achieve this state every time after death. If it is so simple then what the use of the achieving perfection during the lifetime? If "Hitler have come to Eden" then everybody achieve the same. Then what is the use of doing something? And why is it so hard to find the answer on this important question?

Thank You for answering on such primitive and tangled questions.  
With respect.

by alexey » Tue Jan 17, 2006 2:59 pm

It is an addition from Saranagati (translated from russian forum)

"To tell the truth it is better for me to think that we evolve from the part of Brahman. I mean, life has been given to us for development of love to God, consequently for development of our spiritual bodies in which we will come to spiritual world. What do You think, Hari?"

by Hari » Thu Jan 19, 2006 2:25 am

You are struggling with an existential crisis, namely, "Why am I here and what is the purpose of life?" This is a big question.

You can read and experience and come to some conclusion. You can believe what someone says because that is what you believe and you can reject what another says because it is not what you believe. All the time you are living your life and creating your own experiences. You have also created this existential crisis since it is time for you to have it. Thus you are powerful. This is not a game, not a lesson. It is life itself which is a composite of feelings, experiences, and energy.

You decide what you want in life by gravitating towards that which you feel attracts you. No one can tell you what to feel and no one can create that attractive force unless you become attracted to it.

Life is not given to us: it is ours. What you do with it is your choice. Your natural state is to be fully aware in the spiritual essence you are. In that state you are connected with the divine immersed in that spiritual love that you and all spirit is. Any other state is uncomfortable since it

is not what you are and therefore you want to return to your natural state. This is different from a theoretical original state, it is something else. To state that there is an original state that you must return to creates the illusion that this state is static and we just have to get back to where we were long ago. In reality, you are evolving and moving forward. The natural state is the state of full awareness of what you are and connection to the supreme. This state is definitely different than what you were long ago. It does not matter if you were here or there long ago, or you came from here or there. You will not return to that exact state in any case since you are so much more now than you were then. You have advanced and evolved. Therefore your goal could be to return to your natural state of full awareness of what you are now, in the present, as a purely spiritual energy, and in that state focus your connection to the Supreme and all others that share your essential spirituality.

Question from russian forum

by alexey » Tue Jan 17, 2006 2:44 pm

Hello, Dear Hari!

It is a question from saranagati (translated from russian forum):

"Dear Hari, please accept my respect. On one Saturday I have asked You about "substance" that pursue me through my mother. I think I should give more explanations. On Friday we have been meet with person who has subtle vision. He said that "substance" gives to my mother ability for healing, herb-healing (I have noticed she could gather necessaries herbs and could heals herself and others). He also said that she has this ability from dark forces not from lights. I have asked my mother if she have had the teacher. She said she have been studies from one woman. Now (as this man said) it is time to transfer this power to somebody else. They have been selected my daughter, because she is Scorpio, she has dark eyes and hairs. It makes me anxious, because the energy of this "substance" provokes aggression, unmotivated evil in me and the desire to lock inside, to hide. And this "substance" provoked in my mother manifestation of bad qualities and actions. And I was shocked by it. I simply desire to protect my children, give them ability for spiritual advancement, and the ability to heal should go from the light forces, from love. May be this substance want to contact with me, but I can not to get rid of fear, because in my childhood I have often seen the dream where I was fighting with my mother, she was a witch in that dream.

Excuse me for not answering right away, I live in Vladivostok, watch Your broadcasting for 4 months. Thank You for association, for knowledge, for Your Love. Opportunity to receive knowledge from You always be a great stimulus in my life. The man I mentioned above promised to deliver me from this misfortune. If You think it is not right, please say me. Your advice is very important to me."

by Hari » Thu Jan 19, 2006 2:14 am

My dear,

You are aware. You know what is right and wrong. You feel that this energy is not good for your mother and obviously you do not wish to place it anywhere near your children. You do not need to ask me what to do for you already know, in your spiritual wisdom that is your essence, exactly what to do. Therefore have faith in yourself and do exactly what you know and have already expressed to me is right. You do not need my approval, neither do you need my advice, for you are already aware of the best course of action.

To say, "No, thank you," is fine. If they demand an explanation, simply say, "Because I do not feel it is right." Most likely there will be some kind of struggle, but regardless you have to do



what you feel is right in this and in all circumstances. You could not live with yourself if you did not.

May you be blessed and showered with angelic light and power. Call upon that power for yourself and your family.

## New Age

by harsi » Thu Dec 22, 2005 4:45 am

Dear Hari, by reading the following article, how would you define or asses the spiritual worth or goal contained therein for the time and place we are living in?

<http://www.websyte.com/alan/newage.htm>

[http://www.newthought.org/new\\_thought.html](http://www.newthought.org/new_thought.html)

<http://www.newageinfo.com/whatis.htm>

"Similarities Between New Age and New Thought

New Thought and New Age both believe in a direct relationship with the Ultimate, however conceived. Neither movement favors hierarchical organizations, and both groups treat women and men as partners, with many women in leadership roles. Many people in both groups believe in reincarnation, because they feel that we can't learn all we need to learn in one lifetime.

New Age, like New Thought, is strongly optimistic, largely because most people in both groups believe in a good God, and that all people are part of God or have at least a spark of the divine. New Agers are full of hope for the transformation of society and the planet. New Thought accepts, as does New Age, the old Hermetic teaching, "As above, so below," which appears in an early version of the Lord's Prayer as "As in heaven, so on earth" (Luke 11:2). Heaven, in a New Thought interpretation, alludes to one's state of mind, and earth is the manifestation of that state. As in mind, so in manifestation. Symbolically interpreted, Heaven is the uplifted state of consciousness, the wonderful, peaceful sense of universal oneness that the mystic seeks. Charles Fillmore defines it as "a state of consciousness in which the soul and the body are in harmony with Divine Mind." All of Jesus' metaphors about heaven are attempts to explain the necessity for disciplining our thoughts, weeding out the negative ones and treasuring the positive ones; e.g., the pearl of great price, tares growing with the wheat, seeds falling in various places with various results. New Age shares New Thought's interest in metaphor, and the late Joseph Campbell, the preeminent authority on myth and metaphor, is a popular New Age author.

In large part borrowing from or paralleling New Thought, New Agers generally believe that there is only one Presence and Power in the universe and that that Power is good (although there may be a small segment who believe in Satan). Many see that Power as both immanent and transcendent. Both movements have a growing interest in panentheism (not to be confused with the old heresy, pantheism, which holds that God and the universe are one), expounded on at length by one of us (Alan) in New Thought and with perhaps a somewhat different understanding by former Roman Catholic and now Episcopal priest Matthew Fox, in New Age. . . .

Like New Thought, New Age also emphasizes the value of meditation. Much of this interest springs from the influence of Eastern religions on both movements, as well as the importance given to the power of the mind and the necessity for disciplining or training the mind.

New Thought and New Age both frequently seek alternatives to orthodox medicine, especially in overlooked natural and scientific discoveries for healing that lack the huge profit potential of drugs or surgery. Members of both groups use orthodox medicine when it is appropriate, but seek better choices where it falls short or fails altogether. They particularly seek to learn to harness the power of the mind to heal, and increasing amounts of scientific research have supported this approach. New Age physician Larry Dossey in his most recent book, *Healing Words*, has listed over 100 studies on the power of prayer to heal, over half showing that prayer brings about "significant changes." The result of one randomized, double-blind study by a cardiologist was so significant that Dossey states, "If the technique studied had been a new drug or a surgical procedure instead of prayer, it would almost certainly have been heralded as some sort of 'breakthrough'." Dossey also describes three eras in medicine: Era I, physicalistic medicine, dominant from the 1860s to 1950 and "still influential"; Era II, mind-body medicine, arising in the 1950s and still developing; and Era III, nonlocal science and medicine, "just being recognized."

In this, New Age is clearly building on New Thought, which began with Quimby's use of the power of the mind to heal, frequently with absent healing. Most New Age groups indeed, individuals welcome New Thought teachings on healing and general prosperity, along with its views on God, once they become aware of New Thought's existence.

New Age is fascinated with the new physics, and New Thought shares this interest. Both movements are philosophically idealistic, and the findings of the new physics support idealism. Marilyn Ferguson observes, "the new science goes beyond cool, clinical observations to a realm of shimmering paradox, where our very reason seems endangered." Physicists are starting to sound like metaphysicians. Research moves so fast that results are obsolete before they can appear in print. Scientists have repeatedly demonstrated the mind's ability to affect the body, beginning with biofeedback and extending into studies showing that white blood cell count varied according to whether subjects thought happy or unhappy thoughts. Bell's Theorem led to experiments showing that paired particles remain mysteriously connected even after they fly apart, another example of the nonlocality that Dossey mentions in connection with Era III medicine. Neuroscientist Karl Pribram's research on holograms suggests that the universe may be a giant hologram in other words, we are all one. As he puts it, "The brain we know now allows for the experiences reported from spiritual disciplines."

#### And Differences

But New Thought and New Age do differ, whether or not both are viewed as religions. One big difference is interest in the occult. Crystals, pyramids, and other occult trappings belong to New Age, not New Thought. Unity founders Charles and Myrtle Fillmore investigated various occult practices such as channeling early in their ministry and rejected them as largely ineffective and possibly even dangerous for dabblers. Still, New Thought does remain open to truth from whatever unlikely source it may spring. It may discourage interest in the occult, but it does not invariably condemn it.

In the early years of current New Age thinking, John Charles Cooper, in his *Religion in the Age of Aquarius*, characterized New Age interest in the occult as a wholesale rejection of a society founded on materialistic positivism (not to be confused with positive thinking). He found that this interest originated in people's frustration with social conditions that they believed that they could not control. If this is so, New Age and New Thought have different psychological origins; New Thought never has suffered from a feeling of inability to deal adequately with a world held to be essentially mental and subject to mental control.

The supposedly channeled New Age work, *A Course in Miracles*, purportedly coming from Jesus, remains popular among Unity churches despite efforts to discourage its use. Many people undoubtedly have been helped by the Course, especially by its emphasis on forgiveness and its discussion groups in which people share their problems, but it remains quintessentially New Age, not New Thought. New Agers Gerald Jampolsky and Marianne Williamson have mined the valuable nuggets of the Course and set them down admirably in their own writings. . . .

New Thought more nearly relies exclusively on spiritual healing than does New Age. New Thought allows and sometimes even encourages use of both conventional medicine and alternative healing methods, but recognizes them as outside New Thought. In contrast, most if not all of the alternative forms of healing are within the broad boundaries of New Age. . . .

### Summary

New Thought concentrates on the power of the mind to heal and to prosper in a world in which all is mind. New Age especially extends this healing, prospering transformation to the entire planet, and with the inquisitiveness of youth, pokes its nose into numerous interesting corners, some clearly valuable, some questionable, in the process. It is possible to share in many of these interests, beliefs, and practices, yet continue to belong to mainstream Christianity or other religions.

The success of both New Thought and New Age can be measured to a considerable extent by the degree to which their interests and teaching have seeped into cultures that neither know nor care about either group by name. By this measure, both are successful, and probably will become increasingly so. It seems almost certain that New Thought will continue in largely its current organizational ways. Many New Agers will find their way to New Thought organizations, but probably most will remain outside any organized religion, or even organized spirituality. However, the world is far too complex and the changes that are occurring are far too profound to make predictions worth much. What seems clear is that with or without capital letters, we have entered a promising new age, and New Thought will remain an important and distinguishable part of it. "

by Hari » Fri Dec 23, 2005 9:54 pm

I do not see the point of discussing this. I do not like to describe what I think by contrasting it with some school of thought. Sometimes one may do this to make a point, and certainly that is valid, but this description does not appeal to me. New Age or New Thought? What is the use of the labels? Why is the use of the mind or will within a social context as compared with a use of energy within the personal context an important distinction? They are not exclusive and to imply that those who work with energy avoid these contexts is a primitive analysis. As for me, I see anything that works for the individual as valuable.

I like the author's conclusion that regardless of how these 'schools,' as he describes them, affect the world, their effect is significant and is creating a mood of introspection and transformation that is sorely needed.

If a person is capable of and interesting in creating a social or political transformation then I would support their effort to do so. If someone is not inclined and wishes to create transformation using whole planet healing or whatever I would support their effort to do so.

Whatever is required according to the skills and capacities of the individuals wishing to do good for the world is fine with me. Of course, I would not necessarily agree with or support certain ways of action if I saw they were harmful or negative.

I am not a great fan of spending a lot of time in academic research, descriptions, or conclusions. I deal with the world from another point of view. Academicians are concerned with labeling, organizing, and packaging within definable and predictable patterns that which they study. This is not attractive to me. Certainly, I am using intellect and conceptual analysis in my descriptions of the universe, but it would be incompatible for me to either create a school of thought, label existing schools of thought, join one or condemn one, or any other direct interaction with some group of people according to their group's declared philosophical ideals. I see each person, even those within a group or school, as an individual who I wish to be happy within themselves in relating to their energetic space within the universe. I am also not interested in analyzing someone's opinion or rebutting it in some manner. You will not get a useful response from me in such a way.

Your quoting this long and essentially uninteresting article might indicate that you have yet to catch the essence of how I am presenting the tools of evolution. Could this be so? I do not like to write just to write and I am not eager to discuss things to fill up the forums with texts.

by harsi » Sun Dec 25, 2005 1:04 am

*Hari wrote:*

*I do not see the point of discussing this. I do not like to describe what I think by contrasting it with some school of thought.*

Through the years of my search I have also held one precept in mind and that is "Prove all things and hold fast that which is good" My guideline in all things is what resonates as truth within my heart. If words, opinions or teachings, generate fear and uncertainty I let them go. If they generate love, peace and harmony within my soul then I accept and integrate them into my life. Through this I have come to know that what you are writing and teaching resonates well within my heart. Is that what you mean by "a use of energy within the personal context?"

"Your quoting this long and essentially uninteresting article might indicate that you have yet to catch the essence of how I am presenting the tools of evolution. Could this be so?"

Yes indeed, I have indeed some problems to catch the essence, I guess I am not the only one on this forums, or? I would appreciate it if you or someone else on this forums would explain it to me better.

## **Understanding the basic thing**

by Jiva » Wed Dec 14, 2005 2:03 pm

Hello, dear Hari!

I am very eager to know Your opinion on the next topic, I know it is basic, but it is very important to me now.

At one moment one receives information and agrees or feels and formulate inside that he/she is a spirit. Then it comes the shift of priorities and goals. This important admission must bring the ring of questions.

As long as we hold to the position that there is nothing around except the matter, we think about ourselves like an complicity - organized structure.

And if we are spirit than we have the other qualities than the matter.

And the question is: where have we come from and where we go? And what is our position relative to other world. Everybody tries to answer these questions, and I have not answered yet. And when you don't know the answer you don't know to do. How do You have answered these questions for yourself?

by Hari » Fri Dec 23, 2005 9:31 pm

I deal with these questions all the time. Sometimes I think I have them answered and sometimes I am filled with doubts. When I was younger I was convinced that all problems or disturbances in the world could be reduced to a few basic causes and that transforming the circumstances that breed these causes could change the world. As I grew older, I realized that after all my work to implement my theory and plan I was not really closer to the solution I embraced. Even later, I saw that I did not even understand the problem I was trying to fix! You can imagine the shock that created within me!

Everyone knows that there is a practical side of life and some call it the material existence whereas those who are more enlightened think about it as the field of activity. Most understand that there is a spiritual essence which permeates this field and which has a different quality. So long as one is within existence one has to deal with the non-stop dichotomy of making life work "materially" and "spiritually."

For the last few years, I have been speaking about integrating this struggle into one compact essence. We and the world are spirit and nothing else. We are manifesting ourselves within this realm according to our own desire to fulfill our own purposes of attaining experiences that will be a constant catalyst for our non-stop transformation and evolution. Some say we are here because we wanted to re-discover ourselves whereas some say we are here because we were forced to be here due to our being fallen and bad. Those who see life as a process of re-discovery see it from the positive point of view and allow themselves to see themselves as good people who are engaged in a process of evolution out of their own choice. They therefore embrace experience from all points of view and live life with the expectation of advancement. Those who live life as a reaction to being forced to do so usually have a negative feeling about themselves and dislike their 'fallen and sinful' natures which are the 'cause' of their bondage. They require to reject the experiences of the 'material' world to disconnect from this world and connect to the world of spirit.

I prefer the first method as it integrates. I dislike the second method as I saw that it disintegrates people on a deep level and creates dependencies and interdependencies on artificial relationships that weaken them over the long run. My opinion of the second method is borne of experience over many years. My faith in the first method is borne of my experience over the last 7+ years. I am open to adjusting my opinion at a later date.

That does not mean that I am comfortable with life. I struggle regularly with finding meaning in what I do. I had an interesting discussion with myself ;o) about a bad mission being better than no mission (which is a derivative of a comment Sri Ram das made to me once, he is dying in a hospital in California and I am sorry about this, "A bad leader is better than no leader.") and even though I discussed this for a long time I could not come to a final conclusion since the best I can come up with is that all that counts is my experience in each moment of the present. When I have the facility to help a lot of people and can do actions which are widely beneficial, I feel there is a purpose in my life. I am not very good at just living from day to day absorbed in arranging the circumstances of life. Yet, it seems that this experience of living in the 'real' world while attempting to integrate my awareness within all aspects of my life is important at this time and it connects me to most of the people of the world who deal with the same existential doldrums I regularly feel. From that point of view it has value; perhaps more value than I am now aware. I am quite sure that when the powers that be see that I have waited long enough,

or the time is right to engage me, they will. I will remain ready for that moment. And in the meantime I can write a few texts in this forum and speak on Saturday.

I am not sure if this answered your questions, but it is how I answer these questions for myself.

by pamu » Sat Dec 24, 2005 5:13 pm

Existential doldrums are there for a reason, no doubt. What reason? Don't ask me. There is something very mystical with those existential doldrums. The great equalizer!

## Symbol

by Purushottama das » Wed Dec 14, 2005 2:12 pm

What do You think aboy Svastika? What the power it has? I have bought a golden seal-ring with Svastika in Vrindavana a year ago, and I think that thanks to wearing it I have become more lucky. I feel it brings luck. Can You comment on it? May be from Your personal experience or from You store of knowledge.  
With respect to You.

by Hari » Fri Dec 23, 2005 9:34 pm

Personally, I do not have much experience with this symbol. The real symbol can bring power if you know how to connect with it. I do not use symbols and do not connect to anything through the use of symbols. If you want to know about such symbols I am sure there are some pandits in India, or perhaps some literature that explains it in detail.

The symbol used by Hitler was a mirror image of the Vedic symbol and some say that it caused his failure. I think he failed because he tried to do something which was not correct and even had the symbol been in the right direction he would have still lost. Perhaps it was the will of God that he turned it backwards?

## Basic human condition of life

by pamu » Fri Jun 03, 2005 6:00 pm

What is uncertainty? Why is it a basic human condition of life? What role does it have?

Re: Basic human condition of life

by Hari » Sun Jun 05, 2005 10:01 pm

*pamu wrote:*

*What is uncertainty? Why is it a basic human condition of life? What role does it have?*

Pamu! Pamu! Welcome! Did you get a computer? Good for you!

Most likely you have already researched all the available psychological and esoteric texts which elaborately and eruditely define uncertainty, so I will not answer from those points of view. As I am an expert in the feeling of being uncertain if what I am saying or doing is ultimately the best for me and others, I will discuss it from my own particular slant on life. Unfortunately, I am not certain if it is correct, that I can express it properly, or that it is relevant

to you. I certainly know that there is no certainty that others will like what I write and I definitely fear that others will take my words and misunderstand them. Being misunderstood is simply the worst thing for me. Being disliked for what I am is far superior to being liked for what I am not. But that is not the question here. I am not sure if I should leave these little comments in this text. Decisions, decisions, I do not like making decisions because they might be wrong and I might kick myself later on. Alas, what is a doubter to do?

Well, doubts are not everything and courage is required when you create a forum where you are expected to come up with answers to these tough questions. I know that you will see these comments as my attempt to be of service and accept them in the way they are given without the deluded expectation that my opinion is "right" or even interesting. Regardless, I will reply using the term in the way you expressed it and not in its usage as a condition where future events, investments, or situations are uncertain and therefore risky.

It seems that many feel an enormous need to be certain about things and this leads them to develop great conviction in political ideologies, causes of all kinds, certain fundamentalist religions, or to follow some charismatic personalities. Being uncertain is seen as weakness and therefore attempts are made to overcome the deficient state by embracing something that is so 'obviously true!' We all have experience with this.

I like uncertainty. It keeps me honest. When I am certain I become blinded and lose perspective. I do not examine all aspects of a situation and become complacent. Sure, if I am certain that a course of action will be beneficial, I will go for it, but getting to that conviction requires diving into the ocean of uncertainty which stimulates research, questioning, self-examination, and discussion. Doubt deepens our thought processes. Doubt and uncertainty are similar and both are symptoms of intelligence. Only the totally dull and ignorant are without doubt, but I do not recall meeting anyone so qualified! Sometimes I see the more one doubts themselves and their capacity, the more they present themselves as being without doubt and absolutely certain. Such persons make me worried and uncertain as to their sensitivity to my needs as an individual.

There is a seductive comfort in the absoluteness of certainty. It prepares a soft and comfortable bed and sings a lullaby that guides the descent into uneventful sleep. Typically, one wakes up from that certain slumber with a shock as the alarm rattles our brains back into the natural state of uncertainty when the time is right.

It is obvious that uncertainty protects the frail consciousness from being victimized by shadows presenting themselves as light. Uncertainty powers the quest for truth and alerts us to possible pitfalls in what we have accepted as relevant in our lives or what is beneficial for others. Uncertainty powers our development, encourages the growth of intellectual muscle, and facilitates the attempt to act optimally.

Uncertainty does not protect us from doing something that we might later decide to be incorrect. It does not protect us from doing something that others may think is wrong, neither would it protect us from causing harm to others even when we do not wish to do so. Uncertainty is definitely not a peaceful place of rest and recreation, for it demands attention and hard, strenuous work. Uncertainty is not a heavenly experience for it is diametrically opposed to the celestial high of absolute conviction. In other words, it is not a drug, it is a medicine.

Basic human condition of life

by pamu » Mon Jun 06, 2005 3:06 pm

Absolument I have my own computer. For long that seemed as impossible as leaving a certain unnamed religious organization, but, here we are, hovering in the cyberspace, happy as a man can be!

I was glad to find out that you too enjoy the spicy realm of uncertainty.

It was a good answer you gave. Medicine, not a drug, I liked that. This theme of uncertainty is an integral part of my upcoming book (this November). Do you find a connection between the following items: uncertainty, existential anxiety and fruitive mentality? My conclusion was that they are all intimately connected. Would you like to elaborate on that?

Re: Basic human condition of life

by Hari » Sat Jun 11, 2005 8:47 pm

*pamu wrote:*

*Do you find a connection between the following items: uncertainty, existential anxiety and fruitive mentality? My conclusion was that they are all intimately connected. Would you like to elaborate on that?*

Certainly there is a connection between uncertainty and existential anxiety, but only when one has existential anxiety, otherwise there would not be a connection! One could experience uncertainty without being in anxiety about it. I doubt that one could feel existential anxiety without being deep within the grip of uncertainty. It is part of the definition of existential anxiety that one feels the heat of uncertainty. I am often blessed with existential crisis. When it is minor it manifests as uneasiness and a catalyst for seeking out underlying causes. When it is major it often results in laying in bed in deep contemplation which later fuels investigative inquiry. A major crisis is not always resolved but the minor ones almost always are. Sometimes I think a major crisis attack is the culmination of an overload of uncertainty.

But fruitive mentality? I suppose there are other ways to look at it, but let me take your question to be, "Why would someone have existential crisis or be concerned with uncertainty if he had no desire for fruitive future results?" This is an interesting question. The implications of it are enormous.

The easy response would be, "He would not." But then again, even a person free from the desire for gain would still be concerned with his or her overall evolution and advancement and would be eager to develop themselves in a non-materialistic manner.

Some might think, "If I think I am working for the sake of God and have no fruitive desires, then I would feel totally certain and without any doubt. This would free me from the effects of any existential conflicts." Such a statement is true, yet it can direct one into actions that lack foresighted sensitivity to others in the world. Those who accept such ideals can claim that their understanding of things answers all questions and is therefore absolutely correct. In such an absolute world-view, all manner of actions are possible that normally should be questioned by a reasoning mind fueled by doubt, but due to the conviction of the absolutist are not. One can look at history and see hundreds of examples of injustices being performed by religions using this world-view as justification of whatever they do.

I don't feel like going deeper into this as it would lead me into areas which are more mental than relevant to me right now. In my own life at this moment I do not feel very fruitive and I certainly am not passionately working to create something. Simultaneously, I feel a nagging existential uncertainty about my role of service in this world -- not because I do not know what it is, for I do, but because I am uncertain of how to fulfill it. I find myself in existential crisis when I try to balance what I am and how I wish to manifest it with what my service to others



could be. I don't wish to elaborate on this in this text since this was not the question, but I feel that this example demonstrates how the concept of fruitive mentality does not fit perfectly together with uncertainty and existential anxiety. Uncertainty and existential anxiety fit together just fine.

Basic human condition of life

by pamu » Thu Jun 16, 2005 8:57 pm

Not so fast! You have to go deeper into this...please. What if fruitive mentality is there just to "protect" us from existential anxiety and uncertainty? This certainly seems to be the case in this world and it does not matter whether your convictions and the fruitive desires and goals thereafter are of material or of spiritual kind. To me it looks like the fruitive mentality is like an alarm system that goes on immediately as soon as some existential anxiety or uncertainty shows up in the horizon of our consciousness. So in this way at least I think they fit or work together. Existential anxiety and uncertainty are not very popular, to say the least, but maybe they should? Like you said, they keep us honest.

If you agree that uncertainty keeps us honest and helps us to not fall in the seductive comfort of absolute certainty, then you must also be a regular visitor in the not so comfortable chambers of existential anxiety. How do you define existential anxiety and how do you personally cope with that?

ps. I love this forum

by Hari » Mon Jun 20, 2005 4:52 pm

OK, it is hard to avoid you. You are too smart and also too persistent.

You raised a really interesting point! It is indeed a possibility, more probable than we might wish to admit, that goal oriented activity, or even any mind occupying activity can function as a drug to dull existential anxiety. Some might deal with such uncertainty by working hard to create a new project, doing this or that, building empires, or just making money. Others might travel all over the world constantly running from themselves and their feelings. Others might absorb themselves in alcohol, drugs, sex, gambling, politics, studies, expanding and increasing power and positions, getting sick, or any of the million of diversions presently available in the world. Yes, it is definitely a possibility that 'fruitive' actions, as you label them, are even better than TV at dulling our internal awareness so we may avoid dealing with existential anxiety.

We have all done this in our lives at one point or another. Those who are doing it now would benefit by stopping for a moment, reflecting on what they are running from, and turning to face this demon and vanquish it with acceptance. There is nothing better than acceptance to destroy denial.

How do I deal with it? My existential anxiety runs along this line: How can I be of service to people without compromising myself? You can place this anxiety in all realms of my life and correlate it with different groups of people, specifically, my family, my former students and associates, and people I might know or might come to know. This existential crisis is a regular visitor to my awareness for I am definitely in touch with my internal rumblings. Dealing with it has not been easy since those who I could be of assistance to are not living where I live. However, with the creation of these video conferencing tools and this kind of discussion forum, I find this anxiety has seriously abated.

Some topics make me think harder and longer than others. Some of these questions or some of the needs that others express make me think for days. This is compatible with my

personality. I am a researcher of the truth and I do not mind digging, excavating, and examining any artifact or concept to find it.

## **Bhagavad-gita**

by LvU » Fri Nov 25, 2005 9:40 am

in Bhagavad-Gita is said that soul is eternal, it cant die or can't birth i don't understand so this should mean, that in our world is exact numbers of people  
but i think u should agree that numbers of people in the world are growing really fast i hope u understood my question if not tell me i will try to say it in other words  
Created by Love and powered By God

the one who speaks, doesn't know...the one who knows, doesn't speak

by Hari » Sat Nov 26, 2005 10:36 pm

Obviously there is not an exact number of people. Since the population is growing there are obviously more people all the time. Since the Bhagavad Gita is a book that makes sense, it follows that you have made an inference that is not correct.

All the living beings are eternal as all spirit is eternal. Living beings can be in any kind of form and can transfer from any part of the creation to take birth as humans on earth.

Top

by LvU » Sun Nov 27, 2005 10:02 am

humans are replacing, trees, animals etc.

now all this makes sense

THANK YOU

## **Some topics**

by Gaura » Fri Sep 09, 2005 10:50 am

It seems people come to this world to have a growth. And that growth is connected mostly with the interpersonal relationships and overcoming some obstacles on their path. What if man goes on the path of understanding his self (by one of the path, like yoga, meditation and so on). What for then he has come to this world. It seems completely another kind of path then ordinary people do in this world.

And from this the main question is coming what is the reason of our growth. Who we are and why it should be so hard to grow. I have heard an answer that we wanted to forget ourselves and our relationships for when we do find them again it would be SO ENLIVENING. But I have doubt, why if one really want to quit this game something is against that and keeping one in the dream state. For what, for that "GREAT ENLIVENING"? That is strange kind of attitude at list to the poor soul.(Joke)

-----

Then the other question is coming to my mind, which I think interesting and I'm thinking about it now. The oneness. As you have said in one of the lecture, Lord Chaitanya said about oneness and difference. And you said that we somehow get attached to deference and forgot the oneness.

It is said there was a God. And he separated his self to many others to have association. And that separation is forever, from that point. If one ask about the dilemmas connected with that he immediately get answer it's too hi to understand, it's not so important and so on. That means we have to blindly belief in that.

It's seems scientists say the same - it's not important just keep on action with life. The only difference that scientists say we are researching that and religion say that is the fact.

But the oneness is also impossible to understand, but steel it's easier to accept (for me at list for this moment).

Sorry for making a soup of issues, but all of them is interesting for me. You can chose what issue you like. It's very interesting to know your opinion for them.

by Hari » Sat Nov 26, 2005 11:05 pm

This is more of a question than a topic, so I can attempt to answer.

I do agree that learning the art of peaceful evolution together with others in interpersonal relationships is a significant and powerful evolutionary tool. Those who choose to accept a solitary path, such as yogis or meditators who live apart from the crowds of people, are also using that tool by learning the art of detachment from the difficulties of interpersonal relationships. Detaching from a difficult situation deepens one's understanding and clarifies exactly which aspects of these relationships need to be addressed and corrected.

Such yogis, after a life of discipline, might, or may even have to, return to a life where their achievements in these disciplines are tested in their daily actions within a social environment of some kind or another. Who knows how many of us who are entangled in this world of day to day reality were previously engaged in solitary spiritual endeavors? Amongst our group, I suspect there were quite a few. This lifetime or these lifetimes of strict discipline were good for us and had a place within our evolutionary process. It is not that solitude worked against our goal; rather, it supported it over the longer run. This is how I see it.

As far as the second part of the question, I ask you this. Would one cell in your body consciously wish to die off and become detached from the rest of the body? It is unlikely as the existence of the cell is dependent on the body. The nature of that cell is intimately linked to the body and therefore the cell and the body are one unit. Because they are one unit it is impossible for a part of the unit to have a separate desire since the desire is the unit's desire and not a part of the unit.

In other words, we are part of the greater existence, the greater consciousness. Our energy of life is part of life and cannot be separated from it. We are alive and will always be so. We exist and can do nothing else than exist. All spirit shares the connection to the whole spirit and cannot exist without that connection. Certainly we can create illusions of separation, but in reality it does not exist. This is the reason why we are not able to 'quit' existence, as many have tried to do. We cannot quit what we are since that is all we can be. Therefore, when we insist on quitting, due to some trauma or disappointment that leads us down the path of fear of

love of ourselves or others, we must be placed, or we must place ourselves, in an alternative reality such as the dream state you have suggested.

Within this alternative reality, we attempt to ignore the reality we left. Since there are others with the same problem, we are not alone. Groups of people are expert at creating social conditions that reflect their personal interests. So we call this very large group of deflected souls as that special group known as mankind and declare ourselves to be situated just as we should be. Since there are a lot of us, we believe it.

Finding out it is not so is a great shock, therefore no one finds this out until they seek the solution. When the solution is sought and found, they are very happy for they have overcome the intense inertia of a very large group of dreaming souls and contacted the essence.

This is not done by someone to you, you do it to yourself. Since it is your desire, facility is made to assist you.

by Gaura » Sun Nov 27, 2005 12:37 am

Thank you for as usually very nice explanation.

It's interesting, that question I made a few months ago. And now when I read it I think in my now days understanding I wouldn't ask that question. Now I more understand the ones of energy around us and I can feel some growth which took place even in these few months. As I understood from my experience it's not that one can understand and that's it, he is there with wings. I think we gradually understand something and sometimes that understanding is gone and sometimes it's becoming very strong. And by the time as I can see it remains a bit longer and longer.

I think for me it's very helpful trying to be always in reality, some understanding suddenly arises and gradually remains. I think my question connected with the desire to not get born in this world, is coming from ignorance, because when one sees that we are in IT, that there is no difference in energies and one can learn to derive the nectar even in this world then what is the difference? So I'm full of eagerness to move forward in understanding and more awareness.

## **Inside burning thoughts**

by Gaura » Sat Aug 13, 2005 6:27 pm

I have a kind of a question which I want to express for already half a year but can't make it in a way of a question. It's something deeply inside about what I know and don't know. So I'll try to explain it.

What we do in between the life states? Who we are then?

It seems we are there not in our original state. Though you have said during today's lecture that there we have more clear consciousness than here, but I think it's not the absolute state of our clear consciousness yet.

I consider the idea of "what happening here is like a dream about our separation from the existence", is closer to my nowadays understanding. So there, it seems to me also another state of this dream in a more subtle way. It seems to me that who wants to participate in all this dream further, goes there (make some plan), come here to gradually come out of the dreaming state we are in. But if someone wants to really understand and come in contact with his self

and reality, what for does he need to go there again? Is it not possible to get full realization in this life?

And my thoughts go deeper and deeper but I think I was able to give, in short and to some extent what is inside slowly burning me for several month.

by Hari » Mon Aug 15, 2005 9:00 pm

What we do in between the life states? Who we are then?

We are us, without a doubt. The question is: Which state of our evolution are we in? We are the us that is developing without the extra weight of a physical body which is entangled within the web of physical reality. We are not just mind for we are complete with essence and conscious awareness. Even better, we are in a place where we have access to all the events of our life and persons who help us understand what we are, what we were, and why. Our main business is to come to terms with what happened in the last life, how that manifested in the context of our development through many lifetimes, how we transform when we include the physical within our realm of awareness and how we deal with situations that are out of our direct control. When we accept responsibility for what we were, we then can start the process of becoming the next better manifestation in our grand vision of ourselves. We are aware of our idealism in all its glory and we know what we need to do to manifest it. However, due to this idealism we often jump into situations which we are confident to overcome when we are beyond the physical limitations, but which tend to overwhelm us when they actually manifest. For example, we eagerly accept a life as a deformed person for we feel we must do this to learn not to harm others, but the burden can be so difficult to bear we might create more problems than solutions. Therefore our idealism is not the product of complete experience or awareness of our limitations in the physical realm. From this point of view you can say we are not fully aware and advanced. This is all part of the evolutionary process and to be expected. This is why we must go on in our endeavors through these lives.

It's seems we are there not in our original state. Though you have said during today's lecture that there we have more clear consciousness then here, but I think it's not the absolute state of our clear consciousness yet.

We are not interested to go to our original state as returning to that state was not our purpose when we engaged in this play in the physical realm. We wanted to expand our experience and the Divine wished to expand its experience within our spiritual space as this essence wanted to be more. The idea that we are here as a punishment is derived from human conceptions (such as Adam and Eve) and do not reflect the love of the Divine. Our of the desire to expand our awareness and thus manifest as a significant part of the Divine Whole, we accepted a handicap, that is, the physical realm, and are building our essence muscles to expand into experiences that we can relish in a new way. Clarity is not an end, it is a means, or rather, it becomes a constant part of the consciousness when one is in an advanced state of spiritual discovery.

I cannot relate to the word absolute so I will not touch that in my reply. Do you think there is an end somewhere? I do not, but I do think there are realms within which experiences take on a higher quality of love and the interactions are deeper and more intense.

I consider the idea of "what happening here is like a dream about our separation from the existence", is closer to my nowadays understanding. So there, it seems to me also another state of this dream in a more subtle way. It seems to me that who wants to participate in all this dream further, goes there (make some plan), come here to gradually come out of the dreaming state we are in. But if someone wants to really understand and come in contact with his self and reality, what for does he need to go there again? Is it not possible to get full realization in this life?

Dreaming is an important and required part of wakeful consciousness for without it there can be no healthy wakened state. A dream is a reality, but in a form that is different from the

wakened state. I will take your words to refer to the fact that our state of consciousness here is different from the in-between lives state which is different from the state when one has evolved to a more sophisticated realm of conscious awareness. This is all true. One can also certainly get into any state of awareness in this life if one practices to learn how to enter any realm one desires. Those who move from state to state know the feeling when their remembrance of their consciousness state in another realm fades into the category of a dream when returning to the physical plane. That does not mean we dreamed these other states; rather, it refers to our memory. I know that while we are elsewhere it is very real and very powerful, yet often hard to believe when we return. I try to remember that each place is as real and as important as the next, but the way these places impact me is dependent on the state of my consciousness when I am there.

by Gaura » Tue Aug 16, 2005 4:32 pm

Thank you for very inspiring answer.

Actually this topic is very interesting to me and I would like to make some more questions in this topic after digesting and thinking about all this.

by Janus » Mon Aug 29, 2005 7:04 pm

The question is: Which state of our evolution are we in? We are the us that is developing without the extra weight of a physical body which is entangled within the web of physical reality. We are not just mind for we are complete with essence and conscious awareness. Even better, we are in a place where we have access to all the events of our life and persons who help us understand what we are, what we were, and why. Our main business is to come to terms with what happened in the last life, how that manifested in the context of our development through many lifetimes, how we transform when we include the physical within our realm of awareness and how we deal with situations that are out of our direct control. When we accept responsibility for what we were, we then can start the process of becoming the next better manifestation in our grand vision of ourselves. We are aware of our idealism in all its glory and we know what we need to do to manifest it. However, due to this idealism we often jump into situations which we are confident to overcome when we are beyond the physical limitations, but which tend to overwhelm us when they actually manifest. For example, we eagerly accept a life as a deformed person for we feel we must do this to learn not to harm others, but the burden can be so difficult to bear we might create more problems than solutions. Therefore our idealism is not the product of complete experience or awareness of our limitations in the physical realm. From this point of view you can say we are not fully aware and advanced. This is all part of the evolutionary process and to be expected. This is why we must go on in our endeavors through these lives.

Interesting and far preferable to having take birth compelled into some lower life form by our past misdeeds, but where do we see any evidence that human beings are evolving consciously, and are you speculating about all this or do you believe that you know this?  
Self realization begins at home

by Hari » Sat Sep 10, 2005 8:08 pm

There are some books that are written after long research about what happens between lives. The books of Michael Newton, *Destiny of Souls* and *Journey of Souls* illuminate this subject. In my own experience, I see how my evolution is taking place in this lifetime under circumstances and principles that cannot be accidental. I did some regression to see if I could understand this more, and indeed I did! Now I speak from my own experiences that clarify the vocabulary and methodology of Newton and Edgar Cayce. But, I do not claim to have all knowledge in this

field; neither that what I know is common to each and every person in each and every situation. I answered as best I could the question asked.

by Janus » Mon Nov 07, 2005 1:20 am

*Hari wrote:*

*There are some books that are written after long research about what happens between lives. The books of Michael Newton, *Destiny of Souls* and *Journey of Souls* illuminate this subject. In my own experience, I see how my evolution is taking place in this lifetime under circumstances and principles that cannot be accidental. I did some regression to see if I could understand this more, and indeed I did! Now I speak from my own experiences that clarify the vocabulary and methodology of Newton and Edgar Cayce. But, I do not claim to have all knowledge in this field; neither that what I know is common to each and every person in each and every situation. I answered as best I could the question asked.*

Interesting. I am not that familiar with New Age techniques of past life regression and am wondering if they also derive, like our practice and the practices of mediaeval sorcery from vastly ancient sources.

Even so, by what you wrote they seem unacquainted with the mechanics of manifesting past atavisms in the present, as well as some other things. I am sorry but many New Age manifestations of marketing strategies appear to me to be cases of "a little knowledge is a dangerous thing" when they are not outright causes for hilarity. This past life regression that you speak of does not impress me as dangerous.

Concerning our present state of evolution, it appears that as a species that we still largely seem to function on imprinting and conditioning, and that in general we still share with other mammalian species an inability to criticize and examine our own neurological programs. Thus (and again in general); we still find ourselves interacting within a linguistic grid and behaving mechanically and predictably.

Returning to what you wrote, you mentioned deciding to take responsibility for our previous life in the interim between births. Do you know how that is accomplished or what happens if one decides not to take responsibility for what one has done in one's previous life?

Swami Tripurari (whom I generally appreciate) tried to get into the New Age market with his book *Ancient wisdom for Modern Ignorance*. I found it to be rather light reading and slightly offensive due to his posing and negative attitude, which struck me as even racist at times. "Jazz has its roots in the spiritual vacuum of voodoo rhythm."

You'd think that he'd have at least distinguished the rhythms of the rites of the "infernal" loa from those of the more politically correct Rada rites and stopped short of painting the whole religion as vacuous. It's like saying that the whole Krsna consciousness thing is vacuous because some of the Vedic mantras are meant for other purposes other than spiritual development, that they are addressed to the demigods.

The Petro rites with their off beat rhythms do not aim at transcendence after all, the corresponding vevers of the loa that they are directed to are not based upon the vectors of force uniting the four directions of space, but upon the lines between them. They do not call "unto the stars" but into the dark spaces between the stars.

One of the chief elements that the New Age past life regression stuff misses is the Peri-em-hry, or Coming Forth by Day, or "Today" rather, a technique of specific and controlled summoning of the dead.

"Some are born to sweet delight

Some are born to endless night."

"Now I a fourfold vision see,  
And a fourfold vision is given to me;  
Tis fourfold in my supreme delight  
And threefold in soft Beulah's night  
And twofold always. May God keep  
From single vision & Newton's sleep!  
Blake

## Healing. What does it mean?

by harsi » Mon Sep 12, 2005 11:46 pm

Dear Hari,

I was often thinking about this term healing. I know healing aims at restoring the wholeness of a person, by restoring the unity of mind, body and soul disrupted by disease. What does it mean to you, or what are "the diseases" you focus your attention on, by calling the website "Healing Broadcasting"?

Open up your mind and heart to new experiences of consciousness.

by Hari » Fri Sep 30, 2005 2:32 pm

The usual way in which disease is described in the alternative literature is 'dis-ease,' or an unnatural state of being where our energy is agitated and thus out of balance. The term 'ease' implies a state of relaxation and as you know this is a major part of the meditations we do.

There are many causes of dis-ease. Besides accidental changes in our state of health, genetic influences which dictate patterns within our physical plane, bacterial contaminations, or external situations out of our control or inflicted upon us by others, there are causes of dis-ease that are fully within our capacity to control such as what and how we eat, our habits and actions, the stress and anxiety we live with and create, and above all the belief systems within us which we hold dear and never question. I speak about these aspects of life that are within our control. As Andrew Weil, the famous author and doctor, has stated, "All healing is self-healing." If you think about it, the doctor, the medicine, and the techniques used to heal all depend on the capacity of the body to restore internal balance and fight off the diseased condition. Ultimately, all healing is self-healing. Harimedia is all about self-healing, but in an esoteric and sometimes mystical manner.

I try to give you the tools by which you can determine what is wrong in your energy and how to right it. By increasing your awareness of your own energy, the energy of others, and what input is given you from the universe, your sensitivity can develop. This heightened state allows you to know what to eat and when, what to do and what not, even to the point of knowing who can help you and who not. When one is freed from the many misconceptions that were presented as absolute yet had little contact with the self which led to 'dis-eased' conditions, one can deeply relax and in that state of freedom from distortion, experience one's naturally powerful and beautiful personal energy. When in full and conscious connection with our own energy one can contact higher beings and ultimately the Divinity.

If you want to know something specific, ask again.



## **Power protection of children.**

by Dhana-da » Fri Sep 23, 2005 3:46 pm

My friends have asked me to ask to you this question. Some of them have children. How much strong influence on the child renders a ceremony of a christening in orthodox church. It is necessary or not? I think angels always preserve the child, but tradition and parents can insist on this ceremony. If people in the childhood have not passed a ceremony, whether means that they are protected from harmful thin influences less?

Whether parents can call angelic protection or provide it for the child? How to protect the child from influence of world around at a level of energy? Not all probably can even define that someone has sent the child bad ideas...

by Hari » Fri Sep 30, 2005 2:40 pm

Religious people throughout time have been called upon to offer the service of protecting children and channeling blessings to them on behalf of those parents not qualified to do so. Those parents who can either do this themselves or know of others who can do it for them with techniques not within a religious tradition, do not need to accept a ritual when they can do it better elsewhere.

Rituals and traditions are meant to create an atmosphere within which positive energy is instilled within people, places and events. If they succeed in doing this, then fine. If not, they should be revised or discarded.

I do not think, neither is it my experience, that angels only listen to monks. Angels are not prejudiced and do not insist on some qualification on the part of those who request their services. They are happy to offer their help and assistance when asked. Some even do it without being asked.

If you have the qualification to know when bad energy is being imposed upon you or your children, then you can find a means to counter such influences. Doing it yourself is more practical than running off to the church each time something bad happens. If you do not have the qualification and want to get it, then do so. If you are happy with the way the monks render service for the children, then continue.

## **How to combine advanced sensitivity with real life?**

by zulfiya » Thu Aug 25, 2005 12:13 pm

Hello, Dear Hari! I have get an access to Internet and eventually I can to associate with You. Let me thank You heartily for all You have done for me leaving ISKCON. Also I want to thank You for Saturday's broadcasting. Earlier I could not to attend them, but when I had managed to do it, their topics wonderfully have coincided with my inner needs at that moment. And You have been revealing what I touched inside by intuition. This have inspired me and caused influx of life power. Thank You for it.

I very seldom ask You at broadcasting, trying to bother You less and trying to find answers by myself. It helps me to grow faster and opens new horizons and limits, although I have to work hard for it. But the result is worthy of it. And now there is the same situation. It appeared long ago and it repeats again and again. I would like to ask You help me if You do not mind, for it bothers me now and touches my health. Here the situation.

I try to make my sensitivity subtler. My drawing and love to the nature helped it to some degree. But at the same time I have found that now I feel subtler not only beautiful and harmonious things, but also rough and disharmonious ones. The diapason is very wide: from smoking and using a bad language people, selling meat's products, loud and fuming trucks till negative attitude to me, and even disharmonious things and sounds. And all these things physically affect me, in other words after my negative mental appraisal of these things, these energies go through me. What can I do? By nature I am very sensitive and emotional (I am an earth-fire), and it is very hard for me not to react on these things.

by Hari » Sat Sep 10, 2005 8:28 pm

Your "problematic" situation is normal. One has to pay a price for awareness. Remember, "It is folly to be wise for ignorance is bliss." Those who are not aware may be invulnerable to many aspects of modern life and thus we might think they suffer less, always have something they can eat, and can be anywhere at any time. Perhaps that is true to some extent, but when you examine it, they have the same quantity of problems, or perhaps more, than the sensitive souls.

For example, those who smoke, eat meat, and enjoy anything and everything are for the short term having a great time, but in the long term, and sometimes not even such a long term as they hope, they have to deal with the effects of gradually killing themselves. As my Uncle Ang so aptly put it, "If I knew I was going to live so long, I would have taken better care of myself!" Amen.

Awareness has its benefits, without a doubt, and those who are aware become aware because they thrive in this state. Once they are aware, they have a hard time to make themselves dull. But, it has its drawbacks, as you have mentioned, and there is little one can do with the world the way it is besides accepting it. Fighting the world all the time as bad and contaminating is an effort and it weakens awareness. Constant attention to the negative causes one to tune to these negative things, even if one does not wish to do so. After all, those who are sensitive are expert at tuning to anything they want. By concentrating on the negative, you tune to it and are gradually affected by it which causes a loss in awareness.

Better to stop fighting and simply be detached from the surroundings. Be in the world but not of it, for it does its own thing while we move through it on our own wavelength with our own manner and purpose. This detachment from the world while living in it is an art, but it can be achieved when one stops fighting with outside influences by being confident of oneself and one's integrity as an aware and sensitive soul.

But, I too personally try to avoid exhaust fumes from vehicles and tobacco, loud noises, insane situations and all of these negative energies as much as I can. I move as far as I can in saner circles. Sometimes I have no choice, so I simply do what I have to for as long as I have to and move on.

## **Faith and Religion**

by Gaura » Sat Jun 18, 2005 2:08 pm

Dear Hari.

Today I have a discussion about the faith and religion. And I would like to know your opinion about this topic.

I think that faith kills once aspiration to research the truth by his self and force one to remain in sleep. One who is full of faith is a dead men in that sense. This faith bounds ones hand and makes people faiths slave and from another hand it gives a freedom for man to be not responsible for his own life. Why research our way to the truth if everything already there: heaven, hell, demigods, Gods, gurus... All the path is well known from the time immemorial. So one have to blindly(mechanically) follow this path(like a train on rails) and he will be granted all the promised things. Sometimes this goes deep into ones subconsciousness and one even don't ask about this things.

It seems that religion in the beginning frightens people and then shows the exit from that "HELL, demons...". What if there was not fifth canto of Srimad Bhagavatam, or Dantes hell then would people blindly believe in 33 million demigods, or something they didn't saw or fill? Then how could all that religious manipulate poor people?

What if all the HELL is concocted and the real hell is here, when one feels that he is separate from all around world and is not feeling oneness of everything. And after being cured from all that stereotypes one can finally freely breathe without any harassment and really start to research the truth,by making conscious effort.

It seem the MAIN THING is to have VERY HUGE EAGERNESS to find out the truth. Only this differs one from all around people who live their life in sleep (whether having faith or being atheist).

When I'm concentrating on "here and now" I feel very safe. It's seems that all the "concocted things" or something which are not my realization are disappeared in a moment. There is no place for them in that moment (in now). If there is all these religious things then all these can come and I would believe otherwise way should I?

Sorry for me being very radical, but I tried to be very honest with my thoughts.

by Hari » Mon Jun 20, 2005 6:26 pm

I have removed the little discussion that followed this question as it was confusing my capacity to post a reply. Harsi, you can post after my reply in whatever way you want.

Dear Gaura,

I really respect your honesty of expression. Thank you for it. Seekers of the truth do not feel offended by others expressions when these expressions manifest from their heart. The sincerity of one who has contacted his or her being is exquisite and always welcome. This does not mean it is always easy to speak with them for this sincerity comes with a great intensity that stirs up deep emotions in others. I think this is good. I am not sure all can handle it, but I am sure it would be good for them to try.

It seem the MAIN THING is to have VERY HUGE EAGERNESS to find out the truth. Only this differs one from all around people who live their life in sleep (whether having faith or being atheist).

I agree with this. There is a substantial difference between what we believe to be truth and what we know to be truth. A pitfall appears when we so much wish to believe in something that we accept it as the truth by losing sight of the fact that we originally simply believed it to be true.

For example, I have a spiritual wish to advance in my spiritual life. I come upon some philosophy that makes me feel good. I spend some time listening and reading. After a while I accept it and commit myself to believe it, for it is inherent in religion that those who are advanced fully believe. I accept this and believe it because I wish to. It makes me feel right. It makes sense to me at the time and answers most of the questions I had in my life. It has been echoed through time by many others in different ways. Everyone around me accepts it and reinforces my belief. I run with the group and feel secure in the group for the group is a good source of support. Finally my questions are answered and I feel safe. I am relieved. "Pilgrim, your search is over." I rest my weary feet. Future challenges are averted. My path is clear. I will sail home.

Not so simple, as many find later on. Belief in something is quite different than experiencing it with one's inner being. One can talk oneself into thinking that this firm belief is the key to the experience, but generally it is not. When one realizes that the belief is not the same as the experience, one then questions oneself and one's personal capacity to experience the promised experiences for one has accepted the belief so deeply that it becomes axiomatic and therefore sacrosanct. One cannot think the fault in one's lack of experience lies in what one believes. One concludes that the obvious source of the fault is oneself. This leads to self-condemnation for not being good enough to get the realization which was promised by the belief. This leads to stagnation, denial, pain, struggle, intense activity, a lot of 'mea culpa,' and so on. In some few it leads to an intensification of the effort to get the experience that is promised. Some drop away from the path and lament. Some languish in lamentation while still officially on the path. Oh, you get the picture!

I am not stating categorically that just because you believe something to be true it is not! Neither am I saying that just because you accept a package of beliefs that this therefore invalidates all of them. There is much more to religion nowadays than philosophy or prayer. There are expectations, rules and regulations, disciplines, economic responsibilities, works to be done, and so on, all of which are not specifically related to the beliefs but which package the beliefs into an institution. Problems occur when these packaged beliefs start to contradict the 'core' beliefs which make the package attractive.

And yet, there is a good possibility that some of these core beliefs are also just beliefs. It is also possible that they are distorted visions of reality or at least of any reality available for us to experience. Because this possibility exists, a seeker of the truth needs a bit of freedom to determine at all times if the Promised Land is more than just a promise.

Considering that believing in something to be the truth and having experience of a very deep and fundamental spiritual contact, (which I suppose we would call a "truth" which in this case refers to it being of the higher essence we have been seeking) are decidedly different, the question arises, "How to avoid being captured by belief if this diminishes our capacity to live that truth as the essence of our souls?" I shall answer your question as if it were phrased in this manner for I feel this is the essence of the topic.

The key is, as you said, a very huge eagerness (without the screaming, yet relevant capitals!) to live one's own truth. This does not mean that one's own truth is different from "the truth" and therefore somehow less relevant. This means that truth, whatever that means to you, is intricately bound to what you are, for your experience of it is only as valuable as your capacity to appreciate it. Even if there is an absolute truth, and I am not trying to deny its existence here, I can only accept or taste that part of it which relates to me for I am the one who experiences. Your truth or your experiences are fine for you, but they do not necessarily relate to me unless you have the mystic capacity to share your experiences with me to the degree that they become my experiences. I have to find my experience for this experience is the

realization so often spoken about in the religious literatures. A belief is a kind of experience and can also be quite relevant in certain circumstances. Belief can be closely related to faith and the flush that faith can give you when you sincerely, earnestly, and powerfully believe. Picture the faithful dancing in the chapel and proclaiming, "I believe! I have seen!" I do not say this lightly or disdainfully as is often done by those who profess a different kind of faith; rather, I am saying that their experience is a product of their strong and fervent belief, not necessarily of the truth they have experienced. For many, this experience of the manifestation of the miracles attainable through their strong faith is all the experience they need, and this is a magnificent experience in itself. God can work many wonders in many ways. Since people are very attracted to their beliefs, God can enter into their lives as a powerful confirmation of their faith.

But to turn these experiences or beliefs into an absolute, unchangeable and intolerant manifestation of what is right, what is godly, and what is the best thing for everyone else, is a twist which distorts the purpose of the mercy granted them. Here is where things get sticky.

Many of us in these forums have seen these twists in action and have been on the wrong side of the distortions. Seeing these manifestations of religious fervor from the other side of the fence has been a real eye-opener. Therefore we declare our freedom from belief. We state clearly and unequivocally, "We shall remain always seekers of the truth. We shall examine all things from every possible angle available to us. We shall never allow beliefs to limit our evolution; neither shall we allow them to limit our actions if these limitations prevent us from useful and growth-giving experiences. We shall not follow anyone or anything, for we respect our own intelligence and our capacity to decide for ourselves what is best for us. Yet we shall hear what all have to offer, especially those who assist us in our research. We shall live in the present, not the past, for life only exists in the present. We shall follow our hearts, yet are ready to accept change, transformation, and challenge, especially when it comes through our realization of how our accepted value structures, thought or emotional patterns have limited us. We are always ready to right wrongs, be kind and considerate, and to politely, yet firmly, deny attempts to place us within other's definitions or requirements. We stand on our own two feet, on the ground, reaching to the heavens and ready to accept ourselves, the world, and our pathways as they are. We simply wish to know what is, not what we wish it to be, think it should be, or what others say it should be or is. Yet, we shall always work to make life better for ourselves and all others by being ready to render service to them as we can and as they require. We therefore wish to be of service; not to be servants."

by Gaura » Tue Jun 21, 2005 4:55 pm

Thank you. You have wonderfully understood my point and answered even to my inner questions.

Specially I like this part: "We state clearly and unequivocally:!" and I with two hands vote for that statement.

After reading your text several times I appreciate the depth of your thoughts, how you could see the issue from different point of view. Though your point of view is slightly differ, but we mean the same feelings and that prove that the truth is unlimited. It's impossible to pack the truth in the box and make label on it "Truth". It will not work if we try to force the truth be what we expect it be, or taught it to be - it's better being totally neutral try to understand it with all of our heart, with our essence.

by harsi » Sat Jun 25, 2005 11:57 pm

*[quote="Hari"]I have removed the little discussion that followed this question as it was confusing my capacity to post a reply. Harsi, you can post after my reply in whatever way you want.*

No problem dear Hari. I appreciate very much your thoughtful and liberal way of writing.

" We shall follow our hearts, yet are ready to accept change, transformation, and challenge, especially when it comes through our realization of how our accepted value structures, thought or emotional patterns have limited us. We are always ready to right wrongs, be kind and considerate, and to politely, yet firmly, deny attempts to place us within other's definitions or requirements. We stand on our own two feet, on the ground, reaching to the heavens and ready to accept ourselves, the world, and our pathways as they are. We simply wish to know what is, not what we wish it to be, think it should be, or what others say it should be or is. Yet, we shall always work to make life better for ourselves and all others by being ready to render service to them as we can and as they require. We therefore wish to be of service; not to be servants."

Yet on the other hand, for some of us, what you are writing sounds like the following explanation I came across this days in one magazine.

"One hour with a pretty girl goes like a minute, but a minute spent on a hot stove seems to last an hour."

Albert Einstein's explanation of relativity, which he has given to his secretary, so she can give it to reporters and other uninitiated persons or layman.

by Jiva » Tue Aug 23, 2005 5:19 am

I was astonished at minuteness and many-dimensionality of the answer, at revelation of many topics untouched in question. As usual after reading beautiful thoughts I felt that these thoughts were mine, but I never could formulate them so. Thank You!

Dear Hari, could You please to clarify (to evolve) You following statement:

*Hari wrote:*

*We therefore wish to be of service; not to be servants."*

by Hari » Tue Aug 23, 2005 12:07 pm

A servant is by definition one who serves others. The implication, often unstated but always present, is that one must do it. This reminds one of the servants of rich people, the serfs on the land of the nobles, or other exploitative situations.

When one devotee writes to another, "your humble servant," after writing them scathing words, something which is common, we can understand that they do not believe in the above definition of the term "servant." If I am your servant then I will do what you want, but as I am not your servant I will not really do that if what you want is different from what I am willing to give. In reality, I pick and choose how to serve you when I wish. This is quite different from a person who is employed or forced to be a servant for they have to do what the 'master' or employer wants when commanded or requested to do so.

Now none of us are comfortable with being commanded to do something as it is not in our personal culture or even a personal value. Sure someone can say they believe in this as it was stated somewhere or by someone and we must be followers and we must believe and we must

serve for this is our nature and so on. Those who feel like that will force themselves to do something they do not feel like doing, or even do something that they know inside to be wrong on the basis of their being a servant, a follower, and therefore the responsibility of what they do belongs to the master (see any and all texts by Auttareya who personifies this conception and strives to find peace within himself by demanding the master accept his responsibility ['his' can refer to either party as you wish] for he was a follower).

In reality we choose to serve when we feel it is right to do so according to a way we feel is correct and proper. When seen with a clear head, what we are really doing is being of service to others. When you wish to be of service it empowers you rather than disempowers you. You are choosing to be of service according to what you feel is right when you feel it is right according to the best of all involved. If you do not wish to do something you do not have to, neither can anyone force you. Afterwards you do not have to feel guilty for you are in control of what you do, not someone else. The good you do is yours for you chose to do it, not that it belongs to the one who ordered you. The bad you do is also yours for the same reason. This is responsible action.

Therefore, in some cases to be a servant means to attempt to avoid responsibility. Some people use being a servant as a means to avoid all personal responsibility. To be of service means to fully embrace personal responsibility.

One could go on and on about how exploitation often is justified by being a servant. Many have used this explanation in court, even in military courts. But I will let you figure that out for yourself.

When I decided not to be a servant as this put me in extreme conflict with my personal ideals and values, I transformed my way of thought to defining what I do as being of service for it always allowed me to keep my personal ideals and values as the underlying factors in how I would be of service to others.

by Oleg » Thu Aug 25, 2005 12:35 pm

Dear Hari!

Recently I have read in one book an interesting answer about distinction between religion and yoga. I have understood from it that yoga is a living process of searching the truth, and one has to believe only in one thing: the truth exists, that's why I search it. Beside of this the yoga does not need rituals and dogmas. Yogi, searching the truth, can change his outlook many times. And religion is an accepting the form of truth that this organization holds to. It bases on rituals and dogmas. It proves its truth to itself. The believer, being in religious organization, cannot to question its traditions, form of the truth. Otherwise he will have to leave this organization. As I have understood from Your answers, You call upon to leave the life of the religious man and become yogi.

With respect to all, Oleg.

## **To be offended by everybody**

by Jiva » Thu Aug 18, 2005 5:44 am

Hello!

There is a situation: I have communicated, lived happily and been friend with about 10 peoples for a long time. We simply have communicated and have been very glad with our friendship. Then the Fate moved me to the conditions of full isolation. I found myself far away amongst

aliens, and in very bad material conditions. I have been expected my friends to care about me, help me and show me they needed me. They had all possibilities. Nobody responded to me (except 1 person). I have spent several years in such conditions. Thus I have lost all my friends. Now I think that everybody abandoned me, and if the same situation repeats the others will abandon me the same way. I fell hurt by everybody in advance. I do not trust anyone. Now I think people only want a benefit from me, and if I can not give it to them they do not need me. I fell bad about it, because at a once I will have nothing to give except myself, and I will find myself alone. How to resolve it?

Re: To be offended by everybody

by Hari » Sat Aug 20, 2005 11:04 pm

Hmmm. It is very hard to say exactly what is going on and why. This makes it very hard to answer the question.

There could be many reasons why your friends have changed in their dealing with you. I will list a few:

- 1) They could feel that you left them. In other words, as you now feel abandoned, they could have felt the same way when you left.
- 2) Perhaps they felt that you wanted something from them after you left that they were not willing to give? In other words, maybe they felt that you have left them and therefore your requests are unreasonable and presume too much friendship from them?
- 3) Maybe they were not really the friends you thought they were?
- 4) Maybe your idea of what a friend is differs from their idea?
- 5) Maybe they have their own problems and have no capacity to assist you?

Or any of a wide variety of alternative possibilities?

I wonder why you are forcing yourself to be in that isolated situation. Is it really needed? If you value friendship and social interaction, perhaps you should consider relocating to a place where you can meet your economic needs and still have some contact with others? If you are really forced to be where you are, for example because you are taking care of old and invalid parents, then you will have to accept this austerity for some time. This too shall pass.

Perhaps this is an experience you have to go through to understand what it feels like to be abandoned by others? Does the idea that you might have abandoned others in this life or in previous lives resonate with you or in some obscure part of your memory?

Do you have the possibility to meet a hypnotherapist who can assist you to see into your past in relation to this feeling?

And why is it that you cannot connect to anyone where you presently live?

I do not understand why you left in the first place? Did you think things would be better in the new location?

The only way to resolve this situation is to look within and see why it affects you so deeply. The pain in your text is intense and I am struggling to make sense of it. Yet the solution seems to lie within you alone.



## Feedback you want, feedback you get

by pamu » Tue Aug 09, 2005 7:44 pm

Hello Hari!

Good that you asked for feedback about this forum. Here is what I have thought:

The overall tone in the forum is quite serious, maybe a little bit too serious, almost stiff upper lip-class. Why is it like that?

I have only a vague idea of who are participating on this forum. Mostly I see some texts, but cannot connect the writing with anybody. Maybe this is one of the reasons why this forum has a touch of stiff upper lip? It would be comforting and personal to be able to read something about the persons taking part in this forum, their origins, interests, inclinations, about them in general. Now they are just names.

Past sleeps but is not dead. I do not know if it is me or is it so that there is a tinge of uneasiness in you when you have to write about our common past in Iskcon. You mention that you want to be of service. It is quite clear that many of us who have left the Iskconian days behind us or are about to do so, have some catching up to do, and it seems that many of those, especially your old students, have things to clear up with you. If you have the strength and desire to do that, it would be a great to service to many of them.

Your answers are good, but boy oh boy are they sometimes loooong! You remind me of my father, who explains things so thoroughly that not one stone remains unturned. I notice myself sometimes skipping over lines. That is not a good sign.

I would also like to take this opportunity and thank you. If you would have left Iskcon quietly and just disappeared silently into the night, I would still be carrying a big monkey on my back. I am very glad that our relationship still exists and I am even more glad that now we can relate with each other as two human beings.

Re: Feedback you want, feedback you get

by Hari » Thu Aug 11, 2005 11:42 pm

*pamu wrote:*

*The overall tone in the forum is quite serious, maybe a little bit too serious, almost stiff upper lip-class. Why is it like that?*

Maybe it is hard for me to be my usual jovial and clever self in the written form or maybe I am simply afraid of being misquoted and misunderstood? Maybe because I am serious about the topics we are discussing? Or maybe not. Sometimes I have been sarcastic. See my replies to niab.

I have only a vague idea of who are participating on this forum. Mostly I see some texts, but cannot connect the writing with anybody. Maybe this is one of the reasons why this forum has a touch of stiff upper lip? It would be comforting and personal to be able to read something about the persons taking part in this forum, their origins, interests, inclinations, about them in general. Now they are just names.

Most of the participants enjoy their anonymity. It is their right to reveal themselves as they like. For example, who knows who Pamu is? I agree that knowing who I am speaking to is much more fun than speaking to unknown names, but those who want to reveal themselves can as they wish.

Past sleeps but is not dead. I do not know if it is me or is it so that there is a tinge of uneasiness in you when you have to write about our common past in Iskcon. You mention that you want to be of service. It is quite clear that many of us who have left the Iskconian days behind us or are about to do so, have some catching up to do, and it seems that many of those, especially your old students, have things to clear up with you. If you have the strength and desire to do that, it would be a great service to many of them.

It is very, very hard to write in a manner that appeals or interests all the viewers of this site. We have had a broad spectrum of personalities here and I do not see any purpose in attempting to answer all the doubts, confusion, challenges, or critiques that have been offered beyond the way I have done it. My answers are well thought out and exactly what I wish to write. I do not think the resolution to the lingering uncertainty many feel will come from me; rather it will come from each person when they become aware of what it is that stimulated their reactions to whatever it was they thought I did or do, or their own reactions to their experiences from their traumatic times. As far as I am concerned, to explain why I left and the factual circumstances around it would take a book to describe. I have seen that a short reply that touches upon sensitive issues is worse than avoiding the issue totally. For each person to describe how they were misunderstood, exploited, mishandled and so on, would fill this site with verbose ventilations which would not serve to heal, but would rather clutter and disperse the healing effect of open discussion of the underlying themes of our pain. After all, I am not as interested in resolving the traumas that were created in the old days from the perspective of the old days as much as I am in expanding our awareness to accommodate new perspectives borne from one's own experiential initiative and eagerness to move into the future without being a prisoner of the past. Further, I have already discussed many of these topics extensively in the lectures, many of which are unfortunately not posted on this site, and as the vast majority of the participants of this site have heard many of these talks, I do not wish to constantly return to subjects which are long gone from our active interest. For those who are stalled at certain past points, the good old days forum is a chance for them to get some relief. However, I am not eager to participate in that forum for I am tired of the subtle and not so subtle statements that I should continually bear the cross of other's pain. The best way to overcome victimization is to stop being a victim. But, I still respond to each text in the old days discussion with the same serious and steady tone as I feel is proper.

Your answers are good, but boy oh boy are they sometimes loooong! You remind me of my father, who explains things so thoroughly that not one stone remains unturned. I notice myself sometimes skipping over lines. That is not a good sign.

The questions are complex and demand complete replies. It would be disrespectful of me to rifle off trite and terse answers to questions which are deep, filled with uncertainty, indicating internal damage, or the curious desire to know more. I have no problem if you skip over lines or entire texts or even the whole site. I give what I think is right and you take what you want. I cannot function in any other manner. After all, each person will skip over different lines and if I listened to all of you my replies would be merely a '.'

I would also like to take this opportunity and thank you. If you would have left Iskcon quietly and just disappeared silently into the night, I would still be carrying a big monkey on my back. I am not sure what that monkey is. I like monkeys and always wanted to have the small, smooth ones as pets. However, wiser mates have discouraged me from that since they are mischievous and extremely sensitive. But thank you for your appreciation.

I am very glad that our relationship still exists and I am even more glad that now we can relate with each other as two human beings.

Strange, I always saw our relationship as human and very friendly. Maybe it was you who created the non-human idea? We do create the guru according to our expectations. Better to skip this illusory ideal and simply accept each person as they are.

Feedback you want, feedback you get

by pamu » Sat Aug 13, 2005 4:48 am

Oh Lord, don't let me be misunderstood, like it is said in that famous song, right? Wrong, me thinketh. Why don't we accept right from the beginning that this world is mostly just a long unbreakable line of misunderstandings and that only every once in a while we happen to really understand each other? It is just a fact of life. It does not even matter so much whether we write our thoughts or try to see each other face to face, sooner or later and most probably sooner the misunderstanding occurs. We spend a large chunk of our time trying to explain our real intentions to each other. A serious and regulated way of expression is one way to try to avoid that. That causes another problem, mainly the illusion that we have things somewhat under control. Soren Kierkegaard said that humour is Gods way to see the creation. It is so complex and full of contradictions that there is no other way. Laugh, yes, but not in a mean way. I guess sarcasm is slightly mean spirited?

Anonymity has its strengths and I suppose many prefer that, at least it looks like that when I browse through the list of members. Many do not tell even where they are from. I would like to be known (understood?), maybe because I like the idea of having friends and a commune where I know the others too. Now this is like a spiritual AA.

I do understand and mostly also accept what you said about you not being so eager to dwell in the Isckonian days. Healing is very important. But so is ventilating. Maybe ventilating has to be there before one can even consider healing? In my case it was like that. How to facilitate that on this forum I do not know.

Yes, we were always friendly and it was nice. Hell, you were the reason I joined and stayed for so long, but how could I not avoid awe and reverence? That was what we were devoutly singing every day. There was so much projection floating in the air, no wonder the monkey got stuck in my back. Poor ape thought that there was that we were probably in a marketplace and he could have some bananas. Ok, now I must splash and dash with a cup of coffee and out I go with my mtb. Cheerio.

by Hari » Mon Aug 15, 2005 8:31 pm

Nicely put. I understand this and appreciate the way you said it. I hope that I can put this understanding into action since misunderstanding still irks me. Can't help that. Perhaps I am a hopeless idealist? Wouldn't surprise me...

by alexey » Fri Aug 19, 2005 5:47 am

Dear Hari!

I would like to say about Your lectures, writings. There is a one (not the ONLY one ) interesting moment. Practically everybody wants to go easy way. And what does give us an easy solution? The FORMULA. I have noticed that when I have been hearing Your lectures, have been reading Your writings, subconsciously I have been seeking for some formula. But my mind find nothing to catch on! There is no "you should do" in Your lectures. And you start to feel freedom you have. At first it is frightening. Because freedom means responsibility. But than you feel some bliss inside. Freedom means you can consciously make steps in evolution. And these steps are mine! Freedom means searching. And searching leads to awakening.

P.S. The absence of expectations and demands really attracts!

## **Angels at lecture 16 jul 2005**

by Mihail » Sun Jul 17, 2005 10:18 pm

The most interesting was the angels, of course. I probably saw one angel hand -- it was VERY wide. Some seconds after that one or two other angels also appeared to me, and may be much more, but I can not mention details.

Could you make something like that again, at the next lecture? Could you make some "programmed" action, something like parents make for the child -- i.e. to see their hands, and may be legs, heads and so on AND NOT TO LET ME DEAL BY MYSELF? This is because I lost contact when you paused your speech. Although it may be useful to ask them for something, it is very interesting and exciting to see them or to perceive them in other ways.

by Hari » Fri Jul 22, 2005 9:07 pm

It is great that you were blessed to see the angels, even if only partially. Some people cannot see them as clearly as you report. However, they are there and can be seen by opening your awareness to them and accepting them as they are without trying to make them into some form that fulfills our idea of what they should be. In fact, that advice is good for all relationships!

The reason I did not guide anyone in detail through the angel meditation is that I was told not to. As you know, I do not consciously guide the meditations, but rather listen to the guidance given me on the spot and repeat it using my experience. When I was going to continue describing what to do in the meditation I was told to stop and leave everyone on their own. I am not sure why and now you say this caused you difficulty. Perhaps others found my leaving them on their own a good thing and perceived and communicated with the angels better that way? I cannot say since I did not get much feedback.

It is true that sometimes it is better to let people struggle a bit so they may discover their own personal and unique connection to the angels without me. If one depends on me then when one is alone one cannot connect without my guidance or the guidance of some meditation leader. Since connecting to these angels is so important for most of us at this point in time where many of us feel a pinching existential crisis, it is probably important that one learns to do it on one's own. If this was the reason they told me not to continue, then even were we to do the Angel contact meditation again you might again not get that detailed guidance since they might say the same thing again.

I did not do the meditation with the idea that you would have a direct vision of the angels. I did it so you would have a direct communication with the angels. I thought it more important to communicate with them than to see them. I think seeing comes automatically as a result of the communication whereas communication is not a direct result of seeing. Perhaps you should do the meditation again from the recording and not try to consciously see them but rather consciously communicate with them and maybe the result will be better for you?

We can continue this thread if you want or if others want.

by Mihail » Fri Aug 12, 2005 4:06 am

Probably, I remember (after reading your answer). Probably it would be very uncomfortable to me to tolerate full impression I started to receive. So \*I\* stopped this process. After that, I was very interested in seeing and forgot this...

So, you had been told the right thing. Again...

by Hari » Mon Aug 15, 2005 8:29 pm

This is also a testimonial to the kindness and concern of our guides and angels. They are not pushy unless there is a real good reason to be so.

