

Discovery of Truth



Swami Ramsukhdas

It is written in the scriptures that in the human body there is predominance of actions. When man has within him a desire to acquire something, then there is an inclination to act. An action is of two kinds – duty (kartavya) i.e. what ought to be done and “not duty” (akartavya) i.e. what ought not to be done. To do things with the spirit of selflessness is “duty” and to do things with the sentiments of selfishness is “not duty”. The root of doing what ought not to be done “akartavya” is desire for sense (contact born) pleasures. When desire for pleasures is wiped out “akartavya” is not done. When akartavya is not done, then duty is automatically performed. The spiritual discipline that happens naturally on its own is real and genuine, and that which one has to do (make and effort), it is false.

It is not a rule that a desire is always satiated. A desire may be or may not be satiated. Till today, all desires of even a single individual have not been satiated, nor can be satiated. If a desire arises but it does not get fulfilled, then one feels very sad! But the condition of man is such that he continues to feel sad by the non-fulfillment of his desires and at the same time he continues to have more desires! The end result is that neither all desires are satisfied, nor does the sorrow come to an end.

Therefore if a person wants to escape pain, the remedy is the renunciation of desires. Here a doubt may arise that why should we perform an action if we have no desires? The clarification to this is actions can be performed in order to reap its fruit and also to renounce the desire for its fruit. He who wants to be freed from the bondage of actions, he performs actions to renounce the desire for fruits.

Another doubt may arise that if we have no desire whatsoever then how will our life go on? Should we not need food-water etc for the sustenance of this life? The clarification here is that we have been taking food and water for many years, has our hunger and thirst been satisfied? The answer is “No”. So far our hunger and thirst has not been satiated! If we die without food and water, then are we not going to die by taking in food and water? One has to die regardless. As such our life is not dependent on fulfillment of desires. Did we receive mother’s milk at birth due to desiring? Life is not sustained by desire, but by destiny.

All desires are never satiated of any person. Some desires are satiated and others are not satiated – This is everyone’s experience. We should reflect upon whether satiety or non-fulfillment of a desire makes any difference in us (the self). Do we not remain (exist), if our desire is not satiated? Having reflected upon this point we realize that the self ever remains the same, whether a desire is satiated or not. We (the self) ever remain the same, whether the desire is satisfied or not satisfied or renounced. This fact provides us the strength that why should we suffer pain when it does not make a difference in us (the self) if our desire is satiated or not?

There are two options in front of a man – either he should satisfy all his desires or he should renounce them. He simply cannot fulfill all his desires, rather it is not in his control, therefore why the fear of leaving those desires? We don’t do what we can and we want to do what we can’t- it is because of this heedlessness that we are suffering pain.

For he who wants to renounce desires, first and the foremost it is most essential to accept the fact that “in this world, nothing is mine.” So long as we accept this body or any other thing as ours, till then it is difficult to renounce all desires entirely. On acceptance of the truth that in this infinite universes there is no such thing that is mine or for me, then desires will be naturally wiped out; because when there is nothing mine and for me, then what should we desire and why should we desire it? Desires are totally renounced, only when man has no relationship (I-ness, mine-ness) with the body. Therefore, total renunciation of desires means to die, while living (death of ego, dying of sense of I-ness and mine-ness). For example, when a man dies, he does not call anything as his own and wants nothing. He is unaffected by favorable-unfavorable, honor-dishonor, praise or blame, etc., similarly when desires are entirely renounced, man is unaffected by favorable and unfavorable influences, but he remains alive.

Therefore king Janaka in spite of having a physical body was called “Videha” (not bound by physical body). He who dies (suffers death) while living, he becomes immortal. Therefore if a man becomes totally free of desires while living, then while living he becomes immortal.

“yadaa sarve pramuchyate kaamaa yesya hredi shritaah |

Atha martyomrto bhavatyatra brahma samshrute ||

(Katho. 2/3/14; Vrhadaa 4/4/7)

“When all desires residing in an aspirant’s mind are rooted out, then the mortal man becomes immortal and here (in this human life) realizes Brahma (the Absolute).”

When the importance to the satiety of desires does not remain in the aspirant, then all actions are performed automatically through him as a labor of love (selfless spirit), and he is freed from the bondage of action. Being free from the desire for pleasure, all his evils are destroyed, because the root of all evil is desire for pleasure. An aspirant’s life should be free from evils. A life filled with sins cannot be that of an aspirant.

Now let us think over - In whom do the evils reside? There are only two entities in this world - Real and Unreal. Evils (flaws, sins) neither are in the Real (imperishable), nor in the Unreal (perishable). Flaws do not remain in the real because the real never ceases to be - “Nabhaavo vidhyate satah” (Gita 2/16). There is no shortage, nothing lacking in the real. Desires are born only when there is some shortage, something lacking. That which never ceases to be i.e. remains uniform, has no shortage (nothing lacking), therefore there cannot ever be any desire in it, it is not possible. And where there is no desire, there cannot be any flaw in it. Also there cannot be a flaw (defect) in the unreal, because the unreal has no existence - “Nasato vidhyate bhaavah” (Gita 2/16). Something that has no existence, how can there be any flaw in it (since it has no foundation).

The non existence of the unreal is the greatest flaw, in which no other flaw can come. In the relationship between the real and unreal also, one cannot consider there to be any flaws, because just as the relationship of light with the dark is impossible, similarly the relationship between the real and the unreal is impossible.

In the relationship between the real and the unreal also there can’t be any flaw, because as the relationship of the light with the dark is impossible, similarly the relationship between the real and the unreal is impossible. Then in whom do these flaws reside? Flaws are in him who has desires. The reason is that all flaws are born of desire - “Kaam esh...” (Gita 3/37). When man seeks pleasure through the acquisition of things, then greed arises. When a man desires pleasure through a person, then delusion is born. When he desires pleasure through a

particular state, then limitedness (segregation) is born. As in a seed exists a forest spreading for miles, similarly in one flaw, all the flaws are existent.

There is no flaw that does not involve all other flaws. Therefore as long as there is a single flaw, till then a sadhak must not be satisfied. There remains in every person partially evil and partially virtuous qualities. No one is evil in all ways, at all times and for everyone, because at the root he is part of Paramatma. (Ishvar ansh, jeev avinaashi, chetan, amal, sahad sukha raashi.” If a aspirant wants to be entirely free of all vices, then he must totally renounce the desire for contact born pleasures.

Now let us think over – Where does a desire abide? Several people hold that desire abides in the mind, but actually a desire does not abide in the mind, but it comes into (visits) the mind - **"prajahaati yadaa kaaman sarvaanpaarth manodataan (Gita 2/55).**

The mind is an instrument (inner-instrument). An instrument has no desire. Does a pen have desire to write? Does a car have desire to move? No. If we hold that a desire abides in the mind, then if the desire is not satiated, the mind should suffer pain. But if the desire is not satiated, the doer (Self) suffers pain. Therefore in fact the desire does not abide in instruments (mind, intellect), but abides in the doer. An instrument depends on the doer. But being entangled in the duality, in the form of pleasure and pain, caused by the satiety and insatiety of desires, a man's discriminating faculty does not function properly and so he holds the desire to be in the mind.

Now reflect upon – Who is a doer? If the mind has been a doer (agent), it would have not thought according to the determination of the intellect. It is everyone's experience that the mind renounces the desire to do a piece of work which the intellect determines not to do, and it desires to perform an action which the intellect determines to do. But the intellect is also not an independent agent, because the intellect is also an inner instrument. When a man derives pleasure out of the satiety of a desire, then his intellect decides to do that action. But the man who knows that the enjoyment of pleasures results in pain, renounces the pleasure derived out of the satiety of desire, then his intellect instead of being inclined towards pleasures, decides to renounce the desire for pleasure. An instrument depends upon the agent and is very beneficial in the performance (accomplishment) of an action.

The Self is also not an agent because if there had been doership in the self, the doership would have never been destroyed. Therefore the Lord has negated the sense of doership in the self. - **"sharirasthopi kaunteya ne karoti na lipyate"** (Gita 13/31) (The self though dwelling in the body, neither acts, nor is tainted). In fact he who is an experiencer/enjoyer (happy and sad) is the doer (agent)

Now think over, who is an experiencer / enjoyer? Neither the real nor the unreal can be an experiencer; because the real is devoid of experiencership; while in the unreal no experiencership is possible. When an aspirant discriminately totally renounces his affinity with the body, then there persists neither a doer, nor an enjoyer but only the divine entity remains. It proves that **no one is a doer or an enjoyer, but doership or enjoyership is merely assumed.** Here a point needs attention that when the self - is realized i.e. there is knowledge of Self-realization, then an aspirant has no relationship with his body and then he has also no relationship with the indweller in the body. The reason is that the divine entity (the self) , because of its affinity with the body is called indweller (sariri). When it's affinity with the body is renounced, the divine entity persists but it is not called "indweller" (sariri). In the divine entity all indwellers (sariris) become one. The divine entity is called Brahma (the Absolute), and to remain axiomatically established in that natural state, is salvation. Having attained salvation, he should (self) becomes identical in attributes with Brahma i.e. as Brahma is Truth-Knowledge (consciousness)-Bliss solidified, so does the self become Truth-Knowledge-Bliss absolute. **"idam gyaanamupaashritya mama saadharmyamaagataah"** (Gita 14/2) (Those having taken refuge in this wisdom become identical in attributes with Me.) Having become identical in attributes with God, the man (embodied soul) becomes free from the cycle of birth and death - **"sargepi nopajaayante pralaye na vyathanti cha"**- **"Tadaa yogamavaapyasyasi"** (Gita 2/53) and he become pure, enlightened, emancipated, young (free from old age), immortal and independent.

This is called attainment of Yoga (union with God).

Where there is Yoga (equanimity or union with God) there is no Bhoga (worldly enjoyment) and where there is Bhoga, there is no Yoga - this is a rule. But there is also a state when an aspirant becomes proud of Yoga or knowledge (wisdom) or devotion (love), and he holds that he is a Yogi or he is wise or he is a lover. The reason is that from time immemorial, the man has formed the habit of getting

proud of himself, when he establishes relation with anyone or with anything; as having acquired wealth, he declares "I am wealthy" etc. "I am a Yogi" - in fact this is Bhoga of Yoga because in it there is attachment to Yoga; in this case, with Yoga, there is mixture of egoism. 'I am Jnani" (wise)" - in fact this is Bhoga of Jnana because in it there is also attachment to knowledge (wisdom); in it with wisdom, there the egoistic notion is also mixed. When Bhoga is wiped out, then the aspirant does not remain either a Yogi or wise or a lover i.e. the individuality is totally wiped out. The reason is that he gets identified with Yoga, knowledge or love i.e he becomes Yoga personified, or knowledge personified or love personified, therefore he loses the sense of pride. **So long as individuality persists, there remains possibility of a downfall (ruin).**

Therefore he who is proud of Yoga, can sometimes also get entangled in Bhoga (mundane enjoyments or pleasures); he who is proud of knowledge can also sometimes get entangled in ignorance; he who is proud of liberation (salvation) can also sometimes get entangled in bondage; he who is proud of love (devotion) can also sometimes get entangled in attachment.

When an aspirant no longer has pride (bhoga) of Yoga, knowledge and devotion (love), then he is liberated. Even on having attained liberation, a subtle impression of ego persists of the discipline (opinion) which an aspirant prescribes. This is called "Abimaanashoonya Aham" i.e. ego free from pride. Just as roasted (parched) grain are of no use in farming, but are used as an eatable, similarly the ego free from pride, does not lead to birth and death but (because of the impression of one's opinion) causes differences of opinion with other philosophers.

It means that because of that subtle ego, a liberated soul gets satisfied with his opinion (discipline). So long as he is satisfied with his opinion (discipline) and recognizes and honors it only, there cannot be ideological unity with other philosophers. Spiritual practices are different, but Sadhan-tattva (spiritual discipline in essence) is one i.e. Karmayog, jnanayog, (discipline of action) and discipline of Knowledge) etc. – all combined constitute Sadhan-tattva. The opinion of a liberated soul is sadhan-tattva. But taking that sadhan-tattva as the aim, he becomes satisfied.

The soul is a part of God, therefore whatever opinion (spiritual discipline) an aspirant catches hold of i.e. insists on, that appears to be true to him. **Therefore an aspirant should follow his opinion but should not catch hold of it, i.e. should not insist on it. He should insist neither on knowledge nor on devotion. He should not regard his opinion as superior to other opinions but respect (value) other opinions equally.** According to the gospel of the Gita as the renunciation of the “mire of delusion” is necessary, so is the renunciation of the “confusion of mind by hearing conflicting spiritual doctrines” necessary (Gita 2/52-54), because both are stumbling blocks to the progress of an aspirant. Therefore so long as an aspirant perceives philosophical difference between his doctrine and others’ doctrines, and does not value them equally, he should not feel contented with his spiritual progress. Having ideological difference, he can have an access to Sadhan-tattva but he can’t attain the Supreme Goal (Salvation or God Realization). Having attained the Supreme Goal, he does not insist on any doctrine or opinion and all opinions appear alike to him -

The means to achieve an end are several, but the end is one and the same.

The founders or annotators of ideological doctrines don’t indulge in conflicts, but their followers do. The reason is that the followers have not attained a state of liberation, so they insist on their opinion, while the founders have already realized God (attained salvation). It is because of the difference in doctrines or opinions of the founders (annotators) that their followers have attachment to their doctrines (opinions) and aversion to the sects (doctrines of others). It is attachment and aversion which cause a very big stumbling block to the discovery of the truth. But being free from attachment and aversion, an aspirant discovers the truth that when the Real Entity (God) is one, then why are there differences in opinion? Therefore he is not content with salvation. In the discovery of the truth, he loses his own identity also and then only “Vasudeva Sarvam” i.e. “All is God” remains.

An aspirant that has the latent impression of devotion is not content with salvation. The relish of salvation becomes insipid to him and then he attains the Lord’s devotion. **Devotion is a means as well as, an end. - “Bhaktiyaa sajaatayaa bhaktaa” (Srimadbha 11/3/31).** In the discipline of Devotion, because the means (the spiritual discipline) and the end (aim) both are God, so

the insistence of the aspirant on his opinion is easily given up and Sadhya-bhakti (devotion as an end) i.e. every moment enhancing (ever increasing) devotion is automatically attained. **Having attained that love and devotion, “All is only God” – this entire – form of God is obviously realized and profound love for God is aroused.** When such a profound love is aroused, then there remains no insistence on a particular opinion, and all difference of opinions come to an end, and only one Entity remains. In salvation there is constant (integral) bliss, which in devotion there is infinite and enhancing bliss, which increases every moment. **Devotion (love) is the final fruit (aim) of all spiritual disciplines.** Every aspirant has to attain this goal by practicing his spiritual discipline. Therefore this human life is indeed meant for spiritual practice or for devotion (love) to God, because the human life has been bestowed upon us so that we may attain God; and only **attainment of loving devotion to God is the life achievement of human life.**

“Man” and an “aspirant” - both are synonyms. **He who is not an aspirant (sadhak), is in fact not a man.** He who is an aspirant (sadhak) is indeed a man. **A man’s main duty is – to accept the truth.** God exists – this is true; and the world does not exist – this is also true. To accept true as true is acceptance of the truth; and to accept the untrue as untrue, is also acceptance of the truth. To accept our relationship with the Supreme Being, with Whom we have a relation is acceptance of the truth and to not accept our relationship with the inert i.e. a thing or a person with whom we don’t have a relationship, is also acceptance of the truth. **At the root there is only one truth (reality) and that is that there is nothing else at all besides God in His entire form – “Vasudevah Sarvam” (All is God).**

From book “Sadhan, Sudha, Sindhu” in Hindi by Swami Ramsukhdasji

From book "Satya ki Khoj" in Hindi and "Discovery of Truth" in English by Swami Ramsukhdasji

You can also read in HINDI titled "Satya ki Khoj"

May 2010 @ <http://www.satcharcha.blogspot.com/>

