

March 13th, 1980 Questions and Answers After Yoga Sūtra Class with Bābā Hari Dāss Covering Pada II Sutras 40, 41, 42, and 43

Edit notes: The following was typed from notes handwritten at the time of the darśana. Q denotes a question. B indicates what Babaji wrote on his chalkboard, as read by the reader, and then as heard and noted by someone present. R is comments likely of the chalkboard reader. Comments in square brackets are generally those of the typist. Comments in parentheses are likely that of the reader. There was editing for format and IAST transliteration of Sanskrit terms.

SHAUCHAT SVANGA-JUGUPSA PARAIR ASAMSARGAH

Shauchat from purity

Svanga one's limbs

Jugupsa indifference =

Parair with others

Asamsargah non-contact

BC Sutra 40. From cleanliness [shauchat], there comes indifference toward one's own body and non-contact with others.

R: [repeats] From cleanliness [R: shauchat, the first Niyama], there comes indifference toward one's own body and non-contact with others. [cessation of contact]

BC: Purity is of two kinds: physical and mental. By keeping a body clean, the aspirant begins to see, in the course of time, that the body is filled with impurities. By the practices of shath karma [dhauti, neti, etc.], one sees how much mucus and waste products are accumulated by the body. It creates disgust in the mind for one's own body. The mind imagines the same impurities in others, perhaps even more, which stops the desire for physical contact with others. Gradually the indifference toward one's own body and non-physical contact with others develops non-attachment. This non-attachment purifies [the impurities of] the mind.

R: Restating the sutra [from HA]:

Vyasa: "From The Practice Of Purification, Aversion Towards One's Own Body Is Developed And Thus Aversion Extends To Contact With Other Bodies. 40.

"When aversion for his own body arises, the yogin practicing purification, perceives the faults of the body and loses his love for it. Moreover, a distaste develops for the company of others, because for one who has developed aversion for his own body finding that he cannot properly clean it even by ablution, etc., it is not possible to come into contact with the unclean body of another person."

Aranya's commentary: "Through practice of purification of one's own body, an aversion for the body and a distaste for contact with other bodies are developed. An animal expresses its love for another animal through imitation of eating by licking it. Similarly, men by kissing their children and in others ways imitate animals in their show of eating. Such expressions of animality in love are removed by the practices of purification. Love of a yogin is expressed through sentiments of friendliness, compassion, etc. which are free from sensuality."

Q: Babaji, is an attitude of reverence and awe of the complexity and wonder of the human machine a detriment to developing detachment to one's body?

R: [restates] Is a feeling of wonder and awe of the human body, seeing it as a miracle of God, is thinking that way about the human body an obstacle for sadhana? This sutra says an aversion will develop when shauchat is perfected, however, he has an attitude toward the human body that it's a wonderful thing.

B: It will cause attachment.

Q: Well, then, for a health practitioner, a physician, or whatever, who has studied about the body, the mechanism and the wonderful complexity, what would you recommend for someone like that who had to deal with bodies all the time and had a respect of the body and was trying to keep themselves non-attached in the mind?

B: This is for yogis.

R: We've got to keep reminding ourselves what the sutras are about, for whom they were written. Originally, Patanjali was writing these for one class of people only: monks. Male monks in India, sadhus. And that's a very specific class. So some of these rules are very hard and fast and impossible for Westerners and/or householders to follow.

Q: Still, the practitioner should take on the idea that it's a purification of the body, even if it's another person's.

R: That's a good way to see it. And then you can still do that, you can see it's an imperfection and we have to try to bring it up to some kind of equilibrium.

B: They also take full precaution of impurities.

R: You mean self-protection?

B: A doctor.

Q: Washing up.

BD: A related question, but for a yogi. Can a yogi through the depth-of meditation, can a yogi understand the imperfections and the irrelevance of the human body without going through the process of being disgusted with it?

B: Yes. It's one of the effects of Niyama.

MA: Babaji translated it as indifference and Aranya translates it as aversion.

R: Aha!

B: Jugupsa. It says aversion.

- Q: What about the attitude of seeing it like a temple? You know, some people see it as a temple of God. You know, without the body, you...we have to have the body in order to realize that [inaudible].
- R: Right. From the scriptures and other places it says this is the highest birth and it's God's temple, etc. What about this attitude?
- B: It's one of the ways of seeing it. When we are reading about shauchat, then we can't mix it with other things.
- BD: I see there's some confusion. From Patanjali's perspective, I see that aversion is necessary, but also I'm trying to remember that in perfecting all the Yamas and Niyamas, the other ones are perfected as well. Does that mean the results of them or processes? In other words, if one is perfected in Ishvara pranidhana, does one necessarily have to go through that aversion process of shauchat or would one just attain the result of it?
- B: Ishvara pranidhana is perfected by attaining the others.
- BD: Well, maybe that wasn't a good example, maybe svadyaya. If that was one's goal and one perfected that, then my understanding is that...and all the rest are perfected. I'm wondering does that mean in terms of the results, without necessarily the process which has to be gone through in order to perfect shauchat?
- R: - It seems like you're too concerned with the word aversion, that aversion is being mentioned. I think that's more a part of the process. If some- one's passed aversion, then they're not going to be averse, they'll be indifferent. But it's pointing to the same thing whether it's aversion or indifference.

Vyasa begins his commentary, "When aversion for his own body arises..." So there's an initial aversion. The yogi practices purification and he perceives the faults of his body. Then he develops direct knowledge of his own imperfection and later aversion, indifference, or whatever. He doesn't care about his body at that point. That's the heart of the issue.

- Q: Because physical impurity's already been established in that yogi. Then he has aversion towards having any contact with other human beings.
- R: But then he sees that he can't no matter what kinds of shath karma practices he does, no matter how much he cleans his body internally and externally with water, he still can't get it clean. So he says if I do all this and still I can't get my body clean, what about the bodies of others? And then that feeling of non-contact arises.
- B: In vairagi sadhus, some practice non-touching. The reason is to create that aversion.
- PW: Babaji, some people say the body's like an animal. And it seems it is. It has to sleep, it has to eat. And it seems like it's an animal independent of me. I watch and I see something going on. Like an animal.
- R: Well, biologically, we are animals.
- PW: More like an animal. And that body is like an animal and it has its own things to fulfill.
- R: Yeah.
- PW: And we're sitting in another body watching it and then controlling the animal.

B: Subtle body.
R: Subtle body watches, but runs the physical body. Right.
PW: ~ I was thinking, the mind body seems like another animal, too, the mind because it goes on its own, too.
B: It's a subtle animal.
PW: A subtler form?
B: Subtle body's the same as the physical body without the physical body.
PW: We're talking about mind body? :
R: Yeah.
PW: The thinking mind?
R: Yeah. That's the subtle body.
B: What is animal?
PW: The physical body. Like the animals. No con ... what is it ... no thinking faculty.
R: Animals think.
B: The mind is not animal.
PW: Okay.
B: If the gross body is animal, then the mind (which is a part of the subtle body) is not animal. We can make the mind into the animal trainer.
R: But regarding this sutra, there's a quote from the Gospel of Thomas which is a gnostic document discovered recently from upper Egypt. It was written in the first century A.D. and Jesus is quoted as saying something to this effect, "If the soul has come into existence because of the body, it's a great wonder. If the body has come into existence because of the soul, it's a wonder of wonders. But what I find truly amazing (this is a paraphrase) is that such great wealth has made its home in this great poverty." So it's another way of looking at the aversion of the body. Just that God has chosen this unclean thing to inhabit, but we don't have to hold that aversion. We just have to recognize it and work from there. Go from that place.

Any other questions on 407?

Q: There is a concept of a later sutra on perfection of the body. I just wondered does a yogi still have aversion to this body when it's perfected?
MA: [inaudible] perfection of the body.
R: Well, let's wait until we get there.
B: Then body consciousness will not be there.
BD: In order to get perfection of the body, you have to lose the idea that you're perfecting the body.
R: You lose body consciousness.
B: When you attain that perfection, there's no body consciousness.

- Q: It's been answered before but it's still difficult to understand, though, God would pick this thing, this person that's created by God and it has so much perfection, that the immensity of the perfection of the body is ignored.
- B: We see it that way. That the body is unclean, etc. is not for God.
- R: In other words, when we're thinking those thoughts we're not thinking, "This is God's temple."
- B: Those are two different practices.
- R: One is a part of Bhakti Yoga to think that everything is a part of God. I am also a part of God, I'm perfect in this harmony and my love for God and so forth. The other way is the way of non-attachment. The yogi is saying, "God may inhabit this thing, but I have no love for it. I'll work with the subtle essence rather than the gross part of it. I'll leave that and go beyond it because it's imperfect." ;

Of course, it's perfect. The body is perfect, except it's a perfect part of Prakriti. It's a perfect part of creation so if we're always dwelling on its perfection, then we'll come back with a nice body each time, and we won't break the cycle. We're talking about going against that perfection of the body and its functioning, to see it as a hindrance to enlightenment— liberation. It's not an obstacle for evolution. It's the perfect instrument for it.

- Q: I can see why a yogi wants to avoid contact as a method for detaching himself from sensuality and physical desire. It's harder for me to see why avoidance might be based on awareness of impurity as if it were catching, or contagious.
- R: Some is.
- Q: Because, ah, well, some of this would be hard for me to extrapolate in terms of general sense or awareness. Like when I contemplate shaking someone's hand, [inaudible alternative], it's hard for me to imagine not doing that because I've shaken a hand I'm catching a disease or my mucus runs dry [class laughs] because of a general discipline to avoid sensuality.
- B: How to avoid attachment. This is one of the methods.
- Q: What relation to attachments?
- R: Did you know that almost all disease are passed by the hands? Interesting side-point that some recent research has shown that almost everything's passed through the hands. Colds, flu;:, those kinds of viruses. These are ; moving breeding grounds of... [Class laughs.]
- BH: Isn't this sutra talking about what happens on perfection of this Niyama? It just happens [inaudible]. Isn't that what this is talking about rather than that this is a method we would practice that it's talking about?
- R: It's both, It's a method and it's also talking about what happens. It can be done as a method, but it's talking more about the result specifically in the sutra. When one is perfected, one has that cleanliness, shauchat, then an aversion automatically arises, or say indifference, if you don't like aversion.

- Q: So it'd be categorized the same as the Yamas. They're actually very high states of consciousness when you attain, say, total aversion to other bodies. To attain that is like perfection of the Yamas.
- R: It's perfection of Niyamas.
- B: It is actually non-attachment.
- R: When Babaji was doing his milk diet, he said that at one point he couldn't stand to be in the same room with other people because he could smell the grains coming from their bodies. So even that was an impurity for him at that point. So even being in the same room was contact with others. It didn't have to be a physical touching.
- B: The mind can see it that way.
- Q: Would the practice of this non-attachment be for one's body and for other's body, but would it also be for the body of the earth?
- R: It's a hard one to avoid. Can't wear anti-gravity shoes.
- R: I mean it literally. If you were to see a beautiful vista or the hills, would you feel the same aversion for the earth's body, for the mountains, for the nature?
- B: Then you are in paravairaga.
- R: You're beyond dispassion.
- B: Nothing affects you. Even the earth itself has no attraction. Even your own breath. That's when Samadhi becomes a matter of course.
- R: And you're so dispassionate that you don't even care to take your next breath. Take it or leave it.
- Q: We think of the emotions that we have and that other people have makes us the way we are, makes our personalities different. But actually the emotions we have are impurities in our bodies.
- B: When the body includes the mind.
- Q: So then the results are mental. So samskaras aren't necessarily related directly to body impurities. So it's simply additional.
- R: Vice versa.
- B: Samskaras are the cause.
- R: Of all our impurities. Samskaras themselves are impurities. Thoughts are impurities at the highest level.
- Q: We were talking about the animal condition of love. [inaudible] Is that transition of animal love a general and desirable one among yogi householders, married | couples?

- R: Aranya commented that kissing, physical kissing, was an imitation of eating behavior. Animals like to eat. So when they like another animal, they lick them which is an imitation of eating. He says humans also imitate that behavior. So we like someone; because we can't eat them, we kiss them. [Class laughs] He wants to know if that's a good thing for householders to develop, to change the physical showing of love to non-physical.
- Q: To lick.
- R: To lick. It's grabbing. Stop kissing and start licking. [Class howls.] Gradually stop licking. All right, Sutra 41.
- DN: Well, I have two questions. In the progress of non-attachment, when does the aversion change to one of acceptance? For instance, if someone reached out their hand, or if I reached out a hand to someone and someone withdrew their hand because they didn't want to touch because of an aversion, well, that would make me feel unfriendly. That would hurt my feelings. So if someone wanted to cultivate a yogic friendliness and someone reached out their hand, they might go ahead and take their hand out of an overall feeling of acceptance to show friendliness. And that to me would show a higher level of non-attachment.
- B: It's a whole cultural training. In India, it's easy to accept this because there's a general rule of non-touching.
- R: You don't go around touching people because of the caste society problems and so forth.
- Q: Namascar reflects this non-touching.
- R: Right. It's shown even in the way of greeting. It's done this way [he demonstrates] rather than for a grab,
- B: A group of people who are yogis are accepted as they are.
- R: Their practices are also accepted so people can accept, "Well, he doesn't touch. I won't be offended because he doesn't want to touch me." In this country, though, we've got that problem. If you don't want to touch somebody, they think you're on a strange mental...
- DN: I guess some of the other question would be, are some of the Yamas and Niyamas contradictory? For instance, if shauchat implies non-touching and then compassion, you see someone like Mother Theresa meet beggars and take people in her arms and she just gives them love. So maybe the perfection of different Yamas and Niyamas would be contradictory?
- B: That is Bhakti Yoga. Every being is a child of God.
- R: That's Bhakti Yoga, so matter what their affliction or lack of affliction.
- B: Ghandi did the same. But he also practiced Yama and Niyama. These are rules for strict sadhus.
- R: So, of course, in this society we're going to have to manipulate them a little bit without compromising too much. Some compromise is inevitable. First of all, because we're not sadhus and second because we're in this culture.
- B: Even all sadhus don't do the same.

R: There's variation even among the sadhus. : :

Q: I don't think it's the culture so much. I mean, in India they do touch. They have a lot of people there. They have to touch. [Class laughs.]

R: We're talking in a general sense, general frames of mind for the populace at large. In India, non-touching can be accepted and here it's not. And also sadhus are respected as a group.

Q: I mean you get touches, there's people around, there's going to be sex and there's going to be touching, no matter, you know...

R: We're talking about a specific thing here.

B: The whole of India is not a sadhu.

Q: Yeah, that's right, that's what I wanted to ... it's like a doctrine of enlightenment. As long as you live in the world, there's going to be a certain amount of touching. But as you take on that practice of enlightenment, you ... different degrees ... you -

R: That's why we're not talking about the whole world because we would never stop talking. There's always something to talk about. So we've got to stick to these things. :

Q: Right.

R: And then it'll be easier. :

KT: When we study the sutras we figure out we really can't do most of them. How can we ever expect to get any results?

R: So you're worried you're only going to get partial results from partial application of the principles.

B: These are one of the ways.

R: This is one way. The sutras.

B: Perfection in shauchat, cleanliness.

R: In this specific sutra.

B: Perfection in ahimsa, harmlessness. You can take any one path.

KT: So these sutras are a path in themselves, one sutra. So a person in the world studying the sutras as a practice, we just adapt them as much as we can to our lives?

R: That's all we can do. Either reject the whole thing out of hand as unworkable, or we have to compromise.

KT: But we can do each sutra as a path, one sutra?

B: Yes

R: If you have questions to ask, it's okay. No rush.

Q: In relation to [a previous] question, does the wonder and awe of nature, the embodiment of nature in the world, does that also relate to attachment of the body? Does that cause attachment? ;

R: Yeah, remember, go back to the first sutra in the chapter about attachment, explaining attachment in general. It's one of the kleshas, one of the big five. It's attraction. As long as you're attracted to no matter what it is you're attracted to, then it's an obstacle. If you're overly attracted, you can use that attraction as part of your sadhana, Bhakti Yoga. To see the beauty as part of God's beauty and so forth, go to God that way. But if you're attracted for any other reason, than to be closer to God, then you're just going to be trapped, according to the sutras.

Q: May I ask in regard to Dayanand's question? The population of the world still seems to be increasing which indicates regular contact between people. [Class laughs.] Among yogis, there would be less contact and therefore the yogis would not be reproducing themselves. [Class laughs.]

R: [He's] worried we're going to run out of yogis. [Class laughs.] That's a good point. Yogis, as a rule, aren't contacting each other and so we're not reproducing yogis. [Class laughs.] Yogis as a species don't reproduce. [Class laughs.] You think we might run out. [Class laughs.]

B: They're converted. They don't reproduce.

R: It's a conversion process.

Q: Was Darwin a yogi? [Class laughs.] I guess I better withdraw that.

R: Withdraw what?

Q: It seems very complicated. The whole trend of science today seems to accept the Darwinian principle of evolution, by survival of the fittest. I believe the yogis are fit to survive. I do think all of what's been said [inaudible] is quite opposite to Darwin's theory of evolution.

R: Well, it's just an extension. The yogi survives without his body. There's the difference. [Class laughs.]

Q: That's true.

R: All we can do is go on. Sutra 41.

Sutra 41. SATTVA-SHUDDHI-SAUMANASYA-EKAGRYA-INDRIYA-JAYATMA-DARSHANA-YOGYATVANT CHA.

Sattva-shuddhi purity of the chit, the mind

Saumanasya cheerful-mindedness

Ekagrya one-pointedness

Indrya-jaya control of the senses

Atma-darshana vision of the Atma

Yogyatvani fitness for

Cha and

BC: Sutra 41. By the purity of the chit [the mind], one acquires cheerfulness, one-pointedness, sense control and fitness for the vision of the Self.

The word sattva-shuddhi means purification of the chit or the mind. The chit is sattva, pure, because it is a consciousness. Senses are rajas because they identify with the world, and the body is tamas which is functionless without the mind and the senses. When the mind is purified, the result is:

R: The sutra restated [HA]:

"Purification Of The Mind, Agreeableness Of Feeling, Concentration And Ability For Self-Realization Are Acquired. 41."

Vyasa: "The yogin, who practices cleanliness gets purification of heart which leads to mental bliss, or spontaneous joy. From mental bliss develops one-pointedness which leads to subjugation of the senses. From subjugation of the senses, buddhi ['I-sense'] develops the power of realizing the Self. All these are attained by establishment in purification."

Aranya: "The evils of arrogance, pride, attachment, etc., being wholly removed, a sense of cleanliness of the mind arises and a spirit of aloofness from one's own body as well as from other bodies grows. This state, uncontaminated by the body-sense, is called internal purification. Purified mind uncontaminated by the body-sense develops a feeling of gladness or mental bliss and the body acquires a sattvic form of easiness. Without such a feeling of gladness, concentration of the mind is not possible. And without such one-pointedness of mind, it is not possible to realize the soul beyond the senses."

BH: [inaudible] When you were talking about different avenues that could be taken, separation [?] as apart from Bhakti Yoga, [inaudible], everyone being a child of God, the earth is full of God [inaudible] ... I know that ultimately Bhakti Yoga leads to the same non-attachment as the method outlined in the sutra, but what I'm wondering is if you have both, if you have feelings both ways, is it necessary to choose one over the other, you know, if you're practicing yoga and want to develop non-attachment and you have feelings of wanting to cut the attachment but you also have a leaning toward devotion?

B: Sattvik attachment is okay. Attachment which leads to God.

R: You can practice, for instance, you can practice non-touching and still be a bhakta, practice Bhakti Yoga. Seeing God's light shining in someone else doesn't mean you have to necessarily go and embrace them. You can hold that in your mind that they're a manifestation of God, that if I embrace them, I'm only going to get myself trapped in sensuality. TI don't need that. Let me just see God's work and leave it, leave the being, leave the body.

B: A rose can be appreciated without picking it.

- Q: Pretty hard to do though, if you're trying to create a friendly atmosphere for strangers, for instance at Mount Madonna. You invite people up and if everyone is going around sort of, you know...
- R: No, no. We're not talking about a practice of trying to be aversive to everybody. We're talking about a result that comes from perfection. These are also effects of shauchat, Sutra 41 we're talking about. So it's not only aversion for bodies, it's also purification of the mind, agreeableness of feelings, concentration and ability for Self-Realization.
- B: You are forgetting that all these methods are developing pure love in you. Love will shine by itself.
- Q: There was one comment about sattvik ease in the body or of the body?
- R: Right. The purified mind uncontaminated by the body sense, the sense that 'I am the body,' develops the feeling of gladness or mental bliss and the body acquires a sattvik form of easiness. The body's no longer a burden to you. It does what you want it to. It functions naturally and easily. Tamasic easiness is just sitting, unable to move. Sattvik easiness is being untroubled by your body.
- Q: [largely inaudible] about how Babaji shook his father's hand when they met.
- R: Right. Right. That was what was appropriate in the situation.
- Q: Babaji, what does that tell you about a culture, always wanting to shake hands and...
- R: What does that say about our culture, the desire for physical contact is so strong?
- B: It's a cultural thing. We are studying things which apply to a particular group. We can apply these things in certain degrees.
- R: Anything else on 41? Okay, 42.

Sutra 42. SANTOSHAD ANUTTAMAH SUKHA-LABHAH.

Santoshad from contentment :

Anuttamah unexcelled

Sukha happiness

Labhah gained.

R: Santosh, the second Niyama.

BC: The result of perfect contentment is the attainment of superlative happiness. All the desires are finished by the attainment of contentment. Desires are the cause of pains. In the absence of pains, there remains perfect happiness.

R: And a short comment [HA, p. 252]:

"From Contentment Unsurpassed Happiness Is Gained. 42."

Vyasa: "With reference to this, it has been said, 'The happiness gained on this earth through the enjoyment of desired objects, or the supreme heavenly joy, is not even one-sixteenth of the happiness caused by the cessation of desires.'TM

R: Questions on 42?

Q : Why one-sixteenth?

R: I don't know where they got the one-sixteenth figure.

B: It's the eleven senses and the five pramas. It's quoted from the Mahabharata. It was for 16 days.

R: Recitation?

B: The war. [The war lasted 18 days — ed.]

R: Oh, the war was for 16 days.

B: The moon has 16 kalas. Sixteen akshauhini, the complete army, was killed. The number sixteen should be a symbol of a complete 100 per cent. It's like selecting one percent.

Q: How can we be content without God?

R: [adds] If we haven't realized God, how can we practice contentment?

B: Contentment in degrees is practiced.

R: There's completely discontent and then there's completely content. There's every degree in between. We start where we are and try to get to completely content.

B: For instance, you have a car and you don't desire two cars.

R: You're content with one car. So someone can start from that gross a level and generalize to everything we do.

Q: Is cessation of desire the highest, or to desire association with God, desired pleasure of God?

B: Desiring itself should go, to attain non-duality.

R: If you want to get to the absolute nature of God. Some bhaktas, some devotees never want to attain that. They always want to have separation from God in order to worship God and love God. If the yogi wants to get rid of duality, in which he sees duality as illusion, and (as we were saying duality and illusion are the same thing), so he wants to rid self of all duality by merging into God, rather than standing apart from God and worshipping Him.

Q: Might that not be a higher love?

R: Just a second. : :

B: Desiring means separation from God.

Q: May that not be a higher love, in that separation, in that duality, rather than to merge with God? In other words, a relationship can bring about a very high experience of love between two persons and that would merge them. Can there be that high love?

R: Can there be as high a love in merger between lover and beloved as in separation of lover and beloved? Is love stronger when there's separation than in merger?

B: God and devotee?

R: Yes.

B: God and the devotee. The process of separation is for their complete unity. In fact, they are one [R: God and the devotee]. The separation is an illusion. :

R: That the devotee is separate from God is an illusion.

Q: So in the highest sense of devotion, the devotee is God?

B: Yes.

Q: Doesn't the pain of the separation operate as a vehicle to merge with God?

B: I said this.

R: In other words, yes! [Class laughs.]

Q: I'll never say anything.

B: Separation is for merging in God. ;

R: In illusion we're separate from God because we see God and creation as one. And then in enlightenment we see God and creation as separate and become united with God.

[Class seems not to accept.] :

R: There's a paradox; it's a flip-flop.

B: We see union and that causes our illusion. :

R: That causes separation from God. When we see that the separation, our separation from God, is illusion.

B: It only happens when there's separation of God and nature.

R: In our minds.

Q: [Inaudible comment.]

R: [Referring to what Babaji has just written] Babaji's expanding on what I just said.

B: The first union [Purusha and Prakriti] is out of illusion.

R: That's seeing Purusha and Prakriti as the same. That's out of illusion.

B: Separation is out of knowledge. :

R: That you separate Purusha and Prakriti as a result of Samadhi.

B: Then the second union is complete salvation.

R: That's the actual merger of the soul into God.

B: The [inaudible] returning to the cause.

Q: [inaudible] Nature's included in that. At first, it's a separating factor because you're caught in it and don't see anything more. But then when salvation comes, it's seen as one whole again of God.

R: No, because even that seeing ... as long as there's seeing, there's- duality. From the union he's talking about, there's no more seeing, there's no more anything. There's no more being, there's no more person. It's God. That's when total merger takes place. That only comes after separating God from nature, separating Purusha and Prakriti. Only at that point of separation is real union possible.

Q: Does that include dropping the body? :

R: That last union he talked about, of course. No more body.

B: Even within a body.

- Q: How can God become separate from himself?
 B: By the mind.
- Q: Does that mean that the mind is stronger than God, then?
 R: It's illusion stronger than the mind.
 B: We create it.
- Q: So God's creating an illusion for himself?
 B: [negative response]
 R: You're presupposing God is having direct access into this world, and make a little change here and a little mind over there.
 B: We are seeing it that way.
- Q: Ultimately we are God
 PW: Potentially.
- Q : inaud comment.]
- B: If you have \$100.00 in your pocket and you don't know it, then you don't have it.
- Q: Then the not-knowing is more powerful than God.
 B: How? : -
 R: You have the possibility of knowing. As long as there's the possibility, then that question can't arise. If there's no possibility of your ever knowing about your \$100.00, then you could say the mind is more powerful than God.
 B: Not knowing God can't be more powerful than knowing God.
- Q: At this point it is, is it not?
 B: The pravritti creates illusions.
 R: The pravritti is evolution. That's with thought. Everything with thought is creation.
 B: The more dense the illusion gets, the more we forget God.
 R: It's not God's fault. He called everybody to the banquet. Most everybody has something more important to do.
- Q: Shankar, wouldn't that be implying that there are other beings who aren't separated? :
 R: The whole sutra points to that. The existence of these sutras points to at least one person who wasn't separated.
- Q: The one who's God? :
 R: The one who wrote this. Somebody knew something here. [Class laughs.] Unless I'm missing your point.
- Q: Maybe I'm missing the point. I don't know.
 R: Any more questions on contentment? Are you all content on what's been said?

Sutra 43. KAYA-INDRIYA-SIDDHIR ASHUDDHI-KRSHAYAT TAPASA. ;

Kaya-indriya body sense organs

Siddhir perfection

Ashuddhi impurities

Kshyat destruction

Tapasa austerities

Sutra 43. After destruction of impurities by austerities, there comes perfection in body and sense organs.

R: So, we're at the third Niyama, now, tapas. Tapas, austerities. [Repeating BC sutra]: "After destruction of impurities by austerities, tapas, there comes perfection in the body and the sense organs."

BC: By the practice of austerities, one can attain perfect control over the body and senses which are the most important things for a yogi in order to attain Samadhi. The word siddhi means perfection and also occult powers. So the sutra also means that by practicing austerities, the impurities from the mind are destroyed and occult powers [Sh: which will be discussed in Chapter II] are attained.

R: Restating [HA, p. 252]:

"Through Destruction Of Impurities, Practice Of Austerities Brings About Perfection Of The Body And The Senses. 43."

Aranya: "Austerities in the form of pranayama, etc., chiefly remove the impurity in the form of subjection to the limitations of the body." ;

R: This is a good phrasing of the problem.

Aranya: "Austerities, of whatever form, chiefly remove the impurities in the form paraphrased of subjection to the limitations of the body." We're subject to all the ' body's limitations now. Austerity takes us beyond that subjection. Hunger and thirst, unsteady posture, irregular breathing, all the things the body's heir to. When such subjection is removed, the body unaffected by bodily limitations and due to the unhindered growth of will power ... and that naturally develops in order to do the austerity ... it develops will power ... it's another way to remove impurities ... it's developing will power at the same time. So as these impurities are being removed and the will power's : growing, then this can bring about perfections, siddhis of the body and the senses. Austerities like sleeplessness, fasting, steadiness of posture, suspension of breath, etc., are opposed to human nature, and are favorable to the nature of celestial beings, hence they bring about siddhis of the body and t senses. They're not like the things humans do; they're against that. They're in the category of how the Gods behave. So when one gets perfection in it, one gets Godly powers.

R: Any questions on 437? 3

Q: Would you repeat the characteristics of the celestial beings?

- R: Oh, it was showing austerities like sleeplessness, fasting, steadiness of : posture, suspension of breath are opposed to human nature and are favorable to the nature of celestial beings who don't need to breathe, who don't need to eat, who don't need to sleep, who don't even blink their eyes or cast a shadow. That's one of the ways you can tell if a God is incarnated. No shadow and he never blinks. You'll never catch him blinking, or her.
- Q: Harikhan Baba didn't cast a shadow, Yogananda says in Autobiography of a Yogi.
- B: I don't know.
- R: Any other questions on 43, on tapas that unpleasant subject? We don't want to spend too long on it. [Class laughs.]
- Q: Is tapas resisting any natural activity?
- B: Controlling desires is tapas. Controlling desire to sleep.
- R: If you work on controlling that desire, that's tapas.
- Q: Bad desires or hidden desires?
- R: Ultimately all desires are bad. :
- Q: Desire to serve humanity, you wouldn't want to get away from that. a “i
- B: First bad desires. a
- R: First we work on circumscribing the desires we see as harmful or at least . that we see as impediments to our progress in sadhana. The world probably won't see them as bad things.
- Q: Does tapas have to be painful?
- B: Controlling desires is painful.
- Q: Maybe some purification of the body and sense organs through... :
- R: Tapas?
- Q: Well, something besides tapas like, you know, it seems like if through some kind of physical activity, say surfing or [class chuckles], where you're purified and there is a certain amount of pain, but there's also...
- R: A certain amount of heat. Ramakrishna used to say that.
- B: Tapas means burning. :
- Q: Where there's a certain amount of burning, but there's also a certain amount of...
- R: Sunburn. [Class laughs.]
- Q: A certain amount of pleasure in that, too...a certain amount of joy.
- Q: What did he say?
- R: I don't think he accepted at face value your tapas of surfing.
- Q: Well, there's a certain amount of purification.
- B: The result of tapas is always joy.
- R: He wants to know if surfing serves as an austerity. [Class laughs.]
- B: Then what is not tapas?

R: That way, everything in joy is tapas.

Q: The result of tapas is...

R: Just driving a car. [Class chuckles.]

Q: I was relating to this sutra here. He says that there's purification. I was saying that there's some form of activity that's purification, but it also seems to be an almost joyful purification. I don't know.

R: He says some activities seem like purification, but there's no pain involved.

Q: Maybe there is pain, but it seems the joy takes away the pain.

B: How is surfing special tapas? [Class chuckles.]

Q: Here we go.....

MA: How is surfing purification? :

Q: Well, it's being with the elements.

R: It's a swim where they drop the sewer. [Class laughs.]

Q: It is to a certain extent [purification]. There's water that goes through your nose, that purifies and gets the mucus out. It's hard though; it's painful sometimes.

Q: Yeah, it's the same thing with bowling. [Class laughs.]

Q: Why not nod yoga [inaudible]? [Class laughter.]

DN: I hear there are a lot of sadhus in India who practice austerity to get powers and impress the public. It seems like tapas could be abused pretty easily and indulged. They put stakes through their skin and their chest and different things. Is there a rule of thumb? What is a real tapas and where does tapas become another form of indulgence?

B: Controlling desires is real tapas. :

Q: Don't do tapas if you want to do it.

B: Sleeping on thorns is tapas. It can be abused.

R: The gauge becomes whatever you're doing, you're controlling desire. It's serving to help control desires.

B: You can do it to get alms.

R: It can be done for money, or for show, for prestige, whatever.

B: If someone's mind is very stubborn, then hard tapas is used.

Q: Is that true of a sect, too, like we were talking about the other day that sects do this physical torture type of thing. Is that still to control desire?

B: Yes.

R: I wonder why it is that as one does tapas in one area, one desire, other desires in other areas seem to get stronger?

B: At first. Pranayama is the highest tapas.

- R: Regulation of breath is the highest tapas. There's no stronger desire than our desire to breathe.
- Q: In all activity, though, there is a certain amount of tapas?
- B: Tapas is intention.
- R: Tapas has intention or it's not tapas.
- B: Hard work is not tapas unless its aim is to get God.
- R: Control desires and get to God. So tapas has to have an intention, an aim of getting God, or it's not tapas. Otherwise, you could say, everybody in the world is always doing tapas. They're always working.
- Q: They're doing a certain amount of tapas.
- R: No, it's not tapas unless it's to get God. It's a conscious controlling of your desire and inclination in order to attain God. Then it's tapas, otherwise it's not.
- B: To earn money, one sits on a bed of nails. It's not tapas.
- Q: But suppose people sacrifice for the sake of their families and others and suppose they don't believe in God, isn't that tapas?
- R: A man is making sacrifices to support his family and he's an atheist. Is he doing tapas?
- Q: Not just to support his family, but not to have his own way, not to be selfish and so on, or to help the community.
- R: It's for a higher cause.
- Q: A higher cause to serve the family or the community, but he's an atheist and doesn't believe in God.
- B: You don't use the word God, but God's quality is the aim.
- Q: Babaji, in this culture we live such pampered lives, everything's so easy. Oftentimes the mind rebels; how can we control the revolt of the mind to do even a little tapas?
- B: The mind's nature is to revolt when it is obstructed, whether in this culture or any other culture.
- Q: Then it wouldn't be harder for us in this culture than in another?
- B: NO!
- Q: What was the answer?
- R: It's just as hard to control your mind in this culture as in any other part of the world. That was an overstatement of what he said, actually. He said that anytime that the mind rebels ... the mind's nature is to revolt when it's obstructed ... that's the same in any culture.
- B: If one dies by hunger or over-eating, what's the difference? You have everything; some have nothing. Both have desires.
- Q: Another question I have, I was wondering how we trick ourselves into thinking we don't need these things and accept.
- B: By limiting desires.

Q: Are there such things as spiritual desires, or only the desire for cessation of desires?

B: Desire to attain God. First step.

Q: So there actually are some desires we can cultivate?

B: There are seven steps.

R: Desire to attain God is the first step in the process to attain Self-realization.

Q: What about indulging in worldly desires? Can one over-indulge in them and get rid of it that way? [Class laughter.]

R: Do you see that happening a lot around you? [Class laughter.]

Q: It seems like one way you could do it.

R: If one over-indulges in all the things one likes, then could one get rid of it that way? Suppose you always overate, always drank too much, always smoked too much, always had too much sex, so on and so forth, could you get rid of your desires?

B: You make samskaras.

R: According to yoga theory, every action, every thought makes a print. ;

B: Your body may lose capability of enjoying it, but the samskara will remain.

Q: Babaji, at what point does the desire for association with the guru, the physical form, become an obstacle?

B: It's an attachment. When all negative attachments are stopped, then you have to remove the positive attachments. Don't start from the other end.

R: Don't remove all your positive attachments first and then be left with all your negative ones. Any other questions?

BD: One day you said ten dollars in your pocket; today you said one hundred dollars.

R: Inflation.

B: I gave ninety dollars. [Class laughter.]

PD: What are the seven steps? :

B: 1) Shubhechha - Desire to attain God.

2) Vicharana - Reflecting on God's qualities [Sh: Thinking of God].

3) Tanumanasa - Tenuous mind, one-pointed mind.

4) Sattvapatti — Realizing the Self,

5) Asan shakti - Dispassion.

6) Padartha bhavani: - Non-perception of objects or paravairagya.

7) Turiyaga - Beyond all conditions.

Q: Just to clear the tapas. Is it a tapas, say, when someone goes on a diet to lose weight?

R: Tapas is one thing. Austerity is not necessarily tapas.

Q: Okay, I was thinking...

R: Tapas is always austerity, but austerity is not always tapas.

Q: Okay, I was thinking those two were the same.

B: We can include surfing! [Class laughter.]

PD: Surfing goes under the water, can't breathe. Pranayama.

MA: A new category!

Q: How about baseball and volleyball?

R: Actually you're increasing your raga and abhinivesha kleshas.

This material is licensed by Sri Rama Foundation under a Creative Commons: Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike license. The rights of use and limitations can be found at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/>.