

The **Buddha** Said...

meeting the challenge of life's difficulties

OSHO



CONTENTS

- [Chapter 1: The Most Excellent Way](#)
- [Chapter 2: No Prejudice in the Heart](#)
- [Chapter 3: Be Therefore Mindful](#)
- [Chapter 4: Living the Dhamma](#)
- [Chapter 5: The Truth Beyond Magic](#)
- [Chapter 6: The Twenty Difficult Things](#)
- [Chapter 7: In Accord with the Way](#)
- [Chapter 8: A Light unto Yourself](#)
- [Chapter 9: Reflections of Emptiness](#)
- [Chapter 10: The Discipline Beyond Discipline](#)
- [Chapter 11: Spiritual Enlightenment](#)
- [Chapter 12: Always on the Funeral Pyre](#)
- [Chapter 13: There is Nothing Like Lust](#)
- [Chapter 14: Become a Driftwood](#)
- [Chapter 15: Just Working for Peanuts](#)
- [Chapter 16: Away with the Passions!](#)
- [Chapter 17: The Eightfold Way](#)
- [Chapter 18: Remember the Middle](#)
- [Chapter 19: The Discipline of Transcendence](#)
- [Chapter 20: The Ten Grounds of the Way](#)
- [Chapter 21: Provisions for the Journey](#)
- [Chapter 22: Collecting Pebbles on the Seashore of Life](#)

Chapter 1:

The Most Excellent Way

THE BUDDHA SAID:

To be free from the passions and to be calm, this is the most excellent way. Those who leave their parents, go out of the home, understand the mind, reach the source, and comprehend the immaterial, are called shramanas. Those who observe the precepts of morality, who are pure and spotless in their behavior, and who exert themselves for the attainment of the fruits of saintship are called arhats.

Next is the anagamin. At the end of his life, the spirit of the anagamin ascends to the heaven and obtains arhatship.

Next is the skridagamin. The skridagamin ascends to the heaven (after his death), comes back to the earth once more, and then attains arhatship.

Next is the srotapanna. The srotapanna dies seven times and is born seven times, when he finally attains arhatship. By the severance of passions is meant that like the limbs severed they are never again made use of.

Gautama Buddha is like Gourishankar, the highest peak of the Himalayas. He is one of the purest beings, one of the most virgin souls, a rare phenomenon on this earth. The rarity is that Buddha is a scientist of the inner world – a scientist of the spirit. That is a rare combination. To be religious is simple, to be a scientist is simple – but to combine, to synthesize these two polarities is incredible. It is unbelievable, but it has happened.

Buddha is the richest human being that has ever lived; rich in the sense that all the dimensions of life are fulfilled in him. He is not one-dimensional.

There are three approaches towards truth. One is the approach of power, another the approach of beauty, and the third the

approach of grandeur.

The scientific approach is the search for power; that's why Lord Bacon said "knowledge is power". Science has made man very powerful, so much so that man can destroy the whole planet earth. For the first time in the history of consciousness man is capable of committing a global suicide, a collective suicide. Science has released tremendous power. Science is continuously searching for more and more power. This too is an approach towards truth, but a partial approach.

Then there are poets, mystics, people with an aesthetic sense. They look at truth as beauty – Jalaluddin Rumi and Rabindranath Tagore and others, who think that beauty is truth. They create art, they create new sources of beauty in the world. The painter, the poet, the dancer, the musician, they are also approaching truth but from a totally different dimension than power.

The poet is not like the scientist. The scientist works with analysis, reason, observation. The poet functions through the heart, trust, love – through the irrational. He has nothing to do with mind and reason.

The greater part of religious people belong to the second dimension. The Sufis, the Bauls – they all belong to the aesthetic approach. Hence so many beautiful mosques, churches, cathedrals, temples like Ajanta and Ellora – they were created by religious people. Whenever religious activity predominates, art is created, music is created, great painting is created; the world becomes a little more beautiful. It doesn't become more powerful, but it becomes more beautiful, more lovely, more worth living.

The third approach is that of grandeur. The old Bible prophets – Moses, Abraham; Islam's prophet Mohammed; Krishna and Ram in Hinduism – their approach is through the dimension of grandeur, through the awe that one feels looking at this vastness of the universe. The Upanishads, the Vedas, they all approach the world of truth through grandeur. They are full of wonder. The universe is unbelievably there, with such grandeur, that you can only bow down before it – nothing else is possible. One simply feels humble, reduced to nothing.

These are the three dimensions ordinarily available to approach truth. The first dimension creates the scientist, the second the artist, and the third the prophets. The rarity of Buddha consists of this – that his approach is a synthesis of all the three, and not only a synthesis but it goes beyond the three.

Buddha is a rationalist. He's not like Jesus and he is not like Krishna – he's absolutely a rationalist. Einstein, Newton or Edison would not find any flaw in his reasoning. Any scientist will be immediately convinced of his truth. His approach is purely logical,

he convinces the mind. You cannot find a loophole in him.

Somebody has sent me a beautiful anecdote about a famous actor and atheist, W. C. Fields.

He was doing a tour of the United States. One day his manager came into his hotel room and was shocked to see him reading a copy of the Gideon Bible.

“Bill!” he said, “What the hell are you doing? I thought you were an atheist.”

Fields replied, “Just looking for loopholes, just looking for loopholes.”

But you cannot look for a loophole in the Buddha. Yes, you can look for loopholes in Jesus, there are many – because Jesus believes, trusts, he has faith. He is simple like a child. There is no argument within him. The proof exists, but there is no argument for it. His whole being is his proof.

But it is not so with Buddha. You may not be at all in harmony with his heart, you may not believe him at all, you may not look at the proof he is, but you will have to listen to his argument. He has both the proof and the argument. He himself is the proof of what he is saying, but that is not all. If you are not ready to look at him he can force you, he can convince you; he is a rationalist.

Even a man like Bertrand Russell, who was an atheist, purely logical, has said, “Jesus I can fight – with Buddha I start feeling hesitant.” He has written a book, *Why I am not a Christian* – a great and argumentative book. Christians have not yet replied to it; his argument still holds. But faced with Buddha he suddenly feels hesitant, he is not so certain of his ground – because Buddha can convince him on his own ground. Buddha is as analytical as Bertrand Russell.

You need not be a religious person to be convinced by Buddha, that’s his rarity. You need not believe at all. You need not believe in God, you need not believe in the soul, you need not believe in anything – still you can be with Buddha, and by and by you will come to know about the soul and about godliness also, but those will not be hypotheses.

No belief is required to travel with Buddha. You can come to him with all your skepticism – he accepts and welcomes you, and he says, “Come with me.” First he convinces your mind, and once your mind is convinced and you start traveling with him, by and by you start feeling that he has a message which is beyond mind, he has a message which no reason can confine. But first he convinces your reason.

Buddha’s approach is suprarational, but not against reason. This

has to be understood in the very beginning. It has something to do with the beyond, suprarational, but that suprarational is not against the rational, it is in tune with it. The rational and the suprarational are a continuity; this is the rarity of Buddha.

Krishna says to Arjuna, "Surrender to me." Buddha never says that, he convinces you to surrender. Krishna says, "Surrender to me, then you will be convinced." Buddha says, "Be convinced first, then surrender comes like a shadow. You need not worry about it, don't talk about it at all."

Because of this rational approach he never brings in any concept that cannot be proved. He never talks about God. H. G. Wells has said about Buddha, "He is the most godly and the most godless man in the whole history of man." Yes, it is so – the most godly and most godless. You cannot find a more godly person than Buddha. Every other personality simply fades before him. His luminosity is superb, his being has no comparison, but he does not talk about God.

Because he has never talked about God, many think that Buddha is an atheist – he is not. He has not talked about God because there is no way to talk about God. All talk about God is nonsense. Whatsoever you can say about God is going to be false. It is something that cannot be said.

Other seers also say that nothing can be said about God, but they do say this much, that nothing can be said about God. Buddha is really logical, he will not say even this, because he says, "Even to say that nothing can be said about God, you have said something. If you say, 'God cannot be defined,' you have defined him in a negative way – that he cannot be defined. If you say, 'Nothing can be said,' that too you are saying." Buddha is strictly logical. He will not utter a single word.

Ludwig Wittgenstein, one of the greatest thinkers of this age, one of the greatest of all the ages also, has said, "That which cannot be said must not be said. That which cannot be said, one must be silent thereof." Because to talk something about something that is unutterable is a sacrilege.

Buddha is not an atheist but he never talks about God. That's why I say he is a rarity. He brings many people to godliness – he brought more people than anybody else has. Millions of people were brought to become godly in his presence, but he never uttered the word. Not only God but even the soul, the self – he has no theory about it. He simply says, "I can show you the way to go in. You go in and look." He says, "Buddhas can only indicate the path, they cannot provide you with a philosophy. You are there, go in and see."

One man came to Buddha. He was a great scholar, a sort of

professor, had written many books, was known all over the country. Maulingaputta was his name. He said to Buddha, “I have come with a dozen questions and you have to answer them.”

Buddha said, “I will answer, but you will have to fulfill a requirement. For one year you will have to be with me in total silence, then I will answer – not before. Right now I can answer, but you will not receive the answers because you are not ready. Whatever I say you will misinterpret because you have too many interpretations crowding your mind. Whatever I say will have to pass through your mind. For one year you just be silent so that you can drop the knowledge. When you are empty, whatsoever you want to ask I will answer, I promise you.”

As Buddha was saying this, another of his disciples, Sariputta, started laughing – a mad laughter. Maulingaputta must have felt embarrassed. He said, “What is the matter? Why are you laughing?”

Sariputta said, “I am not laughing at you, I am laughing at myself. This man deceived me also. I had come with many questions and he said, ‘Wait for one year,’ and I waited. One year has passed. I am laughing because now those questions have disappeared. He goes on asking, ‘Now, bring me those questions!’ But I cannot bring those questions, they have disappeared. So, Maulingaputta, if you really want your questions to be answered, ask now! Don’t wait for one year. This man is deceptive.”

Buddha introduced many people, millions of people, to the inner world, but in a very rational way. This is simple – that first you have to become a receiver, first you have to attain to silence; then communion is possible, not before that.

Buddha never used to answer any metaphysical questions. He was always ready to answer any question about method, but he was never ready to answer any question about metaphysics. This is his scientific approach. Science believes in method. Science never answers the “why”, it always answers the “how”.

If you ask a scientist, “Why does the world exist?” he will say, “I don’t know – but I can answer how the world exists.” If you ask him, “Why is there water?” he cannot answer; he will just shrug his shoulders. But he can say how the water is there; how much oxygen, how much hydrogen makes the water happen. He can give you the method, the “how”, the mechanism. He can show you how to make water, but he cannot show you why.

Buddha never asks any “why” questions, but that doesn’t mean that he is an atheist. His approach is very different from other atheists. Theists require you to believe, to have faith, to trust. Buddha says, “How can one believe? You are asking the impossible.”

Listen to his argument. He says if somebody is doubtful, how can he believe? If the doubt has arisen already, how can he believe? He may repress the doubt, he may enforce the belief, but deep down like a worm the doubt will go on lurking and eating his heart. Sooner or later the belief is bound to collapse, because it is unfounded; there is no foundation to it. In the foundation there is doubt, and on the foundation of doubt you have raised the whole structure of your belief.

Have you watched it? Whenever you believe, deep down there is doubt. What type of belief is this?

Buddha says if there is no doubt then there is no question of belief. Then one simply knows. There is no need for any Krishna to say, "Surrender, then you will believe" – there is no point. If Arjuna has faith, he has it; if he has not, then there is no way to create it. Then at the most Arjuna can play a game of showing, pretending that he believes. But belief cannot be enforced.

For those whose faith is natural, spontaneous, there is no question of faith – they simply believe. They don't know even what belief is. Small children, they simply believe. But once doubt enters, belief becomes impossible. And doubt has to enter; it is part of growth.

Doubt makes one mature. You remain childish unless doubt has penetrated your soul. Unless the fire of doubt starts burning you, you remain immature; you don't know what life is. You start knowing life only by doubting, by being skeptical, by raising questions.

Buddha says faith comes, but not against doubt, not as belief. Faith comes by destroying doubt with argument, by destroying doubt with more doubt, by eliminating doubt through doubt itself. A poison can be destroyed only by a poison – that is Buddha's method. He does not say believe. He says go deep into your doubt, go to the very end, unafraid; don't repress it. Travel the whole path of doubt to the very end, and that very journey will take you beyond it. Because a moment comes when doubt starts doubting itself. That's the ultimate doubt – when doubt doubts doubt itself. That point has to come if you go to the very end. You first doubt belief, you doubt this and that. One day, when everything has been doubted, suddenly a new and ultimate doubt arises – you start doubting doubt.

This is tremendously new in the world of religiousness. Then doubt kills doubt, doubt destroys doubt, and faith is gained. This faith is not against doubt, this faith is beyond doubt. This faith is not opposite to doubt, this faith is the absence of doubt.

Buddha says you will have to become children again, but the path has to go through the world, through many jungles of doubts,

arguments, reasonings. And when a person comes back home, attains his original faith, it is totally different. He is not just a child, he is an old man . . . mature, experienced, and yet childlike.

This sutra, “The Sutra of Forty-Two Chapters”, has never existed in India. It never existed in Sanskrit or in Pali, but only in Chinese. A certain Emperor Ming of the Han Dynasty, AD 67, invited a few Buddhist masters to China to bring the message of Buddha there. Nobody knows the names of those Buddhist masters, but a group went to China. And the emperor wanted a small anthology of Buddhist sayings to be compiled as a first introduction to the Chinese people.

Buddhist scriptures are so extensive, the Buddhist literature is a world in itself – thousands of scriptures exist. And they go into very great detail, because Buddha believes in logical analysis. He goes to the very root of everything. His analysis is profound and perfect, so he goes very deeply into details. It was difficult. What to translate in a totally new country where nothing like Buddha has ever existed? So these Buddhist masters composed a small anthology of forty-two chapters. They collected sayings from here and there, from this scripture and that, from this sermon and that.

This book was compiled in the style of Confucian analects because it was going to be introduced to a Confucian country – people who had become very well acquainted with the way Confucius talks, with the way Confucian scriptures were made and compiled. People were familiar with Confucius, so the Buddhist masters composed this sutra exactly along the same lines. The analects of Confucius start every sentence, every paragraph with the phrase “The master said . . .” This sutra starts in a similar way – every saying starts with “The Buddha said . . .”

In the beginning of the 20th century scholars used to think that the original must have existed in Sanskrit or Pali; then it disappeared or was lost, and this sutra in Chinese was a translation. That is wrong. This sutra never existed in India. As it is, it never existed. Of course, each saying comes from Buddha, but the whole work is a new work, a new anthology. So that should be remembered.

And that’s what makes it such a good basic introduction to the Buddha’s world. It is very simple; it contains everything in a very simple way. It is very direct. It is, in essence, the whole of Buddha’s message but very succinct, not long and wordy as other Buddhist scriptures are.

THE BUDDHA SAID:

To be free from the passions and to be calm, this is the most excellent way.

Buddha always talks about the way, never about the goal. Because he says, “What to say about the goal? It is futile to talk about it. If you know, you know. If you don’t know, there is no way to figure it out before you reach it.” He talks only about the way. He has not even a single word for the goal – godliness, Brahman, the truth, the absolute, the Kingdom of God. No, he has not any word for the goal; all he talks about is the way.

To be free from the passions and to be calm, this is the most excellent way.

In this one simple sentence Buddha’s whole teaching is present. To be free from the passions and to be calm . . . These are two aspects of one phenomenon, two sides of one coin – to be free from passions and to be calm. You cannot be calm if you are not free from passions, and you cannot be free from passions if you are not calm. They go together, and one has to work for both together.

Why is man so tense? Why is there so much anxiety and anguish? Why is man not calm, collected and centered? So many passions go on pulling you this way and that, pushing you this way and that. You are being pulled in many directions, hence you become fragmentary, you become divided, you become split. You lose your center. You forget completely who you are.

Watch. When you are greedy for money, who are you? You are just a greed for money and nothing else. When you are angry, your ego is hurt, who are you? You are just anger, a wounded ego, nothing else. When you are full of sexual passion, who are you? You are just sexuality, libido, and nothing else. When you are ambitious and you want power, prestige, respectability, who are you? You are simply ambition and nothing else.

Watch, and you will find many passions in you but you will not find who you are – just all those passions pulling you apart, and each passion goes in its own way. If you want money then you will have to sacrifice other passions for it. A person who is mad after money may forget all about sex; it is very easy for a miser to be celibate. In fact, celibacy may be a sort of miserliness. You don’t want to share your energy, you don’t want to share your sexual energy with anybody; you are a miser.

A person who is politically ambitious can become celibate very easily because his whole passion drives him in one way. A scientist who is too much into his research can forget all about the opposite sex. It is easy; if one passion possesses you completely

then you can forget everything else.

It is a well-known fact that scientists are very absent-minded people. Their whole mind goes into one direction, but then they become very poor also. Their field of vision becomes narrower and narrower and narrower. That's what specialization is. A greedy person becomes narrower and narrower. He thinks only about money; he goes on counting money. His whole mind knows only one music and that is that of money; only one love, and that is that of money.

The people who are possessed by one passion are, in a way, integrated. They are not rich, they don't have many dimensions to their being; they have only one taste, but they have a certain integration. They are not split. You will not find this type of person going mad, because they are already mad in one direction, so they are not split. But this happens rarely. Ordinarily a person runs in all the directions.

I have heard:

A scientist and a gorilla were sent into outer space together. Pinned to the front of the gorilla's spacesuit was an envelope with special instructions in it. Dying of curiosity, the scientist waited until it was the gorilla's turn to sleep so that he could sneak a peek into the envelope.

Very carefully he slit the envelope open and unfolded a single piece of paper that was inside. Printed on it was the following: Don't Forget To Feed The Scientist.

A scientist becomes one-pointed; his life is that of concentration, and a concentrated person attains to a false sort of unity. Ordinarily people are not so concentrated. Meditation is far away – they are not even capable of concentration! Their lives are a hodgepodge, a mess. One hand is going north, one leg is going south, one eye is looking to the east, the other eye is looking to the west. They are going in all directions. This pull and push of many directions takes them apart. They become fragmentary, they lose wholeness. How can you be silent, how can you be calm?

The person who is concentrated also cannot be calm, because his life becomes lopsided. He is just moving in one direction; all other aspects of his life are starved. A scientist doesn't pay attention to what beauty is, what love is. He does not know what poetry is; he is too confined by his mathematical world. He becomes lopsided. So many parts of him are starved, hungry. He cannot be calm. When you are starved, how can you be calm?

The person who is moving in all directions has a little more

richness than the specialist, but his richness has a schizophrenia in it; he becomes split. How can you be silent and calm when you have so many masters pulling you in different directions?

These are ordinarily the two types of people, and both are uneasy, deep in turmoil.

THE BUDDHA SAID:

To be free from the passions and to be calm, this is the most excellent way

What is his way?

Those who leave their parents, go out of the home, understand the mind, reach the source, and comprehend the immaterial, are called shramanas.

This word has to be understood, it is very basic – *shramana*. In India, two paths have existed. One is that of the brahmin and the other of the *shramana*. The path of the brahmin is the path of grace. The brahmin believes that by your own efforts, you cannot arrive. Your effort is so small, you are so tiny – how can you possibly know truth by your own efforts? The help of God will be needed, grace will be needed.

The path of the brahmin is the path of grace, so you have to pray. Only when God helps can you move on the path. Unless he wills it, you cannot arrive; there is no possibility for you to move alone. God is necessary, his help is necessary, his hand is needed – unless he takes you above the world, you will be struggling in vain. So for the brahmin, prayer is the path. The brahmin believes in prayer.

The *shramana* is just diametrically opposite. The word *shramana* comes from a root *shram*. *Shram* means “to exert oneself”, to make effort. *Shram* means “effort”. There is no possibility of any grace, because Buddha never talks about God. Buddha says, you don’t know God – how can you pray? To whom are you going to pray? Your prayer will be coming from a deep ignorance. How can you pray to a God you don’t know and that you have never seen? What type of communication is possible? You will be just talking to the empty sky. You might as well be talking to yourself! It is mad.

Have you seen mad people talking to themselves – sitting alone and talking to somebody? They are talking to somebody, but everybody can see that there is no one there. They are talking to themselves.

In the rational approach of Buddha, a man praying to God is mad, crazy. What are you doing? Do you know if God exists? If you know, then there is no need to pray. You say that you are praying in order to know God . . . the brahmin says, “We can know God only by prayer, by his help, by his grace.”

Now this is absurd, logically absurd. You are moving in a circle. You say, “We can know God only by prayer.” Then how can you pray? – because you don’t know God yet. And you say, “Only by prayer will we be able to attain his grace.” This is a vicious circle, this is illogical. The flaw in the reasoning is very clear, the loophole is apparent.

This is the problem with the ordinary religious person – he cannot argue. The atheist can destroy your whole argument in a second. Religious people avoid debate because they know they don’t have any base from which to argue.

You say, “We are searching for God,” and then at the same time you say, “Only through prayer will we be able to search for him.” You don’t know him yet – prayer is not possible. And if you know him, prayer is not needed. Buddha says only through your own effort, through your own *shrama*, will you achieve godliness. There is no question of any grace. In a way it looks very hard, in another way it seems to be very, very scientific. You are alone here, lost in this forest of the world, and sitting under a tree you are just praying, not knowing to whom you are praying, where the God is, whether he is or not. You may be wasting your time. If there is no God, then . . . ? All the time that you wasted in prayer could have been used to search, to find out.

Buddha says once you understand that you are lost and you have to find your own way and there is no help coming, you become responsible. Prayer is irresponsible. To pray is just to avoid responsibility, to pray is to be lazy. To pray is just an escape. Buddha says effort is needed. It is an insult to pray. So in the Buddhist approach nothing like prayer exists, only meditation. You can meditate, you cannot pray.

This is the difference between meditation and prayer. Prayer needs a belief in God, meditation needs no belief. Meditation is purely scientific. It simply says that there are states of mind where thinking stops. It simply says there are ways to stop the thinking, to drop thinking and to come to a silent state of mind . . . a tranquil, serene state of mind. And it is that state of mind that gives you what truth is, gives you the glimpse, opens the door – but it comes only by your own effort. Each individual is alone and has to work hard – and if you miss, only you will be responsible. If you don’t arrive, you cannot blame anybody because there is nobody to blame.

The path of Buddha is the path of the *shramana* – one who believes in his own effort. It looks very austere, arduous. One starts feeling afraid. In our fear we need somebody's help. Even a belief that somewhere some God exists, gives us relief.

I have heard:

The seasick passenger lying listlessly on his deck chair stopped a passing steward. Pointing into the distance, he said, "Over there – it's land, isn't it?"

"No, sir," replied the steward. "It's the horizon."

"Never mind," sighed the passenger, "it's better than nothing."

But the horizon is nothing. How can it be better than nothing? It only appears to exist, it is not really there. Nothing exists like the horizon; the horizon is just illusory. But even that, to a seasick passenger, seems to be good. It is at least something – better than nothing. Belief, to Buddha, is like the horizon. Your gods are like horizons, mirages. You believe in them because you feel alone. You don't know they exist; you create them because you need them. But your need cannot be a guarantee of their truth. Your need cannot be a guarantee of their reality.

You are in a dark night passing through a forest. You are alone, you need a companion. You can imagine a companion, you can start talking to a companion, you can even start answering as if you are the companion. It will give you an illusion that somebody is there. You can believe in the companion, you can be completely hypnotized by it, but that does not mean that you can create the companion in reality.

People start whistling when they are alone. Passing through a dark night, they start whistling. It helps, it is better than nothing. You listen to your own noise and it gives you the idea that there is somebody else. People start singing; listening to their own voice gives a feeling that somebody else is there. Because you have always listened to others talking, the very sound that you hear gives you a feeling that another person must be there.

But Buddha says that just because you feel a need, reality has no necessity to fulfill it. Reality does not change according to your need. Your need is true – that you are alone and you would like a father figure in the sky, a God. That's why Christians call God "the father"; it is a father figure.

Psychologists will agree with Buddha. They say that the idea of God just reflects a need for a father figure. Every small child has a father – protective, giving a sense of security. One feels absolutely okay because the father is there. Then you grow, then you become

mature. Then your father is no longer a protection. Then you know that your father is as weak as you are, then you know your father is as limited as you are. And by and by you see your father is becoming weaker and weaker every day, growing old. Your trust is lost, but the need remains; you need some father figure. You want somewhere to go and talk to your father, who is no longer there. Lost, you create a god, a goddess; you create a father or mother figure. It is your need, certainly – a psychological need – but this need keeps you immature.

Buddha is all for maturity. He says drop all these figures – they don't exist, and even if they did exist this would not be the way to find them. The way is to become calm and quiet. The way is to become so alone and so accepting of one's aloneness that there is no need for anybody's grace. Become so silent and alone that you are fulfilled within your own self, that you are enough unto yourself. Then you will be calm. Then a grace will start happening to you, but it is not a grace coming from God. It is a grace spreading out from your own center. You will become graceful.

Buddha sitting, standing, walking, is grace personified. But this grace is not coming from somewhere else; it is surfacing from his own innermost depths, it is bubbling up from his own center. It is like a flower that has flowered on the tree – it has come out of the tree. It is not a gift from somebody else, it is a growth.

This is the difference between the path of the brahmin and the path of the *shramana*. On the brahmin's path, truth is a gift, God's gift. On the *shramana*'s path, truth is a growth that happens to you from your own being. It is yours. Truth is not something outside to be discovered, it is something inside to be realized.

Those who leave their parents, go out of the home, understand the mind, reach the source, and comprehend the immaterial, are called shramana.

Now, the definition of the *shramana*. Who is called a *shramana*? Who is really a seeker of truth? Who is making real effort, authentic effort to discover what truth is? The first thing – they leave their parents. Now this is symbolic, don't take it literally. It is symbolic and psychological.

A child lives for nine months in the womb of his mother . . . totally protected, in such a beautiful, warm atmosphere; never again will he be able to find such comfort. No worry, no responsibility – even for breathing. He has no need to breathe himself, the mother breathes for him. He has no worry that he will be left hungry; the mother goes on feeding him. He is so protected, so secure. Psychologists say that in the religious search, people are

seeking the same womb again. All their concepts of paradise are nothing but magnified wombs, absolutely comfortable. In the Hindu mythology they say that in heaven there is a tree called *kalpavriksha* – the wish-fulfilling tree. You sit under it, and the moment any desire arises, even before you come to know that it has arisen it will be fulfilled. You think of food and food will be there, instantly. You think of a bed because you are feeling sleepy – instantly the bed will be there. This is what the womb is. The womb is a *kalpataru*, a wish-fulfilling tree. The child never becomes aware of any need. Before he becomes aware it is fulfilled; it is absolutely automatic.

But the child has to leave the womb; it is needed for his growth. Comfort alone can never help you to grow, because there is no challenge. The child has to leave the womb, and the first thing the child will have to do upon leaving the womb is the basis of all survival – he will have to breathe on his own. He will have to make an effort on his own. He is becoming a *shramana*. In the mother's womb he was a brahmin. Everything was happening through grace. Everything was happening, he was not doing anything. But everybody has to come out of the womb. Every brahmin has to become a *shramana*. Buddha says through being a *shramana*, growth is possible.

Then the child by and by grows farther away, farther away from the mother. After birth he will still have to depend on the breast of the mother; then a moment will come when he will no longer depend on the breast either. But still he will depend on the mother to feed him. Then he will go to school. He is going farther away from the mother, he is becoming more and more independent, he is becoming more and more an individual. Then one day he falls in love with another woman and he is cut off from the mother completely.

That's why no mother can ever forgive the woman who has taken away her son. Never – it is impossible for the mother to forgive the woman who has taken away her son . . . it is a deep conflict. But a man becomes really mature when he falls in love with a woman, because then he has turned his back to his mother completely. Now he has turned 180 degrees.

Buddha says that in the psychological world many roots still have to be cut. You should become more and more aware that you may have gone far away from the mother, but you have created psychological mothers. You may have come far away from the father, but then you create a father figure in heaven – God ruling all over the world, the supreme sovereign, and you call him "Father". Again you are trying to become dependent – as if you are afraid of your independence. All these are roots; all the roots have

to be cut.

Jesus says somewhere . . . and I suspect that he must have got those ideas from some Buddhist source, because Jesus came five hundred years after Buddha and by that time, Buddhist attitudes had spread all over the Middle East. They had penetrated far into the middle of Asia, they had entered deep into Egypt. Jesus was brought up in Egypt. He must have come to know about these ideas. And there is every possibility that he visited India before he returned to Jerusalem to teach. There are sources that say that he visited the Buddhist university of Nalanda. He must have come to know about the path of the *shramana*, because in his teachings he says a few things that have no traditional source in Jewish ideology.

For example he says, “Unless you hate your father and mother, you cannot become my disciples.” Christians always feel embarrassed if you say this. What type of teaching is this? – “Unless you hate your father and mother . . .” And you say that Jesus is love and he has come to teach love to the world? You say that God is love? The teaching seems to be full of hatred – “Hate your mother and father.” All the great teachers have said, “Respect your father and mother,” and what nonsense – Jesus is saying to hate them?

He must have heard it from some sources outside of Judaism. Those sources can only be Buddhist, because Buddha says: *Those who leave their parents, go out of the home . . .*

Don't take it literally. Don't take Jesus literally either. He is not saying you should hate your father and mother. He is simply saying to cut yourself completely away from the father and mother. He is saying to cut yourself away from security. Become insecure. Free yourself from all dependency. Become independent, become an individual – that's what he is saying.

Jesus is using a very rough language, and Buddha is using cultured language. Jesus was not very well educated; he was a rough man, a carpenter's son. And the Jewish tradition is very rough. The prophets speak in fiery language. Their language looks more political than religious. Buddha was the son of a king – well educated, cultured. Their terminology is different because they are different persons, but the meaning is the same.

One has to leave the parents, one has to leave the home, one has to leave the past. One has to become totally independent, alone . . . trembling in that aloneness, but one has to become alone. One has to become absolutely responsible for oneself, and then only one can understand the mind. If you go on depending on others, your very dependence will not allow you to understand who you are.

Cut all sources, cut yourself away from all relationship. You are

left alone, now there is nobody else. You have to see into your own soul, you have to encounter yourself. That is the only way to encounter oneself. Then you reach to the very source of your being, by understanding the mind . . . *and comprehend the immaterial.*

See, Buddha does not say comprehend the spiritual. He says comprehend the immaterial. This is the difference. His approach is so rational, he will not assert something in which you can find a loophole. He will not say “the spiritual”; he simply says “the immaterial”.

Ask the physicist, he will understand the language of Buddha. The scientist says, “By analyzing the atom we came to electrons.” Electrons are just electric particles, almost immaterial. Matter has disappeared, only energy is there. You cannot call it matter, you can only call it im-matter. And then by analyzing the electron they have come to almost emptiness – immaterial emptiness. The physicist will understand the Buddhist terminology.

Buddha reached the same point by analyzing the mind. By analyzing the mind he came to a stage where no thought was there . . . simple emptiness. He calls it “the immaterial”. Thought is the inner “material”. When you disperse thought and only space remains, it is immaterial.

The same has happened in modern physics. They were analyzing matter in the outside world and they came to the immaterial. Buddha reached the immaterial on his inner journey, and science has reached the immaterial in its outer journey, but both have reached the immaterial. Scientists also will not say that this is spiritual. The scientist can only say this much – that whatever was matter is no longer there. He cannot say what is there. “This much can be said – that whatever we used to think of as matter is no longer there; all that we can say is a denial.”

BUDDHA SAYS:

. . . and comprehend the immaterial, they are called shramanas.

Now the categories of *shramanas*:

Those who observe the precepts of morality, who are pure and spotless in their behavior, and who exert themselves for the attainment of the fruits of saintship, are called arhats.

Arhat is the highest state of no-mind. The word arhat means “one

who has conquered his enemies”. *Ari* means “enemy” and *arhat* means “one who has conquered the enemy”.

Who is the enemy? It is not outside you. The passions, the distractions, the desires, the hatred, jealousy, possessiveness, anger, sexuality – these are the enemies. In one way your mind is the enemy, the root enemy. One who has conquered the mind is called *arhat*. This is the highest state – one who has come above all the clouds.

Have you sometimes, traveling by air, watched when the airplane goes above the clouds? All the clouds are just below you and you are in the pure, blue sky. That is the inner state of *arhat*. One goes on penetrating the mind. By and by the clouds of passions are no longer there, they are left far behind, and you are soaring higher and higher into pure space, into the immaterial space. This is the state of *arhat*.

In Buddhist terminology that is the highest state. What Christians call Christ, Buddha calls *arhat*. What Jainas call *arihanta* – that word also means the same. Or what Hindus call the *avatara* – Rama, Krishna – that is the same state, the state of *arhat*.

But Buddha is very scientific in that too. He does not call it *avatara*, because *avatara* means “God descending into the world” – you have to believe in God. In no way does he use any term that contains some presuppositions. He uses simple terms, without any presuppositions.

Next is the anagamin.

Arhat is the highest state, next to it is the *anagamin*. *Anagamin* means “one who will not come again”. He says:

At the end of his life, the spirit of the anagamin ascends to the heaven and obtains arhatship.

It is just below the arhat state.

Anagamin – the word means “one who will not come again”. Gone, he will be gone. Gone, he will be gone forever, he will not return. He has come to the point of no return. He is just close to being an *arhat*, he has passed the clouds. Just on the boundary, he is standing on the threshold of being an *arhat*. Maybe a small clinging has remained in him, and that clinging is with the body. So when he dies, that clinging also disappears. He will not be coming back.

Next is the skridagamin.

Skridagamin means “one who comes back”.

The skridagamin ascends to the heaven and after his death comes back to the earth once more . . .

Only once. He has still some clinging – very faint, but there are still a few roots and he will be pulled back to another womb again. He is not absolutely desireless. The arhat is absolutely desireless. A *skridagamin* has passed beyond the gross desires, but subtle desires are still there.

What are the gross desires? Desire for money, for power, prestige – these are gross desires. The desire to be free, to be calm, the desire to attain to the ultimate state of arhatship – these are subtle desires, but they are still desires. He will have to come back only once.

Next is the srotapanna.

The word *srotapanna* means “one who has entered into the stream”. *Srota* means stream and *apanna* means “one who has entered”. *Srotapanna* means “one who has entered the stream”. He has just begun his journey on the path. He is no longer worldly – he has become a sannyasin, he has entered the river. Faraway is the ocean, but he has entered the river, he has started. And when the journey is begun, it will end. However far it is, it is not far away.

The real problem is with those who have not even entered into the stream. They are standing on the bank. These are the worldly people, standing on the bank. The sannyasin, the *bhikkhu*, is the one who has entered into the river – knows well that the ocean is far away, but now half the journey is over, just by entering.

Next is the srotapanna. The srotapanna dies seven times and is born seven times, when he finally attains arhatship.

These are just symbolic, don't take them literally . . . these are just symbolic things. “Seven” does not mean exactly seven. It means many times he will die, many times he will be born, but his face is turned towards the ocean. He has entered into the Ganges and the journey has started.

By the severance of passions is meant that like the limbs severed they are never again made use of.

And Buddha said that by dropping the passions, he means that it

is as if somebody cuts off your hand; then you cannot use it. Or somebody takes your eyes out; then you cannot see through them. One who is ready to enter into the stream is one who, on his own, voluntarily drops passions, who says, “I will not use them again.”

Remember, this is not repression in the Freudian meaning of the term. One does not repress it, one simply withdraws energy from it. Sex remains there – you do not repress it, you simply don’t cooperate any more. The difference is tremendous. When sex is there and you repress it, you fight with it, then you don’t go above it – you remain with it. If you fight with it, you are still clinging to it. And if you fight with it you will remain afraid of it.

Buddha says one simply does not cooperate with it. A desire, a sexual desire arises – what will you do? Buddha says you simply watch. Let it be there. It will come and it will go. It will flicker in the mind, will try to attract you; you remain watchful, you don’t allow any unconsciousness, otherwise it will enter in you. You simply remain watchful.

Says Buddha, “One has to be just mindful. Then one is like a house where lamps are burning, where lamps are lit – the thieves are afraid to enter. When there are no lamps and the house is dark, then thieves enter easily. The person who has really become mindful is like the house where there is a guard at the door, fully awake, and lamps are lit. It is difficult for the thieves to enter, they cannot gather courage.”

The same happens when you are aware – you have a guard. When you are aware, your house is lit with light. Passions cannot enter you. They can come by, they can roam around, they will try to persuade you. But if you simply watch, they will disappear of their own accord – because they live through your cooperation. Don’t fight with them and don’t indulge in them; just remain aware. Then by and by they will drop like severed limbs.

If you start fighting, you are creating another problem. Instead of being an indulgent person you will become a repressive person. The problem is not solved, only the name is changed.

I have heard:

A doctor was treating a man who had been brought in paralytically drunk. “If the patient sees green snakes again, give him some of this medicine,” he told the nurse.

Later on he came back to find the man raving – but he hadn’t been given the medicine. “Didn’t I tell you to give him this medicine if he saw green snakes again?” the doctor demanded.

“But he didn’t see green snakes,” the nurse replied.

“Oh?”

“No, he has been seeing purple frogs.”

Now whether you see green snakes or purple frogs makes no difference – you are drunk! There are people who cooperate with their passions and there are people who fight with their passions – but both remain stuck with the passions. One is friendly, another is antagonistic, but both remain involved with the passions, and both are ways of subtle cooperation.

One has to drop out of the relationship. One has to just become a spectator, a watcher. Once you start watching you will become aware of layers and layers of passions. There are many layers. When gross passions are gone, more subtle layers will be found. Our whole life is like an onion. You peel it – another layer; you peel that – another layer, fresher, younger, more alive. But if you go on peeling, a moment comes when just emptiness is left in your hands. That’s what Buddha calls nirvana – emptiness. All layers gone.

I have heard:

The guitarist of a pop group was involved in a car accident and sustained injuries to his head. On arrival at the hospital the doctor ordered that his long, thick hair be completely cut off to enable the extent of the injuries to be seen. A nurse was detailed to undertake the task, and she set to work with a large pair of scissors.

After ten minutes or so she said to the young man, “You went to North Lancaster Comprehensive School when you were younger, didn’t you?”

“Yes, I did,” answered the youth. “Were you there as well?”

“No,” said the nurse, “I’m from London.”

“Well, how on earth did you know which school I went to?” queried the young man.

“I have just come to your cap,” replied the nurse.

Layers upon layers . . . And the deeper you cut, the more you will find – many things that were missing for many years; you will find your cap! The deeper you go into your mind, the deeper you will go in your childhood. Many things forgotten, lost – again, they are there. Nothing is ever lost, everything goes on accumulating. When you come to a point where you cannot find anything, then you have come to your being. The being is not like a layer; the being is simply space, pure space. The being is simply emptiness.

Buddha calls being “non-being”, he calls it *anatta*. Buddha says

if you find yourself, then there must be some layer still left. When suddenly you come to a point where you cannot find yourself – you are, and you cannot find yourself – then you have come home. And this can be attained only by effort.

This is his framework. Next we will start moving into his methodology – the ways of meditation, the ways of inner discipline; the ways to transcend the ego, the ways to transcend all. That's why I have called this series of talks “The Discipline of Transcendence”. But this is Buddha's framework.

Ordinarily you are standing on the bank. Then you cannot hope, then you are in a hopeless state. If you become a *srotapanna*, if you enter the stream, that's what I call *sannyas*. Through *sannyas* you become a *srotapanna* – you enter the stream, you take courage, you take the jump. It is a quantum leap from the bank into the stream. They are very close, but they are totally different. The bank never goes anywhere. It has no growth, it never moves. It is static, stagnant, stale, dead. And just right there is the flowing river, which is going somewhere.

If your life is not going anywhere, you are standing on the bank. Enter the stream and you start a journey. Your life starts changing, transforming. You begin a transfiguration, a metamorphosis, and each moment new visions open their doors to you. One day the river reaches the ocean. That day you become arhat, you dissolve into the ocean.

First *srotapanna*, then *skridagamin*, then *anagamin*, then *arhata*. These are the states. It is a very scientific framework. From being a worldly person you become *srotapanna* and then your journey has started.

Enough for today.

Chapter 2:

No Prejudice in the Heart

THE BUDDHA SAID:

The homeless shramana cuts off the passions, frees himself of attachments, understands the source of his own mind, penetrates the deepest doctrine of Buddha, and comprehends the dhamma, which is immaterial. He has no prejudice in his heart. He has nothing to hanker after. He is not hampered by the thought of the way nor is he entangled in karma. No prejudice, no compulsion, no discipline, no enlightenment and no going up through the grades and yet in possession of all honors in itself. This is called the way.

THE BUDDHA SAID:

Those who shaving their heads and faces become shramanas and who receive instruction in the way should surrender all worldly possessions and be contented with whatever they obtain by begging. One meal a day and one lodging under a tree and neither should be repeated, for what makes one stupid and irrational are attachments and the passions.

THE BUDDHA SAID:

There are ten things considered good by all beings, and ten things evil. Three of them depend upon the body, four upon the mouth, and three upon thought. Three evil deeds depending upon the body are killing, stealing, and committing adultery. The four depending upon the mouth are slandering, cursing, lying and flattery. The three depending upon thought are envy, anger and infatuation. All these things are against the holy way, and therefore they are evil. When these evils are not done, there are ten good deeds.

The first thing: Buddha emphasizes very much the idea of a

homeless wanderer— the idea of homelessness. It need not be taken literally, but the idea is tremendously significant. If you build a house, if you build a home around you, you are doing something which is not possible in the nature of things because this life is a flux. This life is not more than momentary. This life is not stable, not permanent – we are here only for a few moments. Death is approaching continuously; we are dying every moment while we are living.

To make this place, this space, a home, is absurd. The home is not possible here, the home is possible only in eternity. Time cannot be made a home, and if you try to make a home here then you will be constantly in misery because you will be fighting against nature; you will be going against what Buddha calls dhamma.

Dhamma simply means Tao, the way things are. If you want to make a dream permanent, you will suffer, because dream as such cannot be permanent. Its very nature is to be non-permanent. In fact, even to repeat the same dream again is difficult. The dream is illusory, you cannot live in it forever.

To think of a permanent life here on this shore, the shore of time, is stupid. If you are a little intelligent, if you are a little aware and if you can see all around you what is happening . . . You were not here one day, and you will not be here one day again. How can you make a home here? You can stay here as if one stays overnight in a caravanserai – when the morning comes you have to go. Yes, you can pitch tents here, but you cannot make a home. You can have shelter, but you should not become attached to it. You should not call it “my”, “mine”. The moment you call anything “mine” you are falling into stupidity.

Nothing belongs to you, nothing can belong to you. One is a homeless wanderer in the very nature of things. Time is impermanent. Time means the temporary. Time cannot have any eternal home in it. To make a home in time is to make a house on the sands, or to make a signature in water – you go on making it; it goes on disappearing. Buddha says to understand this homelessness is to become a sannyasin. There is no necessity that you leave home. You can leave if you feel good that way, if it fits with your nature. You can leave home, you can literally become a wanderer but it is not a must. You can remain in the home but it is no longer a home for you. You know you don't possess it. You may be using it for a while, but tomorrow you have to go. So don't make a home anywhere – not even in the body, because that body is also continuously disappearing.

If you don't make a home anywhere then you are a sannyasin in spirit – and a sannyasin is never miserable, because misery comes out of attachment. When your attachments are not fulfilled as you

wanted them to be, when your expectations are not fulfilled, frustration arises. Frustration is a by-product. If you don't expect, nobody can frustrate you. If you don't want to make a home here, even death cannot frighten you. Nothing can frighten you. If you don't cling to anything, how can you be made miserable? Your clinging creates misery, because you want to cling and in the very nature of things, things are changing; you cannot cling. They are slipping constantly out of your hands, there is no way to cling to them.

You cling to the wife, you cling to the husband, to the children, to the parents, to the friends. You cling to persons, to things, and everything is in a constant flux. You are trying to hold a river in your arms and the river is flowing fast; it is rushing towards some unknown goal – you are frustrated. The wife falls in love with somebody else – you are frustrated. The husband escapes – you are frustrated. The child dies – you are frustrated. The bank fails, goes bankrupt – you are frustrated. The body becomes ill, weak, death starts knocking at the door – you are frustrated. But these frustrations are because of your expectations. You are responsible for them.

If you understand that this place is not a home and you are a homeless wanderer here, a stranger in an unknown land; you have to leave, you have to go . . . if you have penetrated that point, if you have understood it, then you don't make a home anywhere. You become a homeless wanderer, a *parivrajaka*. You may even literally become so; it depends on you.

You may really become a wanderer, or spiritually you may become a wanderer. My own emphasis is not to become literally a wanderer, because what is the point? Buddha's emphasis was not so; let it be clear to you. Buddha has not said what to do, whether to follow him literally or not. Millions followed him literally – they dropped out of their homes, out of their families; they really became *bhikkhus* wandering all over the country, begging. I don't insist on that. If really you understand, then there is no need to do it in such a factual way. Because to me it appears that when a person does not understand the idea completely, only then he literally becomes a wanderer; otherwise there is no need. You can be in the home, you can be with your wife and your children, and yet remain alert that nothing belongs to you; remain alert that you don't fall into attachments; remain alert that if things change you are ready to accept the change, that you will not weep for the spilt milk, that you will not cry, that you will not go crazy and mad.

To me this seems to be more significant than really becoming a wanderer, because that is easier. And if there is no home and if you don't possess anything, then how can you renounce? The very idea

of renouncing it makes it clear that somewhere deep in the unconscious you thought that you possessed it, because you can renounce only something which you possess.

How can you renounce? Your wife is not yours – how can you renounce? Your children are not yours – how can you renounce? They don't belong to you, so where is the point to renounce then? You can simply understand that they don't belong to you; that we are strangers – we have met on the way, or we have stayed under the same tree for a few days, but we are strangers.

Understanding it deep in your awareness is enough. My emphasis is to become a spiritual wanderer. There is no need to drag the body like a beggar; just let your spirit be that of a wanderer, and that is enough. Don't create bondage for your spirit.

THE BUDDHA SAID:

The homeless shramana cuts off the passions . . .

Passions are our dreams. Passions are our dreams of the future, desires of the future, desires of how things should be. Deep down we are always discontent; whatever is, is not satisfying. We are continuously weaving dreams to change things – to build a better house, to have a better wife, to have a better education, to have more money, to have this, to have that. We are continuously thinking in terms of how to make life better. We go on living in the future which is not.

Living in the future is a dream because it exists not. Living in the future is based on a deep discontent with the present.

So two things have to be understood about passions. One, whatsoever we have we cling to it. Look at the paradox: whatsoever we have we cling to it and still we are not satisfied with it. We are miserable with it so we desire to modify it, to decorate it, to make it better. We continuously cling to that which we have, and we continuously desire that which we don't have, and between these two we are crushed! And this will be so always and always. It was so yesterday, it is so today, it is going to be so tomorrow . . . your whole life. What you have, you will cling to so that nobody can take it away, and still you will be miserable with it and you will hope that someday things will be better. A person who lives in passion, in desire, lives a futile life – always miserable, always dreaming. Miserable with reality and dreaming about unreal things.

I have heard:

“How many fish have you caught?” a passerby asked old Mulla Nasruddin who was fishing off the end of the pier.

“Well,” said the old Mulla thoughtfully, “if I catch this one that is nibbling at my bait and two more, I will have three.”

This is how human mind goes on dreaming. Our life is short, very short, and our dreams are immense.

Seamus and Bridget met on Rockaway Beach. As they stretched out together on a blanket under the boardwalk, Seamus whispered huskily, “Bridget, I love you.”

“But,” protested Bridget, “we have only just met!”

“I know,” replied Seamus, “but I am only here for the weekend.”

Everybody is here only for the weekend. Life is really very short. How is love possible? How can you make a home here? How can you possess anything? Everything is continuously disappearing. You are chasing shadows.

BUDDHA SAYS:

The homeless shramana cuts off the passions, frees himself of attachments . . .

By attachments he means relationships that really don't exist, only you believe that they exist. You are a husband – you believe that a certain relationship exists between you and your wife, but it is just a belief. Have you not observed the fact that even living with a woman for forty, fifty years, she remains a stranger, and you remain a stranger to her? Down the centuries, men have been trying to understand women and the feminine mind, but they have not been able to understand yet. The woman has been trying to understand the mind of the man, yet it remains a mystery. And men and women have lived together for centuries.

Observe it. How can you relate to anybody? The other remains out of your grasp. The other remains other – unreachable. You may touch the periphery, and the other may even pretend that yes, you have related, but we remain alone. Relationship is just make-believe. It helps, it helps in a way. It allows us to feel that we are not alone. It makes life a little more comfortable, but that comfort is illusory. The other remains the other, and there is no way to penetrate the mystery of the other. We are alone.

When Buddha says “the homeless *shramana* frees himself of all attachments”, he means that one comes to see that attachment is not possible here. Attachment is impossible, relationship is impossible. All relationship is just an absurd effort because you cannot reach the

other, you cannot touch the center of the other's being. And unless you have touched the center, how can you relate? You don't know the other's soul, you only know the body, actions, attitudes – they are just on the periphery. We meet on the periphery, that is the misery of relationship. We remain on the periphery and we keep on believing in our hope, in our desire, that some day the relationship will really happen and the center will meet the center, the heart will meet the heart, that we will dissolve into one another – but it never happens.

It cannot happen. To become aware of this disturbing reality is difficult because it takes the very ground from underneath your feet. You are left so lonely that you again start believing in old dreams, relationship, this and that. You again start trying to create bridges . . . but you never succeed and have never succeeded. Not that your effort is not enough, not that your skill is not enough, but because in the very nature of things attachment is an impossibility. You are trying to do something that reality does not allow.

Your aloneness is eternal. Buddha says that to understand this aloneness and to remain true to it is the meaning of dropping attachments. Not that you escape from the world, but simply all attachments drop, bridges drop. And this is the beauty – that when all attachments drop, you become more understanding, and your life with others becomes more peaceful . . . because you don't hope. You don't hope for the impossible, you don't expect. Whatsoever happens you feel grateful, and whatsoever does not happen you know it cannot happen. You become, in a deeper way, very accepting. You don't try to force reality to be according to your desires. You start learning how to let go, how to be one and harmonious with the reality itself.

. . . understands the source of his own mind, penetrates the deepest doctrine of Buddha . . .

What is the deepest doctrine of Buddha? Buddha's greatest message is the message of no-self, *anatta* – that is his deepest doctrine. That you have to understand. First he says don't make a home here, then he says don't be attached. Then he says look into yourself – you are not!

First he says the world is illusory, don't make a home here. Then he says attachments are just dreams, drop all attachments from your mind. And then he comes to his deepest doctrine. The doctrine is: now look inside, you are not.

You can exist only with a home, with possessions, with relationships. The "I" is nothing but a combination of all these dreams, a cumulative effect. Dreams of possessing things, dreams of

possessing people – relationships, attachment, love, passion, dreams of the future – all these accumulate and become the ego. When you drop all these, suddenly you disappear, and in your disappearance the law starts functioning in its truest way. That is what the Buddha calls the dhamma, the Tao, the ultimate law.

So there are three layers of the ego. The first layer is the world – your house, your car, your bank balance. Second, attachments – your relationships, your affairs, your children, wife, husband, friends, enemies. And the deepest layer, you. And these all are joined together. If you really want to get rid of your ego, you will have to move in a very scientific way. That's what Buddha is doing. First, no home; second, no relationships; third, no self. If you do the two first things, the preliminary things, the third happens automatically – you look inside and you are not there. And when you see that you are not there – there is no entity inside, no substantial entity, you cannot call yourself “I” – you are freed.

This is what liberation is in the Buddhist way. This is what nirvana is. The word nirvana means cessation of the self, arising of a no-self, emptiness . . . the zero experience. Nothing is, only nothing is. Then how can you be disturbed? because now there is nobody to be disturbed. Then how can you die? because now there is nobody to die. How can you be born? because now there is nobody to be born. This nobodiness is tremendously beautiful. It is opening and opening, space and space, with no boundaries.

This is Buddha's concept of reality. It is very difficult to understand. We can understand that ego can be dropped – but the soul!? Then we go on in a subtle way remaining egoistic. Then we call it that subtle ego the soul, the atman.

Buddha is very consistent. He says any idea of yourself, that you can *be* in some way, is egoistic.

Let me try to explain it to you through modern physics, because modern physics has also come to the same point. Ask the modern scientist; he says matter only appears to be, it is not. If you go deeper into matter, you find only emptiness. It is nothing but emptiness. If you analyze matter, if you keep on dividing the atom, then it disappears. At the ultimate core only emptiness remains . . . only space, pure space. The same analysis Buddha did with the self. What scientists have been doing with matter, Buddha did with mind. And both agree that if analysis goes deep enough, then there is no substance left; all substance disappears. Non-existence is left.

Buddha could not survive in India. India is the oldest country in the world which has believed in the self, the atman. The Upanishads, the Vedas, from Patanjali to Mahavira, everybody has believed in the self. They were all against the ego but they never dared to say that the self is also nothing but a trick of the ego.

Buddha dared to assert the ultimate truth. While he was alive, people could tolerate him. His presence was such a powerful presence, his presence was so convincing that they could not deny it, they could not say that what he is saying was against the human mind, absolutely against the human mind. They may have discussed here and there; sometimes a few people came to discuss with him also – “What are you saying? Then what is the point of being liberated if nobody remains? We hope for liberation so that we will be liberated.”

Buddha’s emphasis is that you will never be liberated, because until and unless you die there is no liberation. Liberation is from the self, the self is not liberated. Liberation is from the self itself.

But his presence was very convincing; whatsoever he was saying must be true. His existence was a proof. The grace that had happened to him, the harmony that was surrounding him, the luminousness that was following him wherever he walked, moved . . . the glow. People were puzzled – because this man was saying that there is no self, only tremendous emptiness inside. They could not deny him, but by the time Buddha had gone, they started criticizing, arguing; they started denying. Only five hundred years after Buddha left his body, Buddhism was uprooted from India. People could not believe in such a drastic attitude. Nothing is, the world is illusory, attachments are stupid, and in the final analysis you are not. Then what is the point? If everything is a dream and even the self is a dream, then why should we go into it? Let it be a dream – at least something is there. Why should we make so much effort, so many arduous efforts to achieve just nothingness?

But you have to understand. What Buddha calls nothingness is nothingness from your side – he says nothing remains, nothing of your world, nothing of your relationship, nothing of you – but he is not saying that nothing remains. He is saying nothing remains from your side, and that which remains cannot be expressed. That which is left, there is no way to express it to you, no way to communicate it. Because in whatsoever way it is communicated, it will be misunderstood. If Buddha says, “Yes, the self exists, but the self is a non-ego state,” you may nod your head that “yes, we understand.” But you don’t understand, because the very idea of self carries something of the ego in it: “I am.” Howsoever pure, but the “I” remains. Your idea of atman, self, supreme self, Self with a capital S, is nothing but a transfigured ego.

It happened:

Mulla Nasruddin and the local priest were always fighting and arguing and eventually they finished up in the court.

After listening to evidence from both sides, the magistrate

said, “I feel sure that this can be settled amicably. Shake hands with each other and say something of good will.”

The priest shook Nasruddin’s hand and said, “I wish for you what you wish for me.”

“See, Your Honor?” said the Mulla. “He is starting it again!”

He has not said anything, he has simply said, “I wish for you what you wish for me.” But Mulla knows well what he wishes for the other man. He says, “He is starting it again!” Whatever is said to you will be colored by you.

Buddha remained very pure; he wouldn’t allow you to corrupt. He wouldn’t give you even a hint. He simply denied totally, absolutely. He said whatsoever you know disappears – your world, your love, your attachments, your things, your relationships, you. You are the center, your world is your periphery. They all disappear together. It is not possible that you can be saved when your world is lost. When the periphery, the circumference is lost, the center is also lost. They go together. When the elephant moves, the tail of the elephant also moves with it. When your whole world drops, you also drop with it; you are part of it, an organic part of that dream. But let me remind you – don’t misunderstand Buddha. He was very logical not to say anything about that which remains. He said, “Come and experience it.” He said, “Don’t force me to relate it to you linguistically. Let it be existential experience.” You disappear but in a way for the first time you appear. But this appearance is something so totally different from all your experiences that there is no way to relate it. Whatsoever will be said will be wrong, because you will interpret it in your own way.

The homeless shramana cuts off the passions, frees himself of attachments, understands the source of his own mind, penetrates the deepest doctrine of Buddha, and comprehends the dhamma which is immaterial.

This much Buddha allows – that there is a dhamma, a natural law, which is immaterial. He will not say spiritual; he simply says it is “immaterial”. What is this dhamma? What is this law?

It will be easy if you understand Lao Tzu’s concept of Tao, or if you understand the Vedic concept of *vaidya*. There must be something like a law that holds everything together. The changing seasons, the moving stars . . . the whole universe goes on so smoothly; it must have a certain law.

The difference has to be understood. Jews, Christians, Mohammedans, Hindus, call that law “God” – they personify it.

Buddha is not ready to do that. He says to personify God is to destroy the whole beauty of it, because that is anthropomorphic, anthropocentric attitude. Man thinks of God as if he is just like man – magnified, quantitatively millions of times bigger, but still, like man. Buddha says God is not a person. That's why he never uses the word "God". He talks about dhamma, the law. God is not a person but just a force, an immaterial force. Its nature is more like law than like a person.

That's why in Buddhism, prayer does not exist. You cannot pray to a law; it will be pointless. You cannot pray to the law of gravitation, can you? It will be meaningless. The law cannot listen to your prayer. You can follow the law, and you can be in happy harmony with the law. Or, you can disobey the law and you can suffer. But there is no point in praying to the law. If you go against the law of gravitation you may break a few of your bones, you may have a few fractures. If you follow the law of gravitation, you can avoid the fractures – but what is the point of praying? Sitting before the icon and praying to the Lord – "I am going for a journey, help me" – it is absurd.

Buddha says the universe runs according to a law, not according to a person. His attitude is scientific. Because, he says, a person can be whimsical. You can pray to God and you can persuade him, but that is dangerous. Somebody who is not praying to God may not be able to persuade him. God may be prejudiced – a person is always capable of prejudice. And that's what all the religions say – that if you pray, God will save you; if you pray you will not be miserable. If you don't pray, you will be thrown into hell. To think in these terms about God is human, but very unscientific. That means God enjoys your flattery, your prayers. So if you are a praying person and you go regularly to the church, to the temple, and you read the Gita and the Bible, you recite the Koran, then he will help you; otherwise he will be annoyed by you. If you say, "I don't believe in God," he will be very angry at you. Buddha says this is stupid. God is not a person. You cannot annoy him and you cannot buttress him, you cannot flatter him. You cannot persuade him to your own way; whether you believe in him or not, that doesn't matter.

A law exists beyond your belief. If you follow it, you are happy. If you don't follow it, you become unhappy. Look at the austere beauty of the concept of law. Then the whole question is of a discipline, not of prayer. Understand the law and be in harmony with it. Don't be in a conflict with it, that's all. No need for a temple, no need for a mosque, no need to pray. Just follow your understanding.

Buddha says that whenever you are miserable it is just an indication that you have gone against the law, you have disobeyed

the law. Whenever you are in misery, just understand one thing; watch, observe, analyze your situation, diagnose it – you must be going somewhere against the law, you must be in conflict with the law. Buddha says it is not that the law is punishing you; no, that is foolish – how can a law punish you? You are punishing yourself by being against the law. If you go with the law, it is not that the law is rewarding you – how can the law reward you? If you go with it, you are rewarding yourself. The whole responsibility is yours to obey or disobey. If you obey, you live in heaven. If you disobey, you live in hell. Hell is a state of your own mind when you are antagonistic to the law, and heaven is a state of your own mind when you are in harmony.

He has no prejudice in his heart.

Buddha says one who understands the law has no prejudice in his heart.

He has nothing to hanker after. He is not hampered by the thought of the way, nor is he entangled in karma. No prejudice, no compulsion, no discipline, no enlightenment, and no going up through the grades, and yet in possession of all honors in itself – this is called the way.

This is a very revolutionary statement. You cannot come across such a statement in Krishna's assertions, or Jesus' assertions, or Mohammed's. This is tremendously revolutionary. Buddha says a real man of understanding does not even hanker for enlightenment. Because even to desire enlightenment is to desire, and desire is misery. Whether you desire money or you desire satori, whether you desire some person or you desire enlightenment, whether you desire prestige, power, respectability, or you desire dhyana, samadhi, meditation, enlightenment, desire as such is the same. The nature of desire is the same. Desire means desire, and desire brings misery. What you desire is irrelevant – you desire, and that's enough to make you miserable.

Desire means you have moved away from reality, you have moved away from that which is. Desire means you have fallen into the trap of a dream. Desire means you are not here now, you have gone somewhere in the future.

Non-desire is enlightenment – so how can you desire enlightenment? If you desire enlightenment your very desire prevents its happening. You cannot desire enlightenment, you can only understand the nature of desire, and in the light of

understanding, desire disappears – as you bring a lamp into a dark room, darkness disappears. Desire is darkness. When you light a candle of understanding, desire disappears. And when there is no desire, there is enlightenment. That's what enlightenment is. Try to understand this. This is one of the things you will need very much.

It is very easy to change the object of your desire from worldly things to otherworldly things.

I was in a certain town and I had gone for an evening walk. Just as I was approaching the garden a woman came to me and gave me a booklet. On the booklet there was a beautiful garden on the cover page, and a beautiful bungalow by the side of a spring. Tall trees, and far in the background snow peaks . . . I looked inside. Inside, I was surprised to see that it was a propaganda pamphlet printed by some Christian community. In the pamphlet it said, "If you want to have a beautiful house in the garden of God, then follow Jesus. If in the other world you want such a beautiful house then follow Jesus."

Now this type of attitude seems to be very worldly! But this has been the case. Except Buddha's attitude, all other religions are in some way or other asking you not to drop desire, but to change the *object* of desire. That is the difference. They say, "Don't desire worldly things, desire heavenly things. Don't desire money, desire God." Now you can see the difference, the revolutionary change. Buddha says simply don't desire. It is not a question of what you desire; if you desire you will remain in misery. Don't desire, that's all. Be desireless, that's all. And when you are desireless you are calm and quiet and collected. When you are desireless the ego disappears; when you are desireless, misery disappears. And when you are desireless, you fall in tune with the law.

Your desire is always a conflict with the law. Your desire simply says that you are not satisfied with what is given to you. You ask for more, or you ask for something else. A desireless person simply says, "Whatsoever is, is. Whatsoever is happening is happening. I accept it and I go with it. I have no other idea in my mind. If this is what is happening, I will simply delight in it. I will enjoy it. I will be with it."

This is what I call surrender. Surrendering means non-desiring.

He is not hampered by the thought of the way.

If you are desiring God, paradise . . . in fact, the very word "paradise" means a walled garden . . . if you are desiring some beautiful palaces in the other world, then even the way – the path, the religion, the Bible, the Koran, the Gita – will hamper you. It will burden you, because a desiring mind is always disturbed, always wavering, always thinking whether it is going to happen or not,

always doubting whether it has ever happened to anybody: “Am I foolish in desiring it? Does it really exist? Does it exist, the other world, the God, the happiness, the paradise? Or is it just a myth, a story for children, for people who need toys?” Then even the way becomes a tension, because you are using everything as a means to reach some end.

Buddha says the man of understanding is not even hampered by the thought of the way because he is not going anywhere, so there is no point in thinking of any “way”. He is simply here! When you are going somewhere, you need a way. When you understand, you simply enjoy being here. This moment is enough. There is nowhere to go, so what is the point of a way, a path, a means? There is no end, no goal, nowhere to go.

That’s my emphasis also. There is nowhere to go. Just be here. Just be here as totally as possible. Don’t allow your mind to go anywhere. And in that moment when you are not going anywhere, everything falls into silence. Experience it. You can experience it right now, listening to me, if you are not going anywhere.

You can listen to me in two ways. One way is of the mind, of the desire. You can listen to me in order to find some clue so that you can become enlightened; to find some clue so that you can enter into the palace of God; to find some key. Then you will be uneasy, restless. Or you can listen to me without any idea of going anywhere. You can simply listen to me, you can just be here with me. In that silence when you are just here, delighting with me, listening to me as one listens to a waterfall, as one listens to birds chirping in the trees, as one listens to the wind blowing in the pines – just listening for no reason – then in that moment you are in tune with Tao, you are in tune with dhamma, you are in tune with the universe.

The universe is going somewhere; you fall in tune with it, you move with the river. Then you don’t push the river. Then you don’t have any other goal than the goal of the whole.

. . . nor is he entangled in karma.

A man who understands has nothing to do, he has just to be. His being is all his action. His action is his delight, he enjoys it. You ask a painter. If the painter is a real painter, then he enjoys painting, not that there is some result to it. There may not be, there may be; that is irrelevant.

Somebody asked van Gogh, “What is your best painting?” He was painting something, and he said, “This one – that which I am doing right now.” People were wondering why van Gogh was painting at all because his paintings were not selling. Not a single

painting was sold while he was alive. And he was dying, starving himself, because he had only just enough money to live. Each week his brother was giving him a certain amount of money, enough just to survive. So every week for three days he would eat and for four days he would fast to save money for colors, brushes, canvases – and his paintings were not selling at all. People used to think he was mad, but he was tremendously happy – starving and happy. What was his happiness? The very act of painting.

Remember, an action becomes a karma, a bondage, if you have some end, if you are “going somewhere” through it. If your action is just your delight – like children playing, making sand castles, enjoying, no goal to their activity, just playing, intrinsic play in the very activity – then there is no karma, then there is no bondage. Then each action brings more and more freedom.

. . . no prejudice, no compulsion, no discipline.

A man of understanding need not discipline himself. His understanding is his discipline. You need discipline because your understanding is not enough.

Someone wrote a letter to me saying that he knows what is right but he goes on doing what is wrong. He knows what is wrong, still he goes on doing it. “So how to change it, Osho?” he writes. Now if you really know what is right, how can you do wrong? Somewhere your knowledge must be borrowed, it cannot be yours. If you really know what is wrong, how can you do it? It is impossible. If you do, that simply shows you don’t know.

Socrates used to say, “Knowledge is virtue.” If you know something, it starts happening. But the knowledge must be real, and by real I mean it must be yours, it must have come through your own life, it must be an essence of your own experience. It should not be borrowed, it should not be academic, it should not be scriptural, it should not be just information. It should be your own experience, authentically lived. Then you cannot go against it, there is no way.

How can you pass through a wall knowing that it is a wall? You go through the door. You never come to me and say, “I know where the door is, but still I first try to go through the wall. It always hits my head. What to do now?” If you know where the door is you pass through it. If you say you know and still you try to go through the wall, that simply shows you don’t know. You may have heard, somebody else may have told you, but you don’t trust.

Your action shows what you know. Your action is the only proof of your knowledge, nothing else.

Buddha says no discipline is needed if understanding is there.

Understanding brings its own discipline – intrinsic, inner. There are two sorts of discipline, as there are two sorts of knowledge. If knowledge comes from without, then you have to enforce discipline on yourself. If knowledge springs, wells up from within, then there is no need to enforce any discipline. Discipline comes as a shadow to it; it follows.

. . . no discipline, no enlightenment, and no going up through the grades.

And Buddha says there are no grades. People are there who come and say to me, “I am advanced but still not yet attained.” They want from me a certificate also, so that I can give them an indication of how far they are advanced, on what grade they are.

Buddha says in fact there are no gradations. There are only two types of people – enlightened and unenlightened. There is no in-between. It is not that a few people are there who are just in the middle. Either you are alive or you are dead, there is no in-between. Either you know or you don’t; there is no in-between. Grades don’t exist.

All grades are tricks of the ego. The ego says, “Yes, I am not yet enlightened, but I am far advanced. Just ninety-nine degrees. One degree more and I will be enlightened. I am not far behind – I am far advanced.” Drop all that nonsense. If you are not enlightened you are simply not enlightened.

All unenlightened people are the same and all enlightened people are also the same. The difference is just as if you are sleeping and somebody is sitting by your side fully alert and aware. This is the only difference. If you are awake, you are awake. You cannot say, “I am just in-between.” There is no state like that. If you are asleep, you are asleep; if you are awake, you are awake.

The difference is small and yet tremendous. A person fully alert, sitting awake, and a person snoring by the side – both are the same human beings, same consciousnesses, but one is in deep darkness, lost, oblivious of itself; another luminous, alive, attained to its own inner flame. If something happens then they will react in different ways. The alert person is bound to react in a different way. His reaction will be a response; he will respond, knowing well what he is doing. If the sleepy person reacts, his reaction will be a mechanical reaction, not knowing what he is doing.

BUDDHA SAYS:

. . . no discipline, no enlightenment, no going up through the grades, and yet in possession of all honors in itself –

this is called the way.

Buddha says if you surrender the ego, if you surrender your self, you come into a harmony with the law and everything starts happening on its own. You have only to surrender. If you are ready to disappear, you will be full of the law and the law will take care.

Have you watched it? If you trust the river you can float. The moment you lose the trust you start drowning. If you trust, the river takes you in her hands; if you become afraid you start drowning. That's why dead bodies start floating on the surface of the river, because dead bodies cannot doubt. Dead bodies cannot be afraid. Alive, the same persons went down into the river and drowned. When dead, they surface, they start floating on the surface. Now it is very difficult for the river to drown them – no river has been able to drown a dead body up to now. Alive, what happens? What happens? The dead man must know some secret. The secret is that he cannot doubt.

You must have heard the beautiful parable in Jesus' life – that his disciples are crossing the lake of Galilee and he is left behind and he says, "I will be coming soon. I have to say my prayers." And then the disciples were very much puzzled – he was coming, walking on the lake! They are afraid, frightened, scared. They think it must be some evil force. How can he walk on the water?

One disciple says, "Master, is it really you?" Jesus says, "Yes." Then the disciple says, "Then if you can walk, why can't I, your disciple?" Jesus says, "You can also walk – come!" And the disciple comes and he walks a few steps, and he's surprised that he is walking – but then doubt arises. He says, "What is happening? This is unbelievable."

The moment he thinks, "This is unbelievable. Am I in a dream, or some trick of the devil, what is happening?" he starts drowning. And Jesus says, "You, you of little faith! Why did you doubt? You have walked a few steps and you know that it has happened; then too you doubt?"

Whether this story happened in this way or not is not the point. But I also know; you can try. If you trust the river, just relax in the river, you will float. Then the doubt will arise, the same doubt that came to Jesus' disciple: "What is happening? How is it possible? I'm not drowning" – and immediately you will start drowning.

The difference between a swimmer and a non-swimmer is not much. The swimmer has learned how to trust; the non-swimmer has not yet learned how to trust. Both are the same. When the non-swimmer falls into the river, doubt arises. He starts feeling afraid – the river is going to drown him. And of course then the river drowns him. But he is drowning himself in his own doubt. The river is not

doing anything. The swimmer knows the river, the ways of the river, and he has been with the river many times and he trusts; he simply floats, he is not afraid.

Life is exactly the same.

BUDDHA SAYS:

... and yet in possession of all honors in itself – this is called the way.

The man of understanding is in a total let-go. He allows the law to function. If you want old religious language, non-Buddhist language, you can call it surrender to God. Then the devotee says, “Now I am no more, only you are. I am just a flute on your lips, a hollow bamboo. You sing; the song will be yours, I will be just a passage.” This is old religious language. Buddha is not happy with the old language. Buddha is not happy with the poets’ language; he likes the scientific language more. He talks the same way as Albert Einstein, or Newton, or Edison. He talks about the law – now it is for you to decide. The difference is only of language, but the basic thing is letting go, a total surrender.

THE BUDDHA SAID:

Those who, shaving their heads and faces, become shramanas and who receive instructions in the way, should surrender all worldly possessions and be contented with whatever they obtain by begging.

One meal a day, and one lodging under a tree, and neither should be repeated, for what makes one stupid and irrational is attachments and the passions.

Buddha insisted for his sannyasins to shave their heads, their faces. These are just gestures, don’t take them literally. They are just gestures, indications that you are ready to surrender. They don’t have any other meaning. The only meaning is that you are ready to go with Buddha. When you take *sannyas*, when you are initiated, you are simply saying yes. You are saying, “Yes, I am coming with you. Even if you say to do something mad, I’m ready to do it.” It is just a surrendering gesture.

Buddha used to say that a *shramana* should live in insecurity. That’s why he said become beggars. Again, don’t take it literally. Try to understand the spirit of it. He says you cannot possess anything, it is impossible to possess anything. Life is insecurity and

there is no way to become secure. Death is coming and will destroy all your securities, so don't be bothered. Even if you are a beggar, be happy, be a beggar happily. There is no point in worrying too much about your security. Understand the insecurity of life, accept it – in that very acceptance you become secure.

AND BUDDHA USED TO SAY:

One meal a day and one lodging under a tree and neither should be repeated.

Because, Buddha says, if you repeat a certain thing again and again it becomes a habit, a mechanical habit. And when you become mechanical you lose awareness. So don't repeat. Go on changing the situation, so in every situation you have to be alert. Go on changing the town. Don't beg from the same door again and don't sleep under the same tree again. These are just devices so that you have to remain alert.

Have you watched it? If you move into a new house, for a few days you feel very uneasy. By and by you become accustomed to the new house and then you feel at home. It takes a little time: between three days and three weeks, a person begins to feel at home in the new house. Then the house has become a habit. Buddha says before that happens, move. Not even under the same tree should you sleep twice, otherwise there is a tendency in the mind to claim it.

Beggars also stake a claim. A beggar sits under a tree and begs; then he will not allow any other beggars to sit there. He will say, "Go somewhere else. This is my tree!" Beggars have their dominions. A beggar comes to beg in your neighborhood; he will not allow other beggars to go there, he will fight – this territory is his. You may not know it, but you belong to his territory. He will not allow other beggars to enter.

Buddha says don't allow the mind to become lazy, don't allow the mind to become mechanical. Remain alert, moving. Don't become stagnant, go on moving, because one becomes stupid and irrational if attachment and passions are allowed. If you become attached you become stupid, you lose intelligence.

The more secure you are, the more stupid you become. That's why it rarely happens that intelligent people come from rich families . . . very rarely. Because they are so secure, they have no challenges in life, they have all that they need – why bother? You cannot find many rich people whose money is inherited that are very sharp. They are almost always a little dull – they live in a sort of stupor, dragging. Comfortably dragging, conveniently dragging,

dragging in Rolls Royces – but dragging, dull. Life seems to have no challenge because there is no insecurity.

Buddha used it as a device: become insecure so you become sharp. A beggar has to be very sharp and intelligent – he has nothing. He has to live moment to moment. That's why Buddha insisted for his sannyasins to become beggars. He called them *bhikkhus*. *Bhikkhu* means “a beggar”. It was just a reversal. In India, sannyasins have always been known as swamis – swami means a master. Exactly, the word “swami” means “lord”. Buddha changed the whole thing. He called his sannyasins *bhikkhus*, beggars. But he brought in a new dimension, a new meaning, a new challenge. He said, “Live moment to moment. Having nothing, you will never be secure – and you will never be stupid.”

Have you watched? When you have money, you become lethargic. When you don't have money you become alert. If suddenly all is lost you will become very alert. If you have to keep yourself alive by begging, you cannot be certain about the tomorrow. Nobody knows what is going to happen, whether you will be able to get something or not, whether you will be able to find somebody to give you something or not; you don't know. Tomorrow is not settled, everything is uncertain. In uncertainty, in insecurity, your intelligence becomes more and more sharp. You become more brilliant.

THE BUDDHA SAID:

There are ten things considered good by all beings, and ten things evil.

What are they?

Three of them depend upon the body, four upon the mouth, and three upon thought. Three evil deeds depending upon the body are: killing, stealing, and committing adultery. The four depending upon the mouth are: slandering, cursing, lying and flattery. The three depending upon thought are: envy, anger and infatuation. All these things are against the holy way, and therefore they are evil.

Look at the difference. Buddha says they are against the holy way. If you do these ten things you will be miserable, you will be continuously in pain, anxiety, anguish. It is difficult for a man to be violent and not be miserable. If you kill somebody you will remain in misery. Before you kill you will be in misery, when you kill you

will be in misery, and after you have killed you will be in misery.

Destructiveness cannot bring happiness; destruction is against the law of creation. The law of creation is to be creative. So Buddha says if you are destructive you will be miserable. If you are envious, infatuated, competitive, ambitious, jealous, possessive, you will be in misery. The only criterion to know what is wrong is that it makes you miserable. Now this is a very different attitude. Not that God says, “Don’t do this,” not that there are ten commandments. Buddha also says there are ten things to be avoided, but not that there is a despot, somebody dictating, somebody like Adolf Hitler or Joseph Stalin sitting there on a golden throne in the heavens and dictating, “Do this and don’t do that.” There is nobody. It is for you to decide.

Buddha gives you just a criterion: whatsoever brings misery is wrong. He does not say it is a sin. Look at the emphasis. He says it is simply wrong – just as two plus two are not five. If you make two plus two five, nobody will say that you have committed a sin. It is simply wrong, a mistake.

In Buddhist terminology there is nothing like sin; only mistakes, errors. There is no condemnation. You can correct the error, you can correct the mistake. It is simple. You can put two plus two as four, the moment you understand.

All these things are against the holy way and therefore they are evil.

There is no other reason for them to be evil: simply because they create misery for you. In fact, you create it by following them. If you don’t want to be miserable, then avoid these things.

When these evils are not done, there are ten good deeds.

And this is very significant. Listen to this sentence again:

When these evils are not done, there are ten good deeds.

Buddha does not talk about the good deeds. He says if you don’t do these ten, you will be in harmony with the whole, with the law, and whatever happens will be good. Good is not that which one needs to do. Good is when you are not a doer; when you are in a let-go with the whole, moving with the law, with the river, good happens. Good is not an act.

Now there is no sin, only errors. And there is no virtue, only good deeds happening when you have surrendered yourself. So Buddha says avoid the bad deeds, the evil things. He is not saying practice the good ones, he is simply saying avoid the wrong and you will come in tune with the whole, you will become harmonious with

the law, and then whatsoever happens is good. Good is like health. Don't be ill, then you are healthy. Just avoid illness, that's all, and you will be healthy. If you go to the doctor and you ask him what the definition of health is, he will not be able to define it. He will say, "I don't know. I can simply diagnose your illness. I can prescribe a medicine for the illness. When the illness has disappeared you will be healthy, and then you can know what health is."

The same is the Buddha's attitude. Buddha used to call himself a physician, a *vaidya*, a doctor. He used to say of himself, "I am just a doctor, a physician. You come to me, I diagnose your disease, I prescribe medicine. When diseases have disappeared, whatsoever is left, that presence is health."

When these evils are not done, there are ten good deeds.

So he is not giving you a positive discipline to be followed, just a negative understanding. Just try to understand, so that the error is not committed, so that you become harmonious with the whole. Harmony is happiness, and harmony is heaven. And harmony happens only when you are in tune with the whole. To be with the whole is to be holy.

Enough for today.

Chapter 3:

Be Therefore Mindful

THE BUDDHA SAID:

If a man who has committed many a misdemeanor does not repent and cleanse his heart of the evil, retribution will come upon his person as sure as the streams run into the ocean which becomes ever deeper and wider.

If a man who has committed a misdemeanor comes to the knowledge of it, reforms himself and practices goodness, the force of retribution will gradually exhaust itself as a disease gradually loses its baneful influence when the patient perspires.

THE BUDDHA SAID:

When an evil-doer, seeing you practice goodness, comes and maliciously insults you, you should patiently endure it and not feel angry with him. For the evil-doer is insulting himself by trying to insult you.

THE BUDDHA SAID:

Once a man came unto me and denounced me on account of my observing the way and practicing great loving kindness. But I kept silent and did not answer him. The denunciation ceased.

I then asked him, "If you bring a present to your neighbor and he accepts it not, does the present come back to you?"

The man replied, "It will." I said, "You denounce me now, but as I accept it not, you must take the wrong deed back upon your own person. It is like an echo succeeding sound, it is like shadow following object. You never escape the effect of your own evil deeds. Be therefore mindful and cease from doing evil."

Man is a crowd, a crowd of many voices – relevant, irrelevant,

consistent, inconsistent – each voice pulling in its own way, all the voices pulling people apart. Ordinarily people are a mess, virtually in a kind of madness. You somehow manage, you somehow manage to look sane but deep down, layers and layers of insanity are boiling within you. They can erupt any moment. Your control can be lost any moment, because your control is enforced from without. It is not a discipline that has come from your center of being.

For social reasons, economic reasons, political reasons, you have enforced a certain character upon yourself. But many vital forces exist against that character within you. They are continuously sabotaging your character. Hence every day you go on committing many mistakes, many errors. Even sometimes you feel that you never wanted to do it. In spite of yourself, you go on committing many mistakes – because you are not one, you are many.

Buddha does not call these mistakes “sins”, because to call them sin will be condemning you. He simply calls them misdemeanors, mistakes, errors. To err is human, not to err is divine. And the way from the human to the divine goes through mindfulness. These many voices within you can stop torturing you, pulling you, pushing you. These many voices can disappear if you become mindful.

In a mindful state mistakes are not committed – not that you control them, but in a mindful state, in an alert, aware state, voices, many voices cease; you simply become one, and whatsoever you do comes from the very core of your being. It is never wrong. This has to be understood before we enter into these sutras.

In Humanistic Psychology there is a parallel to help you understand it. That’s what Transactional Analysis calls the triangle of “PAC”. P means parent, A means adult, C means child. These are your three layers, as if you are a threestoried building. The first floor is that of the child, the second floor is that of the parent, and the third floor is that of the adult. All three exist together. This is your inner triangle and conflict. Your child says one thing, your parent says something else, and your adult, rational mind says something else.

The child says “enjoy”. For the child, this moment is the only moment; he has no other considerations. The child is spontaneous, but unaware of the consequences – unaware of past, unaware of future. He lives in the moment. He has no values and he has no mindfulness, no awareness. The child lives through feeling. His whole being is irrational.

Of course he comes into many conflicts with others. He comes into many contradictions within himself, because one feeling helps

him to do one thing, then suddenly he starts feeling another feeling. A child never can complete anything; in the time he could have completed it, his feeling has changed. He starts many things but never comes to any conclusion. A child remains inconclusive. He enjoys but his enjoyment is not creative, cannot be. He delights – but life cannot be lived only through delight.

You cannot remain a child forever. You will have to learn many things, because you are not alone here. If you were alone then there would be no question – you could have remained a child forever. But the society is there, millions of people are there; you have to follow many rules, you have to follow many values. Otherwise there would be so much conflict that life would become impossible. The child has to be disciplined – and that's where the parent comes in.

The parental voice in you is the voice of the society, culture, civilization; the voice that makes you capable of living in a world where you are not alone, where there are many individuals with conflicting ambitions, where there is much struggle for survival, where there is much conflict. You have to pave your path, and you have to move very cautiously.

The parental voice is that of caution. It makes you civilized. The child is wild, the parental voice helps you to become civilized. The word “civil” is good. It means one who has become capable of living in a city; who has become capable of being a member of a group, of a society.

The child is very dictatorial. The child thinks he is the center of the world. The parent has to teach you that you are not the center of the world – everybody thinks that way. He has to make you more and more alert that there are many people in the world, you are not alone. You have to consider them if you want to be considered by them; otherwise you will be crushed. It is a sheer question of survival, of policy, of politics. The parental voice gives you commandments – what to do, what not to do. The feeling simply moves blind, the parent makes you cautious. It is needed.

And then there is the third voice within you, the third layer, when you have become adult and you are no longer controlled by your parents; your own reason has come of age, you can think on your own.

The child consists of felt concepts; the parent consists of taught concepts, and the adult consists of thought concepts. And these three layers are continuously in fight. The child says one thing, the parent says just the opposite, and the reason may say something totally different. You see beautiful food, and the child says to eat as much as you want. The parental voice says that many things have to be considered – whether you are really feeling hungry, or

just the smell of the food, the taste of the food is the only appeal. “Is this food really nutritious? Is it going to nourish your body or can it become harmful to you? Wait, listen, don’t rush.”

And then there is the rational mind, the adult mind, which may say something else, totally different. There is no necessity that your adult mind should agree with your parents. Your parents were not omniscient, they were not all-knowing. They were as fallible, as human as you are, and many times you find loopholes in their thinking. Many times you find them very dogmatic, superstitious, believing in foolish things, irrational ideologies. Your adult says no, your parent says do it; your adult says it is not worth doing, and your child goes on pulling you somewhere else. This is the triangle within you.

If you listen to the child, your parent feels angry. So one part feels good – “You can go on eating as much ice cream as you want!” – but your parent inside feels angry. A part of you starts condemning, and then you start feeling guilty. The same guilt arises as it used to arise when you were really a child. You are no longer a child, but the child has not disappeared. It is there; it is just your ground floor, your very base, your foundation. If you follow the child, if you follow the feeling, the parent is angry and then you start feeling guilt.

If you follow the parent then your child feels that he is being forced into things he does not want to do. Then your child feels he is being unnecessarily interfered with, unnecessarily trespassed upon. Freedom is lost when you listen to the parent, and your child starts feeling rebellious.

If you listen to the parent, your adult mind says, “What nonsense! These people never knew anything. You know more, you are more in tune with the modern world, you are more contemporary. These ideologies are just dead ideologies, out of date – why are you bothering?” If you listen to your reason then also you feel as if you are betraying your parents. Again guilt arises. What to do? And it is almost impossible to find something on which all these three layers agree. This is human anxiety – never do all these three layers agree on any point. There is no agreement ever.

Now there are teachers who believe in the child, who emphasize the child more. For example, Lao Tzu. He says, “The agreement is not going to come. You drop this parental voice, these commandments, these Old Testaments. Drop all ‘shoulds’ and become a child again.” That’s what Jesus says. Lao Tzu and Jesus, their emphasis is to become a child again – because only with the child will you be able to gain your spontaneity, will you again become part of the natural flow, Tao. Their message is beautiful,

but seems to be almost impractical. Sometimes, yes, it has happened – a person has become a child again. But it is so exceptional that it is not possible to think that humanity is ever going to become a child again. It is beautiful like a star . . . far distant, but out of reach.

Then there are other teachers – Mahavira, Moses, Mohammed, Manu – they say listen to the parental voice, listen to the moral, what the society says, what you have been taught. Listen and follow it. If you want to be at ease in the world, if you want to be peaceful in the world, listen to the parent. Never go against the parental voice. That's how the world has followed, more or less. But then one never feels spontaneous, one never feels natural. One always feels confined, caged. And when you don't feel free, you may feel peaceful but that peacefulness is worthless. Unless peace comes with freedom you cannot accept it. Unless peace comes with bliss you cannot accept it. It brings convenience, comfort, but your soul suffers. Yes, there have been a few people again who have achieved through the parental voice, who have really attained to the truth. But that too is very rare. And that world is gone. Maybe in the past, Moses and Manu and Mohammed were useful. They gave commandments to the world. "Do this. Don't do that." They made things simple, very simple. They have not left anything for you to decide; they don't trust that you will be able to decide. They simply give you a ready-made formula – "These are the ten commandments to be followed. You simply do these and all that you hope, all that you desire will happen as a consequence. You just be obedient."

All the old religions emphasized obedience too much. Disobedience is the only sin – that's what Christianity says. Adam and Eve were expelled from the Garden of Eden because they disobeyed. God had said not to eat the fruit of the tree of knowledge and they disobeyed. That was their only sin. But every child is committing that sin! The father says, "Don't smoke", and the child tries it. The father says, "Don't go to the movie", and the child goes. The story of Adam and Eve is the story of every child. And then condemnation, expulsion . . . Obedience is religion for Manu, Mohammed, Moses. But that world has gone, and through it not many have attained. Many became peaceful, good citizens, respectable members of the society, but nothing much more.

Then there is the third emphasis on being adult. Confucius, Patanjali, or modern agnostics like Bertrand Russell – all humanists of the world emphasize: "Believe only in your own reason." That seems very arduous, so much so that one's whole life becomes just a conflict. Because you have been brought up by your parents, you have been conditioned by your parents. If you

listen only to your reason, you have to deny many things in your being. In fact, your whole mind has to be denied. It is not easy to erase it. And you were born without any capacity to reason; that too is there. Basically you are a feeling being; reason comes to you very late. It comes when, in fact, all else that has to happen has happened. Psychologists say a child gains almost seventy-five percent of his whole knowledge by the time he is seven years old, fifty percent by the time he is four years old. This whole learning happens when you are a child, and reason is a very late arrival.

It is very difficult to live just with the reason. People have tried – a Bertrand Russell here and there – but nobody has achieved truth through it, because reason alone is not enough.

All these angles have been chosen and tried, and nothing has worked. Buddha's standpoint is totally different. That's his original contribution to human consciousness. He says not to choose any; he says move in the center of the triangle. Don't choose reason, don't choose parent, don't choose the child; just move in the very center of the triangle and remain silent and become mindful. His approach is tremendously meaningful. And then you will be able to have a clear perspective of your being. And out of that perspective and clarity let the response come.

We can say it in another way. If you function as a child, that is a childish reaction. Many times you function as a child. Somebody says something and you get hurt, and there is a tantrum and anger and temper . . . you lose everything. Later on you feel very bad about it – that you destroyed your image; everybody thinks you so sober and you were so childish, and nothing much was at stake. Or you follow your parental voice, but later on you think that still you are dominated by your parents. You have not yet become an adult, mature enough to take the reins of your life into your own hands.

Or sometimes you follow reason, but then you think that reason is not enough, feeling also is needed. And without feeling, a rational being becomes just the head. He loses contact with the body, he loses contact with life, he becomes disconnected. He functions only as a thinking mechanism. But thinking cannot make you alive, in thinking there is no juice of life. It is a very dry thing. Then you hanker, you hanker for something which can again allow your energies to stream, which can again allow you to be green and alive and young. This goes on, and you go on chasing your own tail.

Buddha says these are all reactions, and any reaction is bound to be partial – only response is total – and whatsoever is partial is a mistake. That's his definition of error: whatsoever is partial is a mistake, because your other parts will remain unfulfilled and they will take their revenge. Be total. Response is total, reaction is

This edition first published in the UK and USA 2015 by
Watkins, an imprint of Watkins Media Limited
19 Cecil Court
London WC2N 4EZ

enquiries@watkinspublishing.com

Text Copyright © The Osho International Foundation 2007
Osho is a registered trademark of Osho International Foundation

Source of the Sutra:
Sermons of a Buddhist Abbot – The Classic of American Buddhism
by Soyen Shaku
Introduction by Taitetsu Unno
Three Leaves (Random House USA) published September 2004
ISBN: 0-385-51048-9

Material in this volume has been selected from an original
series of talks entitled 'The Discipline of Transcendence'.

All rights reserved.
No part of this book may be reproduced or utilized in any form
or by any means, electronic or mechanical,
without prior permission in writing from the Publishers.

US - 5 7 9 10 8 6
UK -7 9 10 8

Designed by Jerry Goldie
Typeset by Dorchester Typesetting Group
Printed and bound in the United Kingdom
british Library Cataloguing-in-Publication data available

UK ISBN: 978-1-84293-112-7
US ISBN: 978-1-84293-115-8

www.watkinspublishing.com