

Beyond the Looking Glass – Part 2

(continuation of previous conversation between
Joe M and Bhakti Madhava Puri Maharaja)

Joe: "I hope you realize I have the greatest respect for you"

BMP: Likewise, but for a completely different reason not directly related to you.

Joe: "I point out that this is a belief you hold."

BMP: You are conditioned to think like that - my belief v. your belief - because for one situated in the world-frame of self-centered, first person epistemology one distinguishes between self and other. Thank you for allowing me to repeat this again and again. But there are three concepts to consider: self, other and the Absolute Source of both.

Please read [Beyond First Person Epistemology](#) that was previously posted to this list.

The word absolute comes from the Latin *absolvere* meaning to release, acquit, set free, where *ab* means 'from' and *solvere* means 'loosen' - in other words 'to absolve.' But if the Absolute means absolve, then we have to inquire who is being absolved and for what? If it is us, then what have we done wrong - are we criminals? The answer is yes in both cases.

When the self presumes itself to be what it is not, to have an existence on its own, to be an independent whole unto itself [this is exactly what the atomistic conception of science foolishly advocates] it becomes a criminal conception against the Truth that the atomic self is only part of the Complete Whole. In the Complete Whole the part [considered as an independently existing whole] is negated, but this does not mean annihilated. In other words, the part is preserved as a whole part but not as an independent whole unto itself - not as a separate existence apart from the Complete Whole. You have an identity which is not your own - it belongs to the Complete Whole, it is infused in you as purpose, the teleological principle or final cause that defines what one is. Otherwise one is left with a false sense of self called *ahamkara* in Sanskrit. This has been clearly explained in [The False Elephant and the False Ego](#) also posted to this list.

In the Absolute this false claim of having a real existence separate from the Truth, in other words this false impersonation of being an absolute reality against the existence of the True Absolute, is a crime punishable by death - not only once but repeatedly - called *samsara* in Sanskrit. Thus it is called a mortal sin. There can only be one Absolute; only the foolish can think that there are two or more realities. Such fools who set themselves up against the Absolute are seriously misled and can also mislead others. They stubbornly refuse to relinquish their false claim to absoluteness so they experience death, the ultimate proof for themselves that their so-called reality is merely a dream or illusion [because dreams exist only for some time until one awakens]. Death is the punishment brought upon themselves for falsely clinging to the crime of

maintaining their arrogant independent being against the Supreme Being of the Absolute.

We must not misunderstand Supreme Being to be something like the highest mountain along side of which so many other smaller mountains also exist. No. The Supreme Being means the Universal Being from which all other so-called beings appear to be. We must understand the difference and relation between universal and particular being in this case. For example, fruit is the essence in all fruits, without which a fruit could not be determined to be what it is. Thus cherries, grapes, plums, and so on are particular existences whose essences are the universal fruit. In the same way, the being of any particular species is in essence its genus. Thus an elephant as a species belongs to the genus mammal as do all elephants and other such animals.

The universal is thus negatively related to the particular, i.e. it is in the particular as its essence yet distinct from a specific particular since it is also in the manifold/plurality of all other particulars. The Absolute Supreme Being is likewise to be understood. Only by renouncing one's self-centered criminal attitude can one be forgiven (absolved) by the Absolute Court of the Supreme Lord and be admitted into the normal society of the spiritual world which is eternal full of knowledge and bliss. Only if one wants to remain an obstinate criminal, refusing to surrender and be forgiven, is one condemned to the prison world, where despite wanting to live, they must die, despite wanting to know what is what, they remain in ignorance, and despite wanting permanent joy, they must experience suffering. Our original Absolute nature is *sat, cit, ananda* but we experience just the opposite when we remain opposed to the Absolute Truth which is the real truth of our own existence when we are ready to acknowledge and submit to it.

Thus we find the prayer of the imprisoned souls to the Supreme Lord in the *Brihadaranyaka Uanisad*

*asato mā sad gamaya,
tamaso mā jyotir gamaya,
mṛtyor mā amṛtaṃ gamaya*

I don't want to be in illusion (untruth) lead me to the truth (reality).
I don't want to be in darkness (of ignorance) lead me to the light (of true knowledge).
I don't want to be subject to death lead me to my true eternal life.

Joe: ""The Tao that can be told is not the eternal Tao; The name that can be named [The Source] is not the eternal name. The nameless is the beginning of heaven and earth."

BMP: These are the words of the conditioned soul who still understands things like self and other, this and that, but who has not yet reached the Absolute plane where the Name and the Named are identical in their difference. Just as the absolute value of $|+1|$ and $|-1|$ is 1, all opposites are identical in their difference in the absolute. I have already explained how identity in difference can be understood by the example: if every x is different, D , from every other x then all $x(D)$ are identical in their being different from

each other. This is the synthesis of Shankaracharya's and Madhvacharya's philosophies called *achintya bedha abedha tattva* (inconceivable oneness and difference).

Joe: "The Truth can be neither proved or disproved. It just is."

BMP: Indeed the Absolute Truth is eternally existing as the true I AM, in which we falsely claim that 'I am' apart from that Truth. Of course the Truth can also be proved or disproved. We are not idiots. As the energy of the Lord we are imbued with reason, and God is not malicious or jealous of Man. Reason also comes from God. By your own statement that "Man is endowed with the "Lord's" abilities" you disprove your above statement.

Joe: "Free will", to me, means I create my own reality.

BMP: In my opinion this is nonsense that Deepak and others also promote. Go to Buckingham Palace and tell Queen Elizabeth that you are the King of England (Why not, if you can create your own reality!) Go ahead, test your so-called creative ability, and let us know if you even get past the guards. Reality is meant to overcome just this type of foolishness about my belief vs. your belief.

Joe: "Without Man, the Source would be Nothing. There would be no Lord."

BMP: The Source already implies there is something it originates, otherwise why would we call it a source. "Lord" means there is something to lord it over - a kingdom, queen, ambassadors, army and subjects. In the same way the Supreme Lord is never alone - never. The meaning of the Lord by Himself is called Vasudeva. He exists but not in his full reality as *svayam bhagavan* Krishna - the Lord with all his entourage, beloved associates, *lila* (playful pastimes), abode, and so on. Those who cannot yet accommodate the true Absolute in their self-centered conception of themselves as absolute are unable to recognize the real world of the decentered subject that is the actual spiritual reality of which you and all are but a part.

Joe: "Then take your believe, and, create what you will with it for yourself."

BMP: When Karl Jung was asked if he believed in God he replied that it was not a belief for him - he already knew it by direct experience. Anyone can believe whatever they want. Jung used to treat the insane by dealing with them according to their deluded sense of identity. A man who believed he was Napoleon would be treated as if he were really that identity. When the insane man realized how foolish he was being in the face of seeing it reflected in the world before him he would snap out of his illusion. Since you want to remain self enclosed, I encourage you to go and prove it to yourself. When you come back to us from your palace humbled and foolish, when you face reality as it is for the first time and know that you are not its master, then you will see what your pompous claims amount to. Then we can all have a good laugh together.

We are participants, members of Reality, fleeting moments of a world, society, history, spirit, God. Yes, you may believe what you want - you have a choice to be sane or insane, criminal or lawful, therefore, every State has an asylum or prison for them so that all may be treated equally according to their choices - their free will. Everyone gets what they deserve. In Sanskrit that is called the law of karma. In Newtonese it is called the law of action and reaction. A child may not believe a fire will burn if they put their hand in it. If they are not intelligent enough to believe those who are more experienced and wise they will have to suffer the consequences whether they are innocent or not. As it is said: only fools learn by experience; the wise learn by hearing from the wise.

Joe: "You are creating an unnecessary separation between us and the Source."

BMP: There is a difference but difference does not mean separation. The sides of a coin are different, but not separate. The poles of a magnet are different but not separate. The Sun and the sunshine are different but not separate. The Source and its products are different but not separate.

Joe: "We are all One, as I see it."

BMP: Only a fool thinks that if the sunshine is in his room the the Sun globe [the source of the sunshine] must also be in his room. Their oneness or unity does not cancel their difference. Neither does their difference cancel their oneness or unity. The "I" is also included in the "We" yet different as in first person singular and plural. Everywhere and in everything there is identity in difference.

Joe: "The Source knew it was all there was—but this was not enough . . ."

BMP: This is nonsensical. When the Source is understood as Absolute it is whole and complete in and for itself. It lacks nothing. It is the finite self that is lacking in proper conception of its relation to the absolute Source. The problem lies in continuing to consider the Source as relative to its products. You have heard this again and again and yet forget it again and again. This is the nature of the conditioned soul. Jesus said they have ears but can't hear. Planck said the minds of the old scientific regime suffered *rigor mortis* long before their bodies did.

At the same time, Krishna says in the Bhagavad-gita (15.15): *sarvasya caham hrđi sannivisto mattah smrtir jnanam apohanam ca* – "I am there within everyone's heart and from Me come knowledge, remembrance and forgetfulness." You are not even responsible for your forgetfulness, what to speak of free will. It is all just one of the Lord's pastime to save the conditioned souls. This is the Vedic conclusion.

Joe: "Do you understand?"

BMP: It's not about me. It has nothing to do with me. It is Him to Whom you have to appeal.