

**PODCAST 193:
ONLY OBJECT CHANGES,
YOU ARE IMPORTANT - NOT APPROACH,
SEEMING CONTRADICTIONS**

Om Sri Sai Ram

Prasanthi Sandesh, episode 193.

There is a group of people who feel that we should only have internal, spiritual desires, and that it is not desirable to have any external desires in our mind. In other words, don't desire anything that is external, but there's nothing wrong with desiring that which is internal.

However, desire is actually one and the same. There's no distinction. So don't divide desire. Don't say, "There are no more worldly desires in me," because there still is a worldly desire there. The other internal desire is as worldly as any external desire.

Any desire is worldly. So let's not divide it. Let's not play tricks with ourselves.

The objects of desire are not significant. It's the *desiring* that is significant. You can desire wealth or you can desire God. The desiring remains the same. Only the object has changed. Wealth is desired at one time, while God is desired at another time. You can desire a palace here or you can desire a palace in paradise.

The objects have changed, but the desire remains the same. You can desire anything whatsoever, but the desire will still be the same. Remember this. With desires you cannot attain realisation because first desire has to be dropped.

So what is to be done? There's really nothing to be done. You have to realise more and more that your desires create suffering.

So any new desire creates suffering. Before there were other desires, but you have left those desires behind, and thus you feel content. You feel peaceful in your life. Your relationships have become more loving because these desires have disappeared.

From now on, be aware that when there were desires in that field you were not content. You were frustrated. You were filled with jealousy, anger, and hatred. Your relationship was difficult. There was suffering and misery. But now desire has left that area. So that field has become peaceful.

What happens next? You ask, "When will enlightenment happen?" Now, become aware that you are creating new suffering: So unless realisation happens, you cannot be content. "How can I be content unless I become a Buddha? So, will I become a Buddha?"

One Buddhist, Nagarjuna, is reported to have said that the desire to become a Buddha is the greatest barrier to becoming a Buddha. The reason is that unless you stop desiring to become a Buddha, you will not come to know that you are already a Buddha.

You desire to be a Buddha but you will only come to know that you are already a Buddha once this desiring dissolves. Then your Buddha-hood appears as it is already there. So, see how new misery comes into being with this new desire.

Every desire brings misery. There's nothing to be done. Simply become aware that every desire brings misery. If you realise this, all desires will disappear.

No desires are needed, whether they are internal or external. When there are no more desires, you have achieved the goal. Then, that very moment is ecstasy. Then, right here and now you have become the goal. Only then, there's no more misery. Therefore, don't make this distinction of external or internal desires.

The mind is so cunning. It goes on deceiving you. It says, 'Okay, if worldly desires create misery, leave them. I will be content with non-worldly desires.' So the object changes, but the desiring still remains the same.

Therefore, in this aspect, one has to be extra careful because the mind continues to be the same. It goes on changing objects, but the inner quality remains the same. So, by whatever name you call desire, it makes no difference.

In other words, a desire for the outer or a desire for the inner is just a change in the object. The mind remains the same. Drop it. Just as you have dropped the outer desire, you can drop the inner desire also. You know now that just by dropping the outer desire, you are feeling a deep contentment within yourself. So why carry this new desire? Drop this one also.

When you drop all desires, you have entered paradise itself. Then you are in heaven! You have *Moksha*! Having desires, you are destroying this state of *being*. When there are desires, you are so occupied with those desires that you cannot be in contact with your own deepest centre, with your own deepest wisdom.

Upanishadic sages had a positive approach towards life, whereas Buddha and Mahavira had a negative approach. So, the question may arise, which is your approach? Affirmation or negation of life? Which approach would you have your disciples take?

In fact, it's not the approach that matters. The emphasis is not on the approach. The emphasis is on the disciple. So don't say that you should follow this or that approach.

Decide for yourself whether you have a negative mind or a positive mind. If you have a positive mind, then follow the positive approach. If you have a negative mind, then follow the negative approach.

There are both types of people in this world and this awareness, this understanding, is absolutely necessary before we enquire about anything more.

We should also be aware that what we need today is a world religion. Hinduism cannot be a world religion. Buddhism cannot be a world religion. Up until now, no religion exists which can be called a world religion, because every religion chooses only one approach. What I am saying is that one world religion can be all-inclusive because I don't choose any approach.

Swami doesn't say to us, "Follow this! Have this approach!" He never says that.

I don't choose any approach for you. All approaches lead to the same goal. Swami has given innumerable examples in this direction. The goal is important and also the disciple who travels the path is important. The path is irrelevant. Therefore, just remember that both types exist.

There is always a balance in nature, and nature sees to it that this balance is maintained. The same polarity exists between the positive mind and the negative mind. Whenever there is a positive mind, there is a negative mind just by its side, so the number is always equal.

Similarly, in the world, half are always Hindus and half are Buddhists, or we can use different religions' names. What this means is that half are positive persons and half are negative persons.

So, Bhagavan does not say, "Follow this." He doesn't choose anything for you. If anyone comes to Him and asks, "Which path is right?" Swami says both are right, because both cannot exist separately. Their harmony is right. So which path is right? Both are right because neither can exist without the other. Their harmony is right.

That's why at times statements made by Swami seem to be quite contradictory. He may be talking with a positive person. Then He has to make a totally different statement when He is talking to another disciple who is a negative person. At this time, He has to make an absolutely contradictory statement to His earlier statement made to the positive person. If and when they meet, they'll be totally confused!

So remember, whenever Bhagavan says something to you, it is said just to you. Don't listen to anybody else. This is personal. Whenever Swami said something to you, it was said just for you.

Please understand this. If somebody says that Swami said something to him which is contradictory to your message from Swami, don't pay attention to that. Swami might have said it because to Swami, approaches are not important; only persons are important.

In fact there's no fixed approach. When a different type of person comes to Him, He immediately changes His approach. He always adjusts His approach to the person. He never tries to do the opposite, meaning adjusting the person to a different approach, because that would be absurd.

In other words, don't take any 'readymade' clothes for yourself and then cut your legs a little because of the dress length. Bhagavan always cuts the dress according to

your measurements. When He feels that it doesn't suit you, the dress is wrong, not you. You are never wrong.

So there are bound to be many contradictions in Swami's statements. I can give you any number of examples where they appear to be contradictory, but really they are meant for people with different states of mind, whether they are positive or negative.

Both approaches are His and that's why He goes on talking about Buddha with as much love as He talks about Patanjali or Lao Tse or Jesus or Mahavira or Mohammed.

The underlying principle is the unity of religions. One approach cannot contain all. Remember that! It will help you to be less confused.

So, a world religion accommodates all. It does not specify any single approach in particular. That is very significant.

I was also thinking about this aspect. For example, Mahavira was in silence for twelve years. He would not speak. He would not go into villages. He would not see anybody. When he started speaking, somebody asked him, "Why were you not speaking before?"

He replied, "Speech becomes valuable only when you have attained silence; otherwise it is futile. Not only futile, it is also dangerous, because you are throwing rubbish into others' heads."

So this was the effort of Mahavira. In that way, he would only be talking about what is relevant to you.

When it comes to us, when our inner talk has disappeared, and we listen to Swami speaking within us, then our talk is no longer a hindrance to others.

Sai Ram. We'll meet later.