

Namaskar

We are in the sixth session of education through Yoga, by Yoga, in Yoga, about Yoga. Yesterday we were dealing with the yamas and niyamas as ethico-religious practices, precisely called as dharmo aachara, dharma niti mimamsa, aachara dharma niti pranani.

So, we were saying that those are not moral-ethical practices. I gave you the examples of Guruji's teachings where he brought in yamas and niyamas in asanas. Let me make a clarification here: Guruji spoke about violation of ahimsa in our Trikonasana. That really did not mean that we were committing himsa, in the sense it is understood in moral-ethical parlance, because you know what is himsa and what is ahimsa in moral-ethical frame. Yet it would be himsa in an asana, on a part of body, or himsa on the mind, or by the mind, himsa on the breath, etc. But that himsa is totally different than our idea of himsa in moral-ethical principles. Yet, there was himsa according to Guruji. When we did our asana we were committing himsa. It is not that we were ferocious, not that we were like a wild beast, not that we were predators. So, it is totally different parameter to understand what is ahimsa while we are in Trikonasana or any asana, or pranayama when you are interacting within yourself. It is a different connotation to himsa and ahimsa.

So, in yoga we are introduced to himsa and ahimsa, unto ourselves, by ourselves, which is very important. While in social realm, we understand someone committing himsa on someone. Someone afflicted, inflicted himsa. So, there is one person who is in himsa, and the other person is suffering, on account of himsa. So that's why these are not moral-ethical principles because ahimsa, satya, asteya, brahmacharya, etc. are subjectivistic, they are intrapersonal, unlike in moral-ethical principle they are interpersonal, all the yamas and niyamas when they come in moral-ethical framework, there is interpersonal aspects of all that, and here is an intrapersonal.

But that is why one more point diverging am divulging you to reinforce the position in your mind, that Patanjali is not speaking about moral-ethical principles, because ahimsa, satya, asteya can come in pranayama, in dharana, dhyana, samadhi even. So in what way would they come, we wouldn't become predators there, we don't become ferocious, yet there can be ahimsa. I will just give you another one more example before I draw a curtain on this. If there is a baby next to me, I just give a mild pinch. The baby cries, it's an affliction to the baby. But suppose I give a pinch of same intensity to an adult. The adult doesn't feel any affliction by that pinch, for a baby, who is a tender baby; a mild pinch also will make him cry. But for an adult person, the same pinch of same intensity may not create any affliction at all. That person will not cry. So, the parameter of himsa has so many aspects, which also we have to consider.

Now, when we are in asana, pranayama, etc., we are not pinching ourselves to say that we are committing himsa, here there is himsa, we may not be agonized, we may not be afflicted, yet there will be himsa committed. So, therefore, it's a totally different parameter for both himsa ahimsa in the social realm as well as in the yogic realm. Anyway, the point is that these are ethico-religious principles.

And therefore we have embarked upon the concept of dharma yesterday. And I made little brief description about what dharma is in comparison with religion. Then yesterday we took that definition which is very popular, very famous in philosophy, Indian philosophy, which is: one who is falling, one who is fallen, one who has fell, one who is about to fall, one who may fall, that which sustains is dharma. Now let me open up this, little analysis here. When it says it sustains, what is it? Say, understand this concept of sustaining. If a pavement dweller is to be sustained, it is not very expensive. It doesn't cost more. Perhaps you can just give a tent to the person and he would be sustained. He is a pavement dweller after all but someone who is a multi millionaire, multi billionaire is to be sustained, you can understand the cost of it.

So, with reference to economics, in the dimension of economics, sustaining a person who is poor is simpler. Sustaining a person who is very rich is difficult.

So, dharma will sustain a human being who has average duty consciousness. Who doesn't have sufficient duty consciousness, sustaining him will be one proposition, and one who has very high degree of this consciousness, sustaining that person will be another proposition, dharma will sustain him very well. So, that's how that aspect also has to be understood. Now, does dharma merely sustain us? Does it mean that we must be just sustainable and sustained in the world, to be in the world, we require much more than mere sustenance. So, the sustenance concept is also flexible. And dharma will cater to all that. Now, there is one of the statements in one of the dharma shastra grantha it is said: if you sustain dharma in one degree, dharma will sustain you in hundred sub degrees. We need to do little bit. It will do a lot. So, that is how dharma works, that is the proportion in which it works. It doesn't just reciprocate. It has always the bounty. Therefore dharma has been considered as something like mother. For mother, you need to do a wee bit, and the mother would give you abundant. The mother doesn't have mercantile mind that you are given something like ten units, and I would give you therefore ten units to the child. No, the mother's magnanimity is different. Similarly, dharma is considered as a mother, and it has this magnanimity. So, it not only sustains, when it is said that it sustains, it does much more than that, it has that magnanimity.

The statement in the text there: dharmo rakshatiye rakshitah, if you protect dharma, it will protect you, hundred folds, thousand folds, million folds. So, that is another definition of dharma.

Now, as I said, it won't be sufficient for us that we are sustained by dharma, we need much more than that. Are we all in this world just living to be sustained or do you look for something much more? Dharma also gives that; there is another definition of dharma. There are several definitions of dharma.

I will give you another definition of dharma. According to that definition, it is said "yatho apshudayanishresha samsiddhi sadharmah". What is dharma? Where you get abhyudaya? Not only evolvment, not only sustenance, but then evolvment. You get that wealthiness, abhyudaya is wealthiness. So, you get the

wealthiness in all the laukika worlds, all the planes in which we will be moving. So, dharma gives abhyudaya in all the lokas. So, there is the concept of Sapta lokas. So it will take care of us, not only sustain us, but it will give you abhyudaya. Abhyudaya is to enrich us. So, it gives abhyudaya in lokas and then it gives us nishreyasa, nishreyasa means ultimate good, final good, ultimate good. So, dharma in its repertoire has so much to offer that it will give us apiurdaiaabhyudaya to nishreyasa. That is why the definition that comes in vaisheshika darshana “yatho abhyudaya nishreyasa samsiddhi sadharmah”

Now, this dharma concept is so subjectivistic. Another misconception is there, prevalent that: the punya is dharma, and papa is adharma. Papa-punya are one pair, they consider one pair. Dharma-adharma is not the same pair. Dharma-adharma is another pair.

Generally, the punya will be universal. The vice is vice, anywhere, anytime, the virtue is virtue anywhere, anytime, except few exceptions. Generally, we can understand that the virtue is virtue in any location, in any region. So, we know what are virtues for human beings, and what are vices in human beings. So if, both thing, if they are bad things in us, we say these are vices, if they are good things, we say these are virtues. The man has been endowed with intelligence to identify papa and punya. To some extent, we have the faculty to identify something that is virtuous; something is vicious. It is not something altogether out of sphere of human intelligence.

So, therefore, what is papa and what is punya can be determined, can be said, can be declared and can be understood. Man is endowed with intelligence to understand vice and virtue. However that is not the case of dharma. The Mahabharata has a wonderful quotation, which says: the dharma is decided in deep core of the heart. In the deep core of the heart, dharma is decided. Dharma is quite relative; it changes from person to person. The papa-punya doesn't change from person to person. What is punya to me is also punya to you. What is papa to me is papa to you. What I consider as virtue is also considered as virtue by all others. What is considered as vices is also considered as vice by others.

But this is not the case of dharma. "Dharma tattva nihito ohayam". In the deep cave, this complex concept of dharma is decided. What is my dharma and what is your dharma, it has a personal reference. What is dharma for me may not be dharma for you. But what is punya for me is punya for you also. What is adharma for me may not be adharma for you. But what is papa for me is also papa for you. So, not to confuse between papa and punya and dharma and adharma. I will just give you one example here: Well, you will know that the two persons in, actually, counter-position to each other, are both adhering to dharma. Therefore, in discussions of the dharma, this example comes very often. In Mahabharata, Bhishma fought against Bhagwan Sri Krishna, of whom he was a devotee. Bhishma was a devotee of Shri Krishna. His name has been mentioned as one of the prominent devotees of Narayana, of Krishna. There is a long list: Prahalad, Narad, Parashar, Pundari, Vyasa, Ambareesh, Sukhashoumiya, Bhishma daalbhya. Bhishma comes there. He is a devotee. But in the battlefield of Mahabharata, he is standing against Bhagwan Sri Krishna. He is not siding Sri Krishna in the battle. He is standing in opposite. That is his dharma. He was not in adharma, it was his perfect dharma to be positioning himself in opposition of Bhagwan Sri Krishna. In the other hand, in Ramayana Vibhishana, another devotee, devotee of equal calibre, because his name also appears in that verse: Prahalad Narad Parashar Pundari Vyasa Ambari Sukhashoumiya Bhishma dalmya maha angad Vashishta vibhishana bhim. His name comes there. He betrays his brother, who is pitted against Bhagwan Shri Ram, and he joins Shri Ram. He fights along with his Bhagwan, it is dharma. Bhishma fights against Bhagwan, it is also dharma.

Dharma has so many other factors to be considered, so dharma is a complex concept. That is why Baghavad Gita also says that the karma, the principle of karma is very difficult to comprehend and understand. This is not the dharma is complex. We are complex. So, one of the lessons to follow, we will try to divulge this as to how we ourselves are very complex. We are not simple. Our psyche, consciousness of human beings is very complex. All dogs are dogs, all cats are cats, all elephants are elephants, all lions are lions. All human beings are not human beings. In their consciousness fabric, all human beings are not human beings. Sometimes human beings can be worst than a cobra. A human being can

be worst than a lion. A human being can be worst than a tiger, can be worst than a crocodile. That is why human psyche itself is very complex. Whereas, we end up saying dharma is confusing, confounding, yoga is a very complex subject. We are complexed, not that they are complexed.

So, therefore, in dharma niti mimamsa, the dharma is so important. Today we are all, actually in run up to yoga; the essential yoga is far away from me. But today yoga has become very fashionable, and we all think that we are all doing yoga. But there is a verse in Baghavat Gita sixth chapter, which describes that, for a neophyte, for a neophyte, for a raw beginner, the yoga is in his karma.

Whereas we have made the yoga so technical subject, get a mat, get a prop do the pose like this, technically do like this, so we are taught to do the pose technically perfect. We have made the subject very, very technical. Whereas Bhagavad Gita says: Where does the Yoga commence for a beginner? “aruruksormuneryogam karma karanamuchyate”. The essential yoga starts when the seeker has karma consciousness. When the seeker has karma consciousness that is to some extent dharma consciousness. More concern about right and wrong from dharma point of view; not right and wrong from technicality point of view. Otherwise you will say somebody is doing right Trikonasana, somebody is doing wrong Trikonasana. So, that is right and wrong technically.

But yoga doesn't lie there, in that correctness yoga doesn't lie there. For a raw beginner, where does it lie? Karma kaarana uchyate. Karma consciousness. That is, in my Achara dharma niti am I right? In the posture I might not be right, but I might be right in my dharma niti. I should score merit. I might be right technically in the posture, but I am wrong in my dharma niti, achadharmaniti. I would score merit. So, yoga is all in dharma. So, essential yoga starts when you are conscious about right and wrong relatively absolutely.

The karma, the consciousness must be pure for the yoga to be pure. Not that your posture is pure, correct, perfect, therefore you are right, your pranayama is right, therefore you are right. In human dynamics, the intent, the drive, the

motive is very important. You just cannot assess a person by the activity, whether it is a right activity or wrong activity. There can be a right activity or wrong motion. So, in any case it will be a wrong activity, because the motion the very motive is wrong. The drive is wrong, motive is wrong. So, first of all the motive should be right, the intent should be right, justified. I will give you one, an example here. Once, a disciple goes to an acharya, and he says, my colleague knows Bhagavad Gita by heart. And I don't know Bhagavad Gita by heart, but my colleague knows therefore I am going to do by heart Bhagavad Gita. Understand the intent. My colleague knows Bhagavad Gita by heart and I do not know it, since I consider him as my competitor, he is my colleague and competitor, he knows I do not know, therefore I want to know. So, he tells his acharya: I want to by heart Bhagavad Gita. Now, it is a good intend: I want to by heart Bhagavad Gita. But when the acharya investigates, why did it dawn on you today? Why did it occur to you today? He said: Because my colleague knows it. So his acharya told him don't by heart it for some time, because you have a wrong drive. The wrong drive will make your act also wrong. First, set rights your drive. So, Acharya tells him: It is a good intent do by heart Bhagavad Gita, but I advise you, don't do it know, wait for a while, let this competitive nature in you subside. Do not have this competitive approach; to be by hearting Bhagavad Gita so, he prevents him from by hearting it. He says wait for some time, let us do it at some other time, not now. This is not the time to embark upon it. Have a launch of it. Understand this advice, because the intent was not right. So, there is a maxim: yatha kratuho bhavati tatkarma kurute yat karma kurute tatabhi sampatte. We know this maxim: as you sow so you reap. This is not the perfect, precise maxim. It is not as you sow shall you reap. As you have the drive, so you reap. As you have a drive, so you sow. As you sow so you reap.

So, behind even sowing seed we have intent. But if the intent is not right, whatever you sow will not be right. And whatever you reap may not be right. And therefore, students of yoga need to understand, so first step in, identifying whereas something is right or wrong, first check your intent. Check your drive. That is very important, because that's the first factor which must be right. If that is not right, then it's going to go hayward. So, dharma tells us about assessing our

own intent. Why am I doing something? Why I feel like doing something? What is the intent? What is the drive? So, yoga will tell you about this. Classical yoga gives this consciousness. Preparatory to classical yoga, you are prepared to develop this kind of inquiry. Don't just do good things. Why are you doing good things? If I am doing good things because my rival is doing good thing and I want to compete with him, your good thing is not a good thing. Intent, drive, is so important. That is the source of our Karma.

So dharma tells us about that. Yoga will start teaching you that, that you must develop karma consciousness, until you develop karma consciousness your classical yoga will not commence. It will be all preparation. That is why the dharma niti mimansa is so important in yoga and the entire practical aspects of it are completely put in a frame of ethico-religious practices. Dharma niti, as I said yesterday right from ahimsa, first of the yamas to asamprajna Samadhi, last of the Ashtanga. It is all aachar dharma niti mimansa.

So I wanted to open out one more dimension of this dharma and once you are in yoga the process of yoga is such that you will always try to assess your dynamics. What are dynamics? Don't be confused between activity and dynamics. Activity is mere activity; what are dynamics? Drive, motive, motion, execution, purpose. for all these have to be assessed, all these have to be ensured that they are proper. So in dynamics try to consider that.

Yesterday I made reference to Guruji's statement: 'my yoga is dynamic meditation'. What is dynamic? It comes from the concept of dharma. So the core of Guruji's practice was in dharma, not his fervour, not his enthusiasm, not any challenge, not any motivation, but dharma. So, dharma niti may not may be so centric in all-practical aspects of yoga. I wanted to add one more dimension here.

So that is all for the day, but before I sign off, let me deal with one question which came to me. Somebody said : Somebody is practicing Surya Namaskar. Is Surya Namaskar a complete yoga? And is it sufficient with just doing Surya Namaskars, will it become whole yoga?

So something in answer to this question: Surya namaskar is Surya Namaskar. Yoga is Yoga. Although there are some yogasanas that you identify in Surya Namaskars, it doesn't become yoga. Fundamentally and basically because Surya Namaskar is a motion. You are in motion, it has to be done in motion, motion becomes paramount in Surya Namaskar, whereas in yoga, when it comes to asanas, 'sthira sukham asanam' steadiness is important whereas in Surya Namaskar, motion is important. So Surya Namaskar is good as a form of exercise and beyond exercise, it is good for coordinating body, mind and breath because in motion it's a different proposition to coordinate body, mind and breath. And of course Surya Namaskars are sun worships, basically, if you revere sun, you should revere sun, you should know why you should revere sun. Then Surya Namaskar should be samantraka then it'll have greater benefit rather than merely a mat exercise, a corporeal exercise. Those should be sun salutations. So, you must be saluting the sun in what you do, its value will be enhanced.

But Surya Namaskars is now here not even incomplete yoga, not even yoga. Because in yoga you need to be steady, 'sthira sukham asanam' meditative practice of yoga, you must be steady 'samam kaya siro grivan dharayann achalam sthirah' Bhagwad Gita. it's stipulated that you must be sitting straight, steady, erect, firm, unmoved. Whereas in Surya Namaskar you have make motions. So don't confuse between Surya Namaskar and Yoga. Although it is said that those are all asanas, they are not asanas, the postures have come in there some of the yogic postures have come there.

In yogic postures for them to become asanas, they are supposed to stay, they are supposed to maintain so many other implications are there, nuances are there for yogasana. When they come in Surya Namaskar none of those are adhered to. Therefore Surya Namaskar is good it has its own virtue but it should not be mixed up with yoga. Hope that satisfies the questioner. Thank you very much.  
Namaskar.