The Gnan Vidhi of the Gnani Purush separates the Self from the self. The reader is requested to allow for the use of capital letters in the book, which have been used frequently for ease of understanding the message of the Gnani Purush. The small ‘s’ is the self or the worldly interacting self, where the reader has to introduce one’s own worldly name. The ‘S’ is used to denote the awakened Self after the Gnan Vidhi or the absolute Self. Similarly, the small ‘y’ is used for the worldly self, and the ‘Y’ for ‘You’ is for the awakened One. The small ‘v’ is for the vision through the worldly eyes or the physical eyes whereas the ‘V’ is for the Vision of the awakened One as the Self.
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‘Non-doer’ as the Self, ‘doer’ as the self

EDITORIAL

What is the cause of karma bondage? Sense of doership (karta bhaav). ‘I am doing’, this wrong belief is called karta bhaav. When this karta bhaav leaves then karma stops binding and moksha happens. In the relative world, Atma (the Self) is the doer; that is the belief and that is a mistake. In fact, Atma is not the doer of karma.

The Lord said that there are two kinds of Atma. One is original (muda) Atma and the other one is vyavahar atma (the worldly interacting self; the non-Self complex) which has arisen due to original Atma (muda Atma). Vyavahar atma is said to be pratishthit atma (The self that has wrong beliefs; energized non-Self complex of thoughts, speech and acts; discharge ego). Now in the relative world this vyavahar atma is believed to be nischaya Atma (the Self). In reality, muda Atma is shuddha chetan (pure Self) and what the world believes to be chetan is nischetan chetan (Selfless self; energized self). In vyavahar this chetan is sakriya (active; working), but muda chetan (original Self) is akriya (inactive), akarta (non-doer).
Energy is generated in the presence of the Sunlight, but the Sun does not have any concern in that. It is generated merely in its presence. In the same manner, ego arises in the presence of the Self and that ego becomes the doer. This is the ignorance.

The vitarag Lords said that the Self is a doer by relative viewpoint (vyavahar), and a non-doer by real viewpoint (nischaya; the Self). A doer by relative viewpoint means a dramatic doer; really it is not a doer. By relative viewpoint the Self is the doer of karma and specifically is the doer of bhaavkarma (cause karma). This, what is seen (effect) is the karma done by vyavasthit.

So by anupcharik vyavahar worldly interaction (something that has no solution; that which is happening and cannot be changed), the Self is the doer of dravyakarma (subtle discharging karma). Anupcharik means, there is no effort done, it is a scientific (scientific circumstantial evidence) vyavahar. By visible efforts (upchar), one is a ‘builder’ of home, city, pot etc. Therefore with swabhav parinati (the nature of the Self, Being the Self) One is the ‘doer’ of state of the Self (nijswaroop), and through anupcharik vyavahar, is the doer of dravyakarma and through par-parinati (when the doer is another-scientific circumstantial evidences-and one believes ‘I am doing’, that is called par-parinati; state of the non-Self), through upchar, is the doer of home-city-pot etc.

Atma (the Self) is the doer of the nijswaroop (state of the Self), means it is the doer of Gnan kriya (it means to ‘know’ and remain in ‘knowing’ as the Self) – Darshan kriya (activity of the Self to ‘see’, to understand gneya–that which is seen). To ‘see’ and ‘know’ is the only function of the Self. Vyavahar (worldly interaction) is vyavahar and nischaya (the Self) is nischaya after attaining Gnan (Self-realization). All the vyavahar is dramatic. We are the non-doer after attaining Gnan. Therefore, ‘we’ have to act in a drama in the name of ‘Chandubhai’ (file number 1; the relative self) by remaining as the Self (nischaya).

After attaining the Gnan of the Self, that pratishthit atma itself becomes the known (gneya), and that is where awareness (jagruti) itself becomes the knower. So, before, ‘I’ was as the pratishthit atma, now ‘I’ is as awareness. When the awakened awareness becomes complete awareness, then it becomes one with the absolute Self.
So now, just as Lord Mahavir kept seeing one pudgal (the non-Self complex of mind-speech and activity), ‘we’ too have to see only one pudgal. What Chandubhai is doing, to see all that continuously, is verily complete Shuddhatma (pure Self). Our goal is to accomplish that absolute state. In compilation of this Dadavani, the highest prayer is that we all find all the missing keys to commence our inner spiritual effort for the completion of attaining our goal.

~Jai Sat Chit Anand

‘Non-doer’ as the Self, ‘doer’ as the self

(The awakened One, the absolute One, is the ‘Self’; the worldly interacting one is the ‘self.’ The Self is nischaya, and the self in worldly interaction vyavahar. The Self is the ‘Knower’, and the self is the ‘doer’.)

Gnani Purush Dadashri

Karma arises through wrong belief
**Questioner:** What is *karma*? What is the root of it? How is *karma* bound?

**Dadashri:** *Karma* is bound through sense of doership (*karta bhaav*). ‘I am doing it’ is doership. Someone else does it and one claims, ‘I did it’. He passes his college examinations on the basis of some other energy, and he claims he passed the exams. That is *aropit bhaav* (attribution of the properties of one thing to another) is the ‘wrong belief’ and this is what binds *karma*. ‘I am Chandubhai’ is itself *karma*.

**Questioner:** Then who does the *karma*? Does *karma* affect the Atma (the Self) or the *pudgal* (the non-Self complex)?

**Dadashri:** *Karma* is not Yours if You are a Gnani (Self-realized), and if you are *agnani* (ignorant of the Self), then they are yours.

It is wrong to believe that the Atma (the Self) is the doer of *karma*. In fact, the Self is not the doer of *karma*. It would never attain liberation if it were the doer. Even the absolutely liberated ones, the Siddhas who have gone to *moksha* would continue binding *karma*, if the Self was the doer of anything. There is no superior energy that binds *karma* or releases one from *karma*. You are whole and sole responsible for your self and *karma*.

What did this Gnani Purush see in Gnan? What did He see that He said that the Self is the non-doer (*akarta*)? So then who is the doer? How does this world run? How does everything happen? When he saw all this in Gnan it became certain that the Self is not the doer of anything in the worldly life. The Self is the doer of its Gnan, it is the doer of *swabhavik* (of the Self) and *vibhavik* (of the non-Self) Gnan. It is the doer of only the light (of Gnan) and has never gone beyond that.

It is not the doer of any rituals or activities. It is the doer of only *Gnan kriya* (to Be the Self and to ‘know’) and *Darshan kriya* (to Be as the Self and to ‘see’). It is not active anywhere else. Only due to the presence of the Self (Atma), all the other elements become active.

One’s own wrong belief of ‘I am Chandubhai’ arises which creates *karma*. The *pudgal* (the non-Self complex) alone cannot cause *karma*. It needs the presence of the Self to do so. The ego that arises due to the presence of the Self is what causes *karma*. It all ends when the ego is fractured. The ego binds *karma*, and nature frees you from *karma*. Nature
frees you from *karma* when the timing is right, and when all the other evidences come together. When that *karma* is leaving-discharging, the ego suffers (*bhogavey*) it, and binds a new *karma*.

**Questioner:** Is the soul stuck to the body or is the body stuck to the soul?

**Dadashri:** This is how it is; no one is stuck to anyone. Everything is instrumental in the process (*naimitik*). Only in the worldly life interaction people say that ‘the soul has stuck to it’, so what they say is, ‘why don’t you let go of this ‘tree’ you are holding on to?’ But is it so easy to let go? These are all scientific circumstantial evidences.

**Questioner:** But it seems that the soul is stuck to the *pudgal* – the non-Self complex. All this has happened because the soul became engrossed (*tanmayakar*) in the *pudgal*.

**Dadashri:** That is mandatory for the soul.

**Questioner:** Why is it mandatory for the soul? Who made it soul?

**Dadashri:** The Self is *chetan* and the *pudgal* is *jada* (without the qualities of ‘knowing’ and ‘seeing’). When the two come together, *vishesh bhaav* (ego, ‘I am Chandulal’ arises). No one does anything there but because the two elements come together the *vishesh bhaav* arises and that leads to the creation of the worldly life (*sansar*). But later when the self comes to realize the answer of ‘Who am I?’ and comes into its original state, the Self; the Self becomes free, and thereafter the *pudgal* also leaves.

The pervasive influence is that of ignorance only!

**Questioner:** If *chaitanya* (mixed atma) becomes pure (*shuddha*), does it ever have to come back?

**Dadashri:** It never has to come back. Once it comes into *shuddhata* (the experience of the purity of the Self), then the ego is gone, and therefore it does not have to come back at all. As long as there is ego, one sows the seed of ‘I did it’, from which arises the ego again. As long as one believes ‘I did it’, the ego will arise again.

**Questioner:** So then the Atma must have been impure to begin with?
**Dadashri:** No, it is still pure.

**Questioner:** So then how did it become impure (*ashuddha*)?

**Dadashri:** It is because people have been calling you ‘Chandu!’ ‘Chandu!’ People give ignorance, which then changes the vision. The entire vision changes and all this is pervasive influence (*amal*).

**The Self is verily pure; the beliefs are wrong**

**Questioner:** The Self in its original nature is pure, so then how have these *kashays* (anger, pride, deceit and greed) affected it? How have the *karma* come to be bound?

**Dadashri:** That is a science. If we put a piece of iron here and if it were living, it would say, ‘there better not be any rust on me’. But the rule of science is that if other circumstances come in contact with it, then it is bound to rust. Similarly, the Self by nature is pure but due to pressures of circumstances, it has picked up ‘rust’.

**Questioner:** At the moment the Self is veiled by *karma* but if the Self were to settle all those *karma*, will it pick up ‘rust’ again?

**Dadashri:** Until one comes into awareness of the Self, the ‘rust’ continues to happen; always the rust will continue to form. Without the awareness and experience of the Self, one will keep on picking up the ‘rust’ because one is in *aropit bhaav* - false attribution, ‘I am Chandubhai’. ‘I am Chandubhai’ is the *aropit bhaav* and therefore the ‘rust’ is constantly building up. When the *aropit bhaav* goes away and one comes into *swabhav*, the nature of the Self, the ‘rust’ will no longer form.

**Questioner:** What must the original state of the Self be like, in the beginning, that it has picked up the ‘rust’?

**Dadashri:** All these elements are present in the universe (*loka*). And as long as one is within the *loka*, one will continue to be affected by all other elements. This is called ‘scientific circumstantial evidence’. When the Self transcends beyond the *loka* (universe); when the Self ascends to the *Siddha gati* (location at the border of the universe and non-universe, also known as *aloka* where all liberated souls go), then it will no longer pick up any ‘rust’ there.
Solution through right belief

It is like this, no other karma have affected it. Where the awareness of the Self has been lost, only those karma have adhered. Otherwise, the Self is pure. Right now your Self is pure. Everyone’s Self is pure, but the external form (the non-Self complex, prakruti) that has arisen; in that form, has arisen the wrong belief. From the time one is born, agnan (ignorance) is bestowed upon that external form. It is a worldly life (sansar), and so from the time a child is born, agnan is bestowed upon him. People say, ‘a baby boy is born; a baby boy…’ Then he is given the name ‘Chandu’ and so people keep calling him, ‘Chandu, Chandu, Chandu’, and so he starts believing, ‘I am Chandu’. Then they tell him ‘this is your daddy’ and ‘this is your mommy’. Everything given to him is only agnan. He is told, ‘You are Chandu, this is your daddy, this is your mommy,’ so he acquires all such wrong beliefs which he cannot get rid of. Only when the Gnani Purush breaks that wrong belief, can he have the right belief. Then the final solution is attained. So the Self is verily pure; this current vision is under illusion only.

It is just a deluded vision (mithya darshan) that has arisen; a belief of pleasure has arisen where there is no pleasure. When ‘we’ give Gnan (Self-realization and more), one finds the path in the right direction. He will find the solution once he finds the way. When ‘we’ change his deluded vision (mithya darshan - wrong belief of ‘I am Chandubhai’) and give him the right belief (samyak darshan - vision of ‘I am pure Self’), he will have his solution, until then he will not have a solution.

Questioner: But how did all this begin?

Dadashri: All these phases have arisen from the coming together of all the eternal elements. This worldly life means ‘samsaran marg’ (path of evolution, starting from the entry of a soul from nigod ending with liberation) and samsaran means it is constantly evolving. Because of the changes, you feel that your self is impure, whereas I see your Self as verily pure. You have wrong belief that is set and that is why you believe that it is impure. When I fracture your wrong belief and replace it with the right belief, You too will see the pure (shuddha) only.

The Self is pure. Right now your Self is pure, but wrong beliefs have set within you. And because of that you see pleasure in temporary things.
Whatever you see with your eyes, hear with your ears, taste with your tongue; they are all temporary adjustments. And you believe that pleasure lies in those temporary things. Right now you are under the effect of that wrong belief. If the wrong belief is fractured, you will not seek pleasure in temporary things but find it in the permanent thing. Permanent pleasure is eternal bliss; it will not go away once ‘You’ attain it. And that is considered as having attained the Atma (Self). It is the experience of the state of the Self (swa anubhav). With such an experience of the state of the Self, You progress to the absolute Self, the Paramatma.

The worldly self – The Self

I will tell you the core facts. There are two kinds of atma. One is the main Atma and because of that Atma, another atma, the vyavahar atma (worldly atma) has arisen. The main Atma is the nischaya Atma (the Self). It has not changed at all. It is exactly the way it was and the other atma has arisen as part of it. Just as you go in front of a mirror, will you not see two Chandubhai?

Questioner: Yes, I will see two.

Dadashri: Similarly, this vyavahar atma has arisen. ‘We’ have called it as ‘pratishthit atma’ (the relative or the charged self). One has done his own pratishtha (life instillation) in it. Therefore, if you still keep doing the pratishtha (instillation) of ‘I am Chandubhai…I am Chandubhai,’ then you will create a new pratishthit atma for your next life. If you believe this worldly life (vyavahar) to be real, then a new ‘vyavahar atma (worldly self)’ will be created. Nischaya Atma (the main real Atma) has remained the same. Now if one is touched by ‘It’, then he is eternally blessed. Right now one is touched by only the vyavahar atma.

The relative self – The real Self

Pratishthit atma is the ‘relative atma’ and the other is the ‘Shuddhatma’ (pure Self). Shuddhatma is the ‘real Atma.’ And the ‘relative atma’ is a ‘mechanical atma.’ It is puran-galan by nature, i.e. it is subject to the phenomenon of charging and discharging. You eat from here (puran)
and then you have to relieve yourself in the morning (galan). You take water from here (puran) and then you have to go to the bathroom (galan), you inhale (puran) and so you have to exhale (galan). So there are only two things, puran-galan (intake and output) and the Shuddhatma.

**Questioner:** What is the difference between the ‘real Atma’ and the ‘relative atma’?

**Dadashri:** The ‘relative atma’ has arisen out of one’s own wrong belief. One comes into the real Atma when that wrong belief fractures. The ‘Gnani Purush’ fractures that wrong belief and establishes the right belief. That is called ‘samyak darshan’ (the right Vision). So the conviction (pratiti) of the Self becomes established.

**Questioner:** Is there a difference between the ego and the pratishthit atma?

**Dadashri:** No. The pratishthit atma itself is the ego. ‘You’ did the pratishta of, ‘I am the body. I am Chandulal, I am the father of this boy, I am his brother.’ How many kinds of ‘I…I…I…I’s’ are there?

**And new pratishta arises**

**Questioner:** So, is one the pratishthit atma and the other a Shuddhatma?

**Dadashri:** Nischaya Atma is Shuddhatma and the one that functions in worldly interactions, is the pratishthit atma. That is because ‘we’ do its pratishta. Now if there is a man who has not attained Self-realization, (Gnan) and his name is Chandubhai, it is his past karma when he says ‘I am Chandubhai, I am his uncle, etc.’ He is saying it as an effect of that karma. What was previously in the form of planning (yojna) is now unfolding as an effect. Now there is no problem if it has come into effect, but he has the same in his faith (belief) all over again, and so he sows new seeds of karma. That is how one keeps doing the pratishta (instilling life), he does the pratishta of ‘this is me’ in the body. So a body is formed again; an idol (body complex) arises. This is how one keeps giving rise to a new murti (idol), by repeated pratishta. And the old murti is destroyed. It (the new body) will continue to give you fruits (effect) because of the pratishta you did.
It is just the belief of the *pratishthit atma*. It is because of the wrong belief that one keeps doing the *pratishtha* of ‘I am this…I am this…’ The old *pratishtha* is destroyed and the new one arises.

**Aashrav – Nirjara - Samvar**

(Influx of *karma* - Discharge of *karma* - Blockage against an inflow of new *karmic* matter)

When he says, ‘I am Chandubhai,’ ‘I am his uncle,’ and ‘I had this thought.’ Now, this is *aashrav* (influx of *karmic* particles creating new bondage) of past *pratishtha* (the belief in the past life, ‘I am this body complex’). Later this *aashrav* then discharges. During the time of discharging, (in this life) it again creates the exact same ‘image’(experienced through mind, speech and body) and then it discharges. Now what does the Gnan that has been given to You, say? It says that when one says, ‘I am Chandubhai… I am his uncle…,’ it is of the past *pratishtha*. But he has Gnan (Self-realization) now and therefore the faithful conviction (*shraddha*) of ‘I am definitely Chandubhai’ has gone away. Therefore he does not do any new *pratishtha*. And that is why it is considered as *samvar* (stoppage of influx of *karma*); no binding of *karma* happens while discharge of past *karma* continues. What is considered as bondage (*bandha*)? Bondage happens when one does not have Gnan. So whatever *pratishtha* you do, the same *pratishtha* arises again.

**They believe the self to be the Self**

**Questioner:** Are the attributes of the worldly self (*vyavahar atma*) and the Self (*nischaya Atma*) different?

**Dadashri:** They would be different of course! *Nischaya Atma* means the real Atma (the Self).

**Questioner:** There is one *atma* but different attributes, is that what it is?

**Dadashri:** It is not like that. If a man trades in almonds, people will say ‘this is the almond merchant’. But in the courts, he is called an attorney. When he arbitrates and pleads, he will be called as attorney, no? In the same manner, if you remain absorbed in the worldly activities, then you are called
the ‘vyavahar atma’, and if You are absorbed in nischaya-the Self, then you are the nischaya Atma. Originally, you are just that, but it depends upon the activity in which you are absorbed.

So people have believed the worldly self (vyavahar atma) to be the nischaya Atma (the Absolute Atma). They refer to it as ‘vyavaharik atma’ but in their mind they believe it to be the real Atma. They believe ‘this’ is the Atma because if not, then how can he speak? How can he walk? The walking, talking, studying the Vedas, then ‘I read and I remember what I read’; all these, one believes to be the atma; the atma cannot be anything else. All that, is nothing but the shadow of the Atma-the Self. If you follow this shadow of the Atma, you will not find the real Atma in a hundred thousand years. The science of Akram openly and clearly questions, ‘why are you hanging on to the shadow?’ In spite of this, the kramic path is not wrong. But they believe the shadow to be the Atma itself. But what I am saying is, ‘believe the shadow to be the shadow and the Atma to be the Atma’.

**Questioner:** The greatest mistake is in this belief.  

**Dadashri:** Everything is wrong when there is a mistake in the fundamental belief to start with. What else remains then?

**Battery charged in the presence of Soul**

**Questioner:** You said that all this is a pudgal (the non-Self complex), so how this pudgal shakti (energy of the non-Self) and Atma shakti (the energy of the Self) fit together?

**Dadashri:** The power of the pudgal is just like the cells of a battery which are charged; as long as you keep the cells in the flash light it will continue to give light. When the energy in the battery cells is discharged, it will turn off. In the same manner, three ‘batteries’ of the mind-body-speech are charged in the presence of the Self (Atma). One will have light as long as three batteries are charged and once the power runs out (discharged) then it will stop (death). Again the new batteries (for next life) are being charged. The old batteries are discharging and the new batteries are being charged.

The current batteries get discharged, and if the new ones do not charged then there is no problem, but for these people in the world, the old are discharging and the new batteries are getting charged.
Energy of the non-Self – Energy of the Self

**Questioner:** So you talked about change, but how much power is there in that *pudgal*, how much is the energy of the *pudgal*?

**Dadashri:** The energy of the *pudgal* is of the *pudgal*, it is not the energy of the Self. So the energy of the *pudgal* is different. *Pudgal*, only that if it was not charged, then the *pudgal parmanus* (subatomic particles) were free only. This is just that it got charged with energy and therefore it works like a *chetan* (the Self). It works so well, as if it is *chetan*. Mind-intellect-*chit*-ego; anger-pride-deceit-greed, all are there. It works like a *chetan* but there is not even an iota of *chetan* in that. This is only the energized charged non-Self complex; it is a charged self. *Vyavahar atma* worldly interacting self, means charged self, and that other one is *nischaya* Atma; that is the real Atma (the Self). That *nischaya* Atma does not do anything at all in this body. It is giving only light to every living being. It is not doing anything else. There is no doership in its nature. That which does anything is the state of the non-Self (*pudgal*). Only the charged self is doing.

**What is nischetan chetan?**

What is the real nature of the Self? The original Self, the exact Self, is pure Self (*shuddha chetan*) and is verily the *Paramatma* – the absolute Self. And what the world believes to be soul (*chetan*), is actually *nischetan chetan* – lifeless life. If a ball of iron is heated, it becomes just like fire (red hot); similarly this *nischetan chetan* is like that.

What is *nischetan-chetan*? It is that which is being charged in the presence of *chetan* (the Self), which then continues to ‘discharge’ – that is called as ‘*nischetan-chetan*’.

**Who is the doer of like-dislike?**

**Questioner:** The *bhaav* (inner intents) of good and bad that happen, to whom does it happen? Does that happen to *pratishthit atma*?

**Dadashri:** It is like this. When the *pratishthit atma* does good or bad intentions *bhaav*, at that time it is not considered as *pratishthit atma*, but it is considered *vyavahar atma* (the worldly interacting self). *Pratishthit atma* is
that which remains after one attains the knowledge of the Self. It is the fruit of the pratishtha of ‘I am - hoonpanu’ that was done in the body, is what remains. Before Self-realization it cannot be called pratishthit atma; it is called vyavahar atma.

**Questioner:** How does the Self (chaitanya Atma) become bound when the vyavahar atma has good or bad bhaav?

**Dadashri:** When the vyavahar atma does good or bad bhaav, it is not alone in the process. Even the nischaya Atma (the Self) is involved in it. His belief verily is ‘I verily am this one.’ (‘I am this body’).

**Questioner:** What is nischaya Atma?

**Dadashri:** Nischaya Atma means Shuddhatma (the pure Self). The vyavahar atma is the doer (karta) in worldly interactions (vyavahar), and really (nischaya) the Self is the non-doer (akarta).

**Questioner:** But the nischaya Atma is the doer of the bhaav (intent), is it not?

**Dadashri:** It is not the doer of the bhaav either. Ignorance of the Self is the doer of the bhaav!

**Questioner:** When do bhaav arise?

**Dadashri:** Bhaav-abhaav (attraction-repulsion, attachment-aversion, raag-dwesh) happens when there is ignorance of the Self.

**Questioner:** Does bhaav happen when there is Gnan?

**Dadashri:** There is no bhaav when there is Gnan. Where there is Gnan, there is swabhav bhaav (awareness of the Self) and where there is ignorance, there is bhaav. Where there is the vision of illusion (mithyatva), there is bhaav-abhaav, not where there is the Vision of the Self (samkit).

**Questioner:** Bhaav-abhaav happens only in the presence of Gnan, does it not?
Dadashri: Yes, bhaav-abhaav happens only in the presence of the Self, otherwise there is no bhaav-abhaav in a tape record (there is no bhaav-abhaav in non-living things).

Questioner: Did bhaav-abhaav arise because the pure Self did par laksha diverted the awareness to the non-Self?

Dadashri: The pure Self never does parlaksha, move its awareness to the non-Self. The pure Self (Shuddhatma) remains verily as the pure Self, with Gnan, with complete Gnan. It is the ‘knower’ of even the parlaksha. It knows who did the parlaksha, who is in the awareness of the non-Self.

Questioner: Who is the doer of parlaksha?

Dadashri: If you understand just this much from the Gnani Purush, you will find the answers to all your worldly questions. You should be able to understand just this very point of who is the one doing the prompting or inspiring.

Inspiration energy of the Self

Questioner: Shrimad Rajchandra has said, ‘Hoy na chetan prerana, to kaun grahe karma?’ (If not for the inspiration of the ‘self’, who would acquire karma?). Please explain that.

Dadashri: What it is that, that is a kramic path. Now what do they consider chetan in the kramic path? They consider vyavahar atma (the worldly interacting self) as chetan. So this inspiration is of that chetan (of the self), so we say that that is all of egoism, and they call it the self. And it gives the inspiration. Now, that chetan is chetan, but we deduced that it is a power chetan, not the main chetan (Self; shuddha chetan). And if it was a pure chetan (Self), if it inspires, it will remain the inspirer (prerak) forever, wherever it goes.

Questioner: So change that pudgal undergoes, who acquires that? What is there to acquire in it?
**Dadashri:** Yes, he is right, ‘Hoy na chetan prerana, to kaun grahe karma?’ (If there is no inspiration of the ‘self’, then who (would be there to) acquire karma?). It is the one who says, ‘I am doing it’, who acquires the karma.

**Questioner:** So it does not acquire anything, it is just a belief.

**Dadashri:** It is all a belief. It is all verily the wrong belief. It is verily a belief and pudgal becomes that form. Whatever the belief, that form of pudgal arises. Fruit of this bhaav, is that one becomes that form of dravya (that which is experienced through the five senses and the mind body complex). Such is the nature of the pudgal, and if ‘I am not the doer’, then nothing happens to that pudgal. Even if it is there, it will become free. It becomes free if one becomes the Knower-Seer. As long as one is the doer, new pudgals are also acquired and the old ones are also released. The one acquiring is ‘he’ (the ego), and the one releasing is also ‘he’ (the ego). And here (In Akram), the one acquiring is gone and the one releasing is vyavasthit, ‘pote – I-the Self’ becomes free from it all.

Now, how can people understand this deep talk? They do not understand it, so they believe that main chetan (Self) is doing all this.

So this is the inspiration of ‘power’ chetan(charged self, energized self), this is not of original chetan (the Self). If it was the inspiration of chetan (the Self), then chetan would have been bound.

**The Self:** ‘Non-doer’ by real viewpoint – ‘Doer’ by relative viewpoint

**Questioner:** Are power (the charged self) and chetan (the Self) separate?

**Dadashri:** Just as the sun and the urja (energy) that arises here on earth; there is that much difference. Urja arises because of the sun, that is how separate is this power (charged self) is. There is no doership of the sun in that. Urja the energy arises when another thing comes in contact with it. If you place a thick glass convex lens here, which is the other thing that met the rays of the sun, because of that glass lens, everything under it, burns. The sun has nothing to do with it. It is because of the meeting the second thing. Move them away from each other then there is nothing again. Now how can it move away?
**Questioner:** If the Self is pure (shuddha), then who gets smeared and tainted by karma?

**Dadashri:** The doer.

**Questioner:** If the pudgal (the non-Self complex) is the doer, but it remains here (after death), does it not?

**Dadashri:** Neither the pudgal (non-Self complex) nor the Self create, bind, ‘do’ karma. It is the ego that arises in the presence of the Self, and it verily is the doer of karma. It is that ego that says, ‘I did this, I am happy, I am unhappy, I attained Gnan, I slipped into ignorance (agnan).’ Ego does all this. Once the ego leaves, one becomes the Self. For the world to understand this, the vitarags have said that the self (atma) is a doer from the viewpoint of the worldly life interactions (vyavahar), but from the view of the Self (nischaya), it is a non-doer. By relative viewpoint, the self is a doer of karma. However, it is not the doer of these visible karma (those evident through mind, speech and body), it is doer of bhaavkarma (the intent through ‘I am Chandulal’) and this charges karma. The doer of the visible karma is nature; it is vyavasthit.

By real viewpoint the Self is the doer of swabhav karma (natural state of ‘knowing’ and ‘seeing’).

**Attained same proof from everywhere**

Lord Krishna has said, ‘Why do you worry, Krishna will do what he wants to.’ So the Jains say that was Lord Krishna who said that and not Lord Mahavir. What has Lord Mahavir said?

‘Rai maatra vadhaghat nahi, dekhya kevalgnan
Not the slightest of change can happen in that which unfolds in front of you, this ‘we’ have ‘seen’ in keval Gnan.

Tey nischay kar jaaniye, tyajee de artadhyan
Therefore abandon the artadhyan with knowledge of the Self.’

Stop worrying: worrying is artadhyan.
So abandon all meditation that is adverse and hurts the self, abandon all worries. But who listens to the words of the Lord nowadays? How can we scold to the one who does not want to listen?

I had accepted and agreed with this a long time ago, I was told this. I agreed, that this is one revelation, and then I investigated on another side. I have found after deep study that there is no difference in what Lord Krishna and Lord Mahavir have said. Even then if there is any chance of error, let us investigate further.

So then, Sahajanand Swami says, ‘No one can break a single blade of grass without my wish.’ You mean to say that without you not a single blade of grass can be cut? And so, now we have three Lords who say the same thing. So I said let’s still look further for another.

Even Saint Kabir has said the same thing in different words. *(Chinta)*

‘Prarabdha pahele banya, piichhey banya sharira
Kabira achamba yeh hai, mun na baandhe dhiir’

‘Destiny (prarabdha) comes first, then forms the body
Kabir, it is a wonder, that the mind does not accept.’ *(Aptavani 1 eng 22)*

The mind does not have patience and that verily is the wonder. I kept getting all this verifications, I kept asking everybody. ‘What is your proof?’ Tell me.

Yes, perhaps one person can be mistaken, but you cannot say that the Vitarags (The Enlightened Liberators) are wrong, unless say the writer made a mistake in his writing. I will never believe that the Vitarags are wrong. No matter how much one tries to convince me otherwise, I have never found fault in them. Even from my childhood, although I was born a Vaishnav (follower of Lord Krishna) I have never believed the Vitarags to be wrong. This is because of their wisdom; merely chanting their names does one’s work. Whereas just look at our state. Have you ever seen a mustard seed? The Vitarags have said that not even a minute change, like that of a mustard seed, can take place in this life. And look at all these people, they stay awake and burn midnight oil! They torture their body by trying to stay awake and in the end they set themselves up for heart failure. *(Worry 9,10)*

Swallowed the medicine which was meant to be applied on the skin
Tirthankaras taught people that this ‘medicine’ is to be applied on the skin, and another one they said to drink. But people are swallowing the one meant for applying on the skin, and rubbing the one meant for swallowing. Where is the fault of tirthankaras in that? What happens when one drinks the medicine meant for rubbing?

**Questioner:** One will not drink it if it is labeled, will one?

**Dadashri:** No they drink even the ones that are labeled.

Vaishnavas (followers of Lord Krishna) do not believe the Self as a doer, followers of Lord Shiva do not believe the Self as a doer, followers of Vedanta do not believe the Self as a doer, only the Jains believe the Self as a doer. Tirthankaras said that, ‘self is a doer by relative viewpoint (vyavahar).’ By relative viewpoint, self is a doer. So we ask, ‘Then Sir, tell us who is a doer by the real viewpoint?’ So then they will tell you that by real viewpoint it is not a doer. Now people believe the relative to be the real.

I am going to speak syadvaad (accepted by all views). But by what expectation (apeksha) view? I did not say it with Vedanta view, and said that the Self is verily pure. Now that does not make it pure. The Self is pure, and why am I in pain? If the Self is pure, then why does it have to have a body? Why did it have to remain here (not go to moksha)? Did they find a fault with God? What this other, the Tirthankaras are saying is that from a certain view the Self is pure, and from a certain view the self is impure. Therefore, we said syadvaad, that if one moves forward with understanding, then it will not create contradiction. So in Vedanta no one will believe that ‘Self is a doer’. They understand that, ‘The Self is pure, it is non-doer’.

Whereas what do people say? They say, ‘God has said that the Self is a doer, and you say it is not’? I said, ‘God said it is ‘doer-sufferer’ karta-bhokta, but it was meant for ‘rubbing’ and you ‘drank’ it, so then what would happen?’

**Questioner:** Believed that to be true?

**Dadashri:** They have believed that to be true. That is exactly what they say, ‘I am doing it’. Is anyone else doing it? Who else is doing? Who else is there?

The Self is the doer-sufferer by vyavahar, what does it mean?
No one’s doership is gone. On the contrary, the scriptures have explained that ‘the self is the doer, the self is the sufferer’. Now, how can that doership leave?

**Questioner:** But there is no explanation of it. This clarification ‘It is doer by vyavahar (worldly interaction) and sufferer by vyavahar’ is not there. Therefore, people will get more confused, will they not?

**Dadashri:** No. They do not even know vyavahar, then where is it for them to be confused, if you tell them that it is doer by vyavahar? They are already confused, what more is there to be confused? They do not even know what ‘vyavahar’ is. They will understand nischaya, if they understood vyavahar. But what is there when they have not even understood vyavahar? Their whole vyavahar is entangled, and they do not even know where the Self is. It is the mechanical self that they believe as the Self, and then they say, ‘I will attain moksha if I make it still’.

**Questioner:** That is what is in the kramic path, then what else can he do?

**Dadashri:** It is true that, that is what is in the kramic path, there is nothing wrong in it. But sooner or later, when one comes to a certain level, one becomes separate, and he understands vyavahar. How long does he understand vyavahar? Until he understands the two parts as separate, vyavahar will go on. The main thing to understand is that the self is ‘doer by vyavahar’. He will be blessed significantly, if he understands just that.

So what has the Lord said? The Self is a doer by relative viewpoint (vyavahar) and a non-doer by real viewpoint (nischaya). So what does doer by relative viewpoint (vyavahar) mean? That means, we are Sthanakvasi (Jains who do not worship statues or idols) from relative viewpoint (vyavahar), but it is not like that in the belief. In the belief, ‘we are non-doer’ If one understands just this sentence of the Lord then he can understand, otherwise how can one understand?

So it should not be in the belief. But one speaks with the belief. One speaks with the belief, does not one? ‘I verily am’ one speaks this only, does not one? Just as you are Chandubhai, if someone asks you, ‘Are you Chandubhai?’ Then you would say, ‘Yes.’ But this is not in your belief. ‘Shuddhatma’ is in your belief.
You are Chandubhai, but is it in your belief?

**Questioner:** No.

**Dadashri:** ‘I am this woman’s husband’, do you have such in your belief?

**Questioner:** No.

**Dadashri:** You would speak that ‘I am this woman’s husband’, but it is not in your belief. However for these people (elsewhere), ‘I am’, ‘I am Acharya maharaj (spiritual master)’, and this is in their belief too. If one is upadhyaya (spiritual teacher) then there is no problem in saying upadhyaya, it is vyavahar (worldly interaction), but it is not in your belief, so if it is by vyavahar then superior-inferior does not remain. Due to this belief one feels superior-inferior.

I am fifty-six years old; do you have this in your belief? Would there be gray hair on the Self (Atma)? All that is destroyed from your belief, is that not? Belief is gone, ‘I am a woman’, do you have such belief?

**Questioner:** No.

**Dadashri:** Good, and if people ask, ‘Who are you? Are you a woman?’ Then you can say, ‘Yes, I am a woman.’ You have to say in vyavahar. But you would not have this in the belief.

Now the Lord said that, ‘You are a doer by worldly interaction (vyavahar).’ So if these people ask, ‘Did you do this?’ then you have to say ‘Yes, I did.’ But this would not be in your belief. People ask, ‘You did this swadhyaya (study of the Self) and gave the sermon (updesha).’ Then you can say, ‘Yes brother, I did.’ But this would not be in your belief. How these full of wisdom are these talks of the Lord! How intelligent this talk is!

**Scientific equation of the Gnani**

**Questioner:** Jada (inanimate; the non-Self) is the doer of the activity of the jada, is that right?
**Dadashri:** It is an obvious thing. The doer of the activity of the *jada*, is *jada* only.

**Questioner:** The Self is not the doer by the view of the Self (*nischaya*).

**Dadashri:** The Lord had given one sentence that the self is a doer by *vyavahar*—worldly interactions. He had not given further other explanation. He said that the self is a doer by *vyavahar*. Lord, we agree with this. Now with this, right down an equation. What does an equation mean? It is that which is scientific and incontrovertible.

Now the self is a doer by *vyavahar* (worldly interaction), and a non-doer by *nischaya* (the Self). Then who is the doer? one will ask. If it is a non-doer by *nischaya*, then who is a doer by *nischaya* (in fact)? It is said that it is a doer by *vyavahar*. So then place trirashi (rule of three), that *pudgal* (the non-Self complex), by *vyavahar* is a non-doer and a doer by *nischaya*. This solution is given in algebra. Have you seen that or not. Did you understand this?

So if the self is a doer by *vyavahar* then what is it by *nischaya*? Then the answer is it is a non-doer by *nischaya*. By *nischaya* means really it is a non-doer and by relative viewpoint it is a doer. Then write another equation that who is a doer of this world by *nischaya*? Then the response is that through *nischaya* (the view of and as the Self) the *pudgal* is the doer and, thus the (Self) is a non-doer in *vyavahar*; if we write such equation then can we get a link or not?

**Questioner:** That is the only way can we find that?

**Dadashri:** Yes, therefore, what God said that as long as you need *vyavahar*, you like *vyavahar*, you are a doer of this. And if you like your real Self and you want to stay in *aroop* (the formless), then You are a non-doer. You are a doer by *vyavahar*. You are nor really a doer. By *vyavahar* means people will say that, ‘You only did this.’ So I have to accept that we are a doer by *vyavahar*. Because people will speak as they will see *vyavahar* (worldly interaction). Therefore, one will have to purify *vyavahar* too at the end. This will not work in *vyavahar*.

**This is called, a doer by vyavahar**
**Questioner:** If one is a non-doer by nischaya, then how did the worldly life (sansar) of the living being increase?

**Dadashri:** So ‘potey – I am’ is not a doer, one is a doer by vyavahar means he accepted the vyavahar. He accepts vyavahar by, ‘I am verily Chandubhai’, he remains the doer of that. Once ‘I am Chandubhai’ leaves, everything is gone.

So who really is the ‘doer’ of this? It is the pudgal. But Gnani (Self-realized) has to ‘know’ that, ‘You’ cannot tell that to agnani (the ones who have not attained the Self through Akram Vignan). Even when I am a Gnani, if I go out and accidently kick someone and he reports it to the police, the police will come and ask me why I kicked him? I cannot say that I am a Gnani and it is this pudgal that kicked him. I have to say that I kicked him. This is a worldly interaction (vyavahar). It is not like that by nischaya, by nischaya pudgal is the doer. But this is vyavahar, therefore in vyavahar I have to say that, otherwise people will say, just because you are a Gnani, does that mean you can get away? Show me; write your name down. Instead, be wise and tell him that, ‘I am A. M. Patel and it is my fault’. And You also know from within that it is not Dada’s fault at all, but I have to write it down, do I not? It is a vyavahar, is it not? So by vyavahar I am the doer.

Gnani feels for sure that ‘I am not the doer’, but does agnani not feel for sure that ‘he is the doer’? So by vyavahar even if You are not the doer you still have to say that you are the doer. This is because you are saying it in vyavahar (worldly interaction), you are not saying it as nischaya (the Self). By nischaya the Self is verily the non-doer.

The Lord says that, ‘The worldly interaction (vyavahar) sentences will never become that of nischaya (the Self). We have spoken all the sentences in worldly interaction (vyavahar), not in the realm of the Self (nischaya). If you take them to be in the realm of the Self (eternal) nischaya, then what can ‘we’ do in that? If you take this sentence, ‘moksha will happen by doing penance’ in nischaya, then what can ‘we’ do in that?

**Questioner:** Shrimad Rajchandra (Gnani Purush 1867-1901, kramic path) says that the Self (Atma) is, the Self is eternal (nitya). The self is a doer (karta) of karma, the self is the sufferer (bhokta) of karma. There is moksha and there is a path of moksha...
Dadashri: Yes. Shrimad Rajchandra is trying to convey that the self is a doer by vyavahar, not by nischaya. By which point it is a doer? What had you read? Is the self the doer forever?

Questioner: As long as one has not gone to moksha, the self is a karta and bhokta (doer and sufferer) of karma, is it not?

Dadashri: What, the Atma (the Self)? Do not say so. If someone just drinks this little amount insecticide, which kills bedbugs, then he will die, what that poor Self (Atma) can do in that? Why are you criticizing poor Self in that? If one just drinks this little medicine, which kills bedbug, what the Self can do in that? Can it be called that the Self did it?

The Self is not a karta (doer), nor a bhokta (sufferer of pain or pleasure). The Self is a doer by vyavahar and a non-doer by nischaya. Pudgal is a non-doer by vyavahar and a doer by nischaya.

If someone is frying chili pepper for vagher (placing mustard seed, asafetida, red whole chili pepper in hot oil or ghee) inside the kitchen, then if you do not want to sneeze even then you have to sneeze. Who makes you to sneeze? That is pudgal. It is not a living thing. On this side one is dying coughing. All this, pudgal is only the doer. But one will have to understand that the self is a doer by vyavahar.

Accept the worldly interaction

People will say that Chandubhai did this. Now, you will feel that it was not your wish, your chit was somewhere else, and whatever happened through this body that was not your wish. And yet people say that Chandubhai did this. Why is that? One would say, ‘Vyavahar will say exactly that. It will say what it sees.’ Vyavahar cannot give you the exact figure. Therefore one is a doer in vyavahar, and if one really understands then he is a non-doer. That is why it is said that it is a doer by vyavahar, but people themselves believe that, ‘I am the doer’. So this wrong belief that ‘I am the doer’ became established.

Therefore, the self is said to be the doer of karma, in vyavahar. Everyone will say, ‘We did it’. We cannot say no to that. You cannot say that, ‘I am Shuddhatma, I did not do it.’ You have to accept vyavahar (worldly
interaction). It is not acceptable to say, ‘Sir, I am Shuddhatma’, when the policeman asks, ‘Chandubhai, why did you do this crime?’ You have to say, ‘I am Chandubhai’. Therefore, you are a doer in worldly interaction (vyavahar), and in nischaya (as the Self) you are really not the doer. You have to say yes in vyavahar, because how does the other person know whether you are Chandubhai or someone else? And why does he have to see that?

**Doer: by invisible and visible ‘doership’**

**Questioner:** ‘Even the Self is full with activities. Every substance that we see is associated with activity (function). Result is with activity, the Self is also full with activity. It is full with activity that is why it is a doer. By anupcharik vyavahar (worldly interaction that is the effect and cannot be changed), the self is the doer of dravyakarma (the subtle discharging karma). By upchar (that which can be changed and appears so) it is the doer of home, city etc. And by swabhav parinati (being in the state of the Self), it is a doer of nijswaroop (the state of the Self).’ -Shrimad Rajchandra. Please explain these words of Shrimad Rajchandra in detail.

**Dadashri:** Now if we do further exposition of ‘doership’, when You come within the Self, in samyak darshan (Vision as the Self), then You become the doer of nijswaroop (the state of the Self, the ‘knowing; and ‘seeing’). And as long as there is dehadhyas (‘I am Chandubhai,’ ‘I am this body complex’), you are the ‘doer’ in this sansar (worldly life).

**Questioner:** So is the Self considered a doer in that?

**Dadashri:** But it is called a doer by vyavahar (worldly interaction), is it not?

**Questioner:** But ‘It’ is said to be doer of nijswaroop, how is that?

**Dadashri:** Yes, if it is a doer of nijswaroop means, then what else is it doer of? Its Gnan kriya (It means to ‘know’ and remain as the Self) and Darshan kriya (means to remain as the Self and to ‘see’) is constantly going on, it is the doer of its own Self (swaroop). So it is the doer of activity of Gnan-darshan (knowing-seeing). Because it is with dravya-guna-paraya (eternal state-attribute-phase), paryayas (phases) arise and are destroyed, arise and
are destroyed. So even while remaining in the siddha (the abode of absolute Self without a body) state, it can ‘see’ all this Gnan and all the unfolding (of karma) and then destruction of it, it can see all the phases only.

**Questioner:** So the Self is a seer (drashta), but how can we call it a doer (karta)?

**Dadashri:** ‘We’ have to say doer of nijswaroop for people to understand, do we not? ‘We’ have to use another word, do we not? Then, when one becomes that roop (form), he will understand what he wants to say. Even that, ‘we’ have to tell him something in its assigned place (sanketik). So this is sanketik language.

So by anupcharik vyavahar (something that has no solution; that which is happening and cannot be changed), the Self is the doer of dravyakarma (subtle discharging karma). What does anupcharik vyavahar mean? Did you have to do (upchar) anything in the formation of this body of eight karmas? Did you do (upchar) anything to make these eyes, make the ears? You did not have to, did you? This vyavahar is anupcharik (it happens and cannot be changed). It is anupcharik scientific vyavahar. There is nothing to be done, but somebody did something, did he not? It is a scientific vyavahar. It is scientific circumstantial evidence. Therefore, by anupcharik vyavahar, the self is a doer of dravyakarma. So it is a doer of eight kinds of karma, doer of gnan avaran (knowledge covering veil), darshan avaran (vision covering veil), mohaniya (karma of illusion), antaraya (obstacle causing), vedaniya (pain and pleasure determining), naam (karma of name and physical attributes), gotra (family, status, lineage determining), and ayushya (life span determining).

By doing in apparent conduct (upchar), one is a ‘builder’ of home, starting of a city etc. If someone is making a pot through his effort (upchar), then we would say that potter made the pot. Would we not? This man built a home. This builder built my home, through his effort (upchar).

**Questioner:** So does through effort, doing, visible conduct (upchar) mean through vyavahar?

**Dadashri:** That which is in conduct (upchar) does mean vyavahar. This through upcharik vyavahar, and this through anupcharik vyavahar (one without a solution). Upcharik vyavahar means that we saw him doing
upchar the work. And no one has seen him doing anupcharik upchar. So then how did it happen? It is scientific. And the one through one’s visible effort, we can see that he started building the house. We can see that the lady made soup, rice, bread, vegetables. One is a doer of karma by upchar visible worldly interactions vyavahar.

Now by swabhav parinati (the nature of the Self; Being the Self) it is a doer of nijswaroop (state of the Self). By swaparinati it becomes the doer of nijswaroop and by parparinati (being the non-Self), by anupcharik vyavahar (that interaction which simply happens, is beyond his ‘control’) atma—the self becomes the doer of dravyakarma (subtle discharging karma). And by par-parinati, by upchar it becomes the doer of home-city. Parparinati means, when the doer is another (scientific circumstantial evidences) and one states, ‘I am doing’, that is called parparinati; state of the non-Self. If one comes even one minute in swaparinati, from that point his path of moksha opened.

In the state of ignorance (agnan) the self (vyavahar atma; the worldly self) is the doer of dravyakarma (subtle discharging karma) in that which is essentially anupcharik (that which cannot be changed and is happening) vyavahar. With such a worldly interaction one is a doer of discharging karmas (dravyakarma). And after Self-realization the resultant state is forever that of the Self (swa-parinam). In this state, the Self does not become vikrut (changed). Indeed if had changed, then everything would change and that would be the end of everything. If you can understand only this much, your work will be accomplished.

One believes, ‘I am the doer.’ Hey you! Where are you in all this? This is all moving and changing (sachar); it is the ‘mechanical’ self. The One within is motionless and unchanging (achar); it is the Shuddhatma (the pure Self). The external part is the prakruti (the non-Self complex which comprises the mind, speech and body) and it is the moving part, and the motionless part within is the Self. People are trying to make still that which is inherently constantly in motion. The prakruti is by nature restless. This world is such that it can never be forgotten even for a second.
‘You-the awakened One of Akram Vignan’ do not have anything to bother with *upcharit-anupcharit* (visible or invisible discharging conduct, activity) do you? These words are taught in the *kramic* path. On what basis ‘you are Chandubhai’, and on what basis you built a home, you did this and you did that? That is through *upchar vyavahar* visible conduct in worldly interaction (*vyavahar*). And *anupcharik vyavahar*, it is one whose visible conduct has not occurred at all, its *yojna* (planning) has not occurred, whose design has not been made; through such *anupcharik vyavahar* the Self is the doer of *dravyakarma* (subtle discharging *karma* in effect, through which *bhaav karma* or charge *karma* happens). Eight categories of *karma* give the fruit, in that visible conduct (*upchar*) it is the doer of home-city-pot-making etc.

‘I am going and I am coming’ is *upchar*. This is so because what has become *charit* (formed in conduct, visible in effect) is becoming *upcharit* (expressing in conduct through mind, speech and body). *Upcharit* of *charit* happens, that which is ready as fruit, unfolds in conduct. And if you want to do the function, make it formal, you have to do *aupcharik*. Then *upcharit* became *aupcharik*. *Charit* (conduct) has already happened (effect), and now *upcharit* (unfolding visible conduct). Does He (Srimad Rajchandra) not say that this is nothing but *upchar*?

Do you understand, ‘With *upchar*, a doer of *ghar-nagar aadi*’ (one is a doer of home, city etc. through visible conduct) and ‘*anupcharya*’ (that which happens will happen. This one (the self in current life) does the design of *bhaav*, and the *pudgal* does the design of the *pudgal* (for next life). Based on the *bhaav* this one does, it happens. Just as you raise your hand in front of a mirror, the mirror shows that, does it not? That is how this is. That is how it happens immediately. Hence, these words are worth understanding, they are very deep words, but in the *kramic* path. We do not need these words (in Akram), do we? I have removed all the *upchar-anupchar* business (all issues of conduct, the effect). I have left nothing for you to memorize. One wanders around with the experience of the Self, the very next day. How much of a problem it would have been if we had to mold a nose or something like that? We can make *ghar-nagar* (home-city), but how much of a problem it would have been if we were given this responsibility (of shaping-making a human body complex). So look, this (state of Yours in Akram) is without any responsibility, is it not?
Intents of the self: Forms of the pudgal

‘One’ keeps doing bhaavkarma, and the body keeps getting constructed (bandharan), formed. That doer of bhaavkarma has nothing to do with the pudgal. But, pudgal is immediately constructed (bandhai) according to the bhaav one does.

Questioner: Those pudgals (non-Self matter) get attracted.

Dadashri: Yes. They become attracted. Having been attracted, they have become ready. They are already extracted. But with bhaav they become bound. Therefore whatever kinds of bhaav one does, they become bound. So this does not come into one’s mind that how all this is bound. How did the design of pudgal happen? Whatever design of bhaav the self does, that design

Atma, the doer of the state of the Self

‘You’ became free, once you knew what the Self is the doer of. It is a doer of swabhav (natural state; state of the Self), it is a bhokta (sufferer) of ‘that’ too. The Tirthankara said that the self is the doer by vyavahar worldly interactions. So people could not comprehend. Peoples’ vision is so bad that they change vyavahar as being nischaya. Vyavahar is vyavahar (relative is relative) and nischaya is nischaya (real is real). Vyavahar is all ‘dramatic’.

Questioner: Dramatic play.

Dadashri: Dramatic play. You simply have to play a drama in the name of Chandubhai. Instead, it becomes ‘I am Chandubhai’, ‘I did this’, and ‘I did that’. He will decide this. People accomplished nischaya the self in vyavahar and they did not accomplish anything in nischaya (the Self).

Questioner: ‘The Self is a doer of swabhav karma (natural state of ‘knowing’ and ‘seeing’, otherwise it is a non-doer.’ How is that? I could not understand that.

Dadashri: The Self is the doer of the natural state of the ‘knowing’ and ‘seeing’ (swa-swabhav). The Self is not the doer of any other karma. The Self is like this light (prakash). It is swabhav (the Self nature), say for instance this is a light; it is a doer of its swabhav karma (natural state of
giving light). It will give light at the most. It will not feed us in our mouth or give us air, will it? Fan will give air if you turn it on. This light cannot give you air, can it?

**Questioner:** It is because its nature is like that.

**Dadhashri:** This is like that only. The Self does not eat-drink like this, it does not do like this-like that.

**Questioner:** What is the meaning of the doer of swabhav karma in this?

**Dadhashri:** The Self is the doer (activity of ‘knowing’ and ‘seeing’) of its own nature, the original nature, the natural state of the Self only. In the worldly life (sansar) the Self is the doer of vibhav (attribute that is not of the Self, ‘I am Chandulal.’) karma. This seems very deep, does it not? It is called the doer of the worldly life (sansar), it is said through illusion (bhranti). As long as there is bhranti (illusion), this (self) is the doer of this sansar. When the bhranti leaves, then it becomes the doer of the Self-state (swaroop), otherwise it is a non-doer. It is not a doer in any matter at all. It does not do anything like this. This we do when we say that ‘I did this’, ‘I did that’, the Self does not do that.

**Questioner:** It is not comprehensible without experience.

**Dadhashri:** If you want experience then you have to come here.

**Questioner:** It means that the intents which are bending towards the non-Self, are aswabhav bhaav (state of the non-Self) and the intents which are towards the Self are swa swabhav (one’s own Self state)?

**Dadhashri:** Yes, when there is par swabhav (state of the non-Self), that as long as the Self ‘is’ in the non-Self (par), it is a worldly life (sansar) only, is it not? When one comes into swa swabhav bhaav (being and remaining in the state of the Self), the worldly life is gone. And par swabhav bhaav means par parinati (state of the non-Self). When the doer is another, (scientific circumstantial evidences) and one says ‘I am doing’ that is called par parinati.

**Non-doer, yet apparent doer**
What is this *vishesh bhaav* (the new intent that arises and that intent is not the property either of the two – the Self or the non-Self; extra intent)? How does the *prakruti* (mind-body-speech complex) arise by itself? ‘I – the Gnani Purush’ have seen all that. ‘I’ speak from what ‘I’ see. That is why, this *vignan* (science) unfolds. No one is the (independent) doer of any thing, and nothing has happened without a (*naimitik* – apparent; one of the evidences) doer!

The self (*‘Potey – I am’*) paints (*chitrey*) the worldly life (*sansar*). Thereafter, it is in the nature’s hand to bring about strangely vivid (*vichitrata*) result. It is the work of nature to make it strange and vivid, and this is due to *vishesha parinam* (extra result from non-Self and the Self coming together) of the painting (*chitra*, the intent). After then no one can interfere in that.

‘We’ are openly declaring that there is no creator of this world up there. Still, this world has not arisen without a doer. Who is considered a doer? One with an independent power. Just by doing *bhavna* (intent, desire) everything arises and is ready. He is called a doer. Therefore, there is really no one creator of this world, and yet it has not arisen without a doer. What am I saying? So then how can the two sentences co-exist?

**Questioner:** I will have to understand that.

**Dadashri:** Yes, so no one has created this world. And it has not arisen without a doer. A from that other man to him, caused him to push you. Now how can you accuse him of being the one who pushed you?

**Questioner:** It is not his fault.

**Dadashri:** The push came from somewhere else, how is this poor man guilty? Similarly, the Self, (*a/k/a* the Lord Himself) got trapped in this. Because of pushing from someone else, do you understand?

God is a *naimitik* doer of this. *Naimitik* means that no one is an independent doer himself. One would become bound if he were the independent doer. One is bound as a *naimitik* doer, and so he will be freed by a *nimit*. Doership has happened through a *nimit*, and he will be free again through a *nimit*. But if he was an independent doer, he will never get a chance to become free.
The Lord called the Self is a doer by vyavahar (worldly interaction), for the benefit of people. Instead people took disadvantage of that. They believed (the Self as a doer) by nischaya (real viewpoint). It would have been better if He had not said anything here. Like this Vedanta, Vaishnavs (followers of Lord Krishna) never believe the Self as a doer, by vyavahar or by nischaya. So they will be bound with less demerit karma (paap, sins). Less karma would be bound. These others established the Self as the doer only.

The Self is akrīya (non-active) itself. ‘I’ have ‘seen’ myself. This gets charged, this gets charged through mere presence of the Self. It gets charged by mere ‘touching’ (close contact) only. If we do not do anything to electricity, and if we touch it then it can harm us, we know so, don’t we? If we touch, then it affects, does it not?

**Questioner:** We feel shock, Dada.

**Dadashri:** Then how much energy would be there in the Self?

**Vyavasthit means the pudgal is a doer**

In Gnan state the Self is a non-doer, in agnan (ignorant state) it (the self) is a doer. It is doer by vyavahar (worldly interaction), and non-doer by nischaya (as the Self). The main doer is the pudgal (the non-Self complex), and the Self is a naimitik (apparent) doer.

By nischaya the Self is akrīya, akarta (inactive; non-doer), by vyavahar it is a doer. Then one would ask, ‘Who is the doer by nischaya (Who is really the doer??’ We introduced that by nischaya, pudgal is the doer, and by vyavahar, pudgal is not the doer. Pudgal means, the pudgal that is by vyavahar, all the ones that have come together, they are the doer. In the beginning, people have to be given religion, and so they have to be told that the self is the doer. Otherwise when they become angry, they will say that I did not do that. It is an illusion, butt it will not work if you do not tell them that. If you have Gnan, and then you say, ‘I did not become angry’, that will work, because for ‘You’ ‘Chandubhai’ did that (became angry) and so there is no violent intent (himsak bhaav) behind that. But for the agnani there is only violent intent behind it, it is clearly anger, it is tanmayakar (has become one with) anger. He might even say, ‘even I am not the doer’. He is the doer, he is the doer of whatever he does as long as he does not attain the Self-
Gnan. He becomes non-doer after he attains Gnan. Having attained Gnan we have *akarta bhaav* (non-doer in intent).

**Questioner:** So, is *pudgal* the doer?

**Dadashri:** The reason we are trying to tell You is that who is the doer now? This is a result, there is no doership of the Self. It is just a word for support. There is no support because there is no doer.

**Questioner:** So then, is there really no one the doer?

**Dadashri:** Actually, *pudgal* of the world is the only doer. But you cannot say that. No one on the outside will accept that today. They will not understand that at all and you will accomplish nothing. He will only say, ‘I am, and therefore I am the doer’.

**Questioner:** I did not understand when you said that, ‘*Pudgal* is a doer by *nischaya*’. Because after attaining the Gnan, we believe that ‘*vyavasthit shakti* (energy of scientific circumstantial evidence) is the doer’. And we understand that neither *pudgal*, nor the Self are the doers. And you just said that, ‘by *nischaya pudgal* is the doer’ (verily *pudgal* is the doer). I do not quite understand that.

**Dadashri:** Do you believe that only *vyavasthit* is the doer? Do you believe that a hundred percent? So *vyavasthit* doer is verily the *pudgal* doer. In *vyavasthit*, there is no influence or control of *chetan* (the Self), all the scientific circumstances come together. There is no control of the Self (*chetan*) in it at all. Is that what you exactly believe?

**Questioner:** Yes.

**Dadashri:** You do not believe the Self as the doer, do you?

**Questioner:** No.

**Dadashri:** So then you believe that *pudgal* is the doer, is correct, is it not? Whole world has ended believing that the Self is the doer, ‘I am definitely the doer, it happens only because I am doing it’. *Vyavasthit* itself is that the *pudgal* is the doer. Coming together and then dissipating is called *vyavasthit*, and that is *pudgal* itself.

**Questioner:** It is *pudgal*. So is it *nischetan-chetan* (Self-less self)?
**Dadashri:** Yes, all this talk is about nischetan-chetan. This pudgal, these parmanus that are out there, they are different. And ‘this’ pudgal, it is a vibhavik (that which is born out of coming together of the Self and the non-Self matter) pudgal. Whatever you can see through your eyes, hear through your ears, all that you can experience, it is all vibhavik pudgal. You never see the swabhavik (natural) pudgal in all this. So this is discussion about vibhavik pudgal. That is the nischetan-chetan.

‘Our’ sentence on the first page, that sentence helps one throughout all the eight hundred pages, it does not contradict itself, anywhere in the book. Not even a word of it is contradictory, and that is called science (vignan). One may feel that why did Dada say it this way today? That, ‘the pudgal is doer by nischaya’, but he will understand immediately, and it will fit him (to his understanding), if he tries to understand it in this way. Therefore, if questions arise, then you should ask within, that how can this happen, and ‘You’ will get the answers.

The state of the world today would he very high, if the world understood that, ‘vyavasthit verily is pudgal is the doer by nischaya (real doer)’. But it is something that one cannot comprehend. And that Gnan has not opened been revealed. Until now only one kind of gnan (knowledge) that has been going on, that the Self is doer by vyavahar. That is all. No one has checked to see, ‘Who is the doer by nischaya?’ No one has ever disclosed it. That way, it was all in the Gnan of the Tirthankara, but the answers will come out only if you ask, will they not? How would you get the answers if you do not ask at all?

When can one call pudgal a doer? After one becomes a Gnani (Self-realized), not before that. If the sadhu-acharyas (monks-spiritual masters) say that pudgal is doer, then everyone will start going on the wrong path. When one follows the five Agnas (special knowledge given to be applied after receiving the Self in the Gnan Vidhi of Dadashri) after attaining the Gnan, then pudgal is the doer. Then ‘we’ say that responsibility is not ‘Yours’.

**Questioner:** Pudgal becomes a doer from inspiration of vyavasthit, does it not?

**Dadashri:** Yes, through the inspiration of vyavasthit. Obviously you can see pudgal is the doer, but it is through the evidence of vyavasthit.
**Questioner:** This will happen only because of the presence of the Self; otherwise it will not happen.

**Dadashri:** Nothing can happen if the Self is not there.

**Questioner:** Without the presence of the Self, can the *pudgal* alone not completely become the doer?

**Dadashri:** No.

**Questioner:** Presence of the Self is necessary.

**Dadashri:** Only if there is presence of the Self. And what does ‘*pudgal* the doer’ mean? Result (effect), we call it result; we do not say *pudgal* is the doer. We are talking about what is in the outside (of non-Self-realized) language, in our language. Otherwise, it is a result. This is the result of your own causes, so then so what more is there to ask?

People of our country refer *vyavasthit* as God, and in the foreign they believe God as the doer, and then painted ‘created’ all *raag-dwesh* (attachment-abhorrence).

**The doer, karamat of the pudgal**

*Pudgal* is doing all this, and people believe, ‘I am doing it’. Even that ‘I’ is *pudgal*. So *pudgal* is doing everything. No one besides the *Tirthankaras* and Gnani Purush can understand such magical work (*karamat*) of the *pudgal*. Not even the Gnanis of the *kramic* path can understand this. ‘We’ have seen that *karamat* of *pudgal*, but ‘we’ cannot describe it. ‘We’ have seen its form, its way, but they cannot be described, can they? It is indescribable thing. Words have a limit, and this is a limitless thing.

‘*Kare chhe kon ey samjey, to ukley kayami koydo*;

‘If one understands who the doer is, the eternal puzzle is solved;

*Karamat pudgal ni baaji, swabhavik Gnan netrey jo’

‘See’ the miraculous play of the non-Self complex with the natural eyes of the Knowledge of the Self’
Through natural Gnan means to see through divine vision (divya drashti), then it says ‘see who does everything through that vision. This is all a play of the pudgal, all this miraculous skillful work (karamat) is of the pudgal. (It is a very profound talk about the karamat of pudgal. It is not comprehensible. Whatever ‘we’ have ‘seen’ and ‘known’ is unprecedented. Let me give you an example. If we all are sitting here, and someone does not want to sneeze but someone is frying spices in the kitchen, then all will start sneezing. So, if you are the doer then you would stop sneezing, would you not? But it cannot stop. That is the pudgal’s karamat.

Again if someone says, ‘show me the doership of pudgal’. A woman is frying spices closing the kitchen door, it is not her wish and one who is coughing does not have a wish, yet it makes people cough, does it not? And this one says, ‘I coughed.’ All this is egoism.

I can see all the subtle skillful work (karamat) of every pudgal, sitting here. If it is not so, then drink milk, drink nectar, drink alcohol and drink poison, then you will know karamat of the pudgal!

If someone robs ten thousand from you, at that time if the awareness (bhan) prevails that this pudgal is physically strong and is therefore robbing ten thousand from this pudgal; that this is a karamat of the pudgal; then it is keval Darshan (absolute Vision). No one had understood this in this world. ‘Whatever is being done in this world, whether the world can or cannot afford it, whether it is acceptable to the world or not, still ‘I’ am not doing anything at all,’ such continuous awareness is absolute Vision (keval Darshan. If one understands the subtle skillful work of the pudgal, then it is called kevel Darshan. If one knows the karamat of the pudgal, then it is keval Gnan (absolute Knowledge). When the karamat of the pudgal comes naturally in Conduct then it is called keval Charitra (absolute Conduct).

**What one has to do? What one did?**

God has said that the self is a doer by vyavahar (worldly interaction; as the self). All this problem has arisen because people took it to be so by nischaya (as the Self). Right now, it is being believed to be the doer by nischaya (in fact). If you ask, ‘what is the Self by nischaya?’ then, they will reply ‘By nischaya (as the Self) it is a non-doer, but by vyavahar (in worldly
interaction) it is a doer’. But in the effect, in their unfolding worldl they believe the Atma to be the doer for sure, and thus they say, ‘I will have to renounce this, I will have to let go of this, and renounce that.’ ‘Hey you! Did you acquire (bind) it that now you have to renounce? Where is the question of renouncing when you did not bind it in the first place? Do something that will get rid of your illusion’.

So it is separate for sure. It is your illusion that, ‘I verily am Chandulal, and I verily am the doer’. If the illusion of ‘I am Chandulal’ goes away, then You indeed are separate. So the Lord says, ‘Get rid of the illusion’. Lord had told to get rid of the illusion, but people try to get rid of karma. They renounce this and they renounce that. Now the ability and authority to let go is in the hands of pudgal (non-Self complex), in the hands of vyavasthit. But one tries to renounce. A human being has the right to get rid of the illusion, but he does not proceed to get this done.

What is in your control in the effect?

Hey, mooah (the one who is dying by the second)! Tell me what have you done till now? Without any usefulness you keep saying, ‘I am doing, I am doing’! You are saying that, ‘I am doing it’, but it is karma (effect) from the past life. So then he will ask, ‘Have I not done anything at all?’ Then the answer is, ‘No, you did only the bhaav karma (charge karma), the rest is under the control of some other entity (par satta).’ In that doership, nothing else is needed. He is the doer of swabhav (the state of the Self), but instead he became the doer of vibhav (extra intent; state of the non-Self), that is all. He has not done anything in that. Then came this, the result of the account of karma. Result of the bhaav karma is this effect, and effect is under the control of some other entity (vyavasthit); par-satta.

Whatever is done with the belief ‘I am Chandubhai’, is all bhaav karma. Therefore karma gets bound. And ‘I am Shuddhatma’ is swabhav (state of the Self) where the Self is in its own natural state. But bhaav karma means in vibhav (attribute that is not of the Self), so ‘I am Chandubhai’ is vibhav-karma, that itself is bhaav karma. That which is seen ‘wrong-with illusion’ (not as it is) is all considered bhaav karma. Everything that is ‘seen’ ‘right-
without illusion (as it is) is *swabhav karma*. The thing called *bhaav* (intent) and through it, that which is seen is the illusion and that is the *bhaav karma*. ‘I will do this and I will do that, and did that’ is all *bhaav karma*.

**Questioner:** The *bhaav karma* that happens, ‘I will do this and I will do that.’ Is that charge *bhaavs* or discharge *bhaavs*?

**Dadashri:** After attaining the Gnan, they are discharge *bhaavs*. For others they are charge *bhaavs*, are they not? ‘I am doing it’ is itself a charge *bhaav*. Yes, it is different matter if the ‘I’ is dramatic. There are only rare Ones with an ‘I’ that is dramatic. However, everything with ‘I am doing,’ is charge. All this that people do, run business and everything, earn money, that ‘I am doing’ is itself *bhaav karma*.

**The one who was charged, discharges through Gnan**

Now you will not find this kind of information in any books. So how can man change? What you find in books are things like, you can put salt, chili, turmeric and jaggery in the soup, but there is nothing about now much and in what proportion. So a person cannot understand it in correct level, can he? And that is why the world believes the *pratishthit atma* to be the real Atma and then they are trying to make it still. And there is nothing wrong with that either. One should make it still. A person will get happiness from it. It is still at night during sleep, but one will get happiness by making it still during the day too. But that happiness is such that it goes away the moment one loses the stillness and he goes back to the way he was before. Now if he were to know at the same time, that the main Atma is always still, then he can make the adjustments. People are unaware of the facts about the Atma. They have accepted the *pratishthit atma* to be the real Atma, but in reality it is not. The *pratishthit atma* is *pudgal* (non-Self complex that arises and dies); there is no Self (*chetan*) in it at all.

There is no Self, Atma, Chetan (all synonymous) in what the world believes to be Chetan. This is my own discovery. I say it as I ‘see’ it. You will not find this in any scriptures. In scriptures, when they talk about improving this self, they refer to the *pratishthit atma*. Should there not be some systematic process? Is there not a systematic process for improving? People are not aware of the systematic process outlined in the scriptures. It has been shown very subtly. And it has been shown through words, has it not? It is like describing Bombay and saying when you go to Bombay, it is
like this; Juhu beach is like this or like that. But that is all in words. How do you benefit from that? So what do the scriptures show you? They show you through words, not through experience, do they? A person cannot get experience through scriptures, can he? So without the presence of a Gnani Purush, none of this can be brought to light.

**Questioner:** The puzzle and the questions that arise, they must be of the *pratishthit atma*, the worldly interacting self, are they not?

**Dadashri:** Yes, that is all of the pratishthit atma. It is indeed the prakruti that we refer to as pratishthit atma. But if we refer to it as ‘prakruti’, then people will not understand it properly. That is why ‘we’ call it as ‘pratishthit atma’.

The Self (Atma) is verily Shuddhatma (pure Self). But until we had wrong belief that ‘I am Chandubhai’, people told you that ‘you are Chandubhai’. So you started doing work by believing that only. So what happened? You are doing pratishtha (instilling life) in the idol (murti) believing ‘I am this’ and because of that new idol is being formed. So pratishthit atma (the self; charged soul) is being formed again as pratishthit (instilling life) for next life. So in the next life ‘You’ and ‘pratishthit atma’, two will remain together. After swaroop Gnan (Self-realization), new ‘pratishthit atma’ does not get ‘constructed’ (bound) and the old one continues to get exhausted (demolished).

**Pratishthit atma is the one with the three yogas**

**Questioner:** Dada, when you give us Gnan, knowledge of separation (*bheda Gnan*) happens; where separation of Shuddhatma (pure Self) and pratishthit atma (relative self) happens. Now Shuddhatma is the Knower and Seer, and pratishthit atma is discharge (*galan*).

**Dadashri:** Galan (discharge) means doer and sufferer.

**Questioner:** It is the doer and sufferer. So whatever pratishthit atma is doing, Shuddhatma ‘sees’ that continuously?
**Dadashri:** Yes, that is correct. *Shuddhatma* ‘sees’ whatever the *pratishtit atma* is doing. What is *pratishtit atma*? Union (*yoga*) of three kinds, *manoyoga* (all that happens through the mind), *vachanyoga* (*yoga* of the speech) and *kayayoga* (*yoga* of the body), is called *pratishtit atma*. The one that is seeing what these three are doing is the function of *Shuddhatma*.

**Pratishtit atma is gneya and I am the ‘Knower’**

**Questioner:** After attaining the Self (*Gnan*), the *pratishtit atma* (the non-Self complex, the ‘self’, will not become engrossed, if there is awareness?

**Dadashri:** Then, one has a certain awareness (*bhaan*), it is a kind of awareness, and when that awareness comes into its nature (*jagruti*), then it, will not become *tanmayakar* (become the mind body form). Because of the force of past *karma*, it gets displaced. It will not become engrossed when the force of *karma* becomes less. Whatever is discharging, it is the ‘water in the tank’ that is as stock of *karma* from the past life.

**Questioner:** So what should I understand from that? You have said that ‘You’ do not become engrossed because of the awareness that has arisen. So how should I understand that?

**Dadashri:** What do I mean by ‘You’ here? Not the absolute Self. Currently the ‘I’ (*hoon*) still exists, remains. Previously ‘I’ used to be in the form of *pratishtit atma* (‘I am Chandulal’), now ‘I’ exists as awareness (I am *Shuddhatma*). That ‘I’ does not become *tanmayakar*.

**Questioner:** I do not become *tanmayakar*, does that mean that *pratishtit atma* does not become *tanmayakar*?

**Dadashri:** No, what do you mean by ‘I’ here? Whoever is present at that time. Whatever is in your belief at that time; it is that. You have not become complete *Shuddhatma*. The *pratishtit atma* is gone. Now the Self has been awakened and that that awakened Self (*jagrut atma*) is the awareness. That resulting awareness does not become engrossed.
**Questioner:** After attaining Gnan, pratishtit atma is there, so what does it do? What is its state?

**Dadashri:** It does not have any state, after that. It is in a discharge form. So it is nischetan-chetan (Self-less self). It remains as gneya (that which is to be known). And knowing ‘what it does’ and ‘what it does not do’, is awareness (jagruti).

Before attaining the awareness of the Self, you used to believe that the pratishtit atma is indeed the knower (gnata). After attaining the Gnan of the Self, that pratishtit atma itself becomes the known (gneya), and that is where awareness (jagruti) itself becomes the Knower. So, before, ‘I’ was as the pratishtit atma, now ‘I’ is as awareness. And there is still the absolute Self beyond these two. When the awakened awareness becomes absolute awareness, then it becomes one with the absolute Self. It remains separate until it becomes absolute. Until then it remains as antaratma (the Self within, interim government) Here, the state of the externalized vision (bahirmukhi) has been left. When the antaratma state comes to an end, one attains the Paramatma (absolute Self) state.

**Main nature is of ‘Seeing’ – ‘Knowing’**

**Questioner:** But this activity of the Self, of ‘Seeing-Knowing” all the gneyas; Gnata-Drashta, that is also one of its activity (kriya), is it not? So that is its karma, is it not?

**Dadashri:** Knowing-Seeing is its main nature. Going out of the nature is considered karma. Anything done contrary to the intrinsic nature (swabhav, the Self) is considered karma. The nature (of the Self) is not called karma. When water flows downward, it is not considered karma, it is called swabhav (nature), and one has to do karma to raise it upwards.

So ‘Seeing-Knowing’ is its nature. So what is its fruit? It is eternal bliss, that is all. It is altogether. ‘Seeing, Knowing’ and eternal bliss. There are other infinite attributes.

**The activity of the Self is only Gnankriya and Darshankriya**

**Questioner:** Even ‘seeing continuously’ is doing something, is it not?
**Dadashri:** No, that is not ‘doing’ something. It is called Gnan-kriya (activity of the Gnan). There is no doer of it. There is no ego in it. All the other activities are of the ego. All bhaavkarma are of ego.

**Questioner:** Then how can one remain only the Knower-Seer in worldly interactions?

**Dadashri:** In worldly interaction, the ‘self’ is in the form of a doer, and really the ‘Self’ is the Knower-Seer. Now, what is he doer of in the worldly interaction? The ‘self’ is a ‘doer’ of worldly life, and the ‘Self’ is really the Knower-Seer, so a doer of Gnan-kriya and Darshan-kriya. There is no other activity (kriya), there is no worldly activity.

Gnan upayoga (applied awareness of the Gnan) is Gnan-kriya (activity of the Gnan), and Darshan upayoga (applied awareness of the Darshan) is Darshan-kriya (activity of Darshan). Now what is Gnan upayoga? This activity filled pudgal results in actions, and the ‘Seer’ of these actions is the Gnan upayoga. It is not a doer of any actions of the non-Self complex (paudgalik). It is the doer of its own swabhad (nature; the Self) and not of the par bhaav (of the non-Self)

Gnan kriya is needed for moksha, agnan kriya is bondage. What is considered kriya (activity)? Activity with ego is called agnan kriya. Egoless activity is called Gnan kriya. It means to continue to ‘see’ the discharging karma effects (charitara mohaniya karma). If one goes to eat food, that is discharge karma. That is ‘seen’ and to continue ‘seeing’ is Gnan kriya. With that Gnan-kriya, there is Gnankriyabhyam moksha (moksha is attained through Gnan-kriya, means to remain as the Self and to ‘know’). What you are doing now, you feel that Chandubhai is doing that, you believe that vyavasthit is the doer. When you keep seeing that, it is a Gnan-kriya.

What is the meaning of Gnan-kriya? To remain as the Self exclusively and to ‘know’. In the Darshan-kriya it is to ‘see’. To ‘See’ and to ‘Know’, that is verily the kriya (activity) of the Self (Atma). Except for the Atma, the element of the Self, no other tattva has the activity of ‘Knowing’ and ‘Seeing’- Gnan-darshan. All other activities are there.

**Questioner:** Dada would the gnan (knowledge) and kriya (activity) both be together in the kramic path?
**Dadashri:** It is like this, that it is the vyavahar gnan kriya (knowledge and activity in worldly interaction). Vyavahar gnan kriya means scriptural gnan-kriya.

**Questioner:** I am talking about after having attained samyak darshan (right vision). I am talking about after reaching the fifth gunasthanak (spiritual stage).

**Dadashri:** Yes, it is vyavahar gnan, vyavahar gnan-kriya. And this ours is called nischaya Gnan-kriya (‘Knowing activity of the Self). Chandubhai drinks tea, relishes the flavor, and You know that, that is called Gnan-kriya. And that is called nischaya Gnan-kriya.

**Questioner:** So then the samyak (right belief) that one attained in the kramic path, what is it that he has attained?

**Dadashri:** He attained bhaan (awareness) of samyak. He becomes aware that this is wrong and this is right and this is the Self. This is right and this is wrong and this one is Atma swaroop. You have to abandon that which is wrong and you have to do right and you have to maintain the state of the Self. So in that kramik path, it will work only if shubha (auspicious work; good work, helpful work) is together all the way. This shubha is his bed. Otherwise how far one can go?

**Questioner:** Yes, that path is not a valid path for him at all. Where does he want any bliss of the Self, at all? That is right.

**Dadashri:** Some ashubha (inauspicious; bad, hurtful) will not refrain from entering in this shubha. So he will moan and groan the whole night if there are gravel pieces in his sleeping bed. The Lord has told him to suffer twenty-two kinds of parishahas (different forms of suffering; like cold, heat, hunger, thirst, etc.)

Yes, they have been told that, if you are made to sleep on rocks, thoughts of that a nice comfortable bed should not come into your meditation (dhyan). You should not have thoughts of how you used to sleep on a nice comfortable mattress, and right now I have like this. Do not have such meditation.
Now, what is in people’s understanding that, ‘nan and kriya, gnankriyabhyam moksha’ ‘Moksha is through the activity of knowledge’. So they hold that we have the gnan (knowledge) based on scriptures, and we are also doing the kriya.’ But that kriya (activity) is called agnan-kriya (activity carried out in ignorance, as the non-Self). And ‘You’ are doing Gnan-kriya (activity with Gnan; activity as the Self). Everything ‘You’ are doing is all a Gnan-kriya. Through that Gnan-kriya, there is moksha. Whatever activity is carried with Gnan, is the basis for attaining moksha. Gnan upayoga is considered Gnan-kriya. And all the solution has come through Gnan-kriya.

‘Seeing’ and ‘Knowing’, both are the attributes of the Self, and ‘doing’ is an attribute of the pudgal (non-Self complex).

~Jai Sat Chit Anand