

Dadavani

August 2021



To speak in such a way that the foundation of belief system of no religion is hurt even in the slightest extent is called syadvaad.

Every viewpoint is kept in the vision. All of the viewpoints, ranging from one to three hundred and sixty degrees, are kept in the vision.

Bhavnagar : Ground Breaking Ceremony of the New Trimandir : Dt. 21 June 2021



Dhrangadhra : Ground Breaking Ceremony of the New Trimandir : Dt. 22 June 2021



Adalaj : Celebration of Pujya Niruma's Gnan Day : Dt. 8 July 2021



Syadvaad-Anekant

EDITORIAL

We all say in the *Pratah Vidhi* (morning prayer) daily, “May no living being in this world be hurt, even to the slightest extent, through this mind, speech, or body...” However, Dadashri says that in this era of the time cycle, it is predominantly through the speech that we end up hurting others. To eliminate this, we ask for the energy daily in the *Nav Kalamo* (nine deep inner intents) that, ‘Give me the absolute energy not to hurt the ego of any living being, and to conduct my thoughts, speech, and action in a manner that is accepted by all.’ (*Mane koi pan dehadhaari jeevatma no aham na dubhay evi syadvaad vani, syadvaad vartanane syadvaad manan karvani param shakti aapo.*) However, do we actually understand the exact meaning of the word *syadvaad*?

While giving the special understanding of the word *syadvaad*, absolutely revered Dadashri [Dada Bhagwan] says that *syadvaad* means to not prove anyone’s viewpoint as wrong. It is to accept every viewpoint. It is to accept every standard, every degree, every religion. Beyond this, *syadvaad* speech is complete. It does not hinder anyone, it does not harm anyone’s thoughts, it does not create divisiveness due to difference of opinion (*matbhed*) with anyone. Everyone finds it agreeable, it accepts the faith of each individual. *Syadvaad* conduct is that which wins over the mind of others. *Syadvaad* thoughts mean they do not hurt the foundation of belief system (*pramaan*) even of anyone’s thoughts. In short, *syadvaad* means to adjust with everyone’s viewpoint and remain in the center, meaning at three hundred and sixty degrees, it is to speak in a way that the foundation of belief system of no degree is hurt.

While explaining the word *syadvaad* in more detail, Dadashri says that *syadvaad* means to remain in the one and only [place] and to remain with different intents, meaning to remain in the ‘home department’, not in the ‘foreign [department]’. And ultimately, *syadvaad* means that we do not have any ‘shop’, everything is ours and in the Real, that which is Mine is Mine. *Syadvaad* speech means absolutely detached (*vitaraag*) speech with an incontrovertible principle. Absolutely detached means *syadvaad* and *anekant*. *Anekant* means it is not insistent, it is speech that is free of insistence. To accept all viewpoints is the all-encompassing, absolutely detached religion (*anekant vitaraag dharma*). When one understands *syadvaad* speech, he has liberation in his hands.

In the current edition, Dadashri’s *syadvaad* speech can be visualized in detail. While experiencing its wonder, the heart becomes overcome with emotion. Dadashri has explained the word *syadvaad* with various welding, which will be very helpful in nurturing the flawless vision on a practical basis. That which has not been expressed for anything except for the purpose of the attainment of the Self, such an extraordinary *syadvaad* speech will light the path to liberation for many ages. Our ardent prayer is that now *mahatmas*, without squandering away their energies on their viewpoint, study the speech with the energy that nurtures both the Real and the relative, and attain the essence given by the One who is in experience of *syadvaad* speech.

~ Jai Sat Chit Anand

Syadvaad-Anekant

Dadashri has given detailed explanations for this Science in the Gujarati language and He has urged those who want to understand its depth fully, to learn the Gujarati language.

While reading these translations of the Gujarati Dadavani magazine, if you feel there is any sort of contradiction, then it is the mistake of the translators and the understanding of the matter should be clarified with the living Gnani.

In order to enhance the reading experience of the English Dadavani, a glossary with the translations of the Gujarati words used in the matter is available on <https://www.dadabhagwan.org/books-media/glossary/> on the internet for readers. Please share your feedback about this change and the overall reading experience of the English Dadavani on engvani@dadabhagwan.org.

Please note that 'S' Self denotes the awakened Self, separate from the 's' worldly self or non-Self complex. The Self is the Soul within all living beings. The term pure Soul is used by the Gnani Purush for the awakened Self, after the Gnan Vidhi. The absolute Soul is the fully enlightened Self. The worldly soul is the self. In the same manner, 'Y' You refers to the awakened Soul or Self, and the 'y' you refers to the worldly self. Also note that round brackets are for translation purposes and square brackets are for clarity that has been added in English which is not originally present in Gujarati.

The Thermometer of Spiritual Progress

Questioner: How can it be known that one studying spirituality has reached the state of completion (*purnata*)?

Dadashri: It is not from anything else, but it is from his speech that one can determine how many lives he has left [until ultimate liberation]! This is because speech is a tool that indicates how many lives he has left. There is gross speech, subtle speech, subtler, and subtlest; of these, in which form is the speech? So in reality, which speech is considered the ultimate? If people of all the religions are sitting here, but if one does not have speech with partiality that hurts anyone, then he will be able to go to *moksha* (ultimate liberation) in one, two, or three lives. And as long as it is with partiality, he will not attain *moksha* even in a hundred lives.

'His' [the One who has attained the state of completion] speech is absolutely detached (*vitaraag*), His talk is absolutely detached, His conduct is absolutely detached. There is total absence of attachment and abhorrence (*vitaraagata*) in

all matters. Even if someone hurls abuses at Him, there is *vitaraagata*, and even if someone showers Him with flowers, there is *vitaraagata*. 'His' speech is *syadvaad*, meaning the foundation of belief system (*pramaan*) of no religion, of no living being, is hurt.

If someone hurls abuse at you, then what does *syadvaad* say? 'He is not a culprit'; *syadvaad* gives you such knowledge. What knowledge does it give? When the other person hurls abuse at you, then what *syadvaad* says is, 'That is his viewpoint.' What is it?

Questioner: It is the viewpoint of the one hurling abuses.

Dadashri: Yes... So it is your offence. A person speaks according to what he sees through his viewpoint.

Let's Understand the Syadvaad of the Vitaraag Lords

Speech is such that it cannot show two viewpoints at the same time. Therefore, in order to express himself, one must say another sentence. One can visualize it completely at a time in his

vision (*darshan*), but if one wants to explain it, then there is nobody who can express it at a time. That is why speech is referred to as *syadvaad*.

In speech, one cannot speak the negative and the positive at the same time. If he tries to say it together, then when he speaks the negative, the positive gets left behind and when he speaks the positive, the negative gets left behind. Therefore, one cannot speak both at the same time! That is why the *vitaraag* Lords (absolutely detached Lords) had to say that the world is without a beginning or an end (*anaadi-anant*)! ‘They’ could not say the positive and the negative at the same time, so They had to say that it is without a beginning or an end!

What does *syadvaad* mean? Words cannot express our intent (*bhaav*) completely. We cannot express two intents in one word. Even if we have the desire to express two intents, we cannot do so. So then all the words will conflict with each other. So, as much as possible, speak the minimal amount. And if it is very necessary, then write it down and give it to the other person. With that, all the intents can be expressed. The context of the past as well as the plan of the future can be read. So, while speaking, there cannot be two intents in one word. That is why the Lord used the word *syadvaad*. And I have said, “All that is spoken is a ‘tape record’ [taped record]!”

Your maternal uncle’s son is your cousin, and he may also be your brother-in-law, but you cannot say both at the same time. So, you have to say only

one thing. How can you say both at the same time?

Questioner: That is not possible at all.

Dadashri: So the reason the Lord established *syadvaad* is that the self is the doer! So in some respect, it is the doer, and in some respect, it is not the doer. Its existence is affirmed from one point of view (*syaad asti*), and its non-existence is affirmed from another point of view (*syaad naasti*).

Questioner: *Syaad asti*, *syaad naasti*; in English, can we refer to that as a lack of decisiveness?

Dadashri: There certainly is a lack of decisiveness, but it is not a question of indecisiveness. But one wants to say the self is the doer and in reality, the self is not the doer. Nevertheless, it must be said that it is the doer. That is why the Lord had established *syadvaad*. In this respect, the self is the doer, whereas in this respect, it is not the doer.

No one can express himself in every way in just one word. That is why ‘our’ words seem that way, and that is why the Lord’s words also used to seem like that. Now people should understand this, shouldn’t they! Speech cannot express two things at the same time. Did you understand all that? That is why it is referred to as *syadvaad*, isn’t it!

Questioner: As speech is incomplete and in parts, it cannot express the complete vision, it is incomplete vision.

Dadashri: Yes. If it were complete,

then one's work would be accomplished, wouldn't it!

The speech of the *Tirthankar* Lords (the absolutely enlightened Lords who can liberate others) was *syadvaad*. And what do these [other] people say? "Ours is right and yours is wrong!" All of that is not *syadvaad* speech. It is considered *ekantik* (adhering to one viewpoint), it is considered insistence, it is considered undue insistence.

So, they go ahead and tell the naked truth, without restraint... If one understands the *syadvaad* of the *vitaraag* Lords, then nothing else is left to be understood. This is because *vitaraag* means that there is nothing to do with anyone else at all; the *syadvaad* of such a Self-realized person.

Syadvaad Is to Not Hurt the Foundation of Anyone's Belief System

Questioner: What does *syadvaad* mean?

Dadashri: *Syadvaad* means to not hurt the foundation of anyone's belief system (*pramaan*). Suppose there is an eighty-year-old man over here right now and you tell him, "Walk faster, what a foolish person you are!" That is considered hurting the foundation of his belief system. And if a twenty-year-old youth is walking fast, and you tell him, "Don't walk fast," even then you are considered to have committed an offense. Therefore, you should not hurt the foundation of anyone's belief system. That is called *syadvaad*.

If a small, two-year-old child is wandering around without clothes, and you scold him, "Wear some clothes," then you have hurt the foundation of his belief system. This is because he has the freedom to wander around without clothes. Whereas what if a forty-year-old man is wandering around without clothes?

Questioner: People would take objection.

Dadashri: Everything must be systematic like that, mustn't it? If a small child is wandering around naked, then that is his *dharma* (function, role), so no one takes any objection. Therefore, the *dharma* should vary. The *dharma* of a child, the *dharma* of a youth, then beyond that, the *dharma* of a forty-year-old, the *dharma* of a sixty-year-old, the *dharma* of a seventy-year-old, the *dharma* of a ninety-year-old, the *dharma* varies for all of them. However, the foundation of belief system of any *dharma* should not be hurt.

One Who Accepts Every Viewpoint Expresses Syadvaad

So, this *dharma* varies from person to person. However many viewpoints there are, there are that many *dharma*. Then, all these people get together and follow one *dharma*, but even then everyone's viewpoint is different. When no one's viewpoint is hurt, that is called *syadvaad*.

Everyone has a viewpoint. No one's [viewpoint] is wrong at all, everyone is certainly correct according to his viewpoint.

Say we place a gorgeous white horse

here, in broad daylight, five hundred feet away. And we call one person at a time and ask him, “Dear fellow, what do you see over there?” Then one person says, “Wait, let me wear my glasses.” So we reply, “Wear your glasses and then tell me.” Then he says, “What I see looks like a bullock.” Another person says that it looks like a donkey. A third person says something else. And it actually happens to be a white horse. Yet if we were to scold the person, “Why are you calling my horse a bullock?” Then whose fault would that be?

Questioner: It would definitely be our fault, wouldn't it!

Dadashri: Yes, it is indeed our fault. The poor fellow cannot see, so what can the poor guy do? If he could see it, then he would certainly not say this, would he! He cannot see it, so what is the poor fellow's fault in this?

What does *syadvaad* mean? It means to not harass anyone's viewpoint, nor strike a blow by saying, “You are wrong, you are like this, you are like that,” and it accepts all viewpoints. ‘We’ accept everyone's viewpoint. This is because it is indeed correct according to his viewpoint. He is more or less correct, to a certain extent. If ‘we’ disregard that, then it is considered an offense. No one's [viewpoint] would be completely wrong, would it! So, that which accepts everyone's viewpoint is *syadvaad*.

To Listen to Everyone's Thoughts Is Syadvaad

Questioner: You say that ‘we’

accept this, ‘we’ accept this, ‘we’ accept this, but what is the meaning of accept?

Dadashri: The meaning of accept is that ‘we’ do not say that one, two, three, and four are all the same. And one cannot say ninety-eight after forty-seven. So, ‘we’ accept forty-seven, ‘we’ accept forty-eight, ‘we’ accept all of them. This is because one thing exists on the basis of another thing, doesn't it?

People do not understand *syadvaad* at all. *Syadvaad* is a different thing.

Questioner: So then if one asks for it, we have to show him the facts, don't we?

Dadashri: Yes, then if he asks for it, you can tell him. If he asks for the facts, then you have to tell him.

Questioner: So we have to give clarity, don't we?

Dadashri: Yes, you have to, don't you! If you don't give clarity, then it will not do, will it! It is such that a person always adheres to his own viewpoint (*ekantik*). He feels that only his own thoughts are correct and he does not accept everyone else's thoughts. Whereas *syadvaad* means that it does not harm anyone's thoughts even slightly.

What does *syadvaad* say? Forget whatever may be the status of your view and listen to what the other person is saying.

Syadvaad listens to everyone's thoughts; if a thief has come having stolen something, even then one would

listen to what he has to say. If a person supports revulsion in that case, then it is not *syadvaad*. If you seat an actual thief down and ask him in private, then he would say, “Dear fellow, I am carrying out my *dharma*, why are you interfering in that? This is my business.” The thief would say that this is my business, wouldn’t he?

Questioner: He would definitely say that.

Dadashri: And if you tell him, “Hey, why are you doing this?” Then he would reply, “God is giving me the inspiration to do so.” Now what can you do with him? Should you or should you not believe him?

And is there a need for stealing or is there a need for donors? What is there a need for?

Questioner: Both.

Dadashri: In what respect is a thief needed and in what respect is a donor needed?

All these good attributes that exist; they are like water flowing out of this tap here. The good attributes go through the flowing water and the bad attributes go down the gutter. Now, if there were no gutters, then what would be the state of the city?

Questioner: It would become filthy.

Dadashri: Everyone would die due to disease. So a gutter is needed at the outset, and then the water taps should be brought. So as long as there are no thieves, cunning people, rogues, worldly

life would not be pleasant; that itself keeps this worldly life levelled and it does not allow filth to arise. Now, if we were to open the gutter and smell it, then what would happen?

Questioner: It would reek.

Dadashri: So the gutter doesn’t say, “You should open me up and smell me.” So what would happen if we were to go about smelling the thieves and those other people. Therefore, we should understand that they are gutters. And they are needed, so abhorrence does not remain towards them. And those who give donations are like the flowing water. So we should not create a hole even there; they are needed.

Syadvaad Keeps Every Viewpoint in Perspective

Questioner: Dada, please explain *syadvaad* in more detail.

Dadashri: What does *syadvaad* mean? To speak in such a way that the foundation of belief system (*pramaan*) of no religion is hurt even in the slightest extent, that is called *syadvaad*. Speech that is spoken in such a way that no one’s religion is hurt, that is considered *syadvaad* speech. Every viewpoint is kept in perspective (*drashti*). The viewpoints ranging from one to three hundred and sixty degrees, all those viewpoints are kept in perspective.

Questioner: The foundation of belief system of no religion is hurt even in the slightest extent; how is that so?

Dadashri: Yes, say there is a

Muslim here; if the Muslim feels hurt, then my speech is not *syadvaad*. Or say there is a Sthanakvasi or Digambari (followers of Jain sects), if they are hurt, then it is not considered *syadvaad*. No one's [foundation of belief system] should be hurt. And the speech should be such that it directly helps him. So 'ours' is *syadvaad*. That is why it is favorable to everyone. No matter what religion one follows, he finds *syadvaad* speech to be favorable. The Lord's *syadvaad* speech was complete. 'Our' *syadvaad* speech is incomplete to a certain degree. Even then, one's foundation of belief system is not hurt. Everything fits him with exactness.

Here, 'we' do not have any objection, such as, "Why did you do this?" It is not something that can be compared or contrasted with anyone. And if a person attempts to compare and contrast, then he would put himself under a lot of difficulty.

This Science is a *syadvaad* Science. *Syadvaad* means no matter what kind of a person he is, whether he is a Muslim, a Hindu, even they will understand this discussion. A thief, a rouse, a bandit, no matter who it is, he would understand this discussion. This is because he should have a Soul, he should have a physical body, and he should be a human being. How pleasant the effect of the surrounding atmosphere is over here! Would anyone forgo it? That surrounding atmosphere is of an altogether different kind!

Syadvaad means that if people from all religions were sitting here, and if I were to speak, then no one would feel, 'This

Dada is partial towards certain religions.' [They would feel,] 'He is impartial.' So, the speech of the *Gnani* (One who has realized the Self and is able to do the same for others) is *syadvaad*. It exists after the ego has departed.

Syadvaad means there is not even the slightest divisiveness due to difference of opinion (*matbhed*) with anyone. Even yours is correct, even his is correct, even that person's is correct, and moreover, He knows in what respect it is correct. Only then is it *syadvaad*! Otherwise, these people do say, "Everyone's is correct." That will not do. Nor will the alternative do. To know from which perspective it is correct, and from which perspective it is fine, and from which perspective is that other person correct; to Know all of this is *syadvaad*!

When Kashay Do Not Arise, It Is Syadvaad

This is *Akram Vignan* (step-less Science of Self-realization)! This is a different kind of Science! This is a Scientific Science! Scientific means it is with an incontrovertible principle, meaning all people have to accept it. Foreigners, those from India, everyone. They have to accept each and every word, don't they! That is because this is a Science! Whereas in the other case, if the follower of one path were to say something to the follower of another path, then *kashay* (anger, pride, deceit, and greed) would arise. What would arise?

Questioner: *Kashay* would arise for others.

Dadashri: Whereas in this case, if something were to be said to the followers of all paths, then there would be no objection. *Kashay* would not arise and this is, in fact, considered *syadvaad*. If the follower of any religion were to come here right now, then there would be no objection, would there!

If it is *syadvaad*, then it will not cause problems to anyone, and if it adheres to a single viewpoint (*ekantik*), then it will cause problems to others. You can understand that much, can't you?

Therefore, do whatever you find suitable. You should either 'drink' the 'medicine' of this one place, or else you can continue 'drinking' that of that place [another path] if you have found it suitable. And on occasion, if you believe, 'That place doesn't suit me, so what should I do?' If you raise such a question, then 'we' would tell you to come here. There is no objection here. Here, there is no objection no matter where you have come from. Here, whenever you come, you are admitted. Here, nothing of the past is taken into consideration. No matter what you were doing; we simply want to bring about a solution in any way possible, don't we? It is not as though this is a religion! There is no establishment, there is no foundation, there is no breakdown [of anything]. So, whatever you are doing, carry on doing it and if it does not suit you there, then come here, this home is yours. However, when anger, pride, deceit, and greed leave, know that your [final] solution has come. So you should know the path to that, rather than getting

confused! Two paths cannot be followed at a time, can they!

The Intellect's Replies Give Rise to Dissention

Questioner: Everyone has his own state of 'I'; everyone [believes], 'Only what I say is the truth,' don't they?

Dadashri: And then disagreement arises.

Questioner: So people have fallen into the illusion of 'What is the truth in this?'

Dadashri: Where does the truth lie? The truth lies where there is no disagreement or dissention (*vaad-vivaad*). Where there is disagreement or dissention, it is considered to be bad company, comparable to a pair of crows that are fighting it out. Where there is spiritual discourse (*satsang*), but if disagreement or dissention arise while asking questions, then know that there is nothing to be gained there.

This is not characterized by agreement, nor by disagreement or dissention. The entire component of intellect is considered disagreement and dissention. Disagreement and dissention means that when one person speaks, I dissent over it. Then the dissent ensues, the discussion ensues. If a single question is answered through the intellect, then a discussion would ensue.

Questioner: If a question is answered through the intellect, then a disagreement would certainly ensue.

Dadashri: The other person's

intellect would rise up, 'You have picked up this sword, so I too will pick up a sword.' I do not give answers through the intellect, so it is quiet! One should not speak through the intellect, then it would help in this, it would help one progress towards the Real path.

The intellect creates disagreement and dissention. If you speak using the intellect, then the other person will counter, "Look, it is not like this, it is like this." Whereas there is no disagreement in this talk of *Gnan* (Knowledge of the Self).

The Self should accept it with exactness. To which one may say, "The Self accepts it [for those people] out there, doesn't it?" No. It is the mind that accepts it, the Self would never accept it in such a case. The Self is not awakened whatsoever. The Self becomes awakened only in the presence of the *Gnani*, otherwise it would certainly not [be awakened]. And 'we' speak from what 'we' see in *Gnan*, in the state of *nirvikalp* (free from the belief 'I am Chandubhai'), in the state of *nirvichaar* (the Seer of thoughts).

If a hundred thousand people were sitting here, then they would all have to accept this talk. Then, if one deliberately wants to speak unfavorably, then he would tell me, "My soul does not accept it." To which I would reply, "I have made a mistake. To have discussed this in front to you, that itself is my mistake." Why would I say that? Although his soul accepts it, he still speaks unfavorably, are there not such obstinate people? There are such people who talk unfavorably, aren't there?

If there is dissention towards 'our' speech, if the other person tries to dissent it, then he will take a beating. I do not want to give him a beating, his karma will cause him to take a beating.

Questioner: So then where did all these disagreements and dissentions come from, if it has happened automatically?

Dadashri: Disagreements and dissentions are of egoism. When two egoisms [egos] collide, that is called disagreement and dissention (*vaad-vivaad*)

As long as there is no clarification, disagreement and dissention carry on. That itself is called worldly life. If one knows how to solve the puzzle, then there is a state of ease!

The Speech That Penetrates the Veils of Ignorance

Just look, there were people who were not familiar with this, but even then, they did not dissent over here. This is because this is indeed the truth, it is exact. No matter how unfamiliar a person is, even then he will say that this is correct. Then whether to accept this or not is his wish. To do so [accept it] or not; he does according to what his *prakruti* (the non-Self complex) says.

This speech immediately penetrates the veils of ignorance and reaches the Self. This is referred to as speech that penetrates the veils of ignorance. It immediately reaches [the Self] directly, and one agrees with it right away. One does not dissent, whereas in other cases, there is disagreement, dissention, and an

uproar! And where there is disagreement and dissention, religion does not exist. That is actually considered squabbling. It is considered a gathering of crows, whereas a gathering with the *Paramhansa* (One who separates the Self from the non-Self) is needed. Upon dipping its beak [into the water], it separates milk from water. The separation of both happens. [The title of *Paramhansa* literally means 'the supreme swan', a symbol of spiritual discrimination. According to Indian mythology, the swan is able to separate milk from water. Thus, the swan symbolizes the ability of a Self-realized master to separate the Self from the non-Self.]

To talk about the Self and the absolute Self is, in fact, a task of the *Paramhansa*. There is nothing else here. Talk about the Self and the absolute Self alone issues forth; it is not like this in any other place. Where there is only talk about the Self and the absolute Self, even the celestial beings grace us with their presence.

Everywhere else, it is considered a gathering of the *hansa* [relative religions], not of the *Paramhansa*. So, they make people forfeit what is wrong, and tell them to take up what is good. Donate, do this, do that, maintain forgiveness, maintain kindness, maintain peace; they keep telling people to do all of that. Why should one maintain all of these things? It is for the sake of what is auspicious. All that is considered the gathering of the *hansa*. There is no talk about the Self there. There is talk about the means of attaining the Self.

It is the path of the means to attain the Self, whereas this is the path to attain the Self, where there is talk of the Self and the absolute Self.

Then there is also a lower gathering than that of the *hansa*, it is considered the *satsang* (association with good or religiously-minded people) of 'crows'. When the slightest, insignificant thing happens, they start 'crowing'. Does this happen within a *satsang* or not?

Questioner: It does.

Dadashri: One person says one thing, another counters it with something else.

These are three major types of *satsang*. And there are endless other *satsang* that take place on a smaller scale. Even the *satsang* of the 'crows' is considered a major one.

When There Is No Dissention Over a Disagreement, That Is Itself the Established Principle

Questioner: If there are disagreements and dissentions, then I would get to know what the truth is, otherwise I would continue to move along according to my own wisdom.

Dadashri: But that wisdom is of no use.

Now if one lets go of his wisdom over here too, then whatever the *Gnani* says is indeed what is correct. This is because the *Gnani* is indisputable. No one has ever created dissention with 'us'. The fact is, the *Gnani's* word certainly

proves to be completely true. However, the holding on one does, and the beliefs one has, they do not allow it to set into one's understanding even one time.

Questioner: I have not come here to start up disagreements and dissention, I have come to understand.

Dadashri: There is no dissention here at all. No person has ever created dissention with me. This is because dissention is created where there is the intellect. Yet there is no intellect in me at all, so how would you create dissention with me? There is not even a cent of intellect within me, and I sit here having been defeated. No one comes here to create disagreements and dissention. Nature does not send such people here at all. This is because this is not the place for disagreement and dissention at all. The statement of the *Gnani Purush* holds true for all three time periods (the past, present, and the future), each and every statement! Every word is true for all the three periods of time! Everything that has been spoken in *Gnan* holds true for the past, present, and future. So this is an exceptional thing. Whoever has interest in it, if they take advantage of it, they will gain tremendous benefit. Otherwise, the entire world is caught up in worldly things, whereas all this discussion is exceptional, it is without dissention.

Whoever listens to the talk here definitely finds it agreeable. Everywhere else, they are considered to be agreements and dissentions. Over there, one has to dissent. Furthermore, there are no counterarguments over here. And the talk

is free of contradictions. So, it is certainly agreeable. If 'we' have talked about something fifteen years ago, the same talk would tally today. The construction of the words may be different, but the talk would tally. The irrefutable principle (*siddhant*) is certainly the same. A *siddhant* is that in which there is no dissention over a point, there is no contradiction, and it holds true for all three time periods. If there were any contradictions, then it would have to be discredited in the future.

All that I have said for the past twenty-eight years over here has been documented in this [tape]. No one can discredit any of the words in it. Not even a single word can be discredited. They can be considered another, a novel form of the scriptures.

If one hundred thousand words have been spoken, that is referred to as *vaad*. If there is no dissention over that *vaad*, then know that this knowledge is correct. If there is dissention over *vaad*, then how can that be considered knowledge at all?

The truth is, the intellectuals engage in disagreements and dissention. This is not speech stemming from the intellect. The speech in which the intellect has been wiped out is referred to as indisputable speech. In which there is no dialogue, no disagreement. Right now, fifty thousand of our people come here, but we have never seen anything like dissention over here. It is the ultimate stage, there is nothing left to know beyond this.

This is the *syadvaad* path! Where there

is *syadvaad*, there is no disagreement, no dissention, and not even counterargument. Those who engage in disagreements and dissention would not find the Self.

A Thief and an Honest Person Through the Syadvaad Vision

Questioner: So what kind of speech is *syadvaad*, please explain that.

Dadashri: *Syadvaad* means to speak keeping in awareness every perspective, every religion. So, it is to speak in a way that all the religions of the three hundred and sixty degrees are not disturbed, no one is hurt. Do not adhere to a single viewpoint (*ekantik*). Do not hold on to certain insistencies. And to speak in such a way that no one's foundation of belief system (*pramaan*) of truth is hurt is referred to as *syadvaad* speech. This is because everyone's truth is definitely different. However, you should speak in a way that fits everyone's truth and no one is hurt.

Questioner: What if the truth of two people is different and we try to protect the foundation of belief system of one person, and the foundation of belief system of the other person does not get protected?

Dadashri: Now, the truth does not vary. The truth is according to one's belief. The truth is only of one kind. However, the other beliefs that one has are different. The other beliefs are interwoven. However, they should not be struck down even slightly. The truth one believes should not be struck down. So, no one's foundation of belief system of truth should be hurt.

Now, the Lord refers to both the one who steals and the one who gives donations as egoistic. This is because the one who steals will suffer the consequence of that, and the one who gives donations will enjoy the consequence of that. However, speak in such a way that if both a thief and an honest person are listening, then it would help both of them. So speak in a way that it helps the truth of the thief and it also helps the truth of an honest person. If you side with any one party, then the inner results of the other party will change. If you side with the thief, then the inner result of the honest person will change. Speak in such a way that no one's inner result changes. That is specially referred to as *vitaraag* speech. Speak in such a way that not a single degree of the three hundred and sixty degrees is harmed. Speak in such a way that it helps people at every degree.

Questioner: So if one person is honest and the other is a thief, then I should speak in a way that helps both of them; please give an example of that!

Dadashri: Wherever I go, people from all walks of life come. However, the speech is such that it does not hurt anyone's foundation of belief system. I have spoken this way my entire life. Otherwise, what would happen when someone asks me a single question? If such questions were asked elsewhere, then their business would not run for even a single day. Whereas 'we' have had the very same business for twenty years! Otherwise, the business would not run for even a single day, and the shop would have to

be closed in just one day. This is speech that is without partiality, it is speech that is beyond truth and untruth, it is neither truth nor untruth. This is because they are both wrong, the truth and untruth are both wrong.

Questioner: So what should we say to an honest person and what should we say to a thief?

Dadashri: You should certainly not have the view that, ‘This is an honest person and this is a thief.’ It is in fact because you have this view that the speech becomes negative. A thief has set up his business and he [the honest person] has set up his business. Each person has set up his own business, so what do you have to do with that? The Lord’s vision does not become negative, so why should yours become negative? The Lord’s vision does not become negative that, ‘This is a thief and this is an honest person.’ The Lord has a neutral vision!

Syadvaad is that which does not hurt the foundation of belief system of any religion. It doesn’t matter if one’s foundation of belief system is at five degrees, but that foundation of belief system should not be hurt. *Syadvaad* is that which does not directly point out the mistakes [of any religion]. [Otherwise,] It is equivalent to striking a blow. What would happen if you directly point out the mistake of a person who is in the illusory state? The *syadvaad* of God is that no one is hurt even in the slightest extent, no matter what religion one follows.

Your speech should be such that

no one feels hurt mentally. This is a very serious point! And it is only when attachment and abhorrence have left that such speech comes forth.

Syadvaad Thoughts, Speech, Action...

Questioner: Now please explain this, “Give me the absolute energy not to hurt, even to the slightest extent, the ego of any living being, and to conduct my thoughts, speech, and action in a manner that is accepted by all.”

Dadashri: *Syadvaad* means to know through which intent, through which viewpoint, a person is speaking. ‘We’ had discovered that the entire world sees through a viewpoint. Within a viewpoint, energies go to waste. Even if one holds out for his entire life, even then the other person’s viewpoint will not change.

Questioner: To understand the other person’s viewpoint, does that count as *syadvaad*?

Dadashri: To understand the other person’s viewpoint, and to interact with him accordingly, that is referred to as *syadvaad*. Carry out worldly interactions such that the other person’s viewpoint is not hurt. When you speak in a way that the viewpoint of a thief is not hurt, that is referred to as *syadvaad*!

When ‘we’ speak here, whether the person is a Muslim or a Parsi, they all understand equally. The foundation of no one’s belief system should be hurt, [by saying things like,] “Parsis are like this, or the Sthanakvasis are like this.” No one should be hurt in this way.

Questioner: If there is a thief sitting amongst us, and we tell him, “It is not good to steal,” then his mind is bound to be hurt, is it not?

Dadashri: No, you should not speak like that. You should tell the person, “This is the consequence of stealing. If you think it is appropriate, then do it.” That is how you should speak. Hence, the matter should be conveyed methodically, then the other person may even be willing to listen. Otherwise, the person will not listen to that at all, and on the contrary, your words will be wasted. The words you have spoken will be in vain, and instead, the person will bind vengeance [thinking], ‘Who is he to tell me!’ That is not how it should be.

People say that it is an offence to steal, but the thief believes, ‘It is my religion to steal.’ If someone were to bring a thief to me, then I would put my arm around his shoulder and ask him in private, “Brother, do you like this business? Do you enjoy it?” Then he would tell me the entire truth about himself. He would not feel fear in my presence. It is out of fear that people lie. Then I would explain to him, “Do you know the liability that comes with what you are doing? Are you aware of the consequences of such an action?” And [the opinion], ‘You are stealing,’ does not even exist in my mind. If that were ever in my mind, then it would have an effect on him. Every person is in his own *dharma* (religion; function). To not hurt the foundation of any religion is considered *syadvaad* speech. *Syadvaad*

speech is complete. Each person’s *prakruti* is different, yet *syadvaad* speech does not object to anyone’s *prakruti*.

Dadashri: What can be considered as conduct that is universally accepted (*syadvaad vartan*)? It is conduct that captivates people’s minds, it wins over people’s minds.

The conduct wins over people’s minds. So everything that comes to memory, the mind stops sprouting out thoughts altogether. It puts a stop to all thoughts pertaining to worldly life. Whoever’s conduct captivates our minds, that which wins over our minds, that is *syadvaad* conduct.

Questioner: What does *syadvaad manan* mean?

Dadashri: *Syadvaad manan* means that even in thoughts, even in thinking, the foundation of any religion should not be hurt. It should definitely not be in the conduct, but it should also not be in the thoughts. Not only in what is spoken externally, but also in the mind, there should be good thoughts, such that the foundation of the other person’s belief system is not hurt. This is because the thoughts that are in the mind reach the other person. That is indeed why these people’s faces look disgruntled. Because your thoughts reach there and have an effect.

Questioner: Should we do *pratikraman* (to recall and confess, apologize, and resolve not to repeat a mistake) if a bad thought arises for someone?

Dadashri: Yes, otherwise the other person's mind will become disturbed. And when you do *pratikraman*, then even if his mind is disturbed, it will calm down. You should not think negatively or anything along those lines, for anyone. Everyone should look out for themselves; that is all. There are no other concerns.

Syadvaad Includes Everyone's Viewpoint

What would happen if everyone in your home were of the same type? In the home, if the wife was a businessperson, the husband was a businessperson, the son was a businessperson, the daughter was a businessperson, then what would happen in the home? Therefore, everyone needs to be different for worldly life to function. Everyone's *prakruti* is different. So the Lord has said that everyone's *prakruti* is different. However, that is a person's viewpoint, and he continues to function based on that viewpoint.

Now, to go about proving that one's own viewpoint is correct, that is considered as adhering to a single viewpoint (*ekantik*). Whereas the *vitaraag dharma* (the religion shown by the absolutely detached Lords) is considered all-encompassing and accepting of all viewpoints (*anekantik*). That in which one includes all viewpoints is called *vitaraag dharma*.

Questioner: 'That in which one includes all viewpoints is called *vitaraag dharma*.' So what do you mean by that?

Dadashri: Yes. That which accommodates all three hundred and sixty degrees, does not have divisiveness due

to difference of opinion (*matbhed*) with anyone, that is referred to as *vitaraag dharma*. Does one who is at three hundred and sixty degrees, one who is at the center have differences with anyone?

Questioner: No.

Dadashri: Everyone is the same, aren't they?

Questioner: Of course!

Dadashri: That is called *vitaraag dharma*. That which is auspicious (*shubha*) is considered as adhering to a single viewpoint (*ekantik*), whereas that which is pure (*shuddha*) is considered as all-encompassing and accepting of all viewpoints (*anekantik*). *Moksha* is attained by *anekantik*. *Anekantik* means there is no insistence, it accepts all truths. The *vitaraag* path is *anekantik-syadvaad*.

Where There Is the Vitaraag Dharma, There Is Syadvaad-Anekantik

The Lord was *anekantik*. *Anekantik* means there is no insistence. In this respect, this is also correct, and in that respect, that is also correct. 'He' would accept both, He would accept every truth. "Why is this of yours wrong?" 'He' does not [say] such things. So, religious sects are considered paths that adhere to a single viewpoint (*ekantik*), and those are certainly not the *vitaraag* path. The *vitaraag* path is *anekantik - syadvaad*.

Where there is adherence to a single viewpoint (*ekantik*), one becomes adamant. Not [only] adamant, but blindness due to one's own tenacious viewpoint (*mataandha*) also arises there.

In worldly interactions, in worldly life, one was blinded by greed (*lobhandha*), he would have become blinded by, 'How can I accumulate money.' However, in this case, one has become blinded by his opinion. And to prove his opinion as correct, he destroys what is correct of the other person, he 'murders' the truth. Therefore, where there are religious sects, there is indeed no *vitaraag dharma* at all. If we were to ask, "Are you an adherent of the *vitaraag dharma* or of a religious sect?" Then he would reply, "Of a religious sect." And a religious sect means adherence to a single viewpoint. And where there is adherence to a single viewpoint, how can the path to *moksha* exist? A religious sect means it is partial. So even their speech is partial, their conduct is partial, their behavior is partial. Whereas God is impartial, He is *vitaraag - syadvaad*.

Vitaraag means *syadvaad* and *anekant*; where there are only [these] two words, it is *vitaraag*.

Ekantik Means Insistent, Anekant Means Free of Insistence

Questioner: So to remain stuck on one thought or viewpoint is *ekantik*!

Dadashri: Yes, that is correct. What a great statement! To remain stuck on one thought is itself *ekantik*. So to accept certain degrees, but not other degrees, that is a view concerning only one side. And to accept all three hundred and sixty degrees is a view that is *anekant* (all-encompassing and accepting of all viewpoints).

Do you and I have any kind of back-and-forth argument while talking about this?

Questioner: Not at all.

Dadashri: You have agreed with 'us' by just this one point, haven't you?

Questioner: Yes.

Dadashri: In *ekantik*, one does not agree [with another], whereas in *anekant* one is considered to agree [with another]. If we were to ask, "Is your account one-sided or all-encompassing?" Then he would answer, "It is *ekantik*," and *ekantik* means a view through ego (*vikalp*). The fact is, the one who is at forty degrees needs that viewpoint, the one who is at eighty degrees needs the viewpoint of eighty degrees, the one who is at a hundred degrees needs the viewpoint of a hundred degrees. Likewise, everyone has to do things differently, don't they! That is referred to as a viewpoint. What is the meaning of *ekantik*? Viewpoint. And *anekant* means it is the Reality, it is the Real.

What does *ekant* mean? If we ask these people, "The path of every religious sect is considered an *ekantik* path," then what would they say? "*Ekantik*." If we ask them, "Why are you writing *ekantik*? Are you writing it having understood it or without understanding it?" Then they would reply, "No, we are writing it having understood it. We have decided only this much; we have decided on only this much insistence. This insistence itself is our religion"; this is what they would say. "We have decided on this

insistence.” So, *ekantik* means insistent (*aagrahi*) and *anekant* means free of insistence (*niragrahi*). Apart from the *Tirthankar* Lords, no one is *anekant*. Even the *Ganadhar* (principal disciples of the *Tirthankar* Lord) cannot be *anekant* in the primary stage. Their speech certainly comes forth with faults in it.

Ekantik means to decide on one thing, such as only this much; these many cardinal statements (*kalams*) have been decided on, so we should certainly act only according to these many cardinal statements, that is referred to as *ekantik*. Whereas *anekant* means to also accept the cardinal statements of others. To accept the cardinal statements of all others, those are all considered *anekant*.

In Syadvaad, There Is No Matbhed With Anyone

Kabir Sahib (a fifteenth century Indian mystic poet and saint) used to live in a Muslim locality, very close to a mosque. So the neighboring people would shout out the Islamic call to prayer; people place their fingers in their ears and then shout out the call to prayer, don't they? What is it called? The Islamic call to prayer. Now, Kabir Sahib was a very alert person, so with reference to the call to prayer, he said, “Do you think Allah is deaf, that you are calling out your prayers so loudly? He hears everything. If you were to put ankle bells on an ant's legs, He would hear that as well. So why are you shouting at the top of your lungs? It really hurts my ears!” The Muslim people retorted, “You are criticizing our God, our religion?” and they beat him severely.

Now, if Kabir Saheb had told me, “These people are doing the wrong thing and they beat me up.” Then I would have said, “What they are doing is correct, the mistake is yours. Understand the other person's viewpoint before you speak. To speak without knowing the other person's viewpoint and to assess everyone through your own viewpoint is a grave offense. To assume that others have the same viewpoint as yours, all of that is considered an offense.” Then I would explain to Kabir Saheb, “The louder these people speak, the more their internal veils will break and then the Allah within will hear them. They have thick veils, whereas your veils are thin like a cloth. So even if you speak internally, it will reach Him. Whereas those people have a thick veil, so they should say it as loud as they can. This is all fine for them, it is correct.” Now, if the followers of Christ were to say their prayers out loud like that, then things would be ruined for them. They need total silence. There should be no speaking at all, no words at all. It is different in everyone's language. So if someone is speaking in his own language and if you tell him off, then we would end up in a state like Kabir Saheb. One who does not understand *anekant* will take a beating like Kabir Saheb. One takes a beating because of his own mistake.

Kabir Saheb was a very cognizant person. There have been many devotees, but out of all of them, Kabir was very cognizant. There have been five to seven devotees who were very cognizant, exceedingly cognizant! They were

hindered only by the attainment of the path to *moksha*. They did not find the path. Had they found the path, then they were such that they would have got their work done one way or another!

During the time of Kabir, the Brahmins were performing a *yagna* (sacrificial fire ritual) in a village. They had brought a big goat to sacrifice in the fire. Upon seeing this, Kabir asked the Brahmins, “Why have you brought this goat here?” To which the Brahmins replied, “Why have you come here? Go away from here. Why do you need to know that?” Then Kabir understood and said, “This goat is alive, he is healthy. Why are you sacrificing it in the fire? How much pain will it undergo?” Then the Brahmins said, “If we sacrifice it in the fire, then it will go to heaven.” So Kabir immediately retorted, “Why are you making this goat go to heaven? Instead, why don’t you sacrifice your father, who is aged, in the fire so that he can go to heaven!” Now this is a statement that would cause a headache! So the Brahmins beat him up badly. So, he suffered a beating everywhere. The one who speaks without understanding the Lord’s *anekant* takes a beating everywhere! Otherwise, never has there been a devotee like Kabir! He was the most excellent of them all! The one who had let go of worldly desires. He did not have any desire for anything of the world, he had become free from desires.

The British stand quietly in a church, that is correct. Muslims call out to pray, that is also correct, and Hindus speak quietly in their mind, that too

is correct. A few Hindus may speak a bit loudly, or not speak at all; if he is expressionless, then tell him, “Say it a little louder.” If he is a Jain who is a bit expressionless, then tell him, “Hey, why do you keep reciting the *Navkaar mantra* (the first part of the Trimantra of Dadashri) in your mind? Say it with a bit of vigor, so it can be heard over here. Say it in a way that the bells ring within.” So, there is a different medicine for each and every person. Every human being has a different ‘disease’ and so there are different ‘medicines’. Every living being has a different ‘disease’. Now, if you were to say, “Give all these people the medicine for vomiting,” then what would happen? So this is how the world is! That is why the Lord has established *anekant - syadvaad*, so that there is no divisiveness due to difference of opinion with any living being.

The Gnani, the Knower of All Tenets

This is the *anekant* path, which has been made *ekantik*. It has been made *ekantik* because people do not understand beyond [their degree] and they created tenets (*mat*). *Ekantik* means tenet, while *anekant* means no tenet, it is impartial, *anekant*! The Lord has said that the *Gnani Purush* should be the Knower of His own tenets and the tenets of others.

To elucidate to those who have the same tenet as his own is considered *ekantik*; one will have to become *anekant*. For anyone who comes with a different tenet and asks for an explanation, an explanation should be offered immediately,

at that moment. And that explanation should be beneficial. As it is, one is only able to give an explanation to those with the same tenets as his own. There is no meaning in that, is there! It is meaningless! What would happen if people with different tenets [religious beliefs] were to come to him?

Questioner: It should bring closure and inner satisfaction to everyone.

Dadashri: This well-versed Vedantic theologian had come here. Just see if a Jain monk can try and tell him, “No, God is not the doer of this.” Then see the respectable man’s air of arrogance! So here, ‘we’ have to say it in a way that his intellect accepts it. The entire world opposes the notion that God is not the doer. There were strong oppositions even in the times of Lord Mahavir. And did this respectable man feel any opposition at all here? No Vaishnav (devotee of Lord Krishna) has any opposition here. This is because ours is a scientific method and ‘we’ are not speaking at all, are ‘we’! It is actually the ‘tape record’ [taped record] that is speaking. Otherwise, not a single person who has a different tenet would change. If there is a person in direct opposition, then he would engage in an argument. If there is no one in direct opposition and it is a tape, then he would not argue. The person would listen to the tape and begin to ponder over it. Why would anyone get into an altercation with a ‘tape’ [egoless speech]?

The Difference Between Anekant and Syadvaad

Questioner: The final path to

moksha is through the *ekantik* path; I don’t understand that.

Dadashri: The entire world actually understands *ekantik*, but they have not understood *anekant*, and when they understand *syadvaad*, then the path to *moksha* will be in their reach.

Questioner: *Anekant* simply means *syadvaad*, doesn’t it?

Dadashri: *Anekant* falls under *syadvaad*. However, *syadvaad* does not fall under *anekant*. *Syadvaad* is such an extensive word that even *anekant* falls under it, even impartiality (*nishpakshpati*) falls under it. There are impartial people in this world, but they are not considered *syadvaad*. There are people who have impartial thoughts and they even speak according to those thoughts; nevertheless, they cannot be considered *syadvaad*.

Questioner: From the elemental vision, *syadvaad* and *anekant* are the same, aren’t they?

Dadashri: No, they are not the same. People may say they are the same, but I do not consider them to be the same, do I! This is because what is the meaning of *anekant*? It is considered free of insistence (*niragrahi*). However many religious paths there are in India, they are all considered *ekantik*. *Ekantik* means certain types of insistence have been decided on, such as, ‘Our role extends only to this point, and these are our beliefs’; that is *ekantik*. Theirs is different and the other person’s is different. Whereas *anekant* means there is no insistence, speech that is free of insistence. The absence of insistence

(*niragrah*) falls under *syadvaad*, but *syadvaad* does not fall under the absence of insistence! *Syadvaad* is a phenomenal thing.

Therefore, *anekant* is a different thing and *syadvaad* is a different thing. *Anekant* is based on insistence, whereas *syadvaad* is based on *vaad*. *Vaad* means speech (*vachan*).

People have turned the *syadvaad* of the Lord into *ekantik*. The *syadvaad* of the Lord was not like this. What is the *syadvaad* of the Lord [Mahavir]? This religion explains things only up to this point and this other religion explains things only up to this point. All those religions are within their own boundary, they are within their viewpoint and moreover they do not differ from each other. These are all standards of the same college. However, the people of each religion have created segregations, 'This is ours and that is yours.' Where there is ours and yours, it is not considered *syadvaad*.

After one attains the Self, *anekant* begins.

Syadvaad means that if you want to refer to it as free of insistence, then you can refer to it as free of insistence. If you want to refer to it as *anekant*, then you can refer to it as *anekant*. *Ekantik* means with insistence, whereas *anekant* means free of insistence. And the speech is such that it is agreeable to everyone. And if people from all religions are sitting here, then no one would feel any disparity through my words. This is because I am of impartial thoughts and this is *syadvaad*

speech. I will explain that later, *syadvaad* speech is a phenomenal thing. Right now, just understand [the concept of being] free of insistence.

Questioner: Now is the significance of the meaning of *syadvaad* and *anekant* different or is it the same?

Dadashri: The significance is only that fighting over even one religious matter is called *ekantik*. Whereas there are no quarrels in *anekant*, there is no insistence, is there! There is no argument at all. *Anekant* means that life is characterized by applied awareness as the Self. Life that is characterized by pure applied awareness as the Self (*shuddha upayog*), that is called *anekant*. Otherwise, it would not be this way in worldly interaction, would it! In worldly interaction, everything is auspicious or inauspicious. *Shuddha upayog* means that One Sees himself as pure and he also Sees others as pure. He even Sees a thief as pure, He even Sees a snake as pure, and He even Sees a tiger as pure; that is called *shuddha upayog*. He does not see a snake as a snake, He only Sees it as pure.

Syadvaad, Anekant, and Nayvaad

Questioner: What is the elemental difference between *syadvaad*, *anekantvaad* (speech accepting different viewpoints), and *nayvaad* (speech pertaining to relative views only)? And in what way? There seem to be many similarities between *syadvaad* and *anekantvaad*.

Dadashri: In this, *syadvaad* and *anekantvaad* are both Real-relative. So they are actually relative, but they are

Real-relative, whereas this *nayvaad* is relative-relative, it is temporary. So, as far *nayvaad* is concerned, it moves further only as one viewpoint is negated with another. And ultimately, this *syadvaad* is needed, because without that one cannot attain *moksha*, and this *syadvaad* is Real-relative. So, this is especially needed.

Syadvaad Is Different and Anekant Is Different

What does *syadvaad* mean? It means there are three hundred and sixty degrees, and one speaks in a way that the foundation of belief system of no degree is hurt. Each religion rests on a degree. So they are all standing on their own viewpoint, and they look from there and they tell each other, "Yours is wrong."

Questioner: But *syadvaad* actually says that they are all correct.

Dadashri: Yes, *syadvaad* says, "You are all correct." So no one's foundation of belief system is hurt.

Questioner: Then what about *anekantvaad*?

Dadashri: *Anekantvaad* means it is not *ekantik*. And in *ekantik*, one decides, 'Only this much is true for us, nothing else is ours.' That is considered to be in the form of insistence. So *ekantik* means insistence that, 'Our religion is only like this.' A religious sect means that one has created his own boundary that it should indeed be like this. Whatever boundary you have created, that much is your confined truth. Whereas *anekant* means

it is not a confined truth, it is complete truth. 'We do this, we don't do that,' that is all considered *ekantik*. Whereas *anekant* means free from insistence. Without one-sidedness! So the one who is *ekantik* has become stubbornly insistent (*hathagrahi*). However many religious sects there are, they themselves say, "Ours is a one-sided tenet. Whatever boundary there is, we will act only within that boundary." Whereas the Lord's path is *anekant*. He does not remain stuck on one viewpoint (*abhinivesh*) anywhere, He does not have attachment to a viewpoint (*drashti raag*).

Questioner: What is the difference between *drashti raag* and *nishpakshapat* (impartiality)?

Dadashri: *Drashti raag* is a different thing. *Drashti raag* means only for one place, for one corner, if one feels, 'Only this is correct and only this degree is correct,' he is stuck over there, he does not move from there; that has been referred to as *drashti raag*. Whereas *nishpakshapati* is actually the state of absolute detachment (*vitaraagata*). If you become *nishpakshapati* for one day, if you become *nishpakshapati* for one hour, even then I would say, "You are God!" Oh! If you become *nishpakshapati* for one minute, even then I would say, "You are God!"

So *anekantvaad* does not halt anywhere. It is worth understanding the meaning of *anekant* in detail. Hence, *anekant* and *syadvaad*, these two words are not the same. *Syadvaad* is different and *anekant* is different.

Anekant means it is not *ekantik*, that is *anekant*! What a wonderful word of the Lord it is! *Syadvaad*! It is to speak from all the degrees, from all the viewpoints. Therefore, *syadvaad* speech is actually considered living *Saraswati* (divine liberating speech).

Syadvaad - Anekant in Worldly Interaction

Questioner: Can the irrefutable principle of *syadvaad* be used for relative application?

Dadashri: *Syadvaad* does not exist in the Real, it is entirely in the relative.

Questioner: So is it true that *syadvaad* does not exist in *Sat*?

Dadashri: *Sat* means Real, and *syadvaad* does not exist at all in the Real, does it!

Questioner: So can *anekantvaad* be integrated in worldly interactions? If it can, then how so?

Dadashri: In the Real (*Nishchay*), *anekantvaad* is definitely there, on its own. In what is Real, there is no *vaad* (speech) at all. So, this is only fitting in worldly interaction. So, all the *vaad* that exist are only in worldly interactions. Even *ekantikvaad* (one-sided speech) is in worldly interactions and even *anekantvaad* is in worldly interactions. Even speech filled with insistence is in worldly interactions and even *syadvaad* speech is in worldly interactions. However, *syadvaad* speech is considered the ultimate speech, it is considered the topmost speech. The

balance sheet of speech has been attained. The balance sheet of *anekant* and *ekantik* has been created. It gradually develops from *ekantik*.

Questioner: Can the relative path be considered *ekant*, and the Real path be considered *anekant*?

Dadashri: There is no such thing as *ekant* or *anekant* in the Real path. Real is Real. There are no adjectives such as *ekant* or *anekant* at all there. The relative has all the adjectives. Therefore, *ekantik* and *anekant* are in the relative. In the relative, those people who are filled with the insistence that, 'Ours is correct,' they uphold the insistence, that is considered *ekant*. And when one accepts everyone's religion, everyone's truth, and the perspective is towards the *anekant*, he does not have undue insistence (*duragrah*), he does not have insistence (*aagrah*), then it is considered *anekant*. When the foundation of belief system of no religion is hurt even in the slightest, then it is considered *anekant*. However, that is relative, it is not Real. There is no adjective in the Real at all. There are adjectives in the relative, because speech itself is relative. Speech is not Real at all. Even *ekantik* and *anekant* are related to speech.

There Is No Insistence Even of Being Free of Insistence

To not have even the insistence that 'I am free of insistence,' that is called *syadvaad*! To become free of insistence is the path of the *vitaraag* Lords. Let go of insistence from everywhere. The Lord

has referred to insistence on the truth as ignorance. 'We' do not have even the slightest insistence! 'We' do not have any type of insistence on any matter even slightly, that, 'It should definitely be like this!' Not even for a second! 'We' do not even have insistence that, 'This is right, this is the truth.' There is no insistence even of, 'This *Gnan* has manifested.' If you say, 'That is wrong,' even then there is no insistence. Whatever has come through your vision is correct.

'We' may look naive, 'we' may appear childlike, but 'we' are very astute. 'We' do not sit around with anyone, 'we' certainly move on. Why would 'we' forsake 'our' progress?

'We' make a request once. Otherwise, 'we' let go of the matter and move on. 'We' explain everything to you, but if you hold onto your viewpoint, then 'we' immediately let go. 'We' know, 'This person cannot see, so how long should 'we' sit around?' 'We' should not sit around, should 'we'? This is because he cannot see beyond [his viewpoint], can he!

Where There Is Syadvaad, There Is Impartiality

Questioner: You were saying, "Every religion of the world is accepted by 'us', 'we' accept them." 'Our' Science accepts the knowledge of every religious sect in the world.

Dadashri: 'We' indeed say that, don't 'we'! If 'we' do not accept that, then [as the saying goes,] 'An ascetic

would not respect the public and the public would not respect the ascetic.' So it would end up like the case of the ascetic. As it is, amidst mingling with all the others, our Sciences exhibits preeminence.

I speak *anekant* speech. *Ekantik* means, 'Ours is right and others are wrong.' *Vitaraag* speech is required. In *vitaraag*, there is no sect or tenet, there are no factions, it is without religious sects, it is *anekant*. I speak *anekant* speech. It does not hurt the foundation of belief system of any religion in the slightest extent, and that is why Sthanakvasi, Swetambari, Digambari (followers of Jain sects), Vaishnav, Muslim, Parsi, all people come to listen to me, because it is *anekant* speech.

If someone is talking about his own religion, if he is saying good things, even then would you know whether what he is saying is right or wrong? You would know immediately, wouldn't you?

Questioner: Yes, immediately.

Dadashri: Yes, you should immediately know that.

Have you ever heard speech with partiality anywhere? That which makes us tainted with the dogma of tenet is all speech with partiality. 'This is ours, this is ours...'

That in which divisions are created cannot be considered *vitaraag* religion. This is because the Lord's religion is *anekant* religion, and it is *syadvaad* religion. The Lord's path is that in which

there is no partiality, it is impartial. If the Vedantis (knowers of the Vedas, Hindu scriptures) come here, then they would become happy when they listen to a Jain monk. However, with the way things are, if the monk of one sect speaks, then the followers of the other sects will get up and walk out. So, with such speech, no one listens to anyone.

[At other places] It is all speech with partiality, and that is certainly why no one attains *samkit* (the right belief 'I am pure Soul'). *Samkit* has been entirely impeded. If someone believes that he will attain *samkit*, then that is a mistake.

Their [the monks'] speech is one-sided, it is partial. If there is a monk of one sect and another monk from another sect, and if they both speak, then the speech of both would be partial. So others would find it very bitter, like poison. It is not like that for 'us'. If 'ours' is so good, then what must the speech of the Lord be like? Everyone comes together here, but no one makes any objection that, 'You are partial.' So what must the Lord's be like!

The True Nature of Syadvaad...

Questioner: Now please explain *syadvaad* in short.

Dadashri: *Syadvaad* means speech that does not harm any religion even in the slightest extent. There are so many religions, violence is not committed towards a single one of these religions in the slightest. And if we delve even deeper, then not a single person's thoughts are hurt even in the slightest extent, that

is called *syadvaad* speech. If backbiting is done about any religion, and one proves himself to be correct and proves the other person to be wrong, then that is not *syadvaad*. There is no violence in *syadvaad* speech.

Questioner: Is there only a description of non-violence (*ahimsa*) in *syadvaad* or are there any other angles?

Dadashri: No, it is only of non-violence, nothing else. There is nothing that does not fall under non-violence. If you understand the interpretation of non-violence, then there is nothing in this world that does not fall under non-violence.

Syadvaad is connected to speech, and the foundation of belief system (*pramaan*) is related to *anekant*. The foundation of belief system of any degree, the foundation of belief system of any religion should not be hurt. When 'we' speak, it does not hurt the foundation of belief system of anyone, and if someone's foundation of belief system is hurt, then 'we' ask for forgiveness. One's foundation of belief system should never be hurt, that should never happen, should it! How can someone's foundation of belief system be hurt? Our path is to not hurt anyone's foundation of belief system. This is because what a person believes in, everyone's foundation of belief system is indeed different. And if someone eats meat, then 'we' cannot get involved in that. And if someone eats fruit and if another does not eat fruit, even then 'we' cannot get involved in that.

Syadvaad speech means *vitaraag* speech, which does not hurt anyone's foundation of belief system. Then even if it is a butcher who comes here; the butcher is indeed in his *dharma* (function; role). Everyone is indeed in their own *dharma*. Those people who do not believe in God, even they are in their *dharma*. Even they do not live outside of *dharma* even for a moment. Without *dharma*, a human being would not be able to live even for a moment. However, alongside, they are in *adharma* (that which hurts the self and others). The proportion of *adharma* increases. The Self exists, so *dharma* should definitely be there. After all, if a person does not believe in God, if he does not believe in idols, people call him an atheist, yet he believes in ethics, and ethics are the directive of God; so that is considered the greatest *dharma* of all. Hence, he believes in one thing or another. One cannot survive without believing in something, can he! So, this is all considered good.

The foundation of belief system of no religion should be hurt, which means that if tribal people are worshipping a rock, and if you ever attack their faith, even then that is not *syadvaad* speech. The speech that accepts the faith of every individual, such speech is considered *syadvaad*.

In *syadvaad*, the talk should only be such that it is directly helpful to the person. So 'our' speech is *syadvaad*. Everyone finds it agreeable. No matter what religion one is practicing, he still finds it agreeable.

When the foundation of belief system of someone's religion is hurt, he feels hurt. The people of all religions may come together, but speak in a way that no one's foundation of belief system is hurt. So it is because 'we' speak *syadvaad* speech that people of all religions come together here. And there is no violence towards anyone's religion even in the slightest.

One monk comes here and says, "Sir, I do not have a great need for a guru. I will focus mainly on the temple and the idols." Even then, God says, "He is correct by his viewpoint." Meanwhile, another person says, "No, I have affection only for my guru, I don't have much affection for idols." Even then, God says, "That is correct." If some person comes and says, "Sir, I am only going to do penance." Even then God says, "That is correct." That is called *syadvaad*.

In Syadvaad, There Is No Matbhed With Anyone

Syadvaad means three hundred and sixty degrees. All these people at a certain degree say that those at other degrees are wrong, these religious people. These three hundred and sixty degrees encompass all the religions of humans. The Self is at the center. Everyone's viewpoint is different for the Self that is in the center. By looking at the center, everyone's viewpoint ends up being different. Therefore, people naturally have divisiveness due to difference of opinion (*matbhed*). There is a difference when one looks from one hundred and twenty-five degrees and when one looks

from one hundred and fifty [degrees]. That difference arises naturally, even that divisiveness due to difference of opinion of yours is natural; that is what I am saying.

But what does *syadvaad* mean? One who does not have divisiveness due to difference of opinion with anyone. He accepts every religion; he accepts every degree.

Whereas those [without Self-realization] argue with each other, one person says, "Yours is wrong," and the other person says, "Yours is wrong." I have gone to the center and come back to three hundred and fifty-six degrees. Therefore, I do not have divisiveness due to difference of opinion with anyone in this world at all. Whether someone hurls abuse at me, hits me, no matter what he does, I do not have divisiveness due to difference of opinion with him. This is because I do not have a mind at all. If there is a mind, then divisiveness due to difference of opinion develops.

And the mind that I have, what is it like? The mind will actually stay right until the end, all the way up until the point of *moksha*. But what is my mind like? It turns every moment. What is it like? It turns from moment to moment. Whereas what is your mind like? If it catches hold of something, then it would remain stuck there for fifteen minutes, for half an hour. A fly moves around in a circle, doesn't it? Just as a fly circles around a piece of jaggery, [the mind] circles around [a particular thought] for an hour, two hours. Whereas 'our' [mind]

does not circle around any place. 'Our' mind is *kshanvaadi* (with thoughts that stay, 'speak' for one moment). Whereas the mind of Lord Mahavir was so subtle that it was *samayvaadi* (with thoughts that last for one *samay*, the smallest unit of time). What was it like? *Samayvaadi*. Whereas mine is *kshanvaadi*. It is a little grosser. Eventually, it will have to become subtle.

Questioner: But if there is no mind, then there would be no opinion (*mat*) either, would there?

Dadashri: Yes, there is no opinion at all. 'We' no longer have any opinion. 'Our' mind has reached the stage in which there is no opinion. There is nothing like 'our' opinion and the other person's opinion. In all the animals and all others, 'we' See only one thing, 'we' See only that everywhere, the Self. And 'we' don't have anything to do with other things. And as far as possible, 'we' are helpful towards other things.

The One Who Is at the Center Can Understand Syadvaad

Questioner: This lady is a Parsi and she has done her M.A. [Master of Arts] in the subject of Jainism. For that, she had to write a thesis, so she has written a thesis on *Syadvaad* and *Sankhya* (one of the six systems of philosophy in Hinduism) and has passed with first rank.

Dadashri: Those who study *syadvaad*, those who teach them are still alive. This lady has studied it, above her there is a teacher who has taught her, isn't there? The world does not have any

idea of what *syadvaad* is. This is actually a shadow of it. That which is taught outside is actually a shadow. *Syadvaad* is actually a fantastic thing. Otherwise, this lady has been taught by her teacher, so the teacher must know what *syadvaad* is, mustn't he? He must have a teacher, mustn't he? Does a teacher have a teacher or not? *Syadvaad* is not limited to being inscribed in a book.

Questioner: *Syadvaad* is immeasurable, it is boundless.

Dadashri: Yes, this is at the gross level. We accept that it is in the gross language. The subtle, subtler, and subtlest; the subtlest level that the Lord has spoken about, that *syadvaad* is a fantastic thing. I will tell you what *syadvaad* is at the gross level. Within these three hundred and sixty degrees, the entire world is at their viewpoint. These foreigners are at one hundred and twenty-five degrees, Muslims are at one hundred and fifty [degrees]. Then others are ahead of that at one hundred and seventy-five [degrees], some are at two hundred [degrees], Hindus are at two hundred and twenty-five [degrees], Jains are at two hundred and fifty [degrees]. In this way, everyone is at their own degree. And as they are on a degree, there is divisiveness due to difference of opinion. When one comes to the center, divisiveness due to difference of opinion does not remain with any degree and he understands people at all degrees.

Questioner: One's own circle rests within a degree; if he understands the center, then nothing remains for him.

Dadashri: If he understands the center, if he has understood what the center is, then nothing remains whatsoever. So, when does he understand the center? It is only when he comes passing all the degrees that he understands the center. Or if a person has not passed them, if a person has reached two hundred and seventy degrees, he has not completed three hundred and sixty degrees, and if he happens to meet a *Gnani Purush*, and he tells the *Gnani Purush*, "Show me the viewpoint of the center," then the *Gnani Purush* will show him. Otherwise, one has to come [to three hundred and sixty degrees] by himself. One has met the *Gnani Purush*, that is why this has been referred to as the lift path, hasn't it!

Questioner: In short, the point is that a circle cannot be formed without a center.

Dadashri: Yes, a circle cannot be formed without a center.

To remain in a viewpoint, to adjust to a viewpoint, and to remain in the center; that is a monumental thing.

In Syadvaad, It Is One, Yet Different

Questioner: *Syadvaad* means to remain in the one and only [location] and to remain with different *bhaav* (view, intent, outlook); please explain this.

Dadashri: Yes, *syadvaad* means to remain in the one and only [location] and to remain with different *bhaav*. Yes, to remain in the one and only [place], meaning to

remain in the 'home department' and to shine the 'light' on different intents [thus accepting the viewpoints].

Do not remain in the 'foreign'. Have you ever entered the 'home department'? When did you enter it?

Questioner: We enter into it daily!

Dadashri: No, you believe the 'foreign department' to be the 'home [department]'. You still haven't even seen the 'home department'. If You attain Your 'home department', then the 'foreign' will remain as the foreign. In fact, you are doing good only for the 'foreign' and you believe that you have attained salvation!

You should remain as the Self and accept those who are at different degrees. No matter what religion one follows, you should accept his viewpoint that he is correct according to his viewpoint, his vision. You are correct based on your account, and he is correct based on his account. While remaining in Your own intent, You should remain in all the other intents. So you will never feel that anyone is wrong. *Syadvaad* means that everyone is indeed correct by his or her viewpoint; that is what 'we' are saying. One knows that his is correct, but [he believes that] because his is right, the other person's is wrong. That is definite, but it is also

definite that when you prove him to be wrong, he feels hurt. And it is also definite that to hurt anyone is not considered religion at all. Therefore, all that has been encompassed in this. This path of *syadvaad* is such that no one undergoes any difficulty.

Here, people of all religions come together, but when I speak no one feels I am being partial. This is because my thoughts are not partial. If I had gotten involved with any particular group, then I would have become partial. Meaning if a monk of a particular religion were speaking, and if a monk from another religion were to go there, then *kashay* would arise for him that, 'Why did this fellow worm his way over here?' And when he talks, he talks only about his own side. So we would realize that this person belongs to a certain religion, and that person belongs to another religion. We would even realize which 'shop' he belongs to! And *syadvaad* means that 'we' do not have any 'shop'. 'Everything' is 'ours', and in the Real, what is Mine is Mine.

This is beautiful talk. The Lord's talk is very deep and subtle; it is worth understanding. 'Our' talk takes time to understand. But if one understands it, then his work will get done.

~ **Jai Sat Chit Anand**

Owned by : Mahavideh Foundation Simandhar City, Adalaj - 382421, Dist-Gandhinagar.

© 2021, Dada Bhagwan Foundation. All Rights Reserved.

Contacts : Adalaj Trimandir, Simandhar City, Ahmedabad-Kalol Highway, **Adalaj**, Dist. : Gandhinagar-382421,

Gujarat, India. Ph. : 9328661166-77, E-MAIL : DADAVANI@DADABHAGWAN.ORG WEB : WWW.DADABHAGWAN.ORG

Mumbai : 9323528901, USA-Canada : +1 877-505-3232, UK : +44 330-111-3232

Australia : +61 402179706, Kenya : +254 722 722 063, Germany : +49 700 32327474



Watch Pujya Niruma / Pujya Deepakbhai on the Following TV Channels



India

- **Doordarshan Gurnar**, Every day 7:30 to 8:30 AM; 9 to 10 PM (**Gujarati**)
- **Arihant**, Every day 2:50 to 3:50 AM; 2:30 to 3 PM & 8 to 9 PM (**Gujarati**)
- **Valam**, Every day 6 to 6:30 PM (**Only in the state of Gujarat**)
- **Swarshri**, Every day 11:30 to 12 PM (**Only in the state of Gujarat**)
- **Doordarshan Uttarpradesh**, Every day 7:30 to 8 AM; 8:30 to 9:30 PM (**Hindi**)
- **Sadhana**, Every day 7:50 to 8:15 AM & 9:30 to 9:55 PM (**Hindi**)
- **Odisha Plus**, Every day 7:30 to 8 AM (**Hindi - Only in the state of Odisha**)
- **Doordarshan Sahyadri**, Every day 7 to 7:30 AM (**Marathi**)
- **Aastha Kannada**, Every day 12 to 12:30 PM & 4:30 to 5 PM (**Kannada**)

USA - Canada

- **TV Asia**, Every day 7:30 to 8 AM EST (**Gujarati**)

UK

- **Venus TV**, Every day 8 to 8:30 AM GMT (**Hindi**)
- **Venus TV**, Every day 8:30 to 9 AM GMT (**Gujarati**)
- **MA TV**, Every day 5:30 to 6:30 PM GMT (**Gujarati**)

Australia

- **Rishtey**, Every day 8 to 8:30 AM & 1:30 to 2 PM (**Hindi**)

Fiji - NZ - Singapore - SA - UAE

- **Rishtey-Asia**, Every day 6 to 6:30 AM & 7:30 to 8 AM (**Hindi**)

USA - UK - Africa - Australia

- **Aastha Global**, Monday to Friday, 10 to 10:30 PM IST
(Dish TV Channel UK-849, USA-719) (**Gujarati and Hindi**)

The Path of the Vitarag Lords Is Syadvaad and Anekant

The entire world actually understands ekantik, but they have not understood anekant. That which is auspicious is considered as ekantik, whereas that which is pure is considered as anekant. Anekant means there is no insistence, it accepts all truths. Moksha is attained through anekant. One acts according to his own viewpoint, to prove one's own viewpoint to be correct, that is considered as adhering to a single viewpoint (ekantik). Whereas the vitarag dharma (the religion prescribed by the absolutely detached Lords) is considered anekant. When One is inclusive of all viewpoints, that is called vitarag dharma! And when one understands syadvaad, then the path to moksha will be in one's reach. Syadvaad is that which does not hurt the foundation of belief system of any religion. It does not directly point out the mistakes of any religion. That which accepts both the Real and the relative is called syadvaad. The vitarag path is anekant, syadvaad.

- Dadashri

