As Expounded by Dada Bhagwan

# **Non-Violence**





Publisher	<ul> <li>Mr. Ajit C. Patel</li> <li>Dada Bhagwan Vignan Foundation <ol> <li>Varun Apartment, 37, Shrimali Society,</li> <li>Opp. Navrangpura Police Station,</li> <li>Navrangpura, Ahmedabad: 380009.</li> <li>Gujarat, India.</li> </ol> </li> <li>Tel. : +91 79 35002100, +91 9328661166-77</li> </ul>			
©	Dada Bhagwan Foundation 5, Mamta Park Society, B\h. Navgujarat College, Usmanpura, Ahmedabad - 380014, Gujarat, India. Email: info@dadabhagwan.org Tel.: +91 9328661166-77 All Rights Reserved. No part of this publication may be shared, copied, translated or reproduced in any form (including electronic storage or audio recording) without written permission from the holder of the copyright. This publication is licensed for your personal use only.			
1 <sup>st</sup> Edition 2 <sup>nd</sup> to	<b>:</b> 2,000 copies, March 2004			
4 <sup>th</sup> Edition 5 <sup>th</sup> Edition	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
5 Lutton	• 2,000 copies, 1 April 2022			
Price	: Ultimate humility and the intent that			
	'I do not know anything'!			
	Rs. 40.00			
Printer	<b>: Amba Multiprint</b> B - 99, Electronics GIDC, K-6 Road, Sector - 25, Gandhinagar-382044. Gujarat, India. Tel. : +91 79 35002142, +91 9328660055			
ISBN/eISBN	N: 978-93-86289-11-7			
Printed in India				

# <u>Trimantra</u>

#### The Three Mantras That Destroy All Obstacles in Life

#### Namo Vitaraagaya

I bow to the Ones who are absolutely free from all attachment and abhorrence

#### Namo Arihantanam

I bow to the living Ones who have annihilated all internal enemies of anger, pride, deceit and greed

#### Namo Siddhanam

I bow to the Ones who have attained the state of total and final liberation

#### Namo Aayariyanam

I bow to the Self-realized masters who impart the Knowledge of the Self to others

#### Namo Uvazzayanam

I bow to the Ones who have received the Knowledge of the Self and are helping others attain the same

#### Namo Loye Savva Sahunam

I bow to the Ones, wherever they may be, who have received the Knowledge of the Self

#### Eso Pancha Namukkaro

These five salutations

#### Savva Pavappanasano

Destroy all demerit karma

#### Mangalanam Cha Savvesim

Of all that is auspicious

#### Padhamam Havai Mangalam ||1|

This is the highest

#### Om Namo Bhagavate Vasudevaya ||2||

**3** 

I bow to the Ones who have attained the absolute Self in human form

#### Om Namah Shivaya

I bow to all human beings who have become instruments for the salvation of the world

#### Jai Sat Chit Anand

Awareness of the Eternal is Bliss

# Who Is Dada Bhagwan?

In June 1958, around 6 o'clock one evening, amidst the hustle and bustle of the Surat railway station while seated on a bench, 'Dada Bhagwan' manifested completely within the sacred bodily form of Ambalal Muljibhai Patel. Nature revealed a remarkable phenomenon of spirituality! In the span of an hour, the vision of the universe was unveiled to him! Complete clarity for all spiritual questions such as, 'Who are we? Who is God? Who runs the world? What is karma? What is liberation?' etc. was attained.

What He attained that evening, He imparted to others through his original Scientific experiment (*Gnan Vidhi*) in just two hours! This has been referred to as the *Akram* path. *Kram* means to climb up sequentially, step-by-step while *Akram* means step-less, a shortcut, the elevator path!

He, himself, would explain to others who Dada Bhagwan is by saying, "The one visible before you is not Dada Bhagwan. I am the *Gnani Purush* and the One who has manifested within is Dada Bhagwan who is the Lord of the fourteen worlds. He is also within you, and within everyone else too. He resides unmanifest within you, whereas here [within A. M. Patel], He has manifested completely! I, myself, am not God (*Bhagwan*); I also bow down to the Dada Bhagwan who has manifest within me."

\*\*\*\*

# The Current Link to Attain Self-Realization

After attaining the Knowledge of the Self in 1958, absolutely revered Dada Bhagwan (Dadashri) traveled nationally and internationally to impart spiritual discourse and Self-realization to spiritual seekers.

During his lifetime itself, Dadashri had given the spiritual power to Pujya Dr. Niruben Amin (Niruma) to bestow Self-realization to others. In the same way, after Dadashri left his mortal body, Pujya Niruma conducted spiritual discourses (*satsang*) and imparted Self-realization to spiritual seekers, as an instrumental doer. Dadashri had also given Pujya Deepakbhai Desai the spiritual power to conduct *satsang*. At present, with the blessings of Pujya Niruma, Pujya Deepakbhai travels nationally and internationally to impart Self-realization as an instrumental doer.

After Self-realization, thousands of spiritual seekers prevail in a state free from bondage and dwell in the experience of the Self, whilst carrying out all their worldly responsibilities.

\* \* \* \* \*

# **Note About This Translation**

The *Gnani Purush*, Ambalal M. Patel, also commonly known as 'Dadashri' or 'Dada', gave spiritual discourses that were in the form of answers to questions asked by spiritual aspirants. These discourses were recorded and compiled into books by Pujya Dr. Niruben Amin in the Gujarati language.

Dadashri had said that it would be impossible to translate His *satsangs* and the Knowledge about the Science of Selfrealization word for word into other languages, because some of the meaning would be lost in the process. Therefore, in order to understand precisely the *Akram* Science of Self-realization, He stressed the importance of learning Gujarati.

However, Dadashri did grant His blessings to translate His words into other languages so that spiritual seekers could benefit to a certain degree and later progress through their own efforts. This book is not a literal translation, but great care has been taken to preserve the essence of His original message.

Spiritual discourses have been and continue to be translated from Gujarati. For certain Gujarati words, several translated words or even sentences are needed to convey the meaning, hence many Gujarati words have been retained within the translated text for better understanding. Where the Gujarati word is used for the first time, it is italicized, followed by a translation explaining its meaning in parenthesis. Subsequently, only the Gujarati word is used in the text that follows. This serves a two-fold benefit; firstly, ease of translation and reading, and secondly, make the reader more familiar with the Gujarati words, which is critical for a deeper understanding of this spiritual Science. The content in square brackets provides further clarity regarding the matter, which is not present in the original Gujarati content.

This is a humble attempt to present to the world, the essence of His Knowledge. While reading this translation, if there is any contradiction or discrepancy, then it is the mistake of the translators and the understanding of the matter should be clarified with the living *Gnani* to avoid misinterpretation.

# **Special Note to the Reader**

The word violence generally conveys some form of physical aggression. However, the spiritual definition of *himsa*, which is roughly translated as violence, is much broader. Any speech or thought that hurts any living being is also considered violence. Similarly, *ahimsa*, or non-violence, is defined as the practice of not hurting any living being even to the slightest extent, through thoughts, speech, and action. Thus, rather than using the English words 'violence' and 'non-violence' in this book, the respective Gujarati words *himsa* and *ahimsa* have been used.

The Self is the Soul (Atma) within all living beings.

The term pure Soul is used by the *Gnani Purush* for the awakened Self, after the *Gnan Vidhi*. The word Self, with an uppercase 'S', refers to the awakened Self which is separate from the worldly-interacting self, which is written with a lowercase 's'.

Wherever Dadashri uses the term 'we', 'us', or 'our', He is referring to Himself, the *Gnani Purush*.

Similarly, the use of You or Your in the middle of a sentence, with an uppercase first letter, or 'You', 'Your' in single quotes at the beginning of the sentence, refers to the state of the awakened Self or *Pragnya*. This is an important distinction for the correct understanding of the difference between the awakened Self and the worldly-interacting self.

Wherever the name 'Chandubhai' is used, the reader should substitute his or her name and read the matter accordingly.

The masculine third person pronoun 'he' and likewise the object pronoun 'him' have been used for the most part throughout the translation. Needless to say, 'he' includes 'she' and 'him' includes 'her'.

For reference, a glossary of all the Gujarati words is either provided at the back of this book or available on our website at:

http://www.dadabhagwan.org/books-media/glossary/

\* \* \* \* \*

# Editorial

In the ocean of *himsa* (violence), there is nothing but *himsa*; however, if a person wants to attain [the state of] *ahimsa* (non-violence) amidst the ocean of *himsa*, then it is only possible if he reads, contemplates on, and follows the speech on *ahimsa* spoken by the absolutely revered Dadashri. Otherwise, there are people who practice *ahimsa* at the gross level to great lengths, but it is difficult to even know about the subtle, subtler, and subtlest levels of *ahimsa*. So forget about the point of even achieving those levels!

If the right understanding does not prevail about the *himsa* towards visible living beings as well as the subtlest of subtle living beings, such as *vayukaya* (one-sensed, non-mobile, air-bodied living beings), *teukaya* (one-sensed, non-mobile, fire-bodied living beings), and so on, all the way to *bhaav himsa* (violence committed towards the state as the Self) and *bhaav maran* (death of the state as the Self) by believing, 'I am the relative self,' 'I did it,' 'It happened to me'), then it will not yield results and the *ahimsa* will be limited to just words or actions.

Only the Ones who have completely conquered *him-sa*, and are dwelling in the state of complete *ahimsa*, have the exact understanding of *himsa* and can disclose it to others! When One becomes steady in the Real form of the Self (*Atma Swaroop*), that is the only one state in which complete *ahimsa* prevails! And only the *Tirthankar* Lords (the absolutely enlightened Lords who can liberate others) and the *Gnanis* (Those who have realized the Self and are able to do the same for others) prevail in such a state! The *Gnani Purush*, who prevails in complete *ahimsa* amidst the ocean of *himsa*, has elaborated upon the exact understanding regarding *himsa*, from the gross level of *himsa*. This speech has been compiled and published with the inner intention

that may the perspective of the people of this era, who are immersed in terrible *himsa*, change to some extent and may they be able to improve this life as well as their future lives.

Besides, who can refrain from committing himsa at the gross level? Even for the Tirthankar Lords Themselves, when They exhaled Their last breath before attaining nirvana (ultimate liberation from all karma, from the physical body, and the worldly cycle of birth and death), so many vavukava ended up dying! If such offenses of *himsa* were applicable to Them at that moment, then They would undoubtedly have to take another birth somewhere else to clear off the demerit karma bound [through that act]. So then, would liberation ever be possible? Thus, what must They have beheld, through which They remained free from all demerit karma, merit karma, and all actions, and eventually attained ultimate liberation? All those mysteries can only be revealed by the manifest Gnani, in whose heart the Knowledge that resided in the heart of the Tirthankar Lords has become illuminated exactly as it is, and that is being published here as it is. The speech that has flowed forth from absolutely revered Dadashri, the Gnani of this era, has been compiled in this book on ahimsa. For those who desire the path of liberation, it will prove to be an extremely straightforward guide to practice ahimsa.

- Dr. Niruben Amin

\*\*\*\*

	<b>Table of Contents</b>	Page
1.	Progress Towards 'Ahimsa Parmodharma'	1
2.	Himsa Can Be Stopped Through Ahimsa	2
3.	The Understanding Regarding Ahimsa	2
4.	The Problem of Bedbugs	3
5.	Bedbug Killer, Are You the Maker of the Bedbugs?	5
6.	One Cannot Steal From God's Garden	6
7.	Do the Penance That Presents Itself Before You	6
8.	His Mother Instilled the Values of Ahimsa	7
9.	Maintain Cleanliness, Do Not Use Insecticides	8
10.	Pay Off Your Debts Quickly	9
11.	Are They Drinking Blood or Making You Let Go of	
	the Affection for the Body?	9
12.	It Is Not Outside the Law	10
13.	They Are Your Own Karmic Accounts	11
14.	Do Not Engage in 'Hitlerism' Anywhere	11
15.	There Is No Difference Between a Thorn and a	
	Mosquito	12
16.	Can Anyone's Right to Live Be Violated?	14
17.	The Fault Is of the One Who Endorses It	16
18.	Violence in Education?	19
19.	The Calculations for the Binding of Demerit Karma	
	Are Different	21
20.	The Law of Merit and Demerit Karma in Farming	22
21.	Special Pratikraman for Farmers	23
22.	Merit Karma and Demerit Karma Do Not Apply	
	to the Self-Realized One	25
23.	Business That Involves Violence	28
24.	The Best Business Is That of a Jeweler	29
25.	To Hoard Is Also Himsa	30
26.	Confront the Other Person, But Do So Calmly	31
27.	Opposing Violence Protects One From Supporting It	32
28.	A Safe Haven for Cows Established by Lord Krishna	1 34
29.	Is Demerit Karma Bound by Picking Flowers for	
	Worship?	37
	10	

30. Where Flower Petals Are Hurt	38
31. The Universe of One-Sensed Living Beings	41
32. Perfecting the Practice of Ahimsa	42
33. First Save the Larger Living Beings	44
34. What Is the Best Food?	46
35. The Science Behind Eating After Sunset	47
36. Root Vegetables, a Warehouse of Subtle Living Beings	50
37. The Gravest Himsa Is That of Kashay	52
38. Understand What Is Being Said	52
39. 'We' Too Had Observed the Prescribed Practices	53
40. Consuming Boiled Water, For Drinking	54
41. A Misconception About Fresh Green Vegetables	56
42. The Himsa Caused by Antibiotics	56
43. One's Diet Is Based On His Spiritual Development	58
44. Aversion Towards Non-Vegetarians	59
45. Would You Kill It Yourself and Eat It?	60
46. The Importance of a Saatvik Diet	61
47. Does Eating Non-Vegetarian Food Lead	
To a Birth in Hell?	64
48. One's Karmic Account Determines the	
Next Life-Form	64
49. Nothing Affects the One Who Is Ahimsak	65
50. Who Is the Culprit, the Butcher or the	
One Who Eats Meat?	67
51. Pigeons Are Pure Vegetarians	68
52. Can Eggs Be Eaten?	69
53. Should Milk Be Consumed?	71
54. Is There Himsa in Killing a Carnivorous Animal?	72
55. One Living Being Is Food for Another	73
56. The One Who Is Absolutely Ahimsak Faces No Threat	73
57. Animal Sacrifice	75
58. Ahimsa Is Supported Through Intention and Prayer	75
59. Who Is the Greatest Ahimsak of All?	78
60. Abhaydaan, for Which Living Beings?	78
61. Abhaydaan Is the Ultimate Donation	79
62. That Is the Ego of Saving Lives	80

63. They Are Both Egotistic	82			
64. Exclusively for Those Who Revere Ahimsa	83			
65. This Is Not for Everyone	84			
66. The Hidden Truth Behind Killing and Saving	85			
67. Death Only Occurs at Its Designated Time	86			
68. Make the Resolution, 'I Don't Want to Kill'	88			
69. No One Dies According to the Lord	89			
70. Bhaav Himsa Is Rampant in India	91			
71. Causes Are Independent, Effects Are Dependent	93			
72. First Save Yourself From Bhaav Himsa	94			
73. Bhaav Ahimsa Happens in This Way	95			
74. The Gravest Himsa Towards the State as the				
Self Is Kashay	97			
75. Death of the State as the Self in Each and				
Every Moment	98			
76. The Intellect Increased Through Ahimsa	101			
77. Is There More Himsa in Fighting or in Kashay?	102			
78. To Strike With the Intellect Is 'Hard' Raudradhyan	105			
79. Doing Just This Much Will Make You Ahimsak	106			
80. Beware, There Is Himsa in Sexuality	107			
81. Ahimsa Is Beyond the Mind	109			
82. The Aura of Influence and Power of the				
Gnani Purush's Ahimsa	111			
83. Where There Is Ahimsa, There Is No Himsa	111			
84. Beyond Himsa and Ahimsa	112			
85. The Gnani Is Completely Ahimsak in the				
Ocean of Himsa	113			
86. Absolute Knowledge Manifests Where There Is				
Complete Ahimsa	118			
87. The Science Behind the Ultimate Ahimsa	119			
88. Wherever There Is Doubt, There the Liability Applies	120			
89. The Sufferer, the Knower, the One in the				
Experience of the Bliss of the Self	121			
91. Can Mud Taint Light?	124			
91. Himsa Does Not Affect the One Who Prevails				
as the Self	125			
$\diamond \diamond \diamond \diamond \diamond$				

# **Non-Violence**

# Progress Towards 'Ahimsa Parmodharma'

**Questioner:** 'On the path of *ahimsa* (non-violence), there is religious and spiritual progress.' Could you please elaborate on this topic?

**Dadashri:** *Ahimsa* is itself the religion and *ahimsa* is itself the spiritual progress. However, here, *ahimsa* means to not hurt any living being, even to the slightest extent, through the mind, speech, or body. This should remain in your awareness, it should remain in your conviction, then religious and spiritual progress will be possible.

**Questioner:** How is the mantra 'Ahimsa Parmodharma' ('Non-violence is the ultimate religion') beneficial in one's life?

**Dadashri:** Well for that, in the morning, before leaving home, you should recite the following intention five times, "May no living being in this world be hurt, even to the slightest extent, through the mind, speech, or body." If you end up hurting someone thereafter, you should take a note of that and repent for that.

**Questioner:** How is it possible in this era of the time cycle, to live life without hurting anyone?

**Dadashri:** You simply have to maintain this intent and ensure that you apply that. Where you are not able to do so, you should repent for that. **Questioner:** Is it really possible to live life without hurting a single living being amongst the many living beings around us? Is it possible to ever satisfy every single living being around us, in every circumstance?

**Dadashri:** The one who wishes to do so, can do everything. Even if it is not accomplished in one lifetime, it will nevertheless certainly be accomplished in two or three lifetimes! Your goal should be decided, the attention should simply be towards that, then it will definitely be accomplished.

# Himsa Can Be Stopped Through Ahimsa

Questioner: What should I do to stop *himsa* (violence)?

**Dadashri:** You should constantly have the intent of *ahimsa*. People ask 'us', "For how long should I practice *himsa* and *ahimsa*?" 'We' tell them, "Lord Mahavir has given the distinction between *himsa* and *ahimsa*. 'He' was aware that the *Dushamkaal* (the current era of the time cycle, characterized predominantly by misery and almost no happiness) was approaching." Would the Lord not have known what is considered *himsa* and what is not considered *himsa*? Lord Mahavir has said, "Maintain *ahimsa* in the face of *himsa*." If the other person uses the weapon of *himsa*, then you should use the 'weapon' of *ahimsa*; only this will give rise to happiness. Otherwise, *himsa* will never stop through *himsa*. Himsa will stop through *ahimsa*.

# The Understanding Regarding Ahimsa

**Questioner:** People are greatly inclined towards *himsa*, so what should be done to turn them towards *ahimsa*?

**Dadashri:** You should give them the [right] understanding. If you give them the [right] understanding, then they will turn towards *ahimsa*. Give them this understanding, "Dear fellow, God resides within every living being. Thus, if you kill any living being, then it will be hurt

immensely, and you will incur a liability for that. And this will in turn give rise to an *avaran* (a veil of ignorance over the Knowledge of the Self) for you, and you will have to regress terribly towards a lower life-form." If you explain it to them in this way, then they will understand. "By killing other living beings, even the intellect deteriorates." Do you give anyone such understanding?

**Questioner:** But if I feel strongly about practicing *ahimsa*, but certain people do not believe in that whatsoever, then what should I do?

**Dadashri:** If you feel strongly about practicing *ahimsa*, then you should practice *ahimsa*. Yet if certain people do not believe in that, then you should gently give them the [right] understanding. By approaching it gently in this way, they will start accepting it. If your efforts are towards that, then one day you will succeed.

**Questioner:** Earlier, You had given the understanding that we should become instrumental in the efforts towards preventing *himsa*. We should speak lovingly with the person who does not believe in the practice of *ahimsa* and give him the [right] understanding. But even after lovingly explaining it to him, if he still does not accept it, then what should we do? Should we allow the *himsa* to continue, or is it appropriate to forcefully try to stop it?

**Dadashri:** You should pray to God in this way, pray to whichever God you believe in, by saying, "Oh Lord, make everyone free of *himsa*." Nurture this intention.

#### The Problem of Bedbugs

**Questioner:** What should I do if there are a lot of bedbugs at home?

**Dadashri:** Once there were a lot of bedbugs in my home too! This happened many years ago. When they would

bite me here, on the neck, I would put them here, on my leg. I could not tolerate them biting me on the neck, so when they would bite me on the neck, I would place them on my leg instead. This is because, if someone comes to our 'restaurant' and leaves hungry, then it is of no use, is it? Isn't it better if one leaves after having eaten at our place! But you may not have the strength to do that. That is why 'we' are not telling you to do that. Instead, you should catch the bedbug and place it outside. At least you will feel satisfied that this bedbug has gone outside.

Now, the natural law is that even if you place a hundred thousand bedbugs outside, if seven bedbugs are going to bite you tonight, then those seven will not refrain from biting you. Even if you kill them, seven of them will still bite you. Even if you place them outside your home, seven of them will still bite you. Even if you place them far away, seven of them will still bite you. And even if you do nothing at all, seven of them will still bite you.

What do the bedbugs say? They say, "If you are noble, then let us take our food. And if you are not noble, then we will feed on our own, but when you are asleep. So why don't vou be noble right from the beginning!" So I became noble. Even if they were biting my entire body, I would let them do so. I could even manage to catch the bedbugs with my hand, but then I would place them back here, on my leg. Otherwise, they would end up feeding fully later anyway, when I would sleep! And they do not bring any containers to carry away any food with them. They feed on their share and leave, and it is not that they feed enough for ten to fifteen days at a go! So how can you let them go hungry? 'Hey! So many feed peacefully and leave!' So at night, you feel satisfied that these many [bedbugs] have left after being fed. You don't have the strength to feed two people, whereas in this case, you have fed so many [bedbugs]!

# Bedbug Killer, Are You the Maker of the Bedbugs?

**Questioner:** But if bedbugs, mosquitoes, and cockroaches pester us at home, should we take any steps to deal with them?

**Dadashri:** To prevent an infestation of bedbugs, mosquitoes, and cockroaches, you should mop the floors and do all such things, you should keep your house clean. For the cockroaches that are already there, you should catch them and drop them off outside, far away, somewhere outside the village. However, you should certainly not kill them.

There was a prominent man, having a post similar to a Collector. He called 'us' to his home. He told 'us', "We should definitely kill bedbugs." 'We' asked him, "Where has this been written?" To that he replied, "But they bite us and suck our blood." So 'we' told him, "Let me explain to you what the general rule is with regards to the right to kill them. Then whether you kill them or not is not my purview. If anyone in the world can create a bedbug himself, then he can kill it. You can destroy whatever you can create. You cannot destroy whatever you cannot create."

So you have the right to kill the living being you can create. If you are not able to make it, if you are not able to create it, then you do not have the right to kill it. You can make this chair, so you can destroy the chair. You can make cups and saucers, so you can destroy them. But you have no right to destroy whatever you cannot create.

Questioner: Then why do they come to bite us?

**Dadashri:** They come because it is your karmic account. And it's not as though this body is Yours, You [the Self] are not the owner of it. You [the relative self] have brought forth all of this karmic stock after 'stealing' it, so now, the bedbugs are stealing from you. With that,

the karmic accounts are all being cleared. So from now on, do not kill or hurt them.

### One Cannot Steal From God's Garden

It's like this; say there is a garden here and outside the garden, there is a fence. And there are sponge gourds, bottle gourds, and other vegetables hanging over the fence. Even if they are outside the garden owner's land, what will people say? [They will say,] "Hey, this is that person's [someone who does not believe in or practice *ahimsa*] garden, don't pick anything from it! Otherwise, he will beat you to a pulp." And if the garden belongs to someone from their own community [those who practice *ahimsa*], then people will pick from it. This is because they know that this garden belongs to a person who has the intent to practice *ahimsa*. He will let them off. Whereas that other person will give them a proper thrashing. So when not a single sponge gourd or bottle gourd can be picked from that person's garden, why are you killing a bedbug belonging to God's 'garden'? You are stealing from God's 'garden'! Do you understand this? So you cannot kill a single living being.

# Do the Penance That Presents Itself Before You

**Questioner:** But what about the fact that the bedbugs bite us?

**Dadashri:** But its very food is blood. If you were to give it *khichadee* (rice and lentil dish), would it eat that? Even if you were to give it *khichadee* with a lot of clarified butter, would it eat that? No. Its very food is blood.

**Questioner:** But it's not at all acceptable to let it bite us, is it?

**Dadashri:** But what about the hunger pangs that arise during the penance of fasting, should you tolerate that? Instead, why don't you do this penance [that presents itself before you]! In fact, this penance is a direct cause for

liberation (*moksha*). Why are you doing penance that you have initiated yourself? Do the penance that presents itself before you! The penance that presents itself before you is a direct cause for liberation, whereas the penance that you initiate yourself is a cause for worldly life.

**Questioner:** Yes, that is a very good point. In the instance of fasting, we are going out of our way to do that penance; instead, we should concede to the penance that presents itself before us.

**Dadashri:** Yes, in the case of fasting, you are forcibly initiating it, whereas this one has presented itself before you, on its own! It's not like you are going out to invite other bedbugs. However many bedbugs have come, [say to them,] "Eat peacefully, this is your home." So feed them and then send them off.

# His Mother Instilled the Values of Ahimsa

My mother was thirty-six years older than me. I asked my mother, "There are bedbugs in the home, aren't they biting you?" My mother replied, "Son, they do bite, but it's not like they come with a lunchbox like everyone else, demanding, "Give me some for my mother and father." The poor things do not come with any containers, and they eat their share and go away!" I said, "Blessed is this mother! And blessed is this son too!"

If I came home after hitting someone with a brick, then what would my mother say to me? "If the poor child bleeds, he does not have a mother, so who will nurse his wounds? Whereas I am there for you. So, come home after having taken a beating, I will nurse your wounds. Come home having taken a beating, but do not come home after beating someone else." Now tell me, would such a mother not make a Mahavir out of her son [in reference to Lord Mahavir, the absolutely enlightened Lord]? **Questioner:** These days, it's the other way around. These days, the parents say, "If you come home having taken a beating, you'll be in trouble!"

**Dadashri:** It's not just these days, it has always been that way from the beginning. It is not something that's changed because of the current era of the time cycle. It was that way from the beginning. This is simply how the world is! In the midst of this, whoever wants to become a disciple of Lord Mahavir can become so, otherwise you will certainly have to become a disciple of [worldly] people. That person is the guru, he is the boss, and you are his disciple. Go ahead and keep taking beatings! Instead, it is better if Lord Mahavir is your boss, at least He is *vitaraag* (absolutely free from attachment and abhorrence). 'He' will not cause you to take a beating.

#### Maintain Cleanliness, Do Not Use Insecticides

Many people do not kill bedbugs, but they put their bedding out in the sun to heat. But I had told them at home to not do even that, I had told them to not put the bedding out in the sun. I told them, "Why are you troubling the poor bedbugs by putting them in the sun?" So, they asked, "Then how will they ever go away?" I replied, "The population of bedbugs does not decrease by killing them. It's a misconception that by killing bedbugs, their numbers will decrease. They do not decrease by killing them. They may appear to decrease, but their number will be the same the following day."

Therefore, you should clean regularly. If everything is cleaned regularly, then the bedbugs will not linger. However, if insecticides are used against them, then that is definitely considered an offense, isn't it! And it's not as if they are destroyed by the insecticides. They may appear to have died in one instance, but then they reappear elsewhere. There is one rule about bedbugs, I had done some investigation on this; at times, you will not see a single bedbug. This is because they are seasonal, and when the season arrives, they proliferate. At that time, no matter how much insecticide you use, they will continue to proliferate.

# Pay Off Your Debts Quickly

**Questioner:** A bedbug will only take however much is in a person's karmic account, right?

**Dadashri:** 'We' had paid off the debts up front, so 'we' are not encountering many [bedbugs] now. But even today, if bedbugs ever come near 'us', they [instinctively] know, 'This person is not going to kill us, he is not going to trouble us.' They know 'our' nature. Even in the dark, 'we' can catch them with our hand. But they know, 'He will let us go.' They know 'our' nature. They know the nature of all the other living beings as well, that, 'This person is merciless, that person is like that.' This is because the Self (*Atma*) resides within them, too. So why wouldn't they know?

And there is no way out without clearing the karmic account. Whosoever's blood you have sucked, you will have to provide blood to them. There are those blood banks, aren't there? Similarly, this is considered a 'bedbug bank'. If someone has taken from two [in the past life], then two of them will draw blood and leave. So, this is considered a 'bank'; it all gets credited in the 'bank'.

# Are They Drinking Blood or Making You Let Go of the Affection for the Body?

So, if the bedbugs are biting you, you should not let them go hungry. How can the poor 'person' [bedbug] leave without being fed at such a noble household as yours?

What 'we' are saying is that if you cannot tolerate

them, then place them outside. You should be able to tolerate them, you should have the strength to feed them. If you don't have that strength, then place them outside [saying,] "Dear fellow, please go eat somewhere else." And if you have the strength to feed them, then let them go after feeding them. And if they leave after feeding, then they will do so after benefitting you greatly. They will liberate the Self. Whatever little affection you have remaining for the body will leave. What are the bedbugs saying? "Why are you dozing off? Why don't you get your [spiritual] work done!" So they are in fact watchmen [who stand guard to alert you].

## It Is Not Outside the Law

**Questioner:** And what about these mosquitoes that harass us a lot?

**Dadashri:** The fact is, anything that harasses you in this world does not do so outside the law [of nature]. So it is not outside the law [of nature]. You are being harassed according to the law [of nature]. Now, if you want protection, then use a mosquito net, use other things, use other means. However, it is an offense to kill them.

**Questioner:** So we should preserve their life, we should not kill them.

Dadashri: Yes, you should preserve their life.

**Questioner:** But if we utter 'Shri Ram' as we kill a mosquito, will it attain a higher life-form [in its next life]?

**Dadashri:** But that action will make you regress to a lower life-form, because the mosquito has suffered.

Questioner: Do mosquitoes bite saints or not?

**Dadashri:** They had bitten even the Lord! They had bitten Lord Mahavir a lot. Lord Mahavir would definitely have cleared the karmic account!

#### They Are Your Own Karmic Accounts

Therefore, even if a single mosquito bites you, it is not baseless; then can anything else be baseless? Moreover, even if it wants to bite your leg, it would not be able to do so; it is only when it bites you right here on the hand, that it gets settled, on this exact spot! The world is arranged with such precision. So is this world baseless? This precise arrangement is the regulator of the world and it constantly keeps the world in regulation, and 'we' are saying all this after having Seen it.

# Do Not Engage in 'Hitlerism' Anywhere

No one in this world is in a position to interfere in your matters. Therefore, do not blame the world, the fault is indeed your own. These echoes are indeed a result of whatever interference you had done [in the past life]. If you had not interfered at all, then not a single 'echo' [effect, consequence] can ever come back to you.

Therefore, not even a single mosquito can come bite you, provided you had not interfered [in the past life]. Say there is a bed full of bedbugs and you are told to sleep on it. If you have not interfered [in the past life], then not a single bedbug will touch you. What is the law behind this? In fact, people will definitely have thoughts about the bedbugs such as, 'Hey, pick them out, do this, do that.' Don't people interfere like this? And do they not spray insecticides? Do they engage in 'Hitlerism'? Do they do such things? Even then, the bedbugs say, "Our lineage will not be destroyed, our descendants will keep increasing."

So, if your interferences and their effects come to a stop, then everything will become cleared. If no interference has been done, then nothing in this world can bite you. Otherwise, these interferences and their effects do not let anyone off the hook. When can a karmic account be considered as cleared? Even while sitting amongst mosquitoes, when not a single mosquito bites you, then it is considered to have been cleared. The mosquito forgets its nature. The bedbug forgets its nature. Say a person has come here after beating up others, but upon seeing 'us', he forgets about beating others. His thinking will change, this is the effect on him, this is the tremendous effect of *ahimsa* on him.

The mosquito does not know that it is going to Chandubhai [reader should substitute Chandubhai with his or her own name], and Chandubhai does not know, 'This mosquito is coming to me.' It is *vyavasthit* (the result of scientific circumstantial evidences) that arranges the circumstances, the time, and everything else, such that it brings the two of them together, enabling both of them to clear their intents, and thereafter separate from one another. It is so orderly and precise! So the mosquito is brought here after being pushed along by the wind, and then after biting, the wind once again pulls it away, many miles away from here! It then, once again gives off the effect [bites] to the one who had committed an offense [in the past life].

# There Is No Difference Between a Thorn and a Mosquito

When people get bitten by a mosquito, people see the mosquito at fault, but what do they do when they get pricked by a thorn? What if a thorn this big becomes lodged inside? There is not the slightest of difference between a thorn and a mosquito; the Lord has not seen any difference between the two. The one that bites cannot be the Self. All people are nothing but 'thorns'. You do not see the fault of the thorn, do you? What is the reason for that?

**Questioner:** No living evidence (*nimit*) is visible in that situation!

**Dadashri:** Whereas that [mosquito] is seen as a living evidence, so the person assumes, 'This is definitely what bit me.' He, himself, has a wrong belief, so he keeps seeing the world with that wrong belief. The Self never bites anyone. After coming into the state as the non-Self, the people of the world are being punished. The absolute Self (*Parmatma*) does not give out punishments. Even the [awakened] Self does not give out punishments, it is simply the 'thorns' that keep hurting everyone.

If a person is hit on the head by a large-sized rock that fell from a hill, then he will look up to see whether or not someone threw it down. And when he does not see anyone, he keeps quiet! Whereas if someone were to throw even a small pebble at him, he would start a war. What is the reason for this? He has a deluded belief (*bhrant drashti*).

What does this *Akram Vignan* (the step-less Science of Self-realization) say? It says that the thorn is also a *nimit* and the person [who threw the pebble] is also a *nimit*, the fault is yours alone. If you step on a flower, there will be no consequence for you, but if you step on a thorn, then there will be a consequence. The same applies to human beings too. So proceed with care. For a thorn to prick or a scorpion to sting, both are effects of the karma charged in the past life. The effect has come, but whose effect is it? Your own. So, one may ask, "What do they have to do with this?" Those poor things are just evidences (*nimit*). The one having the intent to feed others [an unseen *nimit*; the cause] is different!

Therefore, proceed with caution. This world is of a very different kind. It metes out exact justice. Throughout the course of 'our' life, 'we' have assessed everything, and upon assessing things, 'we' have arrived at such a wonderful conclusion, and one day, 'we' will disclose that conclusion to the world! That is when the world will feel at ease. Otherwise, people will not feel at ease. It has to be brought into experience, right! The [spiritual] work can only be accomplished when the stage of experience is attained! 'What will be the consequence of doing this?' One should do such research, shouldn't he!

### Can Anyone's Right to Live Be Violated?

Moreover, 'we' had examined this too. What a reputation the intellectuals have earned! A cat's food is mice. Just let it eat! Whereas if a mole is passing by, the cat will not touch it. If the cat is very hungry and it normally preys on mice, bugs and other living beings, then why doesn't it eat a mole? But it doesn't touch the mole. Ponder over this.

It is because you had bound some merit karma (*punya*) [in the past life] that you received food [in this life] without making much effort. Whereas a laborer has to toil away to earn money, that is when he gets food to eat. Therefore, you should now conduct yourself in such a way that no living being is hurt, in a way that no animals or small insects are hurt. On the one hand, people pray to God, and on the other hand, they keep hurting the very living beings in whom God resides. People go around killing snakes, they even kill bedbugs. That is how brave these people are?! Do people go around killing in this way? They must be extremely brave, right?! So people are brave in killing! But whose creation is this, that you are readily getting involved in its destruction?! If you are able to create it, then you can destroy it. Should there be some sort of justice or not?

The fact is, it is actually from the relative viewpoint that it is a bedbug, but from the Real viewpoint it is a pure Soul (*Shuddhatma*). Do you want to kill the pure Soul? If you cannot tolerate it, then pick it up and place it outside! Now in this case, the person is pursuing happiness by killing all of them. To kill mosquitoes, to kill bedbugs, to kill whatever comes one's way and to pursue happiness, how can the two be possible at the same time?

**Questioner:** What should I do if an army of ants invades my house?

**Dadashri:** Whichever room the ants have invaded, close that room. This is considered an infestation. By natural law the infestation lasts for a certain number of days. Then once that period of time is over, the infestation comes to an end on its own, naturally! So you should just close the room. If you assess all of this, you will also discover this fact. Is this infestation permanent or temporary?

**Questioner:** The ants mostly appear only in the kitchen, so how can I keep that closed?

**Dadashri:** Those are all unnecessary doubts. Understand this much, you should move away from the infestation; keep two separate kitchens. Keep a spare stove. Have a steamed meal on that day. By killing them, an extremely grave liability is incurred.

**Questioner:** We only end up killing the ones that get in our way in daily life, we do not go about killing the rest.

**Dadashri:** Those who want to kill insects will come across such circumstances. And those who do not want to kill them will come across such circumstances.

If, for some time, you make efforts [maintain the intent] to not kill them, then the circumstances will change. If you understand the laws that govern this world, then a solution will come about. Otherwise, the practice of killing will not stop. Consequently, you will not be able to break free from the cycle of worldly life. If an insect is accidently killed, then do *pratikraman* (confess, apologize, and resolve to not repeat the mistake) for that by saying, "I am asking for forgiveness."

**Questioner:** But, on a routine basis, we are killing insects by spraying all these insecticides, so would that have an effect on us?

**Dadashri:** The moment you kill them, the *parmanu* (the smallest, most indivisible and indestructible particles of inanimate matter) within you change immediately and It [the state as the Self] 'dies' [gets veiled] within you too. The death [of the state as the Self] that takes place internally is proportionate to the killing that is done externally. There is an entire world within you just as there is a world out there. So kill as much as you want to, [but understand that] the same amount of destruction will also take place within you. However much is out there in this universe, that much is also within the body.

There are so many thieves around that you would certainly be robbed. [However, because] You have never had the thought of picking someone's pocket or stealing from someone [in your past life], no one picks your pocket [in this life]. So, if you remain *ahimsak* (non-violent) instead of being *himsak* (violent), then you will never come across any circumstances of *himsa*; that is how this world is. Once you understand how this world functions, a solution will come about.

## The Fault Is of the One Who Endorses It

**Questioner:** During monsoon, the number of flies and mosquitoes in the town increases. So either the municipal authorities, or we ourselves, spray insecticide everywhere in the house. Now isn't that considered a bad deed? But if we don't do that, then there would be a terrible outbreak of disease.

**Dadashri:** Then what is the difference between you and that dictator who dropped bombs? You have become a mini version of that dictator!

**Questioner:** But in this case, I am talking about the [safety of the entire] town! In the monsoon, there is inevitably filth everywhere, and therefore the mosquitoes and flies proliferate. So what the municipality does is, they spray insecticides everywhere.

**Dadashri:** If the municipality does that, what does that have to do with you? You should not have such an intent in your mind. The intent in your mind should be, 'It would be better if this did not happen.'

**Questioner:** Then the people who work for the municipality, the ones who have the authority [those who do the spraying], would they be deemed at fault?

Dadashri: No. They too are not deemed at fault.

Questioner: Then who is deemed at fault?

**Dadashri:** They are merely the workers. Who is making them do the work? It is their officers and the like.

Questioner: But for whom are the officers doing this?

Dadashri: It is their duty! They are not doing it for you.

**Questioner:** But I am the one who made the complaint, I wrote the letter and sent in the notice.

**Dadashri:** But those who want to say no, can say no. Those who do not want to participate will say, "Sir, I do not want this. I do not like this." What about then? Then the liability is not one's own. The liability falls on the one who likes it.

**Questioner:** Does that mean it depends on each individual's intent?

**Dadashri:** Yes, one's intent determines the degree of liability one incurs!

**Questioner:** If a mouse or a pigeon happens to die in a water tank, the tank will need to be cleaned. After it is cleaned, it needs to be sprayed with disinfectants or else we call the municipal authorities to come and spray the disinfectants. Hence, all the bugs and insects would get exterminated, wouldn't they? So that is a bad deed, isn't it? Who binds the karma for that? Is it the one who does it or the one who makes others do it?

**Dadashri:** It applies to both, the one who does it and the one who makes others do it. But you should not have that intent [to kill bugs, insects, animals]. You should not have that opinion.

**Questioner:** The intent is to remove the contamination. Because if the contamination is not removed, then all the people who drink the water will be harmed.

**Dadashri:** Yes, nevertheless, the fault will still apply, won't it! The fact is, if you start to take such faults into account, then nothing but faults are constantly taking place in the world.

Therefore, you should not worry about anyone. Look after yourself. Each individual should look after himself. Every living being has brought with him his own time of death and so forth. That is indeed why the Lord has said that it is not possible for one person to kill another [of his own accord]. But do not publicize this; otherwise, people will misuse it.

Suppose there are ten people in the household and the water tank has been contaminated; who will set out to clean it? It will be the person with egoism who sets out to do so by saying, "I will do it. That is not a job for you." So the entire fault gets attributed to the one with egoism.

Questioner: But he is doing it out of his compassion.

**Dadashri:** Be it compassion or anything else, but he will also bind demerit karma for this act.

**Questioner:** Then what should we do? Should we drink the water no matter how contaminated it is?

**Dadashri:** There is no option in that situation. That person will not refrain from exercising egoism. And nothing like that will happen [where you have to drink contaminated water]; you will continue to get truly clean water. Someone with egoism will definitely purify it for you. Yes, indeed, all things in this world are available. There is not a single thing that is not available; however, it is simply your merit karma that is falling short. The obstructions are proportional to the amount of egoism you have. The moment your egoism is eradicated, everything will be available to you! You will not lack for anything in this world! The egoism itself is the obstruction.

# Violence in Education?

**Questioner:** This young man studies in the College of Agriculture; he is a student there. He says that he has to catch butterflies there and kill them in order to study them. So is demerit karma actually bound through that? If he does not catch them, then he does not get marks in the exam. So what should he do?

**Dadashri:** Then he should pray to God for an hour daily, saying, "Lord, how did I end up having to do such a thing?" Does everyone else have to deal with this? You ended up with this, so you should pray to God, saying, "O Lord, I am asking for forgiveness. May I not have to do this again, please help me for that."

**Questioner:** Well it is the professor who advises me in this, he guides me to catch these butterflies and tells me to make an album in this way, so does he not bind any demerit karma?

**Dadashri:** The demerit karma gets divided; the one who advises gets sixty percent, and the one who does it gets forty percent!

**Questioner:** For any of these things that are taking place, are they not considered correct based on the law of *vyavasthit*? The professor was instrumental in the process and the student had to do it. So why does the student end up getting a share of the demerit karma?

**Dadashri:** He binds demerit karma precisely because such a task should not have come his way, yet he is faced with it! If the task of slaughtering goats comes your way, would you like it?

**Questioner:** I would definitely not like it. But Dada, what if he has no choice but to do it? If he is duty bound to do it, if there is no option, then what?

**Dadashri:** If it has to be done then... It is acceptable only if it is done with repentance. You would have to repent for an hour daily. Let's see you create a butterfly! Can the scientists in other countries create a butterfly?

Questioner: No, that is not at all possible, Dada!

**Dadashri:** So if you cannot create it, then how can you destroy it?

All these people should pray to God, 'Why do we have to participate in this? Why has this business of farming come to us...' There is nothing but *himsa* in farming, but it is not like this [of killing butterflies], this is in fact overt *himsa*.

Questioner: A person brings a good specimen after killing it, and on top of that, he takes pleasure in that and says, "Look, I have killed such a good one; what a great specimen I found!" He gets more marks for that. "What a good specimen I caught!" **Dadashri:** He takes pleasure in that, doesn't he! He will bind karma in accordance to the pleasure felt; the effect of that will come later on. However much one took pleasure, that much bitterness will have to be suffered.

# The Calculations for the Binding of Demerit Karma Are Different

**Questioner:** One man breaks off a blade of grass, another man chops down a tree, a third man kills a mosquito, a fourth man kills an elephant, and a fifth man kills a human being. Now, in all of these instances, living beings have unquestionably been killed, but the consequential effect of the demerit karma bound differs in each case, doesn't it?

**Dadashri:** Yes, it differs. The thing is, the blade of grass is not so significant.

Questioner: But the Self does reside within it, doesn't it?

**Dadashri:** That is true. But whatever it suffers, it does so in a state of unawareness!

**Questioner:** So is the binding of the demerit karma dependent upon the suffering of the other entity?

**Dadashri:** The amount of demerit karma you bind is based on the degree of suffering the other entity has.

Questioner: People maintain their own garden area surrounding their homes.

**Dadashri:** There is nothing wrong with that. 'We' advise you not to do that because that much of your time is wasted, and not because of [the violence involved towards] the living beings.

**Questioner:** But we are considered to have become a *nimit* (instrumental in the process).

Dadashri: There is nothing wrong with being a *nimit*.

The world is indeed in the form of a *nimit*. You are not actually hurting the one-sensed organisms (*ekendriya jeev*). All that will keep carrying on. One-sensed organisms, the ones which we do not have to worry about, have become the point of concern. However, do not deliberately pick leaves off a tree unnecessarily as you walk along a path. Do not engage in meaningless acts. But if you need a twig to clean your teeth, then you should ask the tree, 'Please may I have one piece.' Make a request like this.

**Questioner:** Suppose one person is walking on a footpath and another person is walking on the grass; there is certainly a difference in the two, isn't there?

**Dadashri:** There is, but it is not that big of a difference. It is just that people have kept insisting on things contrary to fact. The important points have been overlooked and the minor points have been insisted upon. Becoming irritated with people is considered a major *himsa*, because the other person would feel hurt, wouldn't he!

# The Law of Merit and Demerit Karma in Farming

**Questioner:** Is there any demerit karma bound in the farming that a farmer does?

**Dadashri:** There is demerit karma everywhere. Demerit karma is bound in farming and demerit karma is also bound in the business of selling grains. Don't insects infest the grains? And people sell the grains which contain insects. Oh my! Not only was money taken for the insects but they were also eaten!

**Questioner:** But the one who farms has to nurture one plant while uprooting another plant. So is there still the burden of demerit karma in that?

Dadashri: Indeed, there is!

#### Questioner: Then how can the farmer do farming?

**Dadashri:** It's like this; when one action is done, both merit karma and demerit karma are encompassed within it. When a farmer farms, he uproots some plants and keeps the useful plants, meaning that he nurtures them. For the ones he nurtures, he binds a lot of merit karma, and for the ones he uproots, he binds demerit karma. Twenty-five percent demerit karma is bound and seventy-five percent merit karma is bound, so there is a profit of fifty percent, isn't there!

**Questioner:** So do the demerit karma and the merit karma negate each other?

**Dadashri:** No, they do not negate each other like that. Both are recorded separately in the account books. If they were to negate each other, then no one would have the slightest of unhappiness. And if that were the case, no one would ever want to attain *moksha*. They would say, "It is nice here, there is no unhappiness." People can be very shrewd. However, nothing of that sort happens.

Moreover, the entire world engages in demerit karma as well as merit karma. Merit karma is bound alongside demerit karma. However, the Lord has said to engage in transactions where the profits outweigh the losses.

## **Special Pratikraman for Farmers**

**Questioner:** I have read in a book of yours that, "May no living being in this world be hurt to the slightest extent through the mind, speech, and body." But on the other hand, I am a farmer. So while growing tobacco, I must pinch budding leaves off their stalks. So that certainly hurts the plants, doesn't it? Demerit karma gets bound for that, doesn't it? I crush the stalk in this way for hundreds of thousands of my plants! So how can I bring an end to this wrongful act?
**Dadashri:** In that case, you should feel within, 'Oh, why has this task come on my part?' That is all. You should pinch the budding leaves off their stalks. However, you should feel remorse within, 'Why has this sort of livelihood come on my part?' You should feel within, 'This should not be done.' That is all.

Questioner: But this wrongful act will certainly happen, won't it?

**Dadashri:** That is for certain. Do not concern yourself with that, you should not concern yourself with that. Do not concern yourself with the wrongful act that is happening. You should decide, make the resolve that, 'This should not happen. Why has this task fallen upon me? Had I gotten another, more suitable livelihood, then I would not have done this.' In the other case, remorse is not felt. As long as this is not known, remorse is not felt. One would happily pluck off the plant. If you act in accordance with what 'we' say, then all of your responsibility becomes 'ours'. There is no problem with plucking off the plant, remorse should arise within, 'Why has this come on my part?'

Questioner: I understand.

**Dadashri:** Compared to farmers, the vendors engage in more acts that bind demerit karma, but even more than the vendors, it is these mortal ones, the ones who sit around at home, who bind a lot of demerit karma. Demerit karma is actually bound through the mind [intent at the cause level], not through the body [physical act as an effect]. You have to understand this point. Other people do not need to understand it. You have to understand it for yourself. Whatever other people understand, that is correct for them.

**Questioner:** I have to spray insecticide on the cotton crops, so what should I do? There is certainly *himsa* involved in that, isn't there?

**Dadashri:** Any work where you have no choice but to do it, do so with the condition that you will do *pratikraman* for it.

You do not know how to conduct yourself in worldly interactions. 'We' teach you that. That way, demerit karma do not get bound anew.

By harvesting crops on a farm, demerit karma inevitably get bound. And along with them getting bound, 'we' give you the remedy, that repent in this way. That way, the demerit karma lessens. 'We' give you the remedy to wash off the demerit karma. Shouldn't there be a remedy? As you are engaged in farming, you have to harvest and plow, so demerit karma will inevitably be bound. So many living beings end up dying in that process. Isn't chopping sugar cane considered as demerit karma too? Those poor things are also living beings, aren't they? But 'we' explain to you what to do about that, so the liability you incur is lesser and you can easily enjoy worldly pleasures [in the next life].

When creatures are killed while farming, a fault is definitely committed, isn't it? So, those who engage in farming should pray to God daily for five to ten minutes, 'I am asking for forgiveness for the faults that have been committed.' 'We' tell those who are farmers, "Living beings are dying through the work you are doing. Do *pratikraman* for that in this way. I have no problem with this wrongdoing of yours. But do *pratikraman* for it in this way."

# Merit Karma and Demerit Karma Do Not Apply to the Self-Realized One

**Questioner:** When a person manufactures insecticides and they are subsequently sprayed in the farms, so many insects are killed by this. So does that person bind demerit karma in this or not? Furthermore, is manufacturing insecticides considered an act that binds demerit karma or not? **Dadashri:** Yes, because the insecticide is being manufactured with the intention of killing living beings. When a person buys the insecticide, he also does so with the intention of killing living beings, and when he sprays the insecticide, he definitely does so with the intention of killing living beings. So, all of that binds nothing but demerit karma.

**Questioner:** But the aim is to produce better crops, to produce more crops.

**Dadashri:** The thing is, 'we' Know on what basis the crops grow, on what basis the farmers plow, and sow seeds. 'We' Know on what basis all of that runs. As people do not know all of this, they think, 'This was working out because of me. I sprayed the insecticides, that is why the crops were saved.' However, lending support [to the act of *himsa*] in this way is what binds horrendous demerit karma. And once it [the act of *himsa*] does not get any support, there is no binding of demerit karma.

**Questioner:** So then, where is the *Purusharth* (real spiritual effort to progress as the Self) in this?

**Dadashri:** Well, *Purusharth* is to Know and See as the Self what is happening; that verily is *Purusharth*, nothing else. Secondly, the thoughts that arise in the mind are Your 'files' [Dadashri's word for anything or anyone that one has a karmic account with]. 'You' [the awakened Self] have to See that. Do not get involved in any interference.

**Questioner:** So then should a person do farming or not?

Dadashri: There is no problem with farming.

**Questioner:** But what about the increasing burden of the demerit karma bound?

Dadashri: The fact is, after attaining this Gnan

(Knowledge of the Self), demerit karma do not apply to You [the awakened Self], do they! 'You' are no longer Chandubhai. As long as you believe that you are Chandubhai, you bind demerit karma. Do You firmly believe that You are Chandubhai?

## Questioner: No.

**Dadashri:** So then, how can demerit karma apply to You? The karma is no longer being charged! Whatever farming you have to do, You should finish that [with equanimity]. It is Your 'file'. 'You' should clear the 'file' that presents itself before You with equanimity.

But if You remain in the awareness of 'I am pure Soul' without ever lapsing, in accordance with what 'we' have told You, then no matter how much insecticide is sprayed, it [the demerit karma] will not apply to You. This is because, You are the pure Soul, and who is the one spraying the insecticide? It is Chandubhai. And if you are feeling pity, then you end up becoming Chandubhai.

**Questioner:** By manufacturing the insecticide, selling it, buying it, or spraying it, does one bind karma or not?

**Dadashri:** Yes, but those who have established factories to manufacture insecticides, if they ask 'us', "Dada, what will happen to us now?" 'We' will tell them, "If You live in accordance with what 'we' have said, then nothing will happen to You."

**Questioner:** So that means that as long as One remains in the state as the pure Soul, he can continue to do *himsa*?

**Dadashri:** There is no question of doing *himsa*. There is no *himsa* as long as One is in the state as the pure Soul. There is nothing that needs to be done [in that state], is there!

**Questioner:** So from the perspective of the code of conduct, is it not considered a fault?

**Dadashri:** It is not considered a fault from the perspective of the code of conduct. When does the code of conduct apply? As long as you are Chandubhai, the code of conduct is applicable. So from that perspective, it is indeed considered a fault. However, after attaining this *Gnan*, You are no longer Chandubhai, You have become the pure Soul and this remains in Your awareness constantly. 'I am pure Soul,' when this awareness prevails constantly for You, it is *shukladhyan*. [The awareness of] 'I am Chandubhai' is an internal state of being characterized by egoism.

So many people have become *mahatmas* (attained Selfrealization through *Akram Vignan*), but no one has misused the *Gnan*. On the contrary, they ask 'us'; moreover, they say, "Should we stop our business?" 'We' tell them, "No. If the business comes to a stop [naturally], then let it stop, and if it does not stop, then let it continue."

# **Business That Involves Violence**

**Questioner:** This man was previously involved in the business of manufacturing insecticides. At that time, he did not understand, 'What is wrong with running a business that one gets due to his karmic account?' If a butcher has to sell meat, then how is he at fault in that? He has got whatever is in his karmic account, right?

**Dadashri:** The fact of the matter is, if he did not have any doubts within, then he would continue doing that. But the fact that the doubt arose in him is because of his merit karma. This is considered tremendous merit karma. Otherwise, cold-heartedness would have developed within him. Of the living beings that died, it is not as if their population decreased; [instead] the state as the Self within you 'dies' [gets veiled] and cold-heartedness develops. The awareness as the Self wanes, it becomes dull.

Questioner: Even now, when I meet my old friends,

I tell them that they should quit the business [where *himsa* is involved], moreover I have given them fifty examples of people who have reached the pinnacle of success and later fallen. But the point must not be making sense to them! Later, after incurring heavy losses, they all eventually quit those businesses.

Dadashri: So imagine the amount of demerit karma one has, that he ends up having a business that involves himsa. The fact is, it's best if one can become free of a business that involves himsa. There are so many other businesses. One person told 'us', "Out of all my businesses, this grocery business is the most lucrative." 'We' asked him, "What do you do when the grains of sorghum, pearl millet and other items become infested with bugs?" He replied, "What can we do about that? We sieve the grains. We take all sorts of measures. We attend to them. But if a few bugs remain, then what can we do about that?" To that 'we' said, "'We' have no problem if they remain, but aren't you charging money for the insects? In the total weight? Yes, even if it is just a few grams! What kind of a life is this? A bug may weigh about a few grams! You have taken money for their weight."

# The Best Business Is That of a Jeweler

So which business does a person with tremendous merit karma get? A person with tremendous merit karma gets a business in which there is the least amount of *himsa*. Now, which business is that? It is the business of selling diamonds and jewels, in which there is no scope of selling adulterated goods. Although, nowadays, people are dishonest in this too. However, if one wants to do it without adulterating the goods, he can do so. No living beings are killed in that, there are no problems. And the second best business is that of selling gold and silver. And in which business is there the most amount of *himsa*? That of the butcher. And secondly, the business of pottery. They fire up their kilns, don't they! So that is all nothing but *himsa*.

Questioner: Regardless of the kind of *himsa* it is, it has consequences, doesn't it? One has to suffer the consequences of the *himsa* done, doesn't he, whether it is *bhaav himsa* (violence towards the state as the Self; violence at the subtle level) or *dravya himsa* (violence at the gross level)?

**Dadashri:** Well, people are definitely suffering that, aren't they! One is writhing about in agony all day long...

Those people who run businesses that involve *himsa* do not appear to be happy. They never have any radiance on their face. If a landlord does not plough his land, then it will not affect him to a large extent. It will affect the farmer, so he is never happy. This rule is there from the beginning. So this is but natural. To acquire such a business is a natural process. Even if you try to stop it, it will not stop. You cannot do anything in this. Otherwise, all these people would think, 'If my son joins the army and dies, then my daughter-in-law will become a widow.' Then there would be no soldiers in our country. But no, there are soldiers in every country. This is simply the law of nature. So nature is making all of this unfold. There is nothing new in this. Nature is at work in this. So, don't fret over this too much.

#### To Hoard Is Also Himsa

**Questioner:** When a businessman is inclined towards making an illicit profit, when some industrialist or businessman gives less remuneration in proportion to the labor or if income is made without putting in any effort [adulteration of goods, selling short], is that considered an act of violence?

Dadashri: That is all indeed an act of violence.

**Questioner:** Now, having made money without any effort, if he uses the money to give to charity, then what kind of *himsa* is that considered?

**Dadashri:** However much is used towards charity, however much he gives up, he incurs that much less of a liability. However much he had earned, if he earned a hundred thousand rupees, and then he built a hospital worth eighty thousand rupees, then he is not responsible for that amount. He is responsible only for the twenty thousand rupees. So, it is a good thing, it is not wrong.

**Questioner:** People hoard wealth; is that considered *himsa* or not?

**Dadashri:** It is indeed considered *himsa*. To hoard is *himsa*. It is not useful to other people, is it!

**Questioner:** In order to live a luxurious life, if people amass wealth by causing destruction [to others], then what is that considered?

**Dadashri:** That is definitely considered an offense, isn't it! One will be punished according to the seriousness of the offense. The fewer the amount of possessions one can live with, that is the best life.

# Confront the Other Person, But Do So Calmly

**Questioner:** 'You' say that one should not steal or commit any *himsa*. But if a person steals something from us, if he deceives us, then should we confront him or not?

**Dadashri:** You should definitely confront him. However, you should not confront him in a way that spoils your mind. You should ask him very calmly, "Dear fellow, what wrong have I done to you that you are doing this to me?" And if he has stolen something of yours that is worth a hundred rupees and if you get angry with him, then for the sake of those hundred rupees, you will have incurred a loss of five hundred rupees. So you should not incur a loss of five hundred rupees for the sake of a hundred rupees. So, talk to him in a calm manner. You should not get angry with him.

# **Opposing Violence Protects One From Supporting It**

**Questioner:** To hurt someone in a way that causes mental suffering, to deceive someone, to betray someone's trust, to steal etc., are these considered *sookshma himsa* (violence at the subtle level)?

**Dadashri:** That is all nothing but *himsa*. This *himsa* has more weightage than *sthool himsa* (physical violence; violence at the gross level). The consequences are also graver. To hurt someone in a way that causes mental suffering, to deceive someone, to betray someone's trust, to steal, that is all *raudradhyan* (adverse internal state of being that hurts the self and others), and the consequence of *raudradhyan* is a life-form in hell.

**Questioner:** But is it right to give importance to this kind of subtle violence, as opposed to physical violence such as cruelty done to helpless animals, by slaughtering them, or by exploiting them for the purpose of acquiring meat and other materials for our consumption? Or is it considered appropriate to maintain neutrality towards this horrendous violence, thus supporting this violence?

**Dadashri:** It is not considered appropriate. You should definitely oppose that. By not opposing it, you are supporting it; you are on either one of the sides. If you are not opposing it, then you are supporting it. So no matter who one may be, even if One is a *Gnani* (One who is Self-realized), one must show opposition to it. Otherwise, it counts as supporting it.

Questioner: Can we become a nimit in stopping the

*himsa* against animals, birds or anything else, for whom *himsa* has come into effect in their unfolding karma?

**Dadashri:** Regardless of whose unfolding karma it has come in, if you don't become a *nimit* in stopping it, then you are supporting the *himsa*. So you should try to stop it. No matter what their unfolding karma is, you should definitely try to stop it.

Say someone is walking along a path and due to his unfolding karma, he bumps into something and hurts his leg. And you happen to be passing by over there, so you should get out of your car, bandage his wound using the cloth from your own clothes, and then drop him home. It doesn't matter if it has happened due to the unfolding of his karma, but you should show empathy for him. Otherwise, you will become bound by the intent contrary to that, and you will not become free. This world is not such that it will let you off.

**Questioner:** For those interested in making spiritual progress, is it necessary for them to make an effort towards stopping *himsa*? If it is necessary, then can you please give some advice on this?

**Dadashri:** For those who are interested in making spiritual progress, if they don't make an effort to stop *himsa*, then that is considered as encouraging *himsa*. If they don't make an effort to stop *himsa*, then that is considered as supporting *himsa*. So all spiritual aspirants should make an effort to stop *himsa* from happening.

**Questioner:** Why does one not think about preventing the grave physical violence under such circumstances?

**Dadashri:** It is especially important to prevent physical violence. You should make other efforts for that. If you all get together, organize groups, and elect people to

represent your cause in the government, then this will yield very good results. Everyone needs to nurture the intent [of preventing violence] and the intent needs to be strengthened and encouraged.

**Questioner:** But Dada, ultimately this is all part of the karmic account, isn't it?

Dadashri: Yes, it is a karmic account. But you can say that it is a karmic account after it has happened. If you say it is a karmic account [beforehand], then everything will be ruined. If so-called 'ascetics' were to come to your village and abduct children, even then you would say, "Catch them and put a stop to this!" If someone were to kidnap your own children, if someone were to abduct them, how much suffering would you feel? Similarly, when cows, buffaloes and other animals are slaughtered, you should feel deep sorrow over that and you should oppose that act. Otherwise, that task [effort to prevent himsa] would never be accomplished, would it! You cannot sit around and do nothing. You may regard it as the unfolding of karma, but even the Lord did not regard it as such. Even the Lord expressed opposition to this. So you should express your opposition to it, you should unite against it, and you should oppose it. Truly speaking, you are not really opposing the himsa; rather, it is your ahimsak bhaav (non-violent intent)!

# A Safe Haven for Cows Established by Lord Krishna

During the time of Lord Krishna, the *himsa* had increased to a large extent. So what did Lord Krishna do? 'He' lifted the Mount Govardhan on a single fingertip. Now, the fact that He lifted Mount Govardhan on a single fingertip, even today, the meaning of that persists at the gross level. People have not understood its subtle meaning. *Govardhan* means He [single-handedly] founded a widespread movement to increase the population of cows as well as protect them. 'He' [single-handedly] founded both, the movement to increase the population of cows as well as to protect them. This is because the livelihood of the people of India depends on this. So when *himsa* increases to a large extent, let go of everything else and take care of this first. And you don't need to do anything for the carnivorous animals. Those animals are themselves violent. You don't need to do anything for them. No one hunts them and they cannot be eaten either, can they! Who would eat these cats? Who would eat dogs? No one eats them, nor should anyone eat them. So it is worth holding on to just these two points, increasing the population of cows and protecting them.

A lot of methods should be undertaken to increase the population of cows. When Lord Krishna single-handedly established the movement to increase the population of cows, He did a great thing. 'He' established a widespread movement to increase the population of cows and He opened up cowsheds. 'He' set them up in such a way that thousands of cows got nourishment. Increasing the population of cows and protecting them; He established these two things. As He protected them, it [the slaughter of cows] stopped. And so milk, clarified butter and other dairy items were available in abundance, everywhere! So in comparison to saving the cows [from being slaughtered], it is more crucial to increase the population of cows.

There are so many benefits of keeping cows, there are so many benefits of cow's milk, there are so many benefits of the clarified butter made from cow's milk; if all of those are disclosed, not forcefully, but with the willingness [of the listeners], if these benefits are explained to people and the tradition of keeping cows is established in every village, then the population of cows will increase immensely. In the past, there were cowsheds everywhere, they would house a thousand or so cows. So it is necessary to increase the population of cows. As it is, the population of cows is not increasing and this [slaughtering of cows] carries on. But we can't say 'no' to anyone [who is saving the cows from being slaughtered], can we! And if we tell them to not do so, then it is considered an offense. And it is not as though they are doing anything wrong, they are trying to protect them, aren't they!

**Questioner:** We are not asking that the cows be set free [from the slaughterhouse], but we are trying to prevent new cows from reaching them.

**Dadashri:** Yes, save the new ones from reaching the slaughterhouse. Explain to the owner that he should not do such things. For now, focus on these two things: increasing the population of cows and protecting them. Everything else is secondary! Once this has been completed, you can do other things.

So Lord Krishna had given more weightage to these two things: increasing the population of cows and protecting them. And the ones who increase the population of cows are the male cowherds (*gop*) and female cowherds (*gopi*). *Gop* means those who take care of cows!

**Questioner:** This narrative about the subtle meaning of *Govardhan* is completely new.

**Dadashri:** Yes, there are all sorts of narratives. However, it is beneficial only if it is interpreted correctly. Otherwise, there are all sorts of narratives and they are correct. However, these people understood it at the gross level. They say, "He lifted Mount Govardhan." So the foreign scientists say, "This is nonsense, how can anyone lift a mountain? And if He did lift it, then why didn't He lift the Himalayas? And then why did He die by getting shot with an arrow?" But in reality, it is not like that.

'He' established the increasing of the population of cows in a wonderful way. This is because during that time, violence had increased greatly, violence had increased tremendously. It is not as if only some communities engage in violence. In other communities, it is only those people having a higher spiritual development who do not engage in violence, everyone else engages in violence.

One should definitely not have any *himsak bhaav* (violent intent), should he! A person should definitely have an *ahimsak bhaav* (non-violent intent), shouldn't he? To dedicate one's life towards *ahimsa* is known as *ahimsak bhaav*.

# Is Demerit Karma Bound by Picking Flowers for Worship?

**Questioner:** Is demerit karma bound or not, by offering flowers when we pray at the temples?

**Dadashri:** The offering of flowers while worshipping God at the temple is to be seen from a different perspective. It is an offence to pick flowers. It is also an offence to purchase flowers. However, if you look at it from a different perspective, there is benefit in it. 'We' will explain to you which perspective this is the case.

These days, many people believe that it is a grave fault to pick flowers, whereas other people offer flowers to God. Now, what is the truth in this case? This path of the *vitaraag* (absolutely detached) Lords is that in which the profits outweigh the losses. When a person picks two roses, he has definitely committed *himsa*. He has picked them from their befitting place, so *himsa* has definitely taken place. However, he does not use those flowers for himself. Rather, if he offers those flowers to [an idol of] God or to a *Gnani Purush* (One who has realized the Self and is able to do the same for others), then that is considered as having done *dravya puja* (worship through offerings). So for committing this *himsa*, one gets punished by five percent, and when he offers the flowers to God, he earns a profit of forty percent, and when he offers them to a *Gnani Purush*, he earns a profit of thirty percent. So overall, he retains a profit of twenty-five percent. Thus, this world is for carrying out business in which the profits outweigh the losses. You should carry out business in which the profits outweigh the losses. And if less profit is being made and a loss is taking place, then stop that [business]. However, in this case, the profit outweighs the loss. But if you don't offer flowers [to God], then your business has closed.

## Where Flower Petals Are Hurt...

**Questioner:** I must have bound some demerit karma for the flowers that I have picked up until now, right?

**Dadashri:** Well, [take, for instance, two scenarios; in the first,] you pick flowers for a thousand years and [in the second,] over the course of an entire life, you engage in *kashay* (anger, pride, deceit or greed) with other people or with family members, you quarrel with family members, so compared to the first scenario, the fault of the *kashay* is greater. That is why the Lord has said to first bring an end to the quarreling. There is no problem with picking flowers. Nevertheless, you should not pick flowers without a legitimate reason. Legitimate meaning, if you want to offer them to an idol of God, then there is no problem. You should not pick them for your own pleasure.

Questioner: But there is this saying, "Where flower petals are hurt, it is not in agreement with the directive of the *Tirthankar* Lord (the absolutely enlightened Lord who can liberate others)." ("Pushpa pakhadi jyaa dubhay, Jinavarni nahi tyaa agna.")

**Dadashri:** That has actually been said by Krupaludev [A Self-realized *Gnani* who lived in 1867-1901. He is also known as Shrimad Rajchandra]. The *Tirthankar* Lords had expressed that, so Krupaludev wrote down the words of the *Tirthankar* Lords. But for whom is this applicable? It is for the One who has reached the spiritual level where He does not want anything in this worldly life! But you still have to wear this suit, don't you?

Questioner: And that too, it has to be ironed!

**Dadashri:** And that too, it has to be ironed! So these worldly people want every single thing. That is why it is said, "Offer a flower to God." Do people not place flowers on the idols of the *Tirthankar* Lords? Haven't you ever seen that? You haven't gone to worship an idol, have you? They place flowers on the idol over there.

The Lord had told the monks that they should do *bhaav puja* (worship through intent). While the Jains do *dravya puja* (worship through offerings and rituals) along with that. By doing *dravya puja*, all their worldly difficulties go away. So what 'we' say is, whoever has any worldly difficulties, should offer flowers to the *Gnani Purush*, whereas those who do not have any difficulties, don't need to do anything. Is it the same for everyone? Some people have so many difficulties! All of those will go away. And in the case of the *Gnani Purush*, none of this affects Him nor does it obstruct Him.

Nevertheless, some people tell 'us', "Where flower petals are hurt, it is not in agreement with the directive of the *Tirthankar* Lord. It is not in line with the directive of the Lord, is it?" 'We' tell them, "Why are you bringing up a subject of the third year of college right now in the second standard? You have to pay attention to it in the third year of college. Why are you bringing all of this up right now, in the second standard?" So, they reply, "This is a point worth considering." 'We' tell them, "So think about it. There is no need to bring this up in the second and third standard. Follow it when you are in the final year!" So, they ask further, "What is the limit of this?" 'We' tell them, "Don't you know that Lord Mahavir was married in his final life before attaining moksha?" They respond, "Yes, He was married." So 'we' ask, "How many years did He live a worldly life?" They reply, "For thirty years." 'We' ask further, "Do you have any proof that He lived a worldly life?" They reply, "'He' had a daughter, didn't He!" 'We' tell them, "He' lived a worldly life, so it was not as if He did not have a wife, right? He had one. One can only have a daughter if he has a wife, isn't it? Otherwise, how would there be proof? So He had a wife for thirty years. So what did the Lord See that even though He had a wife in that life, He was still able to attain moksha in that very life? What kind of a discovery did He make?" Thus, this concept [of not picking flowers] has to do with the final stage.

So flowers can be offered to the idols and flowers can also be offered to the idols of the *Tirthankar* Lords. On one hand, one does not hurt the flower petals, yet on the other hand, he engages in *kashay* with his family members and distresses them. A person who does not hurt flower petals should not even awaken a sleeping dog when he walks past it.

This point about not even hurting a flower petal is applicable to the One who has reached the final life before ultimate liberation, it is only when the final fifteen years are remaining that this act should be stopped. So one has to take care of this in the final fifteen years. And from the moment the circumstance of having sexual relations with one's wife is renounced, this act of picking flowers and other such things will be abandoned, automatically. And this will come to a stop on its own. So until then, one should not interfere in worldly interactions at all.

## The Universe of One-Sensed Living Beings

**Questioner:** What are *apakaya* (one-sensed, nonmobile living beings whose body is in the form of water), *teukaya* (one-sensed, non-mobile living beings whose body is in the form of fire), *pruthvikaya* (one-sensed, non-mobile living beings whose body is in the form of earth), *vayukaya* (one-sensed, non-mobile living beings whose body is in the form of air) and *vanaspatikaya* (one-sensed, non-mobile living beings whose body is in the form of vegetation)?

Dadashri: Those are all one-sensed living beings.

**Questioner:** We know for sure that there are living beings in water; that is why we boil water before drinking it.

**Dadashri:** What 'we' are saying is, the point that you have understood about the living beings in water and what you are expressing here, is in fact something that other people have said and you have simply believed. Otherwise, it is not possible to understand this point. It is a point that not even the great scientists of today can understand! And it is a very subtle point. Only the *Gnanis* (Those who have realized the Self and are able to do the same for others) can understand it. However, even if 'we' try to explain this point in detail, it is a point that you will not be able to understand. Of these five you mentioned, it is *vanaspatikaya* alone that you will be able to understand. Otherwise, one will need a very high [spiritual] level to understand the other four types of living beings: *vayukaya*, *teukaya*, *apakaya* and *pruthvikaya*.

**Questioner:** The scientists are researching these very things, aren't they!

**Dadashri:** But the scientists will not be able to understand this. They can only understand about these trees. Even so, they can't understand it to the full extent, they can only understand it to a limited extent.

It's like this, let me explain this to you in the way the Lord meant it. All these trees and vegetation that you can see with the naked eye, they are vanaspatikaya. There are living beings even within these trees. Vayukaya means there are living beings within the air too; they have been referred to as air-bodied living beings. Then there is this soil; there are living beings within the soil and there is also soil. The soil and the rocks that make up the Himalayas, there are living beings within all of those. The rocks are also living; they are referred to as *pruthvikaya*. When there is a sudden burst of fire, there is no fire in the coal. It is in fact the fire-bodied living beings that gather there. Those living beings are called *teukaya*. The water that you drink is made up of nothing but living beings. Yes, the living beings and their bodies, together they make this water. The Lord has referred to these living beings as apakaya. Their bodies are in the form of water. Many such living beings come together to make a glass of water. So, this water is composed of living beings, this food is composed of living beings, this air is composed of nothing but living beings, all of that is composed of living beings only.

## Perfecting the Practice of Ahimsa

**Questioner:** So how can one perfect the practice of *ahimsa*?

**Dadashri:** *Ahimsa*? Well, if a person perfects the practice of *ahimsa*, then He becomes God! Do you currently practice *ahimsa* to a certain extent?

Questioner: Somewhat, not a whole lot.

**Dadashri:** So then decide on practicing it to a greater extent! And here you are talking about perfecting the practice of *ahimsa*! If the practice of *ahimsa* is perfected, One becomes God!

Questioner: Show us how to practice ahimsa.

**Dadashri:** First of all, you should not hurt any living being that feels tormented by you; do not torment it. And you can eat wheat, millet, rice; there is no objection to that. They do not feel tormented by you, they prevail in an unconscious state. Whereas the small ants and large black ants flee from you, so you should not kill them. You should not trouble living beings that are mobile, such as the two-sensed oysters and mollusks that live inside conch shells, all the way up to five-sensed living beings. Even bedbugs feel tormented when you catch them. So you should not kill them. Do you understand?

Questioner: Yes, I understand.

Dadashri: Yes, and secondly, do not eat after sunset.

Thirdly, when practicing *ahimsa*, you should exercise a lot of control over your speech. If someone were to tell you that you are worthless, then would you feel happy or sad?

Questioner: I would feel sad.

**Dadashri:** Then you should understand that if you were to call him worthless, then he too will feel hurt. That is *himsa*, so you should not say that to him. If you want to practice *ahimsa*, then you should be very alert in terms of *himsa*. If there is a certain speech that hurts you, then you should not speak in such a way with other people.

Furthermore, you should not even have negative thoughts arising in the mind. You should never have

thoughts about stealing from others, cheating someone of his possessions. You should not have thoughts about accumulating a lot of money. This is because, the scripture writers have stated, "You will certainly get the money that is in your karmic account." So there is no need for you to think about accumulating a lot of money. If you have such thoughts, then it means that *himsa* is taking place. This is because, when one takes things from others, when one has the desire to take money from someone else's quota, then there is *himsa* embedded in that too. So you should not harbor any such intents.

**Questioner:** So are these the only three things I need to observe for *ahimsa*?

**Dadashri:** There are still some more. Then, you should never eat meat or eggs. You should not eat potatoes, onions, and garlic, even when you have no choice. This is because onions and garlic are considered items that instigate violence; they induce anger in a person, and when one gets angry, it hurts the other person. You can eat any other vegetables you wish to eat.

## First Save the Larger Living Beings

Now, what the Lord was intending to say is that you should first take care of human beings. Yes, learn to stay within the boundary of not hurting human beings through the mind, speech, and body even in the slightest extent. Then come the five-sensed living beings; the cows, buffaloes, chickens, goats, all those animals. You do not have to worry about these as much as you should about humans, nevertheless, you should take care of them. You should take care of them in a way that they do not feel hurt. So you should take care up to this extent, take care of the five-sensed living beings other than human beings, but that is in the secondary stage. And what comes in the third stage? You should take care of two or more sensed living beings.

What is the best food to eat? That which is composed of one-sensed living beings! Those who want to attain *moksha* do not have the right to eat food that is composed of living beings that have two or more senses. So you should not incur the liability of [eating] living beings that have two or more senses. This is because the merit karma that is needed by a person is dependent upon the number of senses a living being [he consumes] has, that much merit karma of the person gets used up!

A person has no choice but to eat, and he definitely incurs a loss for [eating] that living being. The food that we eat is made up of one-sensed living beings. When we eat these one-sensed living beings, as long as they are something to be eaten and you are the one eating them, the responsibility lies with you. But the Lord has given the freedom to do this. This is because you have a large balance of merit karma and you are destroying those living beings. However, when you eat those living beings, how do they benefit from that? In fact, by eating those living beings, they are certainly dying. Nevertheless, by eating them, you incur a loss, but you are also earning more profit. By getting the sustenance to live the entire day, and upon carrying out religious activities, you earn one hundred 'points' [merit karma]. From that, you have to pay a fine of ten 'points' to them. So you are left with ninety 'points' and upon getting ten 'points' from your earnings, they progress to a higher life-form. Therefore, their progress to a higher life-form is based verily on the law of nature. They are progressing from a one-sensed living being to a two-sensed living being. So in this way, the evolutionary development continues to take place. These living beings are benefiting from the profit the humans have earned. In this way, the karmic accounts are all being settled. People cannot understand this science entirely, can they!

So do not become concerned with [the *himsa* towards] one-sensed living beings. If you interfere with one-sensed living beings, then you have egoism. One-sensed living beings are not mobile living beings. Therefore, do not have any second thoughts [about eating] one-sensed living beings. This is because this is simply the way of life. You will have to eat and drink, you will have to do all that.

Besides, the entire world is composed of living beings. The very basis of life are the one-sensed living beings. There is nothing in the world [that can be consumed] apart from living beings; non-living things are not edible. Thus, you definitely have to eat food that consists of living beings; that is the only way the body can get nourishment. And as they are one-sensed living beings, they do not have blood, pus, flesh; that is why you have been given the freedom to eat one-sensed living beings. If you start worrying about them to such a great extent, then when will it come to an end? You do not have to worry about those living beings at all. People do not worry about what they are supposed to worry about, and they end up worrying about what they are not supposed to worry about. There is no need at all to worry about this lightest form of *himsa*.

#### What Is the Best Food?

**Questioner:** Why are certain foods forbidden on the *Kramik* path (traditional step-by-step path of spiritual progress)?

**Dadashri:** There are different categories of food. The most harmful food for humans, and there is nothing else that is more harmful than that, the ultimate type of harmful food is to eat human flesh. Now, what is less harmful than

this? It is better to eat the meat of animals whose population increases rapidly. The population of chickens and ducks increases rapidly. Comparatively, the population of cows and buffaloes doesn't increase as much. The population of fish increases rapidly. So it is better to eat this kind of meat. Nevertheless, for the person who says, "I want to progress [in spirituality]," it is harmful to eat even this kind of meat. Rather than that, it is better to eat eggs. He should not eat meat. Now, if one wants to progress [spiritually] even further, then 'we' would advise him, "Eat root vegetables." If one wants to progress even further, then 'we' would advise him, "Apart from root vegetables, eat everything else, such as lentil soup, rice, Indian flat bread, Indian sweets, clarified butter, jaggery." And if one wants to progress even further, then 'we' would advise him, "Stop eating these six things: jaggery, clarified butter, honey, yogurt, butter and other such things; and eat lentil soup, rice, Indian flat bread, and cooked vegetables." There is nothing else beyond this.

Food is categorized in this manner. Of these categories, a person can choose the category of his preference. All these ways have been disclosed. This is the description of [the different categories] of food. And this description is for you to know, it is not to be put into practice. Why has the Lord made these distinctions? It is so the *avaran* (veils of ignorance over the Knowledge of the Self) break. If one moves forward in this way, then the *avaran* within will begin to break.

# The Science Behind Eating After Sunset

Questioner: Please shed some light on eating after sunset. In Jainism, it is forbidden.

**Dadashri:** If you can avoid eating after sunset, then that is the best thing. It is the best approach. There is no connection between that and religion. Yet this has been incorporated into religion. Why is that the case? It is because, if the body is healthy, then one can make greater progress in religion. That is why it has been incorporated into religion. Otherwise, it is not needed in religion. However, it is the best thing to keep the body healthy.

**Questioner:** Then what about what the *vitaraag* Lords had said to people, to not eat after sunset. Was that in reference to the binding of demerit karma or was it for the health of the body?

**Dadashri:** It was meant for the health of the body and also in reference to *himsa*.

Questioner: But why shouldn't we eat after sunset?

Dadashri: Dinner should be eaten in the presence of the sun. This is what has been said in Jainism as well as in Vedanta (one of the six orthodox schools of Hinduism). The Vedanta states, 'As long as the sun is present, the internal organs are active, thus the meals should be consumed within that time frame.' So if you eat at night, what damage will this cause? The digestive system is inactive, so the food will definitely not get digested quickly. But what other damage will this cause? The Tirthankar Lords have said, "When the sun sets, all living beings return home." The crows, dogs, pigeons, and other birds, they all return home, they return to their nests. They enter their home before it gets dark. Many times, there are clouds in the sky and you cannot tell whether the sun has set or not. Nevertheless, when the animals are returning home, you should understand that the sun has set. Those animals can sense this using their inner energy. Now, during this time, even the smallest of living beings enter their homes too, and the living beings are so subtle that those that cannot be seen with the naked eye, those that cannot be seen under a microscope, even those living beings also enter their home. And when they

enter, they settle on wherever there is food. You will not even know that they have settled on it. This is because the color of their body is such that if it sits on rice, then the color of its body is the same as the color of rice, if it sits on *bhakhri* (Indian flat bread made from wheat flour), then the color of its body is the same as the color of *bhakhri*, if it sits on *rotla* (Indian flat bread made from millet flour), then the color of its body is the same as the color of *rotla*. That is why you should not eat food at night.

Food should not be eaten after sunset, yet people eat after sunset. Many people do not know how harmful it is to eat after sunset, and those who do know are entangled in other circumstances. However, if one does not eat after sunset, then that is the best thing. This is because it is a *mahavrat* (the five great vows as expounded by Lord Mahavir: truthfulness, non-possessiveness, *ahimsa*, nonstealing, and celibacy). Along with the five *mahavrat*, this can be considered the sixth one.

**Questioner:** If a person has to eat after sunset due to his circumstances, then does he bind karma?

**Dadashri:** No. There is no binding of karma. Why does one have to break that rule? And when one renounces eating after sunset, then someone must have taught him that, right?

**Questioner:** It is embedded in the moral and cultural values that are instilled in Jains!

**Dadashri:** Yes. So you should do *pratikraman* (confess, apologize and resolve not to repeat the mistake) in the name of Lord Mahavir. It is a directive (*agna*) of the Lord, so you should follow that directive. And on the day you are not able to follow it, you should ask for forgiveness from Him. Therefore, if you want to practice *ahimsa*, then

as far as is possible, it is best if you eat before sunset. Your body will also remain healthy. Do you normally eat early?

Questioner: I have started that recently.

Dadashri: Who made you do it?

Questioner: I started doing it because of my own desire to do so.

**Dadashri:** But from now on, you should do it with the understanding that you are following this for the sake of *ahimsa*. Dada has explained it to me and I liked it, so I am indeed following this to practice *ahimsa*. The reason being, if one does it aimlessly, without any goal, then it is all useless. If you say, "I am paying this money for a ticket to travel abroad," then you will get a ticket to travel abroad. But if you don't say anything, then why would anyone give you a ticket?

# Root Vegetables, a Warehouse of Subtle Living Beings

Questioner: Is it wrong to eat root vegetables?

**Dadashri:** It is very wrong. However, it is not as wrong as eating after sunset. Eating after sunset comes in second place.

**Questioner:** There are infinite living beings in onions and potatoes.

**Dadashri:** Yes, there are billions of living beings, what about them?

**Questioner:** Then are You advising us to eat such vegetables?

**Dadashri:** The Lord has forbidden it. It should remain in your belief that the Lord has forbidden this. Nevertheless,

if you end up eating them, then that is the unfolding of your karma. But your belief should not change. The faith in what the Lord has said should not change.

**Questioner:** Why has the Lord forbidden to eat root vegetables?

Dadashri: Root vegetables prevent the brain from becoming alert.

**Questioner:** Isn't it because of the destruction of one-sensed living beings?

**Dadashri:** Actually, people think that it is for the sake of protecting the living beings within potatoes that they should not be eaten. Now, if you like potatoes, then do not become overly concerned about this. This is because in this era of the time cycle, people do not seem to like eating any other food items. And what would they do if they stopped eating this?

**Questioner:** But it is said that demerit karma is bound by eating potatoes.

**Dadashri:** The fact is, if you hurt any living being, then you will bind demerit karma. If you hurt your husband, wife, child, or neighbor, then you will bind demerit karma. Otherwise, what is the harm caused by eating potatoes? Your mind will become dull; your intellect will become dull. There are many subtle living beings in root vegetables, they are nothing but a warehouse of living beings. That is why by eating root vegetables, one becomes dull and *kashay* arise. 'You' [the awakened Self] have a need for awakened awareness (*jagruti*), so it is good if you eat root vegetables to a lesser extent. That too, the awakened awareness is especially needed once one starts to abide by the Lord's directives [after attaining Self-realization or *dharmadhyan*, a virtuous internal state of being]. And if you eat root

vegetables, then Your awakened awareness will become dim, and if Your awakened awareness becomes dim, then how will You achieve liberation?

So what the Lord has said is true. If you are able to follow all of this, then do so, and if you are not able to do so, then there is no problem. Follow this as much as you can. It is good if you can follow this.

## The Gravest Himsa Is That of Kashay

The way things are, people have completely misinterpreted the entire concept. On the one hand, they do this [avoid eating root vegetables], and on the other hand, they engage in kashay! So they make a profit of three rupees whilst incurring a loss of ten million rupees! So how can they be considered businessmen? And just imagine, they have insisted on this [avoiding consumption of root vegetables] to such an great extent, yet on the other hand, they are committing endless himsa. If there is any himsa in the world that is considered the gravest, then it is that of kashay (anger, pride, deceit and greed)! Someone may ask, "This person kills living beings and another person expresses kashay, so which of the two binds more demerit karma?" [So the answer is,] There is a greater liability in kashay, compared to killing a living being; kashay binds more demerit karma.

### **Understand What Is Being Said**

All these concepts that the Lord has disclosed, they have been disclosed for you to understand. You do not have to insistently hold onto them. Follow as much as you can. The Lord has not said to do things beyond your capacity.

The *Gnanis* are not such that they tell you to become adamant on something. Other people [who are not Selfrealized] may encourage you to become adamant. What the *Gnanis* used to say was, "Check whether the profit outweighs the loss! If eating onions has a twenty-five percent benefit on the body and a loss of five percent, then there is a net gain of twenty percent." This is how They used to look at things. Whereas these people have ignored the concept of the profit outweighing the loss, and they are forcing people by saying, "Stop eating onions, stop eating potatoes." Hey, why are you doing this? Do you have enmity towards potatoes? Or do you have enmity towards onions? On the contrary, when one is forced to renounce something, he will keep remembering that very thing. The way one [a devotee] keeps remembering the Lord, he keeps remembering this!

# 'We' Too Had Observed the Prescribed Practices

Mind you, I was not a Jain [by birth], I was not a follower of the Jain religion. Even then, before attaining this *Gnan*, I was already observing the practice of not eating root vegetables, I was already observing *choviyaar* (the practice of not eating after sunset), I was already drinking boiled water. Even if I went to another city or no matter where I went, I would only drink boiled water. My business partner and I would always carry bottles of boiled water with us. Hence, 'we' were already observing the practices as prescribed by the Lord.

Now, if anyone finds these practices too difficult to observe, then it is not compulsory for you to follow all of them. 'We' do not tell you that you should do things this way. Do it, if you are able to do so. This is a good thing to observe, it is beneficial. The Lord had said this after Knowing it to be beneficial, He had not said this so that people should adamantly hold onto it. 'He' had not said that one should become insistent on following this.

'We', the *Gnani Purush*, do not engage in renunciation or acquisition. But some people become very upset [and tell 'us',] "You don't practice *choviyaar*? It makes us very sad." So 'we' tell them, "'We' will practice *choviyaar*." What else can 'we' do? In fact, after becoming a *Gnani*, renunciation and acquisition are no longer applicable. But people interpret it as per their understanding. However, 'we' have no need for anything at all! What the Lord has said about 'us' is that, amidst the ocean of *himsa*, 'we' are devoid of *himsa*. Besides, 'we' were already practicing *choviyaar* right from the beginning. Nowadays, because of the *satsang* (spiritual discourse) schedules, 'we' are able to observe *choviyaar* on certain days, and 'we' might not be able to observe *choviyaar* for two to four days. However, 'our' aim is to observe *choviyaar*. That is the important thing.

#### **Consuming Boiled Water, For Drinking**

Questioner: Why is it said to drink boiled water?

**Dadashri:** What is the significance of that? There are infinite living beings in a single drop of water. So when water is boiled a lot, those living beings die. And if you drink that water, then your body will stay healthy, and then *Atma dhyan* (the internal state that results in the constant awareness of 'I am pure Soul') will prevail for You. People, however, have completely misunderstood this.

The Lord has shown these different practices so that the body can remain healthy. That is why He has said to drink boiled water. If you don't drink boiled water, then it means you will have engaged in *himsa* against the living beings. [Some people think,] 'It is okay if it harms my body, but I do not want to boil the water.' Instead, the Lord has said to drink water after boiling it, then your body will remain healthy. And eight hours later, living beings will start growing in that boiled water once again, so you should not drink that water after that time. 'He' has said, "Boil some more water and then drink it." So the Lord has said to boil the water not because of *himsa*, but because it helps maintain a healthy body. By boiling water, *apakaya* (one-sensed, non-mobile, waterbodied living beings) are destroyed. But this [practice] has not been prescribed because of the demerit karma bound [by drinking those living beings]. This practice has been prescribed so that your body stays healthy, so that organisms do not accumulate in the stomach and so that veils of ignorance do not form over the Knowledge of the Self. When the water is boiled, all the larger organisms within it are destroyed.

Questioner: So isn't that considered as himsa?

**Dadashri:** There is no problem with that *himsa*. The reason being, if your body is healthy, then you can carry out religious practices. And as a matter of fact, everything is considered *himsa*, there is nothing but *himsa* taking place in this world. There is nothing other than *himsa*. When you eat or drink, you are consuming living beings.

Now, the Lord has not placed emphasis on [*himsa* against] one-sensed living beings at all. People have misinterpreted this point entirely. If He had placed emphasis on [*himsa* against] one-sensed living beings, then He would have said, "Drink water that has not been boiled; otherwise, by boiling the water, all the living beings within the water will be killed." How many living beings do you kill by boiling the water?

## Questioner: Infinite.

**Dadashri:** The living beings that make up the water are not visible. However, that water is made up of one-sensed, non-mobile, water-bodied living beings. Their body itself is water. Now tell me, where would those living beings be within the water? How can people find them? It is actually their body that is visible. When the bodies of all the living beings are taken as a whole, that verily is water. They are living beings whose body is in the form of water. Now, how can this ever come to an end?

# A Misconception About Fresh Green Vegetables

**Questioner:** It has been said that we should not eat fresh green vegetables in the rainy season; what is the reason behind this?

**Dadashri:** People have also misunderstood the point about fresh green vegetables. [The point about refraining from] Eating fresh green vegetables is not [because of] the *himsa* committed against the living beings. Subtle living organisms settle down on fresh green vegetables [during the rainy season], and when those organisms enter the stomach, they cause disease, they harm the body, and in turn, one cannot carry out religious practices. That is why the Lord has said not to eat them. What 'we' are saying is why have you misunderstood this point? You've swallowed the medicine that was meant for external use, and you keep externally applying the medicine that was meant to be swallowed; that is why healing is not evident.

# The Himsa Caused by Antibiotics

**Questioner:** Suppose I get a fever, a boil had formed and it has become septic, then medications are prescribed to kill the organisms that are proliferating inside...

Dadashri: You should not worry about such organisms.

**Questioner:** If a child has intestinal worms and he is not given medicine for that, then the child will die.

**Dadashri:** Give that child such medicine that absolutely no intestinal worms remain inside; this definitely has to be done.

**Questioner:** Now, we have to keep the body healthy so that we can carry out spiritual practices. However, if living beings are being destroyed in the process of keeping it healthy, then should we do that or not?

**Dadashri:** It's like this, what is considered as spiritual practice? If you maintain the intent that you want to take care of the body, then you will end up doing fewer spiritual practices. If you want to become completely immersed in spiritual practices, then you should not concern yourself with [the health of] the body. The body has brought along everything with it, it has come with everything for its preservation, and you do not need to interfere in it at all. Immerse yourself completely in spiritual practices, one hundred percent. And everything else is 'complete' [as it should be]. That is why 'we' say that the past is gone forever, the future is subject to *vyavasthit*, so remain in the present.

Nevertheless, what 'we' are saying is, consider this body through which you met the *Gnani Purush* to be your friend. Take these medicines even if they cause *himsa*, but take care of the body. This is because, here the business is such that the profits should outweigh the losses. If this body were to survive for an additional two years, then since it is through this body that you have recognized the *Gnani Purush*, you can accomplish a lot of [spiritual] work within those two years. And although you will incur a loss due to *himsa*, in comparison to that, the profit is twenty times greater. So out of the twenty, a net gain of nineteen remains with you. Hence, this is a business in which the profits have outweighed the losses.

Otherwise, there are nothing but living beings everywhere. This world is [filled with] nothing but living beings. Countless living beings are destroyed when one inhales, so what should you do? Should you sit around without breathing? If you did so, that would be good, then their problem would be solved! This is how these people are. They have actually gone about this crazily, without any benefit whatsoever.

Now, it is not possible to bring an end to all of this. So continue doing what you are doing. It is not worth dissecting and analyzing this critically to the minutest level. The only thing to pay attention to is the living beings that feel tormented by you, do not trouble them as far as possible.

## One's Diet Is Based On His Spiritual Development

What do people outside of India say? "God has made this world, meaning that He has created these human beings. And He has created these goats and fish for us to eat." Hey, if He has created them for you to eat, then why don't you eat cats, dogs, and tigers? If He created them for eating, then He would have made them all equal, wouldn't He? God would not do this. If God created this, then He would only create things that are edible for you. However, along with these things. He has also created opium, hasn't He? And there are weeds too, aren't there? 'He' has made those too, hasn't He? If God were the creator, then why would He create all these things? What is the need for weeds and other such things? 'He' would create only those things which would give human beings happiness! So people have ended up believing the wrong thing, that this has been created by God. And people outside of India do not yet believe in reincarnation. So they think that all this has been made for their consumption. Now, if they believed in reincarnation, then the thought would arise, 'What happens when we get reborn?' However, such thoughts do not arise for them.

The people of India have had these thoughts, that is indeed why the *Brahmin* (those of the highest social rank in the traditional Indian caste system, who were traditionally priests and scholars) say, "We cannot touch non-vegetarian food." The *Vaishya* (the caste that merchants, money-lenders, and traders belonged to in the traditional Indian caste system) say, "We cannot touch non-vegetarian food." The *shudra* (members of the fourth, or lowest caste in the traditional Indian caste system) say, "We can touch it." But they eat animals that are already dead. And the *Kshatriya* (members of the warrior caste in the traditional Indian caste system) also eat non-vegetarian food.

## **Aversion Towards Non-Vegetarians**

**Dadashri:** Do you prefer vegetarian or non-vegetarian food?

Questioner: I have never tasted non-vegetarian food.

**Dadashri:** But you have stated that it is a good thing, haven't you?

**Questioner:** No. I eat vegetarian food. But that does not mean that non-vegetarian food is bad.

Dadashri: That is true. 'We' do not say that it is bad.

Once, 'we' were traveling on an airplane. 'We' were the only one sitting in that row; there was nobody sitting next to 'us'. There was a wealthy Muslim businessman, he got up from his seat and sat down next to 'us'. 'We' did not say anything. Then he quietly said, "I am a Muslim and we eat non-vegetarian food. Will that bother you?" 'We' told him, "No, no. I can sit and eat with you. The only thing is that I will not taste any of your food. Whatever you are doing is appropriate and that does not concern me." Then the businessman asked, "But even then you still feel aversion towards me, don't you?" 'We' replied, "No, no. Let go of that belief of yours. You have been consuming non-vegetarian food since the time you were born. Your
mother has eaten non-vegetarian food, and your blood itself is made from a non-vegetarian diet. Now, for whom is there an objection? A person whose blood is not made from a non-vegetarian diet, his mother's milk was not made from a non-vegetarian diet, such a person is not permitted to eat non-vegetarian food. Whereas you are consuming it without thinking about the advantages and disadvantages of it. You do not consume it having known the advantages and disadvantages of it."

Therefore, one should not have aversion towards people who eat non-vegetarian food. These are merely one's misguided conceptions. 'We' have no problem with those for whom it is a part of their established diet.

# Would You Kill It Yourself and Eat It?

**Questioner:** But nowadays, it has become the social trend to eat non-vegetarian food.

**Dadashri:** That is all done for pleasure. If your mother's milk was made from such a diet, then there is no objection if you eat it for the rest of your life.

**Questioner:** What should we do if our mother does not eat non-vegetarian food?

**Dadashri:** Then how can you eat it? How will you be able to digest it, if it is not in your blood? You may think that you are able to digest it today, but ultimately, in the end, it will cause damage to you. You will not realize this today. So it is best if you do not eat it. If you cannot stop eating it, then you should maintain the intention, 'This is wrong, it is best to stop eating this.'

Besides, these cows never eat meat, these horses and buffaloes never eat meat, nor are they fond of it. Even if they are starving and you give them meat, they will not touch it. Even these animals follow this much. Whereas nowadays, the Hindu and Jain children, whose parents do not eat non-vegetarian food, have also started eating nonvegetarian food. So 'we' told them, "I do not have any problem if you want to eat non-vegetarian food, but kill the animal yourself and then eat it. Kill the chicken yourself and then eat it. Hey, you cannot even tolerate the sight of blood and you are eating non-vegetarian food? You shiver at the mere sight of blood! So you have no awareness as to what you are eating, yet you shiver at the mere sight of blood." This [non-vegetarian] diet is only for those who can tolerate the sight of blood. This diet is for those who have 'played' with blood [killed on the battlefields], the warrior caste. Do you tremble at the sight of blood?

Questioner: It makes me uneasy.

**Dadashri:** So then, how can you ever eat nonvegetarian food? If someone else kills the animal and you eat it, then it is meaningless. If you were to hear the agonizing cry of a chicken while it is being slaughtered, then the ensuing dispassion that arises towards worldly life would not leave for the rest of your life, that is how much agony it feels. 'We' too have heard it. That is when 'we' realized, 'It suffers this much excruciating pain!'

### The Importance of a Saatvik Diet

**Questioner:** Do vegetarians and non-vegetarians face any problems in their worship of God? What is your opinion on this?

**Dadashri:** It's like this; who should be a non-vegetarian? His mother's milk should be milk made from a non-vegetarian diet. Such non-vegetarians will not face any problems in their worship of God. The objection is towards the person whose mother's milk was not made

from a non-vegetarian diet, yet he eats non-vegetarian food. Otherwise, there is no problem at all whether a vegetarian or non-vegetarian worships God.

**Questioner:** So can God be worshipped or not without eating a pure and *saatvik* (light, essential, natural, energy-containing) diet?

**Dadashri:** One cannot do so. But what can be done in this era of the time cycle? It is very difficult to find and obtain pure *saatvik* food. And there are very few people who do not get influenced by this current era of the time cycle, where *Kaliyug* (the current era of the time cycle, which is characterized by moral and spiritual decline) does not affect them. And even if it is not difficult to find or obtain such food, then they will end up making friends or fall into the company of those who lead them astray. The influence of bad company (*kusang*) sets in.

**Questioner:** If someone unknowingly eats unsuitable food, then would it affect him in any way?

**Dadashri:** Everyone is indeed doing things unknowingly. Nevertheless, it will have an effect. Just like when you unknowingly stick your hand in the fire, what would happen? Wouldn't a small child's hand also get burnt? Even a small child would get burned. Likewise, this world gives everyone the same effect, whether it is done knowingly or unknowingly. The only difference is in the way one suffers it. A person who does something unknowingly suffers the effect unknowingly, and the person who does it knowingly suffers the effect knowingly. That is the only difference.

**Questioner:** So food has an effect on the mind, is that also certain?

Dadashri: All of this is indeed the effect of food.

Once food is eaten, it turns into 'brandy' [alcohol] in the stomach, and because of this 'brandy', one remains engrossed in the mind-body complex due to being in a state of unawareness as the Self. Even this *saatvik* food gives rise to 'brandy', however, it is a very small amount. It is similar to the effect of losing one's awareness completely when one drinks that other brandy that comes in a bottle. The food that is consumed, all of it gets converted into 'brandy'. These *ladoos* (spherical shaped Indian sweet), the ones that are made specifically to eat in winter, all those items are not *saatvik*! *Saatvik* means very light food, whereas *ladoos* increase intoxication. However, people turn these principles around according to their own convenience.

**Questioner:** Does eating non-vegetarian food affect one's spiritual thinking?

**Dadashri:** Definitely. Non-vegetarian food is heavy, so it does not allow the development of the spiritually-inclined intellect. If one wants to progress spiritually, he should eat light food, the kind that does not give rise to intoxication and allows the awareness to increase. Besides, it's not as though these people have awareness to begin with.

The scientists from abroad cannot understand these concepts of 'ours'. Those scientists said, "Well! This is a point worth pondering over, but we cannot accept it." So 'we' explained to them, "It will still take a lot of time to do that. You have consumed so many chickens, so it will take quite some time. You need to eat lentil soup and rice. You need to be a pure vegetarian." Vegetarian food creates a comparatively thinner *avaran* (veil of ignorance over the Knowledge of the Self), so vegetarians can understand this *Gnan*, they can see everything as it is. Whereas non-vegetarians have a thicker *avaran*.

# Does Eating Non-Vegetarian Food Lead To a Birth in Hell?

**Questioner:** It is said that by eating non-vegetarian food, one is subject to a life-form in hell.

**Dadashri:** That point is absolutely true. Furthermore, there are plenty of things to eat. Why are you slaughtering goats? When a chicken is slaughtered and eaten, wouldn't it feel tortured? Wouldn't its parents feel tortured? What would happen if someone were to eat your children? Consuming non-vegetarian food is something that has not been thought through. It is nothing but beastliness; it is a state in which things have not been thought through, whereas we are thinkers. By eating non-vegetarian food for a single day, a person's mind gets destroyed, he becomes like a beast. So if you want to keep your mind virtuous, you must stop eating all non-vegetarian food, including eggs. [Eating] Anything ranging from eggs onwards is all beastliness.

By consuming non-vegetarian food, the liability incurred of having an *avaran* set in is graver than the fault of killing the living being. The liability incurred in killing the living being is actually not as grave. How is this liability [of consuming non-vegetarian food] incurred? The majority of it gets distributed to the one who is involved in this business. Only a portion of the liability gets distributed to the consumer. However, because it creates an *avaran* over the Knowledge of one's own Self, that in turn causes a lot of obstructions in understanding what 'we' are saying. Many people speedily understand the discussions on worldly interactions, that is referred to as grasping power.

# One's Karmic Account Determines the Next Life-Form

Questioner: But is it ever the case that a himsak

(violent) person is conceived in the womb of an *ahimsak* (non-violent) mother or that an *ahimsak* person is conceived in the womb of a *himsak* mother?

**Dadashri:** Yes, one goes there willingly. One may be *ahimsak* in this life and become *himsak* in his next life. This is because in the next life, he gets parents who are *himsak*. So he becomes that way due to the circumstances around him.

Questioner: What is the reason for that?

Dadashri: It's like this; if one is ahimsak and has to reincarnate in the animal life-form, then he will be born as a cow or a buffalo. If one is *himsak*, then from this life-form, he goes on to become a tiger, a dog, a cat; he takes birth as a himsak animal. However, if one is *ahimsak* in the human life-form, then he may still take birth in a himsak family. There, his upbringing would be influenced by himsa. Even that is the result of past karmic ties, isn't it! That is the karmic account! When attachment and abhorrence arise, that itself is a result of the past karmic ties. The moment attachment arises for a person, a karmic account is bound. If abhorrence arises towards that person, then too, a karmic account is bound. If one expresses abhorrence [with thoughts], such as, 'He is worthless, he is cunning, he is like this or like that,' then his next birth will definitely take place in a family that has such traits.

# Nothing Affects the One Who Is Ahimsak

**Questioner:** When a dog bites someone, how do karmic ties play a role in that?

**Dadashri:** Without a karmic tie, not even a single mustard seed would enter your mouth, it would simply fall outside.

**Questioner:** If a dog happens to bite me, then must I have bound some karma with it?

**Dadashri:** No. You have not bound karma with it in that way. But for that matter, doesn't a person, despite being a human, 'bite' [hurt] another? People even go as far as to say, "This troublesome fellow is gnawing away at me!" One man went as far as to tell 'us', "My wife is just like a snake. She bites me at night." Now, she is not actually biting him. But she says something that would make us feel as if we have been bitten. Now, as a consequence of her speaking in that manner, a dog may end up biting her or something else may end up biting her. Nature is fully prepared to 'bombard' [deliver the effects of the karma bound] everywhere. It has all the tools ready to give you the repayment for the karma that you have bound.

So if you want to attain freedom from this world, from these miseries, then someone may hurt you, but you should not hurt them in return. Otherwise, if you hurt a person even slightly, then in your next life, that person will not refrain from avenging that hurt in thousands of ways, he may be reborn as a snake and bite you. In this world, it is not worth increasing vengeance even in the slightest. And whatever miseries come one's way, they are a result of the problems caused to others, a result of the hurt caused to others; the miseries that come one's way are indeed a result of that! Otherwise, there would be no misery in this world.

**Questioner:** So that means this life is just one constant struggle.

**Dadashri:** Yes, but if you create an *ahimsak* atmosphere, then even a snake will not be able to bite you. Even if someone were to throw a snake at you, it would not bite you; the poor creature would slither away. Even a tiger would not harass you. Such is the tremendous power

of *ahimsa* that you can't even imagine it! There is no power parallel to that of *ahimsa* and there is no weakness greater than that of *himsa*. All this misery is in fact due to *himsa*, it is verily due to *himsa* that misery comes your way.

Otherwise, there is nothing in this world that can ever bite you. And that which is able to bite you is precisely because of your karmic account. Thus, repay your karmic account. And after it has bitten you, if you have this intent arising within, 'These dogs should definitely be killed, this should be done to them and that should be done to them,' then you have once again started off a new karmic account. No matter what the situation is, bring about a solution whilst prevailing in equanimity (*samata*), without the slightest of attachment or abhorrence from within!

Questioner: But in that situation, the awakened awareness or prevalence in equanimity does not remain.

**Dadashri:** It is very difficult to cross this 'ocean' of worldly life, and that is why 'we' are giving you this *Akram Vignan* (the step-less Science of Self-realization).

## Who Is the Culprit, the Butcher or the One Who Eats Meat?

**Questioner:** Suppose there is a butcher who comes to Dada to take *Gnan*. Dada gives him *Gnan*. His butchery business is still operational, and he plans to keep it operational; so what would become of him?

**Dadashri:** But is the status as a butcher wrong? What offense has the butcher committed? You should at least ask the butcher, "Sir, why are you in this kind of a business?" He would reply, "Dear fellow, my forefathers had been doing this and that is why I am doing this. I do it to feed my stomach, to provide for my children." If you were to ask him, "But do you enjoy this?" Then he would reply, "No, I do not enjoy it."

So in comparison to the butcher, the person who eats the non-vegetarian food binds more demerit karma. As far as the butcher is concerned, it is just the poor fellow's occupation. 'We' would give him *Gnan*. If he were to come to 'us' over here, then 'we' would give him *Gnan*. Nor is there anything wrong if he takes *Gnan*. The Lord does not object to this.

#### **Pigeons Are Pure Vegetarians**

Here in India, we have pigeon coops, but do we have crow coops? Why do we not have parrot coops or sparrow coops, but we only have pigeon coops? There must be some reason, right? It is because pigeons alone are pure vegetarians; they do not eat anything that is non-vegetarian. So our people wondered, 'What will these poor birds eat in the monsoon season?' So here, people established pigeon coops and would then place grains in them for the pigeons to eat. Now, if the grain is infested with bugs, then the pigeon will not eat that. It doesn't eat that grain because there are bugs inside it. [Pigeons are] Completely ahimsak! Human beings may cross their boundaries, but these pigeons do not cross their boundaries. Even the pigeons are pure vegetarians. So research was done on 'What is their blood like?' It is very warm. They have the warmest blood and they also have tremendous understanding capacity. This is because they are vegetarian, pure vegetarian.

So it's not only humans who are fruitarians. Even our cows, buffaloes, donkeys, all of them are fruitarians. Is this any ordinary thing? If these donkeys are very hungry and you offer them meat, they still won't touch it. So it's not worth boasting, "I am a pure vegetarian." Hey, even these cows and buffaloes are pure vegetarians, so what new accomplishment have you made! These so-called 'pure' vegetarians may even end up eating eggs once in a while. Whereas those other animals would never do so. So it is neither worth going around constantly saying, "I am pure, I am pure, I am pure." Nor is it worth criticizing those who do [consume non-vegetarian food].

### Can Eggs Be Eaten?

**Questioner:** Some people even argue that there are two types of eggs, ones that are fertile and others that are infertile. So can those be eaten or not?

Dadashri: People living abroad [outside of India] were making the argument that there are *ahimsak* [infertile] eggs! So 'we' told them that anything that is non-living cannot be eaten in this world. One cannot eat anything that is not living. If an egg did not contain life, then that egg would be inedible, it would be considered a lifeless thing. This is because anything without life is considered lifeless. In order to eat foods that contain life, once they have been cut, they have to be consumed within two to three days, before they spoil. Even vegetables can only be eaten within a certain amount of time, once they have been picked [from the plant]; they will start rotting after that. Therefore, only living things can be consumed. Therefore, if an egg did not contain life, then it would be inedible. It is only edible if it is alive. So if people are saying that eggs do not contain life, then that point is entirely humbug. Why do they trap people like this?

It is a wonder in itself how this group, who believes in the consumption of infertile eggs, has represented these infertile eggs in this form [as being lifeless]. If that group were to be asked, "Tell us, is this infertile egg non-living or living? If it is non-living, it cannot be eaten." What kind of people are you, that you have fooled the entire world! If there is no life in it, then we cannot consume it; it is considered inedible. **Questioner:** But these [so-called] vegetarian eggs do not hatch.

**Dadashri:** The fact that they do not hatch is a different matter, but the eggs are still alive.

So, when things have been misconstrued like this, imagine the difficulty arising for Jain children! All these children had argued with 'us' on this topic. Then 'we' explained to them, "Dear children, at least give this some thought. There is no problem at all if the eggs were nonliving, but that which is not living cannot even be consumed." 'We' further explained to them, "Otherwise, if you want to be overly wise, then you will have to stop eating grains too. Go ahead and eat only non-living items. However, non-living things are not useful to the body. They do not contain any vitamins. Items that are non-living might satisfy one's hunger, but they do not contain vitamins. So the body cannot be sustained. It doesn't get the required vitamins, does it! Therefore, non-living items will not suffice as food." That is when those children agreed to stop eating eggs from that day forward. If the point is explained to them, then people are willing to understand; otherwise, these other people represent things in such a misconstrued way that the intellect goes astray.

This wheat and rice, and all other items that we eat, these big bottle gourds that we eat, those are all living beings, aren't they! Are they not living beings? However, the Lord has given the boundary of what to eat, "Eat these living beings. But do not kill the living beings that feel tormented by you, do not eat them, do not do anything at all to them."

**Questioner:** These eggs do not feel tormented, so is it okay to eat them or not?

Dadashri: Eggs do not feel tormented. However, the

life that is contained within an egg is in a dormant state. But when it hatches, you would realize that the chick feels tormented, wouldn't you?

**Questioner:** I would realize that immediately. But the egg does not move around, does it! What about that?

**Dadashri:** It does not do so because the living being within is in a dormant state. That is why it doesn't do so. Even the human fetus is [dormant] just like an egg up to the fourth or fifth month. That does not mean that one can kill it. We humans can understand what happens once the egg hatches.

### Should Milk Be Consumed?

**Questioner:** Just as the so-called 'vegetarian' egg should not be eaten, the milk of a cow should not be consumed.

**Dadashri:** Eggs should not be eaten. However, cow's milk can be consumed freely. Yogurt made from cow's milk can also be eaten and some people can even eat butter. There is no such thing as they cannot be consumed.

Why had the Lord said not to eat butter? That is a different matter. And that too, it was only said for specific people. You can freely eat milk pudding made from cow's milk. If you make other sweets from it, even then there is no problem with that. Even if any scripture has objected to this, 'we' will still tell you, "Fear not, there are no objections to this; that scripture is wrong." However, they do say that if you overeat, then you will experience discomfort. You have to see to that. Otherwise, go ahead and eat within limit.

**Questioner:** But nature intended that milk to be for the calves. It is not intended for us.

**Dadashri:** That point is completely false. That was the case for the wild cows and wild buffaloes, their calves

would drink all of their mother's milk. Whereas in this case, people nourish the cows by feeding them. That way, the calves also get milk and we can all take a share of that milk as well. And this has been the practice since time immemorial. And if a cow is nourished well, then it can produce up to fifteen liters of milk a day. This is because if you feed it well, it will produce more than the normal amount of milk that it requires. That is the way milk should be taken. And ensure that the calf is not starved.

The *Chakravartis* (the emperors of six continents) would keep a thousand to two thousand cows. They would be housed in what was called a *goshala* (cow pen). What kind of milk must the emperors have consumed? If there were a thousand cows in the cow pen, all thousand cows would be milked, and that milk would be fed to a hundred cows. Those one hundred cows would be milked and that milk would be fed to ten cows. Those ten cows would be milked and that milk would be fed to a single cow and the milk of that cow was then consumed by the emperor.

## Is There Himsa in Killing a Carnivorous Animal?

**Questioner:** To kill any animal is *himsa*. However, in the case of carnivores or else animals that can harm other animals or human beings or can be life-threatening, can they be killed or not?

**Dadashri:** Maintain the intent that you do not want to engage in *himsa* towards anything. And if you do not kill a snake, then someone else will come around to do it. So if you don't have the nerve to kill a snake, then there are many other people around here who would kill it, a countless number of people would do so. And there are also many types of tribes who kill. Therefore, don't spoil your intentions of your own accord. There is no benefit in engaging in *himsa. Himsa* only harms oneself.

# One Living Being Is Food for Another

**Questioner:** Humans are creatures who live by using their intellect; thus, they should not harm other animals. But some animals live by preying on other animals, so is this difference between animals and humans only because of the difference in their intellect? What about the *himsa* between the animals themselves?

Dadashri: You are not at all responsible for the himsa between the animals themselves. This is because, there are neither any farms nor controlled grain stores to be found in the ocean. So himsa simply carries on there. The larger fish sit around with their mouths gaping wide open and the smaller fish seep right into their stomachs. Do they have any problem? Then once they shut their mouth, that is the end of the smaller fish! But you are not responsible for that. That indeed is the law of the world. You may object to it, whereas those other [animals] will end up eating goats. Larger living beings prey on smaller living beings, and smaller living beings prey on even smaller living beings, and those smaller living beings prey on even smaller living beings. That is how everything functions in the entire oceanic world. As long as a living being has not acquired a birth as a human being who can discern right from wrong, everything is allowed. Now, over there [in the case of animals], no one tries to save the other, whereas here, people attempt to save them [the animals].

# The One Who Is Absolutely Ahimsak Faces No Threat

Questioner: But people who are *ahimsak* are being shot at.

**Dadashri:** It is not at all possible to shoot people who are *ahimsak*. Even if someone wanted to do so, he

wouldn't be able to. If an *ahimsak* person were to be shot at from a hundred different directions, he would still remain unscathed by the bullets. Only *himsak* people are injured by bullets. Everything has its own inherent nature.

These days, if *ahimsa* alone were practiced, then people would loot you in this worldly life. If they were given the liberty for some time, then they wouldn't even let you sit here. This is because, for one thing, this is *Kaliyug* (the current era of the time cycle, which is characterized by strife, discord, quarreling, and contention); people's minds have become tainted. People have developed all sorts of bad habits. So what wouldn't they end up doing? Therefore, if the bullets are kept, then it is possible for *ahimsa* to be practiced; otherwise, *ahimsa* would have to be practiced under compulsion.

Although, now, the current era is turning this around! Now, the times are changing all this around and you will witness a very agreeable era. You will see everything for yourself.

**Questioner:** There was a saint who was practicing *ahimsa*, but despite this, why was he murdered? Because you just mentioned that an *ahimsak* person never gets shot.

**Dadashri:** Who can be considered as *ahimsak*? A person who does not stick his hand in anything can be considered as *ahimsak*. A person may say, "Give that person more because he is foolish. Though he is foolish, give him more anyway." In doing so, the other party feels slighted; so they get angry. That is considered *himsa*. One should not at all get involved in such things. Such judgment should not be passed. A person who is *ahimsak* never passes judgment. *Himsa* exists where judgment is passed.

Otherwise, if you practice *ahimsa* in absoluteness, then it is impossible for anyone to fire a shot at you. Now, what is meant by *ahimsa* in absoluteness? Not even a single word of partiality should be uttered, and if they are spoken, then only certain words are to be spoken. Other words should not be spoken. You should not get involved between two parties. If you get involved between two parties, then *himsa* will definitely happen towards one of them to some extent!

## **Animal Sacrifice**

**Questioner:** In many temples, animals are offered as a sacrifice; is that a wrongful act or a rightful act?

**Dadashri:** If you were to ask the person offering the sacrifice, "What is your take on this?" Then he would say, "I am doing a rightful act." If you were to ask the goat, "What is your take?" Then it would say, "This man is a murderer." If you were to ask the celestial being [for whom the sacrifice is being made], then he would say, "If he offers it, then I cannot refuse it. I am actually not taking anything. These people just lay it at my feet and take it away." So forget the issue of it being a wrongful act or a rightful act! Besides, whatever you are doing, it is all on your own liability. Therefore, think before you act. Thereafter, offer whatever you like, who is stopping you? But at the time of offering it, keep in mind that the whole and sole responsibility is yours alone, it is not anyone else's.

# Ahimsa Is Supported Through Intention and Prayer

Now, you should nurture such an intention, 'These speechless animals should not be harmed, cows should not be slaughtered,' and explain your opinions to others. Do as much as you can. There is no need to fight with others over this. If someone says, "My religion says that I should eat meat," there is no need to start a fight with him just because it is forbidden in your religion. Be ready to apply the intentions you have nurtured, so that whatever is in the intentions will unfold as a value system. And the intention for the salvation of the entire world remains with you at all times, day and night, doesn't it? Yes, so you should then act in that way.

Questioner: We can at least pray for that, can't we?

**Dadashri:** Yes, yes, you should pray, you should nurture such an intention, you should support it [promote it to others]. If a person does not understand, then you should help him understand. Having said this, this *himsa* did not begin today, it has been around since the beginning. This world is not of one 'color' [viewpoint].

There was a reputed saint, Tulsidas, who had heard a great deal about the renowned saint, Kabir. He was famous for being a great saint, so Tulsidas had decided, 'I want to go and pay my respects to him.' So Tulsidas set out to visit him in Delhi. Once he arrived there, he asked someone, "Sir, where is Saint Kabir's home?" The man replied, "Are you talking about the Saint Kabir who is a weaver?" He said, "Yes." So the man said, "He has built a hut out there. Go through the butchers' market to get there." So Tulsidas, a Brahmin (a member of the highest social rank in the Hindu caste system, who were traditionally priests and scholars), a pious man, entered the butchers' market. Seeing a goat's carcass hanging on one side and a chicken's carcass hanging on the other side, he was put in a difficult situation. He would see one thing on one side and then spit [out of disgust]. Carrying on in this way, he made his way over to Saint Kabir's home. Now, wouldn't he face difficulty! Tulsidas had not put this into practice [was not mentally prepared for such a situation] and all things should always be put into practice. That is why this predicament arose. Eventually, Tulsidas reached Saint Kabir's home. He was told that Saint Kabir was in the kitchen. One or two followers were sitting out there too, so they told him, "Have a seat, sir." They seated him on a bed. Then Saint Kabir appeared and said, "Let's do *satsang* (spiritual discourse)." However, because it was still on his mind, Tulsidas blurted out, "You are such a great saint, you are renown in all of India, so how can you live in this butchers' market?" Now, Saint Kabir was quick-witted, so he didn't have to sit down to compose a verse. Whatever he spoke was itself a verse. He proclaimed, "*Kabir ka ghar bazaar mein, galkateeyo ke paas.*" ("Kabir's home is near the butcher's market.") He proceeded to say, "*Karegaa so paavegaa, tu kyun hove udaas*?" ("The doer will suffer the consequences, why are You [the Self] becoming so despondent?") So Tulsidas realized, "All my spiritual devotion until now has been in vain, my reputation [as a saint] is lost.'

Behave in such a way that you do not lose your reputation like this. You should nurture good intentions. This [eating non-vegetarian food] has not started in this era alone; it has been carrying on like this since time immemorial. Even those who served Lord Ram ate meat. Because would *Kshatriyas* (members of the warrior caste in the traditional Indian caste system) ever refrain from eating meat?

You should nurture good intentions. Do not get involved in this uproar, in these groups [that promote taking action against *himsa* done to animals]. This is because, these people are giving rise to conflict due to the lack of understanding. Nothing is gained from that and harm is done. What is the point of that? And when [should you speak up]? It is if your own king sends an order that, "Citizens, you should not do that [eat meat] on certain days." Presently, you do not have any authority and who has even asked you to be overly wise like this? Just mind your own business! According to the Lord, no one dies at all. You should get your own spiritual work done and remain supportive [towards *ahimsa*]. Do not harbor any negative intents.

### Who Is the Greatest Ahimsak of All?

Instead of [focusing on] saving these living beings, simply nurture this intent, 'May no living being be hurt even to the slightest extent. May they not be hurt even through the mind, nor through the speech, nor through conduct!' That is all, there is no greater *ahimsak* (non-violent) person than this. If this intent is nurtured, then despite having this much awareness, if insects are [accidentally] crushed, then that is *vyavasthit*! And do not speak of trying to save anyone again.

## Abhaydaan, for Which Living Beings?

**Questioner:** What I am saying is that I had taken a vow to stop eating root vegetables ten years ago, so as to give living beings *abhaydaan* (being in a state of conduct which does not induce fear in or hurt any living being).

**Dadashri:** *Abhaydaan* is meant to be given to a living being that can move around, a living being that feels fearful, that understands fear. Those that are tormented by fear are to be given *abhaydaan*. For the others that do not understand fear, how would you be able to give them *abhaydaan*?

Those living beings that can feel fear, even tiny ants feel fearful when you touch them with your finger; give them *abhaydaan*. However, this grain of wheat, this grain of pearl millet, does not feel fearful. What is the point in making them free of fear? They do not even comprehend fear, so how can you give them *abhaydaan*?

Questioner: That point is completely correct.

**Dadashri:** So all this is going on without understanding. The medicine that was meant to be applied externally has been swallowed. Then people will say, "He swallowed Lord Mahavir's medicine and died!" Hey, why are you ridiculing Lord Mahavir? That is the very same business that is going on at present; people are swallowing the medicine that is meant to be applied externally and then they say, "Religion is wrong." Mortal one, can religion ever be wrong? Previously, were you swallowing the medicine that was meant to be applied externally?

Questioner: I didn't know anything at all, before.

**Dadashri:** You did not even know whether to apply it externally or to swallow it! The living beings that feel fear are called *traskaya jeevo*. So the Lord has said this in reference to those [living beings] that have developed the instinct of fear. For the rest, He has only said to not waste water unnecessarily. Bathe with it, drink it, wash with it, wash your clothes using it, but do not waste water unnecessarily, meaning without any specific purpose.

#### Abhaydaan Is the Ultimate Donation

**Questioner:** Then why has such great importance been placed on *abhaydaan* in the Jain religion?

**Dadashri:** Everyone has given importance to *abhaydaan. Abhaydaan* is the main thing. *Abhaydaan* means that if birds are perched over here, then realizing that they would fly away, you carefully walk around to the other side. If you are walking along the path at midnight and two dogs are asleep, then realizing that they will be startled and will wake up by the sound of your shoes, you remove your shoes and quietly make your way home. If someone gets scared because of you, how can that be considered humane? Even the dogs out there should not be startled by you. If you walk along clicking your shoes and the dog raises its ears and gets up, then you should realize, 'Oh, I lapsed in giving *abhaydaan*!' *Abhaydaan* means that no living being becomes afraid of you. Have you seen a

person imbibing *abhaydaan* anywhere? *Abhaydaan* is the ultimate donation.

Even when I was twenty-two years old, I would not let the dogs get startled. 'We' are constantly giving *abhaydaan*, there is nothing else that 'we' give. If anyone were to learn to give *abhaydaan* the way 'we' do, then he would attain salvation! The practice of 'donating' fear is something people already have from before, isn't it? One will say, "I will sort you out." So is that considered *abhaydaan* or is that considered the 'donation' of fear?

**Questioner:** Then these living beings that we save, isn't that considered *abhaydaan*?

**Dadashri:** In fact, the one who saves them incurs a tremendous liability. He is simply exercising egoism. The Lord had just said this much, "Practice kindness towards one's own Self." That's it. That is all that has been mentioned in the entire scripture, practice *bhaav daya* (kindness to one's Self by prevailing as the Self). The Lord has not told you to uphold other forms of kindness. And if you take on the responsibility unnecessarily, then a liability will be incurred.

### That Is the Ego of Saving Lives

People simply believe, 'It is because we save them that these insects are alive.' So what are our people like? At home, they hurl abuses at their mother, while outside they try to save lives!

These people should be sent into the ocean! All these vegetables and grains must be growing in the ocean, right? These fish must be eating that, right?! Or else, we must be sending grains from here, isn't it? We can throw chickpeas and other such lentils to feed them, can't we? Then what food do the fish eat? The tiny fish keep getting swallowed by the bigger fish. Then the bigger fish keep getting swallowed by even bigger fish. In this way, they continue swallowing [other fish] with ease. And on the other hand, the fish keep spawning! Now what would happen if the so-called 'intellectual' people were assigned to [rationalize] this?

What is the prevalent belief out there in the world? They will say, "We are saving [animals]." Moreover, they will have abhorrence towards the butchers. If you were to ask the butcher, "Why are you doing such a lousy business?" Then he would say, "Sir, why are you calling my business lousy? This business has carried on for generations in my family. This is in fact our family business." So this is what he would reply. Therefore, this is considered his family business. If you were to say anything, then he would feel, 'This senseless person doesn't understand anything.'

So those who eat non-vegetarian food do not have the ego of, 'We will kill or do something of that sort.' It is actually those who [claim to be] *ahimsak* that exercise the egoism of 'I am saving lives.' Hey, if you are the savior, then there is a ninety-year-old grandfather at home, he is about to die. Go and save him! But does anyone save [another] like that?

Questioner: No one does so.

**Dadashri:** Then why does he say, "I saved it and I did that!" Even the butcher does not have any authority. There is no one who has ever been born with the authority to kill. This is just unnecessary egoism that one exercises. The butcher may say, "I have slaughtered all sorts of living beings." So he exercises the egoism of that. Now, what does the Real viewpoint say? Will the killer attain *moksha* or will the savior attain *moksha*? Neither of the two will attain *moksha*. Both of them have egoism. One exercises the egoism of saving and the other exercises the egoism of killing. It will not do in the context of the Real viewpoint; it will do in the context of the relative viewpoint.

#### They Are Both Egotistic

The Lord is no less. According to the Lord, what is the rule to attain *moksha*? One person exercises the egoism of drinking alcohol, whereas another person exercises the egoism of not drinking alcohol. The Lord does not allow either of the two to enter [the state of] *moksha*. Those who are intoxicated with egoism are not allowed to enter there. Those who are without the intoxication of the ego are allowed to enter there.

So those people who do not drink alcohol, for them to have a sense of pride and smugness about it in their minds is actually a terrible offense. It is in fact, even graver than that of those who drink alcohol. The poor guy who drinks alcohol will readily say, "Sir, I am the most foolish person of all, I am a donkey, I am worthless." And if you were to pour two earthen pots of water over him, his intoxication would wear off. Whereas the intoxication of illusory attachment (*moha*) that people have, has just not worn off since infinite lifetimes, and they keep thinking, 'I am something, I am something.'

'We' will explain this to you with an example. There was a Jain businessman who lived in a small village. His financial status was average. One of his sons was three years old and the other was one and a half years old. All of a sudden, plague hit their village and both parents died. The two children survived. When the villagers found out, they got together and discussed, "What will become of these two children now? We have to figure out a solution. It would be good if someone is willing to raise them." There was a goldsmith who adopted the older son, but there was no one to take in the younger son. So, a man from a lower caste said, "Sir, I will be his caretaker." So some people responded, "Oh, this is the son of a Jain businessman and you are from a lower caste." But other people said, "If he doesn't take him in, then where else can we send the child? Instead of dying, at least the child will live. So what is wrong with that?" So both children grew up. When the son who was raised by the goldsmith was around twenty or twenty-two years old, he said, "It is an offense to drink alcohol. It is an offense to eat non-vegetarian food." While the other son, when he turned about eighteen or twenty years old, said, "One should drink alcohol, one should produce alcohol, one should eat non-vegetarian food." Now, these two brothers were like two seeds of the same lady-finger, so why did they speak so differently?

**Questioner:** Because of the *sanskaar* (the influence of upbringing, education, religion, company, and so on).

Dadashri: Yes, the sanskaar. The 'water' that was sprinkled was different! So then someone said, "This child cannot be considered Jain at all, can he!" There must have been a saint who was around, so people asked him, "Sir, these two are brothers, but they are saying opposing things. Of them, who will attain moksha?" So the saint replied, "Where does the point about attaining moksha even remain to be discussed in this? One is exercising the egoism of not drinking alcohol, of not eating non-vegetarian food, while this one is exercising the egoism of drinking alcohol, of eating non-vegetarian food. Where does the point about attaining moksha even arise in this? The point about attaining moksha is entirely different. For that, a state that is free of egoism is required." In this case, both of them are egotistical. One has fallen into this ditch, the other has fallen into the other ditch. The Lord refers to both of them as egotistical.

#### **Exclusively for Those Who Revere Ahimsa**

That which people believe is not what the Lord has said. The Lord is a very wise man! The Lord has said

that there is no one in this world who has the authority to kill others. This is because, it is [governed by] scientific circumstantial evidences. How is it possible for one to kill another? It is when so many circumstances come together that a living being dies! And along with that, He has also said, "This concept is such that it should never be disclosed." So someone said, "Lord, You are saying this and You are also saying that." So the Lord replied, "Look, this point is for wise people, 'we' are making this statement for those people who revere ahimsa. 'We' are not saying this for people who revere himsa. Otherwise, they will nurture the intention, 'I want to kill these people.' And though that is not going to happen in this lifetime, if he nurtures this intention, then it will give effect in the next life." So with whom should this concept be discussed? It has been said to discuss this concept with those who revere ahimsa.

### This Is Not for Everyone

The Lord has said, "Do not exercise the egoism of killing and do not exercise the egoism of saving either." If you become the killer, then your state as the Self (Atmabhaav) will die, no one out there is going to die. Thus, himsa towards one's own Self is taking place, nothing else. The Self does not actually die; rather, one is engaging in himsa towards one's own state as the Self. That is why the Lord has said to not do this. And if you become the savior, then you are wrongfully exercising egoism. In that too, you are engaging in himsa towards the state as the Self. So in both cases, you are on the wrong track. Just let go of all this nonsense! Besides, no living being can ever kill another living being. However, if the Lord had clearly stated, "No one can ever kill another," then people would have expressed the egoism of, "I did kill!" No one has the [independent] power to do all this. This world is without any [independent] power. People continue to wander life after

life by unnecessarily engaging in *vikalp* (false notions of egoism). The *Gnanis* have Seen how this world perpetuates. So these are all false notions of egoism that have become established within. So, in such a situation, how can one ever become *nirvikalp* (free from the belief 'I am Chandubhai' and all relative 'I-ness' and 'my-ness' that stem from it, and with the right belief that 'I am pure Soul')?

So amongst all the living beings that exist, not a single one is able to kill another. Not a single one has the [independent] power to kill another. Nevertheless, the Lord did say to let go of himsa and turn towards ahimsa. What He means to say here is, 'Let go of the egoism of killing.' Nothing else has to be let go of; just let go of the egoism of killing. You cannot kill even if you try to, so why are you unnecessarily exercising egoism? By exercising egoism, you'll get into more trouble, you will invite tremendous liability. Let that living being die at the hands of its own nimit (an apparent doer who is simply instrumental in the process)! It is going to die anyhow, but why are you exercising egoism over that? Therefore, it was for the purpose of stopping this egoism that the Lord encouraged ahimsa. This entire discussion had been done to encourage one to let go of the egoism of killing.

**Questioner:** Isn't this too much knowledge for the average person to digest?

**Dadashri:** Yes, it is not something that can be easily digested. That is why it has not been disclosed. Everyone was simply told, "You should save it; otherwise, it will die."

### The Hidden Truth Behind Killing and Saving

Now [to say], "He killed a living being, this one did this, this one saved it," that is all simply from the relative viewpoint. It is not correct. What is it from the Real viewpoint? No living being can ever [independently] kill another living being. In that endeavor to kill, it is only if all the scientific circumstantial evidences come together that it will die. No person can actually independently kill another. So, it will only die if the evidences come together; moreover, the evidences are not in our control. Therefore, no living being can save another living being. It is only if the scientific circumstantial evidences are present that it can be saved; otherwise, it cannot be saved. One is just exercising the egoism of saving it. Yet, alongside that, it has also been said, "You should get rid from your mind, the intent of, 'I want to kill." This is because the intent is one of the evidences. It is when other evidences come together with this evidence that the act will take place. So amongst them, one's own intent is one of the evidences; however, starting with this and inclusive of all the other evidences, one exercises the egoism of having done the act all by himself.

### Death Only Occurs at Its Designated Time

'We' are in fact trying to explain a very subtle point, that no living being can ever be killed unless its time of death has arrived. Suppose you had seven goats and you sold off two of them; of them, only those whose time of death has arrived would be sold. Hey, of the seven, were you not fond of these two? Those poor things were also nice, so why are you giving them away like that? And even the goats would happily go with their new owner. This is because their time of death has arrived! Thereafter, at the slaughterhouse, when they are marked with paint, they would even become delighted, because they think that they are being decorated for a festival. This is how the world is. But it is worth understanding all of this.

Hence, no one dies before their designated time of death. However, because you are nurturing the intent to kill, you are held liable for *bhaav himsa* and that means that

himsa is being done towards your own state as the Self. You are engaging in *himsa* towards your own state as the Self. In actuality, the living being will die when it is meant to die. Its time will come, the circumstances for that will come together, moreover, that is [the result of] scientific circumstantial evidences. It is when so many evidences come together, moreover, it is in fact when evidences that are not visible to the eye come together, that a living being dies. So in his mind, one feels, 'I killed it.' [If we were to ask him,] "Hey, You [the Self] did not have the desire to kill, so how did you end up killing it?" Then he would reply, "But my foot stepped on it!" "Hey, is the leg Yours? Wouldn't your leg get paralyzed?" He would reply, "The paralysis would happen to the leg [not to the Self]." So, in that case, that leg is not Yours! That which belongs to You does not get paralyzed. You are taking ownership of the leg, but that is false ownership. At least go and ask a Gnani Purush (One who has realized the Self and is able to do the same for others), "Is this Mine [the Self's] or does it belong to the non-Self?" Ask Him that! If you ask Him, then the Gnani Purush will make you realize, "Dear man, none of this is Yours. Even this leg belongs to the non-Self, the rest also belongs to the non-Self, and this is Yours." In this way, the Gnani Purush will clarify everything. Have it surveyed by a Gnani Purush. Instead, you are having it surveyed by other people. But these other people who do the surveying are ill advised. They in fact refer to those very things that belong to the non-Self as their own. Hence, a true survey has never been done. The Gnani Purush separates it for you after surveying it and sets up a line of demarcation, "This part is Yours and that part belongs to the non-Self." That which can never become Yours is called *parbharyu*. No matter how hard you try, it will still not become Yours.

Now, the time of death is a matter that is not in

anyone's control. However, the Lord has not disclosed that there are causes behind this. There are certain facts that cannot be revealed. Had the Lord elaborated the facts in this way, then people would have really understood this point. Though the Lord has spoken about it, it is not in people's understanding. The Lord has explained everything in detail; however, these explanations are in the form of sutras (concise statements that usually require commentary for understanding). So it is when a hundred thousand sutras are digested that this much would be derived. What the Lord [Mahavir] spoke was in the form of 'gold' [pure essence] and Gautam Swami [Lord Mahavir's principle disciple] kept weaving the 'gold' into the sutras. Now, if someone like Gautam Swami were around, then he would be able to extract the 'gold' from the sutras. But when will someone like Gautam Swami come around and when will the 'gold' be extracted and when will we make some spiritual progress?

### Make the Resolution, 'I Don't Want to Kill'

Now, there are so many people who have made the resolution (*nishchay*), 'I don't want to engage in *himsa* whatsoever. I don't want to kill any insects.' If such a resolution has been made, then no [circumstance would ever arise in which an] insect would die at one's hands. Even if it were to come under such a person's foot, it would survive and walk away. Whereas for the person who has made the resolution, 'I certainly want to kill living beings,' all the living beings that are meant to die will die at his hands.

Besides, the Lord has said, "There is no single entity in this world who can [independently] kill another." So someone may say, "Oh Lord, what are You saying? We actually witness people killing other living beings!" To that, the Lord would say, "No, that person has nurtured the intent to kill and this living being's time of death is approaching." Therefore, when its time of death approaches, that is when the circumstance of coming across that person comes together; it encounters the one who has the intent to kill. Having said this, it is not possible for one to ever kill another [independently]. However, the living being will die if its time of death has approached, and it is only then that it encounters that person. This is a very subtle point. If only the world understood this, how wonderful that would be!

**Questioner:** When there is a train accident and a person gets crushed underneath the train, then it's not as though the train made such a resolution, is it?

**Dadashri:** The train does not ever require a resolution. When one's time of death approaches, he will say, "I will die in any possible way." If one has this intent that, 'I'm not bothered about which way I die,' then this is the kind of death he gets. His karmic account will be bound based exactly on the intent he has made. However, no one can ever die before their designated time of death.

Now, amongst these, which sentence has to be understood? It is that as long as a living being's time of death has not approached, no one can kill it, and the time of death is not in anyone's control.

## No One Dies According to the Lord

**Questioner:** So, to not commit *himsa*, is that a divine attribute or not? Meaning, to commit *himsa*, is that an offense or not?

**Dadashri:** Shall 'we' reveal a secret matter to you in the presence of all these people? No one is likely to misuse it, so 'we' are telling you.

According to the Lord, no one in this world dies. According to the Lord, no one dies; it is according to the terms of worldly people that one dies. It is according to terminology based on wrong belief (*bhranti*) that one dies. 'We' are stating this fact openly. 'We' have never disclosed it previously. Today, 'we' are disclosing it in your presence.

That which prevails in the Lord's Knowledge, prevails in 'our' Knowledge, and that is this: 'In this world, no one ever takes birth and no one ever dies.' From the time this world came into existence until now, no one has ever died. A living being may appear to die, but that is a wrong belief. And a living being may appear to take birth, but that is also a wrong belief. 'We' have openly stated the plain fact as per what the Lord has said. Now, if you still want to hold on to the old [belief], then hold on to it, and if you do not want to hold on to it, then hold on to the new [belief]. Did you understand 'our' point?

**Questioner:** I understood the point, but you stated it in very general terms.

**Dadashri:** Yes, so according to the Lord, no one dies. If there was a mass killing of a thousand men and Lord Mahavir were to find out about it, then He would not be affected by that at all. This is because He Knows that no one ever dies. It is only in people's belief that they are dying; they are not dying in the real sense. That which is visible is all a wrong belief. 'We' have never Seen anything to be dying! [Whereas] For you, it appears that way, that is why you keep having doubts as to, 'What will happen?' In such a case, 'we' tell you, "Dear fellow, nothing will happen. Remain in 'our' *Agnas*."

Hence, 'we' have divulged a subtle point today, that according to the Lord, no one dies. Yet when people told the Lord, "Lord, just disclose this fact!" Then the Lord replied, "No, it is not something that can be stated openly. People will just believe that no living being ever dies. So they will have all sorts of intents of eating [other living beings]; they will spoil their intents." The Lord had not disclosed this fact because people's intents would spoil. It does not take long for the one who is not Self-realized to spoil his intent, and once the intent is spoiled, he himself [the relative self; the developing I] takes on a form in accordance with that intent. This is because there is no one else besides him; he does not have a superior over him at all.

So as long as the wrong belief [of 'I am Chandubhai'] exists, this statement, "According to the Lord, no one dies," should never be spoken. It is only because you pointedly asked about it that 'we' had to disclose it. And there is no problem in telling 'our' *mahatmas* (Self-realized Ones in *Akram Vignan*). These *mahatmas* are not the sort of people who would misuse it. Will you tell everyone out there, "According to the Lord, no one dies"?

Questioner: I am not afraid of anyone. I would say it boldly.

**Dadashri:** Please do not disclose this. This fact is not something that should be disclosed. It is only worth it for those who have realized the pure Soul to know this fact as given by the Lord. It is not worth it for others [not Self-realized] to know this fact. This [fact] is akin to poison for those people.

#### Bhaav Himsa Is Rampant in India

**Questioner:** Will it take a long time for the widespread propagation of the practice of *ahimsa*?

**Dadashri:** Even if it were to take a long time, it would not spread completely. This is because what is worldly life like? The inclination is entirely towards *himsa*. So that is just not possible. It is actually in India that the readiness towards practicing *ahimsa* arises to some extent, the rest of the people don't understand *ahimsa* at all, do they!

**Questioner:** But is there a subtle intent of *ahimsa* behind trying to save living beings?

**Dadashri:** To save them is not subtle *ahimsa*; rather, it is overt *ahimsa*. People do not actually understand subtle *ahimsa*. How can they understand subtle *ahimsa*? These people do not even understand overt *ahimsa*, so when will they ever understand the subtle level? Moreover, this overt *ahimsa* actually lies in their blood, that is why they uphold *ahimsa* towards these small creatures. Otherwise, all these people continue to commit *himsa* in their homes all day long; everyone does so, aside from an exceptional case!

**Questioner:** Even in the western countries, *himsa* is constantly being committed. In eating, in drinking, in every act. There is *himsa* even in the home. Killing flies, killing mosquitoes, *himsa* takes place even on the lawns outside, spraying pesticides, killing small insects, *himsa* takes place even in the gardens; so how will these people ever become free?

**Dadashri:** Mind you, compared to their *himsa*, the people of India commit even greater *himsa*. Compared to that *himsa*, this *himsa* is much worse. All day long, they engage in nothing but *himsa* towards the state as the Self. That is referred to as *bhaav himsa*.

**Questioner:** These people [of India] are actually committing violence towards their own state as the Self, whereas those people [outside of India] are committing violence towards the Self of others.

**Dadashri:** No. These [Indian] people actually commit *himsa* towards the Self of others too. They commit *himsa* towards whomever they encounter. That entire 'business' is wrong. That is why those people [outside of India] are happy! Secondly, they don't have thoughts of hurting people

indiscriminately, and they keep expressing, "I will help you, I will help you." Whereas people here have their own selfish interests. They will help someone if they think that the person will be useful to them. Otherwise, they won't help him. They first assess whether the other person will be useful to them! Do they make such an assessment or not?

Therefore, the Lord has said that *bhaav himsa* is tremendous *himsa*, and the whole of India is committing such *bhaav himsa*.

Questioner: But the most emphasis on *ahimsa* is actually placed here [in India].

**Dadashri:** Even so, *himsa* is committed the most by the people living here. This is because they engage in nothing but bickering and quarrelling all day long. What is the reason for that? It is because people here are more aware. Nevertheless, the youth of today who have gotten onto the wrong path, those poor fellows do not engage in as much *bhaav himsa* as these people do! This is because they consume a non-vegetarian diet and all other such things, thus they have become dull. So, there is not much *bhaav himsa* in a person who has become dull. Otherwise, where people are more aware, there is nothing but *bhaav himsa*. So all day long, there are quarrels, quarrels, and more quarrels.... if glasses were to break, quarrels would ensue! No matter what happens, there would be quarrels!

#### **Causes Are Independent, Effects Are Dependent**

**Questioner:** Nevertheless, in any way we look at it, for these people, it is still considered *ahimsa*, isn't it!

**Dadashri:** Having the *bhaav* (intent; cause) is *himsa* that is committed independently (*swatantra*), whereas the *dravya* (effect) is *himsa* that is *partantra* (dependent upon the karma bound in the past life). The latter is not in one's

control. Therefore, the *ahimsa* one practices is *partantra*. He is not doing this as *purusharth* (independent effort of charging karma) in this life.

Thus, this type of *ahimsa* is *ahimsa* towards living beings that are visible, but it is not wrong. Whereas, what the Lord had said was, "The *ahimsa* that you practice on the outside, practice that *ahimsa* completely, whether they are subtle living beings or larger living beings, practice *ahimsa* towards all of them. But first see to it that *bhaav himsa* (violence towards Your own state as the Self) is not committed." As it is, nothing but *bhaav himsa* is taking place constantly. Now, people actually do speak of *bhaav himsa* in conversation, but shouldn't they understand what *bhaav himsa* is? If they were to converse with 'us', then 'we' would explain it to them.

In *bhaav himsa*, no 'photo' forms in the other person, whereas *dravya himsa* (violence committed through thought, speech, or action) is akin to a movie; it is like a movie that is playing and you are watching it. When it is visible like that, that is all *dravya himsa*. *Bhaav himsa* takes place at the subtle level, whereas *dravya himsa* can be seen overtly. That which can be perceived directly through the mind, speech, or body is *dravya himsa*.

## First Save Yourself From Bhaav Himsa

So what the Lord has referred to as *ahimsa* is of a different sort. What is the first [level of] *ahimsa*? To ensure that *Atmaghat* (violence towards the state as the Self) is not committed. 'He' has said to first ensure that *bhaav himsa* is not committed from within. Instead of that, this [concept] has been distorted into something else entirely. In fact, *bhaav himsa* keeps taking place, *bhaav himsa* takes place constantly. So initially, the *bhaav himsa* is to be stopped, and *dravya himsa* is not even in anyone's

control. Yet such things cannot be spoken. If one says that, then he will incur a liability. This should not be disclosed to the general public. It can only be told to people with understanding [those who are Self-realized]. That is why the vitaraag Lords did not disclose everything. However, dravya himsa is not in anyone's control, it is not in the control of any living being whatsoever. But if this were to be disclosed, then people would ruin their next life. This is because they cannot refrain from having intents, can they; [intents] such as, 'As it is not in our control, so now there is no fault to be incurred in killing, is there!' That precise bhaav himsa is to be stopped. The vitaraag Lords were so wise! Is a single word of that written [in the scriptures]? Just look, did They allow it to leak even in the slightest! The Tirthankar Lords (the absolutely enlightened Lords who can liberate others) were such wise men; wherever They went, it turned into a place of pilgrimage!

Yet it is only when *dravya himsa* is stopped that *bhaav himsa* can be controlled. Even then, *bhaav himsa* is the one that is important to note. Thus, the Lord has not said to get involved in the *himsa* or lack of *himsa* towards other living beings. The Lord has said, "'You' [as the Self] should not engage in *bhaav himsa*. Then You will prove to be *ahimsak*." The Lord has mentioned just this much.

## Bhaav Ahimsa Happens in This Way

So what has the Lord referred to as the gravest *himsa*? [The Lord has said,] "When a person has killed a living being, 'we' do not refer to that as *himsa*. However, this person harbored the intent to kill; that is what 'we' refer to as *himsa*." Now tell 'us', what do people understand from this? They will say, "He is the one who killed the living being, so catch him." Then another person may say, "This person has not yet killed the living being, right?" It does not matter even if he has not killed it. However, he
harbored the intent that a living being should be killed. That is why he himself is the culprit. Moreover, the actual act of killing the living being is brought about by *vyavasthit*. That person is just exercising the egoism of 'I killed it.' Whereas, the one who nurtures the intent to kill, for him it is akin to he himself killing that living being.

You should say, "These living beings should be protected." Then whether they are saved or not, you are not liable for it. You should say, "These living beings should be protected." That is all you have to do. Thereafter, if *himsa* takes place, then you are not liable for it! You should repent, do *pratikraman* for the *himsa* that happened, that way all the liability dispels.

Now how can human beings understand the subtlety of this point? Is it as though they have the capacity? From where can they acquire such an understanding? If they were to disclose these facts of 'ours' there [to the general public who are not Self-realized], then those people would misconstrue it. 'We' do not disclose this to the general public. This cannot be stated in public, can it! Do you understand?

*Bhaav ahimsa* means that the intent, 'I want to kill a living being,' should never arise and neither should the intent, 'I want to hurt a living being' ever arise. Rather than forcibly bringing it into action (*kriya*), one simply needs to nurture the intention, 'May no living being be hurt to the slightest extent through the mind, speech, or body.' Only the intention needs to be nurtured. How are you going to save [other living beings] through actions? A hundred thousand living beings die with each breath that is taken, and here [when the body moves], there are swarms of living beings that collide [with the body], and they die simply through those very collisions. This is because, we are like large rocks to them. They feel as though, 'This large rock has collided with me.'

# The Gravest Himsa Towards the State as the Self Is Kashay

Where anger, pride, deceit, and greed exist, there *Atma himsa* (violence towards the state as the Self) is taking place, whereas that other is *himsa* towards insects. What is the meaning of *bhaav himsa*? The violence that happens towards Your own state as the Self; this anger, pride, deceit, and greed, they cause you [in the state as the relative self] to come into bondage, so have pity on yourself. The Lord has said to first maintain *bhaav ahimsa* (non-violent intent) towards Your own [state as the] Self and then to maintain *bhaav ahimsa* towards others.

To kill these small insects is called *dravya himsa*, whereas to hurt someone in a way that causes mental suffering, to get angry at someone, to get upset, all of that is considered *himsak bhaav* (violent intent); it is considered *bhaav himsa*. No matter how hard people try to practice *ahimsa, ahimsa* is not so easy to put into practice quickly. And the actual, real *himsa* is in fact anger, pride, deceit, and greed. Killing insects, killing male and female buffaloes is known as *dravya himsa* (violence that is happening in effect). That will simply carry on as per the laws of nature. No one has a say in that.

So what the Lord had said was, "First, ensure that you, yourself, do not engage in *kashay* (anger, pride, deceit, and greed)." This is because *kashay* is the gravest *himsa*. That is referred to as *Atma himsa*; it is referred to as *bhaav himsa*. If *dravya himsa* happens, then so be it, but do not allow *bhaav himsa* to happen. Instead, these people are preventing *dravya himsa*, but the *bhaav himsa* persists.

Therefore, if a person has decided, 'I never want to kill,' then no one will come to die at his hands. Now, on the one hand, he has stopped the overt *himsa* by deciding,

'I do not want to kill any living being,' however, if [on the other hand] he has decided to take advantage of others by using his intellect, then the 'market' [business of *himsa*] is certainly open. So then, the 'moths' [people] will come and collide with him, and that too is nothing but *himsa*, isn't it!

Therefore, no living being should be tormented, no living being should be hurt to the slightest extent; there should be no *himsa* to the slightest extent towards any living being. Moreover, one should not even have the slightest negative opinion about any human being. If a [negative] opinion arises for even an enemy, then that is considered the gravest *himsa*. This *himsa* is graver than that of slaughtering a goat. Getting irritated with a family member is *himsa* that is graver than slaughtering a goat. This is because to get irritated is *Atmaghat* (violence towards the state as the Self). Whereas the death of the goat is a separate matter.

In addition to that, speaking negatively about people is equivalent to killing. Therefore, do not ever engage in speaking negatively about people. Never engage in speaking negatively about anyone whatsoever. That is nothing but *himsa*.

Furthermore, where there is partiality, there is *himsa*. Partiality means [the belief or intent that], 'We are different and you are different'; in doing this, there is *himsa*. On the other hand, such people go around 'displaying a badge' [proudly claiming], "We are an *ahimsak* group of people. We believe only in *ahimsa*." But dear fellow, the number one *himsa* is this partiality. If just this much is understood, then it is more than enough. Hence, the message of the *vitaraag* Lords needs to be understood.

# Death of the State as the Self in Each and Every Moment

For people of the entire world, *raudradhyan* (an adverse internal state that hurts the self and others) and

*aartadhyan* (an adverse internal state that results in hurting the self) are constantly taking place, automatically. No effort at all is required for it. So what is the gravest *himsa* in this world? *Aartadhyan* and *raudradhyan*! This is because they are considered *Atma himsa* (violence towards the state as the Self). The *himsa* towards insects is considered *pudgal himsa*; whereas this is considered *Atma himsa*. So which *himsa* is better?

Questioner: As far as *himsa* is concerned, neither are good. Nevertheless, *Atma himsa* is considered worse.

**Dadashri:** All these people are very cautious about *pudgal himsa*, yet *Atma himsa* is continually happening. The scriptures writers have referred to *Atma himsa* as *bhaav himsa*. Now, after acquiring this *Gnan*, *bhaav himsa* ceases for You. So You experience so much peace within, don't You!

**Questioner:** Krupaludev has referred to *bhaav himsa* as *bhaav maran* (death of the state as the Self by believing, 'I am Chandubhai,' 'I did it,' 'It happened to me'), has He not? There is this statement of Krupaludev, '*Kshane kshane bhayankar bhaav marane ka aho raachi raho.*' 'Then why relish a lifestyle that involves frightful *bhaav maran* in each and every moment?' So, in this case, is *bhaav maran* taking place in each and every moment?

**Dadashri:** Yes; what does He mean to say when He states 'frightful *bhaav maran* in each and every moment'? Mind you, *bhaav maran* is not happening in each and every moment; rather, frightful *bhaav maran* is happening in each and every *samay* (the smallest, most indivisible unit of time). However, He has given a description at the gross level. Otherwise, *bhaav maran* is indeed taking place in each and every *samay*. What is meant by *bhaav maran*? This belief that 'I am Chandubhai' is precisely *bhaav maran*. In any situation that arises, to believe 'it happened to me' means

*bhaav maran* has taken place. All these people [who are not Self-realized] are dwelling in *bhaav maran* [by believing], 'I did this introspection, I did that.'

**Questioner:** So then how can the *bhaav* (state as the Self) be brought back to life?

Dadashri: The state as the Self is not to be brought to life like that. The state as the Self has been 'killed' [in a state of gross unawareness of the Self]. Bhaav maran is referred to as 'sleep' (nidra). Bhaavnidra (the 'sleep' that veils the awareness of 'I am pure Soul' and leads one to believe that 'I am Chandubhai,' 'I did it,' 'It happened to me') and bhaav maran are both the same. In Akram Vignan, the [aaropit] bhaav (the wrong belief of 'I am Chandubhai'; the charging point) itself no longer remains; therefore, bhaav maran does not take place. Whereas on the Kramik path, people are dwelling in nothing but bhaav maran in each and every moment. Krupaludev was a Gnani Purush, so He alone could understand this. 'He' would feel, 'This is actually bhaav maran that has taken place; this is bhaav maran that has taken place.' Therefore, He would constantly be alert. Everyone else would keep dwelling in nothing but bhaav maran.

What is the meaning of *bhaav maran*? It means the death of *Swabhaav* (the state as the Self) and the birth of *vibhaav* (the wrong belief of 'I am Chandubhai'). When you, the [developing] I, dwell as the temporary state (*avastha*), that is the birth of *vibhaav*. Whereas if You [dwell in the state as the Self and] See the temporary state [as separate], then that is the birth of *Swabhaav*.

So if *pudgal himsa* is going on, then some solution will come about for that. However, a solution will not come about for the one who commits *Atma himsa*. People do not explain this at the subtle level like this, do they! They provide an analysis at the gross level!

# The Intellect Increased Through Ahimsa

The thing is, *aartadhyan* and *raudradhyan* arise in Muslims, in Christians, they arise in everyone and they also arise in our people [Hindus]. What is the difference in that? In fact, they arise more in our people. The reason being, a certain limit has been kept on the amount of *himsa* done towards living beings. They tend to arise more [in Hindus] as they practice *ahimsa* [in a state of ignorance of the Self]. This is because their intellect is very sharp, they are intelligent. And as the intellect increases, tremendous demerit karma are bound, especially in this *Dushamkaal* (the current era of the time cycle characterized predominantly by misery, and almost no happiness). And the one with a sharper intellect will even 'beat' [take advantage of; cheat] a person with a not so sharp intellect.

People outside of India and Muslims do not 'beat' others with their intellect. Our people of India actually 'beat' others with their intellect. 'Beating' with the intellect never existed in any of the other eras of the time cycle. This new issue has only arisen in this era of the time cycle. Yet one can only 'beat' others if he has an intellect, isn't it?! So who is considered to have intellect? First, it would be the one who does not kill these living beings, the one who practices ahimsa, the one who does not commit himsa towards the chhakaya (includes all living beings, which fall into two categories: 1. sthavarkaya - one-sensed, nonmobile or immobile living beings, which are of five types: apakaya, pruthvikaya, teukaya, vanaspatikaya, vayukaya. 2. traskava – two to five-sensed mobile living beings that experience fear); such a person's intellect would become sharper. Next would be the one who does not eat root vegetables; his intellect would become sharper. The one who does darshan (devotional viewing) of the idol of a Tirthankar Lord, his intellect would increase. And with this increase in the intellect, what benefit did one get out of that?

Questioner: 'You' are being unjust towards these people.

**Dadashri:** 'We' are not doing injustice. As they have a sharper intellect, they will incur a loss; that is what 'we' have written in the book. If 'we' do not say it as it is, then they will walk even further on the wrong path. To 'beat' with the intellect is a tremendous offense. Is this the way the intellect is to be misused, once it has increased? And the poor people with less intellect have less intense *kashay*.

Those who practice *ahimsa*, those who from birth believe that it is wrong to kill small living beings, those who have this in their understanding, they have a sharper intellect.

**Questioner:** Wouldn't they be considered gentler because they practice *ahimsa* from birth?

**Dadashri:** They cannot be considered gentle. The result of practicing *ahimsa* has come. The result of that is that the intellect has become sharper and they are 'beating' people with this intellect; 'bullets' are being fired with this intellect. If one were to kill a person outright, it would mean the death of only one lifetime, but here, by firing 'bullets' with the intellect, death of infinite lifetimes will come about.

#### Is There More Himsa in Fighting or in Kashay?

In the olden days, the chief of the village would have more intellect. If two people in the village were having a dispute, then the chief would not take advantage of them. Instead, he would call both of them to his home and would clear their dispute for them. Moreover, he would feed them a meal at his home. How would he clear it? Suppose of the two, one person says, "Sir, I don't have two hundred rupees, so how can I pay him right now?" Then what the chief would say is, "How much do you have?" So the man would say, "About fifty or so." Then the chief would say, "Then take a hundred and fifty [from me]." And he would bring a settlement to the dispute. Whereas these days, one would take advantage of the person who approaches him for help!

'We' are not accusing anyone. 'We' continuously See the entire world as flawless (*nirdosh*) only. These are all discussions pertaining to worldly interactions. Even if someone hurls abuses at 'us', beats 'us', hits 'us', or does anything else, 'we' nevertheless See the entire world as flawless only. In this case, 'we' are speaking about worldly interactions. If one does not understand about matters of worldly life, then when will a solution come about for this? And without understanding it from a *Gnani Purush*, it will not be useful. In fact, 'we' do not have problems with anyone.

**Questioner:** So even a small child here in India practices *ahimsa*. That is because of his *sanskaar* (influence of one's upbringing, education, religion, company, and so on) from the past life, isn't it?

**Dadashri:** Yes, that is exactly why! He would not come across this without *sanskaar*, would he! He has received this on the basis of the *sanskaar* from the past life and the merit karma; but now by misusing it, do you know where he will end up?! Is there any sort of certificate of where he is headed?

**Questioner:** He is only practicing *ahimsa*. He is not misusing it, is he?

**Dadashri:** How can that even be considered as [practicing] *ahimsa*? There is no graver *himsa* in this world

than engaging in *kashay* against another human being. Go and find one person who does not do so; one who does not engage in *kashay* at home, one who does not engage in *himsa*. To engage in *kashay* all day long and then to claim, "We are *ahimsak*," is a serious offense. In comparison, people outside of India do not have as many *kashay*. The one with more [worldly] awareness does *kashay*, doesn't he! What do you understand, would a person with more awareness engage in *kashay* or would one with less awareness engage in it? Do you not feel that [engaging in] *kashay* is a serious offense?

Questioner: That's true.

**Dadashri:** Yes, so there is no *himsa* worse than that. *Kashay* itself is *himsa*. Whereas this [practice of] *ahimsa* is actually inborn *ahimsa*; one had simply nurtured this intention in his previous life, which has now come into effect in this life. Therefore, when violence in the form of anger, pride, deceit, and greed stops, that is when *himsa* comes to an end.

**Questioner:** That's right. I have understood that. This has also been mentioned in the scriptures. The emperors of India fought so many battles, they engaged in *himsa*, yet they did not bind *anantanubandhi kashay* (the most intense type of *kashay* which leads to infinite bondage and births and obstructs Self-realization). It is verily those people who follow a *kuguru* (a guru who indulges in pride, sexuality, having disciples, fame, has monetary dealings, and so on), a *kudharma* (a hypocritical religion or a religion that takes one away from the Self), or a *kusadhu* (monks who have not attained the Knowledge of the Self) who end up binding *anantanubandhi kashay*.

**Dadashri:** Yes, there is no *anantanubandhi* [*kashay*] other than that! That has been stated openly, hasn't it!

#### To Strike With the Intellect Is 'Hard' Raudradhyan

**Questioner:** But are there not different types of karma bound in all this?

Dadashri: But can you not understand this? This is something that even a small child can understand. Suppose you are walking with a lantern and someone else is walking with a small oil lamp, and he cannot see in the dark, then wouldn't you say, "Wait uncle, I'm coming, I will share the light of my lantern with you." Would you share the light of your lantern with him or not? So the intellect is akin to this light. You should tell those with less intellect, "Don't do this, otherwise you will get cheated. And you should deal with this in this way." However, people immediately pounce on their prey. The moment they get the opportunity, they pounce on their prey! That is why 'we' have given a strong word for that: 'hard' raudradhyan (internal state that hurts the self and others)! That which has never happened in the other four eras of the time cycle has happened in this fifth era. People have started misusing their intellect.

These merchants with more intellect keep swindling those with less intellect. When a person with more intellect gets a customer with less intellect, he cheats him. To cheat someone with less intellect in any way, the Lord has referred to that as *raudradhyan*, and the consequence of that is unbearable hell. The intellect should not be misused in this way.

The intellect is in fact a 'light'. If someone were walking in the dark, would you charge him money for offering him light? If someone were walking in the dark with an undersized lantern, then should we not offer the poor man some light? By misusing their intellect, people have engaged in 'hard' *raudradhyan*. Even going to hell

will not give them any redemption. 'Hard' *raudradhyan*, the kind that has not happened in any era of the time cycle, is currently going on in this fifth era. Do people not 'strike' others with their intellect? Do you know whether this is the case?

It is a terrible offence to 'strike' with the intellect. Even now, if one lets go of it, and repents for what has been done up until today, and he does not repeat this going forward, then that is good. Otherwise, there is no telling where he will end up in the next life; he is behaving irresponsibly.

#### Doing Just This Much Will Make You Ahimsak

You should not have any himsak bhaav in your mind. You should have the firm intent that, 'I do not want to cause anyone any harm,' and first thing in the morning, you should say, "May no living being in this world be hurt to the slightest extent through the mind, speech, or body." Say this sentence five times and then start your routine activities; so, the liability will lessen. Subsequently, even if you inadvertently end up stepping on an insect, you are not responsible for it. This is because your intent today is to not kill. The Lord does not place emphasis on your actions; He places emphasis on your intent. According to the accounts held by nature, emphasis is given to your intent. Whereas over here, in the government, according to the worldly law, emphasis is placed on your actions. The worldly law [the action] is going to be left here [once the person dies]. The account carried forward by nature [the intent] will be useful there [in the next life]. So examine where your intent lies.

So the one who says the above statement five times in the morning, before he leaves home, is indeed *ahimsak*. Then even if he ends up quarreling with others anywhere, he is still *ahimsak*. This is because, when he had left home, he had done so after having nurtured the resolve [to not hurt anyone], and once he returns home, he should 'lock up'. Upon returning home, he should say, 'Despite having nurtured the resolve [to not hurt anyone] before leaving home, I am asking for forgiveness for any hurt caused to anyone at any point in the day.' That is all. Then he is not at all liable for it!

'I do not want to commit any *himsa* against any living being, nor cause anyone to nor instigate anyone to commit *himsa* against any living being, and may no living being be hurt through my mind, speech, or body;' if you nurture such an intent, then you will have become *ahimsak*! It is considered as having accomplished the *mahavrat* (one of the five major vows as expounded by Lord Mahavir, followed with complete sincerity) of *ahimsa*. You have decided the intent in your mind, meaning you have made the decision. So if you remain completely sincere to your decision, if you adhere to that decision, then it is considered as accomplishing the *mahavrat*. And if you have made the decision, but don't adhere to it, then it is considered [as accomplishing] the *anuvrat* (one of the five major vows as expounded by Lord Mahavir, followed with partial sincerity) of *ahimsa*.

#### Beware, There Is Himsa in Sexuality

If the Lord were to describe the *himsa* associated with *vishay* (indulgence in sexual pleasures), then one would die. People think, 'What *himsa* is there in this? It's not as though we are scolding anyone.' But if you were to see it from the Lord's perspective, then in this situation, *himsa* and *aasakti* (inner tendency inclined towards attraction that attaches) both come together, and due to this, all five of the *mahavrat* are violated, which in turn gives rise to a liability of many faults. Hundreds of thousands of living beings are killed through a single act of sex, the liability of that

is incurred. So, although one has no desire to do so, there is still terrible *himsa* involved in this. So it [indulgence in sexuality] turns into something adverse.

This worldly life persists just because of the indulgence in sexual pleasures. If this indulgence in sexual pleasures did not exist, then there would be no hindrance [to *moksha*] from all the remaining sensory pleasures. Even if sexuality alone were to become nonexistent, one would attain a lifeform in the celestial realm. Once this sexuality becomes nonexistent, then all other sensory pleasures, everything comes under one's control. Whereas if one gets involved in sexuality, then due to that sexuality, he first goes to the animal life-form. Indulgence in sex only leads to a lower life-form. This is because millions of living beings die in a single act of sex! Even if one does not have the understanding, he still takes on the liability, doesn't he!

Thus, as long as a person engages in worldly life, as long as he indulges in sexual pleasures, he is violating the practice of *ahimsa*. Moreover, sexual relations with anyone other than one's own spouse leads to the gravest consequences. A person who has sexual relations with anyone other than his own spouse becomes eligible for a life-form in hell. He should not keep the hopes of looking for anything else, nor should he maintain the hope of being born as a human again. This indeed is the gravest liability. Sexual relations outside of marriage take one to hell.

And one should observe self-restraint [with regard to sexuality] even at home, shouldn't he? The fact is, sexual relations with one's own spouse is not improper. Nevertheless, one should understand that many 'germs' [living beings] die through this act. So the act should not be indulged in without a reason, should it? If there is a reason, then it is a different matter. There are 'germs' in semen, moreover, they are in the form of a human seed. So as far as is possible, you should preserve them. 'We' are sharing this with you in brief. Otherwise, there is no end to this!

#### Ahimsa Is Beyond the Mind

What is the point in believing that which is not *ahimsa* as *ahimsa*? *Ahimsa* means to not have even a single negative thought about anyone; that is considered *ahimsa*. A negative thought does not arise even for one's enemy. 'How may he attain salvation,' such a thought arises even for one's enemy. For a negative thought to arise is an attribute of the *prakruti* (relative self), but to turn that around is Your *Purusharth* (real spiritual effort to progress as the Self). Have you understood this talk about *Purusharth* or not?

If someone with an *ahimsak bhaav* shoots an arrow, then no blood will be shed, and if someone with a *himsak bhaav* throws a flower, even then the other person will bleed. The arrow and the flower are not as effective as the intention is! That is why the intent, 'May no one be hurt, may not a single living being be hurt,' constantly remains in each and every word of 'ours'. 'Our' speech comes forth only with the intention, 'May not a single living being of this world be hurt through this mind, speech, and body in the slightest extent.' Things do not yield the effect; the arrow does not yield the effect, the flower does not yield the effect, but it is the intent that yields the effect.

What does *Akram Vignan* say? Not even the mind should be used as a weapon, so then how can one wield a stick? 'We' have never used the mind as a weapon against any living being in this world, not even against the smallest of creatures, so then there is no question of wielding any other [weapon], is there? Slightly harsh speech may sometimes come forth; slightly harsh speech tends to come forth once or twice in a year. It is just like the difference between handwoven cloth and silk; what is handwoven cloth like? Similarly, the speech that comes forth sometimes is slightly harsh. That too, it only happens once or twice in a year. Otherwise, 'we' have never wielded even speech as a weapon. Nor have 'we' ever used the mind as a weapon!

'We' have never used the mind as a weapon against even the smallest of all living beings, be it any creature in this world, even if it is a small creature. If a scorpion were to sting 'us' right now, even then 'we' will not have raised a weapon against it! It is simply fulfilling its obligation. If it does not fulfill its obligation, then 'we' will not be released. Therefore, rest assured that 'we' have never used the mind as a weapon against any living being! Meaning, 'we' have never used the mind to commit *himsa*. Otherwise, that is the nature of the mind; it cannot refrain from retaliating.

**Questioner:** You must have understood that there is no use for this weapon.

**Dadashri:** Yes, this weapon is of no use at all. The thought that there is a need for this weapon has never arisen at all. Ever since 'we' placed this 'sword' on the ground, 'we' have not picked it up again. Even if the opponent has weapons, 'we' do not pick up the weapons. And ultimately, that is the path that will have to be taken. Whosoever wants to break free from this world, whosoever finds the world cumbersome, will ultimately have to take that path; there is no other path.

Therefore, if the practice of *ahimsa* is perfected, then that is more than enough. When the practice of *ahimsa* has been perfected in its entirety, there [in the presence of such a person], a tiger and a goat would both stand side by side and drink water!

**Questioner:** That was the case for the *Tirthankar* Lords, wasn't it?

**Dadashri:** Yes. And one cannot even begin to describe the *Tirthankar* Lords! 'They' were such great people! If this world had understood even a single sentence of these *Tirthankar* Lords, just one sentence, then the entire world would have sanctified it. However, that sentence does not come into their understanding, does it! And there is no one to explain it to them either.

Questioner: 'You' are here, aren't You?

**Dadashri:** How much sound will 'our' flute alone create?

# The Aura of Influence and Power of the Gnani Purush's Ahimsa

What are the worldly interactions of the *Gnani Purush* like? 'His' worldly interactions are so *ahimsak* that even ferocious tigers would become shy. Even if there are ferocious tigers around, they would cool down; they would develop a cold, they would actually develop a cold! This is verily because of the aura of influence and power of *ahimsa*. The world has seen the aura of influence and power of *himsa*, hasn't it! Haven't you seen the effects of the aura of influence and power that Hitler, Churchill, and other such people commanded? What happened ultimately? They invited [their own] destruction. *Himsa* is something that is temporary, whereas *ahimsa* is something that is permanent.

# Where There Is Ahimsa, There Is No Himsa

**Questioner:** Would *himsa* be present where there is *ahimsa*?

**Dadashri:** There can never be any *himsa* where there is complete *ahimsa*. Otherwise, it is considered partial *ahimsa*. But where there is complete *ahimsa*, there is no

*himsa* there. However many slices you cut of a papaya, they will all certainly be papaya, not a single slice will be bitter. So the slices will be of the same quality; similarly, there cannot be any *himsa* in *ahimsa*, and where there is complete *himsa*, there cannot be any *ahimsa* in that either. However, partial *himsa*, partial *ahimsa*, those concepts are a different matter.

**Questioner:** Is partial *ahimsa* referred to as *daya* (kindness; mercy)?

**Dadashri:** Yes, it is referred to as *daya*. It is considered *daya*. *Daya* is the foundation of religion, and when *daya* is perfected, religion becomes complete.

#### Beyond Himsa and Ahimsa

**Questioner:** Where there is *daya*, there will inevitably be cruelty. Does this apply to *himsa* and *ahimsa* too?

**Dadashri:** It does! *Ahimsa* is present because there is *himsa*. *Ahimsa* exists because there is *himsa*. But ultimately, what do you have to do? You have to come out of *himsa* and come into *ahimsa*, and You later have to come out of even *ahimsa*. 'You' have to go beyond this duality. 'You' have to let go of *ahimsa* too.

Questioner: Which state is beyond ahimsa?

**Dadashri:** This very state; currently, 'we' are beyond *himsa* and *ahimsa*. *Ahimsa* is subject to the ego and 'our' state is beyond the ego! When one claims, 'I am practicing *himsa* or *ahimsa*,' then the one practicing that is the ego. So if One goes beyond *himsa* and *ahimsa*, meaning if He goes beyond duality, only then can He be referred to as a *Gnani*; the One who is beyond all dualities of every variety. So, the Indian ascetics and high-ranking Jain monks are very kind; however, cruelty is also filled within them. As they have

*daya*, they also have cruelty. In one corner, there may be a lot of *daya*. If there is eighty percent *daya*, then there is twenty percent cruelty. If there is eighty-eight percent *daya*, then there is twelve percent cruelty. If there is ninety-six percent *daya*, then there is four percent cruelty.

**Questioner:** Is that the same with *himsa*? If there is ninety-six percent *ahimsa*, then will there be four percent *himsa*?

**Dadashri:** The grand total shows that, doesn't it! It speaks for itself, doesn't it! If there is ninety-six percent *ahimsa*, then what remains? Four percent *himsa* remains.

Questioner: So what kind of *himsa* is that?

**Dadashri:** It is of the kind that will come to an end quickly. The One who has reached that state Knows it and clears it. 'He' quickly clears it and becomes liberated.

# The Gnani Is Completely Ahimsak in the Ocean of Himsa

Hey, people ask 'us', "Even though you are a *Gnani*, you still travel by car? So many living beings get killed when a car is used, so who is responsible for that?" Now, if a *Gnani Purush* is not completely *ahimsak*, then how can He be referred to as a *Gnani* at all? Completely *ahimsak* means that He is completely *ahimsak* even in the ocean of *himsa*! Such a person is called a *Gnani*! 'He' is not held liable for *himsa* even to the slightest extent.

In addition to that, those people told me, "We have read your book, it is very appealing and seems to be without any contradiction. However, your conduct appears to contradict that." So 'we' asked, "What conduct of 'ours' appears to be contradictory?" They replied, "The fact that you travel by car." 'We' told them, "Let me explain it to you, let me first explain to you what the Lord has said in the scriptures. Then you can give the verdict yourself." So they asked, "What has been stated in the scriptures?" 'We' told them, "How much liability would a Gnani Purush, who prevails as the Self, incur? A Gnani Purush does not have any ownership over the body. 'He' has dissolved the ownership over the body. This means that He has dissolved the ownership over the *pudgal* (non-Self complex). So, He as the Self, is not its owner. And as He does not have this sense of ownership over it, He cannot be held liable for it. Secondly, the Gnani Purush does not renounce anything." They replied, "We didn't quite understand the point about the sense of ownership." 'We' asked them, "Why is it that you feel, 'I will end up committing himsa'?" They replied, "If I step on an insect, then I am considered to have committed violence, right?" 'We' told them, "It is because [you believe that] this foot is yours that you are considered to have committed himsa. Whereas, in 'our' case, ['we' have the belief that] this foot is not 'ours'. You can do whatever you want to this body right now. 'We' are not the owner of this body." Then they asked, "Please show us what is considered as sense of ownership and what is not considered as sense of ownership." To that, 'we' replied, "Let 'us' explain it to you using an anecdote."

"In a particular town, there was a nice area surrounded by shops, it was a highly valued area of about five thousand square feet. Someone made a complaint to the government authorities that there were excise goods buried in this area. So the police officers went there. Since the rainy season had recently ended, nice vegetation and bushes had grown there. They first cleared the vegetation in that area. Then, they dug up to a depth of two to three feet, that is when they found the excise goods buried there. So the police sub-inspector asked the people living in the vicinity, "Who is the owner

of this land?" They replied, "This belongs to the merchant, Laxmichand." So the sub-inspector asked, "Where does he live?" Once he found out where the merchant lived, he sent police officers there to arrest him. When the police officers got there to arrest him, the merchant said, "Sir, it's ok that you are claiming this place is mine; however, I actually sold it fifteen days ago. I am no longer the owner of this land, today." So one of the police officers asked, "Tell us who you have sold it to. Show us the proof of that sale." So the merchant showed him a copy of the proof. After seeing the copy of the proof, they went to the person who had bought this land. They asked him, "Did you buy this land?" He replied, "Yes, I have bought it." The police officers told him, "We have found this on your land." So the man replied, "But I bought this land just fifteen days ago, and it appears that these goods have been buried here before the rainy season, so how can I be held liable for this?" The police officers responded, "We are not concerned with that. Who is the owner now? If you are not the owner today, then you are not liable. If you are the owner, then the liability will apply."

So those people understood too. Even though he had only bought the land fifteen days ago, he was still held liable, wasn't he? Otherwise, if one were to critically analyze this, then the goods had been buried there before the rainy season."

Now, it is only when one applies such critical understanding that a solution can come about. Otherwise, how would a solution ever come about? This is actually a puzzle. The world is the puzzle itself. How can this puzzle be solved? There are two viewpoints to solve this puzzle. One is the relative viewpoint and the other is the Real viewpoint. If one does not solve this puzzle of the world, then he himself is considered as being dissolved in the puzzle. The entire world, everyone indeed has been dissolved in this puzzle.

**Questioner:** By saying, "I am not the owner of this body," won't people exploit this point and do as they please? And then won't everyone misuse it in this way?

**Dadashri:** No one says, "I am not the owner." In fact, if someone were to slap him right now, he would become the owner! If someone were to hurl abuses at him, he would become the owner, he would immediately retaliate. So you would realize that he is the owner. You would immediately get proof of whether or not he is the owner, wouldn't you! His 'title' would be evident, as to whether or not he is the owner. The moment you hurl abuses at him, would he immediately flash his 'title' or not? So, it takes no time at all. Otherwise, would simply saying something accomplish anything?

Questioner: But isn't demerit karma bound by travelling in a car?

**Dadashri:** This entire world is filled with nothing but demerit karma. It is only when one is no longer the owner of the body that he can become free of demerit karma. Otherwise, as long as one is the owner of the body, there is nothing but the binding of demerit karma.

When you inhale, so many living beings are killed, and when you exhale, so many living beings are killed. Even while you stroll around, you collide into so many living beings, and they end up being killed. Even when you move your hand like this, living beings are killed. These living beings are not visible to the naked eye, but they still end up being killed.

So, one ends up binding demerit karma through all that. However, when the awareness sets in that 'I am not

the body', when there will be no sense of ownership over the body, that is when He will become free of demerit karma. 'We' have not been the owner of this body for the past twenty-six years. 'We' are not the owner of this mind, 'we' are not the owner of this speech. 'We' have torn up the 'documents' of the sense of ownership over them, therefore 'we' cannot be held liable for them! So wherever there is a sense of ownership, the liability will apply. Where there is no sense of ownership, the liability will not apply. So 'we' are considered completely *ahimsak*. This is because 'we' dwell only as the Self. 'We' dwell only in the 'home department' [the Self], and 'we' do not interfere in the 'foreign' [non-Self] at all. So amidst this entire ocean of *himsa*, 'we' are completely *ahimsak*.

**Questioner:** Does One become *ahimsak* after attaining this *Gnan*?

**Dadashri:** By giving you this *Gnan*, 'we' have made You the *Purush* (the Self). Now, by following 'our' *Agnas* (five directives that preserve the awareness as the Self in *Akram Vignan*), *himsa* will not apply to You. However much *Purusharth* (real spiritual effort to progress as the Self) You do, that much is Yours. If You do *Purusharth*, then You will become *Purushottam* (the absolute state of the Self). Otherwise, You certainly are the *Purush*. So, to follow 'our' *Agnas* is *Purusharth*. How can *himsa* apply to the One who is *ahimsak*?

**Questioner:** *Himsa* does not apply to the person who brings the Nine *Kalams* (nine statements in which one asks for energy to the pure Soul within for the highest spiritual intents) into experience.

**Dadashri:** No, *himsa* does apply to him too. However, by reciting the Nine *Kalams*, the *himsa* that had been done up until now gets washed off. However, *himsa* does not

apply at all to the One who follows the five Agnas, [even though] He traverses through the ocean of himsa; the entire ocean [of worldly life] itself is filled with nothing but himsa. Simply by raising the hand, so many living beings are killed. The world is filled to the brim with living beings. However, for the One who follows 'our' five Agnas. He is not prevailing as the body at that time. And as the body is a physical entity, it ends up hurting other living beings. As the Self is a subtle entity, It cannot harm any living beings. That is why 'we' have clearly written in 'our' books that 'we' are completely ahimsak in the ocean of himsa. The ocean is filled with himsa; 'we' are completely *ahimsak* in that. 'Our' mind is not *himsak* at all, however, 'our' speech is slightly himsak in certain places, it is a 'tape record' [taped record]. 'We' do not have a sense of ownership over it. Nevertheless, as the 'tape record' is 'ours', 'we' are held liable to that extent. 'We' have to do pratikraman for that. The mistake was indeed 'ours' in the past, wasn't it! Who is the owner? To that 'we' reply, "We are not the owner." But someone else might say, "You were the owner in the past. You had not sold it off at that time; had you sold it off at that time, then it would be a different matter."

Questioner: Dada, through Your *ahimsak* speech, all of us *mahatmas* are becoming *ahimsak*.

**Dadashri:** If You follow 'our' *Agnas*, then You are *ahimsak*. 'We' are telling you such a splendid thing, so what more is left! And if they are difficult to follow, then come and tell 'us', 'we' will change them.

# Absolute Knowledge Manifests Where There Is Complete Ahimsa

So the highest religion is that in which the subtlest understanding of *ahimsa* has set in. Complete *ahimsa* is *keval Gnan* (absolute Knowledge)! So where *himsa* ceases, be assured that there is true religion there.

The world does not exist without *himsa*; the entire world is indeed full of *himsa*. When you yourself become characterized by *ahimsa*, that is when the world will become characterized by *ahimsa*, and without the prevalence of *ahimsa*, absolute Knowledge can never arise; the awakened awareness will not emerge in its full-fledged state. There should be no *himsa* whatsoever. Towards whom is the *himsa* being directed? All these living beings are the absolute Self (*Parmatma*), each and every living being is the absolute Self indeed. So towards whom will you engage in *himsa*? Who will you hurt?

#### The Science Behind the Ultimate Ahimsa

As long as you believe, 'I am plucking this flower; by doing so, I am committing *himsa*,' you will be held liable for the *himsa*. And for those who do not have this awareness, they too are held liable for the *himsa*. However, the One who is aware of this and plucks the flower, yet He Himself has come into the state as the Self, He is not held liable for the *himsa*.

It was the case that King Bharat had thirteen thousand queens and he fought in battles, yet the Knowledge of the Self prevailed for him. Imagine the kind of spirituality that was! Whereas these people have just one 'queen', yet the Knowledge of the Self does not prevail for them. King Bharat had told Lord Rushabhdev [the first *Tirthankar* of the current half-cycle of time], "Lord, I am fighting in these battles in which so many living beings are killed, and these are in fact humans who are being killed. If it were smaller living beings that were being killed, then I could push it aside, but these are humans who are being killed! And this is happening because I am fighting these battles, isn't it!" So the Lord told him, "This is all part of your karmic account and you have to clear it." King Bharat replied, "But I too want to go to *moksha*; I do not want to sit around like this." Then the Lord told him, "We' are giving you *Akram Vignan*; that will take you to *moksha*. So despite living with your wives and fighting in battles, nothing will affect You. 'We' are giving you such Knowledge that You will be able to remain *nirlep* (absolutely unaffected by the intents that tend to anoint) and *asang* (absolutely separate from the associated activities of the mind, speech and body)."

#### Wherever There Is Doubt, There the Liability Applies

After attaining this Gnan, You have become the pure Soul. Now, when the Real pure Soul comes into Your understanding, then [You will Know that] even if any sort of himsa is committed or any bad deeds are done, that is not at all a part of Your [the Self's] own intrinsic functional properties. The complete awakened awareness (laksh) of the pure Soul prevails for You. However, as long as a doubt arises in you such as, 'What if I am held liable for the fault? An insect ended up being crushed by me, so I am liable for the fault,' as long as such a doubt arises, You should [make Chandubhai, the relative self] make the following resolve before leaving home in the morning: 'May no living being be hurt even to the slightest extent through this mind, speech, or body.' 'You' should make Chandubhai say this five times before leaving home. 'You' should speak to him casually and tell him, "Chandubhai, say this early in the morning, upon waking up. 'May no living being be hurt even to the slightest extent through this mind, speech, or body, that is my firm resolve." When Chandubhai says this with Dada Bhagwan as his witness and then leaves home, then the entire responsibility lies with Dada Bhagwan.

And if doubts do not arise, then for such a One,

there is no problem. Doubts do not arise for 'us', and it is natural for You to have doubts. This is because You have been given this *Gnan*. If there is one person who has earned the money himself, and there is another person who has the money handed to him, then there will be a tremendous difference in the way they both interact in the world.

Truly speaking, the Self that the *Gnani Purush* has Known, that Self is such that It can never hurt anyone even to the slightest extent, nor can anyone hurt It even to the slightest extent. Truly speaking, the original Self is like this.

# The Sufferer, the Knower, the One in the Experience of the Bliss of the Self

Once, a man was asking 'us', "How can I tolerate these mosquitoes that bite me?" 'We' told him, "Sit to meditate and if the mosquitoes come to bite you, then just observe them." To that he replied, "That is indeed what I cannot tolerate." So 'we' told him, "[Whenever a mosquito lands on you,] Say, 'I am nirved (the Knower only; the One who is free of suffering the effects of pleasure and pain that are felt by the mind, speech, and body); the state as the sufferer (vedak swabhaav) is no longer mine, I am in fact nirved.' In this way, You will gradually come closer to Your 'home department' [the Self]. And in doing this, upon going through the experience of being bitten by mosquitoes a hundred or two hundred times. You will become nirved." What does nirved mean? It means to remain as the Knower alone; to Know, 'The mosquito bit me over here.' The One who does not come into the state of suffering the pain or pleasure is nirved! In reality, You, the developing 'I' (pote), do not actually experience any suffering of pain or pleasure, but the fact that Chandubhai feels he is suffering is because of the previously ingrained habit. It is because of the previously ingrained habit that he says, "The mosquito bit me." So, in reality, You are *nirved* indeed. But by remaining in and listening to this *satsang*, You have to understand this state. 'You' have to understand the state of the [original] Self in Its entirety that, 'The [original] Self is like this in reality.' For now, You will have to make do with the state as the pure Soul. Even if One says just this much ['I am pure Soul'], the binding of karma will come to a stop. When One becomes free of the false belief [of 'I am Chandubhai' and 'I am the doer'], the karma cease to be bound.

**Questioner:** So even if a mosquito bites me, should I simply say, "I am not the sufferer"?

**Dadashri:** Yes, say a mosquito lands on your arm while you are sitting here. So the first experience that you have is, 'It has landed [on the arm].' That comes into Your awareness. When the mosquito sits on your arm, are You in the state of Knowing or are you in the state of suffering? What do you think?

**Questioner:** When it is sitting on the arm, I am only in the state of Knowing it.

**Dadashri:** Yes, then when it bites, You are in the state of Knowing at that time, too. But subsequently, because you say, "The mosquito bit me, it bit me," you become the sufferer. Now, in reality, You are *nirved*. So when the mosquito bites you, You should say, "I am *nirved*." Then as it pierces the skin further, You should say once again, "I am *nirved*."

**Questioner:** Now, You talked about *nirved*. However, You have also mentioned another word, the state of *Swasamvedan* (being in the experience of the bliss of the Self).

**Dadashri:** This cannot be referred to as *Swasamvedan*. That is a very elevated state. *Swasamvedan* is considered

the ultimate state. For now, You should say, "I am *nirved*," so that this suffering decreases. What 'we' are saying is that even then, the suffering will not cease immediately. Whereas *Swasamvedan* is considered as the prevalence of *Gnan*. 'One' simply Knows it! It doesn't matter if one gets stung by an insect, it may hurt intensely, even then One continues Knowing it, He does not suffer it whatsoever. That is referred to as *Swasamvedan*.

**Questioner:** But this mosquito that bit me and the reaction that arose of "This mosquito bit me," does One also prevail as the Knower of that reaction in the state of *Swasamvedan*?

Dadashri: Yes, He would be the Knower of that too.

**Questioner:** But You said that by saying, "I am not suffering, I am not suffering," people will think that feeling of suffering has gone.

**Dadashri:** No, it is not like that; He even Knows that feeling of suffering. However, a person does not have the capacity to go to that extent. Therefore, if You just say, "I am *nirved*," then the suffering will not affect You. The inherent nature of the Self is *nirved*. So when You say that, it will not affect You. However, *Swasamvedan* is a higher state. As One continues to Know, He comes into *Swasamvedan*. In that, all One has to do is to Know, 'It stung here,' to Know just that. Thereafter, to also Know that the stinging feeling has gone away. In doing so, One will eventually come into *Swasamvedan*. However, this 'I am *nirved*' is a step whereby One can tolerate [the pain] without getting irritated.

**Questioner:** The Self can only be Known through *Swasamvedan*, right?

Dadashri: The Self Itself is nothing but Swasamvedan.

However, although You have taken this *Gnan*, the ego and attachment that you have brought forth from your previous life have not yet left, have they!

**Questioner:** The One who is in the experience of the bliss of the Self, His Vision as the Self (*Darshan*) is complete, isn't it?

**Dadashri:** It is complete. However, that state cannot be attained in this era of the time cycle. So there is that much of a shortfall in attaining the state of *Swasamvedan*. It is not possible to have complete *Swasamvedan* in this era of the time cycle. The complete state is attained when *keval Gnan* is attained.

# **Can Mud Taint Light?**

Are you aware of the Light (*Prakash*) of the Self? If the rays of light (*prakash*) from the headlights of a car fall on the bog in the gutters near Bandra Station [in Mumbai], then would the light be affected by the stench? Or would the light take on the color of the bog in the gutters?

### Questioner: No.

**Dadashri:** Then would the light become tainted with mud?

### Questioner: No.

**Dadashri:** This light can touch the mud, but the mud cannot touch it. If this is what the light emanating from a car is like, then what must the Light of the Self be like? It can never be coated with any substance. That is why the Self is *nirlep* and It remains *asang*. The Self is such that nothing affects It and nothing adheres to It.

So the Self is in the form of Light, but it is not this kind of light. 'We' have Seen that Light, it is that kind of

Light. The light emanating from the headlights of a car gets obstructed by a wall. When the light falls on a wall, that light is obstructed. Whereas that other Light cannot be obstructed by a wall. It is this *pudgal* alone that can obstruct It, a wall cannot obstruct It. Even if there is a mountain in Its way, It does not get obstructed.

Questioner: Why does It get obstructed by the *pudgal*?

**Dadashri:** There is the *mishrachetan* (the 'I' with the wrong belief that arises with the coming together of the Self and inanimate matter) within the *pudgal*. If the *pudgal* were *jada* (inanimate; lifeless) alone, then It would not be obstructed. However, It gets obstructed because this [*pudgal*] is *mishrachetan*.

**Questioner:** The example You gave of the bog in the gutters and the light is very pertinent.

**Dadashri:** Yes, but 'we' only use it occasionally. 'We' cannot always use it. This example cannot be used with everyone. Otherwise, people would misuse it.

# Himsa Does Not Affect the One Who Prevails as the Self

Now, if a road is being illuminated by the moonlight and the headlights [of the car] are turned off, then can one drive his car or not?

Questioner: He can drive it.

**Dadashri:** So he will not have any doubts in that situation. However, when he turns the headlights on, doubts start arising. When the headlights are turned on, then in that light he can see that there are so many insects whirring around, they are bashing against the car and they are all being killed. In that situation, the doubt arises that 'I have killed these insects.'

Yes, so most people do not have any 'light' [awareness as the Self] whatsoever, which is why they do not see the insects at all. So they do not have doubts about this at all. They do not even realize that the insects are being killed! But however much light one has, he can see that many insects. As the light increases, one starts seeing the insects in the light, that the insects are bashing against the car and are being killed. Similarly, as one's awareness as the Self increases, He is able to See his own faults. Otherwise, people cannot see their own faults, can they? The Self is in the form of Light; not a single living being is hurt when it touches this Self. This is because the Self is such that It can pass right through living beings. Living beings are gross, whereas the Self is the subtlest. The Self is absolutely ahimsak. If You prevail as that Self, then You are undoubtedly ahimsak. Whereas if you become the owner of the body, then you are *himsak*. It is worth realizing that Self. For the One who realizes that Self, how can He be held liable for any fault? How can himsa affect such a One? So, after becoming the form as the Self, karma can never be bound.

Questioner: Then even if one kills living beings, karma does not get bound?

**Dadashri:** *Himsa* would not happen at all! The One who prevails as the Self cannot commit *himsa*. The One who has become the form as the Self can never commit *himsa*.

So after attaining the Knowledge of the Self, no laws apply to You. As long as one has the belief that 'I am the body,' all the laws are applicable, and it is only in that situation that one binds all the karma. After attaining the Knowledge of the Self, no law of any scripture applies to You, You do not bind any karma; *himsa* or nothing else applies to You. **Questioner:** What is the practice of *ahimsa* like? Does it arise spontaneously?

**Dadashri:** It does not arise spontaneously. However, *ahimsa* is the inherent nature of the Self, and *himsa* is the inherent nature of the [relative] self. It is not the inherent nature of the [Real] Self. It is not the inherent nature that remains permanently with the Self. If we were to take the inherent nature into consideration, then there are many inherent natures. So these are all dualities.

So all you need to do is to understand this concept. This is *Akram Vignan*. This is the Science of the *vitaraag* Lords, it is the Science of the twenty-four *Tirthankar* Lords! However, it is because you have not heard much about it that you wonder, 'Can such a novel concept actually be possible?' So a fearful feeling sets in. And when a fearful feeling sets in, the work cannot be accomplished. It is only if the fearful feeling leaves, that the work can be accomplished, isn't it!

The Real form of the Self (*Atma Swaroop*) is so subtle that It can pass right through fire and yet be unaffected. So tell me, how can *himsa* apply to It? It is when one believes himself to be the physical body, when one identifies himself with the body, that *himsa* applies to him. If it were the case that *himsa* did apply to the One who prevails as the Self, then no one would ever attain *moksha*. However, the arrangement for *moksha* is very precise and exact. You may not understand all these points from where you are currently standing, but after attaining the Self, You will understand everything, the Science will become unveiled for You!

#### Jai Sat Chit Anand (Awareness of the Eternal Is Bliss)

# Spiritual Glossary

Gujarati Woi	·d	English Translation
aartadhyan	-	an adverse internal state that results in hurting the self
aasakti	-	inner tendency inclined towards attraction that attaches
abhaydaan	-	being in a state of conduct which does not induce fear in or hurt any living being
Agnas	-	five directives that preserve the awareness as the Self in <i>Akram Vignan</i>
ahimsa	-	non-violence
ahimsak	-	non-violent
ahimsak bhaav	-	non-violent intent
Akram Vignan	-	the step-less Science of Self-realization
anantanubandh	ıi	the most intense type of kashay which
kashay	-	leads to infinite bondage and births and obstructs Self-realization
apakaya	-	one-sensed, non-mobile living beings whose body is in the form of water
asang	-	absolutely separate from the associated activities of the mind, speech and body
Atma	-	the Self
Atma himsa	-	violence towards the state as the Self
avaran	-	a veil of ignorance over the Knowledge of the Self
bhaav	-	intent; cause
bhaav ahimsa	-	non-violent intent
bhaav himsa	-	violence committed towards the state as the Self; violence at the subtle level
bhaav maran	-	death of the state as the Self by believing, 'I am the relative self,' 'I did it,' 'It happened to me'
choviyaar	-	the practice of not eating after sunset
daya	-	kindness; mercy
dravya himsa	-	violence at the gross level; violence committed through thought, speech or action; violence that is happening in effect

dravya puja Gnan	- -	worship through offerings and rituals Knowledge of the Self
Gnani Purush	-	One who has realized the Self and is able to do the same for others
Gnani / Gnanis-		Those who have realized the Self and are able to do the same for others
himsa	-	violence
himsak	-	violent
himsak bhaav	-	violent intent
Nine Kalams	-	nine statements in which one asks for
		energy to the pure Soul within for the
		highest spiritual intents
kashay	-	anger, pride, deceit, and greed
keval Gnan	-	absolute Knowledge
Kramik path	-	traditional step-by-step path of spiritual
		progress
Kshatriya	-	members of the warrior caste in the
2		traditional Indian caste system
mahatmas	-	those who have attained Self-realization
		through Akram Vignan
mahavrat	-	the five great vows as expounded by
		Lord Mahavir: truthfulness, non-
		possessiveness, non-violence, non-stealing,
		and celibacy; one of the five major vows as
		expounded by Lord Mahavir, followed
		with complete sincerity
mishrachetan	-	the 'I' with the wrong belief that arises
		with the coming together of the Self and
		inanimate matter
moksha	-	liberation
nimit	-	evidence; an apparent doer who is simply
		instrumental in the process
nirlep	-	absolutely unaffected by the intents that
		tend to anoint
nirved	-	the Knower only; the One who is free of
		suffering the effects of pleasure and pain
		that are felt by the mind, speech, and body
partantra	-	dependent upon the karma bound in the
		past life

pratikraman	-	three-step process of reversal from hurting another living being through thought, speech, or action, by confessing the mistake to the Lord within, apologizing, and making the resolve to not repeat the mistake
pruthvikaya	-	one-sensed, non-mobile living beings whose body is in the form of earth
pudgal	-	the non-Self complex
pudgal himsa	-	violence towards the non-Self complex
Purush	-	the Self
Purusharth	-	real spiritual effort to progress as the Self
purusharth	-	independent effort of charging karma
raudradhyan	-	adverse internal state of being that hurts the self and others
saatvik	-	light, essential, natural, energy-containing
samay	-	the smallest, most indivisible unit of time
sanskaar	-	the influence of one's upbringing,
		education, religion, company, and so on
satsang	-	spiritual discourse
Shuddhatma	-	the pure Soul
sutras	-	concise statements that usually require
		commentary for understanding
Swabhaav	-	the state as the Self
Swasamvedan	-	being in the experience of the bliss as the Self
teukaya	-	one-sensed, non-mobile, fire-bodied living beings; one-sensed, non-mobile living beings whose body is in the form of fire
Tirthankar	-	the absolutely enlightened Lords who can liberate others
vanaspatikaya	-	one-sensed, non-mobile living beings whose body is in the form of vegetation
vayukaya	-	one-sensed, non-mobile, air-bodied living beings; one-sensed, non-mobile living beings whose body is in the form of air
vibhaav	-	the wrong belief of 'I am Chandubhai'
vitaraag	-	absolutely free from attachment and
0		abhorrence; absolutely detached
vyavasthit	-	the result of scientific circumstantial evidences $\diamond \diamond \diamond \diamond \diamond$

# Books of Akram Vignan of Dada Bhagwan

- 1. Adjust Everywhere
- 2. Anger
- 3. Aptavani 1
- 4. Aptavani 2
- 5. Aptavani 4
- 6. Aptavani 5
- 7. Aptavani 6
- 8. Aptavani 8
- 9. Aptavani 9
- 10. Autobiography of Gnani Purush A.M.Patel
- 11. Avoid Clashes
- 12. Brahmacharya: Celibacy Attained With Understanding
- 13. Death: Before, During and After...
- 14. Flawless Vision
- 15. Generation Gap
- 16. Harmony in Marriage
- 17. Life Without Conflict
- 18. Money
- 19. Noble Use of Money
- 20. Non-Violence
- 21. Pratikraman: The Master Key That Resolves All Conflicts (Abridged & Big Volume)
- 22. Pure Love
- 23. Right Understanding to Help Others
- 24. Science of Karma
- 25. Science of Speech
- 26. The Current Living Tirthankara Shree Simandhar Swami
- 27. Simple and Effective Science for Self-Realization
- 28. The Essence of All Religion
- 29. The Fault Is of the Sufferer
- 30. The Guru and the Disciple
- 31. The Hidden Meaning of Truth and Untruth
- 32. The Practice of Humanity
- 33. Trimantra
- 34. Whatever Has Happened Is Justice
- 35. Who Am I?
- 36. Worries

### 'Dadavani' Magazine is published every month in English



#### **Dada Bhagwan Foundation**

	8					
India :						
Adalaj	: Trimandir, Simandhar City, Ahmedabad-Kalol Highway,					
(Main Center)	Adalaj, Dist.: Gandhinagar - 382421, Gujarat, India.					
	<b>Tel :</b> + 91 79 35002100, +91 9328661166-77					
	Email : info@dadabhagwan.org					
Bangalore	<b>:</b> +91 95909 79099					
Delhi	<b>:</b> +91 98100 98564					
Kolkata	<b>:</b> +91 98300 93230					
Mumbai	<b>:</b> +91 93235 28901					
Other Countries :						
Argentina	: Tel: +54 9 11 58431163					
-	Email: info@dadabhagwan.ar					
Australia	<b>: Tel:</b> +61 402179706					
	Email: sydney@au.dadabhagwan.org					
Brazil	: Tel: +55 11999828971					
	Email: info@br.dadabhagwan.org					
Germany	: Tel: +49 700 DADASHRI (32327474)					
·	Email: info@dadabhagwan.de					
Kenya	: Tel: +254 79592 DADA (3232)					
·	Email: info@ke.dadabhagwan.org					
New Zealand	<b>: Tel:</b> +64 21 0376434					
	Email: info@nz.dadabhagwan.org					
Singapore	<b>: Tel:</b> + 65 91457800					
81	Email: info@sg.dadabhagwan.org					
Spain	: Tel: +34 922302706					
-	Email: info@dadabhagwan.es					
UAE	: Tel: +971 557316937					
	Email: dubai@ae.dadabhagwan.org					
UK	: Tel : +44 330-111-DADA(3232)					
	Email : info@uk.dadabhagwan.org					
USA-Canada	<b>: Tel :</b> +1 877-505-DADA (3232)					
	Email : info@us.dadabhagwan.org					
(	Website : www.dadabhagwan.org					
(	······································					



#### Where There Is Complete Non-Violence, Absolute Knowledge Manifests!

The world does not exist without violence; the entire world is indeed full of violence. When you yourself become non-violent, that is when the world will become non-violent, and without the prevalence of non-violence (*ahimsa*), absolute Knowledge (*keval Gnan*) can never arise; the awakened awareness (*jagruti*) will not emerge in its full-fledged state. There should be no violence whatsoever. Towards whom is the violence being directed? All these living beings are the absolute Self indeed. So, towards whom will you be violent? Who will you hurt?

- Dadashri





dadabhagwan.org