

A deep study of the upaniṣads reveals why Swami Dayananda Saraswati is insisting that Bhagavān is to be understood as order of orders. The truth is there is no 'thing' around. Everything is stitched together as order of orders, knowledge all the way, Hiranyaagarbha is referred to as sūtrātmā, a stitcher, in some places jyotiṣām jyotiḥ, light of knowledge all the way, inside also antarjyoti, manaso manah, again knowledge, no 'thing'. Swamiji always used to say, since the sense of touch runs all over the epidermis, one has a notion that body is one single entity, whereas body is put together as order of orders, a representative miracle encapsulating the order of orders, matter, energy, all kinds of forces, biological, electromagnetic, chemical, psychosomatic, all kinds of glory, it is knowledge all the way. So ultimately when there is only knowledge and no 'thing' around, fundamentally all of us make the mistake of doing vyavahāra thinking as though there are things around, whereas it is only "vijṛmbayati," meaning projected and sustained as "Mahāyogi iva svecchayā," (by the being's own volition, by its own nature. Since the being is not even a particle, infinitisimally smaller, meaning 'no thing' that is what it means, it is just knowingness-cit, caitanyam hence is all powers that can be imagined, infinitely more than nuclear power and power of a further smaller particle yet to be discovered, etc just extrapolate, unimaginable) feels like kiñcit bhāvam asti, it is all in a flux gives the feeling something tangible is out there, but no. In Tamil in colloquial language, there is one expression, even we use, "enna scene podare", "enna padam kaatare", meaning what is happening around is only like a movie. We compound the problem by attaching false values to these so-called things. We give names, words, meanings, fix connections, relationships, etc as if they are all there as tangible, substantial, but no. Naturally founded on lack of true knowledge assuming 'things' can only misfire. If things happen as we wanted, we are just lucky, we have earned some grace sometimes. So, only hope of redemption is surrender to this all-knowledge knowingness, being, order of orders and slowly unravel in our mind the knowledge involved in

every small aspect of life day in and day out and retract ourselves to the truth of the 'being'. See some details here.

Sri Rudram chanting followed by camakam exemplifies the fact, they being directly from Vedas, everything, the whole society, the world at hand has been projected graphically in all details, Bhagavān emphatically says that seeing them as 'na mama,' seeing them differently but not the real thing, at the same time 'namah', surrender to the knowledge, and follows immediately saying 'ca me, ca me,' exhorts us not to go away with the idea that they are other than 'I', the all-knowing being. In the Mṛtyunjaya mantra that we chant at end of Sri Rudram says, "ṭān yajñasya māyayā sarvānava yajāmahe". Puruṣasuktam also says "ajāyamāno bahudhā vijāyate," the paradox in the same sentence. Gītā says 'matsthāni sarvabhūtāni' and immediately follows 'na ca matsthāni bhūtāni.' Sri Dakshinamurti Stotram compassionately captures the essence of the paradoxes that "māyā kalpita deśa kāla kalanā vaicitriya citrikṛtam," the whole world we confront, all happenings captured like etched in a film, memory screen, and like film rolls, the memory is projected in a continuum as though there is continuous life from the past, like a movie it is played out, a longer bluff, you see only changeless light(vivarta- changeless, upādānam-the light is the knowingness being, lights up all the dimensions of knowledge including ignorance) the changing images on the mind screen are the viśvarūpa, a historical life projected into future, both are unreal, here and now is the only truth. All our intelligence and creativity(I the being) māyayā/avidyayā has seemlessly spilled over through the window of sakṣī into identifiction with 'I thought' to body, name, relationship, status, position, power, opinion, bias, prejudice, judgements, desires, actions, sufferings, etc all strung together like a movie. Everything originates from I the being, sustained by the being and resolves into the being. Namama is namah and ca me(in Sanskrit), it is all I. Just be. Let go. Let God.

Then the question can be "what am I the being, who am I the being referred to here?" Let us look at that.

There is 'I the being.' There is 'I thought.' 'I thought' is largely in the domain of bhagavatśakti māyā and almost all life is determined and guided by that śakti, Īśvara srṣṭi. Ātmavān, 'T' the being, avidyayā identifying with 'I thought' is samsārī meaning limiting ourselves to a fleeting thought in mind and converting into an action, desire, the results are never ending desires, hence samsārī. Ātmavān abiding in 'I the being' is freedom. Generally even students of Vedanta think ātmavān identifying with 'I thought' is essential because śāstra says one should do one's duties with full śraddhā, effort and enthusiasm quoting Viṣṇu Sahasranāma 'mahotsāḥ..', etc that Bhagavān is himself enthusiastically participating in srṣṭi. The good thing is as I said all happenings are within supreme will including the 'I thought' participating in pravṛtti is in the presence of 'I the being', bhagavat śakti operates. In Māṇḍūkya Kārikā talks Swamiji clearly explains there is no Īśvara srṣṭi other than the order, niyati, māyā/avidyayā vijṛmbanam. The asamsārī (not identifying with I thought) ātmavān abiding in the being is freedom. If I look at my life honestly, that is how it is. Be generous in the aloofness, role-play of pravṛtti in all roles. There is no disconnect or dissociation. If we see any disconnect or dissociation, we are only imagining things or we are not willing to drop ātmavān identifying with I thought. We are afraid we would lose all that we have earned over janmas, a pseudo ātmavān. Further,

'I the being' is free and that is life and ātmavān is free enough to commit the error of identifying with 'I thought' and assume I run my life, whereas almost all of life is in Īśvara's domain. Swamiji uses the 'trc' pratyaya (word ending) to refer to I am kartā (kartṛ), I am bhoktā (bhoktṛ) attitude, saying that attitude can only mess up things - trc is only ṭṛsamam, even in tamil trasamam means messing up. The only excuse can be making the error is part of the order and so also is the vidyā that can help you claim the freedom from the error.

For some strange, divine reason, till I first heard Swami Dayananda Saraswati telling 'you are the awareful being', till that moment I never had any notion or concept in my mind, even though at that time I was just nineteen yrs, a science

graduate with good understanding of Maths, physics, chemistry and reasonably religious, I had gone through upanayanam, Gāyatrī initiation, etc. But till I heard Swamiji I never had any thought-process that were to tell me that science or religion would tell me 'who I am'. I always instinctively thought I am the one seeing what science runs in my mind and what religion, God thought runs in my mind. I am the observer of all that, I knew. So when Swamiji said 'you are the awareful being' it rang totally true and I have not looked back since.

So to put it all together, I the being, svarūpa being "knowingness", all so-called things, world spring from this knowingness, severally referred to as ātmā, Brahman, Bhagavān, śakti, all-knowledge. Knowing this I remain. Be, let go, let God.

This is the only truth, the reality that cannot be negated, this is the only knowledge that cannot be improved upon and that can be claimed as knowledge because it is 'T'. Only a flower can know itself completely, can claim flower-knowledge which cannot be negated or improved upon however great a botanist or a biologist be who analyses the flower. So fulfilment is "T" the being. So be I.

*Om tat sat.*

Swami Ramesvarananda Saraswati

Jñāna Pravaha – Vedanta Study Centre, Manjakkudi

“Anything that is considered desirable by us becomes an object of seeking. There are two types of seeking in our life. First is the seeking of things which I look upon as desirable and which I do not have. Things like comforts, money, power, progeny etc., fall in this category. The second kind of seeking also pertains to objects which we consider desirable. But there is a difference. While the first kind of seeking pertains to objects we do not have, this second kind of seeking is for the objects we have, but think we do not have.”

- Swami Dayananda Saraswati