

Grateful to Osho

Arlindo Moraes

2016-06-06

Source: <http://www.shiningworld.com/site/satsang/read/2760>

Marcos: ...but are you not grateful to Osho?

Arlindo: Yes, my Marcos, I am still very grateful to him, and in fact I never held any feelings of resentment against him during those days in Lucknow with Papaji. I sometimes like to say that every student gets the *guru* that he deserves. Osho was perfect for me at the time, and I had great *bhakti* for him for all those years. But love very often is blind – it may not make a clear reading of life situations.

Marcos: I see your point, my friend. This is a very trick one, because as far as helping someone to realize the truth of one's own nature, what works (what can help the person to develop better understanding) is what matters. Sometimes a little trick or a harmless lie can do the job. You don't want to say the naked truth if that may not be digestible to the listener. But that does not mean to say the *adharmic* actions can be generally justifiable when coming from a self-realized *jiva*. No! And Osho used to justify himself many times, saying that he was doing this or that for our own good or the good of the collective. I never really bought that! When *vasanas* are not completely neutralized by application of self-knowledge, one may end up producing *adharmic* actions. Observation of behavior is the only way you can tell the purity of one's mind and heart. Ultimately all *jivas* are the limitless self, but how really free is a *jiva* if he is still a puppet of his own likes and dislikes?

Arlindo: We *jivas* simultaneously experience our own existence and the existence of objects, which means that there are three factors built into our ordinary experiences of life: pure consciousness, the *jiva* (a pseudo-subject experiencing objects) and the creation, or the world of objects of experience). These are the three factors: *paramatman*, *jiva*, creation/Creator. In Sanskrit: *Isvara*, *jiva* and *jagat*, the by-product of the misapprehension of the non-dual nature of *paramatman*, the absolute *atman*). These three factors can be called different orders, or dimensions, of reality.

What can be said about one of these orders of reality does not necessarily apply to the others. Most of the confusion in the spiritual world is due to the ignorance about the overlapping of these three dimensions of the same one reality and their qualities. For example, if we say that the self has no attributes and therefore is not affected by *karma*, this does not mean to say that the *jiva*, which is the self in its secondary apparent nature, is also free from *karma*. No! *Jivas* are subject to time, space and all *karmic*, physical and psychological laws. *Jiva* is limited, and the self is limitless.

This confusion can be easily resolved by the understanding that the self pervades all other dimensions. It is what makes all others possible. Therefore we can say that the self is also the *jiva* and the world, as if apparent extensions of the self. But the *jiva* and the world can say that they are the self. The same way we can say that our physical body is also our hand, but the hand alone cannot claim to be the body.

A *jivamukta* is one that firmly knows that he/she is the

self/consciousness/*paramatman* – many names are given to IT. This firm knowledge naturally and effortlessly cancels one's tendencies to think and act against *dharma*. And this is so because we only break the rules of *dharma* when we have strong desires and fears motivating our actions, which is only possible if the mind is still under the influence of ignorance. In this case the *jivamukta* knows that he is the self, but he is not really free from his/her desires and fears.

I believe that all religions, with a few exceptions such as Buddhism (which does not bring *Isvara* into the picture), know the meaning of the three orders of reality. All spiritual and religious systems seem to have their roots on the *Vedas*.