

SECTION VI.

Mukṭi-Sādhanaṃ.

THE ACHIEVEMENT OF FREEDOM.

The fruit of all this mental labor in metaphysic.—*Mokṣha*.—Its nature.—Its further consequence.—*Yoga*.—Its significance.—Divine vision and illumination.—Their literal and metaphysical meaning.—The *rationale* thereof.—The worlds of the ideal and the real, mental and material, subtle and gross, inner and outer, and the third or universal.—Corresponding sub-divisions under cognition, desire and action.—The realisation of the third of each triplet of sub-divisions as equivalent to *mokṣha* by *yoga*.—Subservience of the six *Upāṅgas*.—Relativity of *bandha* and *mokṣha*, bondage and freedom.—Sin and merit as the two sub-divisions of bondage.—The essential significance of *karma*.—Reward and punishment.—Retrospective effects.—Other sub-divisions of *karma*.—Origin of evil.—Distribution of effects by means of the group-soul.—Pleasure, Pain and Peace.—AUM.

What is the fruit of all this immense mental industry, this labor and travail of thought? The thought itself is ample answer to this question. There is no fruit, indeed, from the

universal or transcendental standpoint (from which there is no labor either); and, or but, from the limited or empirical point of view (that of the individual *jīva*), this knowledge itself, namely, that there is no fruit, is the fruit. The realisation that the *jīva* never had any want to fulfil is the fulfilment of whatever inmost want it suffered from. This is the essential nature of *mokṣha*, as must be clear abundantly to whosoever has undergone that labor and travail of thought. *Mokṣha* is the fruit of this whole science, and of all the sciences subsidiary to and comprehended within it, metaphysical, physical and practical or *yogic*. To know and feel and show in act that 'separateness is not,' is *mokṣha*.

Having achieved *mokṣha*, again, the *jīva* knows that from the universal standpoint there is neither *bandha* nor *mokṣha*, neither bondage nor liberation therefrom. The condition of the *jīva* on the path of pursuit, the *pravṛtti-mārga*, is the condition of bondage; that on the path of renunciation, the *nivṛtti-mārga*, of freedom.

How can there be 'movelessness,' 'unshaken peace,' in *such* *mokṣha*, every moment and every instant of being on a *path* meaning change? The answer is contained in the two words, 'by predominance.' The predominance of the

consciousness of unity over the consciousness of separateness makes *mokṣha*.

The full realisation of all this significance of the Logion, AUM, which constitutes *mokṣha*, is achievable only by *abhyāsa*, 'sitting close,' 'persistence,' 'repeated' practice. Such *abhyāsa* is *yoga*. *Yog-ābhyāsa* is nothing else than the acquisition of the knowledge of the ideation which is the foundation of, and indeed is, the World-process, and then the putting of that knowledge into practice. This *yoga* has therefore obviously many *aṅgas*, 'limbs,' parts, departments, and, indeed, all the sciences whatsoever, *padārtha-shāstra*, material or physical science, and *śilpa-shāstra*, the science or rather the art of construction of all kinds—all these are subservient to it.

From another standpoint, *abhyāsa* requires and implies exercise of *śakti*, power, energy, which includes everything; and yet again, it is *kriyā*, activity, whereby everything is manifested.

For all such reasons, *yoga* is the principal *aṅga*, organ, means and instrument of *mokṣha*, without which freedom cannot be achieved. The divine vision, *divya-dṛṣṭi*, said to be developed in and by *yoga*, in its true metaphysical and universal significance, is the great vision of the Unity of the Self. The

other merely superphysical meanings assigned to the expression are comparative and particular and limited.

The further product of this fruit of *mokṣha* is the bringing of it to other *jīvas*.

When *mokṣha* is accomplished, all, everything, the most distant, most dissimilar, disconnected and incongruous facts of the World-process, are seen as organically co-ordinated. It is true that the details are governed by *an-avasṭhā*, non-finality, endlessness, such as may not be compassed and fully grasped in its totality by any one *jīva* at any one time and space, but the *jīva* that has accomplished freedom has seen that all this *an-avasṭhā* is due to and is comprehended in the Negation. The individual *buddhi* grasps not the whole of this endlessness; nor *manas*; it may not be measured by knowledge or by action, or by time, or by space; it is indescribable, indeed, incomprehensible, from the lower standpoint. How the atom, limited because it is a 'this,' contains the infinite Self; how again it is, though limited, divisible infinitely; how the Self confined in one atom is yet present in all other atoms too; how an atom present in one world acts in and upon things in another world—all this is truly unintelligible from that lower standpoint, but it is plain as day to the

unrestricted outlook of the Universal Self. As the large is, so is the small, and *vice versa*; and all are truly inseparably related and all behave similarly, in the broader view.

Because of this similarity in diversity is there a heredity and the qualities of parents are transmitted to their children; because of it can the character and the conduct of the parents be inferred from the appearance of the progeny; or the nature of one spouse from the looks of the other; or the medical history of a whole family from the appearance of any one member. Because of this can a practical and expert psychologist deduce the ethical nature of a man, or a well-trained architect, who is master of his science, the nature of the buildings and surroundings inhabited or required by that man, from his mere appearance. Because of this connexion of everything with everything along an endless and endlessly arranged and ordered chain and relation of cause and effect, all and every science is possible and has some truth in it (*e.g.*, cheiromancy, physiognomy, phrenology, etc.) however weird and unfamiliar at first sight it may seem.

Thus, from the one point of view, *i.e.*, that of diversity in unity, we have a pseudo-infinite perplexity of detail; while, from the other, *i.e.*, that of unity in diversity, we have one clear,

systematic or indeed partless whole.

By imitation and reflexion, in the concrete and limited and successive, of these two points of view and of their consequences—both equally dealt with by metaphysic—we are always having, in individual experience, the two worlds of inner and outer, ideal and real, thought and thing, mental and sensuous, causal and effectual, etc., corresponding to the I and the This. These two ever exist in one way or another, even in the minerals, indeed in every atom, though the fact be not very manifest. To these two worlds there correspond, in the human kingdom, the *sṭhūla* and the *liṅga* sheaths or bodies, the former being the external and denser, the latter internal and subtler. But, it should be noted carefully, this series of inner and outer is also endless, and as the *sṭhūla* is to the *liṅga*, so is the latter to the *sūkshma*, and so on. The completing third (of this pair of inner and outer, *sṭhūla* and *liṅga*) is the (world or body of) universality, all-consciousness, describable by, and corresponding to, the Negation, and holding together and merging into each other the other two¹. The three are

¹ See pp. 281, *et seq.* of *The Science of Peace*. At first sight there seems to be some inconsistency between these statements and the current *names* given to the bodies. Thus *kāraṇa-sharīra* is the

as externality, internality and relativity or mutuality, (or outside, inside and substance).

Under cognition, these three are reproduced as (1) sensation or cognition proper, (2) memory and its modifications, all thought, and

fourth in the series of *sthūla*, *liṅga*, *sūkshma*, *kāraṇa*, etc.; but it means, etymologically and obviously, the *causal* body. Should not the names have rather been *sthūla*, *sthūla-kāraṇa* or *liṅga*, *liṅga-kāraṇa* or *sūkshma*, *sūkshma-kāraṇa* or *kāraṇa* proper, (see footnote Vol. II, p. 44, *supra*) etc.? Possibly the explanation is that, at the present stage of evolution, the three lower *upādhis*, *sthūla*, *liṅga* and *sūkshma*, are already beginning to be lumped up and merged into one, and the *kāraṇa* is so called because it is now the receptacle of the germs whence the three lower bodies are repeatedly generated, and also of all karmic causes. When this causal body, with more familiar knowledge and use of it, begins to partake of the character of the 'effect'-bodies, then, it is possible that the name of *kāraṇa* may again be slided onwards also. There is an advantage in keeping the name, a name like this, a step in advance of the fact, in order to keep the intellect and evolutionary energy of the *jīva* on the stretch. As a fact we meet already with mention of the *buddhic*, *ṭuriya*, or *mahā-kāraṇa* body; and another still finer, the *ātmic* or *nirvāṇic*, and so on.

(3) the continuum of consciousness, the unbroken thread and net-work of knowledge. The ever-present endlessness of all things appears here also, as everywhere, in the shape of memory within, or of memory, cognition of cognition *i.e.*, apperception, etc.

Under desire, the corresponding forms are (1) the This-desire, the outer, manifested, and effective desire which prevails (over other desires) and guides the action of the physical body, (2) the I-desire, hidden, suppressed and concealed for the time being, not taking effect in outer life, but registered in the inner body, (often the very opposite of the outer and manifested desire, and changing places with it, that is, becoming effective, later on—as will appear in a moment in connexion with the discussion of sin and merit), (3) the absence of either, mere universal and incessant necessity—whence the saying that the knower has no desires, but subsists in and by necessity.

Action has also, of course, similar subdivisions, of inner, outer and all-embracing. (1) The outer action is obvious, it is the execution of (2) the inner determination, resolution; (3) the third is the universal, pseudo-infinite and pseudo-eternal movement of I and This governed by Negation, that incessant birth and life and death and absence and rebirth which

ignores and yet includes all individual will and initiation and determination and execution, etc.

To realise this third of each triplet as including the other two is mokṣha; and this, as said before, is possible only by yog-ābhyaśa. "From the *Veḍānta* learn to *know finally* and exactly the nature of the I and of the This; learn the work, activity, *mentality* or *intention* of the two from the *Mīmāṃsā*; learn their multifarious manifestations in their separate *marshalling* and *leading forth* from *Nyāya*; learn the mutual reflexion and re-reflexion, the classification and arrangement and systematisation, of all these *special manifestations* from the *Vaiśeṣhika*; learn their inner *unity* from *Yoga*; then realise their endlessness *passing all count or number* with the help of *Sāṅkhya*; and finally become *Veḍa-maya*, full of *knowledge*, omniscient, Brahman itself—This is mokṣha."¹

From the universal standpoint, no effort is needed for mokṣha any more than for bandha. Both are 'necessary' and must succeed each other, in the ordinary course, as ought to be clear from the statement already made, that the one corresponds to the path of renunciation and the other to that of pursuit,

¹ The italicised words indicate the meaning of the names of the systems of philosophy.

and that in reality both are naught. Both are halves, in the one successive world-scheme, and follow each other in unceasing rotation. The counsel that is given to jīvas, especially when they are near the turning-point, to strive after liberation, is appropriate only from the limited standpoint of the successive. Thus the *Brahma-Sūtra* says: So long as the scheme of world-experience is not fully known, so long is there bondage for the jīva; and again: All-knowledge is mokṣha. This all-knowledge is gained only by exertion, from the standpoint of the individual.

Bandha and mokṣha being thus seen to be relative to each other, we further find that, by the usual correspondence of the Self and the Not-Self, bandha is of two kinds, while mokṣha has none, or rather is itself the third kind, corresponding as it does with the Negation. (These two kinds of bondage will appear in a moment as corresponding with puṇya and pāpa, sin and merit, or they may be regarded as sub-conscious and conscious, as follows.)

So long as the knowledge or rather the consciousness of the I is less than that of the This or even equal to it, equally balanced and therefore neutralised by it, so long there is bandhana, bondage. But this is an unfelt, a

subconscious bondage, and therefore, in onesense, not a bondage at all. When however the inner I begins to prevail over the outer This, when self-consciousness sprouts forth, when the I begins to be more aware of itself than of the This, then there arises the consciousness of bondage, the sense of limitation by the body and its surroundings, and concomitantly with it the consciousness of the possibility of freedom; and fretting and chafing against the former, the jīva wishes and hopes and strives for the latter. Side by side with the appearance of this special consciousness of bondage, this knowledge of limitation, arises karma in the special human sense. Because minerals, vegetables, animals, (certain kinds of) devas and the earlier races of man do not possess this self-consciousness, therefore they have no sense of bondage or of freedom and create no karma and suffer no consequences in the special sense. These are felt and suffered only by humans and, amongst them too, only by such as have arrived at the stage of knowledge above referred to.¹

¹ Like so many other statements, this must be regarded as comparative. Many animals show more than a glimmer of the law of cause and effect. A dog here and there seems fully aware and shows all the marks of shame at having done wrong. Such

(The speciality of human karma and of its consequence, reward or punishment, consists simply and purely in this addition of *self-consciousness*, and in nothing else. This addition to either side of the equation *appears* as deliberation, volition, free choice, on the one side, the side of karma, and as expected result, known beforehand and all along, on the other side, the side of phala, fruit and consequence, reward and punishment. This is all the significance of the statements that this world, the human world, is karma-bhūmi, the place of karma, that the human body is karma-kṣhetra, the field of karma, that the elemental devas, candraṭmā, etc., that are in line with and anterior to the human kingdom in order of evolution have to be born as humans before they can secure mokṣha. These statements do not and cannot mean that there is any modification of the one universal

may be said to be near the point when the latent germ of individuality will appear as sprout above the surface, when the animal will individualise into the man with glimmerings of self-consciousness. Compare the statements of *The Secret Doctrine*, that the causal body descended into (*i.e.*, developed in) men about the middle of the third Root-Race, after which they fell into sin and bondage, and before which they were innocent.

law of causation regarded as action and re-action for the special behoof of the human kingdom. Karma in the general sense of causal action has its consequence in reaction-effect in all the kingdoms whatsoever, just as much as, and neither more nor less than, in the human kingdom; the distinctive peculiarity of it in the human kingdom is that there is a *consciousness* attaching to it as well as to its consequence, a co-efficient on both sides of the equation. An animal as much as a human will receive pain if it give pain and receive pleasure if it give pleasure; but in the case of the animal the giving of pain or pleasure may be called a mechanical cause and the receiving of pain or pleasure a mechanical effect, whereas in the case of the human, the cause is called conscious sin or merit and the effect conscious punishment or reward.)

Corresponding to the bondage that is no bondage, (for lack of ability to contrast it with freedom) of the earlier kingdoms and stages of evolution on the arc of pursuit, we have that bondage (or non-freedom) that also is no-bondage (or freedom), because undertaken freely as duty, of the later kingdoms and stages of evolution on the arc of renunciation. In this sense, *jīvan-mukṣas*, *jīvas* that have turned the junction-point between the two arcs and

have thus attained *mokṣha*, continue *bound* to work, in the universal and impersonal sense, that is to say, bound to work for the sake and the helping of other *jīvas*; they cease from karma only in the sense of personal selfish karma.

This kind of *bandha*—which indeed is equivalent to *mokṣha* and can be distinguished from it only when the latter is for the time regarded exclusively in the aspect of identity with Negation—may be regarded as illustrating and justifying in one way the relativity, stated before, of *bandha* and *mokṣha*, which relativity requires that they should follow in rotation upon each other. But that relativity is realised in a more literal sense also, for when one cycle is completed and after the due period of *pralaya* is over, and the time for a new succession, a new cycle, arrives, then the *mukṣas* of previous cycles are bound again. For *pravartana*, going forth, pursuing, corresponding to *kriyā*, and *nivartana*, returning, renouncing, corresponding to *prāṭi-kriyā*, and *anuvartana*, following out, going round and round, (corresponding to *vi-kriyā* or rather *upa-kriyā*), or, in other words, *uṭpaṭṭi*, *nāshana*, and *sṭhiti*, birth, death, and life—these constitute the triple incessant and universal karma of the World-process in which

all and everyone must share, whether freed or bound, mineral or omniscient. Karma, in the special sense, begins with man because and when there is a preponderance in him of jñāna-saṭṭva and therefore of discrimination between the Self and the Not-Self.

As to the relation between karma and phala, action and its consequence, every action reacts upon its originator, for the plain reason that the cause is present in the effect, the actor in the work. All the transformations of the work affect the originator in consequence of this indefeasible relation.¹

¹ This is only one of the many instances of the author's apparent inconsequences, or at least very startling transitions, of thought, where to the unalert reader there appears to be a complete shifting of ground. A little more careful scrutiny discloses the real connexion. As the text stands here, it does not appear, *prima facie*, to have much meaning. But take these illustrations. An architect constructs a building; it looks very fine, he acquires fame; a generation later the foundation begins to give way, the reputation begins to suffer; or it is found inadequate for the purpose for which it was intended; the dwelling-house is too hot in the summers and too cold in the winters, for sun and shade have not been duly provided for, or the lecture-room gives a bad echo because acoustic principles have not been properly observed; for

But is not this the case with minerals, vegetables, etc., also? It is so most surely; only the predominance in them of the 'This, as said before, prevents the development of the *feeling* of 'actor-ness', of aham-kāra, 'I do,' 'I act,' to the requisite point, and therefore the *special significance* of karma and phala remains latent. It is also true that the latent may be perceived, may be discovered by means of inference, and may then be stated as an existing fact; but in the first place this has not always a practical use, and, in the second place, is not always possible either, when the latent

all these reasons the architect's reputation suffers retrospectively. Or, again, a statesman, a minister, advocates a certain administrative measure, or succeeds in getting passed a certain law, or throws his country into a certain war; at the time, each one appears desirable or just or profitable to the country, and the statesman or minister wins fame and popularity with the public; but, in the course of years, unexpected and evil consequences ensue from his measures and the country suffers loss; his reputation suffers equally; the future historian condemns him as incapable, as short-sighted, or as interested. In the *Purāṇas* there are statements to the effect that jīvas suffer in naraka or enjoy in svarga so long as their evil or good actions are remembered here on earth. (See *The Science of the Emotions*, 2nd edn., pp. 74, 75.)