

“THE IMMUTABILITY OF DHARMĀḤ”*

All dharmāḥ must be known as belonging to the nature of ākāśa and as eternal. They must not, therefore, ever be considered as in the least multiples in any place

All souls are, for their own nature, resplendent from their origin and eternally immutable. One who has realized this vision has freed himself from the need of further knowledge and has unveiled immortality

Souls are, from their very origin, tranquil, non-born and, by their very nature, totally detached and non-different, just as reality itself is without birth, uniform and pure

All dharma, puruṣa or jīvātman, as reflections of ātman, must be known as non-formal, eternal, non-born and pure. The Reality which permeates the world of phenomenon-spectacle, is one, homogeneous, balanced, without birth and without end...

There can be no perfection for those who have ideas of multiplicity, who walk along the pathway of duality and who speak of plurality...

Insuperable knowledge will belong only to those who are firm in their conviction regarding that, which is without birth and constant...

It is held (by Tradition) that the very knowledge, inherent in birthless souls, is non-born and free of relations. As this knowledge is not related to any object it is said to be unconditioned

If the non-discerning person holds even the slightest notion of birth, etc., there is always attachment; it is useless, then, to speak of destroying the veiling screen

The knowledge mentioned here is metaphysical knowledge, inherent in Being itself; it is knowledge by identity, therefore not the imaginative knowledge...

The *sāadhanā* of *Asparśayoga* consists, therefore, in considering gross (*Virāṭ*), subtle (*Hiraṇyagarbha*) and germinal or noumenal (*Īśvara*) objects as belonging to the domain of relations, duality, rapport and contact; this implies, from the metaphysical perspective, that these concern the sphere of non-reality...

* From Gauḍapāda, *Māṇḍūkya-kārikā*, “Alātaśānti Prakaraṇa”, *kārikā* 91-99. Translation from the Sanskrit, and Commentary by Raphael. Aurea Vidyā. New York.

No soul is under any veil; all dharma are, by their own nature, pure, illuminated and free from eternity. Thus (endowed by nature as they are, with the power of knowledge) it is said that they know

The knowledge of the illuminated being, which is all pervading, has no relation with any object; so, souls have no relation to objects...

So, the *dharma* have no relationship with objects, they are *Asparśa*; this implies that they are of the nature of *Brahman nirguṇa*, of *Turīya*, without birth and without end. But some are only able to comprehend the Creator-creature duality; they are able to conceive only the theological dimension. Others, incapable of grasping the “immobile Mover”, are forced to outline an infinite evolution of the *dharma*, without ever reaching perfection. To hold that a God creates the various *dharma* and universes and then does not grant them the capability of ever being reintegrated in It, means admitting a series of incongruities and gaps from which it is almost impossible to emerge...

It can be stated that:

1. If God is cause and beings effects, one must admit that the effects can be reintegrated into the cause, because they are merely its modifications. So, within the gross dimension, energy resolves into mass and mass can resolve into energy...

2. If self-aware beings are emanations or creations of God's, then they are of the same nature as God himself, ... If nature is identical, one may ask how a *sole* nature may find itself in opposition to itself.

3. If self-aware beings had no possibility of “comprehending” their “Parent” and to return to Him, they would be eternally lacking, incomplete, alienated and orphans, and, if this were the case, for them there could be no expansion of consciousness, nor perfection capable of filling their *eternal* and *absolute* incompleteness...

4. If beings and the universe are creations with a beginning, they must also have an end; now, when they end where will they go? Will they dissolve into nothingness? Nothingness does not exist in reality, it can exist only as a mental category.

If, instead, they have neither birth nor end, then they are as infinite and eternal as the uncaused cause...

5. If God is Person and has in itself Intelligence and Power, why should it chose to *create* or emanate some beings or things which in turn would be eternally lacking and alienated?

6. If God, in that totality, is absolute oneness, can a non-reducible duality ever be

found in it?

From the brief illustration above, one may deduce that the *dharma*, in their deepest essence are nothing but the non-engendered cause, and they cannot but be so, and is only *apparently* that they can believe themselves to be unaccomplished, limited and separate... «... through the power of *māyā*, *Brahman* appears to be the universe» says the *Veda*.

The greatest tragedy which may befall a living being, according to the concepts of some evolutionist doctrines, is that of being *created* by a supreme Entity for the simple purpose of infinite evolving; thus he is forced to elevate himself in order to expand his consciousness more and more in a *horizontal direction* and seek greater perfection, which in any case remains relative because the progression towards perfection is to infinity. An entity, however much it may elevate itself or expand, is faced with a further step to climb; although higher than the preceding one, it will always be lacking and imperfect in comparison to the next one.

In other words, what is asserted is absolute dualism: on the one hand a Perfect being (it has to be admitted if one postulates perfectible beings), on the other, a multiplicity, created by it, imperfect or infinitely perfectible, without end, without hope of complete maturity...

Posing the question of evolution in terms of “more and more”, of a “hierarchical or spiritual career”, can only give rise to a sense of weariness, of tension and even of competition in the entity’s consciousness.

When beings are dragged and forced to grow beyond proportion in a spiral of perpetual, never-ending becoming, obliged to take on more onerous and important tasks and responsibilities, life becomes a struggle, anguish without even the consolation of a solution.

Other evolutionists maintain, on the contrary, that beings, born imperfect and incomplete, by evolving in time-space, will reach absoluteness... their Absolute depends on *time*... In other words, for these evolutionists time, or becoming, leads to Being: but the Buddha, in agreement with all Traditions, maintains that by “going” one never arrives...

But how can one become if one is not already? And if one is already there is no reason to become. If the term evolution means passing from one state of *nature* to another, this means invalidating the principle of identity of being...

If a being does not contain within itself the potentiality of Being, it will never reach the state of Being. Furthermore, time-space is nothing but a mental “figment”, a system of co-ordinates which responds to a certain category of thought.

The supreme Principle cannot depend on time-space-cause conditions because it does not live on mental categories... the supreme Principle, in its truest sense, is

timeless, spaceless, without-a-second...

A datum common to the evolutionists, but this is an inevitable consequence, is to consider “experience” as a basic and indispensable factor for evolution, advancement, progress.

Experience, that is a procedure of the empirical and dualistic order, cannot lead to Being... Being cannot depend on things belonging to the contingent, phenomenal or *māyā* dimension, because it does not depend, as we already said, on time-space-cause.

Empirical experience is the effect of motion; it is the fruit of deed; to experience means to move. Action is *karma*, in the broadest sense, and *karma* and *avidyā* are inseparable factors leading to transmigration... Liberation-realization does not imply a “motion”, a “changing into other”, it does not involve a self-altering, a self-mutation, but only a *self-comprehending*, a *self-recognizing*, a *Being*.

©Asram Vidya.
New York, NY - U.S.A. 2002