

VCD No.777, Audio Cassette No.1263,
dated 7.10.07, at Bangalore -1
Clarification of Murli dated 30.1.68 (for BKs)

Om Shanti. Today's morning class is of 30th January 1968. The spiritual father sits and explains to the spiritual children. Who is the spiritual father and who is the bodily father? The spiritual father means the father of souls and the bodily father means the father of human beings. So, spiritual father sits in the father of human beings and explains to the spiritual children. Human beings are body conscious. He doesn't explain to body conscious human beings. He explains to the children who have sat in soul conscious stage. So, at first, the children have got the introduction of the father. When a small child takes birth, it first gets the introduction of its parents. Even amongst you there are numberwise ones according to their effort who got the introduction of the creator father. Who should we call as the creator father? Should we call the father of the point-like souls, the spiritual father as the creator father? Or is it some other personality whom should we call the creator father? The point-like souls are eternal, imperishable. There is no question of creating them at all. And the father of souls, the spiritual father, even he is not created. He is also eternal and imperishable. So, the spiritual father is neither a creator nor does he create the spiritual children. He only comes and gives the knowledge of soul. So, the children come to know that they are souls. Nevertheless, it is not like this that the soul was not there at first. The children know this too. The father alone is the highest on high. And one has to say only his praise. 'The highest on high and the praise worthy' (*Mahimavant*), does this happen in the corporeal world or in the incorporeal world? The question of highest on high and lowest of low arises in the corporeal world. There is a praise of the highest on high when he performs the highest on high role in this corporeal world. People also praise- *Om shivay namah* (I, a soul bow to Shiv). Om is prefixed to Shiv. They also say- *shivay namah* (I bow to Shiv). *Brahmay namah* (I bow to Brahma), *Vishnuay namah* (I bow to Vishnu), this doesn't suit. *Shivay namah* (I bow to Shiv) suits. For Brahma and Vishnu, it will be said – *Brahma devtay namah* (I bow to Brahma, a deity). When Brahma becomes a deity, one bows before him. *Vishnu devtay namah* (I bow to Vishnu, a deity). So, by attaching (the word) 'devta', the word becomes attractive (*shobhayman*). So, one would have to say *devta* (deity). But the highest on high is 'Bhagwan' (God). There is a difference between *Bhagwan* (God) and deity. When someone comes to the exhibition etc., first one should certainly tell them about the glory of the highest on high father. He is the Supreme father. There is no other father higher than him. The children forget. While explaining, they don't remember that how should they narrate the glory of the father.

First, explain that He is the supreme father, teacher and Guru as well. He is the only one who performs a role in the form of the father as well; he sows the seed of knowledge and gives inheritance at last. He is also the teacher in between and performs the role of Guru at last. So, one will have to remember all the three. If one remembers the father, then one will get inheritance of joy and peace through the relation of the father. If one remembers the teacher, then one will get the depth of each and every matter and if one remembers the Guru, then one will get the true salvation (*sadgati*). (Someone said something.). Yes, one has to remember Shivbaba alone. Moreover, one has to remember in all the three forms, one has to make this firm.

Whether as a father, whether as a teacher, whether as a Sadguru (true preceptor), Shivbaba is the actor in all the three forms. So, first, one has to praise the father. Certainly you know, only then you praise (the father). Then, they consider (*thok dete hai*) such a highest on high God to be

in mud and wall (*thikkar-bhittar*). So, such souls, who are like *thikkar* that is a lump of mud; who will break away, who will disperse if they get a little kick from Maya. God is considered to be pervasive in them.

Those who sit or stand as an obstacle like a *bhit* i.e. a wall in the path of knowledge; God is considered to be present in such ones. If he is said to be in a human being, even then it is alright. A human being is called as the progeny of *Manu*. The one who does thinking and churning is called as a human being. In a way, one cannot say (God is) in human beings too. He doesn't remain in one particular human body always.

He certainly takes loan. Any soul doesn't take the support of anyone else's body. He himself says- I take their support. So, at first one has to be made firm on the main issue. The highest on high father whom we praise, is the true father. He is called as the *truth God father*. He himself narrates to us the true story of Satyanarayan. And the truth father alone makes us Narayan from Nar (the man).

The kingdom of these Laxmi- Narayan was there, wasn't it? Certainly, their kingdom was in the Golden age. How did he become SatyaNarayan? The entire world becomes false; all the human beings become false. The story of one SatyaNarayan is sung in the world of false people. So, how did he become such a truthful one? When was he made truthful like that? Who made him? And when was this true story of SatyaNarayan narrated? When did he teach the Rajyog for becoming Narayan from Nar? Now, you understand all these things. All other human beings have connection (Yog) with human beings. It doesn't happen so that the connection of a human being is with an incorporeal one. And even that incorporeal one is not just for the sake of saying, but with an understanding of what the incorporeal is and what the corporeal is, what the incorporeal one is, how the one who is incorporeal (Nirakari) becomes without vices (Nirvikari), egoless (Nirhankari).

Does he become incorporeal, without vices and egoless, when he is in the corporeal form or is there this praise without the corporeal? So, one should have a knowledge about that too. Even though, now-a-days they establish a connection with Shiv, they worship him but they don't know that Shiv, whom they worship. They don't understand anything at all. They have just placed a *ling* made up of stone in the temple; that is all. They apply a dot (bindi) on that and keep worshipping. They don't know why this ling of stone has been made in the Iron Age. In scriptures, the matter of a golden *ling* has been mentioned, a Silver ling is also mentioned, a Copper ling is famous as well and a ling of iron and stone is also kept.

But, what does it mean? Hm? Does Shiv pass through these four stages? The Supreme soul Shiv doesn't pass through the four stages. He is ever benevolent (*Sadashiv*). But the body in which he enters in a permanent form, that passes through four stages in the entire kalp (cycle of 5000 years). It is because that soul is coloured by the company as well.

They also understand that Prajapita Brahma will certainly be present in this corporeal world. It is not possible that Prajapita Brahma is not there in the corporeal world and subjects are there. Wherever the 5 to 7 billion subjects exist and until the subjects exist, Praja pita will certainly be present in this corporeal world. They are confused. They think that first Prajapita Brahma should be in the Golden age. If Prajapita Brahma were in the Golden age, then why has the subtle world been shown? They don't understand the meaning at all. That Prajapita is also in the bondage of Karma (*karmabandhan*). With whom is the bondage of karma?

It has been said that if Bap Dada want to, they can go back. So, can the one who goes back have bondage of Karma? Then? (Someone said- he has stopped for the children.). He is a father, so a father cannot go back without doing benefit to the children. He is in bondage of karma, then certainly he has some bondage of karma with the children. (Someone said- the children will also have bondage of karma, won't they?) The children will indeed have first. The Father cannot go leaving the children.

Two fathers are sitting in only one personality. One is the father of souls and another is the father of all human beings. He is always *Karmateet* (beyond the effect of actions). Who? The spiritual father is always (*atit*) beyond karma. He remains detached from the bondage of karma even while He performs karma through the bodily organs. And He is himself the giver of the knowledge. There is only one father who gives the knowledge. There are two unlimited fathers. But, the giver of knowledge is only one spiritual father. When he comes and gives you the knowledge, then narrate it to the others. Who comes? When the spiritual father comes and gives you the knowledge, then narrate it to the others. Who should narrate? Arey, even amongst the children, who is the child who should narrate?

The spiritual father is the one who comes; he comes from the spiritual world. He comes and gives the knowledge to you first. When it was said in the vani of '68- 'to you', so, was that 'you' present before (the father) in '68? He was not present, but (Baba) said it by emerging (him). When I give you the knowledge, then narrate it to the others.

If one doesn't have the knowledge, then how can one narrate it to the others? You have to give the introduction of the father. It is very easy and (you) should explain just on *Alaf*. Just like in the basic knowledge, the picture of 32 rays has been prepared and the picture of incorporeal point of light has been kept in the middle (of that). If someone explained on it, then will anyone understand the subject of the 32 virtues, that the incorporeal one has 32 virtues? Nobody will understand it. That is why, one should explain on *Alaf*. One is a point (*bindu*) which is called as *Nukta* in Urdu. Then there is an *Alaf*, the vertical stick (*khada danda*). And then in the second number, there is a horizontal stick (*pada danda*) *Bay*.

So, one should explain on *Alaf*- this is the unlimited father of all the souls. There is no difficulty in giving the introduction to someone. It is very simple. But if the one, who is explaining, himself doesn't have faith, then he cannot explain to anyone. When can the one who explains explain? When he himself has faith. The more firm the faith with which one explains, the faster it will sit in other's intellect. For example, there are the ignorant human beings, similarly if the one who has a faithless intellect sits and explains to someone, then they too will come in the list of ignorant people. If one doesn't have the faith oneself and he makes show off of the knowledge in front of others, if he starts giving introduction of the father then, will such ones be called as knowledgeable or ignorant? If one doesn't give the knowledge, then it means that he is ignorant. The one who is soul conscious will have the knowledge. If one doesn't have the knowledge, then he is a devotee, consider that he is body conscious.

We are souls; our father is the Supreme father Supreme soul. He is our teacher as well as Guru. Prajapita Brahma is also there, isn't he? But, how did Prajapita come in the subtle world? The *praja* (subjects) are here, in this world. So, Prajapita is also in this world. The father has told the occupation of Prajapita Brahma too, he has also told the occupation of Vishnu. It has been told for Shankar that he has no role at all. If he doesn't have any role, then what should one understand, is there Shankar or not? When there is no role, then what will he do, if he is present? A role is performed through bodily organs. Shankar is shown to be sitting in remembrance. So,

remembrance is a matter related to the intellect. One cannot see anybody performing Karma by the mind and intellect. That is why; it has been told that it is as if he doesn't have any role at all.

But it is not like this that Shankar does not exist. Those devotees have combined Shankar with Shiv. Who combined Shiv and Shankar? Why did the devotees combine them? Why did the intellectuals [knowledgeable ones] explain both separately? The devotees don't have the third eye of the knowledge. Do they see the corporeal one or the incorporeal one through the ignorant eyes? (Someone said-the corporeal one.). Did many amongst the so-called Brahmakumar-kumaris see the corporeal Brahma or did they follow the versions of the incorporeal father Shiv? They saw the corporeal one. So, should they be called as ignorant or knowledgeable? Hm? (Some one said-ignorant). They saw the corporeal one and could not understand the incorporeal one in him, so, it is as if they became ignorant. So, the devotees combined both Shiv and Shankar into one. But, why did those devotees not combine Shiv and Brahma into one? Hm?

It is because Brahma does not reach to such a stage of effort that he would become incorporeal, without vices and egoless like Shiv, so that even the consciousness of the subtle body would finish. About Shankar, they will understand later on that he has achieved the stage equal to the father. Then, they think that Shankar performs the destruction. This has also been cooked up. Actually, does Shankar perform the destruction in practical or do the *shaktis*, the destroyers; the destroyer-of-the-demons (*sangharkarini*, *aasur sanharani shaktiya*) perform the task of the destruction? This is the praise of the Shaktis (consorts). So, they have cooked up these issues. Nevertheless, it is not true that the world will be burnt into ashes by Shankar opening his eye. This is a matter in the unlimited sense.

This is the praise of the confluence aged Brahmin world that even the soul of Shankar is at first a Brahmin in the form of an effort-maker in the confluence aged Brahmin world. Just like the other Brahmins are incomplete, he too is in an incomplete stage. But when he opens the third eye of knowledge while in a seed-like stage and in a complete soul conscious stage, then disintegration (*vighatan*) takes place in the old Brahmin world. Just like it happened in the year '76. Such a fire of the knowledge emerges, which burns the ones who are like Ravan, Kumbhakarna, Meghnad. And the ones who have a firm soul conscious stage, do not get harmed by the heat. So, does the destruction take place by Shankar opening his eye? They think that the destruction of the outside world takes place by opening the eye and that he might be having a third physical eye. It is not true. This is about the eye of knowledge.

When the true knowledge sits in the intellect, the destruction of demoniac sanskar and demoniac atmosphere takes place. It is not true that when he opens the eye, the world gets burnt into ashes. These are bombs. Natural calamities take place. The bombs blast and the Earth becomes imbalanced. When the balance is disturbed, massive earthquakes occur, volcanoes erupt, and because the Earth shakes, the biggest population of the world which lives in the multistory buildings; they all get buried and die.

So, see, Shankar has been made sinful. Is the task of destruction dirty or good? (Someone said- it is a good task). Is it a good task? When the destruction takes place, they will shout so much cries of despair. They will become so sorrowful. (Someone said-the sinful karma of everyone gets burnt into ashes due to it.) For e.g., there is some king, he gives punishment to a thief, robber, murderer, but practically, who gives him the punishment of Death (*mrutyudand*), the cremator (*chandal*) or the king? Hm? The cremator gives. The king has only given the judgment so that the good should be distinguished from the bad. The cremator gives the punishment of death. Similarly, the one who is *Prakruti*, i.e. nature, when she becomes very

much degraded (*ati tamsi*), then she becomes instrumental in causing the destruction of the entire world.

If Shankar performs destruction, then as if Shankar will belong to the demoniac community. Does the destruction take place due to purity or due to impurity? The destruction takes place due to impurity. Will Shankar be called as impure or pure? Brahma, Vishnu, Shankar are shown as the subtle world dweller angels. Those who don't have any relation with the people dwelling on the land (*farsh ki duniyavale*) are called angels. If relations are attached with bodily beings, then they are called as sinful. If there is no relation at all, then whom does he remember? One father and none else. The father, whom he remembers, is always incorporeal, without vices and egoless. So, how can Shankar belong to the demoniac community? And on one side, it is said- Dev, Dev, Mahadev. Tridev (three deities) are the biggest Deities amongst the 33 crore (330 million) deities. And the superior deity amongst the three deities is Mahadev. Then, how can deities belong to the demoniac community?

These pictures of Trimurti etc. are not accurate. Towards which pictures the hint has been given? The picture of Trimurty which was prepared with the divine visions, even for that it has been said that these are not accurate. It is because the face of Brahma has been shown in all the three idols (*Murtiya*). The face which has been shown in the form of Vishnu and in the form of Shankar, from those the mustache of Brahma has been removed. The face is the same, as it is. (Someone said-Baba it has been told - Trimurty etc. it means that all the four pictures are not accurate). The picture of Trimurty is in all the four pictures. The one which is Trimurty is there in all the four pictures, isn't it? So, all these are meaningless pictures.

What does 'all' mean? All these four pictures are meaningless. The Trimurty, World cycle (*Gola*), The Tree, The Ladder become meaningless because there is no true picture of the Trimurty in them. How can Vishnu be present with the ornaments in the subtle world? This is not the question of the subtle world at all. Will the sustenance through Vishnu take place in the subtle world or in the corporeal world? The sustenance takes place in the corporeal world. The meaning of the ornaments etc. is different. These ornaments have been shown as a symbol of the virtues. These are the ornaments of the divine virtues. If one understands like this, even then it is alright. Otherwise, even that is not alright. You will say-these are the scriptures, pictures etc. of the *Bhakti marg* (path of devotion). In the path of devotion they understand with superstition that Vishnu must be a personality having four arms. That is not possible there.

This Prajapita Brahma is also a bodily being. There are so many children. So, all these pictures etc are for worship etc. in the path of devotion. How can Prajapita Brahma be present there in the subtle world? The father has explained that this Brahma is *Vyakta* (manifest) but that one is *Avyakta* (unmanifest). When he becomes *Avyakta*, he becomes an angel in the subtle world.

The second page of the *vani* of 30th January 1968. The supreme abode, the subtle world are there practically, aren't they? It is a matter of stage. One goes to the subtle world, doesn't one? So, these pictures etc. are not accurate. The father sits and explains the meaning of these, that what the meaning of Brahma is. If there are words, then they have meanings, haven't they? The names are given on the basis of tasks, aren't they? So, the father explains the true meaning.

Prajapita Brahma, who was a human being, himself, becomes an angel afterwards. Prajapita Brahma becomes an angel, then does the corporeal body remain or not remain? It remains. Then, is there a connection with those dwelling on the land or not? Hm? He becomes an

angel, so the relation with the people dwelling on the land ends. After becoming an angel, here it is shown regarding kingship as well. Then, these will rule. If these pictures of the subtle world are not there, even then there will be a difficulty in understanding.

In fact, this form of Vishnu with four arms is not there as well. The ones who are from the path of devotion don't have the clarification of the form which has the four arms. The Father comes and explains. Arms mean helpers. Some become cooperative in a righteous form and some become cooperative in a leftist form. Vishnu has four arms. Two are in the righteous form and two are in the leftist form. What does cooperative in the righteous form mean? Those two arms meaning the two co-operative souls never looked at the bad qualities of anyone. What did they see in every child? They saw only their virtues. They never described about their bad qualities. They did not see the bad qualities even while looking at it.

And (what about) the leftist hands? Mahakal and Mahakali. What is their role? Hm? Their role is that they see the virtues as well as the bad qualities through the third eye. But, when the bad qualities are seen, then will one get coloured by the company of those bad qualities or not? (Someone said something.). Will they not get coloured? Hm? Will the task become difficult or easy? (Someone said-it will become difficult.). If one looks at bad qualities of someone, and if someone is such an effort-maker that he looks into only virtues, he does not see the bad qualities even while looking at them. So, who will be benefited? For the one who looks at virtues it will be easy. The one who does, will get (*jo karega so payega*). The one who resides above (God) has come. He knows his task. So, by looking at the bad qualities, one certainly gets affected by it to some extent or the other.

So, two souls are the co-operatives in the form of leftist. The task is difficult, even then they are co-operative. So, the four arms have been shown in the form of helpers. These four arms become co-operative in the Godly task. The four-armed form which has been shown in the path of devotion doesn't have any meaning. The father sits and explains here. Because we have to become pure from impure through the Father. So, will we become pure from impure in the subtle world? It is not a matter of the subtle world at all. The soul has to become pure. After becoming pure, we will go back to our abode. When a soul achieves a pure stage i.e. complete stage, then will it remain bound within this body or will it fly up? It will not feel good to remain in the body at all. It will become detached (*upram*).

Of course souls live in the incorporeal world. There are corporeal (people) in this world. As regards the rest, there is no main story of the subtle world. The angels of the subtle world are not praised in the Deity religion. In which religion are angels praised? (Someone said-Islam). Angels are praised among Christians and Muslims. They don't believe in deities. Why don't they believe? Hm? (Someone said- they don't recognize corporeal). It is because; the Christians and the Muslims who get converted into other religions do not take 84 births at all. The ones who didn't take complete 84 births at all, they cannot study directly from the Supreme father Supreme soul and become deities. What do they become? After leaving the physical body, what do they become? They become subtle bodied beings. So, there is the praise of angels in their religions, there is no praise of deities.

Now the father explains the secret of the subtle world as well. Whereas it is told in Murlis- what is the subtle world? It is nothing. So, what is the secret? The subtle world (*Sookshm vatan*) means the subtle stage of the mind and intellect. It is such a subtle stage where the soul forgets the corporeal body, the relations of the body and the materials related to the body. That which is called a subtle stage (*Aakari stage*). It remains in thinking and churning of the knowledge, it

remains in the planning of new world, or the intellect remains in Godly service. The intellect becomes detached from this corporeal world and its occupations.

They are in fact numberwise. The supreme abode (*Moolvatan*), then the subtle world and then the physical world. The highest stage is of the supreme abode. But, no one can directly go to the supreme abode (*Moolvatan*) until he achieves a subtle stage of thinking and churning. Whoever comes, first of all, one should give them the introduction of the father, that the father is a resident of the supreme abode (*Moolvatan*) and he always resides in the supreme abode. He comes in this world, comes in the corporeal world, comes in a sinful world, comes in a sinful body and comes among sinful ones; even so he remains in an incorporeal stage of the Supreme Abode. He is the father.

Even in the path of devotion they say-Baba, Baba, oh God! don't they? But, they only don't recognize. They always say- *Shiv Parmatmay namah* (I bow to Shiv, the supreme soul), they never say Shiv, the Deity. What? They will not say Shiv, the Deity. But, what about Shankar? They will say Shankar is a deity. It means that Shiv is God and Shankar is a deity. They say-*Brahma devtay namah* (I bow to Brahma, the deity). Shiv is called as the Supreme soul. He is also called as the Supreme Father Supreme Soul.

Then, little indeed is he called as omnipresent? Hm? When should he be called omnipresent? He will be called omnipresent when he enters each and every soul. But, does he enter each and every soul? Or does he enter that supreme soul who performs the supreme role, role of a hero among all souls? He enters only one. He comes in only one (*Ekvyapi*), he doesn't come as omnipresent. He has to perform the duty of transforming the sinful into pure, hasn't he? If he will enter everybody and start making the sinful ones into pure ones, then will they remain sinful itself or will they become pure? Hm? Will all effort-makers be alike? No.

The highest on high father comes, and then certainly, he would be entering only the highest on high. Just like, Abraham, Buddha, Christ come, do they enter the highest on high deities, do they enter the highest deities who are numberwise ones, Or do they enter the deity souls who descend at the end of Kaliyug (Iron age)? They enter the numberwise deity souls. Similarly, those religious fathers are numberwise high. They will not be called as the highest on high. But this is the highest on high father. Such a highest on high father will certainly enter in the highest on high actor, only then he can perform the duty of making the sinful into pure ones.

So, will he come in mud and wall (*thikkar-bhittar*) for making sinful into pure ones? If he comes in a lump of mud (*thikkar*), then the ones whose company he will keep, they will also become of mud like intellect (*thikkar buddhi*). If he comes in a stone-like intellect, then the ones whose company he will keep, they will also become of a stone-like intellect [*pattar buddhi*]. This knowledge of omnipresence is called as terrible darkness (*Ghor andhiyara*). But, even this is predetermined in the drama. What? The spread of the knowledge of omnipresence. In which Age (*Yug*) does it spread? This knowledge spreads in the Copper and the Iron Age that the Supreme soul is omnipresent. Where does the shooting take place? (Someone said- in the confluence age). How? No Brahmakumar-kumari over here says that the Supreme soul is omnipresent. (Someone said- they sit and give Drishti). They do not say so but they perform such an action practically, due to which it sits in the intellect of the people that these are forms of the Supreme soul. They do not understand anything. The Father comes and explains-*Yada yadahi dharmasya, glanirbhavati bharat*. Whenever such a defamation of the Supreme Father Supreme soul takes place in India (*Bharat*), that- God is pervasive in mud and wall and in every particle, I come at that time. It has been written in *Sanskrit* in scriptures. Whatever has been written in the scriptures, in which

language has it been written? (Someone said-in Sanskrit). It has been written in *Sanskrit*. Of where are the scriptures a memorial? They are a memorial of the path of devotion itself. The memorials which have been made in the path of devotion, where is their foundation laid? The foundation is laid in the Confluence Age.

What does *Sanskrit* mean? The meaning of *Sanskrit* is the one which is reformed. Will it be called as the reformed knowledge when one starts understanding it, or will the knowledge which one doesn't understand at all be called as the reformed one? Someone reads out a *Shloka* in Sanskrit (A Sanskrit couplet), the gathering doesn't understand anything. So, will it be called as knowledge for the gathering or is it like- to cast pearls before swine [*Bhaiske aage been bajana*], will it be called as ignorance? That is a matter of ignorance. Knowledge is the one which gives understanding.

Whatever was narrated through Brahma, will that be called as *Sanskrit* or *Vedvani*? That was *Vedvani*. *Vedvani* has been written in the Vaidik language in the path of devotion. Sanskrit was prepared afterwards. Similarly, the Murlis which were narrated through Brahma, the knowledge that emerged from his mouth, is *Vedvani*. Nobody understands its meaning. Many matters have been clarified later on in the Sanskrit language. So, father comes and explains its meaning.

It has been written in *Geeta-Yada yadahi dharmasya*, when defamation of religion takes place.... So, the defamation of which religion takes place? Whichever other religions are there in the world, are already irreligiousness in the name of religion. They are not religions at all. Actually, the Ancient deity religion (*Devidevta Sanatan Dharm*) gets defamed. It has been written-*Sambhavami yuge yuge* , I come in every Yug (Age). Then, it has been written-he is omnipresent. What meaning do those people give after narrating the *Shloka*- you children should observe that as well. You have to go there and say that we do not understand its meaning. So, they will narrate immediately. Little indeed will they understand that these are some Brahmakumar-kumaris? Although you have a white dress, but there is no stamp of Brahmakumari affixed on you. If any male goes and asks, then they will narrate immediately. If you come to know what meaning they give, then Baba will explain its meaning. One should give the report to Baba. But no such child is there. This Chinmayanand and so on go; they go everywhere. Wherever you go you should listen to them and come. You can also ask, 'we didn't at all understand its meaning'. See, what they narrate.

All the remaining pictures that are there are for explaining in detail. (Baba) explains such immeasurable knowledge. Make the ocean into ink; even then it doesn't have an end. Then the matter of a second is also narrated here. You have to just give the introduction of the father. He is the only one father who is the purifier of the sinful ones (patit pavan) and the unlimited father. And that father himself is the creator of heaven. All the other human beings do get the title of father, they indeed become a father but nobody establishes heaven. Why don't they? Hm? Because no one is the father. Many have indeed become fathers in the world; Abraham, Buddha, Christ, Guru Nanak became fathers of the highest category. 1.5 billion to 2 billion Christians have considered Christ as their father. But, there is no father among those fathers who always remains in the self stage. For this reason, none of them can establish heaven. This is the only father who is called as Ever Benevolent (*sadashiv*) because he always remains in the self stage. And he alone establishes heaven. We are his children, brothers among each other....