

VCD No.879, Audio Cassette No.1365,
Dated 19.02.08, at Nilanga.
Clarification of Murli dated 21.03.68 (only for PBKs)

Om Shanti. Today we have the morning *class* dated 21st March, 1968. The Father explains: I, the soul am an embodiment of peace. You children have received this *knowledge* very well. What? Which *knowledge*? That I, the soul am an embodiment of peace and the body made of the combination of the five elements, in which the soul is sitting, cannot be the embodiment of peace. Until when? Until the soul, the embodiment of peace resides in it. We souls are the residents of the Soul World and what about these five elements? Are they the residents of the Soul World? No. These belong to this very world and they keep disintegrating. Their form keeps changing every moment. It changes every *second* and what about the soul? The soul is always imperishable. The home of the soul itself is called the Abode of Peace. The soul comes here and plays its *part*. It cannot play any *part* in the Abode of Peace.

Now the Father says: Become pure, because you have to return [home]. It is also written: We have to become pure like a lotus. It is not about becoming pure while living far away [from the family] and being happy. In what way should you become pure? Just as a lotus remains in mud and if it is separated from the mud, then not even a drop of mud remains on it. Similarly, a soul should remain detached even while living in this world of mud. There shouldn't be any attachment. So, the meaning of "being like a lotus" has also been mentioned. A lotus has many children. It is called the *king flower*. For example, a king, all the subjects are like his children. Every member among the subjects is his child. For a king his kingdom is like a very big family. So, a comparison is made with the lotus. Nevertheless, the Father says: Remember Me alone. What does 'nevertheless' mean [here]? Ok, you haven't attained the *stage* of [the one] leading a pure lotus like life, what should you do to attain [that stage]? Remember Me **alone**, then you will attain that *stage*. What if you remember someone else? (Someone said: We won't attain it.) Why won't you attain it? Will there be only one *king flower*? There can also be another *king flower*. If we remember that other one, won't our stage become like that? (Someone said: It can't.) Why? It is because everyone is a *flower* better or worse than the other. They cannot be the same kind of flowers at all.

The Father comes and speaks only to the children. The children understand: Baba comes in this one and explains to us. He says to the children: The entire world follows the household path. What? Do the trees and plants in the world follow the path of renunciation or the household path? Even the trees and plants follow the household path. The aquatic creatures, the living beings, the animals, all belong to the household path. Everyone has a household. This world works only through the household path. This world doesn't work through those who follow the path of renunciation. The entire world follows the household path and everyone has to play a *part*. How are Sanyasis also born? They too are born from householders. When they leave their body, where do they go? They have to go and be born from the householders themselves. So, everyone has to play a *part*. Now the Father says: Become pure. What does it mean? 'Become pure' means become detached through the intellect even while living in the household. Why does He say this only to those who live in the household? It is because only those who live in the household are more in connection and contact [with each other], so who will experience more downfall? It is they who experience downfall. But up until now, those who live in the household didn't find anyone who could show them the path and now they have found the Father. He is the Father of the entire human world and He is the biggest householder. As regards the *kumars* and *kumaris* (bachelors and maidens), they lead a pure life anyway but the Father says: You have been sinful for many

births. ‘You’? Not ‘that one’, not ‘this one’. **You** are sinful. Why so? You, who have had 84 births, and have been the seed of the entire world, you are like an ancestor to the entire world. So, who had more number of births? It is **you**. So, you were sinful for many births.

Human beings know the *history* of just this birth: we have performed many sinful deeds. They say it because it pinches their heart: we have committed such and such sins. We are very sinful souls. The Father says, “It is not about you alone”. All the human beings are very sinful souls. You have been sinful souls for so many births. Even among them (those who had 84 births), you children are especially told: From the beginning Maya has been attacking you a lot. Since then you have started committing sins and the sins are of many births. You have transformed from *satopradhaan* to *tamopradhaan*.

This is certainly a world of sinful souls and that is a world of noble souls. ‘That’ means which one? The [world of] the Golden and Silver Ages is a world of noble souls and this [world of] the Copper and Iron Ages is a world of sinful souls. Why? Don’t the deity souls of the Golden and Silver Ages come and have birth in the Copper and Iron Ages? They do, but their number is very little and the number of the souls which descend from the Copper Age is very big. All of them are sinful souls. Where do they have birth when they come [from above]? Where do the souls that descend from above (the Soul world) from the Copper Age onwards have birth? Do they have birth in the sinful world or in the noble world? They have birth in the sinful world. How can the one who is born of impurity be pure? Deities were pure. Their world itself was pure.

The souls that came from the Soul World were also pure. Their birth itself... what kind of a womb is praised? It is praised as a palace like womb (*garbh mahal*). And from the Copper Age, whichever souls descend [from the Soul World] experience a *jail* like womb. Although in the first birth they enter another’s body, will it be called a palace like womb? It enters the area of the intellect, doesn’t it? It doesn’t enter the stomach. Even then, will it be called a palace like womb or a *jail* like womb? (Someone said: *Jail* like womb.) Why? They don’t suffer punishments. All the souls that descend from the Copper Age onwards, do they suffer punishments in their first birth? They don’t suffer punishments. Then why was it called a *jail* like womb? It is because they too are coloured by the company. Because of being coloured by the company, they experience downfall in just one birth. They go and have a birth through a *jail* like womb. So, this is the world of sinful souls. The Father sits and explains these points to the children. As regards Krishna, he doesn’t appear to be God at all. What? Krishna *Bhagvaanuvaaac*. The soul of Krishna, who is the first leaf of this world, can’t explain these points. He is neither God nor the father. Then why will we accept [him] at all? The first leaf of the world, Krishna is neither God nor the father. The seed is called the father; he (Krishna) is a leaf. So, why will we accept him as the father? There are many who don’t accept him at all. What? There are many in this world as well who don’t accept Krishna as God at all. Who are they? *Arey*, do those who belong to the other religions believe in the Incorporeal One as God the Father or do they consider the corporeal Krishna [as God the Father]? They believe in the Incorporeal One. Yes, it may be that they don’t know the true form of the incorporeal One.

There are also many men who are householders and who narrate the Gita. There are also mothers who sit and read the Gita. Actually, only the Gita [has] the essence. Among all the scriptures, which is the essence-form of the scriptures? It is the essence of the knowledge of all the scriptures. Everyone reads the Gita, the scriptures, etc. in the path of *bhakti*. The Father has explained, to read these scriptures is a path of *bhakti* because the path of *bhakti* comes from the numerous heads of Ravan and knowledge comes from the one Father. So,

everyone does read these scriptures, don't they? They read even these words: lead a lotus like pure life while living in a household and leave all the relationships of the body. This one used to read it as well. Who? This Brahma also read these words in the scripture Gita, but he didn't understand anything. That is why he is called [the one with] a stone like intellect.

There is a difference between a *Paras*¹ like intellect and a stone like intellect, isn't there? What is the difference? What is the difference? There is reformation with the company of the *Paras*² and there is no reformation with the company of a stone. They remain just [the ones with] a stone like intellect. The hint was given about what? *Arey!* The hint was given for the *practical part*. The Father Shiva comes also in the body of Brahma. The Soul is the same. Which soul teaches in the body of Brahma? The Father Shiva; and the Father also comes in the permanent chariot. The Soul that narrates, teaches in both [the bodies] is the same but nobody was transformed from sinful to pure by the colour of the company of Brahma, by obtaining his sustenance, by obtaining the love of his lap; this is why no temples of Brahma are built, he isn't worshipped, idols of him are not made either, whereas temples for Shankar are built. Why? It is because there was transformation through that form. So, will the *Paras* bring about transformation or will the stone bring about transformation? (Everyone said: *Paras*.) If someone has a stone like intellect, nothing will sit in his intellect at all. If someone's intellect is like *Paras*, [the knowledge] will sit in his intellect.

Now you are sitting in the company of Truth, meaning the Father. Were those who were sitting in the company of Brahma, who were obtaining the *BK knowledge*, not sitting in the company of the True Father? (Someone said: They were.) They were sitting [in His company], weren't they? So, if they were sitting in the company of the true Father, they should have been coloured [by His company]. Shouldn't they? (Someone said: It was a mother's *part*, wasn't it?) The mother's *part*? Is the mother false? (Someone said: No.) Now you are sitting in the company of Truth, meaning the Father. You are sitting in the company of the Father; so it is the truth. What does it mean? When you were sitting in the company of the mother, were you sitting in the company of falsehood? (Someone said: No, no.) No, no, no? ☺ Why wasn't there reformation? (Someone said: It was the path of *bhakti*.) Was it the path of *bhakti*? Why? (Someone said something.) Yes, Brahma himself didn't realize the Father's form and you have recognized the Father; so you are sitting in His company. So, a new world is established. When a seed is sown, then the beginning is made with one leaf... or do two, four, eight, ten leaves emerge together? First one [leaf] is revealed.

So, look, there is one Prajapita Brahma. There are many Brahma but there is one Prajapita Brahma. Next, there is the *adopted* clan of Brahmins, the *mukhvanshavali*³. Brahma is certainly not present there. Where? 'There' refers to which place? *Arey*, Brahma is not present in practice even in the world and now, even in the *BK knowledge* it will be said, Brahma is not present there, although they call themselves Brahmins. 'Calling themselves' [Brahmins] is a different thing, but who are the Brahmins in reality? Those who are the children of Brahma. If someone is born through the mouth of Brahma, they are Brahma's *mukhvanshavali* Brahmins. So, where was that Brahmin clan born from? Where was it born from?

¹ Paras means a mythical stone which is said to transform into gold anything that touches it; here it refers to the souls who have an intellect such that just by coming in their company, the souls are transformed

² A mythical stone known to transform anything into gold by mere touch

³ progeny born from the mouth, meaning the knowledge

The people of the world, who call themselves Brahmins and the BKs who call themselves Brahmins, through whom are they born? (Someone said: Through Brahma.) Is Brahma present there? *Arey*, is Brahma present there? (Someone said: No.) Then? Through whom are they born? From where was the Brahmin clan born, so that you call yourselves Brahmins? They won't say the name of any human being. From whomsoever they are obtaining the knowledge, are they Brahma? (Students: No.) No human being can be called Brahma. For example it is said 'The Jaini clan', 'so and so clan' so, they are not the true Brahmin clan.

Don't those from the Jaini clan belong to the true Brahmin clan? Jain people call themselves Jains, whose progeny are they? Jinn. The word '*jī*' is formed... the one who gains victory (*jītna*) over his *indriyaan*⁴ is called '*Jin*'. So, are those Jains the children of the one who gains victory over his *indriyaan*? Are they? Their father, the person through whom they were born, is he a conqueror of his *indriyaan*? No. They just say it. What? We follow Jinn, we are the Jains who follow God Jinn. So, that is not the true Brahmin clan. You belong to the true Brahmin clan. Whose children [are you]? (A student: Prajapita Brahma.) The children of Jinn. What *part* does Baba give to Jinn? Climb up and down the ladder. Jinn used to say, 'Give me [some] work, otherwise I will eat all of you', so Baba assigned a task to Jinn. What? Climb up and down. *Arey!* What is this? It means that if a soul stays in the remembrance of the Father constantly, he is filled with such power that even if he kills the entire world, he is not stained with any sin.

So, you are the true children of the Jinn. You should be the Jains. They have just given the name; what? The Jains. In the path of *bhakti*, the children of Shiva are called *Shaiv*, aren't they? Vishnu's children are called *Vaishnav*. They do say this, but are they the children of Vishnu or the children of Shiva in practice? (Someone said: No.) Similarly, these people also call themselves the Jains, but they are not the children of Jinn and what about you? You are the children of Jinn in practice. [The children of] Jinn means the children of the one who gains victory over the *indriyaan*.

Actually, you are the Brahmins *adopted* by Prajapita Brahma at this time. You are *mukhvanshavalī*. Nobody understands the meaning of it either. Of what? [The meaning of] 'Prajapita Brahma'. What is the meaning of 'Prajapita Brahma'? All the human beings, the subjects of this world, whether they are the Hindus, the Muslims, the Sikhs, the Christians, he is the father of all those subjects, the human beings. This fact has sat in your intellect. It hasn't sat in the intellect of anybody else at all. If you *adopt* someone, he isn't your child. Whose child is he? If you *adopt* someone, he isn't your child. He is the child of his father. Then what do they do? Those who *adopt* [the child] change his name. Even here, it is like this. The tradition of adoption is a memorial of which time?

The Father comes in the Confluence Age and adopts the children [saying:] You are My children. The Father says, "You are My children". The children also say, "You are my Baba". Both of them accept each other, but when? When they change name. So, did the name change? Did it change? When Brahma was adopted, the name Dada Lekhraj changed to what? It became Brahma. When the three personalities are revealed, what does their name also change to? *Arey*, does the name change or not? The name changes to Jagdamba. The name changes, doesn't it? The name Shankar is given. The name changed, didn't it? So, the name is changed; what does it prove? [It proves] that the *adoption* was confirmed. So, you too are *mukhvanshavalī*.

⁴Parts of the body used to perform actions and the sense organs

You have understood: certainly, we are the *mukhvanshavalī* of Prajapita Brahma. Brahma won't be called a *mukhvanshavalī*. What? Why? Why won't he be called [a *mukhvanshavalī*]? What is this? *Arey*, did Brahma recognize the Father? Brahma didn't recognize the Father at all. Then, how will Brahma be called a *mukhvanshavalī*? Brahma is then called the chariot. What? He is definitely the chariot, but he won't be called Brahma's *mukhvanshavalī*. You Brahmins will be called Brahma's *mukhvanshavalī*. Why was the word 'then' used here? Brahma is 'then' called the chariot. Which chariot? (Someone said: The temporary chariot.) No, there is no praise of the temporary chariot. The chariot that is praised is called Bhagirath (the fortunate chariot) who brought the Ganges [from heaven].

Nobody knows how and what Bhagirath is. How is he? *Arey*, how is he a fortunate chariot? *Arey*, who is called fortunate in the world? *Arey*, is anyone called fortunate or not? Someone is called fortunate and someone is called unfortunate. (Someone said: The child of the Highest on high Father.) Then it will have to be explained, who the Highest on high Father is. (Someone said: Prosperous.) If someone is very prosperous, is he called fortunate? *Accha*, and what if someone has a lot of people following him (*janvaan*)? Is he not called fortunate? He is also called fortunate. And the one whose home is visited by many guests is also called fortunate. So, how and what is Bhagirath, nobody in the world knows this. You certainly know. What? [You know] that the fortunate chariot is the one whose home is visited by many guests. Nobody's home in the world can be visited by as many guests.

Then many kinds of pictures of bull⁵ etc. have been prepared in the path of *bhakti*. They decorate [it] so much! Just as those Muslims show the ride on a horse, the horse of Hussain, these people show the ride on a bull. Who? Did you see the bull [being worshipped] among the Hindus? Didn't you? *Arey*, an example of the Muslims was given. On whom is the ride shown among the Muslims? They decorate the horse of Hussain a lot, and what about the Hindus? They decorate the bull. Have you seen it or not? (Someone said: We have seen it.) What have you seen? What decoration do they do? (Someone said: It is decorated.) How do they decorate it? Is it with flowers? No. With what [is it]? It means that you have not seen it at all. (Someone said: We have seen it.) Have you seen it? So, with what do they decorate it? (Someone said: They put a *jhuula*.) Do they put a *jhuula*⁶? (Someone said: They paint the horns.) The horns? ☺

(Someone said: *Pongal* is celebrated in Maharashtra.) What is *Pongal*? (Someone said: They decorate the bull.) The *jhuul* of the bull? (Someone said: Yes.) A cloth *jhuul* is placed [on its back]. Animals are reared in every home; when it is very cold, even they are covered with a *jhuul* (a sack-like cloth to protect it from the cold). It is not the answer. It is something else. (Someone said: *Ghunghruu* (small bells).) Yes, at some places they tie *ghunghruu* and at some places they don't. They might be tying them. That is not the reply either. Nobody is giving the correct answer. Everyone has seen it. (A mother said: We have seen it.)

Arey, the bull is decorated and taken for rounds in the villages and the cities; have you not seen it? (Someone said: We have seen it.) What did you see? (Someone said: The Nandi bull.) Yes, that is the Nandi⁷ bull. So, what do they decorate it with? (Student said something.) *Dhat teri kī*⁸! *Arey*, it is decorated all over just with shells! What is hung on that

⁵Ox, but Baba means bull here, the one that is not used for domestic purpose but is let free

⁶cloth to cover the bull

⁷The vehicle of Shankar

⁸An expression in Hindi to express surprise towards an unexpected wrong or silly answer

jhuul? They attach hundreds of shells to it. When is this the memorial of? It is a memorial of the Confluence Age. That bull is decorated with hundreds of shells. What are these shells a memorial of? (Someone said something.) Yes, the life becomes like a shell - those who remember only the shell, they are full of body consciousness - such shells are attached all over [the bull]. That is called a ride on the bull and they decorate the bull in different ways. In the path of *bhakti*, they do whatever they like.

Now the children do know that this old Iron Age world is to be destroyed. What? What topic were we discussing? We weren't discussing about Brahma. [We were speaking] about Prajapita. The topic was about whom? Prajapita. Then Prajapita is alright. If he is a *mukhvanshavali*, he is Prajapita, but Brahma won't be called a *mukhvanshavali*. This is the topic that we were discussing, wasn't it? So, who is the bull? Who is Prajapita and who is Shiva? Brahma is the bull; Shiva doesn't ride on a bull. On whom does Shiva ride? He rides on Shankar. It means that if Shiva comes, He won't explain to the animals. His task isn't to enter an animal and transform the world.

When Shiva comes, when God comes, He narrates knowledge; and will a bull understand knowledge or will a human being understand it? A human being will understand it. So, Shiva comes in Shankar, who is Prajapita of the entire human world first. He is sinful and when a sinful human being thinks and churns after understanding the knowledge, he becomes a subtle world dweller, an angel. Which angel is considered to be the highest angel among the Muslims? *Jabrail* (Gabriel). *Jabardast* (strong). The Muslims say: When there was destruction, eight angels lifted the throne of Khuda (God).

Now the children do know how the old world is to be destroyed. It is in the intellect of the human beings: when the duration of the Iron Age is over, there will be the destruction. They say it is *lakhs* of years. The duration of what? The duration of the Iron Age has been mentioned to be very long. You do know: now it is the end of the old world. Those people show two globes at *school*. They show [the globe] of Europe and Asia separately.

Now you understand, this globe of the world is only one [globe] and the entire land is standing on the ocean. What? What is the portion of land? The portion of land is much smaller and the portion of ocean is very big. Then some say that there is a bull in the water. What? There is a bull inside the water. The world is standing on its horns. When it becomes tired... the world is standing on one horn and if the weight of the world falls on that horn, will it become tired or not? The horn will start feeling pain. So, he does like this (Baba imitates the bull) and that world shifts from one horn to the other. This is said in the path of *bhakti*, isn't it? The bull does this (the action of shifting the Earth from one horn to the other). When it does this, there is an earthquake. *Arey!* When the world is transferred from one horn to the other, then will it shake a little or not? Earthquakes etc. occur. All sorts of things have been written! What does it mean? (Someone said: They are nonsense.) They are not nonsense. The Father Shiva doesn't narrate nonsensical things when He comes.

Does He narrate the essence of the scriptures when He comes, or does even the Father pick up nonsensical things and narrate them? He picks up the essence from the scriptures and explains it through hints. The children, who are the deity souls who understand the hints, understand it immediately. So, what did you understand? (Student: When it remains on the right horn, it is the Golden Age and the Silver Age.) That is right. (Student: ... then it will come on the other horn.) (Baba is shaking his head in disagreement) Ram and Krishna are [like] the two horns of God the Father Shiva. Call them the horns of His bull. What? These are the two horns on which the world is standing. When He becomes tired working and

balancing the Earth through the *right* [horn]... just now the topic of the shells was mentioned, wasn't it? What is the other name for shells? The Earth. When He becomes tired balancing the Earth, He shifts it to the other horn. So, what happens? There is an earthquake.

Brahma left his body in 68. He left [his body], didn't he? So, the corporeal form of Brahma went away and in 76 the first Brahma; who is he? Prajapita, he completes the 100 years age. So, when the 100 years age is completed, that soul becomes constant in the incorporeal *stage*. The age of Brahma ends in the land of death (*mrityulok*); then, which abode begins for that soul? For him the Abode of Immortality begins. There is no question of death at all. There can't be death in the form of losing faith at all. Nevertheless, Brahma is required, isn't he? Or is he not required? Brahma is certainly required. So, the same soul of Brahma, which leaves his body in 68, enters some or other mother. So, the horn changed, didn't it? Earlier it was one form and then another form appears. And the moon is shown to be adorned on the head.

So, look, what things have been written in the scriptures! Then they say, it has been written like this in such and such scripture and it has been written like that in such and such scripture. Well, the Father doesn't *refer* to any scripture. The Father says: All this is the chaff of the path of *bhakti*. Remove this chaff from the intellect. These are the scriptures of the path of *bhakti*. Second *page* of the *vani* dated 21st March, 1968. Don't even take the name of those scriptures full of chaff of the path of *bhakti*. Don't listen to it at all. *Hear no evil*. Don't take the name? Then why was it said in the murlis: You may *tally* (compare) the Mahabharata, the Bhaagvat and the Ramayan with the present Confluence Age. And just now it was said: Don't even take their name. There is a difference between both versions. "Don't take the name [of the scriptures]" this is a different subject; and "*tally* it [with the Confluence Age]" is a different subject. And [it was said] "you **may** *tally* it." It was not said "you **should** *tally* it." What was said? If you wish to show off your intelligence (*vidvatta*), you may *tally* them, but what is the actual *direction*? Don't even take the name of these scriptures. Don't even listen to them. *Hear no evil*.

You understand that these scriptures of the path of *bhakti* are the scriptures of degradation; that is why don't even take their name. Why are they the scriptures of degradation? (Someone said: We have been experiencing downfall.) Why have we been experiencing downfall? There must be some reason, mustn't there? It is because this isn't a product of just one person. These scriptures have been prepared with many kinds of opinions. They contain many kinds of adulterous opinions. That is why *bhakti* has been said to be degraded and knowledge has been said to be elevated. When the path of *bhakti* is defunct and when the path of knowledge is hailed, only then the new world is established; that is why don't even take the name of these scriptures etc. If you do speak like this, they become angry. [They say:] *Arey*, you refute even the scriptures. You burn them to ashes. They feel we are the Muslims. Just as the Muslims came to India and burnt the scriptures in fire. They tore them and threw them away. They threw them in the rivers. They buried them under the ground. So, they feel, these people are the opponents of the scriptures; that is why they speak like this. They become angry. Then there are some who understand properly. Some don't understand.

Only the one who has to understand will understand. What? What is to be understood? [It is to be understood] that the scriptures have been written by many. They have been referred by many. Many have made *interpretations* of the scriptures and the Father is definitely the One. That one Father Himself comes and makes the true and correct *interpretation* of the scriptures. All the others who clarify them, those clarifications are

proved false. Suppose, there are some Brahmin children now, and Baba has said that you may *tally* [the knowledge] with the scriptures. So, if they sit to *tally* the aspects of the Mahabharata, the events of the Bhaagwat, when they *tally* them, when they make their interpretations and give clarifications, then will their clarification of every topic be correct or will they mix their opinion to some extent in it? It will be mixed. So, that thought, that churning itself became *wrong*. When the thinking and churning became *wrong*, then whoever listens to that churning will also go *wrong*. That is why it was said: Don't even take the name of these scriptures. Numerous human beings have written the scriptures. Why has degradation taken place through the scriptures? It is because it is the knowledge of the adulterous intellect; it is full of the ignorance of the adulterous intellect.

You have the inauguration etc. performed by big, famous personalities, so that those people understand something. But they will never understand because it is their capital now, isn't it? They will remain in the intoxication of their own capital. They are very busy in pursuing their *sovereignty*. They have got authority, they have obtained the seat. It is said, *prabhuta paahi kaahi mad naahi* (who doesn't become egotistic after getting power). The one who obtains the high seat becomes intoxicated, egotistic, proud. So, these facts won't remain constant in their intellect. We have to forget everything in this [knowledge]. Even then it is possible that someone emerges [from among them], who obtains the introduction of the Father and understands: now we have to remember only the Father and we have to forget everyone else.

If we read the scriptures, it will come to our intellect that certainly, someone will have written these scriptures. Will the one who wrote them be the Highest on high Father? No. Even the one who gives the *interpretation* of the scriptures, the one who clarifies it, won't be the Highest on high Father either. It is also said, *kai samjhe ravi, kai samjhe kavi* (whatever has been written by a poet can be understood either by the poet himself or by the Sun). So, there have been many writers of the scriptures, meaning poets who have written poems and *shlokas* (verses) in the scriptures. Those poets are not even present today and there are many who make interpretations of the poems written by those poets. So, are those scriptures false or true? All the scriptures are false. That is why this proverb is true: *ya samjhe kavi ya samjhe ravi*. When that Sun of knowledge God Himself comes on this world, He explains to us the essence of all those scriptures. So, we should remember only the one Father.

They understand, even then they say: We don't have time. So, it is understood: these people can't really continue [in the path of knowledge]. Who? For whom will it be said: "These people can't really continue"? Those who don't have time at all. They do say: "It is nice. The knowledge is very nice. We haven't heard such knowledge anywhere." If they are told, *acchaa*, if it is very nice, come. Then, what will they say? We don't have time. What does it mean? They buttered us, flattered us, but nothing has sat in their intellect. They can't really continue. Day by day the troubles increase. The war against Pakistan, the war against China... when these wars break out, the intellect is diverted towards them. You do know that all these are small wars. What? The war breaks out against Pakistan, the war breaks out against China; all these are small wars. When destruction takes place, then very big wars will break out. Then this capital will be established. There was a *dynasty* of these children too, wasn't there? Whose? The *dynasty* of which children existed? (Someone said: Of these children.) 'These' means who? (Someone said: The Brahmin family.) ☺ Is there any *dynasty* of Brahmins? There was a *dynasty* of these children as well, wasn't there? There is no *dynasty* of Brahmins. Is there a kingdom of Brahmins?

If the Brahmins rule here, their kingship will vanish there. What? If there is any Brahmin here, whether he is a *zonal incharge*⁹, whether he is *incharge* of the whole of India, whether he is an *incharge* of the entire world, he shouldn't give *order* to anyone. What? You shouldn't rule here. What should you do? You should make a *request*: Will you do this service? When our Father Himself has come as an *obedient servant*, then we don't rule over anyone. We are Brahmins. Are Brahmins *sevadhaaris* (servants) or kings? Brahmins are *sevadhaaris*.

So, the sentence that was spoken: "There was a *dynasty* of these children as well, wasn't there?" A hint was given towards which children? (Someone said: Lakshmi-Narayan.) Yes, a hint was given towards Lakshmi-Narayan. There was a *dynasty* of these children as well, wasn't there? So, it should be written the *Suryavanshi* dynasty or family in this [picture of Lakshmi-Narayan] too. There is a word '*dynasty*' in it, isn't it? This is also a mistake. There was a family of the deities. By giving just one name, we don't come to know about the others. That is why [the word] '*dynasty*' should certainly be written. You are establishing a family. A rosary is prepared, isn't it?

Now the children have brought a picture, in which it has been shown how the crown of the kings is snatched. Now you have shown just the kings in this. It has been shown that the crown of the kings was snatched. How can the household path be explained? When the crown of the kings was taken away, was it the crown of the kings of the path of renunciation that was taken away or was it the crown of those belonging to the household path that was taken away? This picture isn't right. Actually, whose crown was taken away first? The crown of the deities who belonged to the household path at the end of the Silver Age was taken away. When the king loses his crown, then the queen also loses her crown; that is why a couple has to be shown. Those who have prepared the picture have shown single crowned kings. Both of them lose their crown. When? In the beginning of the Copper Age. They lose the crown in the beginning of the Copper Age? Is the crown lost only in the beginning of the Copper Age; is it not lost at any other time? *Arey*, is [the crown] lost or not? Isn't [the crown] lost in the *shooting period*? *Arey*? There is a physical crown there and here it is the crown of responsibility.

When the age of duality begins, when its *shooting* takes place, then the crown of responsibility of the kings to establish purity, that crown is lost. That is why it isn't just the kings who lose the crown. The king as well as the queen, both lose their crown. Both should be shown because sometimes the *male* (the husband) understands and he rises [in the *purushaarth* of purity]. Sometimes the *female* (the wife) rises. What do they understand? *Arey*, it is about the crown of responsibility. The one who takes up the responsibility of purity, the responsibility of establishing the pure world will perform the *shooting* of becoming such a crowned person. So, sometimes the *male* rises and sometimes the *female* rises. So, why shouldn't there be a picture of both of them? Both were double-crowned. They experience downfall.

All these pictures etc. Are only to explain to people. For example, when small children are taught, they are shown the pictures in a book. Their intellect will recollect that there was an elephant in such and such book. There was this in that book. Now you know, this is our deity clan that is being established once again. What? (Someone said: The deity clan is being established once again.) What does it mean? Our capital of the household path is being established once again. Both are required to be pure. If, in a *gitapathshala* (gita

⁹ In charge of a zone in India

school), one remains pure and the other remains impure, then what will be said [about them]? Are they losing the crown or are they receiving the crown? What kind of a *shooting* is happening? What kind of a *shooting* will it be called? (Someone said something.) Yes. the *shooting* of the loss of the crown is happening. *Acchaa*, Om Shanti.