

PRABUDDHA BHARATA

VOL. XLIII

AUGUST, 1938

No. 8



“उत्तिष्ठत जाग्रत प्राप्य वरान्निबोधत ।”

“Arise ! Awake ! And stop not till the Goal is reached.”

LET US GO BACK HOME *

BY SWAMI VIVIDISHANANDA

O my mind, let us go back home, our nest of peace and rest !
In the foreign land of this world of strain and change,
Why roam in vain in garments, ugly and strange ?
Things material that glitter and shine and seem so real
Are but dangerous traps to ensnare and ruin the soul.
For their love, shouldst thou ever abandon thy real kin,
And the abiding joy and freedom of thy original home ?

The path of truth, though rough, steep, bleak and dark,
Is the path for thee, pilgrim. Hold up thy head and march.
Use discrimination as the burning torch to guide thy steps,
And be sure to be sustained by love, true, pure and selfless :
It is a priceless meed that will fail thee never, never.

Beware, on the way, of the Evil One and his nefarious gang,
Lust, greed and pride. Like brigands, cruel and sly,
They lie in wait and rob pilgrims of all the treasure they own.
Protect thyself against them, having as thy guards, safe and strong,
Faith, courage and righteousness—good and staunch friends.

* Adapted from the Bengali song “*Man chala nija nicketanay . . .*” This is one of the two songs that Swami Vivekananda sang when he first met Sri Ramakrishna.

If weary, and need rest, take shelter at the wayside resthouse—
The abode of those great souls called mystics, seers and sages.

Shouldst thou be at a loss what road to take, their counsel seek;
Those holy ones will, without doubt, show thee thy way.

When dangers and difficulties insurmountable seem,
Unafraid and undisturbed, have the protection of Him,
Who is the King of kings, before whose rod of justice
Even mighty Death and his emissaries shake and quail.
Infinitely kind, God will ever lead thee by thy hand,
And open thine eyes, revealing His form, matchless and Divine;
And thou shalt rejoice, knowing He is thy kin—thy home and goal.

CHALLENGE OF THE ETERNAL RELIGION

BY THE EDITOR

I

There has been witnessed in recent years a tendency amongst a certain section of Indian thinkers to denounce religion, and to extol speculative philosophy as the sole criterion of Truth. They have spared no pains to paint religion in the most uninviting and fierce colours and to hold it mainly responsible for all sorts of evils that have blackened the history of mankind. In their opinion "there is no crime or vice known to man that has not been committed in the name of religion. The bloodiest of wars, the cruelest of murders, the most inhuman of tortures, by methods infinitely worse than those invented by science are traceable to religion." They hold that "those that fail to derive any satisfaction from scholastic disputations seek refuge in what are known as *mystic experiences, ecstasies, visions, and above all, what they term intuitions.* They believe they have found here the bed-rock on which religion stands and consider it impregnable. For, it is seen that even some of the acutest scientists fear to approach this domain of the

mystic. They hold religious experience or intuition to be beyond the reach of science. But this hesitancy or weakness of the scientist is no proof of the strength of mysticism. Whatever the opinion of the scientist, the fact remains, as has been observed for thousands of years in India, that *the views of the greatest mystics regarding their own experiences and their knowledge of the world are contradictory and in conflict with one another*". Thus these new philosophers have exhausted the whole armoury of vituperative terms to assail the otherwise impregnable citadel of religious ideal, and to justify their crusade they have advanced the argument that "endless disputes, quarrels, nay, wars of religion are proofs positive that *religion is not based on truth.* And consistently do the mystics reject truth or reason as a test of the worth of their experience. Whatever they perceive, feel or think, or imagine, is of supreme value to them, provided it brings them satisfaction . . . for *religionists want satisfaction before Truth*". This new class of thinkers further adds that "religion

interests the largest numbers; for, it is the *simplest* and the *easiest* thing to find satisfaction by imagining whatever pleases one to be the Permanent. Whereas philosophy interests the fewest; for, there it is not imagination or conception that counts, but truth that is independent of them and that is unchanging. So, *what can be universal is only truth, i.e., the world of philosophy but not that of religion*" (italics are ours).

II

From the passages quoted above it is evident that these philosophers have made a scathing arraignment of all religions irrespective of any country, race or nationality. In the white heat of their crusading enthusiasm they have even forgotten to make it distinctly clear in what particular sense the word 'religion' or 'philosophy' has been used here. It is not our purpose to enter into any controversy with this class of philosophers. But the situation demands that there should be a clarification of the relative positions, values and functions of religion and philosophy as understood by the orthodox school of Indian thinkers as well as by the savants of the West. For, the novel interpretation that has been sought to be put on 'religion' and 'philosophy' as also on their respective roles in the solution of the problems of human life and society is likely to sidetrack the unwary into a life of utter irreligion and moral stagnation. As a matter of fact, to draw such a sharp line of demarcation between religion and philosophy in India and to hold the former entirely responsible for all the ghastly tragedies and calamities that have been brought on human life and society is nothing short of an insult to the wisdom of our ancient saints and sages and to the intelligence of humanity

at large. It betrays not only a woeful lack of imaginative power to evaluate the true worth of religion on the one hand, but also a lurking desire to evade the spiritual discipline which a life of religion imposes on every aspirant after truth. Religion, as inculcated in the Hindu Sastras, has never been intended to brutalize human nature. It has on the contrary demanded the greatest amount of self-abnegation, self-control and purity from every pilgrim struggling up the gorge of life to reach the pinnacle of realization. With the Hindu religion belongs to the supersensuous and not to the sense plane. It is beyond all reasoning, or intellectual ratiocination. It is a direct vision, an inspiration, a plunge into the unknown and unknowable. It has been rightly declared by Swami Vivekananda, "Apart from the solid facts and truths that we may learn from religion, apart from the comforts that we may gain from it, religion, as a science, as a study, is the greatest and healthiest exercise that the human mind can have. This pursuit of the Infinite, this struggle to grasp the Infinite, this effort to get beyond the limitations of the senses, out of matter, as it were, and to evolve the spiritual man—this striving day and night to make the Infinite one with our being—this struggle itself, is the grandest and most glorious that man can make." In short, to realize the absolute Unity to which nothing can form the antithesis and where all the queries of intellect are hushed into eternal silence is the be-all and end-all of religion. But, to identify religion with a bundle of creeds or dogmas, rituals or superstitions, and then to hold it responsible for all misdeeds in human society is to stultify oneself and to travesty the sacred and lofty ideal of religion.

It is admitted that like every other

religion Hinduism (or Vedantism properly so called) has also its three parts : (1) Philosophy which sets forth the basic principles of religion,—its goal, and the means of realizing it, (2) mythology which is philosophy concretized in the more or less imaginary lives of men and supernatural beings, and (3) ritual which is made up of innumerable forms and ceremonies and various physical attitudes as well. But it must not be forgotten that these external manifestations of religion—these rituals and ceremonies, forms and creeds—do not constitute the essence or the whole of religion; they are but secondary details;—they serve as so many concrete helps to the human soul for its progressive ascent to the realization of the Supreme Truth. Throughout the history of the world we find that man is struggling to envisage the Reality through these thought-forms or symbols; but when the spiritual life is consummated, the aspirant transcends all these external supports and limitations. In this epic quest of Truth what is of primary importance is not these forms but renunciation—the Alpha and Omega of the life spiritual. For, says the Sruti, “Neither through wealth, nor through progeny, nor through ceremonies, but by renunciation alone that Immortality is to be attained.” “Religion begins with a tremendous dissatisfaction with the present state of things, with our lives, and a hatred, an intense hatred, for this patching-up of life, an unbounded disgust for fraud and lies. He alone can be religious who dares say, as the mighty Buddha once said under the Bo-tree, ‘Death is better than a vegetating ignorant life; it is better to die on the battle-field than to live a life of defeat’. This is the basis of religion. When a man takes this stand he is on the way to find the Truth, he is on the way to God. That determination must

be the first impulse towards becoming religious,” said Swami Vivekananda. In fact religion is nothing short of realization; it is the manifestation of the Divinity already in man. It is being and becoming, and not a mere intellectual assent to or dissent from any particular form or dogma. Of all the forces that have worked and are still working to mould the destinies of the human race, none certainly is more potent than religion. Religion is the greatest motive power for realizing that infinite energy, which is the birthright of every individual. In building up character, in making for everything that is good and beautiful, noble and great, in bringing peace to others as also to one’s own self, religion is the highest motive power. This in fact is the standing *challenge of the Eternal Religion*, and so long as the true spirit of religion is adhered to and followed with steadfast zeal and perseverance, it will never be productive of any evil in the society of mankind. It is only when ‘religion ceases to be religious’ and its lofty idealism is ignored, and mere outward forms and ceremonies are made the governing force in human life and conduct to the exclusion of the spirit, narrow-minded bigotry and intolerance follow as a matter of course, sanguinary warfare is waged in the sacred name of religion, and the world becomes a bloody battle-field of warring creeds.

III

In India *religion* and *philosophy* have never been conceived as two water-tight compartments. Confusion arises when they are looked upon as mutually repellent systems of thought and not as complementary aspects of the same organic whole of life, or when philosophy, as understood in India, is equated with the speculative philosophy of the

West. "There is a considerable difference," says Dr. N. K. Brahma in his *Philosophy of Hindu Sadhana*, "between the conception of philosophy as it is understood by Indian systems of philosophy on the one hand, and as it is taken to be by Western thinkers on the other . . . Philosophy, in the West, is 'the thinking consideration of things'; it is the rational explanation of the universe as a whole, or in the language of Herbert Spencer, it is 'completely unified knowledge'. Philosophy, in the West, is, therefore, something purely intellectual. It is only one among various other subjects of study and, as such, bears no special importance. It is on a par with other subjects of theoretical interest and it does not make any difference whether a man is engaged in working out mathematical problems or is absorbed in reflecting on the nature and destiny of existence . . . In India philosophy occupies a unique position. It has not only permeated the entire cultural life of India, but has even filtrated to the lowest strata of its society. Its origin is not in 'the thinking consideration of things' but in the attempt at reaching the *summum bonum* of life. Philosophy is the be-all and end-all of life;—it relieves man of the threefold miseries of life, bestows on him the richest wealth of salvation and thus emancipates him from fearful bondage." The highest end of philosophy in the West, he further adds, is generally to acquire wisdom for its own sake and not for any practical purpose. But, in India, the theoretical character of philosophy has been entirely subordinated to its practical aspect, and philosophy is of value not merely because it increases knowledge but only because it bestows salvation. *It is because of this predominantly practical character of Indian philosophy that it has been able to retain always its close connection with*

religion. In Vedanta reason and intuition have been very closely associated, and intuition is looked upon as the fruition or culmination of ratiocination. Indeed 'if philosophy serves the cause of religion, it does so not because religion is something different from it, but because it finds that in serving religion, it is serving its own best interests . . . If religion and philosophy have been united in happy wedlock, it is because both, in their free pursuit of truth, have found their ways united in the goal'. But, as already shown, the new school of Indian thinkers has made an invidious distinction between religion and philosophy and has nothing but a derisive smile for the world's 'greatest mystics' and their 'intuitive spiritual experiences'. For, in their opinion, these intuitions of the religionists are not grounded on the solid basis of the final realization of the ultimate Reality and as such cannot claim the genuineness of a philosophic knowledge; at best they can yield a sort of mental 'satisfaction' but do not possess any 'truth-value' in them! These philosophers have therefore undertaken the self-imposed task of eliminating intuition, mysticism or ecstatic vision altogether from the domain of spiritual life to make the world safe for their new-fangled philosophy. A little scrutiny exposes the absurdity of their specious statements. No doubt the usefulness of ratiocination in the interpretation of the Sruti has been fully recognized and even the necessity of an epistemological study in all the philosophical systems of India also justifies the importance of reason in the discernment of Truth, still Vedanta has always attached greater importance to mystic experience or *anubhava*. For, *anubhava* has been regarded as the *final result* or culmination of the enquiry into Brahman. "If the object of knowledge were something

to be accomplished then there would be no reference to intuition. But because the object of the enquiry is an existing (accomplished) substance, intuition which is the *final result* of the enquiry into Brahman is be resorted to" (*Brahma-Sutra Bhâshya* 1. 1. 2). In short, this intuitive experience carries with it the guarantee of its own authenticity. It is beyond the bounds of proof and so touches completeness. It is self-established (*svatasiddha*), self-evidencing (*svasamvedya*), and self-luminous (*svayamprakâsh*). It comes with a constraint that brooks no denial. Thus it is clear that to deny the validity of intuition as a criterion of truth is to fly directly in the face of the pregnant utterances of the Sruti as also of the great seers of India who have always been held in respect for the wealth of their spiritual experiences.

IV

As for the contention that "the views of the greatest mystics regarding their own experiences and their knowledge of the world are contradictory" and as such cannot be regarded as based on truth, it suffices to say that this condemnation of the mystic experiences recoils upon the critics themselves. It only betrays their want of courage and power to undertake the perilous voyage through the uncharted sea of spiritual life, far less fathom its immeasurable depths. The Vedanta enjoins that any philosophical enquiry into Brahman must be preceded by a fourfold discipline (*Sâdhana-chatushtaya*) on the part of an aspirant; for it would be nothing short of a mere intellectual pastime to dabble in such abstruse metaphysical problems without these mental preparations. Needless to say it is the unclarified and undisciplined intellect that bungles and meets contradictions everywhere; but to the synthetic vision of a

master-mind that has attained to the realization of Unity, the One without a second, all apparent contradictions stand harmonized and all religions and spiritual experiences become instinct with life and profound significance. The three great orders of metaphysical thought—dualism, modified monism and absolute monism—are realized by him as so many stages on the way to the Supreme Truth. They are not contradictory, but rather when added the one to the other are found complementary. Such an enlightened soul, standing at the centre of Reality where all diverse radii of experiences proceeding from the different points of the circumference meet, is able to see by means of his synthetic spiritual vision the validity of all religions and various grades of mystic experiences. His life becomes, as such, a living synthesis of all faiths and creeds, all visions and intuitions, and he views with love and sympathy the multiplicity of religious forms as also the varied spiritual achievements of the mystics of the world. Such was indeed the case with Sir Ramakrishna whose life and experience stand as a bold challenge to those who feel no hesitation in characterizing religion as the spring of all evils and find nothing but contradictions in the mystic realizations of the great seers of the world. In fact, as Swami Vivekananda has rightly observed, "to the Hindu, man is not travelling from error to truth but from truth to truth, from lower truth to higher truth. . . Each religion is only a travelling, a coming up, of different men and women through various conditions and circumstances. . . We know that religions alike, from the lowest fetishism to the highest absolutism, are but so many attempts of the human soul to grasp and realize the Infinite. So we gather all these flowers, and binding them together with the cord of love,

make them into a wonderful bouquet of worship. . . Just as in the case of the six Darsanas, we find they are a gradual unfolding of the grand principles, whose music beginning far back in the soft notes, ends in the triumphant blast of the Advaita, so also in the three systems (Dwaita, Visishtâdwaita, and Advaita) we find the gradual working up of the human mind towards higher and higher ideals, till everything is merged in that wonderful Unity which is reached in the Advaita system." These pregnant utterances of the great Swami—one of the outstanding personalities of the modern times—must be an eye-opener to those who are trying to belittle the lofty ideal of religion, and all religious experiences.

As a matter of fact harmony is the very keynote of Hindu thought. "True philosophy," says Prof. Radhakrishnan in his *Reign of Religion in Contemporary Philosophy*, "will result in true religion, as ultimately there cannot be any conflict between faith and reason. . . When we say that true religion and true philosophy will agree, we do not mean that the religious experience of the primitive savage and the totem worshipper will be acknowledged to be valid by the philosopher. We mean that the specialist in religion, the mystic with his experience, wisdom and insight will agree with the rational thinker." But it must be borne in mind that the *purely speculative philosophy* which seeks the aid of reason alone in its search for truths but 'does not build upon the sure basis of infallible and unerring deliverances of intuitive experience will fail to yield truths.' For, to know, to get at the very core of Reality is a mystic act, about which even the best logic can but babble on the surface. In a speculative venture where truth consists in the mere consistency of ideas, the vision of truths remains always a possibility and does

not become an actuality. It is only when philosophy ceases to be an intellectual gymnastics or a matter of mere theoretical interest, but becomes *practical*—a part and parcel of life—, that both religion and philosophy become synthesized into a harmonious method of approach to truth. The sooner the full import of Indian philosophy and religion and also their lofty aims and ideals are realized by this new school of thinkers the better. For, any attempt to confuse issues and thereby to misrepresent them to the world is to do the greatest harm to the Eternal Religion of the Hindus, which is the most sublime creative force in Indian life and society. "We are the Hindu race," said Swami Vivekananda, "whose vitality, whose life-principle, whose very soul, as it were, is in religion. Everywhere in the East and the West I find among nations, one great ideal, which forms the backbone, so to speak, of that race. With some it is politics, with others it is social culture, others again may have intellectual culture and so on for their national background. But this, our motherland, has religion and religion alone for its basis, for its backbone, for the bedrock upon which the whole building of its life has been based. . . For good or for evil, the religious ideal has been flowing into India for thousands of years, for good or for evil, the Indian atmosphere has been filled with ideals of religion for shining scores of centuries; for good or for evil, we have been born and brought up in the very midst of these ideals of religion, till it has entered into our very blood, and mingled with every drop in our veins, and has become one with our constitution, become the very vitality of our lives. . . This is the line of life, this is the line of growth, and this is the line of well-being in India—to follow the track of religion."

GOSPEL OF SRI RAMAKRISHNA

A few devotees from Belgharey had come. With them was a singer whom Sri Ramakrishna had met before. The Master asked him to sing. The man sang, "Awaken, O Mother, awaken," etc.

Sri Ramakrishna: This song contains reference to the piercing of the six centres. God is both without and within. Dwelling within He is occasioning the various states of the mind. After the six centres have been pierced the individual soul goes beyond the realm of Mâyâ and is united with the Supreme Self. This is what is called God-realization.

Unless Mâyâ opens the gate God cannot be realized. Rama, Lakshmana and Sita were going together; in front of all went Rama, in the middle was Sita, while Lakshmana followed behind. As Lakshmana could not see Rama, Sita being in the middle, even so the individual soul is not able to see God, Mâyâ intervening. (To Mani Mallik) But then, if the grace of God descends, Mâyâ opens the gate; as sentries at the gate say, "Master, be pleased to order so that we can open the gate for his entrance."

There are the Vedantic and the Puranic theories. The Vedanta says, "This world is a structure of illusion"; that is to say, it is all false like a dream. But the Puranas and the scriptures of the Bhakti school declare that God Himself has become the twenty-four categories. Worship Him within and without.

So long as He has kept up the sense of 'ego', everything exists. You can no more say it is like a dream. Lentils, rice, potatoes and other vegetables in the cooking vessel boil with a noise because the fire is beneath. They appear,

as it were, to leap and say, "I exist," "I am leaping." The body is, as it were, the cooking vessel; the mind and the intellect are the water; the objects of the senses are, as it were, the lentils, rice and the vegetables. Their 'I' is the egoism—the 'I' which says, 'I am boiling with a noise.' And Existence-Knowledge-Bliss is the fire.

For this reason the scriptures of the Bhakti school have declared this world to be a "mansion of joy." One of Ramprasad's songs refers to the world as a structure of illusion. To it one replied, "This world is a mansion of joy." "The devotee of Kâli is free even while in this body and is always full of bliss." The devotee sees that God Himself has become Mâyâ. He has become the individual soul and the world. He sees "God, Mâyâ, the individual soul and the world" as one. Some devotees see Rama permeating everything. Rama has become everything. Some again see all as permeated by Radha and Krishna. Krishna has become the twenty-four categories. It is like wearing green glasses and seeing everything green.

But then, according to the school of devotion, there are differences in the manifestation of power. It is Rama who has transformed Himself into everything, but power is manifested more in some places and less in others. He is manifested in an Avatara in one way and in an ordinary individual in a different manner. Even an Avatara has the consciousness of body and comes under Mâyâ due to taking to a body. Rama wept for Sita. But then, the Avatara wilfully ties a piece of cloth round his eyes. It is like boys playing blind-man's-buff, who stop their play as soon as mother calls. It is different

with an ordinary individual; the piece of cloth which is tied round his eyes binds him further with eight screws on his back. They are the eight bondages,

namely, shyness, hatred, fear, caste, family, conduct, grief and the desire for secrecy. One cannot escape unless the Guru loosens them.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF SANDILYA

BY PROF. JADUNATH SINHA, M.A., Ph.D., P.R.S.

PLACE OF KNOWLEDGE IN THE LIFE OF DEVOTION

Nârada was passionately devoted to God. He was a God-intoxicated man. His *Nârada-Sutras* seem to be an account of the experiences of his life. He has given here a glowing description of the nature of devotion, the means to the culture of devotion, the results of devotion, and the like. He does not give a psychological analysis of the nature of devotion and its relation to knowledge, desire and will.¹ He does not give a philosophical background to his cult of devotion. He does not discuss the nature of the finite soul (*jiva*), Brahman and the world, and their relation to one another. He does not philosophize. He does not recognize the necessity of knowledge in spiritual life. He looks upon devotion as the means as well as the end. Knowledge does not lead to devotion. Devotion does not depend upon knowledge. And knowledge also does not depend upon devotion. They are not interdependent on each other. Devotion is the fruit of itself.²

But Sândilya is a philosopher and a devotee of God. He assigns a distinct

place to knowledge in spiritual life. It is an indispensable preliminary to the life of devotion. It purifies the mind. Until the mind is purified it cannot feel any hankering for God. Moreover, devotion is not blind faith. It is enlightened by reason. It is not a vague yearning for the Unknown. It is not the groping of the finite spirit in the dark. It is knowing love for God in the full blaze of eternal light. It is loving communion with the God of love who is known definitely as the nearest and the dearest, the Soul of our souls.

So "Sândilya feels the necessity of *yoga* or concentration of mind and cultivation of the intellect for the culture of devotion. *Yoga* is necessary for devotion, since it depends on the concentration of mind in meditation. Knowledge also is necessary for devotion, since it purifies the mind. The cultivation of the intellect for acquiring certain knowledge of Brahman should be continued till devotion is completely purified. Just as thrashing of paddy should be continued till husks are all separated from grains, so the culture of the intellect should be continued till the mind attains perfect devotion free from all impurities.³ Thus the life of devotion to God is not necessarily an irrational life. Sândilya is not an advocate of irrational emotionalism.

¹ These are discussed by Sândilya. See *The Cultural Heritage of India*, Vol. II, pp. 52-55.

² *Nârada-Sutras*, 28-30.

³ *Sândilya-Sutras*, 19-27 and Commentary.

He upholds the cult of devotion enlightened by reason."⁴

Sândilya not only recognizes the necessity of cultivation of the intellect as a preliminary discipline in religious life, but also gives a philosophical background to his cult of devotion.

Carpenter has rightly pointed out: "The Sûtras⁵ of Sândilya, interpreted by Svapnesvara,⁶ occupy a middle position between the philosophies of Sankara and Râmânûja. With the former Svapnesvara declares at the outset the ultimate identity of the soul and Brahman. With the latter he vindicates the reality of the world; to allow its falseness would involve the unreality of its cause.⁷ Brahman and Prakriti are both causes, and Mâyâ is not 'illusion' but power.⁸ The appearance of individuality in the successions of birth and death is due to the internal organ (*antahkarana*), constituted out of the three strands by the *upâdhis* or determining conditions of the particular lot. The great release can only be attained by their removal, and the instrument of this end is *bhakti*, devotion or adoring love."^{9,10}

BRAHMAN AND PRAKRITI OR MAYA

Brahman is Pure Consciousness. It is of the nature of consciousness.¹¹ Mâyâ is the power of Brahman.¹² It is not an unreal appearance or illusion. Brahman and Mâyâ both are real. Brahman is related to Mâyâ as its knower. Brahman is essentially spiritual (*chetana*).

⁴ J. N. Sinha: *The Bhagavata Religion: The Cult of Bhakti in The Cultural Heritage of India*, Vol. II, p. 54.

⁵ Cowell places *Sândilya-Sutras* in the thirteenth century, or possibly, a little earlier.

⁶ A native of Bengal.

⁷ *Sândilya-Sutra*, 86.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 37-42.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 3.

¹⁰ *Theism in Mediaeval India*, p. 419.

¹¹ Commentary on *Sândilya-Sutra*, 85.

¹² *Sândilya-Sutra*, 86.

Mâyâ is essentially material (*ache-tana*).¹³ They are, by their very nature, related to each other as the knower and the known.¹⁴ That which knows is Brahman; that which is known is Mâyâ or Prakriti; and there is no third principle in addition to these two.¹⁵ Both are real and co-eternal; they are eternally related as the knower and the known.¹⁶ And Mâyâ or Prakriti, the object of knowledge, cannot be unreal because it is the power or energy of Brahman.¹⁷

Both are causes of the world.¹⁸ Brahman is the efficient cause. Mâyâ is the material cause. Brahman is immutable. It cannot be the material cause of the world. It is not subject to change, modification, or transformation. But Prakriti is subject to change and modification. So it can be the material cause of the world. Brahman acts through the medium of Prakriti which is but its own power. The divine energy or Prakriti is transformed into the world by the agency of Brahman, the unchangeable and the immutable. Mâyâ is transformed into the world. But Brahman cannot be transformed.¹⁹ Even as the magician is not affected by his magic, so Brahman is not affected by the transformation of Mâyâ. But this is, after all, an analogy. Mâyâ is not an illusion like a magical appearance. Mâyâ is real and eternal. It is the power or energy of Brahman. Brahman and Mâyâ both are necessary and interdependent causes of the world.²⁰

Here we must note that Sândilya emphasizes two aspects of the nature of

¹³ *Ibid.*, 39 and Commentary.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 41 and Commentary.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 40 and Commentary.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 41.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 42 and Commentary.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 39.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 37-38 and Commentary.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 39 and Commentary.

Brahman. He does not advocate the dualism of Brahman and Mâyâ. He uses the Sânkhya terminology and relates Brahman and Prakriti as the knower and the known. But he does not regard them as co-ordinate heterogeneous entities like the Purusha and the Prakriti of the Sânkhya. Prakriti is the energy of Brahman. It exists in Brahman and rests on it. The world is the manifestation of Brahman. It is the transformation of divine energy. Without the world Brahman would be an abstract power or a bare potentiality. Brahman is expressed in the world, but yet it transcends it. Its energy is transformed into the world, but yet Brahman is not affected by it. Sândilya seems to swing between absolute monism and qualified monism, between Sankara and Râmânûja. He cannot effect a harmonious blending of the philosophy of Transcendence with the philosophy of Immanence.

BRAHMAN AND JIVA

In the cult of devotion the loving soul and the beloved Lord—the finite soul (*jiva*) and Brahman—must be distinct from each other. Love presupposes the duality of the two. The devotee and the Deity must be distinct from each other. Sândilya discusses different theories of the relation between the finite soul and Brahman.

Kâshyapa thinks that the *jiva* and Brahman are absolutely different from each other. Brahman is higher than the *jiva*; it has supremacy or lordliness (*aishvarya*) over the *jiva*.²¹

Bâdârayana thinks that *jiva* is identical with Brahman. There is only one Reality; it is the Self (*Âtman*) which is of the nature of Pure Consciousness.²²

Sândilya rejects both these extreme theories and tries to reconcile them by holding that the *jiva* and Brahman are distinct from each other and yet one in essence. The finite soul is potentially infinite while Brahman is actually infinite. But the finite soul is capable of attaining the state of Brahman. Therefore they are identical in essence, though they are actually different from each other.

In the Sruti Brahman is stated to be possessed of supreme power and lordliness as well as the very soul or essence of the finite spirits.²³ How, then, can they be said to be identical with each other? To this Sândilya replies that though Brahman in itself is the creator and Brahman as *jiva* is not the creator, still they are identical in essence. There is no contradiction here. Just as in the act of recognition “*This is that Devadatta*” though there is a distinction between the object perceived (*this*) and the object recalled (*that*) still the distinction is not fundamental, and the judgment of recognition refers to what is common to both (*Devadatta*), so though Brahman as creator and *jiva* as non-creator are distinct from each other, still they are identical in essence.²⁴

Though *jiva* is identical in essence with Brahman, its limitations and sufferings do not, in any way, affect Brahman, because these are mere accidents of the *jiva* and do not constitute its essence. Even after the *jiva* has realized its identity with Brahman it remains distinct from it.²⁵ Thus Sândilya agrees with Râmânûja in recognizing the distinctness of the *jiva* and Brahman even after the liberation of the *jiva*.

The *jiva* is essentially identical with Brahman. They have similarity of na-

²¹ *Ibid.*, 29 and Commentary.

²² *Ibid.*, 30 and Commentary; cf. *Brahma-Sutra*, IV. 1. 3.

²³ *Ibid.*, 31 and Commentary.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 32 and Commentary.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 33 and Commentary.

ture. Therefore limitations and sufferings of the *jiva* are mere accidents in its life.²⁶ They are due to the internal organ (*antahkarana*) which is the *upâdhi* of the *jiva*. The *antahkarana* is the finitizing principle in the *jiva*. Limitations and sufferings, and consequent births and deaths of the *jiva* are but temporal accidents that affect its *upâdhi* which is responsible for its empirical life. They will disappear finally with the dawn of *bhakti* or devotion to the Deity.²⁷ Here Sândilya agrees with Sankara in holding that the limitations and sufferings of the *jiva* are due to the *antahkarana* which is its *upâdhi*, and are mere accidents of the *jiva*. But Sankara holds that these will disappear at the dawn of intuition (*anubhava*) of Brahman, when the *jiva* will realize its identity with Brahman and cease to exist as a distinct entity.

Brahman has supernatural powers, e.g., creativeness and lordliness which constitute its very nature. They constitute the essential nature of Brahman and exist naturally in it, even as heat constitutes the essential nature of fire and exists naturally in it. The powers of Brahman constitute its essence and are co-eternal with it. They are lacking in the *jiva*.²⁸ Here Sândilya differs from Sankara. He identifies Brahman with the Lord (Ishvara) and regards His powers as His essence. But Sankara regards the Lord as a phenomenal appearance of Brahman. But Sândilya agrees with Sankara in holding that the Lord is not affected by the sufferings of the *jiva*, even as the light which is reflected in a dirty mirror is not affected by its uncleanness.²⁹ Sândilya is as keen on maintaining the distinctness of *jiva* and Brahman as on emphasizing

their identity in essence. He is struggling between absolute monism and qualified monism or dualistic monism. Now the philosophical instinct asserts itself in him and inclines him towards absolute monism, and then his religious instinct gets the upperhand and inclines him towards dualistic monism.

Sândilya holds that *jivas* originate from Brahman and share in its divine life. Brahman wills to be many and creates finite souls. They are created by Brahman and sustained by it.³⁰ Brahman dispenses rewards and punishments to the *jivas* for their actions.³¹ Brahman is the creator, sustainer, and moral governor of the world and finite spirits. They have their being in Brahman. They rest on Brahman. They have no reality apart from Brahman. The creativeness and lordliness of Brahman are eternal. They will never cease and Brahman will never be divested of these qualities. It may be argued that after the dissolution of all finite intellects (*antahkarana*) the *jivas* will be liberated and attain the state of Brahman when there will be no further occasion for the exercise of lordliness on the part of Brahman, so that it cannot be a permanent and essential attribute of Brahman. But Sândilya contends that such a time will never come since finite intellects, which are the limiting adjuncts (*upâdhi*) of the *jivas*, are infinite in number, and therefore creation will never cease.³² Moreover, Mâyâ which is the energy of Brahman will never cease to be. The *jivas* are infinite in number and in their nature. The activity of the Lord is necessary for their empirical life as well as their worship and devotion. The agency of the Lord sustains the *jivas* in all their

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 35 and Commentary.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 35 and Commentary.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 34 and Commentary.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 34 and Commentary.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 87-88 and Commentary.

³¹ *Ibid.*, 91.

³² *Ibid.*, 36 and Commentary.

actions.³³ Thus Brahman will never cease to be the creator, the sustainer, and the Lord of the universe.

PLURALITY OF FINITE SOULS ONLY PHENOMENAL

Sândilya maintains the identity of finite souls even after liberation. He stresses their distinctness from Brahman. And still he holds that ultimately there is but one Self, and not many. Plurality of souls is but an accidental phenomenon due to the association of *upâdhis* or adjuncts. One Self appears to be many even as one sun appears to be many owing to its reflection in many pots of water.³⁴

Oneness is the very nature of the Self. Just as the sun is manifested as one when pots of water are destroyed, so the Self is manifested as one when the adjuncts (*upâdhi*) of intellects are destroyed. When the adjuncts of *jivas* disappear with the dawn of supreme devotion the Lord is manifested as one.³⁵ Brahman, as knowledge *per se*, is the cause of the manifestation of the universe. It does not depend upon any other condition to manifest it.³⁶

The finite souls are not subject to change, though their cognitions, feelings, desires and volitions change. In fact, these are mental modes which are reflected in them. They are modifications of *antahkarana* which are reflected in the finite souls. They suffer change but the souls are changeless.³⁷ Here also Sândilya agrees with Sankara.

LIBERATION (MUKTI)

Mukti or liberation of the *jiva* consists in the attainment of the state of

Brahman (*Brahma-bhâvâpatti*). The *jivas* are absolutely identical in their nature with Brahman. Their empirical life (*samsâra*) is due to the limitation (*upâdhi*) of *antahkarana* made up of *sattva*, *rajas* and *tamas*. It is not their natural and essential condition.³⁸ Just as redness of a crystal is due to its proximity to a China rose, so the empirical life of the *jiva* is due to its connection with the adjunct of *antahkarana*. The *jiva* is bound to empirical life by pleasure and knowledge under the influence of *sattva*. It is bound by desire and action under the influence of *rajas*. It is bound by ignorance and infatuation, inattention, indolence and slumber under the influence of *tamas*.³⁹ It transcends all these *gunas* or natural impulses by devotion (*bhakti*) to the Lord.⁴⁰ He alone is the cause of the *jiva's* devotion to Him and its final liberation. The Lord destroys the threefold *antahkarana*, the limiting adjunct of the *jiva*, and makes it share in its infinite bliss.⁴¹ It is the Lord who impels the *jiva* in its worship and devotion.⁴² It is He who evokes devotion in the *jiva* and admits it into His infinite bliss and eternal perfection. Brahman is the Soul of finite souls, their indwelling spirit and immanent essence. Sândilya holds that the empirical life of the *jiva* (*samsâra*) is due to the absence of devotion (*abhakti*), and not to ignorance (*ajñâna*).⁴³ And the liberation of the *jiva* is due to devotion (*bhakti*), and not to knowledge (*jñâna*). Supreme devotion completely destroys the limiting adjunct (*upâdhi*) of the finite intellect (*buddhi*) which produces egoism (*aham-kâra*) or a sense of separate individual-

³³ *Ibid.*, 35 and Commentary.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 93 and Commentary.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 93 and Commentary.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 94 and Commentary.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 95 and Commentary.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 1.

³⁹ *Gitâ*, XIV, 6-8.

⁴⁰ *Gitâ*, XIV, 26.

⁴¹ *Sândilya-Sutra*, 1 and Commentary.

⁴² *Ibid.*, 35 and Commentary.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, 98 and Commentary.

ity, and restores the *jiva* to its pristine purity—the state of Brahman.⁴⁴ Here Sândilya differs from Sankara who holds that intuition of Brahman dissolves the

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 36 and Commentary.

limiting adjunct of the internal organ and makes the *jiva* realize its identity with Brahman.⁴⁵

⁴⁵ See also Nanda Lal Sinha's *The Bhakti Sutras of Nârada* (Introduction).

RELATIVITY AND THE HINDU CONCEPTION OF GOD

BY SWAMI JNANESWARANANDA

There is a very interesting legend about a conversation supposed to have taken place between a great Greek philosopher and a Hindu mystic. The former in the course of his conversation observed that the greatest study for mankind was the study of man. The latter promptly observed, "How can one know man without knowing God." Apart from the authenticity of this legend the question itself demands deeper study.

The more one ponders over this interesting episode the more one feels inclined to believe that both were absolutely correct in their observations and that only a harmony of these two view-points can solve our deepest problems. In fact, these view-points characterize two distinct modes of thinking—the former, the analytical method, and the latter, the method of synthesis. The Western empirical sciences are the offspring of the former, and the entire body of Hindu philosophy is the result of the latter. The Western analytical scientists of the nineteenth century were trying to reach one all-absorbing truth through the study of the phenomenon, whereas India wanted and still wants to understand the phenomenon in terms of the supersensuous Absolute Reality which transcends the comprehension of the senses.

The entire 'Tree', so to say, of crea-

tion in its totality forms the subject-matter of study for both. The knowledge of any fraction thereof can never solve the fundamental problems of any School, for fractions, particularly in knowledge, can never have any lasting or absolute value. However, the School of empirical sciences, first of all, wants to study the leaves, fruits, flowers, and all other fractions of this "Tree" as separate and independent entities without reference to anything "unknown" to these scientists, and subsequently synthesizes, so far as practicable, the separate results of their study into the concept of the entire "Tree" which to them is nothing more than the sum total of all these separate concepts.

On the other hand, the School of "Absolutists" wants primarily and essentially to know the Absolute Reality—which to them is not altogether unknowable—underlying the concept of the "Tree." By following a method or methods peculiar to their School of thinking which they call "Yoga", they say they can know that 'Absolute Reality.' Then with reference to that supersensuous Absolute Truth they propose to study the various manifestations of that "Tree" as different expressions of that one Absolute. सर्वं खल्विदं ब्रह्म—“Everything indeed is Brahman.”

Supposing, there is (let us call it) a transcendental method (or a method of Yoga,) of knowing the *Principle* of Electricity apart from its *expressions*, how much easier would it be to know, understand and explain the various manifestations of electrical energy after one has been able to grasp the subtle truth about the one underlying *Principle*? The Hindu philosophers through experiments have found out that there is a distinct method to know and realize that one fundamental Truth without going through the maze of phenomena. "Know That and you know All."

Only Brahman or that nameless, formless, limitless, unconditioned, Absolute Reality exists; the phenomenon has no absolute or separate existence apart from that Absolute Reality of Brahman. Man, beast, time, space and even that Entity which people call by the name of God are but different relative existences. This is the principal proposition of Hindu philosophy established five thousand years ago by the 'Rishis' or Seers of the Upanishads.

Compare with this the most modern theory of Relativity established and propounded by Einstein in the field of empirical science and the one will throw light on the other. Study the concept of man from the view-point of Einstein as well as from that of the ancient Hindu thinkers, and what is the conclusion? Whatever conception one may form regarding the concept 'man', it is bound to belong to the side of Relativity, but from the standpoint of the Absolute, man has surely an existence which transcends all relative notions. This indefinable, supersensuous, absolute existence in the case of man is called 'Brahman'—तत् त्वमसि—"Thou art That"—according to the Upanishads. This supersensuous or transcendental Reality is the only reality underlying all phenomena, all other states being

only relative, hence changing, impermanent and unreal.

The Hindu philosophers were bold and rational enough to apply this doctrine of relativity even to their conception of God. The concept of God or 'Isvara' also as distinguished from 'Brahman' belongs to the plane of relativity, and as such can never be the ultimate reality. As man is a relative being, so is God. The subjective and objective view-points or standards in the concept of man are small and meagre, whereas those in the concept of God are mighty and glorious. As man has his fundamental and absolute reality in Brahman, so has God.

Now, this relativity has two different aspects—the subjective and the objective. From the subjective-relative aspect man thinks about himself that he is born, is living such and such a life comprised of sex, colour, creed, nationality and so forth. So does the bigger Entity—God, in a much more gigantic way. From the side of subjective relativity God is first of all self-conscious and as such thinks that He is a self-conscious Being or Entity and that He creates, preserves, and takes back into Himself the entire creation. His will is absolutely free from any conditions, whereas man's will is limited by such conditions as time, space, and causation. God being free from causation is eternally present, whereas man being under its power is dragged along by the chain of causation and experiences, births and deaths till he realizes his absolute and unchangeable nature in Brahman. This subjective-relative view-point is called "*upādhi*" or limiting condition which gives every relative entity a limit to its existence. This subjective-relative view-point or standard in the case of God is of a much more gigantic nature than in the case of man.

Again, who and what is this God?—Is He a person? If so, what is His relation with this creation? Is He responsible for the differences and iniquities that we find in this creation?

God is the “Virât Purusha” or inconceivably big Person holding in His body the entire creation, and is yet bigger than all put together. The three different states of existence—*sthûla* (gross), *sûkshma* (fine) and *kârana* (causal), corresponding to His Three states of consciousness,—the waking, dreaming and sleeping, over each of which He has absolute control, form parts of His body. Hence creation in its three states has no beginning as God has also none. In His acts of creation, preservation and dissolution, He acts according to the law of causation, which controls all creation but cannot control Him. He gives effect to the *karma* of each individual being and as such is not responsible for the differences and the so-called iniquities in creation. Owing to the fact that His knowledge and will are not bound by time, space and causation, He cannot make any mistake in His great work of giving the fruits of *karma* to every individual being throughout all the links in the never-ending chain of causation. He is alone of His species; hence the question of sex—as to whether He is he or she, is quite immaterial in regard to Him. This much about the subjective-relative aspect with regard to His existence.

The next question is, what is the objective-relative aspect? Let us, in the first place, consider the objective aspect of relativity in the case of a human being. Suppose, here is a woman in a family. Apart from the subjective-relative view-point regarding her own self-consciousness, she is looked upon and treated quite differently by different individuals so much so that if we could take photographs of the

mental pictures held by all these individuals of this one woman, it would be amusing enough to compare their sharp points of differences, one from another. The son, the husband, the father, the brother and so forth of that one woman would each give a distinctly characteristic picture clearly illustrating the immense varieties of the objective view-points of relativity in regard to that one entity—the woman. Almost in the same way, but with much more advantage, that inconceivably big Entity, God, is viewed objectively from innumerable view-points of relativity by different individuals. He, being the all and much greater still, does not give the lie to any of the objective-relative view-points from which people might see Him. Look upon Him as your ‘mother’ and He is so, without any conflict with the subjective side and yet He is much more than that. Call Him father, friend, judge, even your dear child or sweet lover, He is such to you, but at the same time anyone or all of these relative view-points put together cannot form the *finality* about Him. There would always remain immense possibilities for innumerable objective view-points in relation to Him.

This is the philosophy underlying the Hindu conception of God. He is one subjectively but innumerable objectively. The woman of our illustration is one subjectively but her pictures from the different objective-relative view-points are innumerable. The Western mind always failed to understand this deep but simple truth until the time of Einstein and consequently many of the Western critics of Hindu philosophy and religion have only exhibited their ignorance whenever they have attempted to criticize the Hindu conception of God. Even in the most ancient scripture—the Vedas, we find this philosophy explained, established, and taught.

Again, to go back to our illustration : In view of the fact that the very same woman is looked upon differently by her son, husband, father and brother, can there be any thought of holding any *one* of these relations as true for all, to the exclusion of the others? Is it not ludicrous, repulsive and positively harmful to try to mix up all these relationships into one 'hodge-podge' in order to manufacture one fixed standard of "Electric Truth" to suit all? Let the wise ponder over it and revise their judgment.

The Hindu always says, "God is one as well as many;" his God would never become the subject of fight and quarrel. As a matter of fact, it is only in a

Hindu home that one can find different members of the family holding different view-points as regards the relationship with God and living in absolute peace and harmony.

But, what is the real nature of that woman in our illustration, apart from any relative conception—subjective or objective? She or, more correctly, 'It' is 'Brahman,' the Absolute. So also about the conception of God. God or "Isvara" is not the Absolute Reality. Godhood, manhood, beasthood and in fact any 'hood' have all their final absolute reality only in Brahman—the Absolute Existence. Brahman alone is, and "Thou art That."

THE AMERICAN CONSTITUTION

BY DR. SUDHINDRA BOSE, M.A., Ph.D

At the base of the Republic, let it never be forgotten, is a written Constitution from which government derives all of its authority. The creation of this written Constitution was the greatest American innovation. The Constitution is the constant, fundamental expression of American purpose, the fountain-head of power.—*The Federalist*.

The United States of America is often thought of as a young country. Yet it has the oldest written Constitution among the important nations of the world. And this grand old document is now 150 years old.

September 17 is observed each year in America as Constitution Day, it being the anniversary of the signing of the Constitution which took place on September 17, 1787. In view of this fact, President Roosevelt issued a proclamation last fall designating the period from September 17, 1937, to April 30, 1938 (anniversary of the inauguration of George Washington as first President of

the United States) as a six-month period for observing the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of these events. The United States Constitution Sesquicentennial Commission was also established by Congress to promote this nation-wide celebration.

The purpose of the commemoration is to make the American people Constitution-conscious: to create a quickening of interest in the Constitution and its essential relation to the history of the nation. Moreover, it aims at making the American people intelligently aware of their rights and duties under the Constitution and at emphasizing the

necessity of eternal vigilance to their precious liberty, "the immediate jewel of the soul."

The late William Ewart Gladstone, in the glow of political oratory, once described the Constitution of the United States as the greatest document ever struck off by the mind of man. The American Founding Fathers, when they emerged from the Independence Hall in Philadelphia 150 years ago, were not so sure.

The Constitutional Convention itself had a furtive air. The delegates had been instructed to revise the Articles of Confederation then governing the thirteen States. They had exceeded their powers and written a new Constitution. Their first action had been to close the proceedings to the press and the public: they had debated and discussed behind locked doors. So fearful were they lest the people should learn the nature of their discussions, an American historian tells us, that "they even had a discreet colleague accompany the aged Benjamin Franklin to his convivial dinners with a view to checking that amiable gentleman whenever, in unguarded moments, he threatened to divulge secrets of state."

Old Samuel Adams, the Revolutionary patriot who was more responsible than any other man for the break between the Colonies and their step-mother country, "distrusted the Constitution as an undemocratic instrument." Young Alexander Hamilton, who later became the Minister of Finance, felt that the Constitution went too far toward "the imprudence of democracy." He would have preferred to make the Presidency hereditary and to surround the office with the pomp of kingship.

The common people were suspicious. Said one of them in opposing the ratification of the Constitution: "These lawyers, and men of learning, and

moneyed men, that talk so finely, and gloss over matters so smoothly, to make us, poor illiterate people, swallow down the pill, expect to be the managers of this Constitution and get all the power and all the money into their own hands and then they will swallow up all us little folks, like the great leviathan."

The Constitution, as it emerged from the Convention, contained no Bill of Rights. It embodied restrictions on government for the protection of the rights of property, but none for the protection of the rights of man. *The Federalist*, founded by Alexander Hamilton, actually warned against "the indulgence of an injudicious zeal for bills of rights." Nevertheless, a Bill of Rights was promised and on that promise a bare majority of those who had the right to vote in those days—only about one-tenth of the adult white males took part in the balloting—approved the Constitution. This small majority agreed with the middle-of-the-road view expressed by George Washington. "The Constitution that is submitted," Washington said, "is not free from imperfections. But there are as few radical defects in it as could be expected. . . . As a constitutional door is opened for future amendments and alterations, I think it would be wise in the people to accept what is offered them."

The American Constitution was not born in a philosopher's studio. It did not come down from the mount. It was not granted by a king or a dictator. Washington and his generals were not barons. They were not trying to force an English king to Runnymede and make him seal a Magna Carta of certain rights to the rich and powerful barons.

The American Constitution was born in trouble. The mobs already had arisen. A third of the original delegates to the Convention had given up and gone home. The moral force of Washington

and Franklin kept the rest together. The Constitution was a document of compromise—a compromise between human rights and property rights. Men of good-will submerged their own deep convictions, their own group interests and even their feelings of injustice to the imperative and supreme need for national unity. The compromises of the Constitutional Convention were of absolute necessity to secure the birth of the nation. But the men who signed the document they had written were not sure as they proceeded, or when they had finished it they had succeeded in what they intended to do, or that the people would accept it. To the inquiring lady who asked Benjamin Franklin what had come out of the Convention, a monarchy or a republic, he replied: “A republic, madam, if you can keep it.”

The experience of a century and a half has dispelled the misgivings of the Founding Fathers. The eighty-nine sentences put together in eighty-one days by fifty-five gentlemen, mostly under 45 years of age, have survived all the changes from tallow candle to television. The reforms whose accomplishments make European history a succession of steps forward and leaps backward, bloody revolution alternating with bloody reaction, have been achieved in this country without resort to armed barricades.

The people in ratifying the Constitution and thereby agreeing to the federal union had set up a form of government new to the world. They felt that the choice lay between anarchy and union. The substance of the arguments which convinced the people is found in the motto: “In union there is strength.”

The framers of the Constitution created what has since come to be known as the “system of checks and balances.” They distributed the power conferred on the federal government among three dis-

tinct departments: executive, legislative and judicial. They gave the executive department to the keeping of the President, elected indirectly by the people every four years; the legislative to a House of Representatives elected by the people every two years; and to a Senate, the members of which were elected by State (Provincial) legislatures for six years; the judiciary to judges appointed by the President for life and removable only by the very difficult process of impeachment. The President checked the legislature by the veto which was given to him over its laws; the legislature checked the President by its control over budget appropriations and by the share given to the Senate in making treaties and appointments. The courts checked both the other departments by their ability to treat as null and void any action contrary to law or the Constitution.

The result of this arrangement of checks and balances was the desired one of stability. The people under it could have their own way, but only after a lapse of time sufficiently long to affect all these numerous interlocking authorities. It undoubtedly violated the principle of popular rule. Yet, says Professor John M. Matthews of the University of Illinois, “it is clear that it was absolutely necessary at that time to have a stable central government. If it had not been established, there would probably be no United States to-day.”

The constitution of the United States is the people’s Constitution. But what does this mean to an American citizen to-day?

It means a representative republican government. It allows a citizen a voice in the government through the officials whom he helps to elect. It guarantees a citizen life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. It defends a citizen’s right even against the government itself. It

makes a citizen equal with all men before the law. It confirms a citizen's religious freedom, and liberty of conscience. It accords a citizen free speech. It guarantees a citizen together with all people the right of peaceable assembly. It permits a citizen to petition the government to right his wrongs. It guards a citizen's property rights. It prohibits the government from taking a citizen's property without due process of law. It lets a citizen hold any government office in the gift of the nation for which he is qualified. It prevents a citizen from being held in custody to answer to a complaint unless he has been lawfully accused. It insures a citizen's right of trial by a jury of his fellowmen. It grants a citizen the right of habeas corpus, that is, the right to know why he is held a prisoner. It assures a citizen a speedy trial. It permits a citizen having legal counsel for defence. It relieves a citizen from compulsion to testify against himself. It forbids excessive fines or cruel punishment. It sanctions a citizen bearing arms for the protection of his life and home. It secures a citizen's home from police search except by lawful warrant. It permits a citizen to participate in amendment of the Constitution from time to time.

India, too, has now a brand-new Constitution, so-called. How many are the rights which are guaranteed to the people under it?

In consideration of the relative rigidity of the American Constitution, its survival for a century and a half of national expansion and industrial revolution is phenomenal. Not only has it served the

political needs of a rapidly changing nation, with less than a score of amendments, but it has also been copied closely in most of the South American countries. Certainly the authors of this immortal document deserve to be honoured for their good judgment and their foresight. They had the wisdom of broad horizon and of profound statesmanship.

The Founders of the Republic, for all their imperfections, groped for a truth much of which the world has yet to learn; built American institutions upon it: *that government is most secure which is most free*. Armed men, the all-pervading power of an autocratic state, the thousand-eyed secret police of despotism peering into every window and into every soul: these terrify and impress. They make easy-going democracy's freedom seem an invitation to anarchy. Americans, however, know better. They have seen fortresses of Kaiser, Emperor and Czar engulfed in quick-sands of discontent; the pomp of monarchs dwindled to a little faded gold braid in a museum show-case.

The marvel of the American Constitution, the secret of its staying power, is that it can change so little, yet so much. A limited republican form of government has been transformed in successive peaceful stages into a great representative democracy, and these changes have come about with little alteration in the document itself. A Constitution meant to endure, as Chief Justice John Marshall said, for ages to come, has shown its adaptability to all the exigencies of American national existence.

GLIMMER OF A NEW DAWN

BY PROF. E. P. HORRWITZ

Satya is the mark of a real gentleman who would rather die than tell a lie. *Sat* is the cream of culture which never perishes, but merely changes hands in the periodic shake-up of human destinies. When Greece lay prostrate, the bewildered muses like scared pigeons flew to Italy. When the Roman colossus tottered, blue-eyed giants of the uncouth north became legatees of classical lore which, through the medium of the church, helped to soften and civilize their untutored passions. The proud Nordic eagle still spreads its mighty wings, but often resembles a greedy vulture, pouncing and preying on the weaker creation. The stricken humanities again take flight; "*reine menschlichkeit*" takes refuge with the simpler and sincerer Slavs.

And who are the typical Slavs? Serbs and Czechs are too Westernized to justify that claim. The suave and aristocratic Poles pride themselves on being the Slavic cream; their very language is supple and sublimated like Chopin's luring melodies. But Polish civilization is too complex; moreover, a country, economically altogether dependant on mightier neighbours, can never become a world power like the Roman or British empire. The leading part in future world affairs is reserved to no small extent for the husky Muscovites who are sufficiently Mongolized to direct the destinies of nations, and to conciliate East and West which arrogant imperialism studiously keeps apart. Their new humanity, hostile to profiteering and private property, imperceptibly gives a social uplift to the

fast sinking Western world which hates and rejects Russian socialism.

A few far-sighted falcons, keen-visioned eagle-souls, sense already the first *glimmer of a new dawn* on the historic horizon, shining yet faintly, and hardly noticed by the busy, buzzing, boisterous multitude which eagerly pursues fast pleasures and fat profits. After the long arctic night the aurora borealis displays her rejuvenated charms; like a diamond-studded fan the deva-luminaries ascend with a revised Adwaita view, a modernized version of Siva. Co-operative comradeship has little use for dried-up doctrines, and prizes doubt above lukewarm lip-service.

Creed and dogma of a learned church
Build a fabric, fair with moral beauty,
But drive not the devil from the heart.
Comrades have a nobler code of duty.

The most troublesome and, at the same time, most forceful nations to-day are the Reich and Russia; both seethe and breathe with released energy (*sakti*). The Versailles dictate, framed two decades ago, was utterly unfair to a self-respecting nation which for generations past has turned out the soundest scientists and finest educators. The political pendulum, violently pushed to one extreme, swung back with equal force in the opposite direction. German humiliation was followed by a national resurgence, unprecedented since the Lutheran reformation. Hitler youth has pantheistic leanings, and prefers master Eckart, the medieval mystic, to the catechism. The *Gitā* or Song of Destiny,

that passionate call to the heroic life, strongly appeals to young Germany. Ever since the revolutionary days of the defiant Upanishads, Hindu nobility fought like lions for social justice, leaving bland Brahmins in valour far behind. India more than ever needs young heroes

who believe in themselves, and take a pledge that nothing shall ever hold them in alien service and servitude. Freedom belongs to the brave who are ready to die for liberty, and not to them who capitulate and surrender, so that they might live. *Fortes fortuna adjuvat!*

WHITEHEAD'S PHILOSOPHY OF ORGANISM

BY ANIL KUMAR SARKAR, M.A. (Gold Medalist)

(Continued from the last issue)

The analysis of an actual occasion has shown us that it is bipolar. "Its physical pole is the feeling of other actual entities; its mental pole is the feeling of eternal objects, or the imaginative grasp of new possibilities."⁴ The first refers to physical feeling, the second to conceptual feeling. But the conceptual realization of further possibilities takes us to a new kind of feeling which Whitehead calls the propositional feeling. "That is to say, they are what he describes as 'lures for feeling,' possibilities entertained by the subject (*i.e.*, the subject which prehends, or enjoys them—not the logical subject) as relevant for realization, for instance, 'redness of the book.' Whitehead insists that propositional feelings are not restricted to conscious mentality. They are the conceptual data of any feelings, *e.g.*, of horror, indignation, desire, enjoyment, etc. Consciousness arises from an integration of physical and conceptual feelings, when the conceptual feelings take the form of an affirmation-negation contrast, *e.g.*, when I prehend something consciously as green, I am implicitly distinguishing it from the colours which it is not. (We may recall the statement

in *Process and Reality*, 1., Ch. 1., of the importance of the negative judgment in mentality.)"⁵

We might quote again from Miss Dorothy Emmet to define a proposition: "A proposition is a conceptual realization of a possibility as a form of definiteness characterizing a set of actual entities in their definite nexus with each other. So the particular actual entities characterized in just way are essential to it" (*Ibid*, p. 162). So she points out later on by way of comparison with the view of proposition as held by Bradley that Whitehead "avoids the familiar dilemma of monistic logic (which finds that by this means we cannot say anything about anything without saying everything about everything) by holding that though every proposition presupposes some systematic aspect of the world, it does not presuppose the whole system of the world in all its details."⁶

The propositions are, thus, regarded as a new kind of entity, midway between eternal objects, which are pure potentials, and particular actual entities. They are also called 'Matters of Fact in Potential Determination,' or 'Impure Potentials for the Specific Determination

⁴ *Whitehead's Philosophy of Organism* by Dorothy M. Emmet ; p. 168.

⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 165-6.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 164.

of Matters of Fact.' ". . . Now in a propositional feeling there is the integration of the physical feeling of an actual entity with a conceptual feeling of an eternal object or complex eternal object which does or might characterise it."⁷ "So it is a tale that might be told of actual entities."⁸

In coming to the propositional feelings we are once more reminded of the fact of the growth of the feelings. There is an inner constitution and external relation everywhere. This is their character of concrescence and transition. The former is a genetic or formal study and the latter is objective or morphological study. We have also seen the passage towards subjective forms which is a fact of concrescence, but we have not considered how we come to that stage. The subjective forms are unifications of some aspects (objective data) by the elimination of other aspects. Whitehead calls the unification of aspects as the positive prehension and elimination of aspects as the negative prehension. So what is known as the objective datum or the perspective that is felt in the subjective form is obtained through elimination or negative prehension. The subjective form expresses how the objective datum is felt. So we find here a relation between the feeler and the felt. The subjective form is itself a feeling or an enjoyment. As feeling it is transcendent, but as feeling the objective datum it is immanent. So transcendence and immanence go together.

As every occasion is a subjective form or unification of feelings, an analysis of feeling itself will give us all that we have said now. This can be better known from the three factors of a prehension as expressed by Whitehead in his *Adventures of Ideas*. Let us quote

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 161.

⁸ *Process and Reality* ; p. 302.

him thus: "A prehension involves three factors. There is the occasion of experience within which the prehension is a detail of activity; there is the datum whose relevance provokes the origination of this prehension; this datum is the prehended object; there is the subjective form, which is the affective tone determining the effectiveness of that prehension in that occasion of experience. How the experience constitutes itself depends on its complex of subjective form."⁹

The subjective form expresses how the objective datum is felt by the subject. It is really the character or form of the feeling as immanent in the feeling. The subjective form is wholly immanent in the feeling in contrast with the datum and the subject-superject which are partly transcendent. "Feelings are classified according to the nature of their data. The datum may be an actual entity, or group of actualities, *i.e.*, a nexus, or an eternal object by itself as associated with some actual entities, *i.e.*, a proposition. . . Correspondingly we have four broad classes of feelings: simple physical feelings, transmuted feelings, conceptual feelings, and propositional feelings."¹⁰

As the subjective form is the character or form of the feeling it is a sort of realization of the feeling, but this realization is not a conscious realization. This takes us to another form of feeling which is intellectual feeling.

The passage to the intellectual feeling can be very well drawn from our analysis of the feeling which expresses a contrast between the feeler and the felt. But in mere physical feeling the contrast is not consciously felt. It lies in its

⁹ *Adventures of Ideas* ; p. 227.

¹⁰ Dr. Rashvihary Das: *The Philosophy of Whitehead* ; p. 105. This book of Dr. Das is still in the press. I had the privilege of reading the proofs of it.

very constitution. In intellectual feeling the feeling of contrast is conscious. A propositional feeling is a realization of an eternal object in some actuality. In intellectual feeling the physical prehension of the nexus and the conceptual prehension of the proposition are held together in the experience of the judging subject. Here the contrast is between an objectified nexus (physical feeling) and a proposition (conceptual feeling) whose logical subjects make up the nexus. This contrast felt involves sometimes 'identity', sometimes 'diversity' and sometimes neither identity nor diversity. This refers to three forms of judgments, *viz.*, affirmative, negative and the suspended. The contrast which is implicit in the affirmative judgments becomes explicit in the negative judgments. So there is an ascent in the feeling of contrast in the negative judgments. The suspended judgments help us to think of the possible, so they are of enormous importance in science.

Consciousness is illustrated in all these feelings as they all involve affirmation-negation contrast. "The triumph of consciousness," says Whitehead, "comes with the negative intuitive judgment."¹¹ Intuitive judgment arises from the integration of an imaginative feeling with the indicative feeling. But the integration of a perceptual feeling with the indicative feeling gives rise to what is called conscious perception. Both of them are varieties of intellectual feelings. Intellectual feelings are a form of comparative feelings as they involve always a contrast. There are another class of comparative feelings more primitive than these. They are known as the 'physical purposes.' Here "we have the integration of a conceptual feeling with the basic physical feeling from which it is derived either by

simple conceptual valuation or by both conceptual valuation and conceptual reversion."¹² "This determines the two species of physical purposes, one involving no reversion, and the other involving reversion, in the mental pole. . . . What is felt in a physical purpose is a contrast between a nexus and an eternal object."¹³

This shows that this form of feeling is confined to the very character of the actual occasion which is a unity of feeling and a possibility, *i.e.*, nexus and conceptual valuation (eternal object). Here the contrast is felt between a nexus and an eternal object. Now the subjective form of a physical feeling is re-enaction or repetition, and that of the conceptual feeling is decision, *i.e.*, aversion or aversion. When there is integration of these two feelings the creative process gains some additional force or is enfeebled to re-enact or reproduce what is physically felt beyond the present feeling in the future according as the conceptual feeling involves aversion or aversion.

The integration of the physical feeling (the primary conceptual feeling) and the secondary (reverted) conceptual feeling produces a complex physical purpose. As in conceptual feeling there is a realization in the subjective form, Whitehead refers us to what he calls the subjective harmony and intensity. The category of subjective harmony says that the subjective forms of the different conceptual feelings are "mutually determined by their adaptation to be joint elements in a satisfaction aimed at by the subject."¹⁴ The category of subjective intensity says that the subjective aim, operating in the origination of conceptual feelings, is "intensity of feeling in the immediate

¹¹ Dr. R. Das: *The Philosophy of Whitehead*; p. 121.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 127.

¹⁴ *Process and Reality*; p. 360.

¹³ *Process and Reality*; p. 387.

subject and in the relevant future."¹⁵ So the arising of conceptual feelings involves the realization of intensity of feeling in a subjective form. This attainment of subjective form is found in all classes of comparative feelings.

Thus, the two kinds of comparative feelings expressed in the crude form in the case of physical purposes, and in a refined form in the case of intellectual feeling can account for the continuity from the mere physical world to the conceptual world. The gap between matter and mind becomes closed up inevitably. Moreover he is able to provide a place for the higher thought processes so often neglected by the new realists. This is the view of Charles Morris expressed in his *Six Theories of Mind*.

We can understand here how by introducing the concept of contrast in every physical feeling which is also a conceptual valuation, and by the reversal of it to another conceptual valuation we come ultimately to a feeling of contrast between physical feeling and propositional feeling in the case of intellectual feeling, and this is the origin of consciousness. This comes as a natural process. And our theory of perception, if it comes at all at this stage, is, really, in its proper place. So let us consider the theory of perception as given by Whitehead.

In both *Process and Reality* and *Symbolism*, we find a detailed exposition of his theory of perception. Perception means sense-perception, *i.e.*, our knowledge of the external world. Then what is the meaning of human experience? Whitehead points out as follows: "Our experience, so far as it is primarily concerned with our direct recognition of a solid world of other things which are actual in the same sense that we are

actual, has three main independent modes, each contributing its share of components to our individual rise into one concrete moment of human experience. Two of these modes I call perceptive, and the third I will call the mode of conceptual analysis. In respect to pure perception, I call one of the two types concerned the mode of 'presentational immediacy', and the other the mode of 'causal efficacy.' . . . I will therefore say that they 'objectify' for us the actual things in our 'environment.'"¹⁶ "Of the two distinct perceptive modes one mode 'objectifies' actual things under the guise of presentational immediacy, and the other mode 'objectifies' them under the guise of causal efficacy. The synthetic activity whereby these two modes are fused into one perception is 'symbolic reference.' By symbolic reference the various actualities disclosed respectively by the two modes are either identified, or are at least correlated together as inter-related elements in our environment. Thus the result of symbolic reference is what the actual world is for us, as that datum in our experience productive of feelings, emotions, satisfactions, actions, and finally as the topic for conscious recognition when our mentality intervenes with its conceptual analysis. Direct recognition is a conscious recognition of a percept in a pure mode devoid of symbolic reference."¹⁷

We have to determine here the functions of these two modes with regard to symbolic reference. We shall also see that error in perception is chiefly due to symbolic reference. In human experience it is antecedent to conceptual analysis. But there is a strong interplay between the two whereby they promote each other. The story of the dog losing the morsel of meat in the stream in

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 393.

¹⁶ *Symbolism*, pp. 19-20.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 21-2.

Æsop's Fables, points out that the error is due to erroneous symbolic reference from presentational immediacy to causal efficacy. So the error dwells in the region of synthetic activity. Symbolic reference is one primitive mode of synthetic activity. The error of symbolic reference is finally purged by consciousness and critical reason with the aid of a pragmatic appeal to consequences. So by 'conceptual analysis' human beings can attain freedom from the errors of the symbolic reference. Let us now consider how at all the union of the two perceptive modes is possible.

The world as presented to us in 'presentational immediacy' is a geometrical world of space and time. It is a direct appearance of the world outside us. It is a symbol referring to us something outside. But if we ask how it is given, we are drawn to another mode of perception which is causal efficacy or causal feeling. It clearly points out that the givenness of the *sensa*, though not their existence, is due to "the functioning of the antecedent physical body of the subject."¹⁸ "The geometrical details of the projected sense-perception depend on the geometrical strains in the body, the qualitative *sensa* depend on the physiological excitement of the requisite cells in the body."¹⁹

The different functions of the two modes show that there cannot be symbolic reference between the percepts of the two modes unless in some way these percepts intersect. "By this intersection I mean that a pair of such percepts must have elements of structure in common, whereby they are marked out for the action of symbolic reference."²⁰ "There are two elements of common structure, which can be shared in common by a

percept derived from presentational immediacy and by another by causal efficacy. These elements are (i) sense-data and (ii) locality."²¹

The sense-data play a double role in perception. "In the mode of presentational immediacy they are projected to exhibit the contemporary world in its spatial relations. In the mode of causal efficacy they exhibit the almost instantaneously precedent bodily organs as imposing their characters on the experience in question. We see the picture and we see with our eyes."²² "Thus perception in the mode of causal efficacy discloses that the data in the mode of sense-perception are provided by it. . . . These sense-data can be conceived as constituting the character of a many-termed relationship between the organisms of the past environment and those of the contemporary world."²³

Thus, the very fact of projection of the sense-data to a locus, signifies a relation between the symbol and its meaning. It is nothing but a reaction of a living organism to its environment. It speaks of the fact of adaptation of the living organism to the environment. To quote Whitehead: "The bonds of causal efficacy arise from without us. They disclose the character of the world from which we issue, an inescapable condition round which we shape ourselves. The bonds of presentational immediacy arise from within us, and are subject to intensifications and inhibitions and diversions according as we accept their challenge or reject it. The sense-data are not properly to be termed mere impression except so far as any technical term will do. They also represent the conditions arising out of the active perceptive functioning as conditioned by our own natures. But our natures must

¹⁸ *Process and Reality*, p. 97.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 193.

²⁰ *Symbolism*, p. 58.

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 59.

²² *Ibid.*, p. 59.

²³ *Ibid.*, pp. 62-3.

conform to the causal efficacy. Thus the causal efficacy 'from' the past is at least one factor giving our presentational immediacy 'in' the present. The 'how' of our present experience must conform to the 'what' of our past. Our experience arises out of the past: it enriches with emotion and purpose its presentation of the contemporary world: and it bequeaths its character to the future, in the guise of an effective element for ever adding to, or subtracting from, the richness of the world."²⁴

According to Charles Morris Whitehead's theory of perception wavers between an insistence on the directness of knowledge and an admission of the necessity of the mediation in knowledge. This is due to his emphasis either on the causal efficacy or on the presentational immediacy. This double emphasis relates him either to neo-realism or to critical realism.

The presentational immediacy is regarded as exhibiting the extensive structure of the contemporary world. From this Charles Morris points out as follows: "Since there is only a geometrical structure common to the datum and the contemporary world, Whitehead virtually accepts the position of Russell and certain of the critical realists (such as Sellars) that knowledge only grasps the mathematical structure of the external world."²⁵ Whitehead himself states that if 'animal faith' be taken as 'perception in the mode of causal efficacy' Santayana's doctrine becomes 'perception in the mode of causal efficacy'. Here causal efficacy is invoked to keep a direct contact with the external world, but the difficulties in the treatment of this mode and in its relation to presentational immediacy, and the difficulty of seeing how on Whitehead's theory of

knowledge causal efficacy can be known to be direct, only increase the suspicion that Whitehead's view of knowing is practically identical with that of critical realism.²⁷

The theory of perception leads us to the problem of truth. Truth is always spoken of as reality. Reality is neither true nor false. So the problem of truth demands a distinction between appearance and reality. We always speak of the truth or falsity of an appearance. In Whitehead's philosophy, we find a duality in every actual occasion. The mental pole is the appearance of the physical pole. So there is always a relation of appearance and reality in every occasion. In propositions and in sense-perception the activity of the mental pole becomes very conspicuous. The proposition is a supposition about actualities. So it stands for a possible realization. In sense-perception this is realized in an actual experience. Here there is always a relation between a 'sensum' and an external object. Here the appearance tries to conform to reality. So Miss Dorothy says it is rather a particular kind of correspondence theory than mere coherence of the appearance and reality in the experience of the judging subject. But Whitehead here reminds us of the 'aesthetic ideal' of his philosophy, which is the attainment of 'beauty.' Truth is valuable when it subserves the purpose of beauty. The aim of truth is to attain all-comprehensive harmony. This means the conformation of appearance to reality. So truth aims at the realization of beauty.

But this continual concrescence and transition in this vast realm of nature reminds us of the ultimate principle of creativity. God is the non-temporal principle of concretion. He transcends the world and the world transcends

²⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 68-9.

²⁵ cf. *Process and Reality*; pp. 498, 508.

²⁶ *Process and Reality*; p. 215.

²⁷ *Six Theories of Mind*; p. 194.

Him. The world is the consequent nature of God, which is conceptually realized in the primordial nature of God. He envisages all possibilities. These two natures remedy the defects of each other. These explain limitation and freedom, determinism and novelty. The world is not created by God, it is only realized in God. So God is the poet of the world, and He is the fellow sufferer

with us. The 'Kingdom of Heaven' is with us. This is the end of the profound philosophy of Whitehead. This is how he unites science with philosophy and religion. His famous book *Religion in the Making* shows how "God in the world is the perpetual vision of the road which leads to the deeper realities" (p. 142).

(Concluded)

SAINT RABIA

BY BANKEY BEHARI

How many are there who can say, "I have attained the goal of my quest" and with confidence walk in front of Death? But here was one, the Saint of Arabia, the Mira of the Desert—Rabia of Basra, whom they had seen lying on a tattered mat with the brick for the pillow, and a cracked earthen jar to allay the thirst of the parched physical lips. People have suffered from many ailments. Here was one, who was a ceaseless patient to the "malady of love," who knew relief only in those far-separated moments when He in His infinite kindness bestowed the much-coveted grace. But this came later, after the skin had shown many a wrinkle and the body was nothing but a bundle of bones strung together. She had struggled. She had wept. She had cried, "O! if Thou couldst but show me Thyself;" but repeatedly did the reply come, "One earlier than you sought the same boon and got it; a particle of our manifestation burnt the Mount Sinai and sent him into a swoon. Be content with our Name." But the ever-growing discontent made even the Lord relax His rule, and He did bestow on this gracious lady the third, the intuitive eye, wherewith

she saw His beatific vision and was lost in ecstasy. The pathway she too emphasized was through the portals of death, and unless one died in this life to one's self, it was impossible to tear the veil and peep behind.

Earlier, as a beautiful young orphan she had lost her way on the street of Baghdad. An "evil-minded one" sold her to a Malik, who was astonished at her devotion to the Lord and freed her. She wandered as a flute-player in the Desert of Arabia. In solitude she learnt great lessons and afterwards returned to a cell where she was to pass many years. Her beauty attracted many a devout one, and even Hasan, some say, (although historically it seems doubtful as Hasan long preceded her) offered his hand which she refused. To another one she replied, "O sensual one, seek another like thyself; hast thou seen any sign of desire in me?"

Rabia hated publicity and did not encourage the visitors, lest after her death many an untrue miracle should be attributed to her. Her denunciation of miracle-mongering was characteristic of her unostentatious nature. One day Hasan cast his mat on the surface of the water and beckoned Rabia to come

and pray with him. Rabia smiled and said, "Offer not thyself thus in the bazaar," and letting her mat fly in the air rushed up to it, and said, "Come up; let us pray here." That station was not for Hasan, who was ashamed of his display of vain miraculous power. Then just to keep up his heart she said, "O Hasan, that which you did, a fish can do just the same, and that which I did a fly can do. The real work lies beyond these two, and it is necessary for us to occupy ourselves with the real work."

Wedded to poverty, Rabia lived a life of self-denial till her old age; she died at the age of 90 in 801 A.D. Every offer of pecuniary help was graciously refused in words characteristic of a devotee: "Will He forget the poor because of their poverty or remember the rich because of their riches?" And again, "Verily, I should be ashamed to ask for worldly things from Him to whom the world belongs, and why should I ask anything from those to whom it does not belong?" Her love for her Beloved was deep-rooted and her faith gave her support and made her say, "Shall He not who provides for those who revile Him, provide for those who love Him?"

Her great teacher was fear,—fear of Death. Every time she prayed 'as if it were going to be her last prayer.' And what did she pray for? Not to be relieved of her pain, for did she not say: "My concern is to accommodate myself to His will. He has made me occupied with something other than the tangible things which you see?" And to her friend Sufiyan she said, "Who it is that wills suffering for me? Is it not God who wills it? Then when you know this, why do you bid me ask for what is contrary to His will? It is not well to oppose one's Beloved."

Nor even for a paradise were her prayers directed: "O Lord, if I worship

Thee from fear of Hell, burn me in Hell, and if I worship Thee from hope of Paradise, exclude me thence, but if I worship Thee for Thine own sake, then withhold not from me Thine eternal beauty."

Lonely she was and in that solitude she delighted:

"O my Lord, the stars are shining and the eyes of men are closed, and kings have shut their doors and every lover is alone with his beloved, and here am I alone with Thee."

Not even the scenes outside, not even the blossoming nature diverted her from her repose in the Lord. When her maid-servant said, "Mistress, come out to behold the works of God," she answered, "Come inside that you may behold the Maker. Contemplation of the Maker has turned me aside from contemplating what He has made."

This attitude was carried to the extreme and to an extent that wounded the feelings of many an orthodox faithful one. When they asked her, "Rabia, do you love the Apostle?" She replied, "Verily, I love Him greatly but the love of the Creator has turned me aside from the love of His creatures." "And I have no room left to love or hate anybody. I am so possessed with God."

In her abounding charity to the seeker, she pointed out the Path when any enquired about it from her, "Think on Him often, and so you may speedily be given that which shall bring you rest." According to her no intermediary is needed between Him and the aspirant. Only he should make no fresh ties but knock off the existing ones.

Leading an austere, celibate and cloistered life, she passed her sleepless nights thinking only of Him. Enough shall be the time to sleep in the grave; then why waste precious hours of life? And this self-denial, this fire of passion for the

Lord, this ceaseless yearning brought the fruits for her in its wake; she gained for herself the acme of spiritual life. "She ceased to exist, passed out of herself, became one with Him and altogether His."

This greatest woman mystic of Islam has shown the Path of utter self-aban-

don and faith in His mercy, as she sang the song of life:

"That which thou lovest, O man, that too become thou must;
God, if thou lovest God, dust if thou lovest dust."†

† Quotations in the article are from *Rabia, the Mystic* by Margaret Smith (Cambridge University Press).

THE DESTINY OF A BRAHMAJNANIN

BY PROF. P. M. MODI, M.A., PH.D. (KIEL)

The last topic in the *Brahma-Sutra* IV. 3, is, "Where does the conductor take knowers of Brahman?" The Srutis beginning with the rays (*archis*) say that the conductor leads them upto Brahman (*Chhâ. Up. IV. 15. 5*) or upto Brahma-loka (*Brih. Up. VI 2. 15*). What is exactly the meaning of this Brahman or Brahma-loka? The *Brahmasutras* IV. 3. 7-16 deal with this question, though the Sutas IV. 3. 15-16 refer to a different topic according to Sankara. In these Sutas three different views about the destination of the Brahmajnânin's journey are given, viz., those of Bâdari, Jaimini and Bâdarâyana.

Bâdari raises the above question on the ground of the limits of the conductor's capacity to lead the Brahmajnânin: "How far is it possible for the conductor to go?" He holds that the conductor can go only upto a world which is an effect of Brahman. He cannot go beyond it. Therefore the knower of Brahman can be carried by the conductor only upto a world which is an effect (*Bra. Su. IV. 8. 7*). *Bri. Up. III. 6. 1* and *Kau. Up. 1. 3* distinguish between this effect-world and the Cause or the Para, though this distinction is not found in the *Chhâ. Upanishad*. The *Brihadâranyaka Sruti* distinguishes the

Kârya as Prajâpatiloka and the Para as Brahma-loka which is called there the "anatiprasnyâ devatâ"—the deity beyond which no question should be raised. Similarly, the *Kau. Sruti* distinguishes between the same under the names of Prajâpatiloka and Brahma-loka. On the ground of this distinction, Bâdari argues that the conductor leads the knower of Brahman only upto the Kârya (*Bra. Su. IV. 3. 8*), though this distinction is not found in the *archirâdi Sruti*, e.g., *Chhâ. Up. IV. 15. 5*. If it be asked, "How would you explain the *Chhâ. Sruti*?" Bâdari replies, it does not mean that the conductor leads the knower of Brahman upto the Para, but in that Sruti the Prajâpatiloka is called 'Brahman,' because the former is very near the latter (*Bra. Su. IV. 8. 9*) spatially, just as this world is said to be very remote from Brahman (*Bra. Su. IV. 4. 17*). An express statement like the one in *Mu. Up. III. 2. 7* shows that the knowers of Brahman whom the conductor carries upto the Prajâpatiloka as shown in Sutas IV. 3. 7-8, go further than that in the company of the governor of that loka 'when that loka comes to an end' (*Bra. Su. IV. 8. 10*). And there is a Smriti text, viz., "All of them who have achieved the aim of their life

enter the supreme abode in the company of Brahman (*i.e.*, Hiranyagarbha) at the end of the Para, when the dissolution of the universe is at hand." Thus, in addition to the three arguments, *viz.*, (1) the capacity of the conductor to go upto the Kârya, (2) the mention of the distinction between the Kârya and the Para in *Bri. Up.* III. 6. 1, and (3) the explanation of the word 'Brahman' in the *Chhâ. Sruti* in the sense of 'Prajâpati' (*Bra. Su.* IV. 3. 7-9), *Sruti* and *Smriti* can be quoted in support of the view that the conductor leads the knower of Brahman up to the Kârya, the Prajâpatiloka (*Bra. Su.* IV. 3. 10-11).

Jaimini holds that the conductor leads the knower of Brahman upto the Para, because that Para is the chief aspect of Brahman, but the Kârya is not the chief aspect (*Bra. Su.* IV. 3. 12), and because *Sruti*s like *Tait. Up.* II. 1., show that he reaches the Para (*Bra. Su.* IV. 3. 13). Again it is not that the knower of Brahman has simply aimed at knowing (and reaching) the Kârya (*Bra. Su.* IV. 3. 14).

Bâdarâyana, however, believes that the conductor leads those meditators on Brahman who do not resort to the Symbol 'Om' for their meditation on Brahman. In the case of the meditators who resort to the Symbol 'Om', there is no need of a conductor because they are carried to their destination by the *Sâmans* (*Pra. Upa.* V. 5; *Bra. Su.* IV. 3. 15—*apratîkâlambanânnayatîti Bâdarâyanaḥ*).¹ Now, the meditators on Brahman not resorting to the Symbol for that purpose are of two types according to Bâdarâyana, *viz.*, those who meditate on Pradhâna the *arupavad Brahman*, *i.e.*, *nirâkâra Brahman* (*Bra.*

Su. III. 2. 14, III. 3. 1-11) and others who meditate on Purusha the *rupavad Brahman* (*Bra. Su.* I. 2. 23; *Vide* my Paper on 'The Scheme of the Brahmasutras I. 1-3: A Rapprochement,' pp. 112-120 in the *Journal of the Bombay University*, Vol. IV., Part III, November, 1935).² Therefore there is no conflict both ways, *i.e.*, between the views of Bâdari and Jaimini (*ubhaya-thâdoshât—Bra. Su.* IV. 3. 15). And, again, either type of meditator has made a specific resolution that 'he is going to be born unto that Brahman after having departed from this world,' as stated in *Chhâ. Up.* III. 14. 4 (*tatkratus cha—Bra. Su.* IV. 3. 15). While accepting both the views of Bâdari and Jaimini, the Sutrakâra points out what he thinks to be the exact difference between the two aspects of Brahman, because it is on this point that he does not fully agree with either Bâdari or Jaimini. The Sutrakâra appears to depend upon *Pra. Upa.* V. 2-5 for proving this difference because that *Sruti* seems to have been referred to by him in *Bra. Su.* IV. 3. 16. We have elsewhere shown that the Sutrakâra's interpretation of this *Sruti* is given by him in *Bra. Su.* I. 3. 13 and that it is further discussed by him in *Bra. Su.* III. 3. 39 (*Vide* p. 116 of the above-mentioned paper). In the light of these Sutrakâra, the Sutrakâra understands *jîvaghana* in *Pra. Upa.* V. 5 as the Para and Purusha in the same *Sruti* as *Apara Brahman*. The two are identical and they may be understood as separate according as the meditator wishes (*Bra. Su.* III. 3. 39). This alternative identity and differentiation between these two aspects of Brahman suggests to us the view of the Sutrakâra about the distinction between them. He apparently

¹ It is interesting to note how the *Sruti* (*sa enân Brahma gamayati—*) is interpreted by Bâdari, Jaimini, and Bâdarâyana. Bâdari puts emphasis upon 'sah' (*i.e.* *âtivâhikah*), Jaimini upon 'Brahma', and Bâdarâyana upon 'enân' (*Brahmajñâninah*).

² Only these two aspects are described in detail in *Bra. Su.* III. 3. 11-54, as I propose to show in a book which I hope to publish soon.

believes that the two are not numerically two, though they are not necessarily one and the same; at least for the purpose of meditation they need not be regarded as the same or identical. In so far as the two are *different*, both Bâdari and Jaimini are correct and acceptable to the Sutrakâra inasmuch as the *conductor* is required to lead the knower of Brahman to his destination; and in so far as the two are *identical*, Bâdarâyana modifies the views of Bâdari and Jaimini regarding the difference between the Kârya and the Para (*Bra. Su. IV. 3. 16*).

Now we may give additional arguments in support of what we have said above regarding the main point on which Bâdarâyana differs from Bâdari and Jaimini, *viz.*, the nature of the Kârya, or Prajâpatiloka. According to Bâdarâyana the world of Brahma or Prajâpati is not a Kârya, but it is only a personal or *rupavat* (*sâkâra*) aspect of the Para, the other aspect of which is the *a-rupavat* or *nirâkâra* one. Jaimini and Bâdari distinguished these two *sâkâra* and *nirâkâra* aspects as Kârya and Para which may be called 'Kârana,' but Bâdarâyana takes both of them as Kârana-aspects or two aspects of the Para itself. It is in agreement with this that he drops the mention of the Prajâpatiloka in his list of the stations on the Path of gods (*Bra. Su. IV. 3. 3*). That he would not admit it as a *loka* at all, is clear from the fact that he denies that the Purusha aspect of the Para is subject to the fault of being regarded as a *loka* though there is something common to an ordinary *loka* and Purusha or *sâkâra* aspect. Moreover this latter aspect in his school is on an equal level with the *nirâkâra* aspect, both being equally powerful means for attaining directly absolute liberation, (so much so that an option or choice between the two is given to the

seeker in *Bra. Su. III. 3. 11-54*). The two are only two different names of the Para and the difference in the method of meditation on the two is due to those names (*Bra. Su. III. 3. 8, 10*). The two are different like the serpent and the coil of a serpent (*Bra. Su. III. 2. 27* and *III. 3. 8*). Bâdarâyana would, therefore, not regard the Purusha aspect as a *loka* or a Kârya of Brahman.

As a result of this difference between these three thinkers we find that Bâdari and Jaimini refer to Srutis like *Bri. Up. III. 6. 1* and *Kau. Up. I. 3* in order to prove their view about the difference between the Kârya and the Para (*Bra. Su. IV. 3. 8*.) and Bâdari even explained the *Chhâ.* and *Bri. Srutis* beginning with the rays (*archih*), by giving a secondary sense to the words 'Brahman' (*Chhâ. Up. IV. 15. 6* and *V. 10. 2*) and 'Brahmaloka' (*Brih. Up. VI. 2. 15*). Bâdari had the real support of *Bri. Up. III. 6.1*, which places Brahmaloaka higher than Prajâpatiloka and says that the former is the '*anatiprasnyâ devatâ*'. This phraseology seems to have induced Bâdari and Jaimini to interpret the difference between the Kârya and the Para in their own way. But Bâdarâyana who depends upon the *Chhâ. Up.* and other *archirâdi* Srutis, and also upon many other Srutis like *Pra. Up. V. 2-5* (*Bra. Su. IV. 3. 16*), *Katha Up. III. 10-11*, does not accept their view, but says that both of them are really the aspects of the Para. And he further says that because the Para has these two aspects, the conductor carries the worshippers or meditators of both up to Brahman which is both *nirâkâra* and *sâkâra* in all the states (*Bra. Su. III. 2. 11*). For this reason he accepts the views of Bâdari and Jaimini inasmuch as the conductor carries the knower of Brahman, but he replies to Bâdari that the Prajâpatiloka is not a Kârya, but the Para itself in a

way and he also says to Jaimini that, besides the Para, there is another aspect of the Para, viz., the sâkâra or Purusha aspect to which also a conductor is required to lead and consequently Bâdari's view is not inconsistent with his own view. Or, in other words, both the views could be justified on the strength of the Upanishads.

Though these three authorities differ regarding the nature of the two aspects of Brahman, all of them agree that the attainment of the Para only is the state of liberation. Bâdari holds that the conductor leads the knower of Brahman upto the world of Prajâpati, but the knower goes to or reaches Brahman which is higher than this Prajâpatiloka, in the company of Prajâpati on the dissolution of the Prajâpatiloka (*Bra. Su. IV. 3. 10-11*). Jaimini believes that the conductor himself leads the knower of Brahman upto the Para (*Bra. Su. IV. 3. 12-14*). This also shows that in the opinion of all the three 'going to the Para' is a necessary prerequisite of liberation. Thus, none of them exactly believes in what Sankara calls liberation-by-stages (*kramamukti*) and liberation-in-this-life (*jîvanmukti*). It would appear that Bâdari's view upholds *kramamukti*, but it is entirely different from that as propounded by Sankara, because Bâdari believes that from the Prajâpatiloka the knower of Brahman has to go in the company of Prajâpati to Brahman. Moreover, according to Bâdari the knower of Brahman first goes to the Kârya because the conductor is not able to go further. It is not that the knower lacks some knowledge of Brahman and gets it by staying in the world of Prajâpati. He has to wait in Kârya because none could lead him directly to the Para. Thus Bâdari does not believe in any kind of *kramamukti*.

Sankara's view that Bâdari believes in the impossibility of Brahman being

achieved by the knower of Brahman going to it, is founded upon his own interpretation of *asya* and *gatih* in *Bra. Su. IV. 3. 7* as *kâryasya Brahmanah* and *gantavyatâ* respectively. But we believe that *asya* in the light of the context refers to the *vaidyuta âtivâhika* mentioned in *Bra. Su. IV. 3. 6* and that *gatih* means "going," the act of going, not the possibility of being reached by going to. Moreover, his main arguments viz., (1) *Brahmanah sarvagatatva*—"the omnipresence of Brahman," and (2) *Brahmanah pratyagâtmatva*—"Brahman itself being identical with the inner soul of the seeker," are not given by Bâdari; nor do we find their refutation in the Sutras giving Jaimini's reply to Bâdari. These arguments of Sankara are refuted by Sankara himself in his commentary on *Bra. Su. IV. 3. 14*, from the standpoint of a supposed opponent. Again, to us Bâdari seems to argue that the Prajâpatiloka is near Brahmaloaka or Brahman and thus Bâdari gives a spatial view of Brahman, as would appear from not only the word '*sâmîpyât*' in *Bra. Su. IV. 4. 9.*, but also from the phrase '*atah param*' in *Bra. Su. IV. 3. 10* and '*asannihitatvât*' in *Bra. Su. IV. 4. 17*. But Sankara interprets it in a secondary sense. In order to prove that Bâdari believes in liberation-by-stages, Sankara says that according to Bâdari those whom the conductor leads up to the Kârya get the right knowledge of Brahman in that Kârya itself (See '*tatraivotpannadarsanâh santah*' in *Sâ. Bhâshya* on *Bra. Su. IV. 3. 10*), but from the context Bâdari seems to believe that those whom the conductor leads to the Kârya have already attained the perfect knowledge on this earth. The Sruti which Bâdari seems to have referred to under Sutra IV. 3. 10 (viz. *venântavi-jñânasunisçhitârthâh; Sannyâsayogâ-dyatayah suddhasatvâh, Mu. Up. III.*

2. 7.) also appears to favour this conclusion.

To us it appears that the Adhikarana consisting of *Bra. Su. IV. 3. 7-16* is not meant to discuss whether going to the 'Para' is possible or whether only the 'Kârya' could be reached by going. It is meant by the Sutrakâra to decide upon what station or *loka* the conductor can lead the knower of Brahman (*asya* in *Bra. Su. IV. 3. 7* standing for the *vaidyuta âtivâhika*), and if he cannot accompany him to the Para, who can lead him finally to his destination? While stating the stations on the Path of gods, the Sutrakâra has mentioned the *vidyut* and *varuna loka* and the discussion about the Prajâpatiloka and Brahmaloaka follows in *Su. IV. 3. 7-16* by way of the discussion of the function and capacity of the conductor mentioned in *Su. IV. 3. 6*. Sutra *IV. 3. 15* also confirms our view because "*nayati*" in that Sutra refers to the conductor and Bâdarâyana gives his own view that the conductor carries the meditators on (both the aspects of) Brahman and thereby he says that he carries them to the Para. In his opinion the Sruti and Smriti referring to the knower of Brahman being accompanied by Brahman (*mas.*) or the governor of the Prajâpatiloka deal with the fate of those who belong to the circle of officers (*âdhikârikamandala—Bra. Su. IV. 4. 18*), and have nothing to do with those who know Brahman in this life on this earth. Thus, we are led to conclude that the topic of this last Adhikarana consisting of Sutras *IV. 3. 7-16* is quite different from what Sankara and some other commentators take it to be.

Lastly, Sankara's *pâtha* (reading), according to which Sutras 7-14 and Sutras 15-16 of this Pâda form two different Adhikaranas, has, as he says, the support of a predecessor of his (*Vide*

Sâ. Bhâshya on *Bra. Su. IV. 3. 14*), but according to our interpretation, it would appear that even Sankara's predecessor was not in the possession of a correct *pâtha* (reading). That Sutra *IV. 3. 15* should be taken to be a modification of what the Sutrakâra has said in Sutra *III. 3. 31* and that Sutra *IV. 3. 16* deals with the *kâmya* meditations on particular symbols of Brahman seems to us to be impossible both on the ground of the context and the propriety of the subject-matter in this Adhyâya. Râmânûja takes all these Sutras as forming one Adhikarana. This is quite consistent with other places in the Sutras where Bâdarâyana's view is given under the express mention of his name. A comparison of the Sutras under discussion with *Bra. Su. IV. 4. 10-14*, *IV. 4. 5-7*, shows that this is the case only when the Sutrakâra gives his view *after* discussing the view or views of others also.

If thus our suggestion about grouping all these Sutras (7-16) into one Adhikarana be correct, the view of Bâdarâyana would naturally be the Siddhânta and consequently Sankara's view that the doctrine of Bâdari is the Siddhânta intended here will be found to be untenable. As he himself says, the general rule is that the preceding Sutras are the aphorisms of the Purvapaksha, the succeeding ones those of the Siddhânta. The same rule was followed by Sankara's predecessor and is followed by his successors. And if, as we have shown, Sutra *IV. 3. 7* deals with the question about the capacity of the conductor to carry the knower of Brahman to the destination, Sankara himself would not insist upon taking Sutras *IV. 3. 7-11* as the Sutras of the Siddhânta.

SWAMI VIVEKANANDA: AN APPRECIATION

BY CHRISTINA ALBERS

I met Swami Vivekananda in San Francisco in California. It was at a lecture in the year 1900.

The Swami arrived some twenty minutes before the lecture and was engaged in conversation with some friends. I sat at a short distance from him and was very deeply interested, for I felt he was one who had something to give to me. The conversation was of the ordinary nature, and yet I felt a peculiar force emanating from him.

His health was poor at the time, and when he rose to go to the platform, it seemed an effort on his part. He walked with a heavy gait. I noticed that his eyelids were swollen, and he looked like one who suffers pain.

He stood for a while in silence before he spoke, and I saw a change. His countenance brightened, and I thought his very features were different now.

He began to speak, and there was a transformation. The soul-force of the great man became visible. I felt the tremendous force of his speech,—words that were felt more than they were heard. I was drawn into a sea of being, of feelings of a higher existence, from which it seemed almost like pain to emerge when the lecture was finished. And then those eyes, how wonderful! They were like shooting stars,—lights shooting forth from them in constant flashes. Over thirty years have elapsed since that day, but the memory of it is ever green in my heart and will remain so. His years on earth were not many. But what are years when the value of a life is weighed. Unknown and ignored, he entered the lecture hall of the great metropolis of Chicago in 1893. He left that Hall an adored hero. He spoke. It was enough. The

depth of his great soul had sounded forth, and the world felt the vibrations. One single man changed the current of thought of half the globe—that was his work.

The body is subject to decay. The great strain put upon him, weighed on the physical,—his work was done. Scarcely forty years of life on earth, but they were forty years that outweighed centuries. He was sent from higher regions to fulfil a great mission, and that mission being fulfilled he returned to his seat among the gods, whence he had come.

Great soul, thy work will live for evermore.

We felt thy wondrous being from afar.
Thou brought the whispers of the morning star.

The murmur of the waves from greater shore.

I heard thy voice in torrents bold and free,

And yet the sweetness that flowed through it all

Was like the song of sylvan water-fall,
Like murmur round a cave in Southern Sea.

Thou'st sent thy message thund'ring through the years.

To hear thee was to blend the silver note,

The mellow warble of the songbird's throat,

With thunderbolt that comes from other spheres.

And still we feel the pow'r of that great love,

That noble spirit gently hover near,
To give us courage in this darker sphere,

Blessings from realms of greater bliss above.

PRACTICAL VEDANTA

BY PROF. HIRA LALL CHOPRA, M.A. (Gold Medalist)

Various criticisms have been levelled against the doctrine of Mâyâ in Vedanta since the days of great Sankaracharya. It has commonly been understood that Vedanta preaches the renunciation of all that exists in tangible or perceptible form, and that man has got nothing to do with this phenomenal world, but should aspire after something pertaining to the other-world. It is on this account that Hinduism in general and Vedanta in particular has been described as a religion of inactivity and pessimism.

But all this is based upon the wrong application of its theories. Hinduism is not a static thing, but it is a dynamic force, which leads an aspirant onwards to the realization of Truth in his own self and in the self of the humanity at large. The doctrine of Mâyâ is no doubt a theory of abnegation but that abnegation has its practical value as well. A person has to expand his individual self until it gets above all limitations and becomes identified with the supreme Self. In fact the burden of whole humanity is placed on his shoulders. It is his duty to carry the burden cheerfully and direct it towards perfection along with the perfection of his own individual life.

A person, according to the teaching of practical Vedanta, need not renounce his physical environments and closet himself in a lonely cave or sit in a jungle to attain the metaphysical Truth; he may remain in the world, but he must not be of it. He is only to expand his self to such an extent that he may feel identified with everything and every being existent in the world. Indeed the renunciation that is involved in this

process of self-expansion eventually results in the realization of ultimate Reality.

We see, in the life of Sankaracharya, the greatest exponent of the theory of Vedanta and the loftiest thinker of the world, that he did not retire into any solitary and secluded corner after the realization of Truth, but travelled throughout the length and breadth of India to preach the universal teachings of Vedanta. His Vedanta was also practical. We are aware of the fact that in the four corners of India, he instituted four Maths: Jyotirmath in the north, Shringerimath in the south, Govardhanmath in the east and Saradamath in the west. The idea underlying the institution of these Maths was that the people from one corner of India should come in intimate contact with those living in the other, so that by such inter-provincial contacts a Hindu nation may be formed. He was considerably successful in his venture, as it is obvious from the pages of history that he was able to redirect the people of India to their own ancient and glorious religious ideal.

After Sankaracharya Vedanta was greatly misunderstood and many conceptions crept into it. People came from outside and invaded India very often and in most cases settled in India detaching themselves from the lands of their birth. Massacre and bloodshed became a daily affair and it was then alone that the Indians began to forget the inspiring and lofty idealism as embodied in the Vedantic literature.

In the nineteenth century, the influence of English education dealt a serious blow at the cultural heritage of

the Hindus. English education began, by slow degrees, to destroy the religious fervour of our youngmen and they took pleasure in abhorring Indian ideals. Hinduism was then, as it were, in the melting pot. As a reaction there sprang up movements in all parts of India preaching the ancient idealism with necessary modifications to stem the process of complete denationalisation.

The age needed the appearance of a reformer in India. Sri Ramakrishna Paramahansa, the Saint of Dakshineswar, who diagnosed the disease to its very core, came out with a practical programme. He did not believe in mere theories of religion which sounded very high but were useless for humanity, unless their truths were practically realized in life. To him the service of man in a spirit of worship of the Divine was religion itself. He was looking for a capable medium through whom he could propagate his message, and his far-reaching eyes met with no difficulty in selecting Narendra Nath Dutta, a brilliant graduate of the Calcutta University, for this sacred mission. Narendranath, equipped as he was with Eastern and Western learning, after all sorts of tests and examinations, was convinced of the genuineness of the spiritual realization of Sri Ramakrishna and believed that his Master's universal message was the only panacea needed to save mankind from materialism at the present age. He also realized the sublime truths of Advaita Vedanta and preached the same to the people at large. He found the salvation of India in its practical application alone.

Though a spiritual giant, Swami Vivekananda was one of the greatest patriots India has ever seen. It is said about him that while in America, he was once given a very costly and a comfortable bedding by a host. But he rolled out of it sobbing, for he could not afford to have that kind of bedding when his fellow brethren in India were dying of starvation. To him the economic problem of India was as sacred as the religious problem.

Indeed he was a religious, social, and an educational reformer in one; he found that all these different problems of India were closely connected with one another. He believed in theories, mythologies, Vedantic doctrines and dogmas, but at the same time he did not ignore the physical needs of his suffering countrymen. He openly declared that a sound mind was not possible without a sound body. This is one of the distinguishing features of his practical philosophy which has earned for Vivekananda an abiding place in the hearts of the Indians, irrespective of caste, creed and colour.

Lexicographers and litterateurs may interpret Vedanta in various ways, but the interpretation given to it by Sri Ramakrishna and Swami Vivekananda at the present age stands, with the conception of its practical aspect, quite unique and unchallenged. Vedanta has become practical in a happy blending of *jñāna* and *karma*, i.e., in the dynamic ideal that teaches the service of humanity as one of the potent means of self-realization: **आत्मनो मोक्षार्थं जगद्धिताय च ।**

SRI-BHASHYA

BY SWAMI VIRESWARANANDA

CHAPTER I

SECTION I

THE GREAT SIDDHANTA

ADVAITIN'S POSITION REFUTED

SCRIPTURES DO NOT TEACH A NON-DIFFERENTIATED BRAHMAN

The Advaitins say that the scriptures teach a Brahman which is non-differentiated, immutable, self-proved, eternal and Pure Consciousness and quote as authority texts like, "Existence alone, my dear, was this in the beginning, One only without a second" (*Chh.* 6.1.1), which they interpret to mean that Brahman has no second, not even by way of attributes. This is not correct. This text occurs in that section where it is taught how the knowledge of one thing, the Brahman, leads to the knowledge of everything in this world. That section teaches that Brahman is both the material and efficient cause of the world, that It has infinite attributes of great excellence such as omniscience and omnipotence, and that its thoughts are true and eternal and It is the support and ruler of the world and so on, and lastly, that It is the Self of this world of sentient and insentient beings; finally, it instructs Swetaketu that this Brahman is also his Self. The *Mundaka* text, "That which is not perceived, not grasped, without origin, colourless, without eyes or ears or hands and feet,—that which is eternal yet of manifold expressions, all-pervading, extremely subtle and undecaying, the source of all creation—the wise behold everywhere" (*Mun.* 1.1.6), denies

in the first half all evil qualities of Prakriti in Brahman and in the latter half ascribes to It all auspicious qualities. All material objects are perceivable and graspable and have colour and name and form; but Brahman is quite the opposite of material things. It has neither eyes nor ears nor hands and feet, that is, unlike the individual souls It does not depend on these organs for knowledge and action.

"Existence, Knowledge, Bliss is Brahman" (*Taitt.* 3.1.) does not define Brahman as free from all attributes. The three terms are in co-ordination and denote the one Brahman. Co-ordination means the existence of several attributes in the same substratum, there being a reason or motive for using each of the different terms in it. Therefore, the three terms denote three attributes. It cannot be said that the terms have oneness of meaning and therefore are the very nature of Brahman and not attributes, for in that case only one term would have been quite sufficient to apprehend the nature of Brahman and, moreover such an interpretation would conflict with co-ordination, for in co-ordination there must be different reasons or motives for using these different terms. It may, however, be objected that if these terms denote attributes

and since they are different it would lead to a differentiation of their object and so there will not be oneness of the object. In other words, due to difference in these attributes, we will have a plurality of Brahman. This argument, however, has no force in it for, grammarians define that in a co-ordination terms connoting different qualities are placed in apposition to refer to one object—the very aim of co-ordination is to show that one object is qualified by different attributes.

The words, “One only without a second” in the *Chhândogya* text (6.1.1), the Advaitins say, deny all attributes of Brahman and establish It as homogeneous; they argue that, on the principle that texts of different Sâkhâs have the same purport, all the texts dealing with the causality of Brahman should be taken as teaching a non-dual Brahman. This Brahman which is indirectly described or defined by the causality texts is directly defined by the *Taittiriya* text as “Existence, Knowledge, Bliss is Brahman” and so this text also defines It as non-dual, especially as otherwise these would be in conflict with those texts which describe It as without attributes. All this is not a sound view. The words “One without a second” establish that besides Brahman there is no other efficient cause, and thereby prove that Brahman is unique without the like of It in possessing excellent auspicious qualities. That It has such attributes is known from texts like, “It thought, ‘May I be many, may I grow forth’ and It projected fire” (*Chh.* 6.2.2-3). The principle that all Sâkhâs have the same purport is wrongly applied by the Advaitins, for it in reality means that the attributes ‘all-knowing’ etc., mentioned in other causality texts have to be taken in this *Chhândogya* text also. Consequently the *Taittiriya* text (3.1) also teaches Brahman as

possessing attributes and not as non-dual. This will not conflict with texts which describe Brahman as without attributes, for those texts deny attributes of Prakriti in Brahman. The texts that teach that Brahman is knowledge teach that Brahman is by nature essentially knowledge but not that the ultimate reality is Pure knowledge, for Brahman is a knowing subject and has knowledge for its essential nature. That Brahman is a knowing subject is learnt from texts like: “It thought” (*Chh.* 6.3.2.); “It willed, ‘Let me project the worlds’ ” (*Ait.* 1.1.1); “His high power is revealed as manifold, forming His essential nature which is knowledge, strength and action” (*Svet.* 6.8.); “This Self is free from evil, old age, death and sorrow, without hunger, and thirst, with true desires and true volitions” (*Chh.* 8.1.5) and so on. These texts show that Brahman which is essentially knowledge is also a knower and possesses other infinite auspicious qualities like all-knowing, with true desires, true volitions, and is free from evil qualities like sinfulness, aging, death, grief, etc. The Nirguna texts deny only evil qualities in Brahman and so there is no conflict between the Saguna and the Nirguna texts and therefore there is no need to take any set as being nullified by the other set of texts.

The *Taittiriya* text, “He who knows the Bliss of Brahman from where all speech with mind turns away without reaching it” (*Taitt.* 2-9), describes with emphasis the infinite nature of its auspicious qualities. That Brahman has attributes is also known from texts like, “He who knows that supreme Akasa . . . he realize all his desires *along with* the Omniscient Brahman” (*Taitt.* 2-1), where ‘desires’ means objects of desire, that is, the attributes of Brahman which are desired by the aspirant. The words

'along with' are used to show that the attributes are of primary importance and consequently one has to meditate on these attributes of Brahman according to the principle, "as is the meditation so is the result."

The *Kena* text, "It is unknown to those who know and known to those who do not know" (*Kena*. 2.3), does not mean that Brahman is not an object of knowledge, for that would contradict texts like, "The knower of Brahman attains the Highest" (*Taitt.* 2.1); "He who knows Brahman becomes Brahman" (*Mun.* 3 2-9), where Brahman is realized to be an object of knowledge. The *Taittiriya* text, "Whence speech returns" etc., describes Brahman as possessing an infinite number of auspicious qualities which cannot be grasped by the mind or described by speech both of which are limited, and in accordance with this the *Kena* text means that Brahman is not known by those who view It as this much.

The text, "You cannot know the knower of knowledge, you cannot think the thinker of thought" (*Brih.* 3. 4.2), does not deny a knowing and thinking subject as the Advaitins say, but only refutes the view of the Vaisheshikas who say that the Self though a knower is not of the nature of knowledge but that knowledge is an adventitious attribute of the Self. The text asks not to think like that but to consider this knowing and thinking to be also the essential nature of the Self, the knower. Otherwise the Advaitin's interpretation would conflict with the text, "By what should the knower be known" which clearly says that It is a knower.

The *Taittiriya* text which says, "Brahman is Bliss," does not mean that Brahman is purely Bliss even as It is not Pure Knowledge but a knowing subject as well. "Consciousness, Bliss is

Brahman" (*Brih.* 3.9.28) shows that Knowledge is of the nature of Bliss. Bliss is a congenial state of consciousness. That the two are one is accepted by the Advaitins too, who say that Brahman is homogeneous. That Bliss is different from Brahman, (*i.e.*, Brahman has it as an attribute), that Brahman is a blissful being is known from texts like, "A hundredfold bliss of Prajâpati is a unit measure of the bliss of Brahman" (*Taitt.* 2.8); "The knower of that bliss of Brahman" (*Taitt.* 2.9).

Again texts like, "When there is duality, as it were" (*Brih.* 2.4.14); "There is no difference whatsoever in it. He goes from death to death who sees difference, as it were, in It" (*Brih.* 4.4.19); "When to the knower of Brahman everything has become the Self" (*Brih.* 2.4.14), do not altogether negate the manifoldness established by texts like, "It willed, 'May I be many' " (*Chh.* 6.2.2), but negate plurality in so far as it contradicts the unity of the world which is an effect of Brahman and has It as its Self and Inner Ruler. We cannot possibly imagine that plurality established by scriptures in earlier texts is denied by it in later texts.

Finally, the text, "When one makes the least differentiation in It, then for him there is fear" (*Taitt.* 2.7), does not mean that for one who sees differentiation in Brahman there results fear, for that would contradict the *Chhândogya* text, "All this is Brahman; one ought to meditate calmly on all this as beginning, ending and existing in It" (*Chh.* 3.14.1), where meditation on the manifoldness is prescribed as a means to attaining calmness of mind, *i.e.*, by knowing Brahman as the Self of this manifoldness one attains peace. Thus prescribing to see the manifoldness as Brahman it cannot possibly deny this manifoldness later on. What the *Taittiriya* text, therefore, means is that

when one rests in Brahman there is fearlessness and that fear comes to him when there is a break in this resting in Brahman.

Smritis also say that Brahman has attributes. *Vide Gitá*, 7.6-7; 9.4-5; 10.3, 42, and 15.17-18. *Vishnu Purána*, 1.2.10-14; 1.22.53; 1.23.53-55; 6.5.82-87; 6.7.69-71.

From all this it follows that Brahman is not non-dual Pure Consciousness but possesses infinite auspicious attributes and is bereft of all evil attributes that are common in Prakriti and its effects.

It is the creator, preserver and destroyer of this universe which It pervades and of which It is the Inner Ruler. The entire world, sentient and insentient, forms its body. The individual souls have a real existence and are essentially of the nature of knowledge which in the embodied state is obscured or contracted due to their past Karma as a result of which they regard themselves as material. In short, Brahman is a differentiated entity and this world of sentient and insentient beings is also a reality and forms the body of Brahman and of which It is the Self.

NOTES AND COMMENTS

IN THIS NUMBER

In the *Editorial* we have given a reply to the charges that have been recently brought against religion by a certain section of Indian thinkers, and pointed out the relative importance and functions of religion and philosophy as understood by the orthodox school of Indian thinkers as well as by the savants of the West. Prof. Jadunath Sinha, M.A., P.R.S., Ph.D., of the Meerut College, in his thoughtful article on *The Philosophy of Sandilya*, has shown in the light of the Sandilya-Sutras that Sandilya not only recognises the necessity of cultivation of the intellect as a preliminary discipline in religious life, but also gives a philosophical background to his cult of devotion. In the *Relativity and the Hindu Conception of God* which is an unpublished writing of the late Swami Jnaneswarananda of the Vedanta Society of Chicago, U. S. A., it has been demonstrated that the world with its variety of phenomena has no separate existence apart from the absolute reality of Brahman and that even

the supreme entity which people call by the name of God belongs to the plane of relativity. In his thoughtful article on *The American Constitution* Dr. Sudhindra Bose, M.A., Ph.D., Professor of Political Science in the State University of Iowa, U. S. A., has dwelt upon the fundamental rights and privileges of the American people as embodied in the Constitution of their country. Prof. E. P. Horowitz of the Hunter College, New York City, U. S. A., has thrown light on the stirrings of a new life that are discernible to-day in the East and the West in his interesting article on the *Glimmer of a New Dawn*. Anil Kumar Sarkar, M. A., (Gold Medalist), Research Scholar in the University of Patna, concludes his article on *Whitehead's Philosophy of Organism*. In *Saint Rabia* by Bankey Behari, Editor of the "Temple of Mysticism" of Allahabad, will be found a delightful account of the life and teachings of the Muslim saint Rabia, the Mira of the desert of Arabia. Dr. P. M. Modi, M. A., Ph.D. (Kiel), Professor of the Samaldas College,

Bhavnagar, in his article on *The Destiny of a Brahmajnanin*, makes a comparative estimate of the views of Badari, Jaimini and Badarayana as to the goal of a Brahmajnanin in the light of the Brahmasutras, interprets the Sutras from both historical and philosophical points of view and gives his own conclusions. Christina Albers, the well-known author of "Dramatic Poems," "Ancient Tales of Hindustan", etc., gives her own reminiscences of Swami Vivekananda in her article on *Swami Vivekananda: An Appreciation*. In *Practical Vedanta* Prof. Hira Lall Chopra, M.A., (Gold Medalist), of the Sanatana Dharma College, Lahore, points out some of the prevailing misconceptions about Vedanta philosophy and shows how it can be made practical in human life and society.

INDIA AND TECHNOLOGY

The progress and greatness of a nation to-day are largely measured in terms of its technological advances. If India wants to attain equality of status with the rest of the civilized world on the plane of material efficiency she cannot do without developing a great amount of technological skill among her people. It often strikes a student of Indian civilization as an enigma that the Indian intellect which has exhibited wonderful keenness in the various fields of abstract thinking should be so deficient in technological skill. But the phenomenon is not wholly inexplicable. The discoveries and inventions of science are not quite due to the workings of a capricious chance. They come to those who use both the head and the hand. For a long time the Indian intellectuals have fought shy of manual labour; and it is this dislike of work with the hand which is the principal reason for this deficiency. This abhorrence for manual

labour on the part of the Indian intellectuals was due to certain very obvious reasons which hardly need to be mentioned.

It was, therefore, a very appropriate advice which Prof. J. B. Haldane gave to his audience in his inaugural address at the conference of Indian students organized by the Federation of Indian Student Societies in Great Britain and Ireland, which held its first session in last April in London. Referring to the task that lay ahead of the Indian students of the present generation, the Professor remarked, ". . . You will also have to help to build up a new culture, to apply European technology to Indian problems without carrying over unnecessarily the European ideas which go with the technology and are often very much less important than the technology which they embody. You will have to try to make that synthesis and it will require all your intelligence and all your devotion." Continuing he emphasized the supreme need of technology while paying eloquent tributes to the sharpness of the Indian mind in the field of abstract thinking. "I must lay," he said, "particular emphasis on the extreme importance of technology. Many branches of learning are largely concerned with words and symbols. I would again suggest that the marvellous ability with which the average Indian intellectual handles symbols may be to some extent a danger . . . The greatest achievements of the Indian thought in the scientific and mathematical fields have been in the manipulation of symbols."

The great part that technology has come to play in the life of a modern people can be easily grasped if we compare the present position of Japan with that of either India or China. For ages Japan had been nourishing her mind and soul on the food imported from

India and China; but to-day, thanks mainly to her technological advances during a period of barely sixty years, she holds her erstwhile teachers in an economic vice and is counted among the first-rate powers of the day. India can hardly ignore this lesson of history.

IS MAN WHOLLY UNKNOWN?

The noted scientist, Mr. Alexis Carrel, laments in his famous book, *Man, the Unknown*, that one of the most unfortunate developments of our time has been the enormous advance gained by the sciences of inanimate matter over those of living things. Science has changed the face of the familiar world in which our ancestors lived only a century ago almost beyond recognition. But the unhappy consequences of such an one-sided gain have almost proved one of the major catastrophes ever suffered by humanity. "The environment which science and technology have succeeded in developing for man," says Mr. Carrel, "does not suit him; because it has been constructed at random, without regard for his true self. . . . Science follows no plan. It develops at random. . . . It is not at all actuated by a desire to improve the state of human beings. . . . Modern civilization finds itself in a difficult position because it does not suit us. It has been erected without any knowledge of our real nature. We are the victims of the backwardness of the sciences of life over those of matter. The only possible remedy for this evil is a much more profound knowledge of ourselves. The Science of Man has

become the most necessary of all the sciences."

If science follows no plan, neither does it create any value. It is mute with regard to any ideal to be sought or goal to be pursued. In consequence the power it places in the hand of average man who is aware of himself more as a bundle of selfish impulses and animal passions and whose conception of his own weal hardly includes anything beyond creature comforts, is used practically without any reference to the real interest of humanity.

But is man wholly unknown? In spite of the backwardness of the objective sciences of life, there is a science of man, which claims to have delivered the true knowledge of his real nature to persons in the past as well as in the present. These persons have probed the depths of human life, have discovered its purpose and have discerned the slow but steadily progressing drift of civilization to that goal. These are the great men of religion. They have claimed their study to be scientific, though they have pointed out that it requires a discipline of a far different sort. Here the instruments of knowledge are not the senses but the mind, in fact, the whole personality of man. Armed with such a disciplined personality man can gain an insight into his real nature. The aim, as in objective sciences, is truth; but the method is subjective, for by the very nature of the task objective methods can just touch the fringe of the problem. At best the objective sciences of life can land us in speechless wonder and awe.

REVIEWS AND NOTICES

THE HUMAN FAMILY AND INDIA. BY DR. GUALTHERUS H. MEES. *D. B. Taraporevala Sons & Co. Treasure House of Books, Hornby Road, Fort, Bombay. Pp. 171. Price paper Re. 1-2, cloth Re. 1-14.*

The disturbing social and political conditions of the times are a cause for great anxiety to the modern man. This short book before us is a plea for the re-construction of the present social order in the light of the sociological theories very early advanced, and for a long time adhered to, by the ancient Indians. A deep student of sociology Dr. Mees has already made a profound study of the ancient Indian social theories, the results of which have been embodied in his earlier and bigger work, *Dharma and Society*. After writing it the author came to India and saw at first hand the social conditions obtaining here. During his stay in this country he delivered a series of extension lectures in five Indian universities on the social theories in Ancient India and their application to modern problems. It is upon some of these that the present work is based.

Rarely have foreign writers displayed greater sympathy and understanding in discussing Oriental subjects. Dr. Mees evidently carries a wise head on young shoulders, and in his study he brings to bear an essentially commonsense outlook on facts and theories. In the five chapters into which the book is divided the reader is offered a short comparative study of the various aspects of the Hindu society—theoretical, ideal, and actual—side by side with the Western social system. The author's object is to show by this method that "the social science of ancient India complemented by modern thought provides the key to the solution of the various social and political world problems (which are, therefore, also Indian problems)."

The structure of the Hindu Society, at least in its ideal aspect, rests upon the principle of *châturvarnya*, which the author regards as a universal class theory. The contention is corroborated by ample reference to early scriptures and socio-political treatises. The division of mankind into four natural classes, all related to one another by the ideal of service, is essentially reasonable, for "social equality is as impossible as a body in which

every organ is a stomach or every organ a brain." Human equality can only be a matter of the heart, and democracy is fundamentally a mystic ideal. Though inequality is the normal law of society, natural classes should never be confused with hereditary castes which are a travesty of the former principle. To-day, however, there seems to be a widespread confusion between social inequality and spiritual equality not only in India but all the world over more or less. A healthy society recognizes not only an inequality of classes but also an equality of opportunities for all.

The author's remarks on *varna-sankara* merit special attention. By a careful study of the teaching on the subject he has come to the conclusion that the confusion of classes so dreaded by the writers of the *Dharma-shâstras* indicate the non-correspondence between the social composition and the social constitution. "Not a confusion of castes was originally meant to be prevented." All the great dangers which threaten to overwhelm the modern civilization arise, according to him, out of such a confusion which has placed the destinies of humanity in the hands of either the mass-man or men with intelligence but without moral and religious discipline and character. And the catastrophes can be averted if only men go back to tasks for which nature filled them.

The same principle which lies at the back of the four-fold division of society can be fruitfully applied in curing the malignant features of nationalism and in bringing into existence a true internationalism. Towards the end of the book the author grows a little prophetic about the future of civilization. Humanity, he believes, is slowly drifting towards a kind of world-state where men and groups will work within the spheres assigned to them by their nature without trying to usurp the functions of others. But we have to prepare the way for such an evolution. An ideological revolution must precede the actual realization of such a goal. The author, however, has a hearty distaste for political revolutions, though he can understand and even condone them. But he is not prepared to incubate any, for he believes it is an unnatural way of bringing about a desired goal.

We commend this weighty and thoughtful book to all who aim at a better social re-adjustment and a healthier nationalism.

INDIA AND HER PROBLEMS. BY T. R. SHANKAR. *P. R. Rama Iyar and Co., Ltd., Book-sellers, Publishers and Librarians, Opposite Law College, Madras. Pp. 58. Price 8 annas.*

It does not appear that there is great love lost between the Congress and the writer of this booklet, who reviews some of the problems which face that great organization today, including socialism, Federation, the Wardha scheme of Education, and the Caste System. This is understandable, but what is deplorable is the author's importation of personal feelings into the discussion of the subjects, which should have been done without passion and prejudice. Specially regrettable is the writer's occasional recourse to *argumentum ad hominem*. For example, every cultured reader will strongly resent the writer's wanton diatribe against one of the noblest sons of India. In discussing the subject of socialism he remarks: "We may enlist our sympathy and believe in the essential sanity, the practical possibilities and practicality of Socialism if the Socialist President of the Congress who is so much interested in the cause of the workers and peasants will consent to distribute some of his millions to relieve the grinding poverty and for the economic betterment and social amelioration of the half-starved millions of India."

This is silly and absurd to the extreme and would at once prepossess against him all sober readers. There is further no reason to be jubilant over his treatment which is none too exhaustive and is slipshod and incoherent at places.

1. IN AN EASTERN ROSE GARDEN. *Pp. 311.*

2. GAYAN. *Pp. 107.* BOTH BY HAZRAT INAYAT KHAN. *N. V. Uitgevers—Maatschappij Æ E. Kluwer—Deventer, Holland.*

In An Eastern Rose Garden embodies the reports of twenty-nine discourses on various spiritual subjects, given at different times by Hazrat Inayat Khan who has spent long years in Europe in introducing the message of Sufi mysticism to a large body of public there. The discourses breathe a spirit of peace, beauty and harmony.

Gayan seeks to express rhythmically the same author's philosophical thoughts in

an allegorical manner with the aid of Indian musical terminology.

HINDI

SRI AUROBINDO AUR UNKA YOGA. COMPILED BY LAKSHMAN NARAYAN GARDE. *Sri Aurobindo Granthamâlâ, 4, Hare Street, Calcutta. Pp. 85. Price As. 8.*

Sri Aurobindo is without dispute one of the profoundest thinkers of modern India. Unfortunately, it is not always easy to get hold of his writings and even when they are got hold of, they are not always intelligible to the average reader. For this reason this short and simple introduction to the general principles of Aurobindo's philosophy will be eminently suitable to those Hindi-readers who yearn to pick up a fair acquaintance with it.

YOGA PRADIP. BY AUROBINDO. *Sri Aurobindo Granthamâlâ, 4, Hare Street, Calcutta. Pp. 95. Price As. 8.*

It is a Hindi translation of Aurobindo's *Lights on Yoga*, which has been compiled from his letters to the disciples in answer to their numerous queries regarding the practice of Yoga. It contains bright comments upon many spiritual problems and further affords a glimpse into his philosophy.

PARIVRÂJAKA. BY SWAMI VIVEKANANDA. *Published by Swami Bhaskareswarananda, Sri Ramakrishna Ashrama, Dhantoli, Nagpur, C. P. Pp. 121.*

Originally written in Bengali, *Parivrâjaka* forms in point of style and content one of the best books of travel ever written in that language. Its easy and graceful colloquial diction, its scores of witty and humorous passages and penetrating observations on men and countries make it an ideal book of its kind in any literature. The present translation which has tried to retain much of the original flavour of the clever turns of expression will be an acquisition to the Hindi literature. We feel confident of its welcome by the Hindi-speaking public.

FRENCH

QUELQUES GRANDS PENSEURS DE L'INDE MODERNE. BY JEAN HERBERT. *Depositaires Généraux. France: Adrien-Maisonneuve, 11 rue Saint-Sulpice, Paris. Suisse: Delachaux & Niestlé, Neuchâtel. Inde: Bharata Shakti Nilayam, Pondichéry. Pp. 45.*

This is a series of three radio talks given by Mons. Jean Herbert in June, 1937, on five of the most important personalities of

modern India, namely, Ramakrishna, Vivekananda, Ramana Maharshi, Aurobindo, and Gandhi. These lucid *causeries* will form a valuable primer on Hindu religious and philosophic thought to a vast number of Continental readers who feel attracted by it but who are often frightened away by ponderous scholarly volumes on the subject.

SRI RAMAKRISHNA: LES PAROLES DU MAITRE. ENTRETIENS RECUEILLIS ET PUBLIES PAR SWAMI BRAHMANANDA. TRADUCTION FRANCAISE DE MARIE HONEGGER-DURAND, DILIP KUMAR ROY ET JEAN HERBERT. *Depositaires Generaux: France: Adrien Maisonneuve, 11, rue Saint-Sulpice, Paris.*

Suisse: Delachaux et Niestle, Neuchâtel. Inde: Bharata Shakti Nilayam, Pondichéry.

The efforts of Mons. Romain Rolland and Mons. Jean Herbert have made the message of Sri Ramakrishna familiar to a considerable body of French-speaking public. Thanks, however, to this translation the Master will now directly address them for the first time. The value of these rare counsels on the various problems of spiritual life, recorded by Swami Brahmananda whom Sri Ramakrishna regarded as his spiritual son, cannot be exaggerated. We feel no doubt that they will be eagerly welcomed by all sincere aspirants for spiritual life.

NEWS AND REPORTS

SWAMI VIJAYANANDA IN SOUTH AMERICA (AYACUCHO 2137, BUENOS AIRES, R. ARGENTINA)

Our readers are already aware that Swami Vijayananda of the Ramakrishna Mission has been working in South America for the last seven years and has succeeded in stimulating a deep interest amongst a large section of the Spanish-speaking people of that country in the universal gospel of Sri Ramakrishna and Swami Vivekananda as well as in the lofty ideals of Hindu philosophy. It is really gratifying to learn that his clear exposition of the abstruse philosophical subjects and the catholic teachings of the Master as also his interesting radio-talks in Spanish have been drawing an increasing number of earnest students to his classes held both in the morning and evening. The morning class, writes the Swami, is regularly attended by about 45 students (both men and women), and the evening one by about 65 students, some of whom come daily from a distance of even 5 or 6 miles. The Swami has of late removed to the above address and made it the centre of his present activities in S. America. We doubt not that his strenuous and whole-souled services in the cause of Vedanta and Indian culture will closely unite the two lands in cultural fellowship at no distant future.

HINDU-MUSLIM UNITY

One of the major problems that face India to-day is the question of establishing harmonious relationship between the two great communities of the country, the Hindus and

the Muslims. The *Prabuddha Bharata*, our readers may remember, in its last May and June issues devoted two editorials to finding out a solid basis of unity of these two communities from religious and cultural points of view. We are glad to inform our readers that so far we have received from different quarters very encouraging responses to these articles as a valuable contribution towards an enduring settlement of the question. We reproduce below for our readers some of the appreciative remarks which have reached us up till now.

The General Secretary of the Bengal Hindu Sabha has forwarded to us a copy of the following resolution passed at a meeting of its Executive Council and special members held under the presidentship of Mr. B. C. Chatterjee, Barrister-at-Law, on the 8th of July last:—

“That this Sabha draws the attention of all Bengal Hindus and Mahomedans to the two articles published in the May and June numbers of “*Prabuddha Bharata*” on the topic of Hindu-Mahomedan unity and records its opinion that they constitute a valuable contribution to the cause of such unity.”

The Secretary to His Highness the Nawab Bahadur of Murshidabad, the President of the Hindu-Muslim Unity Association, Bengal, writes under date of the 7th of June last:—
“I acknowledge with thanks the receipt of your letter of the 3rd instant under which you have forwarded the May and June issues of the *Prabuddha Bharata* to His Highness the Nawab Bahadur of Murshidabad, Amir-ul-Omrah, K.C.S.I., K.C.V.O., in the editorials of which the subject of the unity

of the Hindus and the Muslims has been carefully dealt with, and which have been perused with interest. . . .”

Dr. R. Ahmed, D.D.S., of the Hindu-Muslim Unity Association, writes from Calcutta under date, June 7, 1938:—

“ . . . I have read the editorials with interest and congratulate you on the excellent manner you have shown the unity of Hinduism and Islam. I wish your writings will be read by those communalists who rave about the differences between religions. Our association is also trying to bridge the gulf in the political and cultural fields”

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmed, M.A., Ph.D., late Vice-Chancellor of the Aligarh Muslim University, writes from Aligarh:—

“I thank you for the two copies of the *Prabuddha Bharata* which I read with great interest and specially the articles on the comparison of the teachings of Hindu and Islamic religions”

Sir Shah M. Sulaiman, Judge of the Federal Court, Delhi, and present Vice-Chancellor of the Aligarh Muslim University, writes under date of the 7th of June, 1938:—

“Many thanks for your letter of the 3rd inst. as well as copies of the two issues of your valuable paper. I have read your editorials with great interest.”

The Church Standard, a Christian Weekly of Australia (Sydney), in the course of its review of the May number of the *Prabuddha Bharata* writes in its issue of the 10th June last as follows:—

“The editorial article in the May number of the *Prabuddha Bharata* proclaims the glories of religious tolerance, with special reference to the question of Hindu-Muslim relationships. It is good to find the monks of the Ramakrishna Order so thoroughly imbued with the spirit of their Master who insisted, in season and out of season, that each of the religions of the world is a path leading to the Truth, and that one should always respect other religions. The editor, a devout Hindu, takes pleasure in calling attention to the spirit of universal toleration and harmony which animates the *Quoran*. ‘It is really an insult to human wisdom to suppose that the Prophet of Islam did actually advocate compulsion in religion’. He pleads earnestly and eloquently for mutual love and respect between Hindus and Muslims, and if his plea is heeded a decisive step forward in the history of the Indian peoples will be taken.”

We have also received encouraging letters

from many other leading personages including the following: Amin-ul-Mulk Sir Mirza M. Ismail, Kt., O.B.E., Dewan Bahadur of Mysore; Principal N. B. Butani of the D. J. Sindh College, Karachi; Maulana Abul Kalam Azad of the All-India Congress Parliamentary Committee; and Prof. Humayun Kabir of the Calcutta University.

Needless to say that the question of Hindu-Muslim unity demands immediate solution to ensure the healthy development of the national life of India; and as such every person, irrespective of caste or creed, who has the true interest of the country at heart should address himself seriously to the task.

RAMAKRISHNA MISSION SEVASHRAMA, KANKHAL (HARDWAR)

REPORT OF THE KUMBHA MELA RELIEF WORK IN 1938

A short account of the Kumbha Mela relief work carried out by the Ramakrishna Mission Sevashrama, Kankhal, for the mitigation of the distress of the pilgrims who assembled at Hardwar and Kankhal during the last Kumbha Mela is given here for general information.

1. The Sevashrama at Kankhal with its Indoor and Outdoor departments undertook the following programme of temporary relief work and opened branches at different places with a view to give medical aid to the suffering pilgrims:—

(a) *The Branch at Rohri*

The island of Rohri attracted a large number of pilgrims, which necessitated the opening of medical and other relief works there. We opened a Branch on the bank of the Ganges and rendered medical aid to 3,642 suffering pilgrims.

(b) *The Branch at Bhimgoda*

The Udashi Upadeshak Sabha generously offered us a place within their compound to open a charitable dispensary at Bhimgoda and thereby enabled us to give medical aid to the suffering pilgrims and to popularize the spirit of seva among the public. We started a well-equipped Dispensary in February last, i.e., two months before the *Mela*. It treated as many as 6,234 patients till it was closed on the 18th of April, 1938. The Dispensary became a very popular and successful one in the locality which badly needs a permanent institution like this.

(c) *The Branch at Bhupatwala*

Another branch of the Ramakrishna Mission was opened at Bhupatwala near Saptadhara,

the northernmost part of Hardwar, about three miles away from Kankhal. The place was the busiest part of the *Mela* where mostly the Udasi Sadhus had their camps. Our Dispensary was located in a tent, and rendered medical relief to 3,461 patients of the locality.

2. TOURING RELIEF DEPARTMENT

The Sevashrama at Kankhal maintained a touring relief department, the doctors and workers of which went round from camp to camp to find out such patients as were unable to move and come to our centres. The department treated 1,143 patients and rendered various kinds of necessary help to the pilgrims.

8. THE SEVASHRAMA AT KANKHAL

The main centre, the Sevashrama at Kankhal, treated as many as 9,730 patients of which 4,590 were new cases at the Outdoor Dispensary and 222 patients were admitted and treated in its Indoor Department.

The total attendance of the patients treated at the main and branch centre rose, roundly speaking, to 27,000. Besides these, the honorary service of a Doctor was lent to the Municipality for inoculating the pilgrims.

4. RELIEF OTHER THAN MEDICAL

(a) Accommodation of the Pilgrims

The pilgrims suffered most for want of accommodations with proper sanitary and boarding arrangement. The Sevashrama gave shelter to about 600 pilgrims and provided a common mess on which every care was bestowed. Fortunately there was no case of serious illness among the pilgrims living under our care. Those to whom we could not give shelter for want of accommodation were helped by us in securing accommodation in tents etc., near our Ashrama.

(b) Religious Discourses and the Reading Room

During the Kumbha Mela the 103rd birthday anniversary of Sri Ramakrishna was celebrated with great eclat, and a public meeting was held under a big *samiana*. It was attended by almost all the Mandaleswars (Heads of the Dasnami sects) and Mahants (Heads of the Ashramas) and Sadhus and householders of different provinces numbering about 2,000. The Mandaleswars paid their glowing tributes to the Saint of Dakshineswar, which were greatly appreciated by the audience. Occasional lectures and

religious discourses were arranged for the benefit of the pilgrims, and a Reading Room with a number of dailies and periodicals in different languages was opened for the reading public. There were 9 dailies and 32 periodicals of which 18 were in English, 11 in Hindi, 10 in Bengali, 1 in Urdu and 1 in Tamil. Many of them were supplied free by their kind Editors and Publishers for the period. We are glad to state here that the "Hindusthan Standard", the "Madras Mail", "Visala Bharata" and the "Sunday Times" are being continued free for the use of our permanent Library.

(c) Relief to the Helpless

A number of women who lost their relatives in the trains or *Mela* came to us for help. We admitted them into our Sevashrama for the time being and restored them to their relatives who were written to or found out by our volunteers.

We offer our hearty thanks to the kind public whose generosity and benevolence has enabled us to carry on the work of relief to a successful termination. They adequately responded to our appeal for help and co-operation which alone is responsible for what has been done by us.

Our special thanks are due to the honorary physicians and surgeons who gave their valuable services to the institution during the *Mela*. Mention may be made of the following persons:—Dr. P. K. Dey, M.B., Ch.B. (Edin.) of Rangoon, Dr. K. S. Dharadhar, M.B., B.S. of Bombay, Dr. S. K. Ghose, L.M.S. of Chandernagore, Dr. K. N. Roy, L.M.F., Calcutta, Dr. L. K. Haldar, B.Sc., M.M.F. of Calcutta, Dr. B. P. Biswas, L.M.F. of Jessore, Dr. J. N. Sen (Homeo.) of Calcutta, Dr. P. C. Basu (Homeo.) of Midnapore, Dr. J. N. Mazumdar, L.M.F. of Kankhal, and Dr. Gopal Krishna Bardhan, L.M.F. of Dacca.

We express our deep gratitude to the volunteers who came from a long distance at their own expenses and greatly helped us in the work of service to the suffering pilgrims. We also accord our sincere thanks to the Editors and Publishers of Dailies and Periodicals for the kind and free supply of their papers to our Reading Room and also to those who helped us in some way or other.

SWAMI ASIMANANDA,
Hony. Secretary,
Ramakrishna Mission Sevashram,
Kankhal (Hardwar).

THE HUNDRED AND THIRD BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY OF SRI RAMAKRISHNA PARAMAHANSA DEVA

AT JAMSHEDPUR

Under the auspices of the local Vivekananda Society, the Birthday Anniversary of Sri Ramakrishna Deva was celebrated during 8 days from the 20th of March. On the first day a huge procession, which was designed to signify the Harmony of Religions preached by Sri Ramakrishna, started early in the morning from the Society premises with a large number of decorated motor cars carrying the life-size portraits of Swami Vivekananda, Sri Ramachandra, Sri Krishna, Zoroaster, Lord Buddha, Jesus Christ, Sri Sankaracharya, Guru Nanak, Sri Chaitanya and Sri Ramakrishna—all profusely decorated with garlands and flowers. A number of banners with suitable mottos headed by the symbolic representation of different faiths, viz., the Cross, the Crescent and the Trident, added to the picturesqueness of the procession which marched through the principal streets of the city accompanied by band, music and Kirtan parties returning and terminating at the Society premises at about midday when Prasad was served to all people irrespective of caste, creed or community.

As many as seven public meetings, including special meetings for the ladies and the students, were held in different parts of the city, and some distinguished speakers of the Ramakrishna Mission, viz., Srimat Swami Madhavananda, Ghanananda, Tapananda, Srivashananda, Jnanatmananda and Gambhirananda, who came from the Belur Math and other branches of the Mission, delivered lectures in English and Bengali on the various aspects of the life and teachings of Paramahansa Deva with particular reference to the needs and problems of the modern age. The meetings were all presided over by the leading members of the Jamshedpur public including Mr. J. J. Ghandy, General Manager of the Tata Iron and Steel Factory, and a large number of prizes were distributed to the deserving students of the local schools managed by the Society and also to the winners in the essay competitions held among the students and the public on the life and teachings of Sri Ramakrishna in different languages, viz., English, Bengali and Hindi.

The programme included Padâvali Kirtan, devotional music and Sri Krishna Jatra performances which drew huge crowds throughout the week.

On the last day, i.e., the 27th March, there was feeding of the poor when about a thousand people of all denominations were entertained with khitchuri, curry, chatney and sweets.

The hearty response from the Jamshedpur public throughout the period of the celebration clearly showed the profound influence of Sri Ramakrishna's message in the cosmopolitan city of Jamshedpur.

SRI RAMAKRISHNA ANNIVERSARY AT BARISAL

One hundred and third birth anniversary of Sri Ramakrishna was celebrated with usual solemnity here. On Friday, the 4th March, there were in the forenoon Puja and Homa in the local Ramakrishna Ashrama and in the evening Swami Jagadiswarananda gave a lantern lecture on the Life and Sadhana of Sri Ramakrishna. On Sunday the 13th March, about two thousand and five hundred people were fed and Swami Sharvananda of Delhi delivered an illuminating speech on "Sri Ramakrishna and our Modern Problems" before a large and distinguished gathering. Miss Sujata Roy, an eight-year old girl, recited a poem on Sri Ramakrishna very beautifully, which was highly appreciated by the audience.

Swami Sharvananda delivered several more lectures in the town: one to the students of the B. M. College on the "Need of Morality in Modern Life"; two at the Dharma Rakshini Sabha on "Sadhana Tattwa"; two at Jagadish Ashram on "The Gita and the Bhagavat", and another at the Town Hall on "Problems of the Hindu Society and their Remedy." Swamiji also addressed a big gathering of ladies in the Ramakrishna Ashram premises. Swami Jagadiswarananda gave three more magic lantern lectures in the different localities of the town, which were very much liked by the general public.

BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY OF SRI RAMAKRISHNA AT MADANAPALLE

The local Hari Hara Bhakta Jana Samajam celebrated the Birth Day of Bhagavan Sri Ramakrishna Paramahansa in its premises on the 28th and the 29th instant. On the 28th about 1,000 poor were fed. On those occasions Swami Ranganathananda of the Sri Ramakrishna Ashrama, Bangalore, delivered lectures. On the 28th he lectured

on the "Message of Sri Ramakrishna", when Dr. D. Gurumurthi, M.A., Ph.D., Principal of the local Theosophical College, presided. On the 29th he spoke on the "Philosophy of the Gita", when Mr. P. Venkatasubbiah, Asst. Engineer of P. W. D., presided. Both the lectures were highly impressive and were

SWAMI SATPRAKASHANANDA'S ACTIVITIES IN AMERICA

On March 8, 1937, Swami Satprakashananda landed in New York City where he was met by the Swamis of Providence and New York Vedanta Centres, and the same day he took a train with Swami Akhilananda for Providence, Rhode Island, where he was to begin his work in the United States.

On Sunday, March 14, began the celebration of Sri Ramakrishna's birthday, and at the evening service the Swami delivered his first message. He was introduced by Swami Akhilananda and spoke of "Sri Ramakrishna the Master and the Meaning of His Life." His talk was enjoyed and appreciated by all. Swami Nikhilananda of the New York Ramakrishna-Vivekananda Centre was also present and gave an address. The next evening he was present at the functions of the Boston Centre and spoke of "The Inspiration of Sri Ramakrishna." The night following, a dinner was held at the Providence Centre which was attended by many students and friends, and the Swami delivered a talk on "The Significance of the Master's Message." Two days later he returned to Boston to be present at a dinner and again spoke on Sri Ramakrishna to the people there, thus bringing to a close the festivities of the week.

On the 27th of March, he visited the Ramakrishna-Vivekananda Centre in New York as the guest of Swami Nikhilananda, and delivered an after-dinner speech at the birthday celebration of Sri Ramakrishna. The following morning he spoke on "The Cultural Heritage of India", bringing to his American audience the background against which Sri Ramakrishna and the present Vedanta movement stand.

On April 25th, he reopened the Vedanta work in the Nation's capital, Washington. Swami Akhilananda, the organizer of the work, introduced him to the audience. He gave a series of lectures at the Grafton Hotel on "The Practice of Yoga", "Is Death the End", "The Secret of Power", and "The Search after Happiness", which were well attended. The people became interested in

the ideas as presented by the Swami, and regular work was started in the hotel rooms. Tuesday meetings were held for the reading and explanation of the *Gita*, and Thursdays for the exposition of Raja-Yoga. After the talks questions were asked and the Swami answered them at length. The subjects he chose for his Sunday lectures were as follows: "The Mystic Word", "Mental Relaxation", "Religion and the Miracle", and "The True Nature of Man." Among the audience some were showing enthusiasm for the work and came in close touch with the Swami. Classes continued to the beginning of June, at which time, due to the approaching summer heat, they were closed for the season.

From Washington he went to Chicago for a visit with the late lamented Swami Gnaneswarananda. There he delivered two Sunday lectures in the Masonic Temple on "Spiritual Healing", and "The Technique of Meditation", before large gatherings. He also conducted a class on meditation and the *Gita* for the students. There were dinners and social gatherings to entertain the Swami while he was there. On his return trip to Providence he visited Niagra Falls. Then he stopped in New York City and spoke before the audiences in both the centres of the Ramakrishna Order. At the end of June he returned to Providence, all activities being closed for the summer.

Swami Akhilananda sailed for India on August 27, leaving Swami Satprakashananda in charge of his work in Providence. He opened the work with a Sunday night talk on "Spiritual Awakening". Besides Sunday lectures, there were two more services every week discourses on the *Gita*, and the exposition of the Upanishads—the latter was preceded by lessons on meditation. He began with a series of four illuminating Sunday night talks concerning the body, mind, and soul, showing their interrelation, proving the underlying existence of the soul, and indicating how we can realize it and hear "The Music of Soul," which formed the subject of the concluding lecture. Another interesting series of lectures were given by him on "The Social Life and Culture of India". The week of the Divine Mother's worship in October, he gave a talk on "The Meaning of Mother Worship" at the Vedanta Centre in Boston. In Providence he chose as his subject on the same occasion, "Is God Our Mother?" In the middle of November the Swami went to Chicago for a few days on

receiving the sad news of Swami Gnaneswarananda's death, to attend the funeral services with Swami Nikhilananda of New York.

In December and January the Swami gave a course of lectures on "The Practice of Meditation." These were followed by lectures on such other subjects as Intuition, Reason, Faith, and Instinct. Also during December there were several services, commencing with the talk on "The Divine Incarnation" at the beginning of Christmas week. The following Sunday night he spoke on "The Blessed Life of Jesus" which terminated the Christmas season. On December 31 he spoke in honour of Holy Mother's birthday, reviewing her saintly life from childhood to later years, as the fulfilment of Indian womanhood.

New Year's day he was invited by Rabbi Goldman to speak at the opening session of a Parliament of Religions held at the Temple Emanuel on the occasion of its anniversary. He spoke on "What is Hinduism?" which was followed by questions from the audience, and answers from the Swami. At the end of the lecture a young Jewish lady of Montreal, Canada, expressed a desire to be a Hindu. The Swami told her to be a Hindu in spirit rather than in name.

In February a few of the students gathered for a luncheon of Hindu food in honour of Swami Vivekananda's birthday. The sacramental food prepared by the Swami was relished by all as well as his vivid stories of the foremost disciple of Sri Ramakrishna. The next evening a special Sunday service was held, the Swami delivering an inspiring address on "Swami Vivekananda's Message to the Modern World." Refreshments cooked by the Swami were also served to the audience. He also gave an address on Swami Vivekananda at the Boston Centre during the celebration there. Then followed three more lectures on Swami Vivekananda dealing with his mission in America as the first Hindu teacher and founder of the Vedanta Movement in America. This led to a talk on "The Religion that America Needs". Then followed a talk on "What is Vedanta?" in the course of which the Swami expounded the essential character of Vedantic thought and culture. A special service was also held in February in honour of Swami Brahmananda's birthday when a talk was given on his life and great personality.

On the occasion of Sri Ramakrishna's birthday on the 4th of March, some students had a dinner of Hindu food prepared by the

Swami, who later in the evening spoke on Sri Ramakrishna's birth and early life. The following Sunday he talked on "Sri Ramakrishna's Contact with Jesus". On Swami Akhilananda's return from India on the 11th of March, Swami Satprakashananda brought to a close his first year's work in America, having endeared himself to all who came to know him, and who counted it a privilege to listen to his lectures.

THE RAMAKRISHNA MISSION ASHRAMA BANKIPORE, PATNA

REPORT FOR 1937

The activities of the Ramakrishna Mission Ashrama, Bankipore, fell, during the period under review, under the following heads:

Religious and Missionary: Classes and discourses on the Upanishads, the *Gitā*; and the *Bhāgavatam* were regularly held at the Ashrama and at several other places in the town and the suburbs. The Swamis of the Ashrama also granted private interviews to a number of persons and helped to settle many of their doubts and problems as regards religion. The Ashrama further organized special lectures for the benefit of the public in the town and also arranged lecturing tours in various parts of the province. Specially notable was the Centenary celebrations organized by the Ashrama, which were a great success.

Educational and Philanthropic: The Ashrama conducted a free primary school for the boys of the peasants and the labourers; the school contained at the end of the year 38 boys on its roll. The Ashrama also conducted a day school in a neighbouring village which was attended by girls and boys from the depressed classes as well. At the end of the year it had 35 students on its roll. The Ashrama further helped the poor scholars with books and other requisites from time to time.

The Ashrama runs a Student's Home for the students of the Patna University, its principal object being to supplement the university education by a sort of home-training as was prevalent under the *brahmacharya* system of the ancient Gurukula. During the year under review the Home contained two students—one Bengali and other Behari, who were supplied with free board and lodging.

The present needs of the Ashrama are not many. It wants now a contribution of about Rs. 7,500/- only to help it stand on a permanent basis.

THE RAMAKRISHNA MISSION
VIDYAPITH, DEOGHAR

REPORT FOR 1937

The Ramakrishna Mission Vidyapith which stepped into the 17th year of its existence in 1938 is a residential high school for boys. Run on the Brahmacharya line, the institution aims at training the boys in habits of self-help and self-discipline and corporate activities by providing ample facilities in these directions. The Boys take part in various games and scientific physical exercises with or without instruments. Among the extra-academic activities of the institution may be noted the following, namely, "Boys' Court", manuscript and printed periodicals, literary societies, vocal and instrumental music, type-writing, gardening, and dairying.

Apart from these, daily worship, religious services and classes and, above all, the association with a band of self-less workers, instill into the boys' hearts a love for high ideals and a passion for service.

During the period under review the number of boys rose to 139 as against 132 in 1936, though a good many had to be refused admission for want of accommodation. Of these two were free, twenty-three concession holders and the rest paying. All the seven boys who had been sent up for the Matriculation Examination in 1937 came out successful.

Some of the urgent needs of the Institution at present are: (i) a sum of Rs. 2,250 for a gymnasium, (ii) Rs. 15,000 for a prayer hall, (iii) Rs. 10,000 for a library building. Willing

donors can also endow sums for the maintenance of poor scholars and teachers.

THE RAMAKRISHNA MISSION
ASHRAMA, SARGACHI, MURSHIDABAD

REPORT FOR 1937

The Sargachi Ashrama was founded far back in 1897 by Srimat Swami Akhandanandaji of revered memory, who had been deeply moved by the spectacle of poverty, disease, and ignorance of the people of the locality, in the course of his wanderings. The Ashrama, however, was originally started in a nearby village and came to be shifted to its present site some years after. The Ashrama rose from its very humble beginnings to its present position, thanks to the selfless labour of the Swami, which attracted the attention and sympathy of those who became acquainted with it.

It is primarily an orphanage for homeless boys who find shelter here irrespective of their caste or creed and who receive proper education. The Ashrama runs one free upper primary school and a night school for the poor. It also organizes religious lectures now and then by the Swamis of the Mission in neighbouring places and gives occasional relief to the destitute in cash or in kind.

At present there are seven orphans in the Ashrama receiving education. The boys on the rolls in the two schools were 47 and 20 respectively, at the end of the year under review. Further, about 5 mds. of rice and Rs. 9 were given to helpless persons as temporary relief.

THE RAMAKRISHNA MISSION RELIEF WORK

APPEAL FOR FUNDS

Swami Madhavananda, Secretary, Ramakrishna Mission writes:—

The public is already aware of the terrible distress caused by heavy floods in several districts in and outside Bengal. Thousands of people have been rendered homeless in the affected areas. Great scarcity of food and fodder prevails. For want of food the afflicted poor are facing starvation.

The affected area is very vast. We are beginning work in Gopalgunj sub-division in Faridpur District. We have already deputed three Swamis there to inspect and commence relief. We are starting the work with the slender resources at our disposal. Funds are urgently required. Work will be extended as money comes, and reports will appear in the dailies from time to time.

Contributions will be thankfully received and acknowledged by

- (1) The President, Ramakrishna Mission, Belur Math P.O., Dt. Howrah;
- (2) The Manager, Advaita Ashrama, 4, Wellington Lane, Calcutta.