# PRABUDDHA BHARATA

VOL. LVI *SEPTEMBER 1951* No. 9

"उत्तिष्ठत जाग्रत प्राप्य वरान्निबोधत ।"

"Arise, Awake! And stop not till the Goal is reached."

---

## THE DIVINE MINSTREL

My mind is attuned to the music of thy name,
A single move brings the tune of the Unknown Deep,
And gives me lustre from the Eternal Flame,
A gleaming of Reality do my moments reap.

Song of the Beyond that lies in treasure confined,
Gleams not so often to the intellectual height;
But by thy name, it leads to the state so refined
That out of discordance the music flows in blight.

A music that flows out of the Fount of Harmony
Tinges the moments with the divine hue,
Leads the creation to bathe in that Symphony
Which merges the finite in the Infinite View.

Thou hast taken thy strain from that sublime shine
Which when sung makes the singer as such;
Ah, divine thy existence became in Song Divine,
A wondrous music the world got as much.

—STARSON GOSSE

# SEEKING REFUGE IN THE SUPREME

By Swami Turiyananda

May the Lord ever reside in your heart and keep you alert, and may He make you heir to love and devotion to Him and thus enable you to gain the end of human life, being blessed with the enjoyment of pure bliss!

One attains birth in the human body as a result of great merits. The door to Liberation is opened once as soon as one is born in the human body. If one does not strive for Liberation even after having secured this life, who can say when such an opportunity will come again? Therefore one has to strive in every way so that one can attain spiritual Illumination in this life itself. So the scriptures say:

*Mahatā puṇyapuñjena kṛto'yam*
*kāyanaustvayā*
*Pāram duhkhodadhergantum tava*
*yāvannabhidyate*

'It is as a result of great merits that you have got this bark of (human) body to cross the ocean of misery. (Make proper use of it) so long as it does not perish'.

It has further been said:

*Yah prāpya mānuṣam lokam mukti-*
*dvāramapāvṛtam*
*Gṛheṣn khagavat saktastamārūḍha-*
*cyutam viduh*

'He who, after gaining the human life, which is, as it were, the "open door" to Liberation, becomes attached to hearth and home, like a bird, is called by the wise to be (*ārūḍhacyuta*) one who has fallen from a high rank'.

Attachment—this attachment to money, to home and relatives, and to one's own body—repeatedly drags a man down, ever after he reaches the door to Liberation. For this reason, one should desire to get the lotus-feet of God by forsaking everything. Be attached and devoted to Him and love Him alone. If you have that you are free. Otherwise there is no other way.

But He is very merciful. If one advances one step towards Him, He comes forward a hundred,—nay, a thousand—steps. This is the real truth. It is only to be practised in order to be known, and not to be merely spoken of. If only one can once say with all one's heart and soul, 'O Lord! I take refuge in your feet ; I have none else', the Lord is sure to accept him—it cannot be otherwise. One must (be able to) say and know:

*Tvameva mātā ca pitā tvameva*
*Tvameva bandhuśca sakhā tvameva*
*Tvameva vidyā draviṇam tvameva*
*Tvameva sarvam mama devadeva*

'Thou art the mother and Thou the father ; Thou art the friend and Thou the confidant ; Thou art knowledge, Thou wealth ; O God of gods! Thou art my all'.

If it is like this, can the Lord help accepting the devotee? But who is able to say or think thus?—that is the question. So Sri Chaitanyadeva has said:

*Etādṛśī tava kṛpā bhagavan mamāpi*
*Durdaivamīdṛśamihājani nānurāgah*

'O Lord! Such is Thy mercy. But such is my evil fate that I have no love for such a merciful One'.

What is necessary is Love—love and yearning. Then only can the goal be attained. You should pray, 'O Lord! Give me love, give me yearning'. If you do that He will bestow it on you. Pray, pray,—pray with all your heart. The Lord will be pleased. And then there will not remain anything unobtainable. Then the heart will be filled with love and devotion, and life will be blessed. Then

only can one truly appreciate the full import of the following:

*Indrādi sampada sab tuccha hay je*
*bhāve māy*
*Sadānandasukhe bhāse śyāmā yadi*
*phire cāy*

'Even rulership of the heavens, like that of Indra, becomes insignificant to one who thinks of the Divine Mother; if Mother Shyāmā deigns to look back on him he enjoys bliss for ever and floats in happiness as it were'.

Remember and think of Him as much as you can. There is no doubt that everything becomes easy by practice. You must gradually intensify your spiritual practice and try to love Him. There will arise true love in the heart when you can fully surrender to Him alone, knowing everything else to be impermanent and unsubstantial. If once love (for the Supreme) arises, there will be no more fear. He Himself will see that everything is done, provided one takes refuge in Him.

Always remember the Lord. If this can be made into a habit once it becomes very easy. And know this to be the source of all good.

The Lord will listen to your prayers, and He will take you, holding you by the hand—this is my belief.

---

# THE IDEAL OF NATIONAL EDUCATION

By the Editor

'The ideal of all education, all training, should be man-making. Education is not the amount of information that is put into your brain and runs riot there, undigested, all your life. We must have life-building, man-making, character-making assimilation of ideas.'

—Swami Vivekananda

Of all the means that are employed to influence the minds and hearts of men, education is found to be the most potent and offers the greatest promise for ultimate success. The right type of education can solve many problems and cure many ills of life. The reconstitution of a nation has to begin with a resurgence in the field of education as much necessarily as in those of economics or politics. A nation is advanced in proportion as education and intelligence spread among the masses. A healthy system of education is an indispensable plank of an all-round programme of cultural renaissance and national well-being. That education of the right sort, based on the most desirable ideals and principles, is of vital importance to the life of a community can hardly be denied. It is a fact that lack of education or improper education has done immense harm to the virility and efficiency of every phase of life—while the former has made illiterate and ignorant masses of people helpless victims of poverty, disease, and exploitation, the latter, which is more harmful than the former, has brought about moral deterioration, fragmentation of personality, cultural estrangement between nations, and regimentation of thought and action to subserve political ends. Hence it is a patent fact that the ideal of education determines largely the nature and scope of the system of education and the character, conduct, and attitudes of the educated.

No nation can rise to great heights without enthusiastically coming under a lofty and powerful ideal which seeks to inspire and encourage the individual in every walk of life. This, in fact, constitutes the national ideal

which forms, as it were, the backbone, foundation, and life-centre of the nation. All other ideals and ideas are naturally subordinated to and orientated in the direction of this supreme national ideal. The ideal of education, which exerts such an effective and far-reaching influence on the impressionable minds of youth, should not be alien to the national genius and culture. When a nation's vitality is at a low ebb, the reason is generally to be found in its neglect of its own national ideals and traditions and the senseless imitation of degenerate models and modes of alien thought and activity. For, a nation lives and moves as she thinks, and becomes whatever she believes herself to be. She is made great not by her relative superiority but by her thought about and faith in herself and her national ideals. It has rightly been said that a slave who hugs his chains continues to be a slave, and the free in spirit feels ever free in every circumstance. 'Know thyself', is as appropriately applicable to the nation as to the individual. The same spiritual forces that bring about the regeneration of the individual contribute to the moulding of the destiny of the nation.

The task before us as a nation, when we are engaged in a great adventure of freedom and democracy, is a tremendous one. The problems are many and varied. Independence has brought us face to face with realities and imposed on us heavy responsibilities for the present and the future. In these days when plans of national reconstruction and regeneration are taking effective shape in all spheres of progressive nation-building, the problem of the spread of the right type of education calls for deep thinking and an early, correct solution. For, in national re-construction there is no other factor so important as education. Awakening Indians to a sense of the need for a national as well as nation-making education, Sister Nivedita wrote: 'We all know that the future of India depends, for us, on education. Not that industry and commerce are unimportant, but because all things are possible to the educated, and nothing whatever to the uneducated man. We know also that this education, to be of any avail, must extend through all degrees from its lowest and humblest applications up to the highest and most disinterested grades. We must have education of women as well as education of men. We must have secular education as well as religious. And, almost more important than any of these we must have education of the people, and for this, we must depend upon ourselves.' These forceful words were written many years ago when we were experiencing a rut of stagnation and insuperable difficulties on every side—nowhere more helplessly than in the sphere of education. And today, when we are free to shape our national life in accordance with the best ideals we cherish, these words of a great pioneer are even more effective in their appeal.

What is national education? How is education to be made national and nationalizing? It must be clearly understood that the ideal of a truly national type of education has nothing whatsoever to do with any sort of narrow, sentimental or racial or geographical self-glorification. National education is the best and strongest education for nation-making, a training in national idealism, and awakening of the national genius which animates every real vital part of the intellect and emotions of the individual. Nation-making, citizenship-training, and character-building—these are the necessary conditions of all healthy education in all countries, whatever their political position or persuasion. By surrounding the educated young minds with the thought of their nation, country, ideals, and heroes, the safe foundations of a healthy national sense are laid early in life. The construction of national unity, based on a deep sense of cultural solidarity, can never be reached through education whose ideals and methods are entirely foreign to the land. A national education must be made up of familiar ideas, ideals, and elements so as not to create in the mind of the pupil any scope for disintegration of personality, conflict between home and school, or estrangement of the educated minority from the uneducated majority.

Throughout the centuries India has stood for a distinct national ideal of her own. That ideal is spirituality. India is destined to play the spiritual note in the harmony of nations. Consequently, the aims and values of national education in India have been related to the spiritual growth of man. It is on the growth of man as such and his realization of the divinity within that the well-being of the individual and the nation depends. The Vedantic ideal of education insists on the development of character and spirituality, on the manifestation of perfection already in man. Man-making education,—not a mere bread-and-butter education,—is what Swami Vivekananda repeatedly exhorted his countrymen to strive for. He wanted that education should be such that it should inspire tremendous confidence and self-reliance in the educated so that they may be real men among men and hold their heads high. Mere book-learning or intellectual gymnastics can only produce machine-like automatons, with no independent will of their own and fit for nothing better than a mere jellyfish existence. Such an ideal can never satisfy us in the end. Even if the fact that we do not live by bread alone is contested by some, it is easily seen that when the bread and luxuries of life are obtained, we hanker after something higher and better, something more inward than outward. And this spiritual hankering grows no less keen than what we experience in the course of our struggle for bare existence. This goes to prove that we can no more ignore the demands of the soul than we can deny ourselves the needs of bodily life.

Education is not an end in itself, nor can it serve the purpose it is meant to if it has a bland, materialistic or mercenary objective in view. Such negative and wholly unrealistic education can bring no benefit either to the individual or to the country at large. As Swami Vivekananda has often said, the ideal is that we must have the whole of our educational system, spiritual and secular, on national lines, through national methods. The Swami asks pointedly: 'The education which does not help the common mass of people to equip themselves for the struggle for life, which does not bring out strength of character, a spirit of philanthropy, and the courage of a lion—is it worth the name? Further, unambiguously elucidating what kind of education is best for our country, the Swami says, 'We want that education by which character is formed, strength of mind is increased, the intellect is expanded, and by which one can stand on one's own feet. What we want are Western science coupled with Vedanta, Brahmacharya as the guiding motto, and also Shraddhā and faith in one's own self.' Thus the ideal of education has to be pitched high so that it may be a guiding light and an impelling force even in the face of alluring and deceptive objectives which seek to enslave the free will of the educated and make them tools of narrow political or economic aggrandizement.

No education can be said to be national unless it inspires love for the country, i.e. regard for its past, sympathetic understanding of its present, and faith in its future. It is necessary that education should make the pupil conscious of the worth of the soil on which and the environment in which the plant of his life is growing into maturity. He should understand that his education should fit him into life perfectly well, without making him a problem to others or others a problem to him. The ideal of education should be such as to make the pupil know with unequivocal plainness that education has a two-fold objective, not only to let him reap the material, intellectual, and spiritual benefits it confers upon him, but also to equip him adequately for the service of the community —of the people, country, and religion (*jana-deśa-dharma*). Proper education exerts a healthy and desirable influence on the pupil, thereby restraining the naturally tumultuous youthful urges, emotions, and thoughts. Educated persons are, therefore, expected to possess and practice a great amount of self-control, mental concentration, and tolerant and sympathetic understanding. True scholarship bestows ennobling humility and exalted character (*vidyā dadāti vinayam*).

Educational institutions, societies, and organizations are unavailing and of no consequence unless they foster in their alumni those elements of love, sympathy, and care for all for which there is immediate demand everywhere. The highest education is that which gives us not only power through knowledge but also fullness and introspective vision through love and spiritual solidarity. There can be no truer ideal than to live for that ultimate Truth which emancipates us from bondage to Nature. Such an ideal, rooted in the Vedantic conception of the divinity of man and the unity of existence, lets us have 'access to the life that goes beyond death' and 'rises above all circumstances' and gives us 'the wealth, not of things but of inner light, not of power but of love'. Says Rabindranath Tagore, 'Education is a permanent part of the adventure of life. It is not like a painful hospital treatment for curing them (students) of the congenital malady of their ignorance, but is a function of health, the natural expression of their mind's vitality.' It is this grand conception of the Atman, of this spiritual unity which is a matter of direct realization, that should form the core of national education in India. It has been so for ages; and it shall continue to inspire, elevate, and unite the nation.

It is usually contended that the past cannot and should not be revived in any walk of life, for that retards progress. It is held that India's backwardness and subservience to alien rule were the result of a blind adherence to the dead weight of the past. It is perfectly true that the dead cannot be brought back to life. Nobody today can plead for a revival *in toto* of the entire system of ancient educational or other patterns, as they were, without being unrealistic and thoughtless. With the passing of time new orientation is necesary. But it is the height of folly to demand that at any particular stage of our history we should reject everything that preceded us. It is nothing short of cultural suicide for any nation to abandon its rich inheritance of the experiences of a great and enduring continuity of life and thought. A national culture represents the totality of accumulated experiences, gained from traditions and institutions tried, tested, and found indispensable for the survival of the nation. To write off the great national ideals as outmoded and unfit for further support, notwithstanding the thousands of years from which they have descended, is the worst act of self-destruction that any nation can indulge in. Growth means continuity, and on the basis of the past the present stands and the future is to be built. Practices and methods constantly change from age to age, nay, from day to day. Every zealous guardian of the nation's welfare cheerfully welcomes new methods and practices in education, as in other fields of cultural life, and does not blindly cling to the past at the cost of progress, ignoring the needs of the times. But changes, however attractive and ostensibly necessary, cannot be accepted in haste, especially where they seek to supplant everything that was in the past, including the fundamental ideals and principles of the national soul.

The great need in India today is the preservation of our cultural integrity. And this is the task of national education. At the same time as we hold to our own ideals, we know we cannot do without the world outside India. We have to learn many things from other nations. To broaden our horizon of knowledge, to travel to other countries, to assimilate into our own society whatever in others is of real worth to us, and to give other nations what we possess in unique abundance—these are the aims which the national education should place before the sons and daughters of India. In order to be able to do these, they have first of all to be educated in what is their great possession which has sustained the nation through trackless centuries of ebb and flow of political, economic, and social life-current, and which they can proudly share with other nations. This is the great desideratum of the Western mode of education that has obtained hitherto in our country. With the passing of the alien political power that dominated the

life of the people, it is natural to expect that the system of education sponsored by that power will undergo before long a complete reorientation and become truly national in character. We must grow according to our nature and in full consonance with our national life-current. Now we have the freedom to do it, and in this, as in everything else, the vast majority of people are looking up to the leaders for light and guidance.

It is a hopeful sign that thoughtful and progressive men now recognize the fact that while there is always a demand for men and women of the highest type of scholarship, the general trend of national education for the large majority of people should be such as to enable everyone to secure a decent standard of living and, at the same time, become useful to himself and to others by developing a spirit of self-help, character, charity, discipline, and brotherhood. Today it is no doubt a far cry from the ancient forest-institutions of learning (*gurukulà*) where the teacher and his group of pupils resided together and the latter not only acquired a vast amount of scientific knowledge but also *lived* the life of a sincere student (*brahmacarya*). In these forest-institutions the relations between the teacher and the taught were of the happiest kind, and both looked upon education as an achievement of common endeavour. A preparation for complete and wholesome life-affirmation was assiduously undertaken. In these Gurukulas the best ideals of education were spontaneously imbibed by living constantly in communion with Nature and through one-pointed concentration and intimate personal contact—unlike the atrocious method of many a modern institution which aims at educating boys in the same manner as that of the man who battered his ass, being advised that it could thereby turned into a horse.

Notwithstanding the small percentage of educated people, India has a large number of universities some of which can well rank among the best in the world. But it is a well-known fact that the education imparted is not on national lines and, therefore, has failed to inspire in the educated youth faith, character, and a sense of individual and collective responsibility which are indispensable for solving the problems that face the country. Lack of a spiritual background has made education unproductive of the qualities of head and heart without which high principles of morality, honesty, and discipline can never be materialized. Political nostrums of un-Indian origin are finding a fertile soil in the minds of our youth, who are obviously unable to derive an all-round satisfaction of the cognitive, affective, and conative aspects of their soul from the dull, drab, and soulless education they are subjected to. A secular outlook has its advantages in politics or administration, but as applied to the education of tender youth it is fraught with grave risks. When deplorable instances of student indiscipline are witnessed, the leaders are deeply worried and fervently reiterate the need for practising lofty ideals and high principles. Such platitudinous reiteration of ideals fails to carry conviction to and inspire confidence in the rebellious youth. When the malady is deep-rooted, superficial remedies are of no avail. Signs are not wanting to warn us that unless the educational institutions inculcate in its votaries the national ideals of Brahmacharya and Shraddhā through teachers who are themselves living examples of the highest teaching, the process of deterioration may continue unchecked, redounding credit neither to the teacher nor to the taught.

Spirituality is our ideal of national education. This ideal is in perfect accord with our national genius and cultural heritage. Any scheme of national education, in the true sense of the term, must accept this ideal in order that that education may produce men and women who are truly Indian in every respect. The Indian way of life and thought has to be preserved while the mind and heart are to be made receptive, retentive, and creative. The methods and details of an educational system cannot but change from time to time to suit changed circumstances. But the national ideal cannot be replaced without

detriment to national survival. Both science and religion, intellect and intuition, the mundane and the spiritual are to be harmoniously synthesized and expressed in a code of comprehensive education. But the emphasis on the ideal of national education should under no circumstances be relaxed or shifted. Lest we forget, Swami Vivekauanda impresses it on our minds: 'But remember that as Hindus everything else must be subordinated to our own national ideals. The secret of a true Hindu's character lies in the subordination of his knowledge of European science and learning, of his wealth, position and name, to that one principal theme which is inborn in every Hindu child—the spirituality and purity of the race.' The Hindu ideal is in fact what India stands for. Let there be no confusion about it, though unfortunately today the word 'Hindu' is increasingly being misunderstood and misinterpreted. Spirituality is a positive and the most enduring factor of civilization. It cannot be ignored in any country, least of all in India.

---

# WHAT VEDANTA MEANS TO ME

By Christopher Isherwood

In order to say what Vedanta means to me, I shall have to explain what it was that I meant by 'Religion' in the days before I learned about Vedanta. To do this will be to describe a number of prejudices, some of them silly, some of them not without a certain justification, all of them held by thousands of fairly intelligent men and women in the world today.

By 'religion' I meant the Christian religion, or, more specifically, the Church of England, into which I had been received by baptism when I was a baby. Other Christian sects I had been encouraged to suspect or despise; the Catholics were traditionally 'un-English' and involved in sinister international politics, the Nonconformists were 'common' and lower-middle-class. As for the Hindus, Buddhists, and Mohammedans, they were merely picturesque heathens who wailed from minarets, spun prayer wheels, and flung themselves under Juggernauts. You couldn't count them as being 'religious' at all. Such were the attitudes I inherited as a member of an upper-class landowning Protestant family living on a small island which was, at that time, the centre of an enormous colonial empire.

Infant baptism provides dissatisfied Christians with a ready-made grudge against the Church. Why, they ask, should you be conscripted into it before you are old enough to have a will of your own? The Church's answer is to offer the ceremony of confirmation, which enables the adolescent individual to make a voluntary act of accepting his already imposed Christianity. Unfortunately, in my case, as in the case of many others, confirmation was not entirely voluntary. At my school, it was tacitly understood that you would be confirmed, and a good deal of moral pressure was exerted to make you agree to this. You could refuse, of course—one of my best friends did—but that took considerable independence and courage. I hadn't enough of either virtue. So I agreed.

Soon after my confirmation, I began to discover that I had, as they say, 'lost my faith'; or, to be more exact, I discovered that I had never had any. By the time I was twenty, I declared myself an atheist, and I remained in that conviction for the next fifteen years. I said privately and publicly that I loathed religion; that it was evil, superstitious, reactionary nonsense; and I warmly agreed

that it was indeed 'the opium of the people'. These statements were taken as a matter of course by my friends, who were, with one or two exceptions, all of the same opinion as myself. It was, therefore, seldom necessary for me even to discuss the subject in any detail. However, if I had done so, I should probably have argued more or less as follows.

In the first place, I hated Christianity because it was dualistic. God, high in heaven, ruled with awful justice over us, His abject and sinful subjects, here below. He was good. We were bad. We were so bad that, when He sent His Son down to live amongst us, we promptly crucified him. For this act, committed nearly two thousand years ago, we had to beg forgiveness, generation after generation. If we begged hard enough and were sincerely sorry, we might qualify for heaven, instead of being sent to hell, where we naturally belonged.

Who wouldn't rebel against the idea of such a God? who wouldn't denounce His tyranny? Who wouldn't protest against the utter unfairness of this test to which He had subjected us: one short earthly life in which to earn salvation or deserve damnation? Who wouldn't detest His Son, who had come to us as a sort of *agent provocateur,* wearing a hypocritical mask of meekness, in order to tempt us to betray him? Such were the questions I asked myself, and my answer was that only slaves could accept such a religion. If hell existed (which I anyhow denied) then I would be proud to be damned. In hell one could expect to meet every honest and courageous man or woman who had ever lived.

Then again, Christianity (as I saw it) seemed to consist almost entirely of 'dont's'; everything you could possibly want to do was forbidden as a sin. My family has a Puritan background, and there is enough Puritanism in me to set up a conflict whenever the word 'sin' is mentioned. I rebelled so violently against these 'dont's' that I regarded every sin as an act of defiance and hence almost as a virtue. I would have been quite capable of taking dope *on principle* if I had been able to get any.

When I looked at the Christians around me (I knew hardly any good ones, and none of them intimately) I wilfully saw them as a collection of dreary, canting hypocrites, missionaries of ignorance and reaction, who opposed all social reform lest it should endanger the status and privileges of their Church, and all personal freedom lest people should discover for themselves that the 'dont's' were unnecessary. I disliked their stiff Sunday clothes and grave Sunday faces, their sickly humility, their lack of humour, their special tone when speaking of God, their selfish prayers for rain, health, and national victory in war. I assumed, quite arbitrarily, that every Christian was secretly longing to indulge in forbidden pleasures, and that he was only prevented from doing so by his cowardice, ugliness, or impotence. I delighted in stories which told of clergymen being seduced, and monks or nuns indulging in clandestine love affairs. My venom against them knew no bounds. At the same time, I declared that I myself needed no religion to keep me moral, according to my own standards. I would try to behave properly, not because of the Ten Commandments or a fear of hell, but because I freely chose to follow the advice of my conscience.

A psychiatrist could probably tell me to what extent these exaggerated reactions were produced by a father-complex, or by certain experiences in early childhood, resulting in a dread of authority. That does not matter, as far as my present subject is concerned. For my prejudices were not merely neurotic; they had a direct relation to actual facts. There are some aspects of organized religion which I still believe to be bad. What I am trying to show is that my view of religion, during that period of my life, was distorted and very ill-informed.

Though I called myself an atheist, I nevertheless had a religion, or a substitute for a religion—or perhaps I should say two substitutes, since my beliefs were, to some extent,

contradictory. The first of them was a belief in Art. I had discovered, by this time, that I had a certain talent for writing. I believed that I should serve that talent, exercising it to the best of my ability, dedicating my life to it, and rejecting every interest that threatened to interfere with it. I thought reverently of the great masters of literature, remembering how they had not feared to accept poverty, ill health, public ridicule, even imprisonment and death, in their struggle to give form to their inspiration. They were my saints, and I was a humble novice, eager to imitate their example.

This monastic ideal of the artist is a fine one, if you can live up to it. Unfortunately, very few artists do. I did not. Indeed, my attitude towards my vocation was quite unusually arrogant and insincere. Because I had a certain knack of self-expression, I regarded myself as a Special Person, far above the vulgar herd; in fact, one of the Saved. I talked a lot about serving my talent, but what I really meant was that other people should serve it; if they could help me, even indirectly, in the production of my stories—well, they ought to feel honoured! I talked, also, about the necessity of accepting all experience; since experience is the raw material of art. But, in practice, I chose to accept only those experiences which were enjoyable; the 'acceptance' being an alibi for every kind of self-indulgence. As for poverty and public ridicule, I was most unwilling to face them. I privately thought that I deserved to be supported by my wealthier and less talented friends; and I was very indignant when my books got bad notices. As soon as I achieved a little success, my vanity fairly wallowed in it. By the time I was thirty, I had become a pretty hard-boiled operator in the fashionable literary racket. And, at the same time, I often felt disgusted with myself and wondered uneasily if this could really be the height of human ambition; to go on producing book after book—just for the sake of being an author and having your name in the newspapers—until you died.

Meanwhile, I had a second belief; a belief in Social Reform. This belief contradicted the other because it involved a recognition of the equal rights of all men; whereas, as an artist, I was concerned with my special rights as an individual and definitely did not want to submit my work to the judgment of some proletarian literary committee. Social reform is a fine ideal, to which one may dedicate one's life; but, had I really done so, I should have had to give up my own kind of writing and devote myself to political journalism and propaganda. This I was unwilling to do. I was, therefore, only playing at being a reformer; and my second religion-substitute was as invalid as my first.

When the Spanish Civil War broke out, I joined my friends—and the vast majority of English writers—in supporting Republican Government. It seemed to us then that the Government was absolutely in the right, and that its enemies were absolutely in the wrong. This being the case, we believed that the Government was entitled to use any means in its power to overcome these enemies. But, as the war went on, it became apparent that the situation was far more complicated than we, in our political innocence, had imagined. Certain parties within the Government were fighting for power. They stood for divergent political ideals, and, in order to achieve these ideals, they did not hesitate to slander, fight, and kill each other, thus bringing about the ruin of the Republican cause and the victory of its enemies. I began now to realize that bad means cannot ever safely be used even to accomplish good ends. And when, in 1938, as a war correspondent in China, I saw the bombing of civilians and the conscription of mere children to serve in the front-line trenches, I knew that my whole acceptance of armed force as a permissible means of social reform had been due to a lack of feeling and imagination. I would always honour those who fought for what they believed to be right, but, in future, I myself must be an openly avowed pacifist.

It was, therefore, in a very disturbed and

confused state of mind that I came to the United States, early in 1939. I still intended to practise my craft as a writer, but I could no longer justify to myself my existence as a pure, self-sufficient artist. I still believed in social reform, but I no longer believed that it justified the use of false propaganda and physical violence. I desperately needed to find some kind of meaning in life, but I had found my two former beliefs inadequate and I still entertained my violent prejudice against what I called 'religion'. And my newly-discovered pacifism was too limited and negative to form a basis for living; it didn't go beyond the decision to refuse to fight, if there was a war. It was in this state of confusion that I first came into contact with the teachings of Vedanta.

To suggest that I accepted Vedanta philosophy just because it convinced me intellectually would be to claim that I am a creature of pure reason. And, of course, I am nothing of the kind. We none of us are. The really decisive convictions of our lives are never arrived at through the power of arguments alone. The right teacher must appear at exactly the right moment in the right place; and his pupil must be in the right mood to accept what he teaches. But a description of the way in which these various factors combined, in my own case, to influence me, would be too long and complicated, and too frankly autobiographical, to fit the kind of article I am writing. All I can do here is to list some of the reasons why Vedanta appealed to me—reminding the reader, at the same time, that these reasons are only reasons; they really do not explain anything.

1. Vedanta is non-dualistic. Psychologically, this was of the greatest importance to me; because of my fear and hatred of God as the father-figure. I don't think I could ever have swallowed a philosophy that *began* with dualism. Vedanta began by telling me that I was the Atman, and that the Atman was Brahman; the Godhead was my own real nature, and the real nature of all that I experienced as to the external, surrounding universe. Having taught me this, it could go on to explain that this one immanent and transcendent Godhead may project all sorts of divine forms and incarnations which are, as the Gita says, its 'million faces'. To the eyes of this world, the One appears as many. Thus explained, dualism no longer seemed repulsive to me; for I could now think of the gods as mirrors in which man could dimly see what would otherwise be quite invisible to him, the splendour of his own immortal image. By looking deeply and single-mindedly into these mirrors, you could come gradually to know your own real nature; and, when that nature, that Atman, was fully known and entered into, the mirror-gods would no longer be necessary, since the beholder would be absolutely united with his reflection. This approach to dualism via non-dualism appealed so strongly to my temperament that I soon found myself taking part enthusiastically in the cult of Sri Ramakrishna, and even dropping into Christian churches I happened to be passing, to kneel for a while before the altar. Obviously, I had been longing to do this for years. I was a frustrated devotee.

2. Vedanta is not dogmatic. Previously, I had always thought of religion in terms of dogmas, commandments, and declarative statements. The teacher expounded the truth, the dogmatic ultimatum; you, the pupil, had only to accept it in its entirety. (Your sole alternative was to reject it altogether). But Vedanta made me understand, for the first time, that a practical, working religion is experimental and empirical. You are always on your own, finding things out for yourself in your individual way. Vedanta starts you off with a single proposition, which is no more than a working hypothesis. 'The Atman can be known. We say so, on the basis of the past experience of others. But we don't ask you to believe that. We don't want you to believe anything. All we ask is that you make a serious effort to get some spiritual experience for yourself, using the techniques of meditation which we shall teach you. If, after a reasonable period of

time, you have found nothing, then never mind Ramakrishna, never mind Christ, never mind anybody; you are entitled to say boldly that our teaching is a lie, and we shall respect you for saying so. We have no use for blind believers.' Who could decline such a challenge? 'This,' I said to myself, 'is what religion is really all about. Religion isn't a course of passive indoctrination; it is an active search for awareness. Why didn't somebody ever tell me so before?' The question was, of course, absurdly unfair. I had been 'told' this innumerable times. Every moment of my conscious existence had contained within itself this riddle—'What is life for?'—and its answer: 'To learn what life means'. Every event, every encounter, every person and object I had met, had restated question and answer in some new way. Only, I hadn't been ready to listen. Now, as I came to learn something about practical mysticism, I was greatly astonished to find how closely the recorded experiences of Hindu and Christain (not to mention Buddhist and Taoist, Sufi and Jewish) mystics are interrelated. And thus another group of my anti-Christian prejudices was liquidated, along with my ignorance.

3. Vedanta does not emphasize the vileness of man's mortal nature, or the enormity of sin. It dwells, rather, on the greatness of man's eternal nature, and refuses to dignify sin by allowing it too much dramatic value. Vivekananda warns us not to think of ourselves as sinners; such seeming humility can easily degenerate into perverse masochism. We shall do better to remind ourselves continually of what is godlike in man, and try to be worthy of that. As for our sins, we shall not atone for them by sentimental orgies of contrition. What we have to understand is simply this: every act has consequences, and we are paid for everything we think or say or do with an absolute, automatic fairness—neither too much nor too little. If we persist in performing acts which promote a strengthening of the ego-sense, then we shall find that we are becoming increasingly alienated from the knowledge of the Atman within us. And if we perform such acts, we have nobody but ourselves to blame. This is no romantic tragedy of doom; it is merely silly. For we can stop whenever we really want to, and are ready to pray sincerely for strength, to the source of strength in our own minds.

This is the message of Vedanta as Vivekananda preaches it. Like many others before me, I heard it with an almost incredulous joy. Here, at last, was a man who believed in God and yet dared to condemn the indecent grovellings of the sin-obsessed Puritans I had so much despised in my youth. I loved him at once, for his bracing self-reliance, his humour, and his courage. He appealed to me as the perfect anti-Puritan hero: the enemy of Sunday religion, the destroyer of Sunday gloom, the shocker of prudes, the breaker of traditions, the outrager of conventions, the comedian who taught the deepest truths in idiotic jokes and frightful puns. That humour had its place in religion, that it could actually be a mode of spiritual self-expression, was a revelation to me; for, like every small boy of Puritan upbringing, I had always longed to laugh out loud and make improper noises in Church. I didn't know, then, that humour has also had its exponents in the Christian tradition. I knew nothing, for example, about St. Philip Neri, who allowed children to play games around the altar during mass, and who would sit on the Pope's lap and pull his beard in fun.

Speaking of Vivekananda brings me to mention three more or less incidental considerations which, nevertheless, played an important part in my acceptance of Vedanta. They may sound somewhat trivial, to the intelligent reader. I must remind him that my attitude towards religion at that time was not only unintelligent but very naive.

First, I found Vedanta all the more reassuring because its latest great exemplars—Ramakrishna himself, and Vivekananda, Brahmananda, and their brother disciples—had lived so recently. The figures of the major Christian saints, not to mention that of the historic Jesus of Nazareth, are all somewhat dimmed by the

passage of time. But Ramakrishna died only eighteen years before I was born; I have met three people who knew Vivekananda; and Brahmananda was the Guru of my own Guru. These are not remote inhabitants of another epoch, but still living, vivid presences. Photographs of them exist. Records of their sayings and doings are detailed and reliable. You can easily imagine what it would have been like to encounter them as human beings. And, for this reason alone, the guarantee which their lives offer of the truth of Vedanta is singularly impressive. Imagine what it would mean to a Christian to know so much about —let us say—St. Francis of Assisi!

Secondly, Vedanta—or rather, the Vedanta Society of America—attracted me because it was a small movement, without great wealth or the slightest pretensions to political influence. My horror and contempt for the political manoeuvres of the leading Christian churches was very strong at that time, and it has not lessened since. No amount of argument will ever convince me that interference in world diplomacy by religious bodies is anything but evil. If, at some future date, the Vedanta Society becomes involved in American politics, then it will have betrayed Ramakrishna, just as the churches have, in this respect, betrayed Christ. 'My kingdom is not of this world' is said, or implied, by all true spiritual prophets. Meanwhile, it is, at least, a hopeful indication of future policy that the Ramakrishna Order of India, which is certainly neither poor nor lacking in influence, refused to support Gandhi's non-cooperation movement, despite its admiration for Gandhi as a man and its natural sympathy for his cause.

Thirdly, I liked Vedanta because it talked Sanskrit. By this I do not mean that I am a lover of the obscure and exotic; quite the reverse. But I was suffering, at the period of my first acquaintance with Vedanta, from a semantic block against the words which were associated with my Christian upbringing: God, saviour, comforter, soul, heaven, redemption, love, salvation, etc., etc. To some of these, indeed, my reaction was so violent that I would wince and clench my fists whenever they were uttered. I could only approach the subject of mystical religion with the aid of a brand-new vocabulary. Sanskrit supplied it. Here were a lot of new words, exact, antiseptic, uncontaminated by use in bishops' sermons, schoolmasters' lectures, politicians' speeches. To have gone back along the old tracks, to have picked up the old phrases and scraped them clean of their associations—that job would have been too disgusting for a beginner. But now it wasn't necessary. Every idea could be made over, restated in the new language. And restatement was what I most needed; as a mental discipline and even as an alibi, since it was embarrassing to admit to myself that I had been so intolerant. . . .

I have written all this; and yet I have really said nothing. I have failed to explain what Vedanta means to me. Perhaps that was inevitable. Religion, as I have already suggested, is not taught by one intelligence to another but caught through the influence of one personality upon another. And how is one to describe this process? I don't even begin to understand it, myself. I only know that, as far as I am concerned, the guru-disciple relationship is at the centre of everything that religion means to me. It is the one reality of which I am never in doubt, the one guarantee that I shall ultimately surmount my own weakness and win through to knowledge of eternal strength, peace, and joy. Without this relationship, my life would be a nightmare of fear, boredom, and disgust. If, having known it, one could in some terrible way be deprived of it again, then that would be to experience hell, right here on earth. Personally, I do not worry about this, because I do not believe that the guru can ever abandon his disciples, either voluntarily or involuntarily. I believe that their relationship survives death, accident, betrayal, and every other kind of hazard. No one, of course, can prove me wrong—or right. And I must admit that I have an exceedingly optimistic nature.

# SPIRITUAL VALUES

By Anirvan

## I. Introduction: The Role of Inwardization of Consciousness

Theology speaks of man as a spirit who has been born into flesh; but there is obviously a prelude to a real spiritual life. Every religion distinguishes between the natural and the spiritual man: to be born spiritually is an event in life which is consecrated by a sacrament either social or individual. In the Arya society, there was the social sacrament of *upanayana* which admitted the child formally into the spiritual heritage of the community, and there was the individual sacrament of *dīkṣā* for the adult to launch him into his personal spiritual endeavour. But in spite of this formal recognition, the whole is a process of inner continuity like the growth of a seed. To clarify an idea, formality proceeds with discrimination and so draws a line between the spiritual man and the natural man, between spiritual values and life-values. But if life is nothing but the blooming of the inner spirit, too much importance need not be laid upon this artificial division. A free interaction between the two sets of values is absolutely necessary. There must be the congenial social environment which will so mould the life-values as to enable them better to reflect the spirit; and there must also be the intensive training of the spirit so that it can take up and change the life-values into something rich and new. Forms can be used only as means for broadening the outlook on life so that in the end life and spirit become conterminous.

An instance of this may be found in the change of value that the concept of *karma* has undergone in the Vedas and the *Gita*. While the word *karma* is almost exclusively used in the Vedas to mean a conformity to a type of action which is considered spiritual, the *Gita* has widened its scope to spiritualize every form of activity including even the unconscious physiological movements of life. This has meant not only a heightening, but also a deepening and broadening of consciousness; and of course, this is the whole aim of spirituality. It cannot be divorced from life's great aim—the aim of growth. In short, spirituality may be spoken of as life's conscious endeavour to grow by harmonious assimilation. It is at once an intensification of consciousness which marks the inner enterprise and a harmonization with the environment which determines life's aesthetic and moral values.

The enterprise is of course difficult; but it is also universal. We are spiritualizing every moment of our life either knowingly or unknowingly. The unconscious endeavour, whether sustained by social forces or by an inchoate inner urge, is, as we have seen, a prelude to the conscious one; and the whole process is based on a dynamism of consciousness seeking for clarity. A sort of clarity comes when the sensate values of an animal life develops into the ideal values of a human understanding. The power to deal with ideas independent of the sense-data is an achievement of consciousness which marks the beginning of the life of spirit. Sensations are clear and particular for all, even for the animals. But are representations also equally clear? To the animal, obviously they are not. In man, they gain in universality but lose in clarity, as the Naiyāyika observes. Their universality, or the power of the human consciousness to frame universals enables man consciously to order his experiences and so to discover laws of Nature and make regulations

for his own conduct. This gives him a power to control things and derive a maximum of satisfaction by a repetition of the sense-experiences. And it helps to create an inner world which has yet to depend for the values it derives on the outer world. But in the long run, the arrangement is found not to be satisfactory. The particular, which becomes a guarantee for truth, still belongs to the sensuous world. And the crux of the problem is, to speak paradoxically, how to particularize the universal on the ideal plane. This is the pivot on which turns the whole of man's spiritual endeavour: to change the world of senses into the world of ideas so that consciousness may be dynamically free in its self-enjoyment.

The first inevitable step leading to this is inwardization of consciousness. The Upanishadic Seer laid the law very clearly: 'Self-existence has bored outlets for projecting itself into the phenomenal world; and human consciousness follows the same impulse. The result is a dissipation and deadening of the conscious energy. To keep its fire ever burning, the process has to be reversed.' If put in an abstract form, the demand for introversion appears fantastic and even alarming to the normal mind. But the urge for looking into one's own self is a necessary stage in the evolution of consciousness. Even for practical purposes, the object to be handled must be rendered clear and its possible functions anticipated. And this cannot be done without imagination which again requires a vantage-ground within the thought-process itself. In other words, one has to think before deliberately guiding his action; and thought can arise only when the automatism of action has been suspended. One has to hold the breath, take in the situation, and make the plunge.

So even in practical life, a temporary suspension of activity cannot be avoided because it is absolutely necessary for a clarity of consciousness. But a clear consciousness will judge not only the outer world but simultaneously the inner being also, though in this case the judgment is generally a reflexion of the clarity of perception and is overlaid with a *feeling* of confidence. To have a control over things, at which the practical judgment aims, one must have a control over thoughts. A mastery outside thus inevitably creates a personality inside; and personality is a spiritual value that is indispensable for a successful life.

## II. Value as Pure Existence

A peculiar characteristic of human thought is that in its attempt to reduce the concrete into the abstract for a better grasp of things, it becomes in course of time preoccupied with the abstract for its own sake. Pure science and metaphysics as great ventures of the human spirit have been born in this way. If positivism and empiricism have been eager to exploit these achievements in the abstract, it shows only one trend of the movement of consciousness; the counter-movement is equally strong and equally natural.

When man is preoccupied with the development of personality which his self-esteem will compel him to do, he cannot but be carried away by the lure of the abstract. It is simply a question of spiritual dynamism. If the law of conservation of energy is true in the spiritual field also (considering for the time being the individual as a closed system), energy withdrawn from the outer field will very naturally gain in strength in its inward rush; and measured quantitatively, what has been lost in extension will be recovered in intension. Intension in its final phase may completely denude the field, so that consciousness might be left without an object to deal with. If induced abruptly or by some external cause, the denudation might not mean much. But if it is cultivated deliberately, it will lead to a perception of Pure Existence (*sat*) where the polarity of the subject and the object has been fused in a rarefied feeling of innate identity. And this perception is a fundamental spiritual value.

The experience where dualities born of the polarity of consciousness cease, not by abro-

gation but by mutual absorption (*sāmarasya*), is of course beyond the depth of the normal consciousness which can subsist only by a split in the Unity necessitated by its preoccupation with particulars. Yet this experience in a nascent form stands behind all other experiences, not only as the call of quiescence in all rhythms of life and mind, but also as the creative matrix which throws out new forms when old ones are exhausted. In an individual, and even in a race, quiescence-motive may become dominant for a certain period. To look askance at it as escapism is wholly to misunderstand the rhythm of Nature; it is better to take it as a prelude to a creative urge. If in an individual a force seems to be lost by a plunge into its own self, it must reappear somewhere or somewhen if a free play of conscious energy is allowed. Relying upon this law, we may take introflexion (*nivṛtti*) of consciousness as a spiritual value of supreme importance which can be very profitably utilized even for enhancing the life-values created in the normal way. The indwelling consciousness appears to be passive, but it is really not so. It creates an inner tension which outwardly simulates the inertia of dead matter, but is nevertheless a living force with a definite feeling-content. The value of an absolute perception is to be judged by the energy it releases into the feeling and the will: it may be the unmoved mover of things in the spontaneity of a total rhythm both inside and outside. The practical philosophy of dispassionate and disinterested action even while moving with the cosmic current of forces with a clear sense of the ultimate end (as it has been preached and illustrated in the *Gita*) is one of its first-fruits on the plane of will. On the plane of feeling, the Bhāgavatas have notably built upon this foundation the structure of the multicoloured ecstasy of Divine Love which has sublimated some of the fundamental emotions of the social being.

In actual practice, quiescence may well become a vantage-ground for attacking the problems of life. 'The energy of experience moves in quanta and one has to fix one's consciousness on the intermediate void', said a Shaiva philosopher. The technique will be to counterpoise every positive output of energy with a negative weight which leans backwards into a nothingness; and this cannot be done unless a split has been brought about in the normally conjoint action of feeling and will. Consciousness then takes a direction without swerving, but is sustained in its course not by an anticipation and hence a conceptive experience of its emotional contents, but on the contrary, by its alertness which will constantly check and change these emotional by-products into a force dissolving in neutrality. Certainly, this will not be apathy, which, having a positive content, is bound to have a reaction; it will rather be the deadening of all shocks by offering no inner resistance. It will not be inactivity, because the will is there; only the will, even while taking a linear direction, will not be oblivious of the support of the unbounded space that surrounds it. The movement of will will be an event in time, but it will carry in each of its pulsating moments the gradual unfolding of a seed-impulse inspired by the stability of a total vision. If will in this way is welded with vision, it gives an original perspective of Reality which has been so luminously described by the Vedic Seers as *kavi-kratu*, the creative vision of the Divine Fire. A spiritual space-time corresponding to the Upanishadic concept of *ākāśa-prāṇa* then becomes the measure of existence. We move and yet we move not; for all movement is simply the deployment of what was already contained in the seed which in its self-sufficiency can remain gathered in itself if it chooses. If evaluation is made in terms of the ultimate satisfaction that things bring to thought, then a seed-thought, which in every moment of its development can intensify all its energies into a perception of its original existence, need not evolve at all. And yet it evolves; and this is *māyā*, which is certainly not the sensuous valuation called 'illusion', but a meaningful mystery beyond the intellect.

*Māyā* is the Divine Will—the core of a coil expanding into Space and creating Time to mark the process. And as such it creates the dynamic spiritual values projected from the staticity of Pure Existence.

## III. Metaphysical Implications of Pure Existence

Two sections of world existence, one in Space and another in Time, determine two concepts of spiritual values—the static and the dynamic. The Upanishadic thought reduces all ultimates of consciousness into two interdependent forms of *ākāśa* and *prāṇa*,—the consciousness of extension and of dynamism. Logically they might represent two poles; but in feeling, in life itself, extension naturally sprouts into becoming. Being is then the distant prospect of a horizon which might be the view of a moment inclusive of all existences. 'The Void makes room for All', significantly remarks the Vedantist. But is the All a *nirṛti*, a chaos? The concept, which is self-contradictory, is just possible because it hints at the beginning of a process. The Vedic Seer stood before the abyss and described it as the indescribable where all descriptions can only be negative; and hence it can only be a reverse process of darkness deepening into darkness (*tama āsīt tamasā gūḍham*). But evidently, the process cannot be continued *ad infinitum*. Somewhere the discerning consciousness (for, even in the abysmal depths of darkness there is the unwinking Eye that looks calmly on) strikes a rock-bottom and the Formless through self-consciousness sends a thrill of Forms that ripples towards expression: the darkness melts into light and a world is revealed. The sleeper awakens, the unborn is born: and in his perception *ṛta* or order has come into the chaos of *nirṛti*.

But was not this *ṛta* itself a pre-existent Idea, a significant form of Truth? Can Truth as Existence (*satyam*) and Truth as Order (*ṛtam*) be really separated? Is this Order a static perception in Space or a dynamic feeling in Time? Or does it comprise both in a biune aspect of Reality? Convincing answers to these questions can be given only from the standpoint of the individual consciousness which forms a centre around which all existences are ordered. But the individual itself is a moving entity (*samsārī*). Its experiences, which must always be ordered experiences to meet the demands of life, describe a spiral which has a tendency to widen its convolutions as it rises in the scale of being. Several cross-sections may be taken of the spiral ascent at different levels. Each section will then represent to the consciousness an apparently closed universe ordered according to a definite pattern. Stationed on each of these levels, the individual may think that he has come to his journey's end. But it is only an apparent end. There is the mysterious urge of the mystic Fire (*preti-iṣaṇi*) impelling onwards to a goal that is only dimly perceived. 'It is the growing perception of the Vast and the attendant spiritual vigour, with sprinklings of death in between, that sustain existence', said an Upanishadic Seer. In the end, Life wins when it resolves into luminous death of Immortality. The Unmanifest has again returned to the Unmanifest, describing the iridescent rainbow of manifest existence. The sun rose from darkness and returned to its home (*astam*) of the unknown Light. If the beginning was the unmanifest as Non-existence (*asat*), when viewed retrospectively by the individual consciousness, the end must also be an unmanifest Existence (*sat*) viewed prospectively: the Order or *ṛta* stands between the two poles. It is the law of dynamic Existence unfolding itself in the rhythm of Life's seasons (*ṛtu*), attuned to the march of the One cosmic Light, as the Vedic Seers saw it.

The end as Quiescence is inevitable: but it can either be the quiescence of Darkness or of Light. The predilection for Light will determine the norms of Life, which perhaps will only be relative values according to one's vision of the ordered universe. But the lure of the Absolute, which will mean the widest convolution of the spiral where existence might burst its bounds into non-existence, is

still there. It is the purely static spiritual value—the value which Space as unencumbered and unlimited extension of Pure Thought connotes. But its staticity may not exclude dynamism, because 'it gives room to all'. The labour of Life to bring out order from chaos by arranging the movements of will and the colours of feeling into a harmonius whole round a core of integral simple perception (*sahaja*) finds its consummation in a form of existence in which *ākāśa* and *prāṇa* appear not as polarities but as a complete fusion.

And this forms the metaphysical background of the concept of Existence as a spiritual value. It had to be dealt somewhat fully, because it is the pivot on which all other values turn and its incidence on the spiritual evolution of India has been a source of mystification to the modern mind when it has come to appraise her age-long outlook on the aim of existence (*puruṣārtha*).

### IV. Derivative Values: Personality, Joy, Will, Knowledge, and Dynamism

The inwardization of consciousness is essentially a phenomenon of Life. It is a process of absorption and assimilation of experience helping the growth of a personality—a *spiritual* personality which rises above the mind, but instead of rejecting it might use it as a pliant instrument of the Spirit. The focussing of consciousness by inwardization creates the real individual—the radiant ego, the Pippalāda of the Vedas, who can transmute the varieties of experiences into the stuff of the Spirit. The individual stands between the two vastnesses of objectivity and subjectivity, of the particular and the universal. The object strikes to awaken a reaction; this is the general pattern of the working of the natural forces. But if the shock is absorbed at least partially, it can be made to spread like floodwater in the background of the consciousness; and a repetition of the experiment will awaken and strengthen a luminous sense of the universal which will make room for all the particulars and let them arrange themselves in a world of harmony without any intervention from the lower ego. The individual in this way becomes universalized and discovers the basic unity and identity of all ego-structures. The perception automatically translated into feeling becomes the understanding sympathy that can create an artistic vision of life by dispassionately entering into all its movements. It is thus that the individual is transformed into a Person (*puruṣa*)—a universal form of Being gathering in itself, as the Vedic Seer says, 'all that has been and all that is going to be'. The creation of this Personality is a supreme spiritual value born of the quiescence of transcendence.

The inwardization and the consequent intensification of consciousness need not create a blank at the outset, unless the tendency to blankness is deliberately induced or has been inherent in nature. Consciousness, as the Vedic Seer imagined it, is like the marine fire conceived in and nourished by the waters of Life. As long as the life-urge continues, it is essentially a creative force which uses its functions to build up a personality pervading by self-projection the whole field of its experiences. My world and I must become one; there must be nothing unknown, impervious or unassimilable in what excites my interest. Consciousness as a life-force is 'an eater of food (*annāda*)', says the Veda. The process of assimilation is a struggle for overcoming resistance. In Ignorance, it is pain; but in Knowledge, it is energizing, automatically manifesting itself in radiation (*tapas*). What has been conquered and consumed must be given out as higher values. This taking in and giving out which seems to be the systole and diastole of the process of creation is an active feeling of quiescent Joy (*ānanda*).

Joy, quietly abiding in a perfect equipoise and in an unhampered sense of illumination where knowing can be freely equated with becoming, is the third great spiritual value which dawns towards the end of the venture into the Beyond. The value can be both static and dynamic; and the surest means of

fixing it in consciousness is to lay stress on its static aspect. The poise in the Pure Being and the ever-alertness of the Spirit radiating itself in simple awareness, without initiating any movement in the field of experience, creates a reserve of power which might well-nigh be inexhaustible. The feeling of power in restraint is the quietude of Joy which can clearly see Truth and unerringly direct its dynamism. The calm Witness is not uncreative; only he has a complete vision of the end in the beginning and so his creation is not a painful struggle in the unknown but a care-free deployment of the seed-impulse. The Joy of arriving is already contained in the immobility; and so the movement becomes a play of consciousness where determination is perfectly balanced by prolificacy of chance.

Life seeks expression. Even an inner integration in which power is crystallized into a point apparently immobile and adamantine throbs with an energy creating vibrations on different planes of consciousness. The immobility which results from the finesse of movements drawing themselves to the inner core may be described with the Upanishadic Seers as the movement of Life into its ultimate of the luminous Void—a supreme movement (*parā gatih*) whose measure is eternity. It is a fact of Life, because it is a fact of Consciousness. Its expression is in radiation, in creative Joy—the joy that thrills, flashes, bursts into ideal rhythms, and finally materializes in forms. Creative Joy liberates, because it depends for its creation on nothing extraneous. It is the projection of a self-vision, first in the luminosity of an ethereal perception which automatically proceeds towards a polarity simply because Space has been possible for the manipulation of Forms. Since the process is not an absolutely new beginning but an enigmatic cycle where Time can curl into a point, materials which have been discarded during the movement of integration can be taken up again to infuse them with a deeper meaning. The Spirit that soared to the heavens returns to the earth and changes its face. Where there was a clash—Joy in its infinite toleration creates a harmony of lights and shades. And then the pure perception of a totality by its ingathered force touches in the heart of Existence the mainspring of all creative spirals. The total perception discovers the unique meaning—the cosmic Will which like a seed has thrown roots down and branches up. The discovery of the cosmic Will and its assimilation in the individual will-to-be, not in its groping futility but in its lucid sense of mastery over chaotic movements is a new spiritual value starting a dynamic series which forms the natural complement of the static trinity of Existence, Personality, and Joy.

The rest of the process is simple. Once Will has been mastered and poised in the integrity of a total vision, the unity of purpose spontaneously arranges the multiplicity of materials linking each of their varied movements to the causal urge. And this relation we call Knowledge (*jñāna*), viewed not as a passive impression but as a creative operation. This dynatic Knowledge is the second in the triad of the spiritual values born of Power.

The third, the spiritual Activity (*kriyā*) is a value which is the natural consummation of all that has gone before. It is inevitably bound up with the process of Time which may move either slowly or quickly according to some occult determinism. The indeterminability of the pace of Time creates a host of problems both for the inner and the outer world. The timeless vision appears anaemic to the sceptic and the martyrdom of faith seems to be a sheer waste of misdirected energy. Yet all acts are acts of faith. The urge to act is meaningless without a vision. The vision that rose in the One Self as a retrogressive movement of consciousness now hurls itself back on the field of the Many. The forms slowly evolving there have to be quickened; but how? A grim battle ensues, sanctioned by the impetus of the Divine Will. The travail of Mother Earth is reflected back from the face of the Void as Great Compassion

(*mahākaruṇā*). The Omniscience that guides to Freedom (the supreme attribute of Godhead conceived by the Rationalist) lets its mantle fall on the soul of the liberated in life (*Jīvanmukta*). The upward curve of power has come back to its point of origin. The circle has been completed; and in its centre throbs the meteoric soul of a Śaṅkara tearing the veils of *māyā* or shines the *sahaja* bliss of a Kabir plying the weaver's shuttle.

Have the life-values found their consummation in this? Yes. Says the Upanishad: 'Of all those who have known the Vast, worthiest is he who delights in the Self, sports with Souls and wields a silent dynamism of the Seer-Will'.

# LIMITATIONS OF PSYCHO-ANALYSIS

By Prof. D. N. Sharma

## I

The most outstanding event in the history of psychology has been the discovery of the 'Unconscious'. It has come to be recognized as the most effective and potential factor in determining the cause, course, and direction of our conscious life. It aroused bitter opposition from the orthodox school, and the redoubtable James subjected it to a withering criticism in one of the most brilliant and elaborated chapters of his *Principles of Psychology*. All such opposition has now become ineffective before the steadily growing volume of scientific opinion which favours the recognition and acceptance of this concept as a substantial contribution to an understanding of the mental make-up of an individual. There is, indeed, a sharp difference of opinion in respect of its claim to be regarded as the most fundamental, enduring, and essential fact of life—the very truth of all conscious experience; yet it has come to stay by virtue of its competence to fill a part at least of the gaping void in the mental set-up, caused by the failure of the orthodox psychologist to provide a scientific and rational explanation of not a small number of obscure mental phenomena, which had continued to baffle the critical no less than the ordinary intelligence for centuries. He, for instance, had failed to give an intelligent and intelligible explanation of the process by which a forgotten name, that has successfully dodged all previous efforts to recall it, touches the level of consciousness just when you are completely preoccupied with an intellectual activity of quite a different nature. It is a matter of common knowledge that solutions of some of the most complicated and highly involved problems, which are so vital to our very existence and well-being, have occurred to us in a flash in a manner which we cannot diagnose and in moments when we are apparently not engaged in anything like a serious attempt to solve it. The solution, so to speak, 'comes' of itself and in spite of us. Not unoften, we suddenly choose or feel constrained to act, much to our bewilderment and chagrin, in quite the contrary way from the consciously worked out plan to which we had devoted hours of serious and anxious thought.

The emergence of successfully intruding impulse and its irresistible force are matters which throw us into the sea of perplexity in respect of their mysterious source and an equally uncertain mode of their operation. Bertrand Russell writes in the preface to his *Outline of Philosophy* that he sat at his table for hours on end, visibly with the express intention of writing down his thesis in a coherent and systematic form; but the ideas took long in coming and he sat at the table wearing a blank and

vacant look, outwardly passive and helpless. The pen, ink, and paper lay before him for his use, but they were of no avail till, all at once, the flood-gates of his ideas were flung open, and that in an unforeseen and unconscious way. Of a sudden a mass of ideas had been released in a way unknown even to a philosopher of his acumen, and pressed for instant expression. All this clearly demonstrates that what seemed to be an interval of do-nothing passivity was, in fact, a period of intense feverish activity, during which there had gone on, in a continuous and uninterrupted stream, the process of the accumulation and arrangement of ideas and relevant facts. But the most significant fact to note is that the owner of these ideas was simply a passive observer of this interesting drama, if he was not actually unconscious of it. In *Jude the Obscure,* Hardy has attempted a threadbare analysis, with a deep psychological insight, of the motive-force which drew Jude magnetically towards Sue. He enumerates all possible reasons that Jude is consciously aware of, but even when all is said and done he has not exhausted the whole history of his inner mind or laid bare its hidden contents. Hardy probes deeper and records with the unfailing vision of a prophet that 'whatever Sue's virtues, talents, or ecclesiastical saturation, it was certain that those items were not all the cause of his affection for her'. It was this additional 'unconscious' and unnamed motive that held his mind in its iron grips so that the whole array of his ostentatious arguments was designed, and that too unconsciously, as a veil to cover the uncomfortable fact which he did not want openly to acknowledge, even to himself.

The scientific acceptance of its existence has raised the concept of the 'Unconscious' from the level of a vague speculation to the status of a positive force. Futher investigation has tended to show that it can be safely assumed as the substratum or, more plainly speaking, the primary motive of the flow of all subsequent conscious life. The latter comprises merely of ripples formed on the surface of what is virtually an unfathomable sea of the one universal primal life-urge of whose main contents we are largely unconscious. There seems to be a substantial measure of agreement so far as the existence of the Unconcious is concerned; but when it comes to defining or determining its nature, composition, and course of activity, there is, unhappily, such a wide divergence of opinion that rival theories have simply tended to befog the whole issue by investing it with a thick pall of confusing and contradictory ideas. A narrow vision and a limited field of enquiry are mainly responsible for an increased and incomprehensive grasp of the subject, and accounts for the fragmentary nature of our knowledge. A clear-sighted and gifted research student can, nevertheless, work his way to the discovery of the exact identity of the 'Unconscious', provided he could most adroitly and critically abstract from the confusing mass of ideas all those prejudiced and vitiated tendencies which obscure rather than reveal the object of our quest. All that is needed is to trace back our steps to the bare minimum of the unanimity so far achieved on the subject and use it as a basis for raising a subsequent structure on it. This can be easily achieved if our conclusions were made scrupulously to conform to facts that have won their way to universal recognition and acceptance. The 'repressed infantile sexuality' of Freud and the 'self-assertive urge' of Adler, and the 'introverting tendency' advocated by Jung, all point, unmistakably, to the incontrovertible fact of a deep-seated and firmly rooted urge which first germinates, and later determines and dominates, in spite of our conscious and deliberate plannings, the mainsprings of our active life.

The whole mystery of life lies hidden in the psyche—the entire drama of the Unconscious transforming itself into 'the stream of consciousness' is enacted in it and by its aid. Long before Freud, the psyche, with all its varied and profuse operational influences, was admitted to be a potential and effective factor in the dynamics of human life. All the same it had continued to be regarded as a vague phenomenon, and it goes to the immortal credit

of Freud that he directed our gaze to the inner working of this erstwhile mysterious faculty. From a study and analysis of the psychic experience of hysteroid personalities, difficult of treatment under the orthodox system, he was led to conclude, and that correctly, that an unconscious suppression of desires lay at the root of the seemingly abnormal functioning of the psyche. His research, conducted on the most scientific lines, provided the long-awaited rational interpretation to the morbidities, vagaries, and eccentricities of an abnormal life in the cruel grip of complexes and obsessions. The distinction between the normal and abnormal phenomena of life, based on the extent to which 'infantile sexuality' can successfully establish working relationships, or practise adjustments, with the environment, is a substautial contribution to the world of thought. The theory of Freud has not only helped cousiderably in brushing aside the cobwebs in the path of clear thinking but has also provided a scientific explanation and proper understanding of the abnormalities of life. Men known for the sanity and sobriety of their views have acclaimed this analysis as a landmark in the history of thought, but when Freud ventures forth to allocate the cause of all abnormalities to 'repressed infantile sexuality', some at least among the careful observers of facts find sufficient reason to join issue with him and question the soundness of his judgment and the logic of his arguments, based as they are on inadequate, partial, and questionable data.

## II

How did Freud fall a prey to this basic error? The reason is not far to seek. Impelled by a benevolent urge to simplify things for the average intellect, he felt unconsciously driven to the opposite extreme of over-simplification by attempting to reduce the entire gamut of urges and desires to the single one of 'sexuality' as the mainspring of the totality of the emotional drive in life. Now this conclusion, hastily striven after, lacks both the support of facts and the sanction of logic. That the sex instinct plays a major rôle in the dynamics of human life does not, of itself, warrant the validity of the inference that it can be equated with the 'primary impulse'. His analysis of the human psychosis, no doubt, applies wonderfully, and almost with mathematical precision, to all hysteric cases where abnormality can, invariably, be traced back to serious, sudden, and shocking maladjustments, uncomfortable complexes, and morbid obsessions. All these ailments are occasioned by the suppression of such desires as are mainly sexual in character. Unluckily he was tempted to extend the application of the inferences and implications of his scientific discovery and research to such other cases as were evidently not covered by his investigations. Enthused by his success, which had behind it the sanction of scientific certainty, he was led on to the conviction that all abnormality without exception, could be attributed to a frustration or thwarting of the sex instinct. Freud continued to exploit his discovery as a spring-board for the formulation of an all-inclusive theory of universal import so as to include within its range every state of the mind, normal no less than abnormal, healthy no less than morbid. In all this he was impelled by an ambition to give the dignity of finality to what had been conclusively established as the most efficacious formula in a limited sphere of the psychical life. In doing so he evidently overreached the mark and, consequently, arrived at results which are at variance with the higher experiences of life. Even his direct disciples and contemporaries found sufficient cause to be sceptical of his ultimate achievement, and felt constrained to conduct their research on markedly different lines. The larger vision of Jung contemplated the possibility of the 'Unconscious' being the ultimate fact of life rather than a mere phenomenon of 'suppressed desires'. The highest reach and consummation of consciousness is, according to him, a relapse into or a complete immersion in the original unconscious principle—a fact easily nnderstood in the light of the experiences of

Indian Yogis who discovered the fulfilment of life's reaches in Samādhi.

The poetic vision apprehends the truth of life far more clearly than the insight of a psychologist. Long before the advent of psycho-analysis or the discovery of the Unconscious, Wordsworth's prophetic vision had fully realized the potentialities of the unconscious forces, and clearly apprehended the way in which they functioned and influenced the life of a poet, which is just one of the modes in which maladjustment finds a free channel for its self-expression and self-assertion. This is how Wordsworth explains the functioning of the psyche: In an 'hour of feeling', the psyche 'drinks at every pore' the spirit of 'love, now a universal birth' which is unconsciously 'stealing from heart to heart'. Now human love, it has been said, may be distinguished as *eros* and *agape*; the former usually considered as an instinctive reaction of the psyche to beauty in the environment and the latter as directly related to the inner reservoirs or springs which may well be termed as the 'Unconscious'. The 'Prelude' is an exhaustive and detailed record of the way in which what is purely instinctive or psychic develops into an experience of a subtler and purer type where the unconscious generates in the poet's heart love of an unsexual kind. Freud has remarked that the artist, like any other man with an unsatisfied longing, turns away from reality and transfers all his libido and all his interest on to the creation of his wishes in the life of phantasy. This life of phantasy, according to this theory, is a stealthy and sly eruption of suppressed desires and their free and fantastic association at the conscious level but lacking an organized form due to 'repression'.

His analysis stops short here and confuses the 'sub-conscious' region in which are pushed back undesirable or unmanageable desires with the 'unconscious' source and origin of all impulses, urges, and desires. Freud's conception of the Unconscious is rather vague, sketchy, and incomprehensive. Jung seems to have profited by the wider, ampler, and clearer vision of the philosophers and poets and has accepted the existence of the 'Unconscious' as the seat of those 'high instincts', 'first affections', or 'primary feelings' which Wordsworth believes.

> 'Are yet the fountain-life of all our day,
> Are yet a master light of all our seeing.'

It would be far too much to say that these 'high instincts' can, in any way, be completely and exclusively identified with the sex urge. The ampler vision of the poet rejects outright the ambitious but untenable claim of Freud that sex instinct alone determines, guides, and directs all human activity and provides the sole key to the mystery of all deviations from the normal course of life. The main prop of the three-pillared mansion of psycho-analysis (suppressed-infantile-sexuality) thus turns out to be a doubtful and unverified hypothesis, a chimera rather than a reality, a smoke-screen to hide ignorance rather than a light to dispel darkness.

The second pillar, too, has only a seeming reality. The hypothesis of 'suppression' is still more complex and highly involved. That it is a common experience in normal no less than in abnormal life no one who has any regard for facts can deny; yet the phenomenon of 'suppression' is not so simple a fact as Freud was deluded to believe it was. The psyche operates in quite the opposite way when faced with 'suppression' in normal as contrasted with abnormal life. It becomes easily intelligible if proper emphasis be laid on the fact that the process of its origination varies in the two cases. In all hysteric cases, for instance, the psyche is awakened into consciousness by the physical desires of the individual on meeting with a stiff and stubborn resistance and formidable hurdles that drive one to utter despair and confusion, ending in a violent 'suppression' of the desires themselves. The resources of the psyche, at this stage, being obviously circumscribed, its capacity for adjustment gets totally paralysed and accordingly, 'substitution', 'transformation' or 'sublimation' are, in the nature of things, rare occurrences in such cases. The inevitable consequence is the derangement of the normal functioning of the psyche. The process takes

on a completely different form, however, in the case of a normal person in whom the psyche gets tuned to conscious activities because of its being stirred to greater depths as a result of the demands made on it by the urges and desires that are mainly non-physical and non-sexual. Such desires find an opposition from the unyielding elements in the environment which, far from being all too powerful for them, show an inherent incapacity to provide them adequate satisfaction of the kind and nature demanded from them. The poet who longs for an apprehension of 'unrestrained liberty' or 'the immortal spirit of nature' can only despair of having a visible or tangible experience of it. This incapacity or bankruptcy of the environment, blind and stubborn as it is, cannot 'suppress' the psychic energy; it simply provokes it to be diverted into channels where, whipped up by 'resistance' to a new peak of intensity, it seeks to create ideational gratifications for the desires in the world of rich fantasy, and thus gives shape to 'airy nothings' or imparts new and unique significance to common objects, and invests them with the halo of a mystifying glory. The poet sees in the wildness of the West Wind or in the heavenward flight of the skylark a vision of liberty; the nightingale ceases to be a mere 'handful of feathers' or the singer of a song, but becomes the very embodiment of 'immortality'. Experience has shown conclusively that ideational creations can by no means be explained away as the futile and ineffectual floatings of the psyche 'in the void'. These 'airy nothings', with the passage of time, come to exert irresistible influence on the drama of life, take a deep root in the emotional life of the community, and before long, are weighted with substance, human values, and even practical utility. The shadows get metamorphosed into substances. The psyche works powerfully and freely when liberated from the entanglements of the environment which it rejects and by-passes in order to assume vaster proportions in a region where opposition does not obtain, or is rendered ineffective. The 'ideas' and 'images' which populate this region serve as appropriate vehicles and habiliments for the unaccommodated desires to seek gratification. Suppression in a healthy life thus leads to the enfranchisement of the psyche from 'the earthly freight' and the 'weight of custom'. The *freed psychic activity* has come to be termed as *imagination,* and its gratification in the ideational world as *creation*. The liberated psychic *energy* is the *impulse to joy* and *rhythmic play*—the impulse to create beauty; and its quality of self-projection is designated in common parlance as *inspiration.* The poet's vision sees in 'suppression' the origin and birth of the fruitful activities of the creative functioning of the psyche. Suppression throws open the gates of the sub-conscious; creation leads on to a direct contact with the Unconscious.

Now we come to the most fundamental fact of the theory of psycho-analysis and shall once again find reason to discover that we can place greater reliance on the poetic vision as against the insight and analysis of the psychologist. The psychologists, the philosopher, the poet, and the mystic, all seem driven, treading of course on different paths, to the agreed goal of locating the mystery of life in the 'infantile stage'. Freud traces all the difficulties of an abnormal life and its wanderings in the world of 'fantasy' to the suppression of 'infantile' sexuality. Nietzsche, the great German philosopher, distinguishes three well marked stages in the evolution of human life: it starts with the 'camel' stage, progresses towards the 'tiger' stage, and finally gets consummated in the 'child' stage. The *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* reveals the fact that the Pandit (the erudite scholar or philosopher) must perforce acquire, in full measure, all the traits and virtues of a 'child' as a condition-precedent for the ultimate realization of the Absolute Reality. The poet Wordsworth, in a moment of rapturous ecstasy, saw in the 'child' 'father of the man'. Yet we find only a seeming similarity in the viewpoints of the psychologist and the poet-mystic. Up to a certain point there is a clear evidence of a close parallelism between the two; yet the inherently wide and gaping divergence of out-

looks and methods of inquiry lead them to diagonally opposite results. The 'shades of the prison-house' which begin 'to close upon the growing boy' are analogous to the dangerous potentialities of maladjustment; and to a superficial view there appears to be an obvious identity between the 'earthly freight' which the 'lethargy of custom' brings with it and the much-vaunted fact of the 'suppression of desires'. Here, however, the show of the kinship and the affinity of purpose between 'vision' and 'analysis' cease to exist. 'Repression in the life of a man with unsatisfied longings prevents the emergence to the top of an organized free play and gratification of suppressed desires, and the result is that "chaos" is come again.' In the life of an artist too, the inevitable yoke of years causes the 'vision splendid' to die away and 'fade into the light of the common day'. But the light of our life's star can, with the advance of years and dominance of the world which is 'too much with us', still contrive to live, may be with a diminished glory, in the embers of the fading light in the form of 'first affections'. A recollection of these enables the psyche to pick up the fragments of the broken threads to rebuild and reform out of them a new fabric of the divine experience. This rare privilege is beyond the utmost reach of the intellect, much less that of sensibility. The child alone —'the mighty prophet' and 'seer blest'—is the eternal inheritor and sole possessor of this vision. He is the very embodiment of the Unconscious, not yet tainted by the externalizations of the conscious life; he is the living image of eternity, not yet polluted by the muddy stream of time.

(*To be continued*)

---

# STUDIES IN THE BRIHADARANYAKA UPANISHAD

By Dr. Nalini Kanta Brahma

(*Continued from the August issue*)

## VIII

### Conclusion

The *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* has attained the supreme place amongst the works on the *jñāna-vāda* not only because it is a part of the Vedas but because it has given a very clear and elaborate exposition of the path of knowledge and has definitely solved the most important difficulties pertaining to the doctrine in a very satisfactory manner.

### I

In the Upanishads, very often seemingly contradictory descriptions are found about Brahman. Sometimes Brahman is described as everything—*sarvagandhah sarvarasah,* etc. At other places Brahman is described as *'neti neti'*—not this, not this, *asthūlam anaṇu, apūrvam anaparam,* etc. The *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* reconciles these apparently contradictory statements by showing that these do not refer to the same Reality. We have to distinguish between a lower and a higher Brahman, so to say. The *mukhya-prāṇa* is the lower Brahman, and is the immanental Absolute. Everything in this universe owes its origin to it and it is present in all things. It is the essence of all things and is the soul of the system of causes and effects. It is *āñgirasa* ; it is not only omnipresent but is

the soul of all things. All things live, move, and have their being in it. It transcends all limitations—it is *dūr,* i.e. above all sin and suffering, above all finitude and attachment. Although present in everything it transcends them all because of its natural purity and detachment. It is endowed with all *upādhis* and is responsible for creation, maintenance, and destruction. It serves the purpose of God of the theists, and if the Upanishads speak of something higher than this Prāṇa, there is no room for the objection that the highest Reality of the Upanishads is lower than God. The *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* definitely states that there is no *rati* (satisfaction) and there is no *abhaya* (fearlessness) even after the attainment of this stage and it is only when the higher Reality, the One Self or Brahman is reached that *abhaya* (complete fearlessness) results. The transcendental Absolute is beyond all *upādhis* and there is no trace of the particulars in it. The failure to distinguish between the lower and higher Brahman, the Prāṇa and the Atman, the immanental and the transcendental Absolute is at the root of all confusion ; the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* has done a great service by showing clearly the nature and scope of each and those who still hold that the Personal God of the theists is higher than the Impersonal Absolute and claim the support of the Upanishads in their favour have either not taken the trouble of going through the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* or wilfully delude themselves and others. The *prajāpati,* the *Hiraṇyagarbha,* the *mukhya-prāṇa,* all are names of the immanental or lower Brahman ; it is possible to attain this level through *karma* enlightened by *buddhi.* It has been repeatedly stated that this is not the final stage and it has its limitations. The highest stage has been described as eternally existing and real, as eternally accomplished and not something *to be* attained and *karma* has no place here. To the reader of the Upanishad there cannot remain any doubt that the Atman or Brahman that is beyond all duality and division has been definitely shown to be above the Prāṇa or the *Hiraṇyagarbha* which involves and includes duality within it and those who think like Sri Aurobindo that there is a stage beyond the non-duality of the Atman and Brahman are seeking something higher than the highest, a duality above non-duality, which comes as the consummation of all duality and do not know what the demand implies. The *advaita* experience is not something that is opposed to the experience of duality. It brings with it the realization of all duality or *dvaita* as *mithyā* (false). The *dvaita* becomes *bādhita,* the reality of duality becomes falsified in the *advaita* experience. It does not oppose the *dvaita* experience but transcends it. There is no possibility of the reappearance of any *dvaita* experience because it has been transcended already. This is the real distinction between the *laya-samādhi* of the Yogins and the *bādha-samādhi* of the Vedantins. It is not the contention of the Vedantin that there is an *advaita* experience in opposition to the *dvaita* experience belonging to another moment; according to him the *dvaita* gets falsified in the presence of the *advaita* experience. The higher transcendent experience establishes its reality by reducing the lower experience to unreality. Sri Aurobindo really misses this important point and he evidently places the Vedantic experience on a par with the Yogic experience. His exposition and criticism of the Vedantic system have suffered from this fundamental defect and it is because of this that he has failed to recognize the finality and superiority of the Vedantic experience.

## II

The *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* has also reconciled the controversy between *bhedābheda-vāda* and *abheda-vāda,* a really difficult and important controversy in Vedantic literature.

It has been stated that the Absolute after having created the universe of names and forms entered into it. This is *adhyāropa* (super-imposition). The universe, every infinitesimal thing belonging to it, owes its reality to the Absolute. The Absolute is in everything of this universe and has assumed all names

and forms. There is not the least doubt in the matter. Whatever is, is the Absolute. All appearances have their substratum and support in the Absolute. There is nothing 'other' than the Absolute. The Absolute is all in all and the whole universe is its body. This is *bhedābheda-vāda.* The Absolute is One-in Many. The Many belong to the Absolute, form its body, and are not different from it. The One is the Many and the Many are the One. The relation is just like that of the body to its different organs.

The *Bṛhadāraṇyaka* holds that all this is true. So far as the world is concerned, the *bhedābheda-vāda* holds good. The ordinary examples of the tree and its branches and leaves, and of the sea and its waves, do illustrate the *bhedābheda-vāda,* no doubt. But it is to be remembered that so far as Brahman is concerned, these *laukika-dṛṣṭāntas,* instances taken from the world, have no value. It is because of the *adhyāropa,* the superimposition, that the *bhedābheda-vāda* assumes this semblance of reality. But we have to remember that for the Vedantic system the *adhyāropa* is not the final world. The entire Upanishads are anxious to show the *apavāda,* the elimination of the superimposition, which forms the indispensable correlate of the *adhyāropa.* The *nānātva,* the plurality, is not real; Brahman is none of the particulars, *neti neti*—not this, not this; the universe does not form any part of Brahman and does not touch it at all; Brahman is the Pure Consciousness, the direct realization and not any particular state of consciousness—*sa eṣa neti neti,* and many other clear and unambiguous statements show definitely that what was introduced for elucidation of a difficult problem is being withdrawn leaving the Reality, the Pure Consciousness, unenveloped by any *upādhis*, alone. To put faith in the *bhedābheda-vāda* is to see only one side of the picture viz. the *adhyāropa.* There is no other alternative but to accept the *abheda vāda,* the *advaita,* as the only truth when the meaning of the Upanishadic texts from the beginning to the end is sought to be understood. The Upanishads will appear to be a hopeless jumble of contradictory statements if they are not viewed and studied from the standpoint of *adhyāropa* and *apavāda.* This forms the key which alone can unlock the great mysteries contained in the sublime texts. The attempt to comprehend the scriptures by mere understanding, unaided by the helpful suggestions put forward by the scriptures themselves, is sheer folly.

For purposes of the world the *bhedābheda-vāda* is helpful, but for the purpose of *mokṣa* or liberation it is altogether unsuitable. The Absolute which is *asanga,* completely transcendent, and which is not at all touched by the particulars, cannot be the One-in-Many or the Many-in-One. The *niṣedha* Śrutis, i.e. the texts which definitely withdraw the previous superimposition, become meaningless nonsense if Reality is One-in-Many as *bhedābheda-vāda* supposes.

## III

The relation between *jñāna* and *karma* has been very clearly explained and their respective provinces have been unambiguously demarcated. *Karma* is possible only in the sphere of *avidyā,* only so long as the division between the agent, action, and result of the action is maintained. When knowledge dispels ignorance, all division and difference are perceived to be illusory and unreal and the One divisionless Self is recognized to be the only reality. No *karma* is possible at this stage. It is to be remembered that the word *'karma'* is used in a special sense in the Vedanta. Any movement is not *karma. Karma* has its basis in the division between the doer, the action, and the result of the action—*kriyā, kāraka,* and *phala.* The movement or process (*vyāpāra*) that happens without having its basis in the division referred to above cannot be termed *karma*—it is a mere movement and nothing else and it is not in contradiction with *jñāna. Karma* or the action that follows from the sense of difference is opposed to *jñāna* simply because the latter means the sense of absolute identity and non-difference while the former has its source and

basis in the sense of difference. The sense of difference persists even at the stage of the Creator, the *prajāpati* or the *Hiraṇyagarbha,* and the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka* has no hesitation in proclaiming that *avidyā* is not transcended thoroughly even at this stage. So long as there is the least sense of difference and division, so long as there is the faintest trace of any desire (*eṣaṇā*) and hankering, so long as there is the perception of anything 'other' than the Self as real, so long as there is the identification of the Self with any particular *upādhis* or adjuncts, i.e. with anything forming the not-Self, there is the working of *avidyā* and it is still the sphere of *karma. Jñāna* is inconsistent with the sense of division, with desire and hankering, with anything other than the Self, and therefore there cannot be any simultaneity between *jñāna* and *karma.* There cannot be *jñāna* so long as *karma* persists and there cannot be *karma* after *jñāna* is attained. The Self is seen at the stage of *jñāna* to have no connection with anything and, therefore, it cannot be the agent of any action and *karma* at this stage becomes an utter impossibility.

The *Bṛhadāraṇyaka* conclusively shows that the repeated Śruti texts leave no other interpretation possible. That the Self is *asanga,* that there is nothing other than the Self, that all misery and grief (*śoka* and *moha*) cease when the pervasive reality of the One Self is seen, that there is no plurality and no variety, that the Self or the ultimate Reality is *ekarasa* (homogeneous), that names and forms and all particularizations are mere creations and do not persist in the Absolute Consciousness, that there is absence of specification (*viśeṣa sanga*) in the Absolute-realization, that the Self and Brahman are absolutely identical—these texts have so often been repeated that to an earnest student having no partisan spirit there is very little possibility of any other interpretation being suggested. The *adhyāropa* Śrutis and the *niṣedha* Śrutis, the texts showing that Brahman is nothing of the things of the universe, taken together can only suggest the transcendent purity of the Absolute—not at all touched and affected either by the imposition or by the withdrawal.

*Karma* is essential and useful so long as *jñāna* does not arise. The *karma-kāṇḍa* of the Vedas is perfectly valid and has undisputed sway so long as the *jñāna-kāṇḍa* does not find its scope. There is no opposition between the two simply because the scope of the one differs from that of the other. *Karma-kāṇḍa* is valid for the ignorant, it has no scope for the wise and the liberated. Similarly *jñāna-kāṇḍa* is not meant for the ignorant, it leaves them alone. The reconciliation between *jñāna* and *karma* is effected by clearly separating the respective provinces of each and the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka* has done a great service by dispelling the comparison once for all. *Sannyāsa* (renunciation) symbolizes the cessation of *karma* for the *jñānin.* The *bheda-darśana* (sense of division), the *eṣaṇā* (desires), the reality of the not-Self, must disappear and all *karma* based on these must cease before there can be *jñāna.* This is all that is implied in the prescription of *Sannyāsa* as being essential to *jñāna.* It is not mere outward renunciation of works,—it implies and involves the perception of the Self as non-doer from which no action can proceed.

*Bheda* or the sense of division is prior to *abheda* or the sense of non-duality. Persons are born with the sense of *bheda* and hence *karma-kāṇḍa* has its validity for all persons at the outset. It is only when knowledge dispels ignorance and the attendant sense of division that *karma-kāṇḍa* ceases to be valid and the *jñāna-kāṇḍa* acquires its scope. It is an entire misunderstanding of the problem to suggest that there may be a *bheda-darśana,* a perception of difference, following the *abheda-darśa* or the realization of the non-duality. The sense of non-duality that comes as a result of Vedantic discipline is not to be confused with the want of discrimination that is to be found in the child and the stupid, because it is definitely stated that the Vedantic perception of non-duality comes after full discrimination and the ripe development of the intellect. It is true that it trans-

cends discriminative knowledge but it is to be clearly noted that it is not anti-discriminative but post-discriminative. Vedantic non-duality is not opposed to duality in the sense that it is one member of the opposition. It transcends duality because in its presence duality reduces itself to unreality, and as duality and non-duality are simultaneously presented and the one establishes its reality by reducing the other to unreality, there is possibility of duality raising its head o again. This is the beauty of the Vedar logic and metaphysics that it establishes position and its transcendent superiority removing the possibility of any further oppc tion or antithesis.

(*Concluded*)

# THE PHILOSOPHY OF VIVEKANANDA AND THE FUTURE OF MANKIND

By Dr. Gobinda Chandra Deb

## I. Introduction

I am enamoured of the philosophy of Vivekananda because I believe that a great philosophy invariably works behind a great mind. But there is perhaps a weightier reason that goads me to my present task. Rightly or wrongly, I have been led to hold that the future of humanity lies in a practical application of the great philosophy that Vivekananda lived as well as preached. This is, to my mind, the 'perennial philosophy' that underlies all religions and is the meeting-ground of men of religion on the one hand and the modern humanists of different varieties on the other. Naturally enough, I cannot possibly overrate its importance.

But I feel constrained to say at the very outset that to me at least Vivekananda is more a principle than a person. I am a bit too fond of a Platonic reading of his magnetic personality and dynamic character since I look upon the mere reduction of the 'Immortal Idea' into the 'mortal flesh', as a blunder fraught with disastrous consequences for humanity.

If I were to sum up in one word all that is best in human endeavour, since the dawn of history, for a better world and better existence, I can possibly do no better than concentrate upon the magic word 'synthesi The greatness of Vivekananda lies in the fa that he has given us a synthetic code of l which may with justice be looked upon as t philosophy of synthesis *par excellence*.

But his philosophy cannot, I am afraid, detached from the historic background up which it has taken its root. Vivekananda synthetic outlook is but a vivid expression what India in spite of her occasional laps tried, since prehistoric days, to concrete in h collective life, and of which the most matu fruit seems to be Ramakrishna, the 'Seraph Master' of Vivekananda, as Romain Rollar would like to call him.

The synthesis of reason and intuition ar through that of science and religion, of matt and spirit, of the integral phases of the huma mind as approaches to the realm of reality and, above all, of the spiritual urge of the select few with the material needs of the teem ing millions constitute the burden of the gre system of philosophy whose outlines I a attempting to draw. I cannot possibly expe to do the barest justice to its vast magnitude and therefore I confine myself to a simple enunciation of its most salient features.

## II. Epistemology: The Meeting-ground of Intellect and Intuition traced

The watchword of Vivekananda's epistemology seems to be a recognition of the meeting-ground of intellect and intuition on the one hand and sense and intellect on the other, the latter as the corollary of the former. As he beautifully puts it: '. . . instinct, reason, and superconsciousness . . . belong to one and the same mind. There are not three minds in one man, but one state of it develops into the others. Instinct develops into reason, and reason into the transcendental consciousness; therefore, not one of the states contradicts the others. Real inspiration never contradicts reason but fulfils it.'[1] I have found, I think with full justice, the equivalent of instinct in sense, since instinct is ordinarily supposed to be the common feature of man and the lower animals while reason is taken to be the prerogative of man. With obvions justice I can treat intuition as tantamount to what has alternately been characterized as superconsciousness and transcendental consciousness. To my mind, the aforesaid utterance of Vivekananda constitutes the key-note of his philosophy. *Prima facie,* it gives us his epistemology, but a closer analysis reveals that in it is contained the gist of his metaphysics and ethics too. Let us for the present confine our attention to its epistemological aspect.

In ancient India and medieval Europe, often enough, faith has been given a place superior to reason. In modern philosophy, the scale has no doubt turned in favour of the latter. Nevertheless in its affiliation to intellect and intuition, to reason and faith, the present age seems to be in an unstable equilibrium since most of us, at least a good number, are very much dissatisfied with the present social order based purely on the plodding process of intellect. Side by side with this extravagant intellectualism of the day, we, therefore, come across an undertone of faith, an inarticulate assertion in favour of a world beyond the grasp of man's intellect. The unequivocal preference of Rousseau, in the latter half of the eighteenth century, for feeling as against reason and a clear recognition, in Bergson later on, of intuition as an organ of knowledge of reality illustrate the tendency. Kant, of course, attempts to build a half-way house between reason and faith and gives us knowledge without faith and faith without knowledge; but this also is an attempt to accommodate faith somehow. But neither an outright denial of logic nor a reduction of the normal man into a multiple personality can satisfy us. What we want is a synthesis of the demands of our different faculties and not a perpetual tussle between positive dogmatism and negative dogmatism. In the face of such confusion, it therefore sounds like the voice of an oracle when Vivekananda declares that our different organs of knowledge such as instinct, intellect, and intuition do not contradict but supplement each other. But then, how? This indeed is the question of questions. Even a little analysis will clarify the point and carry conviction.

To understand precisely the synthesis of intellect and intuition in Vivekananda, it is essential to ascribe equal importance to its two consecutive moments or more appropriately its two inseparable phases. The first is his unequivocal emphasis upon the experimental and through that scientific as well as logical character of superpsychic or Yogic experiences that constitute the burden of his immortal work, *Rāja Yoga.* While elaborating his attitude to supralogical cognitions, some have invariably referred to this aspect of the topic since it is difficult not to recognize the obvious. Nevertheless, though not equally obvious—rather somewhat hidden—there is a second consideration that has made him an advocate of the aforesaid synthesis, perhaps a weightier consideration without which the first remains incomplete. It is the recognition of the transempirical cognition of identity as the fulfilment of the unrealized ideal of reason, the great *terra firma* of his neo-Vedantic metaphysics.

[1] *The Complete Works of Swami Vivekananda,* Vol. I, p. 185.

The present age is eminently scientific in its outlook and the essence of science, it is suggested, consists in a verification of theories before accepting them as true. Consistently with the scientific temper of the age and with a view to lay the axe at the root of its prevalent scepticism, Vivekananda asserts that, judged by the criterion of science, the objectivity of superpsychic experiences stands unchallenged since they are the outcome of a discipline of the will, of certain processes open to all for verification and not mere figments of imagination. There is no scope for make-believe or wish-fulfilment in them, as their simple method is, 'verify and accept', just the same method as that of a laboratory scientist. In support of his assertion he appeals to Vāchaspati, the renowned commentator on Yoga philosophy, who maintains that the procedure of Yoga is purely empirical, since even a little practice generates a new experience and thus gives the impetus for exploring the unexplored. To quote Vivekananda's own words, inimitable in clarity and force: 'Religion deals with the truths of the metaphysical world just as chemistry and the other natural sciences deal with the truths of the physical world'.[2]

The above defence of supralogical experiences concedes them only apparently a restricted or hypothetical universality, since, according to it, privacy is their accidental feature while universality is their essence. An experience can be labelled as subjective only when it is unconditionally confined to the privileged few. Judged by a false standard, all ascending emergents in the hierarchy of evolution might, on the verdict of the lower ones, be treated as subjective. If restricted sphere be taken as the infallible mark of subjectivity, all our higher experiences will lose their significance and 'Socrates dissatisfied' will in consequence be judged by 'a human being satisfied' and 'a human being dissatisfied' by 'a pig satisfied'.

The higher moral worth of superpsychic experiences has therefore been emphasized unreservedly by Vivekananda. They are taken invariably to presuppose a discipline of the will, a degree of moral perfection but for which no credeuce should be attached to them. Inspiration of the impure must be looked upon as a snare and the trade on behalf of the supernatural and supersensuous, carried on since time immemorial among the credulous, must be treated with contempt. As Spinoza says, '. . . and clearly it must be very hard since it is so seldom found . . . all excellent things are as difficult as they are rare'; or, in the words of the Upanishad, *'kṣurasyadhārā niśitā duratyayā durgam pathastat-kavayo vadanti'*—'Sages declare that the path (to perfection) is hard to tread and hazardous to cross like the sharp edge of a razor'.

Nevertheless Vivekananda's challenging defence of the objectivity and moral worth of superpsychic experiences does not seem to be altogether unqualified since, in the last resort, he is prepared to assess their worth only in relation to a transcendental intuition of identity on the road to which they are but 'milestones'. And if they fail to lead to that consummation, they are no better than useless. It is apparent that while he has made his transition from supralogical experiences to the transcendental awareness of identity, the centre of gravity has shifted and the latter has become the all-important factor. In other words, these supralogical experiences are significant only as an antidote to a narrow intellectualism which refuses to take cognizance of the supersensuous but not as an organ of knowledge of the ultimate Reality. To understand precisely Vivekananda's transition from intellect to intuition it is necessary to bring out the full epistemological implications of this preference throughout his writings and speeches for the intuition of identity.

It may be presumed that this preference itself is conditioned by the same ethical necessity that has made him a ruthless defender of superpsychic experiences. This is admittedly true ; but this is not the whole truth, since Vivekananda is never tired of repeating that the goal of reason and science is unity and

[2] *Op. cit.*, Vol. VI, p. 47.

that the moment unity in a particular sphere is reached, the task of that particular science will be over, and also the moment we can trace the entire world of experience to an ultimate unity, philosophy will reach its culmination. This belief leads him to assert unhesitatingly that Vedanta as the philosophy of unity is the most rational reading of Reality and as such can alone claim a scientific foundation. This uncompromising preference for the notion of ultimate unity, on clearly theoretic grounds, cannot be brushed aside as purely ethical.

There are certain other references though not quite explicit but yet very significant, which seem to lend support to my contention. In his orientation to Vedanta, we find that Vivekananda seems to have something in common with Kant, particularly the Kantian demonstration that the 'thing-in-itself' cannot be known by intellect which invariably works within the framework of space, time, and causation. He appeals to extralogical awareness in order to get out of this predicament of intellect. It will not be very difficult to show that this intuition of the logically unknowable is an intuition of pure identity, since space, time, and causation can have meaning only in relation to the world of plurality. Again, Vivekananda seems to be prone to look upon intuition as the true type of immediate apprehension since, according to him, ordinary perception leaves scope for subjective distortion and as such might be mediate in character. Immediate apprehension thus demands perfect absence of subjective distortions which is possible only if the subject and the object coalesce. In other words, he maintains that undifferenced Absolute alone can be characterized as the immediate apprehension of the true type—*yat-sākṣād-aparokṣād-Brahma*—as it is stated in the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad*.

Besides, in tracing the limitations of reason, he at times asserts that logic works under certain presuppositions which may ultimately be reduced to a fundamental principle whose truth it cannot *ex hypothesi* vouch and verify. The demonstration of the validity of this fundamental assumption of reason he leaves to extralogical intuition. It may perhaps be true that this intuition is no other than the intuition of pure identity, the great fulcrum of his system. An analysis of what we consider the fundamental assumption of reason will bring to light what is being hinted at.

The ultimate assumption behind all logical constructions of philosophy seems to be the concept of pure identity whose epistemological (or logical) equivalent is non-contradiction or self-consistency. The law of self-consistency has been accepted as the most fundamental law of thought by Aristotle. According to competent authorities, the logic of the present day is but an extension of the principles of Aristotle and does not depart substantially from them. Hegel wanted to refute Aristotle by maintaining that the true function of thought is to synthesize contradictories and as such he does not fight shy of them. The Hegelian position seems to be untenable since the very demand of a synthesis of opposites implies a transcendence of them. This virtually implies that thought can find rest in the self-consistent alone. The great metaphysicians of the world like Shankara, Nāgārjuna, Bradley, and others refuse to treat the world that stands before us as the ultimate Reality, since it is shot through and through with discrepancies. The presupposition behind such a reading of reality is that the ultimate ideal of intellect is self-consistency. Spinoza treats the world of experience as a product of imagination since it is temporal and the notion of time is, according to idealists, not free from contradictions. Even Bergson, according to whom time rightly understood is the stuff of reality, contends that time as intellectually conceived is a bundle of contradictions but as intuited it is utterly free from them. The refutation by different schools of Vedanta of the Jaina doctrine that reality is capable of seven exclusive and contradictory predications is based on the recognition that reality is self-consistent. In short, if the ultimate aim of philosophy is the attainment of necessary truth as it should be, there is no escape from the conclusion that self-consistency is its final objective.

But curiously enough, for speculative philosophy the principle of self-consistency, left to itself, is only a necessary concept of intellect, having no element of objectivity in it. To adapt a phrase of Kant, it has 'regulative but no constitutive validity'. Consequently to treat it by itself as the criterion of the felt reality of the world of sense will be the height of folly. In other words, speculative philosophy, as long as it is confined within the bounds of reason, is simply a process of concept-making through a logical necessity, a confusion of the subjective with the objective, and is vitiated by the fallacies of the traditional ontological argument for the existence of God brought to light by Kant in his *Critique of Pure Reason*. An appeal to the intuition of pure identity, *aparokṣa anubhūti,* of the Vedanta alone can make the highest ideal of reason objective and thus save philosophy from wasting its energies in the domain of pure subjectivity. This is the much-needed transition in philosophy from intellect to intuition, from the subjective necessity of self-consistency to its objective validity without which philosophy's search for reality must for ever remain a dream. This is not merely an analysis of 'the feeling where concept fails' as Dr. Otto would have us call it but also a demonstration of the fundamental unity of both the feeling and the concept. The preliminary defence of objectivity of superpsychic experiences, in the philosophy of Vivekananda, therefore, merely paves the way for the recognition of the intuition of undifferenced identity as the goal of philosophy. The first step in the discovery is the demonstration of the objectivity of superpsychic experiences as such and the second and last is the selection of the highest ideal of logic out of the confused mass of extralogical intuitions. To speak in terms of Aristotle, reason gives the ultimate intuition its form while the ultimate intuition gives the highest ideal of intellect its matter. Thus, through mutual aid is resolved satisfactorily the conflict between intellect and intuition and the great gulf between them is bridged.

This explains Vivekananda's rigorous adherence to the world of faith consistently with his uncompromising allegiance to reason. It is perhaps because of this that he looks upon the Vedas, the great source of inspiration of Hindu thinkers since time immemorial, as a storehouse of supersensuous truths realized in the heights of extralogical intuitions and observes, quoting the authority of Manu, that if any portion of the Vedas is not consistent with reason it must be treated with reserve,—a statement whose striking resemblance with Spinoza's observation in the seventeenth century on the Bible may very profitably be noted.

It is then seen that this synthesis considerably helps resolve the conflict between sense and intellect. The ultimate ideal of intellect being now objective may possibly be in a position to accommodate the objective manifold of sense in spite of its discrepancies. The almost insuperable barrier caused by the subjectivity of the one and the objectivity of the other is removed and the remainder of the conflict may perhaps be resolved by a correct metaphysical approach.

A careful consideration reveals that the recognition of the objectivity of the principle of self-consistency would have totally changed the colour of the whole system of Kant, whose importance as a durable work of independent philosophical criticism can hardly be overestimated. His whole system is based upon the recognition of the principle of self-consistency as the ultimate ideal of reason whose verification he seeks in vain in the sphere of the sensible and consequently brands reality as unknown and unknowable. He attempts to compensate for this by moral faith and poetic imagination which cannot possibly serve the exact purpose of a knowledge of reality. He himself admits that he has demolished knowledge in order to leave room for faith, but he fails to see that intellect cannot find satisfaction in faith without knowledge even as our heart cannot in mere knowledge without faith. Kant's approach is based upon a recognition of distinct watertight faculties in man, a conception hardly consistent with the organic unity of our inner life and upon whose repudiation the edifice of Vivekananda's

philosophy is based. Kant has been forced to resort to this artificial procedure because of his unwillingness to recognize any intuition besides blind intuitions of sense, far less the intuition of pure identity that corroborates the objective validity of the ultimate postulate of speculative philosophy.

Hegel refuses to believe in the objectivity of extralogical intuitions on account of their alleged contingency. As contrasted with this, he has no hesitation in believing in the objectivity of logical concepts as they are necessary. The whole structure of idealism built by Hegel and his followers is based on a proposition which Kant spares no pains to repudiate, viz. subjective necessity is tantamount to objective validity. If the famous repudiation of the ontological argument in Kant to which reference has already been made stands, the foundation of idealism of the Hegelian brand needs must be very weak. It is apparent, therefore, that in the absence of a demonstration of the transition in supralogical intuition from subjective necessity to objective validity, the repudiation of Kant in Hegelian philosophy fares no better than a wordy warfare. Hegel simply deifies thought by treating it as an organ of knowledge and by making it, in its wider and larger context, the very fabric of the ultimate Reality. But the transformation of thought into an organ of knowledge cannot be achieved by a mere fiat of will. It can only succeed in making thought itself mysterious and in ascribing a mystic halo to it. Probably this was at the root of the misconception of William James that Hegel was a mystic.

But Bradley who, without being exactly a Hegelian, believes in the central message of Hegel, realizes the difficulty and refuses to admit that thought can directly reach the self-consistent whole of reality. Obviously enough, this precludes the possibility of an identification of thought with reality. He, however, maintains that in resolving contradictions, thought invariably gives rise to fresh ones and this double process continues *ad infinitum*. He would, therefore, prefer a knowledge of reality through 'suicide' of thought to a direct victory of it. It is difficult to understand what exactly this 'suicide' means and a tinge of agnosticism clings to this side of the philosophy of Bradley which cannot, it seems, be removed without an explicit appeal to supralogical intuition.

Of course Bradley very legitimately maintains that reality must satisfy us, a doctrine whose epistemological counterpart we have found in Vivekananda's view that the different faculties of the human mind cannot, in the interest of their organic unity, ultimately conflict with one another. But it would obviously be wrong to maintain on the basis of this quite significant doctrine that the satisfaction which logic is by nature incapable of giving us must somehow be extorted from it under the pressure of circumstances, if not under the pressure of reality. Bradley's cautious and guarded intellectualism is no doubt based on the recognition of this incapacity of thought. But owing to his unwillingness to invoke directly the aid of intuition in order to compensate for the deficiencies of intellect, he resorts to the alleged 'murder' of thought as a means of knowledge of reality and thus tries to ensure its partial victory through the backdoor. Rightly understood, thought can achieve a perfect victory in offering a necessary conception of reality, but it utterly fails in generating a knowledge of the same. It is clear that the satisfaction Bradley attempts to derive from intellect itself by strenuous and artificial efforts must in reality be derived through a transition from the conceptual realm of intellect to its objective counterpart in the sphere of supralogical cognitions. Even judged by the Hegelian standard, the supralogical intuition of identity can claim objectivity since it is nothing short of the corroboration of a necessary concept of reason, more precisely its most fundamental presupposition. In view of this, the refusal of Hegel and his followers to admit the objective validity of such a transempirical cognition seems to be not only unwarranted but also incomprehensible. An over-estimation of the possibilities of thought coupled with an

underestimation of supralogical awareness alone is responsible for this disparity.

In contemporary philosophy, more especially in Bergson, we come across an admission of extralogical intuition as an organ of knowledge of reality side by side with a denial—tacit or explicit—of the ultimate postulate of thought. Bergson's appeal to intuition seems to be conditioned by two factors: one, the recognition of antinomies of pure reason as expounded by Kant ; the other, the recognition of the highest synthesis of opposites as the ultimate Reality as Hegel would have us believe, only with this difference that unlike Hegel he equates it to the free creative flow of a multilinear process instead of an all-inclusive spirit. The first admission gives the impression that he is eager to postulate an intuition which is quite consistent with the ultimate demand of logic, while the second, that it runs counter to the same. But for his anti-intellectual leanings, the unity of the subject and the object, which is the condition *sine qua non* of intuition in Bergson, cannot possibly be identified with a free flow, since the distinction between the subject and the object being the infallible feature of the world of plurality, the alleged intuition must be characterized by an utter absence of plurality, i.e. pure identity. His anti-intellectualism is also apparent in his reduction of intellect to an organ of pragmatic adjustment of our volitional urges, to a stable fiction of its own make within the flow of reality. Intellect, in its psychological operations, may be a slave of the will, but not in its pure ones. In brief, Bergson's demand for intuition appears to be quite logical, but his notion of it remains in the last analysis alogical.

In the whole sphere of the modern philosophy of the West, Spinoza, who at times is regarded as the greatest of modern philosophers, alone unequivocally asserts not only the need of a transition from intellect to intuition but also of a fulfilment of the former in the latter. Philosophy must pass on from the mediate knowledge of ratio to the immediacy of *scientia intuitiva* which simply corroborates the former. It is the highest knowledge of reality which has also been alternately characterized as substance and God, a knowledge identical with a love of God on the one hand, 'Amoris Dei' as Spinoza puts it, and immortality on the other.

It seems that the ingredients of the view of Vivekananda, just elaborated, are there in Shankara, the champion of the ultimate futility of reason on the one hand and of the validity of the pure intuition of identity on the other, as is evident from his attachment to the notion of self-consistency already referred to. The deeper truth behind his oft-repeated contention that intellect cannot lead to a stable conception of reality is nothing short of an unqualified recognition of its incapacity to contribute to liberation, which results not from a necessary conception of reality but from an intuition of it. Speculatively speaking, this is tantamount to the admission of the conceptual necessity of the ultimate intellectual construction less its objectivity.

From the above brief survey of the views of prominent philosophers on the relation of intellect and intuition, it will be apparent that the epistemology and, through that, the philosophy of the future may legitimately draw its inspiration from Vivekananda in its attempt at solving the riddle of the universe and at a discovery of the meaning of life and existence. He was really a great confluence of reason and faith, about whom the following utterance of Romain Rolland appears, on a close analysis, to be a bare statement of fact and no exaggeration: 'Naturally I hope to be able to make other Westerners, who resemble me, feel the attraction that I feel for this elder brother, the son of the Ganges, who of all modern men achieved the highest equilibrium between the diverse forces of thought, and was one of the first to sign a treaty of peace between the two forces eternally warring within us: the forces of reason and faith'.

(*To be continued*)

# NOTES AND COMMENTS

## TO OUR READERS

Mr. Christopher Isherwood, distinguished poet and novelist, is closely associated with the Vedanta Society of Southern California, Hollywood (U.S.A.). He has been ardently studying and practising Vedanta for over a decade now. He profitably spent a couple of years at the Vedanta Society as resident student. In his contribution—*What Vedanta means to Me*—Mr. Isherwood discusses some of the steps which led him to his present firm belief that Vedanta is the answer to his own search for an adequate philosophy of life. It is a rational testimony to the growing significance of the influence of Indian thought on the thought of the West. . . .

The octopus of scepticism, secularism, and hedonism is spreading its harmful ramifications, seeking to limit the growth of man's soul. The importance of *Spiritual Values*,—stressed by Srimat Anirvan, well-known scholar and writer,—can hardly be ignored without great peril to the survival of civilization. In India, in particular, spirituality is the centre and omphalos of national life. . . .

Prof. D. N. Sharma, M.A., one of our old and valued contributors, makes a learned and thought-provoking study of the *Limitations of Psycho-analysis*. We must all admit that we are conscious of very little of ourselves and of the greater part we are unconscious. Yet we know we exist every moment. It is not mere 'consciousness' that we want but the existence of something which is beyond it, beyond all gross matter. Our unconscious thoughts, which are the submerged and petrified old, conscious thoughts and actions, contain in them the power of evil as much as the power of good. Our task does not end with bringing the unconscious under the control of the conscious. We have to go above the conscious to the *superconscious*, in which state man becomes infinite, immortal, and divine. Psychical phenomena and psycho-analytical studies are but stepping-stones to real and advanced psychological investigation whose purpose is nothing short of revival of the whole man, as it were, in order to make him a complete master of himself. In studying this article, readers will do well to remember that the writer uses the terms under discussion in their specially defined technical senses. The article will be concluded in our next issue. . . .

With the present instalment of the *Studies in the Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* is concluded the series of illuminating articles by Dr. Nalini Kanta Brahma, M.A., Ph.D., P.R.S. (All rights of this series of articles are reserved by the author, without whose special permission they may not be reproduced or translated in part or whole). . . .

In one of his famous lectures, Swami Vivekananda said, 'I have a message for the world which I will deliver without fear, and without care for the future'. His message is not for the hour only but for the age, not for the nation only but for humanity. *The Philosophy of Vivekananda and the Future of Mankind* is a remarkably original and brilliantly worded contribution from the pen of Dr. Gobinda Chandra Deb, M.A., Ph.D., Principal, Surendranath College, Dinajpur (East Bengal). The article will be continued in consecutive issues.

## BEYOND ETHICS

The essence of all religion, philosophy, and ethics—in other words, the goal of life—is the direct and immediate realization and manifestation of the divinity that is already in man. Religious practices, ethical codes of conduct, and scriptural injunctions and prohibitions constitute the instruments or means (*sādhanā*) as it were which are essentially helpful in leading the aspirant up to the realization of the highest spiritual experience. The highest expression of spirituality is achieved in and

through actual living experience, and the utility of ethical practice consists in its effectiveness in accelerating the process of integration of human personality through Self-realization or *anubhūti* of the ultimate Truth. Even though man may be unaware of his inherent divinity, yet it asserts itself in diverse ways and makes him feel, however imperfectly, his inner purity and strength and his spiritual solidarity with fellow beings. From this also arises the moral sense in him which functions as conscience or moral intuition in individual life and as a sound system of ethics in collective life.

As commonly understood and used, ethics is synonymous with morality, though a fine distinction is sometimes made between the two. Morality appeals to man's common sense and finds its application and fruition in life actually lived, without apparently concerning itself with a 'future' life or an 'unseen' world. It is held by some philosophers that morality is a meaningful end in itself without any the least spiritual or metaphysical basis. They seem to believe that a man can be moral, and that sufficiently so, without bothering about religion and spirituality or God and soul. Humanism and positivism lend adequate support to the view that metaphysical questions are void of meaning and that the search for something that underlies as well as transcends ethics is fruitless because what is 'supposed to be' beyond ethics is (according to them) empirically unverifiable.

It is easily forgotten or ignored that though moral life of a sort is possible without spiritual knowledge, it can never be complete and stable without the foundation of spirituality. Morality ends in spirituality and spirituality begins in morality. Even as material life is not secure without morality, moral life is not secure without spirituality. The rationale of ethics is in the spiritual oneness of all. Without the awareness of the Spirit, of the unity of the individual self with all other selves through the ever-present Atman that is the same in each and all, a mere ethical system is likely to end in routine formalism or egotistic and demonstrative patronage. Adherence to 'naturally operative ethical principles' which seek to limit man's progress to the world of sense-experience by refusing to recognize what is 'beyond ethics' not excluding the Great Beyond, cannot but obstruct a total and complete understanding of Truth. While moral life is the *sine qua non* of spiritual enlightenment, the *raison d'etre* of morality is the realization of the divinity of man and the oneness of existence.

The purpose of all ethics is to take man beyond the limitation of ethics to that state of ineffable spiritual experience where he finds the culmination of law and morality and lives and moves as the paragon of virtue, like an expert dancer who never takes a wrong step. Yet what he does is in accordance with law. The man of Self-realization who goes beyond ethics does not transgress law but transcends it. Far from being immoral or unsocial, he renounces all sense of ego as agent or benefactor. As Bradley observes, 'Reflection on morality leads us beyond it. It leads us, in short, to see the necessity of a religious point of view . . . what it tells us is that morality is imperfect and imperfect in such a way as implies a higher, which is religion.' Ethical life culminates and fulfils itself in the transcendental spiritual experience where moral imperatives and distinctions are not discarded or ignored but seem utterly inadequate and inapplicable. In the *Kulārṇava Tantra,* the Lord says, 'All the ritualistic observances are useless when the supreme Brahman is attained; of what use is the palm-leaf (fan) when the blissful *malaya* breeze blows?'

This important subject of the true nature, end, and aim of ethics according to the schools of Indian and Western thought, as also the superiority and transcendence of That which lies beyond ethics were ably dealt with by Dr. T. M. P. Mahadevan, Head of the Department of Philosophy, University of Madras, in the course of his learned Presidential Address to the Ethics and Social Philosophy Section of the last (Silver Jubilee) session of the Indian Philosophical Congress. En-

larging upon his conviction that if one is confined strictly within the frontiers of ethics, one runs the danger of getting bogged and missing the life-giving and exhilarating air of the free land of the Spirit, Dr. Mahadevan proceeds rightly to emphasize and justify the Vedantic view that 'morality cannot be man's last rest-place and that he must rise even above it to an experience where there is fulfilment and no more endeavour, no aspiration, and no regret'. He says:

'Now, in what way is ethics concerned with life? Is ethics concerned with life as it is *actually* lived or with life as it *ought* to be lived? The consensus of opinion among moralists is that ethics which is *normative* study deals with the *ideal* of conduct and not with conduct *as such*. Whether the ideal be regarded as a *rule* to which conduct has to conform or as an *end* towards which conduct has to be directed, the morality of conduct is to be determined not by asking how conduct arises or in what manner it functions but by enquiring how far it approximates to the rule or approaches the end. So, ethics is usually defined as the study of what is *right* or *good* in conduct. In other words, what we are interested in, in ethics, is the goodwill or the ideal self, and not merely the actual modes of action or activity-types. We may, therefore, say that where there is no 'ought' there is no morality. It is in the oughtness of morality that its strength and weakness lie. And, it is because of its oughtness that morality cannot be the *finale* of life and can serve only as the footstool of heaven.'

Refuting the obviously untenable view of scientific humanists and positivists that ethics is not a 'value-science' but a 'life-science, included in the wider science of blology', Dr. Mahadevan points out that these and other similarly inadequate definitions of ethics arise from what he considers to be the fundamental defect of modern Western philosophy, viz. its uncritical reliance on the findings of physical science even to the extent of reducing philosophy to the position of the handmaid of science. But philosophy in India, as *darśana*, is nothing less than Self-realizatiou.

'It seeks to discover the *truth* of things by looking within; and its goal is intuitive wisdom or insight and not mere theoretical knowledge. Hence it is that the method of self-discovery one finds in the Upanishads consists in an advance from the outer to the inner, from the gross to the subtle. However far science may go in its analysis of matter, it will still be in the region of the gross. Therefore, the results of positive science have not the power to affect or unsettle the conclusions of philosophy. And, morality, which is one of the modes of self-realization, cannot become the content of a natural science—even though that science be biology.'

Dealing with the central problem of ethics and its main corollary that there is no morality without an 'ought', he observes:

'We, as moral beings, refuse to acquiesce in what is and strive for the realization of an ideal, which for lack of a better term may be called perfection. There is in us a "divine discontent" which makes us dissatisfied with our self as it is and aspire for the ideal Self. The moral experience takes the form of "I ought to have done this; I ought not to have done that", or "I ought to be this; I ought not to be that". That is why it must be admitted that there is no morality without an "ought".'

Action ordinarily binds a man. Law implies bondage. There is no law for the free soul. Morality works within the plane of duality, within the sphere of the three Guṇas. Perfection is in the Spirit, which is beyond all duality and dichotomy. What moral injunction or prohibition can become applicable to a man who has gone beyond ethics (*nistraiguṇye pathi vicaratām ko vidhi ko niṣedhah*)? To one who has realized the unity of his self with the All and through the All with the entire universe, there can be no specific duty or obligation, either individual or social. The unselfish actions of such a liberated soul (*mukta*) go to benefit the whole world, though he himself is free from any the least trace of ego of working for a private end or a public good, however ethically sound. As Dr. Mahadevan rightly concludes:

'The soul that is completely open cannot even be called *a* soul; for it has no individuality. It is from the point of view of us, the unreleased, that the *mukta* appears to be an individual. From his own standpoint—if that can be called a standpoint —there is no division, no duality. He is the same in pleasure and pain, cold and heat, praise and blame. He is not tormented by the thought, "Why have I not done the good (*sādhu*)? Why have I done the evil (*pāpa*)?" Since there is no agency in him, he is no doer at all. His struggles are all over. The *ought* and the *ought not*, the relative

good and evil have no meaning in his case. From the supreme height of spirituality which is his even the so-called good is evil. That metaphysical evil he has transcended by the wisdom that sees the not-dual Spirit in all. As the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka* puts it, "Evil does not overcome him; he overcomes all evil. Free from evil, free from impurity, free from doubt, he becomes a knower of Brahman." It is to this haven of freedom that morality serves as footstool. It is the perfectly open soul that is the ideal of moral endeavour and spiritual progress. *Dharma* is the gateway to *mokṣa*.'

Man must be awakened to a higher consciousness, must conquer his animal nature by his divine, and free the soul from the bondage of duality. Ethics based on a hedonistic pleasure principle and determined by personal preferences (*icchā*) and determined (*dveṣa*) can ill afford any lasting solution to the problems of life. For, ethics derives its sanction from what lies beyond ethics. Discussing the *Gītā* teaching of *niṣkāma-karma* and the synthesis it has truly effected of the conflicting factors in ethics, Dr. Mahadevan observes:

'So, the teaching of *karma-yoga* is that instead of letting the mind be shattered in the pursuit of a plurality of goals, let it be set on the path leading to the true goal, which is spiritual realization. Morality is thus emptied of its finite contents, and at the same time filled by attaching it to the supreme end which is the infinite Spirit. A reconciliation between form and content is effected by opening the door that leads to the region beyond ethics.'

---

# REVIEWS AND NOTICES

THE NYĀYA THEORY OF KNOWLEDGE. By Satish Chandra Chatterji. *Published by the University of Calcutta, Calcutta. Pages 407. Price Rs. 8-8.*

All the systems of Indian philosophy, Buddhism and Jainism included, have a splendid system of Logic of their own, explaining and vindicating the fundamental tenets of their metaphysics. The Nyaya system is by far the most important and indispensable preliminary study for the proper understanding of any system. Dr. Satish Chandra Chatterji's sumptuous volume is doubtless the best study in English on the subject.

Within the compass of a single volume of a little over 400 pages, we get a critical, comprehensive, and comparative account of the several problems connected with any theory of Knowledge. The treatment is at every step comparative. Dr. Chatterji brings to bear his profound and impressive knowledge of European Realism in his elucidation of the Nyaya categories of Knowledge.

The Nyaya system discusses the nature of Knowledge, its validity, its criterion of Truth and theory of Error. In all Nyaya works an elaborate treatment of the four ways of knowing (Pramāṇas) —perception, inference, verbal testimony, and analogy—are discussed at great length. All the systems of philosophy use the Nyaya technique to establish their own tenets. The Nyaya system is not only an instrument for the search of Truth but it also gives us a network of checks and balances to discuss fallacies in others' arguments and to safeguard our own arguments from dishonest sophistry. To avoid the twofold defects of Knowledge, viz. stupid dogmatism and dishonest sophistry, the only remedy is an acute study of Nyaya. Panditic tradition in India insists on the study of Nyaya for a few years as a prerequisite for a study of any system.

The Nyaya is a Pluralistic, Realistic, and Theistic system. It believes in the existence of seven ultimate categories and an omnipotent God. The reality of the universe is asserted and the plurality of souls affirmed. Knowledge, for them, has always a content. It is a quality of the soul, indicating an objective basis. Validity is extrinsic to Knowledge. Error is due not to the lack of objective basis but illegitimate transference (mistaking one thing for another). Truth lies in strict correspondence between the object and the cognition of it. Knowledge is a rational process and it always implies a knower, a known object, and a connecting instrument. Without Pramanas no knowledge is possible. What the Pramanas cannot teach mankind cannot know.

Perception is the fundamental, foundational, and indubitable Pramana. At the first stage, we have bare, unrelated perception of the object with its parts. Then we have the proper perception. There are three varieties of perception and number of contacts. All *relations* are external to the things relating them. The whole world is reduced to its ultimate categories by the Nyaya system, and they are connected in their theory of Knowledge

by forging a number of external connecting links, e.g. categories like Samyoga and Samavāya. The Nyaya system proves the existence of God with the help of Inference. The Nyaya treatment of Inference is unique and difficult. Dr. Chatterji's chapters on Inference are the most profound and at once popular exposition of the subject. The value of the subject and the exposition are enhanced by a constant and correct comparison with the tenets of current European Realism. It adds to the clarity of the exposition and throws the subject-matter into relief.

Dr. Chatterji's volume is an invaluable contribution to the studies in Indian philosophy, particularly of the difficult system and a special aspect of it. It takes its place among the several other important works on the subject like Prof. Keith's *Indian Logic and Atomism*, Prof. Kuppuswamy Sastri's *A Primer of Indian Logic*, Dr. Ganganath Jha's *Sadholal Memorial Lectures on Nyāya*, and the splendid edition of *Tarka-Sangraha* by Professors Athalye and Boda. The volume under review has a distinct comparative view before it. The range and the acuteness of Dr. Chatterji's learning vie with one another in the course of his exposition. It is one of the most profound critical studies, in recent times, of the great Indian philosophical system—Nyaya, which is second only to Vedanta in importance. In this second edition of the book, the learned author has enhanced the usefulness of the work by introducing minor changes and making additions and alterations wherever necessary.

P. NAGARAJA RAO

---

# NEWS AND REPORTS

## RAMAKRISHNA MISSION ASHRAMA, PATNA

### REPORT FOR 1950

The following is a brief report of the activities of the Ramakrishna Mission Ashrama, Bankipore, Patna, for the year 1950:

*Bhuvaneshwar Charitable Dispensary*: This Homœopathic dispensary treated altogether 54,519 cases during the year under report as against 43,892 in the previous year. Of these 10,067 were new cases.

*First Aid and Surgical Section*: This section, opened in November 1949, treated in all, during the year, 13,404 cases, of which 2,821 were new cases.

*Refugee Relief Works*: The Ashrama started refugee relief works at Bihta and Mokameh in Bihar, in May 1950 and carried on relief operations up to the end of the year. A Homœopathic dispensary was opened, at each camp, and they both treated altogether 74,519 cases. Besides, large quantities of powdered milk, sago, barley, and sugar were distributed among 89,086 recipients. Cloth, soap, books and stationery for school children, soda, and cod-liver oil were also distributed among 15,778 recipients. The Ashrama organized and conducted libraries, reading-rooms, games, scripture and religious classes, and festivals in the camps. A Lower Primary School, named 'Sri Ramakrishna Bālaka-Bālikā Vidyalaya', was also built up at the Bihta refugee camp by the Ashrama for the free education of boys and girls at the camp.

*Swami Adbhutananda Upper Primary Pathashala*: This school has been imparting free education to boys of backward and Harijan communities. There were on an average 141 pupils on the rolls and four teachers on the staff during the year.

*Students' Home*: There were six college students in the Home, four of the II Year class and two of the I Year. All the four II Year students passed the Patna University Intermediate examination in 1950, one in the first division.

*Turiyananda Library and Reading-Room*. There were 962 books during the year as against 754 in the previous year. 12 periodicals were received in the Reading-Room.

*Religious and Cultural Activities*: Altogether 433 scripture classes and 32 lectures and discourses were held during the year in and outside the Ashrama premises. Birthdays of great religious prophets and saints were observed with due eclat. About 2,000 poor people were fed on the occasion of the Ramakrishna-Vivekananda birthday celebrations.

The opening and dedicaton ceremony of the Sri Ramakrishna Temple and Prayer Hall, which were constructed in 1949, was performed on the 29th March 1950 by Srimat Swami Virajananda Maharaj, President of the Ramakrishna Math and Mission.

The Ashrama needs funds for the maintenance and expansion of its various activities, and any contribution in cash or kind will be thankfully received and acknowledged by the Secretary.