PRABUDDHA BHARATA

VOL. LVI *FEBRUARY 1951* No. 2

"उत्तिष्ठत जाग्रत प्राप्य वरान्निबोधत ।"

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

LETTERS OF SWAMI VIVEKANANDA

I

To Swami Brahmananda

Deuldhar, Almora,
13th July, 1897.

Going to Almora from here. I made special efforts for Yogen.[1] But he left for the plains as soon as he had recovered a little. From Subhala valley he will write to me of his safe arrival there. As it is impossible to procure a *ḍāṇḍi* or any other conveyance, Latu[2] could not go. Achyut[3] and myself have again come back to this place. Today my health is a little bad owing to this riding on horseback at breakneck speed in the sun. . . .

I was very pleased to know all the news from the Math, and I also heard that the famine relief work is going on well. Please let me know if any money has been received from the office of the *Brahmavādin* for famine relief. Some money will be sent soon from here also. There is famine in many other places too, and so it is not necessary to stay long in one place. Tell them to go to other localities also and write to each man to go to a separate place. All such work is real work. If the field is made ready in this way, the seeds of spiritual knowledge can be sown. Remember this always—that the only answer to those conservative fanatics who abuse us is such work. . . .

You yourselves come to a decision as to what the name of the Math should be. . . . The money will come within seven weeks; but I have no news about the land. In this matter it seems to me that it will be good if we can get the garden of Kristo Gopal in Cossipore. What do you say? In future, great works will be accomplished. If you agree with me, don't let this matter out to anybody either within the Math or outside, but quietly make enquiries. The work is spoiled if plans are revealed in advance. If it can be bought within fifteen or sixteen thousand, then buy at once—of course, only if you think it good.

[1] Swami Yogananda, a direct disciple of Sri Ramakrishna.

[2] Swami Adbhutananda, a direct disciple of Sri Ramakrishna.

[3] Achyutananda Saraswati, a scholar sanyasin, intimately acquainted with Swami Vivekananda.

If something more is demanded, make some advance payment and wait for those seven weeks. My view is that for the present it is better to buy it. Everything else will come by and by. All our associations centre round that garden. In reality that is our first Math.[4] Let the thing be done very privately. **फलानुपेयाः प्रारम्भाः संस्काराः प्राक्तना इव।** 'A work can be judged by its results only, just as one can infer the nature of previous mental tendencies by their resultant in present behaviour'. . . .

Undoubtedly the price of the land of the garden at Cossipore has increased; but our purse has, on the other hand, thinned. Do something or other, but do it quickly. All work is spoilt by dilatoriness. This garden also has to be acquired—if not today, tomorrow—however big the Math on the banks of the Ganges may be. It will be still better if you can broach the subject through a proxy. If they hear that we are willing to buy, they will bid high. Do the work very confidentially. Be fearless; Sri Ramakrishna is our helper, what fear? Give my love to all.

Yours affectionately,
VIVEKANANDA

P.S. (On the cover): . . . Make special efforts for Cossipore. . . . Give up the land at Belur. Should the poor die of starvation while you people at the top are indulging in controversy as to whom the credit should go? . . . Let the poor be benefited. That the work is going on well is good news. Work on with greater energy. . . .

V.

II

To Swami Ramakrishnananda

Almora,
29th July, 1897.

DEAR SHASHI,

I got information that your work there is going on very well. Get a thorough mastery of the three Bhāshyas, and also study well European philosophy and allied subjects—see to it without fail. To fight with others one requires sword and shield—this fact should never be forgotten. I hope Sukul[5] has now reached there and is attending on you all right. . . . Don't forget to send to the Math every week a report of the work, including income and expenditure and other informations. . . .

Yesterday I delivered a lecture in the circle of the local English people, and all were highly pleased with it. But I was very much pleased with the lecture in Hindi that I delivered the previous day—I did not know before that I could be oratorical in Hindi.

Are there any new boys joining the Math? If so, then carry on the work in the same manner as it is being done in Calcutta. At present don't use up your wisdom too much, lest it should become completely exhausted—you can do that later on.

Pay particular attention to your health, but too much coddling of the body will, on the contrary, also soil the health. If there is not the strength of knowledge, nobody will care a fig for your ringing of the bell[6]—this is certain; and knowing this for certain, equip yourself accordingly. . . .

Yours affectionately,
VIVEKANANDA

III

To Swami Brahmananda

Murree,
12th Oct. 1897.

I wrote at length in yesterday's letter. I think it desirable to give you special directions about certain matters. . . . (1) To all those who collect money and send it to the Math . . . the acknowledgment of the amounts will be issued from the Math. (2) The acknowledg-

[4] The main half of the garden and the house in it at Cossipore, where Sri Ramakrishna passed the last days of his life with his disciples and entered Mahāsamādhi, was secured and a Ramakrishna Math centre started therein in 1946.

[5] Swami Atmananda, a (monastic) disciple of Swami Vivekananda.

[6] Refers to Swami Ramakrishnananda's adherence to ritualism.

ment must be in duplicate, one for the sender, and one for filing in the Math. (3) There must be a big register in which all the names and addresses of the donors will be entered. (4) Accounts, accurate to the last pie, must be kept of the amounts that are donated to the Math Fund, and fully accurate accounts should be obtained from Sarada[7] and others to whom money is given. For lack of accurate account keeping. . . see that I am not accused as a cheat. These accounts should afterwards be published. (5) Immediately go and register a will, under lawyer's advice, to the effect that in case you and I die, then Hari[8] and Sarat[9] will succeed to all that there is in our Math. . . .

Yours affectionately,
VIVEKANANDA

[7] Swami Trigunatitananda, a direct disciple of Sri Ramakrishna.

[8] Swami Turiyananda, a direct disciple of Sri Ramakrishna.

[9] Swami Saradananda, a direct disciple of Sri Ramakrishna.

CONVERSATIONS OF SWAMI VIJNANANANDA

SRI RAMAKRISHNA MATH, ALLAHABAD: 1920

In the course of conversation with some devotees, quoting a Bengali couplet which expresses the idea that though the Divine Mother feeds, clothes, and protects us in every way, we only feel that She *is*, but do not know what Her true nature or real form is, Swami Vijnanananda said: 'This idea has impressed me greatly. Though the Mother looks after us and protects us in ever so many ways, giving us everything we want, yet She does not reveal Herself to us. But we cannot blame Her for not vouchsafing Her vision to us. For, in fact, She is ever present near us; it is we ourselves who do not see Her, or try to seek Her. Engrossed in sense-pleasures, we become slaves to our passions. Our senses, for their own fleshly enjoyments, endeavour to keep us in ignorance and spiritual darkness. The best solution is to think of the Mother day and night, to surrender ourselves to Her wholeheartedly, and to firmly resolve not to come under the control of the passions by any means. Complete conquest of the senses is what is needed. Of course it is possible to achieve complete mastery over the senses by slow degrees; but, at this slow rate, one cannot say how long and how many lives it may take!

'There is no faith—that is the difficulty. With the power of intense faith and determined practice pray to the Mother for purification of thought. You will see everything will be all right. Whatever one longs for intensely one certainly gets. Make the mind pure first, and everything else will follow as a matter of course. When the mind becomes pure, you will experience infinite and peerless bliss. In comparison with this divine bliss worldly enjoyments are like a grain of sand by the side of a big mountain. Will anybody who has experienced that bliss even once ever be deluded by worldly enjoyments any more? Those who have controlled their senses will attain the goal; they themselves will feel, in time, that they are advancing towards God.

'Man's hankering for sense-enjoyment persists in a subtle form even after his death. When a man dies, his gross body only disintegrates, but his senses, mind, Buddhi, etc.—all remain intact in a subtle form. With the loss of the physical body, the subtle hankering after enjoyments becomes even more intense than before death. When the subtle state is transcended, the mind continues to exist in the causal state (in which the causes—the thirst after life and enjoyment—that give rise to our physical existence remain in seed form). Only when man goes beyond the causal state and attains to Turiya does he attain complete illumination. When Knowledge dawns, the life on earth which is caused by ignorance, is

shortened. But why should one feel afraid of it? It is a hundred times better to live in enlightenment, however brief the span of life be, rather than in ignorance for a longer number of years.

'God is no more a dream to me—I now see that He is self-revealed. Therefore, I remain calm and quite, seeing that none can reveal His true nature (except He Himself). He is self-effulgent. When the sun rises, what need is there for anybody to reveal his presence with the help of any other light! The sun shines by his own light and reveals himself.

'According to Vedanta, time, space, and causation are said to be Mãyã. Maya is indeed the 'Divine Mother', it is the 'Shakti'. He who has been able to understand the nature of Maya has indeed conquered it—he is a mighty man. He alone who, knowing the utility of this 'time', fully and whole-heartedly utilizes it, truly conquers time. Listen to what Sri Krishna said to Arjuna: "He who sees inactivity in activity and activity in the midst of inactivity sees truly. He is a seer indeed; so you have to be a 'soldier' and a Yogi at the same time." (*Gita,* IV. 18).

'Is life in the world meant for merely whiling away time? It will not do to be idle here. Real rest you will find when you are unselfishly active. Go on working like a hero. Think that the Lord is ever behind you and do your duties always remembering Him. Pursue the path of truth and call on Him, He will assuredly help you and vouchsafe your welfare in every way. Without knowing or understanding the true significance of Maya, we try simply to brush away the world where we live in, by uttering the words, "All Maya—nothing else"! He indeed is a Sãdhu who has *understood* the nature of time, space, and causation and *has gone beyond them.*'

REALITY

By Starson Gosse

The bright moon reflects on the silvery stream
A mystic beam which transports me to the shore
Of that Inner Deep, where neither joys nor sorrows dream,
Nor work nor non-work irks the being any more.

The Spirit swims lightly in the ocean of joy,
No space restricts its course, no time bars;
It rises, melts, reshuffles, and being its envoy
Hears the Song of the Eternity which to its being murmurs.

It opes the gate of the Fountain of Harmony—
The Region Unknown wherefrom the known takes forms,
The mystic process of creation wherein, symphony
Is composed out of sources in the ease of norms.

Till all vanishes; the intellect is no aid;
The mind feels its limits and finds in awakened dream:
Which one is Reality? The world of which is often said
Or That which in this reflection does to me seem?

EDUCATION—THE MANIFESTATION OF PERFECTION ALREADY IN MAN

By The Editor

Nānā tu vidyā ca avidyā ca, yadeva vidyayā karoti śraddhayā upaniṣadā tadeva viryavattaram bhavati.

'Diverse, however, are knowledge (*vidyā*) and ignorance (*avidyā*). What, indeed, one performs with knowledge, with faith (*śraddhā*), and with mystic realization (*upaniṣad*) —that, indeed, becomes the more powerfully effective.' (*Chāndogya Upaniṣad,* I.i.10).

The necessity and importance of universal education in human life has come to be recognized as one of the fundamentals of civilization. There is no individual or society, possessed of modern intelligence and awakened conscience, that will refuse to hold to be beyond dispute the obviously insistent fact that education is a surpassingly vital force of unmixed good. Education of its youth, on right lines best suited to the growth and development of the individual and the nation, is one of the first great responsibilities of the government of every State. Every element that enters into a man's qualification for effective life-work along productive lines is powerfully influenced by the type of education he has received during the formative years of his life. Every State, therefore, takes great care in formulating its educational schemes in order to direct the potent national energy of the growing generation along channels most suited to the immediate aspirations of the nation. As such, it needs no argument to convince any one that education is undoubtedly a mighty factor contributing immensely to the virility and efficiency of every phase of life—individual, national, and international.

Many talk glibly about education, though few have any clear conception as to what is education and what are its ideals. Men differ endlessly in their notions of what is meant by true education, its essential sense, its fundamental aim, and significance. According to some, education is 'preparation for life' or 'the training of good citizens'. According to some others, it is the 'regulated acquisition of knowledge, discipline, and culture with a view to gaining prosperity and power in life'. There are various other conceptions of what education should be, and the disagreements on that point are wide and deep. And unless and until one is sure what true education itself is or ought to be, one can never be convinced of its ideals and purpose. If there is confusion as to the meaning and goal of life, naturally there can be no knowledge of the right method of 'preparation for life'. Education for 'the training of good citizens' is often largely subject to the Aristotelian view that the political stability of a particular State depends on the adaptation of education to the form of the prevailing government. If a State is to endure, said Aristotle, it must educate its youth in the spirit of its constitution. And history provides many an instance where political changes have brought about educational ones, because a person who would be a good citizen in one kind of State may be considered a bad one in another kind.

It is a happy and hopeful sign that today more people than ever are thinking about what true education ought to be. It is also true, notwithstanding the conflicts and divergencies of policy and programme in the field of education, that certain clear and more or less incontestable principles have been arrived at by serious thinkers and workers regarding the ideals and methods of education. In India the importance of education was realized from very early times and the utmost emphasis was laid on the acquisition of knowledge, both sacred and secular. The educational institutions were many and varied in character, and the system of education—liberal and universal

in all respects—was such as to achieve a three-fold object, viz. the acquisition of knowledge, the inculcation of social duties and responsibilities, and, above all, the formation of character, on which was laid the greatest emphasis. There is no dearth of reliable evidence to show conclusively that the wonderful system of education evolved by the seers and scholars of ancient India produced the most comprehensive literature and the best type of men. In the Western countries too, more recently, an immense amount of research, both theoretical and experimental, has taken place in the sphere of educational psychology, leading to revolutionary changes in practical pedagogics. The modern educationists in the advanced countries of the West are unanimous in their opinion that a complete and healthy education of youth, as an institution, must form part of every culture as the foremost means of perpetuating it and as the strongest guarantee of its survival.

Before the epoch-making contributions of Pestalozzi, Froebel, and others to the science of teaching, many early educationists in the West believed that the young pupil was no better than an indisciplined and irrational mass of malleable material which required to be 'sawed, planed, and chiselled' into finer shape. They thought the teacher's task was like that of a carpenter or mason, to build in the pupil's mind an edifice of knowledge by piling up information on various subjects. This incorrect understanding of the child's mind, which was looked upon as a *tabula rasa,* consequently led to unscientific and unnatural methods of teaching, ignoring the important role of the potentially self-creative young mind as a subjective factor of education. A school with such primitive technique of teaching could well be described as a tyrant's house where wagon-loads of information are thrust upon young frightened minds by terroristic discipline. But today modern child education in the advanced countries of the West has developed into a well defined and well organized scientific system, taking into consideration the physical, intellectual, and especially psychological needs of the child. Ideals and methods of education which have no relation with the needs and capacities of the evolving mind of the pupil have long become obsolete in the West. Now the teacher's task, though immensely complicated, is more like that of a gardener, tending the young ones under his or her charge and helping them by a gradual and natural process to unfold their various innate faculties like so many flower-blossoms.

For centuries the dominant motive in formal education has been the study of and training in various branches of knowledge—literature, art, science, crafts, technology, and culture. To most people it has only one meaning and significance, viz. cramming the mind with any amount of tabulated information and technical details, whether ill digested or well, with a view to getting qualified for a livelihood. From the moment of first going to school until the moment of leaving the university it seems but one long drudgery of passive acceptance of text-book facts and the teacher's wisdom, of diplomas and degrees, and of competitive academic scholarship. Not unoften this soulless routine leads the young to regard knowledge from a purely utilitarian point of view, 'as the road to money-making, not as the gateway to wisdom'. For such a deplorable state of affairs the poor teacher is as much not to blame as the innocent taught. It is the form and quality of the essential substance of education that need to be reoriented, if the young ones are to be saved from expending their growing but limited energies and abilities in acquiring willy-nilly something stored up in text-books or certified by tradition and guaranteed by teachers.

In many parts of the world and especially in India where an outmoded Western system of education is still in vogue, a large percentage of the people remain without any education, and even where they receive a meagre education they find it of no practical help in life. Many among the privileged few receiving a higher education, far from manifesting a spontaneous and reverent desire for know-

ledge, feel disgusted with what they learn and long to forget it soon after leaving the educational institution. Unfortunately this negative attitude to present-day education has affected not only those who have no advanced intellectual interests but also those whose desire for intellectual pursuits is strong and genuine.

In ancient India, the underlying principle of the formula that 'the child is father of the man' was well understood by educationists and teachers who took every possible and necessary step for careful and intelligent handling of the pupil at each stage—infancy, childhood, adolescence, and youth—according to the peculiar characteristics and precise requirements of the pupil concerned. They defined education not as book-learning or diverse knowledge but as the training by which the current and expression of will are brought under control and become fruitful in one's life. It was insisted (and followed in practice) that a complete theory of education should deal with all the phases of the pupil's life. Education should train his intellect, help him to control his actions, and purify his desires. It was laid down that neither the study of the Vedas, nor liberality, nor sacrifices, nor any statutory or self-imposed restraint, nor austerities ever procure the attainment of the desired goal to a man whose heart is contaminated by greed and lust. Hence a thorough-going control of one's passions was made indispensable during the period of studentship (*brahmacarya*) which was generally spent in the house of the preceptor (*gurugṛha-vāsa*) under his direct and intimate guidance. The pupil was inspired by the high ideals of the teacher with whom he lived in close contact, and imbibed, in addition to sound scholarship and vast learning, social and moral virtues by the precept and example of his Guru. At the same time the tender and emotional side of the young student's life, though he lived away from his own parental home, was duly safe-guarded and fully nourished by the sweet and affectionate relationship with the wife of the Guru and other children living in the house. It is evident that in the ancient pedagogic scheme of the Gurukula system, that part of education that deals with life and its spiritual values fills a larger place than the part that deals with the mere intellect.

The reputed failure or wastage of modern education of the purely academic and mechanical type is contested by some who think such criticism unwarranted at a time when we have hardly begun to discover how to teach or how to learn. But past history at any point of time can only largely show how far we have come, and though it cannot adequately tell us how far we still have to go, it can and does certainly indicate whither we are likely to go. Past experience and present tendencies do considerably guide and determine men's decisions regarding the course of future action. To test every process, worthy or unworthy, by waiting till we have arrived at its end, ignoring clear warnings *en route,* is to miss to take intelligent advantage of what history tends to give us, viz. a true conception of what is transient as compared with what is lasting in human life.

'And what of the education we are giving to children in the schools and to young men and women in the universities?' asks Dr. L. P. Jacks, a great leader of thought in education, 'Is it actable education? Is it of the kind they can follow up and develop into the continuous culture of a lifetime? Will it help them to enjoy the universe and to love it, or will it merely swell the army of exploiters who would make what they can out of the blind machine, and so increase the confusion into which that unhappy drama is now drifting? Will their education cease the moment they leave school, as a thing for which they have no further use, or will it continue and prolong itself to the end of their days as a vital motive for good work? According as the answer falls out one way or another, you have the difference between an education which is a reality and an education which is a sham. Education will become *real* when all the children and all the adults are being trained

to play their parts as living members of a living universe.' (*A Living Universe*). Educationists everywhere, who sincerely look to the best interests of the student in particular and society in general, will do well to ponder over these pertinent observations and apply themselves to the task of sifting out the shams, of which there are not a few, from what is real and lasting in education.

Most educationists, however, agree that purposes other than the mere development of intellectual power should be borne in mind. Some go so far as to contend that that education is the best which develops the greatest amount of mental force as well as a moral control capable of keeping the lawless intellect and the turbulent emotions in check. At the same time it can hardly be denied that an important aspect of education is to impart sufficient technical skill to enable a man to support himself; it should also stimulate and train his qualities of head and heart to enable him to play his part as a member of the community, society, and nation. For it is the task of education to help every person develop his potentialities for co-operation and brotherhood. But no education is complete and fruitful unless the element of character-training finds an important place in it. Any healthy educational scheme should afford the pupil full scope for the satisfaction of his spiritual aspirations and the development of his personality through strengthening of the will, concentration of mind, and chastening of emotions. In the inspiring words of Swami Vivekananda, 'We must have life-building, man-making, character-making, assimilation of ideas. 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.'

The power of education in forming character and personality is very great and very generally recognized. But educationists, particularly of the West and those of the East who draw their inspiration from the West, are apt to overlook the fact that man is potentially divine and that education is not ultimately the acquisition of something extraneous but the gradual manifestation of the infinite perfection already existing in him. All knowledge and power are inherent in every man, it is all inside everyone, though potential in many. This is the great truth proclaimed by the Vedanta, according to which man is like an infinite spring coiled up in a box, and even as that spring tries to unfold itself, he is trying to unfold the Divinity within him, consciously or unconsciously. All the forces of good and evil and their respective manifestations in greater or less degree come out of their potential source in the human soul. Hence education is the process by which man manifests knowledge, discovers it within himself, which is pre-existing through eternity. Thus what a man is said to 'know' or 'learn' is, in fact, what he himself has possessed always, but which he was not aware of till he 'unveiled' or removed the covering of his own soul which is a mine of knowledge and perfection.

Yet, how often do we see that, in the educational world, ideals formulated by those who are entrusted with the heavy responsibility of teaching and training the younger generation—a precious national asset—are unrealistic, unimaginative, and unrelated to life! In the light of Vedanta as well as modern pedagogy, education has to proceed more on psychological and spiritual lines than in accordance with a crude though widely prevalent system which aims at educating children in the same manner as that of the man who battered his ass, thinking he could thereby turn it into a horse. The teacher's function should consist solely in helping the natural unfoldment of the pupil's latent faculties, by rousing his self-activity and quickening his mind to an awareness of the Divinity in and through the great values of life—truth, beauty, and goodness. The child will teach and educate itself by learning to discipline the cognitive, affective, and conative aspects of its mind provided the teacher helps it, with sympathy and care, to go forward in its own way, by removing the obstacles and creating a healthy and congenial environment.

But this in no way lessens the importance and necessity of the teacher. For, without a proper Guru no real knowledge or training can be gained. In order to achieve the high ideal of education, the teacher should be much more than a mere scholar—he should be one with an immaculate character, full of renunciation and all those virtues which he would like to inspire his pupils with. Above everything, the Guru should be a living example of the highest teaching, a seer, a Brahma-Jñāni (*śrotriyam brahma-niṣṭham*). To rouse the Divinity in the pupil and make him conscious of 'That by knowing which everything else is known', the teacher should be able to transmit spiritual force to the pupil through love and a deeper understanding of the student's soul.

The path of knowledge is one of the surest paths to the attainment of perfection and God-realization. It is also the path to a better understanding of men and things, to independent and forceful productive activity, and to the progress and preservation of society. In education lies much hope for the future democracy and a new world order. Spirituality is the one value in education which should be placed above all other values. For, education finds its fulfilment in life and life attains its consummation in the realization of the Godhead. Both the teacher and the pupil have, for all time, a great lesson in the old Indian maxim which says that 'we do not live to know but *know to live*'.

THE PLACE OF THE PHILOSOPHER IN MODERN SOCIETY

By Sir C. P. Ramaswami Aiyer

Dealing for a moment with recent developments in Europe and America, it is worthy of note that, as Bertrand Russell has remarked, philosophy has steadily declined in social and political importance. It had until quite recently, also largely changed its mode of approach and outlook. But as often happens, the wheel of life turns high and low and a swing-over is taking place. One of the characteristics of the new philosophy has been that it abandons the claim to any special method or any particular brand of knowledge to be obtained by its means. Again to quote Bertrand Russell, philosophy is regarded as no more than one of the sciences, different from many of them only by the generality of its problems and by the circumstance that it concerns itself with the formulation of hypotheses where empirical evidence is still lacking. The trend of present-day thought is to stress that the stuff of the mental and physical worlds is the same, and it has been emphasized that what was considered one of the marked peculiarities of mind, namely, subjectivity or the possession of a specific point of view, can be postulated even in the region of physics. Physics and psychology have approached each other and the old dualism of mind and matter has vanished though in quite a different way from the Eastern conception. Whereas at the beginning of the modern period of European philosophy, Descartes emphasized the dualism in respect of miud and nature, laying down that mental substances are essentially external to material substances. One of the most rigidly analytical of recent thinkers, Prof. Whitehead, has said that the effect of this sharp division between nature and life has poisoned all subsequent philosophy and, in his view, neither physical nature nor life can be understood unless we fuse them together as essential factors in the composition of 'really real things'.

It is worthy of remark that the purely experimental and biological approach to mental problems typified by psycho-analysis has resulted in the adaptation of the developmental view-

point to mental phenomena and Freud, Jung, Adler, and their respective followers with divergent view-points and theories, have nevertheless jointly engendered a belief in the enormous reconstructive power over human motives latent in the new science of psychology. So much so is this the case that a recent authority on the subject, Ven P. Teslaar is able to assert that 'In this present twilight of human division and insecurity, amidst oppressions and strikes, shortages of goods and slumps in welfare, irreconcilable hatred and the rumours of fresh wars, it is still possible for those who have faith and vision to foretell a new release of human life to a secure and world-wide peace, to a sufficient and happy production to satisfy all normal humane needs, to a common life of generous activity and kindliness and lively interest and enterprise and hope'. It is hoped by such persons that it is along the line of sedulous pursuit and a vigorous application of psychological sciences that this release is attainable. It is unfortunately true to say that in spite of the development of material civilization, the mental equipment of humanity is still primitive and the transformation of our baser instincts is what is dreamt of in accordance with the technique of modern psychology. At first sight these developments of Western philosophy and psychology seem to be based on conceptions differing wholly from the older and traditional methods of Eastern philosophical creeds. But, when ultimately analysed they are not in truth different from those which were enunciated in the last recorded words of the Lord Buddha, speaking to Ananda, his chosen disciple: 'Therefore, Ananda, be ye lamps unto yourselves. Be ye a refuge to yourselves. Betake yourselves to no external refuge. Hold fast to the truth as to a lamp. Hold fast to the truth as a refuge. Look not for refuge in any one beside yourselves.' Aldous Huxley has, in his *Perennial Philosophy*, summed up the contrast between the Western and the Eastern points of view. According to one theory the end of human life is contemplation or the intuitive awareness of the Supreme. Action is viewed as one of the chief means to that end and it is affirmed that a society is good to the extent that contemplation is made possible and easy. In this view existence of at least a minority of contemplatives is necessary for the well-being of society. The other line of thought is that the end of human life is action, that contemplation may be one of the means to that end and that a society is good to the extent that the action of its members makes for progress in technology and organization which is almost equated with ethical and cultural advance. The contrast is seen very clearly indeed when it is realized that according to the Vedanta as well as the Buddhist and medieval Christian speculation, right action is deemed to be the means for the preparation of the mind for realization which is, in the end, what matters.

The items of catastrophic news that reach us from day to day, from East to West, convey a message of gathering gloom and at no time has the impact of daily and hourly events been so continuously distressing. The great nations of the world, some of whom have attained hitherto unforeseen standards of comfort and material well-being, are constantly quarrelling with each other, such quarrels arising in many cases out of fear that those standards may be lowered and in some because of a vague unrest that constantly seizes them and makes them apprehensive that the foundations of their present life are insecure. The world is threatened by new, and terrifyingly destructive ideals and methods like those associated with well-known and alarming developments of the Marxian doctrine. The question is ever more insistently put by thoughtful individuals to each other and to themselves whether the basic character of the present-day civilization is sound and whether the social and racial competitions, hostilities, class conflicts and continuous restlessnesses are not an inseparable concomitant of the present outlook on life. In spite of all that science has done or can do, there is an obvious disequilibrium in respect of production, distribution, capital, labour, and, above all, there is a growing lack of leisure and the right means of utilizing that leisure. One has the ever-present feeling that constant up-

heavals are an inseparable part of the present scheme of things and no solution can be seen save in the speedy and effective realization of the unity and interdependence of the world, as opposed to an international set-up based on a display of force, the advertence to an exploitation of malign forces like those released by atomic fission and the equally calamitous exploitation of the so-called backward races and communities by those who call themselves 'civilized'. Both within the precincts of the United Nations Organization and outside there is a constant call for peace, but such peace cannot come about unless the world is prepared to work and sacrifice for it. Such work and sacrifice can only be on the lines of an abandonment of the so-called imperialism and aggressiveness in thought and act and a complete reorientation of the world on the basis of equality and insistence on a world community. In the language of Dr. Radhakrishnan, 'peace demands a revolutionary desire, a new simplicity, a new asceticism'. The creation and fostering of this new simplicity and this new asceticism is the duty and the privilege of the modern philosopher and his task and *modus operandi* are and should be the same whether the approach is from the point of view of the experimental West or the intuitive East.

THE VEDIC RELIGION: A TWOFOLD WAY

THE WAY OF PROSPERITY AND THE WAY OF SUPREME GOOD: HOW THEY MEET

By Swami Satprakashananda

(Continued from the January issue)

III. The Four Main Human Objectives. The Imperative Need of Virtue in the Pursuit of Wealth and Happiness.

In formulating the scheme of life the teachers of the Vedic religion have kept in view four main human objectives (Purushārtha): virtue (Dharma), wealth (Artha), pleasure (Kāma), and Liberation (Moksha). Of these four Liberation or Supreme Good is the ultimate value, the rest are instrumental.[22] Virtue is the *sine qua non* for Supreme Good as no spiritual unfoldment is possible without it. Not only that, it is indispensable to material welfare also. Any progress in life, material as well as spiritual, has to be based on man's moral worth. So virtue, and not wealth, is considered to be the primary object of life. Such a view may not readily appeal to the man of the world. To him economic values rather than the moral are of primal necessity. He thinks money can solve the problems of life better than morality. And for gaining wealth also, he finds cleverness and technical devices more effective than honesty. In his view, moral scruples rather hamper worldly success. He believes he has a better chance of prosperity and happiness by sacrificing moral principles than by adhering to them. The dictum 'honesty is the best policy' may be good, according to him, for winning the kingdom of heaven but not the citadel of fortune. The ancient seers, however, saw things differently. Why? We shall see.

Virtue (Dharma) means inner excellence and worthiness for the performance of an individual's duties towards himself and others. So it includes intellectual abilities as well.[23] In the Vedic culture the early part of life has to be devoted exclusively to the cultivation of virtue. But it emphasizes moral development more than intellectual; while the modern system of education stresses intellectual growth dis-

[22] *Vide Bhāgavata*, I. ii. 9, 10.

[23] Manu enumerates wisdom and knowledge under virtue (Dharma); (*Manu-Smṛti*, VI. 92).

regarding the moral. In the *Taittirīya Upaniṣad* we find that a preceptor gives the following instruction to his pupil on the eve of his returning home after finishing his study: 'Speak the truth. Do your duties. Swerve not from your study. After satisfying the teacher with gifts due to him,[24] you shall marry and have children. Never deviate from truth. Never fail in your duty. Never neglect your welfare. Never neglect your prosperity. Never neglect study and teaching. Do not disregard your duties towards God and the ancestors. Serve the mother as a god. Serve the father as a god. Serve the teacher as a god. Serve the guest as a god. You should do such deeds as are irreproachable, and not others. You should do such virtuous deeds as we have done, and not others.'[25]

A man should try to prosper in this world by honest and efficient discharge of the duties of his station in life. Wealth or position gained by any other means is insecure and may even be harmful. Worldly success without corresponding inner development is no mark of progress. For the secret of man's strength, wisdom, freedom, and happiness is not in his external conditions but in his inner nature. Wealth does not bring wisdom, machinery does not give moral courage, mastery over physical nature does not lead to self-mastery, sense-enjoyment does not assure health and happiness. The inner well-being of man is much more important than pomp and power. He cannot rest satisfied with the fulfilment of physical needs and cravings. Human beings live on a plane different from other animals. We must not forget that man's problems are mainly psychological rather than biological. A fortune-seeker may amass wealth huge enough to convert night into day, yet without inner light he cannot see his way in life. An aggressor may conquer territory after territory and rule over the destinies of millions of human beings, yet he remains a slave to his passions and impulses. A queen may indulge in all the comforts and luxuries of the world, yet a streak of jealousy or vanity can make her miserable for life. Science may tap some multipotent or plenti-potent force out of the bosom of nature, such as nuclear energy, yet it will do nothing but incalculable harm to the world, if man does not have the good sense to harness it to his own service. On the human level fitness for survival depends not on physical ability, nor even intellectual, but on moral and spiritual worth. It is an historical fact that nations that try to live by material prosperity and military tactics or diplomatic manoeuvres perish soon.

Under no circumstances should man sacrifice virtue for the sake of wealth. Moral values are far more important than the material. External possessions cannot help man as much as inner resources. 'Virtue protects him who protects her', says the *Mahābhārata*.[26] In storm and stress she is the best friend. A man of real worth cannot fail. He can gain wealth, position, name, and fame even though he has none. On the contrary, a person may have fortune and friends, yet there is every chance of his losing them if he has no control over his emotions and temper. It is not true that honesty does not succeed. Only man has not the patience to try it. There are people in business and other fields who have made themselves prosperous by fair means. The secret of their success is the influence of probity that wins the confidence of others. 'Truth alone triumphs, not untruth', says the *Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad*.[27] The following ten qualities have been specified by Manu under virtue (Dharma): contentment, forgiveness, uprightness, non-stealing, cleanliness, self-control, wisdom, knowledge, truth, and equanimity.[28] These are to be practised by the seekers of prosperity as well as by the seekers of Supreme Good. Student or teacher,

[24] In ancient India the students lived with the teacher and received education free of all charges.

[25] *Taittirīya Upaniṣad*, I. xi.

[26] Anushāsana Parva.

[27] III. i. 6.

[28] *Manu-Smṛti*, VI. 92.

priest or soldier, monk or householder, hermit or merchant, farmer or king, none, desirous of his well-being, should deviate from them. It is morality that maintains man's morale. Virtue strengthens, vice weakens. Principle is invigorating, policy enervating. 'No great deed is accomplished by cunningness', says Swami Vivekananda, 'but through love, devotion to truth, and superb vigour all work can be done'.[29] Without virtue no corporate life is possible. There will always be conflict among individuals and among their groups, if selfishness, pride, jealousy, deceitfulness, hatred, and so forth rule within them. No security, no peace, no prosperity are attainable in the absence of social harmony. No decent life is possible where dishonesty, arrogance, and mistrust prevail.

As in the pursuit of wealth so in the pursuit of pleasure one must stick to the path of virtue. Man wants to live and be happy. For this he secures wealth and property. Self-gratification is no less strong an urge in him than self-preservation. He tries to get the utmost pleasure even from the essential needs of life,—his food and drink, clothes and bed, house and furniture. Not satisfied with this, he surrounds himself with luxuries and accumulates possessions. But even these cannot make him happy unless he is in a position to enjoy them. The two essential requisites for the enjoyment of life are a sound body and a sound mind. He who is physically and mentally sick cannot relish anything. And without virtue nothing can secure the health of the body and the mind. A virtuous person can be happy with bare necessities of life because his mind and body are in normal state. By dishonest means a man may gain opulence but not happiness. 'He who is habitually dishonest, who earns money by falsehood, who injures others, attains no happiness in this world', says Manu.[30] His mental disquiet does not permit him to find joy anywhere. In the name of enjoyment he betakes to self-indulgence. Excitement is followed by exhaustion. In gratifying the senses one has to observe propriety and moderation. What is pleasant is not necessarily good. Sense-enjoyment does not guarantee physical and mental well-being. Any excess will have an unhappy reaction. So the seeker of happiness should in no way transgress virtue. From virtue arises happiness, from vice suffering. 'Wealth and enjoyment result from virtue', says the *Mahābhārata*. Therefore the pursuit of wealth (Artha) and the pursuit of pleasure (Kama) both should be in accord with virtue (Dharma). This is the lesson enjoined by the Vedic seers on all seekers of prosperity,—the followers of the way of activity (Pravritti Mārga)[31].

IV. The Predicament of the Modern World: Its Cause and Cure. The False View of Progress. No Scheme of Life Complete Without the Spiritual Ideal.

It is the disregard of this universal principle that is mainly responsible for the present predicament of the world. Despite their unprecedented power and progress, modern peoples do not succeed in strengthening the bonds of universal harmony but are forced to prepare themselves in the name of self-defence for another global war which threatens their very existence. Neither ideological difference, nor cultural diversity nor economic maladjustment is the real cause of this tragic situation. There is something more fundamental at the bottom. Do not people having ideological, cultural or religious affinity quarrel and fight among themselves? Only ideological, cultural or religious unity cannot solve the problem. Economic maladjustment, apparently a frequent cause of conflict, originates mainly in greed. In fact, it is the subordination of ethical values to the material, resulting in lack of moral integrity in the life of the people, which is the root of major troubles in modern world.

With the development of physical science and technology the thought of the Western world became pretty well focussed on the

[29] A letter written in 1895.

[30] *Manu-Smṛti*, IV. 170.

[31] *Vide Manu-Smṛti*, II. 224, Kulluka's Commentary.

material plane. As a result, the inner life of man was ignored or subordinated to secular interests. Ever since Francis Bacon pointed out the utilitarian standard of knowledge, human intellect was progressively devoted to practical ends.[32] Modern man learned to measure world progress and civilization in terms of material achievements. He was taken up with the idea that he could solve all problems of life, remove all its miseries and enrich it indefinitely only by his ingenuity to unravel the secrets of Nature and utilize them for the invention of all possible means and appliances for human needs and comforts. Science became the new messiah and technics the way of deliverance. Dazed by the glare of 'mechanical discoveries' men were dreaming of millennium.[33]

From the middle of the eighteenth century advocates of progress, beginning with Turgot and Condorcet, were writing about 'ever increasing perfection' and 'indefinite improvement' of mankind on earth.[34] Some conceived progress not as a condition to be brought about by human will and endeavour, but as a settled fact, as a Law of Nature. 'Progress is not an accident,' says Herbert Spencer, 'not a thing within human control, but a beneficent necessity'.[35] The optimists' vision of 'inevitable progress' received one rude shock after another as the beneful effects of mechanistic and materialistic outlook on life appeared in succession in the form of greed of wealth and power, industrialism, exploitation of the weak by the strong, mercantile colonization, imperialism, militarism and so forth. Then followed the first world war. Still they had hopes for a new and better world. Their disillusionment was all but complete when the second world war ended in the holocaust of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

Evidently, the optimists lost sight of some important truths. They generally identified human happiness with material prosperity.[35a] It did not perhaps occur to many of them that physical comforts and pleasures do not necessarily make men happy. Human happiness depends primarily on psychical factors rather than physical. Many again, made the assumption that man's moral development goes hand in hand with his material and intellectual advancement. [36] But this is not a fact. Not

[32] *Vide* J. B. Berry, *The Idea of Progress*, Chapter II. 'The principle that the proper aim of knowledge is the amelioration of human life, to increase men's happiness and mitigate sufferings—*commodis humanis inservire*—was the guiding star of Bacon in all his intellectual labours. . . in laying down the utilitarian view of knowledge he contributed to the creation of a new mental atmosphere in which the theory of progress was afterwards to develop.'

[33] *Cf.* Lewis Mumford, *Technics and Civilization*, p. 58—'The machine came forth as the demiurge that was to create a new heaven and a new earth; at the least, as a new Moses that was to lead a barbarous humanity into the promised land.'

[34] *Vide* J. B. Berry, *Selected Essays*, p. 27—'The total mass of the human race marches continually though sometimes slowly to an ever increasing perfection.' (Turgot's *Discourses sur l'historie*, 1750).

Alfred Tennyson, *Locksley Hall* (Poems, 1842):

'Forward, forward let us range,
Let the great world spin for ever down the ringing grooves of change.'

(Written after seeing the first opening of the railway line between Manchester and Liverpool).

Charles R. Darwin, *The Origin of Species*, last chapter: 'And as natural selection works solely by and for the good of each being, all corporeal and mental environments will tend to progress towards perfection'.

Herbert Spencer, *Social Statics*, p. 259, 260: 'And when the change at present going on is complete, none will be hindred from duly unfolding their natures; for while everyone maintains his own claims, he will respect the like claims of others. . . . And thus, perfect morality, perfect individuation, and perfect life will be simultaneously realized'.

[35] *Essays*, Vol. I, 'Progress: Its Law and Cause'.

[35a] *Cf.* Benjamin Disraeli, 'The equality which is now sought by vast multitudes of men in many countries is physical and material equality. The leading principle of the new school is that there is no happiness which is not material and that every living being has a right to share in that physical welfare'. Speech at Glasgow University, November 19, 1873.

[36] *Cf.* Lewis Mumford, *Values for Survival*, (1946), p. 66: 'For the last two centuries the liberal and humanitarian groups in the Western

only prosperous but even highly intelligent persons are often found to be morally deficient. Neither material success nor keenness of intellect is a mark of moral growth. Truly, intellect does not develop into insight without moral purity. Man's rational nature depends more on his moral goodness than moral goodness on his rational nature. Reason does not function until the mind is free from emotional involvement. To see things impersonally one has to overcome passions and prejudices. In fact, rational life does not grow without the cultivation of virtue. Good conduct brightens the intellect, as evil darkens it.[36a] Then there were others, who in judging man's material achievements overlooked his moral nature. They did not perceive that material progress unrelated to the moral is meaningless. Any new invention, or a technical device can be either for man's good or evil according to the way he uses it. Progress means movement towards a desirable, salutary end. Without the ethical content it has no meaning.

A common error, which the advocates of progress were usually subject to, is the conception of good and evil as two independent existences. So they mostly cherished the hope that in course of time evil would be completely eliminated and unmixed good alone remain. But in truth, good and evil in the relative existence are interdependent. One exists in relation to the other. With the disappearance of one the other is bound to disappear. They are like the two sides of a sheet of paper. In eliminating one you eliminate the other, in retaining one you retain the other. If might, for instance, ceases to exist, there will be neither night or day. If ugliness ceases to exist there will remain neither ugliness nor beauty. So when poverty disappears, richness will vanish. When wrong disappears, justice will vanish. To experience light you have to experience darkness, to experience beauty you have to experience ugliness, to experience wealth you have to experience want, to experience right you have to experience wrong, to experience pleasure you have to experience pain. Absolute good or spiritual perfection is beyond relative good as well as relative evil. The divine Spirit or Supreme Consciousness alone is good in the absolute sense. 'There is none good but one, that is, God', says Jesus Christ.[36b]

Material life is not secure without a moral basis and moral life is not secure without a spiritual basis. So material wellbeing depends finally on spiritual idealism. Essentially, morality is the attunement of the individual self to the universal, the Soul of all souls, and therefore inseparable from spirituality. Whenever worldly glory and enjoyment become the primary objects of life, material values gain supremacy over the moral, greed takes hold of the human mind, ethics tends to degenerate into expediency. Under this condition ethical standards can hardly prevail even as 'enlightened self-interest' against heavy odds. This invariably happens when the physical universe is considered to be the Supreme Reality and the sense-life an end in itself. All noble pursuits of man, such as arts, science, ethics, philosophy, and even religion (in whatever form it may exist then) become as a matter of course subservient to the interests of sense-life. Ethics has to guide and govern material interests dominated by sense-desire insatiable by nature. It cannot be determined by, or derived from, them. It must be independent of them and stand on a solid ground beyond, that is, on spiritual consciousness, the sole controller of sense-desire.

Without the spiritual ideal, without God-realization or Supreme Good as the ultimate goal, no scheme of life can be self-sufficient or safe and sound. A spiritual outlook on life is necessary not only for the attainment of the kingdom of God but also for the security of

World have been governed by two leading ideas. One of them was the belief in mechanical progress, more or less openly accompanied by the conviction that there was a positive relation between material improvements and moral perfection. The other was the belief that through the free use of human reason, the world was ripe for a sudden transformation that would establish peace and justice for ever'.

[36a] *Cf. Naiṣkarmyasiddhi,* IV. 63.

[36b] *Mark* X. 18.

earthly peace and prosperity. Mere recognition of the supremacy of the spiritual ideal, even though one may not be able to pursue it, serves as a check on one's sense-desire. It is the inveterate sense-desire, the root of his selfishness, that makes man deviate from the moral path. Without its control no moral development is possible. But modern man, while holding to earthly prosperity and enjoyments as the supreme end of life, expects his moral nature to be free and sound enough to regulate his material interests, which is absurd. He permits sense-desire, which has a constant tendency to overpower his reason and will and to lead him astray, to be the ruler and still he thinks that in practical life,—social, political, or economic, his moral judgment will be intact. Above all, the spiritual ideal provides us with an absolute standard of values. Except Supreme Good all life-values are relative. Without reference to the ultimate value a right scale of values cannot be framed. For all these reasons, any 'this worldly' ideal, humanistic or deistic, such as 'world affirmation', 'life affirmation', 'accent on life', 'social duties', or the like, realistic and practical though it seems to be, is prone to lead to confusion of values and defeat its own purpose. But modern man refuses to see that it is his very love of life that makes him lose life. 'He that loveth his life shall lose it; and he that hateth his life in this world shall keep it unto life eternal', says Jesus Christ.[37]

A complete scheme of life must include all the life-values, relative and absolute. Not only that, it must integrate them into a harmonious whole. This cannot be achieved without a right appraisement of the values. We have to recognize their relative importance and assign them appropriate places in the plan of life. The Vedic seers attained this end by the fourfold classification of the human objectives under virtue, wealth, pleasure, and Liberation. The first three include all secular pursuits. Broadly speaking, virtue implies the inner resources, and wealth the external. One may seek wealth in many forms, such as property (immovable and movable including live-stock), children, friends, health, beauty, fame. In this scheme virtue is the primary value and Liberation or Supreme Good the ultimate value. The point is that life must be viewed as a whole. All the aspects of life—physical, moral, intellectual, aesthetic, and spiritual—have to be taken into account. Man's difficulty is not in 'the will to live', as some modern thinkers hold, but in the *way* of living, which cannot be determined without knowing the goal.

(To be continued)

[37] *John*, xii. 25.

THE PILGRIM

I am a pilgrim,
Gone wandering far away,
Thy love may guide me further,
And shine upon my way.
In Thy heavenly shadow
I find a cool abode,
An evergreening meadow,
That marks the wanderer's road.
To God in whole devotion
Relieve the soul! . . . and then
Upon the stormy Ocean,
In desert's lonely glen:
My heart is full,
Enraptured. God!
I am no more alone.
I feel Thee near,
I see Thy Light,
With Thee I am at One.

—FRANCOISE ENGEL

MEDIEVAL INDIAN ARCHITECTURE AS A SYMBOL OF HINDU MUSLIM UNITY

By Dr. Nandalal Chatterji

The most noteworthy feature of India's national culture has been its unique capacity for steady and continuous assimilation of the diverse elements which it has received from outside. It is this remarkable vitality which has kept the continuity of Indian culture unbroken through the ages. This process of living synthesis not only saved the soul of India, but led to a cultural *rapprochement* between the two rich and potent cultures—Hindu and Muslim. Communal bickerings of today have obscured the basic fact that, during Muslim rule, there sprang up a vital movement of cultural intermingling despite all the inevitable conflicts in the domain of politics. In all spheres of cultural activity, there was an exchange of ideas which provided an enduring meeting-ground between the two major communities.

This process of assimilation or synthesis was nowhere more spectacular and concrete than in the domain of architecture which still survives as a living symbol of national unity. This process was not merely a matter of coincidence or chance, but was the result chiefly of royal patronage or initiative. The fusion of Hindu and Muslim styles was fostered by the Muslim rulers and also Hindu Rajas and their feudatories. The blending of architectural ideas and tastes produced an unparalleled synthesis and a new architectural renaissance which had all the glory of a real efflorescence of art. The new architecture was one whereof both the Hindus and Muslims were equally proud, and in the creation of which both the communities made a supreme co-operative effort.

The manner in which the fusion took place is of special interest. It resulted from the action and reaction of two distinct and independent architectural styles upon each other, and this interaction was so complex that it is often difficult to ascribe any of the constituent elements to its original source. Rarely in the history of art has the spectacle been seen of two types, so powerful and so richly developed, yet so vastly different, as the Hindu and the Muslim, meeting and interacting on each other. The very dissimilarities which marked each of them make the story of their impact peculiarly instructive. The building of mosques, tombs, palaces, and cities was the common hobby of the Muslim rulers. This allowed much scope both to the artists and craftsmen who came from outside and to the Indian master-builders. The indigenous artists evinced a remarkable capacity for adaptation when they had to work under Muslim patronage and inspiration. As the number of foreign artists was always comparatively negligible, the Muslim rulers were obliged to depend on local artistic genius. So, although the Hindu craftsmen had to adhere to Muslim tastes and conventions as far as possible, they could find ample opportunities of introducing some of their own ideas and standards of art and craftsmanship which were alien to the ideals of Muslim art. This led to a blending of forms which gave the Muslim buildings of India a look perceptibly unlike that of similar buildings in Muslim countries outside India. In fact, according to authorities like M. Saladin, Indo-Muslim style of architecture differs radically from its Islamic prototype in other lands.

It is this divergence which led E. B. Havell, an outspoken admirer of the Hindu genius, to reject the term 'Indo-Saracenic' as 'an unscientific classification based on the fundamental error which vitiates the works of most European hitories of Indian civilization'. He obviously meant the works of European scholars like James Fergusson who gave currency to the term 'Indo-Saracenic'. However, even Havell, with all his pronounced bias for ancient Indian art traditions

and his emphatic stress on the unbroken continuity of Indian art traditions, had to admit that the traditional Indian styles were influenced by the works of Muslim art in medieval times. Even assuming, therefore, what authorities like Havell and Coomaraswamy have stated about the continuity of Indian art, one cannot deny that the Hindu craftsman of medieval India was not merely a lender of architectural ideas, but was also a borrower in no small a degree.

Medieval Indian architecture was thus built on the principle of give-and-take which in effect amounted to unity in diversity. The earliest mosques in India were patterned on Muslim style, yet the craftsmen who were mostly Hindu adapted local elements of construction and decoration. In the Quwwat-ul-Islam mosque of Delhi, for example, the indigenous workmen, unfamiliar with the erection of arches, and ignorant of proper voussoirs, created false arches by means of projecting or horizontal courses of masonry found in temple Shikharas, and studded the arcaded screen with carved decoration common to local buildings. The Qutb Minar which is Muslim in character was built by Hindu craftsmen under Muslim supervision in a manner which bears testimony to the admixture of Hindu features. The Alai Darwaza built by Alauddin, which shows the climax of early Indo-Muslim art, is Muslim in its general appearance, yet in its decoration there is much that indicates Hindu taste and Hindu tradition. In other words, from the beginning of Muslim rule in India, many Hindu motifs like the lotus, bell and chain, and structural details like lintels and brackets crept into Muslim buildings.

Even though Muslim puritanism was much in evidence during the Tughluq period, the architecture both in Delhi and the provincial centres once again evinced the process of assimilation from the fifteenth century onwards. The architecture of Gujarat or Jaunpur, for instance, bears witness to a splendid fusion of Hindu and Muslim ideas. The tendency reached its high-water mark in the Mughal period when Hindu and Muslim elements mingled to produce a new and harmonious style of architecture. Hindu style based on the principle of horizontal construction and characterized by a profusion of decorative detail coalesced with the Muslim emphasis on the arch and the dome and with the Muslim insistence on grace and harmony, no less than symmetry and artistry of Pietra Dura inlay, geometrical patterns in relief, enamelled tiles, and carved inscriptions. Where the synthesis was a real success, there could be wonders of art like the Taj Mahal which makes the consummation of a truly national style.

Indeed, the Taj is a gem of architecture of which there is no parallel in any of the Muslim countries. It is Indian in body and in soul, and is in fact neither purely Hindu, nor purely Muslim. It is the grandest example of the Hindu-Muslim co-partnership in architecture. Even the bulbous dome which is the finest feature of the Taj is, according to Havell, ultimately traceable to the old Hindu-Buddhist canon based on the lotus and the water pot—the symbols of creation and the creative element. Again, the apotheosis of womanhood which the Taj symbolizes was inspired by Hindu idealism, for anthropomorphic idealism was not encouraged in Islamic art.

Mughal monuments at Fatehpur Sikri, Agra, and Delhi are veritable masterpieces of design, construction, and decoration, which are all of a style which may be called Indian, for it is neither Hindu nor Muslim purely. In short, there is a fundamental Indianness in all the thirteen Indo-Saracenic styles enumerated by Fergusson, although it might not be visible always to the same extent.

The intermingling of modes and features was not one-sided, for it was as much to be seen in Hindu buildings of medieval India as in contemporary Muslim monuments. Examples of pure and unalloyed Hindu style are to be found mainly in the Deccan, for in the South the continuity of Hindu traditions remained intact on account of the comparatively lesser degree of Muslim domination. But, the contrast between the temples of the North and those of the South is so apparent that it attracts

the notice even of the superficial observer. The emphasis on lines and angles which marks the Deccan temples does not appear in the Northern temples. The latter show an adaptation of the Muslim arch and the circle. Even if domes are not common, the turrets and kiosks are dissimilar from those of the South. Those who have not seen the South Indian temples cannot feel the underlying harmony between the Northern temples and mosques. The exuberance of sculptural ornamentation which one notices in South Indian temples is not to be seen in the Northern temples. The moderation of decorative work in the North is obviously due to Muslim influence. The Hindu buildings of the North also exhibit the Muslim emphasis on harmony of lines and balanced massing on a large scale. Unlike the temples of the South, the temples of the North reflect constructional unity more than the richness of the component parts. This is clearly traceable to Muslim influence. The medieval Hindu palaces of Rajputana or Central India are Hindu in structural design, but they show a considerable influence of Muslim taste in execution and in decoration.

Again, the typical temple of the North is crowned by a curvilinear tower or Shikhara, whereas the Southern temples have a pyramidal tower with stepped sides, in addition to towering gateways called Gopurams. This difference is likewise due to the pervading influence of Muslim style of architecture. That the Hindu builders of the North did not hesitate to assimilate Muslim traditions even in the sphere of temple building shows the degree and variety of the interaction of ideas and ideals.

With the advent of the puritan Emperor Aurangzib, Mughal architecture rapidly declined, and soon disappeared as a distinct entity. The craftsmen took refuge in Hindu States of Rajputana and Central India where they kept up the old traditions long after the eminence of Delhi had passed away. That the real greatness of Mughal architecture was a result of the co-operation between Hindu and Muslim genius is thus negatively proved by the sudden deterioration that came in the reign of the bigoted Aurangzib. The tombs and mosques of his reign show a falling off of standard and taste which resulted from the snapping of the ties of partnership between Hindu and Muslim artists. The historic communion of ideas came to an end when Aurangzib drove out all but orthodox Muslim craftsmen, and shunned the indigenous traditions of art. In other words, the decline of medieval Indian architecture started only when the chain of intercommunal co-operation in art was abruptly snapped.

The real greatness of the architecture of medieval India may thus be justly ascribed to the fusion of ideas, which was generated in the course of centuries. Architecture was indeed the concrete objectification of the urge to unity and synthesis which gave birth to the composite culture of India.

'. . . Now, true Art can be compared to a lily which springs from the ground, takes its nourishment from the ground, is in touch with the ground, and yet is quite high above it. So Art must be in touch with Nature—and wherever that touch is gone, Art degenerates—yet it must be above Nature. . . .'

—SWAMI VIVEKANANDA

KNOWING AND DOING

By Swami Pavitrananda

Knowledge is power, but if knowledge is not put into practice or sharpened by application, it becomes ineffective and powerless. Mere theoretical knowledge is useless. Knowledge for knowledge's sake may to some extent help one's mental growth or give one intellectual joy, but that is a mere luxury or embellishment, if that knowledge has no relation to life or does not train one to face life. So the whole purpose of education should be how to train one to face life. It does not mean that education should aim at only ensuring bodily comforts or meeting physical necessities, though their importance is by no means negligible, but the main purpose of education should be to build up the mental fibre in such a way that one can stand the shocks of life and react to circumstances in the right way. Many are good and moral, and even ideal, so long as the tenor of life runs smoothly. But when there appear whirlpools and eddies in life—as they are bound to appear —the same persons behave most disappointedly, if not shockingly. A moral man under trying circumstances is found to be immoral; a virtuous man turns to be vile in difficult situations. The goodness of an average man is only surface-deep, it is just an outer veneer,—similar to the external courteousness in society life. It has not struck deep root in him; consequently one is not sure when it will give way. Our moral muscles grow through ceaseless struggles, just as the body is built up by regular physical exercises. Education has everywhere failed miserably, because it fills the mind with ideas and theories, dreams and visions, without giving it corresponding power to put them into action. It is said that Hitler was suspicious of intellectual people. For they are so many Hamlets. They will think this way and that way—sometimes contrary to one another, and it is very difficult to combine them to united efforts. The less the intellect, the greater is the chance to lead them into action.

Some of the thought leaders of the world had not much of book-learning. They had direct access to the fountain-head of all knowledge. Rather they tackled the fundamental problems of life so successfully that they had no necessity of any minor knowledge. And out of their direct experience and revelation what they gave to the world served as the basis of knowledge to scholars and philosophers for hundreds of generations. And what is surprising is that the lives of these thought leaders were more telling than their spoken words. Rather their words and teachings derived their strength from the lives they lived. Their lives were like a book of revelation to others. Their deeds conformed to their words, and their words were the true reflection of their thoughts. There was perfect harmony among their deeds, words, and thoughts, which is sadly lacking in ordinary human level. The world is tired of hypocrisy which lurks behind the words of most men. And one is suspicious of the motives which underlie many actions of many men. In this way pile up mountains of hypocrisy in society and national life, which, all on a sudden, explode in the form of some social upheavals or national calamities such as revolutions and war. Real thought leaders of the world—we mean prophets and saints—live ideal lives as much as their words are precious gems of truth. Their approach to knowledge was not through mind and intellect, but through life itself. Their fundamental problem was how to make life better, and as life began to unfold itself spiritually, their words began to reflect truth itself. So right knowledge comes from right actions as much as right actions follow right knowledge. Rather we are not sure whether right action will follow right knowledge, for more often than not man cannot do what he thinks and knows to be right. But if he can take care of his actions, right knowledge is sure to come. The greatest difficulty of man is, as St. Paul said, that he does,

in spite of himself, what he wishes not to be done, and he cannot do what he longs to do. This is the problem with most men—or all men except hardened criminals and habitual wrong-doers.

From the prophets as we come down to their followers, we find that they repeat the words of their masters, but they cannot fully carry them out in their own lives. So their words become less and less effective. But still they pursue their vocation of preaching and teaching, and succeeding lines of disciples follow the same blank method till it comes to this: 'Do what I say, and follow not what I do'. There is a wide disparity between their words and actions. Nobody takes them seriously. And religion as taught by them becomes a bundle of hypocrisy.

Sometimes it is seen that the disciples progress far better than those from whom they learn. It is because the disciples, in their naive faith, try their best to put into practice what they have been taught, whereas their teachers spend all their time and energy in teaching and preaching instead of in practising. So the result is that the disciples grow whereas their teachers remain standstill or deteriorate. Religion is a matter of practice, and truth is no respecter of persons. Whoever puts the precepts into practice ennobles his life. Whoever does not do that has a retrograde motion.

It is generally found that the original founders of religion couch their message in very simple language and easy words, so simple and easy that even a child can understand them. But as time passes, commentaries after commentaries are written on them till most abstruse philosophy is built on them, which is the enjoyment of the learned but scares away the common man. It is said that because the followers find it difficult to put into practice the message of their masters, they try to intellectualize away their weakness under cover of philosophical interpretations and discussions. The energy that should be devoted to action goes to discussions or intellectualizations. The result is that there grows a forest which obscures your vision, in place of a path which guides your footsteps. Thinking is good. But thinking that is not translated into action or has not its counterpart in deeds is airy nothing, without having any root on the earth.

Because we ignore this simple truth, we do not derive full advantages from the reading of even the scriptures. Scriptures contain directions to follow, and not mere good thoughts for intellectual enjoyment. Scriptures can be utilized for intellectual joy, they can be used for spiritual objects. They can be applied for self-deception too. For, some religious persons daily read scriptures with the idea that that will give them religious merit. But because all their religious pursuits end with the reading only, their lives are as stagnant as ever, though all the while they think they are doing something for progress in spiritual life. A man who follows a single precept of the scriptures in practice is far better than a Pandit who knows all the scriptures by heart or can give learned discourses on them. So the mere scriptural knowledge is compared to the burden of an ass. An ass carries a burden on its back. It does not know what the load contains. Similarly a scholar carries the scriptural knowledge in his head, but he does not in the least realize the importance and utility of that knowledge. With him it is as good as knowledge locked in printed pages. The only difference is that he can carry that in his head without taking the books. Whereas a simple-hearted person, without having the pride and self-complacency of a Pandit, applies in life what little precept he knows or has heard of, and develops an ideal character. He thus brings a supreme joy to the society to which he belongs, and becomes beloved of God, men, and angels.

This divergence between words and deeds, profession and practice is evidenced not only in the field of religion but in almost all walks of life. Sometimes it is due to human weakness, sometimes it is deliberate: one becomes so practised in it that one does not at all consider it wrong. In politics we find leaders in every country talking in terms of high ideal-

ism. Their words will indicate that they have become saints. But in practice the thin veneer of fine expressions is torn asunder, and their real design comes out. Even in war times, how the national leaders on both sides say from the house-tops that they are the most peace-loving people under the sun, and the sin and burden of war is put on the opposite camp! But both sides are guilty, both sides want to cover their evil motive with high-flown words. They play with the destiny of millions of people to satisfy their personal ambition or personal grudge. They create feelings against the enemy nation by propaganda—false or exaggerated. And the innocent masses fall sad victims. If the war is won, the masses do not really get much advantage; if the war is lost, they suffer most. But they are led to war against their calm thought and sober judgment. When peace is made, both sides know that it will be observed so long as it serves their own purpose and convenience, and will be thrown away like a scrap of paper when it does not. So clever and experienced people do not take the words of the political leaders too seriously. For, few of them say what they mean and mean what they say. And sometimes they raise high hopes which they themselves know cannot be realized. Not that there have not been any exceptions to this. But those few great men, honest to the backbone, do not really fit in the sphere of politics. They are at war with themselves and in conflict with the environment. Thus they suffer inwardly and outwardly, and because of their very honesty they are sometimes thrown out of the pedestal of important position.

Similar things happen in business and commercial world. Business morality is different from ethical morality as is ordinarily understood. In business transactions everyone is on guard that he is not deceived by another. That indicates everyone is or is taken to be on the alert to take advantage over others. It is not considered to be wrong. Or the public have become so accustomed to it that they take this for granted. One does not consider it wrong to get rich by making many people poor. Those who are wealthy have many advantages in business life. They utilize them fully, and poorer people cannot compete with them. So wealth accumulates in few hands, and men in general decay. Then there is the economic exploitation of a nation by another nation by which the weaker one is sucked out of all wealth by the stronger party. Thus at a stroke millions of people become the sad victims. This is not considered ungenerous or inhuman. Even one's guilty conscience becomes hardened when one persists in wrong-doing. The result of all this is that man who has the possibility of becoming godly degrades himself, and earth which could be turned into a heaven becomes a hell. And people cry in despair for peace on earth.

The evil starts with the education that is given to the boys and the system that is followed in educational institutions. Education stresses too much on the acquisition of theoretical knowledge and too little on the building up of character. A boy is taken to have passed an examination or a young man is given a Degree, if he has amassed in his brain certain amount of information, but it is not considered whether he has developed any human and social qualities. There should be a test even for that. The reading of history is not enough; it is to be seen whether the students absorb in their lives the lessons of history. To be able to discuss philosophical and psychological problems is the least part of education; one should develop a bent of mind to live their conclusions in their lives. There are moral lessons of science as much of art and religion, poetry and philosophy. What is wanted is not the acquirement of information but an attitude and readiness to put the lessons of this information into action. A young man's education is incomplete or lost, if he has not developed social virtues and qualities that will contribute to the betterment of the society in which he will live. It is said that the competitive system of education, encouraging rivalry among boys to score higher marks in examinations, sows the seeds of rivalry among different members in a society or even among different nations in

the world, which, in its operation, crushes all gentle human feelings in one's heart. Instead of competition for intellectual brilliance, can there not be competition for noble qualities? —say, for instance, spirit of service, readiness for self-sacrifice, and so on? Such qualities should be taken note of, when a young man is given a Degree. It is said that science has given more knowledge to man than he can ethically absorb. Man has got scientific knowledge, but as he has not ethically developed in the same proportion, that knowledge has been a source of evil rather than of good to the world. The same thing may be said of other kinds of knowledge too. A wily economist devises methods how to exploit others. Even a philosopher, who has developed intelligence more than others by trying to probe into the mysteries of being, applies his cleverness to hoodwink others in a subtle way and serve his gross selfish ends. All these because, from the very beginning of education, emphasis was put on knowledge and not on action and practice. The famous scientist, Dr. Einstein, puts it very clearly when he says: 'Sometimes one sees in the school simply the instruments for transferring a certain maximum quantity of knowledge to the growing generation. But that is not right. Knowledge is dead; the school, however, serves the living. It should develop in young individuals those qualities and capabilities which are of value for the welfare of the commonwealth. . . . But how shall one try to attain this ideal? Should one perhaps try to realize this aim by moralizing? Not at all. Words are and remain an empty sound, and the road to perdition has ever been accompanied by lip-service to an ideal. But personalities are not formed by what is heard and said, but by labour and activity'.

If action is better than knowledge, if doing is better than knowing, being is better than even doing. After all, what is the object of action? It is only to be better. When a man is really good, good action is bound to follow. With an average man good action comes out of deliberate thinking. But with a better type of men good action comes as spontaneously as the air one breathes in. Rather it is difficult for them to do evil. And the highest type of men cannot do evil, see evil, or hear evil. The influences of prophets and saints are so great and far-reaching because their lives are so exemplary. The problems of the world are becoming more and more complicated because precept is not followed in practice, and there are not many persons whose lives are one long, continuous, silent precept.

TAGORE, THE POET OF NEW INDIA

By Dr. Amaresh Datta

Seldom has it been the privilege of poets to enjoy overwhelming praise and receive world-wide recognition in their lifetime. Poetic geniuses of the world almost always have appeared to their contemporaries as men of no mighty importance. Yet Tagore, by the grace of his personality and the magic of his poetry, cast a spell over a considerable part of the world for a fairly long span of time. Popularity is no indication of greatness and Tagore's popularity, particularly in Europe, led his uncritical admirers to make exaggerated claims for him. But a reaction has set in, in recent years, against Tagore both in India and abroad. Many popular writers have been thrown into comparative insignificance or even disclaimed by subsequent generations, but what is unfortunate about Tagore is that he was seldom praised for the very best and truly excellent in him, particularly by the Western world, nor is he being judged now on his masterpieces by his severe and incompetent critics. Thus, if

one calls him the greatest poet of the world, the other characterizes his works as 'greeting card poetry'. But this is not unwarranted altogether, for, if his dynamic personality, lofty idealism, and profound mysticism made him a towering genius of his time, imperfect and superficial translations of his works have been responsible for the steady decline of his popularity after his death. The Indians who read their Tagore through translations and are willing to get at the truth about him, therefore, should guard against the general tendency of looking at him through Western eyes.

But whatever the forms of appraisal, greatness can never be denied to him, and appreciation of greatness is a perpetual celebration of the glory of man. Great literature can never pass into total oblivion. For, as Matthew Arnold has so aptly said, 'currency and supremacy are insured to it, not indeed by world's deliberate and conscious choice but by something far deeper—by the instinct of self-preservation in humanity'.

Tagore passed the formative years of his life at a time when new India was shaping herself. The West had already come to this country not only with its mighty material power but also with an equally powerful ideology, a fundamentally different outlook on life. A conflict was inevitable. On the material plane it was a one-sided game, but the conflict between ideologies was an undecided battle. The result was that the orthodox became more orthodox in the support of their traditions and culture, and the unscrupulous yielded without any resistance to a simian imitation of the West. But the makers of new India saw in this conflict the possibility of a happy reconciliation, a grand synthesis. Our indispensable nineteenth century witnessed this great conflict and compromise—the greatest perhaps in the cultural history of our country. Tagore and his family hailed the coming of the West as providential and saw in the meeting of the East and the West the potentiality of a new world, a new civilization. Time had come when geographical barriers were sinking into imaginary lines and circumstances were, perforce, not only bringing different nations closer but also making one dependent upon another. Keeping this happy inevitability in view, Tagore sang:

> The door has opened in the West.
> Let us come with our gifts
> In a spirit of give and take
> And meet on the seashore of a mighty humanity
> In this our India.

This mighty ocean of humanity had been fed by many tributaries in the past and many streams in many ages have mingled with it. It is, therefore, in the tradition of the country to keep open for ever the door to the stranger, the unfamiliar, for this not only speaks of her large hospitality but also of her unshaken confidence. For Tagore, therefore, deliverance is not in a mere formal renunciation, and his God is one who '. . . hast made me known to friends whom I knew not. Thou hast given me seats in homes not my own. Thou hast brought the distant near and made a brother of the stranger . . .' . And when one knows his God, then 'alien there is none, then no door is shut'. So his prayer is: 'Grant me my prayer that I may never lose the bliss of the touch of the One in the play of many'.

Hence when Tagore says that 'complete man must not be sacrificed to the patriotic man', his political compatriots may resent and sneer, as indeed they did even when he was alive, but he who set 'men above abstraction' and wished 'ardently to see the flowering of a rich humanity' cannot unsay it even for the sake of his national freedom. Because that freedom would mean seclusion, insularity, breaking up of the world into fragments by domestic walls—as indeed it means today.

As a poet he has accepted the secular outlook of the West and yet laid the emphasis on the profound mysticism of the East. The spiritual, he believes, does not become real without the material. The man who has seen, felt, thought, and accepted life with all its human warmth, has become a true mystic, for he has truly known its glory and seen its ever elusive mystery when the known has melted into the unknown, the familiar into the unfamiliar, the object into idea, thoughts into feelings. Thus,

paradoxically though but most truly, by being Western in outlook he could be a real mystic, and his being Indian enabled him to be so largely Western.

He surrendered himself with utmost elasticity to all forms of good influences; European writers vied with the Indian in influencing him. He even compelled them to contribute to his writings; yet, by his wonderful power of assimilation, he could outgrow them all and create a literature typically his own.

Tagore wanted his country to wake in a world of freedom and he strove to lay the foundation of that world all through his life. Many a time, particularly just before his death, when the Second World War broke out, he saw it being shaken rudely by enemies of God, but he never lost his inherent faith in the destiny of man. This faith is the abiding spirit of his imperishable songs. But it will be untrue to say that Tagore has only brought Europe to India, for, the truth of the matter is, he has revealed the East to the West. If he has seen the possibility and realized the desirability of the West influencing the East, he has also allured the West to draw profusely from the fountains of Eastern lore and wisdom. A careful and critical study of Tagore's life and works will show how a typical Asian mind —essentially religious and deeply human, steeped in the traditions, yet profoundly assimilative, should react to the complexities of modern European life.

To the generation like ours, torn by jealousy, weakened by hatred, and laid low by frustration, Tagore's call is a beacon. It is a call which may not be denied for long if we do not want to give ourselves up completely to the powers of darkness. In 1802 Wordsworth invoked the spirit of Milton. In the middle of the twentieth century, which has the queer habit of calling itself civilized, 'Tagore, thou shouldst be living'. It is his courage of conviction, his faith in the dignity of man that is the need of the hour. As Tagore has beautifully said:

> Who can hold thee, O Sun!
> Except the sky?
> I can dream of thee,
> But to serve thee
> I can never, O never!

'Thy soul was like a Star and dwelt apart', said Wordsworth of Milton. 'Who can hold thee, O Sun! Except the sky?'—is our question of wonder. Nevertheless, we have seen our sky and earth bathed by the sun's rays of joy and health.

RIGHT AND WRONG APPROACHES TO RAMAYANA

By K. S. Ramaswami Sastri

The *Rāmāyaṇa* is not only our supreme national epic poem, it is our national scripture as well. There is no inherent contradiction between studying Rama as an incarnation of God and studying him as the ideal man. In fact Vālmikī asks Nārada, in the original *Rāmāyaṇa,* about a living (*sāmpratam*) ideal man but pitches his qualities so high that only the Godhead can have them. For immediately he asks, 'of whom even gods are afraid, when he is angry'. Narada fully realizes the spirit of the questioner and replies that he knows one who has *all* the highest qualities (*sarvaguṇopeta*). Strangely enough while Rama says that he regards himself as a man and as Dasharatha's son, almost all the other characters in the epic, all the gods, and finally the poet himself regard him as an incarnation of God. The difference between the story of Rama and the story of Krishna is that while Rama claims to be a man and acts like God, Krishna claims to be God and acts like God. It would hence be doing violence to the poet and the poem to empty the divine content and emphasis in the

work and to look at Rama as at Alfred or Ashoka or Akbar.

The act of incarnation is an act of gracious self-veiling by God so that we may stand near without awe, fear, and trepidation and receive the full benefit of such proximity. It is often asked how Rama could weep for Sita when she was abducted, or how he could not distinguish between Vāli and Sugriva at first, or how he failed to know the truth about the golden deer if he was omniscient. It seems to be that such arguing will end in argument in a circle. It may be well asked how he could be omnipotent if he were to be unable to put off his omniscience for a while. The generally adopted trend is that the incarnation is fully conscious of his divinity and that all his thoughts, words, and acts on the human level are a piece of play-acting. But a more acceptable view is that God veils His omniscience both to Himself and to others and acts on a human level and with a human consciousness, while His thoughts, words, and acts have a superhuman height of greatness. I fail to see why there should not be moments when not only omnipotence but also omniscience peep through the veil. Rama orders Jatāyu to go to heaven, which no mere man could do (*Araṇya,* LXVIII. 30). He tells Sutikshna and Sharabhanga that he would absorb all their merit and confer the highest salvation, instead of mere heaven, on them (*Araṇya,* V. 35 and VII. 14). He says further that he has only one equal in prowess, viz. Tryambaka (*Shiva*) (*Yuddha,* XCIV. 38). When a Yogi can function on two levels of being, viz. the ordinary level and the yogic level, what is there wonderful or incomprehensible in God doing so?

But we have no right to say that Rama was an erring person like us because 'to err is human', that he actually gave way to grief, anger, etc. like ourselves, and that that is why we feel kinship with him. We will do well to realize that even in his grief—treating it as real—there is a sublimity that is far beyond us, and that he exhibits himself only partially in such moments but fully in his moods of self-recovery and self-composure. His so-called 'peccadillos' are not the peccadillos of people like us who are limited, sensual, possessive, and bound by Karmic chains.

It therefore follows that we will be interpreting the poet correctly and honouring Rama aright only if, while conceding his grief for Sita and other acts as real moods of his on the human level, we realize that he did not speak or act like us or even less than us. It is not correct to say that 'if Rama was the ideal always and at every moment, in big matters and in small, to the great ones and little ones, he would be a bloodless robot, an impossible prig, mounted on stilts and hardly visible in perspective'. The renunciation of a Rama or a Buddha cannot possibly have a parallel in the acts of ordinary Karma-bound human beings who calculate and act under the subtle influence of selfishness and self-interest. It does not mean that because they stand on a level far above our own, they are robots or prigs or impossibilities. We feel in our heart of hearts that at least after much self-examination, self-refinement, and self-elevation we can rise nearer and nearer to such a level and eventually attain and keep that level. Harishchandra was only a man and yet reached a superhuman level. Dadhichi was but a man and yet reached a superhuman level. Rantideva was but a man and yet reached a superhuman level. Man at his highest, by his contemplation of God, can reach the divine levels of thought, speech, and action, here and now, or at some time or other and in some place or other. In the case of incarnations of God and perfected souls, the human level on which they act is far higher than the ordinary human level and is co-existent with or succeeded by the divine level of being.

Hence it seems to me that it is not right to say that in Rama there was a lower nature like ours which he conquered. Even discarding the view that the grief etc. were a mere piece of play-acting (*nātya*) to teach us the highest lessons of life and taking the moods to be real, we must regard them as superhuman in the sense of being above our levels, and as fitting us for the truly exalted, sublime, divine moods of *viveka,*

vairāgya, and *lokasañgraha*. If we pull down Rama and Sita to our levels of being and our lower and selfish altitudes of thought, speech, and action, or even if we regard them as mere Rishis and Yogis, we cannot get that self-purification, self-exaltation, and self-sublimation which we can have when we feel that they think, speak, and act on divine levels of being, though, out of compassion for us and to draw us nearer to them by drawing near to ourselves, they veil their divinity deliberately, thereby coming down not to our earthly levels but standing on sublimely higher levels than ours and fitting us for our ascent to the supreme, divine levels of being and consciousness.

Let us take a few instances. Did Rama ask Sumantra to lie to Dasharatha and say, 'I did not hear your ordering me to stop the car' (*Ayodhyā*, XL. 47). The more proper meaning would be: 'I did not obey your command, as that would prolong the agony and would be a grievous sin'. Rama had a little innocent fun (*parihāsa*) with Shurpanakha. That brings him nearer to us without annihilating the distance between him as he was and us as we are. Rama's anger against Sugriva was not like our mean-motive anger and melted away in a trice. It is wrong to say that when hurling the Gandharva Astra, there was *māyā* or *kūta-yuddha* on his part. That was the nature and efficacy of that spiritual weapon.

The three incidents urged oftenest against Rama are the killing of Vali, the entry of Sita into the fire, and the final banishment of Sita. Taking the killing of Vali first, I think that Rama did not hide himself but was in the open field, and Vali was so full of the thought of killing Sugriva that he did not see Rama. It is wrong to urge that there was a pact between Vali and Rāvana to share women. The *ardhabalam* theory is a myth. It is entirely wrong to say that Rama suspected Sita's fidelity while he expressly says that he knew her purity but wanted it to be attested before the whole world. The words *'dipo-netrāturayava'* (*Yuddha*, CXVIII. 17) means that he told her that he could not tolerate her any more than a man suffering from eye disease can put up with a radiant flame. It is wrong to say that he asked Sita to *fix her affections* on Lakshmana, Bharata, Sugriva, or Vibhishana. They were like his younger brothers and he asked her to be under the protection of one or another of them. What was the net result? The demonstration of the divine purity of Sita in a manner unparalleled in the literature of the world.

Equally sublime is the final banishment and farewell of Sita. After having brought divine characters into history, the poet had to give them a sublime exit—not the usual human exit by disease. After the ordeal by fire and the testimony of the gods and the acceptance by Rama, there were widespread rumours that Rama did wrong in accepting her after a year's sojourn in Ravana's house. This was likely to lead to a lowering of the moral standards among the people. Rama, as the custodian of public morality, set before himself very exacting standards which were far higher than the ordinary standards of a private gentleman and which are felt by us as staggeringly high. For the sake of truth he threw away the crown. The poet uses the word *sarvalokātiga* (transcending the whole world) in regard to that incident (*Ayodhyā* XIX. 33). That word is even more appropriate in regard to Sita's banishment. Kālidāsa, Ānandavardhana, and others follow Valmiki in regarding this act of self-sacrifice as the highest peak in the lives of Rama and Sita. Anandavardhana says in his *Dhvanyāloka* that in it we see the culmination of *karuṇārasa*. To say that Rama treated Sita as a chattel or passed the decree of banishment *secretly* or that Rama's conduct in abandoning Sita must be put down to the influence of jealousy is a grievous error. There is no parallelism whatever between Rama and Othello or between Sita and Guinevere, and it is incorrect to contrast Sita's banishment by Rama with Ahalya's acceptance by Gautama!

I may give here a few other illustrations of right and wrong approaches to the *Ramayana* of Valmiki. It is wrong to say that Bharata was unfilial in his conduct towards his mother

Kaikeyi. Kaikeyi was a good woman and loved Rama, but her mind was poisoned by Manthara. Bharata's seeming harshness removed the poison by means of an antidote and she became her own self again. Nor is it right to say that Dasharatha sent away Bharata and planned the coronation of Rama by a stratagem. It was Kaikeyi that sent Bharata to her father's house in the natural course of things (*Ayodhyā*, VIII. 28). As Dasharatha was very old and had a horoscopically bad time and apprehended death or a stroke depriving him of mental alertness and grip (*Ayodhyā*, IV, 18, 20), he decided on the immediate coronation of Rama and felt sure that the noble-minded Bharata would enthusiastically approve such an auspicious act. The word *kṛtaśobhi* (*Ayodhyā*, IV. 27) is a word that clinches the matter. In the same way the partial views about Rama's 'fatalism' and Lakshmana's diatribe against fate and *dharma* are but half-truths and merely express fleeting moods and not the centralities of character. Nor is it right to call Rama a 'martinet'. Blaming Sita for equivocating about Hanuman to the Rākshasis is equally wide off the mark. She had to save Hanuman from being convicted out of her mouth and killed, and the demonesses were themselves in the know of all that took place between her and Hanuman and merely wanted to inveigle her into a confession. Saving a person from death is the highest moral law. Similarly, it is wrong to say that Hanuman had fits of forgetfulness and suffered from amnesia and often failed in his projects. It is equally wrong to say that Vibhishana did wrong in going away from Ravana. After trying till the very last to wean Ravana from his evil and suicidal courses and only when he was threatened with disgrace and death did he leave the ordinary worldly levels of duty and non-cooperated with strident and shameless evil and co-operated with righteousness and the laws of God. It is equally wrong to say that he hankered after sovereignty. His own words and acts belie this charge. Others may have misread and mis-represented his motives. But he could not be blamed for that. In the interests of world welfare, Rama laid the burden of sovereignty on his shoulders and he bore the same as a duty imposed on him by the Lord in the best interests of the people who had been ruined by the sins of Ravana.

India has always rightly regarded *Rāma-rājya* as the ideal government for all men, at all times, in all places. The welfare of the people in Rama-rajya was not described by Valmiki as being externally different from their welfare in Dasharatha-rajya, for instance. But internally there was a difference because in Rama-rajya the true Rama spirit of *satya, ahimsā,* defensive and protective valour, etc. possessed every person in the realm (*Rāma-bhūtam jagadabhūt Rāma rājyam prasasati*). Rama is the model man, Sita the model woman, and Rama-rajya the model State for ever and ever.

'Even the Incarnations are conscious of the body. Embodiment is due to Maya. Rama wept for Sita. But the Incarnation of God puts a bandage over His eyes by His own sweet will, like children playing blindman's buff. . . .' —*Sri Ramakrishna*

STUDIES IN THE BRIHADARANYAKA UPANISHAD

By Dr. Nalini Kanta Brahma

(Continued from the January issue)

III

The Self or Brahman

Brahman is described in the Upanishads *nirastasarvaviśeṣam, nirastasarvopādhi.* It has been shown that its adjectives (*viśeṣaṇa*) are all seeming and are mere adjuncts (*upādhi*). It is *sarvopādhi, sarvātmā,* it is the all and is the substratum of all adjuncts because it assumes all names and forms, all adjuncts, although it never departs from its real nature. The adjuncts (*upādhi*) are all superficial assumptions which do not touch its real nature. It is the All (*sarva*), it is the soul of everything (*sarvātmā*), it is the substratum of all adjuncts (*sarvopādhi*), yet it is nothing of this seen universe—*neti, neti, nirupādhi,* has no adjuncts, *nirupākhya,* has no specific characters at all. This is its transcendence—it is All, yet is Nothing, is everything yet is not touched by anything, it gives reality to everything but is not limited by any of these things and is different from them altogether (*vilakṣaṇa*).

The Upanishads have sought to establish the existence of the transcendental Self which is identical with Brahman by reference to the states of waking (*jāgrat*), dream (*svapna*), and dreamless sleep (*suṣupti*). It is sometimes puzzling to understand how the Self which is limited and individual can be identical with the Supreme Reality, the Absolute Brahman, the unlimited and undisputed Lord of the universe. But the answer seems to be simple from the point of view of the Upanishads. The Self in its essence is pure consciousness, *cidekarasa,* all-consciousness. It is not that which has consciousness, but is consciousness itself. It has nothing else than consciousness. What is not *cit* or *prajñāna* is not Self—it has no inside and outside, it is the All. What seems to be not-Self is only a false super-imposition, is the creation of *avidyā,* is nothing

Brahman is described in the Upanishads *apūrvamanaparamanantaram abāhyam ayam-ātmā sarvānubhūti,* as identical with the Self and as that which has no before and no after, no inside and no outside, and which feels everything being its innermost essence. It has also been described as *satyasya satyam,* as the truth of all that appears to be real. It is at the root of what is known to be the essence that upholds the things of this universe. The Prāṇa or the energy that holds the things of this universe is *satya* (real); Brahman is *satyasya satyam* or the truth that underlies even the Prāṇa, i.e. that which gives reality even to this Prāṇa which is seen to give reality to all the things of the world. It is described as *sākṣāt aparokṣāt* or that which is direct, immediate knowledge. There is no gap or interval between the knower and the known in Brahman. Brahman stands for or signifies the realization which is *prajñānaghana,* that is, which is all-consciousness and which contains nothing but consciousness like the lump of salt which is all salty and contains no other taste (*saindhavaghanavad ekarasam*). It is also described as *aśanāyādyatītam,* as beyond hunger, etc. and also as *agṛhya, aśīrya,* and *asanga,* as that which cannot be grasped by the senses, as that which is not liable to decay and destruction and as that which is utterly transcendent. It has been described as *asthūlam anaṇu ahrasvam adīrgham,* as that which is neither thick nor thin, neither short nor long, as *ajam amaram amṛtam abhayam,* as the unborn, as the undecaying, as the immortal, and as the fearless. It has also been described as *neti, neti,* not this, not this, in order to indicate that its real nature is pure consciousness, unalloyed by any adjunct—

in reality. Hence *prajñānaghana* is all *cit* and all consciousness. The Self seen as free from all Upādhis or adjuncts can in no way be distinguished from Brahman in its Nirupādhic essence. It is the adjuncts or Upādhis that seem to limit the Self and hence there appears to be a difference between the Atman and Brahman, but there is no difference between Nirupādhic Self and Nirupādhic Brahman, because both are pure *cit* where there is no ground for any distinction or heterogeneity. In order to show that the Self is pure *cit* which is absolutely *nirviśeṣa* and which contains no *upādhi* and no variety, the Upanishads have attempted to analyse and compare the states of *jāgrata, svapna,* and *suṣupti.* They have been able to show by this means that the Self which is experienced and felt to be pure *cit* in the stage of dreamless sleep is in its essence *nirviśeṣa* and that the mnltiplicity and variety noticed in the stages of waking and dream do not belong to its essence and are only adjuncts and false superimpositions. This discussion forms the basis of the Vedantic doctrine and is the unassailable rational ground of the system. As such it deserves special treatment and an attempt is being made to give the details of the argument as far as possible.

At the *jāgrat* or waking stage, all the sense-organs remain active and hence it cannot be ascertained whether there is any such thing as pure *cit* or consciousness apart from the special contributions of the senses. Hume, for example, maintains that he is unable to catch any glimpse of the so-called Self or pure *cit* apart from the particular modalized states of consciousness. Here, in India also, the Vijñānavādins hold a similar view. They deny the existence of any Self over and above the particular states of consciousness. Not only the Vijñānavādins but all the philosophical schools excepting the orthodox Upanishadites reject the doctrine of the Self as pure *cit,* maintained by the Vedantins of the Shankara school. It becomes difficult to accept the Vedantic doctrine of the Pure Self on the testimony of waking consciousness alone. In waking, it is not possible to eliminate the contributions of the sense-organs and the mind and to see whether there is any such thing as Pure Consciousness. The *samādhi* state or the state of absorption and full concentration is not only coloured, except in the highest *nirvikalpa* stage, but also it cannot be cited as evidence simply because it is not within the reach of the experience of the ordinary man. The Vedantin knows this difficulty full well and even as early as the earliest Upanishad, we have a discussion of the states of dream and dreamless sleep and a comparison of them with the waking state with a view to show the purity of the Self in its essence as manifested in the state of dreamless sleep.

In the dream state, the sense-organs do not work and there is the additional advantage of studying the Self when it is free from the turmoil of the senses. Hence Ajātaśatru goes to a sleeping person and attempts to awake him by addressing him as *'bṛhan', 'pāṇḍaravāsa',* and such other names of the Prāṇa or vital energy,—it is stated in the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad.* The sleeping person does not respond. Ajātaśatru concludes therefrom that the Prāṇa is not the master of the body and is not the Self or the ultimate Reality. As it does not respond even when it is called by its secret esoteric names, it cannot be supposed to be awake and, therefore, it cannot be the Self or the Atman which is ever vigilant and which never sleeps and which is all consciousness.

Great importance is attached to the state of dreamless sleep. The daily experience of this dreamless sleep when all modalized or particularized states of consciousness are absent and when the Pure Consciousness or Self rests in its serene composure and shines in its undisturbed glory, is the infallible testimony to the Vedantic theory of the Pure Self which is held to be identical with the transcendental Absolute. But for the experience of *suṣupti* or perfect sleep, the Vedantic theory could not be proved at all. The continuity between the experiences before one falls into dreamless sleep and the experiences after one awakes from that sleep shows that there cannot be any

absolute void or blank or utter negation in the interval. Consciousness must be supposed to be identically permanent throughout the states of waking, dreaming, and dreamless sleep in order that memory and recognition may be explained satisfactorily. The feeling that a person has after waking from dreamless sleep, that he slept well, and did not have any particularized state of consciousness, is a direct evidence of the persistence of the Pure Consciousness at the state of dreamless sleep. The freshness that one feels and the energizing that one experiences after sound sleep also indicate that one must have dived deep into an unruffled and bottomless ocean of bliss and energy. As the Upanishad puts it, 'The *puruṣa* rests in the *sat* aspect of Brahman during sleep, but as there is still the envelopment of the *avidyā* or nescience, there is no awareness of this merging or resting in the Absolute'. It is an unconscious attainment of Pure Consciousness, as it were. The individual touches the Pure Consciousness, but the mind knows it not. The way to the hidden reservoir of energy and the ocean of bliss is not shown to him—he is led blindfolded as it were to the hidden place. He is allowed to enjoy the bliss and again carried blindfolded to his waking consciousness—the plane of his normal working. It would not have been possible at all to establish the possibility of the existence of Pure Self or Nirupādhic indeterminate Absolute if there had not been this direct evidence of the state of *suṣupti* every day. The Upanishads have described this state of *suṣupti* in such language as is applicable only to *mukti* or the state of liberation and sometimes a genuine confusion arises as to what exactly has been meant. Is *mukti* nothing but the dreamless sleep and are the Upanishadic seers to be identified only with the lotus-eaters? That *suṣupti* or sound sleep is not *mukti* has been definitely indicated by saying that in *suṣupti* there is *ajñāna,* there is the covering of dark ignorance, while in *mukti* it is all light, it is all knowledge—there being no veil or obstruction at all. In *suṣupti* there is absence of all knowledge—*na kiñcana veda;* but in *mukti* the *prajñānaghana* Atman, the Self which is all-knowledge, shines in its own light. But as *suṣupti* or dreamless sleep is the only experience which resembles the state of liberation or Absolute Consciousness in respect of the absence of all particularizations, it is described to signify the purity and the absence of all limitation of the Pure Consciousness and hence a confusion naturally arises as to whether the Upanishads have really meant the state of *suṣupti* to be identical with the state of *mukti.* In the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad,* it has been said that in this state of *suṣupti,* the person attains identification with the *sat,* the Absolute Brahman (*sata saumya tadā sampanno bhavati*). Even the etymology of the word *'svapiti',* the Sanskrit term for sleeping, indicates that in this state it attains the Self—*svam ātmānam apiti apigacchati.* The working of all sense-organs is withdrawn at the stage and as such all particular modalized states are absent and hence the Self rests in its own natural and normal purity. The particularizations are all due to its connections with the *linga-śarīra* or the subtle body. As these connections cease during sleep, the Self rests in its non-particularized, normal, undivided purity. But although the Upanishads have thus indicated in many ways that the Self recovers its native purity and undisturbed glory during sleep, they have not been silent to preach the wide difference between this state and the state of liberation. The saying, *sati sampādya na viduti,* clearly indicates that this identification between the empirical and the transcendental Self is not realized by the surface-consciousness, that there is no awareness by the intellect or the Buddhi of this identification or of this state of the Pure Self. There is *satsampatti,* the union with the *sat* or the Absolute, but there is no awareness by the surface-consciousness of this stage because *avidyā* or nescience is still present during sleep. As Anandagiri states in his commentary, *svāpādhikāre svābhāvikatvam avidyāmātrāsammiśritatvam,* the native purity of the Self during sleep is to be supposed as

covered merely by the presence of the *avidyā,* although it is not disturbed by its elaborate workings and amplifications.

The experiences of the waking state do not confirm the dream experiences. A person dreams that he has become a king and is enjoying kingly pleasures so long as the dream state lasts, but as soon as he awakes he finds himself in all his old surroundings and realizes that the dream experiences are unreal, being not in harmony with the stable experiences of his waking life. It cannot be maintained that the experiences of waking life may similarly be supposed to be unreal, being in conflict with dream experiences which are also real so long as the dream lasts. As between the two,—waking experiences and dream experiences,—the former have greater validity being in conformity with the facts in space and time and having a greater workability. It is not possible to go on in this world accepting the reality of the dream experiences. Hence these are declared unreal, being in conflict with waking experiences which are accepted as valid. But from another standpoint, the waking experiences are on the same level with the dream experiences, and the one is as unreal as the other. The dream experiences do not represent the nature of the person dreaming and these cannot be said to be his *dharma* (permanent attributes), because these do not belong to him in his waking state. Similarly, the waking experiences also cannot be supposed to be his *dharma,* representing his permanent attributes, in as much as these are also absent in his state of dreaming. The pains which give him trouble in the waking state are absent completely when he enjoys sleep. The waking and the dreaming experiences, therefore, cancel each other and both have to be declared equally unreal from the point of view of the unchanging, ever-abiding Pure Consciousness which remains in the same undisturbed state during waking, dreaming, and dreamless sleep. The particular states in the stages of waking and dreaming do not touch the ever unmodalized Pure Consciousness and the serenity of the latter is left undisturbed amidst seeming disturbances. There is just a glimpse, a momentary experience, as it were, of the serenity of the unmodalized Pure Consciousness, of the transcendent Self during dreamless sleep, and hence dreamless sleep has been of supreme importance to Vedantic epistemology as supplying the analogue in experience of the transcendental vision. It is never to be forgotten, however, that this experience during sleep is an experience in darkness and that the mind and the intellect have not been sublimated or made fit to understand and profit by the experience, but have been rather dulled to sleep and as such this dark state of *suṣupti* is, from one point of view, farthest removed from the clear and all-luminous stage of the direct realization (*aparokṣānubhūti*) of the Pure Self. The analogy holds good only so far as there is absence of all particularization or modalization in both and is not to be extended to other points. *Suṣupti* or dreamless sleep conclusively proves that there is the existence or continuity of a Pure Consciousness where all particular states are absent and this is an invaluable aid, if not the only means, to the establishment of the Vedantic conception of the transcendental Self which is identical with Brahman, both being pure *cit,* beyond all particular modes.

As the dream experiences are falsely superimposed on the Pure Self, so also are the waking experiences. The objects of experience have to be distinguished from the subject having those experiences. The *vijñānamaya draṣṭā,* the all-knowing seer, is not really related to the objects seen, the *dṛśya,*—it remains as pure as ever in dreams as well as in the waking state, because purity is its essence, its nature, its *svabhāva,* and there cannot be any departure from nature. The particulars are all Upādhis, assumed appearances falsely supposed to belong to its essence. This is shown by Ajātaśatru when he puts the questions, 'Where was it then?' and 'Whence did it come?'. These questions were not put in expectation of an answer. They only indicate that as there is nothing but the Self, these

questions regarding its whereabouts are meaningless. The only answer implied is that it was in its own Self (*svātmani eva abhūt*). The Shruti texts such as *'svātmānām apito bhavati', prajñānenātmanā sampariṣvoktah', 'para ātmani sampratiṣṭhe'*—all confirm this view. As the spider spins the web out of its own self and does not gather any material from the outside, so also from the Self alone issue all variety and multiplicity, all energy, all organs, all Lokas or habitations, all gods, all creatures. The Prāṇa or creative energy that is at the source of all created objects itself issues forth from the Self. This process may be compared to the issue of sparks from fire. The Self is the *upādāna,* or the material, as well as the *nimitta,* or the efficient cause of everything. The aim is to show that the Self is the One Reality, the *only* Reality, that supports the entire variety of this universe. and is the unchanging and abiding Reality that continues the same through waking, dream, and dreamless sleep. All things are real in the reality of the Self. The illustration of spark and fire does not indicate that there is a relation of part and whole between Brahman and the nniverse, or between the Absolute and the individual. It only shows that first as the sparks have no existence other than fire, just as the spark is nothing but the fire itself, so also there is identity between the Absolute and the universe. The universe or the individual is not a part of the Absolute. It is a superimposition on the Absolute and has no existence apart from the Absolute.

The illustration is to be taken as indicative of similarity in this point only and not to be extended to imply that there is similarity in other points also. It is never the intention of the Upanishads to imply that just as a spark is a part of fire, so the world or the individual is a part of the Absolute, because that would be in contradiction with their beginning (*upakrama*) and end (*upasamhāra*), with their whole purpose viz. the establishment of perfect identity between the individual and the Absolute.

The Vedantic epistemology is the epistemology of Idealism. All objects are nothing but the Self and, therefore, if the Self is known everything is known. The Vedanta seeks to prove this position by showing that no object can be apprehended without the apprehending consciousness and that without which something cannot be apprehended at all has to be supposed as non-different from that something. As nothing can be known without consciousness or *cit,* as consciousness accompanies and must accompany all knowledge of objects, it follows that objects are nothing apart from consciousness and they have to be regarded as non-different from or identical with *cit* or consciousness. This *adhyāsatatva* or *kalpitatva,* this assumedness of objects i.e. their *adhiṣṭhāna,* is the pivot of the Vedantic system. Only *cit* or consciousness is self-revealing (*svayamprakāśa*)—being *prakāśa* or revelation itself, and being nothing but revelation it cannot be supposed to be revealed by something else. Objects are revealed because they get themselves identified with *cit* which is of the nature of revelation. As the objects in the waking and the dreaming states cannot be apprehended without consciousness (*prajñāna*), they have to be supposed as having no existence apart from *prajñāna.* The particularizations are all constructions in (or rather on) consciousness. As they are not always the same and as they do not always persist, they conceal one another and cannot be supposed to be real. They are mere appearances on that which always persists and is ever the same. Therefore consciousness or *cit* is not only the Reality underlying the particular appearances but has to be regarded as the *only* Reality which absorbs all appearances as identical or non-different from it, being nothing but its own constructions (*cinmātrānugamāt sarvatra citsvarūpātaiva iti gamyate*).

The Vedanta attempts to establish the existence of the pure *cit* by showing that it is the One thing that remains identical amidst differences and persists in all circumstances, differing from and cancelling one another.

The conclusion is reached by accepting the inference that what remains constant amidst differing states must have to be accepted as different from them. That which persists during waking, dream, and dreamless sleep must be something different from all these states, because these states are all different from one another. The conditions of waking do not apply to dreams and those of dream do not apply to dreamless sleep, etc. The conclusion that there is something that transcends all the three states and is something different from them all is reached inferentially. But the Upanishad wants a more definite information about this 'something'. It is not satisfied with merely establishing inferentially the existence of a persisting Reality, but it asks the further question: What is this Reality which persists when all the external and internal senses are withdrawn, when not even the mind nor the Buddhi works? The answer is given by saying: Atman is the luminary that illumines. The Self shines when all other light disappears; it is the source and substratum, the reservoir of all energy, of all light. Consciousness, *cit*, or the Self, the Atman is the one light that is self-revealing, that requires nothing else for its revelation (*svayam anyena anavabhāsyamāna*). This Self is described as *vijñānamaya*, as all-knowledge, not because it is meant that it is identical with Buddhi, but because it is not ordinarily distinguishable from its connection with Buddhi and its knowledge-function (*buddhivijñānopādhi-samparkāvivekāt*). But there is no possibility of confusion here. Because the Shruti at once says that this Atman resides inside the Buddhi and is the Prāṇa and as such is different from them (*hṛdyantarjyotih*). It is necessary thus to state in clear terms that although the Atman and the Buddhi seem to be similar, the two are not identical and the one is very different from the other. It seems *as if* the Atman meditates (*dhyāyati*), *as if* it moves (*lelāyati*), because of its non-discriminability from Buddhi by mere intellectual exercise. The operations of the Buddhi are erroneously taken to be its functionings, but in fact it is different from Buddhi. The Buddhik *prakāśa* or consciousness and the knowledge that attends Buddhi is also traceable to the Atman. It *assumes* the waking state, it *assumes* the dream state, and these states do not belong to its essence. Its similarity or resemblance with Buddhi is also due to *adhyāsa* or false superimposition due to want of discrimination (*aviveka*).

An important question is raised here and the Vedanta does not attempt to ignore any difficulty but boldly faces all objections that may possibly be put forward against its contentions. It is asked why the Atman should be supposed to be different from Buddhi. As neither perception nor inference can establish the existence of Self, distinct from Buddhi itself, there is no reason to admit the existence of such a principle which is designated as the Atman. Why should the revealer of Buddhi be supposed to exist, when Buddhi is seen to reveal everything by bifurcating itself into the subject and the object, the *grāhaka* and the *grāhya*? If a revealer of the all-revealing Buddhi is supposed to be necessary, that would lead to infinite regress and would stand in the way of regarding the Self even as ultimate. Why should not the Buddhi be regarded as ultimate?

To this contention of the Buddhists, the Vedantic reply is very forcible though simple. The distinction between the revealer and the revealed, the *avabhāsaka* and the *avabhāsya*, cannot be dispensed with. The illustration of the lamp which is supposed to reveal other objects and itself is not an instance in point, because the lamp as a material object has got to be apprehended by consciousness and as such cannot be self-revealing. So, although the Buddhi is seen to reveal other things like the lamp, its revelation by consciousness remains a necessity and it has got to be revealed like other objects. It cannot be urged that if a revealer of Buddhi is supposed necessary, it would lead to infinite regress. That which is apprehended must have something different from it as its subject, every-

thing which is *grāhya* must have a *grāhaka* different from it. As *vijñāna* itself is apprehended by *cit,* it cannot be regarded as the ultimate self-revealing Reality. That which is *grāhaka* in all relations (*ekāntatah*) and never a *grāhya* need not and cannot have a *grāhaka*. That which witnesses the Buddhi is the permanent, ever-unchanging Atman which never becomes the *grāhya,* which is never apprehended as an object and, therefore, there is no possibility of infinite regress (*anavasthā*) being urged against the doctrine (*na ca buddhi sākṣiṇo grāhyatvam asti kūṭasthadṛṣṭi svābhāvyāt tat kuto anavasthā*).

If *vijñāna* is regarded as ultimate and it there be no external objects at all, then the variety of experiences cannot be explained. It cannot be said that pure *vijñāna* becomes impure by being bifurcated as subject and object, because if there be no such thing as object over and above the pure *vijñāna,* how can impurity come in? Impurity can be supposed to creep in only by contact or relation with something other than itself. But as the Vijñānavādins do not admit the existence of anything other than the *vijñāna,* this contention of theirs has no justification.

Buddhi has a waxing and a waning, an increase and a decrease in its functioning. What is clear to the Buddhi at one moment loses its clarity at another; what was not intelligible a moment before becomes perfectly clear a moment after. This changing nature of the Buddhi which is perceived by the Pure Consciousness that remains ever unchanging (*kūṭastha*) shows that it cannot be ultimate. The change must be due to something other than Buddhi, the influences of which determine its differing states. That these changes are perceived shows that it itself is an object which is apprehended and the ultimate Reality which never becomes *grāhya* (object). The falling off and a rising up—these are marked characteristics in the case of Buddhi, and the *grāhyatva* of Buddhi being established on these undeniable facts, has got to be accepted. And as soon as the *grāhyatva* (objectness) of Buddhi is established, the existence of the Atman that apprehends Buddhi but itself is not apprehended as an object cannot be denied. It is to be remembered that the existence of the Pure Self or Atman cannot be proved in a more definite or a more direct way. When Ushasta asks Yājñāvalkya to show him the Self directly, to place it before him as an object,—just as the cow is shown by holding her in the horns,—the latter answers that this cannot be done with regard to the Self, because the very nature of the Self does not allow it to be done (*vastusvābhāvyāt*). The Self can never be grasped as an object, can never be made an object of the process of seeing, because it is the eternal seer, the seer of even the sight that sees objects. The Buddhi and its processes can reveal the objects but these are not competent to reveal that which is the revealer of the Buddhi itself. The sight of the eternal seer or the sight that is the eternal seer, the sight that never fails, that never changes, the light that ever illumines but is not illumined by anything is what is meant by the Atman. It cannot be seen, it cannot be grasped as an object, it cannot be shown as an ordinary sight (*laukika dṛṣṭi*), by the organs of vision and knowledge. That which is *grāhaka,* that which is *vijñāta,* cannot be known, because this would imply *kartṛkarmavirodha,* the contradiction implying the identity of the seer and the seen, the subject and the object. Again, the Atman is not the ordinary seer of the *vijñāta, dṛṣṭa,* it is the seer of the sight, the *draṣṭā* of *dṛṣṭi,* the Seer of the seer, the eternal and never-failing seer.

(To be continued)

NOTES AND COMMENTS

TO OUR READERS

In modern times, the scientist is seen to be a greater favourite than the philosopher with those who cannot but visualize a wide difference between the goal of philosophy and that of science. Plato held that the rulers and administrators of an 'ideal State' should be philosophers. At a time when all the values of civilized life are in the melting-pot, it is in the fitness of things that a deep thinker and scholar and an eminent statesman like Sir C. P. Ramaswami Aiyer, writing on *The Place of the Philosopher in Modern Society,* makes a strong plea for the creation and fostering of a new simplicity and a new asceticism in philosophical outlook for the establishment of peace in the world and goodwill among men. . . .

Dr. Nandalal Chatterji, M.A., Ph.D., D.Litt., of the Department of History, Lucknow University, makes a brief but illuminating study of *Medieval Indian Architecture* and brings out its essential character *as a Symbol of Hindu Muslim Unity*. . . .

Not a little of the misery in the world is due to the fact that precepts—of which there is no dearth—are not followed in practice. If action is better than knowledge, if doing is better than knowing, then 'being' is better than even doing. This is the *leit-motiv* of the article on *Knowing and Doing,* by Swami Pavitrananda. But will some of the glib intellectuals and reformers see the error of their ways and learn to understand that the force of 'being and becoming' is far more effective than all the preaching in the world?. . .

Dr. Amaresh Datta, M.A., Ph.D., of the Saugor University, points out that *Tagore, the Poet of New India,* has a dynamic personality, lofty idealism, and profound mysticism which are not properly understood by many of those who read Tagore through translations only and tend to judge him by Western standards. . . .

Rāmāyaṇa is one of our supreme national epics. Rama is the model man, Sita the model woman, and Rama-Rājya the model State. But even a great incarnation of the Godhead is not free from criticism, and many incidents in the life of Rama have been censoriously commented upon by critics. In answer to such criticism, Sri K. S. Ramaswami Sastri, the well-known scholar and writer of South India, convincingly shows the *Right and Wrong Approaches to Rāmāyaṇa.*

INDIAN CULTURE AND THE VEDAS

It is recognized on all hands that Indian culture is all-comprehensive in its structure, tolerant in its outlook, assimilative in its functioning, and fascinating in its appeal. The causes for this are not far to seek. For, the mainsprings of Indian culture derive their sustenance and vitality from the most ancient and sublime scriptures of the world—the Vedas, which are 'deep as the ocean and broad as the sky'. In short, Indian culture is Vedic culture. The Vedas give us the highest vision of the Truth Eternal, and many of the grand pronouncements of this perennial philosophy have penetrated, with significant force and grandeur, every region of the civilized world. The irresistible influence the Vedas have exercised on every aspect of Indian life and thought is obvious to every student of Indian history down the ages. To the Indian mind, the Upanishads represent all that is highest and best in spiritual knowledge—the veritable Himalayas of the soul of man. Swami Vivekananda once declared that 'If it (the Upanishads) be human literature, it must be the production of a race which had not yet lost any of its national vigour'. So healthy, fresh, and uplifting are the life values found in the Vedas.

Today none need feel called upon to dispute the obviously apparent fact that Indian culture is a 'composite culture', to the shaping of which have contributed several cultures that came into India from beyond its borders. Semite, Mongolian, Aryan, and Dravidian—all meet in India. But it has to be conceded that

this influence of the intermingling of cultures, though it did exert itself effectively on the surface-current of the life of the people, could not affect, to any appreciable degree, the inner core and the essential spirit of Indian culture, which alone, even to this day, largely determines the Hindu outlook on life and its problems. The ideas and ideals that animate the heart of the nation are distinctly Indian or, to be more precise, Vedic in conception and origin. Every important feature of Indian culture can be traced, in its origin, to the Vedas. More often it is found that the ancient synthetic outlook in the Vedas, prior to the ushering in of the present-day 'composite culture', is broader and healthier, bolder and clearer. Every serious student of the Vedas will be struck at once by their spirit of enquiry and love of truth, by their broad and tolerant attitude on religious questions, by their comprehensive view of life as a whole, by the absence, in them, of any squeamish and meaningless distinctions of 'theocratic' and 'secular', by their amazing insistence on the need for a harmonious meeting of the way of prosperity and the way of Supreme Good, leading to greater and more lasting joy in life, by their full support to the establishment of equalitarian social solidarity, free from narrow and crystallized caste restrictions, and last, but not the least, by their realistic and democratic approach to economic and political problems.

Swami Vivekananda, addressing the youth of India, in the course of his Indian lectures, repeatedly uttered the clarion call to 'go back to the shining glorious Upanishads'. The Swami declared: 'The Upanishads are the great mine of strength. Therein lies strength enough to invigorate the whole world; through it the whole world can be vivified, made strong, energized. They call with trumpet voice upon the weak, the miserable, and the downtrodden of all races, all creeds, and all sects, to stand on their feet and be free. Freedom, physical freedom, mental freedom, and spiritual freedom are the watchwords of the Upanishads. Aye, this is the one scripture in the world, of all others, that does not talk of salvation, but of freedom.' It was the Swami's great desire to start Vedic colleges all over the country in order to endeavour to rouse national righteousness among the people through the teaching and preaching of the great truths and principles of the Upanishads. Even on the last day of his illustrious life on earth, the Swami earnestly discussed this idea with one of his brother monks. When questioned about the efficacy of Vedic studies, the Swami said, 'It kills superstition'.

If Indian culture is rapidly to regain its pristine vigour and glory, if we wish to fashion the image of our society in accordance with the historical aim of our culture, it is essential that we should re-emphasize and strengthen the Vedic foundations of Indian culture. It was, therefore, most appropriate that Dr. M. R. Jayakar, Vice-Chancellor of Poona University, delivering the last Convocation Address at the Banaras Hindu University, drew the attention of our countrymen to this imperative need and pleaded for the study of Sanskrit and the adoption of Vedic culture. 'In Vedic culture,' observed Dr. Jayakar, 'there exists the notion of university. The ancient Indians called their religion Sanatana—eternal, and they could not study Sanatana Dharma unless and until they studied the ancient language—Sanskrit. In this country we have inherited the long legacy through Sanskrit language which must be procured and advanced because cultural progress depends upon the preservation of this language.' The process of national cultural resurgence should rightly begin with the fundamentals that concern the education of the younger generation. The true aims and objects of the university should be to foster and convey the message of Vedic culture.'

Dr. Jayakar further observed: 'The ancient sages of India wanted that India should be so great that men from all over the world should flock here and regulate their daily conduct and behaviour from what they learnt in this country. They made absolutely no distinction on the basis of nationality or

religion. They regarded life as the best gift of God unlike the Buddhists who considered it full of misery and wanted to escape as early as possible.'

Deploring the present tendency in the country to look upon anything connected with religion as a taboo, Dr. Jayakar boldly asserted: 'If secularism means complete abolition of any religion, that will be a vain attempt. If secularism means that no religion will have an established place in the State, nobody will disagree with it. If it means that there should be no special privileges on the basis that he or she professes a particular religion, everybody will agree. Secularism is good upto a limit and beyond that limit it is foolish.' We agree with Dr. Jayakar and hope that this significant elucidation from the eminent Head of a leading university will act as an eye-opener to all those who, in their anxiety to usher in a secular, welfare State, seem to have come to the conclusion that our education and culture should have no truck whatsoever with God or religion.

It is also highly significant that Vedic culture has no communal tinge about it. Such expressions as 'Hindu culture' and 'Hindu civilization', freely current for long years, appear to be disliked and discouraged by many persons today on the ground that they are likely to be misconstrued in a narrow, sectarian, and communal sense. But it has been made clear beyond a shadow of doubt that Hinduism is merely a convenient name for the nexus of Indian thought. Indian culture—the ancient culture of all the inhabitants of this ancient land—cannot possibly be anything different from 'Vedic culture' or 'Vedantic civilization'—which offer alternative designations, free of communal and sectarian associations. It is for the people of Independent India to exemplify the fact that the ideal of one world and the conception of four freedoms was also the goal of ancient Vedic scriptures.

REVIEWS AND NOTICES

THE YOGA OF SRI AUROBINDO (PART V). BY NOLINI KANTA GUPTA. *Published by Sri Aurobindo Library, 369 Esplanade, Madras 1. Pages 82. Price Re. 1-8.*

Here is a booklet, neatly printed, meant more for the foreigner than for the Indian. The Mother, a French lady at the Aurobindo Ashrama, Pondicherry, has interpreted much of Sri Aurobindo's expositions of Vedanta, Yoga, and Karma. This French interpreter of Aurobindo, is lucid, terse, and precise as is natural and native to her language and culture. Terseness results in many beantiful Sntras, scattered particularly under the heads: Ignorance or Ajñāna, Man the Prototype or Pinda, The Role of Evil and The Soul of A Nation. Here is an example: 'The game once begun develops its own scheme and pattern and modality. For that crucial step in the movement of freedom, that definite moving away, the assertion of complete independence and isolation immediately brought about a reversal of realities, a complete negation of the original attributes. Thus light became obscurity or inconscience, life became death, delight became pain and suffering, power became incapacity, knowledge became ignorance, and truth became falsehood. In other words, Spirit became forthright Matter.' Hindu thought does not accept such contrasts but simply uses the negating prefixes—A or An.

The reviewer feels the title of the series, of which this book is the Fifth Part, is somewhat misleading. There is and can be no such distinctly original thing as the 'Yoga *of* Aurobindo'. Truth is much older than the seers of Truth, and there is no view of Yoga whatsoever which has not been expounded in the Yoga Upanishads and Tantric works. Further, these talks of the Mother have nothing to do with Yoga as such, nor does she, on the subjects she handles, quote from her Master in support of her interpretations of him. 'Talks of the Mother' or some similar title would, perhaps, have been more appropriate.

DR. MOHAN SINGH

TO THE STUDENTS. BY M. K. GANDHI. *Published by Navajivan Publishing House, Kalupur, Ahmedabad. Pages 344. Price Rs. 3-8.*

Gandhiji was a great revolutionary in every field of life activity and his deep and abiding contribution to educational thought and the welfare of the student community is well known. His great constructive ideas for a new way of life, based upon truth and non-violence, are presented plainly in this important collection of extracts from his writings and utterances meant essentially for students. The appeal is rightly made to the students as they are the great springs of the nation and it is from them—young men and women—that the future leaders of the country are to rise.

In this book there is nothing in the fashion of 'lessons' which students are generally accustomed to. These pages contain a sound philosophy of life most needed for the younger generation in order to build up character—a sound mind in a sound body—and to earn the ability to fulfil the heavy duties of responsible citizenship. For Gandhiji was both a sound thinker and a practical man, and that is his greatness. He had great ideas and possessed greater faith and determination to translate them into actual practice. What he said he always meant. Not only that. What he said he did. This is the discipline, the culture, that he wants the students to possess. He would like them to be fearless under all circumstances. He says: 'Freedom can never be won by those who are afraid of rustication, poverty, and even death. The greatest fear for students of Government institutions is rustication. Let them realize that learning without courage is like a waxen statue beautiful to look at but bound to melt at the least touch of a hot substance.' The publishers have done well in arranging chronologically, in one volume, articles and extracts from Gandhiji's speeches and writings, specially addressed to students, to whom the importance of the contents of this book need hardly be over-emphasized.

B. S. MATHUR

SCATTERED FLOWERS. By SHOBHARANI DAS. *Published by Educational Publishing Co., Benham Hall Lane, Girgaum, Bombay. Pages 23.*

The young, exuberant poetess, whose delightful poems, seventeen in number, have been collected together in this little brochure, deserves to be congratulated on her maiden attempt which is very promising indeed. As a worthy daughter, Shobharani Das has chosen to express her deep devotion and love to her beloved mother through these poems which she appropriately dedicates to her. Swami Vivekananda once wrote to a young person, 'Devotion to the mother is the root of all welfare'. This is true all the world over, and especially so in India. As such, it is encouraging to find that these poems, though bearing upon different themes, emphasize, in general, a true regard for one's mother.

BENGALI

MARKSVAD. By BATAKRISHNA GHOSH. *Published by Vangabharati Granthalay, Kulgachhia, P.O. Mahishrekha, Dist. Howrah, West Bengal. Pages 79. Price Rs. 3.*

This is a brief but penetrating criticism of the Marxist philosophy. The author attacks the materialistic basis of Marxism which denies free will, and so, real progress in culture and which leads to what he calls animism, exclusive attention to bodily needs. This materialism cannot be reconciled with, and far less be made an explanatory basis of, the conscious processes of the mind by the magic word 'dialectic', for matter and consciousness are essentially different substances and dialectical materialism is a contradiction in terms. Moreover, this philosophy is self-stultifying as there will be no further development in a State when it reaches the state of perfect economic equality. The author holds that Marx himself did not mean seriously his materialistic assertions which were made only incidentally. It is his disciples, particularly Engels, who developed a materialistic doctrine. The author shows some inner contradictions of this philosophy and also some inevitable inconsistencies between its profession and practice. He is not, however, against the Marxist State which he believes can serve as a guardian for other States better than America, only if she sheds away her dogmatic and rather aggressive materialism.

Individual freedom and social equality can be reconciled only on a transcendental plane in love and goodwill which have been preached by Christ, Buddha, and Gandhi. Unless some eternal values and verities are recognized nothing can be fruitfully effected, for otherwise we are deprived of the very means of conceiving and judging our aims and methods. Dr. Ghosh's book is thus very helpful as a critique of Marxist philosophy from a broad idealistic standpoint. Yet it is handicapped by some misunderstanding of the true spirit of Marxism. Matter in Marxism is not what the traditional philosophy conceived it to be, it is not wholly blind and rigid, and Marxists are not at all forgetful of higher values of life. They believe in the physical basis of these values and so seek first material solvency for all to make higher values more available and extensive. The author has preoccupied himself too much with the niceties and inconsistencies in the written philosophy of Marxism and has missed much of the true philosophy that is implied by and inspires Marxist practice.

P. J. CHAUDHURY

NEWS AND REPORTS

SWAMI PAVITRANANDA AND SWAMI AJAYANANDA LEAVE FOR AMERICA

Swamis Pavitrananda and Ajayananda of the Ramakrishna Mission left Calcutta on the 30th January, 1951 for Bombay from where they will be sailing on the 3rd February, 1951 to the U.S.A. *via* the continent and U.K. The Swamis accompany Swami Akhilananda, Head of the Vedanta Society of Providence, U.S.A., who had been to India on a short visit.

Swami Pavitrananda will take charge of the Vedanta Society of New York, the oldest Vedanta Centre in U.S.A., started by Swami Vivekananda himself during his first visit to America. The Swami needs no introduction to our readers. He was lately the President of the Advaita Ashrama, Mayavati, for about twelve years and is also one of the Trustees of the Ramakrishna Order. His remarkable literary talents found expression when he was the Editor of the *Prabuddha Bharata* for four years from 1931 to 1934. His organizing and administrative abilities were of outstanding usefulness in developing the Publication Department of the Advaita Ashrama at Calcutta. Swami Pavitrananda, we are glad to inform our readers, was a member of the Advaita Ashrama for over two decades, as a worker and as the President—the longest period of association with the Ashrama for any monastic member.

The *Common Sense About Yoga* and the *Modern Man in Search of Religion*, two books written by him, are deservedly popular both in India and abroad, for they have treated in a simple, lucid, and convincing manner some of the most baffling problems that confront humanity at the present day.

We are sure that the Swami's rich background of administrative experience in India, his spiritual insight and a warm and human approach to the world's problems, will endear him to all who will in future seek his guidance in their lives. We are equally confident that he will be a worthy successor to Swami Bodhananda to whom the development of the Vedanta Society of New York was so largely due.

Swami Ajayananda of the Ramakrishna Mission, who is a scholar of no mean order, is going to the U.S.A. as an associate of Swami Akhilananda. The Swami has seen service in various fields of activity in India. His genial and kindly disposition, we believe, will no doubt make him a great success in his new field of activity.

We wish the Swamis *bon voyage*.

RAMAKRISHNA MISSION, NEW DELHI

Report for 1948 and 1949

The following is a short report of the activities of the Ramakrishna Mission, New Delhi, for the years 1948 and 1949:

Spiritual and Cultural: During the two years under report, religious classes numbering 125 and 165, and lectures totalling 30 and 69 respectively were arranged. The birthday anniversaries of Sri Ramakrishna and Swami Vivekananda, and other religious prophets were celebrated. There was feeding of the poor, though on a restricted scale, during the birthday celebration of Sri Ramakrishna. A special feature of the birthday celebrations of Swami Vivekananda was elocution and recitation competitions conducted in English, Sanskrit, Hindi, Bengali, and Tamil for college and school students. There were 350 participants in 1948, and 668 in 1949.

Library and Reading Room: There were 2,443 books in the library at the end of 1948 and 2,502 at the end of 1949. 747 books were issued in 1948 and 980 in 1949. The reading room received 8 dailies and 35 other periodicals.

The Outdoor General Dispensary: A total number of 22,075 cases were treated in 1948 and 18,442 in 1949. The treatment is mainly based on the Homœopathic system.

The Tuberculosis Clinic: The clinic, which was started in 1933, found its permanent home in November 1948 in a spacious three-storeyed building in Karolbagh. The formal opening ceremony of the new premises of the clinic with 16 observation beds was done by the Hon. Rajkumari Amrit Kaur in May 1949. The clinic is equipped not only for general treatment but also for surgical measures; it has a laboratory for clinical bacteriological work. It is also equipped with a vertical X-ray set for fluoroscopic examinations and another X-ray unit for skiagraphy, and an ultra-violet ray apparatus. An Ear-Nose-Throat department was added in 1949.

The clinic treated 12,202 patients in 1948, and 33,090 in 1949. Between August and December 1949, 44 indoor cases were treated in the observation wards.

New Construction: The construction work of the two-storeyed building on the south-west corner of the Mission premises, the ground floor to house the dispensary and the first floor to house the reading room and library, at an estimated cost of Rs. 40,000, was commenced in October, 1949.

SRI RAMAKRISHNA'S BIRTHDAY

The Birthday Anniversary of Sri Ramakrishna falls on the 9th March, 1951.