PRABUDDHA BHARATA

VOL. LXII *OCTOBER 1957* No. 10

"उत्तिष्ठत जाग्रत प्राप्य वरान्निबोधत ।"

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

FOR SAFETY AND JOY

LIKE the rising sun in darkness, like a raft to those sinking in the sea, like the cloud raining sweet water to those whose throats are parched by thirst, like a treasure-trove available for the pennyless, like a physician to a patient suffering from a chronic, torturing disease,—so comes Lord Śauri to us to give us safety and joy.

Śrī Kṛṣṇa-karṇāmṛta

Tamasi ravir-ivodyan-majjatām amburāśau
Plava iva, tṛṣitānāṁ svāduvarṣīva meghaḥ,
Nidhir-iva nidhanānām, dīrghatīvrāmayānām
Bhiṣagiva, kuśalaṁ no dātumāyāti Śauriḥ.

AMBROSIA

GOD (*Contd.*)

4. Just as ordinary people consider education useless if it does not fetch money, even so should good people regard it worthless if it fails to evoke love of God in the possessor.

5. God resides in all. Do you think He is not you? It is our ignorance which has kept Him hidden from us. Lord Śrī Kṛṣṇa said, 'I am the whole and all these are my parts.'

6. Do you ask what happens if one believes in God and loves Him? He is rendered innocuous, he cannot do harm to anyone; this brings peace to himself and to society. There is One overhead. Commit wrong and you suffer.

7. What is the fate of the family where every man is its lord? Hitches are eliminated where one is obeyed. Even so is our spiritual life smoothed if we make Lord our only guide.

8. What folly! The One whom we should fear we do not fear, and those whom we should not fear we do fear! Can he commit wrong who knows God is everywhere?

9. People call on God in order to avert danger. But you cannot cheat Him by praise. If you love God, well and good; if not, well and good again. It is all the same to Him.

10. If you seek refuge in God all powers will come to you, for He is the source of all powers. But do not think you will have no turns of fortune. Weal and woe are the lot of man. Even the Lord, when He incarnates on earth, has to bear crosses. These are the tolls souls have to pay for the use of the body. Individuals should pray to the Oversoul that, buffeted by the turns of fortune, they may not forget Him. So prayed, the Lord grants patience and strength to bear afflictions.

11. Do you want to hide anything from Him? Sitting in the eyes unperceived, He sees all—He is all-seeing, all-knowing.

12. He is under no laws, no obligations. But when He incarnates on earth He is not absolutely free either. He accepts the bondages of Māyā in sport. *Can'ts* do not apply to Him. Nor are we given to understand all His laws—we puny creatures. When in love we get identified with Him and He in His infinite mercy bestows wisdom on us, we commence to understand Him and His devotees. Laws are meant for you and me, for ordinary creatures.

13. What difference is there between instructions imparted by the mortals and those by the Lord Himself (in His incarnations)! Pray to Him, worship Him. When His powers descend on you you are irresistible. Prayers are for your own benefit. Your hymns and praises add nothing to Him.

14. Everything has its own time. You cannot hasten time by a second. You are not to be impatient. Work and wait. When you fall in evil times you shall have to exercise patience. In such circumstances, have patience and keep on calling on Him, you will tide over difficulties smoothly.

VISION OF GOD

1. As long as you do not have the vision of Atman, God and *guru* will continue to be different. However much you may reason and ratiocinate, doubts are sure to crop up. But if you get that vision but once, all your doubts will be resolved, yon will have the firm conviction that God and *guru* are one. As long as you do not have that conviction know for certain you have not reached the haven. Dangers are lurking about.

2. That *sādhu* alone who has realized God knows what God and dispassion are. The garb does not make a *sādhu*. Realization of God is the thing.

3. What a difference between the study of scriptures and realization!

KRISHNA *

By Swami Vivekananda

Almost the same circumstances which gave birth to Buddhism in India surrounded the rise of Krishna. Not only this, the events of that day we find happening in our own times.

There is a certain ideal. At the same time there must always be a large majority of the human race who cannot come up to the ideal, not even intellectually . . . . The strong ones carry it out and many times have no sympathy for the weak. The weak to the strong are only beggars. The strong ones march ahead. . . . Of course, we see at once that the highest position to take is to be sympathetic and helpful to those who are weak. But then, in many cases the philosopher bars the way to our being sympathetic. If we go by the theory that the whole of this infinite life has to be determined by the few years' existence here and now, . . . then it is very hopeless for us. . . . and we have no time to look back upon those who are weak. But if these are not the conditions—if the world is only one of the many schools through which we have to pass; if the eternal life is to be molded and fashioned and guided by the eternal law, and eternal law, eternal chances await everyone—then we need not be in a hurry. We have time to sympathize, to look around, stretch out a helping hand to the weak and bring them up.

With Buddhism we have two words in Sanskrit; one is translated religion, the other, a sect. It is the most curious fact that the disciples and descendants of Krishna have no name for their religion, [although] foreigners call it Hinduism or Brahmanism. There is one religion, and there are many sects. The moment you give it a name, individualize it and separate it from the rest, it is a sect, no more a religion. A sect [proclaims] its own truth and declares that there is no truth anywhere else. Religion believes that there has been, and still is, one religion in the world. There never were two religions. It is the same religion, [presenting] different aspects in different places. The task is to conceive the proper understanding of the goal and scope of humanity.

This was the great work of Krishna: to clear our eyes and make us look with broader vision upon humanity in its march upward and onward. His was the first heart that was large enough to see truth in all, his the first lips that uttered beautiful words for each and all.

This Krishna preceded Buddha by some thousand years. . . . A great many people do not believe that he ever existed. Some believe that [the worship of Krishna grew out of] the old sun worship. There seem to be several Krishnas; one was mentioned in the Upanishads, another was a king, another a general. All have been lumped into one Krishna. It does not matter much. The fact is, some individual comes who is unique in spirituality. Then all sorts of legends are invented around him. But all the Bibles and stories which come to be cast upon this one person have to be recast in [the mold of] his character. All the stories of the New Testament have to be modeled upon the accepted life [and] character of Christ. In all of the Indian stories about Buddha the one central note of that whole life is kept up—sacrifice for others . . . .

In Krishna we find . . . two ideas supreme in his message: The first is the harmony of different ideas; the second is non-attachment. A man can attain to perfection, the highest goal, sitting on a throne, commanding armies, working out big plans for nations. In fact,

* Reprinted from *Vedanta and the West* with the kind permission of the Publishers.

Krishna's great sermon was preached on the battlefield.

Krishna saw plainly through the vanity of all the mummeries, mockeries, and ceremonials of the old priests, and yet he saw some good in them.

If you are a strong man, very good! But do not curse others who are not strong enough for you. . . . Everyone says, "Woe unto you people!" Who says, "Woe unto me that I cannot help you"? The people are doing all right to the best of their ability and means and knowledge. Woe unto me that I cannot lift them to where I am!

So the ceremonials, worship of gods, and myths, are all right, Krishna says . . . . Why? Because they all lead to the same goal. Ceremonies, books, and forms—all these are links in the chain. Get hold! That is the one thing. If you are sincere and have really got hold of one link, do not let go; the rest is bound to come. [But people] do not get hold. They spend the time quarrelling and determining what they should get hold of, and do not get hold of anything. . . . We are always after truth, but never want to get it. We simply want the pleasure to go about and ask. We have a lot of energy and spend it that way. That is why Krishna says: Get hold of any one of these chains that are stretched out from the common center. No one step is greater than another. . . . Blame no view of religion so far as it is sincere. Hold onto one of these links, and it will pull you to the center. . . . Your heart itself will teach all the rest. The teacher within will teach all the creeds, all the philosophies. . . .

Krishna talks of himself as God, as Christ does. He sees the Deity in himself. And he says: "None can go a day out of my path. All have to come to me. Whosoever wants to worship in whatsoever form, I give him faith in that form, and through that I meet him. . . ." His heart is all for the masses.

Independent, Krishna stands out. The very boldness of it frightens us. We depend upon everything— . . . upon a few good words, upon circumstances. When the soul wants to depend upon nothing, not even upon life, that is the height of philosophy, the height of manhood. Worship leads to the same goal. Krishna lays great stress upon worship. Worship God!

Various sorts of worship we see in this world. The sick man is very worshipful to God. . . . There is the man who loses his fortune; he also prays very much, to get money. The highest worship is that of the man who loves God for God's sake. [The question may be asked:] "Why should there be so much sorrow if there is a God?" The worshiper replies: ". . . There is misery in the world; [but] because of that I do not cease to love God. I do not worship him to take away my [misery], I love him because he is love itself." The other [types of worship] are lower-grade; but Krishna has no condemnation for anything. It is better to do something than to stand still. The man who begins to worship God will grow by degrees and begin to love God for love's sake. . . .

How to attain purity living this life? Shall we all go to the forest caves? . . . What good would it do? If the mind is not under control, it is no use living in a cave because the same mind will bring all disturbances there. We will find twenty devils in the cave because all the devils are in the mind. If the mind is under control, we can have the cave anywhere, wherever we are.

It is our own mental attitude which makes the world what it is for us. Our thoughts make things beautiful, our thoughts make things ugly. The whole world is in our own minds. Learn to see things in the proper light. First, believe in this world—that there is meaning behind everything. Everything in the world is good, is holy and beautiful. If you see something evil, think that you are not understanding it in the right light. Throw the burden on yourselves! . . . Whenever we are tempted to say that the world is going to the dogs, we ought to analyze ourselves, and we shall find that we have lost the faculty of seeing things as they are.

Work day and night! "Behold, I am the

Lord of the Universe. I have no duty. Every duty is bondage. But I work for work's sake. If I ceased to work for a minute, [there would be chaos]." So do thou work, without any idea of duty. . . .

This world is a play. You are His playmates. Go on and work, without any sorrow, without any misery! See His play in the slums, in the saloons! Work to lift people! Not that they are vile or degraded; Krishna does not say that.

Do you know why so little good work is done? My lady goes to the slums. . . . She gives a few ducats and says, "My poor men, take that and be happy!" . . . Or my fine woman, walking through the street, sees a poor fellow and throws him five cents. Think of the blasphemy of it! Blessed are we that the Lord has given us his teaching in your own Testament. Jesus says: "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me." It is blasphemy to think that you can help anyone. First root out this idea of helping, and then go to worship. God's children are your Master's children. [And children are but different forms of the father.] You are His servant. . . . Serve the living God! God comes to you in the blind, in the halt, in the poor, in the weak, in the diabolical. What a glorious chance for you to worship! The moment you think you are "helping," you undo the whole thing and degrade yourself. Knowing this, work. "What follows?" you say. You do not get that heartbreak, that awful misery. . . . Then work is no more slavery. It becomes a play, and joy itself. . . . Work! Be unattached! That is the whole secret. If you get attached, you become miserable. . . .

With everything we do in life we identify ourselves. Here is a man who says harsh words to me. I feel anger coming on me. In a few seconds anger and I are one, and then comes misery. Attach yourselves to the Lord and to nothing else, because everything else is unreal. Attachment to the unreal will bring misery. There is only one Existence that is real, only one Life in which there is neither object nor [subject]. . . .

But unattached love will not hurt you. Do anything—marry, have children. . . . Do anything you like—nothing will hurt you. Do nothing with the idea of "mine." Duty for duty's sake; work for work's sake. What is that to you? You stand aside.

When we come to that non-attachment, then we can understand the marvelous mystery of the universe: how it is intense activity and vibration, and at the same time the intensest peace and calm; how it is work every moment and rest every moment. That is the mystery of the universe—the impersonal and personal in one, the infinite and finite in one. Then we shall find the secret. "He who finds in the midst of intense activity the greatest rest, and in the midst of the greatest rest intense activity, he has become a yogi." He alone is a real worker, none else. We do a little work and break ourselves. Why? We become attached to that work. If we do not become attached, side by side with it we have infinite rest. . . .

How hard it is to arrive at this sort of non-attachment! Therefore Krishna shows us the lower ways and methods. The easiest way for everyone is to do [his or her] work and not take the results. It is our desire that binds us. If we take the results of actions, whether good or evil, we will have to bear them. But if we work, not for ourselves, but all for the glory of the Lord, the results will take care of themselves. "To work you have the right, but not to the fruits thereof." The soldier works for no results. He does his duty. If defeat comes, it belongs to the general, not to the soldier. We do our duty for love's sake—love for the general, love for the Lord. . . .

If you are strong, take up the Vedānta philosophy and be independent. If you cannot do that, worship God; if not, worship some image. If you lack strength even to do that, do some good works without the idea of gain. Offer everything you have unto the service of the Lord. Fight on! "Leaves and water and one flower—whosoever lays any-

thing on my altar, I receive it with equal delight." If you cannot do anything, not a single good work, then take refuge [in the Lord]. "The Lord resides within the heart of all beings, making them turn upon his wheel. Do thou with all thy soul and heart take refuge in him. . . ."

These are some of the general ideas that Krishna preaches on this idea of love [in the Gītā]. There are [in] other great books, sermons on love—as with Buddha, as with Jesus. . . .

A few words about the life of Krishna. There is a great deal of similarity between the lives of Jesus and Krishna. A discussion is going on as to which borrowed of the other. There was the tyrannical king in both places. Both were born in a manger. The parents were bound in both cases. Both were saved by angels. In both cases all the boys born that year were killed. The childhood is the same. . . . Again, in the end, both were killed. Krishna was killed by accident; he took the man who killed him to heaven. Christ was killed, and blessed the robber and took him to heaven.

There are a great many similarities in the teachings of the New Testament and the Gītā. The human thought goes the same way. . . . I will find you the answer in the words of Krishna himself: "Whenever virtue subsides and irreligion prevails, I come down. Again and again I come. Therefore, whenever thou seest a great soul struggling to uplift mankind, know that I am come, and worship. . . ."

At the same time, if he comes as Jesus or as Buddha, why is there so much schism? The preachings must be followed! A Hindu devotee would say: It is God himself who became Christ and Krishna and Buddha and all these [great teachers]. A Hindu philosopher would say: These are the great souls; they are already free. And though free they refuse to accept their liberation while the whole world is suffering. They come again and again, take a human embodiment and help mankind. They know from their childhood what they are and what they come for. . . . They do not come through bondage like we do. . . . They come out of their own free will, and cannot help having tremendous spiritual power. We cannot resist it. The vast mass of mankind is dragged into the whirlpool of spirituality, and the vibration goes on and on because one of these [great souls] gives a push. So it continues until all mankind is liberated and the play of this planet is finished.

Glory unto the great souls whose lives we have been studying! They are the living gods of the world. They are the persons whom we ought to worship. If He comes to me, I can only recognise Him if He takes a human form. He is everywhere, but do we see Him? We can only see Him if He takes the limitation of man. . . . If men and . . . animals are manifestations of God, these teachers of mankind are leaders, are gurus. Therefore, salutations unto you, whose footstool is worshipped by angels! Salutations unto you leaders of the human race! Salutations unto you great teachers! You leaders have our salutations forever and ever!

'The Avatāra is always one and the same. Plunging into the ocean of life, He rises up in one place and is known as Krishna, diving again and rising elsewhere, He is known as Christ.'

—*Sri Ramakrishna*

REFLECTION AND CONTROL OF REACTIONS

By the Editor

I

Verification is an essential element in scientific pursuit. Certain kinds of verification can be done by many persons at a time. For example, while one student turns the handle of a simple electric machine, the sparks produced can be witnessed by everyone in the class-room. But in other cases, like the identification of bacilli invisible to the naked eye, it is only the student who looks through the microscope that succeeds in detecting them. What bystanders see is merely the fact of his handling an instrument. To get the enlarged view they must do exactly as he does. Every item of knowledge which alters the outlook comes under the same category, verifiable directly by the learner alone. His teachers and others can judge his mastery only indirectly, by putting some problems before him and by marking how he tackles them. If this is true with regard to subjects like mathematics or engineering, we can imagine the difficulty of our neighbours attempting to verify the effect of our controlled thoughts on ourselves. The extent to which such thoughts penetrate the personality, the type of resistance they encounter there, and the chain reactions till equilibrium is established are no doubt verifiable, but only by ourselves, the experimenters. What is wanted is the ability to keep the power of observation steady and unwavering. It is well known that when the interest flags, the mind 'winks', as it were; and during those intervals, irrelevant thought-forms appear, make unexpected turns, and run into strange corners! Reflection, which involves connected thinking within a definite framework, is one of the most effective methods to prevent these awkward 'jumps'. When properly undertaken, it speeds up 'mental purification'.

Even substances of daily use, like water, can become the starting point for useful reflection. Electrolysis shows that water is made up of two gases. But even when they stand together, we do not see water as such. We see it only in the company of heat, technically called 'fire' in scriptural texts. So far as our sense organs are concerned, we may say that the invisible union of the two gases takes three widely different shapes according to the degree of heat added to it. In a way they are its 'reincarnations',—first, as ice over whose surface non-swimming creatures can safely crawl, next as water whose tendency to flow into lower levels can be utilized for irrigation purposes, and lastly as steam whose pressure can make engines run and drive the wheels of industry. Our mind not only traces the movement of this 'element' from anyone of its 'halting stations' to the others, but also grasps the relations between its formless aspect and its controllable manifestations.

Familiarity often blunts our power of observation, or prevents us from learning useful lessons. Take the example of any tree standing in front. The power latent in the seed selected the necessary materials from the environment and gradually organized them into the forms of its gigantic trunk, and its own special type of leaves, flowers, and fruits. It is remarkable how the same field and the same extra manure become the support for trees of many varieties. Each one of them retains its individuality while passing from the state of the minute seed into its fully developed form. Animal bodies too present the same feature. An elephant and a man may live on the same food-stuffs for a month, but there will be no violation of the manner in which the tissues of their respective bodies are built up. The movements involved are twofold: from the formless into forms, and from an unmanifested state, with individuality latent in

it, into the manifested state. By the practice of reflection we learn to shift attention quickly, first from the external appearance of any creature to the imperceptible rearrangements constantly taking place in its bodily cells, and secondly from every individual formation to the non-differentiated aspect of the entire universe. It is from that unmanifested fund of matter that creatures evolve their bodies, and it is into it that all bodies become dissolved when the force that 'organized' them is exhausted. The next step in reflection is to introduce the wider concept of energy into all gross formations and habituate ourselves to look upon the birth, growth, and final disintegration of physical bodies as expressions of an invisible fund of energy pervading both the inanimate and animate worlds.

II

The special characteristic of the human 'mould' is that the energy flowing into it takes the shape of thought which, under training, can be used for a conscious intensification of virtues and extension of good will. Mind and thought can be viewed from different angles. To begin with, we may call mind a sixth sense whose range is much greater than those of the other five. The eye, for example, sees only the object to which we can direct it at the time. It does not directly operate when we listen to a radio broadcast and come to the conclusion, 'This *is* the *voice* of the person whom we *saw* in the Library *yesterday*.' Co-ordination implies not only the existence of a store where records are kept but also an agency to pick them up and weave them into patterns which can even run counter to the events taking place in front. The General who sees the battle going against him and who quickly regroups his men to outmanouvre the enemy uses something far surpassing the records of his eyes and ears. If we accept only five senses, his creative thinking transcends them. If, on the other hand, we regard mind as the sixth sense, all thinking processes fall within its special field; and its user, the thinker, remains, technically, distinct and independent.

Often we put body and mind in opposing categories and try to estimate the influence of one over the other. What is needed for a trial of strength is that there should be 'two' parts to be moved. They can as well be taken wholly from the physical side. For example, we can press one palm against the other, or drag the head down by both hands while using the muscles of the neck to resist the pull. In a similar way, when the body is tired after a full day's work, we can goad it into further exertions by presenting to the mind the urgency of some important business beneficial to ourselves and others. When interest is sufficiently aroused, it has a way of penetrating the body and releasing abundant energy for physical activities. If we can learn the art of shifting the point of interest by turns, we shall seldom be overpowered by dullness. And when we decide to let go all interest, we shall drop off into sound sleep almost at will, leaving it to Nature's delicate hands to rebuild our wasted tissues and fill them with fresh vigour. Reflection itself can lead to an unceasing flow of energy, provided we approach every topic from its most attractive and creative aspects. What is essential is to see that the mental horizon is actually widened so as to include and harmonize the sectional views given by piecemeal analysis based on body, mind, chemistry, physics, or psychology. Reflection must be considered incomplete if gaps persist.

Influence works the other way too; for, as is well known, weakness of the body reduces mental efficiency. When curd is churned, its subtle portion comes together and rises to the top as butter. Likewise, of grains and other items taken in as food, and 'churned as it were by gastric fire' and other processes within the stomach, the subtle part rises up and becomes transformed into mental energy. Following traditional ways of calculation, one ancient teacher explained to the student, his own son, that 'this strength of mind, increased by food, is divided into sixteen parts', which may be called the sixteen parts of the human

being. It is only when this strength exists that the man can see or hear, think or understand, do or know.[1] On its waning his faculties slip away from him. To convince his son of the truth of this assertion, the father made him go without solid food for fifteen days and then asked him to repeat familiar scriptural texts. The young man could not remember them. But when he began to take food he got his memory back. If out of a well-lighted fire everything except a single coal of the size of a fire-fly is gone out, it would not be possible by means of that surviving ember to burn anything more than what its size warrants. So it was that when fasting had brought down his bodily strength to a bare one-sixteenth, his mental ability proportionately dwindled. Eating revived it, as the careful addition of dry grasses and faggots can revive the fire in the remaining piece of coal and make it blaze forth as before.[2] The basic energy is one alone. Under certain conditions it operates in and as the world of the five senses. Under others it functions in and as the sphere of the sixth. Each influences the other since they form parts of the same 'organized' unit, the personality. Both move in perfect agreement if controlled from a level higher than either.

III

For our present purpose mental movements may be divided into two main kinds: conscious, and those that fall outside the conscious. One scripture gives a 'specimen' list of the conscious thus: 'Desire, deliberation, doubt, faith, want of faith, steadiness, impatience, modesty, intelligence, and fear.'[3] It says that 'all these are but mind', in other words, 'forms' taken or presented by the internal organ. Psychology may have a more exhaustive list, with facts and relationships arranged in different ways. The requirements of reflection do not come into clash with them.

What the man of reflection finds particularly useful to him is the capacity of thought to disconnect itself from sense reports and shake off its slavish subservience to them. When properly trained, it can come back to resume control of bodily limbs and senses with a greater light and power developed in the course of its independent flight. Thought is in some respects like an aeroplane. We know that the plane uses its own power to cover the runway and to maintain its position in the air during a survey flight. So too does thought rely on its own inherent energy to speed along the sense contacts before and after everyone of its creative sweeps. It matters little whether the runway and the take-off points for its upward movement are supplied by objects that appear attractive or repulsive at first sight. There is no direct causal connection between them as such and the moral or spiritual worth of the return 'dive' when survey is complete. No one willingly agrees, ordinarily, to forgo his night's rest or risk his limbs or life. And yet, when greater loves are involved, people keep night-long vigils near a sick-bed or rush into the field of battle to defend their native land. All acts of self-sacrifice or heroism are the result of a rearrangement of values, slow or rapid, stimulated no doubt by external events, but planned, refined, and resolutely upheld by an inner drive, a passion and a sense of dedication waiting to blossom forth in the individuals concerned. Had the mere presence or perception of pains or dangers been the invariable compelling force for broad-minded reactions, fellow-feeling and compassion would have been

[1] Dadhnaḥ mathyamānasya yo'ṇimā, aṇubhāvaḥ sa ūrdhvaḥ samudīṣati, sambhūyordhvaṁ navanīta-bhāvena gacchati, tat-sarpir-bhavati. . . Evam eva annasyaudanāder-aśyamānasya, bhujyamānasya, audaryeṇa agninā vāyu-sahitena, khajeneva mathyamānasya, Yo'ṇimā. . . tan-mano bhavati, mano'vayavaiḥ saha sambhūya mana upacinoti. . . Sā'nnopacitā manasaḥ śaktiḥ ṣodaśadhā pravibhajya puruṣasya kalātvena nirdidikṣitā. . . Yasyām satyām draṣṭā, śrotā, mantā, boddhā, kartā, vijñātā, sarva-kriyā-samarthaḥ purnṣo bhavati. Hīyamānāyām ca yasyām sāmarthyahāniḥ. *Ch. Up.* VI, vi. 1 and Śaṅkara's Bhāṣya.

[2] *Ibid*, 2-6.

[3] Kāmah, saṁkalpo, vicikitsā, śraddhā' śraddhā, dhṛtir-adhṛtir-hrīrdhīr-bhīr-ityetat-sarvam mana eva. *Brh. Up.* I.v.3.

universal, and murders and plunders absolutely impossible.

It looks as if reactions in an ascending order of good will and sublimity are arranged in our personality, like a series of cylinders, one inside the other, each capable of rotating in the same direction as the one outside it, or of pausing for a while and moving thenceforth in the opposite direction. Thus a king, seeing a prosperous country beyond his frontiers,—exactly as its ruler or subjects see it, so far as sense records go—may consciously rotate within himself the 'cylinder' suggesting the glory of selfish possession and annex it after a ruthless massacre of its valiant defenders. But when he marches in triumph into its capital, the death and destruction wrought by him might penetrate into his heart, as nothing could do before, and set the 'cylinder' of compassion whirling in the reverse direction, carrying along with it higher 'cylinders' lying in deeper levels.

How strong even a temporary revulsion can be after the destruction of an enemy, who had once been an object of love and respect. is brought out vividly in Vālmīki's *Rāmāyana*. The context is Vāli's death and the piteous lamentation of his wife, son, and a host of faithful followers. Smarfing under his brother's continued persecution, Sugrīva had been eagerly waiting for this very moment of total vengeance. But he was not prepared for the final picture as it took shape after the hero's fall. It literally swept him off his feet and the memory of all the good Vāli had done came rushing into his mind all together. The poet says that Sugrīva then slowly approached Rāma and, in effect, said to him with tears choking his voice: "You have been pleased to carry out to the very letter what you promised to do for my sake. But I see now that I have committed a crime whose enormity is beyond description. Many a time in my previous encounters with my brother, he almost stunned me with severe blows, often using branches of trees which he wielded with his prodigious strength. Each time, however, he took pity on me, consoled me and let me off with the remark, 'Go, go; but do not do this again!' Such words expressed the magnanimity natural to him. His large heart could not seriously entertain the idea of endangering my life. He stuck to brotherly love, nobility, and virtue, while I gave full vent to anger, lust and monkey-nature. For as soon as an opportunity presented itself I took his very life, dictated by the crookedness that has been mine all along! I seek your permission to enter the flames and join my high-souled brother." The poet adds that on witnessing this sudden turn of events, Rāma stood dejected for a time, his heart overflowing with sympathy and his eyes with tears![4]

Readers of *Adhyātma Rāmāyaṇa* are familiar with the description of how Valmīki's life was transformed by his contact with the Seven Great Sages. He was then leading a robber's life. On seeing the reverend Ones, his first reaction was to try to rob them of whatever they had,—even their weariug apparel—so that he could maintain his wife and children therewith. It was easy for the Sages to see that the man before them was proceeding on the false assumption that those whom he looked after would surely take a share of whatever sins he committed for their sake. So they asked him to go home and ascertain for himself how far each member was prepared to join him in facing the consequences of his cruel deeds. The Sages

[4] Na tvāṁ jighāṁsāmi careti yan-mām
Ayam mahātmā matimān uvāca,
Tasyaiva tad-Rāma vaco'nurūpam,
Idam punaḥ karma ca me' nurūpam! Kiṣkindhā, xxiv. 8.
Vadho hi me mato nāsīt-
Sva-māhātmyāvyati-kramāt;
Mamāsid-buddhi-daurātmyāt-
Prāṇa-hārī vyatikramaḥ.
Druma-śākhā' vabhagno'ham. . .
Sāntvayitvā tvānenokto
Na punaḥ kartum arhasi. . .
Bhrātṛtvam āryabhāvaś-ca
Dharmaś-cānena rakṣitāḥ;
Mayā krodhaś-ca kāmaś-ca
Kapitvaṁ ca pradarśitam! 10—12.
Sañjāta-bāṣpaḥ para-vīra-hantā
Rāmo muhūrtam vimanā babhūva! 24.

assured him that they would not leave the place till he returned. That appeared to be a fair proposal and the man hurried to his wife and children. Their replies acted as a partial eye-opener. For they told him bluntly that if there was any gain it would be theirs by right, while if punishments were due they would go to none but himself! The rest of the story is simple. The merciful Sages instructed him, and by faithfully carrying out the discipline they prescribed for him, he developed supreme insight and became the well known saint Vālmīki,—so called because of the *valmīka,* ant-hill, that grew around him during his prolonged meditations.[5]

So far as the study of reactions is concerned, this story is highly significant. What Vālmīki's eyes recorded before and after his conversion did not alter in the least, for that was the physical appearance of the Sages. Their faces always indicated fearlessness and kindness. The revolution that took place was solely in his own thought world. His programme had been built on three notions: a fancied identity of interests, in every respect, between himself and his family; a supposed unalterable responsibility to maintain them at all costs; and as the direct means to it, the snatching of material goods from those whom he chose to regard as his legitimate 'victims'. It is interesting to see what the Sages found at the same time. What their eyes recorded was naturally the fact of the robber rushing towards them shouting. 'Stop, stop!' But since their perceptions moved unobstructed in the subtle world, they were able to understand the inner worth of the man in front. Behind the threatening attitude and murderous intention which were indisputable psychological facts at the time, they noticed that the 'cylinder' of wisdom and service stood ready to begin spinning in the opposite direction for ever. What was needed was a little help from outside to pull back the only obstacle that stood in its way, namely, his misplaced trust in the people whom he blindly loved. When that help was given in a manner which fitted well into his dominant ideas, two things happened. First, his original programme was found to be untenable, so it disintegrated. Secondly, its essential element, the desire to gain something useful from others, passed quickly from the first lesson in discrimination, already completed with proper verification, to other lessons, more valuable, that the venerable Ones might surely be willing to teach, if properly approached. We may sum up the change by saying that the profit motive, inherent in the very first movement of thought, became disentangled from some of the false assumptions he had made, and the base attachments he had built up on them. It survived as the yearning for illumination,—that being the only form in which it could stand when divested of the extraneous factors which may manage to cling to it and lead it astray, if one is not vigilant.

Re-shuffling of values can come either through the disillusionment caused by shocks from the external world, or through calm and quiet reflection, deliberately undertaken when there is nothing particularly unpleasant in the environment to upset the mind. It goes without telling that the second alternative is the nobler one.

IV

Where, however, baser emotions have become well entrenched in the personality, peaceful methods like those which the Sages tried on Vālmīki, may be of no avail. It is possible for an individual sometimes to count upon his physical strength, social influence, or financial resources and utilize them to exploit and oppress the weak. When his iniquities increase, the machinery of the government is put into action against him. The law courts, the police, and the army 'mend or end' him

[5] Pāpaṁ tavaiva tat-sarvam,
Vayaṁ tu phalabhāginaḥ!
Tat-śrutvā jāta-nirvedo
Vicārya punarāgamam
Munayo yatra tiṣṭhanti
Karuṇā-pūrṇa-mānasāḥ.
Munīnāṁ darśanād-eva
Śuddhāntaḥ-karaṇo' bhavam.
Ayodhyā, vi. 74-76.

and his accomplices. But there can arise a situation when the offender is the ruler of a State, who contrived through foul means to seize the administration and keep every limb of it tightly in his own hands. The very army which, normally, ought to serve as an effective instrument for enforcing justice and promoting virtue, becomes in his hands an unfailing tool to enslave neighbouring States and indeed all humanity. This possibility was clearly seen by ancient Indian story-writers. The greatest tragedies of life, according to them, were not caused by the murderous instincts of those who had no occasion to step into cultural fields. They were,—and they are still mostly—due to the endless scope for exploitation and persecution which any shrewd and unscrupulous person could get by doggedly disciplining himself in certain ways. Those writers have depicted their villains as men who saw the necessity to push aside their wicked intentions to the extent that was required to enable them to pick up from the surface flow of mental energy just the elements signifying 'power', as distinguished from universal compassion. They then relied upon the sheer force of repetition to step up this 'power' till it assumed almost irresistible proportions. The psychological drama enacted to facilitate the execution of this project to build up a 'position of strength' involved the invocation of favourite deities representing Power, until they appeared in a vision and granted the desired 'boons'. When this stage was reached, there was no further obligation, they felt, to hold back their schemes for aggrandizement. They found that they could thenceforth make their own mental movements produce corresponding combinations in the fields of energy and of matter whenever and wherever they chose. It was a tragedy, in a personal sense, when anyone took the trouble to climb up all the steps leading to the highest wisdom and contented himself with merely snatching the power lying scattered along the route. Many a small-minded man goes to a place of pilgrimage, prompted by the profit motive, and comes back delighted with the wealth gained by clever speculations in the shopping areas found near by! But tragedy transcended personal limits and spread steadily in every direction, like a wild fire, when, armed with the boons,—which meant, in their case, a fusion of wickedness and military might—the villains started on a career of conquest and extended their sway not only over the whole of the earth but even beyond its limits.

There was only one way to pull down such an oppressor; each sufferer had to, and could, push his virtues up. His body might be held in chains and his mouth shut. But there was one dimension where his movements could never be obstructed. That was his own mind. His hot sighs or tears could not be expected to give a direct hit to the tyrant. But every mental heaving for freedom could do it, whether accompanied or not by language in the form of a complaint or of a fervent prayer addressed to the Supreme Dispenser of Justice. If the aggressor could pick up 'power' from the stream of thought flowing through him, amplify it, and employ it to injure others, his victims too could follow the same procedure, though guided simply by faith, till the total forces sucked up and converted by their individual heavings, in their inevitable evolution, led up to a Cosmic Stress, too strong for earthly schemers to withstand. Its visible effect would be the appearance of a Hero, a Man of the Hour, a Liberator, a Royal Sage, or what Hindus call an Incarnation. His, or Her programme would be twofold: promotion of virtue, and the elimination of wickedness,—even through the utter destruction of the physical prowess and military superiority on which alone tyrants usually count.

The *Caṇḍi* gives us two striking examples of incurably perverse reactions. Of its three main stories one deals with Mahiṣa and another with two brothers, Śumbha and Niśumbha. The pattern of events is the same: They enslaved the celestials, tormented religious people, and made spiritual pursuit well nigh impossible. In answer to the appeals of the afflicted, Divinity descended to the earth as the Divine Mother to take the field against the

oppressors. She came as the embodiment of matchless valour and boundless compassion. Sages left off their silent meditation to fall at Her feet and sing Her praises. Dwellers in heaven were filled with delight, for they saw their day of deliverance fast approaching. At the sight of Her calm and trust-inspiring face, lit with a half-smile, charming like the full moon, and glowing like burnished gold, they too made repeated obeisance to Her and chanted Her glories. But that same face evoked altogether different reactions in the minds of the demons to whom sense pleasure was the highest goal. To Śumbha and Niśumbha, ever on the special look out for gems of all kinds, this 'gem' of a woman seemed to be an ideal mistress to be brought over by persuasion, or captured and dragged by the hair if She resisted. The only concession they were willing to give Her was the right to stay with *either* of them, as She chose! They were left with no other alternative than to fight to the death, since She not only taunted them but also went on striking down the armed men sent against Her in larger and larger numbers. As for Mahiṣa, Her challenging roars from the start excited his ire and compelled him to resort to arms. This left him little room to dwell longingly on Her exquisite beauty. When the celestials hymned Her after She had slain him, they particularly mentioned that it was a wonder how he,—or anyone with even common notions of physical charms—could respond to Her *only* by rushing in anger to strike Her captivating face,[6] which unmistakably showed the protection and grace She was ready to bestow on those who wanted them!

If a person is sincerely desirous of lifting himself above the passing attractions of the sense world, he can find plenty of take-off grounds for reflective flights, all around him. Wherever there is uncommon progress, greatness, or splendour, it is She, the Mother, the Divine Saviour, who exists there, assuming that particular form to bless Her struggling children. It is, again, She who functions as Art and Learning, as Prosperity in the abodes of the good, as Faith in the hearts of the devout, and as the very Womanhood among all human beings.[7] Where is it that the reflective mind cannot perceive Her gracious presence?

[6] Iṣat-sahāsam-amalam paripūrṇa-candra-
Bimbānukāri kanakottama-kānti-kāntam
Atyadbhutam prahṛtam āttaruṣā tathāpi
Vaktram vilokya sahasā Mahiṣāsureṇa! iv. 12.

[7] Vidyāḥ samastās-tava Devi bhedāḥ,
Striyaḥ samastāḥ sakalā jagatsu... xi. 6.
Yā śrīḥ svayaṁ sukṛtinām bhavaneṣvalakṣmiḥ,
...sukṛtinām hṛdayeṣu buddhiḥ,
Śraddhā satāṁ... Tāṁ tvāṁ nataḥ smaḥ...
iv. 5.

TAMIL MYSTICISM

By Prof. K. R. R. Sastry

Mysticism has no genealogy. It is a state of "thinking and feeling to which minds of a certain temperament are liable at any time or place, Occident or Orient" (Vaughan). From the Age of the Upaniṣads down to the present day there has been a succession of eminent mystics.

All mystics constitute the "musical band of God and each constitutes his note in such a way that the whole becomes a harmony and a symphony wonderful." (R. D. Ranade) The great mystics of the world through the ages had the unitive knowledge and integrated experience of the 'Witness within us all.' These saints and mystics have a twofold interest to us. First on the evidence of the known facts

of their lives, these are remarkable individuals. Secondly, their unique spiritual experiences are offered to us as objective truth.

Were all these mystics of China, India, Greece and those of the Catholic Calendar, the Sufis and the mystics of Islam emotionally unbalanced, or victims of neurotic disorders? Assuming that the Lord chose 'cracked vessels into which He could pour his good wine,' conscious dishonesty so far as their experience is concerned need not be attributed to these seers.

Three relevant generalizations can be made from the records of these mystics:

(1) Records related of them which transcend or run counter to established natural law are objective statements of truth;

(2) There exists a condition of sanctity which distinguishes the sanctified individual from the general run of mankind.

(3) A mystical state is achievable wherein the mystic has complete absorption into the 'Deity.' (Goodwin)

"Iron when it becomes red-hot seems to be turned into pure fire but remains no less iron than before." So when "rational substances pass into God, they do not lose their identity but pursue it in a higher state of being" (Plotinus). Dionysius of the fifth century defined the mystic state as "an intuitive or experimental sense of the Divine."

Psychology of Mystical Experience

Theosophists and Spiritualists claim that they have probed and proved the existence of the world invisible. The psychology of the superconscious will place the saints, seers and *Siddhas* in a new light.

Mystical experience "consists in the penetration of consciousness or awareness into the region of the superconscious which is a state of spiritual awareness and brings with it a *sense of expansion of being* and *increase of understanding* so extraordinary that *no words* can truly describe it to those who have no experience of such a state." (M. R. Walker)* Being the *reasonable outcome* of many lives of *spiritual development,* its psychology is as explicable as it is "the direct, immediate, first-hand apprehension of God."

Tamil mysticism, in point of its start, is chronologically almost a continuation of Upaniṣadic mysticism. As sources of 'deep mystic knowledge' and supplying clues to spiritual progress, the Upaniṣads have an universal appeal. As a cross-section of this divine society, it is at once a discipline to understand them and of high objective value. The earliest blossomings, though they started in Northern India which sent Agastya, the first Aryan to cross the Vindhyas, get their *first expression* in Thirumūlar, one of the nine Natha-Siddhas, Sambandhar, Appar, Sundarar and Mānickavāsakar (7th to 9th century A. D.). Their philosopher was the great Śrī Śaṅkarācārya (788-820 A. D.). The chain gets an added fragrance through the great Vaiṣṇava devotees, the twelve *Ālwārs* of whom Nammālwār, Periālwār, Thiruppānālwār and Āndāl (a lady devotee) (8th to 11th century A. D.) are the more important, leaving the philosophy to be formulated by Ācārya Śrī Rāmānuja (1017-1137 A. D.). If the line is taken till Śrī Rāmānuja, the travel of this Vaiṣṇavism to the north through Rāmānanda, and blossoming through Chaitanya Mahāprabhu, Bhakta Mīrā Bāi, and Śrī Tulsidāsji is connected.

Later again, a wave of Śaiva mysticism flourished from the 15th century to 19th century, represented by Pattiṇathu Swāmigal, a rich multi-millionaire turned mystic (15th century), Thāyumānava Swāmigal (18th century), one of the disciples in the line of Thirumūlar and Saint Rāmalingam (19th century), whose memory is green with many. Maharṣi Ramaṇa was a living example of a 'boy-turned Seer' who gave solace to thousands, far and near.

* Italics mine.

ART AND RELIGION

By Georg Olden

One day on one of my all too infrequent outings with S. P., we were driving through Westchester when suddenly he turned to me and asked, "Could you write an article on 'Art and Religion'?" Without a moment's hesitation I replied, "Yes." Had I reflected even for a moment on the enormity of the task, let alone my inadequacy to meet it, I would have been less sure. After all, there are so many "arts"—not just visual. And in painting alone there are national divisions and ideals. Within each of these there are myriad periods, schools and movements. How could these be dealt with in anything short of a volume? How can it be done without bringing in examples—names of paintings and painters unfamiliar to the layman as well as the reader steeped in the tradition of a different culture with an entirely different roster of artistic masterpieces and heroes? And what of religion? Did not these same problems of diversity and complexity exist there, perhaps even compounded? It was apparent that the entire question must be stripped bare and dealt with in the broadest possible sense if indeed it would be dealt with at all within the confines of a short article.

The dictionary seemed a logical place to begin, especially as I had never come to any satisfactory definition in my own mind as to what art is. Though presumably I am equipped by formal training (the kind academicians recognize) and by profession to have a somewhat clearer idea of art than religion, this is not the case. Not that I lay claim to any great knowledge of religion either, but I am not so blind that I do not recognize that in this sphere I have had a distinct advantage in my search. In the lives and teachings of Sri Ramakrishna, Swami Vivekananda and the great disciples of the former, I have had instructors without parallel. I have spent many hours listening to and questioning the disciples of these great men and have not forgotten all that I have heard from them. This calibre of tutelage has not been mine in the realm of art. Perhaps had art produced a representative of the magnitude of a Ramakrishna and a spokesman equal to Swami Vivekananda to enunciate the truths, purposes, and aims of art—or more correctly, had my desire for light in art been as great as that which I had for religion, things might now be different. It has been said, "Seek and ye shall find." One finds answers, it seems only logical to suppose, in areas where one asks questions.

The New Century dictionary defines art as "The production or expression of what is beautiful or appeals to the faculty of taste". Ah! The lead afforded immediately by this definition is so pat, so obvious, that it seems trite because it is so simple. Don't all religions include in their definitions of God that He is beauty? Then art is an attempt to express the beautiful or God.

And how does the artist proceed to do this? The creative process involves almost invariably, deliberately or not, some sort of thinking and reflecting on a subject or idea until a solution as to the most appropriate objectification presents itself to the thinker from within. This reflection, especially in the production of a work of genius, may at periods achieve an intensity, a singularity of focus that resembles what the Vedāntist would call meditation. In this concentration only the thought exists. The reflective process, in varying degrees of intensity, may continue, waxing and waning for days, months and even years. And when this concentration persists, sooner or later *THE* solution comes. I stress *THE* solution because during the process many seeming solutions come and are rejected. When *THE* solution comes there is no doubt about it. He knows

it is true. By objective standards he may not be able to prove it is true, but that doesn't matter. Truth has the peculiar quality of not needing explanation or proof. It is self-evident. And if the skill of the artist's hands, his brain, and his ability with the physical paraphernalia of his craft are equal to the task of bringing this inner vision faithfully into the light of day, a work of art will have been created. If they are not, it will miss the mark. But most of all, it will miss the mark if this meditation (for lack of a better word) is abandoned short of the flash of inspiration that is *THE* clear and unmistakable solutiou. If any intermediate solution is settled for due to discouragement, a feeling that a better solution is not likely to be found, or because of laziness, or for any reason, the work will fall short of greatness, of true art. This abandoning of the concentration is the primary reason, with the possible exception of a tendency on the part of some clients to invite,—even insist on, mediocrity, for the failure of nearly all commercial art to achieve status as art. Though there is no real line of demarcation between the so called 'fine' and applied arts, there indeed exists a very real distinction in the minds of many artists when they undertake a 'commercial' assignment. In nearly every instance because of lack of respect for the work, or that old bugbear 'the deadline', the artist stops far, far short of the genuine inspiration—*THE* solution through the meditative process.

This meditation is an attempt to penetrate to the inner reality of the subject and involves an intensive and exhaustive visual editing that arranges and rearranges form, mass, line, plane, and content, and paradoxically withal a silent waiting. In this process the artist is saying in effect, "To portray this idea there is one way of doing it that is truth for me. There is such a thing as the 'truth' of this idea objectified. There is one presentation and one alone of this idea that is the 'truth' of it in expression, and I must find it. There may be many ways of portrayal, in fact, many have occurred to me but in each there is a flaw. Intuitively I recognize each as false and discard it. Were I to allow myself to be deceived by them and bring them to fruition, I or other persons may not be able to point a finger directly at it but there will be something decidedly wrong. It will not be art. This *one* way I am seeking is the 'thing in itself'—'das ding in sich' of Kant—the truth of this idea!"

And what is the acid test of this truth? Aside from the 'standing the test of time' factor it is, simplicity. Truth is always simple. The greatest spiritual personalities have always spoken the simplest language. Even a child can understand every sentence of a Christ, a Krishna, or a Ramakrishna. But a corps of Philadelphia lawyers will often be inadequate to cope with the theologians and pundits who 'explain' them. Complexity, whether philosophic or aesthetic, is synonymous with overstatement. When a writer has nothing to say he wrestles the thesaurus until he has disguised his mental sterility under an awe-inspiring avalanche of impressive verbiage. An artist or musician in the same sorry condition will embellish his 'nothing' under the delusion that by the sheer complexity of the mess something wonderful or at least meaningful may find its way in by accident. But if it is truly art it is simple. If it is not, then chances are that the 'meditator' stopped short of the revelation that lay somewhere deep within. If it is not, an interim solution has been settled for. It is not truth.

The real artist, then, is a seeker of truth. By deduction based on the dictionary definition he is also a seeker of beauty. God is Truth. God is Beauty. On these two points, I believe, all religions will agree.

IDEALISM AND ITS EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS

By Prof. R. C. Wadhera

Opposed to schools of Pragmatism and Naturalism, Idealism interprets universe, and its relationship with persons, places and phenomena in terms of mind, spirit and values. It considers reality as a being, a fixed entity that is suffused with Plato's "unchanging constants" and Lasky's "great bold ideals". It treats man's origin as deity, his nature as freedom, and his destiny as immortality. It exalts the worth of personality which implies "the dynamic organization within the individual of those psycho-physiological systems which determine the unique adjustment to his environment" (G. W. Allport). It holds fast to absolute standards of truth, beauty, and goodness—and these concepts form the core of Philosophy, Aesthetics, and Ethics respectively. Representative of this idealistic trend are the following writers: Fechner conceived universe as a large organism having body and soul. Hegel regarded world as a thought process of God. E. Kant's distinction between phenomenon and Noumenon; and his advocacy of the "categorical Imperative". Richard Livingstone: "All drive comes from within." Leibnitz: "Mind is a governing monad", i.e. psychic entity. Aristotle: "Man is the measure of all things." Bishop Berkeley's "subjectivism" contended that reality has no existence apart from our perception. Plato's value; and his paramount emphasis on the engendering of right type of loves and hates is a pointer in this direction. William James: "Truth happens to an idea, it becomes true, and is made true by events."

The following educational aims symbolize idealistic impact and import.

1. Nunn ("Education—Its Data and First Principles"): "Education is a complete development of individuality according to one's best capacity."

2. Zakir Hussain, the foremost promoter of Basic Education in India, remarks that education is an individualized revivification of objective culture. And cnlture constitutes the sum total of all man-made things and values.

3. H. H. Horne, in "The Philosophy of Education", states that education is the eternal process of superior adjustments of the physically and mentally developed, free, conscious human beings to God, as manifested in the intellectual, emotional and volitional environment of man. Horne's ultimate aim is the development of humanity in the image of divinity.

4. Harry S. Broudy, in "Building a Philosophy of Education", avers that idealistic educational system aims at a delightful rapprochement between the condition of learning and the claims of good life which is characterized by self-determination, self-direction, self-integration and self-realization.

5. Kandel: "There is nostalgia for values towards which the world is to move."

6. M. L. Jacks, in "The Education of the Whole Man", puts forth the plea that every piece of knowledge is a disguised imperative ordering us to live this way and to avoid other avenues.

7. Spencer advocated complete living aim that embraces adequately the cognitive, affective and conative aspects of our living.

8. Herbert emphasizes that education consists in the conquest of the lower impulses by the higher intelligence. Culture aim of education stresses knowledge for its conventional and ornamental value which is antithetical to the vocational aim that seeks to make learning a current coin; and concretises instructional process with a bias for commerce, industry, and technology with reference, all the while, to the applicability of learning skills

and competencies. Idealistic approach to education underlines the primacy and potency of ideas (Deway's "Think and Grow Rich" points to this fact), it underlies all the systems of thought and points of departures. It is a superb motivation for initiative and enterprise, and provides a substratum for conceptual organization that results in a variety of blue prints, and frame-work of schemes.

Historical Retrospect: In India before East India Company's emergence, maktabs madrassas, pāṭhshālas and forest schools symbolized selective schooling. "Filtration Theory" held sway; "Elite Core" was catered to. In contemporary educational literature Happold's "Towards a New Aristocracy" is a pointer. At present, Public Schools and some of the Universities clamour enthusiastically to safeguard their autonomy in order to diffuse sweetness and light, sense and sensibility among their alumni strictly according to their own lights. Public Schools in England have outstandingly upheld the "Ivory-tower mentality" and have consistently nurtured social stratifications and spurious classifications that have, in a way, furthered specialized efforts and social cohesion. In America, Oregan Law of 1926 established "voluntaryism" and the parents' right to choose school for their wards. But idealistic trend basically aims to popularize and universalize educational opportunities and facilities with an eye on individual and social development to the optimum level in balanced consistency. It does not revel in dealing with bare ideas and ineffectual symbols in a vacuum, thus giving "a local habitation to airy nothings", and staying all the while divorced from social heritage, prevailing mores and the peculiar type of developmental tasks. Instead, it is supposed to facilitate the conservation, transmission and enhancement of racial experiences that are an epitome of crystallized, cumulative wisdom of different climes and times. Idealistic line of thought is meant to furnish generous vision without which individuals and institutions deteriorate, decay and die away. It supplies scintillating inspiration that makes one's and nation's career a wondrous privilege and a bold adventure—instead of "a pendulum between a tear and a smile."

Educational Implications

1. Child is approached and treated as a temple of God with humility and reverence. Child's untapped potentialities are awakened and brought into play through judicious provision of positive, ample and worthwhile life experiences. As Rousseau remarked: "Life is the trade that I shall teach my Emile." But this trade is perpetually varying, and hence the responsibility of the teaching sources, to deliver the goods as a debt of honour, becomes all the heavier.

2. Teacher assumes and enjoys a pivotal position under the influence of idealistic philosophy. He is required to approximate his life and professional calibre to the classic model of Henry Van Dyke's "Unknown Teacher". His personality is desired to be compelling, his methods effective, his life a dedicated mission, and his work typifying a sort of worship. He needs to be a real lamp-lighter with an "Excelsior-spirit", never faltering, failing, or floundering. It is well known that attitudes are caught through emotional contagion (McDougall's primitive, passive sympathy, imitation and suggestion) and are not taught formally in the impersonal, businesslike atmosphere prevailing in most of the teaching institutions that are correctly described as "teaching shops". "As is the teacher, so is the school" remains undisputed; and on the efficiency and extent of education rests the stability and civility of any organized group. To live up to the high traditions of the vocation, teacher has to be equipped with professional ability, with firm faith in the nobility and educability of human nature, with inclusive sympathies and abundant love, with equable temper, soft voice and ceaseless struggle for self-improvement.

3. Atmosphere at the "school plant" needs to be permissive and supportive. It has to be

definitely constructive and creative. But freedom should not stretch to licence or waywardness. It should connote regulated liberty and guided efforts. No laxity or looseness should go unnoticed and unadjusted.

Different idealistic concepts of freedom are listed below (vide W. J. McCallister's "The growth of Freedom in Education"):

Aristotle's freedom through "Golden Mean"; Montaigne's freedom through "Mild severity"; Hegel's freedom through "Self-estrangement"; Herbert's freedom through "Inner discipline" i.e. wounding the desire to do evil; Plato's freedom through control (his emphasis on gentleness, spirit, desire, and reason); Tolstoy's freedom embodied in the remark that education is a tendency to moral despotism raised to a principle; Fichte's freedom through "Instinct of respect"; McDougall's freedom through "Instinct of self-respect"; Mill and Nunn's freedom through the unfoldment of individuality; Comenius' freedom through pansophy; Locke's freedom through "Indifferent Action", Froebel's freedom through "Third Term" i.e. unity and spontaneity.

4. Curricular offerings should cover and introduce aptly the condensed and cumulative social heredity in both the logical and psychological sequence. Students should be exposed to the healthful influences and events contained in the humanities, arts, literature and social studies that include analytic surveys. Human aspect of all the natural sciences, organic and inorganic, should be brought home to school-going population so that it may quicken their imagination, broaden their loyalties, and deepen their loves. This arrangement and perspective will checkmate the increase of single-track minds that react to surroundings and situations like bullocks in blinkers and will enable such victims to shed their "frog-in-the-well mentality."

5. Total personality will have to be cultivated in all the major areas of living, namely, home; health consciousness and physical fitness; civic, political, religious, and personal adjustments; vocational competence and avocational "at-ease", aesthetic appreciation and ethical awareness. Personality of an individual is the product of inherited dispositions and environmental experiences which occur within the field of his physical, social, and mental interactions that are constantly modified through progressive socialization and acculturation. An excellent definition of the concept of personality is offered by Kluckhohn, Murray and Schneider in their book: "Personality in Nature, Society and Culture" on page 49 thus: "Personality is the continuity of functional forms and forces manifested through sequences of organised, regnant processes and overt behaviours from birth to death." In the ultimate analysis, we must view persons as an end and not as a means. Then, alone, hnmaneness and the elevation of Homo Sapien's destiny will be recognized and respected, and common fraternity and an element of interdependence will be realized.

6. Idealistic philosophy contributes most vitally in the spheres of religion, morality, and values. In the religious realm, it beacons towards the applicability and currency of common denominator values. It lashes out against institutionized and organized religion which, under intellectual scrutiny, appears to be a fossil, an empty form devoid of real meaning. It stands allergic to the sheer rituals and ceremonies, binding dogmas and taboos, exclusiveness and the pull of obscurantism. It brings to the forefront the redeeming touch of service, sacrifice, and detached endeavours for achieving poise within and peace around.

In short, idealism gives life "an exciting task of winning over our self completely and to establish communion with the Unseen Power". Rightly runs the quotation: "Man partly is, he fully hopes to be." Idealism, thus, is basic to all "isms" and inheres in all that is good, great, and glorious in life's pursuit. Short of idealistic spark, this life will become pointless, insipid and vapid, and times will, verily, get out of joint.

THE LOGIC OF RELATIONS IN VEDĀNTA

By Dr. P. S. Sastri

1. That which is apprehended appears to be an existent.[1] If the object is represented as totally other than the subject, there will be no *tertium quid* to bring them into a relation; and their relation itself can never be a fact. If we assume a relation because there is the capacity for being related, then since this capacity endures, one should always be aware of the object. There would be an absence of non-awareness.[2] Whatever may be the relation between the subject and the object, the mere having of knowledge does not establish the reality of the object.[3] Similarly the existence of an object cannot be established merely on the ground that we use certain words.[4] As far as our experience is concerned the external world cannot be categorised. It consists of forms and names only. Kumārila, on the other hand, accepted substance, quality, activity and universal as the only categories through which the world is presented to us. The Vaiśeṣikas added particularity and inherence to these. The Sāṅkhya offers twenty-five while the Nyāya has sixteen.[5] These and similar categories are employed only to make the external universe intelligible to ourselves. Thus we speak of substance, quality, action, generality, particularity and inherence. We speak as if each of these has its own absolutely distinctive characteristics, though we treat the last five as being dependent on the first. But objects that are absolutely distinct from each other do not depend upon one another. If quality and the rest are dependent upon substance, since they exist only when the substance exists, it is reasonable to hold that it is the substance alone which from different points of view and under different states, can be described as quality, action and the like.[6] When we predicate number, form, and quality to a substance we are implicitly holding that there can be a substance which does not have any of these predicates. Such a substance is not what we do experience. We are never aware of it. What we mean by a substance is the form or the colour or some quality. Apart from these there is no substance.[7]

When we say that x and y differ, is this difference one of form? Is it one of mutual exclusion? Is it any dissimilarity? X has a form of its own, and y has its own. Apart from their respective forms there is no third feature bringing about any difference between them. If x is to exclude y, how can it exclude y without including the y in it or being included in y? In the absence of any such inclusion there cannot be a relation of exclusion.[8] When I apprehend x and also become aware of its excluding the y, this y must enter my apprehension of x. Otherwise the exclusion of y is no object of apprehension. And then x must have the character of y or the character of excluding the y. In either case x ceases to be mere x, and then we cannot postulate a mutual relation of exclusion. In other words, the apprehension of difference is grounded in the apprehension of nondifference.[9] And if the difference of x is no other than the form of x, we should never misperceive it as y. But we do misperceive nacre as silver.[10] Thus two entities can differ merely by themselves without the intervention of any other factor; and any additional

[1] Pramānavārtika Alamkāra, 412.26
[2] Vedānta Sūtrabhāshya of Śankara 498.6-8.
[3] PVA 475.5-6.
[4] VSB 514.13-14.
[5] PPV 209.1-8; VPS 200-1.
[6] VSB 517.3-9.
[7] KKK 579.
[8] cf. Kh 45.
[9] KKK 111.10-113.5; TP 167-8.
[10] KKK 617.1-2.

factor only complicates the relation between the two.

X cannot be merely different without being different from something or other. Difference needs two entities.[11] Then is the form of x the same as its difference from y? Or is this difference from y a quality or property of x? In the former case x does not have a character of its own. It has a character that involves y necessarily. Without having its own character, it ceases to have any claim to be real.[12] In the latter case, y enters x as its property and then it cannot be totally different from x. X as having the character of y cannot be other than y.[13] In this manner x has to depend on y, and y on x. It is illogical to maintain that x differs from y because it depends on y, or that y differs from x because it depends on x.[14] In other words, to say that x is different, we can only bring in an indefinite and infinite non-x from which x can differ. Bnt this non-x cannot be any determinate y or z since we have already found reason to reject such an argument. X then will differ from that which does not exist.[15] Even if we admit that x differs from non-x which qualifies it, we have to apprehend the two together if we are to apprehend their difference. And in such an apprehension we have a unitary cognition that does not affirm the difference. If we want to assert the difference, then we should first have the non-x as qualifying x; and we can have this only when we have the difference.[16] X can be apprehended as having the character of x, as having the character of non-y, and as a determinate entity. Thus a piece of cloth is cognized as a cloth, as a non-pot, and as made up of threads. A smell is a smell, a not-colour and a fragrant one.[17] Mutual exclusion cannot therefore account for the difference between any two entities.[18] And without the category of difference we cannot establish the reality of the external world with which is bound the logical activity.

Is there only one difference? Or are there many differences? If difference is a relation and therefore universal, there must be only one difference which is instantiated in many cases. Difference, on this argument, is numberable. As numbered, it must have a form to which the number is applied. Then it will cease to be a nniversal. Moreover as one, it would entail all differing objects to differ in an identical manner. This is possible only when all the objects can be classified only into two groups, each group having a series of objects that are identical with one another.[19] This absurdity compels us to hold that there are different differences. The difference of x from y must be different from the difference of p from q. Here the difference of one difference from another becomes dependent on the objects that differ. It is a conditional, not a natural, difference.[20] If two differences differ, then there is a third difference emerging between the two, and this leads to a regress. If they do not differ, they must be identical, and then no term can differ from any other.[21]

A difference in the functions cannot account for an actual difference. The same fire, for instance, is capable of helping us in burning a house and in cooking something. Because there are exclusive functions, we cannot speak of the fire differing from itself.[22] Moreover when we speak of the causal conditions working together to bring forth one specific effect, we are admitting difference in the conditions and not in the result.[23] If the emergence of an effect can resolve difference, then difference is no longer an ultimate fact of the world of experience. Further, in one and the same

[11] KKK 625.8.
[12] KKK 125.1-3; TP 170.8-9.
[13] KKK 126.1-3.
[14] KKK 114.1-116-9; 618.
[15] KKK 120.15-16.
[16] TP 169.8-14.
[17] KKK 636.1-7.
[18] NMA 48; TP 172.
[19] BS 49.2-4.
[20] KKK 635.7-8.
[21] NMA 44-6, 51; KKK 122.1-123.2; TP 172.10-173.2.
[22] BBV Sambandha 957; BS 50.21-22.
[23] BS 51.19.

object we have different activities like burning and cooking. The difference here is not ultimate. It is a constructed difference. These differences are grounded in an identity; and if they are ultimately real, the object ceases to be one and becomes a many.[24]

2. To overcome such difficulties, it was held by some Vedāntins that the world of experience has to be interpreted in terms of an identity-in-difference. The world on such a view is a system, a relational unity. Kumārila, amongst the Mīmāṁsakas, subscribed to such a view; and it appears not only in some pre-Śaṅkara thinkers but also in Rāmānuja and in Hegelianism. On this theory, we are told that identity and difference cannot be mutually exclusive concepts.[25] The identity of x is not other than x itself. The cognition that apprehends x and that which apprehends the identity of x refer to one and the same object. But these two cognitions are not identical. They have different contents, though they have an identical referent. And it is an error to conclude from this that every object involves an identity in difference. If a single object gives rise to two different cognitions, it only implies that the cognitions refer to two aspects of the same; and since these belong to the same referent, they cannot be exclusive characters.[26] It is also certain that the cognition of x and the cognition of x being non-different from itself are not identical cognitions because the latter has the negation of difference as its object. If it is said that the latter is a cognition of identity, it would go to show that identity depends on difference and that difference depends upon identity. And then we can cognize neither.[27] If an object is identical with itself and different from others, are the identity and difference identical with it or different from it? If they are different, they cannot be its features because that which is different from a thing is another thing, not a quality. If they are not different then they are identical with it and therefore they cannot be its qualities. They cannot be both identical and different at the same time.[28]

Does this argument imply that the object is self-contradictory and therefore unreal? To say that it exists and has a character, and yet is nnreal, is a self-contradictory argument. If it is a self-contradictory thing, it is no existent; and if it exists, it cannot be self-contradictory. But if it has no character of its own, it is an appearance; and an appearance is always an appearance of something. This something must be real. We can negate, moreover, only that which is a false or improper predication. And an improper predication is a character attributed to something which does not admit it. This something cannot admit any predication, proper or improper, if it is not a real existent.[29] We have therefore to admit that the world of experience implies the reality of something of which it is the appearance.

3. Taking an appearance to be that which claims to exist, we can enquire into the nature of the existent. The idea of existence includes the relations of comparison, concurrence, connection, space, and time. The relation of connection is most varied and fundamental. It includes the relation of whole and part. Is the whole related in entirety to its part? If it is related as a whole completely, the object which is a whole must exist prior to and distinct from its parts; and a whole that is related in entirety to one part, cannot have any positive relation to a second part. If, on the other hand, an aspect of the whole is related to a part, is it related through this aspect or through some other aspect? No entity can relate itself, for a relation is not identical with the terms related. And a part x cannot be a relation relating to the parts y and z. A relation is always *between* the terms, not *in* the terms; and as such there is nothing in which it can be found.[30] We cannot then

[24] KKK 127.1-3.
[25] cf. AKJ 1.57-59.
[26] cf. BS 59.20-25.
[27] IS 319; BD 81.
[28] IS 100.'11-14.
[29] B 558.1-7.
[30] cf. McTaggart: Nature of Existence. I. 81.

speak of the interrelation of the parts prior to the formation of the whole. In other words there can be no whole which is distinct from its parts.[31] The object considered as a whole of parts, seems to present both difference and identity.[32] The two aspects are interdependent.

When we speak of the relation between a whole and the parts, we assume that there is a difference or distinction between the whole and parts. The assumption is faulty since the whole is not a whole if it can still admit of a relation to a part. If we are trying to know how the part of a whole is related to the whole, we are abstracting the part from the whole and thereby we falsify the character of the whole. The whole implies the interrelated existence of many parts; and a part is one of the many parts that make up a whole. The parts and the whole are not opposed to one another. They are not separate. Such a whole involves in itself the concepts of substance, number, order, unity and the like. In such a case how does the concept of difference creep in? It may be said that the relation is between one part and another, not between a part and the whole.[33] But if all the parts are different there can be no unity; and if they are not different, as Āryadeva asks, how is it that the foot is not the head?[34] We cannot bring in the difference in function to overcome this difficulty, since such a difference can depend on spatial distinctions with reference to the whole, and these spatial distinctions do not eliminate the difficulty but only take us to the very basis of the whole.

Moreover, we have various kinds of wholes. Some of them do not owe their character to their parts at all. Thus a piece of thread is related to a group of flowers. The thread is a whole and it strings together these flowers into a garland. The parts of the thread and the thread bring the flowers together. It is neither a part of the thread nor the whole that enters the flowers, but the form of the thread as such. The whole enters into the garland as the form of the thread. Here at least we find two wholes interpenetrating, and yet trying to assert their unmodified characters. It is a peculiar relation that does not bring about any change to the entities related. If these entities retain their original character without any change even after the relation, we cannot speak of a relation here. Further, the human organism being a whole, does the whole move when a hand or a foot moves?[35] If it does not move, we have to admit a whole which does not change even when there is change within that whole. This is not the nature of the objects that we experience. When a part of the whole is covered, we do not say that the whole is covered even though the whole is not absent at the place where the part is located.[36] We do make a distinction between the parts and the whole. The two are not identical. If they do not differ, can we say that we apprehend the whole by perceiving all the parts? This is an impossibility as long as only the parts are visible. Nor can we say that we perceive the whole by apprehending a few parts.[37] If a certain part is bulky or red, the whole too may have to be taken as voluminous or red.[38] When a part is perceived, in reality the whole is not perceived,[39] at the most, the whole may be inferred. If the whole is not other than its parts, we have to admit that the whole is both perceived and not perceived since at any moment we do not perceive the whole in its entirety.[40] Considered in any way, it is impossible to remove self-contradiction from the nature of the object conceived as a whole. The jar is a jar. It exists and it is a unity. Now the jar, existence and unity are not

[31] See NBV 4.2.6-9; NV 503-4; PVA 287-17-26.
[32] See Bosanquet: Logic, I.26.
[33] NBV 4.2.11-12.
[34] PDS 40.
[35] PV I.84; NVTT 383.10-13.
[36] PV I.85.
[37] NVTT 383.21 ff.
[38] PV 1.85.
[39] PDS 55.
[40] NVTT 384.20.

synonymous expressions.[41] Then as other than existence the unity or jar cannot lay any claim to existence.[42]

4. It may be urged that whatever is revealed in experience cannot be brushed aside as self-contradictory. We may be reminded that we have a knowledge of difference between two entities. If we have such a knowledge, is it real? If it is not real, is it uncaused? If it originated in the activity of certain conditions, does it have no referent? If it has a referent, is the difference negated subsequently? We have an awareness of difference, of otherness. Two objects, x and y, differ from one another. They differ because they are finite entities, entities that are limited by space, time, and other factors. Difference then implies limit.[43] If our awareness of difference is not real, it would put an end to all distinctions of our waking state. A distinction in its turn implies negation. X and y are distinct because they negate or exclude one another. This would entail the factual basis of our knowledge of difference. But if difference is not real, it can be so only on the condition that it is the product of the operation of certain conditions. Whatever is an effect is not ultimately real. Difference then ought to be a product; and this product requires the existence of at least two entities, not their operation. It is a strange product which does not require for its emergence any causal activity. If difference arises from certain conditions, it has an objective status. It cannot be without a referent.[44] But a referent called difference is not found in the external universe. It is we who construct the concept of difference and apply it to this universe in our attempt to understand it.

Even if the entities are continuous, we speak of one point-instant as being different from another. And yet we expect difference to imply the absence of spatial and temporal continuity.[45] All the varieties of difference can, however, be resolved into three groups. There is a difference of ground and its consequent. There is a difference involving overlapping or intrusion. Finally there is a difference which consists in the limit of the object.[46] These varieties involve questions of identity, difference, and similarity, which are relations. These relations are supposed to subsist between the objects or events in the universe. But when we consider the face and its reflection, we actually find that difference does not involve even two real objects, but only one. It is the specific medium of the mirror that brings forth the appearance of difference. The ether conditioned by a jar differs from that conditioned by a room only in so far as the conditioning medium is concerned.[47] Difference refers to the medium, not to the character of an entity.

(To be continued)

[41] PDS 37 ff.
[42] PDS 43-4; cf. CS 14.3.
[43] BS 44.14-15.
[44] cf. ATV 249.
[45] PVA 246.29.
[46] B 725.67.
[47] PPV 67.9-11.

REFERENCES

AKJ Anekāntajaya Patākā
B Bhāmati.
BBV Brihadāranyaka Vartika.
BS Brahma Siddhi
CS Catuḥ Śataka.
IS Ishta Siddhi.
Kh Khandanoddhāra.
KKK Khandana.
LS Lankāvatāra Sūtra.
MMK Mādhyamakakārikā.
NBV Nyāyabhāshya.
NMA Nyayamakaranda.
NV Nyāyavārtika.
NVTT Tātparya Tikā.
PPV Pancapadika Vivaraṇa.
PV Pramāṇa Vārtika.
SS Samkshepa Śārīraka.
TP Tattva Pradīpikā.
TS Tattva Sangraha.
VPS Vivaraṇaprameya Sangraha.
VSB Vedānta Sūtrabhāshya of Sankara.

THE FESTIVAL OF LIGHTS

A REFLECTION

By Sri S. Kamala Kant

The most profound thoughts and the innermost yearnings of a community or a race, or of a nation and its people, are very often found embedded in the local customs and manners, and in the ceremonies and festivals they observe. Through these ceremonies and festivals, the fond aspirations and vague speculations of a nation get crystallized into firm and deep convictions of the head and the heart, and the unexpressed ideals for which the nation stands find a way of expression. And, in course of time, they form the channels through which these ideals are carried from generation to generation. Repeated observance of these festivals, year after year, serves to bring before the minds of the people who participate in them a vision of their glorious ancient culture. The dead past becomes for the moment the living present, and acts as the guiding star for the future.

While this is true of every nation and community, it is specially so with regard to the festivals of India, and particularly the Hindus. The Hindu Calendar abounds in a number of festivals. And almost all of them are of religious significance. To the Hindus, as Swami Vivekananda pointed out, religion and philosophy have been, from times immemorial, the one theme of interest and attraction in life, which has called forth all their energies into a single focus. That has been the one object for which many a Hindu is prepared to leave hearth and home and dedicate himself wholly, body, mind, soul and all, sacrificing everything else. Naturally, the festivals they observed, as everything else they did, centred round some religious or philosophical ideal.

Though primarily of a religious nature, these festivals were not without the other sides of life also represented in them. Everything was given its due place, and no aspect was left out of the picture. In fact, these festivals had an educative value all their own. The persons who instituted them had in their minds all the intellectual, aesthetic, psychological, ethical, and moral implications resulting from them, and tried in various ways to provide for the full expression and development of the personality in all these spheres. Socially, these festivals, by bringing together large numbers of people to engage themselves in a common endeavour, helped to inculcate in them a sense of unity and brotherhood, and impressed on them the value of co-operative effort of which we hear so much nowadays. All these things were achieved by our ancient seers smoothly and imperceptibly, without the least fuss or confusion, under the pleasant veneer of mirth and joy, merriment and play, in the shape of these festivals. So a peep into the value of these festivals must usher us into a veritable mine of thought and wisdom, and open before us a vast vista of religious and philosophic treasure.

A fact to be remembered with regard to most of these festivals in India is that they are almost invariably associated with some mythological story or other. Mythology has often come under the ridicule and laughter of the ununderstanding modern generation as but the childish imaginations of puerile minds. This attitude is mainly due to ignorance of the proper place of mythology in the Indian scheme of life, and also due to a disinclination to understand things in their proper perspective. But, approached with an open mind, a little reflection and study is sure to make us realize that mythology was a clever device adopted by our wise ancestors to bring to the doors of

even the most unlearned person the benefits of their own experiences and realizations. By a beautiful combination of history and legend, education in all fields—art, literature, humanity, sciences—was imparted to the masses, easily and without any feeling of hardship on the latter's part, and at very little expense. Education—worldly or spiritual—means a careful handling of the human mind, and necessarily demands from the teacher a thorough knowledge of the mental and psychological apparatus of the student. And astonishingly enough, behind some of the simple stories of mythology, we find hidden great psychological truths.

The ultimate aim of all this, as pointed out earlier, was, of course, to make people feel the grandeur and greatness of a truly spiritual life, and thus lift them up slowly to the highest level of human and divine perfection. For this purpose, whenever a historical fact could be made use of, it was pressed into service. But when it was not available, imagination came into play. Imaginative and legendary stories were utilized to serve the same purpose. And around the stories were built up a number of external acts which, while they provided recreation and enjoyment and thus took away dreariness and boredom, at the same time brought about an inner revolution in the life of the participants, unknown to themselves very often.

Of the many festivals observed in different parts of India, Dīpāvali, or the Festival of Lights, as it is called, has been one which people in every village and town, to whatever strata of society they may belong, await with great eagerness. Days ahead, preparations for the festival go on in every house with much zeal and enthusiasm, and the actual arrival of it fills one and all, young or the old, the rich or the poor, official or the servant, farmer or the merchant, with unbounded happiness and joy. The deafening sounds of the squibs and crackers fill the air, and a visitor is greeted with the colourful display of the throw of fireworks. The country becomes a veritable mansion of beauty with the innumerable lights brightening up every house and corner of the street. Everywhere an exuberance of love and affection is manifest expressing itself in the felicitous meeting of friends and relatives, and the distribution of sweets to children and charity to the poor and the needy.

One of the many familiar stories found associated in different parts of India is that of the killing of Narakāsura by Śrī Kṛṣṇa. The demon, Naraka, born of Bhūmi (earth) by the touch of the Lord in His incarnation as Varāha, is a tyrant king with his capital situated at the city of Prāgjyotiṣa. Mad with his own physical power and strength, he has gone on many fighting expeditions, and after defeating many kings, carried away their young and beautiful princesses, sixteen thousand in all, to his own capital and kept them confined in his palace. Not satisfied with his lordship over the kings of the earth, he goes to fight with Indra, the king of the gods, drives him away from his position, and returns to his capital with Indra's umbrella and his mother Aditi's ear-rings. Indra complains to Kṛṣṇa of his fate. Kṛṣṇa pacifies him, and along with Satyabhāmā, flies on Garuḍa to the capital of Naraka. He kills Naraka and restores the ear-rings to Aditi, and the umbrella to Indra. Meanwhile the princesses kept confined by Naraka have all the time been 'contemplating Kṛṣṇa's lotus-feet that liberate individual souls (Jīvas) from bondage (Samsāra)'.[1] They all 'mentally choose' Kṛṣṇa as their beloved consort.[2] And Kṛṣṇa, the Lord of perfect bliss, at their own wish and desire, accepts all of them as his wives. This, in brief, is the story as narrated

1. Bhaumaṁ nihatya saganaṁ yudhi tena ruddhā
Jñātvātha naḥ kṣitijaye jitarājakanyāḥ,
Nirmucya saṁsṛti-vimokṣam-anusmarantīḥ
Pādāmbujam pariṇināya ya āptakāmaḥ. *Bhāg.* X. 83, 40.
2. Tam pravistaṁ striyo vīkṣya naravīraṁ vimohitāḥ,
Manasā vavrire'bhīṣṭam patiṁ daivopasāditam. *Ibid*, X 59. 34.

in the Bhāgavatam, forming the nucleus for the celebration of Dīpāvali.

Now this story may be historically true or not. That is beside the point and does not affect the social, moral, or spiritual lesson that we can derive from it. As a historical event, we may consider the festival as but the commemoration of a victorious war waged against a tyrannical monarch, which ended the oppression and misery inflicted by him on his snbjects and neighbouring kings. The recovery of the imprisoned princesses by Śrī Kṛṣṇa is of great social significance. When the whole world would have looked down upon them as having become unchaste (though for no fault of theirs) and fit only to be rejected, Śrī Kṛṣṇa accepts them openly and raises them to the rank of 'queens' that they richly deserved. To a world, beset with its strange and cruel notions of purity and social 'rejection', it is a great lesson to be learnt that forcible abduction of women does not stain their character in the least.

Apart from the historical aspect of it, the story contains in itself a philosophical ideal for the edification of mankind. The phenomenon of evolution from the state of the lowest inorganic matter to the appearance of life in the form of the plants and the primitive animals, upto the stage of man, meant till very recent times to many of the modern scientists, but a dead, mechanical operation taking place in nature without any purpose or aim. But to the ancient Indian thinkers and philosophers the same phenomenon meant something more. They saw in that a progressively higher and higher unveiling of the glory of a permanent, immortal, ever-perfect and all-blissful entity. This underlying essence, they called Brahman, when viewed as forming the background of the Cosmos, or Ātman, when looked at as the reality behind the individual personality. The evolution that is taking place in nature is, according to them, the result of a former involution of this Ātman or Brahman, and will ultimately come to an end with the regaining of its original perfection. This forms the main burden of the thought and philosophy of the Indian seers, and every story, every myth, every festival, and every ceremony was but an attempt to give expression to this idea and show the means of achieving it. The present story is also one such.

Philosophically Varāha (literally boar) in the above story is symbolic of the Ātman.[3] And Bhūmi (Earth) symbolizes matter and the material nature of things. Naraka represents the quality of Tamas.[4] The birth of Naraka through the contact of Bhūmi with Varāha only signifies the covering up of the real nature of the Ātman by the cloud of Tamas. The ambitious activities of Naraka, detailed in the story, are all characteristic of a life of Rajas. When under the control of Tamas and Rajas, a person, full of ignorance and doubt, and incapable of right judgements, acts always contrary to the injunctions of the scriptures. He would have very little regard for the words of men of wisdom. This state of mind can be likened to the attitude of the pseudo-scientific temperament towards things religious. This is represented by the incident of Naraka stealing the ear-rings of Aditi, and carrying away the umbrella of Indra. In that state of mind, all the instincts and emotions of a person are misdirected towards the fulfilment of his own lower desires and selfish ends. Naraka keeping the princesses confined is only symbolic of this misdirection of emotions and feelings. To such a person, acting under the influence of Tamas and Rajas to the utter neglect of the scriptures, the first thing necessary for evolving himself higher is the development of the Sattva and a faith in the scriptures. Kṛṣṇa coming on Garuḍa along with Satyabhāmā is symbolic of this further progress. Satyabhāmā represents Vidyā Śakti and Sattva. Garuḍa stands for the scriptures.[5] The whole story is only symbolic of the conquest of Rajas and Tamas by Sattva and the

3. Cf. 'tasya upaniṣad ahaḥ iti'. *Br. Up.* 5. 5. 3. 'Vara' means 'excellent, most beautiful and precious'.
4. Cf. 'Narakas-tama-unnāhaḥ'. *Bhāg.* XI. 19.43.
5. Cf. 'Chandomayena garuḍena samuhyamānaḥ'. *Bhag.* VIII. 3. 31.

sublimation of the various instincts and emotions of the mind to higher purposes, resulting in the realization of one's own real nature, or Ātman.

The use of the word 'Prāgjyotiṣa' for naming the capital of Naraka is highly suggestive in this context. The word literally means 'that which was full of light before'. Our body is often compared in our scriptures to a city.[6] Naraka, as said earlier, is nothing but the embodiment of the qualities of Tamas and Rajas. The Ātman in the heart is ever of the very essence of light. It is 'the Light even of lights, That is said to be beyond all darkness. Knowledge, the Knowable, the Goal of Knowledge. (It) is implanted in the heart of every one.'[7] But darkness of Tamas and Rajas which have, as it were, taken possession of our body and mind, has covered up this innate purity and brightness of the Ātman within. Our duty lies in struggling to get rid of this darkness. This reminds us of the words of Śrī Rāmakrishna: "The shrine of the body should not be kept dark. One should illumine it with the lamp of wisdom. Every house has a connection for gas. Apply to the Gas Company and it will arrange for your supply of gas. Then your house will be lighted."[8]

May the innumerable lights lighted on the occasion of Dīpāvali inspire us to apply to the 'Gas Company' and get our hearts illuminated!

6. Cf. 'Navadvāre pure dehī'. *Gītā*, V. 13; and 'Sṛṣṭvā purāṇi' etc. of *Bhag*. XI. 9.28.

7. Jyotiṣāmapi tajjyotiḥ tamasaḥ paramucyate, Jñānaṁ jñeyaṁ jñānagamyaṁ hṛdi sarvasya dhiṣṭitam.-*Gītā*, XIII. 17.

8. *Gospel of Sri Ramakrishna* (1st edition), p. 128.

EVENTS IN THE YEAR OF THE KURU WAR

(HISTORICAL SEQUENCE)

By Prof. V. B. Athavale

(Continued from the previous issue)

The first 19 chapters of Udyoga-parva are rightly called 'Senodyoga' by Sauti because they indicate the efforts by each to collect armies on their sides. Udyo. 4 gives the list of the kings who were invited by Drupada to join the Pāṇḍava side. The case of Śalya is unique, because he started to join the Pāṇḍavas but he was accosted by Duryodhana on the way and thus he decided to join the Kaurava side. Sauti had to write Ch. 8-11 to explain the fact. The name of the 49th Parva of Vyāsa is also 'Senodyoga'.

Udyo. 20-32 are 'Sañjaya-yāna'. For, Sañjaya was sent to Upaplāvya by Dhṛtarāṣṭra after the emissary from Drupada had returned. The 50th Parva of Vyāsa is also called Sañjayayāna. Ch. 33-40 is 'Prajāgara', Ch. 41-46 is 'Sanatsujāta', Ch. 41-71 is Yāna-sandhi. The 51st, 52nd, and 53rd Parvas of Vyāsa have exactly the same names. As these Parvas deal with the philosophical discussions, we can ignore them.

Ch. 72-150 of Sauti are called 'Bhagavadyāna'. 54th Parva of Vyāsa has exactly the same name. It tells how Kṛṣṇa started from Upaplāvya to go to Hastinapur and what incidents occurred there till he returned and his meeting with Karṇa and Sañjaya in the chariot just before he left Hastinapur. The 55th Parva of Vyāsa is called Karṇa-vivāda-parva

which means this meeting of Kṛṣṇa and Karṇa.

We can now follow the events from Ch. 72. Verse 15 gives (a) Avisthala, (b) Vṛkasthala, (c) Makandi, (d) Vāraṇāvata, (e) any other 5th as the minimum demand for negotiations. Vāraṇāvata can be identified as Varnava and it is 35 miles north of Delhi. Lākṣā-gṛha (shellac house) incident occurred there. Ādi. 138.73 tells that Makandi is near Kampilya, the capital of South Pāncāla, where the marriage of Draupadī took place. Kampil is a village four miles north of the Kaimganj railway station on the Mathura Farukabad line. Five miles west of Kampil is a village called Bhargain. Ādi. 191.1, refers to this place as Bhārgava-yāna, where the Pāṇḍavas arrived for the Swayamvara of Draupadī. Vṛkasthala is the place where Kṛṣṇa halted on his way to Hastinapur.

Verses 32-47 are some questions raised by Yudhiṣṭhira. There is a close resemblance of these with the questions raised by Arjuna in Gītā I. 34-47. Ch. 73.1-7 is a reply of Kṛṣṇa to the questions raised by Yudhiṣṭhira. The words 'kārpaṇya' and the 'laws of Prajāpati' about the behaviour of a Kṣatriya closely resemble Gītā II. 7-49; III. 10-16. Verses 36-37 say that Kṛṣṇa told Yudhiṣṭhira that he would put forth this minimum demand as their legal and moral right and never as a favour. If they did not agree, he would declare war and come back. It appears that Maharṣi Vyāsa had gone to Upaplāvya on this occasion. For, Śalya. 62.32, says that when the Pāṇḍavas entered the Śibira of Duryodhana, on the river Dṛṣadvati after his defeat in the mace fight, Yudhiṣṭhira said, 'Upaplāvya maharṣih me Kṛṣṇaḥ-Dwaipāyano' bravīt Yato dharmaḥ tataḥ Kṛṣṇaḥ, yataḥ Kṛṣṇaḥ tato jayaḥ'. Gītā, the composition of Vyāsa ends exactly with the same verse.

Chs. 74-82 are the discussions of Bhīma and others before Kṛṣṇa departed. Ch. 83.6-21 tell that Kṛṣṇa started in the Kaumuda month, when the moon was in Revati and the Śarad season had not yet ended. In the Pāṇḍava period, the Āśvina month was called Kaumuda. For, the Kārtika month is directly referred to in Sabhā. 23.29 and Bhīṣma. 2.23. The Bhādrapada month is called 'proṣṭhapada' in Bhīṣma. 3.15.

In the Āśvina month, the moon is in Revati on 14th of the bright half. Hence the day of the departure of Kṛṣṇa gets fixed. Ch. 84.1-4 tell that ten Mahārathis accompanied Kṛṣṇa and Sātyaki was one of them. One thousand other soldiers were asked to follow them in order to be ready for any emergency. Ch. 88.12 tells that people used to travel by chariots at the rate of 14 Yojanas per day. (1 Yojana = $4\frac{1}{2}$ miles. 1 Dhanu = 4 hands = 6 feet; 1000 Dhanus = 1 Krośa; 2 Krośa = Gavyūti; 4 Krośa = Yojana = 4 or 5 miles). On horseback, a man could cover 100 miles in 8 hours.

Ch. 85.16 tells that the party reached Vṛkasthala in the evening, and Duryodhana had made arrangements for their reception there. Ch. 86.1-19 say that Dhṛtarāṣṭra told Vidura that Kṛṣṇa had reached Vṛkasthala from Upaplāvya and he was expected to reach Hastinapur the next day. He asked the men to keep the house of Duḥśāsana ready to accommodate the party because it was larger than the house of Duryodhana.

Ch. 88.12-18 tell that Duryodhana asked his father not to divulge his plan of imprisoning Kṛṣṇa, but his father did not like this treachery in the case of a *Dūta* like Kṛṣṇa. We have already seen that Kṛṣṇa had anticipated this move and had made arrangements for this emergency. Ch. 89 tells that Kṛṣṇa reached Hastinapur in the afternoon. He accepted the formal reception but went to stay with Vidura, who did not stay at Hastinapur, but at Daranagar, a place 10 miles from Hastinapur. The *Meerut Gazetteer* has recorded this tradition. Hence Kṛṣṇa must have arrived at Hastinapur on Āśvin Vadhya 1st.

Ch. 90 tells that Kṛṣṇa went to meet Kuntī on the next day in the afternoon. Ch. 91 tells that after meeting Kuntī, Kṛṣṇa went to the house of Duryodhana and found that

Karṇa, Śakuni and Duḥśāsana were also there. Then Duryodhana invited Kṛṣṇa for dinner but Kṛṣṇa refused. When Duryodhana asked Kṛṣṇa as to why he did not take advantage of the facilities that were offered to him for his stay in the town, Kṛṣṇa replied that he had come there to negotiate peace and not to enjoy feasts and facilities. It is the duty of a 'Dūta' (emissary) to finish his job first and then to think of felicity and receptions. Duryodhana said, 'How is it possible for me to foretell the result of your mission? The assembly will decide it after it meets.'

In Ch. 91.22, Duryodhana says, 'Pāṇḍavas are our enemies but you are not. We are inviting you as our friend and relative. We do not understand why you should refuse our cordiality.' Verses 23-32 is the famous reply of Kṛṣṇa to this taunt. 'I shall never divert from the righteous path.' Nāham kāmāt na samārambhāt, no dweṣāt, na arthakāraṇāt na hetuvādāt lobhāt vā dharmam jahyām kathamcana. You are hating the righteous Pāṇḍavas even from their childhood. I am always on the side of the righteous. I hate those who hate the righteous. I never accept the food of the unrighteous nor their cordiality. Vidura is righteous and hence I am staying with him.'

Ch. 94-95 tell how Kṛṣṇa went to the assembly meeting for negotiations. Ch. 96-123 is an Upākhyāna of Mātali. But as this is not mentioned in the Parvas by Vyāsa, we can ignore it. Ch. 124-128 give the detailed account of the meeting. Ch. 127.25 is the famous statement of Duryodhana that the Pāṇḍavas can never get even a portion of the land of the size of a sharp point of a needle. Ch. 128.22, Duḥśāsana tells Duryodhana that if he did not accept the negotiations, 'Kṛṣṇa would capture you and hand you over to the Pāṇḍavas.' Verse 50 tells that Kṛṣṇa then asked Dhṛtarāṣṭra to imprison Karṇa, Śakuni, Duḥśāsana and Duryodhana so that he would take them over to the Pāṇḍavas. Ch. 129-131 tell how the plans of Duryodhana to imprison Kṛṣṇa failed, because Sātyaki knew the plans through Vidura and he asked Kṛtavarmā Bhoja to keep the thousand soldiers ready at the entrance to carry Kṛṣṇa safely to Vidura.

Ch. 132 tells that Kṛṣṇa went to meet Kuntī on his way, and told her about the failure of the negotiations and asked her the message to be given to the Pāṇḍavas. Verse 34 "Yudhyasva rājadharmeṇa mā nimajjīḥ pitāmahān mā gamaḥ kṣīṇapuṇyah tvam sānujaḥ pāpikām gatim." Ch. 133-137 is an Upākhyāna which is not referred to by Vyāsa and hence it can be ignored. Ch. 137.25-29 tell that after meeting Kuntī, Kṛṣṇa had a long discussion with Karṇa in the chariot while Kṛṣṇa was returning to Upaplāvya from Hastinapur. Ch. 140-143 is a talk between Dhṛtarāṣṭra and Sañjaya about the meeting of Kṛṣṇa and Karṇa in the chariot, because Sañjaya was with Karṇa on that occasion.

The most important part of the talk is that we know the day on which this meeting took place. Ch. 142.18 tells that the Amāvāsyā was on the 7th day from that date. Hence the day must be the 8th in the dark half of the current month. Ch. 143.8-10 tell that Saturn is in Rohiṇī, Mars is retrograding from Jyeṣṭhā to Anurādhā, Rāhu is receding towards Chitrā from Swāti and hence there might be a solar eclipse on the Amāvāsyā day. Venus is in Proṣṭhapada. We know that Kṛṣṇa arrived at Hastinapur on the next day after the Āśvina full moon. Hence the day of the meeting of Kṛṣṇa, Karṇa, and Sañjaya must be Āśvin dark 8th.

S. WARIS ALI SHAH OF DEWA

By Dr. M. Hafiz Syed

In the first quarter of the nineteenth century when the British rule had been established, a child was born in a small town in Oudh, whose word and example were destined to influence the religious conceptions and ideals of a large number of human beings. He was Shah Waris Ali of Dewa. It is an ancient town to the north of Bara Banki in Uttar Pradesh. The Shah came of a family of Husaini Sayyads distinguished for piety and learning. His father, S. Kurban Ali, was a man of considerable learning and had completed his education in Baghdad. Shah saheb was born in the year 1819 A.D. He was not quite three years old when he lost both of his parents. At the age of five he committed the Holy Quran to memory in two years' time. He did not take any interest in the study of other subjects. He preferred to spend his time in solitude rather than in the study of his books. He used to run away to out-of-the way places. Once on his search being made, he was discovered in a jungle sitting alone absorbed in meditation. He was never seen playing with the children of his age. He was very fond of giving money in charity to poor people.

His biographers have left nothing on record about his intellectual attainments and learning. People round about him discovered in course of time that he had little or no interest in worldly affairs. His brother-in-law, Khadim Ali Shah, a Sufi of no mean order, took charge of this precocious boy's education. When he was only eleven years old he was initiated into the mysteries of Sufism.

At the age of fourteen he commenced his mission and started initiating people into his order and a large number of disciples gathered round him. At the age of fifteen he started on a pilgrimage to Mecca. He gave away all his property including a valuable library to his relatives and consigned all the documents relating to the landed estates which he owned till then, to a pond.

That he led an ascetic life from his early age is indicated by the fact that he ate once in three days. For twelve long years he travelled in Arabia, Syria, Palestine, Mesopotamia, Persia, Turkey, Russia, and Germany. He performed the Hajj ten times in the course of his travel.

Thousands of persons are said to have become his disciples during his sojourn in the countries which were at one time the birth place of Islam. There is no instance on record of one so young starting life as a Darvesh and attracting so much notice, specially in foreign lands. His biographers say that he was a born-saint. It is interesting to note that on the occasion of his visit to Berlin Shah saheb was a guest of Prince Bismarck. He went on pilgrimage to Mecca seven times from India. Three times out of seven he completed his journey barefooted.

When he returned home after more than a decade, his own people could not recognize him. His paternal house was in ruins. He went round the village but no one came forward to welcome a faqir like him. After this experience he went away. Next some people saw him just before the Mutiny. He spent about fifty years of his life in travelling far and wide in different parts of the world. It was not till 1899 that he again came to his home town, Dewa, to stay permanently at the earnest request of some of his disciples.

Shah saheb's asceticism led him to adopt a life of complete celibacy. Being habitually absorbed in divine contemplation, he was a man of few words. He usually spoke rather quickly and in soft tone with downcast eyes. He often repeated his words to emphasize their meaning. He had a sense of humour.

He was particularly good and considerate to the poor and his general bearing was one of humility. His exterior corresponded to his interior. His features were handsome, with an unusually broad and intellectual forehead. But his eyes formed the centre of attraction. They possessed a magnetic power which was quite irresistible. He never sat on a chair or a sofa nor did he use a bedstead. He slept on the floor, throughout his life, but without a pillow to rest his head on. Some of his close disciples bear testimony to the fact that they never found him fast asleep.

We have already referred to his habit of fasting. It may be added that from the age of fifteen to forty, it is reported on good authority that he ate only once in three days. He proved by his example that "man liveth not by bread alone but by every word that cometh out of the mouth of God."

Shah saheb belonged to the Qadiriya and Chistiya school of Sufism. The keynote of his system was Divine and Universal love. The Sufis believe that the eternal order of the universe is based on love. It may therefore be stated as one of the first principles of mystic philosophy that the deeper a man's love of God is, the greater is his spiritual knowledge in due proportion to his capacity and depth of love. This in a word was the quintessence of Shah Waris Ali's so inspiring teaching.

We have already stated that he was given to contemplation from his early childhood. With his growing years the habit gained such force that he had practically lost all self-consciousness.

The Sufis believe that the final consummation of the love of God is union with God. "In that state," to use the words of Al Ghazzali, "man is effaced from self", so that he is neither conscious of his body nor of outer phenomena. Even the thought that his self is effaced should not occur to him for a moment. This was doubtless the state of spiritual height to which Shah saheb had attained. It is remarkable that he never mentioned his own name nor did he ever write it with his own hand. It may be taken as an indication of the fact that he had effaced himself to such an extent that he was not even conscious of his own separate existence. It is the crown of spiritual height, the highest form of self-realization according to the Sufis.

A Sufi has to pass through several stages on the path of spiritual progress, out of which the two most important are complete dependence upon God and resignation to His will.

It has already been stated that Shah saheb had given away all his property and there was nothing which he could call his own. He did not accept any present in the form of money, nor did he ever touch it. Whenever anything was given to him as a gift, he immediately gave it away to other people.

It is said that he showed a stoical indifference to the disagreeables of life. He never complained even of the inclemency of the weather. He never said a word that might convey the sense of suffering. He did not like to hear other people speak of their troubles and enjoined complete resignation to the will of God. Far from claiming to alter the decrees of Heaven, he moved in perfect harmony with the Divine will.

The inner bent of his mind and his inward occupation prevented him from holding long discourses and giving sermons and this may account for the lack of any systematic teaching left behind by him. His biographers have been able to collect just some of his pithy precepts based upon his own direct knowledge which are chronicled here for the benefit of the readers:—

(1) Love of God is not easily acquired by self-effort. It is inborn in a man by virtue of his spiritual evolution.
(2) There is no method in love.
(3) Distance does not count in love. "If you love me," says Shah saheb, "I am with you even if you are at a distance of a thousand miles."
(4) "My disciples are my children. They should love one another like brothers."
(5) Do not ask God for anything even if you are starving, for He knows what is

good for you. What is called worldliness is nothing short of forgetfulness of God and His existence. A true faqir wants nothing because he has renounced everything. Trust in God fully and completely. If you rely upon Him wholeheartedly, you need not worry about your daily wants. Not a moment should pass without constant memory of God. It is no use going to the Kaba for those who cannot see God here and now. The same God is to be found in the mosque, the church and the pagoda. God does not live on the empyrean. He exists everywhere.

The seers of the essence of things of all ages say that God manifests Himself chiefly in man whom He created after His own image. One can see Him in His manifestation in the human soul. Once Shah saheb said, "The seat of God is not to be found in Heaven alone. You should seek Him in your own hearts."

Sufism has a broad outlook; its spiritual depth cannot be fathomed, nor its height be measured. A genuine Sufi is a friend of every creature. He makes no distinction between man and man. He adores the hidden life vibrant in every atom. In consonance with this ideal Shah saheb freely admitted into his order men and women of different religions, people of every caste, sex, or colour. He had fully realized that all are but parts of one stupendous Whole and he openly declared that in his sight Hindus, Muslims, Jews, Christians were alike in spiritual essence. In his presence one felt truly the touch of natnre which makes the whole world kin. Unlike other Sufi saints he did not initiate people privately. He had different formulae for members of different faiths. He did not advise non-muslims to disregard or renounce their religion in which they were born. On the contrary he advised them to follow it with greater zeal and sincerity. The extraordinary spell exercised by him not only on the popular mind but on the rich and the poor, the educated and the illiterate alike, can only be accounted for in the light of the principle that if you have all the world to love you, you must first love all the world. He disliked all formalism and seemed to agree with Jalaluddin Rumi who once said, "Fools exalt the mosque, but ignore the true temple in heart."

He impressed upon the minds of his disciples the fact that one should pray to God for its own sake and not with the hope of gaining any spiritual or temporal good. He was of the opinion that when a man identifies himself with God, His powers are manifested through Him unconsciously.

Some of his Hindu devotees believed that he was an incarnation of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. All his followers acknowledged his spiritual greatness.

He lived beyond the allotted span of life, three score years and ten, and peacefully passed away on 17th April, 1905. He was buried at the spot where he died. His tomb is respected as a sacred shrine which upto the present day is resorted to by his followers, devotees, and admirers year after year in large numbers. His sense of common humanity and his wide sympathies enabled him to break away from the artificial bars of religion and made people of various shades of opinion understand and love each other as brothermen. What he achieved by the sheer force of his *spiritual will* and *silence,* was never accomplished by any man, however great and distinguished he might have been. His only mission was to teach the Unity and Love of God to all mankind.

'What good is it if we acknowledge in our prayers that God is the Father of us all, and in our daily lives do not treat every man as brother?'

—*Swami Vivekananda*

ŚRĪ-BHĀṢYA

By Swami Vireswarananda

(*Continued from previous issue*)

Topic 4 :

THE SUPREME PERSON TO BE MEDITATED UPON IS THE SUPREME BRAHMAN

In the last topic it was shown that Brahman is not an object of sight: 'Verily this Imperishable, O Gārgi, is never seen, but is the seer' etc. (*Bṛh.* 3.8.11.) Therefore the Person who is described as the object of the act of seeing in *Pr.* 5.5 cannot be the supreme Brahman. To remove such a doubt this topic is begun.

ईक्षतिकर्म व्यपदेशात् सः ॥ १।३।१२ ॥

12. Because of his being mentioned as an object of (the act of) seeing, he (the supreme Brahman, is that object).

'He again who meditates upon the supreme Person with the syllable Om consisting of three Mātrās, he comes to the light and to the sun. He is freed from all sins, even as a snake is freed from its slough. He is taken up to the world of Brahmā (Brahmaloka) by the Sāman hymns; He *sees* the Person dwelling in the heart who is supreme, higher than the individual souls' (*Pr.* 5.5). The question here is whether the object of *meditation* and *seeing* is Hiraṇyagarbha (Brahmā), the presiding deity of Brahmaloka, or the supreme Brahman. The opponent holds it is Hiraṇyagarbha. In the preceding verse it has been stated that he who meditates upon one Mātrā, returns to the world of men where he enjoys; that he who meditates on two Mātrās attains the world of the moon in the heavens. After that the text says, 'He, again, who meditates on the supreme Person with the syllable Om consisting of three Mātrās' etc. The Brahmaloka mentioned in the text can be only the world of Hiraṇyagarbha as that is situated above the world of heavens. So the Person seen as a result of this meditation on the three Mātrās and who is said to be in the Brahmaloka can be only Hiraṇyagarbha (Brahmā), its presiding deity.

This view the Sūtra refutes and says that the supreme Person is the supreme Brahman. For in the text we find that one bereft of all sins sees the supreme Person. The place reached by such a person cannot be merely the world of Hiraṇyagarbha, and so the object of *seeing* cannot be this Hiraṇyagarbha. With respect to this Person the text says later, 'By the Sāmans is attained that which is known only to the wise. What is peaceful, immortal, free from all fear and supreme, the sage also attains by means of this Om' (*Pr.* 5.7). From the words, 'That which is known only to the wise', one recognizes the world of Viṣṇu, the supreme Brahman, mentioned in the text, 'The wise behold always that supreme abode of Viṣṇu' (*Subal. Up.* 6). The qualities mentioned in the text, viz. peaceful, immortal etc. are apt only in the case of the supreme Brahman and not in the case of Hiraṇyagarbha. Moreover, in *Pr.* 5.5 we have, 'He sees the supreme Person', in which one recognizes the supreme Person mentioned in, 'So the wise man, freed from name and form, goes to the supreme Person' (*Mu.* 3.2.8). That this *Muṇḍaka* text refers to the supreme Brahman has been shown while discussing *B.S.* 1.2.22. So the object of seeing is the supreme Brahman and none else, as its qualities are mentioned.

Topic 5:

THE SMALL ĀKĀŚA IS BRAHMAN

In the last topic it was shown that the Person in the heart (*Pr.* 5.5) is Brahman. But

as this Person in the heart is designated by the word Ākāśa (*Ch.* 8.1.1) which commonly denotes the material ether, a doubt may arise about the Person in the heart being the supreme Brahman. To remove this doubt this topic is begun.

दहर उत्तरेभ्यः ॥ १।३।१३ ॥

13. The small (Ākāśa) (is Brahman) because of the subsequent texts (which mention the qualities of Brahman).

'Now there is in this city of Brahman (the body) a small lotus-like palace (the heart), and in it is a small Ākāśa. What exists within that small Ākāśa is to be sought, that is to be understood' (*Ch.* 8.1.1). Now the question is: What is this small Ākāśa? Is it the material ether which is the ordinary meaning of the word Ākāśa, or is it the individual soul or Brahman? The opponent holds that as the ordinary meaning of the word Ākāśa is material ether, and as it is also designated as small, it can only be either the ether or the individual soul and not Brahman. The Sūtra refutes this view and says that the small Ākāśa is Brahman, as the texts later on say that it is the support of the whole world (*Ch.* 8.1.3) and free from all sins, old age, death etc., and that its desires are all fulfilled and resolves turn out true (*Ch.* 8.1.5).

A further objection is raised that as the text says that what is within this small Ākāśa is to be sought, the small Ākāśa is only the abode of something else which is the object that is desired, and that the small Ākāśa is not itself this object. This objection cannot stand for the following reasons: The small Ākāśa is said to be the real city of Brahman, the Self in *Ch.* 8.1.5, and the rest, the desires contained in it, are its qnalities. So *Ch.* 8.1.1 should be understood as saying that the small Ākāśa together with the desires contained in it, i.e. the qualities that abide in it, should be sought. This is made all the more clear by *Ch.* 8.1.6 where it is said, 'But those who depart from here, having understood the Self and these true desires (i.e. the qualities mentioned in *Ch.* 8.1.5), for them there is freedom to act as they wish in all the worlds' and not those who depart without the knowledge of these two, viz. Ākāśa and its qualities.

गतिशब्दाभ्यां, तथा हि दृष्टं, लिङ्गं च ॥ १।३।१४ ॥

14. (The small Ākāśa is Brahman) on account of the going (into Brahman) and of the word (Brahmaloka); (the individual soul's going into Brahman) is likewise seen (from other Śruti texts); and (there is) an indicatory sign.

'Thus do all creatures day after day go into *this* Brahmaloka' etc. (*Ch.* 8.3.2). The word *this* in the text connects the place where these creatures go into day by day with the subject-matter of the chapter, viz. the small Ākāśa. Again the word *this* is co-ordinated with Brahmaloka, thereby showing that the small Ākāśa is the supreme Brahman. In other Śruti texts also we find that this going of the individual souls daily into Brahman in the state of deep sleep is mentioned. 'All these creatures having become united with the Real (*Sat*) do not know that they are united with the Real' (*Ch.* 6.9.2). The word Brahmaloka is also used to designate the supreme Brahman in other texts also. 'This is the world that is Brahman' (*Bṛh.* 4.3.32). Moreover, it is not necessary to get the support of other texts to show that the creatures go daily into Brahman. The text itself says that as at the time of Pralaya (dissolution) so also in deep sleep state the individnal souls get merged in the small Ākāśa and are free from all sufferings. This is a sufficient indicatory sign to show that the small Ākāśa is the supreme Brahman. Again the word 'Brahmaloka' which refers to the small Ākāśa establishes that the latter is the supreme Brahman if we interpret 'Brahmaloka' as the world which is Brahman itself and not as the world *of* Brahmā. There is therefore no need of support from other scriptural texts.

धृतेश्च महिम्नोऽस्यास्मिन्नुपलब्धेः ॥ १।३।१५ ॥

15. Moreover on account of the snpporting

(of the world by the small Ākāśa, it is Brahman) for this greatness is seen in that (i.e. Brahman) (only).

'That Self is a bank, a limiting support, so that the worlds may not get confounded' (*Ch.* 8.4.1)—in this text we find, in the small Ākāśa, that greatness of the supreme Brahman by way of holding the worlds asunder. Therefore it is the supreme Brahman. That this greatness belongs to Brahman alone is seen from other Śruti texts. 'Under the mighty rule of that Imperishable, O Gārgi, the sun and the moon are held in their positions' (*Bṛh.* 3.8.9); 'It is the demarcating bank for keeping these worlds distinct from one another' (*Bṛh.* 4.4.22).

प्रसिद्धेश्च ॥ १।३।१६ ॥

16. Also because of the well-known meaning (of Ākāśa as Brahman, the small Ākāśa is Brahman).

In scriptural texts the word 'Ākāśa' is used to denote Brahman also. 'Who indeed, would breathe, who would remain alive, if this Bliss was not in the ether (Ākāśa)!' (*Tait.* 2.7). 'All these beings take their rise from Ākāśa (ether) alone' (*Ch.* 1.9.1). As the qualities like being free from sin etc. are predicated of this (small) Ākāśa, its meaning as Brahman is stronger than the other meaning which signifies merely the material ether.

इतर परामर्शात् स इति चेत्, न., असम्भवात् ॥ १।३।१७ ॥

17. Because of the reference to the other (i.e. the individual soul in a complimentary passage) if it be said that it (is meant by the small Ākāśa) (we say) no, on account of the impossibility (of such an assumption).

The other i.e. the individual soul. 'Now that being, the individual soul in deep sleep, which having risen above this earthly body' (*Ch.* 8.3.4)—in this passage the individual soul is referred to and so the opponent holds that the small Ākāśa is this individual soul. This, however, cannot be, for the qualities mentioned in *Ch.* 8.1.5 are impossible in its case.

उत्तराच्चेत्, आविर्भूतस्वरूपस्तु ॥ १।३।१८ ॥

18. If (it be said) that from subsequent texts (which refer to the individual soul, the small Ākāśa means it) (we say) but (that reference to it is in so far as its) real nature is made manifest.

An objection is raised that in *Ch.* 8.7.1 the individual soul is described as free from sin etc., therefore it is quite possible to interpret small Ākāśa as referring to it. Moreover, as the three states, waking, sleeping, and deep sleep are predicated of it, the reference is only to the individual soul and not Brahman, as these three states do not apply in the case of Brahman. So the individual soul is the topic of the teaching and hence small Ākāśa means the individual soul and not the supreme Brahman.

The second half of this Sūtra refutes this and says that the reference to the individual soul as free from sin etc. is in so far as it has realized its real nature. In the state of bondage (Samsāra) its real nature is hidden from it, due to Karma, and it suffers pain and pleasure. But when it frees itself from Karma and rises above the body, i.e. gets disembodied and approaches the supreme light i.e. Brahman, its real nature which is freedom from sin etc. is manifested. But the earlier sections deal with the small Ākāśa whose nature is never hidden and is always free from sin etc. Moreover, the texts ascribe other qualities to the small Ākāśa which are not true of the individual soul even in the state of release—qualities like being a bank or support of the worlds. The small Ākāśa, therefore, is none other than the supreme Brahman.

अन्यार्थश्च परामर्शः ॥ १।३।१९ ॥

19. And the reference (to the individual soul) is for a different purpose.

'Now that being, having risen out of this body and reaching the highest light, appears in its own true form' (*Ch.* 8.3.4). Here the individual soul is brought in to show that by meditation on the small Ākāśa it attains its

true nature and not to show that it is the small Ākāśa.

अल्पश्रुतेरिति चेत्, तदुक्तम् ॥ १।३।२० ॥

20. If it be said that because the Śruti declares the limitedness (of this Ākāśa, it cannot be the supreme Brahman); (we say) that has already been explained.

The text declares that the Ākāśa within the heart is small; and so it can be only the limited individual soul that is referred to and not the supreme Brahman. This objection has already been answered in *B.S.* 1.2.7 where it has been shown that for the sake of meditation Brahman may be viewed as of small size.

Therefore it is clear from the foregoing Sūtras that the small Ākāśa is the supreme Brahman which is ever perfect and has an infinite number of exalted qualities. On the other hand the being taught by Prajāpati as being under bondage, and attaining its true nature later when it approaches the highest light, is the individual soul and not the small Ākāśa.

अनुकृतेस्तस्य च ॥ १।३।२१ ॥

21. And on account of the attaining of the likeness of that.

As the individual soul is said to attain the likeness of the supreme light, the small Ākāśa, by meditating on it, the individual soul cannot be this small Ākāśa.

The attainment of the likeness of the supreme Brahman by the individual soul in a state of freedom consists in its being free from sin etc. So the one which attains this likeness, (viz. the individual soul) and the one whose likeness is attained (the small Ākāśa, the supreme Brahman) are different. This attainment of likeness by the individual soul is also taught in other scriptural texts. 'When the seer sees the self-effulgent Being—ruler, maker, and source of the creator (Brahmā)—then that wise one, shaking off merits and demerits, attains supreme likeness, being free from all passions (*Mu.* 3.1.3).

अपि स्मर्यते ॥ १।३।२२

22. The Smṛti also states this (attainment of likeness by the individual soul).

Smṛti (Gītā) also says that the individual soul, by meditation on it, attains its likeness in attributes. Vide Gītā 14.2.

(To be continued)

NOTES AND COMMENTS

TO OUR READERS

Swami Vivekananda's lecture on "Krishna" was given on April 1, 1900. It is one of the number of previously unpublished lectures given in the San Francisco area that were noted down at the time of delivery by Ida Ansell and transcribed for publication only a short time before her death. Swamiji is reported as having spoken so arrestingly as to make any complete record of his words difficult to make. In the interest of absolute faithfulness, when transcribing them no alterations were made in the somewhat incomplete notes Ida Ansell was able to take down. Where omissions were left because of some obscurity, these in the printed version have been indicated by three dots. Any matter added for purposes of clarification has been placed in square brackets. . . .

Śrī K. R. R. Sastry is the Principal of the University Law College, Jaipur. In his brief article, he has shown that the mystic state

brings with it 'a sense of expansion of being and an increase of understanding.' By the mention of Śrī Ramaṇa Maharṣi, he has brought his list of the great mystics of our land down to the 20th century. An exposition of the special contributions of the important Ālwārs and Nāyanmārs will be welcome . . .

We are grateful to Swami Pavitranandaji, Head of the Vedanta Society of New York, for sending us the very interesting article on 'Art and Religion'. Georg Olden is the Director of Graphic Arts for the Columbia Broadcasting System Television Network and a member of the Vedanta Society of New York. He has most imperceptibly led us to the very heart of genuine art and religious inspiration. The whole section explaining how the artist proceeds to arrive at THE solution is finished with a few brilliant and sure strokes of the pen, possible only for one who has mastered the two essential processes: meditation, inclusive of 'exhaustive visual editing', and effective control of the 'physical paraphernalia' needed to bring 'this inner vision faithfully into the light of day.'. . .

'Idealistic trend,' says Prof. R. C. Wadhera, M.A., M.Ed., 'basically aims to popularize and universalize educational opportunities and facilities with an eye to individual and social development to the optimum level in balanced consistency.' It is meant to 'furnish generous vision without which individuals and institutions deteriorate, decay, and die away.' According to its principles, 'child is approached and treated as a temple of God.' His 'untapped potentialities are awakened and brought into play through judicious provision of positive, ample, and worthwhile experiences.' Naturally, in such a programme of work, 'Teacher assumes and enjoys a pivotal position.' His personality has to be compelling, his methods effective, his life a dedicated mission, and his work typifying a sort of worship.' Those with teaching experience will see the wisdom of the remark: 'Attitudes are caught through emotional contagion and are not taught formally in the impersonal, business-like atmosphere prevailing in most of the teaching institutions that are correctly described as teaching shops.' The article abounds in useful quotations and is highly suggestive. The writer has rightly emphasized that the 'total personality' has to be 'cultivated in all the major areas of living' and that life itself should be given the 'exciting task of winning over our self completely' and of establishing 'communion with the Unseen Power.' . . . .

'The Logic of Relations in Vedānta' is a very well thought out article on the same lines as 'Logic of Being in Vedānta', contributed by Dr. Sastri last year. The comments we made in October '56, when the first instalment of the latter was published, apply equally to this article also, which is 'extremely closely reasoned', 'every line of which, as is evidenced from the numerous references', indicates 'the tremendous amount of trouble the author has bestowed upon it.' 'It is a masterpiece of translating Indian philosophical thought of highly polemical character into Western terminology in simple lucid sentences.' 'The article is tough reading so far as the arguments are concerned. But the lucidity of the author's language sustains the reader throughout.' . . . 'Without the category of difference, we cannot establish the reality of the external world with which is bound the logical activity.' But then many questions arise: 'Is there only one difference? Or are there many differences?' 'When we say that x and y differ, is this difference one of form? Is it one of mutual exclusion? Is it any dissimilarity?' These and many other questions are in turn raised and their logical implications analyzed to the farthest limit possible. On reading Dr. Sastri's article one realizes that there can be an evolution of arguments resembling the methodical movement of a simple musical phrase into every possible intricate and appealing combination of notes till their beauties reach their natural climax, and it becomes necessary to drop it smoothly

and take up another equally charming for a similar treatment . . . This time, too, paucity of space has compelled us to publish the article in three consecutive issues beginning with the present one . . .

Many festivals are common for all parts of India, but the stories associated with a few of them are not the same everywhere. There are local differences; and the Festival of Lights is one such. But whatever stories are accepted as the background for the festivals 'the philosophical ideal' they hold up 'for the edification of mankind' remains unchanged. Sri Kamala Kant, who is well versed in the Upaniṣads as well as Itihāsa-Purāṇa, has clearly shown 'the intellectual, aesthetic, psychological, ethical and moral implications' of such stories in general, and of the Narakāsura episode of the *Bhāgavata* in particular. The sages who composed these stories and organized the festivals aimed at lifting people up, according to their own speeds, 'to the highest level of human and divine perfection.' . . . It is easy to see that the main defect in the outlook of Narakāsura, as described in the *Bhāgavata,* is usually present in a much greater scale in society as a whole, and more particularly, in modern society with its global problems of war, more than of peace! As the writer aptly concludes, let this festival inspire us to apply to the 'Gas Company' to 'get our hearts illumined!' . . .

Throughout the ages there have been some eminent people who resigned themselves completely to the will of God and thereby made themselves channels for the free flow of His grace. What they thus 'freely' got, they 'freely gave' to all irrespective of man-made barriers of caste or creed. S. Waris Ali Shah of Dewa was one such precious soul. While giving us a brief account of the saint's life, Dr. M. Hafiz Syed, M.A., Ph.D. D.Litt., has taken care to stress many features that are of vital importance to all of us at the present day. 'The seers of the essence of things of all ages,' he reminds us, 'say that God manifests Himself chiefly in man whom He created in His own image. One can see Him in His manifestation in the human soul.' 'A genuine Sufi,' he adds, 'is a friend of every creature. He makes no distinction between man and man.' Waris Ali Shah, the great Sufi, 'openly declared that in his sight Hindus, Muslims, Jews, Christians were alike in spiritual essence.' He did not advise non-muslims to disregard or renounce their religion in which they were born. On the contrary he advised them to follow it with greater zeal and sincerity.' We are strongly reminded of Swami Vivekananda's saying that Vedānta makes a Hindu a better Hindu, a Mussalman a better Mussalman, a lawyer a better lawyer and even a fisherman a better fisherman. . . Waris Ali Shah's 'sense of common humanity and his wide sympathies enabled him to break away from the artificial bars of religion and made people of various shades of opinion understand and love each other as brothermen. . . The same God is to be found in the mosque, the church, and the pagoda' . . . and of course, in the hearts of *all* men. . . As often as human welfare is threatened by a perverted application of racial, religious, or linguistic factors, and political and economic controls,—separately or in combination—our safety lies in holding up before the people's minds the examples of those who 'fully realized that all are but parts of one stupendous Whole' and in whose presence 'one felt truly the touch of nature which makes *the whole world kin'*.

REVIEWS AND NOTICES

THE ATHARVA VEDA, VRĀTYAKĀṆḌA : By Hon. Sri Sampurnanand. *Published by Ganesh & Co. (Madras) Private Ltd., Madras 17. Pp. 62. Price Rs. 3.*

Hon. Sri Sampurnanand originally wrote his commentary *Śrutiprabhā* in Sanskrit. Referring to its first edition, Dr. C. Kunhan Raja says in the Preface that he was 'very much impressed by the deep scholarship of the commentator and also by the facility with which he handles Sanskrit.' There was a Hindi version included in it. The book under review is its English rendering by Sri Sampurnanand himself. Vrātyakāṇḍa, he explains in his valuable Introduction, is 'the first book of the Atharva Veda ever translated into an occidental language. 'It has the further distinction' that 'Sāyaṇa has left it alone, contenting himself with a short paragraph by way of introduction. No other Indian commentator, with the exception of some Arya Samajist scholars, has ventured to elucidate the text which baffled Western scholars as well.' But what they found 'obscure', Sri Sampurnanand has explained beautifully, making references to well known Upaniṣadic passages wherever necessary. 'In the first Sūkta, the coming into existence of the universe from Paramātmā, here called Vrātya, has been described.' 'In the succeeding Sūktas, this theme has been elaborated, and some of the numerous forms assumed, and the activities undertaken by him, are described'. 'He who knows Vrātya becomes Vrātya.' 'Bhava, Śarva etc. are all names of Eka-Vrātya, the Paramātmā.' The author explains Rudra as 'He who makes a sound (ru, rauti) and gives wealth and prosperity (dra, dadāti rayim).' The commentary contains many instances where the wisdom of the scholar and the administrator finds natural expression. Here is one: He says that 'the person who knows this', i.e., 'has realized Paramātmā', controls 'both nescience and knowledge.' 'In this world of appearances, practical use has to be made even of nescience.' 'Rulers are given the blessing to become Samitinjaya, victors over the Samiti.' This book deserves careful study. 'Yoga, accompanied by selfless action, is the real Yajña.'

NEWS AND REPORTS

Passing Away of Swami Adyananda

We are sorry to announce the passing away of Swami Adyananda at the age of 61 at Chandigarh on the 30th August at 2 a.m. He had a sudden heart attack, to which he succumbed in fifteen minutes.

A disciple of the Holy Mother, he joined the Dacca Math in 1920 and had his Sannyasa in 1926. He was the first President of the Singapore centre (1928-1933). In 1934 he was sent to South Africa as a preacher, and for nearly a year lectured successfully in different towns. He was the Head of the Lahore centre from its inception in 1939 till its suspension due to the riots in 1947. Asked later to transfer the work to Chandigarh, the capital in the making of the Punjab, he was raising funds for starting that Ashrama and making preparations for construction on the site secured by him, when he was snatched away. Of late he had been in indifferent health, but in his optimism he had overlooked it. By his demise the Organization has lost a veteran worker, who was open-handed and bilarious. May his soul rest in peace!

Correction

In the August 1957 issue, p. 344, col. 2, line 15 from the bottom (including foot-note) please read 'dancer' for 'danger'.