

PRABUDDHA BHARATA

VOL. XLIV

JUNE, 1939

No. 6



“उत्तिष्ठत जाग्रत प्राप्य वरान्निबोधत ।”

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

A HYMN FROM THE DEVARAM*

BY M. ARUNACHALAM

Lord Siva's praise—my wisdom lore,
Lord Siva's praise—the art I know;
Lord Siva's praise—my tongue proclaims;
Lord Siva's praise—the right way shows.

What though ye bathe in Ganga's stream?
What though ye bathe in Kaviri's flow?
What though ye bathe in waters, cool
and sweet to smell, off Comorin?
What though ye bathe in waving seas?
It boots him not who does not feel
that everywhere the Lord pervades.

The Lord that gave us mouth to praise,
A head to bow, and mind to think,—
To Him not praying, at His feet
Not laying flowers, lovely sweet,
Why wasted I long years of life?

* These verses were originally sung in Tamil by Saint Appar, one of the Saiva Samayachariars of Tamil land. The Saint records some facts of his own spiritual experience and exhorts all men to lead lives of piety and godliness in the world.

As fire in wood, as ghee in milk,
 The luminous one lies hid within.
 First fix the churning rod of love,
 pass round the cord, Intelligence,
 Then twirl,—and God will bless thy sight.

AS MANY FAITHS SO MANY PATHS

(यत् मतं तत् पथं)

BY THE EDITOR

Every age has its own peculiar problems to solve. Different races and nations with their distinctive social and religious ideologies need from time to time a healthy readjustment on both material and spiritual planes so as to gather new momentum for the realisation of their destiny. And that is one of the cardinal reasons why great spiritual figures endowed with superb wisdom and powers appear in the arena of human life at different epochs. The modern age is not an exception to this universal law of Nature. The East, no less than the West, is torn to-day to a considerable extent by the interaction of multiple conflicting ideas and ideals. And every student of history knows it perfectly well how India, which was at one time regarded as the homeland of amity and goodwill amongst various creeds and sects, has of late developed into a theatre of warring principles and bitter communal strife. The situation in India, as elsewhere, demands a close scrutiny and proper understanding of the etiology of such a regrettable state of affairs. Various leaders of thought have tried and are still trying to tackle this knotty problem from their individual points of view, but the results hitherto achieved hardly warrant a legitimate confidence in the methods adopted for driving away this malig-

nant malady from the body of human society.

It is an oft-repeated phenomenon in the economy of Nature that the various religious systems bequeathed unto humanity by great spiritual geniuses more often than not lose their original freshness and vigour, purity and simplicity in the hands of their followers through the accretions of ages. Truths get institutionalised, and innumerable usages and customs, dogmas and ceremonials overlay the shining gems of spiritual truths in the process of time. "If you study the history of any religious movement," rightly has it been observed in the *Brotherhood of Religions*, "you will trace three stages, three periods, during which the true becomes corrupted, the good becomes vicious. The first period is the period of the Teacher, the Reformer, the Prophet. The function of every spiritual Teacher is a twofold one: first, to expose the corruption of religious creeds, and secondly, to teach the way of the Inner Soul Life. Then comes the second period: after His death, the true disciples, apostles, pupils, try to systematise the teachings and to promulgate them as faithfully as possible by repeating what the Teacher gave or recorded. In the third period the priest comes to the fore, and

organises out of the teachings another religious creed !” And that is why the illuminating gospel of a Buddha or a Christ, a Mohammed or a Chaitanya is not found to-day to prevail in its pristine purity and integrity in the lands of its origin or elsewhere. Innumerable sects, each with its own creed and formula, have sprung up in the fold of every historical religion. And so long as human nature exists, no body can prevent the growth of such sects or religious bodies in the world. These diversities are a psychological necessity. Rightly does Swami Vivekananda say, “You cannot make all conform to the same ideas. I am glad that sects exist. If you and I and all were to think exactly the same thoughts, there would be no thoughts for us to think . . . It is the clash of thought, the differentiation of thought, that awakes thought . . . Whirls and eddies occur only in a rushing, living stream. There are no whirlpools in stagnant and dead water. When religions are dead, there will be no more sects. It will be the perfect peace and harmony of the grave” (C. W., Vol. II, pp. 360-61).

In fact these varieties of thoughts, and different methods of approach to truth must exist so long as the world lasts. There is no harm in having different sects, different religions, each with its individual dogmas and ceremonies, philosophy and ideal, provided they all agree to live with fellow-feeling and mutual goodwill. In the words of Prof. Radhakrishnan, “The Supreme presents itself in a variety of aspects to the human mind. The bewildering variety of Hindu theism and pantheism, the Buddhist developments of an impersonal law and a personal saviour, the old classical paganism with its personal gods and goddesses, the Hebrew faith in an inflexible Lord of righteousness, the Catholic Christianity with its somewhat

distant personal deity and more immediate minor divinities from the Madonna to the Patron Saints, the Protestant view of a personal God, and the Muslim creed of one and only God are the different ways in which men have tried to orient their relations to the Unseen reality conceived as something higher, better and more sovereign than the individual self. If we admit the diversity of human nature, we can easily understand this variety of the appeal of God to it and the utter futility of reducing all dogmas to one. Underlying all the diversity of dogmas is the undefined and indefinable conception of an Ultimate Reality” (*The Future of Civilisation*). Mr. H. H. Wilson also sings to the very same tune when he remarks in his *Essays and Lectures* (Vol. II., p. 8), “Contrarities of belief, and diversities of religion are part of the scheme of Providence; for as a painter gives beauty to a picture by a variety of colours, or as a gardener embellishes his garden with flowers of every hue, so God appointed to every tribe its own religion that man might glorify Him in diverse modes, all having the same end and being equally acceptable in His sight.” As a matter of fact an iron uniformity of thought or religious ideal is unthinkable in view of the diversities of human nature. If we want to prevent the sterilisation of the mind and the stagnation of the soul of humanity, we must not repudiate or refuse recognition to any one of the historical religions or sects. The passion to impose one’s own opinions on others belongs only to selfish tempers and is in most cases the fruitful cause of all atrocities and hostilities in the world.

II

It is interesting to note that the great spiritual geniuses of the world have never failed to discover the underlying link of

unity in the bewildering variety of apparently contradictory thought-systems. The Brahman of the Vedantins, the Ahura-Mazda of the Zoroastrians, the Buddha and the Law of the Buddhists, the Jehova of the Jews, the Father-in-Heaven of the Christians and the Alla of the Muslims are different names of the same Eternal Principle. The Vedas have declared, "The Truth is one; sages call it by various names" (*Rig-Veda*, 1.164.46). In the *Quoran* it has been said, "Revile not those whom they call on beside God, lest they, in their ignorance, despitefully revile Him" (Sura 6, verse 108). "Our God and your God are one God and after Him we all strive" (Sura 29, verse 45). Similar is the case with Christianity. St. Peter also accentuates the same thing when he says, "Now of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons, but in every nation, he that feareth Him and worketh righteousness is accepted by Him." "There is one supreme God without natural offspring," wrote Maximus of Madaura to Augustine about 390 A.D., "Who is, as it were, the God and mighty Father of all. The powers of the Deity, diffused through the universe which He has made, we worship under many names, as we are all ignorant of His true name" (Dr. E. Carpenter: *Comparative Religion*, p. 35). Even in Virgil's *Ænied VI*, we find the same spirit of unity eloquently expressed in a magnificent verse,

"One life through all the immense
 creation runs,
One spirit is the moon's, the sea's,
 the sun's;
All forms in the air that fly, on the
 earth that creep,
And the unknown, nameless monsters
 of the deep,
Each breathing thing obeys One
 Mind's control,
And in all substance is a single soul."

Thus when properly studied, comparative religion increases our confidence in the universality of truth and our respect for all forms of religions extant in the world. As already stated, Truth is one; only its manifestations vary. Swami Vivekananda has pertinently remarked, "Then arises the question: How can all these varieties be true? If one thing is true, its negation is false. How can contradictory opinions be true at the same time? . . . But I will first ask you: Are all the religions of the world really contradictory? I do not mean the external forms in which thoughts are clad . . . But I mean the internal soul of every religion. Every religion has a soul behind it, and that soul may differ from the soul of another religion; but are they contradictory? Do they contradict or supplement each other?—that is the question . . . I believe that they are not contradictory; they are supplementary. Each religion, as it were, takes up one part of the great universal Truth and spends its whole force in embodying and typifying that part of the great Truth . . . System after system arises, each one embodying a great ideal, and ideals must be added to ideals. And this is the march of humanity. Man never progresses from error to truth, but from truth to truth; from lesser truth to higher truth,—but it is never from error to truth . . . The child may develop more than the father, but was the father inane? . . . Your present stage is the knowledge of the child plus something more . . . Then, again: we also know that there may be almost contradictory points of view of the same thing, but they will indicate the same thing. Suppose a man is journeying towards the sun and as he advances, he takes a photograph of the sun at every stage. When he comes back, he has many photographs of the sun, which he places before us. We see

that not two are alike, and yet, who will deny that all these are photographs of the same sun, from different standpoints? Take four photographs of this church from different corners: how different they would look, and yet they would all represent this church. In the same way, we are all looking at Truth from different standpoints which vary according to our birth, education, surroundings and so on. We are viewing truth, getting as much of it as these circumstances will permit, colouring the truth with our own heart, understanding it with our own intellect, and grasping it with our own mind. We can only know as much of truth as is related to us, as much of it as we are able to receive. This makes the difference between man and man, and occasions, sometimes, even contradictory ideas; yet, we all belong to the same great universal Truth" (C. W., Vol. II, pp. 363-64). Endowed with such a width of vision and depth of understanding, it is no wonder that a great soul like Swami Vivekananda would declare, "I accept all religions that were in the past and worship them all. I worship God with everyone of them, in whatever form they worship Him. I shall go to the mosque of the Moham-medan; I shall enter the Christian's church and kneel before the crucifix; I shall enter the Buddhistic Temple, where I shall take refuge in Buddha and his Law. I shall go into the forest and sit down in meditation with the Hindu, who is trying to see the Light which enlightens the heart of everyone. . . . I shall keep my heart open for all that may come in the future. . . . The Bible, the Vedas, the Koran and all other sacred books, are but so many pages, and an infinite number of pages remain yet to be unfolded. . . . We take in all that has been in the past, enjoy the light of the

present and open every window of the heart for all that will come in the future" (*Ibid*, p. 372). This synthetic vision of the great Swami raised him far above the ordinary limitations of human nature and enabled him to proclaim unto the world the ideal of religious harmony received as a sacred legacy from his great Master, Sri Ramakrishna, the un-lettered Saint of Dakshineswar.

III

It is now a common knowledge that Sri Ramakrishna explored in his own life all the varied approaches to the supreme realm of eternal wisdom. There is practically no religion he did not live, and no truth he did not realise. Every form of religious faith unfolded to his vision a new world of spiritual significance. We find that in Vedanta all religious ideals and aspirations of humanity have been generalised into three principal systems, *viz.*, dualism, qualified monism, and absolute monism, according to the graduated scale of spiritual experiences in the lives of different individuals. In the life of Sri Ramakrishna also we witness an eloquent vindication of this very fact; for he realised that these three great orders of metaphysical thought are stages on the way to the supreme Truth; that they are not contradictory but rather when added the one to the other are complementary. For, religions alike from the lowest fetishism to the highest absolutism are but so many attempts of the human soul to grasp and realise the Infinite, and in these three systems we find nothing but a gradual working up of the human mind towards higher and higher ideals, till everything is merged in that wonderful unity which is reached in the Advaita Vedanta. It is needless to point out that in this world of multiplicity one single system of thought can hardly fit into the diverse mental make-up of mankind. Every one is born with

his own individual fund of ideas and mind-stuff, and naturally it would be an impossible feat to prescribe the same ideal or the same method of approach to Reality for all and sundry. That is why numerous systems and paths have come into being to allow all types of minds infinite scope and freedom for their unfoldment according to their respective traits and lines of growth. The great synthesis, once arrived at by Sri Krishna in the *Gîtâ*, received an added light and life in the modern age in the many-sided personality of Sri Ramakrishna, who looked upon all religions as but so many paths for the realisation of the Supreme. He declared that, when followed with steadfast zeal and sincerity, each of the four Yogas (*Jñâna-yoga*, *Bhakti-yoga*, *Karma-yoga* and *Râja-yoga*), would eventually lead to the same goal, and no colour, caste or creed would be any the least bar to the sacred temple of self-realisation. A Hindu and a Muslim, a Christian and a Buddhist, a Jaina and a Parsi—all were to Sri Ramakrishna but pilgrims following different trails according to their individual predilections to reach the same holy Land of Truth. For, does not the scripture also say, “Like different streams coursing through straight or crooked channels and losing themselves eventually in the one fathomless deep, men treading the various paths of religions according to their individual tastes and mental make-up, ultimately reach Thee, O Lord, who art the resort of all” (*Mahimnah Stotram*, 7)? Similarly does the *Gîtâ* sing, “Even those devotees who, endowed with *Sraddhâ*, worship other gods,—they too worship Me alone, O son of Kunti, but without knowing the proper method” (IX. 23). “Whosoever comes to Me through whatsoever form, I reach him. O Partha! All men are struggling through paths which in the end lead unto Me” (IV. 11).

IV

The message of harmony thus delivered by Sri Ramakrishna at the present age to bring about peace and goodwill amongst the wrangling sects and creeds of India and of the outside world is reflected in most of his illuminating and inspired utterances. The Master says, “God is one—He differs only in names and forms. He reveals Himself unto a devotee in whatever form he wishes to see Him.” “God with form and God without form are not two different beings. He who is with form is also without form. To a devotee God manifests Himself in various forms. Just think of a shoreless ocean—an infinite expanse of water—no land visible in any direction; only here and there are visible blocks of ice formed by intense cold. Similarly under the cooling influence, so to say, of the deep devotion of His worshipper, the Infinite reduces Himself into the finite and appears before him as a Being with form. Again, as on the appearance of the sun, the ice melts away, so on the appearance of knowledge, God with form melts away into the formless.” “As the same fish is dressed into soup, curry, or cutlet and each has his own choice dish of it, so the Lord of the universe, though one, manifests Himself differently according to the different likings of His worshippers and each one of these has his own view of God which he values most.”

Sri Ramakrishna illustrated this variety of expressions of the same eternal Being with a beautiful parable: “A chameleon lived on a tree. One person came and saw it was green, a second man saw it black, a third one, yellow. In this manner a number of persons saw it as of different hues. Each of them was disputing the other and saying, ‘No, the animal is green.’ Another called it red, another yellow, and so on. At last

they went to the man who had been sitting under the tree. He said, 'I live under the tree night and day. I know it is a chameleon; it changes colour every moment. And sometimes it has no colour at all.' Indeed, 'Various are the paths,' says Sri Ramakrishna, 'that lead to the Ocean of Immortality. Life is blessed, no matter by whatever means you get into it.' 'Different creeds are but different paths to reach the one God. Various are the ways that lead to the temple of Mother Kali at Kalighat. Similarly, various are the ways that lead to the House of the Lord. Every religion is nothing but one of such paths that lead to God.' In fact what Sri Ramakrishna demanded from the aspirants is not mere lip-homage to their respective religions but a deep-seated loyalty to their ideals, a crystal sincerity of purpose, and a spirit of love and respect for the faiths of others. The trouble arises when each one claims his own method as the *only* true one. Some say that only in a Shiva temple is communion with God possible; others declare that the Vishnu temple is superior. Muslims believe salvation to be possible only through the *one* Prophet, while Christians believe that Jesus is the *only* door, and if you happen to be a Roman Catholic you cannot be saved even by Jesus alone: you must also recognise the Pope! To these narrow-minded zealots Sri Ramakrishna replies, 'Be not like frogs in the well. It knows nothing bigger and grander than its well. So are all bigots, they do not see anything better than their own creeds.' 'A common man through ignorance considers his own religion to be the best and makes much useless clamour, but when his mind is illumined by true knowledge, all sectarian quarrel disappears.' 'When one is sincere he can realise the Lord through whatsoever path he proceeds. God is infinite; so are the paths

leading to Him.' 'I had to practise all religions—Hinduism, Islam, Christianity. I had to come through all paths—Shâkta, Vaishnavic and Vedantic. I have realised that God is one and all are coming to Him through these different paths.' It is indeed wrong to imagine that a deep-seated love for one's own religion must spell a corresponding hatred and ill-feeling towards the faiths of other communities. On the other hand, as the life of the Master conclusively shows, deepest spirituality and broadest catholicity are not contradictory but can stand synthesized in one and the same personality. In matters religious, the more one's mind is chastened through spiritual practices, the more comprehensive becomes his outlook on life, and as a result the blind forces of bigotry and fanaticism get attenuated and ultimately yield to the compelling spirit of love and respect for all irrespective of caste, creed or colour. It is only the half-religious and the irreligious that fight and not the truly religious. For, the more religious one grows, the more tolerant of diversity he becomes. Higher intuition takes account of the natural differences of things and seeks to combine them in the ample unity of the whole. Sri Ramakrishna therefore urged that to realise God an aspirant must stick to his own faith but at the same time look upon all other faiths as so many paths, and shall never dogmatise that his is the only true faith and all else is wrong. He even did not allow his disciples to cherish hatred towards the secret cults followed by some esoteric societies of the Shâktas and Vaishnavas. 'There are many diverse entrances to a house,' he used to say, '—the front gate, the back-door and the door for the scavenger who comes to clean the dirty places in the house. Know these cults to be akin to this last-mentioned door. No matter through which door

one enters, when once within the house, all reach the same place. Are you therefore to imitate these people or mix with them? Certainly not. But do not hate them in any way".* In fact, to a seer of Light all apparent contradictions melt eventually into a stream of harmony.

V

It must not be forgotten that every religion is an expression of the mental and social evolution of the people who adopt it. The peculiarity of Hinduism lies in the fact that it has ever kept its door open for all men of all grades of cultural equipment and religious instincts. It has in fact maintained since hoary antiquity a religious atmosphere permeated by the highest philosophic wisdom as well as by symbolic worship to suit the temper and genius of the men of diverse religious calibre, and as such it has no word of condemnation for any form of religious faith. It recognizes that even the crudest religion has its place in the cosmic scheme; for, does not a gorgeous flower justify the muddy roots from which it springs? The crude conceptions will give way in slow degrees before earnestness and sincerity, and the duty of the true reformer is not to supplant the existing beliefs by new ones but only to improve the mental and moral outlook of men so as to make them fit for receiving higher and higher ideals. So did Swami Vivekananda emphatically declare, "If

anybody dreams of the exclusive survival of his own religion and the destruction of others, I pity him from the bottom of my heart and point out to him that upon the banner of every religion will soon be written, in spite of resistance, 'Help and not Fight,' 'Assimilation and not Destruction,' 'Harmony and Peace and not Dissension'." Man, born in a particular church, hardly realizes the saving truth that the aim of every religion is to teach its votary to outgrow its external forms through a natural process of mental evolution. It is indeed good to be born in a church but to die in it is a mark of moral stagnation and lack of spiritual illumination. With the gradual unfoldment of his inner being, the aspirant after Truth must outgrow the limitations of his church, however indispensable they may be at the initial stage, attain to a universal outlook through an intensive process of spiritual culture and learn to view with love and respect all the faiths extant in the world. In the significant words of Count Keyserling, no partial view will then be falsely taken for an all-embracing view, any non-central position will be abandoned, every spiritual formation will be put in its astrologically exact position, and at the same time understood as the correct expression of the creative Significance which animates it. It is in this way that all religions may, as comprehension of Significance advances, remain in principle, on the plane of this life, what they were previously, and yet may nevertheless signify something absolutely new. It would simply bestow on them a fresh significance which would transfigure them. This, in short, is the crowning realisation of a true Advaitin (a monist), to whom toleration is a religion in itself. "While an individual owes special allegiance to his own religion or *svadharma*, which chooses

* For the above quotations, *vide* (1) *Teachings of Sri Ramakrishna*, pp. 8, 212, 289-294; Advaita Ashrama, Mayavati; (2) *Sayings of Sri Ramakrishna*, pp. 149-156; Sri Ramakrishna Math, Mylapore, Madras; (3) *Gospel of Sri Ramakrishna* (original Bengali), Part II, pp. 17-18, 22, 146, 166; III, pp. 11, 32, 46; IV, pp. 14, 141, 155, 238; V, pp. 24, 92-93, etc.

him rather than is chosen by him, he feels that the religion of others is not only sacred to them but to himself also. This in fact is the practical aspect of the Advaitic view of all individual selves being the one self The brotherhood that is practically recognized in this religion is the brotherhood of spirits realising their *svadharma*, the *dharma* of each being sacred to all. If then in this view it is irreligious to change one's faith, it is only natural to revere faiths other than one's own. To tolerate them merely in a non-committal or patronising spirit would be an impiety, and to revile them would be diabolical" (*The Cultural Heritage of India*, Vol. I, p. 500; Advaitavada and its Spiritual Significance: by Prof. K. C. Bhattacharya, M.A., George V Professor of Philosophy, Calcutta University). It will not be out of place to mention in this connection that a purely *ethical* principle is quite inadequate to establish harmony in the realm of faiths. It is, on the other-hand, as already shown, the recognition of 'all individual selves being the one self,' which is the *raison d'etre* of the ideal of religious harmony and toleration. This is the dictate of Indian philosophy, and it is on the bedrock of this transcendent idealism that the great edifice of human unity and harmony of religions is to be built. The greatest day in world-religion, as Dr. Cousins pertinently observes, will be that on which the religions that are separated because of differences of names and local terminology will hear the one Voice in whatever name it spoke through in various times and places, and will unite in one aspiration for purity and illumination, and in one power against evil, unclouded by mental and emotional non-essentials, unweakened by erroneous enmities and superstitions.

VI

It is really gratifying to find that some enlightened religious bodies, both Hindu and non-Hindu, have set on foot in recent years a movement on a non-sectarian basis to bring together all schools of thought on a common platform. It cannot be gainsaid that such cosmopolitan gatherings offer an excellent opportunity to understand one another's viewpoints at close quarters, to interpret their respective creeds on a liberal basis, and to open thereby suitable avenues for eliminating, as far as possible, from the field of religion all grounds for mutual misunderstanding and suspicion, hatred and antagonism. Needless to say these Parliaments of Religions and Congresses of liberal thinkers furnish a wide forum to the competent exponents of all faiths to meet on terms of equality and mutual respect and to discuss the catholic message of every great prophet for the promotion of mutual understanding and harmony. They, in short, serve to break down the barrier of exclusiveness which more often than not balks a free enquiry into the truths of one another's religions and prevents the fostering of love and toleration so much needed to ensure amity and peace in human society. The more frequently such religious conferences are held, the greater are the chances of curing bigots of their swell of passion, thrust of desire, and blindness of temper. What is needed is to make a reverent and unbiassed study of the essentials of every religion. Instead of allowing ourselves to be swayed by silly sentimentalism and influenced by the seeming differences palpable on the surface, it must be the lookout of every religious-minded man, to whatever church he may belong, to cultivate a spirit of respect for every faith and to find out the underlying link

of unity in the substance and soul of all the religious systems of the world. The message of religious harmony bequeathed unto humanity in the latter part of the last century by the Prophet of Dakshineswar is still a living force today, and is steadily functioning through innumerable fields to create an atmosphere of peace and goodwill among warring creeds in India and abroad. It is a hopeful sign of the times that "the different religions are slowly learning to hold out hands of friendship to each other in every part of the world. . . The study of comparative religion is developing a fairer attitude to other religions. It is impressing on us the fundamental

unity of all religions by pointing out that the genius of the people, the spirit of the age and the need of the hour determine the emphasis in each religion. We are learning to think clearly about the inter-relations of religion. We tend to look upon different religions not as incompatibles but as complementaries, and so indispensable to each other for the realisation of the common end" (*The Hindu View of Life* by Prof. Radhakrishnan). It is time that we all worked in unison and in a spirit of fraternity for the realisation of this universal idea and prepared the ground for the dawn of an era of lasting peace and harmony in the society of mankind.

GOSPEL OF SRI RAMAKRISHNA

It was Wednesday, the 10th of October, 1883. Sri Ramakrishna had come to Adhar's house with a number of devotees including Balaram's father. Balaram's father was an old Vaishnava. . . .

Sri Ramakrishna (To M.): I thought, why should I be a particularist? I too put on the robe of the Vaishnava Vairagi (man of renunciation) at Brindaban; I remained so for three days. Again I got myself initiated into the mystic formula of Rama at Dakshineswar. I had a long devotional mark painted on the head, wore a piece of diamond round my neck. A few days later again I cast them all away.

A person had a tub. People used to come to him to get their clothes dyed. The tub contained a solution of dye. But whatever colour a person wanted, if he dipped his piece of cloth into that solution his piece would get dyed in that colour. One who had watched this was overcome with wonder and

said to the dyer, "Now, kindly give me the dye with which you have dyed these."

Was Master hinting that men of all religions would come to him and have enlightenment?

Sri Ramakrishna was further saying, "A chameleon lived on a tree. One person came and saw it was green, a second man saw it black, a third one, yellow. In this manner a number of persons saw it as of different hues. Each of them was disputing the other and saying, 'No, the animal is green'. Another called it red, another yellow, and so on. At last they went to the man who had been sitting under the tree. He said, 'I live under the tree night and day. I know it is a chameleon; it changes colour every moment. And sometimes it has no colour at all.' "

Was Sri Ramakrishna saying that God has attributes and assumes different aspects, and that He is again without attributes and beyond thought and speech, and he enjoys the sweet-

ness of God through the path of devotion, the path of knowledge and all other paths?

Sri Ramakrishna (To Balaram's father): Don't any more read books, but then read devotional scriptures such as the *Chaitanya Charitamrita*.

The long and the short of it is to love Him, to taste His sweetness. He is the sweet sap and the devotee is the enjoyer who drinks it. He is the lotus and the devotee is the bee. The devotee drinks the honey in the lotus.

As the devotee cannot live without God, even so God cannot remain without devotees. The devotee then becomes the sap and God, the enjoyer; the devotee becomes the lotus and God, the bee. He has become two to taste his own sweetness; this is the reason for the divine sport of Radha and Krishna.

Pilgrimages, wearing rosaries round necks, and other observances are necessary at first. When Reality is seen and God is realized, one gradually grows less and less fussy about outward appearances. Then one is content with His name alone and His remembrance and contemplation.

The small copper pieces which can be exchanged for sixteen rupees make a big pile, but when you put the sixteen rupees together they don't look so big. When you exchange them for a gold mohur it becomes so small. And if you change that for a piece of diamond, people don't know about it even.

The Vaishnavas carp at the absence of rosaries round necks and the lack of observances etc. Was it for this that the Master was saying that one does not so much cling to rosaries and robes, etc., after the realization of God? When God is realized, outward activities lessen.

Sri Ramakrishna (To Balaram's father): The Kartâbhajâs speak of

pravartakas (beginners), *sâdhakas* (aspirants), *siddhas* (men of realization), and the *siddha* among *siddhas*. The *pravartaka* wears devotional marks, rosaries round the neck, and adheres to observances. The *sâdhaka* does not bother himself so much about outward appearances, e.g., the *bâul*. The *siddha* is one who has true faith in the existence of God. The *siddha* among *siddhas* is Chaitanyadeva. He has seen God and holds communion with Him always. They call the *siddha* among *siddhas* *sâin*. There is none above the *sâin*.

Aspirants are of different natures. The *sâttvika sâdhanâ* is done in secret. The *sâdhaka* prays and practises in secret. Outwardly he appears to be a normal man. He meditates inside the mosquito net.

The *râjasik* devotee puts up a big front. He wears rosaries, dons a robe, *gerua* or silk clothes, and the beads are of gold. It is like sitting after putting up a sign-board.

The Vaishnava devotees do not have much respect for the *Sâkta* and *Vedântic* devotees. The Master was counselling Balaram's father to eschew that narrow feeling.

Sri Ramakrishna (To Balaram's father and others): Whatever be the religion and whatever the dogma everyone is calling on the same God; so one should not disregard or hate any religion or dogma. It is He whom the Vedas declare to be Sachchidananda Brahman. It is He whom the Puranas like Bhagavata and others declare to be Sachchidananda Krishna, and the Tantras Sachchidananda Siva,—that One Sachchidananda.

The Vaishnavas are of successive grades. The Vedas declare Him to be Brahman. One school of Vaishnavas call Him Alek Niranjana. Alek means one who cannot be viewed; one who

cannot be perceived by the senses. They say that Radha and Krishna are two bubbles of Alek.

According to the Vedântic doctrine there is no Avatâra; the Vedântins say that Rama and Krishna are the two waves on the Ocean of Sachchidananda.

There is only One and not two. Whatever one may say, one is sure to come to God if one calls on Him sincerely. It is necessary to have only yearning.

Sri Ramakrishna had been telling these to devotees in a state of ecstasy. He became a little normal then and was saying, "Are you Balaram's father?"

All were keeping quiet; Balaram's old father was telling beads silently.

Sri Ramakrishna (To M. and others): Well, they tell beads so much, they have

made so many pilgrimages; still why is it so? It is like a (slow-moving) year which seems to end after eighteen months.

I said to Harish, "Why go to Benares, if you don't have any yearning? If you have yearning, Benares is even here."

They go on so many pilgrimages, tell beads so much, yet why don't they have any result? It's because there is no yearning. He shows Himself if one calls on Him with yearning.

At the start of the Yâtrâ play there is much noise; Krishna does not appear then. When afterwards Nârada arrives at Brindaban full of yearning, and calls on the Lord playing on the lute and cries, "O Govinda, my life and my soul!", Krishna can no longer remain still. He comes forward with the cowboys and says, "Stay Dhabali, stay."

INDIA TODAY

BY JEAN HERBERT

This year, as during previous visits, I came to India as a pilgrim, only desirous of gathering from the wisdom of great Indian sages whatever little crumbs I could hope to grasp and assimilate, and it had not been my intention to give any critical opinion as to what those few months enabled me to see in present-day India. But many of my Indian friends came to me again and again with the same question, which after all was quite a natural one: "What is your impression of India this time?" and I felt it would not be quite fair to withhold from them any thoughts that might have arisen in my mind about the country of which I had the great honour of being a guest.

I shall do so in a spirit of great humility, realising full well that I saw

only a very few of the numberless facets of life in that sub-continent which is called India, where hundreds of millions of people have evolved a unique civilisation and culture in the course of thousands of years, and where everything now seems to be moving so swiftly. If I carefully avoid expressing any opinion on subjects of political controversy, it is not owing to any lack of interest on my part, but merely because I feel that the only internal politics about which a Frenchman should venture to take a stand are French politics, and that it would be highly improper for me to meddle with those of any other country.

What struck me most is the considerable progress which seems to have been achieved recently in the field of educa-

tion. I do not know what results statistics can show, and those after all are only of secondary importance, since they record quantity and not quality, but I felt that everybody in India was giving much more attention to the problem than was the case two years ago. I was amazed by the number of new educational institutions of all kinds which have been springing up all over the country, by the stupendous growth of many of those already existing, and by the keen effort made by all concerned to adapt the teaching to local conditions and local needs. The time seems now gone when the ideal of educators in India was to implant in the minds of the pupils a number of foreign ideas and habits without considering whether those would ultimately prove beneficial or otherwise. A great attempt is now being made to devise and apply methods chosen for their own merits, and not blindly taken over from some other civilisation. Both Swami Vivekananda and Sister Nivedita would certainly feel very proud of the turn education is taking in India.

The results which I was privileged to see in the kindergarten, primary, secondary and industrial schools, in Indian universities, in classes for children and for adults, in institutions for Harijans and for other special groups of society have convinced me that the effort is bound to succeed in bringing a rich harvest of results. While I do not wish to give undue prominence to any institution which I happened to visit, I cannot refrain from mentioning particularly, as being worthy of careful study and whole-hearted support, the Ramakrishna Mission Students' Home in Madras, the Kindergarten school of the National High School in Bangalore, the Ramakrishna Gurukul in Trichur, the efforts of Miss Gokhale among the

poorer classes in Bombay, and the Nivedita School in Calcutta.

But to me the greatest marvel was to see the extraordinary body of workers, most of them young men and women, who have devoted themselves heart and soul to the cause, many of them renouncing the joys of family life for the sake of their work, and embracing Brahmacharya. The value of a teaching given by a staff of that category cannot be overestimated. Whereas the natural tendency of a paid teacher who has chosen his profession mostly for the sake of earning a salary is to cram book-knowledge into his pupils in order to show good results at various examinations, those devoted young people, who are patriots in the truest and noblest sense of the word, are endeavouring to build up men and women who may prove a credit and an asset to their country. The enthusiasm and the remarkable technical efficiency with which I have seen them work is one of the main reasons why I have such great hopes in the coming generations of Indians.

Another great reason for looking confidently forward to the future of India is that in spite of the considerable spread of Western science, technique and culture, the thirst for spirituality remains practically unabated. It is only natural that young and immature students especially, attracted by the lure of what the West can teach them, anxious to give their country the full benefit of the power and knowledge accumulated by Western nations, should be ready, or even desirous, to brush away some at least of the spiritual preoccupations which have been the keynote of India through many centuries, and should feel inclined to substitute for the old Indian spirit of service that spirit of keen competition which has become characteristic of the West. They

may justly feel that this spirit of competition was one of the conditions without which the West would never have advanced so far and so fast in the realms of science and technique and worldly power. But many of them, even in their student days, and far more still in after life, have discovered under the wise guidance of their great spiritual leaders that Western acquisitions and Indian spirituality are not mutually exclusive. While the West probably needed the incentive of that spirit of competition to make all those wonderful scientific discoveries and technical inventions thanks to which we could now—for the first time in recorded history—feed and clothe and house all men, women and children on the face of this earth, it is nevertheless true that the results of all that research are now available for any individual and any nation to take and to use, without needing the incentive.

And it is equally true that if the West has so utterly failed to utilise its wealth and power for the benefit of humanity, but rather uses them for purposes of destruction, it is because it has not yet been able to disentangle itself from that spirit of competition which was once one of its most valuable tools. Many people in India seem to realise that the spirit of service and the thirst for spirituality which their country has preserved throughout the ages for the greater benefit of mankind can and should provide the answer to the great riddle of the modern world and show how the invaluable acquisitions of Western science and technique can be put to truly constructive uses.

Therefore it was most gratifying to me to see so many of the finest specimens of Indian youth and of the Indian intelligentsia still flocking to all the spiritual teachers to obtain instruction

and guidance in all the problems of life, and eagerly taking the advice given.

Another extremely encouraging indication is to be found in the type of men whom the various groups in India, political and otherwise, have chosen as their leaders. Whereas in the West astuteness and clever oratory are too often considered as the highest qualifications for political leadership, regardless of the spiritual, ethical or even intellectual worth of the man—so much so that in some countries, calling somebody a politician is tantamount to an insult—India seems to have preserved an entirely different scale of values, even in the great recent developments in the political situation. If India can maintain at the head of all groups and parties men who are exclusively actuated by an interest in the public weal, and whose character commands respect from their fellow-countrymen, irrespective of their opinions on debatable topics, she will have brought one more invaluable contribution to mankind, not to speak of all the benefit she will derive from it herself.

It is true that of late there have been some charges of corruption. If they are founded, it is a very serious matter, and if they are not, it is perhaps more alarming still that they should have been made. But the stir which they created is a definite proof that in this as in other matters, the masses are still healthy and uncontaminated.

As regards the problem of caste restrictions, which still looms sufficiently large on the social horizon of India to engage much of the attention of many great leaders, I will frankly admit that I have not been able to study it enough to give any considered opinion on what has been done or remains to be done, although I am full of admiration for many of the activities I have witnessed in this connection. The same applies to the various

problems arising out of the adjustment of communal differences.

I was glad to see that the inferiority complex which was manifest mostly among the young people educated on Western lines is gradually waning. Indians are now less prone than they were even a few years ago to be apologetic for everything that in their country does not conform to Western standards. They seem less inclined to use about Indian life deprecatory words like "idols" or "vernaculars" with which they were saddled by people suffering from a sad superiority complex. They no longer seem to believe that India is the only country in the world where dirt and filth and dire poverty can be found and that Western countries and people are all like the pictures on the magazine-cover. Many of them now admit that forks and spoons are not a sure criterion of civilisation or even of social standing, and that table-manners should vary with the kind of food taken at meals.

On the other hand I found little or no decline in what I might call the spirit of provincialism, particularly in the case of people from one province who have come to live in another. Indians too often look down with something akin to contempt on the people, the customs, the language, the art, the food, the culture of whatever does not hail from their own native region. While that is quite natural in a country where family, caste and local traditions are so strong and have contributed so much that is of great value, it nevertheless might some day prove a source of serious problems and even lead to the appearing of linguistic and ethnical minorities in various provinces. A European who knows what terrible calamities the existence of such minorities has led to may be excused if he expresses the hope that

such a situation should never arise in India and that steps should be taken in good time to prevent it.

Generally speaking, and with many notable exceptions, I also found little improvement in the Indian's sense of the value of time. I fully realise that all his traditions, religious and otherwise, have taught him to appreciate values for which the purely quantitative notion of time does not play a preponderant part, and that he is not trained to work "against the watch," and I am only too well aware of the fact that Westerners have gone to the other extreme and made a sad confusion between perpetual agitation and constructive activity. But in spite of that, and whatever philosophical or metaphysical excuses may be adduced by well-intentioned people, it remains a fact that if we want to achieve anything on the physical plane on which most of us still live, we must make the best possible use of the materials at our disposal, and time is one of them. When Indians have learnt not to waste their own or other people's time any more than is really necessary, their country will make a bigger step forward than most of them can possibly imagine.

The last few points however are of very minor importance as compared with the preceding ones, and in a country with such vast potentialities, such a capacity for whole-hearted devotion to a high ideal and such strong foundations in a noble civilisation thousands of years old, they are easy to remedy. Even if they should not be completely removed, they can at the most very slightly retard the full blossoming out of one of the most magnificent and beneficent periods which Mother India has known in the course of time, and which even a very superficial observer cannot fail to see coming in the near future.

THE BASIS OF RELIGIOUS DISCUSSION

BY H. D. BHATTACHARYYA, M.A., B.L., P.R.S., Darsanasagar

One of the notable features of the celebrations in connection with the birth or death anniversaries of the prophets of different religions in recent times, at least in India, is the increasing participation of speakers of different faiths. Some movements are avowedly based on certain common fundamental principles of morality and religion (and also dogma) and their organization is such that it is possible for people of different faiths to participate in common religious activities without forsaking private or communal religion. The Theosophical Society, for instance, does not demand that a man should cease to be a Hindu or a Parsi or a Christian or a Muhammadan in order to join the brotherhood. In his social relations he continues to be as before, and although he has to profess faith in certain theosophical tenets he does not become a whole-time theosophist in the sense that he abjures the social practices or religious ceremonies of his community altogether. There are other brotherhoods which are more religious in the sense that they have a decided religious leaning. The Ramakrishna Movement with its Hindu religious background is primarily a Hindu organization although it is patronized by members of other faiths also because of its social service and its theoretical appreciation of the merits of each religion. In this particular movement seasonal gatherings would probably be addressed by people of diverse faiths, and tributes paid to the spiritual qualities of its prophet; but it is not expected that the speakers would become devotees of the Paramahansa in the religious sense and become converts to his creed. The Ahmadiyya Move-

ment is more definitely religious in the sense that it is not a mere brotherhood but a communal organization, and although people of other faiths are invited to speak on the life of Muhammad, only Musalmans can join the movement and that by adopting certain definite articles of religious belief. The New Dispensation of the Brahmo Samaj has also a system of celebrating the days of the prophets of different religions; but it too is a religious body of the dissenting type like the Ahmadiyya Movement. The Comtists had a calendar of the saints of different religions modelled on the Roman Catholic calendar of Christian saints, because according to them Humanity was the only object of reverence, being the only visible spiritual being, and this human species had evolved rare spirits in all places and at all times and not within the Christian Church alone. But the Comtists were not a religious body in the devotional sense and they had no transcendental beliefs or speculations about the supersensuous. Their positivistic assumptions precluded that type of faith and speculation.

When a particular religious organization invites people of other faiths to address gatherings in honour of their own prophet or saint, there might be present *two different types of motives*. The *one* is a rather political or diplomatic idea to have praises sung in honour of the prophet with the full knowledge that the speakers would reproduce certain pieces of information from standard books without any personal conviction. It is never expected in this case that the speakers would genuinely appreciate the message of the prophet in question; but

their speeches serve the purpose of delighting the audience and informing them (sometimes wrongly) that outside their own brotherhood or community there are thoughtful people who see the beauty of their creeds and they thus strengthen their faith by this outside appreciation. It is obvious that no useful purpose is served by inviting such speakers, for those who do not genuinely believe that every prophet has a message to give are not honest when they undertake to participate in such seasonal celebrations. The *other* motive is more laudable, namely, the idea is to give a speaker an opportunity to learn something of the message of the prophet in question so that he might know that spiritual truth is not a monopoly of any particular saint or messenger of God. Nothing is so chastening as a sense that in personal religion much is merely traditional and purely regional; and this enlightenment comes easily when one studies the tenets of different religions and compares the messages of different prophets. There are certain eternal verities on which all prophets have harped; but there are also certain topical revelations that are destined to pass away in course of time.

In a religious gathering a speaker is expected to appreciate the merits of a faith—of other faiths if he is invited to speak on other prophets. In parliaments of religion a speaker appreciates his own faith most without attacking other faiths and puts his own religion in the best light possible, not exactly with a missionary spirit in all cases but very often as a justification for professing the same personally. Men often put the telescope to the blind eye when looking at the faults of their creeds, and even when they know their existence they seldom point them out to aliens in faith. It would be an interesting gathering if people of different religious denomina-

tions were to meet and delineate openly the imperfections of their own religion so as to warn others against the pitfalls of their own faiths. Possibly they feel that in that case they would not be able to justify their own adherence to that religion. The fact is that the religion we profess is not a mere faith or dogma—it is more often a socio-economic attitude towards life, inherited and acquired, and therefore not easy to abandon. This is why reforming religions have always been obliged to make concession to the practices of the discarded faiths by incorporating elements therefrom in order to make themselves easily acceptable. Hinduism, Christianity, Judaism and Islam have all behaved in a similar manner to capture converts from older religions. If without making any compromise with the essential principles it is possible to conciliate an older faith, why not do it?—this has been the guiding consideration in all cases. The Kaaba might remain as the place of pilgrimage but the idols must be destroyed. The high places might continue to be the places of Yahwist worship but the images of the *baals* must disappear. The solar cult must be suppressed but the birth-day of the *Sol Invictus* might be appropriated to Jesus Christ. The Nâga worship must cease but the serpent might provide Siva with his sacred thread and Vishnu with his bed in the ocean. As religion is not philosophy and includes much else besides faith in God, an inability to justify belief does not bring about apostasy. This will explain why the educated people are so difficult to convert although they are the first to detect deficiency in their own religion—they can rationalize while the ignorant, not being so able, succumb more easily to the blandishments of other faiths. Of course, no mention need be made here of forcible conversion or conversion by allurements of prospects

in life or through economic pressure or on account of social oppression, for in these cases extra-religious factors operate to change a creed.

This will explain why in recent years, in spite of frequent meetings on a common platform to understand the basic principles of the different religions, practical animosity between different faiths has been on the increase. Interest in their theory and opposition to their practice characterize the attitude towards other faiths, with the effect that while scholars are delving into the mysteries of different faiths the general public are sharply dividing on communal lines and obstructing the peaceful performance of the religious practices of people professing other faiths. This has been specially the case where the Church and the State interests coincide. In these days of democracy power goes with population; and religion being one of the strongest bonds of union, it dominates secular alliances to a very great extent. Possibly the case would have been different had religion remained an affair of personal relation to God; but religion is the basis of society and each religious community entrenches itself within a wall of separation from other communities by prohibiting most of the important social relations through injunctions and taboos. No inter-marriage, no interdining, no common worship—this triple prohibition suffices to cut off cordial relationship. The practical abolition of the second prohibition in advanced sections of all communities has not improved social relation to any appreciable extent, for the cultural background of different faiths is so powerful that a complete understanding is possible only on the basis of complete surrender on the part of all other communities to one community and this no community is willing to do. In fact, communally we all suffer from

reminiscences of past quarrels and past wrongs, or else of past glory and past mastery—there is either resentment or contempt towards other creeds in the communal mind and this prevents understanding and concord. Very seldom is there any earnest belief that each religion has some advantage over the rest in some particular point, and the belief is least present in religions that claim a monopoly of spiritual truths personally communicated by God to the Prophets concerned. A race that knows least of the condition of things elsewhere is apt to remain in blessed ignorance of the diverse ways in which spiritual illumination may come to different people, and historical needs might also dictate a policy of uniform faith rigorously enforced upon a nation. This disallowance of private religion has necessitated almost invariably a theocratic organization of society, with the prophet or the priest as the highest power in the land. The resistance offered by the spiritual heads of such states to the spread of secular ideas results in the perpetuation of intellectual slavery in the community and a conservatism that effectively shuts out all progress and liberal thought. The rise of a class of religious ministrants, who are financially interested in the continuance of ignorance and superstition, is fraught with still greater danger; so also the rise of any political party which thrives by playing upon the fanaticism of ignorant masses. The position of such communities has been the same as that of countries in which war-time measures have become peace-time laws—what was justifiable for putting down defection or preventing migration from an infant community or a community in danger is however not defensible as a permanent institution. Communal war-cry deadens the voice of protest and closes the door upon rational thinking and a calm and dispassionate

examination of rival creeds. Similarly, a religion that ceases to experiment with its capacity to satisfy new people or develop new features in consonance with the growing intellectualism of the community shrivels up into a mummified dogma and degenerates into a tribal custom or a soulless practice.

If the intellectuals of any community attend religious functions of other communities or take part in extolling their religious heroes with the genuine intention of ventilating the narrow room of communal belief, periodical meetings and discussions have a value which cannot be overestimated. But unless liberal thoughts are backed by liberal actions and by attempts to enlighten members of one's own community regarding the good points of other religions, such contacts are almost valueless as a solution of communal problems. Certain religions are prohibited by their presuppositions from acknowledging that there might be truth in other religions also, just as they deny that there might be defect in their own creeds. If it is claimed by the 'scripturary' religions that every word in their scriptures is inspired and that they embody truth and nothing but the whole truth, then it is useless to argue with their votaries, for they would admit neither defect nor error nor contradiction in their particular religious belief and, to disarm opposition, make God the author of their scriptures, ignoring altogether the fact that other religions also claim the same right and yet these 'scripturary' religions do not agree among themselves and accuse one another of false teaching. If the Jew and the Christian and the Muslim all claim to communicate the only authentic voice of God and if Krishna commands all to forsake other religions and take refuge in him alone, the devout person naturally feels bewildered, not knowing what faith to

accept. Here either reason must decide the issue, or personal temperament and enlightenment must dictate an exclusive religion for each, or the faith of the ancestors must continue to hold us in thralldom in spite of its many inconsistencies and imperfections. The third alternative is what operates in the largest majority of cases, for few have either the capacity to evolve a personal religion or the courage to accept a faith that appeals most to their conviction—most of us have not the strength of mind necessary to make a sacrifice of social relationship and friendship and of economic advantage, which a change of faith involves. In former times asceticism and personal enlightenment were resorted to and even now the very few true mystics prefer to live isolated from all religious groups; but men at large prefer a snug corner where they may feel the contact of social groups having identical thoughts and practices. Religion, as it becomes a habit instead of being a conviction, holds us in thralldom not through its creeds but through its customs and communal organizations. This is why intercommunal gatherings bring enlightenment but no change of creed in personal life and neither of them in communal life. Culture spreads slowly and invisibly by infiltration of ideas through mass contact—very rarely does it extend to other groups by literary discussion. We are excepting, of course, cases of economic necessity and forcible conversion. The most effective method of changing creed and conduct is a communal consciousness of imperfection and contradiction in the philosophy of life and of the necessity of adjusting creed to the expansive knowledge of truth, and conduct to the widening circle of social life. To fail to take note of advancing thought in different fields of knowledge and to attempt to confine a community within mediæval darkness

and barbarous practice would not only prove futile but also turn out to be dangerous to the religion itself in the long run. In fact, no religion—not even a revealed religion—has been able to avoid development of all kinds; a frank recognition of this fact would prevent many misunderstandings and quarrels and would enable each religion to reorient itself to changing circumstances within the basic framework of its creed. In the heat of strife we are apt to overlook this salutary lesson of history and to endeavour to achieve the impossible task of putting the community into a strait-jacket for all times to come and cramping its natural growth.

This brings us to the foremost problem of all religious discussions, namely, whether they should accept the position that although there is truth in every religion, no religion is true. When we say that no religion is true we mean that it either contains wrong information about natural and spiritual life or that it does not contain the whole truth of spiritual life. Of course, another meaning is possible, namely, that all religion is a false attitude of life and that we should be wholly secular in our beliefs and practices. This attitude would mean disowning the spiritually supersensible altogether and accepting the sensible alone as having value and validity. We need not discuss this position just now, although it would not be irrelevant to point out that even professional scientists have to assume the existence of supersensible entities in order to explain sensible phenomena and that therefore religious men would be in fairly good company if they also accept supersensible principles for explaining certain features of their experience. But atheism, scepticism and agnosticism apart, there still remains the question whether religion is true only so long as a higher gnosis does not arise. Should

we believe that religion would one day be transcended altogether in certain rare cases and be superseded by a higher intuition or knowledge? Hegel thought that speculative reason or philosophy would take the place of religion in certain privileged minds when the standpoint of duality which all religions imply would be transcended and spiritual matters would be viewed not through imagination and understanding but through thought. Some again have claimed this position for Art. In India the Advaita Vendantists have claimed that God exists for lower knowledge only and that higher intuition annuls the distinction between the knower and the known—Isvara and the Jiva, and leaves the Brahman alone in the field—a philosophical view of which the nearest Western parallels would be the systems of Bradley and Bosanquet in more recent times and also of Taylor when he forgets his Christian theism. But theoretical speculation seldom changes the creed of practical life, and even if philosophically a Vedântist, a Mahâyânist and a Sufi are very much alike, each prefers to follow the prescriptions of his own socio-religious creed when he abandons high philosophy and comes down to the mundane level. In this, religious men have followed the Spencerian view that a negative contradictory is not a mere non-entity, for in that case all negative contradictories could be interchangeably used, e.g., unlimited for indivisible and indivisible for unlimited, which is not the case; they have, by coming down from the Real to the realm of the Unreal—from Mysticism to Religion, not come down to the same God but to their own communal God and refused to use interchangeably with His name the names given to God by other religious communities. And so it happens that monotheists fight about the name of God, as if God has any special name like

finite individuals; and, what is more, they have even professed to know the hidden name of God revealed to them for the first time through their prophet and also some specially sacred names by which their God wishes to be called on particular occasions if special favour is expected of Him.

It appears, therefore, that transcendence of religion is not seriously taken by any community and to that extent all religions claim a certain amount of finality. So the question arises whether any religion is true in the absolute sense. Religions all over the world have opposed critical and philosophical scrutiny by pure reason alone, holding that human reason is not competent to pass any final judgment on the validity of religious experience. We must be prepared to uphold partially this contention, for in religion there come into operation certain factors of human experience which philosophy rightly ignores to deserve being called the thinking consideration of things. This does not mean that philosophy may not examine religions and appraise their merits; for in that case all faiths would be of the same value and the squabbles of creeds would cease. What is meant is that man cannot know God unto perfection and also that the numinous elements of religion cannot be wholly handled in a rational way; this would leave scope for extra or supra-rational mode of apprehension, appreciation and affection which religion claims as its own. But it is one thing to say that religion may be true even if not philosophically understandable as a whole and another thing to say it is true even when not partially understandable or that it is true in an absolute sense, meaning thereby that it neither lacks any element nor contains any untruth. Now it is this last sense claimed by most religions that has caused all the troubles, for the

advocates of religion have drawn out implications from sacred texts to show their conformity to later known facts and also glossed over inconvenient contents of scriptures to defend their infallibility. Even if God speaks, He speaks through a human medium—no argument about plenary inspiration can get away from that uncomfortable fact. In order to avoid suspicion about inadequacy and imperfection, religions have adopted different methods to get over the human factor. The Vedas are supposed to be uncreate, the Bible is revealed through inspired prophets and even the voice of God is occasionally heard to dictate commandments and issue certificates, the Qur'an contains the actual Arabic words of the copy of the scripture in heaven conveyed through Gabriel who took complete possession of the soul of Muhammad when delivering the eternal Divine message, and God is Himself the speaker in the Gita. Each religion claims to be the real brand of Divine direction to man, insinuating openly or by implication that the other brands are either false or highly adulterated. Nay, some religions have gone so far as to suggest that God has divided the false gods among those nations and individuals whom He wished to keep in Hell, which would otherwise be emptied of its inmates. Although some religions have conceded that ultimately all souls would be garnered by God and the kingdom of Satan would be taken away from him, other religions have advocated the theory of an eternal hell and consigned to it the wicked, the apostate and the infidel. These would assure the assassins in the cause of the Church or the Faith eternal felicity in heaven but deny to the saints of other religions any place in that heaven. These childish fancies would have evoked laughter had they not had a serious bearing on inter-

communal harmony and intersocial dealing.

It is better to admit that no religion is wholly true and that at different times and in diverse places God has revealed His will and pleasure to man, but strictly in accordance with the capacity of the hearer has such revelation been understood and communicated. There can be no finality in revelation and with growing knowledge of men and things the laws of the spiritual life would be better understood as time advances. The Brihadaranyaka Upanishad puts the matter in a nutshell when it points out how the same Divinely uttered sound *da* was meant to be understood differently by the gods, the men and the devils—as a direction to the gods to be self-restrained, to the men to be bountiful, and to the devils to be compassionate. It adds also that the full direction is to practise all the three even though each type chooses one of the three meanings according to its need or capacity. Unless man becomes like unto God—as Christ, for instance, claimed to be in his occasional utterances—the possibility would always remain that even if God speaks the whole truth to all prophets alike at all times, they would not understand Him fully and that further revelations would be necessary to suit changed times, places and circumstances. God's hands cannot be tied down nor the potentialities of human wisdom limited for all times to come by a theory of final revelation. This then leaves us with the second alternative, namely, that there is truth in every religion.

But what exactly does this mean? Are we to understand the proposition in the sense that all religions are equally true relatively or equally untrue in an absolute reference? Just as the different perspectives of a solid object are true from particular positions but none

can take the place of the rest nor does any represent the whole truth about the object in question, do the different religions express adequately particular aspects of divine truth absolutely or relatively to the culture of the age or need of the time but none embodies all the aspects of the truth nor replaces the other religions which embody other aspects of the same truth? Did God reveal Resignation to Islam, Love to Christianity, Devotion to Vaishnavism, Fight against Evil to Zoroastrianism, Maintenance of Social Relations to Confucianism, Active Compassion to Buddhism and Non-injury to Jainism? If this is the meaning of 'There is truth in every religion', then in order to be fully religious one has got to collect the peculiar teachings of all the religions and synthesize them in one's life. But the difficulty is that mere aggregation is not equivalent to organization, and by simply collecting the tenets of different religions a man may find himself torn between conflicting loyalties. How to organize them all into a unitary whole is the most important problem, for the teachings may not automatically fit into one another like the pieces of a puzzle picture. When then we talk of a harmony of religions, do we mean that we are to attempt a synthesis of the good points of the different religions into a new faith? And what about the practices? Shall we build temples like the Hindus and pray like the Musalmans and observe the fasts and festivals of the Christians? Shall we celebrate the birthdays of all the prophets and the saints without exception to get inspiration about different spiritual truths? It is evident that no religion will accept this as a correct description of its proper method of regulating life, for each believes that it contains all the elements necessary for ensuring correct devotion and conduct. If we omit the

most bigoted, which would regard all other scriptures as inspired by the Devil, the utmost that any religion is willing to concede is that there might be truth in other religions but not to the extent possessed by itself. In other words, different revelations are not sections but perspectives of the Divine prescription, the religion professed by ourselves being the most satisfactory representation of reality. Difficulty arises, however, when a religion claims that it would remain the most satisfactory at all times to come without undergoing any change or development.

But would matters improve if each religion were to respect the rest and admit the validity of each? When it is proclaimed that every religion leads to the desired goal (*yata mat tata path**—every view is an avenue), the looseness of thinking that may lurk there is not properly apprehended. This spiritual *laissez faire* may be the best method of preaching toleration among warring communities but would hardly serve as a basis of spiritual advancement. Nobody would admit, for instance, that the savage worshipping his fetish is following a religion which is equal in value to the mystic vision of the seer or the highly developed monotheism of a Christian or a Muslim. All that can be conceded is that in the intellectual stage in which the savage is he cannot develop more satisfactory religious ideas and that it is far better that he should have the religion he understands than that he should be bewildered with a creed which

he cannot follow. But can the same latitude be given to a man who is capable of much higher thinking—should he be allowed to remain undisturbed in his primitive creed when all around much better creeds are available? Should it not be the duty of all advanced religions to convert the minds that are capable of understanding their message? If they are not capable, should it not be the duty of cultured communities to spread education and culture with the object of pulling up the level of their understanding and appreciation of spiritual values? All reforming movement and all missionary enterprise would stand condemned if it is not the right and the duty of all advanced religions to propagate their doctrines and, as an indispensable preliminary thereto, to educate the people at large. Should religion be treated as a matter of native taste and should people not be taught to acquire new taste in this particular direction? Should there be any experiment with truth or should we remain contented with the faith in which we were born, never trying to improve it in personal and social lives? The very fact that with the advance of age and education people spontaneously change or develop their religious attitude and belief shows that there is no native religion proper. And the fact that all conversions are not forcible or prompted by secular greed lends additional weight to the view that improvement in one's religion is possible. Men may find that religion is such an organic affair that it is not possible always to conform to the socio-economic institution of one religion while alienated in thought from its basic spiritual foundation. In such cases it is not possible to remain satisfied with the doctrine that every view is an avenue, which cuts both ways in fact because it justifies change of faith as easily as bigoted conservatism, seeing that to it the new and the old faiths are equal

* We have tried to bring out in our Editorial of this month the implication of the dictum "As Many Faiths, So Many Paths" (*yata mat tata path*), and also shown *inter alia* the need and usefulness of the Parliaments of Religions held on a cosmopolitan basis. The readers would do well to read our Editorial in connection with the observations made on these subjects by Mr. H. D. Bhattacharyya in his learned article.—Ed. P. B.

pathways to reality. Even if it be admitted that it only enjoins that a strict observance of one's own creed would suffice for salvation, it does so on the condition that each man tries to use his religion at its best and not choose the baser and darker aspects of the creed. But this is tacitly accepting the view that all paths are *not* equal and that inside *each* path there are some lines where hurdles obstruct the progress of the soul and others where the soul has an unimpeded motion towards spirituality.

The truth then seems to be that all religions are not equally true and that although there may be truth in each religion the degree of truth is not the same in all religions. It is necessary to dissociate the true and the false in each religion and to discard the temporal and retain the eternal element. Had it been possible to practise a religion without belonging to any community in particular and had truth been the only religion, national and communal boundaries would have ceased to exist and humanity would have been the brotherhood to which all men would have belonged. But when the false is accepted along with the true or when the local, the temporal and the historical have to be retained in the creed along with the universal, the eternal and the ubiquitous, men's outlook becomes narrowed and personal religion is sacrificed in the interest of social cohesion—this specially occurs in religions where the maintenance of temporal power is regarded as an essential part of the faith. It is difficult to say whether at any time a universal religion would be evolved, for the human factor cannot be omitted altogether from any religion and without omniscience provision cannot be made for meeting all contingencies of life. The claim of omniscience made by or on behalf of a saint or a seer is, therefore, easily understood; for if this claim is not conceded, his vision would

not extend to all times and places and the scripture revealed through him would lose its validity in course of time. There is the possibility that men would agree about certain fundamental metaphysical propositions; but then this would not be religion, for religion contains factors which philosophy is constrained to ignore. Similarly, principles of morality may attain universality in course of time even though their application may depend upon the understanding of the persons concerned; but religion implies an attitude of mind which mere ethics is unable to bring about.

What can be done, however, is to acknowledge that men do not belong to the same type and that different tempers require different religious occupation. Meditation which comes natural to an introvert may be extremely difficult to an extrovert who would feel quite at home in social service and ceremonial observance. Emoticonalism is favourable for devotion but intellectualism is indispensable for speculation. The Indian religions broadly divided men into three categories—the devoted, the active and the curious, and prescribed the paths of *bhakti*, *karma* and *jñāna* respectively for these. If by 'Every view is an avenue' is meant that no man need despair of salvation because he happens to belong to one of these types, then the motto has an understandable meaning. Genuflexion in a mosque or a church may not suit the temper of a particular man nor compulsory fasting for a day or a month; but that does not mean that other men may not find this to be an excellent method of focussing their attention on things eternal. The Vaishnava (or Saiva), Mimāmsā and Advaita methods of worship may thus appeal to different tempers, and a recognition of the fundamental diversities of human nature would prevent many misunderstandings of religious motives and practices. It would

be found on last analysis that men, to whatever religion they might belong, do differ in temperament and that kindred spirits are drawn to one another by virtue of their native equipment. Education

may change the object of our devotion or thought or action but does not alter our psychological type. In any scheme of universal religion this diversity of types must be acknowledged.

ACHILLES CATCHES THE TORTOISE*

BY W. B. GROVE

The starry heavens—the dark-blue vault, “thick inlaid with patines of bright gold”—have been a theme for poets and philosophers since man came on the scene.

Go out of doors and sit in the garden on a calm, clear moonless night in February to look at the southern sky where Orion reigns supreme. No more wondrous sight can well be imagined for mortal eyes. Yet, strange to say, there is one important aspect of the sight which has attracted little attention until recent times, and, in fact, could not have done so while no clear ideas existed about the distance of the celestial objects from the human eye.

Let us consider a particular case: search for a telescopic field in which only two bright stars appear, and let us suppose that one of those objects is twice as far away as the other—say 1,000 million miles and 2,000 million miles respectively.

THE PATCHWORK UNIVERSE

If we had only the ordinary telescopic aids, *i.e.*, no means of spectroscopic analysis of the light, we might see two equally bright points, apparently indistinguishable from each other; while, as a matter of fact, at the time when we are looking at these, one of the objects may have exploded and vanished in dust many thousands of years ago while the

other is still untouched. The time taken by the light to travel to this earth must be taken into account or, to put in a sentence: *we never see the universe as it really is*, but only as a patchwork made up of pieces belonging to different ages put together like the fragments of a jigsaw puzzle.

Let us now study a contrasting scene: a picture on the “silver screen”, showing a crowd of people dancing in a public ball-room. Here we see couples whirling round, cannoning into one another, interweaving in complicated patterns, as one photograph after another merges into the apparently continuous whole. The point to be noted is that each of these pictures presents the crowd as it was *at one instant*, let us call it briefly an “instantograph.”

Comparing this with the universe as we see it in the heavens, it is plain that a similar series of photographs of the latter could be obtained only by a long and complicated process.

Imagine a celestial photographer who began, aeons ago, to take photographs of the sky at short intervals. To fix our ideas let us consider a small and

* Received through the kindness of Dr. A. H. Reginald Buller, D. Sc., LL.D., F.R.S., a friend of the writer (Mr. Grove), who passed away on January 6th, 1938. Dr. Buller informs us that this article was written by Mr. Grove in his 90th year.—

compact group of stars, the Pleiades. Let each of the photographs bear a date, and let us calculate the distance from us of each object in the group. Then it is clear that, if we could do this, we could name the exact moment at which each of these objects emitted the light-rays by which it was photographed.

Cut all the photographs into curvilinear pieces, as in a jig-saw puzzle, one object on each piece, and all the pieces of the same size and shape. Then from the whole complex of picture-pieces we could pick out the set which referred to the same instant of past time, and by putting these together in their respective places we could make up a composite picture representing the group of the Pleiades as it really was arranged at the exact moment chosen, an instantograph, and not as it was seen or could have been seen by any human being.

Suppose that a huge series of such instantographs could be made, at short intervals apart, and that all these were arranged to show in a machine like a mutoscope or a "zoetrope" in rapid succession in due order. The observer would then be in the same position as one watching the ball-room party on the cinema-screen. He would see the Pleiades as a solid scenic model, but one changing moment by moment as the stars went through their evolutions, *i.e.*, he would see the group as it might appear to an all-seeing omnipresent, supernatural being.

In other words, he would see this little cosmos (or on a larger scale might see the universe) as a four-dimensional body, having length, breadth, and thickness (like an ordinary solid in this world) but varying continuously in those dimensions as time went on.

Perhaps one might be allowed to put it that he would make a minute ap-

proach to the mental state of a divine personality, who was omniscient, omnipotent, all-pervading, and all-seeing—at least in the particular respect of viewing this universe, externally, as it really is, an entity having four dimensions, three of space and one of time.

ZENO'S PARADOX

Permit me to retell Zeno's famous paradox in modern language. One morning Achilles was strolling aimlessly along a suburban road: the road stretched away to infinity, perfectly straight, exactly level. Suddenly he perceived in front of him, at a distance of one hundred yards, a fine tortoise ambling gently along. Now, Achilles could run ten times as fast as a tortoise: and he said to himself—"That's a fine fellow: I must have the little beggar." So he sprinted after him. But when he reached the spot, lo! no tortoise was there. Looking forward, Achilles saw the animal ten yards away in front of him, so he continued to run without a pause. Again he was disappointed, but he could see the tortoise was now only one yard in front. Another rush brought him with a little more than three-and-a-half inches, but still no capture.

In fact Achilles did not achieve his object, and Zeno argued, with perfect truth, that *under the conditions stated* he never could do so. The tortoise would always be at a shorter and shorter, but still measurable, distance in front. This argument is irrefragable, though, for two thousand and four hundred years, logicians have vainly disputed about it in a wilderness of verbiage, awaiting Einstein's coming.

Yet we know that Achilles could catch his tortoise; every-day experience proves it. Where is the error? It lies in the fact that the problem is incorrectly posed, as will be shown below.

DEFICIENCIES OF NOTATION

But, before doing so, let us consider a parallel instance.

Arithmeticians tell us that $\cdot\dot{9}$ is equal to unity. This is untrue in logic, though it may pass as true in the stress of daily life. $9=1-1/10$ th; $\cdot99=1-1/100$ th; and so on. There is always the possibility of adding another nine to the long row of nines, but, however small the deficit from unity may become, it still remains. One-tenth of a real and definite quantity is as real and definite as the first quantity; therefore $\dot{9}$ is not equal and never can be equal to unity. The reason why we are obliged to admit the untruth into our practice lies at the fault of our decimal notation.

A convincing proof of the deficiency in our notation may be given in the following way.

Imprimis, geometrical diagrams need not be drawn on paper; the old philosophers' way of sketching them upon sand with a pointed stick is as good for the purpose as our finest drawing materials. The true geometrical drawing upon which we reason is always drawn *by the mind, in the mind, and on the mind*, and is perfectly and absolutely exact.

Ask a dozen persons to make this simple diagram: "Draw two straight lines AB and AC at right angles to one another, each one unit (say one inch) in length". All the drawings will be different from one another; not one of the lines will be exactly one inch long, and none of the angles will be an exact right angle; the mental diagram with which we have to deal, however, will be perfect.

Join BC; then the geometrician tells us that BC is $\sqrt{2}$ inches in length: that is true, but when he goes on to say that $\sqrt{2}=1.414\dots$ an interminable decimal which can never be exactly evaluated,

he is trenching on an untruth, as our mental diagram shows.

Think for a moment: in it AB is drawn from a definite point A to a definite point B, and is exact in length; the same is true of AC. But BC is drawn from a definite point B to a definite point C and therefore must be as exact in length as they are. BC is correctly represented by $\sqrt{2}$, but is not correctly represented by 1.414.....If we cannot express the exact length in a form suitable for measuring purposes, that is the fault of our inadequate notation.

Perhaps the reason for the confusion of thought recorded above is to be found in the ambiguous use of the word *limit* by some mathematicians. When we say that 1.0 is the limit of $\cdot\dot{9}$, we mean that its value approaches nearer and nearer to unity as the long line of nines extends, but even if the line is continued to "the last syllable of recorded time" the sum is still short of unity, and can never actually reach it.

Again, on a circular arc take any point P and draw the chord PQ and the tangent PT. Then, as Q moves along the arc towards P, the direction of PQ moves nearer and nearer to that of PT. Finally, at the instant when Q is sliding over and becoming identical with P, PQ slides over and becomes identical with PT. We may say that PT is the limiting position of PQ, but the difference is that in this case the limit is actually reached; it would be better if the difference were marked by a change in the mode of expression.

THE TIME DIMENSION

There are four dimensions to space-time, but they are not four homologous entities. Three of them are measures of space—length, breadth, and thickness (along OX, OY, OZ); the other is a measure of time, of a quite different

character from the other three, and to be measured in a different way.

The nonsense which has been printed in many scores of ephemeral books during the last half-century, about this fourth dimension as being at right angles to the other three (an absolute impossibility in the universe to which we are born, however, thinkable it may be as a mere mathematical conception) has had its day and ceased to be. The time-axis (OW) cuts through all three planes of space at any angle, as the case may be.

It is not possible to draw two lines supposed not to be in one plane, at a right or any other angle, on the same piece of paper, except by a conventional device. It is true that, by such means, in solid geometry diagrams, we affect to represent the third axis, OZ , obliquely on the paper, at right angles to the plane XOY ; but our imagination pictures this line as projecting from the paper into space on both sides. This trick is of no effect when we want to represent the fourth axis also.

But it happens that, in considering Zeno's problem we do not need to take into account more than two of the four axes. For the Achilles-tortoise race may be regarded as confined in space strictly to one straight line, and does not require to make any reference to the two other axes of space.

Let us draw a diagram in which OX represents the suburban road, stretching away to infinity. On OX mark off OA , 100 units long, and AT , ten units long. Then O may represent the position of Achilles, and A the position of the tortoise at the beginning of the race, while A may represent the position of Achilles and T the corresponding posi-

tion of the tortoise at any future moment.

Let the plane on which OX is drawn rotate round OX until it is brought into such a position that it contains the time-axis. Draw OW to represent this time-axis, at any angle with OX . Then we have in the field WOX all the materials required for plotting and tracing the world-lines of the two contestants, *i.e.*, the routes of Achilles and the tortoise in space-time.

Draw AA^1 and TT^1 parallel to OW , and both of the same length; these latter lines represent the time occupied in the period considered, which is the same for both the actors in the scene.

Join OA^1 and AT^1 ; then by the parallelogram convention these diagonals represent the actual motions of Achilles and the tortoise in space-time during the interval. That is Achilles does not move from O to A and then A to A^1 , but along OA^1 ; and similarly the tortoise does not move from A to T and from T to T^1 , but direct from A to T^1 .

But since, by the conditions of the problem, OA^1 is inclined at a smaller angle to OX than is AT^1 , it follows inevitably that these lines OA^1 and AT^1 must meet if produced and intersect somewhere in the field XOW , say at Q . Then Q represents the time when, and the point at which, Achilles overtakes the tortoise in space-time.

It is a fundamental postulate of the Space-Time of Relativity that the same route in space can never be twice traversed, *i.e.*, by two bodies one succeeding the other. In a similar sense, one cannot bathe twice in the same river.

Thus Achilles captures his prey, as we know he did. Zeno posed the problem; more than two thousand years later Einstein solved it.

WHAT SWAMI VIVEKANANDA STOOD FOR

BY MRS. CHANDRA KUMARI HANDOO, M.A.

Within the last hundred years, our motherland has given birth to many great sons, who have contributed in various degrees to the renaissance in India to-day. Swami Vivekananda holds a high position amongst these makers of modern India. Though a versatile genius we honour his memory as a saint and a patriot. Primarily a man of action yet he scaled inaccessible spiritual heights. His courage and will knew no obstacle and defeat. Strength of mind and body, tenacity of purpose, utter sincerity, and fearlessness in all walks of life were his pass words.

But, more than all this, his sacred memory is clear to us for excavating the soul of Hinduism buried by centuries of superstition and vain customs. With his world famous speech at the Parliament of Religions when he took America by storm a greater Hinduism came to light.

Many attempts were made before him to revive the pure teachings of the Upanishads but in sifting the good from the evil there was a danger of much being destroyed. A hundred sects sprang up, each loud in praising itself and denouncing the other. To bring unity in this vast body of Hinduism was a task for no ordinary man. Hence we see the star of Ramakrishna rising in the Indian sky, undergoing all kinds of spiritual practices to find the underlying unity not only of the warring sects of the Hindus but also of all religions in the world. His disciple Swami Vivekananda carried his message far and wide. Unlike the others he rejected nothing. In the largeness of his heart he perceived the image

of God in the most grotesque idol, just as we may see a glimpse of the sky in the dirty drain as well as in the purest drop of dew. All roads lead to Rome. All radii converge to the same centre. No human soul is condemned for ever. Consciously or unconsciously we are moving towards the same goal which is God. Each individual should be free to choose his own Ishtam—the ideal which appeals best to him. Does he worship Siva or Shakti, Jesus or Buddha, Allah or Zoroaster, it matters not. It is but the same water which gets its form from the pitcher in which it is filled. Let each one drink its own water and allow the rest to drink theirs. Why need we quarrel with one another when there is plenty of water for everybody to drink.

Like our present Mahatma he was able to feel the pulse of India and in that lay his genius. Sunk in the depth of inertia and dullness we were posing as great ascetics who did not care for the pleasures of the world. The truth was just the contrary. We were too lazy to make an effort even for the ordinary pleasures of life. The line of least resistance was ours. Servility to meaningless custom and fear to depart from it even by an inch was sapping the very roots of Hinduism. Time seemed to bestow sanctity on many customs whose utility was long over. There was no spirit of enquiry. Fear of losing caste was uppermost in the minds of all. Religion consisted of "Don't-touchism" and had purely a negative value. Convention held everybody in a deadly grip, but Swami Vivekananda saw through this sham and hypocrisy. He

condemned weakness and fear wholeheartedly. 'Be strong and manly' was his advice to the young. In one of his lectures he said, "I have respect even for one who is wicked so long as he is manly and strong; for his strength will make him some day give up his wickedness and will then eventually bring him into the truth."

Swami Vivekananda was tall and well built, and men paid homage to him wherever he went. But behind his imposing exterior was a heart full of compassion. His love for the starving millions of India burnt like a steady flame which almost consumed him. Two conflicting desires fought for ascendancy in his mind. One was that of a monk desiring to lead a life of contemplation in solitude, and the other was to live in the world and serve his country and humanity. He had once said that his greatest ambition was to remain immersed in Samâdhi—to be forever in sweet communion with God—but he had been immediately rebuked by his Guru who chided him for having such a selfish desire. He was born for a greater purpose, said Sri Ramakrishna who likened him to a great banyan tree which would give shelter and rest to many world-weary travellers on their path of life.

To fulfil this destiny he remained in harness till the very last. In America he was the guest of the richest in the land, and they literally smothered him with luxury; but in the comfort of their palaces he sobbed away the whole night thinking of his countrymen to whom were denied the bare necessities of life. During an epidemic—a Pandit once complained of not being able to talk to him of religion. At that moment he said, "So long as even a dog in my country is without food my whole religion will be to feed it".

His heart, so full of love for suffering

humanity, has been compared to that of Lord Buddha who appeared to him in a vision while still a young boy. In physical appearances there was a marked resemblance between the two. Swami Vivekananda loved the Prophets and Saints of all religions. Lord Buddha was the special object of his love and reverence and he spoke of him often to his disciples. On one occasion some one struck by his devotion to Buddha asked him in surprise if he was his follower. He replied with great emotion, "I am a servant of the servant of the servant of Lord Buddha".

As a wandering monk he had walked the length and breadth of India and had lived with the highest and the lowest. India was to him no figure of the imagination but she was a living mother at whose feet he poured the love of his heart. He had the vision to foresee the greatness and glory of India which is but partially realised to-day. "India is immortal", he said, "if she persists in her search for God. If she gives it up for politics she will die". He prophesied that as in the days of Buddhism a spiritual wave from India had spread all over the world, so another and a greater wave carrying the seeds of India's spiritual heritage would now fertilise the earth again.

On his way to America he went via China and Japan and in both countries he found many relics of old Hindu civilization. This led him to believe in the spiritual unity of Asia. India was the mother country and the Buddhist countries were her spiritual daughters. India had never conquered by the sword but by love, and her mission was to spread peace and goodwill on earth. Her empire was of the spirit alone.

Superficially the unity between Eastern and Western Asia does not seem to be so pronounced but here again India is the connecting link. Asia has given

birth to all the great religions of the world, and these pearls of her thought have been strung together on a thread which runs throughout this vast continent. The life of her people is based on religion and a culture of the spirit as against the West which is ever striving for the conquest of nature or the outer self.

Swamiji had the greatest regard for Islam,—a religion very often misunderstood by many. Unfortunately Islam has been associated in history with bloodshed and forcible conversion. But this does not detract from its original spirit of catholicism and tolerance. Violence and coercion were never preached by the Prophet who himself was a man of great gentleness and humility. Love for all human beings and even for birds and beasts has been strictly enjoined on his followers, and it is a religion essentially based on what is known as love or Ahimsâ.

Swami Vivekananda's love for Christ

is well known to those acquainted with his life. On being asked what he would do if Christ were alive, he answered reverently, "I would wash his feet with the very life blood of my heart". His was a universal religion. In the light of his Master's teachings his sole aim was to help us in our own chosen path, be it Christianity, Hinduism, Islam or any other religion in the world.

With the advent of the British, India was nearly carried away by a slavish imitation of the West. But Swami Vivekananda stemmed this tide, and reminded India that her ideal unlike the West was not enjoyment but renunciation and service. He believed that India had a message to give to the world. Within the brief span of two score years he woke the nation up from its slumber, defended her faith abroad, and showed the world that India would not sacrifice any part of her spiritual culture against the onslaught of material civilization.

SOME VEDANTIC VIEWS ON UNIVERSAL CAUSATION

BY PROF. ASHOKANATH SHASTRI, M.A., P.R.S., VEDANTATIRTHA

VACHASPATI MISHRA'S VIEW¹

Vâchaspati, the author of the *Bhâmati*, feels very strongly against calling Mâyâ the material cause of the world. According to him, Brahman is the apparent cause of the world. Mâyâ, on

¹ In two of our previous articles (*vide*, P. B., June and October, 1938) we endeavoured to give in brief the views of the authors of the *Padârthatattvanirnaya*, *Vivarana*, and *Samkshepashârîraka* about the question of Universal Causation. In the present article, we shall try to analyse the views of a few more Advaita writers on the same subject. The next thinker chosen for this purpose is Vâchaspati Mishra, the celebrated author of the *Bhâmati*.

the other hand, is regarded as the instrumental cause (*sahakâri*) only, but never as the material cause proper.²

Vâchaspati postulates two different types of Mâyâ or Avidyâ.³ The first is called the original or causal Mâyâ (*kâranarûpâ*), and the second is the totality of the memory-impressions of previous illusions (*vâsanâ*) possessed of the power of creating the appearance of

² "Vâchaspatimishrâs tu Jîvâshritamâyâvitshayîkritam brahma svata eva jâdyâshraya-prapanchâkârena vivartamânatayopâdânânam iti mâyâ sahakârimâtram"—*S. L. S.*, p. 77.

³ Anirvâchyâvidyâdvitayasachivasya prabhavato . . ."—*Bhâmati*, introductory verse 1.

the multifarious entities.⁴ These individual *vâsanâs* exist as potentialities in the causal Avidyâ, and by an inherent energy are actualised in the perceived illusions. The causal Mâyâ is an identity existing from the beginningless time in the individual self. It has got a double function. In the first place it functions as the repository of the *vâsanâs*, and in the second place, it screens the Reality from our view.

The question of insentience of the world may be raised here also. Vâchaspati thinks that the insentience of the world is not derived from its material cause, but is an attribute natural with the effect. So there is absolutely no need to bring in Mâyâ as the material cause of the world to justify the insentience found in the product.⁵

Prof. Radhakrishnan, however, observes in this connexion, "The insentience (*jadatâ*) of the world must be due to something else than Brahman pure and simple, and it is perhaps better to say that the world with its finite-infinite nature is to be traced to Brahman-Mâyâ."⁶

Prof. Radhakrishnan seems to think that Vâchaspati has failed to explain the origination of the material world from Pure Absolute Consciousness (Brahman), and for this he believes

⁴ "Svakârane'nirvâchyâyâm avidyâyâm lînah sūkshmena shaktirûpena karmavikshepakâvidyâvâsanâbhih sahâvatishthanta eva . . ."—*Ibid.*, under 1.3.30., N. S. Ed., p. 333. Also—"Kâranabhûtayâ layalakshanayâvidyayâ prâksargopachitena cha vikshepasamskârena. . ."—*Ibid.*, under II.2.2., N. S. S., p. 494.

⁵ "Jagaty anugatam jâdyam na kârana-gunah, kintu jagata eva svâbhâvikam; atas tatsiddhaye mâyâyâ upâdânatvam kâryânugatadvârakâranatvam vâ na kalpanîyam"—*S. L. S. Tîkâ*, pp. 76-77.

⁶ *Ind. Phil.* Vol. II, pp. 552-53. In making this statement, Prof. Radhakrishnan seems to prefer the solution given by the author of *Padârthatattvanirnaya* to that of Vâchaspati.

that the service of a Cosmic Mâyâ, existing in Brahman, must necessarily be requisitioned. We, on the other hand, are inclined to think that Vâchaspati's explanation of the insentient world as an appearance over Brahman through the instrumentality of the two-fold Mâyâ is neither inadequate, nor logically inconsistent. It may, however, be and has actually been attacked on other grounds which we are stating below.

Many an eminent writer of Vedânta has lent his support to this view of Vâchaspati. Thus Achyutakrishnânandatîrtha, in his commentary on the *Siddhântaleshasamgraha*, while introducing the view of Vâchaspati, explicitly states that the insentience of the world is not to be traced to its ultimate cause, but is a natural attribute of the product.

This view of Vâchaspati derives its final support from Bâdarâyana himself. Because, the objection raised by the Sânkhyas (in the '*Na-vilakshanatva adhikarana*') that the effect must be of the same nature as the *causa materialis*—sounds consistent from this point of view only. According to the *Bhâmatî*, the cause (*i.e.* Brahman) is intelligent, but the effect (*i.e.* the world) is non-intelligent. The objection raised by the Sânkhyas can, therefore, be urged against this position of the *Bhâmatî* with the greatest force.

The answer given by the *Bhâmatî* is also very cogent; for the *Bhâmatî* states that every attribute of the product cannot possibly be traced to its material cause. In that case the difference between the cause and the effect would be indiscernible. The insentience of the world, for example, is not to be deduced from the material cause (Brahman), but is natural with the effect itself (the world). The Sûtra-kâra, too, supports this answer in the

aphorism—‘But it is seen’—where he declares that the objection of the Sāṅkhyas is without any force; since the homogeneity of the cause and the effect is not an essential condition of causality.⁸ It is often seen that animate objects such as scorpions, etc., are produced from inanimate matter such as cowdung etc. Thus a non-intelligent material cause (Mâyâ) need not be dragged in to explain the insentience of the world. On the other hand, those that assume a non-intelligent cause merely on the ground of explaining the insentience of the world would not be able to make their positions consistent with that of the Sūtrakâra. The objection raised by the Sāṅkhyas and the refutation of the same by the Sūtrakâra would be utterly meaningless from their viewpoint. For the reply given by the Sūtrakâra to the Sāṅkhya objection distinctly points out that the homogeneity of the cause and the effect is not necessary at all. So it is the *Bhâmatî* only that has been able to grasp the true spirit of the *Brahmasûtras*,—while others, who insist on a non-intelligent cause (Mâyâ) to account for the insentience in the effect, would find it extremely difficult to reconcile their positions with the doctrine set forth by Bâdarâyana in connexion with this topic.

It is for this reason that Vâchaspati contends that the individual self (Jîva) is the locus of Mâyâ. He finds no reason to associate Mâyâ with Brahman and to trace the causality to Brahman-Mâyâ, as almost all other schools of Vedantic Monism and Qualified Monism have endeavoured.

⁷ “Drishyate tu”—*Br. Sû. II. 1. 6.*

⁸ This principle is adopted on all hands by all subschools of the Advaita system and by Râmânuja as well—in fact by all who have tried to refute the objection raised in this connexion by the Sāṅkhyas.

⁹ “Chinmâtrâshritam ajñânânam Jivapakshapâtivât Jivâshritam uchyate”—*Vivarana-prameyasamgraha.*

According to Vâchaspati, ignorance rests on the individual self, because all our actual experiences of ignorance are of the form—‘I am ignorant’ (*aham ajñah*). On an analysis of the judgment it is found that it is consciousness as determined by the ego-sense that is the locative of ignorance. There can be no steadfast rule that the locus and the object of covering should be self-identical. Ignorance situated in Jîva, therefore, can easily cover Brahman as its object, though the latter is distinct and different from the former (of course, from the empirical standpoint, where alone the question of covering by ignorance can rise at all). The authors of *Vivarana* and *Samkshepashârîraka*, however, controvert this view saying that Brahman must be the locus and object of Mâyâ, since there is no incompatibility in the object and the substratum of a covering being identical and coincident. This is seen to be the fact in the case of external darkness. Darkness covers the very place in which it exists, and Avidyâ or ignorance is nothing but internal darkness and should have the same incidents. But Vâchaspati contends that just as in ordinary illusions, the individual ignorance located in Jîva, covers up the consciousness particularised by the shell which is situated outside, so in the case of the original ultimate Avidyâ, too, the object and the locus should be different.

The entire dispute turns on the interpretation of the common experience of ignorance expressed in the proposition—‘I am ignorant.’ Vâchaspati, we have pointed out, holds that the subject of ignorance is not unqualified Consciousness, but Consciousness as determined and delimited by the ego-sense (*ahantâ-vishishtam chaitanyam*). Ignorance is seen to be predicated of this limited consciousness or self. It will be wrong

to hold, Vâchaspati contends, that ignorance is predicated of Consciousness pure and simple. Because this interpretation runs counter to the unmistakable evidence of experience. Prakâshâtman, however, does not accept the analysis of the illusory experience as offered by Vâchaspati. He holds that the predicate in the judgment—'I am ignorant'—is not ignorance only, but also the ego-sense. The two adjectives 'ignorance' and 'ego-sense' are simultaneously predicated of Pure Consciousness as the Subject and the judgment follows as a matter of course (*ekatra dvayam iti rîtyâ jâyamânam vishishtajñânam*). Mâdhava, however, tries to reconcile the view of Vâchaspati with that of the *Vivarana*. He thinks that the difference between the two views is not fundamental. Though the individualised consciousness as Jîva is regarded as the substratum of ignorance, still the real locus is Pure Consciousness, which forms the background of the Jîvahood. Achyutakrishnânda also lends support to this view. He says that Consciousness is the locus of ignorance and the individuality of the Jîva only serves to determine the incidence of ignorance and certainly does not enter as a factor into the locus of ignorance. So there is ultimately no difference between the two schools in the matter of Consciousness alone being the locus of ignorance. There is, however, a very material difference, viz., that Vâchaspati does not subscribe to the existence of one cosmic ignorance or *Mâyâ* existing outside the individuated selves as an adjunct of the Absolute, which is the position of the *Vivarana*. The result is that Personal God becomes a matter of individual illusion and thus has no independent existence outside

the individual minds. He becomes as much a product of individual ignorance as the phenomenal world—an apparent anomaly in which we have a man-made God instead of a God-made man,—the protests of the *Kalpataru* notwithstanding.

Now, the fallacy of logical 'see-saw' (*anyonyâshraya*) or mutual dependence, has been urged against Vâchaspati's conception of Avidyâ as residing only in the individual selves. Vâchaspati thinks that Avidyâ is responsible for the defects of ignorance and as these cannot be conceived to exist in the Absolute, Avidyâ is incompatible with it. Its existence in the individual is, however, indisputable; so the individual self is regarded as its locus. But here also a difficulty arises. There is no denying the fact that Brahman is the only Reality and the existence of the multiform world and the multiplicity of Jîvas or individuals is a false appearance due to the influence of Avidyâ. So Avidyâ must have a prior existence in order that the existence of Jîvas may be possible. Avidyâ is the cause of individuation and to make this Avidyâ dependent upon individuated selves is to put the cart before the horse. Individual selves are dependent upon Avidyâ; and to make this Avidyâ, again, dependent upon the individuals for its very existence and functioning is clearly a case of arguing in a vicious circle.

Followers of Vâchaspati contend in reply that there is a case of reciprocal dependence in the very connotation of Jîva. But this reciprocity does not involve any logical absurdity. Only those cases of reciprocity are vicious which make the independent origination or cognition of the things in reciprocal relation an impossibility. In other words, where a particular thing

A can come into existence, in dependence upon another thing *B*, and this *B*, again, is supposed to owe its existence to *A*, or the cognition of *A* is made possible by *B* and the cognition of *B* by that of *A*,—it gives rise to a logical fallacy. The implication is that this fallacy arises where the relation in question is one of causality. But in the present case, the relation of Avidyâ and the individual is not one of causality, but one of co-existence. And such co-existence of two factors, though mutually determined is not logically absurd, as it is attested in uncontradicted experience. To take a concrete example, there is such mutual dependence between a thing being a substance and being a substratum of attributes. Now, the possession of attributes determines a thing to be a thing and *vice versa*. Or, as in a triangle, the attributes of triangularity and three-sidedness are found to be co-existent and mutually determined without any question of priority or posteriority. But this is not open to logical objection, as the relation, though one of mutual implication, is not one of causality. The existence of one is not brought about by the existence of another as a condition precedent. The two factors co-exist as a matter of logical necessity. Had this relation been one between an antecedent and a consequent, it would have been a case of logical see-saw. The existence of the individual implies the existence of Avidyâ, and this implication is logical and not causal. The two factors are really aspects of the same thing, involved by an equal logical necessity in the very meaning of it. Avidyâ and individuality are thus two co-existent facts logically involved in a self-identical situation, and no question of priority or posteriority, therefore, arises.

Another objection is advanced against the position of Vâchaspati regarding the causality of Brahman. Now, Brahman is regarded as the substantive cause of the world-appearance by all schools of Sankara Vedânta, and this is held to be possible by the existence of a quasi-real principle, viz., Mâyâ in and upon Brahman. In fact, as we have made it clear, the world is but the effect of Mâyâ, and is regarded as the effect of Brahman because Mâyâ and Brahman are co-associated. According to Vâchaspati Mâyâ or Avidyâ exists in Jîva, and so the world as the effect of this Avidyâ should be regarded as the effect of Jîva-cum-Mâyâ.

But this will be in direct opposition to the accepted position of Vedânta. Vâchaspati in reply contends that the location of Mâyâ is immaterial. It is the substratum of the world-appearance that should be regarded as the material cause. Mâyâ, though located in Jîva, operates upon the substratum or Brahman and focuses the world-appearance upon it. Vâchaspati thus succeeds in bringing his position into line with the accepted doctrine of the causality of Brahman; but that has been possible only by virtue of a forced interpretation of the concept of material causality (*upâdânatâ*). A material cause is defined as not only the substratum of the effect, but one that is possessed of productive efficiency. In Vâchaspati's view, the productive efficiency cannot be predicated of Brahman. So one important factor is lacking. In this view, moreover, no means or criterion is left to us to distinguish between what should be a material cause proper and a mere locus. For example, the ground surface, on which a table rests, is a mere locus and not the cause. But in Vâchaspati's interpretation, the locus should be

regarded as the material cause which is absurd.¹⁰

And the fatal objection is that Vâchaspati reduces Vedânta Philosophy to pure Subjectivism, and Solipsism is but one step farther from it. The objective world may have an ontological foundation in Brahman which rather serves as the silver screen of the Cinema show, but it has no extra-subjective status. For consistency's sake, Vâchaspati cannot believe in the existence of the world when the individual ceases to perceive it, "*Cessante causa cessat effectus*"—the cause having ceased to act, the effect ceases also. Belief in the existence of other thinking subjects does not improve matters. This would at most make the world inter-subjective, and so far as the objectivity of the world and its independent laws of existence and function are concerned, it is only a blank. The Idealism of Vâchaspati is perilously near to the Subjective Idealism of the Vijnânnavâdins and of Berkeley and is thus exposed to all the consequences of those two types of philosophy. It should, however, be noted in fairness to Vâchaspati that his metaphysics is entirely different from the metaphysics of the Buddhists and of Berkeley in more than one fundamental respect. To be brief, Vâchaspati is a monist; the individual selves are a creation of eternal Avidyâ and they have no independent existence and are ultimately merged in the Absolute; whereas the Subjectivistic schools maintain the existence of a plurality of selves. Another momentous difference from the Buddhist Idealism lies in the nature of the objective world. Though according to Vâchaspati the world is but

a manifestation of Avidyâ inherent in the individual, this manifestation is made possible only because the Absolute serves as its background. In the Buddhist account, the world is but an unfounded illusion. Vâchaspati, therefore, insists that though a creation of the individual's ignorance, the world-appearance should be affiliated to the Absolute Consciousness as its cause, as it cannot emerge without such a substratum.¹¹ The individual and his ignorance rather serve as an occasion and as a condition only; but the world-appearance becomes possible only because it is supported on the Absolute. It would have been a purely subjective creation, if the world could come into existence without the assistance of the substratum. The causality of Brahman, therefore, stands unshaken, as without it the individual Avidyâ or *vâsanâs* are absolutely impotent to bring the world into existence.¹²

Before bringing this review of Vâchaspati's philosophy to a conclusion, we feel it imperative, in view of the paramount position it occupies in the history of Vedânta, that we should go deeper into the meaning of material causation. Of course, Isvara, *i.e.*, Brahman, endowed with a Cosmic Energy in the shape of Mâyâ, is regarded as the material cause of the world in other schools of Monistic Vedânta, pre-eminently the *Vivarana* school. And this conception of Brahman as creating the world from its own Self serving at the same time as its background, makes the causality of Brahman more intelligible to our understanding than the conception of Brahman acting only as

¹⁰ Compare and contrast the position of Vijnânabhikshu who advocates the doctrine of locative causation (*vide*, part II).

¹¹ Cf. "Niradhishthânavibhrânter abhâvâd âtmano' stitâ; Shûnyasyâpi sasâkshivâd anyathâ noktir asya te"—*Pañchadasi*, VI. 76.

¹² *Bhâmatî*, under Jagadvâchitva adhikarana—*Br. Sû.* 1.4. 16-18.

its substratum, as Vâchaspati maintains. But though this interpretation holds good of personalised Brahman, it is absolutely inapplicable with regard to the Impersonal Absolute. The *Vivaraṇa* cannot deny the causality of the Impersonal Absolute. But this causality can be possible only in the sense of its merely being the substratum of the world-appearance. If it is maintained, as is really done by Appaya Dīkshita in his *Siddhāntaleśhasamgraha*, that Impersonal Absolute, divested of all relation with the Cosmic Energy, is not yet an accomplished fact, but would emerge only after the exhaustion of the world-process with

the emancipation of all the individual Jīvas, the view would be open to the charge of another extremism. Vâchaspati may be ridiculed for making Personal God contingent upon the individual; but the other view makes the situation worse in making the Impersonal Absolute a future contingency. In other words, Brahman, according to this view, would be an imperfect, rather a less perfect Being than the Impersonal Absolute, whom alone we can conceive as the most perfect existence. Had the Personal God been a perfect existence we would have no warrant to postulate the existence of another Ultimate Impersonal Absolute.

A PRACTICAL MYSTIC

BY REV. DR. RALPH O. HARPOLE, PH.D.

First of all, when so many people hear the word "mystic", they think of it in terms of irrationality. They think of a mystic as being psychopathic and of religious ecstasy as being a sort of mild form, at least, of religious epilepsy. It is desirable therefore to start with a definition of mysticism which is generally acceptable to-day. Rufus Jones says that a man is not only a mystic but a practical mystic when his life becomes an organ for the life of God, and when by his efforts he raises the moral tone of his church, of a school, of a village or even of the Sunday School. A man is called a mystic when he has an immediate and direct experience of God.

Horace Bushnell had such an experience. He was born in 1802 in Connecticut. His life was practically contemporary with that of Darwin and of Abraham Lincoln, and that helps us to locate him. Perhaps it explains in part why so many people have called him the

Emancipator, the Liberator of American theology. I wish to point out how he does fit into the category of Rufus Jones, *ie.*, how his life became a direct organ for the life of God and an instrument for raising the tone of the church, school and community.

In the first place, Horace Bushnell started out with a mild religious experience in his youth. Later, after he had graduated from Yale, his religious life ran down, and when a tutor he was overcome by the darkness of death. In a religious experience which was chiefly based upon Jesus, he affirmed that if he found the truth he would follow it, if there were a God he would give him all of his life. It was not, however, until 1848 after he had become a minister in the church at Hartford that he woke up in the middle of the night and roused his wife to say that the letter which they had been waiting for, more than they had been waiting for the dawn, had

come. She said, "What?" And he said, "The Gospel." The Gospel had been opened to Horace Bushnell in such a way that he changed the whole tenor of Protestant theology, in America. Up to that time the theology of Jonathan Edwards had, with its strict, rational logic, ruled the field of Protestant thought; but Horace Bushnell brought in something of God's love which was lacking in the older thought. It was his efforts which caused thinkers to adjust their thought to the new science that was just being born at the time. In the first place, Jonathan Edwards had talked about the enslavement of the will, bound under the adamant chain of cause and effect, and Horace Bushnell in his book, *The Natural and the Unnatural*, spoke about the freedom of the will, and in that book he put forward the right of religious thinkers to accept the accredited results of true science as these results were then being brought into existence. In his book, *God and Christ*, he broke away from the old Tri-theistic position in theology. In that book he had something of the warmth of God's love which was absent from the variant and divergent theories of atonement which were produced at that time. One of our greatest American thinkers, Frank E. Foster, wrote that Bushnell had left a deeper impression than any other man since Jonathan Edwards upon the field of American thought.

Horace Bushnell was profoundly a preacher, and he wrote what, the *New York Tribune* said, was one of the three greatest sermons in American literature. His writings were the outpouring of his deep religious life. We pass from this contribution that he made to thought to a little about his own personal experience, the experience of the Gospel that had broken into his life. Horace Bushnell could be called a Protestant saint. Many people are aware of the

story of the little boy that had gone with his parents into a great cathedral. They had come home and he was asking his mother what a saint was, and she said, "Don't you remember the pictures of those lovely looking characters in the old stained glass windows of the cathedral?" "Yes, Mother," he said, "I do remember. Saints are men who let the light shine through, aren't they?" Stand outside of the great window at Notre Dame and the glass is opaque, but when one gets inside the light shines through. That is what the inner experience of the presence of God did for Horace Bushnell, and time after time, he speaks of how the soul is opaque until the light of God shines through. Horace Bushnell was constantly stating that as a step towards the possession of the sense of the immediate presence of God, one must first of all clear out the rubbish of sin in one's life, before he could enter into the state of love, and he consequently thought that by realization, by acceptance and by trust, one could recognize the God who is seeking for His children in love.

We may call him a practical mystic for some of his practical works. If you go down to the City of Hartford to-day, you see a park in the centre of the city. It is Bushnell Park. If you see the State Capitol there in the centre of the city, Horace Bushnell picked out the site. If you take a drink from the faucet, it was Horace Bushnell whose engineering skill showed them how to bring down the water from Windsor to supply the municipal needs of Hartford. Someone wrote of him immediately after his death what was written about Sir Christopher Wren in his great cathedral in London: "If you wish a monument, look about you." The Hartford paper said the morning after his death, "Seldom has it been in our time that any man has left such an imprint upon the

life of a city as Horace Bushnell has left upon the City of Hartford." It was he who gave the great impetus to the public school system. It was he who was interested in every matter of social reform, who not only suffered because of his new theological beliefs, but also suffered as a social and a religious reformer in his day.

Not only by his practical works, by the monuments that he left, but also by the ideals that he had, he was a practical man. When the University of California was looking for a site, it was Horace Bushnell who chose the site of Berkeley for it in one of his enforced vacations. Again, when other engineers were undecided about the route that should be taken through the mountains in California, it was Horace Bushnell who suggested a site for the railroad across the Sierra Nevadas and the Coastal

Range, a site that thirteen years after became the site for the new railroad which was built. Here is a man that was an engineer, a social engineer and a religious engineer, a practical mystic.

Early in his career he became tubercular, and we are told that on one occasion when he climbed Mount Mercy his trail was left up the mountain side in blood on the snow, from his lung. They were trying to find a new route up the side of Mount Mercy in the Adirondacks, and having rested the night, Joseph Twitchell said, "Bushnell, don't you think we had better go back?" He turned to him and said, "You may go back if you wish, but I am going on," and his spirit was ever thus. His religious experience made him what William James said of Ignatius, one of the most powerfully practical human engines that ever lived.

MULAMADHYAMA-KĀRIKĀ

BY SWAMI VIMUKTANANDA

CHAPTER I

EXAMINATION OF CAUSALITY

An enquiry is now being made into the definition of *pratyaya* (cause).

उत्पद्यते प्रतीत्येमानितीमे प्रत्ययाः किल ।

यावन्नोत्पद्यत इमे तावन्नाप्रत्ययाः कथम् ॥ ५ ॥

इमान् These प्रतीत्य reaching उत्पद्यते originates (कार्यम् effect) इति therefore इमे these किल verily प्रत्ययाः causes (भवन्ति are) यावत् as long as न not उत्पद्यते arises (कार्यम् effect) तावत् so long इमे these अप्रत्ययाः non-causes कथं how न not (भवन्ति are) ?

5. Those facts depending on which an effect originates are verily called causes. But so long as no effect is produced why should they not be non-causes?

An antecedent contingent depending on which an effect is produced is called a cause or *pratyaya*, so a cause is inseparably connected with the effect.

But when the effect is not yet produced no one can consistently think of a cause at all.

It is opined that while we have seen some similar causes producing some effect at some other time, why should we not call a particular thing a cause assuming that it will also produce some result in the future? This is not acceptable, for, it is taken for granted that some thing in the past was really the cause of some effect, which is not a fact, as the same difficulty will present itself when we shall make an enquiry into the causal relation between the past cause and effect. So causality is an impossibility.

नैवासतो नैव सतः प्रत्ययोऽर्थस्य युज्यते ।

असतः प्रत्ययः कस्य सतश्च प्रत्ययेन किम् ॥ ६ ॥

असतः of non-existent अर्थस्य of thing प्रत्ययः cause न not युज्यते becomes proper एव verily (तथा so) सतः of existent (अर्थस्य of thing) न not एव truly, असतः of non-existent (अर्थस्य of thing) कस्य of which प्रत्ययः cause (स्यात् should be) सतः of the existent (अर्थस्य of thing) च also प्रत्ययेन by a cause किम् what (स्यात् should be) ?

6. It is not proper that either a non-existent or an existent thing should have a cause. If it is non-existent, then whose is the cause? and if existent, what for the cause?

A cause is redundant in the case of an existent entity as its production a second time is superfluous. But in the case of a would-be effect one can speak of a thing as its cause if the latter has the potentiality (*shakti*) to produce the result. A lump of clay that has the potentiality to produce a pot may be called a cause with reference to a future pot. But this is untenable. It is the invariable condition of a cause to have its effect co-existing with it, and what now exists is not the effect but only the potentiality to produce it. The particular cause in question is never the cause of the co-existing potentiality but it is desired to be the cause of the result. So in the absence of the result a cause is no cause.

Thus causality in general is refuted; now the refutation of particular causes is attempted.

न सन्नासन्न सदसन्धर्मो निर्वर्तते यदा ।

कथं निर्वर्तको हेतुरेवं सति हि युज्यते ॥ ७ ॥

यदा while सन् existing धर्मः thing न not निर्वर्तते comes into being असन् non-existent (अपि also) न not, सदसन् existent and non-existent (अपि also) न not, (तर्हि therefore) एवं सति this being so निर्वर्तकः generating हेतुः cause कथं how हि verily युज्यते becomes proper ?

7. While there never originates an existent or a non-existent entity nor one which is both existent and non-existent, then how can there be any generating cause at all?

It is already seen that an existent entity has no necessity to be produced again, and a non-existent one cannot be produced at all, and a third entity that is at once existent and non-existent is an impossibility, and so there is no production for it. As there is nothing to be produced there is hardly any need of a generating cause.

Next is denied the supporting cause (*ālambana-pratyaya*).

अनालम्बन एवायं सन् धर्म उपदिश्यते ।

अथानालम्बने धर्मे कुत आलम्बनं पुनः ॥ ८ ॥

अयं This धर्मः (चित्तचैतः) the mental phenomenon अनालम्बनः without any supporting cause एव verily सन् (सालम्बन इति) as having (a cause) उपदिश्यते is instructed अथ then धर्मे अनालम्बने (सति) the mental phenomenon having no cause (and therefore without any existence) कुत how पुनः again आलम्बनम् supporting cause (सम्भवति is possible) ?

8. Although *dharma* or mental phenomenon has no supporting cause, yet it is instructed (as having one). When such phenomenon has no cause (and is, therefore, non-existent), how could then a supporting cause at all exist?

Ālambana or the supporting cause serves as a base for all mental modifications. But such a cause cannot be maintained in view of the fact that it cannot be the cause of either the existent, non-existent or existent-non-existent mental phenomena for the reason already shown.

अनुत्पन्नेषु धर्मेषु निरोधो नोपपद्यते ।

नानन्तरमतो युक्तं निरुद्धे प्रत्ययश्च कः ॥ ९ ॥

धर्मेषु अनुत्पन्नेषु Before the origination of things निरोधः cessation न not उपपद्यते becomes proper निरुद्धे (कारणे) while there is cessation (of the cause) च also कः what प्रत्ययः cause (भवति is) अतः therefore अनन्तरम् immediately contiguous (as cause) न not युक्तम् is permissible.

9. Cessation (of the cause) never becomes possible before the origination of things (i.e. effects); and if the cause ceases to exist (even before the effect coming into existence) what would be the cause (of the effect)? So *anantara* or the immediately contiguous (as a condition for production of things) is not permissible.

The destruction of the cause at a moment immediately preceding the origination of an effect is a necessary condition of causality. This is what is signified by the *anantara* (or *samanantara*) *pratyaya*. But here is a difficulty. It is seen that so long as there is the cause there is no effect, and as soon as the effect has sprung into existence the cause has been destroyed, and thus the two can never meet. So no relation of cause and effect can be established between the two, for such a relation always implies that the relata must be

co-existing. Thus there is no cause, neither any effect, and the cessation of the cause and the origination of the effect have therefore no meaning at all, and so *anantara pratyaya* cannot stand.

This verse can also be explained by following the principle enunciated in the first verse of this chapter. While there is no origination there is no cessation as well, and origination and cessation being absent there is no scope for *anantara-pratyaya*. And if there is cessation of the cause (to produce the effect) there is nothing that can be called a cause.

Next is considered the additional cause (*adhipati-pratyaya*).

भावानां निःस्वभावानां न सत्ता विद्यते यतः ।

सतीदमस्मिन् भवतीत्येतन्नैवोपपद्यते ॥ १० ॥

यतः Because निःस्वभावानाम् without any essence or particularity भावानाम् of things सत्ता existence न not विद्यते is (अतः so) अस्मिन् सति that being इदम् this भवति becomes इति thus एतत् this उपपद्यते becomes possible एव verily न not.

10. Inasmuch as the entities are devoid of essence and, therefore, without any real existence, the assertion "this being that appears" has no validity ; (so there is no room for an additional cause or *adhipati-pratyaya*).

An additional cause or *adhipati-pratyaya* is described as "this being that is" or on whose existence depends an effect. Here the reality of both the cause and effect is taken as an *a priori* truth, whereas in point of fact everything is of dependent origination and therefore devoid of any reality. So how can it be declared that "this being that is" when both "this" and "that" possess no reality? *Adhipati-pratyaya* is therefore impossible.

It is proved that the four causes are inadequate to produce any effect separately. Can they do so corporately?

न च व्यस्तसमस्तेषु प्रत्ययेष्वस्ति तत् फलं ।

प्रत्ययेभ्यः कथं तच्च भवेन्न प्रत्ययेषु यत् ॥ ११ ॥

तत् (तत्र) There व्यस्तसमस्तेषु प्रत्ययेषु in the causes separate and composite च also फलम् result न not अस्ति is यत् which (फलम् effect) प्रत्ययेषु in the causes न not भवेत् is तत् that (फलम् effect) च again प्रत्ययेभ्यः from the causes कथम् how (भवेत् arises) ?

11. The effect neither exists in the individual causes nor in their aggregate ; how can an effect which is not contained in the causes come out of them?

The causes cannot produce either individually or corporately an effect which is not in them. A piece of cloth cannot be in reality produced by the thread or the weaving implements separately nor by their assemblage.

Even if an effect can come out of such causes it will not be free from defects.

अथासदपि तत्तेभ्यः प्रत्ययेभ्यः प्रवर्तते ।

अप्रत्ययेभ्योऽपि कस्मान्नाभिप्रवर्तते फलम् ॥ १२ ॥

अथ Then असत् non-existent अपि also तत् that (effect) तेभ्यः from those प्रत्ययेभ्यः from causes प्रवर्तते proceeds (तर्हि then) अप्रत्ययेभ्यः from non-causes अपि even फलम् effect कस्मात् why न not अभिप्रवर्तते proceeds ?

12. If the effect being non-existent (in the causes) can come out of those causes, why should it not proceed even from non-causes?

If it is not a necessary condition for an effect to inhere in the cause, it can originate equally from a cause and from a non-cause, and it will naturally lead to the absurd position that everything can come out of everything. This will cut at the root of all causality, as causality always presupposes some definite and invariable law to guide all happenings and admits no caprices in nature.

Even if the result is directly derivable from the cause, one cannot consistently explain causality.

फलं च प्रत्ययमयं प्रत्ययाश्चास्वयंमयाः ।

फलमस्वयमेभ्यो यत्तत्प्रत्ययमयं कथं ॥ १३ ॥

फलम् The effect च (expletive) प्रत्ययमयम् derived from the cause प्रत्ययाः the causes च again अस्वयंमयाः not self-caused (i.e., have no cause for themselves and therefore non-existent) अस्वयमेभ्यः from uncaused causes यत् which फलम् effect तत् that कथं how प्रत्ययमयम् derived from the cause (भवेत् is) ?

13. The effect is derived from the cause ; but the cause in its turn is not derived from any other cause. How can an effect that is produced from an uncaused (i.e. neither caused by itself nor by any other cause and therefore non-existent) cause, be said to be derived from a (really existent) cause?

An effect may be said to have the nature of the cause if it can be proved that the cause has any intrinsic nature of its own. A cause cannot be self-existent (*vide infra* I. 1), and if it is derived from another cause it will lead to *regressus ad infinitum* and we shall never come to a point when we can declare with certainty that we have truly found out the nature of the cause. Thus the cause which is devoid of any innate nature of its own cannot bring forth any real effect.

Since there is no effect there is no cause or non-cause.

तस्मान्न प्रत्ययमयं नाप्रत्ययमयं फलं ।

संविद्यते फलाभावात् प्रत्ययाप्रत्ययाः कुतः ॥ १४ ॥

तस्मात् Therefore फलम् effect न not प्रत्ययमयम् derived from a cause न not अप्रत्ययमयम् without a cause संविद्यते is फलाभावात् the effect being absent प्रत्ययाः causes अप्रत्ययाः non-causes कुतः how (स्यूः should be) ?

14. So an effect is neither derived from a cause nor from a non-cause (and therefore it is non-existent). The effect thus being non-existent, now could there be any cause or non-cause?

Cause and effect are two correlatives and one cannot survive the other. When it is proved that an effect cannot be derived either from a cause or a non-cause, and therefore it is non-existent, the question of cause and non-cause cannot have any meaning at all. In the ultimate analysis all idea about causality comes to naught, and only the uncaused and therefore unsubstantial nature of the phenomena becomes more vivid.

But granting that there is no causality how can one account for the various things and events that are happening everyday before one's eyes? To all unsophisticated minds that take only a commonsense view of the world, causality is an unassailable fact which explains the world phenomena. But to those who are capable of looking at things from a philosophical view-point everything appears to have no finality in them and therefore possesses no reality except in *sunya* wherein cease all differences, and which is ever unborn and beyond all causality.

NOTES AND COMMENTS

IN THIS NUMBER

In our Editorial entitled *As Many Faiths So Many Paths* (यत् मत तत् पथ), we have attempted to bring out the underlying significance of the ideal of harmony of religions as proclaimed by Sri Ramakrishna and Swami Vivekananda in modern times, and have also pointed out the utility of Parliaments of Religions held on a cosmopolitan basis. In the article on *India To-day*, Mons. Jean Herbert of the League of Nations, who twice visited India very recently, has recorded his impressions about the progress India has made in certain directions. While unfolding a bright picture of the internal life of Modern India, he has also pointed out some drawbacks in her national character. Mr. H. D. Bhattacharyya, M.A., B.L., P.R.S., Darsanasagar, Head of the Department of Philosophy, Dacca University, in his thoughtful article on *The Basis of*

Religious Discussion, has raised certain pertinent questions about the problem of establishing religious harmony, and put forward his own view on the subject. The readers would do well to read our Editorial of this month in this connection so as to have further light on the points discussed by Prof. Bhattacharyya in his article. Mr. W. B. Grove, in his scholarly article entitled *Achilles Catches the Tortoise*, deals with the puzzling paradox of Zeno as embodied in his celebrated story of Achilles and the Tortoise, and explains the modern theory of the universe having four dimensions,—three of space and one of time, with the help of some analogies and suggested diagrams. In *What Swami Vivekananda Stood For*, Mrs. Chandra Kumari Handoo, M.A., has given a brilliant pen-picture of Swami Vivekananda's contributions to the renaissance of Indian life as also his message to the outside world. Prof. Ashokanath Shastri, M.A., P.R.S.,

Vedantatirtha, of the University of Calcutta, in his learned article on *Some Vedantic Views on Universal Causation*, gives a lucid exposition of the exact philosophical position of Vâchaspati Mishra, the author of the *Bhâmati*, with regard to the cause of this phenomenal world. According to him, says the Professor, Brahman is the apparent cause of the world, whereas Mâyâ is only the instrumental (*Sahakâri*), but never the material, cause of the world. The readers will find in *A Practical Mystic* by Rev. Dr. Ralph O. Harpole, Ph.D., Minister, Congregational Church of Pawtucket, R. I., U.S.A., an interesting account of the mystic life of Horace Bushness, who became known as the liberator of American theology.

SPINOZA AND HINDU THOUGHT

Prof. Kurt F. Leidecker of New York in his paper entitled "Spinoza and Hinduism" (published in the *Open Court*) makes an attempt to trace definite parallels between the principal tenets of both the systems. Though there are certain points on which we may not see eye to eye with the Professor, we agree with him when he says that there are conceptions which are above time, space and circumstance, and which are discovered and rediscovered by men of the East and the West alike at different times and in different tongues. If philosophy is an endeavour to describe reality, identical finding is but inevitable. Thus, apart from its value as a piece of philosophical research, this paper is indirectly the author's submission of faith in and acceptance of certain conceptions. And as such it will be found to be of considerable interest to our Indian readers. It will serve as further evidence of the welcome tendency in the men of letters of the West to invest their time and thought in Indian culture and religion.

Hindu philosophy, Prof. Leidecker says, had reached its heights when the beginnings of the Occidental philosophy were to all appearances still lost in speculations about the physical world. Although in the West there has been a continuous effort to build up idealistic systems, yet the strong critical Western attitude 'threatened to tear down the noblest structures, the highest ideas, whereas in India debates were meant only for raising the highest to yet loftier peaks.' The principles set forth in Vedic literature stand unshaken in their sublime grandeur. The sayings of the Upanishads are still the living heritage of India.

Proceeding further Prof. Leidecker compares Brahman of the Hindus with Spinoza's God. *In Spinoza's sense*, both are substances. Spinoza's God has existed from all eternity and an identical conception is reported from the *Brihadâranyaka Upanishad* (1. 4. 10). When Spinoza used the term *causa essendi*, implying that God is the cause and existence of all things, he echoed the well-known Indian view. Substance is infinite and from its nature there follows an infinity of things in infinite modes and forms. God is all and everything in Vedanta philosophy and in Spinoza. Brahman has been described as *ananta*, that is, limitless, infinite. The absence of any limitation whatever to Brahman has been likened to mathematical infinitude by the Professor, in whose opinion everything spoken of Brahman can be attributed (so to speak) to Spinoza's substance. Spinoza's God is constrained by nothing. He is independent in the fullest sense of the term. This idea has been expressed in Sanskrit in many words but most admirably in the word *svatantra* which stands for complete and absolute self-reliance. Throughout the *Ethics* one sees Spinoza attempting to make his God the most

perfect Being. In the Upanishads It is described in a negative way *neti, neti* not this, not this,—so that the Brahman of the Hindus may not be compared or confused with anything in the perceptual world. According to the seventh Proposition (Part II) of his *Ethics*, the power of Spinoza's God to think is equal to His power to act. This is a double aspect which is again apparent in the later Hindu speculation where the highest Being "shines forth" through the whole creation.

Spinoza says that the whole creation is God's pleasure and no motive suggested by theology applies to him. Man cannot fathom His purpose and the philosopher describes all attempts of this sort as flights of human fancy. A seeming exception is the *deus sive natura*, which is the perfect parallel to the Hindu use of the masculine pronoun *sa* and the neuter demonstrative *tat* as applied to the ultimate reality. The views are typically Eastern. Further, Spinoza's God, like Brahman, is one, *eka*, without a second, *advaita*.

The Hindu metaphysical speculation turns round the two poles of Brahman and Atman, the human soul being the writ small of Brahman. In the second and the last two parts of the *Ethics*, Spinoza comes very close to this conception. His soul too is eternal and in essence identical with God. Following the Eastern view Spinoza recognizes human soul as part of the infinite intelligence of God.

In the Upanishads distinction is drawn between knowledge and *true* knowledge, *Brahmavidyâ*,—the other shore beyond darkness and sorrow. Spinoza with his

confident recommendation that knowledge is good but knowledge of God is supreme good follows the Hindu thought very closely. The attainment of true knowledge, according to the Hindu view consists in the realisation of the nature of the human soul which is Existence-Knowledge-Bliss (*sat-chit-ananda*). This knowledge places the aspirant above all doubts and pairs of opposites. Spinoza's true knowledge too dispels the fear of error and uncertainty. And, at the close of the second part of the *Ethics*, Spinoza admits that his doctrine confers entire peace and boundless bliss. As a matter of fact Spinoza stands linked with the Eastern thought, more than any other philosopher, for he asserts that mere speculation cannot be the end of philosophy.

Even the attitude of the wise man of the *Ethics* finds its parallel in the Hindu attitude of a *bhakta* as found in the Bhagavad-Gita. The devotion of a *bhakta* is the piety of the wise man of Spinoza. Further, the *Ethics* often stresses that the wise greatly excel the ignorant, which is in keeping with the views of the Stoic philosophers who divided mankind in wise men and fools. In the Upanishads a sharp distinction is drawn between knowledge and ignorance in the words *vidyâ* and *avidyâ* which sum up, as it were, the philosophy of the Stoics and the conception as found in the *Ethics*.

Prof. Leidecker admits of a few points on which Spinoza disagrees with the ancient Eastern thinkers, but his inquiry concerns itself, as will be clear to our readers, with the fundamental conceptions in which there is no difference of opinion.

REVIEWS AND NOTICES

THE SPIRIT OF INDIAN CIVILIZATION. BY DR. DHIRENDRANATH ROY, M.A., Ph.D. *Published by the University of Calcutta. Pp. 296. Price not mentioned.*

Nothing has been so much misunderstood and adversely commented upon as the civilization of the Ancient Indians. The servitude of India, for centuries, under alien rule, as also the inaccessibility of adequate historical materials were no less responsible for this regrettable state of affairs than the lack of genuine enthusiasm on the part of the students of Indian history to discover the hidden treasures of her culture. Dr. Dhirendranath Roy, who is a well-known man of letters, deserves our warmest congratulations, for his very able exposition of the spirit and antiquity of Indian civilization.

The book covers a large ground. There are fourteen chapters and all of them are mines of information. The book opens with an intelligent survey of the events in Europe and the Far East, where the powerful nations are perpetrating inhuman atrocities, under the plausible excuse of 'carrying civilization' to those who are weak, and are treated as backward people. The author exposes the naive assumptions of the West, that "civilization is the exclusive property and product of the powerful," and that "civilization is not possible, where the people lack in power", and he condemns the attempt of the big powers to force the conquered people to adopt the ways and things of the former, and discard all the native characteristics which are different. The second chapter deals with the 'meaning of civilization', and here again, the author does not spare those Western writers, who have given a much too narrow and personal definition of civilization, thus grossly misrepresenting most of the non-Western civilizations. Civilization is a 'process', as well as a 'product', the one subjective and the other objective. In the former sense, civilization means socialization, fellow-feeling and absolute self-abnegation, and in the latter sense, it means the various inventions and acquisitions of a people, that invariably result from such a process of civilization. According to the author, the nine factors that are indispensable to any civilization are: Agriculture,

Industry, Language, Literature, Art, Science, Morality, Philosophy and Religion. He says that "civilization is like an organism, with these things representing its limbs. Each of them is vitally connected with the others and all grow upon their mutual adjustment and co-operation. No civilization is worthy of the name, unless its different factors are related to one another, in the same manner as the limbs of an organism." The third chapter, 'Is it Progress?' would be read with interest and profit by those, who are enamoured of everything that comes from the West, in the name of 'progress' and 'civilization', and are anxious to implant the same on Indian soil, whether suitable or not. The next chapter discusses the most distinguishing factor of Indian civilization, viz., Mysticism. Dr. Roy tries to meet all possible criticisms, levelled against the methods and beliefs of the Hindus, by the Western missionaries, by laying bare many salient points of Ancient Indian life and culture, such as, the glorious ideal of Brahmacharya, adoration of Nature and 'Mystical Indianism' or the noble spirit of mysticism which has made the Hindus so tolerant and catholic. The next two chapters deal with the Culture and Ideal of India, and the spiritual significance of the two sacred rivers, the Ganges and the Jumna. The rivers, Ganges and Jumna, represent the twin principles of wisdom and devotion, which "invariably meet somewhere, and then move on together for some time, until the two in one are lost in the sea of truth." In a long chapter, the author discusses threadbare India's cultural relationship in the past, with the great countries in the West and the East, and clearly vindicates "her right position as the cultural *guru* of the ancient world." In the chapter on the social position of Indian women, the author compares the social evolution of the Western woman with the position, in society, occupied by the Indian woman, at different periods, from the Vedic times to the present day. The author rightly observes that the problem of rivalry between the sexes does not arise, because the two are complementary and their union is a necessary condition of society. One interesting chapter is devoted to a description of the ancient institution of

castes in Hindu societies and its moribund state due to India's sad economic dislocation. According to the author, the Hindu keeps to a normal standard of living, divorced from luxury and extravagance, and based on the conceptions of *satyam* (truth), *shivam* (goodness) and *sundaram* (beauty). The closing chapters dwell upon the various causes of the degeneration of India's hoary civilization, as also upon the imperative duty of every educated Hindu to jealously conserve the spiritual, ethical and aesthetic values in India's virile culture.

We recommend the book to all who want to get a correct knowledge about the true spirit of Indian thought and culture. The book is undoubtedly a valuable addition to the stock of cultural literature and will be found exceedingly useful by all students of Indian civilisation. The printing and get-up of the book leave nothing to be desired.

HIND SWARAJ OR INDIAN HOME RULE. BY M. K. GANDHI. *Published by the Navajivan Press, Ahmedabad. Pp. 180. Price 4 as.*

The name of Mahatma Gandhi is a household word in India to-day. The present book sets forth in unequivocal terms, the Gandhian ideology, a clear understanding of which is so much necessary at the present time. Writing about the theme of the book, Gandhiji says: "It teaches the gospel of love in place of that of hate. It replaces violence with self-sacrifice. It pits soul-force against brute force." In the book, Gandhiji severely condemns the 'modern civilization' imported from the West and holds that the only true civilisation "is that mode of conduct which points out to man the path of duty." He originally wrote the book in Gujarati, in the year 1908, while on his way to South Africa from London. It was first published in the columns of the *Indian Opinion* of South Africa, which was then being edited by Gandhiji himself. We hope this book will be read with deep interest by all those that love to study and practise the principles of Truth and Non-violence.

1. TOWARDS THE LIGHT. *Pp. 39.*

2. THE YOGA OF SRI AUROBINDO. BOTH BY NOLINI KANTA GUPTA. *Pp. 57. Price As. 8. Available at the Arya Publishing House, 63, College Street, Calcutta.*

1. The author is an ardent and sincere follower of Sri Aurobindo. In this small book he gives useful hints on the various

means and problems of spiritual life, practices and attitudes, written mostly in poetic prose.

2. The book under review contains four articles which give a glimpse into the profound philosophy of Sri Aurobindo. "The descent of the Divine into the ordinary human nature in order to purify and transform it and be lodged there is the whole secret of the sâdhanâ in Sri Aurobindo's Yoga." The author refutes some of the criticisms levelled against Aurobindo's sâdhanâ and his Ashrama. The last article deals with Sri Aurobindo's Gita which is undoubtedly the most scholarly work of Sri Aurobindo.

BENGALI

SRI SRI RAMAKRISHNA KATHASARA. COMPILED BY KUMARA KRISHNA NANDY. *Available at Students' Library, 57/1, College Street, Calcutta. Pp. 268.*

The book is a collection of the sayings of Sri Ramakrishna. The sayings have been divided under eighteen different topics and thus made very convenient for the readers. Some sayings of the Holy Mother are also included and a useful index of sayings in alphabetical order has been appended. The book will no doubt be a valuable companion of all seekers of Truth.

PRÂCHINA BHÂRATE HINDUDER RAJYASÂSANA PRANÂLI. BY SISIR KUMAR BASAK, SAHITYA BHUSAN. *Available at Gurudas Chattopadhyaya and Sons, 203/1/1, Cornwallis Street, Calcutta. Pp. 62. Price As. 10.*

In the preparation of this small book the author has drawn upon some very authoritative treatises on the subject not excluding even Kautilya's Arthashastra, and consequently the book is full of information of absorbing interest. The book touches upon a number of topics such as king, ministry, espionage, judicature, police, self-government, citizenship, social life and other administrative systems in ancient India. Written in a simple style the book makes delightful reading.

HINDI

1. SVETASVATAROPANISHAD: With Sankara's Commentary. *Pp. 256. Price As. 14.*

2. SRI BHAGAVANNAMA-KAUMUDI. TRANSLATED BY PANDEYA RAMANARAYANADATTA SASTRI. *Pp. 292. Price As. 10.*

3. BHAKTARAJA HANUMAN. By SHANTANUVIHARI DVIVEDI. Pp. 73. Price As. 5.

4. SATYAPREMI HARISHCHANDRA. BY SHANTANUVIHARI DVIVEDI. Pp. 60. Price As. 5.

All published by the Gita Press, Gorakhpur, U. P.

1. The publishers have done a great service to the public by bringing out a lucid translation of the Svetasvatara Upanishad and the commentary of Sankaracharya on it. The original text is accompanied by a paraphrase, and the original commentary in Sanskrit, of Sankara is nicely printed along with a free rendering of it in Hindi; foot-notes are given wherever necessary.

2. The book under review, which is a valuable Sanskrit work of medieval Bhakti literature by Lakshmidhara, contains a large number of verses in praise of the names of God. The book is divided into three parts, and in each part the author answers various questions which he anticipates from the

Purva-paksha, such as: whether the numerous hyperbolic expressions given in praise of God in the Purānas are consistent with the true nature of God or are a mere exaggeration; whether the inherent power of the name of God leads one to the state of purity directly or through the means of other rituals; and whether the Lord's name can become an independent means of washing away sins even in the absence of faith, devotion, renunciation and practice. The original Sanskrit text is accompanied by a very literal and lucid translation and short notes in Hindi.

3. The book gives a faithful picture of the life of Hanuman or Mahavir. It is full of interesting incidents depicting Hanuman's unflinching valour and profound devotion to the Lord and is written in simple Hindi.

4. It contains an account of the illustrious life of King Harishchandra written in simple Hindi, showing the sufferings of the King in the cause of Truth and Dharma.

The last two books contain a large number of beautiful one-coloured, bi-coloured and tri-coloured pictures.

NEWS AND REPORTS

CONVENTION OF RELIGIONS: FORTHCOMING ASSEMBLY IN SOUTHPORT, LANCASHIRE

Arrangements for holding in Southport in August a Convention of Religions at which prominent leaders of Eastern and Western religions will discuss the contribution of religions to modern life and problems, were discussed at an informal meeting at the residence of Rabbi Dr. Silverstone, Lathom-road, Southport. The Convention is to be held in conjunction with a Summer school for the study of Yoga and Vedanta which is to be held under the auspices of the Ramakrishna-Vivekananda Vedanta Society at Southport in the same month.

The gathering was representative, those present including Swami Avyaktananda of the Vedanta Society; Dr. and Mrs. Silverstone, Canon W. E. Harston Morris, Rev. W. V. Walmsley, Rev. A. Dixon, Rev. J. Norman Beard, Rev. E. H. Morris, Rev. W. A. Holden, Rev. Geoffrey Carr, Rev. V. G. Davies, Miss Gibb (Y.W.C.A.), and Mr. J. J. Tanton.

Dr. Silverstone said that Swami Avyaktananda was at present in Southport to make preliminary investigations regarding a Convention of Religions to be held in the final week in August. The idea of the Convention was not by any means the unification of religions, but simply to discuss the essentials of their own faiths and find a common basis upon which they could combine.

The Swami said that the main source of inspiration for the Convention was the life of the Indian saint Ramakrishna, who preached his ideas at the end of the last century. This man had not only practised Hinduism, but Islam, Buddhism and Christianity, in seeking truth, and after practising them he came to the conclusion that all religions were seeking—along different lines, the same truth—God-consciousness, like different radii with the same centre.

The objects of the Convention were, firstly, to show regard for all religions. Secondly, to discuss the essential harmony of all religions; and thirdly, to discuss the spiritual basis of human solidarity and the contribu-

tion of religions to modern problems. The fourth object was to create a spirit of understanding between the East and West. If there was to be any understanding it could not be along the lines of politics or economics, it could only be along spiritual lines.

Referring to the sponsors of the Convention, the speaker said they were representatives of nearly all the main religions. He read the names which included that of Dr. Silverstone. The sponsors were, he said, to give their moral support and advice—there was no financial responsibility.

He invited the societies and churches to co-operate and send as many delegates as possible. In answer to a question the speaker said that the religions which would be represented were Christianity, Buddhism, Islam, Hinduism, Judaism and Sufism.

All the ministers present except the Rev. A. Dixon agreed to become sponsors of the Convention, and other suggestions were put forward by those present.

It was stated that the Mayor would open the Convention.

BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY OF SRI RAMAKRISHNA, VEDANTA SOCIETY OF PROVIDENCE, R.I., U.S.A.

The Vedanta Society of Providence, Rhode Island, celebrated the birthday of Sri Ramakrishna on Feb. 21st. Swami Vishwananda of Chicago and Swami Akhilananda performed elaborate worship with Homa and other necessary rituals. Special offerings were made and a few devotees joined in the worship, attending the Vesper service as well. The Prasada was served to the students who gathered in the evening.

A public dinner was held on Feb. 24th in honour of Sri Ramakrishna. Many professors, ministers, and distinguished citizens of Providence were present. The guests were treated to delicious Hindu food which Swami Akhilananda himself had prepared for them. Swami Akhilananda introduced the distinguished speakers, each one of whom paid special tribute to Sri Ramakrishna. In the intervals between the speeches, delightful music was provided by Professor Faucher, an eminent violinist, who was ably accompanied on the piano by Mme. Faucher. Their brilliant performance was a rare treat, and they gave generously of their talent. A vocal selection was beauti-

fully rendered by Miss Ruth Webber, accompanied by Mrs. Marian Currie.

The speakers of the evening were Professor Joachim Wach of the Brown University, Rev. Frederick Wilmot of Fitchburg, Mass., Dr. Allen E. Claxton of the Methodist Church, Providence, Swami Vishwananda of Chicago, and Swami Akhilananda. Professor Wach, an eminent and well-known scholar of comparative religions showed how Hinduism and Christianity are similar in their experience of the "Holy", and in their expression of different holy aspects of the Personal God. Mr. Wilmot spoke feelingly of a visit which he had made to India, and especially described the Temple of Dakshineswar which he had seen there. Here Sri Ramakrishna had lived, and the wonderful spirit of his Divine Presence seemed, to Mr. Wilmot, to permeate the atmosphere still. Dr. Claxton emphasized the similarity between the life and teachings of Christ and of Sri Ramakrishna. The Christian land, he pointed out, would be benefited by the practices of meditation and concentration which were taught by Sri Ramakrishna, while his synthetic view of religion would help all in establishing understanding and peace amongst different races and groups.

Swami Vishwananda of Chicago made a most interesting and inspiring address on Sri Ramakrishna himself giving glimpses into his life, and telling of his wonderful power of mind that could solve the problems besetting the world. Swami Akhilananda spoke of the Great Master as one who placed a new emphasis upon religion, who verified that God is actually to be experienced,—a man who lived a life of renunciation and intense realization. He came at a time when man was rapidly reaching the zenith of scientific progress, when spiritual life and thoughts were in danger of being crowded out of existence. Not only did Sri Ramakrishna teach that God is to be known and experienced, but also that He is to be found through all the religions. He himself verified this, proving conclusively that all faiths lead to the same goal,—that all religions are but the various paths that we may choose to follow to reach Him.

On Sunday, Feb. 26th, both Swami Vishwananda and Swami Akhilananda gave lectures on the life and teachings of the Great Master. Swami Vishwananda emphasized Sri Ramakrishna's divine message of harmony to a blind, materialistic world, and likened the methods of this great teacher

to those of Christ. Swami Akhilananda gave in a few words an excellent portrayal of the meaning of Sri Ramakrishna's message to the world, and spoke of Swami Vivekananda who was the first to bring the treasure of Hindu spirituality and culture to the West. The function ended with excellent music furnished by Miss Flora Leigh, who was accompanied by Mrs. Marian Currie.

THE RAMAKRISHNA MISSION: 30TH ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING

PROGRESS OF WORK IN 1938

The 30th Annual General Meeting of the Ramakrishna Mission was held on Good Friday at the premises of the Belur Math, the Headquarters of the Mission, with Srimat Swami Virajananda, the President, in the chair. A large number of lay and monastic members were present. Swami Madhavananda, the Secretary, presented his report for the year 1938. The following extracts from it clearly indicate the progress of work done by the Mission during the year under review.

CENTRES

There are at present 102 centres of the Math and the Mission in India and abroad. At the end of 1938, the total number of centres of the Mission in India, Burma, Ceylon and Straits Settlements was 54.

TEMPORARY RELIEF WORKS

The Mission conducted both Temporary Relief Work and Permanent Work as usual. Flood Relief work in Bengal and Cyclone Relief work in Orissa were done. In all, over 2,844 mds. of rice, 2,989 new clothes and blankets, and 2,328 old clothes were distributed among 7,580 recipients of 2,241 families belonging to 105 villages of 12 unions in Faridpur and Murshidabad Districts in Bengal, and Puri and Ganjam Districts in Orissa. In Murshidabad District over 6,300 cases of malaria and other ailments that appeared in the wake of the floods were treated. Rs. 160 were given as aid in cash, besides seed-grains. 279 huts were also put up in Ganjam District.

The above relief work is exclusive of the minor relief done by the Headquarters before July, 1938, and the relief done by the Mission centres at Dacca and Sonargaon, Rangoon and Cawnpore, as well as by the Math centre at Malda.

PERMANENT WORK

The Permanent Work was of three kinds as usual, *viz.*, Philanthropic, Educational and Missionary.

PHILANTHROPIC

The Philanthropic Activities fell into three distinct divisions, *viz.*, Indoor Hospital Work, Outdoor Dispensary Work, and Regular and Occasional Service of various kinds.

There are at present 7 Indoor Hospitals under the Mission, including the Maternity Hospital and Child Welfare Centre, popularly known as the Shishumangal Pratishtan, and 10,394 patients were treated as against 9,007 in 1937 at Bhowanipore, Calcutta. There were 467 beds in 1938 as against 444 in 1937 in all these hospitals. Rangoon and Benares centres had 170 and 145 beds respectively; Shishumangal Prathistan and Kankhal 60 and 50; Brindaban, Midnapore and Tamruk 24, 12, and 6.

34 centres including the Headquarters conducted Outdoor Dispensaries, each centre having one or more. These dispensaries are flung in different parts of India, and some of them are situated in Benares, Hardwar, Brindaban, Allahabad and other places of pilgrimage, and in cosmopolitan cities and towns such as Rangoon, Bombay, Cawnpore and Lucknow, where they have been alleviating the sufferings of lakhs of poor sick people hailing from different parts of the country and speaking diverse tongues. In all, a total number of 12,86,143 cases were treated in 1938, as against 11,37,794 in 1937; the new and repeated cases being in the ratio of 11:20.

The Sevashram at Benares, which is one of the most prominent centres, treated 2,21,541 cases and had a daily average of 607. The Rangoon centre treated 2,54,123 cases and held the highest record for outdoor as for indoor work, as usual, the daily average being 696 in the Outdoor Department. The Dispensaries at Bankura, Kankhal, Lucknow, Bhubaneshwar and Salkia each treated between 23,000 and 30,000 new cases. The Tuberculosis Dispensary at New Delhi treated a total number of 15,733 cases.

Miscellaneous regular and occasional service of various kinds was done by 26 out of the 46 centres in India. In all 106 helpless patients were nursed in their homes, 49 dead bodies were cremated, Rs. 3,654-1-1½ given as aid in cash, 455 mds. 1 sr. 4 chks. of rice and 272 pieces of cloth and blankets distri-

buted, the total number of persons helped regularly or casually in cash or in kind being 2,244.

EDUCATIONAL

The Educational Work of the Mission falls into two divisions mainly, *viz.*, (1) Boys' Schools, Girls' Schools and Mixed Schools, the classes ranging from the Matriculation standard to the Primary, as well as Night Schools, Adult Schools and Industrial Schools; (2) Students' Homes and Orphanages. Mass Education for adults and juveniles through day and night schools formed a feature as usual.

41 centres in India, Ceylon and Straits Settlements conducted one type of educational work or other. In all the centres together there were 28 Students' Homes and Orphanages, 3 Residential High Schools, 7 High Schools, 5 M. E. Schools, 60 Vernacular Schools, 11 Night Schools and 2 Industrial Schools. The total strength of these 116 institutions in India, Ceylon and S. S. was 11,115 in 1938 as against 8,250 in 1937 in 96 institutions, the number of girls being over 26%.

Rural educational work was done by such centres as Sarisha near Diamond Harbour, Contai in Midnapore, Habiganj and Sylhet in Assam. The centre at Sarisha had 488 boys and girls in all its institutions.

The Industrial Schools taught one or more of the arts and crafts and industries which may be grouped under the following heads; (1) Mechanical and Automobile Engineering, (2) Spinning, weaving, dyeing, calico-printing, tailoring, (3) Cane-work, (4) Carpentry, cabinet-making, (5) Shoe-making. In the Industrial School and Workshop at Madras the Mechanical and Automobile Engineering course covers a period of five years and is recognised by the Government. The centre at Habiganj conducts two shoe-factories to provide better training to the cobbler boys of the locality, and runs two Co-operative Credit Societies for the benefit of the cobblers.

In Madras, there were 2,020 students in the Students' Home, Industrial School, Residential High School, and Branch High School at Thyagarayanagar and the Sarada Vidyalaya and its institutions in that place had 869 pupils, the total strength in all the institutions at Madras being 2,389. The Sister Nivedita Girls' High School at Baghbazar, Calcutta, had 603 girls. The

Mission Residential School at Deoghar, the Students' Home at Gouripore near Calcutta, and the Nivedita Girls' High School at Baghbazar, Calcutta, produced very brilliant results. The Residential High School at Periyayanakanpalayam in Coimbatore also did valuable work. The Dacca centre had 437 pupils in all its Schools; Jamshedpur Vivekananda Society 338; the Contai centre 266; the Shillong centre 386; and Taki 286.

LIBRARIES AND READING ROOMS

Each centre had one or more Libraries and Reading Rooms. The Mission Society at Rangoon did excellent library work and had an attendance of over 29,381 in its reading rooms in 1938. The Students' Home at Madras had more than 20,840 volumes in all its libraries. The total number of books in the Mission centres may be roughly computed to be about 1 lakh and the total number of periodicals 600, in the year under review.

MISSIONARY

The monastic members went on preaching tours in India and abroad. A Swami was deputed on invitation to Fiji, and another to Chicago.

More than 300 classes were held and more than 400 meetings convened during the year under review.

There are colonies for the Harijans and for the backward classes, conducted in Trichur (Cochin), Shella (Khassi Hills), and other places by the monks of the Mission.

EXPENDITURE

The total expenditure for the Mission's permanent work in 1938 was about 6 lakhs of Rupees.

THE IDEAL OF SERVICE

Swami Vivekananda, the Founder of the Mission, sounded the clarion call for self-dedication and service of humanity, irrespective of caste, creed, colour or sex. Such a noble Ideal alone is capable of giving peace and light in the world to-day with its clash and conflict, darkness and despair. Will not the youngmen of India respond to the call?

SWAMI MADHAVANANDA,
Secretary, Ramakrishna Mission