PRABUDDHA BHARATA

VOL. XLVIII *DECEMBER, 1943* No. 12

"उत्तिष्ठत जाग्रत प्राप्य वरान्निबोधत।"

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

TEACHINGS OF SRI RAMAKRISHNA

BY M.

With the Brahmo devotees—Spiritual discipline for householders—Non-attachment—Dependence on God—Renunciation—Bhakti, Bhâva, and Prema—Wealth, position, and empty scholarship are of no avail.

November 26, 1883. It was the day of the annual festival of the Sinduriapatti Brahmo Samaj arranged in the house of Manilal Mallick. The worship hall was beautifully decorated with flowers, wreaths and evergreens, and many devotees were assembled eagerly awaiting the worship. Their enthusiasm had been greatly enhanced by the news that Sri Ramakrishna was going to grace the occasion with his presence. The leaders of the Brahmo Samaj—Keshab, Vijay, and Shivanath—held him in high respect. His God-intoxicated state of mind, intense love for spiritual life, burning faith, intimate communion with God, and respect for women whom he looked upon as the veritable manifestations of the Divine Mother, together with the unsullied purity of his character, his complete renunciation of worldly talk, his love and respect for all religious faiths, and his eagerness to meet the devotees of all creeds, attracted the members of the Brahmo Samaj to him. Devotees came that day from far-off places to join the festival as it would give them a chance to get a glimpse of the Master and listen to his inspiring talk.

Sri Ramakrishna arrived at the house before the worship began and became engaged in conversation with Vijaykrishna Goswami and the devotees. The lamps were lighted and the divine service was about to begin.

The Master inquired whether Shivanath would come to the festival. A Brahmo devotee said that he was not coming as he had other important things to do.

Master: 'I feel very happy when I see Shivanath. He always seems to be absorbed in the bliss of God. A man who is respected by so many, must possess some divine power. But he has one great defect; he doesn't keep his word. Once he said he would come to

Dakshineswar, but he neither came nor sent me word about it. That is not good. It is said that truthfulness alone constitutes the austere spiritual discipline of the Kaliyuga. If a man sticks tenaciously to truth he ultimately realizes God. Without this regard for truth one gradually loses everything. If by chance I say that I will go to the pine grove, I go there even if there is no further need for it, lest I lose my attachment to truth. After my vision of the Divine Mother, I prayed to Her, taking a flower in my hands: "Mother, take Thy knowledge and take Thy ignorance: give me only pure love. Here is Thy holiness and here is Thy unholiness. Take them both, Mother, and give me pure love. Here is Thy righteousness and here Thy unrighteousness. Take them both, Mother, and give me pure love." I mentioned all these, but I could not say: "Mother, here is Thy truth and here is Thy falsehood. Take them both." I relinquished everything at Her feet but could not bring myself to relinquish truth.'

Soon the divine service commenced according to the rule of the Brahmo Samaj. The preacher was seated on the dais. After the opening prayer, he recited from the holy texts of the Vedas and was joined by the congregation in the invocation to the Supreme Brahman. They chanted in chorus: 'Brahman is truth, knowledge, and infinity. It shines as bliss and immortality. Brahman is peace, blessedness, the one without a second, pure and unstained by sin.' The minds of the devotees were stilled, and they closed their eyes in contemplation.

The Master went into deep Samadhi. He sat there transfixed and speechless. After some time he opened his eyes, looked around, and suddenly stood up with the words: 'Brahma, Brahma!' on his lips. Soon the devotional music began, accompanied by drums and cymbals. In a state of divine fervour the Master began to dance with the devotees.

After the worship was over, the Master said to the devotees: 'It is difficult to lead the life of a householder in a spirit of detachment. Once Pratap said to me: "Sir, we follow the example of King Janaka. He led the worldly life in a detached spirit. We shall follow him." I said to him: "Can one be like King Janaka by merely wishing it? He acquired divine knowledge after endless austerities. He had practised the most intense form of asceticism for many years, and then returned to the life of the world."

'Is there, then, no hope for householders? Certainly there is. They must practise spiritual discipline in solitude for some days. Thus they will acquire knowledge and devotion. Then it won't hurt them if they lead the life of the world. When you practise discipline thus in solitude, keep yourself totally away from your family. At that time you must not allow your wife, son, daughter, mother, father, sister, brother, friends, or relatives near you. While thus practising discipline in solitude, you should think: "I have no one else in the world. God is my all." You must also pray to Him with tears in your eyes for knowledge and devotion.

'If you ask me how long you should live in solitude away from the life of the world, I should say that it would be good for you if you could spend even one day in such a manner. Three days at a time are still better. One may live in solitude for twelve days, a month, three months, or a year, according to one's capacity and power. One hasn't much to fear if one leads the life of a householder after attaining knowledge and devotion.

'If you break a jackfruit after rubbing your hands with oil, then its sticky milk will not smear your hands. While playing the game of hide-and-seek you are safe if you but once touch the "granny". Be turned into gold by the philosopher's stone. After that, even if you remain buried under the ground for a thousand years, still you will be the same gold when taken out.

'The mind is like milk. If you keep the mind in the world which may be likened to water, then the milk and water will get mixed up. Therefore keep the milk in a quiet place and let it set into curd, and then churn butter from it. Likewise churn the butter of knowledge and devotion from the milk of the mind through spiritual discipline practised in solitude. Then that butter can easily be kept in the water of the world. It will not get mixed up with it. The mind will float detached on the water of the world.'

Vijay had just returned from Gaya where he had spent a long time in solitude and holy company. He had put on the ochre robe of a monk and was in an exalted state of mind, always indrawn. He was seated before the Master with his head bent down, as if absorbed in some deep thought.

Casting his benign glance on Vijay, the Master said: 'Vijay, have you found your room? Let me tell you a parable:

'Once two holy men in the course of their wanderings entered a city. One of them, with wondering eyes and mouth agape, was looking at the marketplace, the stalls, and the buildings when he met his companion. The latter asked him: "You seem to be filled with wonder at the city. Where is your baggage?" He replied: "First of all I found a room. I have put my things there, locked the room, and now feel totally relieved. Now I am moving about the city enjoying all the fun." Therefore I am asking you, Vijay, if you have found your room. (To M. and the others) You see, the spring in Vijay's heart has been covered, as it were, all these days. Now it is open.

(To Vijay) 'Well, Shivanath is always in the midst of great trouble and turmoil. He has to write for magazines and perform many other duties. Worldly duties bring much worry and anxiety along with them.

'It is narrated in the *Bhâgavata* that the Avadhuta[1] had twenty-four Gurus, of whom one was a kite. In a certain place the fishermen were catching fish. A kite swooped down and snatched a fish. At the sight of the fish, about a thousand crows chased the kite and created a great noise with their cawing. Whichever way the kite flew with the fish, the crows followed it. The kite flew to the north and still the crows were after it. He went east and west, but with the same fate. As the kite began to fly about in confusion, lo, the fish dropped from its mouth. The crows at once left the kite alone and flew after the fish. Thus relieved of its worries, the kite sat on the branch of a tree and thought, "That wretched fish was at the root of all my troubles. I have now got rid of it and, therefore, I am at peace."

'The Avadhuta learnt this lesson from the kite, that as long as a man has the fish, that is, worldly desire, so long he must perform actions and consequently suffer from worry, anxiety, and restlessness. No sooner does he renounce these desires than his activities fall away, and he enjoys peace of soul.

'Work without any selfish motive is good, to be sure. That does not produce worry. But it is extremely difficult to be totally unselfish. We may think that our work is selfless, but selfishness comes, unknown to us, from nobody knows where. But if a man has already passed through great spiritual discipline, then as a result of it he may be able to do work without any selfish motive. After the vision of God it becomes easy to do unselfish work. In most cases action drops off after the attainment of God. Only a few, like Nârada work to bring light to mankind.

'The Avadhuta accepted a bee as another teacher. After days of labour, bees collect honey. But they cannot enjoy that honey, for a man soon breaks the comb and takes it away. The Avadhuta learnt this lesson from the bees, that one should not lay things up.

[1] A holy man of great renunciation.

Sâdhus should depend hundred per cent on God. They must not gather for the morrow. But this does not apply to the householder. He must bring up his family; therefore it is necessary for him to provide. Birds and monks do not hoard up anything; yet the bird also hoards after the chick is hatched. It collects food in its mouth for the young ones.

'Let me tell you one thing, Vijay. Don't trust a Sadhu if he keeps bag and baggage with him and a bundle of cloths with many knots. I saw such Sadhus under the banyan tree of the Panchavati. Two or three of them were seated there. One was picking over lentils, some were sewing their cloths, and all gossipped about a feast they had enjoyed in a rich man's house. They said among themselves, "That rich man spent a hundred thousand rupees on the feast and fed the Sadhus sumptuously with cake, sweets, and many such delicious things." ' (All laugh).

Vijay : 'It is true, sir. I have seen such Sadhus at Gaya. They are called the Lotâwâlâ Sadhus[2] of Gaya.'

Master (to Vijay): 'When love for God is awakened, work drops off of itself. If God makes some men work, let them do it. It is now time for you to give up everything. Renounce all and say, "O mind, may you and I alone behold the Mother, letting no one else intrude." '

With these words Sri Ramakrishna began to sing in his soul-enthralling voice :

Cherish my darling Mother Shyâmâ,
Tenderly within, O mind ;
May you and I alone behold Her,
Letting no one else intrude.

* * *

(To Vijay) 'Surrender yourself completely to God, and set aside all such things as fear, shame, and the like. Give up such feelings as, "What will people think of me if I dance in the ecstasy of God's holy name?" The saying, "One cannot have the vision of God as long as one has these three—shame, hatred, and fear," is very true. Shame, hatred, fear, caste, pride, secretiveness, and the like, are so many bondages. Man gets his liberation when he is free from all these.

'When bound by ties one is Jiva, and when free from these one is verily Shiva. Love for God is an extremely rare thing.

'First of all one gets Bhakti. Bhakti is single-minded attachment to God like that which a wife feels for her husband. It is extremely difficult to have unalloyed devotion to God. Through devotion one's mind and soul merge in Him.

'Then comes Bhava, intense love. Through Bhava man becomes speechless. His nerve currents are stilled. Kumbhaka[3] comes of itself. It is like the case of a man whose breath and speech stop as he fires a gun.

'But Prema, ecstatic love, is an extremely rare thing. Chaitanya had that love. When one has that love for God, one forgets all external things. One forgets one's own body, which is so dear to a man.'

The Master began to sing:

Oh, when will dawn the blessed day
When tears of joy will flow from my eyes
As I repeat Lord Hari's name?

* * *

The talk of divine things thus went on, when some invited Brahmo devotees entered the room. There were among them a few Pundits and one high Government official.

Sri Ramakrishna had remarked that Bhava stills the nerve current of the devotee. He said, continuing, 'When Arjuna was about to shoot at the target, his eyes were fixed only on the eye of the fish. His vision was not diverted to anything else. He didn't even notice any part of the fish except the eye. In such a state the breathing stops and one experiences Kumbhaka.

[2] Sadhus carrying a water-pot.

[3] An experience which the Yogi has, when his breathing stops while he is practising Prânâyâma.

'Another characteristic of God-vision is that a great spiritual current rushes up along the spine and goes towards the brain. When one goes into Samadhi, one gets the vision of God.'

Looking at the Brahmo devotees who had just arrived, the Master said, 'Mere scholars, devoid of divine love, talk incoherently. There was a Pundit called Samadhyayi. He once said, in the course of his sermon, "God is dry. Make Him sweet by your love and devotion." Imagine! To describe Him as dry, whom the Vedas declare as the essence of bliss! It makes one feel that the Pundit didn't know what God really was. Therefore his words were so incoherent.

'A man once said, "There are many horses in my uncle's cowshed." From that one can understand that the man had no horses at all. No one keeps a horse in a cowshed.

'Some people pride themselves on their riches and power, wealth, honour, and social position. But these are only transitory. Nothing will accompany you at the time of death.

'There is a song which runs:

Remember this, O mind, that nobody is your own;
Vain is your wandering in this world.
Trapped in the subtle snare of Mâyâ as you are,
Do not forget the Mother's name.

* * *

'One must not be proud of one's money. If you say that you are rich, then there are richer men than you, still richer, and so on. At dusk the glow-worm comes out and thinks that it illumines the world. But its pride is crushed when the stars appear in the sky. The stars feel that they give light to the earth. But when the moon rises the stars fade in shame. The moon feels that the world smiles at its light, and that it gives light to the earth. Then the eastern horizon becomes red, and the sun rises. The moon fades out, and after a while is no longer seen.

'If wealthy people would think in that way, they would get rid of the pride of their riches.'

A sumptuous feast had been arranged by Manilal to celebrate the festival. He entertained the Master and the other guests with great love and attention. It was late at night when they returned home.

A HINDU VIEW OF CHRIST AND CHRISTIANITY

By the Editor

I

How does a Hindu look on Christ? It is extremely difficult to speak on behalf of such a vast community as the Hindus. But so far as one can judge from the scriptures which form the basis of Hinduism, so far as one can understand Jesus through the life of Sri Ramakrishna who is recognized as the greatest embodiment of Hindu universalism, and so far as one can get an intellectual grasp of such a mighty personality as Jesus, one can say without fear of contradiction that for Jesus one cannot assign any place other than in the galaxy of prophets by whom the world has been blessed from time immemorial. The same Spirit that shone in Its power of goodness through Râma, Krishna, Buddha, Shankara, Ramanuja, Chaitanya, and others, permeated also the whole being of Jesus.

This does not, however, mean that the Hindus should read Christ's life and teachings in the light of the interpretations offered by the Christians. To the pages of the Bible the Hindus turn not for any new theology, not for any novel philosophy, not for any new-fangled religion, but they do so in order to get a fresh evidence of the truth that God

is one though called by different names in different climes, and to get convinced that the spiritual path is essentially the same everywhere though variations may creep up due to change of environment. The Bible reveals to them in a tangible form the scriptural truths in the life movements of a concrete personality, and they enjoy being introduced to one whose very foreign environment forces them to look at truths from hitherto unknown points of view.

Christians may claim finality, novelty, and infallibility for the Bible. The Hindus need not quarrel with them. They may read it in the light of their own Vedas and Upanishads, which, they may argue, do not rest on the historicity of any person but are records of truths that were revealed to the Rishis of old and will for ever be revealed to other qualified aspirants. The Bible only records a few of these truths as they were experienced by Jesus. These have, therefore, to be studied against a background of human experience through the long centuries of the past and must be tested in the light of impersonal utterances emanating from men of realization of all races and climes.

Christ's personality is undoubtedly lovable and inspiring, his utterances bear the stamp of realization, and the effects of his life and teachings have been marvellous. But these considerations need not deter us from taking a wider view of things. We need not jump to the conclusion that a spiritual life can be manifested thus and thus only, that realizations can have no better expressions in human language, or that no other divine life and spiritual teaching can have equal social values. Truth to say, even the Christians are not agreed as to the true meaning of the life and teachings of Jesus Christ. We may, therefore, brush aside all dogmatism and take as universal a view of the prophet of Nazareth as possible. There are several views in the field, and the Hindus also can have a Hindu view of Christ. And when critical judgement is not ruled out of court and the true meaning and ends of a spiritual life are kept in the foreground, it will be found that the Hindu view is by no means negligible; nay, it may even add greatly to the richness and depth of a Christian life, as it certainly will add also to the Hindu life.

II

One thing seems certain to us that though the Christian mystics of old came nearer to the Hindu view of life, present-day Christianity has greatly broken away from that tradition. Whereas Christianity of old had its best representatives in the lonely hermits immersed in Sâdhanâ, who after drinking deep at the fountain of spirituality emerged as leaders of religious life, present-day Christianity believes more in organized effort. Besides, the emphasis seems to have shifted from spirituality as such to humanism in various forms. It may be argued that we are indulging in sweeping generalizations. But the readers must remember that we are concerned only with a detached study of the tendencies and not the details. We make distinctions with a view to making our points clearer, and not for creating unbridgeable differences. The Christians have their own points of view, and, perhaps, with good reason too. But we realize that theirs is not the only possible view.

Take, for instance, the monastic life. A Hindu monk once told us that he went to meet a high official in an Indian State. The gentleman was a Christian; but when meeting the monk he bade advice to all Christian charity and said, 'Are you one of those who feed fat on the earnings of the poor people?' Nothing abashed, the monk replied, 'I am proud to belong to the same order to which your Christ belonged.' We forget the simple truth that Jesus was the disciple of John who lived on locusts and wild honey, and the Son of Man had not where to lay his head. A Hindu likes to think of him as a Sannyasin, which he certainly was. The ideals of

India are renunciation and service, and both these were eminently manifested in the life of Jesus, who left home to spend his life in the service of the poor and the afflicted so that God's kingdom might be established on earth.

But not only has the West put renunciation in the background, it has also gone to the other extreme of equating social service with religion. The negation of renunciation has resulted in a never ending tug-of-war between multiplication of wants and irresponsible capitalism. Man is now thought of as an economic being, and the economic interpretation of history is considered the most scientific—they call it dialectic materialism. Service, alienated from its natural ally renunciation, has been degraded to mere material welfare and business stunt. A Government *serves* its people by providing physical comforts, and industrial plants and commercial firms *serve* their clientele by producing or supplying covetable things at the cheapest possible price! But did Christ care only for material welfare? He did, of course, perform miracles; but with what reluctance? He refused to heal a girl of Canaan; but when her mother's importunity was great,

> Jèsus answered and said unto her, O woman, great *is* thy faith: be it unto thee even as thou wilt. (Matt. 15. 28).

It is faith that mattered the most. Miracles were not ends in themselves. When the disciples were caught in a gale on a lake and nervously woke up Jesus to work a miracle for them, he rebuked them saying, 'Where is your faith?'

Jesus did not believe in a progress which is synonymous with unlimited multiplication and satisfaction of wants. He rather stressed the need of poverty and mortification. For his ultimate aim was to achieve spiritual realization and not material prosperity; and he knew fully well that one cannot worship God and Satan at the same time. That these were not idle words is amply proved by his own life. For, as Aldous Huxley remarks:

> Contemplative prayer and mortification not only of the passions but also of the intellect and, above all, the imagination—these are the means whereby men and women can fit themselves to receive the grace of a direct apprehension of Reality and Eternity.

It is because of this stress on things spiritual that Jesus could not tolerate buying and selling in his Father's temple.

Jesus' instruction to his disciples on the eve of their being sent out on a preaching tour is equally clear and emphatic:

> And commanded them that they should take nothing for *their* journey, save a staff only; no scrip, no bread, no money in *their* purse: But be shod with sandals; and not put on two coats. (Mark, 6. 8-9).

How does this compare with the organized, State religions of the East and the West?

Jesus was a true Yogi given to inner culture and meditation. He made no secret of his dislike for showiness:

> Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye make clean the outside of the cup and of the platter; but within they are full of extortion and excess. (Matt. 23. 25).

And for days he would be out of contact with the world, meditating only on God. There seems to be a gap in the life of Jesus after his baptism till his re-appearance as a public preacher. The Hindus can easily understand this period of silence, which they imagine, and perhaps rightly so, was spent in intense spiritual practice, though there may not be any truth in the assertion that during this period Jesus visited India, where he learnt from the Indian Yogis. That his heart naturally inclined more towards his Father rather than to the everyday affairs of the world, is transparently clear to anyone who reads the Bible. At the end of a busy day, how eagerly he would retire to a solitary place to avoid the crowd and to be left to himself! He did serve the world, but never allowed it usurp his Father's throne.

Another point which the modern world seems to have lost sight of is Jesus' recognition of the difference in the spiri-

tual capacity of his audiences. He did not think that all men were capable of receiving the highest spiritual truths. He did not believe in casting pearls before swine. He had his own inner circle of disciples to whom he revealed the higher truths, but to the multitude he spoke in parables:

> And with many such parables spake he the word unto them, as they were able to hear *it*. But without a parable spake he not unto them: and when they were alone, he expounded all things to his disciples. (Mark, 4. 33-34).
>
> I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. (John, 16. 12).

The modern world, pre-occupied with false conceptions of equality and democracy and mad after regimentation, gives its own interpretation to such passages. It takes these as rules of morality at the same time that it considers these as an unattainable ideal. Whereas the Hindus accept Adhikâravâda, and present spiritual truths in conformity with the spiritual stature of each aspirant, the modern world wants the same coat to fit one and all, and is consequently in a quandary.

> But Christ was much more practical; he did not teach impracticable things. The rules that he gave were meant to be carried out, but not by all, only by those to whom the carrying out of them could bring benefit and who were able to carry them out. (*A New Model of the Universe by* P. D. Ouspensky, p. 194).

Unable to realize this simple truth modern Christianity has identified religion with only one phase of it, viz, its manifestation in the lives of householders. But here again, not all householders, but only the statesmen, the war lords, and business magnates, are mostly the beneficiaries—the poorer classes in many countries are in open revolt against it. The fact is, as we say in Indian terminology, there is a confusion of Varnas and Ashramas. The distinction among them being lost sight of, the poorer classes find no comfort in a morality that works to the advantage of the richer classes. Besides, there are no Brahmacharins preparing for a higher spiritual life, no Vânaprasthas spending their days of retirement in high contemplation, and no Sannyasins holding ever before society the highest goal of humanity.

III

The West may have gone wrong. But that is no reason why the East should be oblivious of Christ's true mission. The East has a right to look at Him from its own angle of vision. And when it does so, what wonderful parallels to the Eastern scriptures do Jesus' life and the Bible reveal! The Hindus, at least, find in the Bible a continuation of the thoughts of India. That this is no mere fancy is apparent to any one who makes an unbiased and critical study of the life and teachings of Jesus.

To start with, one thing is certain: Jesus' countrymen never understood him properly. To one section of them he appeared as the promised Messiah who would deliver the Jews from political thraldom. To a second section he was an agitator and a seducer, whose lifelong spiritual ministration and exemplary moral character deserved nothing but crucifixion at their hands! And none of them could read a universal message in Christ's teachings. As a result, Christianity emerged as a proselytizing religion cursing and condemning all other creeds and its cause was furthered by fanatical leaders indulging in inquisitions and crusades.

It was no mere accident that the wise men of the East were the first to recognize Christ. For, spiritually, Christ was a stranger among the Jews—his spiritual affiliations were more pronouncedly with the East than with Judæa. Modern research tends to establish that Buddhism had its outposts in the land of the Jews. There were sects like the Essenes who differed fundamentally from the thoughts and customs of the Jews. It has not been finally established whether Jesus belonged to one of these Buddhist sects. But the evidences collected so far prove beyond the shadow of a doubt that there are Eastern influences almost at every turn. It is

true that there are scholars, who while admitting the divergence of Christianity from Judaism, are yet loath to admit Buddhist influence. E. Renan, for instance, writes:

> It is particularly in the parables that the master excelled. Nothing in Judaism had given him a model for this delightful form. It is he who created it. . . . It is true that one finds in Buddhist books parables of exactly the same tone and the same composition as the Gospel parables. But it is *difficult to admit* that a Buddhist influence was exerted in this.

But in the light of further research one fails to see why it should be so *difficult to admit* Buddhist influence. The migration of fables was originally from the East to the West and not *vice versa*, as the presence of lions, jackals, elephants, and peacocks, etc., which play a leading part and which are not European birds and animals, amply proves. It is now admitted on all hands that the *Aesop's Fables* is only a Greek version of the *Panchatantra*. The *Jâtaka* tales also found their way into Europe. Furthermore, Buddhist rituals and customs have left their impress even on present-day Christianity. The French missionary travellers Hue and Gabet were impressed in 1842 by the close resemblance between Catholic and Lhamaistic rituals:

> The crozier, the mitre, and chasuble, the cardinal's robe, . . . the double choir at the divine office, the chants, the exorcism, the censer with five chains, the blessing which the Lhamas impart by extending the right hands over the heads of the faithful, the rosary, the celibacy of the clergy, their separation from the world, the worship of saints, the fasts, processions, litanies, holy water—these are the points of contact which the Buddhists have with us.

The points of contact, however, are deeper than these superficial customs and rituals. In thought, too, Christianity is greatly indebted to India. Through the Eleatics, the Orphic teachers, the Pythagoreans, and through Socrates, Plato, Zeno, and others, Indian thought percolated into Asia Minor, Alexandria, and Greece. The Essenes, the Mandeans, and the Nazarene sects were filled with the spirit of Buddhism. The result of this contact is summed up thus:

> It is not too much to say that almost the whole of the moral teachings of the Gospels as distinct from the dogmatic teaching, will be found in Buddhist writings, several centuries older than the Gospels: that for instance, of all the moral doctrines collected together in the so-called Sermon on the Mount, all those which can be separated from the theistic dogmas there maintained, are found again in the Pithakas. (Quoted in *Eastern Religions and Western Thought*, p. 43).

The modern world fails to appreciate Jesus properly because it does not view things against their proper historical and spiritual setting. As pointed out by Aldous Huxley,

> The early Christians made the enormous mistake of burdening themselves with the Old Testament, which contains, along with much fine poetry and sound morality, the history of cruelties and treacheries of a Bronze-Age people, fighting for a place in the sun under the protection of its anthropomorphic tribal deity. Christian theologians did their best to civilize and moralize this tribal deity; but inspired in every line, dictated by God Himself, the Old Testament was always there to refute them. (*Ends and Means*, p. 328).

IV

Turn we now from this long but useful discussion to a consideration of some of Christ's teachings from the Indian point of view. One thing is obviously clear to us that Christ does not preach conversion in the accepted sense of the term. In the long centuries of controversy on this point no scholar has been able to quote any sentence from Jesus which can unquestionably be accepted as an exhortation for conversion. There are references to faith, repentance, sincerity, and taking up the cross, etc. But there is no mention of change of faith as such. Jesus might have asked people to follow him. This, however, does not mean that one should give up a particular religion and enter a Christian church. For as Dean Inge points out:

> The main doctrines of Christianity. . . are all pictorial and symbolical.

A too literal interpretation of the teachings of Christ irrespective of the

frame of reference is bound to land us into innumerable difficulties.

The other point, mentioned earlier, is that Christ recognized difference in spiritual stature. Let us look at some of his utterances. 'I and my father are one.' 'The kingdom of God is within you.' And he speaks of 'Our Father which art in heaven'. Those who are acquainted with Hindu thought will easily find indications of Advaita (Non-dualism), Vishishtâdvaita (Qualified Monism), and Dvaita (Dualism) in these utterances. These correspond to different stages of spiritual realization.

Jesus' claim, 'I am the door', can be very well accepted by the Hindus, though not in any sectarian sense. We readily recognize that unless God comes down to edify us by rending asunder the veil of Mâyâ through the palpably spiritual life of an incarnation, we cannot conceive of a higher human existence, or even if we intellectually acknowledge the possibility of such a thing, conviction will be lacking and the belief will fail to influence life. Truly did Christ say, 'He who has seen the son has seen the Father.' But this does not imply that Christ is the only and the last Avatâra, or that an acceptance of Christ necessarily means the rejection of Râma, Krishna, Buddha, Shankara, and others.

Christ made a distinction between social customs and spiritual behaviour. There can be no hard and fast rule about a spiritual life. Social morals may be binding in the social field, but an advanced spiritual soul may consider them as shackles. Spirituality can have no set rules : it implies a certain freedom of choice. Ordinary people need not give up their national customs, which are necessary for their moral health. But advanced spiritual souls live in another world, and for them the question of customs and rituals does not arise. It is absurd, therefore, to argue that there is a well-defined Christian way of life, which all lovers of Christ must follow. There can be no Christian way, though there can be a spiritual way of following Christ which is the same all over the world. But dogmatism is a bad seducer of men. Says Christ,

> Howbeit in vain do they worship me, teaching *for* doctrines the commandments of men. For laying aside the commandment of God, ye hold the tradition of men, *as* the washing of pots and cups. (Mark, 7. 7-8).

The Christian doctrine of original sin is a stumbling block to the Hindus, who on reading the Gospels fail to see why such a narrow view of Christ's words should be taken. If the kingdom of God is within us, and if we can get rid of sin, then sin is not certainly a part and parcel of ourselves.

There are similar other doctrines, like the doctrines of the Trinity, resurrection, etc., which according to the Hindus are only partial representations or distortions of the original truths preached by Jesus. Resurrection, for instance, is a distorted view of the theory of Karma and transmigration; and the doctrine of Trinity represents a partial truth. But we need not linger on these points. Enough material has been presented to show that there can be a very reasonable *Hindu view of Christ and Christianity;* and we cannot do better than conclude this by an allusion to an incident in Sri Ramakrishna's life to show how a Hindu can love and honour Christ without changing faith.

Sri Ramakrishna heard the Bible from a Hindu gentleman. One day as he was looking intently on a picture of the Madonna with the Divine Child in her hands, a light issued from the Child and engulfed him and merged into him. Sri Ramakrishna fell into a trance, thus demonstrating the oneness of the Spirit that incarnates in every age.

Christ is thus very near and dear to the Hindus. But let us love and understand him in our own way.

IS THE WORLD UNREAL ?

By Prof. N. K. Brahma, M.A., Ph.D.

(*Concluded*)

We may now attempt a summary of the points that have been put forward here in defence of the Vedantic metaphysics explained by Shankara:—

(1) There is no relation of antagonism or opposition between the transcendental and the pragmatic orders of reality. Shankara never conceives of anything being *opposed to* Brahman. All the Advaitins following Shankara have regarded Brahman to be the substratum or Âshraya of *Ajnâna* or ignorance. Shankara would be a *Dvaitavâdin*, a dualist, if he holds that Brahman is antithetical to ignorance. It is a hopeless misunderstanding of Shankara's position which thinks that Shankara's Brahman annuls or destroys the universe, and that it is one member of the opposition. Brahman is above all opposition, all duality, all division. It is, therefore, not true that one who realizes Brahman and becomes Brahman cannot have any dealings with the universe. The conception of the Jivanmukta, in one sense the pivot of Vedantism, is a direct proof against this contention. Ishwara, who is Nityamukta, eternally free, also has dealings with the universe, and so the charge that is brought forward against Vedanta that its Brahman denies or negates the universe is ill-founded. Brahman and the universe exist *simultaneously*, the former as Paramârtha Sat and the latter as Mithyâ, and not successively. It is not the case that when Brahman exists, the world does not exist, or that when the world exists, Brahman does not exist. It is true that both do not and cannot exist as Paramartha Sat simultaneously. The Paramartha Sattâ of Brahman reduces the existence of the world to Mithyâtva. The Sat and the Mithya are not opposed, as is so often erroneously supposed even by great scholars. The Shankarite school of Vedantins have taken great pains to show that the Sat is not opposed to the Mithya. The Mithya is a very successful logical category that solves many difficulties.

(2) The Vedantic Brahman is not identical with Sankhya Purusha and is not silence or staticity opposed to and devoid of movement and dynamicity as is wrongly supposed even by many Indian scholars. Brahman is above silence and dynamis, above permanence and change, above all duality or opposition. Sankhya Purusha has Prakriti outside it, but Brahman has nothing—not even Mâyâ and her products—outside it. Brahman transcends both Purusha and Prakriti.

(3) Vedantic transcendence is different from all other notions of transcendence and is really unique. It is not spatial or temporal transcendence, it is not the transcendence of aggregation or totalization, it is not the transcendence of harmony or equilibrium, in short, it is not immanental transcendence, but it is transcendent transcendence, if we may use this expression, an absolute going beyond, a leap or a conversion, an awakening or living in a new category, in a new order, in the Whole or the Full that knows no parts, in the One that knows no second. Brahman is not merely the All that is omnipresent, not merely the Eternity that endures and abides through all time, not merely the Power that moves everything, not merely the Whole that includes everything within It, not merely the Prânatattva of the Upanishads, but is the Âtman that is absolutely transcendent, Asanga. We have to distinguish very

clearly between immanental transcendence and transcendent transcendence, the Sâttvika transcendence and the Gunâtita transcendence, the transcendence of harmony and equilibrium and absolute transcendence. The Sattvika Jnâna is that which sees the one in the many (Sarvabhuteshu ekam bhavam avyayam), in one sense transcends the one and the many, and, it is true, goes beyond the isolated one and the many detached and separated from the One. Sattva or harmony reconciles the opposition between Tamas and Rajas, between rest and motion, between silence and dynamis. The one-in-many, the one that is expressed in and through the many, is really this transcendent category, the transcendence that is reached in harmony, the transcendence that harmonizes and equilibrates the opposing elements and thus goes beyond the opposition. This is immanental transcendence, the transcendence that is within the rigion of division, the transcendence that belongs to the all-embracing, Sarvabhutâtmabhutâtmâ Mukhya Prana of the Upanishads, the transcendence that overcomes the limitations of space, time, and causality. But this is only relative transcendence. The Shruti is never tired of pointing out that absolute transcendence belongs only to the Atman, and repeatedly points out the distinction between Agnividyâ and Brahmavidyâ, between the Prana-tattva and the Atma-tattva. The Atman is Gunatita and Asanga, beyond the division of the Gunas and is absolutely transcendent. The Muktasanga Anahangvâdi, the detached self-less self, the Sâttvika Kartâ is still Karta or agent, and is very different from the Asanga transcendent Self, the Kevala Atma which is not agent at all. The Turiya, Gunâtita, is the transcendent stage, which is certainly not the inactivity that is afraid of activity, not the activity that disturbs the silence of inactivity, not also the serenity that remains undisturbed in activity as well as in inactivity and retains its harmony in both, but is something that has not entered into the division of silence and activity at all. It is beyond silence and activity, not in the sense of their harmony and aggregation, but in the sense of something that is the *prius* or background of the division but which itself transcends the division and does not enter into the division. This higher transcendence is expressed by the words Asanga and Atita. The Purushottama transcends the Kshara (Ksharamatita) and the Akshara (Aksharâduttama), and is Anya, different from both. The lower transcendence, the transcendence which harmonizes and comprises both, is immanental transcendence, and should not be supposed to be higher than the superior transcendence, the absolute Asanga, commonly mistaken as only an isolated part of the lower transcendence.

(4) Shankara explains transcendence by saying that Brahman is beyond the causal series. The causal chain that links together everything in the empirical world and explains all things as causes and effects, does not extend to the transcendent reality of Brahman. The unmanifested and the manifested, the latent and the patent, are stages in the causal process, and the eternity that is composed of time-divisions and in a sense transcends temporal limitations, itself belongs to the realm of causation. The Absolute, that is the ground of the world in the sense of the cause that manifests itself through the effects, is not beyond time, and is either conceived of as the starting point of the causal process or as the whole that contains all time-divisions within it. The Absolute that is the cause, contains the effect within It and has division latent in It. The effect is the cause transformed; and the Absolute that is the cause of the world cannot but be supposed to be transformed or divided in some way or other. Hence Shankara thinks that the Absolute Fundamental Reality must be beyond the causal chain, if It is to save Itself from impermanence and destruction. The relation between the Absolute that transcends causality and

time and the world that is in time and is causally connected, has been explained logically by Shankara by his doctrine of Maya and his category of Mithyatva. The Absolute cannot be a member of the causal series; the world or the causal series, therefore, cannot be related to the Absolute as Its effect. Hence Brahman is Jagat-vilakshana and transcends the world. The Absolute that does not transform Itself into the world yet is the ground or substratum of the world, the Absolute which without entering into the cause-effect relation still is the ground of the causal series, is just like the Adhishthâna or Ashraya of an Adhyâsa or illusion, and this is Shankara's Vivartavâda or Mâyâvâda. Any theory which holds that the Absolute is not *transformed into* the world and still is the source of the world, cannot but subscribe to Shankara's Vivartavada. This is the crucial test that distinguishes between pseudo-transcendence and genuine transcendence. The causal series or the temporal series that finds and retains its reality as temporal and causal in the Absolute and belongs to the Absolute as inherent in It, is only related to the pseudo-transcendent. The genuinely transcendent is beyond the time-series altogether and the relation between this Absolute and the world cannot but be Vivarta or Maya. If one is disposed still to regard this relation as causality, it is to be remembered that it is very different from what is ordinarily understood by causality. Kant's noumenon is the ground and not the cause of phenomenon, Spinoza's Substance is not the cause but the ground of the modes; Plato's Ideas are not the cause but the ground of the world of sense; Schelling's Absolute is the foundationless or groundless ground; Shankara's Brahman is the ground or Adhishthana, yet not cause of the world.

All master-minds of the world have noticed the logical difficulty of designating the Ultimate Reality as the cause and regarding the relation between the Absolute and the world as one of causation. The lesser minds, who have not been fortunate enough to acquire the illumined vision—the intellectual intuition that grasps the transcendence and understands the transcendent causality, the groundless ground, have failed to understand their masters' teachings and have missed in the transcendent Absolute any explanation of the world. Their narrow vision only understands the ordinary causal explanation; and where anything is preached which transcends this ordinary causality, they find only inconsistencies and absurdities. The realization of this absolute transcendence has been sought to be expressed and explained by all great minds of this world. But it is only Shankara who has attempted a thorough logical justification and a perfect philosophical presentation of the transcendent realization. It is not strange that lesser minds would not be able to rise up to the height which the genius of Shankara had reached; but it is a pity that even some of the greatest minds of the modern age including among them some of his own countrymen, should not only fail miserably to realize the supreme glory of his teachings, but should fall so low as to attempt to deprecate him without rhyme or reason and find satisfaction merely in abusing such a master mind. Shankara has no quarrel with anyone claiming to give an account of his illumined vision or intuition, but if the latter is attempting to justify his position *logically*, he finds in Shankara a bitter opponent. It is sheer logic which cannot brook or allow even the faintest contradiction that forces Shankara to declare the world to be false, Mithya; and he is the last person to condone any view which would regard the timeless and the temporal, the Absolute and the world to be *both* real. We should all pay homage to the great soul who has not only explained clearly the distinction between genuine transcendence and pseudo-transcendence or rather between absolute transcendence and relative transcendence, but who has also given us a vigorous logical defence

of the transcendent realization preached by the Upanishads.

(5) Shankara's philosophy is not a mere logical theory without any relation to life and concrete experience but is based on Anubhava or realization. It is a mistake to suppose that Shankara lives in an abstract dream-land of his own and that his logical analysis and penetration, however correct and stimulating, fail to comprehend the richness and complexity of Absolute Reality. Shankara's logic is not based on the partial one-sided working of the discursive and theoretical understanding that is separated and detached from life, so that it would fail to grasp the harmony that is perceived by the synthetic reason, but it is grounded on supreme experience and realization that is not only all-comprehensive but also all-transcending, that not only comprises the working of the theoretical and the practical understanding, but goes beyond this synthesis into the transcendence of the intuitive reason. The modern followers of Hegel think that Shankara has affirmed the One and denied or rejected the many and thus is guilty of one-sided abstraction. Their Ultimate Reality is, on the other hand, like Hegel's Absolute Idea, the one that does not reject the many but contains and explains the many, and is, therefore, supposed to be superior to the one-sided and abstract Brahman of Shankara. Life and reality present to us the harmony of the One and the many and solve for us the contradiction that presents itself to the abstract analytical intellect. That which seems insoluble to the understanding, Hegel and his modern followers argue, is not only no contradiction to the synthetic reason which perceives the harmony of concrete life and reality, but is the soul of Reality. The Absolute that is both silence and movement, both One and many, must be supposed to be superior to, they argue, the Absolute that is only silence and not movement, that is only the One and not the many. This is a simple argument and in its simplicity is to be found the great charm that it has for the generality. Put in this way, Shankara's system seems to be defective. But this is a wrong presentation and a misinterpretation of Shankara's theory. Shankara has not rejected the many and affirmed the One to the exclusion and neglect of the many. The synthesis of the One and the many and the solution offered by the ancient Bhedâbhedavâdins and their modern representatives appear to Shankara to be superficial; and he has attempted a deeper solution and not ignored the problem. According to him, the One and the many are reals of different orders—while the One is absolutely real, the many are only relatively real; while the One has Pâramârthika Sattâ, the many have a Vyâvahârika Satta. The many have no absolute, fixed, or permanent reality; and, therefore, strictly speaking, they are not Sat or Real, because there is no meaning in ascribing reality to that which is not fixed and permanent. The many are not Asat, non-existent, but are Mithya, unreal or false, in the technical sense of the term. We have to understand carefully Shankara's meaning of the term Mithya and should not hasten to suppose that Shankara has rejected the universe.

Many find difficulty in understanding why the world should be declared unreal proceeding as it does from the Ultimate Reality. Shankara repeatedly asserts that the world has its ground in Brahman and it can have no other ground. Ajnana has its support and substratum (Ashraya) in Brahman. So there is no ambiguity in the supposition that the world is grounded in the Absolute and comes from It. Why, then, should Shankara hold that the world is unreal, Mithya? What can be his meaning? His opponents think that Shankara's inadequate and partial realization is responsible for this one-sided abstraction. But does it require an enlightened vision or a pointed intellect to realize even this much, that the world that comes from Brahman

cannot be Mithya? The eulogy that has been bestowed on Shankara's logic seems hardly to be in consonance with the intellectual poverty which this supposition implies. Shankara must have a deeper meaning in his mind.

By declaring that Brahman is Sat and the world is Mithya, Shankara means to express that the duality that characterizes the world and forms its inner essence is not inherent in the Absolute. The world is not an *expression* of the Absolute and the Absolute is Jagatvilakshana. The Absolute is not *necessarily* expressed in the world. The world is a *free creation*, a *Vivarta*, and not a necessary product, a transformation or a Vikâra. The appearance of the world does not touch the Absolute at all (Anumâtrenâpi an sambadhyate). This freedom, this transcendence, this non-causal or non-mechanical causation, this absoluteness is what Shankara means by Brahman. We have already explained this transcendent causation in a previous paragraph. Brahman is the ground of the world in this sense, and the world that does not express the Absolute and does not touch the Absolute is Mithya also in this sense and not in the sense of non-existent, Asat. The duality that *appear*s in and through the world and forms its essence but which is not inherent in its ground, viz, the Absolute, cannot but be Mithya. If the Absolute is supposed to have an inherent dualism, if dualism is supposed, in other words, to be the essence of the Absolute, then there would be no distinction between the Absolute and the world, and there will be no synthesis of the One and the many. The One that has the many inherent in it, the One that is expressed in and through the many, is really many and not One, and so Hegel's One-in-many and the Ultimate Reality of his modern followers that is both silence and dynamis, is not the much longed for synthesis that can solve the problem but is only one term of the opposition, viz, the many. The real solution has been attempted by Shankara. The many that come out of the One but do not touch or disturb It, the many that have their ground in the One but are not inherent in the One, the many that can be explained by the One but still do not interfere with the transcendent fulness of the One, are not in opposition to the One, and thus are in happy harmony with the One. Shankara finds the solution in his experience of this transcendent causality, this non-causal causality; and his category of Mithyatva is the attempt to justify this transcendent experience logically. If mechanical causality is the only causality, Shankara's Mithyatva falls to the ground and must appear to be absurd even to the stupidest mind. But if Shankara is not more stupid than the stupidest, his category of Mithyatva explains to us another kind of causality, a freedom that is not intelligible in terms of mechanism, a perfection that is not a gradual progress from imperfection, a fulness that is not an aggregation of parts, a Purna or Full from which if the Purna (Full) is taken away, the Purna (Full) remains intact, an Advaita or non-duality that is not compromised with a duality or Dvaita, but the Dvaitâtita, the transcendent non-duality that knows no compromise and division. From the Sthula to the Sukshma, from the Sukshma to the Kârana, from the gross to the subtle, from the subtle to the unmanifested, in short from the manifested to the unmanifested and again from the unmanifested to the manifested, we have the realm of causation; and here the cause and the effect are equally real. But the Shruti speaks of the Turiya state as well, which is not on a line with the Sthula, Sukshma and Karana, but which transcends all the three not as their synthesis merely but as something which passes beyond them altogether. If Hegel's Absolute or his followers' Ultimate Reality is the ground of the world and has no *inherent* dualism, he cannot avoid being a follower of Shankara; if his Ultimate Reality has an inherent dualism he can-

not be preaching the Upanishadic monism; if he says dualism is both inherent and non-inherent, he is a Bhedabhedavadin having no secure place in the realm of logic and philosophy. Shankara's philosophy is the most logical explanation of the Upanishadic teachings.

THE IDEAL OF BODHISATTVA IN MAHAYANA BUDDHISM

By Prof. Sujitkumar Mukhopadhyaya

Gautama Buddha, as it is recorded in the *Jâtakas*, was Bodhisattva in his previous existences. Whether an animal or god or human being, he possessed wisdom as well as goodwill towards all. He was ever prepared to sacrifice his life for others. From these stories of previous existences of the Buddha, one may have an idea of the ideal of Bodhisattva.

What is the meaning of the word Bodhisattva? *Bodhi* may be translated as 'Enlightenment' and *sattva* as 'being'. Thus, the literal translation of the word Bodhisattva is, 'Enlightenment-being', i.e., 'a being destined to attain the most perfect Enlightenment or Buddhahood'.

This Enlightenment is not intended for any personal interest. We find in the commentary of the *Bodhicharyâvatâra*, the explanation of the word Bodhichitta or Enlightenment-mind as follows: 'Enlightenment-mind' means, 'the mind for Enlightenment or Buddhahood', i.e., 'a firm resolution, accompanied by efforts, to attain Enlightenment or Buddha-hood, with the intention of liberating all sentient beings'. (Cf. *Bodhicharyavatara-Panjikâ*, I-6, 15).

So it is clear from the above explanation, that the Enlightenment of a Bodhisattva aims at the well-being of all the world. That he has not got any trace of selfish motive behind this, may be shown later on.

In the Sanskrit, Tibetan, and Chinese literatures of the Mahâyâna, we frequently meet with this ideal of Bodhisattva. We also find records of the lives of great Bodhisattvas who sacrificed their lives, accepting inhuman tortures, for the well-being of others.

Out of many, the two great good qualities of a Bodhisattva, are Maitri and Karunâ. Indians are familiar with these two sacred words. But the meaning which the Buddhist attributed to these words, is very high and sublime. Love towards all sentient beings, like that of a mother towards her only child, is called Maitri. (Cf. *Shikshâ-samuchchaya*[1], p. 19; *Mahâyânasutrâlamkâra*, pp. 123, 134). Affection towards all the afflicted world, like that of a father towards his afflicted son, is known as Karuna. (Cf. *Bodhi*, IX. 76).

> As a mother protects her only son even at the risk of her life, in the same way, one has to create love,[2] towards all living beings. (*Sutta-nipâta*, I-8-7).
>
> As a householder loves his only and meritorious son, from the very core of his heart, in the same way, the compassionate Bodhisattva loves all living beings, from the very core of his heart. (*Shiksha*, p. 287).

Karuna is so highly regarded in Buddhism that it is said, where there is Karuna, all the Dharma of the Buddha is there. (Cf. *Bodhi*, IX. 75).

The Bodhisattva who has acquired the great Maitri and Karuna, sacrifices his body, his life, all the root of good (i.e., absence of anger, greed, and delusion, which is the root or source of good), without desire of any recompense. He desires the Enlightenment of all others, before his own. (Cf. *Shiksha*, p. 146).

He is not overcome by pain, when his

[1] A compendium of Buddhistic teachings; passages from more than a hundred works are collected in it.

[2] Lit., 'Immeasurable mind', which is a term for Maitri, Karuna, etc.

body is cut into pieces, even then he pours out love for the universe. He bears all this pain, for the liberation of those who inflict it on him. (Cf. *Shiksha*, p. 187).

He says,

All the creatures are so helpless, they are overcome by anger, greed, and delusion. So they have no strength left for doing any good action which would compass their own liberation; when they are unable to liberate themselves, how could they liberate others?

Therefore, I undertake to shoulder the suffering of all living creatures. I have made a firm and irrevocable resolve to do this. I shall not swerve from this path. I shall not grow despondent or tremble with fear. I shall not flee like a coward from this resolve. (*Ibid.*, pp. 280-2).

From the above passages, it is clear, that the doctrine of Bodhisattva, is the doctrine of a hero. The Bodhisattva is a Vira-sâdhaka. He is full of manliness and heroism (Virya).

It is said in the scriptures that he who wishes to acquire the merit of forgiveness, must cultivate manliness and heroism (Virya). Without Virya, forgiveness and endurance of suffering are not at all possible. Enlightenment is founded on Virya. As without wind no movement is possible, in the same way it is not possible to acquire merit without Virya. (Cf. *Bodhi*, VII. 1).

Bodhisattva, the great hero, taking on himself, the suffering, penury, and miseries of others, serves in various ways, the countless creatures of the countless worlds in the universe, until all of them have attained to liberation. (Cf. *Bodhi*, III. 21). He is like the Sun illuminating all the world, without distinction, with his rays of wisdom; like the moon, cooling the suffering of all sentient beings equally, with the universal compassion. Like the tree he stands well-rooted and grows firm to give shades to all sentient beings of the world. Like a hero, riding on a chariot, wearing the armour of patience, drawing the sword of knowledge, he protects the world. He is a helper to the helpless, a guide to the wayfarer, a boat, a bridge, a dam to those who desire to cross over to the other shore. He is a physician to the sick, a nurse to attend on them until they are healed and made whole. He is an inexhaustible store for the poor: he attends on them in the form of a fulfilment of their manifold needs. (Cf. *Shiksha*, pp. 102-3; *Bodhi*, III. 7-17).

He says,

For the fulfilment of the needs of all the creatures I surrender dispassionately my being in all my manifold existences, all my objects of enjoyments, all the merit accumulated by me in the past and in the present and that which I may acquire in the future. (*Bodhi*, III. 10; *Shiksha*, p. 17).

I shall stay behind in the world, till the very end of it, for the sake of even one individual. (*Shiksha*, p. 14).

May all those attain to Buddhahood, who would soil my fare name with falsehood, who would cause injuries to my body and mind, who would scoff at me; may others also attain to Buddhahood.

This body of mine is for the satisfaction of whatever pleasure they (creatures) desire; let them hurt it, censure it, soil it with dust; let them do it whatever they like—play, laugh, wanton, etc., whatever conduces to their happiness. I have given this body of mine to them. Let them get out of it whatever begets happiness; why should I thus worry about myself? (*Bodhi*, III. 12-16).

These are not simply precepts or empty words; there were persons who lived and died, illustrating them in their lives. When the enemy stabbed the Bodhisattva Arya-deva, the great expounder of the *Shunya* Doctrine, he advised the man to take his robe and escape immediately in the guise of a monk. The Guru was at the point of death, and disciples were around him; some of them were weeping, some were crying and shouting: 'Who committed this heinous sin? Where is the murderer?' The Guru calmly said,

There is neither murder nor murderer
Nor there is one who is murdered.

(Cf. The life of Arya-deva from the Chinese sources. Vide the Chinese catalogue by B. Nanjio, No. 1340, 1462).

When we hear from great men, 'forgive the evil-doer,' 'love your enemy,' the question naturally arises in us, 'Why should we?' The Bodhisattva attempts to answer such questions. We quote below a few such passages:

A person maddened with anger hurts himself, by pricking his own body with thorns,

etc., giving up food he starves himself. Others put an end to their lives, either by hanging themselves with a rope, or throwing themselves from a precipice, or by drinking poison, etc.

If the unfortunate creature who is under the sway of lust anger, etc., hurts himself in this way, how can you expect that he would not hurt others?

Just as we do not get angry but rather pity a person, who is possessed by some evil spirit, even if he acts in various harmful ways, in the same way, why should we not pity, instead of getting angry with those who, possessed by the evil spirit of lust, anger, etc., commit suicide physically, as mentioned above, or spiritually by doing harm to others.

When one strikes me with a stick, I do not get angry with the stick, but with him who wields it; therefore, when a person wielded by ill-will, strikes me, I should get angry with the ill-will and not with him.

The weapon with which I am struck, and the body where I am struck, both are cause of sufferings—with whom shall I get angry, the weapon-wielding foe or with myself, who wield a body?

This body is like a festering boil which feels pain easily and quickly. I do not desire suffering (caused by some weapon), yet I desire the body, which is the cause of that suffering. Verily I am a fool. I am the main culprit. Why do I get angry with others (who are only abettors or accomplices in the crime)? (*Bodhi*, VI. 35-45).

Of all the sacrifices, the sacrifice of the desire for praise and honour is, perhaps, the most difficult. There are great men who, although they have sacrificed all their material possessions, all the means of worldly pleasures, cling to these two things—praise and honour. They cannot forgive the man who stands on their way, while they strive for these things. But a Bodhisattva considers these things to be fetters. Those who dishonour and disgrace him, are regarded by him as friends and helpers who help him, in filing away his fetters:

I desire liberation; the fetters of gain, praise, and honour do not become me. How strange it is, then, that I have ill-will against those who help me to file away those fetters?

They bar the door against me when I desire to enter suffering. They are as if made to act by the grace of the Buddha. How could I then ever have ill-will against such benefactors of mine? (*Ibid.*, VI. 100-1).

According to a Bodhisattva, there is no evil-doer who can do evil to us. He, whom we consider our enemy, instead of doing us harm, practically does good to us by helping us in the acquisition of virtues:

I acquire the virtue of forgiveness through the instrumentality of the person whom I think the evil-doer. This cancels the demerits of the past. On the other hand, through my instrumentality, is born in the evil-doer violence, ill-will, etc., which drag him down to the hell of continuous and unbearable sufferings. It is obvious, therefore, that he, who seems to me to do me evil, is in reality my benefactor; and it is I who do him evil. O wicked mind, why then drawing contrary conclusion, dost thou get angry?

Even when my meritorious act is obstructed by some one, then also I have no justification for getting angry with him; for there is no greater virtue than forgiveness, and it is only due to him that I have an opportunity to exercise this virtue.

If I am intolerant and do not forgive him, then the obstruction in my meritorious act is caused only by myself. Even when there was an opportunity of acquiring merit, by forgiving the evil-doer, I did not acquire it.

This fruit of forgiveness is acquired by his and my co-operation. He should be, therefore, the first to share it; for he is the primary cause of, and principal helper in, my earning it (the above-mentioned merit).

If one were to ask that my enemy, the evil-doer, had no such intention of helping me to achieve merit through forgiveness, and so, even though he may be the cause of my acquiring merit, he is not worthy of honour, then may I ask him, Why he worships the Good Law (i.e., the religion of the Buddha) which is the cause of his acquiring merit, seeing, that it is also void of intention?

If the answer is made that it is true that the Good Law is void of intention, but he (the enemy) is also intent on doing harm, then this may be countered by saying that it is just because he has the intention of doing harm that the enemy is the cause of my exercising forgiveness. The occasion of exercising forgiveness would not have arisen at all, if he had not the evil intention of doing harm to me. If without having any malicious intention he had tried, like the physician, to do good to me, would it have been ever possible for me to have any hatred for him, or would there have been any question of forgiving him?

My forgiveness is evoked precisely because he has the evil intention; therefore, he is the cause of my forgiveness. Like the Good Law, he is also to be honoured. (*Ibid.*, VI. 48-49; 102-11).

In all the great religions of the world, it is said, that the enemy or the evil-doer should be forgiven; but that the evil-doer or the enemy is, in reality, a great friend, a benefactor, and that he is to be honoured like the Good Law, is a sublime vision that is, perhaps, to

be found only on the soil of India. It reminds us of the uttering of that unknown saint, who while in trance, being stabbed fatally by the bayonet of a soldier, died instantly, with these words: 'O Râma, so You have come at last in this form!'

There are many persons who in heart appreciate the merciful deeds of the compassionate one. They have also a hidden desire in some corner of their heart to follow his example; but when they think of this path of compassion (Maitri and Karuna) where at every step one has to sacrifice one's wealth, one's happiness, one's beloved wife, sons, daughters, etc., even one's own life, nay one's limbs one by one, they do not dare tread on it. To them says the Bodhisattva,

> In the beginning the pilgrim on the 'path of Universal Compassion', will have to give up things as worthless as a straw. Gradually and slowly, he will be habituated into giving up things which are comparatively a little more valuable and a little larger in quantity.
>
> In this way the pilgrim gradually reaches a stage when he gladly and effortlessly sacrifices even his own blood and bones.
>
> When this practice reaches its highest peak, when one considers one's own flesh as worthless as a straw, then is it at all difficult to give up one's blood and bones? (*Bodhi*, VII. 20-26).

It may be argued that much of suffering is created by compassion. To this question the answer is, that there is no end of suffering in this world, and if one could visualize the manifold infinite suffering of this world, one could realize then that compared with that, the suffering created by compassion (in one's heart) is insignificant.

Besides, it stands to reason that if individual suffering can remove the suffering of many, then let the individual suffering be caused. The compassionate one, therefore, should try to create such suffering in his own heart as well as in the hearts of others. The life of Bodhisattva Supushpachandra illustrates this:

There was a king by name Suradatta. He had his capital in Ratnâvati. His subjects were given to evil ways. Therefore many Bodhisattvas were attempting for their uplift. The king, however, banished all of them from his territory. These exiled Bodhisattvas then began to reside in a forest named Samantabhadra. Among them there was one Supushpachandra. Intensely pained at the evil ways of the people, he resolved to lead them to the path of good. He told the others of his resolution; but they all tried to dissuade him from going back to the people and thus put his own life in danger. He, too, knew the dangers attending on his mission. Notwithstanding, he left the forest to preach the Good Law; and in due course he arrived at Ratnavati, where he succeeded in bringing a large number of people to the path of good. The royal priest and even the princes accepted his teaching. Seeing that the people were attracted to him in such large numbers, the king in anger and envy ordered that Supushpachandra be killed. The executioner, in accordance with the king's order, hacked his body, limb by limb, and plucked his eyes with a pair of tongs. In the end, his body was thrown on the high road.

Though Supushpachandra knew for certain that by going to the king he would have to put his own life into danger, yet he accepted the suffering thus caused in order to remove the suffering of many others. He did not try to spare himself the suffering at the cost of the sufferings of many others. (*Bodhi*, VIII. 104-6; *Shiksha*, p. 360).

We have no language to express our admiration for these noble deeds of these great men. We ordinary mortals, to whom they appear like fables, simply wonder, how these are possible! But it is possible. These noble souls feel no pain at all when undergoing such suffering. On the contrary, they feel joy. The scriptures say,

> Even by sacrificing his body, he does not feel pain; what of sacrificing wealth! This is simply extraordinary and wonderful! But that which even surpasses this, is that *joy* which he acquires by such sacrifice. (*Mahâyâna-sutrâlamkâra*, XVI. 59).

In another place it is said,

> All-sufficing unto them is that overflowing joy which they experience when, through this kind of their incomparable service, they see the sufferers set free, step by step, from the bondage of pain. Of what avail to them then is dry-as-dust liberation[3]? (*Bodhi*, VIII. 108; *Shiksha*, p. 360).[4]

[3] We also find in the scriptures that there is a trance (Samâdhi) called 'the trance of feeling joy in all things'. Through the attainment of this trance one has no other feeling except the feeling of joy in all the objects of the senses. So whatever suffering one shoulders, be it immeasurable, infinite, the feeling of joy is there. Even when one's hands, feet, ears, nose are cut off, eyes are taken out, when one is pounded like sugarcanes, crushed like reeds, burnt with blazing oil, the feeling of joy is constantly there. Cf. *Shiksha-samuchchaya*, p. 181.

[4] Regarding most of the translations of the passages quoted here, the writer acknowledges his debt to Sj. Gurdial Mullik, who translated them from the writer's Bengali work—*Maitri-Sâdhanâ*, a compendium of Brahminical and Buddhistic teachings on 'Universal Love' (Maitri).

THE MESSAGE OF CONTEMPORARY SCIENCE

By P. S. Naidu, M.A.

There has been of late a great deal of heart searching and introspective self-analysis among scientists of the present day. Champions of science, and others who worship at the altar of science, have formed a cordon round her to protect their goddess against the onslaught of profane, irrational, and unscientific men of the world. Science, it is contended, is not to blame for the ills that our age is heir to. It is true that knowledge which is now misused for inhuman purposes was created by science, but 'How can you', asks the protagonist of science, 'lay the blame on science for the abuse of scientific knowledge?'

> If Nature's gifts have been developed and perfected by man not for any higher purposes but to enable him to indulge in a blind orgy of destruction and devastation, the blame cannot be laid at the door of science. . . . gunpowder was manufactured not to kill thousands of innocent lives, but to blast a hillside, to provide a channel of pure drinking water to the thirsty people on the other side of the hill, and to provide thoroughfares for the masses. . . . Thus it is, that man at the dictate of his animal passion is out to prostitute science and the truths available to science, and thus to suppress and strangle 'truth'.

So observed Dr. B. C. Roy in his address as Chairman of the Reception Committee for the delegates of the thirtieth session of the Indian Science Congress which met at Calcutta in January last. His defence is typical of the attitude taken by the general body of scientists. Denials, often vigorous and spirited, but sometimes mild and apologetic, are made, of the serious charges brought against science. But we are apt to suspect the existence of guilt where there is an unduly loud protestation of innocence. We have to observe that if science can succeed in sharpening the intellect, without improving the moral nature of man, then science is necessarily to blame for the deplorable result. It is now a well-known fact that in the totalitarian States, scientists are prostituting their knowledge to the nefarious purposes of the dictators. If the mental discipline prescribed by a branch of human knowledge can quicken the intellect, while leaving the conative and the affective life of man cold and undeveloped, then there is something radically wrong with that discipline. That is exactly the charge that we bring against science. Not the inventions and discoveries of science, not the mere method of science, but the spirit which is behind all these that is responsible for the degradation of human nature. In this article we shall show how the blame for the sufferings of the contemporary world must be laid at the door of science.

The civilization of the West is a typical product of science. Intense cultivation of science in its many departments has resulted in a type of society with *advanced* social, political, economic, and cultural organizations. Now, let us see what thoughtful men have to say about this *advanced* society of the West.

> The environment born of our intelligence and our inventions is adjusted neither to our stature nor to our shape. We are unhappy, we degenerate morally and mentally. The groups and the nations in which industrial civilization has attained its highest development are precisely those which are becoming weaker. And whose return to barbarism is the most rapid. But they do not realize it. They are without protection against the hostile surroundings that science has built about them. In truth, our civilization, like those preceding it, has created certain conditions of existence which, for reasons still obscure, render life itself impossible. (*Man the Unknown*, pp. 38-39).

This is what Dr. Alexis Carrel, an eminent biologist and Nobel Laureate has to say about the present-day civilization. Let us now turn to a psychologist and hear him pour out his heart in agony.

The usual arguments of the protagonist of modern civilization concerning the manifold advantages of the scientific research of their times, as a rule, leave out of account the fact that the scientific achievements of our age have gone beyond man's ability rationally to control them. Consider, for instance, how the modern devices for the intercommunication of news and thought, which were expected to unite human family closer together in greater nnderstanding and tolerance, have served to aggravate the traditional hostility and national arrogance of men. And when we think of the ways in which the fruits of the scientific labours of man have been used for the destruction of mankind, the conviction grows on us that these are by no means the unqualified enrichment of human life that some people claim them to be. (Dr. Latif's presidential address to the Psychological Section of the Science Congress, Benares, 1941).

Here is a third picture of Western culture painted by Dr. Kewal Motwani in his special address delivered before the Science Congress at Baroda in 1942.

Our concern here is to get a co-ordinated picture of the results of the industrial revolution as we witness them to-day before our eyes. These results are integrated parts of a whole, and they may be summarized as follows:

In the realm of economics, the world has developed the ideology of poverty amidst plenty. . . trade cycles, depressions, crashes and slumps, glutted markets, irregular employment, labour unrest. . . , and finally the tragedy of national planning ending in international chaos.

Education in the West is permeated by a pragmatic philosophy of vocational training, fostered by the economic and political institutions of the countries. Commercialism has taken a grip of their educational systems. . . . Intricate and invisible scientific mechanisms are used to convert thinking human beings into articulate animals, shouting slogans and shibboleths, with their mental integrity utterly dissolved, so that they are easily drilled to destroy or die. Thinkers and scientists are forced to buy their security by selling their conscience and submitting themselves as bond slaves to the powers that be.

The arts have not escaped a similar fate. . . . Most of the literature produced in recent years is either erotic or neurotic. The age of the great writers who immortalized and idealized man's inner, spiritual hunger, his sacred hopes and aspirations, has passed away, yielding place to the rebellious scribe of the criminal and the sensational. Current literary criticism has no philosophy and no scheme of values.

This, then, is the picture of Western culture to-day. . . . The key-note of this culture is conflict, antithesis, Adharma ; the present armageddon, unparalleled in insanity of destruction, is the result of this culture.

Dr. K. Motwani who has made these shrewd observations fails to see the cause of the trouble. He believes that science will rescue man from the clutches of Adharma.

Science and her twin sister Technology are jointly responsible for the degradation into which the human spirit has been plunged. It is the spirit of science, and the spirit behind its method that are responsible for this degradation. Let us remember that science has been cultivated intensely only during the last two hundred years, and that too in the West. And within these two hundred years we have seen the rise of materialism, agnosticism, scepticism, and anarchy of every type in the West. If we note merely the list, without any further comment, of wars which the West has waged within the last hundred years we shall be struck dumb with pain and amazement. Here is a list of some of them: the Boer War, the Franco-Prussian War, the Austro-German War, the War between Prussia and Denmark, the Franco-Sardinian War against Austria, the Crimean War, the African, Mexican, and Chinese Wars, the Turko-Italian War, and the last World War. Now, we contend that the leaven which science has introduced into the human mind is responsible for these wars.

Science is a specialized discipline. Specialization is necessary in the interests of depth of knowledge. Each science confines its attention to the objects in the very narrow field whose boundaries it has circumscribed with great rigour. This specialization has been carried to such an irrational extent that it has resulted in narrowness of vision. Breadth of vision has been sacrificed in the pursuit of depth of knowledge. And when breadth is time and again suppressed in the interests of specialization, then the corresponding mental capacity atrophies, resulting in extreme narrowness and intolerance. Each class of scientist is like a community living in a long strip of a narrow and deep valley, bounded by very

high and steep mountain sides. The little ribbon of the sky visible overhead is, for that community, the whole of the expansive firmament. Of other valleys beyond their limiting mountain range and of other communities, this community is blissfully ignorant. The human mind, under the influence of specialized science, steadily contracts. The ability to see the other man's point of view, to believe that there may be an aspect of truth contradictory to your own; the capacity to enlarge your vision and to make compromise—these certainly are not fostered by science. *Narrowness of mind, then, is the first unfortunate result produced on human nature by the intensive cultivation of science and technology.*

Each science is in conflict with others. The physical and biological sciences come into conflict over their very fundamentals. The law of mechanistic causation is the first article of faith of classical physical science, while for the biological sciences this principle will be a formidable obstacle in the way of their progress. A conflict, therefore, is bound to arise between these two groups of sciences, and to add to the trouble, the social sciences, which are of recent origin, seem to be up against both the physical and the biological groups. These conflicts between disciplines which are supposed to widen our mental horizon, can hardly have any healthy or desirable influence over the human mind. In this matter, too, *science seems to have a disintegrating influence on human nature.*

The sciences, taken collectively and individually, can never explain any phenomenon. They can only describe how events happen by tracing them to their causal antecedents. Why events occur, or what they are in essence, no science can explain. Consider such a simple phenomenon as the behaviour of water below 4°c. Disobeying all the laws of science, water expands below that temperature. And so, ice is lighter than water. Now, why should this exceptional event occur? Science has no explanation to offer; it dodges round the corner and bolts in the face of these challenging Natural events. Now the explanation can be found only by taking the goal or purpose of the phenomenon into consideration. What purpose does the expansion of water cooling below 4°c. serve in the general economy of life? It is in the answer to this question that we shall find the secret of the challenge to the laws of science.

Water is necessary for life. The teeming millions of aquatic creatures maintain most beautifully the balance of life on earth. There are, however, large tracts of the earth where during a longer or shorter period of the year the temperature of water falls below 0°c. If water, instead of expanding, as it now does, were to contract below 4°c., in other words, if the density of water increased with the fall of its temperature, then in the great lakes, rivers, and reservoirs, water would freeze into ice from the bottom to the surface, and all creatures living in these vast aquatic regions would be frozen to death. Moreover, with the return of the sunny season, only a thin layer of ice at the top would melt. Life would become impossible, first in some parts of the earth, and then, over the whole of the globe. As it is, only a thin layer of ice is formed at the surface of the great water masses. This crust prevents further freezing. Water below is not only preserved in a fluid condition, but the temperature is maintained and enough warmth is secured for the aquatic creatures to live on till the return of warm weather, when the crust of ice is melted down, and the whole of Nature quickens to life from the drowsy torpor of winter.

The consideration of purpose reveals to us the secret of disobedience to the laws of science displayed by certain Natural phenomena. There are hundreds of exceptions in the concrete realm of life (such as the rise of sap against gravity, the inclination of the earth's axis, the giddy spiral dance of the electron) which defy the abstract laws of

science. Their purpose should be elucidated, and it is the neglect of purpose by science that is responsible for its failure to read the meaning of many Natural phenomena aright.

The neglect of purpose leads us on to another and more serious type of neglect with which we are bound to charge science. It is the neglect of values. *Science neglects values; nay more, science ridicules values.* Look at the picture of man presented to young and immature minds by popular scientific treatises. Recently the Home Library Club of Bombay issued a series of excellent popular books on many topics of general interest. One of the volumes has the attractive title *The Miracle of Life*, and on the frontispiece of this widely read book we find the picture of man's skeleton with the legend 'What a Man is Made of'. The contents of a man weighing ten stones is listed as below:

> Enough fat for ten bars of soap; enough water to fill a ten-gallon barrel; sufficient lime to whitewash a chicken coop, magnesium for a dose of salts; sulphur enough for a packet of sulphur tablets; iron to make a two inch nail, enough carbon for 9,000 lead pencils; and phosphorous to make 2,200 match heads: *And the total cost of the various ingredients would not be more than a few shillings.*

I have taken only the legend. There is a striking picture to drive home this analysis of man into lime wash, match heads, purge salts, and other ridiculous things. One can easily imagine what a pernicious influence such a picture, presented under the authority of science, is likely to have on young minds. And the sting of the whole thing is in its tail where man is valued at a few shillings. *Yes, man is worth a few shillings. That is how science views man.* Of man, the mighty creature whom God has made only a little less than the angels; of man, the noble creator of values; of man, who is the creator of science itself (remember it is the human mind that formulated the laws of gravitation, evolution, relativity, and so forth); of man, the lord of the earth, science sees nothing. Neglect of values through ignorance is excusable, but *wilful suppression of values is nothing less than a crime.* Values are what we live by; moral values, truth values, and religious values—these are what make life worth living on this earth. In the absence of these earthly life is intolerably boring and painful and purposeless. Any discipline which neglects values can have only a crippling effect on our minds. And a branch of knowledge which ridicules values is a poison to the human mind. Maharshi Tagore, during the last days of his earthly life, pleaded hard with the intoxicated minds of the present day for desisting from pouring ridicule on those things which the Vedas and the Upanishads valued. Truth, beauty, and goodness, and above all spirituality, are the stuff of our life. *This war as well as the last is the direct consequence of that attitude of ridicule and disrespect for things of the spirit shown by Western science.*

Science, after all, is concerned with the training of one third of our mind—the cognitive third, which as contemporary psychology has shown, is the least important third of the human mind. The affective and conative parts are left untouched by science. Our feelings and will are left in a crude and undisciplined state by scientific study. It is this over-development of the intellect at the cost of feeling and will that is responsible for the stultification of man's moral nature. *When morality degenerates, man reverts to his original beastly nature and indulges in the orgies of war and wanton destruction.*

We shall now turn our attention to another piece of disservice that science has done man. Classical science accused religion of anthropomorphism. 'We shall look for Natural causes of events and dispel all superstition,' said the scientist. And then came the great Copernican revolution which dethroned all superstition and enthroned the law of causation. The law of Natural deterministic causation was henceforth to be the only reliable or trustworthy guide

to knowledge. And the poor layman had his faith in supernatural things rudely shaken. Religion, things of the spirit, and truths not amenable to scientific experimentation were held up to ridicule. So great was the force of the propaganda of ridicule that soon man lost his faith in the old things and became a willing slave to the new doctrine of scientific materialism. And this merry-go-round went merrily on for two centuries. Suddenly science found herself in a quagmire. Instead of the promised land of security and safety, science led its votaries on to treacherous quicksands. What I am referring to is the remarkable phenomenon of the dethroning of causation by science, and its replacement by statistical averages. Having lured man on to the quicksands, science has suddenly deserted him saying, 'Well, friend, so sorry. We have lost our way!' And before the poor victim has had time to recover from his shock, science has departed without so much as a good-bye. Without turning a hair, science disappears from the scene of causal determinism. With his faith in religion gone, and with his new born faith in the omnipotence of science rudely shaken, man faces blank ruin before him. *No wonder, then, with his mind ravaged in this way, man invents wars and destruction as the only way of escape from the intolerable sense of frustration and disappointment within.*

Let me mention one more charge against science. The materialistic attitude engendered by science has produced many bizarre doctrines in politics, economics, and sociology. But look at the most bizarre of all its effects—*test-tube babies, and artificial insemination.* The frame of mind which can invent this method of reproduction and practise it without turning a hair, is, to say the least most sub-human. It is this degradation of man to the level of a machine, to the level of stud-bull —it is this degradation of man to the chemical compounds that compose his body—*it is this degradation, I say, that is directly responsible for the present war.*

I have argued vehemently against science. It is true that I hold that the spirit of science is responsible for all the misery of the West to-day. Yet, I do not suggest that science should take a holiday. I am not for the abolition of science. In throwing the bath-water out let us not cast away the baby too. There are certain elements of value in science, and these must be preserved. *Science has a message for man. Understood aright this message is a true gospel, otherwise it is a mess.* The humble role which science has to play in the general scheme of things human, its very severe limitations, and the need it has for being guided and corrected by spiritual truths—these are the most important aspects of the message which science has to deliver to humanity of the present age. Science has a place under the sun, but science must be kept in its proper place; and what that place ought to be will become evident when we consider the true nature of scientific knowledge. We may formulate the following fundamental propositions as defining the true scope and aim of science in the general frame-work of human knowledge:

1. Scientific knowledge is hypothetical, relative, limited, and ever-changing. Absolute truth is beyond the reach of science.
2. Scientific knowledge is subjective. Science can never reach that which is objective.
3. Scientific knowledge is man-made. There is nothing certain about it.
4. Science aims only at practical knowledge. It is not made for contemplation, but only for action.
5. Science deals only with that which is superficial. Of the deeper meaning of existence, science can never hope to have even the remotest glimpse.

On the subjectivity and hypothetical nature of science we have weighty pro-

nouncements by leading authorities of the contemporary period. Says Karl Pearson in his *Grammar of Science*,

> Law in the scientific sense is essentially a product of the human mind, and has no meaning apart from man. It owes its existence to the creative power of his intellect. There is more meaning in the statement that man gives laws to Nature than in its converse that Nature gives laws to man.

Sir Arthur Eddington writes:

> The mind has by its selective power fitted the processes of nature into a frame of law, of a pattern largely of its own choosing; and in the discovery of this system of law the mind may be regarded as regaining from Nature that which the mind has put into Nature.

Sir James Jeans in his presidential address to the British Association for the Advancement of Science in 1934, observed:

> In the older physics, men imagined they were studying an objective Nature which had its own existence independently of the mind which perceived and which had existed from all eternity whether it was perceived or not. In the new physics the Nature we study does not consist so much of something we perceive as of our perceptions; it is not the object of the subject-object relation, but the relation itself. There is, in fact, no clear-cut division between subject and object; they form an indivisible whole which now becomes Nature.

These are revolutionary statements, and they are typical of the attitude which the more thoughtful among the contemporary scientists take to their respective sciences. Again, on the ever-shifting and purely hypothetical nature of scientific laws, we can have no weightier pronouncement than that of Prof. Whitehead who writes:

> The laws of Nature have been changed as frequently and fundamentally as the laws of man during the past two or three centuries, and it is possible and even probable that the existing body of scientific law is highly ephemeral . . . the conception of a universe evolving subject to fixed eternal laws should be abandoned.

I have elsewhere dealt with the question of objectivity in science and have shown that subjectivity is the foundation of science. The point is pressed home further in the opening chapters of Professor Schrödinger's great work, *Science and Human Temperament*. The lessons that we have learnt may be summed up in the words of Prof. Westaway: (1) The true man of science is one who never says, 'I know', but says, 'I believe', or 'the evidence seems to show', or 'it is possible'. (2) Nature delights in making fools of men by encouraging them to think that any term they may invent has infallibly a counterpart in herself.[1] And to these we may add, (3) that the mission of science is a very humble one of pointing beyond itself to spiritual forces which govern the laws studied by herself.

Despite all these limitations of science it will still be claimed that this branch of knowledge has put power into our hands, and has enabled us to control Nature for our benefit. Puny man believes that he has conquered Nature. What he has done amounts only to disturbing the balance of Nature. The concepts invented by science do seem to work for the present, but of what is happening behind the scene, the scientist has not even the vaguest idea. The scientist will soon see whether it is he who has conquered Nature, or Nature who has conquered him. I am reminded, in this connection, of a very striking incident in the life of a little girl. Every morning she used to go out into the garden with her doll and play all by herself. We wondered what she was doing alone in the garden. One day she told her mother that she had discovered a Vâhana for her doll, and that every morning she gave her doll a good long ride on the mount. The mother took the whole affair as a big joke. The little girl, however, pestered the mother to come and have a look at the real live mount of her beloved dolly. What was her horror when she discovered that the Vahana was a huge black scorpion of the most vicious kind. Luckily for the little girl the venomous creature had been caught at the bottom of a cement basin with very smooth sides which could not be scaled. The girl used to bend down, put her dolly on

[1] *The Endless Quest*, pp. viii-ix.

the back of the scorpion, goad it with a stick, saying, 'Gee up!' and the black Vahana obeyed! When the matter was reported to the father of the girl, he (a high-placed judicial officer with keen philosophical interest) remarked, 'Ah! My little girl is a true scientist. She has framed a concept—the concept of Vahana—and forced it on Nature. *And it worked beautifully.*' But if the scorpion had got out and stung her, then the little fool would have known whether the venomous creature was her dolly's Vahana, or she the victim of the poisonous insect.

I shall now conclude with what I have said elsewhere about the way in which science should be studied and taught, because my remarks also suggest the way in which the message of science should be conveyed to the world at large, and particularly to the impressionable minds of our young men and women.

In teaching science to young and plastic minds we must see to it that the seeds of degradation are not sown by the denial of God, and the exaltation of matter and force. The best way of guarding against this danger is to impress on the tender minds of boys and girls, by constant repetition, that science is only incomplete, partial, and unsatisfying knowledge of a very narrow part of just one aspect of man's experience. The best method of achieving this aim is (1) to show first the purpose of phenomena studied hy science, pointing out how science is temperamentally incapable of dealing with purpose, then (2) to deal with the purely scientific aspect of the question, declaring at the same time that science has only a very humble role as a mere describer of events in the grand scheme of human knowledge, and (3) to revert to purpose in the cosmos and stress the need for recognizing the fact that science should be urgently supplemented by philosophy and religion in order that man's nature may be kept in proper balance.

In the higher stages of education, science should be made an adjunct to philosophy. All students of science should be made to seek, as Jeans, Eddington, Whitehead, Haldane and others are seeking, the true foundation of science in its service to religion. Philosophy should be presented as the culmination of science.

And, what is more important, the higher branches of science should he made accessible only to those who have a well developed moral nature. Scientific knowledge—I mean research knowledge, should not be scattered broadcast before all and sundry. Like the great sages of old, the teacher of science, (who must be a great sage himself and a Sannyâsin) should first test the moral character of his pupil and impart such knowledge as he is fit to receive according to the level of his moral development. *For knowledge is power, and power is a great corruptor of human nature unless it is held in check by moral and religious restraints.*

Finally, the highest reaches of science should be made inaccessible to one who has the least attachment to this world. Creative research in science should be undertaken only by an order of monks similar to the Ramakrishna Order who are *in* the world but *not of* it, and who can say to a dictator of the Hitlerian type, 'Get thee behind us Satan, thou shalt not attempt to bend our knowledge to thy will.'

It is by these methods alone that science may be prevented from working havoc with the human mind. Presented in the proper way and under the guidance of philosophy and religion, science will release the creative energies of man. Left to herself science will produce what we are witnessing to-day —a world war of the most horrifying nature.

CONSCIOUSNESS OF IDENTITY IN COLLECTIVE LIFE

By Prof. Govinda Chandra Dev, M.A.

Though it may sound paradoxical yet the consciousness of identity that characterizes the nature of Ultimate Reality can be utilized for the furtherance of the earthly values. The notion of identity, it is thought, takes us away from the earthly life to the highest altitude of Reality and hence any suggestion as to its healthy consequences upon life on the material plane is, as a rule, considered to be extremely preposterous. But this misunderstanding

is traceable to an ignorance of the true nature of identity. Identity is usually conceived to be purely static and, as such, is treated as capable of putting a stop to the operation of life and not as a liberator of action. This is the gist of the comment made by Western critics upon the notion of intuition as conceived by Shankara. But rightly understood, identity is the seat of plurality, staticity of dynamism; and consequently if power be responsible for a release of action, the notion of identity has its immense possibilities for life in the material plane.

It is a fact of history that those who have self-confidence, succeed despite great difficulties and obstacles. This fact might be treated as an induction per simple enumeration and is, perhaps, explicable only on the hypothesis that the hidden strength of man becomes released through a practice of faith in his own self. Of course, self-confidence understood in this reference does not mean a consciousness of the self metaphysically conceived as identical with Reality. But, nevertheless, the very fact that normal self-confidence is effective—that it works—shows beyond dispute that explicit consciousness in the potentialities of the self, clearly conceived in terms of metaphysics, would be much more fruitful for work-a-day life. Again, consciousness of love is found to be almost irresistible; and, as a rule, it is not condemned. To condemn unselfishness is very difficult, and this is why it has to be criticized at times by showing that it defeats its own end. This is, perhaps, the gist of the occasional underestimation of love and charity in the interest of modernism. It seems that such criticisms of love and charity are too surface deep to deserve serious notice: unselfishness and love is at least theoretically applauded as an ideal of life without reservation. This predilection for love, sympathy, and fellow-feeling cannot be the result of mere education but seems to be a tacit recognition of the identity of the ultimate stuff behind plurality: it is, perhaps, an unconscious intuition of the Transcendent Reality in which the plurality of experience rests. Be that as it may, it cannot possibly be gainsaid that consciousness of one's identity with the dynamic reality must on the one hand be a great source of strength and of an enduring love and wide sympathy on the other. The civilization that stands before us as a whited sepulchre has no doubt, by enhancing self-confidence on a national basis, released stupendous powers; but, being essentially selfish, it lacks love and has been responsible for the groaning miseries of the vast majority which it exploits for the sake of an extremely indecent self-aggrandizement of the microscopic minority which utilizes all its powers in the ignoble cause of not only bringing fresh chains upon the exploited but also to kill them systematically by depriving them of the bare necessities of existence—and that, tragically enough, in exercise of a curiously burdensome trust for here as well as for hereafter. If this civilization can accept the notion of metaphysical identity as its ideal, it will overcome its narrow, selfish outlook and would be the expression of power in a superlative scale consistent with love of an abiding, deep, and comprehensive character.

The protagonists of religion took in the past an extremely narrow view of the notion of identity and, under a misapprehension of its nature, reserved the notion for an exclusively spiritual use and that also mostly in a sense of alienation of one's self from the collective concern. Hence the traditional idea is that the notion of identity must be kept hidden as an esoteric truth (Rahasya) to be communicated by an illumined preceptor to an aspirant with requisite qualifications intended for putting an end to the operations of life in any form whatsoever. This spirit of making light of the material needs of society, if not in theory at least in practice, characterized average religious reforms of the past. And owing to a general attitude of extreme hostility of

Vedantic metaphysics to the world of plurality, this much misunderstood other-worldly attitude became more often than not the prominent note of Vedantic spirituality as it was commonly understood. What was worse this other-worldly, narrow, individualistic outlook was not always reserved for an application in individual cases where it did not produce as a rule bad effects, though consequences far more desirable from the individual as well as the collective standpoints could have been derived from it, but it was super-imposed under a neophytic zeal and want of familiarity with the depths of human psychology upon the vast majority as a panacea for all evils of this life and as a substitute for its material needs. Gradually, super-imposition of other-worldly spirituality, misread and misunderstood, came to be treated as a most efficient instrument for the callous exploitation of the weak by the pseudo-advocates of the collective spiritual interest whose only motive in preaching religion was to monopolize all that is best of the earth for themselves and to benumb the material thirst of the rest by holding systematically the prospect of heaven before them. The Gospel of extreme other-wordliness, despite its great concern in the collective interest, perhaps contributed most to this misapplication of religion and this utilization of it for a most cruel diplomatic purpose because of their unequivocal emphasis upon the transience and unimportance of the life on earth being preached without reserve to all. This has made the contemporary hostile estimation of organized religion not only a truth but a truism, despite its excesses conditioned by a failure to penetrate into the deeper spiritual interest of man—more appropriately of the individual man—and its pre-occupation with a balanced distribution of the comforts of life in the material plane.

Hinduism theoretically understood the importance of the material life for the vast majority: by its separation of Karma-kânda from Jnâna-kânda, as against some people's exclusive emphasis upon the latter, it fought against pseudo-other-worldliness to the best of its capacities; but yet it did not, as a rule, find a link between the notion of metaphysical identity and the life of material prosperity. The inevitable consequence of a clear-cut separation of the material life from the spirit, despite the effort of the preacher of the Gita for a synthesis, as Shankara points out, was that it failed to invigorate the national life in all its phases and only shone before this life as an inspiring ideal like a Platonic form. The result was that material life, which is the sole concern of the bewildered majority, became sacrificed to the other-worldly interest of the negligible few who, even if not taken care of, could have looked after their own spiritual perfection. Often enough, the lack of a complete theoretic understanding of an inextricable bond between a faith in the metaphysical Reality and the life on the material plane, has made the history of Hinduism a curious complex of sublime idealistic outbursts of unfathomable depth and social inequalities of a grim, cruel nature. Despite the recognition of the metaphysical equality of all, in practice, however, social distinctions of an extremely objectionable character still have their sway: it would be unfair to characterize them all as the inevitable corollaries to variations in human potentialities. The history of Hinduism is too often a specimen of misapplication of Adhikâravâda. Though even the Vedas declare that the Kitabas and the Dâsas are specimens of Brahman, yet in practice they were, and even to this day, are treated as untouchables; and though the same scripture observes that woman is Brahman, yet persistent efforts have been made to deprive her of her legitimate position in life. Political bondage of India, along with her other evils, has by unsympathetic critics been causally linked with her philosophy, notwithstanding its immense possibilities for her all-round prosperity. The puzzle

can be explained if the source of the present degeneracy of India be traced to the disparity between her sublimest notion of equality in philosophy and her social practices shot through and through with inequalities. Of course, it has to be admitted unequivocally that her greatest champions of the aforesaid idealism in their individual life fought for a consistency between her philosophy and social practices; but their efforts were never crowned with success to the desirable extent because of a gulf between the spiritual and material life already created, knowingly or unknowingly. The result is that Hinduism, inspite of its best efforts for doing justice to the collective material demand of the vast majority, could not thoroughly rid itself of the fetters of the extreme other-worldliness.

As a reaction against this negativistic outlook, a compromise between spirit and flesh, God and matter, was effected which ended to a great extent in an idealization of the real. This compromise no doubt fostered the spiritual interest of the few who are not fit for a life exclusively devoted to spirit but yet pine for it; but because of its justification of the earthly as spiritual, the new movement unconsciously lent a helping hand to the exploitation of the weak and the poor. If there is no incongruity between enjoyment of earthly prosperity and mystic absorption, the vast majority can very effectively be deprived of their legitimate material rights in the name of maintaining a high spiritual standard. Thus, though monastic rigour came to be excluded from the spiritual life, the old prospect of life in heaven as a compensation for the deficiencies of the present remained. We are not yet altogether free from such a notion of religion. It is, perhaps, more than true to say that this alone explains the psychology of the self-imposed trustees of moral and spiritual interest of the have-nots who are said to be exploited for the sake of their post-mortem spiritual security. So under this new regime of materialization of spirituality, economic exploitation of the weak and the poor comes to be treated as religion and is supposed to serve the best spiritual interest of its victims who are applauded as martyrs. No wonder that the prophet philosopher of this new cult, Hegel, detected in the Prussian State the highest political fulfilment of the self-realizing Absolute, a State which after passing through the onward march of evolution for a century became metamorphosed into the most potent instrument of suppression of individual freedom and growth. If extreme asceticism asked the vast majority to make light of their bread, this equation of matter with spirit resulted, perhaps, against its intention to a reservation of the best bread for itself, and it considered this possession to be an act of vicarious atonement. So, there was no longer any necessity of delivering unto Caesar what is Caesar's and unto God what is God's, because Caesar became identified with God, and power and luxury with crucifixion.

This, I believe, is a synoptic survey of the general course of development of the history of religion from a speculative standpoint. Being a speculative analysis, it traces the general course of history of religious thoughts and confines itself to their main types leaving aside inexhaustible particulars and also exceptions. Naturally enough, the result of the aforesaid development is a full-fledged reaction in contemporary thought-world against religion as such and the demand for a wholesale rejection of it in the best interest of mankind.

The way out of the difficulty lies in a reservation of the spiritual life in its purity for a selective application and a release of it from its narrow groove for an application in a collective scale in the material interest of the vast majority. Even the naked spiritual life of the selected few should, as far as possible, keep it in close touch with the collective material needs of society.

The result would be on the one hand the preservation of the integrity of the spiritual life in its fulness and on the other a furtherance of the collective interest consistently with the same. The application of the notion of identity on a wide scale in the material interest of mankind would make it a living force in the true sense, and consequently it would not merely be a transcendent religion like the old asceticism shining far above with its eternal glory, but would also be an immanent religion penetrating through the warp and woof of the society. The transcendental religion of the past concentrated upon an application of the notion of identity in the spiritual plane, in the attainment of self-absorbed spirituality that did not dream of a descent upon the normal plane or treats it as a departure from its original grandeur or at least as an undesirable phenomenon. But immanental religion would demonstrate the unlimited potentialities of the dynamic identity with its varying grades, on the material plane. Thus, if a concentration on identity has led in the past to a self-absorption in Nirvâna, its application in the material plane would make of the vast majority intellectual and material giants. It would broaden the notion of superman and hold out the possibility of its realization before all. The notion of identity being a universal property, its natural application in addition to its selective use of the past leaves scope for the construction of a society that can welcome the highest expression of variety along with uniformity, that can encourage growth of individuality to its furthest limit, maintaining at the same time a common standard. This is to my mind, the great ideal before the civilization of the future, the divine descent and the advent of a race of superman, to adopt the phrases of Sri Aurobindo. Swami Vivekananda with his prophetic vision saw in this practical application of Vedanta, possibilities of the civilization of the future and even a rational analysis reveals that he was entirely in the right.

A TALK ON ART

By Swami Prabuddhananda

During my short visit to Santiniketan towards the end of February, 1948, I was privileged to meet Sjt. Nandalal Bose. The present article is based on his answers to the questions of a layman like myself. It may be interesting at least to a class of readers who have just begun to ask themselves, 'What is art?'

Question: What is art?

Answer: Art is imagination. It is feeling expressed in line, form, and colour. Art must evoke feeling, otherwise its value is nothing. There is, however, a grammar, a science of art. But feeling is of the highest importance. It precedes science. It leads first to form particular life-movement to merge ultimately into cosmic movement. It is that sympathy in virtue of which the artist becomes one with the object he contemplates. He lives in his art. Art is the mirror of the artist's life and mind with a clear vision. He is inseparable from it. The aim of art is creation, and not imitation of Nature. The same creative impulse that moves in Nature, impels and inspires the artist. And it is this inspiration which the hand of the artist paints to the senses. Art is thought. To be communicable, thought must take concrete form.

We all have the power of communication, but of all things only art can be a fit vehicle of communicating feeling and Rasa. Art is rhythm. Ideas, feelings, forms, colours, and movement

appeal to our aesthetic nature, only when they are rhythmically composed. For the most effective way of expression is the rhythmical way. Art is suggestion. By the little that it actually portrays it evokes a world of association and feeling.

Question: You just mentioned about 'life-movement' and 'rhythm'—what do they really mean?

Answer: In any work of art, life-movement is that movement which is impelled by the very first impulse of inspiration, which carries in it the intrinsic quality and character of the particular Rasa that has to be expressed. In a picture it is the most vital line; in a poem it is the inevitable word or combination of words. It is there that one feels the very pulse or life-throb of a picture or a poem. It, at once, renders unity and character to the work in hand.

Rhythm is a further elaboration of that life-movement; it combines other elements, motifs, units; it catches up the original movement and adds to that a continuous swing; continues it in a perfect harmony of contrasting as well as corollary movements. For, the birth and growth of a work of art is organic. Coming out of a seed, it has some simple vital movement by which alone it lives and moves and grows—expresses its unique self; it creates other movements, too, which flow out of the original one and make for detailed harmony and richness.

The truth of the above may be understood and felt in a proper study and contemplation of any genuine work of art.

Question: What is perspective? It seems to have raised much controversy. Does it play any important role in art?

Answer: Perspective is the artist's apparent relation with the objects seen at a distance. Things, when looked at from a distance, appear smaller than their actual size. This is a phenomenon which an artist has got to take note of. Omission of this knowledge in any work of art means violation of the law of perspective. But what is the truth in perspective? The mind sees things in a way peculiar to itself. An object which is distant to the physical eye may be near to the mind; a near one, distant. The mind often ignores the category of space. There are, therefore, two kinds of perspectives, namely, visual and mental. Following the mind, the oriental artists, not infrequently, omit visual perspective in their works of art. So, some Western critics find fault with them. But they do not realize how much mind contributes to art. It is mind not eye which is the real artist.

Question: We see a tree, but cannot appreciate its beauty. An artist comes and draws a picture of it. What a difference! It starts, all on a sudden, reveals its hidden beauty. What is the reason of it?

Answer: An artist does not wholly imitate Nature. He adds, he subtracts, he revises Nature's form and thereby creates something unique. He selects certain traits and rejects others so as to produce the desired effect. It is not possible to look at one object from all points at one and the same time. Neither does anything attract all of us alike. If five artists were to paint a tree, their pictures would wholly differ, one from the other. For example, one may be impressed most by the green of the leaves, another by the effect of light and shade, another by the freshness and beauty of its flowers, another by the structure or movement of the branches. To still another, the tree may appear altogether a different object, say, an ascetic in meditation.

Question: What are the contributions of the different countries in the realm of art?

Answer: China excels in landscape of a kind which expresses spiritual realization and spiritual experience in the artist through conventional and symbolical forms of Nature. Realistic portrait painting has reached its high watermark of excellence in Europe. India has excelled in the expression of spiritual realization through conventional and symbolical drawings of animals and

human figures. The real difference in realization between China and India lies in their respective attitudes—the Chinese artist loses himself in Nature, himself being only a component part of it. The Indian artist, on the other hand, harmonizes Nature with his self to form an integral part of his realization.

Question: You say that we should see works of art in order to appreciate them?

Answer: Yes. And you have to look at them with the eyes of a child. You should not approach them with preconceived ideas, or the analytical eye of a mere critic. Art is not to be appreciated in that way.

Question: What is the significance of the image of Buddha?

Answer: The image of Buddha is the symbol of meditation. A particular spiritual experience or idea creates for itself a particular type. When that type is perfected no further development in the same line is possible. The image of Buddha is such a perfection. The image of Natarâja is another type, it is that of the cosmic movement which radiates from and returns to a centre of peace. The image of Buddha is the same cosmic movement, restrained and held in peace, motionless like the flame of a lamp in a windless place.

One last word of caution. Spiritual significance of art is something quite other than its moral or religious meaning. It is simply that expansion which elevates one to feelings of consciousness, poise of mind, and unity in harmony.

WORLD PROGRESS—A FICTION

By Chunilal Mitra, M.A., B.T.

Our belief in progress or no-progress forces us to subscribe either to optimism or to pessimism—whether we are optimists or pessimists, whether we believe in the ultimate goodness of the world or in its utter badness, whether the world is full of bliss or covered with curse and darkness. As an answer, it can briefly be said that both the views can be established with equal amount of logic and stringency. For while the pessimist argues: 'Well, the world is full of evils; our life is full of misery and distress; furthermore, our very birth is a penalty.' The optimist replies: 'The opponent's view is altogether a misrepresentation and misinterpretation of the nature of things; what is called an evil is apparently so, and not really so; misery and mishap arise from the individual standpoint and not from the universal one; lastly, if there is evil, it is undoubtedly less than good.' It is actually so. Evils strike us most because they are *made* to be so. The newspaper takes note of a railway accident, a cheating case, a few robberies and murders, a dozen divorces, and a hundred suicides. But it is oblivious of a hundred reverse cases. Thus both have their strong arguments in favour. However, it is unprofitable to deal with theories and indulge in metaphysical controversies. Let us take stock of the facts of reality.

It is argued that in psychology no two experiences are alike. We cannot dip twice in the same river. Ideas are fast fading giving place to new. This is because we are ever progressing, world process and human knowledge are ever discovering new things.

In science theories are being changed constantly. The atomic theory is being superseded by the theory of electrons and protons—this again by the electric charges, which again by the radium theory. The Einsteinian Relativity has

revolutionized the Newtonian infinities. In the domain of philosophy, we have had pragmatism as a reaction against absolute idealism. In the domain of psychology, the 'terra incognito' of human mind has been discovered and importance is being attached to the subconscious and unconscious regions. The behaviouristic school of thought, with Watson as its exponent, has been discarded and replaced by the hormic theory of McDougall.

In material welfare, we are still forging ahead. As a means of communications, we can do away with boats, ships, steamers, and even railways and avail of air-planes. We have had in our days not only gramophones and telephones, but radios, televisions, and refrigerators. We have become international in every walk of our life. East and West can no longer be isolated either in thought or in life. Contacts between them, which were hitherto occasional and brief, have now become steady and permanent. Discoveries in arms and weapons are also there in legion.

In the sphere of labour and economics, organizations have crept up to safeguard the interest of the labourers in the name and shape of trade unions, communism, and socialism, etc. To prevent future wars and conflagrations, we have been hearing of the 'Federation of the Nations', the 'common-weal' of mankind. To overcome the religious disbeliefs and disharmonies, we have been suggesting and actually carrying out the 'Peace Congress', 'the Faith Conference', 'Disarmament campaign', and 'Congress of Religions'. In common ideals and on the common grounds the conservatives, the liberals, the democrats, the socialists, and the communists are meeting together.

These undoubtedly speak of progress. If progress means the widening of our outlook, then surely we are progressing as some of us have a long while been surpassing the land of communalism, provincialism, and nationalism, and even have gone so far as to think in terms of internationalism. Thus from the brief survey of the matters of today we may conclude confidently that the world is in rapid progress and that we are progressing constantly.

But herein we must not neglect taking note of the other side of the shield. And herein also we must be guided by factual events and concrete data. Side by side with the signs of bliss and indications of well-being and comfort, we must record that in our age we have had to witness the worst types of crimes, viz, theft, robbery, murders, kidnapping, and cheating. In consonance with this state of society, our jurisprudence has interminably been creating novel (?) and cruel forms of punishment, viz, execution, transportation, detention, and expulsion—not to speak of other forms of conviction! As we see there are attempts at preserving the equilibrium and tranquillity of society, so we have the disheartening news of riots and strikes as well. We have been long talking of the best form of Government, and while criticising one we are advocating the other. But by probing deep into it, we can see that every form of Government as such is neither good nor bad. It has got its transitional value and chance importance. For Aristotle's saying still holds good: 'It is not the form of Government, but men who govern that is of primary importance,' and that concerns the people most. Propagation of some form of Government, for instance, is neither a progress nor a discovery. It may at most be characterized as a rediscovery, i.e., taking things anew in a different fashion.

Side by side with purity, there are instances of moral depravity. For instance, to-day amongst some, motherhood seems to be a jargon, and virginity a thing of the past. Here principle has been sacrificed at the altar of expediency. Having Mrs. Sauger, the chief international champion in the forefront, there are sisters who want to be mothers without being wives. Though an innovation and a latest finding as a solution to some social problems, birth control

is at once a violence, a psychological inconsistency, and a physiological deformity. And it is acclaimed as a sign of progress and a mark of cvilization! He is hopelessly misguided who becomes a victim to this process as a solution of the problem of over-population.

Thus it will surely be a precariously hasty generalization if we conclude that the world is progressing. The outputs and achievements of the age and civilization are undoubtedly the *signs* of progress, but not progress *as such* and *in toto* On the contrary, if progress consists in the realization of our self—in the fruition of our better and finer self rather than the baser and vulgar one, that is to say, to be selfless in the highest sense—the world is *not* in progress at all. The fighting nations, with all the history of culture at their background, are exhibiting examples of barbarism and brutality. Aptly, therefore, has an European critic remarked, 'Unlike our European revolutionaries Gandhi is not a maker of laws and ordinances, but a builder of a new humanity.'

Thus we are forced to say that the world is neither progressing nor regressing, neither proceeding nor receding. As Freeman has said, 'Every step forward is a step backward.' Surely our *angles of vision* may be and *have been changed* but *not the eye*. The study of America from the economic standpoint is *not* surely a *better* study than its study from the social, political, or historical standpoint. One is simply *different* from the other. Thus the events of the world are mere realities—neither true nor false, neither good nor bad. *The world process is indeterminate—it is without designation.* We are only to do what we deem wise and best without pretending to make the world better and progressive. We are only to wait and see and as a matter of course, things will *come* to be true, right, and good as things are good fundamentally, and in their nativity. For to quote Bradley:

> Ethics (or man) has not to (and cannot) make the world moral (and better) but to reduce to theory the morality current in the world.

BROWNING THE BUDDHIST AND VEDANTIST

By D. M. Desai

For an ordinary reader, Robert Browning—the great Victorian poet—is the most difficult English poet to understand. As somebody has remarked, 'you can't read Browning without a dictionary'. It must be admitted that Browning is at times obscure to a degree which even the difficulty of his subject does not justify; but this defect has been dwelt on to weariness. A very large portion of Browning's poetry presents no serious difficulty to an ordinarily attentive and unprejudiced reader. The complaint of obscurity comes most loudly from those whose knowledge of his work is slight. It is they who

> Endure no light, being themselves obscure.

The second reason of obscurity, I believe, is due to the ignorance of an average Western reader of the Oriental philosophical background of Browning's poetry. Browning is an optimist who thinks life is meant as a struggle and that we shall go on struggling after death. This is hardly Christianity, but a sort of Buddhism. 'Strive and thrive!' Cry 'Speed—fight on, for ever there as here'.

Death is not the herald of extinction but

> A groom that brings a taper to the outward room.

His belief in life after death is stated again and again.

> Ah! But a man's reach should exceed his grasp, or what's a heaven for?

The doctrine of Ahimsâ—which Mahatma Gandhi renders in English as the principle of non-violence—is the central conception of the Buddhist philosophy. In other words—

> Love all, hate none.
> Love is all-powerful and a potent agent.

One of the supreme moments in all Browning is that in which the brutal Guido, condemned to execution, makes his fearful appeal for mercy to Christ, Maria, God—mere names to him—and then in a single moment of inspiration, to the love of his wife Pompilia, upon whom he has wrought the most foul and dastardly wrong.

> I am the Garduke's—no I am the Pope's!
> Abate—Cardinal—Christ—Maria—God. . . .
> Pompilia, will you let them murder me?

No theory can have any worth as an optimistic reading of life which does not reconcile its beneficent principle with the prevalence of evil, pain, and misery.

The principle by which all problems are understood, the principle which is at the root of all creative thought and action, is contained in the Buddhist doctrine of the 'middle way', or what Aristotle calls the 'golden mean'. This is not an exclusively Buddhist doctrine, but Vedanta is equally clear on the subject. The middle way must be carefully distinguished from mere compromise or moderation. It is not so much that which is between extremes as that which is born of their union—as Mr. Watts points out in a beautiful simile—as the child is born of man and woman. By means of it we are able to be at peace with life and death, to recognize alike the demands of conscious and unconscious, to harmonize reason and Nature, law and liberty. The error of the opposites is not in distinguishing between life and death, but in attempting to isolate them, to hold to the one and reject the other. According to Vedanta this is called Mâyâ, delusion.

As Professors Walker and Young point out, Evil is a condition of man's moral life and of his moral progress. Evil is necessary to the evolution of good. We can trace this all through Browning's work.

> And what is our failure here but a triumph's evidence for the fulness of the days? Have we withered or agonized?
> Then welcome each rebuff, that turns earth's smoothness rough. Each sting that bids nor sit nor stand, but go!

According to Browning, life is a persistent struggle towards an ideal. The whole worth of life lies not in perfection, but 'in the effort to be perfect'; not in accomplishment, but in the strife to accomplish. How closely these ideas resemble the theory of Karma as taught in the Gita. Good action will entail upon us good effect, bad action, bad. But good and bad are both bondages of the soul. The solution reached in the Gita in regard to this bondage producing nature of work (Karma), is, that if we do not attach ourselves to the work—Anâsakti—it will not have any binding effect on our soul. We are concerned not with the result or fruit of our action but with action and action alone. Duty for duty's sake should be our motto.

> This high man, with a great thing to pursue,
> Dies ere he knows it.
> That low man goes on adding one to one,
> His hundred's soon hit;
> The high man, aiming at a million,
> Misses a Unit.

Man lives in two worlds, the finite and the infinite; he is conscious of the spiritual world by the enthusiasm, aspirations and ideals in the soul. If there are two worlds for the soul there are two standards of judgements for conduct. The man who succeeds as the world counts, has failed utterly by the criterion of infinity.

Hence our success or failures here do not count—only our action does.

> Not on the vulgar mass called 'work' must sentence pass,
> Things done, that took the eye and had the price.

NOTES AND COMMENTS

To our Readers

From January the readers will miss *The Teachings of Sri Ramakrishna*, as these, with mush additional matter, are being published soon from the Ramakrishna Math, Madras, as a book, under the title *Gospel of Sri Ramakrishna*. But the readers will have a masterly study of Sri Ramakrishna's life and teachings from one of his foremost disciples, Swami Saradananda, portions from whose Bengali work *Lilâprasanga* will be published serially. . . . Prof. S. K. Mukhopadhyaya of Santiniketan presents in this issue a well-documented *Ideal of Bodhisattva*. . . . Mr. P. S. Naidu's *Message of Contemporary Science* lays bare the limitations of science. . . . Prof. G. C. Dev proves how non-dualism can be the basis of an equitable society. . . . Swami Prabuddhananda records an interesting *Talk on Art* with Sjt. Nandalal Bose. . . . Mr. C. L. Mitra raises doubts as to whether progress is a reality. . . . Mr. D. M. Desai of South Africa links up India and England through Browning.

Religious Education in Schools

One of the chief controversial problems facing modern educationists in India is the introduction, in schools, of a correct method of religious education. Writing in *The Aryan Path* for October, Mr. A. R. Wadia, referring to schools in India, says that though many leading educationists are dissatisfied with the present system of education obtaining in this country for its lack of emphasis on religion and morals, yet have a curious antipathy to religious instruction as such. According to him, the main reasons for this antipathy are: (1) Religion is purely an individual affair and cannot be taught in a class, (2) In India there are so many different religions that it is impossible to provide for their teaching in an impartial manner, (3) Religious instruction, if introduced, will only inflame religious fanaticism and serve to divide the people, (4) Most of the Government and Government aided schools have to observe religious neutrality as a rule, and this necessarily precludes religious instruction, (5) Among the modern educated parents there is a total indifference to any kind of religious or moral education for their children. These apparently cogent reasons against the introduction of religious education have proved an easy excuse for modern Western-educated dilettanti to give the go-by to religion from our entire life's activities. Answering these charges, Mr. Wadia says:

> If this dilemma is to be solved at all we shall have to begin with a clear understanding of what religion means. If it means this or that particular religion with an emphasis on its dogmas and miracles and rites, all the arguments mentioned against religious instruction will have to stand except in schools where all the pupils are of one religious denomination. But there is a sense in which religion transcends all particular religions. Many will agree with the statement that *religions are many, but Religion is one*. Religion in this highest sense runs right through human history, and particular religions are only historic manifestations of that universal religion which consists in the Quest for God.

There can be no two opinions regarding the place of religious instruction in the education of Indian children. For, we have to bear in mind the important fact that the foundation of the Indian nation is religion. Swami Vivekananda repeatedly tells us,

> In India religious life forms the centre, the keynote of the whole music of national life.

The Swami warns us that if we attempt to throw off religion and take up instead politics or society or any other thing as the vital centre of national life, it will spell ruin to

the whole nation. But the few irreligious acts of fanatics and narrow-minded politicians are exaggerated and religion is held responsible for our national and social degradation. The remedy does not lie in destroying religion, for to deny religion is to deny the highest experiences of the greatest of men who have guided and blessed humanity in its onward march. Real religious education will help the growth of a healthy attitude towards religion, and emphasis should always be laid on making a sincere effort to translate the principles of true religion into actual life characterized by toleration and mutual admiration. Mr. Wadia draws our attention to the fact that even the well-known scientists of to-day accept the limitations of science, and do not find any incompatibility between science and religion.

If religion even in the twentieth century has not become superfluous, and if all human history shows the power of religion as one of the most dominating traits of human nature, it would be futile to imitate the ostrich and say that religious instruction is a superfluity or an absurdity.

What, then, is the correct method of religious instruction?

And the only correct method is to slip over the particulars of religions and bring out the universal in all religions. This can be done only by successfully pointing out that all religions have a core of universality, and that again implies how a student of religion must study religions, for only in that way can he see the thread of divinity running through all of them.

Vedanta Abroad

In September last we celebrated the fiftieth anniversary of Swami Vivekananda's advent at the Parliament of Religions at Chicago. Swami Vivekananda's exposition of the universal principles of Vedanta in the West, and the starting of the Vedanta movement in America and England have greatly contributed to the systematic growth and propagation of Vedantic ideas outside India. We give below extracts from an article, under the above title, by Mrs. Irene R. Ray contributed to the *Navavidhan* of 23 September, 1943, illustrating instances of Vedantic thought in the literature of other countries.

Swami Vivekananda told an American audience that the West had not yet properly understood the teaching of Jesus. That is doubtless true. 'The Kingdom of Heaven is within you' and 'I and my Father are one' are very clear expressions of Vedantic principles to those who have understanding. But that understanding has not yet come to the West. Yet there are many instances in the teaching of Jesus which show that he had a very clear perception of Reality and of the unreality of the world, and that he was indeed a man of realization.

But Vedanta existed in the West before Christianity went there. This poem taken from the literature of ancient Ireland in an expression of unity in diversity . . .

I am the wind that bloweth upon the sea;
I am the wave upon the great waters;
I am the sound of the sea;
. . . .

In German legend we find an echo of the discovery of the ancient Rishis of India that mystery of life can only be solved by introspection, searching within one's self. . . .

The Red Indians of America also knew Vedanta. . . .

. . . .

Life-that-never-passeth,
Happiness-of-all-things,
Meeting, joining one another,
Helpmates, ever, they,
All is beautiful,
All is beautiful,
All is beautiful, indeed.

Another of the world's great Vedantists was Akhnaton, King of Egypt . . . 'Everything changes', said the king, 'but the laws according to which changes occur have been and will be for ever the same.' . . . 'Something indestructible behind all things that *is* behind all things that seem to be. That unique Essence is what we call God. It is unknown—perhaps unknowable. But there are moments when one gets direct glimpse of it in a way that words cannot explain, for as it is at the bottom of all things, so it is too at the bottom of our own being.'

REVIEWS AND NOTICES

ANNALS OF THE BHANDARKAR ORIENTAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE, VOL. XXIV, PARTS I-II. *Published by the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona. Pp. xlviii+106.*

This illustrated issue of the *Annals* opens with an account of the Silver Jubilee celebrations of the Institute, together with interesting extracts from the speeches of important men. Sir S. Radhakrishnan's address is given in full. This is followed by Dr. S. M. Katre's *The Influence of Popular Dialects on Sanskrit* where the eminent scholar concludes: 'Thus while Sanskrit has influenced the linguistic, spiritual, and cultural life of more than two continents, it has in that slow but continuous process imbibed within itself traces of such contact, and made its own a large part of the vocabulary and grammatical features.' P. K. Gode follows with an account of *Raghava Apa Khandakar of Punyastambha —His works and Descendants.* H. G. Narahari's *Devayana and Pitriyana* traces the significances of the terms in the Samhitâs and the Upanishads. Dr. N. J. Shinde holds that while Vyâsa was the author of 24,000 verses of the *Mahâbhârata,* 'the Bhrigva-nagirases were jointly responsible for the final redaction of the *Mahabharata,* for making it a Dharma Shastra and a Niti Shastra, and an encyclopaedia of the Brahmanical traditions, and for preserving its unity in the midst of its manifold diversity'. N. V. Kibe's note on the Bhagavadgita reminds us that the school of thought believing in the post-Buddhistic origin of the Gita is determined to have a forced post-mortem existence. There are also other readable articles.

SRI AUROBINDO, THE DIVINE MASTER. BY YOGI SRI SHUDDHANANDA BHARATIAR. *Published by the Anbu Nilayam, Ramachandrapuram, Trichi Dist. Pp. 126. Price Rs. 2.*

In this book the author discusses the genius of Aurobindo, his poetry, his mystic experiences, and his integral Yoga. It purports also to be a summary of the philosophy of the *Life Divine.* Although a vast literature is growing round Sri Aurobindo's personality, literary achievement, and spiritual contribution, one more synopsis and appreciative study is by no means redundant. But apart from this consideration, the book has its own merits. A section of it deals with Aurobindo's contribution to Indian nationalism. Another large section is devoted to Aurobindo's interpretation of many Vedic and Upanishadic conceptions. And the concluding section deals with his metaphysics. The book is informative, though it suffers from its self-imposed but ambitious task of compressing too much information within too short a space.

JAINA SYSTEM OF EDUCATION. BY DR. DEBENDRA CHANDRA DAS GUPTA, M.A. (CALIF.), ED.D. (CALIF.). *Published by the Hony. General Secretary, Bharati Mahavidyalaya, 107, Maniktala Street, Calcutta. Pp. 134. Price: bound Rs. 3-8, unbound Rs. 3.*

Dr. Shyamaprasad Mookherjee remarks in his short *Foreword* that anything which contributes to publication of the glories of Indian culture, no matter whether in its Hindu, Buddhistic, or Jaina aspect, is welcome; and with this we heartily associate ourselves. The present volume, which is possibly the first attempt of the kind, is the outcome of the first series of Mahavira extension lectures delivered by the learned author, who approaches the subject generally from a technical point of view. But the lay public can derive much benefit from it, inasmuch as the defects of the present system of education can be mended by a synthetic study of the ancient systems of education prevailing in Gurukulas, Vihâras, monasteries, and nunneries. The volume will also remove much misconception in the minds of the public, to whom the contribution of the Buddhists, thanks to the partiality of historians, appears to be the only factor worthy of consideration. The book is not certainly exhaustive. But it opens an immense possibility of research in the different systems of education as well as in the one under consideration. The chapters relating to academic degrees and female education are highly interesting. We earnestly hope that the book will attract the attention that it so eminently deserves.

SRI AUROBINDO MANDIR, SECOND ANNUAL. *Published by Sri Aurobindo Pathamandir, 15, College Square, Calcutta. Pp. 242. Price: cloth, Rs. 5/8/-; paper Rs. 4/-.*

The Pathamandir must be congratulated on its second successful attempt to interpret through a symposium the significance of Sri Aurobindo's message. Mr. Dilip Kumar Roy in his opening poem has shown how Sri Aurobindo's followers look on him:

The prayer is heard: thou art incarnate, Friend!
Our right to blindness must we still defend?

The general reading public, and even the religious public, may not agree to walk all the way with Mr. Roy; but that is no reason why they should not take at least an intellectual interest in the volume; and this interest will be fully satisfied by the accredited interpreters of the school like Mr. Nolini Kanta Gupta (*Lines of Descent of Consciousness*), Dr. K. C. Varadachari (*The Individual Self in the Philosophy of Sri Aurobindo*), Dr. Indra Sen (*The Problem of Life and Sri Aurobindo*), Dr. S. K. Maitra (*Sri Aurobindo and the Religion of the Future*), Dr. K. R. Srinivasa Iyengar (*Sri Aurobindo as a Literary Artist*), Anilbaran Roy (*The Ideal of the Jivanmukta*), Prof. Haridas Chaudhury (*Sri Aurobindo and Absolutism*), and others.

It is not necessary for us to go into the merit or demerit of the essays, nor is it possible to do so within the short compass of a review. Our scanty references will do less than justice to the eminent scholars. It is not also for us to adjudge which of the articles represent Sri Aurobindo correctly and which do not. But one thing strikes us: the writers have not always taken a detached intellectual view. There is often much of emotion or reverence which aims at placing the reader on a plane of uncritical appreciation rather than critical judgement. Stock phrases and bigoted assertions often mar the beauty of the essays, e.g., 'asceticism of the Monist' (p. 189), 'Shankarananda is considered to be the most famous among the Advaitic commentators on the Gita' (p. 238), 'his (Sri Ramakrishna's) extreme emphasis on the Spirit focussed all attention on it with the result that the integral vision could not be always there and its fulfilment was still further away' (p. 154), 'To all appearances Shankara did show the promise of being a precursor of that great age in India. But he had not the complete vision, the whole view, of the larger integral ideal of ancient India' (p. 148), 'the external life of man must be based on spirituality; but for this the Advaita of Shankara does not furnish a sufficient basis,' (p. 129), etc., etc.

These devotional outbursts apart, the volume will repay a thoughtful perusal; for the philosophy of Sri Aurobindo has made a positive contribution to Indian thought and outlook on life.

FREE INDIA—DASARA NUMBER. *Ammapet Main Road, Salem Town. Price Rs. 1-8.*

This Dasara number of the *Free India* containing a good number of coloured pictures and many readable articles, all in art paper, is a real achievement in these difficult days.

NEWS AND REPORTS

THE RAMAKRISHNA MISSION RELIEF WORK

REPORT AND APPEAL

The Ramakrishna Mission has been carrying on Distress Relief Work in different parts of Bengal for some time past. At present it is working through 55 centres, which are scattered over 15 districts and cover 446 villages as well as the towns of Calcutta, Howrah, Midnapur, Tamluk, Bankura, Rampurhat, Narail, Bagerhat, Barisal, Berhampore, Malda, Dinajpur, Faridpur, Dacca, Narayanganj, and Mymensingh.

Rice and other food-grains are being distributed mostly free and some at concession rates. Monetary help is also being given in accordance with the needs of certain localities. During the second half of October 1,391 mds. 19 srs. of rice, 196 mds. 12 srs. of atta etc. and Rs. 7,412-1-0 in cash were distributed among 24,527 recipients, and 89 mds. 14 srs. of rice was sold at concession rates to 1,285 persons, the total number of recipients being 25,812.

Besides, 7 free kitchens are being run at the villages of Sonargaon and Baliati in the Dacca district, at the town of Midnapore, at the Baghbazar, Hatibagan and Manicktolla centres in Calcutta and at Belur, the Headquarters of the Mission. In all over 4,600 persons are being daily fed at these kitchens. We are also running milk canteens for children and sick persons at Baghbazar and Hatibagan in Calcutta and at Mymensingh, Belur and Taki (24-Parganas), the daily recipients being 750. Moreover, we are cooperating with other relief parties in running free kitchens and milk canteens at Sarisha (24-Parganas), Salkia (Howrah), and Berhampore (Murshidabad).

The total receipts up to the 15th November are Rs. 3,35,258-8-8 and the total expenditure is Rs. 3,03,695-6-6. We have also received about 5,700 mds. of rice and other food-grains, which we have despatched to our various centres.

The relief so far given is quite inadequate to the extent and severity of the distress. In addition to food, with the setting in of winter, the need of clothes and blankets

has become very acute. The condition of the distressed people is indeed pitiable. Most of them are homeless, having sold all their belongings, including the sheet roofing of their houses, and are thus exposed to the inclemency of the weather.

Cyclone Relief Work

The work is at present being conducted in 200 villages of Midnapore and 24-Parganas. During the second half of October we distributed from our 8 centres 4,982 mds. 14 srs. 6 chs. of rice, 525 mds. 25 srs. 2 chs. of other food grains and 34 tins of barley to 67,586 recipients. Homoeopathic and allopathic medicines and diet, etc., are also given from four of our centres. The total number of cases, including repeated ones, treated during the fortnight, most of which were malaria cases, was 10,429.

It is the Distress Relief Work, however, that needs the greatest attention. While conveying our grateful thanks to all donors through whose generosity we have been able to conduct our relief activities so far, we earnestly appeal to the benevolent public to do all they can to save thousands of our helpless sisters and brothers. Contributions, however small, ear-marked for either of the above relief activities, will be thankfully received and acknowledged by the Secretary, Ramakrishna Mission, P.O. Belur Math, Dt. Howrah.

Swami Madhavananda,
Secretary, Ramakrishna Mission,
22. 11. '43.

N.B.—Cheques should be made payable to the 'Ramakrishna Mission.'

LITERARY ACTIVITIES OF THE RAMAKRISHNA MATH AND MISSION

Rightly do the Ramakrishna Math and Mission devote a great part of their energy to preaching and philanthropic activities. The public have, as a consequence, got the impression that on the literary side their achievement is insignificant. A closer study would falsify such a surmise.

The Ramakrishna Math has three main publication centres: the Advaita Ashrama of Mayavati with its publication office in Calcutta, the Ramakrishna Math of Madras, and the Udbodhan Office, Calcutta. The Advaita Ashrama publishes English books, the Madras Math has to its credit a considerable number of Tamil and Telugu books in addition to the English publications, and the Udbodhan Office specializes in Bengali books, though it has quite a good number of English books as well. There are other publications from various centres, of which the Ramakrishna Ashrama of Nagpur is fast developing into a centre of Hindi and Marathi books, and the Ramakrishna Ashramas of Mysore and Bangalore are rapidly increasing their publications in Canarese. The Malabar centres have brought out a considerable number of books in Malayalam.

Very often these books relate to the lives and teachings of Sri Ramakrishna and Swami Vivekananda. But this does not mean that there is any sectarian tinge about them, for these spiritual giants embodied the essential and universal aspects of Hinduism and, in fact, of all religions. As a natural consequence many of the publications deal with religious questions in a general way. Besides, there are many Sanskrit books with translations in English and provincial dialects. For want of space we refrain from mentioning all these by name. The following table will give some idea of the vast work done so far:

Language	Number of Volumes Published	Centres of Publication
English	43	Mayavati
,,	22	Udbodhan Office
,,	18	Madras
,,	10	Various centres
Sanskrit—English	13	Mayavati
,,	12	Madras
,,	2	Mysore
Bengali	84	Udbodhan Office
,,	20	Various centres
Sanskrit—Bengali	6	Udbodhan Office
Tamil	34	Madras
Telugu	18	,,
Canarese	14	Mysore and Bangalore
Malayalam	35	Malabar centres
Total	331	

Of the latest publications mention should be made of the English translations of *Vedânta-paribhashâ*, *Kathâmrita* (the American edition of which has come out from the New York centre), and *Upadeshasâhasri*, besides *Thiru-arul-mozhi* in Tamil, *The Disciples of Sri Ramakrishna* in English, and the Bengali translation of *Chhândogyopanishad*.

The following magazines are published from the centres shown against them:

Language	Name of Magazine	Centre of Publication
English	*Prabuddha Bharata*	Mayavati
,,	*Vedanta Kesari*	Madras
,,	*Vedanta and the West*	Hollywood
Bengali	*Udbodhan*	Udbodhan Office
Tamil	*Sri Ramakrishna Vijayam*	Madras
Malayalam	*Prabuddha Keralam*	Trivandrum