

# PRABUDDHA BHARATA

VOL. XLVIII

NOVEMBER, 1943

No. 11



“उत्तिष्ठत जाग्रत प्राप्य वरान्निबोधत।”

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

## TEACHINGS OF SRI RAMAKRISHNA

BY M.

Knowledge of the Absolute is beyond ordinary people—Samâdhi through Bhakti—Pundit Padmalochan—Pundit Vidyasagar—Brahman is beyond all qualities—Brahman is beyond speech—The “ripe I” and the “unripe I”—Charity and attachment.

Sunday, July 22, 1883. Taking advantage of the holiday, many household devotees visited Sri Ramakrishna in his room at the temple garden of Dakshineswar. The young devotees, mostly students, generally came on week-days. Sometimes the Master asked his intimate disciples to come on Tuesdays or Saturdays, days which he considered very auspicious for special religious instruction. Adhar, Rakhal, and M. had come from Calcutta in a hired carriage.

Sri Ramakrishna had enjoyed a little rest after his noonday meal. The room had an atmosphere of purity and holiness. From the walls hung pictures of gods and goddesses, among them one of Christ rescuing the drowning Peter. Outside the room were plants laden with fragrant flowers, and the Ganges could be seen flowing towards the south. The Master was seated on the small cot facing north, while the devotees sat on

mats and carpets spread on the floor. All eyes were directed towards the Master. Mani Mallick, an old Brahmo devotee, about sixty-five years of age, came to pay his respects to the Master. He had returned a few days earlier from a pilgrimage to Benares and was recounting his experiences to Sri Ramakrishna.

*Mani Mallick* : ‘A monk whom I met in Benares said that no religious experience is possible without the control of the sense-organs. Nothing could be achieved by merely crying “God, God”.’

*Master* : ‘Do you know the views of teachers like him? According to them, one must first practise spiritual discipline : self-restraint, self-control, forbearance, and the like. Their aim is to attain Nirvana. They are followers of Vedanta. They, constantly discriminate, saying, “Brahman alone is real, and the world illusory.” But this is an extremely difficult path. If the world is

illusory, then you too are illusory. The teacher who gives the instruction is equally unreal. His words, too, are unreal as a dream. But this experience is beyond the reach of the ordinary man.

'Do you know what it is like? If you burn camphor, nothing remains as residue; but when wood is burnt, at least a little ash is left. Finally, after the last analysis, the devotee goes into Samadhi. Then he knows nothing whatsoever of "I" "you" or "the universe".'

'Padmalochan<sup>1</sup> was a man of deep wisdom. He had great respect for me, though at that time I constantly repeated the name of the Divine Mother. He was the court pundit of the Maharaja of Burdwan. Coming to Calcutta, Padmalochan took up his abode in a garden house near Kamarhati. I felt a desire to see him and sent Hriday there to learn if the pundit had any vanity. I was told that he had none. Then I met him. A man of great knowledge and scholarship, still he began to weep on hearing the devotional songs of Ramprasad from my lips. No conversation with anybody else gave me such satisfaction as I had in talking to him. He said to me, "Give up the desire for the company of devotees, otherwise people of all sorts will come to you and make you deviate from your spiritual ideal." Once he entered into a controversy by correspondence, with Utsavananda, the Guru of Vaishnavacharan. He told me an interesting incident. Once a meeting was convened to decide who of the two deities was the greater, Shiva or Brahmâ. Unable to come to any decision, the pundits at last referred the matter to Padmalochan. With characteristic guilelessness, he said, "How do I know? Neither I nor any of my ancestors back to the fourteenth generation have seen Shiva or Brahma." About the renunciation of lust and greed, he said to me one day, "Why have you given up those things? Such distinctions as, this is money and that is clay, are the outcome of ignorance." What could I say to that? I replied, "I don't

know all these things, my dear sir. But for my part, I cannot relish such things as money and the like."

'There was a pundit who was tremendously vain. He did not believe in the forms of God. But who can understand the inscrutable ways of the Divine? God revealed Himself to him as the Primal Power. This vision made the pundit unconscious for a long time. After regaining partial consciousness, he uttered only the sound "Kâ! Kâ! Kâ!" He could not fully pronounce "Kâli".'

A devotee: 'Sir, you met Pundit Vidyasagar. What did you think of him?'

Master: 'Vidyasagar has both scholarship and charity, but he lacks inner vision. Gold is hidden in the inner self. Had he but found it out, all these external activities in which he is engaged would have become less and less. At last these would have stopped altogether. Had he but known that God resides within our hearts, then his mind would have been directed to Him in thought and meditation. Some persons must perform selfless actions for a long time, before they can attain to renunciation or direct their mind to the spiritual ideal and be absorbed in God.'

'The activities that Vidyasagar is engaged in are indeed good. Charity is very noble. There is a great deal of difference between Dayâ<sup>2</sup> and Mâyâ. Daya is good, but not so Maya. Maya is the love for one's relatives, such as wife, children, brother, sister, nephew, father, and mother. But Daya is the same love for all created beings without any distinction.'

M.: 'Is Daya also a bondage?'

Master: 'But that is something far beyond you. Daya springs from the quality of Sattva. Sattva preserves, Rajas creates, and Tamas destroys. But Brahman is beyond the three qualities. It is beyond Prakriti.'

'The three Gunas cannot reach Truth; they are like a thief who cannot come to a public place for fear of being arrested.'

<sup>1</sup> A great Vedantic scholar who visited the Master before the arrival of his devotees.

<sup>2</sup> Charity.



Sattva, Rajas, and Tamas are like so many thieves. Listen to a story.

‘Once a man was going through a forest, when three robbers fell upon him and robbed him of all his possessions. One of the thieves said, “What’s the use of keeping this man alive?” With these words he was about to kill him with his sword, when the second thief interrupted him saying, “Oh, no! What purpose will be served by killing him? Tie his hand and foot and leave him here.” The thieves followed that suggestion and went away. After a while the third thief returned to the spot and said to the man, “Ah, I am sorry. Are you hurt? I will release you from your bonds.” After setting the man free, the thief said, “Come with me. I will take you to the main road.” After a long while they reached the highway. Then the thief said, “Follow this road. Over there is your house.” Thereupon the man said, “Sir, you have been very good to me. Come with me to my house.” “Oh, no!” replied the thief. “It is not possible for me to go there. The police will know me.”

‘This world itself is the forest. The three robbers prowling here may be likened to the qualities of Sattva, Rajas, and Tamas. It is they that rob a man of his knowledge of Truth. Tamas wants to destroy him. Rajas binds him to the world. But Sattva rescues him from the clutches of Rajas and Tamas. Under the protective shelter of Sattva, man is rescued from anger, passion, and the other evil effects of Tamas. Further, Sattva loosens the bonds of the world. But Sattva also is a robber. It cannot give him the ultimate knowledge of Truth, though it shows him the road leading to the supreme abode of God. Setting him on the path, Sattva tells him, “Look yonder. There is your home.” Even the quality of Sattva is far from the knowledge of Brahman.

‘What Brahman is cannot be described, even he who knows It cannot talk about It. There is a saying that a boat, once reaching the “black waters” of the ocean, cannot come back.

‘Once four friends, in the course of a walk, saw a place enclosed by a wall. The wall was very high. They all became intensely anxious to know what was inside. One of them climbed to the top of the wall. What he saw on looking inside made him speechless with wonder. He only uttered, “Ah! Ah!” and dropped in. He could not give any information about what he saw. The others, too, climbed the wall, uttered the same cry, “Ah! Ah!” and jumped in. Now who could tell what was inside?

‘Sages like Jadabharata and Dattatreya, after the realization of Brahman, could not describe It. The “I” of a man completely disappears when he goes into Samadhi, after the attainment of the knowledge of Brahman. Therefore Ramprasad sang,

If you find the task too hard,  
Call upon Ramprasad for help.

The mind must completely merge itself in Knowledge. But that is not enough. “Ramprasad”, that is, the principle of “I”, must vanish too. Then alone one gets the knowledge of Brahman.’

*A devotee* : ‘Sir, is it possible then that Sukadeva did not have the ultimate Knowledge?’

*Master* : ‘According to some people, Sukadeva only saw and touched the ocean of Brahman; he did not dive into it. Therefore he could return to the world and impart religious instruction. According to others, he returned to the world of name and form after attaining the knowledge of Brahman, for the purpose of teaching others. He had to recite the *Bhâgavata* to king Parikshit and had to teach people in various ways; therefore God did not destroy his “I” altogether. God kept in him the “I of knowledge”.’

*Devotee* : ‘Can one maintain an organization after achieving the knowledge of Brahman?’

*Master* : ‘Once I talked to Keshab Sen about the Knowledge of Brahman. He asked me to go deeper into it. I said, “If I proceed further, then you



won't be able to preserve your organization and following." "Then please stop here!" replied Keshab. (All laugh). But still I said to Keshab, "I" and "mine" indicate ignorance. Without ignorance one cannot get such a feeling as, "I am the doer; these are my wife, children, possession, name, and fame." Thereupon Keshab said, "Sir, nothing whatsoever would remain if one gave up the 'I'." I reassured him and said, "I am not asking you to give up all of the 'I'. You should give up only the 'unripe I'. The 'unripe I' makes one feel, 'I am the doer. These are my wife and children. I am a teacher.' Renounce this 'unripe I' and keep the 'ripe I' which will make you feel that you are the servant of God, His devotee, and that God is the Doer and you are His instrument'."

*Devotee:* "Can the "ripe I" form any organization?"

*Master:* "I said to Keshab Sen that the "I" that says, "I am a leader, I have formed this party, I am teaching people," is an "unripe I". It is extremely difficult to preach religion. It is not possible to do so without the commandment of God. The approval of God is necessary. Sukadeva had a commandment from God to recite the *Bhagavata*. If after the realization of God a man gets His commandment and becomes a preacher or teacher, then that preaching or teaching does no harm. His "I" is not "unripe"; it is "ripe".

"I asked Keshab to give up this "unripe I". The ego that feels, "I am the servant of God and lover of God", does not injure one. I said to him, "You have been constantly talking of your organization and your followers. But people also go away from your organization." Keshab answered, "Sir, it is true. After staying in it for several years, people go to another organization. Further, on deserting me they abuse me right and left." "Why don't you study their nature?" I said. "Is there any good in making anybody and everybody a disciple?"

"I said to Keshab further, "You should admit the Divine Mother, the Primal Energy. Brahman is not different from Its Shakti. What is Brahman is also Shakti. As long as a man retains body-consciousness, he seems to see duality. It is only when a man tries to describe what he sees, that he finds two." Keshab later on recognized Kali, the Divine Mother.

"One day when Keshab was here with his disciples, I said to him that I would like to hear him preach. He delivered a lecture in the Chândni. Then we all sat at the bathing ghat and had a long conversation. I said to him, "It is Bhagavan alone who in one form appears as Bhakta, and in another as the *Bhagavata*. Please repeat '*Bhagavata-Bhakta-Bhagavan*'." Keshab and his disciples repeated the words. Then I asked him to repeat "Guru-Krishna-Vaishnava". Thereupon Keshab said, "Sir, I should not go so far now. People will say that I have become an orthodox Hindu."

"It is extremely difficult to go beyond the three Gunas. One cannot reach that state without the realization of God. Man dwells in this realm of Maya. This Maya does not permit him to see God, and has made him a victim of ignorance.

"Once Hriday brought a bull calf here. I saw, one day, that he had kept it tied with a rope in the garden, so that it might graze there. I asked him, "Hriday, why do you tie the calf there every day?" "Uncle," he said, "I am going to send this calf to our village. When it grows strong I shall yoke it to the plough." No sooner did I hear these words than I fainted. I thought, "How inscrutable is the play of the Divine Maya! Kamarpukur and Sihore are so far away from Calcutta! This poor calf must go all the way there. Then it will grow in the village, and after a long time it will be yoked to the plough. This is indeed the world! This is indeed Maya!" I regained consciousness after a long while."

It was three or four o'clock in the afternoon. Sri Ramakrishna was in an

abstracted mood. After a while the devotees heard him talking to the Divine Mother. In the course of his soliloquy he said, 'O Mother, why hast Thou given him only a particle?' Remaining silent a few moments, he added, 'I understand it, Mother. That little bit will be enough for him and will serve Thy purpose of teaching people.'

Did the Master thus transmit spiritual powers to his disciples? Did he thus come to know that his disciples, after him, would go out into the world as teachers of men?

Rakhal was in the room. Sri Ramakrishna was still in a state of semi-consciousness when he said to him, 'You were angry with me, weren't you? Why did I make you angry? There was a reason: only then would the medicine work. In the case of an abscess, the surgeon first brings it to a head. Only then he applies some medicinal herb, so that it may burst and dry up.'

After a pause he went on, 'Yes, I have found Hazra to be like a piece of dry wood. Then why does he live here? This has a meaning too. The play is enlivened by the presence of trouble-makers like Jatilâ and Kutilâ<sup>3</sup>.

(To M.) 'One must admit the forms of God. Do you know the meaning of the image of Jagaddhâtri? She upholds the universe. Without Her support and protection, the universe would fall from its place and be destroyed. The Divine Mother, Jagaddhatri, reveals Herself in the heart of one who can bring under control the mind, which may be compared to an elephant.'

*Rakhal*: 'The mind is the mad elephant.'

*Master*: 'Therefore the lion, the carrier of the Divine Mother, keeps it under control.'

<sup>3</sup> Two trouble-makers depicted in the *Bhagavata* in the episode of Sri Krishna and the Gopis of Brindavana.

---

## THE CALL OF THE HIMALAYAS

When the sun-beam kisses the morning roses,  
 And the city to its vain tune, dignity imposes,  
 My mind longs for thy holy snowy height,  
 The proper seat of all beauty and delight,  
 To which thy call invites the sons of the Earth,  
 To realize the joy of the bliss beyond home and hearth,  
 Beyond all narrow bounds, all pangs, and pines,  
 Where the will for work in non-work resigns.  
 The individual communes with Infinite. Slowly flow  
 On thy mighty space, the dreams of evening glow,  
 I receive the voice of the calm, the message of silence,  
 That chants the mid-night in deep suspense!  
 The beginning and end mingle in mysterious one.  
 The voice of beauty awaits, till thou hast done  
 One great song to the mighty inner Self:  
 'Low art not thou—thou heir to Divine Help.  
 Arise and awake in thy holy bright flame,  
 Merge in thy self, to which lie, actual, thy claim.'  
 I arise to receive thy message, when the snows fall.  
 Allow me, O mighty Mount, to respond to thy call.

STARSON GOSSE

---



# LEST WE LOSE THE PEACE

BY THE EDITOR

Be united ; speak in harmony ; let your minds apprehend alike. Common be your prayer ; common be the end of your assembly ; common be your resolution ; common be your deliberations. Alike be your feelings ; united be your hearts ; common be your intentions ; perfect be your unity.—*Rigveda*, X. 191. 2-4.

## I

Mussolini has been hurled from power, and he will soon be followed by other dictators. Fascism, Nazism, and all isms that flourish by pampering the selfish side of individuals and nations and making a philosophy of 'might is right', are doomed to die the ignoble death they deserve. But unless humanity is determined to have a better order of morality, that will be a political death and not spiritual extinction. Unless the Allies take thought in advance and deserve to win an 'all-out' peace, just as they are to-day striving to achieve a total victory, the triumph of the democratic Allies may not mean a triumph of democracy—and that for many good reasons.

First, the moment of victory may find the big Powers scrambling for power; and dead Fascism and Nazism may take their vengeance by setting the stage for a yet bigger war. Secondly, paranoia in a particular nation illuminates the dark places of normal behaviour of other nations. What is regretted as a derangement in some, may be already seeking for favourable conditions of growth in others. Thirdly, there is such a thing as persistence of ideas—good or bad, they are never totally extirpated. Mahâdeva reduced the God of Love to ashes, only to find at the end that the latter had spread all over the world in a more subtle form. During the American Civil War the North fought the South for the emancipation of the Negro slaves. But the ideas associated with slavery got rooted in the soil; and the emancipated Negro now finds him-

self an untouchable all over the country. Fourthly, hero-worship is a crafty seducer. Napoleon ransacked Europe for years, and it required the best energy of England, Prussia, and Russia to put him out of harm's way. But a Napoleon out of war was worse than a Napoleon at the head of his victorious army. For whereas the victorious Napoleon was hated and opposed, a defeated and dead Napoleon was loved and studied with avidity. Napoleon is still the hero of youthful Europe. Hitler and Mussolini are only indications of the deadly legacy of 'will to power' left by Napoleon unnoticed in many hearts. Things being as they are, he will be a bold man who asserts that after the undoing of Hitler and Mussolini the soldiers returning victoriously to their hearths and homes will not carry with them in fine caskets the ashes of Nazism and Fascism as souvenirs of glorious days in the field. The glories of the victorious nations may easily get blended with the glories of the vanquished. Lastly, to beat the enemy at his own game the Allies have been forced, much against their better judgement, to adopt some of his methods so far as war tactics and organization of resources are concerned—and this at a time when emotion is running high. Psychology shows that ideas associated with strong emotions, however adventitious and for howsoever short a period the former may be, are hard to be rooted out. And who knows if war frenzy will not leave in the hearts of many an indelible mark, and with it will not remain for ever associated the circumstantial ideologies and the consequent modes of social behaviour? Who knows



if the moral outlook of the victors will not receive a lasting orientation all for the worse? If that happens, then we repeat, the defeat of Nazism will be its real victory, and the victory of democracy, its real defeat.

## II

To avert this we require forethought and planning, not only in economic and political fields but in the moral field as well. But here, again, there are two great difficulties. Human nature is habitually apathetic to thinking in advance. And when it does think, the thoughts run along the usual ruts. It is argued that a total war cannot brook any diversion of energy to fields unessential to the immediate problem. Besides, nobody knows what the post-war problems will exactly be. Under the circumstances our best plans may prove inadequate, and our best thoughts futile. Apparently so. But if our present pre-occupations prevent us from thinking for the future, the future may find us deeply involved in the quagmire of the present. Moreover, it is not true to say that we do not know some of the most vital problems that we shall have to face, nor are we too busy to spare a few moments of fruitful thought for the future. As a matter of fact, even at the present moment there are many plans and public utterances by responsible statesmen. The defect with them is that they are not the results of organized thought, and as such they lack proper sanction. Furthermore, though their moral tone is often very high, they leave morality as such entirely out of consideration. There are plans for economic and political welfare, but the world is not sufficiently awake to the need of a moral planning. And yet it can hardly be gainsaid that this should be our first consideration. If the past has taught us anything, it is this that human progress cannot be achieved along immoral or amoral lines. Our goals must be pure and perfect, and our methods must be well thought out, free from selfish-

ness and consciously directed towards moral ends.

Planning is necessary. Want of forethought has brought us to the present state of things. To understand this truism let us confine our thought for a moment to things nearer home. There is a food shortage which foresight could have averted. There are the Japanese at our very door, which might not have happened. Want of pre-planning finds our industrialists fighting against time. In fact, want of imagination on the part of the Allies, found the aggressors better equipped. It required a Herculean effort to make good the lost time—and that after so much loss of life and property! The little foresight they had, was directed towards armament and political make-shifts. We are not convinced that with better forethought and a purer moral outlook international relationships could not have been placed on a sounder basis so that the war would not occur at all, or even if it did it would not be as furious and long drawn as it actually is. Forethought and morality are not antithetical to statecraft. For if statecraft is concerned only with self-interest in the immediate future, morality takes note of a wider and more lasting selfishness. But, perhaps, our condemnation of statecraft is too sweeping. Statesmen, in the past, did often take a long-range view. But the real tragedy lay in those views being concerned only with man as a producer and consumer of wealth. It took little heed of the fact that he is a bestower of love and despiser of comfort as well.

The pre-war world studiously cultivated a scientific outlook. Morality was ruled out of court as a matter of private concern. Such theories as 'survival of the fittest', 'struggle for existence', and 'God's chosen people' were publicly promulgated or privately adhered to. The irresponsibility of science, the increase of want without any let or hindrance, ingenuous propaganda with a view to keeping up the national morale, maladjustment of demand and supply, exploitation of



foreign markets and foreign resources, economic warfare waged on all fronts—tariffs, bounties, preferences—sowed the seeds of a mighty conflagration. And to heal these maladies political bungling was considered the only panacea. Such an over-simplification of deep-rooted and complex problems betrays an utter absence of depth of thought. If politics can make men better, then why this armageddon? If banishment of spiritual integrity from public life can make the vision clearer, then why this solicitousness for raising all sorts of isms to the status of religion? If moral planning smacks of medievalism, then why this manufacture of slogans and shibboleths? If economic betterment can ennoble the mind, then why are the Germans, Italians, and Japanese found wanting in humanism? If legislation can make men morally strong, then why are whole nations cowed down by dictators? Truth to say, human advance does not lie that way. We must seek elsewhere for the remedy of human ailments; and that is exactly where we fail. We are loath to believe the common-sense truths that honesty, justice, and love are not only valuable as national virtues, they are useful in the international field as well. Not being convinced of this we plan really for war when we believe we are working for peace.

### III

The pages of history are chequered with great hopes and unmitigated disillusionments. 1914 began as a war to end war. 1914-18 brought home to us many valuable lessons, which, if fully accepted, would make God's kingdom come down on earth. But 1918 dashed to the ground not only the hopes nurtured during the war, but earlier ones as well. To the people of 1914-18 the last World War was unprecedented in its devastation—geographically, physically, and mentally. Countries were laid waste, bodies were mutilated, and shell-shocks and mental derangements were quite prevalent. New and compli-

cated social and economic problems made their appearance. War children, trade slump, and hankering for cheap excitement were only some of the outstanding legacies of the period. But worst of all, internationally speaking, was the acceptance of international hatred and suspicion as a normal state of things; and this had, as its corollary, the division of the whole world into two opposing camps—the aggressors and the aggrieved. There was an absence of Christian charity. Whole nations were branded as criminals and forced to pay reparations under duress. Not only this; freedom of speech, freedom of association, freedom of belief, which had been curtailed during the War, continued to remain so, though in modified forms, even after the War—the national administrators were loath to let go the useful instruments of control forged during the emergency, and the citizens submitted willy-nilly as they were suspicious of the rival camp, which, they believed, and rightly so, was preparing for a second world war. There were insincere movements for disarmament, which turned out to be merely attempts at air and naval parity—not disarmament but limitation of armament. Politics played its part with admirable dexterity, while morality looked on with helpless anguish.

The first world war thus led to the present total war. But what a novel situation it is! The progress of civilization is counterbalanced by an unchecked growth of brutality! The fight between armies of old (they should rather be called bands in comparison with the modern nations in arms) was a simple affair of exchange of arrows or lance thrusts. Matters did not change very much when matchlocks and guns replaced arrows and lances. When rifles and powerful navies came into existence things were beginning to look ugly. But civilization had more surprises in store. There came machine guns, howitzers, submarines, battleships, tanks, aeroplanes, bombs, mines, and gases. The number of fighting men



increased by leaps and bounds. The war fronts lengthened out and spread out. Armies fought on hundred miles and thousand miles fronts; and they came to clashes on the sea, in air, and under water. Besides, there came into existence home fronts, economic fronts, labour fronts, industrial fronts, and what not. As things stand now, no exploitable human energy is immune from war service, and no world-weary decrepitude is safe from air bombing. National efficiency thus marches hand in hand with moral bankruptcy.

The last war gave us a foretaste of such a cataclism. But national pride and international brigandage coupled with blunted moral feeling and intellectual fogginess made no provision against this. On the contrary—and that is an inexplicable human perversity—every nation actively worked for this human carnage, and yet every nation made a show of morality by forging for national consumption the most appealing and appalling ideologies. So did they of the *Mahâbhârata* war. Each called the other a sinner and killed unscrupulously. Perhaps, the cause of justice was vindicated at Kurukshetra by the extermination of both the armies. But did that establish lasting peace? Neither in the East nor in the West was triumph of *virtue* synonymous with safety, and specialization in killing synonymous with peace. Kurukshetra was followed by the self-extinction of the Yâdavas, which was again followed by a total destruction of the Nâgas by Janamejaya. And 1914-18 has as its necessary sequence 1939-. The ideological wars in the East as well as the West led to great victories but to little moral consolation. Yudhishtira shed bitter tears at the moment of his empty triumph, and Wilson left the European shores with his idealism wholly blasted! But Kurukshetra achieved one indirect result, to which the last war cannot lay any claim. The former made an effective, clean sweep of the power of the immoral Kshatriya potentates, thus setting the stage for a better order of

things, whereas the European war only whetted the appetite for more raw materials and colonies, so that although people agreed to call it a famous victory, nobody can say what good has come out of it. Past experience has generated a pessimism in us about the moral and cultural content of any future victory. The inarticulate misgivings of millions find expression in John Hayne's *Unity* (March 1943):

What one ponders is the problem as to what we are to have here after we have won this war. Are we to preserve any democracy, any culture, any of the institutions of progress and enlightenment which make us a free people?

#### IV

War will be followed by peace. It is coming—perhaps sooner than we expect. But a peace that is worth having should not be one contributing only to the political and economic welfare of the victors. It should be a 'total' peace, and it must proclaim the victory of moral and spiritual values all around: it should be a moral victory not only for the United Nations, but for all right thinking men. 'Empires, spheres of influence, protectorates, mandates, and the like are veritable volcanoes covered with snow.' If these danger spots are to be avoided our minds should be purged of queer ideas about master races and chosen peoples. Mere restoration of the *status quo* will not do. Nor will it help the world much if the victors elect to reserve for themselves for all time the military, economic, and political leadership of the world. The future peace must be based on universal and moral outlook, economic and political justice, and social and cultural rhythm. It is good that the United Nations talk of setting up a commission for bringing war criminals to book. The world is sick of recrudescence of war frenzy. In judging these criminals there must be no consideration of fear or favour. But, then, there should be no ill will either. Modern criminology has established the fact that punishment, when reformative, achieves the best re-



sult, whereas vindictiveness reacts on the punishing society like a boomerang. If this is true in the ordinary social field, there is no reason why it should not be equally true in the international field.

The world failed to make use of the hard-won peace of 1918, because such moral considerations were ruled out of court by those who negotiated for it. If that failure has taught us anything it is this that a peace should be laboriously and intelligently planned for, long before the hour of victory, by people who are not actually in the thick of the fight, and it should be negotiated by people who are not out for advancing only the national interests. Non-attachment to immediate issues and a strong moral background are the *sine qua non* for a fruitful peace. Yudhishthira took his peace plan from Bhishma, the redoubtable general of the vanquished army, for Bhishma could give dispassionate counsel just as he had fought only as a matter of pure duty. To modern ears such a procedure may sound quixotic, for modern societies laugh all old-time virtues to scorn. Moreover, it may so happen that though the statesmen of the United Nations are actuated by pure motives, the enemy in his perversity may not take as disinterested a view of things a Bhishma did. And so we may be left with a dictated peace—a peace for the victors only and not for humanity at large. And, perhaps, humanity cannot blame the United Nations for such a possibility, since humanity has not morally armed itself against such a possibility. Since civilization has not based itself more thoroughly on morality, the moment of triumph as well as the period of calamity find it pursuing ill-conceived plans based on an onesided view of things.

Morality is primarily an individual affair. A group can never be more moral than its individual members are. You can organize morality on a national or international scale when you have the individual data in hand, just as you can organize national economy when you

have certain resources under control. In the absence of such a solid basis you may talk morality in national and international relationships, but it is bound to prove empty. It may for a time deceive us by its gilded surface and high-sounding phraseology, but a mere scratch will reveal the base metal inside: there will be constant disillusionment and irresolvable clashes. Thus even in the midst of this war for the establishment of democracy, the recrudescences of the pre-war spirit of racial recrimination are a constant reminder to many of the black metal within the glittering surface of our civilization. The Pegging Act of Africa and the race riots of the U.S.A. will come to many minds in this connection. They will point out that the Atlantic Charter has been interpreted by some as applicable only to the European nations, and the demand for a Pacific Charter finds no response as yet. Many people will naturally say, if these are indications of the future, then God help the coloured races!

## V

The peace plans so far advanced seem so unpromising because of this lack of planning for individual morality. In the absence of moral sanctions the most honest declarations seem empty—broken promises, diplomatic bluffing, and racial discrimination in the past have set such a high discount by international honesty! The plans in the field are often highly recommendable. We ourselves do not doubt the sincerity of their protagonists. But when you want to play Hamlet without the Prince of Denmark, the whole thing is bound to fail despite the best stage setting. That is certainly no fault of the author of the play. The national statesmen may be good authors and may mean well; but if the citizens with whom the ultimate sanction lies, do not undertake the scheme in the spirit of the authors, who will redeem the situation?

An examination of some of the schemes will add force to the foregoing discussion. They will reveal how some of



these totally lack moral considerations, while others have a highly moral tone. But all of them are wanting in moral planning as such. That the whole social, educational, political, and economic outlook requires a thorough overhauling, is not recognized by them. Our point is that such tinkering with morality cannot make nations moral and save humanity from further misery. Let us now look at the schemes.

Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek's plan wants (i) that the United Nations—meaning the United States of America, Soviet Russia, Great Britain, and China should 'reach complete agreement of policy and build a concrete foundation for post-war co-operation'; (ii) that 'the future peace should be a peace seeking the emancipation of the entire mankind'; and (iii) that 'there must be post-war world organization with the solid backing of an international force'. It will be noticed that the scheme hinges on political organization rather than on moral sanction, though morally it is sounder than many others. Its other defects are: (i) it grants leadership to the four major partners; (ii) the future peace is to *seek for* the emancipation of the entire mankind, i.e., to say, imperialism is not to terminate with the war; (iii) the United Nations are to maintain peace through a kind of armed League of Nations, which as a practical proposition cannot stand any scrutiny.

The Atlantic Charter is gloriously vague so far as practical application is concerned, and theoretically, as already mentioned, it is meant for Europe. Evidently, it cannot form the basis of world peace.

In addition to these political schemes there are other economic schemes as well. The representatives of the United Nations gathered at Hot Springs (U.S.A.) and devised important proposals for solving the food problems. Currency problems have also come under the scrutiny of experts. The Keynes plan and the White plans set out the British and the American points of view. Sir William Beveridge's plan for social

security has been discussed in the press threadbare. But all these apply to certain limited territories, or touch only the fringe of some intricate problems. Humanity at large does not feel any interest in them.

But Mr. Wallace, Vice-President of the U.S.A. has a better conception of the New World that can satisfy human aspiration, and that can be a befitting epilogue to the present tragedy. Says he,

We shall not be satisfied with a peace which will merely lead us from concentration camps and mass murder of Fascism into an international jungle of gangster Governments operated behind scenes by power-crazed money-mad imperialists. We seek a peace that is more than a mere breathing space between the death of the old tyranny and the birth of a new one. . . . Our choice is between Democracy for everybody or for a few. Fuller democracy for all is a lasting preventive of war. . . . Three outstanding peace-time responsibilities as I find them today are firstly, the enlightenment of the people, secondly, mobilizing peace-time production for full employment, thirdly, planning world co-operation. . . . The Atlantic Charter provides a broad base of general principles to safeguard our decisions. The American people intend that it shall work and that it shall endure.

The moral sincerity and fervour of the speech is apparent, and it just befits the Vice-President of an idealist country like the U.S.A. Equally sincere and fervent is President Roosevelt's speech in commemoration of the second anniversary of the signing of the Atlantic Charter:

We are determined we shall gain a total victory over our enemies and we recognize the fact that our enemies are not only Germany, Italy, and Japan. They are all the forces of oppression, intolerance, insecurity, and injustice which have impeded the forward march of civilization.

There were as sincere idealists in 1918. But how did their idealism fare at the peace table, is a matter of history. We wish all success to the idealism of the present generation. But so long as humanity does not re-arm itself along with a disarmament of nations, we do not see how the idealism of some outstanding statesmen alone can ensure a lasting peace. To make the idealists



succeed world opinion must be fully mobilized and the broad outlines of moral plans fully filled up in advance

so that peace may not find us again at the mercy of irresponsible science and ill-conceived diplomacy.

## THE SECRET OF THE DICTATOR'S ART

BY PROF. M. S. SRINIVASA SARMA, M.A.

It is a common saying that the mind is free, and that man is usually guided in his conduct by his conscious reasoning faculty. But a little reflection will show that this overlooks the deeper instincts and emotions which are the prime movers of all action and thought. This is not always easy to recognize, partly because the instinctive springs of action lie buried far below the level of the conscious mind, and partly because the conscious mind is disinclined to face the fact of instinctive motives on the false assumption that instinct and intelligence are opposed to one another. Man is basically motivated by his emotional and instinctive attitudes. His fundamental values rest upon emotional conditioning rather than upon intellectualized ideas; in fact frequently the intellectual processes are employed in concocting 'rationalizations' rather than in primary determinations of conduct.

### THE HERD INSTINCT

Each individual is a component part of numerous groups, and has a share in numerous group-minds—those of his race, his caste, his religion, and his nationality. The group life is essentially an inter-mental life. The chief exhibition of the gregarious instinct is found in tendencies to derive comfort from thinking as other people do, and discomfort in thinking differently. Hence we are prone to adopt the opinions of our neighbours in business life, philosophy, religion, and science. We do not do this after dispassionate weighing of evidence, but accept their views uncritically. From a biological point of view the herd instinct represents the

need of the individual for opportunity to develop and use his powers to the utmost and the success of the group whether for defensive or aggressive purposes depends on its unanimity. To this first necessity of common action among the members of the group can be traced these definite tendencies of the mass mind, namely, sympathy, suggestibility, and imitation.

Sympathy is the power to feel emotion as communicated from the other members of the group. The emotion of fear experienced by one member and manifested by its instinctive expressions will spread rapidly to all the others. Suggestibility is the tendency to receive ideas by direct transmission from the other members of the herd, especially from the leader. Imitation is that which brings about a similarity of action between all the members of the group. By these means the necessary unanimity is secured within the group for that common action which ensures to the individual his safety and well-being.

### THE MOR

There is always a certain degree of mental homogeneity in all gatherings of men. Thus the members of a political meeting are drawn together by common political opinions and sentiments. The audience at a music performance shares a common love of music or a common admiration for the artist. Consider how under such circumstances a very ordinary joke or point made by a political orator provokes a huge delight, and how at a concert the admiration of the applauding audience soars to a pitch of frantic enthusiasm. Panic is the



crudest and simplest example of mass mentality. The essence of panic is the collective intensification of the instinctive excitement with its emotion of fear and its impulse of flight. This character of the crowd is due to two peculiarities of the collective mental life. In the first place, the individual in becoming one of the crowd loses in some degree his self-consciousness, his awareness of himself as a distinct personality. In the second place, there is the diminution of the sense of personal responsibility and the power of self-criticism. Hence even a highly intelligent and self-reliant member of a crowd is apt to find his critical reserve broken down; and when an orator makes some proposition which the mass of the crowd applauds but which each more intelligent member would as an individual reject with scorn, it is apt to be uncritically accepted by all alike, because it comes to each not as a proposition of the orator alone, but as a proposition which voices the mind of the crowd with the power of a mass-suggestion.

#### SUGGESTION

Suggestion is the process of arousing in the mind an idea or tendency to action which operates mechanically and non-rationally by its subconscious character. The individual as a member of the herd is quick to respond to the ideas and emotions of the other members and to assimilate his thoughts to theirs. The prevalence of emotional excitement hampers correct observation and reasoning; thus there occurs an arrest of thought in the working of the crowd mind; and so the crowd becomes impulsive, irritable, and extraordinarily credulous and open to influence. Consequently a chain of logical arguments is totally incomprehensible to crowds; and this powerlessness of crowds to reason aright prevents them from discerning truth from error or of forming a precise judgement on any matter.

Prestige in its various forms is a prevalent condition of suggestion. It is a sort of domination exercised on our

minds which entirely paralyses our critical faculty, and fills us with astonishment and respect. Prestige is of two kinds, acquired and personal. Acquired prestige results from name, position, fortune, office, or reputation. Personal prestige, on the contrary, is something essentially peculiar to the individual, and is possessed by a small number of persons whom it enables to exercise a veritable magnetic fascination on those around them. Founders of religion have often established their creeds solely because they were successful in inspiring crowds by the sheer force of their personal prestige, and swaying their minds to accept their tenets unquestioningly. Religious sentiment has all the characteristics of the mob-mind such as worshipful attitude, fear, blind submission to authority, inability to discuss its dogmas, the desire to spread them, and a tendency to consider as enemies all those who do not accept them.

#### PROPAGANDA

Propaganda is a deliberate attempt to make people think and act alike. Take any daily newspaper or one of the more popular periodicals. The first thing you notice is that about half, and sometimes more, of the printed space is taken up by advertisements. You may be amazed at the sums of money spent in advertising patent medicines, and wonder if there are really so many sick people in the world. But the fact is, there are many people who think they are ill! A sales manager of a manufacturing firm once remarked that you can convince any one of any thing if you advertise enough! He pointed out that the cost of production and that of advertising that product were in this proportion: cost of goods one unit, cost of advertising ten units. Many commercial firms have carried advertising to the point where the public were stupefied, hypnotized or otherwise reduced to believing anything. Ambitious politicians have learnt the same lesson. Hitler and Mussolini have made



more use of propaganda than any other weapon. With propaganda in one hand and terror in the other, one can rule the minds of millions.

The principal vehicles of propaganda are newspapers, pamphlets, films, radios, books, and lectures. In times of war it is employed with perfected skill to excite patriotism and discourage the enemy. In the belligerent countries at the present day, all—even the intellectuals—must think, if they think at all, in one particular way. It is notorious how in Germany no one—not even a philosopher—will be tolerated who does not think in the Nazi way and deify its Dictator.

#### CENSORSHIP

Akin to propaganda and linked with it is censorship, the very object of which is to present you with newspapers which are compelled to conceal things from you, instead of telling you about them. You are not allowed to learn the full facts about home affairs, and much less about foreign opinion. Under this censorship you are told only what the authorities think is good for you! It is essentially a negative process. It derives its force very largely from fear and threats of fear. In times of war the political control of censorship is dominated by the military exigencies of national survival. But the censorship of the drama and cinema, of immoral books or of divergent politico-economic doctrines like communism and anarchism, forbids the circulation, in the printed page or by word of mouth, of social attitudes or ideas which threaten the economic and political stability of the nation. Thus censorship is a form of collective behaviour rooted in the inhibitions of our own and others' thoughts and expressions of opinion when our cultural values are threatened in crisis.

#### FANATICISM

The crowd mind is biassed and intolerant, and is marked by hatred and violence. It cannot dissect, weigh, and compare; its actions are akin to reflexes.

This is evident in crowd action towards races and classes which we fear and against which we develop antagonisms. Hatred is a combination of fear and rage against some object, and breeds intolerance. It is essentially a defence mechanism. Intimately related to this is bigotry which consists in holding a view or creed with no regard for common reason. In a crowd a man is a bigot; he is always right. Anti-semitism in Nazi Germany and 'lynching' in America among a highly civilized and intelligent people are the best illustrations of the nature of the mob mind. In handling the recalcitrant Negro and the irresponsible Jew, they have evolved a technique of mob violence, and rationalize it by such slogans as 'keeping the Nigger in his place', 'protecting white womanhood', 'saving Germany from its internal enemy', etc. The most obvious aspect of this mob mentality is the sense of emotional freedom, the loss of individual responsibility, the disappearance of rational thought, and a feeling of absolute rightness in what is being done by the group. Persons of intelligence and culture are not unlikely to lose their rational self-control in the excitement of the mob, to accept whatever suggestions happen to fall upon them, and to act accordingly even though such action is foreign to their normal self-possession.

#### PROGRESS—PRODUCT OF FREE MIND

Although the herd tendencies are more marked in the individual when he is actually one of the assembled crowd, yet the same tendencies are always at work in his mind. Unconsciously he tends to assimilate his ideas, emotions, and actions to those of the persons who make up his professional, religious or social groups. The strength of this mental bond uniting the individual to the group is reflected in the extreme sensitiveness of the individual to, and his ready acceptance of, beliefs and opinions sanctioned by the group. The force of group suggestion is permanently so strong in his mind that his reason



cannot usually operate against it. He may even accept false opinions such as are current in his set, and then justify them to his own mind by 'rationalization', that is, by finding 'reasons' which sound convincing to himself and other people, but which are not the real foundations of his belief. If any of us does adopt new or unpopular truths, it

is because we have been able to free ourselves from the powers of suggestion contained in the opinions of our immediate group by the consciousness of belonging to some smaller group, perhaps a school of thought, by which those doctrines are accepted; and to such exceptional individuals is due the steady and peaceful progress of civilization.

## THE OUTLAWRY OF WAR: A PSYCHOLOGICAL PROBLEM

BY DEWAN BAHADUR K. S. RAMASWAMI SASTRI

It is true that all the religions of the world proclaim the divine origin, being, and destiny of life, and insist on love, service, co-operation, and renunciation. It is true that modern science has annihilated distance and has linked up the ends of the earth. The economic unity of the world has been stressed by the experts in political economy. Politically we have had a long series of treaties, alliances, and *ententes* and finally even a League of Nations. Yet war persists. The Great War of 1914 was a war of pygmies compared with the greater war of to-day fought as a total war by all the nations in the five continents and the seven seas!

The real origin is to be sought in political and economic causes, which again have to be traced to basic human nature. Dynastic and religious wars are things of the past. But the desire for imperialism and for economic exploitation is more active than ever before. Nationalism is up in arms against imperialism, and economic self-sufficiency against economic exploitation. Dumping is met by tariff walls, and the economic friction glides soon into a deadly war. A loan or a trading concession blossoms into an empire. The flag follows the trade as often as the trade follows the flag. The days of colonial expansion by the mere grab of territory are almost over, though

Italy's recent exploits show that that era is still in existence. But the desire for more money and more comfort is deep-rooted. 'The desire for money is the root of all evil,' is true to-day as ever before, though in a wider sense and with far grimmer and more widespread consequences. The problem of surplus population and the need for the emigration outlet are also live factors. In the case of Japan they are insistent and potent in their influence on the economic causes of the Japanese world-challenge by resort to arms. Overpopulation is sought to be solved by emigration or industrialization or both, and such an endeavour is sure to be resisted by other peoples and States.

Thus the frequent war explosions to-day are due to many deep-seated causes. We see everywhere more mechanization and more militarization in the mind of men. The divine touch has vanished and even the human touch is vanishing. We are passing into an era of more civilization and less culture. The conquest of Nature is growing, but the conquest of human nature is weakening. Mechanization deadens humanity in modern workers who are mere animated adjuncts to machinery, and at the same time it ruins the agriculturists and the producers of raw materials abroad to pamper the industrial workers at home with surplus wealth, with which



grow drink, debauchery, gambling, and worthless and demoralizing amusements. Thus the mechanization of life in the predominantly industrial countries and the pauperization of life in the predominantly agricultural countries lead to a double and accelerated depletion of human values. The latter countries—especially China and India—are rapidly industrializing themselves almost as a result of instinctive self-protection. They contain half the population of the world and enormous raw materials. The inevitable economic clash is a forerunner of the inevitable political and military clash. The frenzied search for external markets is met by the closing of those markets to foreign trade as the result of industrial development and expansion in the exploited countries.

Thus the modern materialistic civilization has upset the old absolute eternal human values, and has sowed the dragon's teeth everywhere in an abundant measure. The spectre of unemployment is stalking in the industrial countries as the result of rationalization. It stalks the agricultural countries in an even greater measure as the raw materials are sucked in to feed the machines, even though the population in the exploited countries is too poor to buy the over-produced goods dumped all over the globe.

There is no need to probe the causes of war *in extenso*. They are psychological in basis and express themselves in economic, social, and political ideologies. Of those the most important to-day is the economic ideology which gains strength from barriers to emigration and barriers to commerce. If we get rid of the basic cause rooted in human psychology, the evil brood of wicked economic, social, and political ideologies will disappear. If we analyse the basic human psychology, we realize the truth of the psychological analysis in chapter XVI of the Bhagavadgita. We see everywhere the clash of the Dāivi Sampad (divine temperament) and the Āsuri Sampad (demoniacal

temperament). The desire for domination and the desire for gain are the basic evil desires.

Aristotle characterized war as 'a means of acquisition' and as 'a species of hunting'. Man is the only animal which hunts its own species. Why is this so? Because the acquisitiveness of man knows no limits, and his power to retain and use later on what he acquires has no limits either. A tiger cannot kill a thousand antelopes at one and the same time, and hope to eat one and keep the rest without rot. But man has discovered money, and money will keep for millennia. It has been cynically pointed out that the American civil war was prompted more by the desire for slave labour and the consequent gain than by the right of self-determination and of secession from the Union.

The fact is that man has been neglecting the creative side of life and has been pursuing too avidly the possessive aspects of life. Even education has been used for the latter purpose, and even the school has become a nursery of competition and pugnacity. Religion must come into her own again and the eternal values of life must gain their sway over the soul of man. Art must be prized much more than it is to-day, for man does not live by bread alone but by every word that proceedeth from the mouth of God. Science has brought races nearer than before, but their hearts have not come nearer. Physical contiguity without psychological propinquity will only increase and intensify war. Though the League of Nations is dead because it was an unarmed League of armed nations, a new armed League of unarmed nations should be born. There must also be working by its side a world economic League and a world League of religions and a world League of cultures. War can be outlawed only when the human mind can taste 'the peace that passeth all understanding' and the institutions of peace replace the institutions of war everywhere.



# SCIENCE AND RELIGION

BY DEV PRAKASH NAYAR, M.A.

'Reason is the best arbiter, the law of law itself', said Milton, and 'faithful ignorance is better than presumptuous knowledge,' said Augustine. These two statements are typical of two attitudes of life—the scientific and the religious—really complementary ways of discovering the truth, and sometimes fruitfully combined, yet working very often in antagonism, leading to the distortion of truth, which they had set out to discover. This antagonism is due to the presence of tendencies in each, which, if given greater worship than is their due, lead to the neglect, even contempt, of the equally important tendencies in the other.

One very important set of such potentially antagonistic tendencies is the attitude of science and religion to *faith and reason*. Religion tends to emphasize the importance of faith to the neglect of reason. Francis Cheynell, the great Puritan authority, said, 'Deny your reason and submit to faith.' Iqbal, interpreting the Quran sets (according to some) reason (Aql) very much lower than faith or love (Ishq). Even in the most philosophic book, the Bhagavad-gita, Lord Krishna says to Arjuna that he should not repeat his discourse to the doubting. Doubt, on the other hand, is the essence of the rationalistic and scientific attitude. Science tends to emphasize the importance of reason to the neglect of faith. This also leads to a distortion of the truth and does much harm.

Science forgets that there are more things in heaven and earth than reason can dream of. This over-simplification on the supposition that everything is explicable by reason, results in falsification. For example, by depending too much on reason science has left the ele-

ments of mystery and emotion out of its conception of the universe and man; and hence the diagnoses of the scientists of the world's ills and their remedies have convulsed rather than soothed the world. In rationalizing the universe they destroyed God—the Mysterious, the Unknowable, the Unthinkable, the Omnipotent. But they forget that the full meaning of man's life is derived from something immeasurably above him to which he can offer limitless, irrational devotion. Hence the destruction of God resulted only in His replacement by false gods. Religion was replaced by mischievous doctrines of Nazism and Fascism. Again, science said that marriage was a contract not a sacrament. Birth control and licentiousness became rife. Homeless husbands, wandering wives, childless mothers, reprobate men and reprobate women constituted the mass of seething humanity. Home was no longer the refuge of man but his seat of torture, impelling him to murder and suicide. Science was perplexed. It realized, or ought to realize, that jealousy, the sense of possession, and the sanctity of the marriage tie are realities, not superstitions. It is because of the neglect of this fact that the scientist fails to realize that machine has done a disservice rather than a service to the worker. With the help of a machine a worker can do a work quickly, but it is no longer accompanied by that artistic pleasure which working with the hand gives and which much more than makes up for the fatigue involved in the longer work.

Man ultimately lives by emotions, which have to be taken into account in any calculation of life. The meddling intellect, indeed, misshapes the beautiful shape of things. It not only destroys beauty, it introduces positive hideousness



into life if it is allowed to usurp the place of emotions. Reason has a place in the discovery of truth; but it cannot visualize the whole truth. Truth is the result of the seer-like vision of the whole man attuned to the verities of life. Reason, indeed, is a very treacherous guide to truth. One can reason any way. It is in fact a handmaid to desire. So it leads into complexes that do not resolve. The rationalist comes to the conclusion that nothing is absolute. True, life is changing. But we require the eternal as a foothold in this world of change. The human mind instinctively believes in and craves for permanence in the midst of change. Not finding it by reason it laments: 'Son of man, you cannot know or guess.' This sense of impotence, this sense that man is a worm, an imbecile, creeps upon us as we read through modern literature. And it is helped by the discovery of the position of the earth in the universe and of man in the universe. Man is not important enough to be 'ever in his Great Task-master's eye', but as J. Alfred Prufrock says, 'a tiny speck on a tiny speck.' So the very gift of science—the confidence of man in himself—science itself takes away! Dependence on reason as the sole guide to truth undermines confidence in another way too. This flexible and corruptible guide to truth presents so many sides to a question without any means of choosing among them that the powers of action are paralysed; and we have the modern man so caught up in the web of his own philosophy as to be incapable of deciding so far between the good and the harmful. The remedy of science, entire dependence on reason, is impracticable, despite all its pretensions of practicability.

It is not only impracticable, it is unwise also. Truth, as said above, being the result of the seer-like vision of the whole man attuned to the verities of life, can be received only by the whole man. He can only feel it if he has lived it. Hence it is sheer presumptuousness on our part to reject a religious truth simply because it does not appeal to our

intellect, till we have lived it and found it wanting.

On the other hand, blind faith leads to the stoppage of the realization of truth, the very nature of which is progressive, and leads it to degenerate into 'a muddy pool of conformity and tradition'. Any religion which has neglected this fundamental fact of change and progress has grown useless, and an impediment in the path of its followers rather than a help. It is one of the main causes of the survival of Hinduism through centuries that it has continually sought to adapt itself to the changing environment, the form in which the eternal manifests itself. For this adaptation, reason is an invaluable guide in the interpretation of experience. To condemn it is incredible folly; for that would take away the only instrument we have, humble as it is, for resisting the abuse of true religion. Religion stresses the importance of faith. Faith tends to be confused with authority. And authority tends to be usurped by a class. This class, in order to secure its hold, invents a maze of forms, in which true religion is lost. It happened in the priestly domination of Medieval Europe and its accompanying terrors of the inquisition; the bloody wars, which kept Europe on the wrack for centuries; and the drying up of the human mind in various ways. In India it engulfed the country in an ocean of social and religious follies, leading to her downfall. It led, again, to the mass slaughters, in India and other parts of Asia by the Muslim conquerors. And it is not accidental that the emancipation of the various peoples took place only with the advent of reason—with the coming of the Renaissance in Europe, and with that of the rationalistic outlook of the Western influence in India. We owe our progress to faith in Self and reason, to the spirit which says:

It matters not how strait the gate,  
How charged with punishments the scroll,  
I am the master of my fate:  
I am the captain of my soul.



It is to such confidence, and not to the Medieval sense of impotence that we owe our attainments. True, it has its limits. But to condemn it altogether would be to court disaster.

Science and religion, again, tend to antagonize each other by their attitude to *matter* and *spirit*. Science, although in its latest phase it is veering round to the belief that there is something beyond the material which it cannot understand, has always, so far, said that matter is all, and spirit is just an illusion. This has led to the neglect of the spirit in the individual; and we have the ridiculous spectacle of the seekers of the paths of stars incapable of travelling in the realm of their own thoughts. Incapable of understanding themselves, they become confused and restless. That is why their whole scheme of enjoyment is based on escape from self rather than on self-expression or self-realization. Incapable of feeling the life in their own thoughts, they crave for a substitute living, for an external life, whose crudeness enables them to feel that they live. Cinemas, naked dances, night clubs, drinking, smoking, etc., are their very life. Indeed, a perpetual need for stimulus is the inevitable outcome of the poverty and vulgarity of the soul. Hence we have the dismal spectacle of the various sons of success engaged in the fruitless task of pursuing ever elusive happiness. For they neglect the fact that the sources of happiness lie within; and inward poverty seems to be the first condition of success in this material and mechanical world of science.

It is the contempt of the soul again which has allowed the scientific age to let the speed of modern life develop unhampered, leading to the impoverishment of the human soul. It has caused the death of the power of aesthetic appreciation, and of deep feelings, which require time to take root. The weakening of the domestic ties and the almost complete loss of the communal life are patent facts to-day. The selfish individualism of the modern world contrasts

in curious ugliness with the beauties of the old world.

Science has, again, led to the neglect of the spiritual in the universe: the neglect of God and the other world. This, as said above, has starved the innate craving of man for the spiritual, and forced it to find unhealthy outlets in the false idealism of Nazism and Fascism, the fruits of which we are reaping to-day. It has, again, degraded man from being a part of the Universal Self (the Gita) to an unashamed petty gambler after wealth, a selfish brute, denying his nature, and inevitably falling into the cauldron of destruction, in which he lies wallowing to-day.

Religion, on the other hand, tends to emphasize the spiritual to the neglect of the material. The Puritans, for example, said that man and all this world is depraved, the spirit and the other world are all important. Man being evil, all his actions are also bound to be so. Hence the only sensible course for him is to escape from his flesh and this world by motionless adoration of the Deity. This attitude, if accepted, would have made it impossible for us to have made any progress. The springs of action would have dried up.

It is only when Hinduism, for example, seeks a synthesis of the worth of this world and the next that it evolves a dynamic as well as a spiritual religion. Only by working ceaselessly in a detached spirit in this world of matter do we attain our salvation and become a part of the universal Self. The same is the lesson of the Quran (if Iqbal's interpretation of the Quran is legitimate):

True renunciation (*Fuqr*), which is the goal of the individual, lies in the conquest of the material as a foothold for rising to the spiritual.

Thus science tends to be rationalistic and materialistic while religion to be entirely dependent on faith and the spiritual. Their relationship has been varying. Sometimes they have been at loggerheads. At other times they draw near. Not only at different times but



also in different religions the proportion of the four ingredients has been varying. What is required, however, is a synthesis of religion and science for the advancement of the human race through the dis-

covery of truth. For nothing, indeed, is really evil in this world. It depends upon man to make of it what he will. He enjoys both the danger and the privilege of choice.

---

## LIMITATIONS OF BIOLOGY

BY PROF. D. N. SHARMA, M.A.

There is probably, no branch of science in which greater progress and more fascinating discoveries have been made in the past twenty years than in biology. It is, moreover, a science which concerns everyone—not only the professional student but every person who desires information on the fundamental facts and problems of life. Yet it is a science in which, more than in any other, 'a little knowledge is a dangerous thing'. It raises issues on which people are apt to take violently partisan attitudes. Biology raises issues of profound importance for the statesman, the sociologist, and the man in the street.

The most controversial point, naturally, is the origin, nature, and function of 'life'. From the point of view of the chemist and physicist the living body may be regarded as a machine always working to adjust itself to its environment. But the living body is something more than a machine: it breeds, it acts, it reacts.

So overwhelming is the accumulated evidence for evolution that evolution is generally accepted as a fact to-day. The main principle has not only come to stay but is being gradually accepted by a growing majority of thoughtful people. It has successfully supplanted the most fallacious belief that the different species of organisms were created once and for all, and that no changes had occurred since the beginning of the universe. To become perfect this theory needs to be supplemented by two facts, (1) that evolution is the characteristic of and obtains only in the realm of 'expression',

and (2) that it apparently takes the form of the unfolding of a spiritual purpose.

The continuity of life through generations is obvious even to a superficial observer and this evidently points to an uninterrupted process of evolution through the ages. But even if we give full support to this view it does not necessarily follow that the methods and conclusions of biologists must of necessity be true. The flux and flow of life, correctly emphasized by the biologists, may have been of a nature that is beyond the ken and scrutiny of those whose gaze is hopelessly limited to the surface and form rather than the inner and deeper significance of facts and events. Our differences with the biologists relate to the *method* rather than the *fact* of evolution.

Let us begin with stating the case of the biologists as briefly and concisely as possible. Evolution postulates the possibility of tracing back the origin of the bewildering diversity of natural phenomena and the complexity of human organism to a common background which is *matter*. That which is a mystery to common sense is simply a result of evolutionary processes to a biologist. The biologist is firmly convinced (1) that the human organism is the resultant effect of the countless stages through which the germ-plasm had to pass till it hit upon its present shape by natural selection and (2) that the methods sponsored by him were accurate and satisfactory. Evidence, he adds, is fast growing in volume and authenticity that *evolution has occurred*



and is occurring. Observation reveals to view tendencies towards 'increased specialization' with consequent 'divergence and multiplication of types'. Looking at the history of mankind one need not strain one's intelligence to the breaking point to be convinced that there does exist

a main trend in evolution which consists in raising the upper level attained by life in regard to various qualities making for greater control over and independence of the environment.

Evidence is accumulating day after day that has once and for all silenced all 'questionings and doubtings', especially of those who bring to bear a scientific attitude on the problem of reality. The diversities and complexities that characterize natural and human life have come into existence after a series of gradual and at times painful struggles, some successful, others halting and still others deviating from the main current and tending towards decay and destruction. A full and detailed evidence from fossils is, by itself, enough to establish the truth of this statement. Evidence from vestigial (rudimentary) organs is at once interesting and conclusive. The fact that they are of no direct use to their possessor but are useful in other animals of the same general construction, is left unexplained by any of the various theories of 'special' creation. Their presence is a matter of no wonder or bewilderment to a student of evolution.

The facts of embryology and those concerning the common plan which is found to underlie the structure of the whole groups of animals, . . . the facts of geographical distribution, . . . the facts concerning variation both in domestic animals and in Nature, and especially the total impossibility of drawing any short line between individual variations, local races, sub-species, and species

cannot be so satisfactorily explained by any theory other than that of evolution.

Evolution is due to 'natural causes'. The various forms of life have evolved from lower to higher levels by some process of 'transformation'. This idea is traceable to two facts. The first is the 'amazing fecundity of life', every species producing far more individuals than do,

or can, survive; the second is the 'universal variability of life'. The members of any one of the species would fill the universe if all survived and continued their geometrical rate of reproduction. Again, no two animals or plants are alike in all respects. From this observation it is not a long step to conclude that in the 'struggle for existence' a large majority of the individuals perish, making room for the minority which survive being 'most fitted' and adapted to the environment.

These individuals are endowed with favourable variations in virtue of which they survive.

These variations pass on from generation to generation till a new species makes its appearance. Variation is due to some change, either (a) in the factor of 'inheritance', e.g., germ-plasm actually transmitted, or (b) in the conditions under which it develops—'environments'. Weismann believes that modifications are not transmitted and there is no good reason to believe that they are cumulative. When some variation is due to a change in conditions it may be called a 'modification'; when it is due to alteration in the factor of inheritance it is called a 'mutation'.

A new mutation will be inherited provided the environment remains constant; but in order that a new modification may be transmitted it is essential that the necessary conditions must be present.

Mutations, being due to lasting alterations of the factors of inheritance, will be persistently inherited, and by the addition of *new* mutations may lead to evolution.

The quintessence of Darwinism

as summarized in his own words,

is the Origin of Species by means of Natural Selection, or the Preservation of Favourable Races in the Struggle for Life.

The preservation of favourable and destruction of harmful variations is called natural selection or the survival of the fittest, the one term referring to the process and the other to the result.

Let us now subject this theory, of



which we have here given a short outline, to a critical examination. Let us first consider *adaptation*. Some biologists contend that outer conditions cause transformations in a *direct* manner (the hypothesis of Eimer) by causing alterations in tendencies, whereas others hold the contrary view that they can affect such changes duly *indirectly* by

favouring those representatives of a species which the chance of birth has best adapted to the environments. (Darwin).

The *positive* influences in the first case give rise to variations, the negative influences in the second case merely *eliminate* variations. The second hypothesis of 'the elimination of the unadapted' does not carry us far in explaining the successive developments and progressive complexities of the organism. Besides, we are interested not so much in what has been eliminated as in what has actually survived. The second hypothesis ignores certain facts whose absence proves fatal to it. How do the conditions create a new form into which the organism must fit itself for the purposes of adaptation?

There is no form yet, and life must create a form for itself, suited to the circumstances which are made for it. It will have to make the best of these circumstances, neutralize their inconveniences and utilize their advantages—in short, respond to outer actions by building up a machine which has no resemblance to them. Such adapting is not repeating, but *replying*. (Bergson).

Replying, however, is definitely an 'intelligent' and not a 'mechanical' activity. It is not 'natural selection', it is 'creation', it is the unfolding of a purpose. The futility of both hypotheses is patent enough from their failure to explain why *different* evolutionary processes result in *similar* forms.

Variations may be either *accidental and insensible* or *abrupt and sudden*. If they be accidental, how do the different parts of an organ, such as an eye, change at the same time simultaneously so as to develop into a still more complicated mechanism? If we say they are insensible and do not in any way obstruct the function of that organ, how can such

variations help the organ unless corresponding changes take place in the remaining parts as well? How can variations, in that case, be retained by natural selection? On the hypothesis of sudden variations the difficulty of so many simultaneous changes is no doubt obviated; but it bristles with difficulties of a serious nature. How do all the parts, for instance, (without some sort of consultation), change suddenly? None of the two hypotheses gives a satisfactory explanation of the variations that do occur but are certainly neither due to accidental nor inner causes.

Let us now consider the direct influence of outer circumstances. It is quite obvious that an organism, in order to adjust itself to the circumstances, modifies its *form* and *size*. But how can mere adjustability account for the growing complexity of the *structure* of the organism? When an organism improves itself, in consequence of its endeavour to adjust itself to the environment, '*the matter merely receives an imprint*'; but when it changes its structure, '*it reacts positively, it solves a problem*'. If we take into consideration the gradual formation of the eye and take into account all that is inseparably connected with it, we are not dealing only with the direct action of light. The entire process suggests a certain capacity of organized matter to build up very complicated machines.

As to the 'transmissibility of acquired characters' the theory of the 'continuity of the germ-plasm' has set all doubts at rest, so that we can now say that hereditary transmission is not possible. If, however, we surmise that soma can influence the germ-plasm, it can bring about only a general alteration of the germ-plasm. In that case it is not the habit of the soma that is transmitted, rather the *natural aptitude* which existed prior to the habit; and thus we would be led to believe that 'hereditary transmission is the exception and not the rule'. Heredity is incapable of creating the complexity of an organ; it cannot



pile up so many and varied modifications. Prof. Lamarck attributed to the living being the

power of varying by use or disuse of its organs and also of passing on the variations so acquired to its descendants.

The variation that results in a new species, springs from the very *effort* of the living being to adapt itself to the circumstances of its existence.

This theory has an advantage over the Darwinian hypothesis as it accounts for an *inner principle* and can give a satisfactory solution for the building up of identical complex organs on independent lines of development. But never has effort been known to produce the slightest complication of an organ. . . . The truth is, it is necessary to dig beneath effort itself and look for a deeper cause. . . . We cannot help believing that these differences (inherent in the germ borne by the individual) are the development of an impulsion (inner principle) which passes from germ to germ across the individuals, that they are, therefore, not pure accident. (Bergson).

The rock on which the mechanistic barks of all schools of evolutionists strike to be smashed to pieces is the factor of 'newness' that creeps in at all stages of development and in the absence of which the very process would be no-existent. As we have seen heredity fails to establish it; nor can accidental or incidental variation account for the growing complexity not only of the form but also of the structure of an organ.

Development or evolution definitely implies the culmination of a process of change in the establishment of a state of things which is relatively *new*, and implies, further, that the relatively new state of things may truly be regarded as the end or completion of this special process of change. Thus the fundamental peculiarity of all evolutionary ideas is that they are essentially *teleological*; the changes, which are evolutions, are all changes thought of as throughout relative to an *end* or *result*. Except in so far as a process of change is thus essentially relative to the *result* in which it culminates, there is no sense in calling it a development. (Taylor, *Elements of Metaphysics*).

The whole argument of the biologist is vitiated by the illogical and untenable assumption that *something* of a positive nature can come out of *nothing* simply by a mechanical process of a high-sounding name; and that *unconscious* matter can evolve into living and *conscious*

beings; or that mere *accident* working along diverse lines of progress and retrogression can create organs of a similar nature and structure with identical functions as if *purpose* had been at work. The whole theory derives its vitality from 'may be' arguments of a dubious nature. Only if we *attach consciousness to matter*, the entire argument becomes perfect, scientific, and conclusive.

The evolutionists make a constant use of the concepts of progress and degeneration, and their admission of 'higher aspects' of life is very significant. Every evolution is an advance to a 'higher' or a decline to a 'lower' state of development. What is the measure or test of progress? It is either internal or external. If it be internal, how can we call a step progressive or otherwise unless evolution has reached the last stage? If it be external, evolution ceases to be an independent process not having even a distant relation to consciousness. Progress and regress are only possible where the process of change is regarded as throughout relative to the *end* to be attained by the process; except in reference to such an end, there can be no distinction at all between progressive and retrogressive changes. The argument does not rest here.

The conceptions of *end* or *result* and of subjective *interest* are logically inseparable. Hence we seem forced to infer that, since evolution is an unmeaning word, unless there are genuine, and not merely arbitrarily assigned, ends underlying the processes of physical *Nature*, the concept of evolution as characteristic of the physical order *involves the metaphysical interpretation* of that order as consisting of the teleological acts of sentient beings. (Bradley, *Appearance and Reality*).

It would be a travesty of facts to say that 'higher' life is also that life which is best 'adapted' to the circumstances. If progress means the reaching out to 'higher aspects' of life on one hand and 'adaptability' on the other, it is doubtful whether the human organism is more adapted to the environment than the organisms of some other animals who, though far low in the scale of life, are more adapted to the surroundings.



A very inferior organism is as well adapted as ours to the conditions of existence, judged by its success in maintaining life: why, then, does life, which has succeeded in adapting itself, go on complicating itself and complicating itself more and more dangerously? . . . Why did not life stop wherever it was possible? Why has it gone on? Why indeed, unless it be that there is an impulse driving it to take greater and greater risks towards its goal to an ever higher and higher efficiency?

The biologist wilfully ignores the fundamental fact of human endeavour to change, modify, and even create the environment to suit the needs of the organism. Herein lies his failure. Evolution implies the presence, throughout successive stages in a process, of something which is permanent and unchanging.

Whatever develops must have a permanent individual character of its own of which the successive stages in the development process are the gradual unfolding.

The infinite individual, however, cannot have development ascribed to it without contradiction. The Absolute

cannot develop, cannot progress, cannot degenerate.

The whole discussion lends itself to the inevitable conclusion that evolution characterizes the physical order of things and the development of finite individuals. It is, however, one 'phase'—though an important one—of life, but not the whole of life. With the steadily increasing success of evolutionary hypotheses in dealing with biological problems, there has naturally arisen a tendency to extend the application of the general concepts of evolution far beyond the sphere in which it first originated. This is an illegitimate extension of the scope and function of this useful science. Biology, like modern science, must begin to feel humble and realize its limitations. Instead of aspiring to offer an exhaustive and conclusive explanation of evolution, it shall have served a useful purpose if it contented itself with giving a detailed and comprehensive account of the history of evolution.

## SANSKRIT POET RAMACHANDRA BHATTA OF AYODHYA

BY PROF. JATINDRA BIMAL CHAUDHURY, M.A., PH.D.

There is a general belief that Sanskrit had a distinct decadence after 1200 A.D. The more we hunt up manuscript materials, the more are we disillusioned as to this. In every branch of Sanskrit studies, monumental works were composed between 1200 and 1800 A.D. As regards Sanskrit poetry, innumerable gems are preserved in the form of Sanskrit anthologies composed during this period. The attributions of the verses to respective poets appear at times to be wrong or contradictory. But thorough investigation finally establishes that the ascriptions of the anthologies are quite dependable. It is further remarkable that not a small number of Sanskrit poets were liberally

patronized by the Muslim rulers of India; and many of them were really their court-poets. Local Hindu rulers also patronized many of them, our Ramachandra Bhatta being one of them.

In V. 13 of the *Padyâmrita-tarangini*, the name of the poet is given as Ayodhyâka-Ramachandra-Bhatta. A verse of Ramachandra has also been quoted in the *Padya-veni*, in which the poet highly praises his patron Virasimha.<sup>1</sup> The same poet wrote his *Râdhâ-charita* at his instance.<sup>2</sup> From the *Krishna-Kutuhala-kâvya*<sup>3</sup> it is

<sup>1</sup> V. 62.

<sup>2</sup> Haraprasad Shastri's *Notices*, I. 318.

<sup>3</sup> *Pandita*, VI. 108.



known that one Ramachandra Bhatta, younger brother of Vallabha Acharya, son of Lakshmana Bhatta, was born about 1484 in Kankaravada in the Telinga country, and composed this work in 1520 A.D. From the concluding verse and the colophon of the *Rasika-ranjana* and its commentary,<sup>4</sup> we come to know that these were composed by Ramachandra Bhatta, son of Lakshmana Bhatta, in Ayodhya in the year 1524 A.D. Ramachandra Bhatta, son of Lakshmana Bhatta, also composed the *Gopala-lilâ-kâvya*.<sup>5</sup>

From the details given above it is found that Ramachandra Bhatta, though a Southerner, was patronized by Virasimha of Ayodhya, and as the poet expressly refers to Ayodhya and Virasimha in the works mentioned above, we have no hesitation in coming to the conclusion that all the works mentioned above are by the same author. Again, Virasimha, son of Madhukara Shah and grandson of Prataparudra, ruled at the time when the books dated above were composed. So there is no chronological difficulty at all. Virasimhadeva's son Chandrabhanu was the patron of Ananta Pandita who composed his commentary *Vyangyârtha-kaumudi* on the *Rasamanjari* of Bhanuchandra in 1685 A.D.<sup>6</sup> Supposing that Chandrabhanu was a senior contemporary of Ananta Pandita, the date appended to the *Vyangyârtha-kaumudi* by the author himself also fits in well with the date of Virasimhadeva, father of Chandrabhanu.

So there is no doubt that Ayodhyaka Ramachandra Bhatta quoted in the *Padyamrita-Tarangini* and Ramachandra Bhatta of the *Padya-veni* referring to Virasimha in his verse are identical and also that the same poet was the author of the *Rasika-ranjana*, *Krishna-Kutuhala-kavya*, *Gopala-kavya* and *Româvali-shataka*. The two verses of the poet on Romavali quoted in the

SHV,<sup>7</sup> are probably selected from this last book.

The total number of verses of Ramachandra Bhatta collected from various anthologies is 20. The verses may be classified as follows:—

1. Incarnations of Vishnu :<sup>8</sup>

- (i) Matsya PV. 851.
- (ii) Kurma PV. 852.
- (iii) Nrisimha PV. 856.
- (iv) Parashurâma PV. 859.
- (v) Balarâma PV. 861
- (vi) Buddha PV. 868.
- (vii) Krishna PT. 18.

2. The King:

- Stuti PV. 62, SS. 45.
- Prasthâna-varnana SS. 149, PT. 94; SS. 151 and 152.

3. Description of features:

- Simanta-tilaka SHV. 1582.
- Karna-tâtanka PV. 256.
- Romavali (2) SHV. 1691 and 1698.

4. Love:

- Surata-varnana (2) PV. 469; SSS. 712; SSS. 715.

5. Season:

- Rainy-season SSS. 369.

6. Anyokti:

- Bhramara PV. 686.

In his verse on Krishna he very much regrets for wasting time in vain; Krishna resides in the heart, still He could not be known.<sup>9</sup>

The poet prays for the blessings of Nrisimha whose nails besmeared with Hiranyakashipu's blood resemble a sprout tinged with the red glow of the evening.<sup>10</sup> Ramachandra praises Bala-

<sup>7</sup> Verses 1691, अमुष्मिन् लावण्यामृत, etc. and 1698, उपाकृताया नवयौवनेन, etc.

<sup>8</sup> Abbreviation: PV. = *Padya-veni*; PT. = *Padyamrita-tarangini*; SS. = *Sukti-sundara*; SHV. = *Subhâshita-hârâvali*; SSS. = *Subhâshita-sâra-samuchchaya*.

<sup>9</sup> *Padyamrita-tarangini*, 13.

<sup>10</sup> *Padya-veni*, 856, दितितनय, etc.

<sup>4</sup> *Kâvya-mâtâ*, IV. p. 149.

<sup>5</sup> Published from Benares Medical Hall Press, 1872.

<sup>6</sup> Peterson's *Reports*, IV. 29.



rama for bringing down even the lunar disc from heaven, drinking the nectar in it, and making an attempt to use the same as a drinking vessel later on.<sup>11</sup> The poet also pays homage to Lord Buddha for his bold stand against killing any animal and for his advocacy of the doctrine of mercy. Buddha was not opposed to the Vedas; on the other hand, he, possessed of true knowledge as he was, acted as a true follower of the Vedas when he stated that non-violence was the highest religion.<sup>12</sup> The other verses also of the poet on the incarnations of Vishnu exhibit his great religious fervour. As his verse on seven incarnations of Vishnu have been traced, it may reasonably be assumed that he wrote on the remaining three incarnations as well. Presumably, he wrote a *Dashâvatâra-stotra* either as a separate hymn or as a part of a complete work such as his *Gopala-lila-kavya*.<sup>13</sup> That he was religiously minded is seen from his complete works on Gopala, Radha, etc.

In his verse in eulogy of king Virasimha<sup>14</sup> the poet has exhibited a striking ingenuity. He says that the king and his enemy are in all respects just the same except that only the first letter of each adjective is to be dropped with regard to his enemy. Thus, the king is 'Vaikunthabhah prakamam' and his enemy is 'Kunthabhah prakamam';<sup>15</sup> again, the king is 'Kamala-yuta-shirah' while his enemy is 'Mala-yuta-shirah';<sup>16</sup> and so on.<sup>17</sup> And consequently the contrast between Virasimha and his enemy is brought out simul-

taneously and exhibited graphically. *This is a marvellous verse.*

The verse on the prowess of the king<sup>18</sup> is slightly indelicate but the pun in it enhances the beauty of the verse. The poet in two other verses preserved in the *Sukti-sundara*<sup>19</sup> praises the king starting for conquest. In one he fancies that the fire emerging out of the nether regions after the breaking atwain of the earth would have consumed the whole world, if the torrential tears of the wives of his enemies did not extinguish the same forthwith. In the other, the poet fancies that because on account of the majestic marching of the king, the earth bends low, she tries to cover as it were the two breasts in the form of the Eastern and Western Ghats by means of the rolling skirts in the form of waves resounded with the beating of drums.

The verse of Ramachandra Bhatta on the Simanta-tilaka<sup>20</sup> is identical in sense with Padmavati's verse *Kasturi-tilakam Tasyah*, etc.<sup>21</sup>

In his verse on the rainy-season he humorously says that whatever be the difficulties of all others in ascertaining whether it is day or night—so cloudy the sky becomes, even during the daytime—Krishna has a means of escape from this trouble; he touches again and again his navel-lotus and ascertains for himself.<sup>22</sup>

to the elephant for hunting excursions, war-purposes, etc. whereas the enemy has defective eyesight on account of palsy. The king is Kodandodâra-nâma, i.e., is well-known as an archer whereas his enemy is notoriously vicious. Virasimha has innumerable attendants whereas those of his enemies are limited. The former is celebrated throughout the world while the latter is like a dog. The former is attached to the beautiful ladies whereas the latter is attached only to the cave, i.e., is compelled to reside in caves. The king conquers his equals in fight whereas his enemy courts death. The king is ready to receive bracelets while his enemy lives on particles of foodstuff.

<sup>18</sup> *Padyamrita-tarangini*, 94.

<sup>19</sup> Verses 151 and 152.

<sup>20</sup> *Subhabhishita-hârâvali*, MS. V. 1582.

<sup>21</sup> V. 57 of *Sanskrit Poetesses*, Part A.

<sup>22</sup> *Subhashita-sara-samuchchaya*, MS. 369.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid*, 861, निष्यात्याशु, etc.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid* 863, अघमेसाधनं, etc.

<sup>13</sup> Owing to the exigencies of the international situation, all the rare, out-of-print, and valuable works have been sent away from Calcutta; so no verification is possible now.

<sup>14</sup> वेकुण्ठाभः प्रकामं, etc., PV. 62.

<sup>15</sup> i.e., the king resembles Krishna whereas his enemy is devoid of any glow.

<sup>16</sup> i.e., the king's head is adorned with lotuses whereas that of his enemy is defiled.

<sup>17</sup> The king is Kunjarâkrishta-drishtih, i.e., the attention of the king is always directed



Thus we find that amongst the verses of Ramachandra, there are some which are grand. The excellence of some from the rhetorical point of view is also

quite manifest. The Utprekshâs of Ramachandra are indeed refreshing and befit a first-class poet.

## THE SHIVA-SHAKTI CULT OF YOGIGURU GORAKSHANATHA

BY PROF. AKSHAYA KUMAR BANERJEA, M.A.

(Concluded)

### VI. JIVA AND JAGAT ESSENTIALLY NON-DIFFERENT FROM SHIVA-SHAKTI

Gorakshanatha is a supporter of Satkârya-vâda and maintains that the world of effects exists before its production in an unmanifested state (Avyakta) in its material cause, the Shakti of Shiva. In that state the effects are undifferentiated from one another and remain identified with the Shakti, which remains perfectly identified with Shiva. Shiva-Shakti has then no outer self-manifestation. This is the state of Pralaya, from which creation proceeds. He also maintains the principle that Kârya or effect is essentially non-different from Kârana or cause, which ultimately is of the nature of Shakti or Power. Accordingly, in his view, the whole universe (Brahmânda) with the diverse orders of individual bodies (Pinda) within it—in the unmanifested and unified as well as in the manifested and diversified state—is essentially non-different from Shakti, which is its material cause. But as Shakti is in reality non-different from Shiva—as Shiva, the Shaktimân, is the true self of Shakti—the world must be conceived as non-different from Shiva.

Accordingly, Shiva is the true Self of the world (Jagat) and the true Self of all individual selves (Jivas). From this point of view, as Shiva does not become anything other than Himself—as Shakti does not modify or transform Itself into something substantially

different from the Ultimate Reality—it may be rightly said that there is no new creation at all, no new production of the world and the individuals in it. (See S. S. P. I. 2.). Gorakshanatha accordingly teaches all truth-seekers to see Shiva in all—in the self as well as in all other beings, Shiva is the indwelling Self in all individual bodies and is the truth of the bodies as well. He is the cosmos as well as everything that appears and disappears in it. From this viewpoint individual life becomes identified with cosmic life. Moksha or liberation is to be attained through the realization of this truth. For the fulfilment of the spiritual demand of life, the realization of the spiritual unity of all diversities, the unity of the individual self with the cosmic Self, the ultimate unity of spirit and matter, the Shivatva of Jiva and Jagat, (all these being included in what he calls Samarasakaranam) is of paramount importance. (S. S. P. V.).

But from the phenomenal point of view and for the formation of an adequate rational conception of the world-order of general experience, the process of the evolution of diversities from the original absolute unity, of Jiva and Jagat from Shiva, must be explained. The first chapter of Gorakshanatha's *Siddhasiddhânta-paddhati* is devoted to the exposition of the gradual unfoldment of the Shakti of Shiva, leading to the creation of the world of living and non-



living, conscious and unconscious finite beings.

#### VII. FIVE STAGES OF THE BECOMING OF SHAKTI

The exposition starts with the conception of the Absolute One, who is the ultimate ground of the manifestation of all diversities. When there is no action nor actor, no cause nor causality, no differentiation of unity nor unification of diversities, when the Supreme Spirit is absolutely unmanifested and exists in and by Himself then He is one nameless (Anâma), self-luminous, pure Being. (I. 4). This is, phenomenally speaking, the state of Mahâpralaya, and metaphysically speaking, the transcendent character of Brahman or Shiva. He has within Him His own Power (Nijâ Shakti), which is of the nature of *Pure Will* (*Ichchhâmâtradharmâ*) and is perfectly identical with the owner of this Power (Dharmini). (I. 5). Thus at this pre-creational stage Shakti is there united with Shiva, but as the Power has no manner of manifestation, not even any subtle impulse to manifest Itself in diversities, It is in no way differentiated from the Spirit—Its presence in the nature of the Spirit is in no way cognizable. It is a will that wills nothing and as such has no self-expression. It is characterized by five negative attributes, viz, eternity (Nityatâ), stainlessness (Niranjanatâ), motionlessness (Nishpandatâ), unreflectingness (Nirâbhâsatâ), and changelessness (Nirutthânatâ). (I. 10). There being no difference between Shiva and Shakti, the Reality, whether designated as Shiva or Shakti—is without any predicate, without any attribute, without any name or form.

At the second stage there arises within the Power a subtle impulse or tendency (Unmukhatva) to unfold Itself, the Will becomes characterized by an inner urge to realize Its indefinite potentiality. The Power or Will so characterized is called Parâ Shakti (Supreme Power). (I. 6). There being

some sort of distinction without difference between the changeless Self-luminous Reality Shiva and His Power of self-manifestation, Shakti exists at this stage *not as Shiva*, but in Shiva. The unfoldment of Shakti in the form of a tendency or dynamic urge distinguishes It from the transcendent character of the Spirit. But there is as yet no actual movement or action in Shakti. Gorakshanatha describes this Para Shakti also in terms of five qualities (Pancha Gunâh), viz, existence (Astitâ), immeasurableness (Aprameyatâ), undifferentiatedness (Abhinnatâ), infinitude (Anantatâ), and unmanifestedness (Avyaktatâ). (I. 11). Shiva characterized by this creative Will, unmanifested, but tending towards manifestation, seems to advance one step in the direction of revealing Himself as a self-conscious and self-determining spiritual personality.

At the third stage some internal movement or vibration (Spandana) arises in this creative Will. The Power is then characterized by some Internal activity, though not by any outward transformation. It is then called Aparâ Shakti. (I. 7). Shakti is at this stage more clearly distinguishable (though never separable) from Its eternal changeless self-luminous Self or Lord Shiva. It moves and has the ground of movement within Itself. It reveals Itself and shows the power of self-revelation within Its own character. It is full of enthusiasm for unfolding and enjoying all that is potentially existent within Its nature. These are the characteristics of Shakti at this stage. (I. 12). Shiva as the sole owner, Illuminer, seer, enjoyer, and Self of this active Will, appears somewhat like an active agent, though He always transcends all actions.

At the fourth stage, a consciousness of ego or I-ness (Ahantâ) evolves within this subtly active creative Will of Shiva, and the Shakti is then called Sukshmâ Shakti. (I. 8). Shiva, as the possessor of the Sukshma Shakti is conceived as becoming conscious of Himself as the



sole self-existent, self-conscious, and self-determining personality. Before this stage of self-modification and self-expansion of His Shakti, Shiva was an impersonal spirit. Now He has become a personal God. But even now He is not conscious of Himself or of His Shakti as having any differentiation into parts (Amsha), or as having temporal or spatial differences (Antara) within or without, or as having any kind of actual movement or self-transformation (Chalatâ), or as having any doubt (Anishchayatâ), or indetermination, or any process of knowledge involving distinction between subject and predicate, self and not-self, soul and body (Vikalpatâ). Absence of any plurality, absence of any sequence or externality, absence of any uncertainty, absence of any effort for the realization of any unrealized truth or ideal, absence of any process of knowledge in the empirical sense, are the characteristics of this perfectly pure and tranquil self-consciousness of Shiva. (I. 13). Power is here perceived, but perceived as one with the Self. Power now appears as the body of Shiva, but the body is as yet wholly spiritual and, as such, not clearly differentiated from the soul. Shakti has not as yet created any evil upon the transcendent unity and self-luminosity of Shiva.

At the fifth stage Shakti becomes distinctly a knowing, feeling, and willing Power (Vedana-shilâ) and is then known as Kundalini Shakti. At this stage of self-evolution Shakti appears as perfect (Purnâ), omnipotent (Prabalâ), self-transforming (Prochchalâ), moving towards creation or self-diversification (Pratyagmukhâ), and reflecting in a variety of forms the nature of Shiva (Pratibimbâ). (I. 14). The entire cosmos with all the diversities that should be created, i.e., into which Shakti is to transform Itself, is *ideally* manifested in the Kundalini Shakti and illumined by the consciousness of Shiva, Shiva then dwells in an *ideal* universe as its embodied self and becomes, so to say, conscious of Himself as the soul and Lord and substance of this universe.

#### VIII. THE COSMIC EMBODIMENT OF SHIVA

In this manner Gorakshanatha traces the gradual self-unfoldment of the infinite and eternal Shakti of the Absolute Spirit Shiva. As Shakti unfolds Itself, Shiva appears to acquire newer and newer attributes, more and more glorified existence. It is through further self-unfoldment, self-diversification, and self-objectification (Shakti-chakra-kramena), that the cosmic body of Shiva is created. In relation to the aforesaid five stages of the internal self-unfoldment of Shakti, Gorakshanatha gives five different names to Shiva, viz, Aparamparam, Paramapadam, Shunyam, Niranjanam, and Paramâtmâ. (I. 17). They seem to correspond to Sadâshiva, Ishwara, Rudra, Vishnu, and Brahmâ of the Tantras.

The process is the progressive descent of the Divine Consciousness into more and more manifested forms of His dynamic nature. This may be viewed on the one hand as the gradual self-veiling, self-conditioning, and self-limiting of the infinite, eternal, absolute, impersonal, self-luminous, spiritual character of the Divine, and on the other hand as the progressive self-expanding, self-glorifying, and self-enjoying of the Divine Spirit through the self-unfoldment of the Power which is eternally innate in and identical with His nature. Light posits shade, which offers resistance to it, in order to enjoy its brilliance. Infinite knowledge divides itself gradually into numberless subjects and objects in order to realize and enjoy in details all that is eternally unified in it. Infinite impersonal bliss multiplies itself into diverse orders of enjoyers and enjoyables in order to realize its infinitude through the finite enjoyments in boundless time and space.

The Divine existence, the Divine knowledge, the Divine Power, the Divine bliss, which are all perfectly unified in the impersonal Divine nature, are manifested in diverse forms in the cosmic order, and the Divine Spirit as the



ground, support, soul, Lord, witness, and illuminer of them all, assumes diverse appellations and enjoys Himself in them. Hereby the impersonal Divine Spirit becomes the omnipotent, omniscient, perfect, and all-enjoying personal God. The Power unfolded becomes His body, and the more is the Power diversified, the more glorious does His body appear to be. As the one soul of this cosmic body, Shiva pervades the universe with His all-illuminating consciousness and regulates and enjoys all its parts, all its affairs. This cosmic body of Shiva is called by Gorakshanatha Para Pinda and Shiva as the Soul of this cosmic body is called *Para Shiva*. (I. 15, 16).

Gorakshanatha is cautious enough to remind us that, in tracing this progressive self-unfoldment of the Divine Shakti, undue importance should not be attached to the time-element. Shiva is not at one time impersonal and at another time personal; but transcendently He is always impersonal, since Shakti with Its manifestations is always non-different from Him, and phenomenally He is always personal, since Shakti is always operative and always constitutes His cosmic body. This cosmic body has no absolute beginning in time; it does not come from a non-existent state to the existent state at any moment or any particular period in time. It is, therefore, called Anâdi Pinda (beginningless body). (I. 23, 24). In the temporal order, however, this Anadi Pinda of Shiva remains in the undifferentiated state in Mahapralaya and passes through the subtle state of internal differentiation to the gross cosmic state of external differentiation.

Now, with the unfoldment of Shakti as Kundalini, the cosmic body of Shiva appears; but there is as yet no distinct manifestation of individual selves and individual bodies within it. The difference between Jada (material) and Chetana (spiritual) has also not arisen at this stage. This body may be regarded as a spiritual body or a mental body, all the possibilities of the cosmic

order being ideally present in it. Gorakshanatha then traces the evolution of the Jada-jagat (material world) within the body.

From Âdya (i.e., the Anâdi Pinda or Para Pinda) is produced Mahâkâsha, from Mahakasha Mahâvâyu, from Mahavayu Mahâtejas, from Mahatejas Mahâsalila, from Mahasalila Mahâprithvi. (I. 31).

Thus the Para Pinda of Shiva is, through the further unfoldment of His Shakti, manifested as the Mahâsâkâra Pinda (the body with the great cosmic material form). (I. 36). Shiva is then embodied in one vast objective world and dwells in it as its Great Soul (Paramatma). He is then the Vaishwânara of the *Chhândogya Upanishad* and the Virât of the Purânas.

It is from and within this all-pervading, all-comprehensive, self-objectified cosmic body (*Mahasakara Pinda*) of Shiva-Shakti that countless orders of individual bodies (*Vyashti Pinda*) are manifested through further self-conscious and self-determined self-unfoldment of the Shakti. (I. 38). They all live and move and have their being in embodied Shiva, pass through various stages of evolution and involution by His will and the law of His cosmic body, and the course of the life of each individual terminates ultimately in the conscious realization of identity with Shiva. Shiva is the true Soul of every individual body, whether inorganic or organic, insentient or sentient, irrational or rational. The individual souls are the self-manifestations of Shiva in individual bodies, and they are conditioned by the limitations of these bodies. It is the one supreme universal soul that manifests Itself as innumerable individual souls dwelling in diverse kinds of bodies. The limitations are caused by Its own Shakti. All the individual existences of the universe are pervaded by the life, power, and consciousness of Shâktiyukta Shiva.

#### IX. MAN AND HIS PSYCHO-PHYSICAL ORGANISM

The fully developed psycho-physical organism of man is the culmination of



the course of *natural* evolution in the cosmic body of Shiva. It is in such a body that the entire cosmic body is distinctly mirrored, and the self-conscious spirit conditioned by such an organism is capable of seeing and feeling and enjoying the whole cosmic system within this organism through proper self-discipline. The microcosm is really identical with the macrocosm,—whatever exists in the world outside is present within the human body. When this is perfectly realized, the individual human soul experiences its identity with the universal Soul, the Jiva enjoys its identity with Shiva. Thus Shakti had started Its evolutionary course from the absolute unity of Shiva, and having transformed Itself into a spatially and temporally limitless diversified universe consisting of countless orders of finite transitory individual existences, returns through the fully developed and perfectly refined individual human body to the blissful consciousness of the unity of the individual and the universal, the finite and the infinite, the temporal and the eternal, the material and the spiritual, the Jiva-jagat and Shiva-Shakti.

Gorakshanatha devotes the greater portion of his illuminating treatise to interesting analysis of and reflections upon the human body. The human body appears to be the central topic of the book. The six chapters of the book are: (1) Origin of the body (*Pindot-patti*), (2) Reflections on the body (*Pinda-vichâra*), (3) True knowledge of the body (*Pinda-samvitti*), (4) The true sustainer of the body (*Pindâdhâra*), (5) The equation of the body and the Supreme Reality (*Pinda-pada-samarasakaranam*), and (6) The characteristics of the individual who has perfectly realized the identity of himself and all the individual realities and the cosmos with the Supreme Spirit and His Shakti (*Avadhuta-yogi-lakshmanam*). It is to be noted that by Pinda or body Gorakshanatha does not mean merely the gross physical body, but the psychophysical organism from its most subtle and almost unmanifested state to its

fully manifested, fully differentiated, fully organized, and fully unified form.

Having traced the origin of the body from Shiva-Shakti in the first chapter and analysed its physical, psychical, and spiritual nature in the second, Gorakshanatha begins the third with the assertion that he who has recognized the presence of the entire cosmic system—the cosmic body of Shiva—within his own body, can be properly said to have truly known his own body—to have realized the true significance of his own individual existence. (III. 1). In his search for the *Âdhâra*—the ground, Support, Sustainer, and Substance—of the cosmic body as well as the individual bodies, he arrives at the conclusion that Shakti identical with Shiva—the omnipotent Power identical with the supreme consciousness—is the *Adhara* of all *Pindas*. The equilibration of the *Pinda* with the *Pada* (the Supreme Spirit)—the realization of the identity of all existences with Shiva—requires the systematic practice of Yoga and the grace of the Guru (who must be one who has already fully realized it and become one with Shiva). The Yogi-guru's philosophy necessarily contains practical lessons for the culture of Yoga, for the true end of philosophy is, not merely intellectual apprehension, but spiritual realization. Lastly, in his description of the character of *Avadhuta* or *Nâtha* or *Siddha-yogi*, he presents the ultimate ideal of human life in a concrete form. In the person of an *Avadhuta*, there is perfect union between Jiva and Shiva.

#### X. THE HIGHEST OBJECT OF WORSHIP

It is Shiva-Shakti so conceived, that is the highest object of worship to the followers of Gorakshanatha. They worship Shiva, not as a deity among so many deities, but as the Absolute Spirit eternally enjoying the infinite bliss of His changeless transcendent character and eternally manifesting the inexhaustible spiritual glories of His



perfect existence in and through the self-unfoldment of His innate spiritual Shakti into a beautiful and sublime cosmic system, in which countless individual beings of diverse orders are being continually created, sustained, and destroyed. They worship Shakti as eternally present in, identical with,

wedded to the Supreme Spirit Shiva, and as the sole Mother of this universe. They see and enjoy the playful self-manifestation of Shiva-Shakti within themselves and everywhere in the universe. Kâli dancing on the breast of Shiva is a grand representation of their conception of Shiva-Shakti.

## IS THE WORLD UNREAL ?

BY PROF. N. K. BRAHMA, M.A., PH.D.

(Continued)

The *Mithyâ* has its ground in the Sat, belongs to It, and is resolved into It. It has its Paryavasâna in the Sat. The Mithya has no other reality than the Sat, is not an other to the Sat. If the Mithya had been opposed to the Sat, the Advaita theory would have cancelled itself by this suicidal supposition. The logic of Advaita Vedanta is too well-grounded to allow this contradiction. The absolute reality of Brahman reduces the reality of the world to an empirical, pragmatic status; and the Satyatva of Brahman is quite consistent with the Mithyâtva of the universe. The Mithya Jagat is not outside Brahman, not opposed to It, not a reality of the same order with Brahman;—there is no opposition or Nirodha between Brahman and Jagat. It is the Mithyatva of Jagat that saves Advaita Vedanta from being dualistic. Mithyatva is a very significant category. The world becomes Mithya in the presence of Brahman; that is, the simultaneous cognizance of Brahman and the world shows the former to be Pâramârthika (absolute) and the latter to be Prâtibhâsika (relative) or Mithya (illusory). Those who are content with ascribing a relative reality to the world and an absolute reality to Brahman, may very well do that; and they are strictly in agreement with the doctrine of Advaita Vedanta. Relative reality, according to Vedanta, is Mithyatva, because absolute reality

alone is Sat or Satyam. We have already seen that Vedanta means by Mithyatva Nyuna Sattâkatva; and, therefore, the Mithya Jagat is in no way opposed to Brahman.

It is to be clearly understood that the *simultaneous* perception of Brahman and Jagat shows the Mithyatva of the latter clearly. The world is not negated or denied but transcended. Brahman is perceived to be the ultimate value or category which reduces at once the value of the categories previously perceived. Those who think that there cannot be simultaneous perception of Brahman and Jagat are mistaken. Both Brahman and Jagat, it is true, cannot be perceived to be *absolutely* real. But the Sat Brahman and the Mithya (not Asat) Jagat are not only perceived together but it is their togetherness alone that can explain the Satyatva of the one and the Mithyatva of the other. The *Brahmavid Jnânin*, the Jivanmukta, can very well perform all actions in the universe; and his resting in the Brahman consciousness or becoming Brahman is in no way inconsistent with his Jagat-jnâna, because according to Vedanta Brahman and the Jagat exist simultaneously, belonging as they do to different orders of reality. This reconciliation or solution of dualism attempted by Vedanta is to be clearly perceived. There is no dualism between Brahman and the



world, the One and the many, because the One transcends the many. The many are not non-existent, not Asat, not differentiations or manifestations or segmentations of the One, but belong to an order of reality, or form a category, that does not touch or affect the reality of the One. Shankara has, in this respect, much in common with Spinoza. It is *imaginatio* that perceives the reality of the modes; *intuitio* sees the reality of the One Substance only; it is Ajnâna or ignorance that perceives the reality of the many; the true Jnana sees the reality of the One. Not that at one stage there is the One and at another there are the many; not that the One is differentiated into the many and we may see the One in the many or the many in the One. The One, not the numerical one but the whole and the full, the indivisible and the perfect, always is and remains the One and is beyond the division and differentiation that is the source and life of the world of the many. The one that is opposed to the many is only the numerical one, which is a member in the world of many and is not the One that transcends the many. To right knowledge, reality is the One, to ignorance it appears to be many. The category of transcendence or Mithyatva is the solution that is offered by Vedanta to reconcile all forms of dualism.

The relation of the temporal and the eternal, of time and the timeless, ought to be fully discussed in this connection. That the eternal or the timeless transcends the temporal is admitted by all schools of philosophy; but the term 'transcendence' is understood very differently by the different schools. Shankara is often understood by his opponents to mean by transcendence mere negation. The world in time is an illusion, and in the timeless Absolute there is no temporal world. His opponents, mainly the Bhedâbheda-vâdins—both ancient and modern—hold that this is not the real meaning of transcendence. The real timeless includes time and should not

exclude or negate the temporal. The truly transcending eternal is not subject to the limitations of time, but does not on that account annul temporal distinctions; rather by including the temporal within it, it proclaims and reveals its timelessness and transcendence of the limitations of time. From this standpoint, these opponents of Shankara have missed in his conception of Brahman real transcendence and have regarded Brahman to be only an abstraction, a partial conception, that fails to synthesize the temporal and the eternal. Shankara, however, thinks that the real Absolute is beyond time and *transcends* time in the genuine sense of the term. The eternal that manifests itself in and through time, that has the whole temporal series as its content, that has meaning only in reference to time, is not really beyond time and does not transcend time. This eternal is only the latent or the unmanifested temporal or rather the compressed temporal. It is the ground (Kârana) of the temporal, and as such does not transcend time. The really transcendent Absolute is beyond time, beyond the eternal and the temporal, beyond the ground and the consequent, beyond the cause and the effect. It is not *both* cause and effect, *both* ground and consequent, *both* eternal and temporal. The division of the eternal and the temporal is within the sphere of time; and the transcendent Absolute cannot be the eternal that is opposed to the temporal, nor can it be the aggregation of the eternal and the temporal.

Shankara's Brahman should never be interpreted as the eternal that negates or denies the temporal. But it should not, on the other hand, be supposed to include the temporal as its content. It is not the Sâmkhya Purusha that is to be realized by isolating and withdrawing from Prakriti, not the subject that is different from the object, not the permanent that is opposed to the changing. It is not certainly, however, Prakriti, the Parinâmi Nitya, the temporal-eternal, the eternal or the



Nitya that has the changing universe as its content, the Absolute Reality of the modern disguised Bhedabhedavadins who follow Hegel. Hegel's Absolute, the category of identity-in-difference, is nothing but the Sankhya Prakriti, the category of Parinami Nitya. Shankara's Brahman is above the Sankhya Purusha and Prakriti. The modern criticism of Shankara as upholding the conception of the timeless that excludes time applies to the Sankhya Purusha and not to Shankara's Brahman. The category of identity-in-difference which the modern Absolutists following Hegel want to substitute for Shankara's identity, is the conception of the Sankhya Prakriti, which is ever a lower conception than that of Purusha. The Akshara Purusha which excludes the Kshara, is the Sankhya Purusha that has Prakriti different from it and is only wrongly identified with the Vedantic Brahman which being the highest conception of the Absolute excludes nothing. To lose sight of the distinction between the Akshara Purusha and Brahman is to miss the fundamental and most important point of difference between Sankhya and Vedanta.

If Purushottama transcends the Kshara and the Akshara merely because It is not confined to either but includes both and not because It is Anya, i.e., altogether different from the Kshara-akshara division, if Its transcendence is merely the transcendence of a limited portion of a division and not the transcendence of all division and separation, it is a poor conception of transcendence, and Purushottama would be reduced to the level of the Sankhya Prakriti which also has a Ushara, Parinami, or changing aspect and an Akshara, unchanging, or Mithya aspect. It is the word 'Anya' that shows the real transcendence of Purushottama. Brahman is Jagatvilakshana; this Vilakshanatva or Anyatva is what we mean by transcendence. Division characterizes the region of the Gunas; what is beyond the Gunas is marked by an absolute non-division, an absolute non-duality.

The identity that is supposed to be expressed in and through difference belongs to the region of division, to the region of the Gunas. It is only the identity that cannot be expressed through difference which is genuinely absolute and really transcends all division and the region of the Gunas. The Vedantic Brahman transcends the universe in this sense. Transcendence is a peculiar category which is neither inclusion nor exclusion, neither aggregation nor wholeness! Transcendence means the uniqueness that belongs to a superior or higher category, which is, consequently, not expressed or expressible in and through the categories that are inferior to it.<sup>1</sup> Purushottama is as transcendent as the Vedantic Brahman only if It goes beyond the Kshara-akshara division, only if the Kshara-akshara division does not form Its element, only if It is altogether unexpressed by this division, i.e., only if It is really Anya.

The Vedantic Brahman is transcendent in this highest sense of the term. It is a unique category that is not expressed or expressible by any category lower than Itself. This is Its Advitiatva or Dvaitatitvatva—Its transcendence or otherness from the region of Dvaita or division. There is the world of mixture and heterogeneity; thoroughly different from it there is the Reality which is perfectly homogeneous (Ekarasa) and which does not admit of any mixture. Anything that admits of division is in time; even eternity admitting of time-divisions within it is itself timeless only relatively. The Absolute that transcends time altogether must be beyond division.

The Vedantic transcendence can be best understood when we remember that Pratyabhijnâ or recognition forms its psychological basis. Devadatta, whom I saw in the past, is very

<sup>1</sup> This point has been elaborately explained in my paper *Vedantic Transcendence*, Presidential Address (Section of Indian Philosophy), Indian Philosophical Congress, Aligarh, 1941.



different from Devadatta whom I see before me now—'Sa Devadatta' is very different from 'Ayam Devadatta'; and the two cannot be identified with each other. When, however, we are conscious of the identity of the self of Devadatta which is present in both, i.e., when we rise to a higher point of view which resolves the opposition between 'that Devadatta' and 'this Devadatta', we can declare—'Soyam Devadatta—this is that Devadatta.' The transcendent consciousness of the personal identity of Devadatta reduces the opposition between 'this Devadatta' and 'that Devadatta' to a Mithyatva and overcomes or solves the opposition permanently. It is a conscious transcendence that sees the opposing members being reduced to Mithyatva, a simultaneous perception of the reality of the identity and the falsity of the opposition. Vedanta does not neglect or ignore the many, does not merely declare that the many do not exist, does not attempt to realize the One by a cowardly or stealthy withdrawal from the many, but it boldly faces the many that appear, and finds them being reduced to Mithyatva or rather realizes their Mithyatva simultaneously with the reality of the One. This conscious transcendence, this simultaneous perception of the falsity of the many and the reality of the One, is a unique feature of the Vedantic Jnana which has been described as Bâdha-samâdhi, which knows no falling off or Vyutthâna, in distinction from the Laya-samadhi of the Yogins. The Vedantic Brahman is to be realized not by withdrawing and isolating from the universe, not by negating or denying or leaving it aside, but by realizing its true worth, i.e., by perceiving its evanescence, temporality, and falsity in the light of the unchanging and permanent value of the Real.

This view of the relation of the One and the many, viz, that the One is real and the many are false (Prati-bhasika or Mithya), seems to be the most satisfactory logical solution of the problem. If we ever say that only the

One is, the many are not—or that the many that appear to us are the only reals, the One that is never perceived is not real—we are merely making dogmatic statements implying either monism or pluralism without attempting any philosophical discussion at all. If, however, we say that neither an extreme monism denying the reality of the many nor an extreme pluralism denying the reality of the One is true, but that the One and the many are related as cause and effect, that the One is the cause of the many and that the many have come out of the One—it also does not give us any real solution of the problem. We fail to understand how the many can come out of the One. If the One is a homogeneous unit, if the One is really one and not an aggregation, we do not understand how the many can at all develop from the One. If, however, in order to get rid of this difficulty, it is held that the One is not really the Abstract One devoid of all variety and plurality, but that the real One is really one-in-many, a unity-in-diversity, an identity-in-difference—instead of solving the difficulty it rather confirms the previous suspicion and explicitly shows that the One which is expressed in and through the many, the One out of which the many develop themselves, is not really one, not homogeneous (Ekarasa). The one-in-many is one only relatively, a unity that maintains itself in and through division and not the One that is beyond all division; it is only the Parinami Nitya, the immanent universal, the Prâna Tattva of the Upanishads, and not the Âtman, the indivisible transcendent One, that is beyond all division. The solution that the Upanishads offer is that the One transcends the many, that the One is Sat or real and that the many are false, Mithya. The One is the ground of the many, just as the Adhishthâna or basis is the ground of the appearance. The many do not form part of the One and do not belong to the same order of reality as the One. The 'many' that



is part and parcel of the One, that is as real as the One and is inherent in the One, disturbs the oneness of the One; and the One that has the many as Its content, is really many and not one. It is called one-in-many only by courtesy; really it is many and not one. Its oneness is the unity of aggregation and not the absoluteness beyond all division.

If we are to admit the one-in-many—which we have just now seen is really many and not One—to be the ultimate category, we really hold that difference is ultimate, and we practically deny the usefulness of the mission of philosophy. Philosophy attempts at unification, and its task is not fulfilled until and unless it arrives at completely unified knowledge or perfect homogeneity that leaves no room for any further ‘why’. Difference or diversity calls for an explanation; and because human reason cannot rest satisfied with diversity, cannot

accept it as ultimate, science and philosophy originate. The goal of philosophy has to be accepted as some such state where there is no diversity left as an irreducible surd, but where all difference, all otherness, all Anâtmâ, has been absorbed, Paryavasita, found its culmination in the Atman, in the Absolute. Vedanta places before us this state as the culminating point of philosophy and religion. A philosophy that accepts diversity or difference as ultimately real, really denies the usefulness of philosophy. If diversity does not call for any explanation, if this is ultimate, why should there be any philosophy at all? The Mithyatva of the many and the Satyatva of the One is the only satisfactory solution which retains the absoluteness of the One and still *explains* the appearance of the many.

(To be concluded)

---

## NOTES AND COMMENTS

### TO OUR READERS

As the closing stages of the War are approaching we devote a few pages to the cause of peace. Prof. Sarma, Dewan Bahadur Ramaswami Sastri, Mr. D. P. Nayar as well as the Editor look at the problem from various points of view. But the discriminating reader will discover a connecting link among these. . . . Modern thought is greatly influenced by biology, which is also partly at the root of the present debacle. Prof. Sharma, therefore, reminds us of the *Emmitations of Biology*. . . . But though busy with immediate problems, we cannot afford to ignore culture and philosophy, and Professors Chaudhury, Banerjea, and Brahma provide us with a sumptuous repast.

### THE PLACE OF RELIGION

The main charges against religion, according to Mr. U. Ratnakar Rao,

B.A., LL.B., writing in the *Human Affairs* under the above heading are:

Firstly, . . . religion appears vitiated by the atmosphere of undue mysticism which surrounds organized religion. . . . It apparently bothers more with the possibilities of the life hereafter, the next world, rather than with the hard realities of the present. . . . Secondly, organized religion is very often an enemy of clear thought . . . vested interests seem scarcely to have a better ally than certain so-called representatives of organized religion. . . . (Organized religion is) frankly opposed to human effort and the idea of progress. . . . It is the opinion that religion is only for the defeated or for those who lack courage.

The charges may be substantially true when levelled against organized religion. But that is no reason why religion as such should be impugned. Even scientists are coming to realize that this world of appearance does not exhaust Reality. There is something beyond it. To quote Professor Eddington:

The idea of a universal Mind or Logos would be, I think, a fairly plausible infer-



ence from the present state of scientific theory, at least it is in harmony with it.

Surely, this other world must be somebody's affair. As for this world, no truly religious man can tolerate the interference of organized religion with politics. As Gandhiji remarks:

History shows that the priesthood has not always interfered with political matters to the benefit of mankind. Very often unworthy ambition has moved the priesthood of the world, as it has moved unscrupulous men, to take part in politics. (*Young India*, 28. 3. 1929).

But politicians, too, go wrong. So there must be somebody to stand for truth. A priest has thus a valuable part to play:

Walking always in the light of God, steadfast in his devotion to truth, he should stand four square to all injustice, impurity, and wrong wherever it may be found. (*Ibid*).

Society stands to gain by the presence of such religious men. Religious men do not suffer from any defeatism. The proper religious mentality has rarely any defeatist trait in it.

Who that has heard or known of the life and doings of a Buddha, a Christ, a St. Francis of Assisi, a Paramahansa, a Vivekananda, a Gandhi, will dare to say that these men among men, turned to religion only because they suffered the bitterness of defeat on the worldly plane?

The world would be poorer if these men had not blessed it. Religion has its own positive contribution to make to individual and social life:

There is in it that which . . . satisfies and supplies a latent craving of the human heart, and brings to it, while being torn by mortal anguish, peace and comfort. . . . Religion . . . inspires man and drives him ever onward

to realize 'heart-unity' with not only fellow human beings, but all living things.

#### THERE IS NONE GREATER THAN MAN

'The sentient being is the God,' 'the living creature is none else but *Siva*,' the Hindus are familiar with such expressions. Perhaps, there is no nation except the Hindus who honoured even the puniest creature of the universe so greatly. And yet, it is a tragic fact that it is the Hindus who have hurled the greatest insult on man, the most perfect of all creatures.

Thus observes Prof. Sujitkumar Mukhopadhyaya in *The Modern Review* for September; and he quotes exhaustively from various scriptures to prove his thesis that ancient India upheld the dignity of man in an emphatic manner. We present below only a few of his quotations:

The same God dwells in different forms in different temples, 'in some as woman, in others as man, in some as youth, in others as maiden, while in some others as a decrepit tottering old man, wandering about with the aid of a staff. In the entire universe in every direction, it is He who has come into being. It is the selfsame God who has manifested Himself as father, as well as son, as an elder, as well as a youngster. It is He who has entered into the heart and mind. The same Being who was born at the beginning of creation, also exists now in the embryo.' *Atharvaveda*, X. viii. 27-28.

How to worship this God? Where to find flowers for his worship? 'That which enters into the heart of great souls, that which is known as soothing as the Moon, by that sweet compassion, one should worship God, who lives within man.' *Yogavāsishtha*, *Nirvāna-prakarana*, *Purvabhāga*, 38-39.

'Knowledge, peace, equality, are the best flowers for his worship.' *Ibid*, 26-27.

'I undertake the service to the world, with my whole being. Let the multitude put their foot on my head or let them kill me.' *Shikshā Samuchchaya*, p. 156.

'There is none greater than man.' *Mahābhārata*, *Shāntiparva*, 300-20.

---

Each soul is potentially divine. The goal is to manifest this divine within, by controlling nature, external and internal.

Do this either by work, or worship, or psychic control, or philosophy, by one, or more, or all of these—and be free.

This is the whole of religion. Doctrines, or dogmas, or rituals, or books, or temples, or forms, are but secondary details.



## REVIEWS AND NOTICES

**DOCTRINE OF SHAKTI IN INDIAN LITERATURE.** BY THE LATE DR. PRABHAT CHANDRA CHAKRAVARTI, KAVYATIRTHA, M.A., P.R.S., PH.D. *To be had of General Printers and Publishers Ltd., 119, Dharmatala Street, Calcutta. Pp. 123. Price Rs. 5/-.*

In this scholarly book the late Professor Prabhat Chandra Chakravarty gives a historical outline of the doctrine of Shakti in Indian literature. Owing to his premature death he could not give a finishing touch to his work by writing a chapter on Shâkta Tantra literature and by recording his concluding remarks. Though this is extremely regrettable, the book is complete so far as it goes and reveals at every turn a critical and erudite mind bent on going to the fundamentals of things. His research reveals Shakti at work in every department of Indian philosophical thought beginning from the time of the Vedas. Such astute thinkers, for instance, as the Nyaya and Vaisheshika schools, though they reject Shakti as a separate category cannot do without it for all practical purposes. 'Shakti made its way into their theory of causation, conception of Godhead, and into so commonplace a thing as the denotation of meaning by a word.'

Shakti had its place in the Vedic literature. Vâk, Idâ, Rudrâni, Kâli, Ambikâ, Karâli, and Umâ are some of the aspects of Shakti with which the Vedic Rishis were familiar. There are also references to the power of Vishnu (*Rigveda*, I. 154. 1, III. 55) and the Mâyâ of Indra (*Ibid*, VI. 47. 8). Vak as a vehicle of communication of ideas is a power that rises from within. This Vak is referred to as Devi. (*Ibid*, VIII. 100. 11). The activities assigned to the various deities can be explicable only on the assumption of Shakti. (*Nirukta*, VII. 10).

The Upanishads make clear references to Shakti. (*Shvetâshvatara*, I. 2). The *Devy-upanishad* mentions different embodiments of Shakti. The *Tripurâtâpanyupanishad* interprets the Gâyatri as referring to Shakti.

In later literature the place of Shakti becomes more prominent. It is recognized both as a material force and a spiritual entity. The Yoga system has indirectly referred to the supreme Shakti or all-knowing power of Ishvara. Mention is also made of Chitishakti, which is held to be identical with Purusha. Then the Yoga-shaktis are nothing but different manifestations of Shakti. The Sâmkhya system, too, could not explain causation without the help of

Shakti. The Mimâmsakas acknowledged Shakti, though not strictly in a spiritual sense. In the Vedanta philosophy of Shankara Shakti has a distinct place. Shankara recognizes its manifestation on the material, mental, and spiritual planes. 'Shakti appears to be the most conspicuous content in Shankara's conception of Godhead.' His Maya is nothing but Shakti in its fullness. The *Vedanta Sûtras* also refer to Shakti. The other schools of Vedanta are equally indebted to various conceptions of Shakti for the development of their philosophies. In the Puranas and in the Vaishnava philosophy can be found an elaborate exposition of the doctrine of Shakti. The *Devibhâgavata*, for instance, touches upon the cardinal point of Shaktivâda when it lays down that Shakti represents both Purusha and Prakriti, there being no essential difference between the two. The hymnal literature abounds in praises of Shakti as the highest spiritual entity.

It is impossible to do full justice to such a book of research in a short review. The pages of the work are packed with valuable conclusions and thought-provoking hints. No one who wishes to be acquainted with this important phase of Hindu religious thought can afford to neglect this book.

**UNITY.** BY MAHATMA GANDHI, MAULANA AZAD, PANDIT JAWAHARLAL NEHRU, AND OTHERS. *Published by Hamara Hindostan Publications, 207, Kalbadevi Road, Bombay. Pp. 79. Price -/8/- as.*

The book presents the views of eminent Indian leaders on the question of Indian unity. It clearly shows how basic and how enduring is the all-round unity of India—political, religious, racial, and cultural. Despite interested propaganda India's unity is destined to endure and grow apace. Those who have any misgiving as to this will do well to read the booklet. It is an interesting and timely publication.

**THE FIFTY FACTS ABOUT INDIA.** EDITED BY 'SOME STUDENTS'. *Hamara Hindostan Publications, Hamam Street, Fort, Bombay. Pp. vii+58. Price -/8/- as.*

Some time ago a pamphlet entitled *Fifty Facts about India* was circulated in America. The book abounded in *suppressio veri* and *suggestio falsi*. The present book refutes those misrepresentations with a plethora of facts and figures. The polemical



side apart, it deserves to be read as a book of information about the state of things in India. Queer ideas are not the monopoly of interested propaganda; they often sit even on our own minds like an incubus. The present book is calculated to cure us of such a disease.

### BENGALI

**RABINDRA-SANGIT.** BY SHANTIDEV GHOSH. *Published by Viswabharati Granthalaaya, 2, Bankim Chatterjee Street, Calcutta. Pp. 164. Price Rs. 1-8.*

Mr. Ghosh, who is a talented musician himself and had lived in close touch with Rabindranath for several years, deserves our hearty congratulations on his very worthy attempt to show in this lucidly written book the contribution of the great poet in the field of Indian Music. Some have an erroneous notion that Rabindranath was a rebel in the musical traditions of this land. The author refutes this view with strong arguments in the light of convincing facts. Far from destroying the classical traditions, the poet's creative genius had enriched them by giving a new mould to all the different aspects of music, namely, composition, tune, metre, technique, and melody. A portion of the book was written and shown to the poet during his lifetime, and his deeply touching remarks put on the front-page in facsimile have added to the value of the book. An instructive chapter has been devoted to Rabindranath's dramas and another to his signal contributions in the sphere of Hindu dancing. The biographical touches here and there have made the book immensely interesting.

S. S.

### HINDI

**JAGANNATH KA RATH.** BY SRI AUROBINDO. *Published by Sri Aurobindo Granthmala, 16, Rue Desbassin de Richmond, Pondicherry. Pp. 36. Price 8 As.*

This little book is a new publication in Hindi of Sri Aurobindo's *Jagannath Rath*, originally published in Bengali. The translator is Sri Madan Gopal Garhodiya. Sri Aurobindo is looked upon by many as a seer as well as a great teacher of modern times, and the addition of this little book of Sri Aurobindo to those already translated and published by the Aurobinda Granthmala will be welcomed by the Hindi-reading public. *Jagannath Ka Rath* contains five essays, and the translator has succeeded in depicting in clear Hindi the somewhat abstruse and mystic language of Sri Aurobindo.

We hope the Granthmala will soon undertake the translation in Hindi of some of

Sri Aurobindo's more important works like *The Life Divine*. The Hindi-knowing public has so far been deprived of taking advantage of the spiritual teachings of this great work, and it is time that its translation is made available to them.

D. D. PUNETHA

### SANSKRIT

**PREMA-VIJAYAH.** BY SUNDARESHA SARMA. *Published by the General Stores, Tanjore. Pp. 74. Price Re. 1/-.*

It is always a pleasure to read a well-written drama. Poet T. S. Sundaresha Sarma deserves the heartiest thanks of the Sanskrit-knowing public for presenting before them his drama *Prema-vijayah* written in so very chaste and elegant Sanskrit. The style of the drama is so simple and attractive that even a casual reader will not fail to appreciate the beauty of the composition. In these days of declining Sanskrit culture, it is all the more heartening to see a real poet writing a new drama in the Sanskrit language. The story of the play is not in the least uninteresting and hackneyed, there being the triumph of love depicted in a really beautiful manner. We whole-heartedly recommend the drama to the public, wishing at the same time to see more new original Sanskrit works of the author.

PROF. DINESH CHANDRA GUHA

**SITAVICHARA-LAHARI.** BY N. GOPALA PILLAI, M.A., *Principal, H. H. The Maharaja's Sanskrit College, Trivandrum. With a Foreword by Sir C. P. Ramaswami Aiyar and an Introduction by Mahakabi Ullur S. Parameshwara Aiyar. Pp. vii+49. Price not mentioned.*

The task of a translator is always very hard. To keep the entire spirit and matter of the original in translating it is all the more difficult. The difficulty becomes almost insurmountable when one tries to maintain a natural and idiomatic style in the translation. Mr. N. Gopala Pillai, M.A., has been able to show all the qualifications of a good translator in rendering in beautiful Sanskrit verse the celebrated poem of Kumaran Asan; and he deserves special congratulations of the Sanskrit-knowing world on producing such an excellent piece of work which has all the merits of an original one. We have no doubt that the reader will be charmed to read the *Sitāvichāralahari*, and unless he is reminded that it is a translation, he will not be able to understand it to be so—a remarkable achievement of the translator indeed.

PROF. DINESH CHANDRA GUHA



# NEWS AND REPORTS

## THE RAMAKRISHNA MISSION'S 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 48 centres, which are scattered over 15 districts and cover 257 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 first half of October 782 mds. 15 srs. of rice, 87 mds. 20 srs. of atta, etc., Rs. 1,311-10-6 in cash and 2,245 pieces of new cloth were distributed among 13,818 recipients, and 458 mds. 21 srs. of rice and 7 mds. 15 srs. of atta, etc., were sold at concession rates to 6,176 persons, the total number of recipients being 19,994.

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 4,450 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, at Mymensingh, Belur and Taki (24-Perganas), the daily average being 470. Moreover, we are co-operating with other relief parties in running free kitchens and milk canteens at Sarisha (24-Perganas), Salkia (Howrah) and Berhampore (Murshidabad).

The total receipts up to the 15th October are Rs. 1,53,979-5-3 and the total expenditure including outstanding bills is Rs. 1,02,314-1-0. We have also received 2,066 mds. 32 srs.

12 chs. 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. To cope with the situation at least partially, the work requires immediate and wide-scale expansion. For want of funds and food-grains, particularly owing to transport difficulties, our efforts in this direction have not been successful. The need of cloth also is very acute.

### *Cyclone Relief Work*

The work is at present being conducted in 200 villages of Midnapore and 24-Perganas. During the first half of October we distributed from our 8 centres 4,983 mds. 37 srs. 9 chs. of rice, 323 mds. 10 srs. 6 chs. of paddy, 471 mds. 39 srs. of dal, and 22 tins of barley to 61,586 recipients. Homoeopathic and allopathic medicines and diet, etc., are also given from four of our centres. At our Haludbari and Kalicharanpur centres 1,073 sick persons, mostly malaria patients, were treated with allopathic medicines, and at the Kedgerree and Contai centres, 380 patients were treated with homoeopathic medicines.

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 ear-marked for any of the above relief activities, however small, will be thankfully received and acknowledged by the Secretary, Ramakrishna Mission, P.O. Belur Math, Dt. Howrah.

SWAMI MADHAVANANDA  
Secretary, Ramakrishna Mission,  
25. 10. '43.