

PRABUDDHA BHARATA

VOL. LX

MAY, 1955

No. 5



“उत्तिष्ठत जाग्रत प्राप्य वरान्निबोधत ।”

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

AN UNFINISHED ARTICLE BY SWAMI VIVEKANANDA

My mind can best grasp the religions of the world, ancient or modern, dead or living, through this fourfold division:

1. **Symbology**—The employment of various external aids to preserve and develop the religious faculty of man.
2. **History**—The philosophy of each religion as illustrated in the lives of Divine or human teachers acknowledged by each religion. This includes mythology, for what is mythology to one race or period is or was history to other races or periods. Even in cases of human teachers much of their history is taken as mythology by successive generations.
3. **Philosophy**—The rationale of the whole scope of each religion.
4. **Mysticism**—The assertion of something superior to sense knowledge and reason, which particular persons, or all persons under certain circumstances, possess; and which runs through the other divisions also.

All the religions of the world, past or present, embrace one or more of these divisions, the highly developed ones having all the four.

Of these highly developed religions again, some had no sacred book or books and they have disappeared; but those which were based on sacred books are living to the present day. As such all the great religions of the world today are founded on sacred books.

The Vedic on the Vedas (misnamed the Hindu or Brāhmanic);

The Avestic on the Avesta;

The Mosaic on the Old Testament;

The Buddhistic on the Tripitaka;

The Christian on the New Testament;

The Mohammedan on the Quoran.

The Tāoists and the Confucianists in China, having also books, are so inextricably mixed up with the Buddhistic form of religion as to be catalogued with Buddhism.

Again, although strictly speaking there are no absolutely racial religions, yet it may be said that of this group the Vedic, the Mosaic, and the Avestic religions are confined to the

racés to which they originally belonged; while the Buddhistic, the Christian, and the Mohammedan religions have been from their very beginning 'spreading' religions.

The struggle will be between the Buddhists and Christians and Mohammedans to conquer the world and the racial religions also will have unavoidably to join in the struggle. Each one of these religions, racial or 'spreading', has already been split into various branches and has undergone vast changes, consciously or unconsciously, to adapt itself to varying circumstances. This very fact shows that not one of them is fitted alone to be the religion of the entire human race. Each religion being the effect of certain peculiarities of the race it sprang from, and being in turn the cause of the intensification and preservation of those very peculiarities, not one of them can fit the universal human nature. Not only so, but there is a negative element in each. Each one helps the growth of a certain part of human nature, but represses everything else which the race from which it sprang had not. Thus for one religion to become universal would be dangerous and degenerating to man.

Now the history of the world shows that the two dreams, viz. that of a universal political empire and that of a universal religious empire, have been long before mankind; but that again and again the plans of the greatest conquerors had been frustrated by the splitting up of his territories before he could conquer a considerable part of the earth and that similarly every religion had been split into sects before it was fairly out of its cradle.

Yet it seems to be true, that the solidarity of the human race, social as well as religious, with a scope for infinite variation, is the plan of nature; and if the line of least resistance is the true line of action it seems to me that this splitting up of each religion into sects is the preservation of religion, by frustrating the tendency to rigid sameness, as well as the clear indication to us of the line of procedure.

The end seems, therefore, to be not destruction but a multiplication of sects until each individual is a sect unto himself. Again a background of unity will come by the fusion of all the existing religions into one grand philosophy. In the mythologies or the ceremonials there will never be unity, because we differ more in the concrete than in the abstract. Even while admitting the same *principle*, men will differ as to the greatness of each of his ideal teacher.

So, by this fusion will be found out a union of philosophy as the basis of union, leaving each at liberty to choose his teacher or his form as illustrations of that unity. This fusion is what is naturally going on for thousands of years; only, by mutual antagonism, it has been woefully held back.

Instead of antagonizing, therefore, we must help all such interchange of ideas between different races, by sending teachers to each other, so as to educate humanity in all the various religions of the world; but we must insist, as the great Buddhist Emperor of India, Ashoka, did in the second century before Christ, not to abuse others, nor to try to make a living out of others' faults; but to help, to sympathize, and to enlighten all.

There is a great outcry going over the world against metaphysical knowledge as opposed to what is styled physical knowledge. This crusade against the metaphysical and the 'beyond this life', to establish the present life and the present world on a firmer basis, is fast becoming a fashion to which even the preachers of religion, one after another, are fast succumbing.

Of course, the unthinking multitude are always following things which present to them a pleasing surface; but when those who ought to know better follow unmeaning fashions, pseudo-philosophical though they profess to be, it becomes a mournful fact.

Now, no one denies that our senses, as long as they are normal, are the most trustworthy guides we have; and the facts they

gather in for us form the very foundation of the structure of human knowledge.

But if they mean that all human knowledge is only sense perception, and nothing but that, we deny it.

If by physical sciences are meant systems of knowledge which are entirely based and built upon sense perception, and nothing but that, we contend that such a science never existed nor will ever exist. Neither will any system of knowledge, built upon sense perception alone, ever be a science.

Senses no doubt cull the materials of knowledge, and find similarities and dissimilarities, but there they have to stop.

In the first place, the physical gatherings of facts are conditioned by certain metaphysical conceptions, such as space and time. Secondly, grouping facts, or generalization, is impossible without some abstract notion as the background. The higher the generalization, the more metaphysical is the abstract background upon which the detached facts are arranged.

Now such ideas as matter, force, mind, law, causation, time, and space are the results of very high abstractions, and nobody has ever sensed any one of them; in other words they are entirely metaphysical.

Yet without these metaphysical conceptions, no physical fact is possible to be understood. Thus a certain motion becomes understood when it is referred to a force, certain sensations to matter, certain changes outside to law, certain changes in thought to mind, certain order singly to causation, and joined to time to law. Yet nobody has seen or even imagined matter or force, law or causation, time or space.

It may be urged that these, as abstracted concepts, do not exist, and that these abstractions are nothing separate or separable from the groups, of which they are, so to say, only qualities.

Apart from the question whether abstractions are possible or not, or whether there is something besides the generalized groups or not, it is plain that these notions of matter or

force, time or space, causation, law or mind are held to be units abstracted and independent of the groups, and that it is only when they are thought of as such, that they furnish themselves as explanations of the facts in sense-perception.

That is to say, apart from the validity of these notions we see two facts about them—first they are metaphysical, second, that only as metaphysical do they explain the physical and not otherwise.

Whether the external conforms to the internal or the internal to the external, whether matter conforms to mind or mind to matter, whether the surroundings mould the mind or the mind moulds the circumstances, is an old old question, and is still today as new and vigorous as it ever was.

Apart from the question of precedence or causation, without trying to solve the problem as to whether the mind is the cause of matter or matter the cause of mind, it is evident that whether the external was formed by the internal or not, it must conform itself to the internal for us to be able to know it. Supposing that the external world is the cause of the internal, yet we shall have to admit that the external world, as cause of our mind, is unknown and unknowable, because the mind can only know that much, or that view, of the external which conforms to, or is a reflection of, its own nature. That which is its own reflection could not have been its cause. Now, that view of the whole mass of existence, which is cut off by mind, and known, cannot certainly be the cause of mind, as its very existence is known in and through the mind.

Thus it is impossible to deduce mind from matter. Nay, it is absurd. Because on the very face of it that portion of existence which is bereft of the qualities of thought and life and endowed with the quality of externality is called matter, and that portion which is bereft of externality and endowed with the qualities of thought and life is called mind.

Now to prove matter from mind, or mind from matter is to deduce from each the very qualities we have taken away from each, and

therefore, all the fight about the causality of mind or matter is merely a word puzzle and nothing more. Again, throughout all these controversies runs as a rule the fallacy of imparting different meanings to the words 'mind' and 'matter'. If sometimes the word 'mind' is used as something opposed and external to matter and at other times as something which embraces both the mind and matter, i.e. of which both the external and internal are parts; on the materialistic side the word 'matter' is sometimes used in the restricted sense of something external which we sense and again it means something which is the cause of all the phenomena both external and internal. The materialist frightens the idealist by claiming to derive his mind from the elements of the laboratory, while all the time he is struggling to express something higher than all elements and atoms, something of which both the external and the internal phenomena are results, and which he terms matter.

The idealist, on the other hand, wants to derive all the elements and atoms of the materialist from his own thought, even while catching glimpses of something which is the cause of both mind and matter, and which he oft-times calls God. That is to say, one party wants to explain the whole universe by a portion which is external, the other by another portion which is internal.

Both of these attempts are impossible. Mind and matter cannot explain each other. The only explanation to be sought for is in something which will embrace both matter and mind.

It may be argued that thought cannot exist without mind, for supposing there was a time when there was no thought, matter, as we know it, certainly could not have existed. On the other hand, it may be said that knowledge being impossible without experience, and experience presupposing the external world, the existence of mind, as we know it is impossible without the existence of matter.

Nor is it possible that either of them had a beginning. Generalization is the essence of

knowledge. Generalization is impossible without a storage of similarities. Even the fact of comparison is impossible without previous experience. Knowledge thus is impossible without previous knowledge; and knowledge necessitating the existence of both thought and matter, both of them are without beginning.

Again generalization, the essence of sense-knowledge, is impossible without something upon which the detached facts of perception unite. The whole world of external perceptions requires something upon which to unite in order to form a concept of the world, as painting must have its canvas.

If thought or mind be this canvas to the external world it in its turn requires another.

Mind, being a series of different feelings and willings, and not a unit, requires something besides itself as its background of unity. Here all analysis is bound to stop, for a real unity has been found. The analysis of a compound cannot stop until an indivisible unit has been reached. The fact that presents us with such a *unity* for both thought and matter, must necessarily be the last indivisible basis of every phenomenon, for we cannot conceive any further analysis, nor is any further analysis necessary, as this includes an analysis of all our external and internal perceptions.

So far then, we see that a totality of mental and material phenomena, *and* something beyond, upon which they are both playing, is the result of our investigation.

Now this something beyond is not in sense-perception, it is a logical necessity and a feeling of its undefinable presence runs through all our sense-perceptions. We see also that to this something we are driven by the sheer necessity of being true to our reason and generalizing faculty.

It may be urged that there is no necessity whatsoever of postulating any such substance or being beyond the mass of mental and material phenomena. The totality of phenomena is all that we know or can know, and it requires nothing beyond itself to explain itself. An analysis beyond the senses is impossible,

and that the feeling of a substance in which everything inheres is simply an illusion.

We see, that from the most ancient times, there has been these two schools among thinkers. One party claims that the unavoidable necessity of the human mind to form concepts and abstractions is the natural guide to knowledge and that it can stop nowhere until we have transcended all phenomena and formed a concept which is absolute in all directions, transcending time, space, and causality. Now if this ultimate concept is arrived at by analysing the whole phenomena of thought and matter, step by step, taking the cruder first and resolving it into a finer, and still finer, until we arrive at something which stands as the solution of everything else, it is obvious that everything else beyond this final result is a momentary modification of itself, and as such, this final result alone is real and everything else is but its shadow. The reality therefore is not in the senses but beyond them.

On the other hand, the other party holds that the only reality in the universe is what our senses bring to us and although a sense of something beyond hangs on to all our sense perceptions that is only a trick of the mind, and therefore unreal.

Now, a changing something can never be understood without the idea of something unchanging, and if it be said that that unchanging to which the changing is referred, is also a changing phenomenon only relatively unchanging, and therefore to be referred to something else, and so on, we say that however infinitely long this series be, the very fact of our inability to understand a changeable

without an unchangeable forces us to postulate one as the background of all the changeable. And no one has the right to take one part of a whole as right and reject the other at will. If one takes the obverse of a coin he must take its reverse also, howsoever he may dislike it.

Again, with every movement man asserts his freedom. From the highest thinker to the most ignorant man everyone knows that he is free. Now every man at the same time finds out with a little thinking that every action of his had motives and conditions and given those motives and conditions his particular action can be as rigorously deduced as any other fact in causation.

Here again the same difficulty occurs. Man's will is as rigorously bound by the law of causation as the growth of any little plant or the falling of a stone, and yet, through all this bondage runs the indestructible idea of freedom.

Here also the totality side will declare that the idea of freedom is an illusion and man is wholly a creature of necessity.

Now on one hand this denial of freedom as an illusion is no explanation; on the other hand, why not say that the idea of necessity or bondage or causation is an illusion of the ignorant? Any theory which can fit itself to facts which it wants to explain by first cutting as much of it as prevents its fitting itself into them is on the face of it wrong. Therefore the only way left to us is to admit that the body is not free, neither is the will; but that there must be something beyond both mind and body which is free and

'As a lump of salt dropped into water dissolves with water, and no one is able to pick it up, but whencesoever one takes, it tastes salt, even so, my dear, this great, endless, infinite Reality is but Pure Intelligence. . . .'

—*Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad*

RESURGENCE OF ASIA—III

THE TRAINING OF LEADERS

BY THE EDITOR

So Asia is half awake and half asleep. The movement is there but the consciousness is lacking. She observes the advanced nations of the world, their powers and enjoyments, and wants to emulate them. Exploiting hands, turned friendly under pressure of circumstances, are extended; and advice, gratis and with loans and gifts of every kind, is offered. But suspicion, not unwarranted, intervenes, and the offers are rejected. She wants the enjoyments of the advanced nations but not their hatred and preparations for an exterminating war, their achievements but not their soul-killing materialism. Asia's hoary past of blessed spirituality has claimed her peoples for all times; yet her present degradation, her poverty and squalor, raise doubts as to its efficacy in modern times and sets her thinking if she were to follow the West to be happy and prosperous. She observes the present plight of Europe and America and turns back. Japan, who never hesitated before, has lost her cocksureness after the last World War. China has chosen the path of Russia, though with some qualification. How far she would repudiate her past she is yet to think out. India and Burma took keen interest in the phenomenal progress of Russia and were on the verge of deciding in her favour when disquieting news percolated; they stopped and mused. Will they take to their own traditions? They decided to prefer freedom to prosperity if the two are really incompatible. Though it is pretty certain that they are not going red, their leaders, at least some prominent ones, are not very willing to accept spirituality as the basis of their future culture. This hesitancy to choose and follow up is noticeable in all the western and south-western countries as well.

We have noted that spirituality, rather than religion, and morality, based on and oriented towards the universal brotherhood of man, are bred in the bone of the Eastern nations and are the common bonds that bind them together. It is foolish and useless to try to cut ourselves off from these wholesome moorings. The West has given us sufficient warning. We have discussed also the change in, or rather the re-interpretation of, religion that is required, and the steps that should be taken to bring it into line with spirituality, thus making it the vanguard of peace and prosperity.

The church and the priestly class as well as the military lords or juntas are to serve and not to govern. They must democratize themselves or go the way of kings and emperors. Kings and peoples combined and dislodged the popes but spirituality remains, for it is the core and essence of man; the nobles and peoples joined hands and dethroned kings but administration remains, for law and order are the laws of man's being; now peoples are marching on, shoulder to shoulder, to pull down nobility or aristocracy, which will go without doubt, but culture and humanity will abide as long as two men tread on the globe, for they are those. So the real powers and virtues of the priest, the king, the noble, and the people remain unchanged but the masks fell or are falling. This is the law of evolution—the true, the real, the beneficent remain; and the false, the fake, the evil drop off. The church, the king, and the noble derived their powers and merits from the people, remained and prospered as long as the people were benefited, and vanished when they clashed with or stood against the interests of the people.

Who ply ships and fly 'planes and win battles? Who fire shells and release H bombs? The people—who are the source of all powers and virtues; and they are to be served and worshipped. Man was ignorant and he governed and became vain. Knowledge came to him and he serves and is humble. In pride and madness he waged wars and snatched away wealth and property; in humility and sanity he seeks peace and gives away and lightens his encumbrance. He deprived others and became small; he deprives himself and is great and one with all. Where has the priest, the king, and the noble gone? To the people. And who have gained in this grand festivity of giving away? The people, in whom are included the former priests, kings, and nobles. Who then have lost? The titles and the false sense of importance.

The people have come to their own. Thus enthroned and worshipped they wake up to their own greatness and manifest the dormant divinity. This manifestation of the noblest in man, which is divinity or spirituality, is what is real religion. This religion should not and cannot be suppressed; on the contrary, its practice should be encouraged by all collective and individual efforts and methods. To awaken peoples to this great task is the most important duty of all the Asian leaders from Arabia and Turkey to Japan, Philippines, and Indonesia, which comprise the East or Asia. Palestine, Arabia, Iran, India, China—all these lands gave birth to saints, prophets, and avatars, and are still the sources of spiritual inspiration. What is expected of their leaders is to give a little jogging to the slumbering peoples. Let the peoples awaken to their spiritual heritage, all else will come as a matter of course.

How to bring about this awakening is not the problem, for 'education' is the obvious answer. The real problem is what things are to be taught and by whom. The supply of necessities and even amenities of life must get the primary over everything else. But lest in the planning and imparting of educa-

tion we lose sight of the goal and take a path, the progress along which widens the declension, we are to associate the goal with all its various stages and branches, so as to make deviation impossible anywhere. This association being so important, the qualification of the educator is of the greatest consequence. He must what they call 'live the life', i.e. by long and constant pondering over and practice of the ideal he has to attune his nerves to it so thoroughly that any slight fall of temperature in the moral atmosphere around will cause an intense pain in his heart. This feeling of a genuine pain at the shortcomings and deviations by the teacher is the most potent means of inculcating any ideal upon a learner. It must act as a matter of course to be un-failing in its results, to be irresistible. This means that the teachers themselves must undergo a long, strenuous course of training. As teachers' teachers are not available, all the training and inspiration must come from within the teachers themselves; and as collective efforts are mutually more helpful than individual endeavours and as the teachers are to organize bigger groups of children and youths to make them fit for still larger institutions, it is imperative that they get their training in an organization, especially or primarily meant for the purpose. The ideal being the unification of Asia on the basis of spirituality, such training centres should seek representatives from as many Asian countries as possible. Their living together in love and amity and showing respect for their peculiar habits and customs, and in the spirit of labouring in the same vineyard of the Lord for the same identical end, will itself be the highest practical training conducive to the realization of the goal. Man's innate narrowness, born of generations of social and family training regarding food, dress, and habits of mutual intercourse and thought can never be transcended unless the teachers themselves imbibe the spirit by actually living the life, and impart the same to students, not by precepts but by example. The deep-seated superstitions and prejudices

can never be overcome except by practice under strenuous circumstances, receiving shocks and knocks with a good grace and with an iron will to learn at all costs.

II

Location of such a training centre for teachers is equally important; for the country where it can be started must inspire confidence in the hearts of trainees from other countries, and the government must be prepared to create a favourable atmosphere for its true development and render sufficient financial assistance to it. To breed confidence, it must be the declared policy of the country's government and an overwhelming majority of the educated public, that they would not join any power block and maintain friendly relation with all, irrespective of the form of government, social order, or religious faith of any country. The consent and co-operation of both the people and the government are necessary, for governments are liable to change, and people's help is rendered ineffectual if the government be against a scheme. This indispensable criterion is fulfilled by India alone. Undoubtedly there are people in India who are extremely bigoted in matters religious, social, and even political. But they do not count; and the number of broad-minded persons is increasing every day, and as to the quality and power of the latter there is no doubt that they are far superior to all the others put together.

This is due to the fact that all the all-India leaders since the days of Raja Rammohan Roy have unhesitatingly preached universalism in social and religious spheres—a universalism that has been taken to the field of politics by the saint of Sabarmati so effectively that it has surpassed the results noticeable in the other two domains. World-opinion and the unqualified admission by the Asian countries indicate that they hold India a truly neutral country genuinely seeking the good of humanity. There is, further, a compelling reason for this attitude of India, which being a country of many religions, races, and social

orders, cannot afford to be narrow in any important matter without falling into disorder, which her past history has bitterly taught her not to repeat.

The location of such a centre in India will be greatly beneficial to the country itself by directing the nation's attention to the significance of the institution and chastening its endeavours to rise equal to the call on the one hand and by intensifying the friendly feelings of all the Asian countries towards her on the other.

A common language for the free and adequate exchange of thoughts and feelings is necessary. It is a delicate problem. And it has to be decided in the best-interests of all. The size and population of China and India can reasonably enlist votes for the language of either country. It will, however, be foolish to decide that way. If most of these trainees are to learn a new language, it is wise to learn one that will give them the greatest benefit in all international deliberations, as also an easy access to the thoughts of the world. Such a language is English. All important thoughts in any advanced country is immediately rendered into English and find the widest circulation throughout the world. French comes next. But in view of the fact that English is the language of U.S.A. and the Commonwealth countries, the two leading groups of nations, our decision should be in its favour. The consideration of its being a non-Asian language or the sentiment of humiliation or enmity should not weigh with us. Our purpose is to make ourselves most efficient in as many ways as possible. English being the language that is understood in the largest number of countries in all the continents, we gain by adopting this language as the medium of instruction and in common talks and discussions in such an all-Asian centre of training as the one proposed. There is, further, a surcharge of emotions, which are generally irrational, in all the countries of Asia; and this language, coming as it does from matter-of-fact mercantile nations, would help us to curb this unneces-

sary dissipation of energy which outbursts of emotions are. If, however, the trainees learn an Asian language other than their own it would stand them in good stead in their direct dealings with the country of that language. So it is advisable to have a second Asian language included in the curriculum; and the delegates will gain if they learn more. But the medium of common dealings should be English.

What would the teachers do in that centre? Their aim being the establishment of the friendliest possible relations among the countries, cultivation of that intimacy through games and sports, through common board and lodging, through interchange of ideas by free and frank talks and discussions on all current problems and cultural peculiarities should be the preoccupations of the inmates; and there must prevail an atmosphere of informality, as of a family. All the teachers are expected to be fully informed of the culture of their own land, the mental traits of the people, the prevalent social, political, moral, and religious movements, and the ideals and activities of the various groups. Dailies and periodicals and books dealing with modern topics should pour in from the mother countries to these teachers to keep them well informed of what their peoples are thinking and doing, and to initiate debates and to get the opinions of other leaders in the light of information received from other countries. Such collocation of facts viewed from different angles and diverse settings and perspectives will give a correct understanding of a situation and yield a practical solution that will be beneficial to all or most and cause irritation to none. Full utilization of a library well stocked with books dealing with ideas on cultural and practical subjects will sufficiently occupy and broaden and enlighten the minds of the inmates and make them intellectually fit for the leadership of their countries and the continent.

What, however, is of prime importance is the moral and spiritual training by ardent contemplation and feeling of oneness with the

underlying unity of being and consciousness that is the source, sustenance, and end of the bewildering multiplicity of modes and forms, of things and beings; and the application of this truth in the daily life of this brotherhood of many nations, by calling forth the love and reverence for that unity whose modes are the beings. For, if this contemplation and application are wanting, no amount of material benefit and secular feeling can bring about and sustain the love and goodwill required to tide over difficult situations that are bound to crop up now and then. It is an experience tried and found successful through the millennia of human history of individuals and groups though not of nations. Now is the time when this experiment is to be repeated in the wider sphere of many nations; and logic and psychology being in its favour, there need be no misgiving regarding its success. Man must know his nature to be successful in his undertakings. He must know what cross tendencies obstruct his progress, what devils are leading him astray, and what a benign power is working for freeing him from their clutches and waking him up to his true nature of universalism. The dawn of this consciousness must bathe with its calm and serene light our life—individual, national, and international—if we are ready and determined to usher in the new era of divine blessedness. It is Asia's task, it is Asia's sacrifice, it is Asia's sure achievement. She lives for this.

When the prospective leaders enter, through this training, into the spirit of all the Asian nations—their hopes and aspirations, their historical and racial characteristics, their virtues and vices—and develop a genuine love and sympathy and an active desire to help and be helped, they will have discussed and arrived at common plans of operation in various spheres of their national lives leading to a general 'co-prosperity' of Asia. What remains now to add is the acquisition of a first-hand knowledge of the countries concerned. By travelling together and studying problems on the spot, so to say, and endear-

ing themselves to the peoples and governments of the countries they visit, their intellectual equipments will be rid of all visionary stuff that might have crept in during the theoretical training period. But before setting out on this continental tour they must get a thorough training in statesmanship. Wherever they will go they are to seek out problems and test their abilities by meeting important people and thus widen and deepen their own knowledge and experience. This practical training in statesmanship is very important in view of the fact that in most oriental countries every agitator considers himself to be a leader and claims to lead and to be heard. True leadership must supplant these false prophets and selfish upstarts.

This institution is for training leaders in all-Asian politics and economics. There may be other bodies run on similar lines to train leaders in other spheres of activities, such as engineering and medical. The main purpose of the members of the various institutions of this type would be to learn to think in terms of Asia and to live the life to realize that end; and the study of special subjects and problems should always occupy a secondary position and be directed to enhance this common end. The trainees, however, should never lose sight of the ultimate end of the human existence, viz. to serve humanity individually and as a whole as the Divine and thus to be Divine. For if this ideal be not always kept in view, they may, in their zeal and enthusiasm, pit Asia against other continents and commit the same old mistakes of their elders and forbears which have led humanity to this dangerous stage of imminent annihilation. So Asia must be taken as a symbol of humanity, and the solution of an Asian problem must be capable of being extended to the whole human race. National and continental problems must be tackled in a spirit of charity and service and in terms of abundance and overflow, to reach the widest circle of beings.

The UNO has failed, because the delegates are sent there to safeguard the interests of

their respective nations. If they do not follow the instructions of their own governments, which are all narrow and selfish, they are recalled and 'suitable' persons are sent. They are but thoroughly briefed advocates of their nations. With such persons at the helm of affairs better results cannot be expected. Even if just and generous persons go there they would not produce better results, for the controlling power is in other hands. The national governments must themselves be generous and charitable to send proper delegates to the UNO to make it a real blessing to mankind. And such delegates, without a practical training in universalism and a knowledge and grasp of problems and their solutions, cannot give that august body the dignity it deserves. The leading nations in the UNO, we mean their governments, are too narrow in outlook, are too 'practical', to accept and act up to this universalism, which requires a high idealism and a spirit of sacrifice. Consisting of too many nations in different grades of culture and civilization and prone to succumb to the wirepullings of interested nations, it is too unwieldy and unreliable a body to undertake the necessary reforms to make it a really universal organization to serve the purpose of peace and prosperity. Hence arises the necessity of having a smaller body with delegates from nations who are fired with the ideal and want their best young men to get the required practical training to realize the ideal, at least in their limited sphere of activity, and to wait for the time when, seeing their lives and ways of solving life's problems, others would join willingly or start similar organizations of their own, ultimately to bring the ideal UNO into being as their crowning achievement.

There are indications that some of the Asian countries have caught the spirit and are eager to do something towards the achievement of this ideal; there are others who do not see any harm in joining such a venture; there are still others who think it advantageous to join a clique that would support their legitimate claims against political and

economic oppression and exploitation. But all of them have a culture at their back which is universal in outlook and for which the peoples have a genuine regard and veneration. So let us have an institution of such an all-Asian character to train the best youths of the continent to realize the high ideal. Self-training makes individuals perfect.

This Asian training to Asia's ideal will make this part of the globe great, happy, and prosperous.

III

It would not be difficult for India to allot an extensive plot of land for the purpose and to offer all possible amenities to the inmates; funds also will be available if the nations so will. But the selection of the proper type of teachers, to start with, would not be so easy, for such people are rare indeed. To transcend all narrowness, social, national, racial, and cultural and to love and revere others in spite of faults and shortcomings, simply because the Divine perfection lurks within each soul, to infuse and maintain the spirit of comradeship in the face of irritations and to combine robust realism and practicality with high idealism and intellectuality, are endowments found in rare personalities, but absolutely necessary for this great task ahead. This requires intensive training and no country is even conscious of the dire necessity of such training.

Great personalities are, no doubt, born in many countries; but even they have shortcomings, which would render them unfit for such teachership. Such being the case, we are to give up the idea of having a permanent staff of teachers. They should be recruited from the best brains and characters of the nations concerned on a temporary basis. They are to come and live with the trainees and guide deliberations on special subjects, themselves taking part on equal footing with their students in other matters under similar guidance of specialists from other countries. It is desirable that the first batch of teachers should be leaders of international repute so as

to draw a spontaneous love and regard from the students; and that their selection be made by an international body of the Asian-African conference type. The curricula should be comprehensive in order to cover all possible topics necessary for the improvement of the various countries and the study should be intensive with regard to the collection of data, consideration of alternative means, and co-operation among member nations. Naturally the leader-teachers will have to be thoroughly conversant with their own subjects and must have a working knowledge of other problems in whose deliberations they are to join. Thus the temporary residence of these leaders in the trainees' camp will improve and broaden their own knowledge and experience, which will redound to the advantage of their respective national governments.

This scheme of being trained by the noblest and cleverest sons of the Asian countries and living in *camaraderie* with the leaders of thought and activity will be a rare privilege for the trainees, because it is thus, more than in other ways, that they will enter into the real spirit and genius of these countries, which will lead them to the solution of problems to the highest advantage of the peoples concerned. Nobility is a universal quality, and the noble children of any country are the best specimen of humanity. What they live and preach, consciously and unconsciously, tend to peace and happiness, as to general prosperity. The main purpose of such an institution being this noble universalism, they are the fittest teachers to the future leaders, the trainees. Their long association with the institution being impossible at present, when none of the countries can spare their services, this is the best practical solution, which will make up the deficiency in intensity with the richness in variety. In the incipient stage, when all the countries are so backward in education and even in social coherence, too intensive training runs the risk of being misunderstood. Richness in variety, providing many alternatives carefully chosen and oriented to the ultimate end, will prevent misunder-

standing, help to develop willing co-operation, and pave the way to strenuous efficiency in future. When co-operation and efficiency are offered as alternatives it is wise to choose the former, which is the basis of all undertakings and bids fair to lead to the latter.

One important question should be answered before the larger problem of the appointment of teachers is satisfactorily solved. Should the teachers be 'party men'? In every country there are various political parties, the members whereof are subjected to more or less intensive indoctrination. Can such indoctrination be consistent with the universal outlook that is the aim of this training centre? In the abstract the ideal is accepted by all, the moment it is stated; but when a group of people honestly set to work out details, difficulties, almost insurmountable, crop up at every stage. To put only one case bluntly: Can the Communist ideal of universal brotherhood work in unison with that of the non-Communist? This is an important question in view of the fact that China is an Asian nation that is Communist, whereas Pakistan, though still amorphous, is anti-Communist. If these two countries are to send their best men as teachers, they would naturally send these two types of representatives. Can they live together in *camaraderie*, which is most important in such an institution?

The best solution of this rather knotty question is an attitude of mind that refuses to be bogged in *isms*, and analyses their contents, and accepts those that are not only consistent with but conducive to our ultimate end. What is our ultimate end? Surely the greatest good of the greatest number, which as certainly includes the underdogs, the suppressed and oppressed humanity, the masses, the labourers, who toil and do not get the necessaries and luxuries they produce. Do the democracies deny it? The other principle on which humanity rests is freedom, individual freedom. Do the Communists say 'no' to that? Or do the capitalists not admit that for the sake of society or for the country individual freedom should be curtailed, and

even denied under special circumstances, as during and after the Second World War? Is it, again, not a fact that individual freedom has been curtailed to an unwarranted degree in some countries, both Communist and non-Communist? Is nationalization of some industries a taboo for its own sake? What did the Socialist government of England do and will again do when they come to power? Let India alone. Or is private sector in industries prohibited in Communist countries? What about China? Is not nationalization a logical consummation of big combines and limited companies? There are principles, which are, strangely enough, common to *isms* that are apparently contradictory. So nothing or everything is a taboo under circumstances, and even the best principles are prostituted, if power is usurped by selfish people or groups. Therefore the wisest way of judging any theory is not to fall in love with or turn inimical to it as a whole but to test the principles it involves in all their bearings and see if they or some of them are capable of universal application. If they do we must be ready to accept them without caring for their name or the nationality of their discoverers or followers. Men must be bold enough to face truth, benign or terrible.

Nobody hides anything except his weakness. If Communism is a correct theory iron curtain is useless, nay harmful. If Western democracy is strong MacCarthyism is foolish and irritating. It was Hitler's weakness that drove away the Jews from Germany; it is America's weakness that has made the lives of eminent scientists insecure and uncomfortable, it is the weakness of the whites in South Africa that leads them to practise the invidious racialism and dig their own graves. If Asia is to rise she must rise in strength; if she is to expand she must expand in love and amity; if she is to 'penetrate' she must penetrate in her welcome holiness. Hence the institution for training leaders should not slam its doors against a teacher simply because he is a 'party man'. Does he love humanity? Is his heart free from hatred or jealousy against any

section of mankind? Is he a man of character? Is he competent to teach what he is coming to teach? If the exacting standard implied in these questions is fulfilled nobody is to be debarred from occupying a chair in this college.

Being in a party does not necessarily preclude universal outlook, though there are men in every party who are rabid; it is the latter class of people who disqualify themselves to tread the sacred precincts of such an organization. If any government send such a representative to this college they expose themselves as insincere, they may do it not without an ulterior motive. Purity of means, as of the end, is absolutely necessary for the success of this institution. And as the best brains and hearts are gathered together for the achievement of a grand ideal it will not be easy to throw dust into the eyes of the trainees and the teachers for any length of time, however clever may be the man or the nation that would like to exploit it.

The UNO is a political body, its constitution bristles with selfish and narrow clauses, men are sent there with set purposes to grind their national axes. This is, on the other hand, a training centre, where men come and are sent to learn and live universal love and to discuss and devise methods to achieve the objective; only the institution is limited to Asian countries for the time being; every now and then it should check that the ways and means it adopts do really tend towards the ultimate goal and no deviation takes place anywhere in its workings.

Let men of diverse opinions and ideologies come and preach their plans and schemes of universal brotherhood based on love and goodwill for all sections of mankind and for all nations and countries; but they must be frank and sincere and must be above all temptations and keep their minds open to new thoughts and schemes, if they prove to be rational and wholesome, moral and spiritual. No forming of parties or groups will be countenanced. Opinions are to be formed on the basis of rational discussions and to be changed by

further debates in the light of new facts and arguments. Executive bodies are sometimes to face immediacy of action; but this being a deliberative body for the formation and dissemination of noble ideas and practical schemes for national well-being and international co-operation, to be put into effect only when they are accepted by the nations and governments, it need not labour under any compulsion of time nor should there be any secret and immoral canvassing of party politics. Plans should be discussed frankly and openly and as many times as are called for by the discovery of new plans and facts. If the purpose of the training centre is properly understood by the countries and their leaders, its detailed workings, in spite of honest divergence of opinions at the initial stages, will not present insurmountable difficulties. Difficulties there must be, should even be created, for to remove obstructions and obstacles is a valuable part of the training, which the inmates must learn by practice.

IV

This ideal of building a universal brotherhood on the basis of the divine nature of man, as we have seen, is still amorphous in most of the Asian countries. Some are not conscious of it; others are even antagonistic; many consider it a superfluous burden. Under such circumstances it is unlikely that many countries will approve the scheme of such an all-Asian training centre and actively cooperate with the few countries whose ideal is clear and who are eager to get their future leaders thoroughly trained for the task ahead. It may even be doubted if India would get one country to join her in the undertaking that appears to be so Utopian. Will then the idea be dropped, at least for the present?

If the idea is good, it must be propagated. What is the best honest propaganda but to give a practical shape to the idea and show by actual results that it works, and works to the best advantage of those who join the organization? Hence India is to start the institution even if none join her, not even

Burma, Ceylon, and Indonesia, who have grasped the ideal of the brotherhood quite correctly. The countries concerned are to judge the necessity of such an institution. If others decide in the negative India must 'walk alone', as her great poet has sung. This is the tax she must pay for the descent of Divine Grace on her, for having understood the future of mankind and being impelled to work for it. To the younger generation of India and to not a few of the older generation, these are not empty words or washy sentiments. The impulsion is too strong and serious to remain confined to ideas only. The elders are duty bound to provide a proper field for the ample play of the holy energy.

This will do immense good to India herself and the money and energy to be spent on the scheme will be repaid hundredfold. There are numerous political parties in the country, not based so much on principles as on personal ambition of leaders; and there are constant quarrels and bickerings within each camp, mostly due to the same cause. There are fissiparous tendencies still growing in the land that has seen the vision of brotherhood of mankind. There are no dearth of wicked persons who trouble the water and fish in it. A training centre for leadership will divert this exuberance of energy to fruitful channels. Moreover, ideas, unless realized in life by constant remembrance through activities, do no good either to the individual or to society; and, if pursued emotionally, develop split personalities and neurotics. And

lukewarm pursuance of ideas very soon chill down into inaction and lethargy. All these are to be guarded against if we are to reap a rich harvest of the Divine Grace. This can be done if an institution of this type is started in India in which best brains and characters would come willingly to take the needed training in universal love and brotherhood through discussions and elaborations of co-operative schemes and, above all, actually living the life of a spiritual commune, where petty exclusive ideas of food, dress, language, local habits and traditions would be looked down upon and healthy diversities would be honoured by enthusiastic participation. Such an institution will change the face of the country; racial and religious bigotry, which are on their last legs, and provincialism, which selfish politicians even in the Congress camp are spreading by actual participation and indirect instigation, will be things of the past. Once out of these blind alleys, the country will take to the grand road of true Indianism, which is love and brotherliness divine, which has built the culture of Asia and is going to shape the world. And when India comes to her own through the training received in such an institution other countries will send their trainees gladly and the college will assume the dignity of an all-Asian organization. In the mean time the institution must start functioning with the trainees of the willingly participating countries. We are sanguine to get at least another participant. If that too is denied India will 'walk alone' under God's guidance.

'Do not care for doctrines, do not care for dogmas, or sects, or churches or temples; they count for little compared with the essence of existence in each man, which is spirituality, and the more this is developed in a man the more powerful is he for good. Earn that first, acquire that, and criticise no one, for all doctrines and creeds have some good in them. Show by your lives that religion does not mean words, or names, or sects, but that it means spiritual realization.'

—Swami Vivekananda

NEW DISCOVERIES REGARDING SWAMI VIVEKANANDA—III

BY AN AMERICAN DEVOTEE

I

Before continuing with the story of the Parliament of Religions, which was left half finished in the previous installment, I am afraid I shall have to present some material regarding Swamiji that belongs to the pre-Parliament days. Regrettable as this chronological irregularity may be, it is inevitable, for during the preparation of this series of articles valuable new material keeps coming in, and it would be unfortunate not to share it with the readers of *Prabuddha Bharata*.

In the present instance the material has come from Mr. John K. Wright, son of Prof. and Mrs. John Henry Wright. Readers will remember that in the first installment of this series, which dealt with Swamiji's pre-Parliament days, a letter written by Mrs. Wright to her mother was reproduced, in which she told of Swamiji's visit to Annisquam in August 1893. At the close of her letter Mrs. Wright mentioned that she had taken some notes on that extraordinary event as material for a possible story. That story has now been discovered among her papers, and Mr. Wright has very kindly sent us a copy of it. Writing to us about it, he tells us that "sometime in or after 1897, she [his mother] prepared the account from the original notes, which have disappeared. She either typed it herself or had it typed by a stenographer and then thoroughly revised it in ink." Mr. Wright's deduction regarding the date of the manuscript is based on the fact that the typewriter on which it was written did not come into the family until 1897.

When we first received a copy of this manuscript, it seemed both familiar and new, and on comparing it with material in "The Life," we found, to be sure, that some portions of it had already been published. On page 416 of the fourth edition, readers will find an article, said to have come from a newspaper, which is a very much abridged version of the same story. Mr. Wright was not aware that his mother had contributed her article to a newspaper, and it is not known where or when it first appeared; but inasmuch as we are now in possession of the complete manuscript, this is of little importance. The unpublished portions comprise a good half of the original article and are, I believe, of absorbing interest, for they give an intimate picture of Swamiji from the pen of one who well understood that her subject was no ordinary person. But perhaps it is a picture that might also prove shocking. Mrs. Wright has caught Swamiji in one of his bursts of fire, hard for some to reconcile with his calm, all-compassionate, all-loving nature. Fire and compassion, however, are not disparate—indeed they often are as inseparable as the two sides of one coin. Swamiji's heart, one never can forget, was full of unhappiness for the suffering of his motherland, and correspondingly his mind was full of anger against all that contributed to her degradation. In the early days, as will be seen, he ascribed a great deal of that degradation to the imperialism of the British, and it was only natural that he would lash out against a people who had ruthlessly crushed those whom he loved. It is well known that when Swamiji later met the English people on their home ground he became an ardent admirer of their many noble characteristics, but, nonetheless, he never

changed his opinion of British imperialism, nor, for that matter, of any oppression of one people by another. Swamiji was a thorough student of the world's history, and whenever in the story of man's life he found injustice and inhumanity he never hesitated to point them out in no uncertain terms.

However, here are the unpublished portions of Mrs. Wright's article. For the sake of clarity and continuity I have here and there retained portions which have already been quoted in "The Life," and I have also found it necessary to omit a word or phrase here and there and to make a few minor corrections.

According to Mrs. Wright, the Annisquam villagers and the boarders at the Lodge first caught sight of Swamiji as, in company with Professor Wright, he crossed the lawn between the boardinghouse and the professor's cottage. So astonishing a sight did Swamiji present in this quiet little New England village that speculations set in at once as to who this majestic and colorful figure might be. From where had he come? What was his nationality? And so forth. The article continues as follows:

. . . Finally they decided that he was a Brahmin, and the theory was rudely shattered when that night, at supper, they saw him partake, wonderingly, but evidently with relish, of hash.

It was something that needed explanation and they unanimously repaired to the cottage after supper, to hear this strange new being discourse. . . .

"It was the other day," he said, in his musical voice, "only just the other day—not more than four hundred years ago." And then followed tales of cruelty and oppression, of a patient race and a suffering people, and of a judgment to come! "Ah, the English, the English," he said, "only just a little while ago they were savages, . . . the vermin crawled on the ladies' bodices, . . . and they scented themselves to disguise the abominable odor of their persons. . . . Most hor-r-rible! Even now, they are barely emerging from barbarism."

"Nonsense," said one of his scandalized hearers, "that was at least five hundred years ago."

"And did I not say 'a little while ago?' What are a few hundred years when you look at the antiquity of the human soul?" Then with a turn of tone, quite reasonable and gentle, "They are quite savage," he said. "The frightful cold, the want and privation of their northern climate," going on more quickly and warmly, "has made them *wild*. They only think to kill. . . . Where is their religion? They take the name of that Holy One, they claim to love their fellowmen, they civilize—by Christianity!—No! It is their hunger that has civilized them, not their God. The love of man is on their lips, in their hearts there is nothing but evil and every violence. 'I love you my brother, love you!' . . . and all the while they cut his throat! Their hands are red with blood." . . . Then, going on more slowly, his beautiful voice deepening till it sounded like a bell, "But the judgment of God will fall upon them. 'Vengeance is mine; I will repay, saith the Lord,' and destruction is coming. What are your Christians? Not one third of the world. Look at those Chinese, millions of them. They are the vengeance of God that will light upon you. There will be another invasion of the Huns," adding, with a little chuckle, "There will be another Attila. They will sweep over Europe, they will not leave one stone standing upon another. Men, women, children, all will go and the dark ages will come again." His voice was indescribably sad and pitiful; then suddenly and flippantly, dropping the seer, "Me,—I don't care! The world will rise up better from it, but it is coming. The vengeance of God, it is coming soon."

"Soon?" they all asked.

"It will not be a thousand years until it is done."

They drew a breath of relief. It did not seem imminent.

"And God will have vengeance," he went on. "You may not see it in religion, you may not see it in politics, but you must see it in history, and as it has been; it will come to pass. If you grind down the people, you will suffer. We in India are suffering the vengeance of God. Look upon these things. They ground down those poor people for their own wealth, they heard not the voice of distress, they ate from gold and silver when the people cried for bread, and the Mohammedans came upon them slaughtering and killing: slaughtering and killing they overran them. India has been conquered again and again for years, and last and worst of all came the Englishman. You look about India, what has the Hindoo left? Wonderful temples, everywhere. What has the Mohammedan left? Beautiful palaces. What has the Englishman left? Nothing but mounds of broken brandy bottles!—And God has had no mercy upon my people because they had no mercy. By their cruelty they degraded the populace, and when they needed them the common people had no strength to give for their aid. If man cannot believe in the Vengeance of God, he certainly cannot deny the Vengeance of History. And it will come upon the English; they have their heels on our necks, they have sucked the last drop of our blood for their own pleasures, they have carried away with them millions of our money, while our people have starved by villages and provinces. And now the Chinaman is the vengeance that will fall upon them; if the Chinese rose today and swept the English into the sea, *as they well deserve*, it would be no more than justice."

And then, having said his say, the Swami was silent. A babble of thin-voiced chatter rose about him, to which he listened, apparently unheeding. Occasionally he cast his eye up to the roof and repeated softly, "Shiva! Shiva!" and the little company, shaken and disturbed by the current of powerful feelings and vindictive passion which seemed to be flowing like molten lava beneath the silent surface of this strange being, broke up, perturbed.

He stayed days [actually it was only a long week end] . . . All through, his discourses abounded in picturesque illustrations and beautiful legends. . . . One beautiful story he told was of a man whose wife reproached him with his troubles, reviled him because of the success of others, and recounted to him all his failures. "Is this what your God has done for you," she said to him, "after you have served Him so many years?" Then the man answered, "Am I a trader in religion? Look at that mountain. What does it do for me, or what have I done for it? And yet I love it because I am so made that I love the beautiful. Thus I love God." . . . There was another story he told of a king who offered a gift to a Rishi. The Rishi refused, but the king insisted and begged that he would come with him. When they came to the palace he heard the king praying, and the king begged for wealth, for power, for length of days from God. The Rishi listened, wondering, until at last he picked up his mat and started away. Then the king opened his eyes from his prayers and saw him. "Why are you going?" he said. "You have not asked for your gift." "I," said the Rishi, "ask from a beggar?"

When someone suggested to him that Christianity was a saving power, he opened his great dark eyes upon him and said, "If Christianity is a saving power in itself, why has it not saved the Ethiopians, the Abyssinians?" He also arraigned our own crimes, the horror of women on the stage, the frightful immorality in our streets, our drunkenness, our thieving, our political degeneracy, the murdering in our West, the lynching in our South, and we, remembering his own Thugs, were still too delicate to mention them. . . .

Often on Swami's lips was the phrase, "They would not dare to do this to a monk." . . . At times he even expressed a great longing that the English

government would take him and shoot him. "It would be the first nail in their coffin," he would say, with a little gleam of his white teeth, "and my death would run through the land like wild fire." . . .

His great heroine was the dreadful [?] Ranee of the Indian mutiny, who led her troops in person. Most of the old mutineers, he said, had become monks in order to hide themselves, and this accounted very well for the dangerous quality of the monks' opinions. There was one man of them who had lost four sons and could speak of them with composure, but whenever he mentioned the Ranee he would weep, with tears streaming down his face. "That woman was a goddess," he said, "a *devi*. When overcome, she fell on her sword and died like a man." It was strange to hear the other side of the Indian mutiny, when you would never believe that there was another side to it, and to be assured that a Hindoo could not possibly kill a woman. It was probably the Mohammedans that killed the woman at Delhi and at Cawnpore. These old mutineers would say to him, "Kill a woman! You know we could not do that"; and so the Mohammedan was made responsible.

In quoting from the Upanishads his voice was most musical. He would quote a verse in Sanskrit, with intonations, and then translate it into beautiful English, of which he had a wonderful command. And in his mystical religion he seemed perfectly and unquestioningly happy. . . .

It is interesting to compare the prophetic utterances Swamiji made in Annisquam with those reported by Sister Christine in her "Reminiscences": "Sometimes he was in a prophetic mood, as on the day when he startled us by saying: 'The next great upheaval which is to bring about a new epoch will come from Russia or China. I can't quite see which, but it will be either Russia or China.'" And I have been reliably informed that at another time Swamiji made a statement to the effect that if and when the British should leave India there would be a great danger of India's being conquered by the Chinese. I mention these statements of Swamiji just in passing, and the reader may accept them in whatever spirit he likes.

Mr. John Wright was kind enough when he sent us his mother's article to send us also a letter written by Swamiji to Dr. Wright together with a copy of a hitherto unknown snapshot of Swamiji, taken during his stay at Annisquam in 1893. This is probably the first picture of Swamiji to be taken in America. Mr. Wright has made a notation on its back which reads: "Swami Vivekananda—from a print of photograph probably taken either in Cambridge, Mass., or Annisquam, Mass., in 1893 or 1894." From internal evidence with which I will not bother the reader, we are inclined to think that it was taken in Annisquam in 1893. Unfortunately the photograph is faint and somewhat hazy, but nonetheless, all who have seen it have been impressed by the majesty and power in Swamiji's face that shines indestructibly through the dimness of the print. It is truly a unique representation of him. I will not attempt to describe the picture in detail, however, for I am herewith sending a copy of it to the publisher of *Prabuddha Bharata* in the hope that he may find it possible and convenient to reproduce it in this issue.¹ I will also present here the letter written by Swamiji to Dr. Wright, who at the time was in Cambridge, although chronologically it ought to come much later in this narrative. For the benefit of English and American readers it perhaps should be mentioned that the term "Adhyapakji" means "Respected Professor."

¹ The publisher regrets that the photo, being too blurred, could not be published.

New York
4th May 1894

Dear Adhyapakji

I have received your kind note just now. And it is unnecessary for me to say that I will be very happy to do as you say.

I have also received Col. Higginson's letter—I will reply him.

I will be in Boston on Sunday. On Monday I lecture at the Women's Club of Mrs. Howe.

Yours ever truly
Vivekananda

The Colonel Higginson whom Swamiji mentions was one of the more liberal-minded Christian delegates to the Parliament of Religions. His absorbing interest was the study of comparative religion and he had instituted meetings on the "Sympathy of Religions" at Plymouth, Mass. It is known Swamiji was invited to speak before one of these meetings in August of 1894, and it is possible that the above letter was an answer to a similar invitation. But we must leave such speculations to a later installment.

II

It is time now to continue with the story of the Parliament of Religions. Readers will remember that the last installment told of the preparations for that extraordinary and historic gathering and of its opening day on September 11, 1893. The present article will complete the story of the following sixteen days.

For the most part each day was divided into three sessions lasting from two and a half to three hours each. At the opening of each morning session the presiding chairman—there was a different one each day—"invited the assembly, rising, to invoke, in silence, the blessing of God on the day's proceedings; then, while the assembly remained standing, [a chosen member of the Parliament] led in 'the Universal Prayer,' 'Our Father which art in Heaven.'" Talks by the delegates were limited to half an hour apiece, but this ruling was at times relaxed, for the crowd had its favorites and would brook no interference with them. The greatest favorite, of course, was Swamiji; and the story is well known how the attraction of the crowd to him, embarrassing as it may have been to some of the defenders of Christianity, was used to good advantage. From the *Boston Evening Transcript*, as quoted in "The Life," we know, for instance, that "the four thousand fanning people in the Hall of Columbus would sit smiling and expectant, waiting for an hour or two of other men's speeches, to listen to Vivekananda for fifteen minutes." In a letter to India Swamiji himself remarked upon this trick of holding the best until the last, and recently we have come across other accounts of the maneuver. One of these is given by Virchand Gandhi, the Jain delegate, in the January 1895 issue of *The Arena*, an American periodical now defunct but once widely read, which described itself as "A Monthly Review of Social Advance":

"... at the Parliament of Religions . . . it was a fact that at least a third and sometimes two-thirds of the great audience of Columbus Hall would make a rush for the exits when a fine orator from India had closed his speech. It was even a very noticeable fact that, long before the close of the great Parliament, some of my countrymen, made popular by the Parliament, were used as a drawing card to hold the great audiences, and in this way thousands were compelled to sit and listen to long, dry, prosy papers by Christians. They showed plainly that they were not interested, but there they sat enduring with much murmuring, expecting the next speaker might be one of the popular Orientals whose name was usually first on the bulletin board. . . ."

The allusion no doubt included Swamiji, and the following account from the *Northampton Daily Herald* of April 11, 1894, leaves no question regarding the matter:

. . . At the Parliament of Religions Vivekananda was not allowed to speak until the close of the programme, the purpose being to make the people stay until the end of the session. On a warm day when some prosy professor talked too long, and people would leave the hall by hundreds, it only needed the announcement that Vivekananda would give a short address before the benediction was pronounced to hold the vast audience intact, and thousands would wait for hours to hear a fifteen minutes talk from this remarkable man.

Officially the Parliament was not intended to be a controversy but rather a symposium of all the faiths of the world. The subjects presented were divided into two categories. The first comprised speculative and abstract topics, such as the nature of God, the nature of man, the importance of religion, revelation, the Divine Incarnation, immortality, and so forth. These and like subjects were discussed from the second to the tenth day of the Parliament. Then, the metaphysical doctrines of the various faiths having been made clear, the remaining seven days of the Parliament were devoted to papers bearing upon the second category of subjects, namely, the relation of religion to practical social problems, such as family life, the arts and sciences, the love of mankind, morals, Christian missionary methods, and so on.

During the first ten days of the Parliament every religion had its say. A paper by Manilal N. Dvivedi gave a technical exposition of Hinduism and Indian philosophy. Dharmapala of the Maha-Bodhi Society in Calcutta defined Buddhism in all its aspects. Confucianism, Shintoism, Japanese Buddhism, Mohammedanism, Judaism, and many other religious doctrines were expounded and re-expounded. And of course, as we know, Swamiji in his "Paper on Hinduism" not only explained the teachings of Vedanta, but made them come alive as eternal truths pertinent to all men everywhere.

No doubt some members of the audience had come expecting to hear strange and weird beliefs regarding idolatry, blood sacrifice and polytheism; for the popular conception, fed by missionary propaganda, was that the Oriental lands were rife with dark and unholy practices. But there can be no doubt that by the time the first half of the Parliament was over, many hitherto fast-imbedded misconceptions regarding Eastern religions had become pried loose in the popular mind. Not only Swamiji's "Paper on Hinduism," but other papers served to undermine the popular notions concerning, among other things, idolatry. *The Review of Reviews*, March 1894, in an article on Barrows' book, "The World's Parliament of Religions," reflects the change of attitude that was brought about on at least this one point:

The book contains many pictures of idols such as one mostly finds in missionary literature. There they are intended to excite the horror and pity of the Christian reader. Here the attitude to idolatrous religions is avowedly sympathetic rather than critical; but one can scarcely escape a twinge of the old feeling at a sight of the fantastic objects of worship. Nevertheless, the popular Protestant notion of idolatry was emphatically repudiated by those who spoke in the name of imageworshippers.

In substantiation of this, the article quotes briefly from the papers of Dvivedi and J. J. Modi, a Parsi of Bombay, and then goes on to quote at great length from Swamiji's "noble address," the "Paper on Hinduism." Accompanying the article is a photograph of Swamiji in profile.

The change in the popular attitude toward Eastern religions was also reflected in other contemporary journals and periodicals. *The Christian Herald* of October 11, 1893, wrote:

From the Parliament of Religions which has just closed its sessions in Chicago two significant and important results have come. First we have learned from the addresses delivered by representatives of many religions, especially those of Asia, that the leaders of these faiths have generally the same aim as that of the Christian preacher. They are seeking in their way to eradicate sin and vice, to ennoble and purify the lives of men and to encourage kindness, charity and helpfulness. Thus, so far as morality is concerned, they are allies rather than opponents of Christianity.

The thing that strikes us with something of a shock today is that this was news! *The Outlook* of October 7, 1893, made an even more profound discovery:

The relations of the ethnic religions to Christianity are, in every phase of these meetings at Chicago, forced more and more into prominence, as the strong personalities of the men who represent Brahmanism, Buddhism, Confucianism, Shintoism, press themselves upon the listening thousands; their seriousness, earnestness, devoutness, and spirituality, as they sit side by side with Greek, Anglican, German, and American Churchmen, preclude the thought that their religions are ancient shades which will fall or melt into mist as the triumphant light of Christianity shines through them. The representatives of the Hindu cults, in particular, are no men of straw, and through their eyes Christians have looked, many perhaps for the first time, into the depths of religions which for thousands of years have not only occupied the minds of philosophers, but have formed the ethical codes and directed the Godward aspirations of millions and millions of human beings.

During the first ten days of the Parliament the full range of Christian conviction was also expounded. Although the principles of universal toleration for which, ideally, the Parliament stood were earnestly and well expressed by some of the Christian delegates, the notion that a universal religion meant nothing other than a universal acceptance of Christianity not only insinuated itself into the proceedings, but was sounded forth in unabashed oratory. An example or two may indicate something of the general trend.

On the third day of the Parliament, the Reverend Thomas Ebenezer Slater, of the London Missionary Society Evangelist to educated Hindus, gave a talk entitled, "Concession to Native Ideas, Having Special Reference to Hinduism." It may be worth noting here that the Reverend Mr. Slater had written a book called, "Studies of the Upanishads," in which he stated: "The Vedanta, the highest conclusion of Indian thought, is based on a mistaken and pessimistic view of life; on a formulated dogma unsupported by any evidence and untaught in the hymns of the Rig-Veda: the whole an elaborate and subtle process of false reasoning." In his talk at the Parliament Reverend Slater conceded to native ideas the fact that they were based on a search of the human spirit for the Divine. "The Vedas," he said, "present 'a shifting play of lights and shadows; sometimes the light seems to grow brighter, but the day never comes.' For, on examining them we note a remarkable fact. While they show that the spiritual needs and aspirations of humanity are the same . . . we fail to find a single text that purports to be a Divine answer to prayer, an explicit promise of Divine forgiveness, an expression of experienced peace and delight in God, as the result of assured pardon and reconciliation. There is no realization of ideas. The Bible alone is the Book of Divine Promise—the revelation of the 'exceeding riches of God's grace' . . . And for this reason it is unique . . ." And so on.

On the fourth day, the Reverend Joseph Cook from Boston, a doughty man with fuzzy

sideburns, gave a talk on "Strategic Certainties of Comparative Religion." The Reverend Mr. Cook was a popular and well-known lecturer who belonged to no particular denomination—"The servant," as he said, "of no clique or clan." He had delivered talks throughout the world, and his "Boston Monday Lectures" had been widely published. Reverend Cook's paper at the Parliament consisted of one theme repeated over and over obsessively. It was in brief this: "It is clear that we cannot escape from conscience and God and our record of sin. It is a certainty and a strategic certainty that, except Christianity, there is no religion under heaven or among men that effectively provides for the peace of the soul by its harmonization with itself, its God, and its record of sin." Reverend Cook concluded his talk with a poem that he wanted to have engraved on his tombstone. Space does not permit quoting the entire poem here, but perhaps two stanzas will suffice:

Endless sin means endless woe.
 Into endless sin I go,
 If my soul, from reason rent,
 Takes from sin its final bent.

Balance lost, but not regained,
 Final bent is soon attained.
 Fate is choice in fullest flower.
 Man is flexile—for an hour!

Reverend Cook's obsession with sin and lurking damnation was representative of what in that day was given out as religion by a large part of the Christian clergy. It is important to understand this, for one cannot otherwise appreciate, on the one hand, the shock with which some sections of the audience must have heard Swamiji's ringing words: "Ye divinities on earth—sinners? It is a sin to call a man so. It is a standing libel on human nature," nor, on the other hand, the enthusiastic approval of other sections. A stanza of a poem which appeared in *The Open Court* of October 12, 1893—a contemporary organ of popular opinion—reflects the latter reaction. The poem was entitled, "Aunt Hannah on the Parliament of Religions," which accounts for its dialect:

Then I heered th' han'some Hindu monk, drest up in orange dress,
 Who sed that all humanity was part of God—no less,
 An' he said we was *not* sinners, so I comfort took, once more,
 While th' Parl'ment of Religions roared with approving roar.

It was, indeed, this approving roar with which Swamiji's teachings were met that seriously alarmed many a Christian missionary. Later an attempt was made to set matters straight. "The Swami by his denial of sin," the missionaries cried, "shows that he knows nothing of true religion, and that he is a teacher of deadly error. Woe! woe! woe! to those who follow a blind guide to their own destruction." This quotation is taken from a little book entitled, "Swami Vivekananda and His Guru," published in 1897 by The Christian Literature Society for India.

Although many of the doctrines of Eastern religions which had been expounded during the first week of the Parliament by such men as Dvivedi and Dharmapala were hair-raising in the light of the orthodox, evangelical Christianity of 1893, particularly the conception of a creation without beginning and without end, they had been delivered in dry and pedantic form, not apt to set fire to the soul, and therefore not alarming to the Christian ministry. But the enthusiastic reception which Swamiji was given from the very beginning was a matter of serious concern, and it was perhaps this that prompted several of the Christian

delegates to an open attack on Hinduism the very day that Swamiji was scheduled to read his paper—the ninth day, September 19.

On this day, Houghton tells us, "The Hall of Columbus . . . could not accommodate all who endeavoured to gain admittance." And from the Chicago *Interocean*, as quoted in "Swami Vivekananda and His Guru," we learn that

Great crowds of people, the most of whom were women, pressed around the doors leading to the hall of Columbus, an hour before the time stated for opening the afternoon session, for it had been announced that Swami Vivekananda, the popular Hindu Monk, who looks so much like McCullough's Othello, was to speak. Ladies, ladies everywhere filled the great auditorium.

There was, no doubt, electricity in the air, and before long it began to crackle, eventually calling forth one of Swamiji's short but flaming rebukes—one which has not hitherto been known.

The Dubuque, Iowa, *Times* of September 29, 1893, gleefully reviews this ninth day as though a tournament were under consideration. The report, being somewhat impressionistic, does not make it entirely clear at exactly what point in the proceedings Swamiji had heard enough, but it was undoubtedly before he had delivered his "Paper on Hinduism." The news article, in so far as it has bearing on the debate, is quoted here:

GOD MAN AND MATTER

BRETHREN ALL, YET THEY INDULGED IN SHARP WORDS.

Rev. Joe Cook Criticised the Hindoos, and the Hindoos
Attacked Christianity. . . .

WORLD'S FAIR, Sept. 28.—(Special).—The parliament of religions reached a point where sharp acerbities develop. The thin veil of courtesy was maintained, of course, but behind it was ill feeling. Rev. Joseph Cook criticised the Hindoos sharply and was more sharply criticised in turn. He said that to speak of a universe that was not created is almost unpardonable nonsense, and the Asiatics retorted that a universe which had a beginning is a self evident absurdity. Bishop J. P. Newman, firing at long range from the banks of the Ohio, declared that the orientals have insulted all the Christians of the United States by their misrepresentations of the missionaries, and the orientals, with their provokingly calm and supercilious smile, replied that this was simply the bishop's ignorance.

Buddhist Philosophy

In response to the question direct, three learned Buddhists gave us in remarkably plain and beautiful language their bedrock belief about God, man and matter. . . .

Following this is a summary of Dharmapala's paper on "The World's Debt to Buddha," which he prefaced, as we learn from another source, by singing a Singhalese song of benediction. The article then continues:

His [Dharmapala's] peroration was as pretty a thing as a Chicago audience ever heard. Demosthenes never exceeded it.

Cantankerous Remarks.

Swami Vivekananda, the Hindoo monk, was not so fortunate. He was out of humor, or soon became so, apparently. He wore an orange robe and a pale yellow turban and dashed at once into a savage attack on Christian nations in these words: "We who have come from the east have sat here day after day and have been told in a patronizing way that we ought to accept Christianity because Christian nations are the most prosperous. We look about us and we see England the most prosperous Christian nation in the world, with her foot on the neck of 250,000,000 of Asiatics. We look back into history and see that

the prosperity of Christian Europe began with Spain. Spain's prosperity began with the invasion of Mexico. Christianity wins its prosperity by cutting the throats of its fellow men. At such a price the Hindoo will not have prosperity."

And so they went on, each succeeding speaker getting more cantankerous, as it were.

At the end of the afternoon session, Swamiji delivered his now famous "Paper on Hinduism." If some of the ideas which it contained had been presented before, they had never before been presented with such sublime eloquence, nor with the full force behind them of a divine mission. There was actually no ground left for the evangelizing Christians to stand on, for Swamiji was living proof that Hinduism was a religion that not only soared to the highest reaches of the Divine, but attained them.

III

Nonetheless, up until the very last day of the Parliament, the Christians, that is to say, the missionary-minded Christians, continued to claim, with even greater conviction it would seem, that theirs was the superior religion, in fact the *only* religion. The Hall of Columbus rang with such sentences as: "Christianity is absolutely superior in its motive power, its purifying influence and its uplifting inspiration from any and all other religions with which it comes in competition. The greasy bull of Madura and Tanjore has little in common with the Lamb of God who taketh away the sins of the world," or "The attitude . . . of Christianity towards religions other than itself is an attitude of universal, absolute, eternal, unappeasable hostility; while toward all men everywhere, the adherents of false religions by no means excepted, its attitude is an attitude of grace, mercy, peace, for whosoever will." That is, for whosoever will become a Christian!

It is tempting to go on quoting similar statements made during a parliament, the purpose of which was simply to bring together the representatives of the great religions of the world for mutual enlightenment and understanding. But perhaps by now the general trend has been made clear.

It must be said, however, lest the reader get too one-sided a view of the scene which confronted Swamiji, that there were several spots of light in this murky atmosphere. There were many men attending the Parliament who were truly liberal and who were possessed of that blessed trait which seems to go with true liberality, namely, humor. Many of these were laymen. Prince Serge Wolkonsky, for instance, who informally represented Russia, and Colonel T. W. Higginson of Cambridge both spoke for a religion as broad and all-inclusive as the skies, and both later became friends of Swamiji. Lyman Abott, Alfred W. Momerie and Merwin-Marie Snell were others who represented the liberal trend and who welcomed Swamiji. But the talk most remarkable for its broad views came from the Reverend E. L. Rexford of Boston, who in the course of a long paper on "The Religious Intent" said: "No ruthless hand shall justly destroy any form of deity while yet it arrests the reverent mind and heart of man. There is only one being in the world who may legitimately destroy an idol, and that being is the one who has worshipped it. He alone can tell when it has ceased to be of service. And assuredly the Great Spirit who works through all forms and who makes all things his ministers, can make the rudest image a medium through which he will approach his child. . . . And the great religious teachers and founders of the world . . . have lived and taught and suffered and died and risen again, that they might bring us to themselves? No; but that they might bring us to God.

'God-Consciousness,' to borrow a noble word from Calcutta, has been the goal of them all."

Such papers were indicative of a decided swing toward a broad and liberal outlook, but they were nonetheless rare. To the Christian clergy as a whole it never occurred that evangelism was presumption nor that soul-saving in foreign lands might be similar to carrying coals to Newcastle.

Although the Parliament was not intended to be a controversy, it was inevitable that a current of debate should weave through the entire proceedings, sometimes coursing beneath the surface, sometimes coming into open view. The question under consideration was not only whether or not Christianity was superior to other religions, but whether or not it was to replace other religions through missionary endeavor, and if so, how. It was a debate closely watched by a large part of the Christian world. Officially, only one session—the afternoon of the twelfth day—was devoted to a discussion of this all-important issue, but actually from first to last it colored the proceedings; it was there by implication, if not by overt expression, in most of the Christian talks, it cropped up in the papers of the foreign delegates, and it appeared irrepressibly in unscheduled discussions.

The Christian missions were, on the one hand, scathingly criticized by the representatives from China, Japan and India, and, on the other hand, passionately defended by the missionaries themselves. The foreign delegates contended that the failure of Christian missions was due to the fact that the missionaries were intolerant, selfish, ignorant and bigoted, and also to the fact that the countries they represented were anything but Christlike in their imperialistic policies. Moreover, while maintaining respect toward Christianity, the non-Christian religions showed beyond any reasonable doubt that Christian conversion was not necessary to the salvation of their followers. The Christian speakers replied to the effect that (1) Christian missions were *not* a failure; (2) although individual missionaries might make mistakes, missionaries were, on the whole, worthy followers of Christ; (3) Christianity was the *only* religion that gave assurance of salvation.

Although Swamiji found it necessary to deliver a few decisive blows, as the extent and virulence of Christian bigotry became more and more apparent, it was on the whole the other foreign delegates who in prepared talks roundly trounced the missionaries.

In the course of expounding the doctrines of their respective religions during the first days of the Parliament, the Confucian, Pung Kwang Yu, and the Japanese Buddhist, Horin Toki, found little that was good in the intrusion of Christian missionaries into China and Japan. The missionaries, they said, were uneducated, arrogant and totally unnecessary. Such denunciations were delivered with impeccable and devastating politeness. A third talk, given by Kinza Riuge M. Hirai, a Buddhist layman of Japan, attributed the failure of Christian Missions in his country not to the missionaries themselves, nor to the fact that Japan was already possessed of a satisfactory religion, but to the immoralities of Christian nations in their treatment of the Japanese people. This was an essentially political speech, and it brought down the house. The *Chicago Herald* of September 14, 1893, as quoted by Barrows, reported:

Loud applause followed many of his [Hirai's] declarations, and a thousand cries of "shame" were heard when he pointed to the wrongs which his countrymen had suffered through the practices of false Christianity. When he had finished, Dr. Barrows grasped his hand, and the Rev. Jenkin Lloyd-Jones threw his arm around his neck, while the audience cheered vociferously and waved hats and handkerchiefs in the excess of enthusiasm.

Shortly the Hindus entered the field. Nagarkar, the Brahma-Samajist, cried on the seventh day for less soul-saving and more education. "Little, how little, do you ever dream that your money is expended in spreading abroad nothing but Christian dogmatism and Christian bigotry, Christian pride and Christian exclusiveness. I entreat you to spend at least one-tenth of all this vast fortune on sending out to our country unsectarian, broad-learned missionaries that will spend all their efforts and energies in educating our women, our men, and our masses." The force of this plea, however, was lost in a talk devoted, on the one hand, to a rhapsodic tribute to the moral and civilizing influence of English rule in India—an account which must have caused Swamiji no little anguish—and, on the other, to the reform movement of the Brahma-Samaj.

The evening session of the tenth day "was concluded," Barrows says, "by a brief speech from Swami Vivekananda." This was the now well-known address, "Religion not the Crying Need of India." The version of this talk as quoted in Volume I of the "Complete Works," is provocative enough, but there is evidence that it is not quoted in full. *The Christian Herald* of October 11, 1893, includes in its article on the Parliament some quotations from the address that are new to us. "Christian missionaries," Swamiji is here reported as having said, "come and offer life, but only on condition that the Hindus become Christians, abandoning the faith of their fathers and forefathers. Is it right? . . . If you wish to illustrate the meaning of 'brotherhood,' treat the Hindu more kindly, even though he be a Hindu and is faithful to his religion. Send missionaries to them to teach them how better to earn a piece of bread, and not teach them metaphysical nonsense."

The Catholics received Swamiji's criticism with hearty enthusiasm. In the chapter of Barrows' "History" entitled "Introduction to the Parliament Papers," it is reported that ". . . on the eleventh day, Bishop Keane said: 'I endorse the denunciation that was hurled forth last night against the system of pretended charity that offered food to the hungry Hindus at the cost of their conscience and faith. It is a shame and a disgrace to those who call themselves Christians.' . . . Bishop Keane, who read Mr. Donnelly's review of the history of Catholic charity, said that in India their system was one of absolute indifference to the religious faith of the needy, and in addition to endorsing the denunciation by Mr. Vivekananda of Christian charity any way limited to converts, he pronounced justifiable, from the Hindu point of view, 'the denunciation of the Christian system of the atonement, that came also from the heart of the Hindu monk.' He declared that we do not hear half enough of such criticism, and that if by these criticisms Vivekananda can only stir us and sting us into better teachings and better doings in the great work of Christ in the world, he for one would only be grateful to our friend the Hindu monk."

Turning to the actual report of Bishop John J. Keane's reading of Mr. Donnelly's paper, we find a further parenthetical observation: ". . . My heart was glad when I listened last night and heard our good friend, the Hindu, confess that for years he did not know where he was going to get his next meal. That was the way with these poor Franciscan monks. They were reduced to poverty in order that they might better consecrate themselves to the service of God everywhere."

Here again is evidence that Swamiji said more in his talk that has been recorded in any of the histories of the Parliament. It is also possible that Swamiji spoke at other sessions on the subject of missionaries, for *The Outlook*, October 7, 1893, in giving an impressionistic picture of the Parliament, adds this highlight:

. . . The subject of Christian work in India calls Vivekananda, in his brilliant priestly orange, to his feet. He criticises the work of Christian missions. It is evident that he has not tried to understand Christianity, but neither, as he claims, have its priests made any effort to understand *his* religion, with its ingrained faiths and race-prejudices of thousands of years' standing. They have simply come, in his view, to throw scorn on his most sacred beliefs, and to undermine the morals and spirituality of the people he has been set to teach.

This may or may not be a reference to Swamiji's talk, "Religion not the Crying Need of India," on the tenth evening, but in any case, it is certain that we have not the full text of Swamiji's extemporaneous utterances at the Parliament.

The afternoon of the twelfth day of the Parliament was officially devoted to the "Criticism and Discussion of Missionary Methods." "On this day," Barrows tells us, "the crowds in the Hall of Columbus were, if possible, more dense than on any previous day." It is conceivable that these crowds expected to witness a row. If so, they were destined to disappointment, for there was no row. Dharmapala and Narasimhacharya represented the Eastern religions; the Reverends G. T. Candlin and R. E. Hume, the Christian. [Swamiji was not present, being that afternoon at the Scientific Section]. Each gave a short but cogent talk. Dharmapala who opened the discussion did not spare the missionaries; whereupon, in reply, the Reverend George T. Candlin, an American missionary to China, who for some inscrutable reason always dressed during the Parliament in Chinese costume, objected with indignation to Dharmapala's "personal remarks." Narasimhacharya, who followed, did not attribute the failure of Christianity to the selfishness and intolerance of the missionaries, but rather to their interference with native custom. It was, of course, not to be admitted by the Christians that Christian missionary work had by any means failed in foreign lands. The Reverend Mr. Hume informed Narasimhacharya that "in a generation all the positions of influence and of responsibility will be in the hands of the Christian community in India," and went on to add that missionaries sometimes do make mistakes and are grateful for correction. This same minister, as will be seen in a following article, attempted some months later to engage Swamiji in public controversy without appreciable success.

The session was short, and it was over without mishap. But the tension that had accumulated throughout the Parliament finally broke down the control of the Reverend George T. Pentecost, who on the following Sunday, when Swamiji was most likely present, interspersed throughout his paper many glaring violations of the Parliament's watchword: "Tolerance and Fraternity." For a report of this incident I quote from Barrows:

"The argument of [Pentecost's paper, "The Invincible Gospel,"] was the ultimate triumph of Christianity as assured by its essential superiority to all other religions. Certain impromptu remarks interjected between the lines of the paper drew forth a reply on the following day. He was reported by the press as saying: 'Some of the Brahmans of India have been here and have dared to make an attack upon Christianity. They take the slums of New York and Chicago and ask us why we do not cure ourselves. They take what is outside the pale of Christianity and judge Christianity by it.' Proceeding then to attack the religious systems of India on the point of morality, he alleged that among the followers of Brahmanism there were thousands of temples in which there were hundreds of priestesses who were known as immoral and profligate. They were prostitutes because they were priestesses, and priestesses because they were prostitutes."

It is true that the Reverend Mr. Pentecost represented the extreme of bigotry and not the spirit of the Parliament; but he represented also that large number of his kind, both in America and in India, who were later to do their utmost to destroy Swamiji.

IV

On the evening of September 27, after seventeen days of long, sometimes tiresome, sometimes stirring sessions, the Parliament of Religions came to a close. Every shade of religious thought had been expressed, from the most light-filled to the most clouded, and it could not have been lost upon the audience—indeed, it *was* not—that the heights of spiritual expression came from the least expected quarters.

Yet despite the fact that, due to this complete reversal, there were moments of tension that came close to justifying the fears of those who had predicated a scene of discord rather than one of harmony, the total impression one receives through reading the accounts of the Parliament is one of festivity, as though, no matter what some of Her children might have thought, the Divine Mother had arranged this party and was present through it all. It is difficult to put one's finger on the source of this impression. It is not to be found in the high-flown protestations of harmony, nor is it in the handkerchief-waving. Perhaps it is simply in the fact that, regardless of what was said about God, each man spoke of Him in utter earnestness, and in the further fact that each was allowed to speak so. Certainly at the close of the Parliament the elation was marked.

“More than seven thousand persons were crowded into the Halls of Washington and Columbus,” Barrows writes. “For more than an hour before the time announced, the eager crowds swept up against the doors of the Art Palace. The throng extended from the doorways to Michigan avenue and thence for half a block in either direction. . . . An eyewitness reports: ‘. . . The last and closing scene of the great Parliament of Religions is one that will live forever in the memory of those who were so fortunate as to be spectators. The great Hall of Columbus was illuminated by a myriad of lights. Every inch of room was used by the greatest crowd that ever sat within its walls. On the stage, beneath the folds of the flags of all nations, were the representatives of all religions. The dull, black and somber raiment of the West only intensified the radiantly contrasted garbs of the Oriental priests.’ Twice during the evening flashlight photographs were taken of the historic group on the platform.” [Lest the reader forget, the illumination was gas light, and the flashlight a burst of gunpowder.]

In passing it should perhaps be noted here that Swamiji unfortunately does not appear on the platform in any of the published pictures of the Parliament, of which there are three, taken, respectively on the morning of September 14, the morning of September 21 and the evening of September 27. In the last of these, which has been published in the second edition of “The Life,” Swamiji has been tentatively identified in the front row of the delegates; I am sorry to say that a comparison with an enlarged and annotated copy of the same picture shows that this is not Swamiji but Narasimhacharya.

The immediate results of the Parliament were mixed. Perhaps it is correct to say that the bigots became more bigoted, for their backs had been pressed to the wall, and that the liberal-minded became more liberal, for they were now confirmed in their views. This latter outcome, however, was undoubtedly the more important and enduring. It is un-

deniable, moreover, that the American people had not been merely intellectually impressed by the nobility and supreme wisdom of Eastern doctrines which hitherto, in the words of Dr. Alfred Momerie, "they had been taught to regard with contempt," but that they had been touched by and had responded to the tremendous power of living spirituality that Swamiji embodied. Something far more important and more far-reaching than an intellectual appreciation of Eastern religions had taken place. It was as though the soul of America had long asked for spiritual sustenance and had now been answered. This is not to say, as has sometimes been implied, that Swamiji was recognized by all for what he was—the spiritual leader of the age. Some attributed greater spirituality, for instance, to Mazoomdar, whose talk on the Brahmo-Samaj unaccountably inspired the multitude to rise to its feet and sing the hymn, "Nearer, my God, to Thee." The *Advocate* of September 9, 1893, after stating that Swamiji's "knowledge of English is as though it were his mother tongue," went on to say:

. . . This is equally true of Mazoomdar, who however is a man of far greater spirituality and profounder religious conviction. The chief representative of the Brahmo Samaj, he is careful to say that he did not get his religion from the missionaries, but that it is an evolution out of Hindoism, now laying hold of all that is true in that as in all other forms of religion, but culminating in the acceptance of Jesus Christ as the Son of God and the Savior of the world.

It is not too surprising that the *Advocate* gave first place to Mazoomdar. In the same article the observation was made that since

most of the representatives of the religions of India and Japan were accomplished English scholars, . . . it was inevitable . . . that their expositions of Brahminism, of Buddhism, of Shintoism, should take colouring from the truths they had learned directly or indirectly of Christ.

It is amusing in this connection to take note of Barrows' remarks in regard to Swamiji's final address. As will be remembered, Swamiji said in the course of his talk: "The Christian is not to become a Hindu or a Buddhist, nor a Hindu or a Buddhist to become a Christian. But each must assimilate the others and yet preserve its individuality and grow according to its own law of growth." This was, of course, not at all the hoped-for lesson of the Parliament. Certainly the Christian was not to become a Hindu or a Buddhist. With Swamiji most would have cried, "God forbid!" But the halls had resounded with the conviction that the Hindus and Buddhists were to become Christians. Barrows tells us that "Swami Vivekananda was always heard with interest by the Parliament, but very little approval was shown to some of the sentiments expressed in his closing address."

The public reaction was different. A description of the closing scene is quoted here from *The Critic* of October 7, 1893, with the omission of the text of Swamiji's address:

. . . The scene was one not to be easily forgotten. Before an audience which filled every corner of the great hall, the delegates from distant lands paid tribute to the purity of Christian ideals. They bore witness to the spirit of charity which animated the speakers of the congress, and a kind of exhilaration possessed them, as of something large and fine accomplished. With the black-coated Occidentals were seated thus the dark-skinned men from the East, quiet, attentive and dignified.

A young African prince, whose black face showed what is best in the Ethiopian type, arose in his dark-richly-embroidered robes, to express a conviction that the Parliament had promoted a feeling for the brotherhood of man which can unite all races. "The very atmosphere," he said, "seems pregnant with an indefinable, inexpressible thing—something too solemn for human utter-

ance." And it was this background to the joyousness that appealed to the imagination and gave the occasion its peculiar impressiveness. . . .

But the most impressive figures of the Parliament were the Buddhist priest, H. Dharmapala of Ceylon, and the Hindoo monk, Suami Vivekananda. "If theology and dogma stand in your way in search of truth," said the former incisively, "put them aside. Learn to think without prejudice, to love all beings for love's sake, to express your convictions fearlessly, to lead a life of purity, and the sunlight of truth will illuminate you." But eloquent as were many of the brief speeches at this meeting, whose triumphant enthusiasm rightly culminated in the superb rendering by the Apollo Club of the Hallelujah chorus, no one expressed so well the spirit of the Parliament, its limitations and its finest influence, as did the Hindoo monk. I copy his address in full, but I can only suggest its effect upon the audience, for he is an orator by divine right, and his strong intelligent face in its picturesque setting of yellow and orange was hardly less interesting than these earnest words and the rich, rhythmical utterance he gave them. . . . [After quoting the greater part of Swamiji's Final Address, the article continues:]

Perhaps the most tangible result of the congress was the feeling it aroused in regard to foreign missions. The impertinence of sending half-educated theological students to instruct the wise and erudite Orientals was never brought home to an English-speaking audience more forcibly. It is only in the spirit of tolerance and sympathy that we are at liberty to touch their faith, and the exhorters who possess these qualities are rare. It is necessary to realize that we have quite as much to learn from the Buddhists as they from us, and that only through harmony can the highest influence be exerted.

Chicago, 3 Oct., 1893

[signed] LUCY MONROE.

Other organs of public opinion attest to Swamiji's popularity and influence. Many quotations from these are already known to the readers of "The Life," but one more can here be added from the *Chicago Interocean* of September 1, 1894, which almost a year following the Parliament recalled Swamiji's unquestionable popularity:

VIVEKANANDA AND THE HINDOOS

There was no delegate to the Parliament of Religions who attracted more courteous attention in Chicago by his winning ways, his ability, and his fearless discussion of all questions relating to his religion than Swami Vivekananda, who represented the Hindoos of South India. This distinguished Hindoo was enthusiastic in his admiration of the greatness of the Western World and its material development, eager in his efforts to learn of those things that might be beneficial to his people, earnest in his desire to recognize the religions of all people as related to each other, and all sincere efforts in behalf of virtue and holiness, but at the same time he defended the Hindoo religion and philosophy with an eloquence and power that not only won admiration for himself but consideration for his own teachings.

To a request of the *New York World* of October 1, 1893, for "a sentiment or expression regarding the significance of the great meeting" from each representative, Swamiji replied with a quotation from the Gita and one from Vyasa:

"I am He that am in every religion—like the thread that passes through a string of pearls." "Holy, perfect and pure men are seen in all creeds, therefore they all lead to the same truth—for how can nectar be the outcome of poison?"

And this certainly was the lesson learned through the Parliament. Though some may have been loath to acknowledge it at the time, it was a lesson that struck deep and that was not forgotten. The back of bigotry, although not broken, had received its first hard blow.

INDIAN UNIVERSITIES AND UNIVERSITY TEACHERS

BY DR. P. T. RAJU

(Continued from the April issue)

If the university teacher is only a servant of the university and so should not be a member of the executive bodies, how can he co-ordinate the many aspects of university life and influence the constitution and policy of the university? And if he is to have no hand in framing them, who else is better fitted to frame them? He is allowed by most of the universities to become a member of the Board of Studies or the Academic Council or both. But the final confirmation, even of the syllabi and textbooks, lies not in his hands but in the hands of a body from which he is excluded, which is an anomaly. Some educationalists are of the opinion—I think rightly—that not even the lower grades of university teachers should stand for election. And there are other ways than election for getting into the academic bodies, which can be discovered and worked out properly. *A fortiori*, they should not enter by election into the executive bodies also. And if a sound policy of university education requires that the university teacher should be in the executive body also—most of us think that the University Commission is right in opining that it does—other ways than election can easily be worked out. The reason that they are servants but not masters is not cogent. Even ministers of states and the centre call themselves servants of the people and yet they have executive powers and frame the policies of the state. Democracy does not require that university teachers should not be members of executive bodies. We should not forget that everyone is not equally qualified to be a member of the executive bodies of universities. By excluding university teachers from their executive bodies, some of the universities are doing a disservice to them-

selves. We have to add that many of the university teachers do not like such work as it interferes with their academical work; and some dislike elections and canvassing. But the services of some may be available, and universities should not forgo them. Some of the answers to the *questionnaire* suggest that university teachers may be made members of executive bodies, but that they should not allow selfish interests to influence the proceedings. This caution should apply to all, whether they are university professors, principals of constituent colleges, or public men. It is a commendable moral principle; but it should not exclude the people best fitted to do the work.

If the principle that the vice-chancellors should be academical men is sound one cannot understand why the members of the executive body should be non-academical men. No university is worth the name unless it is a teaching university also; otherwise, there will be none within the university to judge the academical standards in the light of the latest developments in the subjects. It is of no use, and is unfair, to blame the professors of constituent colleges of a purely affiliating university that they are not up to date. Even if they have the will to work, they do not have the facilities of libraries and laboratories. There is nothing wrong in the idea of a purely affiliating university if its constituent colleges can have the necessary equipment for their professors' research and study. A student of a post-graduate college in a purely affiliating university cannot be so well up in his subject as the student, say, of Dr. Sahani could be in Lucknow; and this difference is certainly not due to the difference in the intellectual calibre of the two students but to the difference in facilities. But as conditions now obtain in

India—and these hold true of some of the most scientifically advanced countries—the governments cannot give the necessary finances to the constituent colleges for their development. Even in some of the universities the library and laboratory facilities are very poor, nothing to say of the constituent colleges of purely affiliating universities. So every university must at least be a teaching university also; and its professors should have adequate voice in its executive bodies, and as much as the principals of the constituent colleges and men of other interests. And the services of at least the willing professors should be welcomed.

But how will it look if the employees are asked to fix their own salaries? This may be the main difficulty in allowing university teachers to become members of executive bodies. But there are universities with such members; how are they working? Safeguards can be worked out for preventing abuse of position. There is also another way. In the state University of Illinois, for instance, the Senate, which consists mainly of university teachers and which corresponds to our Executive Committees,—the University has no other body corresponding to the latter—, is the supreme administrative authority in charge of everything except the final sanction of the budget. Even in the case of the budget, it makes the final recommendation, which is generally sanctioned by the Board of Trustees. So in the Indian universities also the power for the final sanction of the budget may be vested in an impartial body containing financial experts. Financial committees appointed by the Syndicates cannot be expected to be indifferent to the feelings of the Syndicates. It looks therefore inconsistent that the university teachers are not given any voice in the administration and yet blamed for the shortcomings of university education. In fact, the University Commission opines that, even in the case of the universities which are both teaching and affiliating, all the deans of the faculties should be university teachers and at least six of them out of a total of twenty-

one should also be members of the Syndicate. It gives no consideration to the constitution and control of purely affiliating universities perhaps in the hope that they will, in the near future, become teaching universities also. It says, 'The purely affiliating university is today doing more harm to the good name of the Indian universities as a whole than any single factor, and we urge that this type shall disappear from the Indian landscape at the earliest possible moment'. (p. 415, Vol. I.) Its reasons are: First, such a university is hardly more than a machine for conducting examinations as though examining is the university's main function; secondly, it cannot be a satisfactory examining machine even, for the desire to keep the percentage of passes high, as a good advertisement, 'necessarily vitiated the procedure for appointing examiners and the standards of degrees awarded'. In order to remove this possibility, it is necessary for these universities to develop their teaching side immediately. And when they cannot, I should suggest, they invite professors of teaching universities to help them in their executive bodies. In all universities, therefore, we should suggest, one-third of the members of executive bodies should be university teachers belonging to research departments.

Nowadays students go on strike if they do not have facilities for studying this or that subject. The university teacher may at least ask for good facilities for research. If it is recognized, especially at the post-graduate level, that one who is not a good researcher cannot be a good teacher, post-graduate colleges without facilities for research should be treated as out-moded survivals. There was a time in the history of Indian education when physics and chemistry were taught without any apparatus and laboratory, and students were asked to imagine the experiments with the help of diagrams. If we cannot think of following that method now, we should not also think of a post-graduate professor without any facilities and experience of research. Research gives the teacher a greater grip of the details of the subject than mere study for the purpose

of next day's teaching. For instance, the student who only reads of colour combinations knows much less than one who handles the colour disc. And the teacher who carries experiments on the subject of colour vision knows much more than one who handles the disc for teaching. Even in humanities the man who knows an idea knows much less than one who works with the idea and on the idea. Only the latter can have a grasp of its deeper significance. Now, when the equipment of the colleges is poor, it is unfair to blame either the professor or the student for the low standards of teaching and achievement.

The university teachers have a moral responsibility also, which the University Commission's observation that the backwardness in research is partly due to their lethargy indicates. For a long time research was not emphasized by many universities including even Madras. Research traditions are not as old as the Indian universities. And in a few universities they have not yet been established. The quality of research in humanities is on the whole not high. For instance, in philosophy, about which I can speak with less ignorance than about any other subject, we are still within the period of exposition and interpretation to a large extent. New translations, new expositions, new interpretations—each new work showing some improvement or other upon its predecessor, is still supposed to be the main task. Most people admit that creative work has been little or none. I hear that history also is not in a much better position, though it seems to have more to its credit quantitatively. It looks as though we have not yet got the criteria for judging quality, without which creative work cannot be done and appreciated. In philosophy, comparative philosophy, when fully and systematically developed, may give us new ways and ideas; but it is still in its childhood. Here also I may add that facilities for such work are badly wanting in India—a want which affects our academical standards as well. For, unless a professor knows more than what is needed

for teaching, he cannot either do or guide research.

It would be relevant to note here a point discussed at the last Quinquennial Conference of the universities. When the question of exchange of professors came up, it was pointed out that one of the difficulties was that an Indian professor was not given the place of a British professor in exchange, because he was not considered to be as well qualified as a British professor. We still send our teachers for a higher degree in a foreign university, and when he returns with that degree, we appoint him immediately as a reader or as a professor and place him in charge of research students also. This practice is lowering the prestige of our universities in the eyes of foreign universities and has to be seriously reconsidered. In the very university from which the teacher returns with a higher degree, he may not, with that qualification, be allowed even to take post-graduate classes. And when he is appointed to a higher place in our universities, the foreign universities naturally think of our universities as below their standard. I heard a few like Sir C. V. Raman maintaining that students of Indian universities should be considered to be equal in qualification to the students of British universities. His opinion is true for some subjects in some universities. There has been a time when a student of a foreign university even in Sanskrit was preferred for appointment as a university teacher to one of an Indian university, even though the latter had an oriental degree in addition to his university degree and had more command over the language, for the reason that the former was better trained in research methods. I imagine we no longer follow the practice. In philosophy and many other arts subjects also, we have reasons to discontinue it. But there are still subjects like engineering, medicine, and technology in which our universities lag far behind and foreign training makes a real difference. A differential consideration in different subjects seems to be necessary now for maintaining the standards of our univer-

sities and also their prestige. And if the country throws the burden on the professors, due consideration should be given not only to their conditions and status but also to their laboratory and library equipment. In U.S.A. there are some professors whose salaries are higher than those of the governors of the states. And though we cannot and need not follow America in this respect, we can follow the spirit behind the practice.

For this advancement of research and for raising its qualitative standards, both in the sciences and the humanities, I feel, it is very desirable to have a National Institute for Advanced Studies on the lines of the Irish Institute for Advanced Studies and the Princeton Institute for Advanced Studies. It is De Valera's opinion that small countries like Ireland cannot afford to have such institutes for applied subjects but only for pure arts and sciences. It is very desirable to have such an institute for as many subjects as we can find finance for. It can easily have a chair for subjects like philosophy, history, mathematics, pure physics etc. Professors well known for their work in the subjects and still capable of creative research should be chosen to occupy the chairs. Professors in universities should be given sabbatical, so that they can go to the Institute once every six or seven years and spend their time in study and research. The salaries in the Institute may not be too attractive to create undesirable competition among university professors. I know of cases in which university professors refused membership of the Princeton Institute. The salary should however be a little higher. None below the age of fifty should be appointed for the chairs and he should be capable of real creative work. Such an Institute automatically helps co-ordinating the work in the subjects; for as university professors come and go, they come into contact with each other and know of each other's work. And it may be considered a qualification for a professor to have worked at the Institute. But the library of the Institute should be as well

equipped as possible in the different subjects. National academies for different subjects at different places scatter out resources and cannot create the atmosphere which a National Institute for Advanced Studies can create.

Now comes the question of the social usefulness of the university. Universities must be capable of moulding the personality of the individuals; but the effect does not depend entirely upon the teacher but on the university as a whole. What the university teacher can do is to train the student for self-reliance in his own field. That the student must become a self-reliant and useful citizen, capable of leading society forward is in general the purpose of university education. To lead society forward needs the power of independent thinking, the power to see beyond existing conditions. And this power the university eminently provides through the power to think in pure and unmotivated devotion to truth, which is best exemplified in research. There is an important element in the observation that one who seeks to improve society may often have to go against society, for if one yields to social prejudices, one cannot remove them; but unless one sees the truth in what one does, one cannot have the self-confidence to do it. One German emperor asked his clown whether anything was difficult for an emperor to obtain in the world. The clown replied that it was truth when it was unpalatable. None likes to tell an emperor an unpalatable truth. It is generally children, saints, and academical men who give unpalatable truths. It should be the privilege of the university to discover pure truth and tell it, whether it is palatable or unpalatable; and society will be the beneficiary. And the more the truth which universities can discover, the more beneficial will it be for society.

There is a lesson we can draw from American universities, which were started with the avowed purpose of serving society and catering to its needs, but not imposed on the society from the top. We are following the old idea that a student, in order to obtain a degree, must take a particular set of subjects

and finish his course within a prescribed period. But in American universities there are no such restrictions. An Indian student, if he fails in a particular subject, which he does not like but has to take, fails in all, however well up he might be in the rest. And however much he dislikes the subject, he has to take it, because it is one of a particular set. Not only is he not allowed to change that particular subject to another in which he can do better, but also he has to appear in all the subjects again. Secondly, if he, for reasons of health or finance, has to discontinue in the middle of his course for a year or so, he has to do what he did all over again. In the third place, if he wants a different kind of grouping, his choice is very much restricted. If, for instance, a student of European or Indian history wants to study European or Indian philosophy, he cannot do so. Is it necessary for a student of commerce to study culture? In America he does it and can do it. Some oil companies have the name or picture of Rama, the sun etc., on their tins. But how would that company fare in Iran or Arabia if it has the name or picture of Mohammad on its tins? Now, if a student of commerce wants to study Indian culture and its effects on trade and industry, Indian universities cannot permit him to do so as part of his course. American universities do not have prescribed sets of subjects but divide each subject into several units or parts, so that the student can have a large field for choice according to his needs. And men and women regularly employed also can take up new subjects as need arises. In the fourth place, this system of study and examinations solves to a large extent the problem of adult education also. For adults, whether employed or unemployed, can attend university classes either for knowledge or professional requirements, according to the time they can spare, and obtain higher qualifications. Our universities can cater to the social needs much better, if this system is adopted, of course with the necessary changes to suit our conditions. So far as knowledge of the subject

goes, we cannot be right in saying that one who takes his B.A. in economics in two years knows more than one who takes it in four years as he cannot devote equal time and has to earn his livelihood at the same time. And if an adult thinks that his profession requires knowledge of commerce with some philosophy, universities should have provision for his needs also. Certainly, a student with commerce subjects alone knows more of commerce and will be preferred to such an adult for a teachership in commerce. But the university will serve its social purpose better, if it can cater to the latter also. It need not of course give him a teachership in commerce. And lastly, the present overburdening of courses can be avoided by the introduction of this system. We are overburdening our courses especially in two ways: first we want that students of humanities should know something of science and scientific thought and the students of science should know similarly something of humanities and culture. As we cannot reduce the courses in the subjects, we are adding these as additional subjects and making them compulsory. Secondly, we find that knowledge in each subject is advancing and accumulating. And whenever we find something new and important, we tack it on the existing course and the course grows into a heavy one. When the course becomes really heavy and we cannot finish teaching it within the prescribed period, teaching and handling the topics become superficial and the student gets a bewildering number of unconnected and unassimilated notions, which he cannot intelligently use but attempts to remember. Now, if the subjects are divided into significant parts and the student is asked to choose a definite number from each, he will choose according to his needs and aptitudes and will not feel overwhelmed by the subject.

Why is it said that the university teachers are the most harmless and charmless beings? Even the Government does not seem to have recognized their usefulness, except for recruiting some of them into responsible government posts, after which they lose touch with much

of their subjects. University teachers are supposed to be absent-minded men, dealing with abstractions unconnected with life and reality. But has the nation tested them? Has it given them national problems for study and solution? In this respect, foreign countries have realized how best to utilize the talent of their university teachers. Some of the departments of almost every important university are handling some national or international problem. Even subjects like culture and philosophy are significantly connected with commerce, economics, international politics, and diplomacy. Psychology is connected with war and its equipment. And the politicians of Washington receive advice from universities. If the nation knows how to use the universities, the national and social usefulness of universities becomes more and more tangible. This, however, does not mean and necessitate governmental interference.

Summary of suggestions:—

As already indicated, it is not possible in a single paper to study and make detailed suggestions for every type of university. The suggestions are of a general nature only.

1. Research facilities for university teachers should be made adequate.
2. Immediate steps should be taken to raise the status of university teachers.
3. Purely affiliating universities should develop their teaching side immediately in the interests of university education.
4. About one-third of the members of executive bodies should be university teachers, so that they can have adequate voice in the management of university affairs, as recommended by the University Commission Report.

5. A National Institute for Advanced Studies at least in Pure Arts and Sciences should be established on the lines of the Irish Institute for Advanced Studies and the Princeton Institute for Advanced Studies.
6. A new system of examinations and division and choice of subjects should be introduced so as to enable more people of the country to take up the subjects they need and complete their courses within periods suiting their circumstances and professions and so as to offer more adults the benefits of university education.
7. The practice of preferring men with foreign degrees, immediately after they obtain them, for appointment as university teachers in charge of higher research should be reconsidered in the interests of parity of standards of our universities with those of the advanced countries of Europe and America.
8. The nation should utilize, through the Government and private bodies, the specialist knowledge of university teachers for purposes of nation building.
9. Elections for all university bodies, so far as university teachers are concerned, should be discontinued and the university teachers should be offered membership in them by rotation and according to seniority.
10. As it is not true to the changed conditions of society to compare university teachers to our ancient *rishis*, the university teachers should be treated as other useful members of society with the same duties, rights, and privileges.

(Concluded)

'Without the personal life of the teacher, there would be no education. . . . Without real sympathy we can never teach well. . . . Take every one where he stands and push him forward. . . . The only true teacher is he who can convert himself, as it were, into a thousand persons at a moment's notice.'

—Swami Vivekananda

NOTES AND COMMENTS

TO OUR READERS

'An Unfinished Article' by Swami Vivekananda is an undated paper. Beyond the familiar handwriting of the Swami no other clue as to the genesis of the article could be found. The paper was in the custody of one of our Swamis who kindly handed it over to us for publication. From the inter-dependence and eternality of both mind and matter and from man's sense of freedom in the midst of inexorable laws the great Swami wanted to derive the idea of God. He might have advanced other arguments as well; but the article remained unfinished, for reasons not yet known to us. . . .

TACTICAL ATOMIC WEAPONS

America has announced that she will use tactical atomic weapons of precision 'which are becoming conventional weapons within the U.S. armed services'. These are of 'relatively small dimensions but with considerably more explosive power than was contained in conventional weapons.' There is no danger, we are told, of radio-active fall-out. These can be used with precision on military targets and without endangering civil population.

This is no doubt a major assurance; this use of imps instead of Satan himself cannot be regarded as a small mercy. But will it be effective, and can it possibly be limited to these small things? If the evil effects of the tactical bombs are not extensive, the enemy will not be deterred from achieving his aims. If they are, the danger is minimized, one may say, greatly, but is not negatived.

What is the real danger in the use of these weapons? That they will affect the future generations of living creation. The release of the gamma rays, we suppose, cannot be

prevented. It is this, attended by many other similar radiations, that will tell upon the unborn innocents.

Military targets will surely include munition and some chemical factories, where thousands will be working in war times; nothing can prevent them from being affected. We are not concerned so much with the dead millions, who will be saved from the misfortune of witnessing the horrible miseries of the remnants and their descendants, as for the latter classes, the physically and morally loathsome, who will infect the species. There is no escaping from this consequence, if atomic energy is used for the purpose of destruction. Killing and maiming are inevitable in wars; and the consequent economic dislocation and moral degradation are the price the belligerents are to pay. But no nation or group of nations has the right to degrade the species to abomination.

During the last World War no side used poisonous gases, and the European war was won without them as well as the atom bombs. Japan too was falling back on all fronts without the two fatal bombs. So war, when thrust upon, can be won without detriment to the human species.

If, however, some people think that sufferings shall be unilateral, on one side only, they are surely living in a fool's paradise. The use of atomic energy is no longer a secret. If one nation has developed smaller and less dangerous tactical weapons besides, others have the more dangerous varieties in their stock. And when defeat and destruction and large-scale devastation would be the fate of one country, despair and the spirit of retaliation would prompt it to release the more dangerous ones on enemy countries, producing chain reaction of retaliation, leaving the earth in ashes, with none to wail her lot.

REVIEWS AND NOTICES

ATOMS, MEN, AND GOD. BY PAUL E. SABINE. *Published by Philosophical Library, 15 East 40th Street, New York 16, N.Y., U.S.A. Pages 238. Price \$3.75.* ..

This is a book that seeks to reconcile to science its so-called opposite,—religion,—Christianity in particular. As usual, the author senses and faces a pseudo-problem, that science somehow can explain Nature without the help of any conscious purposive principle behind it. A layman naturally thinks too highly of science and even some scientists think like that. What is required is a more correct understanding of the methodology of science. Science cannot comprehend Nature without remainder, for consciousness and purposiveness are given in Nature and cannot be explained by any mechanistic theory either of causation or chance. Certain spheres of Nature are more or less amenable to a mechanistic mode of understanding. All this should be pretty obvious to a clear-thinking man. The author takes pain to establish this. He seeks to offer a stereoscopic view of reality as 'both physical and psychical', 'natural and divine'. He makes a brief historical survey of the subject-matter which is instructive. He rightly points out the limitations of science. Modern science cannot explain the origin of physical Nature, for the world as 'running down' presupposes a wound-up state which may be ascribed to some agency unknown to science. Then life and the conscious self cannot be explained by science. The author holds that 'by ascribing physical as well as psychical properties to the ultimate stuff of the world we effect a conceptual synthesis that resolves dualism of mind *and* matter into a mind-matter concept of reality that points us to think of the downhill process of material universe and creative process of evolution as two aspects of the expression of a Living Purpose in a living world'. (p. 82). How far is it a real synthesis and a contribution of the age-old problem of mind and matter, the intelligent reader may judge for himself. We cannot distinguish it from the naive hylo-zoism of ancient Greece.

The author finds another evidence for his psychological view of reality in the situation that the mathematical relations in relativity physics that make the physical world understandable are mental. But the mental and physical interact in knowledge; therefore they are essentially one. So that, by taking a metaphysical step, he brings about a further synthesis that thought in the mind of God constitutes the physical universe, which

thought in the individual mind 'creates' (or discovers?) the symbolic mathematical relations. Though there is much over-simplification in this idealistic interpretation of modern science, it is not without its peculiar appeal to our rational as well as religious sense. The main issue that is left out is, if the brute given, the physical events, integrated by mathematical relations, are thoughts in the mind of God, He is then external to us, though we can know His thoughts. Then either God affects our minds from outside as Berkeley conceived or we have the capacity to read His thoughts. Either way, there remain matters to be clarified. If God is the Universal Mind, as the author himself states, then His relation to the individual mind should be explicated. It cannot be external, and this would lead to the question how that which appears as objective may really be mind-made or projected. The author does not sense these problems. Rather he slurs over the difference between the mathematical relations and the physical data integrated through them, that is, the difference between mathematics and physics. He, of course, does not fall into subjective idealism, for he conceives the mathematical relations as objective, symbolism as referring to substance. But he fails to bring out the further implications of this objective reference of the mental image of the world that science offers and to rise to a higher synthesis. The author just states that 'the human mind is an individualized expression of the Cosmic Mind', and condemns dualism. He offers an argument for his monism drawn from modern physics; it is that the world we know is physically altered by the process of our knowing it, the observer is a necessary part of the observed. This is patently a wrong interpretation of Heisenberg's principle. It is not the observer's *mind* that alters the observed, but his instruments. Physics cannot speak of mind changing facts; for physics is not epistemology, rather it presupposes the epistemological principle that facts are independent of our knowing them.

There are other interesting matters in the book such as the vindication of human freedom against determinism of classical physics by the employment of Heisenberg's Uncertainty Principle, then a critical exposition of behaviourism and psycho-analysis. In the last chapter the author regards Christianity as a stage in the evolution of man and holds that man is moving towards the fulfilment of Christ's vision of the Kingdom of God. All this is professedly arbitrary faith.

To conclude this review, there are many gaps

and leaps and many loose-ends too in this book which is however an interesting study for the variety of thoughts that is to be found there and for the worthy objective which is to reconcile Christianity to modern science.

P. J. CHAUDHURY

ANCIENT INDIAN CULTURE AND CIVILIZATION. BY K. C. CHAKRAVARTI. *Published by Vora & Co., Ltd., 3, Round Building, Kaladevi Road, Bombay 2. Pages 3782. Price Rs. 9-8.*

Trustworthy books on Indian culture are rare. This is a timely book of singular interest and value. It is a handy volume giving the essentials of Indian culture and civilization with special emphasis on the underlying unity as well as a connected and fascinating account of the ancient history of India based on the results of the researches of scholars.

There are twenty-one chapters, many of them of absorbing interest. The necessary background is furnished in the opening chapter which deals with the unity and continuity of Indian culture. The topic of the second chapter, dealing with the European Indologists, furnishes interesting reading. Further chapters deal with the Indus Valley civilization, the Aryans and the Upanishads, the beneficent influence of the Sanskrit language, Buddhism and Jainism, historical accounts of Magasthenes, and the reign of Asoka—'the philosopher-king of India'. The different senses of the much-misunderstood word 'Dharma' are discussed and its real significance is explained. An attempt is made to compare Buddhism and Christianity and also reveal

the mutual influence of the Greeks and the Hindus on each other.

The uniqueness of India's contribution to juvenile literature is demonstrated with striking illustrations. Another fascinating subject, Indian learning and sciences, is the topic of a brilliant chapter. It mentions the development of mathematics, astronomy, and geometry in ancient India. The development of art and architecture is traced with sufficient detail. The chapter dealing with the system of education and the ancient universities is one of the most interesting in the book.

Indian philosophy is the theme of a chapter, the Yoga system having been dealt with in detail. The greatness of Shankara is found duly appreciated. Medicine, chemistry, and other sciences cultivated in ancient India are well described. The spread of Indian culture beyond Indian shores, with a suitable map, will act as an eye-opener to Indians themselves, as also ill-informed critics. But some of the author's conclusions expressed while seeking to compare and contrast the distinct contributions of the people of the North and those of the South, generally designated as Aryans and Dravidians, may not find full support from many scholars who have also gone into this interesting subject of ethnological research.

The index is helpful, but the printing quality needs to be bettered, specially in a book of this kind which can be recommended also to foreign readers who are interested in an intelligent appreciation of the unity and uniqueness of Indian culture.

P. SESHADRI

NEWS AND REPORTS

ACTIVITIES OF THE VEDANTA SOCIETY, NEW YORK

The following description of activities of members of the Vedanta Society, New York (34 West 71st Street), as seen by one of its members, Fred Burkel, was broadcast by the Voice of America on the occasion of the birthday of Shri Ramakrishna:

'I should like to say, before mentioning specific activities, that all of our activities, it seems to me, should centre round the ideal of seeking the truth. And what greater inspiration for this quest could we have than the life of Shri Ramakrishna?

I suppose that not even the oldest of our members fail to recall the happiest recollections and feel a deep bond of understanding in watching the impact of his great life upon each new member.

'New members can easily be recognized by their especially radiant smiles, and by their use of exuberant expressions, such as, 'Why I had no idea that this was what religion was all about,' or 'India must be completely different from the rest of the world.' All previous experiences, and all ordinary knowledge, it seems, are trivial beside the grandeur and finality of one's first glimpse of what it means to seek the real meaning of life and to strive for perfection.'...

'On special occasions, we . . . have *pujas* in our chapel. Flowers abound on the altar around the picture of Shri Ramakrishna, and everyone is in a joyous mood. Such times leave a long lingering impression of the richness of Hindu tradition, and of the simplicity and directness of its ancient scriptures.

'Those of us who are fortunate enough to live nearby come to the chapel early in the morning for meditation. This is not formal, group worship. Each comes and goes according to his own schedule. Yet a strong bond grows among us, perhaps just from knowing that we share a common quest, and are striving daily to place that foremost in our lives. In the evenings also, there are always to be seen a few people sitting quietly before the altar. After a day of activity in crowded, busy New York, City, one needs to find peace and deep inspiration for yet another day. Life is adventurous only as long as we recognize its purpose, and can believe that our efforts to achieve our highest end will not ultimately end in failure. All of us are grateful that Vedanta constantly strengthens our faith, and encourages us to grow.' . . .

'Another most rewarding activity is in preparing special entertainment for our more festive occasions. We sometimes have Indian music, which we grow to like more and more, played on the *sitar* by one of our Indian members. On other occasions we have had Western music by a string trio or solo. Currently we are engrossed in preparing a brief dramatic presentation based on the *Bhagavad-Gītā*. This will be given in full costume, with the participants all speaking their lines in Sanskrit. The eight verses which make up the play give a very strong impression of scope and meaning of the *Gītā*. Among other dramatic presentations in years past was one depicting scenes from the life of Buddha.

'At our meetings, we occasionally have guest speakers, among whom there have been Mr. Vincent Sheean, author of *Lead, Kindly Light*; Indian Ambassador Mr. G. L. Mehta; Dr. Suniti Kumar Chatterjee, president, Bengal Legislative Assembly; Dr. P. C. Ghosh, former Chief Minister of Bengal; Mrs. Lakshmi Menon, member of the Indian Parliament; Dr. C. O. Arndt, professor of International Relations, New York University; Dr. H. Shapley, the great astronomer of Harvard University, and many others.

'Of all our activities, none can displace our regular Sunday morning meetings and the evening scripture classes, not to mention the weekly members' meetings, all of which afford us an opportunity to benefit by the special wisdom and example of our Swami.'

On the same occasion the following talk on Shri Ramakrishna by Doctor Abraham Rieger was broadcast by the Voice of America:

'This is a time of flux and change. Bickerings and antagonisms are rife all over the world. What is needed is a spiritual undercurrent strong enough to check the flood of disharmony. In our time Shri Ramakrishna has launched into the world such a powerful current, and its good effects are already evident especially in the peace efforts of modern India and the tremendous impact of these efforts on all the eastern and western countries.

'Although Shri Ramakrishna's teachings were on the purely spiritual plane, they became especially through the message of the great Swami Vivekananda, Shri Ramakrishna's most important disciple, the vital nucleus of an independent, self-confident, and rejuvenated India, a country which has now re-emerged as one of the really great Powers in present-day world history. The Vedantic movement organized by the great Swami is spreading its broad philosophy all embracing of creed, race, and color in the East as well as the West, and its spiritual tenets should prove an efficient lever to keep intellectual and spiritual values on a balanced keel.

'A philosophy declaring the potential divinity of man and the unity of mankind in God cannot be neglected or deflected from its right influence on the thought and actions of man. It is the true promise of peace in the world. It is the real promise of the future.

'In this Vedantic Centre in New York from which we talk, the first Centre started in America by Swami Vivekananda and now under the leadership of Swami Pavitrananda, we daily absorb the wonderful tenets of peace, love and devotion to God and find that this doctrine not only appeals to the intellect but powerfully sways the human heart with the noblest emotions and aspirations. We are confident that the influence of our Centre and the other Centres in America will gain momentum rapidly to the spiritual and physical benefit of mankind.'