

PRABUDDHA BHARATA

VOL. LXIII

JUNE 1958

No. 6



“उत्तिष्ठत जाग्रत प्राप्य वरान्निबोधत ।”

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

MAKE THY HEART A SHRINE

BY SRI A. R. SHENOY

Make thy heart
A noble shrine,
For the dance of thy Lord divine.
Sweep away,
Pride, prejudice, and attachment's clay,
And build on the Rock of Truth,
Thy storm-proof Citadel gay.

Decorate,
With Love's fragrant blossoms,
And fill thy shrine-bowl to the brim,
From Yearning's crystalline fountain stream.
And await,
With Renunciation's *naivedya* plate,
For thy eternal Lord of Love.
Thus make thy heart
A noble shrine,
For the dance of thy Lord divine.

INTRODUCTION TO JNANA YOGA

BY SWAMI VIVEKANANDA

This universe of ours, the universe of the senses, the rational, the intellectual, is bounded on both sides by the illimitable, the "unknowable", the ever unknown. Herein is the search, herein are the inquiries, herein are the facts, from this comes the light which is known to the world as religion. Essentially, however, religion belongs to the supersensuous and not to the sense plane. It is beyond all reasoning and not on the plane of intellect. It is a vision, an inspiration, a plunge into the unknown and unknowable, making the unknowable more than known, for it can never be "known". This search has been in the human mind, as I believe, from the very beginning of humanity. There cannot have been human reasoning and intellect in any period of the world's history without this struggle, this search beyond. In our little universe, this human mind, we see a thought arise. Whence it rises we do not know, and when it disappears, where it goes, we do not know. The macrocosm and the microcosm are, as it were, in the same groove, passing through the same stages, vibrating in the same way. In these lectures I shall try to bring before you the Hindu theory that religions do not come from without, but from within. It is my belief that religious thought is in man's very constitution, so much so that it is impossible for him to give up religion until he can give up his mind and body, until he can give up thought and life. As long as a man thinks, this struggle must go on, and so long man must have some form of religion. So we see various forms of religion in the world. It is a bewildering study but it is not as many of us think, a vain speculation. Amidst this chaos there is harmony, throughout these discordant sounds there is a note of concord, and he who is prepared to listen to it will catch the tone.

Now the great question of all questions at

the present time is this: Taking for granted that the knowable and the known are bounded on both sides by the unknowable and the infinitely unknown, why struggle for that infinite unknown? Why shall we not be content with the present? Why shall we not be content with eating, drinking, and doing a little good to society? This is in the air. From the most learned professor to the prattling baby, (all ask us) to do good to the world, saying that that is all of religion, and that it is useless to trouble ourselves about questions of the beyond. So much so is this the case that it has become a truism. But fortunately we have to question the beyond. This present, this expressed, is only one part of that unexpressed. The sense universe is, as it were, only one portion, one bit of that infinite spiritual universe projected into the plane of sense consciousness. How can this little bit of projection be explained, be understood, without knowing that which is beyond? It is said of Socrates that one day while lecturing at Athens, he met a Brahmin who had travelled into Greece, and Socrates told the Brahmin that the greatest study in the world was mankind. And the Brahmin sharply retorted, "How can you know man until you know God?" This God, this eternally Unknowable or Absolute or Infinite or without name—you may call Him by what name you like—is the rationale, the only explanation, the *raison d'être* of that which is known and knowable, this present life. Take anything before you, the most material thing; take one of these most material sciences, as chemistry or physics or astronomy or biology; study it, push the study forward and forward, and the gross forms will begin to melt and become finer and finer, till they come to a point where you are bound to take a tremendous leap from these material things into the immaterial. The

gross melts into the fine, physics into metaphysics, in every department of knowledge.

Thus man finds himself driven to a study of the beyond. Life will be a desert, human life will be vain, if we cannot know the beyond. It is very good to say, "Be contented with the things of the present." Cows and dogs are, and all animals, and that is what makes them animals. So if man is content with the present and gives up all search into the beyond, we shall all have to go back to the animal plane again. It is religion, the inquiry into the beyond, that makes the difference between man and an animal. Well has it been said that man is the only animal that naturally looks upwards; every other animal naturally looks prone. That looking upward, and going upward, and becoming perfect are what is called salvation; and the sooner a man begins to go higher, the sooner he raises himself towards this idea of truth as salvation. It does not consist in the amount of money in your pocket, or the dress you wear, or the house you live in, but in the wealth of spiritual thought in your brain. That is what makes for human progress, that is the source of all material and intellectual progress, the motive power behind, the enthusiasm behind, that pushes mankind forward.

Religion does not live in bread, does not dwell in a house. Again and again you hear this objection advanced, "What good can religion do? Can it take away the poverty of the poor?" Supposing it does not, would that prove the untruth of religion? Suppose a baby stands up among you when you are trying to demonstrate an astronomical theory, and says, "Does it bring gingerbread?" "No, it does not" you answer. "Then," says the baby, "it is useless." Babies judge the whole universe from their own standpoint, that of producing gingerbread, and so do the babies of the world. We must not judge of higher things from a low standpoint. Everything must be judged by its own standard, and the infinite must be judged by an infinite standard. Religion permeates the whole of man's life, not only the present but the past, present, and

future. It is therefore the eternal relation between the eternal Soul and the Eternal God. Is it logical to judge it by its action upon five moments of human life? Certainly not. These are all negative arguments.

Now comes the question: Can religion really accomplish anything? It can. It brings to man eternal life. It has made man what he is and will make of this human animal a god. That is what religion can do. Take religion from human society, what will remain? Nothing but a forest of brutes. Sense happiness is not the goal of humanity; wisdom (Jñāna) is the goal of all life. We find that man enjoys his intellect more than an animal enjoys his senses, and we see that he enjoys his spiritual nature even more than his rational nature. So the highest wisdom must be this spiritual knowledge. With knowledge will come bliss. All these things in this world are but the shadows, the manifestation in the third or fourth degree of the real Knowledge and Bliss.

One question more. What is the goal? Nowadays it is asserted that man is progressing infinitely forward and forward, and there is no goal of perfection to attain to: Ever approaching, never attaining; whatever that may mean and however wonderful it may be, it is absurd on the face of it. Is there any motion in a straight line? A straight line infinitely projected becomes a circle; it returns to the starting point. You must end where you begin; and as you begin in God, you must go back to God. What remains? Detail work. Through eternity you have to do the detail work.

Yet another question. Are we to discover new truths of religion as we go on? Yea and nay. In the first place we cannot know anything more of religion, it has all been known. In all the religions of the world you will find it claimed that there is a unity within us. Being one with divinity, there cannot be any further progress in that sense. Knowledge means finding this unity amidst variety. I see you as men and women, and this is variety.

It becomes scientific knowledge when I join you together and call you human beings. Take the science of chemistry, for instance. Chemists are seeking to resolve all known substances into their original elements and if possible, the one element from which they are all derived. The time may come when they will find one element that is the source of all other elements. Reaching that, they can go no further; the science of chemistry will have become perfect. So it is with the science of religion. If we can discover this perfect unity, there cannot be any further progress.

The next question is: Can such a unity be found? In India the attempt has been made from the earliest times to reach a science of religion and philosophy, for the Hindus do not separate these, as is customary in Western countries. We regard religion and philosophy as but two aspects of one thing which must equally be grounded in reason and scientific

truth. In the lectures that are to follow, I shall try to explain to you first the system of the Sāṅkhya philosophy, one of the most ancient in India, or in fact in the world. Its great exponent Kapila is the father of all Hindu psychology, and the ancient system that he taught is still the foundation of all accepted systems of philosophy in India today, which are known as Darśanas. They all adopt his psychology, however widely they may differ in other respects.

Next I shall endeavour to show you how Vedānta, as the logical outcome of the Sāṅkhya, pushes its conclusions yet farther. While its cosmology agrees with that taught by Kapila, the Vedānta is not satisfied to end in dualism, but continues its search for the final unity, which is alike the goal of science and religion. To make clear the manner in which the task is accomplished, will be the effort of the later lectures in this course.

ATTAINMENT, DELIGHT, AND NON-SWERVING

BY THE EDITOR

Adopt means for the end you seek to attain. You cannot get butter by crying yourself hoarse, 'There is butter in the milk!' If you wish to make butter, you must turn the milk into curds, and churn it well. Then alone you can get butter. So if you long to see God, practise spiritual exercises. What is the use of merely crying 'Lord! Lord!?'¹

'O Virtuous One! Realize your soul which is none other than that Supreme Light, seated in the triple forms of (individual) seer, his cognition, and the object of cognition. Realize it through proper discipline.'^{2a}

I

We speak of the external and the internal worlds. We do so for the sake of intensive study and research. All of us are not equipped with the same type of talent. Some with the requisite inborn gift can profitably specialize in exploring the world of matter. Others can, as naturally, plunge themselves into the world of mind. Systematic enquiry can help each set to discover how creative forces operate in

the field of its choice. In both, the process adopted is practically the same. It is the triple process of observation, generalization, and verification. Success in any stage leads to the unravelling of truth,—truth related to the layer reached. After certainty has come,

¹ *Teachings of Sri Ramakrishna*, 432.

^{2a} Draṣṭṛ-darśana-dṛśyānām madhye yad-darśanam sthitam.

Sādho! tad-avadhānena svātmānam avabudhyase. *Yoga Vāsiṣṭha, Utpatti Khaṇḍa*, ix. 75.

the relevant force has to be mastered. It has then to be wisely used to serve human purposes, not harmful but beneficial, not unworthy but noble.

We may ask if the initial bifurcation of external and internal will not persist throughout. Will we not, as we advance, travel in progressively diverging areas, with no chance to arrive at any common meeting ground? Ancient teachers have given us the answer. They have pointed out not only in what direction the meeting ground lies but also that it is our duty and glorious privilege to press onward till we reach it. They have called it the Supreme Truth, or Reality. It is described as existing equally in both the worlds and at the same time transcending them. They have also claimed that, while both worlds show the possibility of evolving, Its Perfection stands as the inescapable impulse for evolution, as its sustaining power and as its ultimate goal. The door for verification is ever open in a unique sense; for that Supreme Truth is always present in the starting ground itself,—the very personality of man, the enquirer. Says Gauḍapāda: 'Having known the truth regarding what exists internally (i.e. within the body etc.) as well as the truth regarding what exists externally (i.e. earth etc.), the aspirant becomes one with the Reality, derives pleasure from It, and never deviates from It.'²

II

Let us examine more closely some of the valuable ideas contained in this terse statement with which Gauḍapāda's second chapter ends. To begin with, we shall take up the expression, 'become one with the Reality'. We can never become one with something that is entirely unrelated to, or beyond the reach of, our being. We learn mathematics or music. What does it imply? It implies that the relationships of figures or quantities, or

² Tattvam-ādhyātmikam dr̥ṣṭvā tattvam dr̥ṣṭvā tu bāhyataḥ Tattvī-bhūtas-tad-ārāmaḥ tattvād-apracyuto bhavet. *Māṇḍūkya Kārikā* ii. 38.

the effects of sound combinations are not truths that demand only a casual intellectual assent from us. They are truths that can enter into us, penetrate into the deeper layers of our personality, and become second nature with us. We can afterwards turn them to good account, for the benefit of ourselves and others. Mastery, in fact, means the ability to use them so at will. The personality and its reactions to the varying pressures of the environment provide the field and opportunity for adequate verification. The verification of the Supreme Truth too is to take place, more or less in the same way. The one preliminary condition to be fulfilled is the purification of our psycho-physical mechanism through proper exercises. When its present selfish pulls and pain-causing twists are eliminated, it can act as an easy and effective channel for conveying Cosmic Creative Energy and converting it into 'forms' suitable for each context. 'Becoming one' is, thus, neither a flight into wishful thinking nor a misguided attempt to prevent the thinking apparatus from responding to the noblest impulses common for all humanity. It means just the opposite. It means the patient acquisition of a twofold skill: first, to purify and coordinate all faculties, thoughts, and emotions; and secondly, to so poise the harmonized personality that it spontaneously registers, and unobtrusively answers, mankind's yearnings as much as the situations warrant at the time. We have a tendency nowadays to measure the worth of any individual or movement in terms of sheer quantity or number. Has not the term 'million' a charm of its own? Thus do we often ask: How many among the 'masses' have been contacted by a candidate, lectured to from a platform, and made to 'vote' for the cause that we uphold? The larger that number, the greater must be the man; so we conclude. So also do we try to ascertain the vastness of the area covered by any programme that may be chalked out for constructive work, or the extent of the money expected to be spent when it would be taken

up for execution! With size and bigness haunting our imagination, we are bound to look at the creative value of spiritual attainments from a wrong angle and, hence, come to totally false conclusions about it.

To put it briefly, the spiritually perfect person is one who habitually 'sees' the Spirit in all Its glory in everyone with whom he has to deal,—even in thought. When the physical eye and connected reasoning bring in the picture of a suffering or blundering neighbour, the eye of illumination, opened up by steady discipline, confronts it with the infinitely more powerful assurance of the Divine Presence. Every saint is, in this way, a 'centre' radiating positive influences, whether he is engaged in attending to his bodily needs or living in 'retirement', writing some books. That 'right thought' is a subtle creative force, who can deny? Do we not accept that the loving, forgiving, and expectant attitude of parents and teachers imperceptibly moulds the character of children and students who live with them? The thought-patterns of mature minds change the environment for the better. Even today physicians of the 'old' Āyurvedic system carry on their day to day work on this basis. The 'orthodox' among them may be few in number; but they are men of meditation. Their daily exercises enable them to see the Wisdom of the Heavenly Physician blended harmoniously with their own skill on the one hand, and the need of the afflicted on the other. They enter the consulting room, firmly established in the consciousness of the Divine Presence everywhere. The idea is simple. The mind that is kept in contact with the Creative Source of all Life not only moves into the truth, of its own accord, but also progressively awakens true, just, and beneficial responses from the areas to which it is directed. If that area consists of people who sincerely struggle for self-improvement, their responses will be quicker and more lasting. Others who are too indolent to change their ways or correct their faults will be unable to receive or assimilate much. All, however, will register some result; for no contact with a realized soul will be wholly unproductive.

But how is anyone to measure the extent of such 'results'? Where is he to look for them? There are insuperable difficulties in the matter of making a statistical study of the effects of a sage's eminence upon the general public. For the 'receiving' capacity of no two persons can be the same in all respects. Even when instructed by the same teacher about items of sense perception, we find a few students grasp him fairly aright, but a larger number misinterpret his meaning. Some interpret his words into the exact contrary of his view, and others do not understand him at all.³ What then must be the divergence in the 'results' where the perception of subtle values and the transformation of the entire personality are concerned? It may so happen also that out of those who 'visit' a sage, a few who are receptive may progress in certain directions for a time and then apparently remain 'stagnant', whereas others who appear indifferent at the start may suddenly show signs of quick 'assimilation' later. Peters may 'deny' in unexpected contexts, and Sauls may take the lead in persecution; yet both may become changed beyond recognition as days pass. Then again, it is quite possible that only a bare handful of simple-hearted devotees gather round a saintly person in his own lifetime. But after hearing from them and being struck by their extraordinary calmness and sweetness, large numbers belonging to the next generation may proceed to record the Master's teachings and attain spiritual insight themselves. When they try to share their experiences with others, the message is bound to spread into wider and still wider circles. In this expanding movement, it may not be only pure mystics who take a share, but also men and women with diverse talents,—scholars, poets, musicians, painters, sculptors, merchants, and even administrators. History shows that whenever there appeared an illu-

³ Loke api ekasmād-guroḥ śṛṇvatām kaś-cit yathāvat pratipadyate, kaś-cit ayathāvat, kaś-cit viparitam, kaś-cit na pratipadyate; kimu vaktavyam atīndriyam ātmatattvam? Śaṅkara Bhāṣya, *Kena*, ii. 1.

mined soul of a high order,—even though his career was brief like that of Jesus or Ācārya Śaṅkara—great cultural movements originated and continued to flow for centuries together, embracing in their majestic sweep countless millions spread over the earth.

Sages have sometimes been compared to the spring season.⁴ The comparison is highly suggestive. When spring comes, it brings freshness and vigour with it. Not only big trees, considered mighty and useful by men, but even little plants growing unnoticed by them in some crevices on solitary hill-tops do get tender leaves and flowers suited to their own nature. The rejuvenating force of the season is the same; yet the visible and 'statistically recordable' changes in the 'receiving' entities depend upon the order of developments inherent in their structural patterns. Besides, spring, like other seasons, has its own rhythm and principle for its appearance. It does not stand in need of respectful invitations from any one; nor does it expect even thanks from us for having given us its best. The idea is that great souls, similarly, radiate invigorating influences on all alike,—that too, unasked, unobtrusively, and without the least expectation. We have to make one qualification, however. On spring's approach, all vegetation in the relevant locality bursts forth into a new song of joy and activity at the same time. But humanity's music of spiritual communion and service has a slower movement. For only those with adequate preparation are capable of being caught up by it. But by way of compensation, as it were, it has a way of gathering momentum with every new generation. As its wakening notes become repeated and their thrills penetrate farther, larger areas become affected; and greater numbers join the group with their special skills,—thereby adding a richness, depth, and intensity of appeal that the original participants could never have dreamt of in their days.

⁴ Vasantavat loka-hitam carantaḥ. *Vivekacū-dāmani* 37.

III

So far we have seen that the Truth realized by saints covers what we, in the early stages of analysis, distinguish as the 'external' and the 'internal' worlds. Let us now turn to the second expression used by Gaudapāda. He says that, having 'become one with the Reality', the sage 'derives pleasure from It'. We have to remember here that every scriptural text somewhere or other stresses this one point: that when the Self shines upon (or through, or as) the properly purified and poised mind, there is a welling up of unique joy. Words are ordinarily coined, or meant, to facilitate transactions of the sense world. Scripture is 'revelation' transmitted to us through teachers of the past. The maximum that any illumined teacher can do is to select the best from available words and combine them in ways that may help us to catch supersensuous truths. He may employ allied words in a series. Or he may add a succession of qualifying terms. These may enable the discerning student to experience higher values rising into a *crescendo* whose effect is unforgettable. The teacher can, thus, start with a simple statement that the sage 'enjoys, seeing the Self in the self by the self.' A commentator may add: The meditator has to adopt suitable disciplines (of Yoga) to prevent his attention from straying in all undesirable directions. When the scattered rays of Awareness are gathered together and made to rest calmly and steadily on the Self, he attains realization. He then directly 'sees' the Self to be of the nature of blazing Awareness itself.⁵ In this Supreme

⁵ Cf. the expressions used in stanzas 18 to 22 in *Gītā* vi, along with Śaṅkara Bhāṣya; viniyatam cittam . . . ekāgratām āpannam, hitvā bāhyacintām . . . svātmani sthitim labhate . . . drṣṭa-adrṣṭa-viṣayebhyaḥ . . . tṛṣṇā yasya yoginaḥ nirgatā . . . yasmin kāle . . . cittam uparatim gacchati, niruddham, sarvato nivārita-pracāram . . . yogānuṣṭhānena . . . samādhi-parisuddhena antaḥ-karaṇena, ātmānam Param caitanya-jyotiḥ svarūpam . . . upalabhamānaḥ sve eva ātmani . . . tuṣṭim bhajate . . . sukham . . . anantam . . . buddhyā indriya-nirapekṣayā . . . indriya-gocara-atītam, aviṣaya-janitam . . . ātma-svarūpe . . .

Principle he 'sees' the seeker, the seeking, and the sought to be interchangeable terms. This gives him an access of joy. In the absence of a better expression, we may say that he feels it 'within his self'.

In what sense is it a new joy? Is there not a kind of joy felt when a coveted sense object is acquired? Yes; but that joy is limited and perishable. Surely there was a period of anxious waiting before we could possess the object. Its retention being doubtful, there is bound to be a secret fear that it may be suddenly lost in the future. Besides there is no guarantee of enjoyment though the object might remain intact before us. What pleasure do we get from a collection of paintings if we happen to lose our eyesight? The organ through which objects could be enjoyed being lost, their very presence can occasion greater misery than their previous non-possession. In contrast to such 'conditioned' pleasures, the bliss of the Self stands without a parallel. It does not come to us through the senses, but directly from the comprehensive Principle that makes the senses and their objects function. How does this contact come? Where is the 'limb' that can reach It?

The reply is that the Buddhi or judging faculty itself blossoms into the necessary sensitive 'limb' when mental purity reaches its peak. At present our mental movements are made through internal 'jets', as it were. They are: desire; words uttered mentally to frame desire; pictures raised up of objects, relations, and sensations representing the fulfilment of desire; a sense of waiting; anxiety on that score; accusation of people who seem to be blocking our way; consciousness of sin committed; fear of its recurrence and of the future being blighted; and so on. Cosmic creative energy, flowing through us as Awareness, becomes conditioned by these 'jets'. The result is a condensation in the shape of endless painful situations. As the nature of the thoughts is, so is the experience of joy or sorrow when the time for fructification arrives.

IV

What happens when meditation is practised correctly? Unwholesome memory tangles are eliminated. Creative energy flowing through all the 'jets' is slowly and systematically centred on Perfection Itself as a Fact in the immediate present. Meditation is, thus, an intensely active and total effort of the personality. The beginner has to lift himself into it through graded steps. He has to start with a threefold distinction, viz. himself as the meditator, his process of meditation, and lastly, the goal of it, looked upon as the Self or simply as Liberation. The 'meanings' connected with these three usually take the shape of a mental proposal: 'I, so-and-so, direct my attention this way, to realize the glory of the Self.' This is technically called 'Form', *Sva-rūpa* as against 'Meaning or Essence', *Artha*. Here, 'I', 'attention', and 'the Self' call up various 'associations' in keeping with the antecedents and cultural advance of the meditator. After some diligent practice, most of the wayward jumpings of thought can be controlled. Still a minimum sense of internal split and of separation from the Ideal is sure to persist, impeding the full expression of delight. This is because 'memories' of meanings basically surrounding the three terms, 'seeker', 'seeking', and 'Goal' have not been consciously integrated with the concept of the Self. Any thought-movement stirred up with the mental speech, 'I, the seeker', must register a sense of smallness or bondage. Similarly, 'seeking' must suggest a tedious process, and 'Goal' a desirable, yet at present *unattained*, Entity. This must create an undercurrent of pain or restlessness, however minute, until 'memories' dependent upon inwardly spoken words are disentangled and suitably harmonized.⁶ To do this, a further heaving of the personality will be required. That will be the last step, so far as fusion of

⁶ It will not be difficult to see the implications of the Yoga Sūtras, *Smṛti-pariśuddhau sva-rūpa-śūnyā iva artha-mātra-nirbhāsā nirvitarkā* (I. 43) and *Tad-eva artha-mātra-nirbhāsam sva-rūpa-śūnyam iva samādhiḥ* (III. 3).

values is concerned. After that, the meanings not only of the three terms, 'seeker', 'seeking', and 'Goal', but also of all other terms and entities of the internal as well as external worlds will undergo a permanent transformation. The limit is reached when they all stand revealed as natural, variegated, and fully enjoyable 'scintillations' from the priceless Jewel,—the Self, looked upon as 'individual' or 'Supreme'.

Attention may, and will, yet call up images and deal with objects corresponding to them, as they appear. But there will be no sense of *compulsion* to accept them or reject them in a special way, as before. As they pass, the internal Judge of values will habitually give each of them the adoration previously reserved for the Self *imagined* to be fundamentally different from them. Adoration and delight naturally go together. Delight is no more an experience expected to come in the future as the result of any action done in the present. It is contacted in the present moment itself, and in every succeeding moment as it arrives.

At this stage, the main three terms of the 'Form', *Sva-rūpa*, lose their previous power to rouse up totally separate meanings. For they all now mean only the Self. 'Form' has thus fulfilled its function. Being no more operative in any special way, it is said to have 'disappeared' and, *as it were*, 'dissolved'. This is, technically, *an* attainment of the 'Formless'. Positively paraphrased, it reads: 'The meaning, or Self, alone shines.' Whether this comprehensive value has emerged can be verified only by one's own inner Judge. That Judge is the special sensitive 'limb', evolved and strengthened through disciplines. It is about this that scriptures have spoken in various contexts.

One point more may be touched upon here. It is related to the last expression in Gauḍapāda's statement, viz. that the sage 'never deviates' from the Truth. In his commentary Ācārya Śaṅkara says in effect: A person who is ignorant of the Truth is likely to mistake his mind to be the Self. He may think that his self is caught up in movement

matching his mental fluctuations. He may also identify his self with the body etc. So he may interpret bodily movements as deviation from Ātman and say, 'Oh, I am now fallen from the Knowledge of the Self!' On the contrary, when his mind is concentrated now and then, he may feel happy, thinking, 'I am now one with the essence of the Truth!' But the knower of the Truth never makes any such statement. For he sees directly that Ātman is ever one and changeless and that it is impossible for it to deviate from its own nature. The consciousness, 'I am the Supreme Truth' never leaves him.

We may very usefully remember here the long description of the Sthita-prajña or the man of steady illumination, given in the second chapter of the *Gītā*. We may remember too the special mention elsewhere that he will be absolutely free from fear, and unruffled in the midst of great sorrows. Ācārya Śaṅkara comments: 'Sorrows, such as may be caused by weapons like a sword and so on.' Who can forget that the Teacher of the *Gītā* is a military hero, choosing of his own accord to act as an unarmed charioteer in the midst of the terrible conflict at Kurukṣetra?

'Yathā atattva-darśi kaś-cit cittam-ātmatvena pratipannaḥ, citta-calitamanu calitam ātmānam manyamānaḥ, tattvāt calitam dehādi-bhūtam ātmānam kadācit manyate pracyuto'ham ātma-tattvādidānīm iti. Samāhite tu manasi, kadācit, tattva-bhūtam prasannātmānam manyate idānīm asmi tattvī-bhūta iti. Na tathā ātmavid-bhavet. Ātmanaḥ eka-rūpatvāt, pracyavana-abhāvāt ca. Cf. also Śaṅkara's comment on *Gītā* vi, 21, Ayam vidvān ātma-svarūpe sthitaḥ tasmād-eva tattva-svarūpāt na pracyavate. Ātma-lābham prāpya duḥkhena-śāstra-pāta-ādinā, guruṇa mahatā api na vicālyate (vi. 22).

Cf. the description of the man of self-control and real Peace, given in *Yoga Vāsiṣṭha*, Mumukṣu Khaṇḍa, xiv 75, for example. 'He whose thoughts shine like the cool moon-beams, whose mind remains unruffled when confronted with fighting or death, even as at the prospect of festivity,—he indeed is called a self-controlled man of Peace.'

Tuṣāra-kara-bimbābham mano yasya nirākulam,
Maraṇotsavayuddheṣu sa śānta iti kathyate.

MĀYĀ AND AVIDYĀ

BY PROF. SURENDRANATH BHATTACHARYA

It will not be too much to say that the concept of Māyā and Avidyā, in some form or other, has been the determinant of Hindu culture, its philosophy, art, literature, and everything else from the prehistoric time down to the present day. To understand the Hindu view of life it is necessary to realize the implications of this doctrine in all its bearings.

With all the theistic schools of Indian thought, excepting the Advaita, Avidyā and Māyā are distinct concepts. Māyā is essentially the creative power of the Lord and has an objective implication. Avidyā, on the other hand, is a purely epistemological and subjective concept.

Among the Advaita thinkers too, there is a class which, for the sake of convenience, often makes a distinction between Avidyā and Māyā. Thus Vidyāraṇya takes Māyā in the sense of 'Extraordinary Power'.¹ He is of opinion that Māyā is the original source. It is comprised of the three *guṇas*, *Sattva*, *Rajas* and *Tamas*. This *Mūlāprakṛti* is said to have two forms.² When there is a preponderance of pure *Sattva*, *Prakṛti* may be called Māyā and when *Sattva* is overwhelmed by *Rajas* and *Tamas* it may be called Avidyā.³ (Purity of *Sattva* lies in its preponderance over *Rajas* and *Tamas*, and its impurity in its obscuration by them.) Or, the distinction between Māyā and Avidyā may be made thus: The same original *Prakṛti* is called Māyā in reference to its preponderating *Vikṣepa Śakti* (projecting function) and Avidyā in reference to its preponderating *Āvarana Śakti* (concealing function).

¹ *Pañcadaśī* II. 47.

² Māyā ca avidyā ca svayameva bhavati. *Nṛsīnhottara* 9.

³ *Pañcadaśī*

Māyā with its characteristic of projection (*Vikṣepa*) is the *Upādhi* (condition) of Īśvara; and Avidyā with its characteristic of obscuration (*Āvarana*), in addition to *Vikṣepa*, is the *Upādhi* of Jīva (the individual).

Śaṅkara often takes the word Māyā in an objective sense. The omniscient Lord is the cause of endurance of the created world inasmuch as He is the Regulator, just as a magician is the stay of the magical show.⁴ Just as a magician is not affected at any time (past, present and future) by the illusion produced by himself,—for the illusion is unreal—so also is the Supreme Lord ever untouched by the illusion of the world.⁵

Again in reference to creation, Śaṅkara speaks of the Lord as a Great Magician. The Omniscient and Omnipotent Lord, the Great Magician, manifests Himself as a second self, viz., the world.⁶ Or like a magician, the Great Magician, the self-knowing and all-powerful Lord, did all this.⁷

Again, when Śaṅkara says that the apparent distinction between Brahman and Jīva is simply due to false apprehension, and that the distinction between one Jīva and another is only a creation of Avidyā (*Avidyā-kalpita*), he evidently takes Avidyā in an episte-

⁴ Sarvajñaḥ sarveśvaraḥ ... utpannasya jagato niyantrtvena sthiti-kāraṇam, māyāviva māyāyāḥ. *Sārīraka Bhāṣya* on *Brahma Sūtra* II. i. 1.

⁵ Yathā svayam prasāritayā māyayā māyāvī triṣu api kāleṣu na saṁsprīyate, avastutvāt. evam Paramātmā api saṁsāra-māyayā na saṁsprīyate. *Ibid* II. i. 9

⁶ Sarvajño devaḥ sarva-śaktir-mahāmāyā ātmānam-evātmāntaratvena jagad-rūpeṇa nirmimīte. *Ait. Bhāṣya* I. 1.

⁷ Māyāvivad-vā mahāmāyāvī devaḥ sarvajñaḥ sarva-śaktiḥ sarvam-etaccakāra. *Ibid* II. 1.

See also, *Bhāṣya* on *B.S.* II. 1. 28. Tathedam prapañcākhyam māyāmātram dvaitam rajjuvan-māyāvivac-ca advaitam paramārthataḥ. *Māṇḍūkya Kārikā Bhāṣya* I. 17. See also *Ibid* II. 19.

mological sense.⁸ In the introduction to his Bhāṣya on the *Brahma Sūtras*, having fully explained Adhyāsa (evidently in the epistemological sense), he concludes: 'This Adhyāsa the wise regard as Avidyā.'⁹

From the above it will be seen that Śaṅkara conveniently makes use of the term Māyā whenever the question of creation is involved, and he almost invariably uses the term Avidyā when the question of Jīva's relation with the world is discussed.¹⁰ This, however, must not be interpreted to mean that he regards Māyā and Avidyā as two distinct principles. Although he definitely speaks of Māyā or Avyakta as the Śakti (power) of the Lord,¹¹ yet he does not take it in the sense in which other Vaiṣṇava and Śaiva Vedāntists take it. The following extract from Śaṅkara leaves no room for doubt that he regarded Māyā as only another name for Avidyā: 'That seed-power is of the nature of Avidyā and is indicated by the term 'Avyakta' (Unmanifested). It is sustained by the Lord; it is the great sleep constituted by Māyā. . . . This is Avyakta and, in some Śruti is called Akṣara, in some, Māyā. Māyā is, indeed, Avyakta (Inexplicable), for it cannot be determined either as this or that.'¹² Again, in the

⁸ See Bhāṣya on B. S. I. 3. 19, II.1.21, 28 etc.

⁹ Tam evam-lakṣaṇam-adhyāsam paṇḍitā avidyeti manyate.

¹⁰ Sarvajñasya īśvarasya ātmabhūte iva avidyā-parikalpīte nāmarūpe tatvānyatvābhyām-anirvacanīye saṁsāra-prapañca-bīja-bhūte sarvajñasya īśvarasya māyāśaktiḥ prakṛtir-iti ca śruti-smṛtyor-abhilāpyate. Bhāṣya on B.S. II.1.14. See also *Ibid* I.iv.3, I.ii.22.

Sarvasya jagato bīja-bhūtam-avyākṛta-nāmarūpam satattvam sarva-kārya-kāraṇa-śakti-samāhārarūpam avyaktam avyākṛta-ākāśādi-nāma-vācyam paramātmāni ota-prota-bhāvena samāśritam vaṭakanīkāyām-iva vaṭavṛkṣa-śaktiḥ. Bhāṣya on *Kaṭha* III. 11. See *Sarva-vedānta-siddhānta-saṁgraha* 309 and *Tattvopadeśa* 110.

¹¹ Eka eva parameśvaraḥ kūṭastha-nityo vijñānadhātur-avidyayā māyāyā māyāvivad-anekadhā vibhāvyaṭe. Bhāṣya on B.S. I. 3. 19.

¹² Avidyātmikā hi bīja-śaktir-avyakta-śabdānirdesyā parameśvara-āśrayā māyāmayī mahā-susuptiḥ... tad-etad-avyaktam kvacid-ākāśa-sabdānirdiṣṭam ... kvacid-akṣara-śabdoditam ... kvacin-

commentary on *Māṇḍūkya Kārikā* I.16. Śaṅkara speaks of Māyā functioning from beginningless time and as being of the nature of *anyathā-grahana*, taking one thing for another. Here he practically defines Māyā as Adhyāsa.¹³

Again, in the course of his explanation of the Vedic text, '*Indro māyābhiḥ puru-rūpa īyate*', he himself raises the objection that the word Māyā cannot mean *Ajñāna*, as its primary sense is 'apprehension', and then meets this objection by saying that all sensuous knowledge is illusory and as such Māyā is an appropriate equivalent of this knowledge. Quotations may be multiplied to show that with Śaṅkara, Māyā is the same as Avidyā.¹⁴

The Vivaraṇa school thus proves the identity of Māyā and Avidyā:¹⁵ The distinction between Māyā and Avidyā is neither definable, nor sanctioned by Śruti or usage. Whatever might be the conception of Māyā and Avidyā, it will be agreed by all that in either case the distinctive characteristic of suppressing the real object and of projecting that which is other than that object is invariably present. Hence there cannot be any substantial difference between Māyā and Avidyā. Both are inexplicable (*anirvacanīya*). A distinction is, however, sought to be made between the two in the following manner: Māyā does not bewilder its locus and follows the will of the person who exercises it. But Avidyā affects the locus and is not dependent upon the will of the person who is affected by it. Neither is the term Avidyā applied to things produced by an enchanter. But if by

māyeti sūcitam...avyaktā hi sā māyā, tattvānyatva-nirūpaṇasya aśakyatvāt. Bhāṣya on B.S. I.iv.3.

¹³ Tattva-pratibodha-rūpeṇa bījātmanā anyathā-grahana-lakṣaṇena ca anādi-kāla-pravṛttena māyā-lakṣaṇena svapnena.

¹⁴ Nanu prajñā-vacano māyā-śabdaḥ, satyam, indriya-prajñayā avidyā-mayatvena māyātvābhy-upagamād-adoṣaḥ, māyābhir-indriya-prajñābhiḥ avidyā-rūpābhir-ityarthaḥ. Bhāṣya on *Māṇḍūkya Kārikā* III.24. See also Bhāṣya on B.S. I.ii.22.

¹⁵ See *Rju-Vivaraṇa* and *Tattvadīpana* on *Pançapādikā-Vivaraṇa*. *Brahma Sūtra* — Calcutta Sanskrit Series P. 207 ff.

the locus (*āśraya*) is meant the observer, he is certainly deceived by *Māyā*. If the person who exercises it be called the locus, his immunity from deception is due, not to his being the maker of the *Māyā*, but due to his knowledge of its falsehood and ability to check it. Otherwise he too is liable to deception like the observer. Again, as to the independence of the person in producing *Māyā*, it is to be noticed that his independence lies in his using the materials (*mantra-auśadha-ādi*, charm, medicinal herb etc.) and not in the product *Māyā* itself. Even in cases of subjective illusions (*avidyā*), sometimes the subject's will can make or unmake it. For instance, by the intentional movement of the finger the illusion of the double moon may be produced. With the help of certain charms and herbs, particular dream illusions may be assured. The illusion of reflections is also an illustration to the point. The term *Māyā* is clearly used in the sense of *Avidyā* (to be removed by true knowledge) in Vedic texts like the following: 'By meditating on Him, by uniting with Him, and by becoming one with Him, there is cessation of all *Māyā* in the end, etc.'¹⁶ For practical purposes, however, the self-same principle may be called *Māyā* or *Avidyā* according as prominence is given to its power of projecting or of concealing, or in accordance with its being subject to will or not.¹⁷

The author of the *Prakāṣārtha Vivaraṇa* observes that although *Māyā* is a beginningless simple, yet we may attribute parts to it in reference to its functions of *Āvaraṇa* and *Vikṣepa*. *Āvaraṇa* is that power which keeps back reality from our view and finds expression in such experience as 'Brahman is not', 'Brahman shines not' etc. *Vikṣepa* is individual experience. In this latter aspect, *Māyā* may conveniently be called *Avidyā* and, as such, it primarily appertains to the *Jīvas*.

¹⁶ Tasyābhidyānād-vojanāt-tattvabhāvāt
bhūyaścānte viśvamāyā-nivṛttiḥ etc.

¹⁷ See *Pañcapādikā Vivaraṇa* C. S. S. No. 1,
P. 211.

Vidyāraṇya, in his *Vivaraṇa-Prameya-Saṅgraha*, discusses the question whether *Māyā* and *Avidyā* are identical or not. He attempts at a reconciliation of different views and holds that the same entity may be called *Māyā* when we look at it as a power producing extraordinary effects and as being controlled by the agent, and *Avidyā* when we look at it as an independent power obscuring true vision.

Sarvajñātamuni, in his *Saṅkṣepa Śārīraka*, makes no distinction between *Māyā* and *Avidyā*. He makes *Avidyā* alone responsible for the world-appearance. He even goes to the extreme of taking *Avidyā* (and not *Māyā*) as the condition of *Īśvara* (*Antahkaraṇa* is said to be the *Upādhi* of *Jīva*).

The definition of *Ajñāna* in *Vedāntasāra*¹⁸ makes it clear that the epistemological and cosmological senses have been blended together. Here *Ajñāna* is partly *Māyā* and partly *Avidyā*.

Nārāyaṇa Saraswati makes the following observation: 'Avidyā being of the nature of darkness (*Tamaḥ*), its locus cannot be different from its object. The Pure *Cit* is at once the locus and object of *Avidyā*. So, to institute any real difference between *Māyā* and *Avidyā* on the ground that the locus of *Māyā* is *Īśvara* and that of *Avidyā* is *Jīva*, is meaningless. However, if any distinction has at all to be made, it may be made with reference to its different functions. When *Ajñāna* veils up Pure *Cit* it may be called *Avidyā* and when it does not do so, it may be called *Māyā*. It should also be noticed that the functioning of *Avidyā* or *Māyā* is due to the *Guṇas* of which it is constituted. *Ajñāna* may be called *Māyā* with reference to the preponderance of *Sattva Guṇa* (which is of the nature of lamination), and then its locus may be called unveiled Pure *Cit*. This very unveiled Pure *Cit* may be called *Īśvara* when it is conditioned (*upahita*) by the *Guṇas*. Then It is also called Omniscient, Omnipotent etc. The object of this *Māyā*, the condition of *Īśvara*, is *Jīva*, inasmuch as through the

¹⁸ See *Jacobi's Ed.* P. 8.

preponderance of *Rajas* and *Tamas* this *Māyā* conceals Pure *Cit* and at the same time projects the world. When Pure *Cit* is thus veiled by *Māyā*, due to the preponderance of *Rajas* and *Tamas*, this *Māyā* may be called *Avidyā*.

Then *Jīva* may be called the locus of this *Avidyā*, and *Īśvara* its object. For *Jīva* is the Pure *Cit* veiled up by *Māyā*. Hence there is no essential difference between *Māyā* and *Avidyā*.

EMOTIONAL SECURITY

(FOR CHILDREN)

BY SRI SUDHANGSHU BHUSAN PAL CHOUDHURY

What parents today seem to want most for their children is security. The word has been used so much and so indiscriminately that it has become a *cliché*. Yet parents cling to the term because, more than any other, it represents an attitude, a frame of mind, that they know is essential for the mental health of their children. The other basic idea that seems to concern parents most is discipline. They are puzzled about the 'right' kind of discipline, how they can carry it out, and what its true goals are.

WHAT IS SECURITY?

A sense of security is that feeling of self-respect and confidence in one's own power which enables an individual to meet with interest and courage what each day offers and to use his experiences constructively for himself and for those around him. Basic to this, of course, are physical security,—health; the satisfaction of fundamental physical needs; freedom from external dangers, attack, and war; and economic security, the freedom from want that is so essential to decent, happy living. But by security, parents mean primarily the emotional security that will enable their children to live more satisfactorily in our complex world. And since the external forces of turmoil and destruction are today more threatening than ever before in the

memory of man, the idea of inner security has become more and more important.

SECURITY AND DISCIPLINE

Trying to translate new scientific ideas and new insights into practical everyday procedures, many thoughtful parents are confused, caught between two opposing attitudes toward discipline. They have learned that children feel insecure when they have been made afraid of disapproval and punishment for acting on their natural, spontaneous feelings and urges. Too often, it has been pointed out, insecurity results from a too critical attitude, too little freedom, too little opportunity for a child to satisfy his normal desires. It is not hard to see how the strict Victorian attitude—which still persists in many families and communities—has caused much misery and crippling of personality.

Many parents were ready and eager to break away from this attitude. The newer point of view seemed convincing. In many cases it helped them to comprehend the adulthood experiences from which they had suffered. The implications, then, seemed clear; in order to build confidence, children need freedom, not repression,—activity without restraint. There seems little doubt that by and large children are benefiting by greater freedom, more varied and more creative activi-

ties, and the free flow of parental sympathy and affection the newer attitude has encouraged.

In many instances, however, children who were allowed great freedom to express their wishes and feeling seemed uneasy and restless, often whining and annoying. Not only did their parents find this behaviour difficult to tackle, but the children, too, seemed unhappy about what they were doing. The cartoon in which nursery school children ask each other, "Do we have to do what we want?" expressed a situation that frequently developed further into something like "We don't like it when we always do just what we want. Tell us how far we can safely go."

So parents came face to face with the central dilemma: the old type of rigid control was bad and dangerous; on the other hand, lack of discipline didn't work well either. What, then, do children need in order to attain the security, confidence, and peace we want them to have?

WHAT BUILDS SECURITY?

Years of research in children development and actual observations of children indicate that these are the essentials for building a child's security: (1) Close relationships that give him love and affection and from which he gains support and comfort as well as a feeling of his own worth; (2) freedom to develop his mental and physical capacities as he gradually grows toward independence and confidence; and (3) sympathetic guidance through discipline that both helps him to develop his own control and protects him against those outside experiences and inner impulses that may be too much for him to handle by himself. Parents who understand the essential needs of all children and think, too, about some of the ways in which these needs are in danger of remaining unfulfilled, may find their answers to the question of how to help their own children toward security.

LOVE AND WARM RELATIONSHIPS

Objective research has shown that infants

who are for long periods deprived of warm personal care and mothering do not continue to develop as they should and often show tragic signs of deterioration. This has brought into sharper focus what wise people have probably always known: that babies who are loved and 'enjoyed' receive an intangible something on which they thrive. This point has been so forcibly stressed, however, that it has created problems for some parents. Perhaps because they interpret it too literally and too strictly, they sometimes feel burdened by it. "Of course we love the baby," they say, "but we can't feel loving all the time." How can they, faced as they are with the thousands of small demands that make up life within a growing family? Nor is constant high-pitched feeling what doctors and educators are thinking about when they speak of showing love. What they have in mind is rather an underlying attitude of affection, concern, and tenderness with which parents generally respond to their children. It is a kind of sensitivity and unselfishness,—particularly when the children are young and whenever else it is especially required—that helps parents to meet their children's needs. When this attitude exists, boys and girls are not upset by their parents' occasional lapses and pre-occupations. Somehow they sense that basically they are loved and will be taken care of.

Parents differ greatly in the way they express their feelings of love for children; some are much more demonstrative than others. Fortunately most adults respond spontaneously to the appeal of a baby and enjoy giving him the cuddling so essential to him. The modern emphasis in pediatric care on breast feeding whenever possible and on holding infants when they take the bottle encourages mothers to maintain the physical closeness that babies need. Yet some mothers find it hard to be tied to their children in this way and are tempted by the many attractive and ingenious bottle holders flooding the market. In most cases, however, parents readily accept the new interpretations of babies' needs, especially when they have already been groping toward

these ideas and need only to have them clearly formulated in order to recognize their truth.

As children grow older parents express their love less and less in physical form. Sensing that their school-age children want their physical separateness, they are usually reluctant to break in on this feeling. Yet there are times when any child welcomes a pat on the hand or an arm around the shoulder as a quick reminder that his parents are still ready to give support and encouragement. But more important, from the earliest days on, is the indirect expression of love in the sensitive, aware responses to a child's needs at different stages. A parent shows his love, too, when he gives just and due praise for a child's accomplishments. A child feels that his parents love him when, for example, they appreciate a picture he tries to make, even though it does not even remotely approach grown-up standards, or when they quietly listen—but really listen—to what he regards interesting in the events of his day.

Affection expressed continually in these different ways, then, is what gives a child the comfort that eases periods of stress. It gradually builds in him the feeling that if people care for him with tenderness and consideration he must be worth their concern and have merit of his own. It does more than this, too. Receiving love opens the way for children to give love in return and to continue to do so as they mature. Children who are self-absorbed or self-seeking, who have little or no affection or consideration for others, are usually those who grew up without loving care and close relationships.

FREEDOM TO DEVELOP

Love and loving care supply the base. On this children have to develop their own abilities so that in time they can take care of themselves. Toward this goal they need freedom suitable to each stage of growth,—freedom to do what they are ready to do when they are ready. This means that parents themselves must be ready for their children to change as they grow. It means, too, that they have to

look at their young with a clear eye, ready to see the signs of new understanding and new powers emerging. Then they can give the guidance and encouragement that help children to take the next step.

We have observed the dramatic way in which children's powers unfold in an orderly sequence, as if they were following a universal blueprint. From infancy on, each new stage of maturation anticipates the need for new activities and skills. But of course children vary considerably in their rate of development, just as they vary greatly in so many other ways.

The idea that they learn to do things completely by themselves is not true. Instinct is supposed to be a determining factor in this learning. It is clear, however, that much of what children learn is by imitation and in response to stimulation. Whatever the complex mechanisms and motivations involved, there is no doubt that in this process the adults around them play an important part.

A child, for example, who is kept too long in his carriage or play pen without being given opportunity to move in a larger space usually discovers the thrills of mobility later than others,—sometimes so late, in fact, that he may lose interest in trying. The mother who gives her baby many chances to play on a rug or on the grass with bright coloured objects to reach for is offering a better kind of experience, one that helps the child to make use of his abilities as they develop. Her enjoyment of his new skills encourages him to try more and more activity and adds to his growing sense of accomplishment.

The challenge for the parent is to be alert to the child's changing interests—which is not always easy, at eight months, or eight years, or eighteen—and to encourage his growth at his own pace. Such an attitude avoids the dangers of two extremes: causing tension by pushing a child faster than he is ready to go, and limiting him and blocking his growth by restraint and lack of proper freedom to test his powers.

Parents hold their children back for many

reasons; some of these they recognize, and of others they themselves are often not aware. Sometimes it is merely because they are too set in their ways, not flexible enough to respond to the quick growth changes of infancy and childhood. Sometimes they are quite understandably too preoccupied and harassed with their own problems. Many parents enjoy their children most when they are little and helpless; though babies need constant care, these parents find them less demanding when they stay in one place than when they begin to run around, investigate, and assert themselves. How often one hears a parent say, "If they could only stay this way for ever." Some parents act as if they would like to keep their children at one stage by ignoring their readiness for the next.

Because of their own lack of confidence, other parents are afraid to let children experiment. These parents fear that bad results may follow if their children, of almost any age, are allowed more freedom of activity: the toddler might fall and hurt himself; the school-age child might be exposed to illness; the teen-ager might do things to bring down the disapproval of their contemporaries or of grown-ups.

Though many of these fears are realistic, it is doubtful whether children learn better by avoiding situations than by meeting them directly.

There are just as many reasons why some parents tend to push their children too fast and to over-stimulate them. Practically all parents want their boys and girls to develop to the best of their ability. Some want their children to have what they themselves lacked and to accomplish what they did not achieve. Others are spurred on by comparing their children with the neighbours' children, perhaps even more nowadays because of the stress that has been laid on the norms of development. Such parents feel that if a son differs from the children who are better than average, he is shamefully inferior.

Whatever the reasons that cause them to put pressure on their children, parents usually find out that too much pushing, like too much restraint, brings tension and unhappiness. Children who try to live up to expectations that are too high for them sense only too clearly that they have failed. This can be as true of social successes as of intellectual achievements.

ARTHUR SCHOPENHAUER

A BRIEF STUDY

BY SRI SUBHASH CHANDRA

I

In the year 1813, at a tea-party at Jena, a young Doctor of Philosophy, bored by the tedious and trivial gossiping reigning over the tea-table, betook himself into a window-niche, and was soon lost in the mazes of speculative meditation. His countenance wore the signs of inward contemplation, which clearly indicated the depth and intensity of the thoughts which were seething in the

furnace of his mind. A group of girls, amused by the seemingly vacant and expressionless appearance of his face, were making fun of him. Goethe, that immortal German bard, attracted by the laughter of the girls, looked first at them, and then at the cause of their mirth. And, having grasped with his luminous insight the significance of the look on the face of the young man, he went up to the giggling girls, and said with a mild re-

primand: "Children, leave that youth in peace; in due time he will grow over all our heads." And Goethe erred not in his prognostication, for that young man was Arthur Schopenhauer.

The philosophy of Schopenhauer constitutes an important landmark in the history of Western philosophy. It marked a momentous departure from the then prevailing traditions of European thought. His philosophy was a vehement protest against the paralysing primacy of a decadent form of rationalism. Rationalism, which had begun as a healthy and constructive reaction against the medieval scholasticism and its hair-splitting logic, had, in the days of Schopenhauer, itself become an imposing monument of mental gymnastics. The Iceland of Rationalism was governed, not by the facts of life, but by the stultifying niceties of a lop-sided logic. Rationalism had begun with the Dream of Descartes, and culminated in the frozen and frenzied ballet of bloodless categories. Schopenhauer's philosophy was a living epigram against these rationalistic modes of thinking. But, the philosophy of Schopenhauer was not simply a reaction. It was not a mere negative denunciation of rationalism, but also a fresh and vigorous exploration of new regions, and the opening of novel avenues of study and approach. It was at once a protest and a prolegomena. As Schopenhauer himself, in a letter dated March 18, 1818, and addressed to his Leipzig publisher F. A. Brockhaus, observes: "My work is a new philosophical system: but new in the complete sense of the word: not a new exposition of the already existing ones: but an interconnected series of ideas in the highest grade, which hitherto has never yet come in the head of any one man."¹

The philosophy of Schopenhauer is embodied in his monumental work *Die Welt Als Wille Und Vorstellung*. This book is not just a great work, but is the outpouring of the

spirit of a genius. As Höffding puts it, it "grew within him (Schopenhauer) as the child grows in the womb of its mother."² In it we find Schopenhauer at his best. Every page of this work bears the authentic stamp of a masterpiece. It is free from the tedious redundancy, which invariably creeps in a voluminous work. Furthermore, Schopenhauer could not have chosen a better title for his *Magnum Opus*, for these six words epitomize the cardinal aspects of Schopenhauer's philosophy. *Die Welt Als Wille Und Vorstellung* has been translated into English, by Haldane and Kemp, under the title 'The World As Will And Idea' While the first part of the title has been correctly translated, we feel that the rendering of the German word 'Vorstellung' by the English word 'idea' is unfortunate and confusing. For the translators have rendered another pivotal word of Schopenhauer's philosophy, viz. 'Idee' also as 'Idea'. The translators have tried to distinguish the two terms by spelling the English for "Idee" with a capital, 'Idea,' and the English for 'Vorstellung' without a capital, 'idea'. We have referred to this point in order to obviate any confusion, since we have used the translation of Haldane and Kemp for this article.

II

Before we embark upon a study of the philosophy of Schopenhauer, let us take into account the factors which influenced and, to a certain extent, shaped his philosophy. No philosopher can claim to be an intellectual hermit. And Schopenhauer is no exception. He was deeply influenced by the writings of Plato and Kant, and by the lofty and inspired wisdom of the sages of the Upanisads. As he himself puts it: "I confess that, next to the impression of the world of perception, I owe what is best in my own system to the impression made upon me by the works of Kant, by the sacred writings of the Hindus, and by

¹ *Allgemeine Geschichte Der Philosophie* by Paul Deussen (Leipzig, 1920) Vol. VI, p. 400.

² *History of Modern Philosophy* by Höffding, Vol. II, p. 220.

Plato.”³ Schopenhauer regarded the Upaniṣads as the solace of his life, and was confident that they will be the solace of his death. He regarded the Upaniṣads as his Bible and emphatically declared: “There was more to be learnt out of one page of these (the Upaniṣads) than out of ten volumes of the post-Kantian philosophers.”⁴ He used to speak of Plato as “the divine Plato”. Schopenhauer’s thought is so much dependent on the Copernican Revolution brought in philosophy by Kant that Paul Deussen writes: “Kant’s doctrine is the bare trunk, (and) without the Kantian substructure Schopenhauer’s teaching would hang in the air: both lie together in an organic unity.”⁵

We have already alluded to the anti-rationalistic character of Schopenhauer’s thought. Schopenhauer was convinced that: “Reason is feminine in nature; it can only give after it has received. Of itself it has nothing but the empty forms of its operation.”⁶ He shared with Descartes an attitude of hostility towards syllogism, and was in consilience with the British empiricists that perception is the only legitimate and trustworthy foundation for philosophy, if philosophy is not to degenerate into a shallow sophism. He candidly observes: “With me perception is throughout the source of all knowledge.”⁷ Schopenhauer’s preference for perception has its roots in his childhood. It is well known that Schopenhauer’s father, a successful and prosperous merchant, was very keen that his son should become a businessman. He did not consider scholastic education as an asset to a businessman. The guiding principle of the father was: “Mein Sohn soll im Buche der Welt lesen” (My son shall read in the book of the world). His

³ *The World As Will And Idea*, by Schopenhauer (London, 1883, E. T. Haldane and Kemp) Vol. II, p. 5.

⁴ Cited by Helen Zimmern in her book *Schopenhauer* (London, 1932) Pp. 109-110.

⁵ *Allgemeine Geschichte Der Philosophie*, by Deussen, vol. VI, p. 378.

⁶ *The World As Will And Idea*, vol. I, p. 65.

⁷ *Ibid.*, vol. II, p. 213.

son did, indeed, read the book of the world, though in a way different from the one planned by the father. Though the father failed to make his son a businessman, he succeeded in making his son a keen and a sensitive observer of the world. The extent to which the craving for the concrete was ingrained in Schopenhauer can be seen by the fact that, when he joined the Gottingen University he enrolled himself, at first, as a student of medicine. And when, in 1811, he joined the University of Berlin, he was once more primarily occupied with his studies in physics, chemistry, botany, anatomy, etc.

No wonder then, that we find Schopenhauer writing: “The inmost kernel of all genuine and actual knowledge is a perception; and every new truth is the profit or gain yielded by a perception. . . . On the other hand, merely abstract thoughts, which have no kernel of perception, are like cloud-structures, without reality.”⁸ The philosophy of Schopenhauer is bereft of the confusion which perpetually haunts the systems sustained by speculative abstractions. Schopenhauer never leaves us in doubt as to what he is trying to say. Clear and concise exposition coupled with a passion for the concrete enable Schopenhauer to evade the fetters of terminological abstractions, self-deluding catchwords, and misleading phrases. For Schopenhauer the real is empirical, and the empirical real; as against Hegel, for whom the rational is real, and the real rational. Rightly, therefore, has Pro. Johannes Volkelt observed: “So then one feels oneself, when one reads Schopenhauer, in the immediate neighbourhood of nature and human world. All is full of perception and inner experience. The words are so chosen and set, that they still taste of the freshness of the field of experience. . . . One has the feeling: he lives himself joyous and vigorous in his language.”⁹

That Schopenhauer was an empiricist is a

⁸ *Ibid.*, vol. II, p. 245.

⁹ *Arthur Schopenhauer*, by J. Volkelt (Frommanns Klassiker der Philosophie, Stuttgart, 1923), p. 378.

fact which no one can deny. "Wisdom and genius, these two summits of the Parnassus of Human Knowledge, have their foundation, not in the abstract and discursive, but in the perceptive faculty."¹⁰ And, again: "Our intellect is like a bank, which, if it is to be sound, must have cash in its safe, so as to be able to meet all the notes it has issued, in case of demand; the perceptions are the cash, the conceptions are the notes."¹¹ Hence, there can be no doubt, so far as the empirical method of approach in Schopenhauer is concerned, that he was essentially an empiricist. But the empiricism of Schopenhauer was not one of those narrow and cramped varieties of empiricism, which inhibit and constrain their enquiries by chaining them, to the sense-perceptions. Schopenhauer's empiricism was not coincident with the shallow platitudes of a naive realism, which ends its journey even prior to commencing it. Nor does it correspond to the stale and stolid form of empiricism prevailing nowadays under the dignified and pompous designation of Logical Positivism, which equates philosophy with a barren linguistic analysis, and makes the urge to know subservient to the canons of a sterile pseudo-science of semantics. Schopenhauer does not permit his empirical outlook to choke and emasculate his enquiries. His philosophy does not hang precariously on the frail support of the senses, but is rooted in the reality which underlies the manifold phenomena. Schopenhauer prefaces his supplementary chapters to the second book of his *Magnum Opus* with a quotation from Goethe which eloquently reveals the attitude of the philosopher:

"You are following the false track,
Think not, we are jesting!
Is not the essence of nature
In the hearts of men?"¹²

¹⁰ *The World As Will And Idea*, vol. II, p. 249.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, vol. II, p. 244.

¹² *Ibid.*, vol. II, p. 397:

Ihr folget falscher Spur,
Denkt nicht, wir scherzen!
Ist nicht der Kern der Natur
Menschen im Herzen?

The empiricism of Schopenhauer, in short, includes within itself the vision of poets, the inspiration of artists, and the intuitions of mystics.

The contribution of Schopenhauer has been primarily a metaphysical one. Though he has discussed ethical questions with a marvellous acumen, and his elucidation of the Social Contract theory of the Origin of State constitutes a valuable contribution to political philosophy, and his theory of instincts has inspired the contemporary Hormic School of psychology and its two foremost exponents, viz. Freud and McDougall, and his theory of laughter represented the first serious attempt to understand the psychological factors involved in laughing, and his discussion of the nature of beauty and of the various forms of arts constitutes, perhaps, the most precious legacy of aesthetics,—yet metaphysics embodies the very nucleus of his thought. As he himself writes: "My philosophy, at least, does not by any means seek to know *whence* or *wherefore* the world exists but merely *what* the world is."¹³

III

The very first sentence of Schopenhauer's main work is: "Die Welt ist meine Vorstellung" (the world is my idea). That the world, as it appears, is only my idea, is a fact true for all living things. However, only in man does it enter into reflective consciousness. No truth is more certain and indubitable than this, because it alone can be affirmed *a priori*. Schopenhauer maintains: "'The world is my idea' is, like the axioms of Euclid, a proposition which everyone must recognize as true as soon as he understands it; although it is not a proposition which everyone understands as soon as he hears it."¹⁴ Schopenhauer was quite aware of the fact that he was not saying anything original in declaring the world to be his idea. This thought has figured prominently in the Upanishads, in the dialogues of

¹³ *Ibid.*, vol. I, p. 108.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, vol. II, p. 164.

Plato, in the writings of Berkeley, Kant, and many other thinkers.

The world is as it appears through the avenue of the senses, and as known by the understanding. The external objects have no independent status of their own. For, an object without a subject is a logical absurdity. It must be borne in mind that, Schopenhauer's philosophy starts neither from subject nor from object, but from the *idea*, which is the first fact of consciousness. And the first and basic form of the idea is the antithesis of subject and object. Every object necessarily entails a subject. "Suns and planets without an eye that sees them, and an understanding that knows them, may indeed be spoken of in words, but for the idea, these words are absolutely meaningless."¹⁵ Space and time are the *a priori* forms of the object, which invest multiplicity into the object. The subject, on the other hand, is entire and undivided in every percipient being, and is not in space and time. The essence of matter consists of a coalescence of time and space. Space imparts form to matter, and time lends continuity to it. For, matter, according to Schopenhauer, is nothing but causation, and the law of causation signifies not just a variation of things, but *succession* of things at the same part of space, and the *co-existence* of various things at the same instant of time. "If the world were in space alone," maintains Schopenhauer, "it would be rigid and immovable, without succession, without change, without action; but we know that with action, the idea of matter first appears. Again, if the world were in time alone, all would be fleeting without persistence, without contiguity, hence without co-existence, and consequently without permanence; so that in this case also there would be no matter. Only through the union of space and time do we reach matter."¹⁶ Lastly, Schopenhauer cautions us not to mistake the relation of the subject and the object as one of cause and effect. For, the

envisaging of the object as the effect of the subject is tantamount to bereaving it of all reality, and reducing it to a dream. Almost all systems of idealism have fallen prey to this error, and brought themselves precariously near to solipsism. The relation between subject and object in the Schopenhauerian scheme of things is that of objects alone. Only the subject is an *immediate* object, whereas objects are known only *indirectly* through the agency of the senses, and are conditioned by time and space. The world, for Schopenhauer, is not an empty phantom, or an ethereal bubble. It is, indeed, unfortunate that, not only hostile critics of Schopenhauer's philosophy like Copleston,¹⁷ but also fair and balanced Schopenhauerian scholars like Johannes Volkelt also talk of Schopenhauer considering the world as synonymous with a dream.¹⁸ Schopenhauer categorically states: "The whole world of objects is and remains idea, and therefore wholly and for ever determined by the subject; that is to say, it has transcendental ideality. But *it is not therefore illusion or mere appearance*; it presents itself as that which it is, idea, and indeed as a series of ideas of which the common bond is the principle of sufficient reason."¹⁹

IV

Having arrived at the conclusion that the world is an idea, Schopenhauer assiduously applies himself to the search for the reality underlying the world as idea. Schopenhauer could not subscribe to the despair of the Kantian thought, and declare the thing-in-itself as unknowable. Schopenhauer was impressed by the strained diffidence with which we accept any philosophy, which declares the world to be an idea. This reluctance connotes that the world as idea, however true it may be, is but a one-sided and incomplete standpoint. We cannot for long remain content under the

¹⁷ *Arthur Schopenhauer*, by F. Copleston (London, 1946), p. 44.

¹⁸ *Arthur Schopenhauer*, by J. Volkelt, p. 78.

¹⁹ *The World As Will And Idea*, Vol. II, P. 18 (Italics are ours).

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, vol. I, p. 38.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, vol. I, p. 12.

insubstantial shadow of a phenomenal world. We long to know the source of this shadow, and its true nature. To adduce Schopenhauer: "We ask whether this world is merely idea; in which case it would pass by us like an empty dream or a baseless vision, not worth our notice; or whether it is also something else, something more than idea, and if so, what?"²⁰ We endeavour to find out the Unity sustaining the multifold diversity. We seek to lift the veil of *māyā* and find out what lies beyond it, and to know the *Ding an sich*. And, according to Schopenhauer, the world as idea is the objectification of the Will. The Will is the thing-in-itself. "As the magic lantern shows many different pictures, which are all made visible by one and the same light," avers Schopenhauer, "so in all the multifarious phenomena which fill the world together or throng after each other as events, only *one Will* manifests itself, of which everything is the visibility, the objectivity, and which remains unmoved in the midst of this change; it alone is thing-in-itself; all objects are manifestations, or, to speak the language of Kant, phenomena."²¹ The Will is the noumenon, the eternal and unchanging substratum of the phenomenal world. The Will constitutes the quintessence of the world. It is important to note here that the relation of the Will to the world is not that of a cause to an effect. The world is the *Will in appearance*, or, as Schopenhauer would prefer to say, it is the objectification of the Will. The relation obtaining between the Will and the world is not that of a seed and a tree, but of the snake and the rope. Rightly has Georg Simmel, therefore, observed: "Its (Will's) relation to the appearances is throughout not that of the cause to the effect, but what the Will-in-itself is, is on the other side appearance."²² We are happy to find Schopenhauer in concurrence with the *vivarta-vāda* of the Advaita Vedānta.

The Will is above the jurisdiction of the

principle of sufficient reason. It is totally free from all the forms of the phenomenal world. It is beyond time and space. It is changeless and eternal, since all change, all coming in and going out, are possible only within time. It is indivisible, because only things spatial are divisible. In it multiplicity and diversity find no place, for, as Duessen succinctly puts it: "All multiplicity is only possible as a simultaneity in space or as succession in time. From this follows, that to the Will as thing-in-itself all multiplicity is foreign."²³ The Will is one indivisible Unity, though its manifestations are countless. The Will is independent and self-subsisting. The fact that the Will is beyond the province of the principle of sufficient reason renders it groundless. All things are grounded upon the Will, but the Will as thing-in-itself is not grounded upon anything, for there is nothing beside the Will. All the objectifications of the Will serve some purpose or other, but the Will has no purpose of its own—it is purposeless. Volkelt aptly remarks: "The unity of the Will is for Schopenhauer already given therewith, that the Will is placed beyond all forms of the world of appearance, beyond space and time, beyond all multiplicity and division."²⁴ Finally, though it may appear paradoxical at first, the Will as thing-in-itself is unconscious. Because, consciousness as we shall see later, is a later grade of the objectification of the Will, and falls within the domain of time, space, and causality.

The world is the objectification of the Will. Everything in it, from the inert stone to the cognitive man, is an expression of the Will. The Will is always striving for higher objectifications. The question, why does the Will objectify itself at all is a meaningless one, for it has no answer. In its objectification the Will becomes the Will to live. In the Will to live, the metaphysical Will finds itself asserted. There is nothing to which a man clings so tenaciously as to the fragile thread

²⁰ *Ibid*, vol. I, p. 128.

²¹ *Ibid*, vol. I, pp. 199-200.

²² *Schopenhauer Und Nietzsche*, by Georg Simmel (Munchen und Leipzig, 1923), p. 43.

²³ *Allgemeine Geschichte Der Philosophie*, by Deussen, p. 505.

²⁴ *Arthur Schopenhauer*, by J. Volkelt, p. 176.

which is his life, and there is nothing which a man tries to avoid, or at least to ignore, with such pathetic determination as death. The terror with which we hear the condemnation of any wretched being to death, the unspeakable horror we experience when we witness the heartrending spectacle of somebody being executed (the graphic account of an execution given in Arnold Bennet's novel, *The Old Wives' Tale*, bk. III, ch. 3, is worth reading in this connection), and the contempt with which we regard the vocation of an executioner constitute the most compelling proofs of the presence of the Will to live. The perpetual search for the Elixir of life eloquently corroborates Schopenhauer's view that the Will to live is the very foundation of our life. The perennial craving for immortality finds its metaphysical enucleation in Schopenhauer's doctrine of the Will to live. The Will to live is, of course, a universal phenomenon, and not just an anthropocentric monopoly of the human beings. To sum up with Schopenhauer: "Every glance at the world, to explain which is the task of the philosopher, confirms and proves that Will to live, far from being an arbitrary hypostasis or an empty word, is the only true expression of its inmost nature."²⁵

So, then, at the root of the world lies the Will to live. The whole world is one colossal affirmation of the Will to live. But, all that begins also ends. Every birth carries in its bosom its inevitable end: death. The moment we are born, we are condemned to die. How, then, does the Will to live surmount the all-devouring monster called death? The answer is—procreation. The Will to live is disdainfully nonchalant so far as the individuals are concerned. The perpetuation of the *species*, and not of the *members* of the species, is the vital concern of the Will to live. Nature is

²⁵ *The World As Will And Idea*, vol. III, p. 107.

alarmed whenever the existence of any of its species is threatened. When in the fourteenth century, on account of the hideous Black Death, Europe faced the sordid prospect of extinction, something entirely unprecedented happened. It was noticed that, immediately after the Black Death, most women were giving birth to twins! But the Will to live, so mindful of the species, is nefariously indifferent to the piteous pathos of a bereaved mother, to the wailing of a widow, and to the lamentations of an orphan. The continuance of the species is the watchword of the Will to live. And, procreation is the way to perpetuation. Father lives in his son, and the present generation is assured of its existence in the future generation. The sexual impulse is, therefore, the concretisation of the Will to live. "The sexual passion is the Kernel of the Will to live."²⁶ It is the strongest of all instincts, because it does not serve the individual, but sustains the race. No wonder, then, that the sexual love "shows itself the strongest and most powerful of motives, constantly lays claim to half the powers and thoughts of the younger portion of mankind, . . . interrupts the most serious occupations every hour, sometimes embarrasses for a while even the greatest minds, does not hesitate to intrude with its trash interfering with the negotiations of statesmen and the investigations of men of learning, knows how to slip its love letters and locks of hair even into ministerial portfolios and philosophical manuscripts. . . ."²⁷ The sexual love is not just a mutual attachment of a Jack and a Jill, but represents the profound act of creating and continuing life. To sum up: the metaphysical Will in its objectification is the Will to live, and the Will to live articulates itself in the love of the sexes.

(To be continued)

²⁶ *Ibid*, vol. III, p. 314.

²⁷ *Ibid*, vol. III, p. 339.

SECULARISM AND SPIRITUALITY

BY SRI K. S. RAMASWAMI SASTRI

We are all prone to use the terms secularism and spirituality without clearly defining their meaning to others or even to ourselves. Sometimes we think that 'secular' is what appertains to now and here while 'spiritual' is what appertains to post-mortem affairs, or what takes place elsewhere than on the earth. We sometimes equate 'secular' with the laity and 'spiritual' with the clergy or the monastic and ecclesiastic orders. Such a view is superficial and is not in touch with the deeper realities of life.

We must not forget that man alone walks erect and looks not only beneath and around but also above. His feet are planted on the earth but he has an inner voice which whispers to him about transmundane and super-terrestrial things. As Oscar Wilde says in a famous epigram: 'We are all in the gutter; but some of us look at the stars.' Man is neither an animal nor an angel but stands midway with an inner urge towards angelhood. He is a gregarious animal but he is much more. The knowledge of an animal or a bird is limited to search for food and its love is limited to mating and rearing. But man hungers and thirsts to know everything and master all the secrets of Nature and know all her laws. He is never happy unless the range of his love is widened so as to go beyond the bounds of the family life and extends to all humanity, nay, to the whole creation, nay, to the source of all creation.

It is in this boundless aspiration of man that we must seek the real privilege and distinction of humanness. The attainment of the highest spiritual stature is the inherent birthright of every man. The family, the society, the state, nay, humanity itself is the means of such attainment. Perfect knowledge and perfect love are the desidera-

tum which appeals to the deepest truth of our being. This is expressed by the vedic utterance that the deepest and purest essence in us is *Ānanda*.¹ Essentially man is infinite, eternal, supreme *Sat-cid-ānanda*. It is with this declaration that the Bhagavad Gītā gospel begins and not with mere comparatively trite observation that the soul exists even after the body dies.

That is why we feel a sense of enlarged freedom in altruism and a sense of inhibited freedom in egoism. In altruism the *Sat-cid-ānanda* essence of the soul has unhindered self-expression. The contrary is true of egoism. That is why metaphysics precedes ethics in the Gītā. Every act of virtue done in a spirit of surrender to God and without attachment to the fruit of action helps the real nature of the soul to have free and unhindered self-expression. It is the *Sthita-prajña* as described in the second chapter of the Gītā who attains the *Brāhmī-sthiti* and *Brahma-nirvāna* described in the last verse in that chapter.

That is also the reason why the spiritual life is rooted in *asanga* (non-attachment) and in *niṣkāma-karma* (self-less action without a sense of egoistic doership and a clamant desire for the fruits of action), but flowers in love and bears the fruit of *Brahmānanda* (infinite spiritual bliss). This is called also as *Daivī Sampat* (divine endowment) in the Gītā whereas its converse is called *Āsurī Sampat* (demoniac endowment) in the sixteenth chapter.²

The secular life by itself will never fully

¹ *Ānando brahmeti vyajānāt.* (Tait. Up. VI. III.vi.1).

² *Daivī sampat vimokṣāya nibandhāya āsurī matā—The Daivī Sampat leads to spiritual liberation whereas the Āsurī Sampat leads to spiritual imprisonment.* (Gītā XVI.5).

satisfy humanity. Man in the modern age is eager to master the secrets of Nature and to increase his country's economic and political and military potential. But such an endeavour will later on breed dissatisfaction and result in a recoil. C. E. M. Joad says: 'Man will have mastered Nature and satisfied his material needs but will be totally unable to find occupation for his starved mind or food for his starved soul.' Lord Jesus taught us long ago: 'How shall it profit a man if he gains the whole world but loses his own soul?' The wiser course of action is not the modern method of secularizing the spiritual but is the method of spiritualizing the secular. If we do not hold fast to the highest spiritual realizations vouchsafed to us, the human spirit will seek lower spiritual satisfactions rather than be content with a merely secular life. Professor Toynbee says well: 'The truth is that the spirit of man abhors a spiritual vacuum and if a human being or a human society has the tragic misfortune to lose a sublime inspiration by which it has once been possessed, then, sooner or later, it will seize upon any other spiritual food that it can find—however coarse and unsatisfactory this new fodder may be—rather than remain without any spiritual sustenance at all.'

Thus secularity and spiritualism are mutually opposing forces. They are, to use the language of the Gītā, the *Āsurī Sampat* and the *Daivī Sampat*. It is open to man to secularize everything or spiritualize everything or to define their respective boundaries. The modern tendency is to deflate the spiritual and inflate the secular. The ancient tendency was *vice versa*. When *kāma* and *krodha* and *lobha* (lust and hate and greed) are in the ascendant in us, the *Āsurī Sampat* is dominant and the urge is to secularize everything in life and deny or ignore the spiritual realities. Śrī Kṛṣṇa calls them in the sixteenth chapter of the Gītā as the gates of hell. Conversely *Prema* and *Sānti* and *Dayā* (pure love and peace and compassion) tend to spiritualize life. The former three are due to *Rajoguna* and

Tamoguna. The latter three are due to *Sattvaguna*. Egoism is the parent of the former while altruism is the parent of the latter.

Out of the four *puruṣārthas*, *artha* and *kāma* (wealth and pleasure) belong to the secular aspects of life while *dharma* and *mokṣa* (righteousness and spiritual liberation) belong to the spiritual aspects of life. By sheer formalism and mechanized behaviour and hypocrisy we secularize the latter just as by *niṣkāma-karma* and *dhārmic* control we can spiritualize the former. The Gītā says: 'He attains peace, who, self-controlled, approaches objects with senses devoid of love and hatred and brought under his own control.³ In peace there is an end of all his miseries; for, the reason of the tranquil-minded soon becomes steady.⁴ There is no wisdom to the unsteady, and no meditation to the unsteady, and to the unmeditative no peace; to the peaceless, how can there be happiness?'⁵ The fierce egoistic pursuit of pleasure based on secularism defeats its own purpose and ends in suffering and a sense of emptiness. On the other hand, the spirit of *tyāga* (altruism) intensified by *niṣkāma karma* (disinterested action) spiritualizes all actions in life and ends in poise and purity and pleasure and perfection. That is why scripture advises us to see God in everything and give up egoistic possessiveness (*bhoga*) and act in the mood of altruistic non-possessiveness (*tyāga*): 'All this—whatever moveth on the earth—should be covered by the Lord. That renounced, enjoy. Covet not anybody's wealth.'⁶

³ Rāga-dveṣa-viyuktaiḥ tu viṣayān-indriyaiś-
caran, Ātma-vaśyair-vidheyātmā prasādam-adhi-
gacchati. (Gītā II.64).

⁴ Prasāde sarva-duḥkhānām hānirasyopajāyate,
Prasanna-cetaso hyāśu buddhiḥ paryavatiṣṭhate.
(Ibid II. 65).

⁵ Nāsti buddhir-ayuktasya na cāyuktasya
bhāvanā, Na cābhāvayataḥ śāntiḥ aśāntasya kutaḥ
sukham. (Ibid II.66).

⁶ Īśāvāsyam-idam sarvam yat-kiñca jagatyām
jagat, Tena tyaktena bhujīthā mā gṛdhaḥ kasya
svid-dhanam. (Īśa. Up.1).

Milton says in his great epic poem *Paradise Lost* that the mind can make a heaven of hell and a hell of heaven. Similarly, it can make spirituality out of secularism or secularism out of spirituality. A certain mental bias intensifies secularism out of spirituality. A certain mental bias intensifies secularism in life and increases the extensiveness of its area. The opposite attitude of mind intensifies spirituality in life and increases the extensiveness of its area. When the latter mentality gains the

upper hand and the mind takes delight in *niṣkāma karma* and *tyāga* and *dayā* and *prema* and *dhyāna* and *bhakti* and *prapatti* and *jñāna*, life becomes totally spiritualized and we enjoy pure happiness in earth and achieve full spiritual liberation: 'Doing all action always depending on Me, he will get the eternal and unending state of perfect bliss by My grace.'"

⁷ *Sarva-karmānyapi sadā kurvāno madvyapāś-
rayaḥ, Mat-prasādāt avāpnoti śāśvatam padam-
avyayam. (Gītā XVIII.56).*

SCIENTIFIC FOUNDATIONS OF ASTROLOGY

BY DR. SAMPURNANAND

(Continued from previous issue)

II

The first scientific foundation of Astrology is astronomy. Without this the whole edifice of Astrology would collapse in a moment. The Astrologer takes the ephemeris prepared by the astronomer for granted. He does not check the movements of the planets by personal observation. He accepts the information given by the astronomer. The slightest mistake in the determination of planetary positions would vitiate the subsequent astrological calculations. Attention may be drawn to a very important controversy that is going on at present in the field of Indian Astrology. The controversy is as to whether the *Sāyana* or the *Nirayana* system of computations should be used. In simple language the matter may be stated thus. Owing to the phenomenon called the "precession of the equinoxes", the Sun reaches a particular point in the sky every year a little earlier than in the previous year. There was a time when the year began on the day of the Vernal Equinox and it was on that day that the Sun entered *Meṣa* (*Aries*). There has arisen in the course of the last 1300 years a difference nearly of three weeks. The Hindu

astronomers are aware of this fact, but Hindu Astrology does not take note of it. Officially, for instance, the Vernal Equinox is fixed on the date on which it used to fall 1300 years ago, although now, as a matter of fact, it comes about 21 days earlier. To give an example, probably familiar to everyone here, we celebrate the *Makara Sankrānti* on the 13th or 14th of January every year, although the actual *Sankrānti*, namely, the passage of the Sun from *Sagittarius* to *Capricorn* (*Dhanus* to *Makara*), takes place on the 25th of December preceding. It is extremely doubtful, to say the least, if calculations based on data which do not correspond to natural events can give correct results. Western astrologers, on the other hand, follow the data based on observations. Hindu astrologers, however, have evolved a theory justifying their procedure. Assuming that Astrology is a science, it would be interesting to see which of these systems gives results in accordance with actual events.

Another science on which the astrologer depends is mathematics. His work has been

considerably simplified and advanced towards greater accuracy by the application of the calculus and logarithmic tables.

At this point perhaps it would be desirable to clear up a matter of terminology which is the source of much confusion of thought and provides material for cheap ridicule to those who refuse to think seriously about the subject. It is generally said by professional astrologers, and following them by laymen, that the stars or planets, as we should rather say, influence or cause the happening of certain events on the Earth, whether the event is of the nature of a natural phenomenon like rainfall, or an earthquake, or an incident in the life of a man or a community. There is nothing particularly wrong with the word 'influence', but somehow people seem to read a deeper meaning into it than is usual, when it is used in Astrology. There is, in fact, great need for clarity of thought as to what constitutes an astrological phenomenon. The writer in the book which I have already referred to above says that the warming of the Earth by the Sun is an astrological phenomenon; so, one may say, is the raising of tides by the Moon when it occupies certain positions in the sky relative to the Earth. Of a similar nature are phenomena like the aggravation of certain diseases, Elephantiasis for example, in co-ordination with certain phases of the Moon, the stimulation of a depressing mental condition in certain meteorological conditions and the peculiar behaviour noticed in certain birds and animals preceding a volcanic eruption.

It is as correct to speak of a planet influencing events in the lives of men as to speak of the barometer influencing the weather. The weathercock gives you a warning about the kind of weather which one may expect within the next few days, but it would be thoroughly unscientific to say that it causes that particular kind of weather. At the same time, I do not suggest that all words like 'cause' or 'influence' should be completely ruled out, provided that we make sure that we use them strictly in the sense in which they are used in the physical sciences. If a position of the Moon relative to

the Earth and the Sun results in a solar eclipse, which in its turn is found to lead to disturbances in the functioning of delicate electro-magnetic instruments and is accompanied by certain nervous and psychic disturbances, then we might justifiably say that that particular position of the Moon is the cause of those electrical disturbances on the one hand and those nervous and psychic disturbances on the other hand.

Let me give another example. We know that above a certain height from the surface the gaseous envelope which surrounds the Earth is called the ionosphere because it consists of a large percentage of ionised particles of matter. Ionisation and re-combination, no doubt accompanied by discharges of energy, are constantly going on there because of the bombardment by interstellar, and more particularly solar, radiation. In the course of millennia, nature has been able to strike some kind of a balance. As we know, the ionosphere is responsible for what is called radio weather. In other words, it is responsible for the disturbances in our radios and other instruments operating within the same range of radiated energy. Indirectly it also affects the weather in general. A sudden and large-scale increase or decrease in the tempo of ionisation would most certainly affect the forces under which vegetable and animal life is possible on the Earth. In a paper read before the All-India Police Wireless Officers' Conference, Sri C. P. Joshi, the U. P. State Radio Officer, has collected useful information about "periodic and systematic variations in the ionosphere" and shows how phenomena like eclipses and tides have quite a marked influence in this region of gas. The question is still being studied; but we can see easily that the interrelation, if it is established, will be of an astrological nature. An eclipse implies certain relative positions of the Sun, the Earth, and the Moon. A study of these positions should give an indication of ionospheric changes which in turn would indicate physiological and psychological changes.

Important though all this is, it is only a

prelude to Astrology proper. According to Indian custom, every science is attributed to the *R̥ṣis*. In a way, perhaps this is right, but this assumption does not help us at all; on the other hand, it hampers progress because any attempt at reform becomes almost an act of sacrilege. So far as I can see, Astrology, like any other branch of science, claims to be based on observation. It is, therefore, essentially of a statistical nature.

The tendency of the untutored mind is to work on the principle, '*post hoc ergo propter hoc*'—'after this, therefore on account of this'. If a certain event is found to have been preceded by another event, it must have been caused by the former. If a death in the family has occurred just after a meteoric shower, the meteors must have been the cause of the death. But men must have noticed that such a sequence did not always happen. All deaths were not preceded by meteoric showers and meteoric showers were not always followed by death in the family. Associations are, therefore, perceived to be accidental. But it may be that other phenomena do happen to occur in groups, so to say. If the number of observed cases of this kind is fairly large, covering a large number of instances and spread over a number of centuries, it would be difficult not to come to the conclusion that they are connected in some manner, the sequence being the effect and the precedent the cause. If a certain type of event is observed to happen for a sufficient number of times when a particular planet occupies a certain place in the sky, the conclusion is obvious that the two are connected with each other in some way. Among the planets, Mercury and Venus pass from one zodiacal sign to another very rapidly. It would probably be difficult easily to link up terrestrial happenings with their positions, but planets like Jupiter and Saturn occupy one sign for a fairly long time—one year in the first and two years and a half in the second place. This gives ample time for observation and I have an idea that observations in ancient times must have been attracted by these planets

first. I shall give an example of a remarkable set of what might be called parallelism between earthly events and certain astronomical phenomena. My attention was first drawn to this subject by a small book by Dr. Gore of the College of Science, Raipur, in which he has taken up the task of showing how modern researches in Physics and other sciences lend support to Astrology. As he says, the ruling zodiacal sign for India is *Makara* (*Capricorn*). Exactly 180° from *Capricorn* comes *Karka* (*Cancer*). Saturn happened to be in *Karka* from June, 1946, to July, 1948. Three important events took place in India during this period, namely, the Independence of India, the birth of Pakistan and the murder of Mahatma Gandhi. Calculating backward from this point, Dr. Gore has shown that a number of important events have been occurring in India at 30-year intervals, namely, at the period when Saturn was in *Cancer*. He followed this up for a century. I followed it up for four centuries and anyone who chooses to do so can still go further back. It seems that the presence of Saturn in *Cancer* somehow coincides with an important event in Indian history. I shall name a few of these events here,—Montagu's Declaration in Parliament (1917), Birth of the Indian National Congress (1887), the First War of Independence (1857), First Mysore War (1767), Death of Aurangzeb (1707), Second Battle of Panipat (1557), First Battle of Panipat (1527), Vasco da Gama's voyage to India (1497). Two things have to be noted in this connection. All the events which I have gathered are not of equal importance and I find a blank for 1647. I shall give the reason a little later.

While pursuing this subject, another curious set of events came to my notice. They follow each other at intervals of 12 years. It should be remembered that Jupiter's period of revolution round the Sun is 12 years. I started with 1942 when Jupiter was in *Meena* (*Pisces*). 1942 was, of course, the year of the Quit India Movement. I followed the series for about two centuries. Some of the events for this period may be mentioned by way of

example,—the Congress Declaration of Complete Independence of India at Lahore Session and the Salt *Satyāgraha* (1930), Partition of Bengal (1906), End of the East India Company and assumption of power by the British Crown (1858), Establishment of the Office of the Governor-General in India and appointment of Warren Hastings (1774), Rise of Hyder Ali (1762). Here, again, I may point out that no important events, or events of very minor importance, can be found to correspond to some of the years. It may also be mentioned that in both series I have given what might be called the peak year. As the periods of revolution of Saturn and Jupiter are not actually exactly 30 years or 12 years, the actual time when they would be in *Cancer* and *Pisces* respectively would be somewhere near the date I have given, falling a few months either on this side or the other. Students of Astrology know, of course, that in *Cancer*, Saturn is 180° from *Capricorn* of which he is the ruler; while Jupiter is the ruler of *Pisces*. Asked to explain why all the events corresponding to these years are not of equal importance and why some years seem to draw a blank, the astrologer will give the reply,—and I am sure everyone will agree that it is a very sensible reply—that, after all, Jupiter or Saturn is not the only planet in the Solar System. In studying events the positions of other planets must also be studied simultaneously.

This is an example of the kind of observation which would lead to astrological predictions. A person who has followed up these sets of parallel events over considerable periods and found them to be correct might be justi-

fied in predicting that, keeping in mind Jupiter alone, important events would be likely to happen in near about 1954, 1966, 1978 and so on. Similarly, keeping in mind Saturn alone, another set of important events would be likely to happen in 1977, 2007, 2037 and so on. I may also, incidentally, point out that if the two series happen to intersect each other at a certain point, we should expect something of very great importance thereabout. I shall give one or two examples of this. The period 1857 to 1858 falls both in the Saturn and the Jupiter series and we know how important it was. It seems that the period 1977-78 will also be common to both the series. It might witness the happening of a very important event in our history.

I should like to draw attention at this point to two interesting predictions by De Wohl to whom I have referred earlier. He observed—by the way, I may point out that the book was published in 1952—that Saturn and Uranus would be occupying the same positions relative to each other in November, 1952, which they occupied in July, 1945, when the first Atom Bomb was exploded. He predicted that something of a similar nature should happen in November, 1952. It is interesting to note that the first Hydrogen Bomb was exploded on November 1, 1952. Again, he says that the positions of Saturn and Uranus are such that the period from October, 1963, to July, 1964, may see the setting of the sparks to the biggest war in all history. It is curious that, judging from the position of Jupiter, I have also arrived at the conclusion that 1964 may be a very important year for India.

(To be continued)

THE ARTIST AND HIS CRITIC

BY SRI P. SAMA RAO

I

Art criticism is not a mere dissection into various elements out of which a work of art has been composed. It is an expression of the synthesis in a medium different from that of the artist, rebuilt out of those very elements in the heart and brain of the critic. A work of art is an expression of the idea. This idea concretized by the artist is always an infinitesimal part of himself against an infinite background of forces known and unknown surging around and pervading him. The work of art is an expression of only a few of such of them that have befitted his composition. It is thus a homogeneous product of a selection of these forces combined into an unity by the artist in his aesthetic activity. The product is a crystallization of his own vision of the idea. The idea together with its composing strands have to be fished up successfully by the critic, and recomposed into a similar synthesis, as it were, by the critic with the help of his own knowledge and understanding of the artist generally and the work of art in particular, before the critic could judge either the propriety and the adequacy of the elements or the symphonic architecture into which they have resulted or synchronized, namely, the work of art. There cannot be a valid judgement of the piece unless and until the critic has converged all his higher knowledge of men and things into the object of his criticism. In a way, though not gifted with the same quality or amount of creative genius, the critic may be regarded as more versatile than the artist. Without this versatility the critic cannot apprehend the artist's idea. One cannot measure the Himalayas with a yardstick.

The psychological set-up of the artist before he produced the work of art and the psychological set-up of the critic who is out to apprehend

its idea must be similar. Without a correspondence and accord between the two there cannot be an essential understanding of the piece. This correspondence is variously called, 'Sympathy' by the layman, 'Empathy' by the aesthician, and 'Effluvium' by the philosopher. This kinship between them may be likened to the digestive juice which while conferring taste on the tongue, helps the tongue to sense the quality of the eatable, and, as in a process of assimilation, confers health on its masticator. The synthetic apprehension is like a mastication. It is also a recomposition of the piece of art in the critic's imagination. Unless the artist's vision and the critic's vision tally there cannot be any due appreciation as well as a judgement.

But this appraisalment is only by the way. The primary function of the critic consists in the education of himself into the aesthetic ways of the artist. Educating others is only secondary. For, the ideal critic judges not lest he be judged, although he has to spotlight the artist's quality for the benefit of the world. But in his worldly conduct the critic has to plunge into the artist's spiritual depth, fish up the vision he has concretized and present it to the world. The critic is therefore a pearl-fisher. But not all the oysters he throws up contain the pearls of the artist. Thus his own equipment and competency for the task are conditions precedent for the critic's just approach to the work of art. The critic is in essence an interpreter of it too.

The artist's creation is a minim of the divine creation, and at its best is only reminiscent of it. The mystery that attaches to the divine surrounds the human product too. The unravelling of the mystery into dispassionate, clear and articulate terms is the *summum bonum* of criticism. The spiritual injunction

Devo Bhūtvā Devam Yajet (becoming divine, adore the divine) is applicable to mundane existence also. The critic's own *samskāra*, his imagination and insight, together with powers of apprehension of both the temporal and eternal values of life,—all these, with his own knowledge of the here and the hereafter, constitute his *adhikāra* and equipment for the purpose. Without these he can neither be wise, nor just, nor illuminating.

Reverential sympathy, open-mindedness and a genuine desire to know, are the preliminary preparation for the critic for the understanding of the artist's conception and his technique. For without this proper approach the effluvium will not flow into the critic's heart which would otherwise be chokeful of his own predilections. It is only the clean mirror that gives the best reflection.

The artist and his critic are both nurslings of their times. They cannot be completely free from the historical influences in their constitutions. Earthly ones are exclusively realistic in their outlook and conduct, while the spiritual are often abstract and care only for spiritual values. It is easy to determine these two extremes. But it is difficult to grasp the import of a super-sensuous product that lies in between them, and which is ingrained with its own infinitude of charm and is symptomatic of the Truth that is protean. It is in this realm of the supra-sensuous and the supra-mental that the artist and his critic often flounder. Thus a knowledge of the artist's heritage, physical and spiritual, becomes necessary for the critic. For the artist knowledge and intuition determine the idea, and discrimination the elements proper for its architecture. These are the very elements of the critic's analysis, reconstruction (of the artist's vision), and appraisal. As Paul Ganguin has put it, "Art is an abstraction 'which is derived' from nature in dreams in the presence of nature." Thus the beauty in Nature becomes the real springboard for the artist's jump into the beauty of the empyrean. The critic can ill-afford not to recognize this fact. In more ways than one, the artist's composition

is only an alchemization or sublimation of the gross into the subtle, and a regathering and blending, as it were, of the myriad arcs of light into a dazzling perfect round. This he does into his own melody consonant with his own *svabhāva* and quite adequately for his own purpose.

II

The different theories of art, 'Art for Art's sake', 'Art for morality's sake', 'Art for utility's sake', etc. and the various schools, 'the Natural', 'the Impressionistic', 'the Abstract', 'the Cubistic', 'the Realistic', 'Dadaism', 'Fauvism', 'Pointillism', 'Graphism', 'the Calligraphic' etc. and their super-types resulting therefrom, are, to put it hard, emanations of the uncertain mind that knows not itself. At best they are honest statements of self's adventures in the realm of beauty infinite and indeterminate, sometimes charmingly delineated and at more times repulsively portrayed. But as the creeds stand they are based upon one's own predilections of like and dislike. 'Water finds its own level' in the aesthetic field too, and these various schools in the matter of both conception and execution are inevitable; for, the human being is not of one temperamental or cultural pattern. In the swelter and confusion of these there has resulted a great imbalance and disquiet in the heart of a genuine seeker of beauty.

Art is one though its facets are many. It is predilection that defines its nature and function differently, colouring them, however, with the light of its own eyes. It is indisputable that art which has the greatest appeal to senses, and is unique in that it is not abstemious but combines pleasure with profit to an utmost degree and has the rarest power to lift us out of ourselves into subtle realms of the human spirit, should be our most reliable guide to spirituality. Thus the function and the object of art is not merely temporal. Art abides in eternal values, inspiring and helping one to become that from which both the edible and the inedible, and the ineffable have proceeded as though from a magician's wand. Art is

never deficient, but always full. The forms in which it shows itself are various and inexhaustible. Its residuum is also full. It does not suffer from surfeit. Behind its cloying appearance there is the indestructible Norm of all things. There is nothing like the good and the bad, nor the true and the false in art that endures. The main function of the critic lies in lifting the golden bowl of illusion from off appearance to discover for us the Truth concealed thereunder. It is therefore imminent that the art critic should be an ideal guide.

Assessment of a piece of art should be only on permanent values. In the matter of their determination it is no good shying at the issue saying that it is metaphysical or hyper-psychological. When once it is granted that the mind is the seat of all ideas, and that all theories are but tangible expression of them, the inward constitution of man becomes the real actor behind the scenes. As Dr. Cousins has put it, "Art is religion turned outwards: religion is art turned inwards." Simply because the motive de force is complex or undecipherable it is no reason to justify the eccentric specimen of art on the ground of its author's independent outlook or originality. Novelty is not necessarily an element of beauty. In fact there is nothing new under the sun save perhaps the antics of the mad; for, the mad is the most original because he is possessed of an infinite number of faces and his acts are sporadic and seemingly unrelated either to past or the future. A piece of art does not become charming or true because majority apprehend its import, or less so because all are unable to understand it. Therefore the critic is really the negotiator of an understanding of the artist by the layman.

'Art for Art's sake' in the pure material sense is now a dead slogan, for all photographic realism stands condemned. This slogan is alive only on the metaphysical plane where art is deemed *yoga*, and perfection is defined as *karmasu kauśalam*. The creation of genuine and enduring art-pieces is motiveless, spontaneous, unpremeditated and unintentioned.

Since everything is linked up by time and causation, nothing is free and existing for its own sake. Everything reflects the divine though in different degree. Thus the cubistic trend which strives to incorporate multiple planes of existence through geometrical patterns is really laudable provided it could give us a synthetic composition instead of a criss-cross medley of unpolarized planes analysed through intellect. The cubistic art as it now obtains even at its best lands us into an eerie realm of archaeological remains of dead bones rather than into a world of living beings where like is attracted to the like with the sensuous spell of flesh and blood by a life force both temporal and eternal. For, the cubistic piece is a product of pure intellect and appeals only to the intellect. It does not touch and sway the heart. This intellectual attempt to break up rather than compose form is like dissection of a *Sirīṣa* to know its melody of tint and perfume; for, art's glory and delectability lie only in synthesis and not in analysis.

Expression is the concretization of the intangible abstract with the aid of tangible medium like sound or form. Impression is the perceptible image made over the mind by expression. Impressionism and its supertypes are but conditions for any percept. There cannot be expression or impression communicated without the attempt to crystallize the nebulous or margining off the infinite into the finite. Thought is abstract but the delineation of it is not strictly abstract any longer even in its most cloudy state. Thus we see there is absolutely no meaning in any regimentation of art into the different schools excepting perhaps to grade its quality from the technical viewpoint. This cannot change either the nature or function of art, which remains yet supreme. Life is made up of the gross as well as the subtle; the technique that may be appropriate to hit off the gross can in no manner be deemed so in our dealings with the subtle and the eternal. Rugged masses of tint recklessly splashed or scratches of broken lines criss-cross, or the eye-piercing angular attitudes, cannot be justified in any true conception of art and its appro-

priate technique, essential for administering *Sāntam, Śivam, and Sundaram*, which is necessarily the supreme triune function of all art. For the cactus can nowise be deemed the maidenhair.

Many of the above schools of art are differentiated mostly by technique. They are based upon different notions of effectiveness. Pointillism is in fact the decomposition of the organic and the synthetic into what may be called its elemental amorphous state. At its best it manipulates successfully the blending of one element of composition into the other effacing their marginal outlines. In a way this style transfigures the essential unity of life in that objects are not quite independent of one another, and that true edibility lies only in the mutual blending of one into the other in a holy 'camaraderie', as it were, of the softest colour-blend. This flowing in of the colour masses, one into the other, like the non-egoistical blending of individualities is really symbolical of harmony. That technique is the proper and best which appropriately and adequately sets out in the most glamour-way the aesthetic concept. It can never be labelled as such and such. The poetry of Turner's landscapes, the sublimity of Leonardo da Vinci and Michelangelo, the eternality of our Padmapāṇi, Sārnath Buddha, Śrīśaila Natarāja-Śiva, Elephanta's Maheśa-mūrti, the cloying sweetness of Sithanivassal Dancer, and the spell of the Titian tint or the luminant dark of Rembrandt, are very much to be wished for in the modern renascent India.

If we believe in evolution, biological and spiritual, and its continuous progress there is no need to hark back to primitive types of art despite their being spontaneous, rhythmical and vigorous. These qualities are not their monopoly. There ought to be levelling up rather than levelling down in any activity of life. The sedulous aping of the modern western art, conceptionally as well as technically, has only landed us into a morass and wiped out our unique and precious art-heritage.

III

An individual piece, however true and representative, may not suggest the artist's quality fully. It is only a record of his mood or being at a particular moment of his evolution. Most pieces of art register only being and not becoming. The 'becoming' ones are the really prophetic. It is also true that most works of art are pictorial delineations of the artist's lyrical or metaphysical flashes. These moments are as fugitive as the artist himself, though not his quality that has over-reached itself on the way to the eternal and the Absolute. This seeming paradox of existence in both temporality and eternality at the same peak of time, between being and becoming, is not peculiar to the artist and his creations. It is the critic's duty to be similarly comprehensive.

There is absolutely no shadow of the critic's ego in a just or proper appraisal save perhaps his own individual manner or style of interpretation. Just as the artist is a vehicle for divine thought the critic is a vehicle for its correct interpretation. The critic is therefore bound to 'deliver the goods' all safe and sound. He cannot legislate his own terms in such a bargain. In a way a just critic is often the artist's best showman. He is not his 'conductor' or 'stage-manager'. Though criticism is roughly an accompaniment in a different medium of the artist's tune in creation, yet it is individual in the sense it is the critic's own. It should be purged of all 'dispersion and diffusion' in order to be clear and authoritative.

A good critic is also an enjoyer of the piece of art, to the same degree as the artist himself. But there is a difference between the critic and the layman. The critic's enjoyment and the apprehension of its truth is deeper and more comprehensive, intellectually and intuitively, than that of the layman. Hence the critic is entitled to be its interpreter and educator.

High art may or may not be a true reflection of the times but its *genre* type is. The latter portrays the social, the ethical and the

spiritual trends of the society. In every form of art there is the suggestion of That that is beyond one's pure intellectual cognition and sensory apprehension. Hieratic art may be cited as an instance. It is only the supra-logos akin to spiritual insight that can be sure of reaching the artist's supermental activity and apprehend the Truth it has grasped. Like the spiritual artist his critic is also "no man in every man, and every man in no man". In other words, for true and valid criticism the critic should have sunk his own individuality in the Universal like Sri Ramakrishna and lived out imaginatively the multiple existences of life. He should lean only on 'Truth, Goodness and Beauty' in order to be just, fair and attractive. In a way the good critic, like the artist, is a high-priest of the Divine in that he also interprets the Divine. Like Isis hiding herself in her cloud of tresses the artist may hide himself in his technique. The artist's duty lies in unravelling the mystery. His duty is not the counting of the spots in the sun or the moon; for the sun and the moon are great not because of them but in spite of them. The artist and his critic therefore adore the Divine though in different ways. They are indispensable complements of each other like the knower and the knowledge.

"But" is an eternal shadow over existence. It delimits perfection. As Browning stressed,

the artist should "prepare the eye for future sight and the tongue of speech, present us with the complete engineery of a poet, . . . the function of beholding with an understanding keenness the Universe, Nature, and Man in their actual state of perfection in 'imperfection'." The artist does not paint pictures and hang them on the walls, but carries them on the retina of his own eyes: we must look deep into his own eyes to see those pictures on them. He is rather a seer accordingly than a fashioner and what he produces will be less a work than an effluence. That effluence cannot easily be considered in abstraction from his own personality,—being indeed the very radiance and aroma of his personality projected from it but not separated.

The primary function of both the artist and his critic,—one with his own creation and the other with a true and an adequate interpretation thereof—is to lift their "fellows with (their) half-apprehensions upto (their) sphere(s) by intensifying the impact of details (of) the phenomena around (them), whether spiritual or material and rounding off their universal meaning." For, "not what man sees but what God sees—the Ideal of Plato" and of Śrī Śaṅkara (*Svātma-nirūpanam*: V. 95) "the seeds of creation lying burning in the Divine Hand—it is towards these" both the artist and his critic struggle.

'The secret of Greek Art is its imitation of Nature even to the minutest details; whereas the secret of Indian Art is to represent the ideal. The energy of the Greek painter is spent in perhaps painting a piece of flesh, and he is so successful that a dog is deluded into taking it to be a real bit of meat and so goes to bite it. Now, what glory is there in merely imitating Nature? Why not place an actual bit of flesh before the dog?

The Indian tendency, on the other hand, to represent the ideal, the super-sensual, has become degraded into painting grotesque images. Now, true Art can be compared to a lily which springs from the ground, takes its nourishment from the ground, is in touch with the ground, and yet is quite high above it. So Art must be in touch with Nature—and wherever that touch is gone, Art degenerates—yet it must be above Nature.

Art is—representing the beautiful. There must be art in everything.'

—Swami Vivekananda

ŚRĪ-BHĀṢYA

BY SWAMI VIRESWARANANDA

(Continued from previous issue)

TOPIC 7

BRAHMAN IS ALSO THE MATERIAL CAUSE

प्रकृतिश्च प्रतिज्ञादृष्टान्तानुपरोधात् ।१।४।२३॥

23. (Brahman is) the material cause also, (on account of this alone) not being contradictory to the proposition and illustrations (cited in the Śruti).

In the previous topic it was shown that the Self to be seen was the supreme Brahman. The argument was based on the proposition, 'By the knowledge of one thing everything is known'. This is possible only if the 'Self' to be seen is the cause of the whole universe, sentient and insentient. The individual self cannot be such a cause of the whole universe of sentient and insentient beings. So it was established that the supreme Self is the object of knowledge prescribed in the text. This shows that Brahman is also the material cause of the universe.

An objection is raised that Brahman cannot be both the efficient and material cause of the world, as it is contrary to common experience. In the world we see the potter and the clay,—the efficient and material causes respectively of the pot—are different from each other. Similarly Brahman cannot be both these causes. That Brahman is the efficient cause of the world is known from texts like, 'It thought . . . It created Prāṇa' (*Praśna*. 6.3-4).

That the efficient and material causes of the world are different is known from texts like, 'From that, the Lord of Māyā sends forth all this'; 'Know Māyā is Prakṛti, and the great Lord is the Māyin' (*Svet*. 4.9-10). Moreover, scriptures declare that Brahman is

unchangeable. Therefore Brahman can only be the efficient cause and not also the material cause. So we have to infer the existence of a Pradhāna which serves as the material cause, though not clearly declared in the scriptures. 'Animating My Prakṛti I project again and again this whole multitude of beings' etc. (*Gītā* 9.8)—this text clearly declares the existence of a Prakṛti different from Brahman.

This view is refuted by this Sūtra which declares that Brahman is both the efficient and material cause of the universe. For otherwise, texts like, 'By which what is not heard becomes heard' etc. (*Ch*. 6.1.3), which declare that by the knowledge of Brahman everything is known, would be meaningless. If Brahman is the material cause of the universe, then as effects are not different from the cause, the proposition will hold true. The illustration given to explain this, viz., 'My dear, as by the knowledge of one lump of clay, all that is made of clay is known' etc. (*Ch*. 6.1.4), also establishes that Brahman is the material cause. As Brahman has for Its body the whole world of sentient and insentient beings in the causal and effected states as modes, there can be no contradiction in Its being both the causes. The change at creation is only in the insentient part of Its body which was in a fine condition before creation and which manifests in a gross form assuming names and forms in the effected state. There is no change in Brahman as such in this modification, even as in a child, when it grows up to be a youth, there is no change in the person but only in the body. So Brahman is changeless, as texts describe It. Even though Brahman, having for Its body the sentient and insentient beings, is the material

cause, texts like, 'From that the Lord of Māyā sends forth all this (universe) . . . In this the other is bound up through Māyā' (*Svet.* 4.9) show that It is not in any way affected by the imperfections or changes in the world. Therefore, on account of the proposition and illustrations given in the Śruti texts, Brahman is both the efficient and the material cause of the world.

अभिध्योपदेशाच्च ।१।४।२४॥

24. Also on account of the statement of will (to create on the part of Brahman, It is the material cause).

'It wished: May I be many, may I grow forth' etc. (*Ch.* 6.2.3)—this text shows that Brahman wished to become many, as the world of multiplicity. This shows that It is both the efficient and the material cause.

साक्षाच्चोभयान्नात् ।१।४।२५॥

25. And because the Śruti texts directly declare (that It is) both (the efficient and material cause of the world).

Scriptures directly declare that Brahman is both the causes. 'What was the wood, what was the tree, from which they have built this earth and heaven? . . . Whereon it stood supporting the worlds?'—in this text a question is asked as to the efficient and material cause of the world. The reply given in the text is, 'Brahman was the wood, Brahman the tree from which they built heaven and earth . . . it stood on Brahman supporting the worlds' (*Tait. Br.* 2.8-9). Therefore Brahman is both the causes.

आत्मकृतेः ।१।४।२६॥

26. (Brahman is the material cause of the world) because (Śruti says that) It created Itself.

'That Itself manifested Itself' (*Taitt.* 2.7)—this text shows that Brahman, the creator, manifested Itself as the world. Therefore Brahman is both the causes. It is possible for the same thing to be both the agent and the object of activity as not having and

having names and forms, i.e., as existing in a fine state without names and forms, and manifesting itself in a gross form with names and forms.

An objection is raised: If Brahman manifests Itself as the world which is full of imperfections, ignorance, misery, change etc., then Brahman would cease to be free from evil, all-knowing, infinitely blissful, etc. This objection is answered by the next Sūtra.

परिणामात् ।१।४।२७॥

27. On account of modification (it is possible).

The modification taught by the Vedānta texts is as follows: Brahman has for Its body the universe of sentient and insentient beings in an extremely subtle form before creation. At the time of creation Brahman wills to create the world in its gross form: and Its body undergoes a modification and develops names and forms. 'This universe was then unmanifested. It manifested itself only as name and form' etc. (*Bṛh.* 1.4.7). In both conditions Brahman is Its inner Self. All imperfections, ignorance etc. belong to the sentient world which forms one part of Its body, and all change is in the insentient world which forms the other part of Its body. But Brahman, the inner Self, remains ever blissful, free from all imperfections, all-knowing, unchanged etc.

That the whole universe of sentient and insentient beings is Brahman's body and that It is its inner Self, is declared by the *Bṛh. Up.* 'He who is inside the earth . . . whose body is the earth' etc. (*Bṛh.* 3.7.3) up to the end of the section. Many more texts can be quoted in support of this declaration.

योनिश्च हि गीयते ।१।४।२८॥

28. And because (Brahman) is called the origin.

'That which the wise regard as the origin of all things' (*Mu.* 1.1.6). Vide also *Mu.* 3.1.3. These texts show that Brahman is the material cause of the universe.

TOPIC 8

ALL VEDĀNTA TEXTS REFER TO
BRAHMAN ALONE AS THE FIRST
CAUSE

एतेन सर्वे व्याख्याता व्याख्याताः ।१।४।२६॥

29. By this all (texts relating to the cause of the world) are explained (as referring to Brahman alone).

In these four Pādas of this chapter, it has been shown by various arguments that

Vedānta texts which relate to the origin of the world declare only an all-knowing, all-powerful Brahman which is different from the sentient and insentient world. By this, i.e., by the arguments hitherto given, all texts which refer to the cause of the world, other than those already explained in these Pādas, are also explained as referring to Brahman alone.

The repetition of the verb in the aphorism shows that the chapter ends here.

(To be continued)

NOTES AND COMMENTS

TO OUR READERS

We have the privilege of having access to three lectures by Swami Vivekananda, hitherto unpublished. They were found in the papers of Miss S. E. Waldo by Swami Raghavananda, when he was in the United States. Obviously they formed part of a series of lectures from which they have got detached. Perhaps it is no longer possible to re-establish the link. The readers may refer to the discourses on Jñāna Yoga found in the Complete Works of Swamiji. . . . The first of the three lectures is published in this issue under the title 'Introduction to Jñāna-Yoga'. . . .

It is only through spiritual discipline under the control of a competent sage that the 'relationship' between the aspirant's individuality and the Power that has projected the Universe can be directly grasped. As a preliminary to the discipline as well as at various stages in the course of it, there arises the need to distinguish what is directly 'seen' and 'valued' with the help of suitable technical terms. Avidyā, Māyā, Īśvara, Jīva and Brahman are some of the technical terms. There must first be an intellectual understanding of their sense, and this has to be followed by the processes of reasoning and contempla-

tion known as Manana and Nididhyāsana. Prof. Surendranath Bhattacharya, M.A., has during his active service taught batch after batch of students and enabled them to master philosophy in all its aspects. He has very kindly sent us an exhaustive study of Māyā and Avidyā 'in all its bearings'. We shall gradually bring out the sections he has already sent us. Every para of his writings contains the fruits of his life-long study and mature experience. We are profoundly grateful to him. . . .

The very fact that religions exhort their followers to cultivate new habits shows that defects of character can be so far eliminated by persistent discipline as to make individuals and groups attain legitimate human 'goals'. From behaviour patterns we can infer the nature of the tendencies, *samskāras*, operating from the deeper recesses of the personality at any time. But we are not, and indeed should not, regard them as finally and irrevocably 'fixed'. For, in that case, Freedom or Salvation would be impossible in this very life. Religions aim at making us carry out, here, while in this body itself, all that is humanly possible and needed for effecting the change over. Thus, whatever the tendencies and their

combinations under various external stimuli may be, every care must be taken by us, particularly by parents or teachers, to arrange the domestic and social settings in such a way that children or persons in 'need' can benefit by them and learn systematically to alter their outlook. If the right turn is given in the most impressionable period, later expansions, adjustments, and co-ordinations would be rendered easy, and every crisis, instead of causing a breakdown or a retreat in fear, would act as a powerful incentive for greater and more creative efforts. So far as parents are concerned, their sympathy, encouragement, tactful restrictions, and fine poise are the most effective factors in moulding the character of their children, and as Sri S. B. Pal Choudhury, with his knowledge of science and medicine, aptly shows, in laying a solid foundation for healthy reactions,—especially from the standpoint of 'emotional security and discipline'. . . . Since the article was unduly long, we have divided it into two parts with different headings. The second part will appear in the next issue. . .

'To Schopenhauer every universal, original force of nature' is nothing but 'the objectification of Will.' 'In thunder and lightning, in the fury of the flood, in the scourge of the storm . . . in the eruption of the volcano, in the convulsions of the earth, and in the climatic upheavals, Schopenhauer witnesses the objectification of the Will,' and 'the doctrine of pessimism' 'forms an integral part of his philosophy.' In the course of a detailed study, Sri S. Subhash Chandra, M.A., makes a clear and interesting exposition of these two important features of the philosophy of that eminent thinker whose work 'constitutes an important landmark in the history of Western philosophy.' Incidentally the writer briefly gives a picture of the context and environment in which it 'grew within' Schopenhauer, 'as the child grows in the womb of its mother.' The pregnant words that formed the guiding principle of the great philosopher's life are well worth remembering: 'Life is short and

truth works far and lives long; let us speak the truth.' We may as well wish they formed the guiding principle in the lives of all individuals and nations. As the article was a little bit long we are publishing it in two instalments. . . .

If the Government of a State adopts 'secularism' as its policy, does it necessarily mean that the people belonging to that State also should or could adopt the same as a goal in their individual life? For those who feel that way, the article on 'Secularism and Spirituality' by Sri K. S. Ramaswami Sastri, B.A., B.L., is an invitation to bestow much care and thought on the subject. As he correctly says, 'The secular life by itself will never fully satisfy humanity . . . If we do not hold fast to the highest spiritual realizations vouchsafed to us the human spirit will seek lower spiritual satisfactions rather than be content with a merely secular life.' . . . 'The wiser course of action is not the modern method of secularizing the spiritual but is the method of spiritualizing the secular.' 'It is open to man to secularize everything or to spiritualize everything.' . . .

Among the points referred to in this second section of his 'article' on Astrology by Dr. Sampurnanand, we find mention of the first Atom Bomb in 1945 and the first Hydrogen Bomb in 1952. We add one more, viz. the Sputnik put into its orbit by Russia on Oct. 4, 1957. The March '58 number of *The Astrological Magazine* (Raman Publications, "Sri Rajeswari", Bangalore 3) has an interesting Editorial on it. "According to an esteemed German correspondent who quotes the usually authoritative *Astrologie Monatshefte*", it was launched "at about 1-47 a.m., Irkutsk, E. Siberia." Time, which has its unique potentiality, is of course, the most important base for calculations; and if it is wide off the mark, we cannot expect a fair estimate of possible developments. Beginning from, "Lord of Lagna aspects Lagna, thus rendering the Ascendant strong," Prof. Raman remarks: "The disposition of Mars and the Moon indi-

cate that the movements of the Sputniks would enable scientists to get more information about Mars, the earth and the moon," especially about "the density of the Earth's atmosphere." "Mercury's exaltation in the 3rd denotes that the satellites would contribute enormously to the advancement of knowledge pertaining to weather forecasts." So far about the favourable side. Next, we are shown that the position of Mars is "intriguing". It "should cause concern to the world." "About the end of Mars Daśā the nightmares of the military uses the satellites would be put to may become a reality." "At any rate, the earth will not suffer . . . until the eight-planet combination in Capricorn in 1962." . . . Next comes a significant comment by Prof. Raman about Samyamas mentioned by Patañjali in his *Yoga Sūtras*. By Samyama,—of course, properly learned and employed, and not merely read of in books—Patañjali has pointed out that man "can get direct knowledge of the planetary and starry systems, their structure and the mysterious force that regulates them." Samyama "is the great instrument of acquiring all the knowledge of supersensuous verities." "Without the paraphernalia of laboratories, the ancients appear to have devised methods of understanding the universe and its great mysteries." Let us, while stressing the methods of science, as the Westerners understand the term, remember also what Eastern sages have claimed, viz., that the human mind, properly disciplined and made sensitive, is capable of spontaneously grasping truths when suitably and intently focussed,—truths capable of verification by actual investigation later in the world of the senses.

Regarding India's "Sign", we find Dr. Sampurnanand taking it as Capricorn, while the *Astrological Magazine* has been mentioning it as Kanyā. "Bhrigu" being one of the

well known writers to *A.M.*, we consulted him about this matter and he gave us the following brief reply. "Varāhamihira in his *Brihat-samhitā* and elsewhere refers to Kanyā as India's natal sign; and this is accepted by tradition. The rationale appears to be found in the fact that the solstitial point was found in Citrā Nakṣatra, and that too on the 29th degree of Kanyā. The Vindhya ranges which almost form the centre of the country are also assigned to Kanyā. Under Capricorn Varāhamihira assigns only a part of India. But the Western astrologers have assigned India to Makara, probably because they misread the part for the whole; for the general basis of assigning the signs to countries and towns was the Indian tradition to the earliest Arab and Western astrologers." Unless we approach a competent Western astrologer, we shall not be able to know why they really take India's sign to be Capricorn . . .

In the May 1957 issue of *Prabuddha Bharata* we published Sri P. Sama Rao's excellent study of Vijayanagar Art. This time he has explained the respective functions of the artist and his critic. 'The object of art is not merely temporal.' True art 'abides in eternal values, inspiring and helping one to become That from which both the edible and the inedible, and the ineffable have proceeded.' 'The artist's creation is a minim of the divine creation.' And the 'unravelling of the mystery' that 'surrounds' this 'human product' into 'dispassionate, clear and articulate terms is the *summum bonum* of criticism.' Referring to the different schools and theories of art, the author rightly remarks: 'There is absolutely no meaning in any regimentation of art into the different schools excepting perhaps to grade its quality from the technical viewpoint . . . Art is one though its facets are many.'

REVIEWS AND NOTICES

HINDUISM: ITS MEANING FOR THE LIBERATION OF THE SPIRIT. BY SWAMI NIKHILANANDA. Published from Harper Brothers Publishers, 49, East 33 Street, New York 16, N.Y., U.S.A., Pages 196. Price \$4.00.

Swami Nikhilananda, leader of the Ramakrishna-Vivekananda Center, New York, is one of the great interpreters of Hindu thought to the West. His translation of the major Upaniṣads and the *Gītā* based on the commentaries of Śrī Śaṅkarācārya, *The Gospel of Sri Ramakrishna*, and *Vivekananda: a Biography* are works of outstanding merit. In this book, written especially for the modern reader, he describes in his usual lucid style the fundamental tenets of the ancient faith in its theoretical and practical aspects, and its relation to the other great religions of the world.

The first four of the eleven articles, viz. The Spirit of Hinduism, The Godhead and Creation, The Soul and Its Destiny, and Hindu Ethics, deal with the religious, philosophical, and spiritual ideas of the Hindus as revealed in the scriptures. "According to the Vedas," he says, "ultimate reality is all-pervading, uncreated, self-luminous, eternal spirit, the final cause of the universe, the power behind all tangible forces, the consciousness which animates all conscious beings. This is the central philosophy of the Hindus, and his religion consists of meditation on this spirit and prayer for the guidance of his intellect along the path of virtue and righteousness." (p. 7). The next five essays deal with the four yogas and the Tāntric way of realization. Day-to-day observances are described in the chapter of 'Hinduism in practice'.

The last chapter contains an illuminating discussion on the harmony of religions. "Religion is not God, but shows the way to God." All religions are ways to God. They are equally effective and any claim to superiority by any one is wrong. The correct attitude for the present age is the one taught by Sri Ramakrishna, the Prophet of the Harmony of Religions.

"Humanity is stricken today with a serious malady", "essentially spiritual; political friction, economic unrest, and moral confusion are only its outer symptoms. Man is not at peace with his neighbours, with nature itself, with himself, or with his Creator." "Ill-will and suspicion are poisoning the very source of interracial and international relationships. The challenge of aggressive evil which is undermining human society can be met only by aggressive good." Human nature shall have to be

transformed. But this transformation can come neither through psychotherapy nor through science and technology, nor through military, political, or economic pacts. It is religion that can contribute in a large measure to bringing about the change. The great faiths of the world owe it to humanity to rise to the occasion". (p. 196).

This beautiful volume is number seventeen of the World Perspective series sponsored by Prof. Ruth Nanda Anshen to help humanity transcend "fear, ignorance, and isolation which beset it today." Says Prof. Northrop of Yale University: "I know of no other book on Hinduism which presents it in all its aspects in so short a compass." We recommend this volume to all who seek a clear exposition of Hinduism and Indian culture.

B.S.C.

HINDI AND ENGLISH IN THE SOUTH. BY M. K. GANDHI. Navajivan Publishing House, Ahmedabad. Pp. 26. Price 30 n.P.

The views of Gandhiji on this question are culled from his bigger book, *Thoughts on National Language*. If Rajaji, who had pioneered the Dakṣiṇa Bhārat Hindi Prachār Sabhā, Madras, and has been its 'illustrious' Vice-President for many years, is seen 'agitating' against Hindi as the Official Language of India, it is no 'irony of the situation' but a timely warning to all to ponder deeply on the question and act wisely. The book fails to provide a sufficiently scientific answer to the real problem to which Rajaji is trying to draw our attention now.

S. K.

KRISHNAMURTI THE MAN IN REVOLT. BY ANDRE NIEL (Translated from the French). Published by Chetana Ltd 34, Rampart Row, Bombay. Pp. xiii+109. Price Rs. 3.50; \$ 1.75; 7 sh.

The book is an appreciatory presentation of the nature of the 'revolt' advocated and pleaded for by Krishnamurti as 'the only hope of man's survival as a human being' in a world torn by factions, conflicts, distress and anguish. The root cause of the malady is traced to the 'primæval and fatal contradiction' in which we are caught 'between the Me and the Not-Me', 'the inner and the outer', 'the subjective and the objective'. The real remedy and cure is said to lie in realizing that 'fundamentally and biologically we are one', and 'to go beyond this fundamental duality of the Me and You.' There must be a 'true revolution' in the 'hearts of men' and not merely in 'ideologies and systems.'

S. K.

NEWS AND REPORTS

THE R. K. MISSION, SINGAPORE

Report for 1956

Swami Vitasokananda who had taken charge of the centre in June, 1954, returned to India for health reasons in October, 1956, and Swami Ekatananda was appointed President.

A thorough renovation of 38, Norris Road, the Mission's Girls' School premises, together with the replacement of all furniture, was taken up and completed. The Ministry of Education, Government of Singapore, magnanimously sanctioned a grant of the full expenditure incurred in that regard. The renovated building now accommodates both the boys' and the girls' schools by shifts as also the night school for adults.

A monastic member conducted at the local prison a weekly class for the Indian prisoners.

Library and Reading Room: New books in different languages on arts, literature, philosophy, etc. were added to the Library which was well utilised by the members.

Boys' Home: It was in 1940, during the last World War, that the Mission started this Home for orphans.

To supplement their school education with a knowledge of some trade, an Industrial Section was opened through Government help in 1948. Many of the boys learnt tailoring, carpentry, toy-making and weaving and were soon able to make their own clothes and small articles of furniture. The old dormitories were demolished and a new building, though only partly finished, was opened by Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru in 1950. By the end of 1953, almost all the boys were studying in the various English Schools. So much so, the feeder Tamil School at the Home was soon closed. The appointment of some of the old inmates of the Home as police inspectors, engineers and English and Tamil School Teachers, etc. has been a source of great encouragement to the younger boys. Several of the boys acquitted themselves remarkably well in sports and games and won a number of prizes and trophies.

A fund called the Higher Education Fund has been created so as to provide the Home boys with

the necessary finance for prosecuting their post-school studies either in Malaya or abroad.

The Mission is always willing to accept non-Indian and non-Hindu deserving orphans in the Home, with an assurance that their religious susceptibilities will not be wounded but duly respected.

As members of the Singapore Youth Council, to which the Home was affiliated in 1955, a few boys gave a display of Yoga exercises on the occasion of the 'Festival of Youth'.

The Department of Social Welfare, in the Ministry of Labour and Welfare, helped the Boys' Home with augmented grant and regular supply of bread and fruit.

Vivekananda Tamil School: Started in the year 1932, this Government-aided School has imparted Higher Elementary Education to hundreds of young persons of several communities, some of whom are at present teachers in the island or elsewhere. In 1956 the strength was 141 in its 7 classes (Std. I to Std. VII).

Sarada-Devi Tamil School: This school, also Government-aided, came into existence in 1938. Besides Hindu girls, a number of Indian Christian girls and adopted Chinese girls study here. It had a strength of 153 girls.

Both the schools, as usual, taught handicrafts. They also took part in the Agricultural Exhibition organised by the Government during the early part of 1956.

Night School For Adults: This is one of the earliest undertakings of the Mission for the labourers of the locality. Many have profited through this school which teaches English. Out of the 4 classes containing a total of one hundred and eleven students in 1956, 2 were affiliated to the Singapore Adult Education Council.

All donations to the Ramakrishna Mission Boys' Home (formerly called 'orphanage') are exempted from income tax according to the amended Income Tax Ordinance, 1948 (No. 20 of 1948), Singapore.

The magnificent Ramakrishna Temple at Bartley Road with its marble statue of the Master attracted visitors of all communities from and outside the island.