

বীক্ষণ

**BEEKSHAN**

*The Philosophical Journal of  
J. B. College (Autonomous), Jorhat  
Assam, India  
Vol. XI, September 2019*

**Editor**

*Dr. Panchami Bhattacharyya Borah*

**BEEKSHAN** : A biennial and bilingual philosophical Journal, published by the Department of Philosophy, J.B. College (Autonomous) Jorhat, Assam, Dibrugarh University.

---

Price : ₹ 200/-

## **BEEKSHAN**

Volume XI

*Period*

December 2017 to

September, 2019

*Date of Publication*

September, 2019

*Cover designed by*  
Sri Prasenjit Bora

*DTP*

Sailen Goswami

*Printing*

G.S. Print Service,

Tarajan, Jorhat

*Price*

₹ 200/-

## **ADVISORY BOARD**

*Prof. (Dr.) Kalyan Kr. Bagchi*

Prof. Emeritus, Former HoD, Philosophy  
Visva Bharati, Santiniketan

*Prof. (Dr.) Manjulika Ghosh*

Prof. Emeritus, North Bengal University

*Prof. (Dr.) Sibnath Sarma*

Former HoD, Philosophy & Dean, Faculty of Arts  
Gauhati University

*Prof. Prabhat Ch. Mahanta*

Former HoD, Philosophy, J.B. College (Autonomous)

*Dr. Anjana Chaliha*

Former Principal & HoD, Philosophy, J.B. College (Autonomous)

*Dr. Bimal Barah*

Principal, J.B. College (Autonomous)

*Arotee Neog*

Ex Academic Vice-Principal & HoD, Philosophy Dept. J.B. College

## **EDITORIAL BOARD**

*Dr. Sumitra Purkayastha*

*Nibedita Bezboruah*

*Juri Hussain*

*Dr. Ranjit Battacharyya*

*Pompy Bhuyan*

## **EDITOR**

*Dr. Panchami Bhattacharyya Bora*

*pppanchami@gmail.com*

## বীক্ষণ বাৰ্তা (Message of Beekshan)

## সূচীপত্ৰ

বীক্ষণ ??  
অনুবীক্ষণ নেকি ? হয়।  
দূৰবীক্ষণ নেকি ? হয়।  
নিৰীক্ষণ, পৰীক্ষণ-পৰ্যবেক্ষণৰ  
সমাদৰি বৈজ্ঞানিক দৃষ্টি,  
বিশ্লেষণ, সংশ্লেষণ, নিগমন, আগমন  
সকলো সামৰি লৈ—  
বীক্ষণে কৰিব খোজে—‘প্ৰজ্ঞা’ত বুৰ মৰা  
প্ৰজন্মৰ সৃষ্টি।  
মহা মহা চিন্তনায়কৰ চিন্তা পথত পোৱা  
জগত বীক্ষা আৰু জীৱন বীক্ষণ  
আৰু হ’ব—  
জগতত জীৱনৰ প্ৰমূল্য সন্ধানী  
বিতৰ্ক আৰু বিচাৰৰ থলী।  
বিতৰ্কত আলোকিত খণ্ড দৃশ্য অতিক্ৰমি,  
বীক্ষণ আঙুৱাব অভিমত অতিক্ৰমি  
প্ৰজ্ঞাক উদ্দেশ্যি।  
উজনিৰ জ্ঞান-মন্দিৰৰ  
অতীত গৰিমাৰাজি শ্ৰদ্ধাৰে সুঁৱৰি  
বীক্ষণে প্ৰচাৰিব  
প্ৰজ্ঞাশ্ৰয়ী সংস্কৃতিৰ বাটৰ বাতৰি  
প্ৰয়াসীৰ সহযোগ পথৰ সাৰথি।  
.....  
বীক্ষণৰ অভিপ্ৰায় শান্তি আৰু সৃষ্টি  
অন্ধ বিজ্ঞানক দিয়ে দৰ্শনৰ দৃষ্টি।

### ENGLISH SECTION

	Page No.
1. On Friendship – Dr. Manjulika Ghosh	9
2. Sachindranath and Suresh Chandra on Wittgenstein: Mysticism, Transcendentalism and God–Soyam Lokendrajit	16
3. Anviksiki : The epistemology of Indian Philosophy –Dr. Anjana Chaliha	38
4. The Concept of Freedom in Sartre–Dr. Punyeswar Bora	48
5. Hindu, Hinduism & Hindutva–Dr. Rajen Barua	55
6. Universal Approach to Yoga Philosophy in the Context of Indian Philosophical Heritage –Dr. Mukta Bishwas	63
7. Moral Justification of Euthanasia–Dr. Arotee Neog	72
8. Interfaith Dialogue and Comparative Religion:For a Better world Order – Dr. Jyotirmoyee Devi	77
9. Vedantism in Sri Aurobindo’s Political Thought – Dr. Sumitra Purkayastha	82
10. Ethical Relativism and Practical Ethics – Dr. Panchami B. Borah	88
11. Degradation of Values and Its Impact on Society – Nibedita Bezbaruah	93
12. Prospect of Social Peace and Harmony in the Practical Vedanta of Swami Vivekananda –Niranjan Haloi	98
13. Relevance of Religion in Present Society –Bibha Rani Goswami	104
14. The Principles of Non-violence–Dipak Chandra Bora	108
15. Gandhian Religion : A Solace in the Strife-Ridden World –Juri Hussain	110
16. Human Personality in Tagore’s Philosophy–Jadumoni Dutta	113
17. ‘Benefits of Yoga’– Madhuchandra Kaushik	119
18. Concept of Soul in the Meno –Dr. Ranjit Bhattacharya	125

	Page No.
19. Spirituality in Sankardeva: A Philosophical Study –Moloya Borah	133
20. Educational Ideals of Rabindranath Tagore –Pompy Bhuyah	140
21. Satyagraha : Mahatma Gandhi –Nitumoni Dutta	146
22. Swami Vivekananda’s Treatment of the Vedanta Philosophy in the Light of Physics –Rosemin Akhtara	151
23. Understanding Maya in Vivekananda ‘s Philosophy –Pinki Barah	157
24. Concept of Man in Rabindranath Tagore’s Philosophy –Polly Rajkhowa	162

#### অসমীয়া শিতান

১) কুৰুক্ষেত্ৰ বণত শ্ৰীকৃষ্ণৰ ভূমিকা — ড° অঞ্জনা চলিহা	171
২) বৈষ্ণৱ দাৰ্শনিক মধ্বাচাৰ্যৰ জীৱন আৰু দৰ্শন — ড° গিৰীশ বৰুৱা	183
৩) গান্ধীৰ দৰ্শনত সত্য আৰু অহিংসাৰ ধাৰণা—অসীম স্বৰ্গীয়াৰী	195
৪) লোকমান্য বাল গংগাধৰ তিলকৰ গীতা বহস্য : এক আলোকপাত —ৰশ্মিৰেখা সন্দিকৈ	200

ABOUT THE CONTRIBUTORS.	207
-------------------------	-----

## Editorial

Just like the nature, man’s capacity of thinking is always dynamic. That is why we have seen the changeness in all the aspects of human life. But the foundation which is already laid down cannot be changed. Modern Science takes the help of models in scientific explanation. Just as the engineer consults models in constructing bridges and buildings the thinkers should take the help of conceptual models. The thinkers of new education policy 2019 have also taken a model of education on the basis of the Indian tradition of Ashrama systems. The National Education Policy which tries to meet the changing of the population’s requirement with regard to quality education, innovation and research. Our expectation is, this, new policy of education which aiming to make India a knowledge super power by equipping its students with the necessary skill and knowledge.

‘Beekshan’, the biennial and bilingual philosophical journal of the department of Philosophy, J.B. College (autonomous) always tries to focus the philosophical ideas after having completed its continuous and successful journey of twenty years since 1999, the year of its inception. This eleventh volume of Beekshan is enriched with diverse contents contributed by renowned philosophers of Assam and outside of Assam. There is a humble effort on our part

# On Friendship

Manjulika Ghosh

to give a platform to our research scholars and Ex-students to express their thoughts.

I express my gratitude to the Advisory and Editorial Boards for their guidance and support. I would like to extend my special thanks to Dr. Bimal Borah, the Principal, of our college for his moral and financial support. The Philosophy department will be always indebted to our revered teacher, former HoD Philosophy & former Principal, J.B. College, Dr. Anjana Chaliha, who is the 'mother' of 'Beekshan' as well as the writer of 'Beekshan Vārta' for her constant advice and blessings along with her valuable two articles. I also thankful to all the contributors for their valuable articles, without whom Beekshan could not have published. I offer my heartfelt thanks to my departmental colleagues for their co-operation. I would like to extend my special thanks to our student, Ashim Swargiary, for his constant help in Proof -reading. Finally, I offer my thanks to Manoj Kr. Goswami, the proprietor of Grantha-Sanskriti, for his continuous efforts in bringing out the journal within a short time.

Long live Beekshan.

Dr. Panchami Bhattacharyya Borah  
Editor, Beekshan

Friendship, in all times and all cultures, is considered a virtue – a moral goodness. It has been discussed in classical literature as well as in contemporary writings. In India we have the Sanskrit verse on friendship. A friend is one who sees you through thick and thin, and stands by you in your good days as well as in your adversity. It goes as follows:

utsave vyasane caiba  
durbikshe rastraviplave  
rajodvare sasmane ca  
yatisthati sa vandhavah

In ancient Greece there had been much discussion on friendship both in Plato's dialogues *Lysis* and *Symposium* and Aristotle's *Nichomachean Ethics*<sup>1</sup> and *Eudemian Ethics*<sup>2</sup>. Aristotle has distinguished between different kinds of friendship. These are as follows:

- (1) There is the friendship based on utility; the bond is formed primarily on the basis of mutual utility. This is found in business relations, e.g., "I have a friend in the air lines; he can check the status of the air ticket".

There is the friendship based on pleasure, where the basis of friendship is shared pleasure, e.g., the friendship between music-lovers and viewers of films. The shared interest in listening to music and viewing films makes them friends. In this connection, it would perhaps, not be beside the point, to recount a real life story published, some years ago in the monthly magazine *Reader's Digest*. One young man and one young

woman met during an adventure tour in the wilderness of America. The shared pleasure in undertaking the adventures, the hardships and challenges created a bond of friendship between the two strangers.

The friendships just mentioned are, according to Aristotle, secondary forms of friendship. They are easily dissolved and tend to disappear when the source of friendship dries up. Though useful and necessary for everyday living, they are not true friendships. To go back to the story of the Digest, the friendship was lost after coming back to the civilized world. The young lady who is the narrator of the story avers that the friendship that flowered in the wild did not survive in the city.

What, then, is true or perfect friendship? What is first friendship according to Aristotle? It is an important human good. It is a human condition in which two persons of equal character, equal in virtue, mutually care for each other for their own sake. Thus, friendship is on the basis of character. Such a friendship endures as long as virtue endures and is not easily dissolved.

Aristotle, who has written extensively on friendship and who values it very much, calls the friend a “second self” (*allos or heteros autos*). What is his argument for saying this? It goes like that. Friendship proceeds from self-love. We all love ourselves. Aristotle claims that a man is his own best friend. He ought to love himself the best. Self-love is very common. What is the basis of the self-love? It is not the self as a seeker of pleasure, money or honors but the self as a rational being. Self-love has two senses. One is equivalent to self-interest and is used of those who run after money, honors, and pleasures to themselves, gratifying the irrational part of their soul. In the second sense it is used of the person who assigns to himself what is most truly good, the deliberative or rational part of the soul. Living a life of reason is a virtue, a good, a worthy thing, a life worth living. When a person recognizes the same virtues which he admires and cherishes in himself, in another person, there is perfect friendship between them. True friends, Aristotle tells us are friends of equal virtues. This prompts Aristotle to say that a friend is one with whom one shares a single soul. The friend

is a soul mate. What is a friend, then? A single self and two bodies. Our friends manifest those traits of character which we cherish in ourselves. In perfect friendship between equally virtuous persons one friend will share the other’s character. This means that what one cherishes in oneself he will also recognize and admire in the other. True friends are character friends.

It is needless to say that true or perfect friendship which is called first friendship is a two-way traffic. The recognition of virtues is a mutual recognition. One of the parties cannot remain indifferent. Aristotle has a reciprocalist or mutualist scheme of friendship. This mutuality is reserved for men because it implies the faculty of deliberation which belongs neither to animals nor to God. As Derrida observes in his gloss on Aristotle, God has no friends. For He has no use of friends. He thinks himself and nothing else.<sup>3</sup>

Aristotle well understands the inestimable value of friendship because he believes that man aspires for happiness. A happy life is a life excellently or virtuously lived. A happy life is a self-sufficient life, lacking in nothing. A friend is necessary for the self-sufficiency. One who lacks a friend lacks self-sufficiency. And if he is not self-sufficient he is not happy. Hence, it is necessary for one who wants to be happy to have excellent friends. It is to be noted that not only Aristotle but other thinkers too have put friendship within a moral framework. The intimacy of a close friend is seen as a kind of self-examination and character-improvement. As Nancy Sherman observes:

Each is inspired to develop himself more completely as he sees the admirable qualities . . . manifest in another whom he esteems. . . Character friends . . . are eminently suited as models to be emulated.<sup>4</sup>

A similar thought is found expressed in Laurence Thomas. According to him because of the love friends have for each other they are committed to each other’s flourishing. Now the expression “flourishing” occurs many times in Aristotle’s ethics. It signifies “living well” or “living

successfully”, which the friend seeks to enhance rather than stifle.<sup>5</sup>

However, if we consult our everyday experience friendship does not always inspire us to moral improvement. There is a gap between the philosopher’s accounts of the good of friendship and everyday experience. Friendship may involve moral risks. Through loyalty to a friend one can be led into moral wrong doing. Close friends are dangerous.

Dean Cocking and Jeanette Kennett in their article, “Friendship and Moral Danger”<sup>6</sup> have focused on the conflict between friendship and morality. They have argued that the good of a friendship has little to do with morality. The attempt to embed the good of friendship wholly within a moral framework is said to be “absurd” by them. It is rather the value of friendship that may conflict with moral considerations and may at times override such considerations. To substantiate their contention they have resorted to the analysis of a film, *Death in Brunswick*. Let us follow the story and its analysis by Cocking and Kennett.

Carl is the protagonist in the film. He has many defects of character and he cooks in a night club of dubious reputation. His assistant Mustapha is a dealer in drugs. He was badly beaten up by the strongmen of the night club and was told that Carl is responsible for the beating. So one night he enters the kitchen and attacks Carl. Carl had a multiple-pronged fork in his hand. Mustapha falls on it and dies. In acute panic Carl calls his best friend Dave. When Dave saw the dead body his immediate reaction was to call the police. But Carl begs him not to do so as it would mean his going to the jail and he cannot cope with a jail-life. So Dave helps Carl to move the body and takes it to the cemetery where Dave works. Dave breaks into a coffin in an open grave, stamps on the decaying decomposing corps to make room for Mustapha and re-closes the coffin. Later they deny all knowledge of Mustapha to his wife and son. Dave’s actions are a series of wrong doings by any standard. And they show the moral danger of friendship.

Cocking and Kennett’s observation is that although Dave has failed as a moral agent in failing to do what he ought and doing what he

ought not have done, he has not failed as a friend. One might even think that it is the requirement of close friendship in the circumstance that makes him do what he does, and he fails Carl seriously if he does not. Carl’s asking for help is an appeal to Dave’s friendship and he regards Dave’s action as a mark of the strength of their friendship.<sup>7</sup> Friendship is a valuable relationship and that it is part of both the nature and value of friendship that one may be led morally astray by the demands of friendship.<sup>8</sup> In this way, against the dominant philosophical account of a highly moralized conception of friendship the authors of “Friendship and Moral Danger” have upheld a view of friendship in which Dave’s action is not against moral reason. In so far as he acts for Carl’s view of his own good, he acts for a moral reason. In their words “. . . many apparent conflicts between friendship and morality should better be seen as conflicts within morality”<sup>9</sup> To reject my friend just when she is in trouble, whether through her own fault or not suggests that I fail to be a friend. To be a friend is to turn to our friends when they are in trouble even when it involves certain moral wrong doing.

The second question that arises is: Who can be a friend? Both in classical writings and critical literature the friend is a brother. The notion of friends as brothers promises for relationships built on intimate connection and like-mindedness. It suggests both equality of rights and intimacy. Aristotle had a reciprocalist or mutualist theory of friendship. But the reciprocity or mutuality is incomplete. For friends are equal and bound by the bonds of fraternity. Friends speak directly with one another; there is a face to face communication between friends. Friendship signifies liberty, equality, fraternity. Women do not enjoy liberty nor are they equal and hence fraternity with the men folk is out of the question. They occupy the private space while the men are in the public space. Woman is the symbol of the erotic. She is an object of male love. There cannot be perfect friendship between men and women. Commenting on this Derrida says that in all the philosophical discourse on friendship, on the one hand, there is a double exclusion of friendship between women and on the other between men and women.<sup>10</sup> And further on referring to Nietzsche Derrida says: “Women are not capable of friendship. She only knows love”. The

question remains if friendship between women is unnatural and conceived of as immoral.

As Derrida clearly understands it the goods internal to friendship bring with them their own challenges. Aristotle did not address these challenges because he conceived of friendship as a relationship between men, specifically good men in virtue of their goodness. The androcentric notion of friendship has been challenged by the feminists. The fact that women are repeatedly pushed to the inner quarters is a sign of their spilling over to the boundary. There is no reason why there cannot be a stable friendship between men and women and between women themselves. There is also the need to dislodge the supreme role assigned to reason as a male virtue and reorient human relationship in terms of emotion and feeling. In fact Derrida's criticism of logo-centrism in Western tradition has been an important trend setter in decentralizing reason. Though, it cannot rid us, once and for all, of the concepts fundamental to rationalism, it can transform them, displace them, and turn them against their presuppositions and little by little to modify the terrain of our thought and thereby to produce new configurations.

### References:

1. *Nicomachian Ethics*, trans., H.Rackham, Loeb Classical Edn., Cambridge: Harvard, 1925.
2. *Eudemian Ethics in The Athenian Constitution*, trans., H.Rackham, Loeb Classical Editions, Cambridge: Harvard, 1952.
3. *J.Derrida, Politics of Friendship*, London: Verso, 1997, p.361.
4. "Aristotle on the Shared Life" in Neera K. Badhwar, *Friendship: A Philosophical Reader*, Ithaca: Cornell, 1993, PP.91-107.
5. *Living Morally: Psychology of Moral Character*, Philadelphia: Temple, 1989, pp. 153-55.

6. "Friendship and Moral Danger", *The Journal of Philosophy*, 2000, pp. 278-96.
7. *Ibid.*, p.280.
8. *Ibid.*, p.279.
9. *Ibid.*, p.283.
10. J. Derrida. op.cit., p.362.



# Sachindranath and Suresh Chandra on Wittgenstein: Mysticism, Transcendentalism and God

Prof. Soyam Lokendrajit

## 1. Introduction

The Tractatourian metaphysics is; the world is the sum totality of facts, all that is the case. “All” means a closure, a boundedness. It also means; – all that is to be said is said or all that can be said is said. Saying about the world is language. Or what is said about the world is language. As a counterpart to the Tractatourian metaphysics of facts, the Tractatourian language is mirror of reality or the sum totality of facts. Saying something about the world is mirroring the world. A mirroring picture has a logical fidelity; as perfect as the Platonic form. Almost all the commentaries on the Tractatus converge on one crucial point that the Tractatourian Wittgenstein affirms a formal symmetry between human nature, language and reality – as a condition of adequate description. This formal symmetry, it is claimed, ensures the fixity of meaning as the essence of sentences or propositions. The Tractatourian model is logically elegant, the sum totality of facts and the sum totality of propositions holding on to each other in isomorphic relation. But it is such a closed model. No wonder Wittgenstein finds it a cage not unlike the Platonic cave. A point repeatedly emphasised by Suresh Chandra. No wonder that the desire to be free from the cage or prison house or cave is universal in man. A desire for which Wittgenstein had the profoundest respect.

There is the crucial issue of whether Tractatus is the logical formalisation of an ideal language that gives us conditions of adequate

description. But we need not dwell on the issue. A minimalist interpretation of the Tractatourian view of language will serve our purpose. And the minimalist interpretation is, language is a system of propositions mirroring facts and these propositions are either true or false.

Look at the sentence or proposition “I love you” through the Tractatourian prism. What do we see? A fact or state of affairs, an emotion, an act, a disposition, a promise, a proposal or a what? How do we interpret the meaning of the verb “love” sandwiched by two personal pronouns? Formalising the sentence or proposition as relational *Liy* is of no help either. Even admitting that formalisation gives the logical form which I doubt, it does not give us the substance of what love is. Proceeding further, take up a Bollywood example. After tensions and counter-tensions in the Bollywood love game of hide and seek, the heroine falls in the arms of the hero; beating his breast with her two hands as drumsticks to declare “I hate you”. The audience rapturing into tearful applause, understands “I hate you” means “I love you” and vice-versa. Don’t deny that they have understood. The Bollywood love-industry and violence-industry would have collapsed long back if they have not understood. So, love and hate are commensurable in use and in their commensurability points to what is intriguing if not wholly mysterious. We, therefore, see that the many uses of a word, a sentence or a proposition do not have the same logical form or essential meaning. Our language is a maze of meandering streets and squares of old and new houses. It can be seen, according to Wittgenstein, as an ancient city with additions from various periods.<sup>1</sup> Now, then, Wittgenstein argues that our city called language, with newer and newer additions, has too many surprises to be accommodated within the neat logical formalisation of the Tractatus. The Tractatourian engagement with the logical form or meaning of propositions (the sum totality of which is language) has to give way to looking for the uses of languages. We find our ways with the world or in the world using words and sentences. And our ways of using language have criss-cross similarities. What Wittgenstein calls family resemblance.<sup>2</sup> It is never the case that there is something to be called a meaning running like a common thread in all of them.<sup>3</sup> Finding our ways with the world, of course, still implies that our language and world hold on to each other constituting a boundedness or a cage. What lies

beyond this boundedness is not sayable. But it is not unimportant. Rather it is a perennial problem of philosophy. The present paper is to highlight the thoughts of two eminent philosophers, Sachindranath and Suresh Chandra, on Wittgenstein. Views on mysticism, transcendentalism and religion to be precise. On what Wittgenstein calls the unsayable.

## 2. Sachindranath on Wittgenstein's Mysticism

Wittgenstein's picture theory of meaning as well as his views on logic highlighting the distinction between the sayable and showable, points out that what is showable cannot be said in language again. The showable, therefore, is the unsayable. Philosophy, saying the unsayable is in Wittgenstein's view, absolutely senseless. Philosophy making lofty claims of discoursing on a transcendent reality is equally senseless. A tremendous consequence of this doctrine, according to Sachindranath is, "in a perfect Wittgensteinian republic it is the philosophers who will be banished".<sup>4</sup> In this regard, Wittgenstein is not even making an exception of himself. He himself frankly admits that the Tractatus should be thrown away once we have the book as a ladder to climb up. Sachindranath quotes;

6.54 My propositions serve as elucidations in the following way: anyone who understands me eventually recognises them as nonsensical, when he has used them – as steps – to climb up beyond them. (He must, so to speak, throw away the ladder after he has climbed up it).

He must transcend these propositions, and then he will see the world aright.<sup>5</sup>

Sachindranath opines that the last sentence betrays the 'mystical' in Wittgenstein. He points out that when the world is seen properly and in its totality, there is always a sense of rightness. When I describe, I describe only a part of the world. But I can see that this part is only a part of the totality. Thus, any part of the world that I can describe equally manifest the totality. In Sachindranath's interpretation of Wittgenstein, I can see the totality in any description and thus am aware of the limit of how much can be said. He then concludes that this constant sense of limit of the 'expressible' is sure to impart a mystic awareness. Mystic silence here should not merely be construed as a 'failure of expression' but as a zone

where the self enjoys his security and freedom. Perhaps, where the self is unburdened from the bounds of communication; where seeing is all that need be. It is also difficult to relate what Wittgenstein calls the non-speakable (mystic) with the ordinary trend of mysticism that we find in India or elsewhere.<sup>6</sup> That is to say, mysticism based on a certain kind of experience. Do we confine ourselves to what Wittgenstein explicitly states in the last section of the Tractatus? Do we relate what is said in the Tractatus with the three famous personal experiences of Wittgenstein namely; (i) the sense of wonder at there being anything at all (Wittgenstein believes it to be what people were referring to when they said that God had created the world) (ii) the feeling of absolutely safe which some people would say is the same as feeling safe in the hands of God, and (iii) the experience of feeling guilty which one might say is the same as feeling that God disapproves of our conduct?<sup>7</sup> Or do we agree with Otto Neurath whose comment on Wittgenstein's conclusion 'Whereof one cannot speak, thereof one must be silent' was "One must indeed be silent, but not *about* anything"?<sup>8</sup>

A.J. Ayer's sympathies lie with Neurath. Here Ayer does not deny the occurrence of mystical experience or that those who enjoy them are entitled to set a great value on them. Ayer says he is only rejecting the suggestion that mystic experiences reveal the existence of anything higher, or that they supply an answer to the 'the problems of life'. He does not like to bury ethics and aesthetics together in the mystical, also. He admits that his emotive theory of Ethics is developed under the spell of the Tractatus. But he is not in agreement with Wittgenstein's views on Ethics.<sup>9</sup>

Further more, Ayer makes the interesting point that the experiences (mystic?) to which Wittgenstein turns to throw light on his sense of absolute values do not provide the basis for any set of moral principles. They offer no guidance for the conduct of life. At the same time, Ayer gives his testament, on the basis of abundant evidence that Wittgenstein maintained very strong moral attitudes. That his judgements of people's conduct including his own, were frequently harsh. Ayer also testifies that Wittgenstein never bothered to bring his "very strong moral attitudes" into accord with any philosophical theory.<sup>10</sup>

Now, here is a fruitful paradox exploration of which will reveal

Wittgenstein's views on the nature of philosophy as an activity, as well as his views on the mystic and the religious. Wittgenstein himself reminds us always that things mystical make themselves manifest through forms of life. Surely, what is to be explored is; this manifestation through forms of life. Ayer's verification principle (drawing inspiration from *Tractatus* itself) forbids him to follow where the paradox leads.

Considering these points and counterpoints in the discussions on Wittgenstein's mysticism, Sachindranath observes that the mystic assumes a relatively self-sufficient status perhaps because the rest of the *Tractatus* hardly needs to be interpreted in terms of Wittgenstein's remarks on the mystical. This part, in his opinion, is a free-for-all zone where one may develop *one's own ideas which are only occasioned by the Text of the Tractatus*. He concentrates on what he calls the 'being mysticism' of the *Tractatus* as expressed in the off-quoted line: "It is not how things are in the world that is mystical, but that it exists" (6.44). His exposition is as follows:

The Upanishadic texts of India discourse on 'Sat' which is of the same root as satya or truth. The self, Sat, the universe, are identical. They are also considered under the concept of existence or the more general term 'being' which is an eternal source of mysticism in the Indian spiritual thought. The identification of the Self or Brahma with 'Sat' or 'the universe' led the Upanishadic seers to conclude that one cannot describe the true nature of the 'self'. They declare; "one who says he knows Brahman does not truly know him". This identity, Sat = Satya = Universe = Self = Brahma throws up the concept of 'existence' or the more general concept of being which is the eternal source of the mystic. This is precisely what Sachindranath calls 'being-mysticism' which leads one to silence. A true meditation on the self which is silence is a zone where one feels free and secure as selves. Sachindranath points out that Wittgenstein's approach to silence is intensely familiar to the Indian mind. Silence in the Upanishadic texts as well as the *Tractatus* is constructive, unlike Otto Neurath's silence which is not about anything. It is not a dumb man's silence but silence born out of an inevitability of expression. Sachindranath's strategy to unlock the mystic in Wittgenstein's thought is, to look at the nature of the signs and the inevitable status that we have to give to them in order to express

reality. It means looking at the signs in abstraction but as a part of the concept of being. And for this way of looking, Sachindranath coins a term, namely, 'sign mysticism'.<sup>11</sup>

How do we explain sign mysticism? The essential feature or 'logical form' so to say, of a symbol-type is that it acts as a medium and a transparent world at that through which a world is or can be described with a T-F pole. The sign character of a symbol or the propositional sign itself is a fact. According to Sachindranath, this implies that language as a medium often behaves as an opaque phenomenon through which I do not see the world but see another world in the language. We are then led to believe that language itself is a fact which may not describe anything else. That our opaque language cannot describe that we see another world in the language. Our signs are too bad to do the job. They are passive, opaque repositories of 'logical form' mirroring – but unable to reach reality. Once this is admitted we push ourselves into sign mysticism. How do we transcend both language and the world to say again that one mirrors the other? Impossible. Hence, silence! In Sachindranath's own words;

Where language behaves opaquely we lose a sense of reality and feel trapped into a situation where all that we have are facts, and no model to describe them; because the model itself is a fact. To be surrounded by facts without being able to organise them into a scheme makes us aware of a sort of existential limitation. I live with facts and cannot talk about them except creating another hierarchy of facts. Thus an easy communication appears to be impossible and we feel compelled to be silent. We strike against language-opaque and the feeling of a very formidable fate creeps into our life and expressive behaviour. We often then cry out, 'Silence'!<sup>12</sup>

Interestingly, he links this to the enjoyment of aesthetic experience – a point I am going to return again.

### **3. Suresh Chandra on Wittgenstein's Mysticism and Transcendentalism**

The mystical is the inexpressible. The relation of facts and propositions, as noted above, is showable but not sayable. Therefore, inexpressible, that is, mystical. We have noted why and how Sachindra

Nath calls it sign mysticism. Russell interprets Wittgenstein as maintaining that the inexpressible contains the whole of logic and philosophy.<sup>13</sup>

Suresh Chandra points out that not only logic and philosophy, but Ethics, Aesthetics and Religion are also mystical for yet a different reason. They are engagements with mystery, transcendence, valuation, time and eternity, God, continuity of life after death, resurrection, the promise of second coming, immortality, righteousness, the Good and the Beautiful. These engagements cannot be expressed in language, which is too small a teacup to hold them. Wittgenstein's classic metaphor of this inexpressible, taking the example of Ethics is;

It seems to me obvious... That we cannot write a scientific book, the subject matter of which could be intrinsically sublime and above all other subject matters. I can only describe my feeling by the metaphor, that, if a man could write a book on Ethics which really was a book on Ethics, this book would, with an explosion, destroy all the other books in the world.<sup>14</sup>

If Ethics, Aesthetics and Religion are inexpressible, and hence mystical, then, what is the nature of our engagement with these? Here Suresh Chandra draws our attention to the following remarks of Wittgenstein:

There are, indeed, things that cannot be put into words. They make themselves *manifest*. They are what is mystical.<sup>15</sup>

According to Suresh Chandra, Wittgenstein's point is that, it is not showing through language that ethics, aesthetics and religion are manifested. Here Max Black's view, "any effort to express the mystical, whether by saying or by showing must result in absurdity" is not true. Suresh Chandra argues that Black's view may be true of logic and philosophy, but not of the forms of life. The forms of life cannot be absurd, because they are not linguistic expressions, and cannot be reduced to them. The argument is further reinforced by emphasizing the point that the source for Wittgenstein's mystical attitude towards the human values arises out of the fact that he finds the world limited and bounded. According to Suresh Chandra, when Wittgenstein writes "Feeling the world as a limited

whole – it is this that is mystical", the feeling he is discoursing on is certainly unique, not reducible to any other feeling. This mystical feeling is not what led Wittgenstein to say that logic cannot be expressed in language. Logic cannot be expressed in language, not because it is bounded and limited, but because it expresses the essence of language. The conclusion, therefore, is, Wittgenstein has two senses of the mystical. One, a sense in which logic is mystical. Two, a sense in which engagements with human values, such as Ethics, Aesthetics and Religion are mystical.

In the Preface to his book Wittgenstein: New Perspectives, Suresh Chandra gives us the following testament:

A question may be asked: what is new about the perspective from which I have written on Wittgenstein? At least one thing is new, that I am an Indian, born and brought up in the Vedantic tradition, not the tradition that gave birth to Wittgenstein.<sup>16</sup>

He also takes note of the fact that Professor R. Balasubramanian has been interpreting Wittgenstein in terms of Vedantic transcendentalism, in his lectures. Also, of Professor S. Panneerselvam's comparing Wittgenstein with Shankara maintaining that Wittgenstein's transcendentalism is closer to Indian tradition, particularly the Vedantic tradition, than to the orthodox Judaeo-Christian tradition of the West. Despite his testament and reference showing that transcendentalism is not something new to the Indian tradition, Suresh Chandra opts neither Vedantic transcendentalism nor Vienna-Circle logical empiricism in his interpretation of Wittgenstein. In unfolding Wittgensteinian transcendentalism in the light of philosophical paradox sandwiched and sustained by the early and later Wittgenstein, Suresh Chandra is at his creative best. The point that emerges in the course of unfoldment is, Tractaturian transcendentalism flowering into the thought-landscapes Wittgenstein could sketch in the Philosophical Investigations; so much so that the Tractatus remains to be revisited again and again. Suresh Chandra compares the growth of Wittgenstein's thought to that of a Banyan tree of which the root is the Tractatus, the logico-analytic techniques of Frege and Russell the trunk transmitting nourishment to the fruits, flowers and leaves, the Philosophical Investigations the fruits and the Philosophical Remarks branches spread out in all directions to

take roots again to support the old trunk and the tree in its totality.<sup>17</sup> To me the tree metaphor is deep and insightful, holding out promises for future researches on Wittgenstein.

With these remarks, let me dwell on Suresh Chandra's thoughts on Wittgenstein's views on religion.

#### **4. Suresh Chandra on Wittgenstein's view on Religion**

According to Suresh Chandra, Wittgenstein does not wish God's divinity to be questioned. Therefore, he restricts God to the transcendental realm. God's revelation in the world implies His physical presence also. But God's own physical presence or the physical presence of His messenger give a chance to the people to question His divinity. This questioning will injure His divinity. If God's transcendental character is to be preserved; revelation is to be ruled out. Here Suresh Chandra's interpretation is; if God is allowed to be physically present even once, His repeated physical presence cannot be prohibited. God's incarnation and therefore, reincarnation, must be stopped.

In support of his interpretation, Suresh Chandra points out the similarities between Wittgenstein's views and Tagore's portrayal of God in the play *Raja or The King of the Dark Chamber*. Tagore's portrayal expresses Wittgenstein's own religious ideal. Like Surangma, Wittgenstein did not wish to see God or to find reasons for his existence. Surangma, a maid-servant in the play, feels the presence of King (who symbolises God in the play) though she never saw him. She is so very different from Sudarshna (married to the King) who wishes to see the King. Surangma does not require any reasons to believe in the existence of the King (God), so also she does not require a visual glimpse of him. She has faith in His existence and feels His presence. Sudarshna is superficially so close to the King but is far away from Him. It's a play of hide and seek. Far is near; near is far.

Tagore and Wittgenstein had their inspiration in Kierkegaard. According to Kierkegaard, there is an infinite gulf between man and God. Which has to be bridged if man is to reach God. But the gulf is Infinite. So, the bridge has to be one capable of overarching the Infinite gulf. Will Reason serve the purpose? Not at all. Kierkegaard says, only and only

when man takes a leap of faith can this gulf be bridged, and God be reached. Kierkegaard is emphatic that faith, that is leap of faith is the essence of Christianity. And the phenomenal history of the Church's institutional success is never a substitute for this Christian faith. It is not even an iota of evidence. Remember Nietzsche's aphorism; in the history of mankind there had been only one Christian – the one crucified.

Suresh Chandra in his exposition points out that Kierkegaard rejected reasons and visual glimpses of God, which inspired both Tagore and Wittgenstein. He also refers to Wittgenstein's view; "Kierkegaard was by far the most profound thinker of the last century. Kierkegaard was a saint".<sup>18</sup> He then poses the question; is it possible that Wittgenstein carved out his own position on religion from the positions of Tagore and Kierkegaard? The prompt reply is; no matter from which direction the seeds come, they grow differently in Wittgenstein's soil. To this effect Suresh Chandra quotes:

I believe that my originality (if that is the right word) is an originality belonging to the soil rather than to the seed. (Perhaps I have no seed of my own.) Sow a seed in my soil and it will grow differently than it would in any other soil.<sup>19</sup>

No matter wherefrom the inspiration is, the originality of the thought is Wittgensteinian. Suresh Chandra therefore concludes that it would be wrong to call Wittgenstein a Tagorean or a Kierkegaardian. And in his writings Wittgenstein exhibited a profound transcendentalism – from the early writings till his last piece of writing. Suresh Chandra considers it his aim to exhibit Wittgenstein's transcendentalism in order to remove those misunderstandings about his philosophy generated by the empiricist philosophers of the West and the non-empiricist philosophers of India. In the *Tractatus*, Wittgenstein says;

6.432 How things are in the world is a matter of complete indifference for what is higher. God does not reveal himself in the world.<sup>20</sup>

How to interpret this aphorism in relation to the concepts of prayer and grace? If God does not reveal Himself in the world and if He is far far away indifferent to what is happening in the world, then how He will listen to our prayer? How will he intervene in the world? Surely intervention

implies active involvement.

Suresh Chandra's response to the problematics of interpretation is to affirm the autonomy of religious life from the worldly life, the transcendental from the mundane, the religious attitude from the scientific attitude. While the 'business' of the world moves in its own momentum, God's intervention is not what is prayed for. For example, for water to boil at 100 degrees centigrade, or for hens to lay eggs, intervention may not be needed. We do not pray for such things. For problems to which the ways of physical nature and the ways of the world provide no answers, we certainly do pray. In such prayers, we transcend the world where water boils at 100 degrees centigrade, hens lay eggs and big fishes eat up the smaller ones or might is right. Suresh Chandra understands Wittgenstein as meaning that prayer to God is possible only when we give up our scientific personality and become religious persons. It simply means that prayer is not a request for scientific manipulation of the world using true/false descriptions of the world, to suit our fancies or purposes. If prayer to God transcending the world is possible and if God listens to prayer, then God's grace is the only way available to man. Of course, it is obvious that God's grace is not identical with showering utilitarian end. After all, we do not seek God's grace for having eggs for breakfast. Nor has God created hens for enriching our breakfast. Suresh Chandra gives his interpretation succinctly;

Looking the world religiously is very different from, not only looking it scientifically but also looking it in an utilitarian fashion. A religious person for Wittgenstein looks at the world from outside, unlike a scientist who looks at it from inside. A religious person wonders that the hens lay eggs and water boils at 100 degrees centigrade. A scientist simply describes these facts without any element of wonder. Both religion and art, in their own ways, according to Wittgenstein, awaken us to wonder, but science is a way of killing this awakening. It sends us 'to sleep again'.<sup>21</sup>

Suresh Chandra also points out that Wittgenstein's later lectures and writings are devoted to two issues. One is showing that a religious belief is qualitatively unlike a scientific belief. The other shows that the language of religion is autonomous, that there is an independent language

game of religion which belongs to the family of language games. Let us dwell on his interpretation of Wittgenstein's thoughts on these two points.

According to Wittgenstein, Sir James Frazer and Father O' Hara are both guilty of totally demolishing the distinction between science and religion. He points out that Father O' Hara is one of those people who make it (religious belief) a question of science. Here, O' Hara's fault is not just that he gives a scientific interpretation to religious beliefs. His fault precisely is; he gives reasons. *Scientific or otherwise*.

Wittgenstein says; "What seems to me ludicrous about O' Hara is his making it appear *reasonable*".<sup>22</sup> It is simply pointless to give reasons, including the scientific ones, in support of a religious belief.

Frazer's fate fares no better in Wittgenstein's views. In the *Golden Bough* he treats the story of the King of the Wood at Nemi as a rite of spring. The King of the Wood is slain by his successor. The successor, in his turn, is also destined to be slain by his successor and so on. Frazer interprets this way of succession of kings as a practice designed to secure the succession of crops. He treats them as exercises of magic and considered magic as simple-minded science. Now, did not primitive men lose faith in their practice when they discovered that it did not work? The answer is; it did work or it was not found to fail. As Frazer puts it;

A ceremony intended to make the wind blow or the rain fall, or to work the death of an enemy, will always be followed, sooner or later, by the occurrence it is meant to bring to pass; and primitive men may be excused for regarding the occurrence as the direct result of the ceremony, and the best possible proof of its efficacy.<sup>23</sup>

Wittgenstein finds Frazer's account of the magical and religious views of mankind unsatisfactory; it makes them look like errors. It makes religious beliefs look like as if they are descriptions of our habits of mind which can be considered true for which counter examples have not been found so far. Here, Suresh Chandra interprets Wittgenstein as saying that no kind of reasons, including the scientific ones, should be given in support of a religious belief. The priest speaking in the language of the scientist and the scientist speaking in the language of the priest seems to converge on one point, that is, God after all is a hypothesis although an expensive one at that. And Wittgenstein firmly rejects explanation of religious belief,

because "every explanation is a hypothesis". In his opinion, a religious belief is not any kind of hypothesis, nor is grounded in any kind of hypothesis. Religious beliefs and practices speak for themselves. They do not require any external support.

Suresh Chandra draws our attention to an important argument Wittgenstein gives from the presence of different language games. The argument points to the absolute and transcendental character of religious beliefs. A poem, for example. Even though it is composed in the language of information, it is not used in the language game of giving information. A poem is not a move in the language game of information giving. Likewise, statements expressing religious beliefs are expressed in the narrative form, the form which is usually used for expressing scientific forecasts. But religious statement and scientific forecasts are poles apart.

Wittgenstein points out;

Suppose for instance, we know people who foresaw the future; make forecasts for years and years ahead; and they described some sort of a Judgement Day. Queerly enough, even if there were such a thing, and even if it were more convincing than I have described, belief in this happening would not be at all a religious belief.<sup>24</sup>

The simple reason is that the evidence adduced for such a forecast suits only a scientific prediction. Now, if the Day of Judgement is only a scientific prediction, no one would have bothered at all. For, a scientific prediction can always be otherwise. It has no absolute transcendental character. As Wittgenstein further says:

Suppose that I would have to forego all pleasures because of such a forecast. If I do so and so, someone will put me in fire in a thousand years, etc., I wouldn't budge. The best scientific evidence is just nothing.<sup>25</sup>

In his interpretation of the above quotation, Suresh Chandra points out that statutory medical warnings based on scientific studies, which are written on tobacco and cigarette packets have not stopped devoted addicts from smoking or chewing tobacco. He even cites his own case as a classic example. This is so because medical warnings in the form of scientific propositions always allow exceptions on which one can peck a hole for inclusion or security. In his own words:

If the Day of Judgement is only a scientific prediction, then one may possibly escape hell-fire in spite of all the crimes one has committed in his life. One's attitude towards a scientific truth is very different from one's attitude towards a religious truth. It is not science but religion that makes sure that there is no escape from the Day of Judgement. Only with God's grace and his intervention that one could be saved.<sup>26</sup>

The all-important point is; Wittgenstein introduces a rigid distinction between a religious belief and a scientific belief. On this very point, Suresh Chandra also cites Wittgenstein's views on Christianity:

Christianity is not based on a historical truth; rather, it offers us a (historical) narrative and says: now believe! But not, believe this narrative with the belief appropriate to a historical narrative, rather: believe, through thick and thin, which you can do only as the result of a life. Here you have a narrative, don't take the same altitude to it as you take to other historical narratives! Make a quite different place in your life for it. –There is nothing paradoxical about that!<sup>27</sup>

The point is, a religious narrative though a narrative, demands a unique kind of attitude. Wittgenstein further says;

Queer as it sounds: The historical accounts in the Gospels might, historically speaking, be demonstrably false and yet belief would lose nothing by this: not, however, because it concerns 'universal truths of reason'! Rather, because historical proof (the historical proof-game) is irrelevant to belief. This message (the Gospels) is seized on by men believingly (i.e. lovingly). *That* is the certainty characterizing this particular acceptance-as-true, not something else.

A believer's relation to these narratives is *neither* the relation to historical truth (probability), nor yet that to a theory consisting of 'truths of reason'.<sup>28</sup>

In his interpretation of Wittgenstein's thought Suresh Chandra points out that religion does not express empirical truths, therefore; it does not express probable truths also. Again, it does not express non-empirical necessary truths which could not be otherwise. The point simply is, looking at religion, as transcending the contingent/necessary dichotomy.

Like Kierkegaard, Wittgenstein looks at religious beliefs as a

passionate commitment to a system of reference. Although a belief, it's a way of living. It is transformation consequent upon passionately taking hold of a system of reference following freely one's own conscience.

Suresh Chandra points out that the same point is reinforced in Wittgenstein's views on proof of God's existence. He quotes:

A proof of God's existence ought really to be something by means of which one could convince oneself that God exists. But I think that what believers who have furnished such proofs have wanted to do is give their 'belief' an intellectual analysis and foundation, although they themselves would never have come to believe as a result of such proofs. Perhaps one could 'convince someone that God exists' by means of a certain kind of upbringing, by shaping his life in such and such a way.<sup>29</sup>

Wittgenstein also remarks that life can educate one to a belief in God. And our experiences too can bring this about. But by experiences Wittgenstein does not mean visions and other forms of sense experience which show 'the existence of this being'. The experiences that can educate us to a belief in God are, for example, sufferings of various sorts. But these experiences of suffering does not show us God in the way a sense impression shows us an object. Wittgenstein consistently prohibits God from coming down to the world of senses. Our experiences (suffering of various sorts etc.) also do not give rise to conjectures about Him. Again, Wittgenstein consistently prohibits God from manifesting to man's intellection. Experiences and thoughts of suffering – the way of life one prays to be destined for, force awareness of God on us. In a return to the thought-architecture of the Tractatus, Wittgenstein suggests that the Tractaturian 'object' answering to the logically proper name may be of help in reminding ourselves the transcendental nature of God. If 'object' is the logical condition of adequate description, God is the transcendental condition of the way of life which is religious. Suresh Chandra's interpretation of Wittgenstein's views is; Religious beliefs including belief in the existence of God can be justified, only by one's conduct. One's form of life is the best evidence for religious beliefs. Such words as 'proof', 'evidence', 'justification', explanation etc. do not have the same meaning in religion as they have in science.

We next proceed to Suresh Chandra's interpretation of Wittgenstein's view that the language of religion is autonomous, that there is an independent language-game of religion which belongs to the family of language-games. Suresh Chandra points out that Wittgenstein in his Remarks on Colour finds theology 'fumbling around with words'. In Philosophical Investigations he declares that we should consider "theology as grammar". Grammar of what? Answer is; grammar of religious language. A theologian is grammarian, but not of language as a whole, only of the religious language. Art and religion may be quite close to each other in that their grammars are different from the grammar of science. Suresh Chandra interprets Wittgenstein's view as meaning that the theological objects such as God, destiny etc., depend for their existence on the grammar of religious language. This is corroborated, according to Suresh Chandra by Wittgenstein's remarks on grammar in general, "grammar tells what kind of object anything is". In his opinion, this is inversion of the Tractaturian metaphysics. In the Tractatus the essence that is expressed by grammar used to mirror the essence of reality. The configured simples (objects) of reality were mirrored by the configured simples (names) of language. So much so that language mirrors reality with an amazing logical fidelity. Here language is reflective, not constructive. But in the later Wittgenstein of the Philosophical Investigations "Essence is expressed by grammar". The essence is what is spoken about. That is say, the use of language actively constructs reality in the way of finding newer and newer aspects of reality which is our ways of expressing also. What it comes to is, in the later Wittgenstein we have to search objects in reality by studying the grammar of our language. The reality of objects in the world, or outside it, depends on grammar. I am sure, this is pivotal paradigm shift needing an in-depth exploration.

According to Suresh Chandra, Wittgenstein's grammatical turn (which I would like to call a paradigm shift) is corroborated by the following remark from *Culture and Value*:

The way you use the word 'God' does not show you *whom* you mean – but, rather, what you mean.<sup>30</sup>

Here Wittgenstein's meaning is, using the word 'God' is not *naming* an entity to which one may be referring. The argument is, the



meaning of the word 'God' does not depend on the existence of an entity (in the world or outside it) but on the use of it. In support of this argument Wittgenstein points out; to say "God's essence guarantees his existence really means that what is here at issue is not the existence of something. On being asked why existence is not at issue, the answer is there is no telling what it would be like if there were such a thing as God. Take, for example, colour. Suppose one says; the essence of colour guarantees its existence. What does that really mean? It simply means one cannot explain what 'colour' is, what the word colour means, except with the help of a colour sample. But here in this, there is no such thing as explaining 'what it would be like if colours were to exist'.

According to Suresh Chandra, Wittgenstein's argument is drawing our attention from the question as to the existence of God to the question concerning the use of the word 'God'. The use of capital letter does not mean that it is a proper name, it simply means that it is an important word, more important than, say, such a word as 'table'. The important question is then, "How are we taught the word 'God' (its use, that is)?" On this important question, Suresh Chandra quotes Wittgenstein as saying;

I cannot give a full grammatical description of it. But I can, as it were, make some contributions to such a description; I can say a good deal about it and perhaps in time assemble a sort of collection of examples.<sup>31</sup>

The point, however, is, no matter what sort of collection of examples we would like to assemble, what we in fact do or can do is to give a few examples and explanations. And Wittgenstein reminds us that no more than this is necessary. "What use could we make of an enormously long description?" Why involve a long description? The longer the description, the more difficult it is to understand the meaning of the word in question.

Here Suresh Chandra points out that Wittgenstein's later God talk is very different from the early God talk. To be sure, the Tractatuarian God was not an entity found in the world. But it was an entity of some sort – a transcendental entity, a transcendental presupposition of world's existence. The Tractatuarian transcendental God has been replaced by a God spoken about in our everyday use of words. From the transcendental

heights, we land in the everyday uses of words. Wittgenstein's paradigm shift is not restricted to religion only. He begins looking at the world through the grammar of language. The theologian must not struggle with words now to point to a transcendental God in his way. Because this will be trying to say something without knowing how to do it. He is simply to realise that "Practice gives the words their sense" in the new Wittgensteinian God-talk.

### **5. My Response: In Lieu of a Conclusion**

The present paper is not intended to be a critique of Wittgenstein's views. Nor a critique of Sachindra Nath and Suresh Chandra's views on Wittgenstein. My aim is to present how Wittgenstein grows in the Indian soil. In the works of the above two original thinkers to be precise. Both Sachindranath and Suresh are my revered and beloved teachers who introduced me to the Wittgensteinian texts. This paper is a presentation in memoriam, fond and sacred to me. So, in lieu of a conclusion which normally follows a critique, I will give my response.

Let me interface Wittgenstein's God (Judeo-Christian?) with my God (God of Manipuri Vaishnavism), if at all such a thing is possible. Wittgenstein's God is a transcendental God, not to be manifested in the world as that would injure His divinity. My God of Manipuri Vaishnavism is transcendental, yet He manifests in the yearning and love flowering in the heart. This flowering however is not crystallised in facticity – just as one fact in the sum totality of facts which Wittgenstein calls the world. Although the frail vessel (to quote Tagore) is a finite repository, the yearning and love in itself is in continuum with the transcendental we call God. So much so that the beginning of one is to converge in the other and vice versa. Our language may fail to describe the continuum. Hence silence – a zone where according to Sachindranath, we as selves feel free and secure. In Manipuri Vaishnavism, silence does not imply failure of communication. It simply means a form of life, a mystic life has taken over. Manipuri Vaishnavism presents a life-world woven with rarified aesthetic forms becoming yearning and love of God. I don't know when and where Heaven and earth meet. But I have been taught by my birth and upbringing that yearning for love and beauty is what makes living a continuous flow of the

transcendental.

When it comes to prayer and grace, one point is clear. A Manipuri Vaishnav mystic lacks nothing of this world. Hence, a prayer for God's intervention for things in the world does not arise. Scientific or otherwise, He prays for a yearning heart. No blessing is greater than a yearning heart passionately flowering towards love and beauty which is His and His only. And where from can blessing be save His and His grace only. Here I agree with Suresh Chandra's interpretation of Wittgenstein's concept of Christian prayer – that a man is a changed person while praying. The hour of prayer belongs to the religious person, not to the scientific person. Prayer is never a scientific transaction. Science moves within the discourse of facticity, probability, hypothesis, deduction and generalisation. Prayer cries out in the language of yearning and transcendence.

In Wittgenstein's discourse on the Last Judgement the terror of eternal torment in hell is a punishment in store for man's forgetfulness of God. A Manipuri Vaishnav mystic never looks at human destiny from the bipolarity of heaven and hell. Eternal yearning of infinite love and beauty or the loss of it – that is what makes the fateful difference. Hell's torment after all, is not that frightful compared to a dry heart bereft of passion for yearning.

This brings us to the God-talk of the later Wittgenstein, the pivotal paradigm shift of landing in everydayness of use of words. It is that practice gives the words their sense in the new Wittgenstein God talk. I have a feeling that this Wittgensteinian turn if followed closely may be leading us to opposite directions; Marx's views on religion on one hand and the aesthetic mysticism of Manipuri Vaishnavism on the other. Marx's Kingdom of freedom may pave way to what Sachindranath calls silence zone where we as selves feel free and secure. The ritual performances of Manipuri Vaishnavism may help us in understanding deeper Wittgenstein's God talk. And conversely, Wittgenstein's God talk may help in looking at Manipuri Vaishnavism from a new perspective. Maybe, a new surprise is in store for us.

## Notes and References

1. Wittgenstein, Ludwig, *Philosophical Investigations*, Trans. Anscombe, G.E.M., Eds. Anscombe, G.E.M. & Rhees R (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1972) p 8 Section 18
2. Ibid., p 32 Section 67
3. Loc. cit.,
4. Ganguly, Sachindranath, *Wittgenstein's Tractatus: A Preliminary (Santiniketan: Centre of Advanced Study in Philosophy, Visva Bharati, 1968)* p 115
5. Wittgenstein, Ludwig, *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus* Trans. Pears, D.F. & McGuinness, B.F. (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1981) p 74  
Quoted by Sachindranath Ganguly in his book, *Wittgenstein's Tractatus: A Preliminary* p 115
6. Sachindranath Ganguly, Ibid., p 116
7. Wittgenstein, Ludwig, "A Lecture on Ethics" in Johnson, Oliver A edited, *Ethics: Selections from Classical and Contemporary Writers* (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Wiston, INC 1974) pp 412-415  
Wittgenstein delivered this lecture at Cambridge University in November, 1929. The manuscript was preserved and published in *The Philosophical Review*, Vol LXXIV No. 1 (January 1965). A.J. Ayer in his book on Wittgenstein refers to the later source.
8. Ayer, A.J., *Wittgenstein* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1985) p 32
9. Ibid., pp 32-33
10. Loc. cit.,
11. Sachindranath Ganguly, *Wittgenstein's Tractatus: A Preliminary*, pp 116-117
12. Ibid., p 118
13. Russell's Introduction to *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*, p XXI
14. Ludwig, Wittgenstein, A Lecture on Ethics p 411
15. *Tractatus*, Section 6.522 Quoted by Suresh Chandra in his book, *Wittgenstein: New Perspectives* (New Delhi: Indian Council of Philosophical Research, 2002) p 136

16. Suresh Chandra, *Wittgenstein: New Perspectives*, p VII
17. *Ibid.*, pp 28-29
18. M.O’C. Drury, ‘*Some Notes on Conversations with Wittgenstein*’ in *Rush Rees (Ed.) Ludwig Wittgenstein: Personal Recollections*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1981 p 102.  
Quoted by Suresh Chandra in his book, *Wittgenstein: New Perspectives*, p 24
19. Wittgenstein, Ludwig, *Culture and Value* (Trans.) Peter Winch (Ed.) G.H. Von Wright in collaboration with Heikki Nyman (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1980) p 36  
Quoted by Suresh Chandra in *Wittgenstein: New Perspectives* p 24
20. Quoted by Suresh Chandra in *Wittgenstein: New Perspectives* p 137
21. Suresh Chandra, *Ibid.*, p 138
22. C. Barret (Ed.) *Wittgenstein’s Lectures and Conversations on Aesthetics, Psychology and Religious Belief*, Oxford, 1966, p 58  
Quoted by Suresh Chandra in *Wittgenstein: New Perspectives*, p 143
23. Sir James Frazer, *The Golden Bough*, p 59.  
Quoted by A.J. Ayer in his book, *Wittgenstein*, p 88. The quotation is from Ayer’s book.
24. C. Barret (Ed.) *Wittgenstein’s Lectures and Conversations on Aesthetics, Psychology and Religious Beliefs*, p 54.  
Quoted by Suresh Chandra in *Wittgenstein: New Perspectives*, p 143
25. *Ibid.*, Suresh Chandra, p 144
26. Suresh Chandra, p 144  
Wittgenstein also points out that one may have a scientific attitude or a religious attitude to the Last Judgement. Suppose the Last Judgement is presented as the result of induction. It is then not a religious belief, but only a superstition. The substance of belief in the Last Judgement, according to Wittgenstein is; “No induction. Terror. That is, as it were, part of the substance of belief.” (Suresh Chandra, p146) Understanding Last Judgement scientifically leads to superstition.

Whereas belief in the Last Judgement religiously overwhelms one with terror, fear and torment so as to cry out for infinite help. Says Wittgenstein:

The Christian religion is only for the man who needs infinite help, solely, that is, for the man who experiences infinite torment. The whole planet can suffer no greater than a *single* soul. The Christian faith – as I see it – is a man’s refuge in this *ultimate* torment. (*Culture and Value*, p 46)

This Christian faith, according to Wittgenstein is the substance of religious belief. He makes his position clear in another remark again:

If a man said to me after a dream that he believed in the Last Judgement. I’d try to find what impression it gave him. One attitude: ‘It will be in about 2000 years. It will be bad for so and so, etc., Or it may be one of terror. (C. Barrett (Ed.) *Wittgenstein’s Lectures & Conversations*, p 56.

Quoted by Suresh Chandra, p 147

Here, Suresh Chandra interprets Wittgenstein as meaning that the latter characterises religious belief, whereas the former characterises only a scientific attitude, an attitude of making a future prediction. A scientific prediction fails to create terror and torment, because the believer in such predictions knows that they could possibly be false. One may also escape the hell-fire. Hence, one need not be terrified or tormented.

27. Wittgenstein, *Culture and Value*, p 32.

Quoted by Suresh Chandra in *Wittgenstein: New Perspectives*, p 145

28. *Ibid.*,

29. *Ibid.*, p 85

30. *Ibid.*, p 50

31. Wittgenstein, *Culture and Value*, p 82.

Suresh Chandra, *Wittgenstein: New Perspectives*, p 140

# Anviksiki : The epistemology of Indian Philosophy

Dr. Anjana Chaliha ,

Contrary to the western view, epistemology is not a new or young study in India, It is studied here with its many of the related problems from the very beginning. Public debating was in fact an ancient custom as reflected in the Upanishads and in the earliest Buddhist texts; though naturally these were not in strict logical forms. It is not easy to ascertain the chronological order of the rise and development of Indian logic and epistemology as it is with other branches of philosophy. Yet, Buddha, being prominently a historical figure, the Buddhist writings seem to give us a type of chronology. The *Kathāvatthu*, a Pali text of the *Stahaviravādi* Buddhists compiled in the 3rd century B.C. a collection of more than two hundred debates where we find logic proper. A similar text is the *Vijnankāya* of the *Sarvāstivādi* Buddhists which present the debates and refutations in strict logical forms of propositions.

In India we see that here logic includes epistemology, or here the analysis of knowledge is related always with the study of reasoning. By Indian study of logic is meant particularly the Nyaya system of Gautama, alias Akshapada of unknown date, the author of the famous *Nyāyasutra*. Logic in India is of course studied by all the systems and it is there also in other fields of *Vyākarnana* and *Itihāsa* etc. It is taken in very high esteem, as 'knowledge' as opposed to 'ignorance' is considered here to be the means of liberation and hence it is discussed seriously by all the systems. Though the Carvaka materialist is an exclusion from this general remark, yet they used to make the destructive criticisms of the Brahmanical tradition. The Carvaka (or lokayata) is famous for developing a critique of the theories of inference of the logicians. The whole edifice of their materialistic

philosophy is supported by their sense-perception-based epistemology and for its establishment they were to refute the other sources of knowledge with the use of logic.

In India the prayer, '*Jyotirgamaya*' is only a part of the complete prayer of '*Satgamaya*' and '*Amrtam gamaya*', '*Jyoti*' or knowledge is prayed not for the sake of knowledge alone, but with a view to discover truth or reality as distinguished from the untruth and unreality and thereby to attain immortality. Hence, logic and epistemology are here studied not as separated from other topics of philosophy unlike in western philosophy. Not to speak of the logical and epistemological standpoints of *tarkasāstra* or *Ānviksiki*, the comprehensive philosophy of India studies the same reality from the different standpoints where we meet the different angles of *tattvavidyā* with *dharmatattva*, *manastattva*, *arthanity*, *dvandanity Baidyasāstara* (Science of medicine) *Jyotirvidyā*, *Jagat-tattva* and so on and so forth. All the studies again stand on the firm footing of *Vyākarnana* or the science of language.

As the supreme goal is liberation so the study of knowledge or *jñanavidyā* or *Ānviksiki* is only a means. In *Kautilya's Arthasāstra* there is mention of *anviksiki* as a separate study from the other three viz., the *trayee* (three vedas), *Vārtā* (commerce) and *Dvandanity* (Politics). But yet it is learnt that when it aspires to become an independent study being forgetful of its goal, then naturally it faces criticisms. In the Ramayana (11-100-36), *Ānviksiki* is censured as leading man away from the injunctions of the *dharmasāstras*. Manu also holds that those who being misled by the *hetusāstra* or logic and disregard the Vedas or the dharmasastras deserve ex-communication. But it is allowed to flourish even by Manu within its recommended limit to act as means to good life and he prescribes a course of *ānviksiki* even for the kings. Logicians were included in the kings' courts. The *Nyayasutravrtti* of Viswanatha states that Vyasa claims to have arranged the Vedas by means of *ānviksiki*.

*Ānviksiki*, which seems to include both the studies of *tarkavidyā* and *jñanavidyā* is referred to by different names. In the Chandogya Upanishad there is the term *Vākavidya* which Shankara interprets as *tarkasāstra*. But Mahabharata refers to both *ānviksiki* and *tarkasāstra*

and states that Narada was familiar with the Nyaya syllogism. In the Buddhist work *Milindaprasna* there is mention of Nyaya system under the name of *Nitya*. In the *Lalitavistara*, logic is called *hetuvidya*. Jayanta Bhatta, (the famous commentator of Nyaya of 9th century from Kashmir) says, “There was logic even before Gautama as *Mimānsā* was before Jaimini and grammar was before Panini.” In the *History of Indian Logic*, Dr. Vidyabhusan says, that a number of writers made contribution to Indian logic before the author of the *Sutra*. He mentions the names of Dattatreya, Punarvasu Atreya, Sulabha, the lady ascetic and Astavakra.” (History of Indian Logic, PP 9-17).

When the Heterodox systems made their destructive criticisms of the ancient tradition, the six systems took definite shapes by replacing poetry and myths with help of logical reasonings. They needed logical defence in order to codify their views, *Ātmavidya* or *Tattvadarshana* was to be supported by *Ānviksiki* or *science of an enquiry concerning human knowledge*.

One special feature of Indian studies of knowledge is its concern with language. The texts on knowledge are given in *sutras*, the concise statements or the aphorisms which are based on *vyākaraṇa* (grammar) and *Nirukta* (Etymology). The grammarians have claimed the status of an independent darshana for themselves. The *sutra* of the different philosophical systems were based on the principle of *lāghava* (economic criterion) of the grammarians, that description of language should limit repetitions and superfluous elements. Encyclopedia informs us that “the grammarians rejoice over the saving of the length of half a short vowel as over the birth of a child” (P: 52). The logicians too adopted the economy criterion from these grammarians. From them the logicians could obtain their *paribhāsā* or technical language and also the rules of ‘use’ and ‘mention’ in cases of conflicting views of opponents, which made the texts free from quotation marks. Due to these technicalities the original texts cannot be understood without commentaries and commentaries are also not easy to understand as the roots of the meanings may be only there in some texts of remote past coming in a chain of a long continuing tradition to the commentator. This is why, a certain scholar in Indian thought remarks,

“A person may be a perfect master of Aristotelian logic and the varied systems to which it has given birth in Europe. But such mastery, though acquired after years of toil, will not in the slightest degree help him through the tangled webs of logomachy and sophistry as also of correct reasoning, which stand out in bold relief from the pages of standard works of Hindu Philosophy. To be able to bring this enterprise to a successful issue, he must master the high sounding terminology and the cumbrous modes of reasoning by which the Indian logical system is differentiated from all other rival schemes.” (R.C. Bose-Hindu Philosophy, Asian Educational Service, New Delhi, 1986, page 198.)

In order to attain the goal of the study which Gautama refers to in the very first sutra as the attainment of the highest ideal of *Apavarga* or liberation, the aspirant must avoid the defects of ignorance. The Socratic maxim ‘Knowledge is virtue’ seems here not to be a mere theory but is a practice itself in India.

As the formation of the systems and the subsequent development of the sub-sects caused by different commentaries on *Sveswara* and *Nireeswara Sāmkhya*, *Purva Mimānsā* and *Uttara Mimānsā*, or of *Prabhākara* and *Bhāṭṭa Mimānsā* or of *Adaita*, *Dvaita*, *Visitadvaita*, *dvaitādvaita* etc. are seen to follow the logical three-fold method of *purva paksha*, *Khandana* and *uttarapaksha*, So the knowledge, of *Nyaya paribhāsā* is very much essential for these studies. Regarding analysis of knowledge, we see that the systems Samkhya, Yoga and Advaita Vedanta speak of a distinction between knowledge as it is in itself (*svarupa caitatnya*) and knowledge of experience (*vr̥tti caitanya*). The svarupa Caitanya is identical with self or atman itself in these three systems. Study of knowledge is related with three factors of *Pramatr* (Knower), *Promeya* (known) and the relation between the two. Viz. *Prama* or knowledge itself. According to the advaita vedanta, the distinction of the *pramatr* and *prameya (jnātā and jneya)* is only a practical make-belief untenable in the ultimate analysis both being apparent aspects of the only reality, Self/atman or Brahman. So knowledge here is nothing but self-shining consciousness, the very nature of existence, Regarding *vr̥tijnana* the Samkhya Yoga philosophers say that it becomes possible only when the

object produces some images of itself through the senses (which includes mind also) in the intellect (*buddhi or citta*). This is true according to the advaitins also, but to them, true only in case of dualistic belief of the *vyavahārikā sattā* alone.

The realistic and idealistic epistemological doctrines with which our students are much more familiar today, are there in Indian systems as well. To the *vijñānavadi Buddhistic idealism* every objective knowledge is an illusory externalization of a subject idea. It may be compared with the Berkeleyian idealism. In *Sautrāntika Buddhism*, there is a type of representationism like that of *John Locke* and the *Vaiśhāsika* school's view is similar to the direct realism in western philosophy.

The Nyaya system gives realistic theory of epistemology. They say that all the basic categories of reality are given in perception from the beginning as the *Vaisesika Sutra* States, "Whatever is nameable is knowable."

In Western logic we see that its rise with Aristotle was simply with deduction and for the development of the inductive methods of J.S. Mill, it was to wait for several centuries. But in India from the very beginning the dual modes of deduction and induction or of formal and material reasoning seem to exist together. The Vaisesika system which formed a part of the old Nyāya is found to give stress on the material validity of its inductive arguments. According to them the basis of inference is an '*asya idam*', 'this of this', because of possessing this own quality, say 'touch' in 'air', we may establish 'air' as an independent substance, there being no other substance which has just this quality. In the realistic epistemology of Vaisesika, the causal theory of *asatkarya vada* is stated elaborately with such inductive finding as "from the non-existence of cause, non-existence of effect can be inferred, but not the vise-versa." They also introduced the method of 'exhaustion' when they say that if all other possibilities seem to be exhausted, the remaining one is to be accepted as the correct conclusion which resembles Mill's method of residue.

During the period of Buddha and Mahavira, argumentation was

enriched. Buddha's method of answering questions are 'true', 'false' or 'neither', became the touch stone of Nagarjuna's *Madhyamika* school. Mahavira developed the *syādvada*, the *saptabhanginaya*, a 'logic of perhaps'.

In the Jaina works—*Sthananga*, *Bhagavati*, *Uttarādhyana* etc. of the Svetambara school are seen development of epistemology, where many of the terms seem to be similar with those of the Buddhist text *Upayahrdaya*. Another Jain work *Niryukti* of Bhadrabahu introduces a ten-membered syllogism contrary to our familiar five-membered syllogism of *Nyāya Parārthanumana*. The constituent propositions are called *avayavas* like the *Naiyāyikas*, A.K. Warder thinks that the Jaina syllogism must be earlier than the Nyaya and the arguments were gradually reduced to its logical essentials in the system of Gautama, Bhadrabahu's form is like this—(i) *Pratijnā* (ii) *Pratijnavivhakti* (iii) *Hetu* (iv) *Hetubibhakti* (v) *Vipaksha* (vi) *Vipaksha Pratishedha* (vii) *Drstanta* (viii) *Āsankar* (ix) *Āsankā Pratishedha* (x) *Nigamana*.

Logic was there in India's study of medicine also. The *Caraka-samhita* a text on medical science introduces the debate under the name of *vāda*. In Caraka *vāda* proper "is a constructive discussion guided by the law of logic as between members of the same school willing to advance their philosophy." Other *Nyāya Prameyas* are also there in Caraka, as viewed from his standpoint, which may or may not be similar with the *Nyāya* use.

The *Pramānas* are dealt differently by different schools of philosophers. With reference to epistemology, within six-systems, *Mimānsā* may be placed as second to Nyaya only. *Mimānsā* is called *vākyasāstra* or the science of sentence interpretation. When the western logic is involved mainly in study of 'inference', in India we find discussions of one to six ways of knowing or *pramanas* like *pratyaksha*, *anumāna*, *sabda*, *upamāna*, *arthāpatti* and *anupalabdhi*. The logicians dealt with these *pramanas* intensively, for, they seemed to know the truth that 'knowledge of the thing to be measured' depends on the knowledge of the measures." This they realized centuries before the birth of Kant and

Locke, the precursors of western study of ‘knowledge of knowledge’.

*Pratyaksha* is defined as ‘*indriyārtha sannikarsa janya jnanam*’, i.e. knowledge generated by the sense-object-contact. But senses here mean not only the five organs related in perception in western epistemology. Here mind is also a senses organ and it is only an organ, never the knower or the owner of knowledge. Within perception (*pratyaksha*) they describe not only our ordinary perception or *laukika pratyaksha* but also of the *alaukika* types where there may occur immediate or direct perception without having the mediacy of the senses. Again they speak of *Savikalpaka* (linguistically expressible) and *nirvikalpaka* (concept free) *Pratyaksha*.

In addition to *anumāna* which is the central theme of logic, the *Ānviksika* deals also with *sabda pramana* which is given a separate consideration. In the Nyaya system it is also called *āptavacana*. To be a *pramāna*, the words constituting the propositions are to fulfil certain conditions of which the two important ones are *prakarana* (understanding of the context) and *Tātparya* (intention of the speaker.) Of the *sabda pramāna*, a noteworthy remark is seen in a passage of the C.H.I., That “If we disbelieve authority we have to go without so much of valuable knowledge obtainable from the statements of specialists, experts and the scriptures.” (The Cultural Heritage of India Vol-P 556).

The *Ānvikshiki* deals also with *upamāna* or comparison which is based on the perception of similarity with the knowledge of the object to be known. There is also the *pramāna* named *Arthāpatti* (implication) which is not in the list of the Nyāya system but is in *Mimāṃsā* and Advaita Vedanta etc. It is there also in Caraka, but he names it as *arthaprāpti*. It is a way of knowing by reconciling two apparent inconsistent facts. The stock example is of Devadutta, though not eating by day continues to be healthy and strong, leads to the conclusions that he should be eating by night. This *pramana* is like a hypothesis which is needed to explain any fact either observed (*drsta*), or heard about (*sruta*). So also we suppose a word in a sentence where it remains understood, or the supposition of a secondary or figurative meaning of a sentence, where the primary meaning does not suit. Of course, the upholders of this source of knowledge take

it to be necessary not as provisional unlike in the case of hypothesis.

Some thinkers like Kumarila and Shankara admit *anupalabdhi* or non-cognition also as *pramāna*. It is illustrated in the knowledge of the absence of something (a jar) through the perception of the locus (the room).

In addition to these six *pramānas* some minor schools admit *aitihya* (tradition) and *pratibha* (pre-sentiment) etc. as way of knowing.

*Ānviksiki* the term itself means *anumana* which is its proper study. Etymologically the term is derived from *anu* (after) and *ikshana* (apprehension). It is called *anviksha* or investigation, since it consists in re-viewing of a thing previously apprehended (*ikshita*) by perception and verbal testimony etc.

Inference is dealt extensively in Nyaya, the system of Indian logic and epistemology per excellence. History of this system is a long continuing one from the time of its propounder Gautama and then coming through a long listed commentators and sub commentators up to the time of Navya-Nyaya thinkers of Mithila and Bengal, and in Nava-Dvipa, Bengal, it is till nourished.

A full fledged *Ānviksiki* or study of knowledge is the *Nyayasāstra* based on the *Nyāyasutra* of Gautama whom Dr. S.C. Vidyabhusan placed in the 6th century B.C. although in some works he is placed in much earlier date, and according to Vidyabhusan Akshapda was another thinker who completed the *Nyāya sutra*. In popular usage the term *Nyāya* means what is ‘right’ or ‘just’ and hence the science of right reasoning becomes *Nyāya*. The term Nyaya means literally that by which the mind is led to a conclusion - ‘*Niyata anenaiti nyaya*’. In its narrower sense it means syllogistic reasoning and in its wider sense it means the examination of objects by *pramāna*. Thus, it becomes the *pranāma sastra* or the science of correct knowledge.

As the term *Nyāya* means both the system and the syllogistic reasoning, Vatsayana, the famous commentator of the *Sutra* uses the word *paramanyaya* for the five membered syllogism of the system and Dinnaga calls the members of a syllogism *nyayavayava*.

*Anumana* is defined as a kind of knowledge derived through a

relation of *vyapti* or invariable relation between *linga* (a sign) and the *lingi* (something bearing that sign). *Linga* is called the *hetu*, *Lingi* is the *paksha* and with the help of the *hetu*, *paksha* is related with the *sadhya*. This inference will contain only three propositions like that of the Aristotelian syllogism but it is only inference for oneself (*swārtha*), but when it means for others it must be of five propositions, where it is called *parathanumana*.

The reasoning based on *vyapti* which is to be established by different types of inductive methods as with *anvaya-vyatireka*, *kevala anvaya* and *kevala-vyatireka* according to applicability. *Anumana* may be again of three types. *purvavat*, *sesavat* and *samanyatodrsta*.

The items of the sixteen categories of *Nyaya sutra* show that Gautama's aim was to establish truth not only formally, but also materially, *Udaharana* or *drstanta* being an essential element. The first two categories of *pramana* and *prameya* clarify its specific standpoint that Nyaya concerns itself with the examination of the process of knowing. Other fourteen categories are also auxiliary either in the discovery of truth or safeguarding it against illogical attacks. The elaborate discussion of the *hātvabhasas* or fallacies help to guard the truth from the defects in reasoning. The list as a whole represent the stages in dialectical controversy intended to reach the goal of *nigrahasathna* or conclusion, by pointing out the *purvapaksha's* 'unfitness to be argued with.' Radhakrishnan's remark seems to be right here that, "There is no doubt that Gautama's logic sprang from the dialectal tournaments, the sound of which filled the durbars of kings and the schools of philosophers." (Indian Philosophy, Vol. II. p.). The history of Indian logic (*Vidyabhusan*) divides the history of the *Nyaya* philosophy into three periods—Ancient (650 B.C. to AD 100), mediaval (upto AD 1200) and thirdly the modern era started by Gangesha, the propounder of *Navya Nyaya*.

It is seen that the aim of old *Nyaya* was ascertainment or *nirnaya* of the normative forms of thought on the basis of the *prameyas* or the contents of thought, as Gautama considered in the first and the second sutras of his great work that correct judgement of the categories leads to perfection or *Nihisreyas* or *apavarga* for which wrong judgements must

be annihilated.

But the case is different with the modern *Naiyayikas*. These *Naiyayikas* were under 'constant pressure from a remarkable series of philosophical Buddhists who took *Nyaya Vaisesika* as their main target.' (Encyclo) Commentaries after commentaries are written by the Nyaya logicians to defend their view. With the composition of the *Tattvacintamani* in early 14th century by Gangesha starts the *Navyanyaya* literature where use of technical vocabulary and methods gets upper hand. They devote great attention to *pramana* and the theories of definition in neglect of the *prameyas*.

Several thinkers on knowledge develop *Navyanyaya* after Gangesha up to Raghunatha Siromoni both of whom are of particular mention. Thus *Ānviksiki* the old study is till nourished by these thinkers whole attempt is to make it an independent study. There may be neglect of the goal, but yet they are continuing the same age-old tradition of the study of logic and epistemology.

\*\*\*



# The Concept of Freedom in Sartre

Dr. Punyeswar Bora

The Problem of freedom may be considered as the central problem in the philosophy of Jean-Paul Sartre, because the main objective of this philosophy is to establish human being as a free being. Really speaking, Sartre is trying to show that there is no difference between man and his freedom, that man is identical with his freedom.

In the treatment of freedom Sartre appears to proceed from existential, that is individualistic standpoint to sociological standpoint. The treatment of freedom from existential standpoint is presented by Sartre in his early writings like *Being and Nothingness* and its treatment from sociological standpoint has been presented in his later writings like the *Critique of dialectical Reason*.

In his *Being and Nothingness* Sartre tries to show that the being of man consists in his freedom and that it is the foundation of all actions and values. Man as a solitary being in a hostile world makes his own destiny only due to his freedom. But in the later period of his life, in his days of maturity, coming in contact with Marxism Sartre has realized that man cannot materialize his freedom without help and co-operation from others. So, Sartre's conversion from 'I' to 'We', from individual to community, from individualism to socialism is obvious. Now the problem is—if man is by nature free why does he everywhere appear in chains? Sartre's later writing reflect an attempt to solve this problem.

## **Freedom is the Being of Human Reality :**

According to Sartre freedom is identical with human reality. It is impossible to distinguish freedom from the being of human reality. Freedom is not a property which belongs to the essence of the human being. Human freedom precedes essence in man and makes it possible. In *Being and Nothingness* Sartre portrays the relation between freedom and human reality as follows:

“Human freedom precedes essence in man and makes it possible; the essence of the human being is suspended in his freedom. What we call freedom is impossible to distinguish from the being of human reality. Man does not exist first in order to be free subsequently; There is no difference between the being of man and his being free.”<sup>1</sup>

Sartre holds that human reality is its own nothingness. In case of for itself to be is to nihilate the in-itself which it is. So, freedom can be nothing other than this nihilation. In Sartre's own language “I am condemned to be free.”<sup>2</sup> This means that no limits to my freedom can be found except freedom itself. In other words ‘we are not free to cease being free’.

Freedom in its foundation, according to Sartre, co-insides with the nothingness which is at the heart of man. Human reality is free because it is not full and sufficient like in-itself. Man is free because he is not himself but presence to himself. “Freedom is precisely the nothingness which is made to be at the heart of man.”<sup>3</sup>

Thus, “freedom is not a being, it is the being of man, i.e. his nothingness of being”.<sup>4</sup> Man, as Sartre argues, remains free even when it chains.

## **Freedom is the foundation of Action:**

Sartre maintains that the fundamental condition of all human actions is the freedom of the agent. In *Being and Nothingness* Sartre proclaims : “We must recognise that the indispensable and fundamental condition of all actions is the freedom of the action being.”<sup>5</sup>

According to Sartre every action must be intentional; each action must in fact, have an end and the end in turn is referred to a cause. In his view the for-itself must confer on action its value as cause or motive. He holds that it is impossible to find an act without a motive, but this does not mean that the motive causes the act. The motive actually is an integral part of the act.

Thus in his view, freedom has no essence. We must say of it what Heidegger said of the *Dasein* in general : “In its existence precedes and commands essence”<sup>6</sup> So, for Sartre freedom makes itself an act and we attain it across the act which it organizes with the cause motives and ends.

Very significantly Sartre argues : Thus, human reality does not exist first in order to act later, but for human reality, to be it to act, and to cease

to act is to cease to be.”<sup>7</sup> Therefore, for Sartre, freedom is the freedom of Choosing, but not the freedom of not choosing.

### **Freedom and Responsibility:**

According to Sartre there is no indispensable relation between freedom and responsibility. Human reality being condemned to be free carries the weight of the whole world on his shoulders”.<sup>8</sup>

The ethical consequence of Sartre’s metaphysics is a recurrent theme on his novels and plays. There is, for instance, Mathieu, the professor of philosophy who finds himself an adilemma :... He was alone in a monstrous silence free and alone, without help, without an excuse, condemned to decide without any possible recourse, condemned for ever to be free.”<sup>9</sup>

Further, in a similar way, in the tragedy, “The Flies” another Sartre’s hero Orestes explains: “Suddenly, freedom dashed upon me, as penetrated me.... I am condemned to have no law other than my own ... For I am a man and each man has to invent his own way.”<sup>10</sup>

It is only because of man that whatever happens in the world has got its significance. Our surrounding world is built up by our own actions. Man himself is responsible for all the wars that bring panic and devastation to the world. Thus from Sartrean standpoint there is nothing non-human in this world. Absolute responsibility of a man for what he does is simply “the logical requirement of the consequences of our freedom.”<sup>11</sup>

Sartre maintains that one never encounters anything except one’s responsibility. “I am condemned to be wholly responsible for myself” because there is no chance of escape from this responsibility.

Under such circumstances the responsibility of the for-itself extends to the entire world as a peopled-world. Thus it is precisely that the-for itself apprehends itself in anguish. A man is one who realizes in anguish his condition as being thrown into a responsibility. A man for Sartre, is nothing but a freedom which perfectly reveals itself and its being consists in this very revelation.

In ‘Existentialism and Humanism’ Sartre says that in exercising his freedom man is not only committed to himself but also is committed to the whole of mankind. “When we say that man is responsible for himself we do not mean that he is responsible only for his own individuality, but that

he is responsible for all men.”<sup>12</sup>

Thus, Sartre has extended our responsibility from the realm of individuality to the realm of entire humanity.

### **Freedom and Facticity : Situation**

We know that Sartre is the proponent of absolute freedom, but at the same time he also maintains that there are many things which obstruct our exercise of our freedom.

### **In Being and Nothingness he proclaims:**

I am not free either to escape the lot of my class, of my nation, of my family, or even to build up my own power or my fortune or to conquer my most insignificant appetites or habits,<sup>13</sup>

However, obstacles to freedom can be Categorized under five heads – my place, my past, my environment, other human beings and my death. “These Categories”, as Sartre comprehends, “may obstruct human freedom to a certain extent, but in all of them it is possible to construct a new situation.”<sup>14</sup>

Sartre tries to show that freedom gives meaning to the situation. If we accept man’s dependence on situation Sartre’s Conception of freedom cannot be characterized as absolute. But, in fact, when Sartre says that human freedom is absolute he does not mean by it that man can do whatever he wishes to do”.<sup>15</sup> According to this theory of freedom we cannot say that a prisoner can go out of prison at any time. But what Sartre does mean is that the prisoner can always try to escape, that is to say, he can try to win his freedom.

Now, it appears that Sartre has given us a radically new concept of freedom : The pour-soi’s situation or status as it exists itself ontologically”.<sup>16</sup> Through an analysis of the circumstances of my place my past, my environment, my fellowmen, and my death Sartre has presented before us an existentialist picture of the situation in which man has to exercise his freedom.

### **Sartre’s Conversion from Individual to Society:**

Sartre’s account of freedom in Being and Nothingness is mainly

Concerned with the being of the individual man. But his writings after 1946 have shown a shift from the problem of individual ontology to social philosophy.

We have already seen that it was the freedom of others that enslaved Sartrean man, it was his own freedom that plunged man into anguish, it was freedom from which he fled, it was freedom that ultimately reduced his hopes for a stable identity to nothingness.<sup>17</sup> It is the story of solitary man trying to exercise his freedom in a futile manner.<sup>18</sup> Perhaps due to this very fact that Sartre has proclaimed at the end of his book ... we lose ourselves in vain. Man is a useless passion”.<sup>19</sup>

Early defence of absolute ontological freedom has eventually forced Sartre to a consideration of a social world—especially when he could comprehend the existence of a social bondage acting upon innate human freedom. Now, Sartre’s mission is to see-if a man is by nature free, why does he appear everywhere in chain?

Considered from a realistic standpoint it may be stated that Sartre could not discover authentic freedom in Being and Nothingness, because of his one-sided emphasis on individuality. But fortunately, later on after 1946 he came to realize his imperfection and took into account the role of society in ascertaining freedom of the individual man in the true sense the term.

In the ‘Problem of Method’ Sartre argues that Marx’s philosophy is to be considered as the true synthesis of Hegelian concept of man as objective and social being and Kierkegaardian concept of subjectivity.

Unfortunately, later day Marxism has deviated from Marx’s original synthesis. So, Marxism in his view is to be reinterpreted especially to the extent of Marxism has become involved in the objectivistic misunderstanding. Sartre has put forward ‘the Critique of Dialectical Reason’ from two interrelated but distinct perspectives. On the one hand his philosophy of absolute ontological freedom had to accommodate the fact of social freedom. On the otherhand Marxism had to be restored to its true roots in a dialectic which incorporated human agency as its ineliminable basis.<sup>20</sup>

#### **Class Struggle and Dialectical Reason:**

Sartre, in the Critique of Dialectical Reason, has clearly portrayed the

working class as an exploited class in history. Just like Marx, he seems to recognise the fact of class exploitation as the cause of the formation of the Proletariat. The proletariat, according to him, is the suffering class, but above all it is the struggling class. Capitalist exploitation give rise to this class struggle. The capitalism of accumulation can be grasped as oppression and its real foundation is always elsewhere exploitation.<sup>21</sup> The revolutionary outlook of the working class is the result of its class exploitation, of its class situation and of absolute necessity of transforming this situation.

In the conclusion of his investigation in ‘the Critique’ Sartre holds that the only possible intelligibility of human relations is dialectical and that this intelligibility can be expressed only as an antagonistic reciprocity. Class struggle necessarily leads us to dialectical interpretation and in the history of human multiplicities class struggle is necessarily produced on the basis of historically determined conditions. Sartre, therefore, proclaims : “Our history is intelligible to us because it is dialectical and it is dialectical because the class struggle produces us as transcending the inertia of a collective towards the dialectical combat-groups.”<sup>22</sup>

Thus, for Sartre, class struggle which is the motor of history of a class society will continue so long as class exploitation and oppression will continue. Now, it becomes obvious for the above discussion that in Sartrean treatment of human freedom manifestation of the truth that “human reality is identical with freedom” can be possible only in communism, that is to say, in a classless society which is free from all kinds of exploitation and oppression.

Now, it follows from the above discussion that Sartre may reasonably be considered as one of the greatest exponents of human freedom in the modern world.

#### **Reference:**

1. Jean-Paul Sartre, Being and Nothingness, Trans. Hazel E. Barner, New York, 1966.P.30
2. Ibid, P. 357.
3. Ibid, P. 538.
4. Ibid, P. 539.

5. Ibid, P. 533.
6. Ibid, P. 535.
7. Ibid, P. 583.
8. Ibid, P. 677.
9. Sartre, *The Age of Reason*, P. 249.
10. Jean-Paul Sartre, *Being and Nothengness*, P. 681.
11. Sartre, *The Flics*, PP. 100-101.
12. Jean-Paul Sartre, *Existention and Humanism*, P. 29.
13. Jean-Paul Sartre, *Being and Nothengness*, P. 589.
14. M.K. Bhadra, *A Critical Survey of Phenomendogy and Existentialism*, P. 369.
15. Ibid, P. 371.
16. Manrice Natanson, *A Critique of Jean-Paul Sartre's Ontology*, P. 52.
17. Jamse Miller, *History of Human Existence*. P. 158.
18. M.K. Bhadra, *A Critical Survey of Phenomenology and Existentialism*, P. 379
19. Jean-Paul Sartre, *Being and Nothengness*, P. 574.
20. James Miller, *History and Human Existence*, P. 173.
21. Jean-Paul Sartre, *The Critique of Dialectical Reason*, Trans Alan Sheridan Smith, Ed. Jonathon Ree, London, 1976, P. 749.
22. Ibid, P. 805.

## Hindu, Hinduism & Hindutva

*Twists of the Hindu Identity thru the ages*

Dr. Rajen Barua

### *(Part I: Hindu & Hinduism)*

Etymologically, the word *Hindu* has a twisted history; it had different meanings in different times. It is a foreign word, coined by foreigners, and the word is not be found in any Indian language. We do not find its reference in any of the Vedas or in any other ancient *Hindu* scriptures. What we find, nearest to the modern word *Hindu*, is the term *Hapta Hendu* in the *Avesta* of Persia that recorded the teachings of the *Zoroastrianism* religion of ancient Persia; *Hapta Hendu* was the name of the land described to be the fifteenth land created by the *Zoroastrianism God, Ahura Mazda*. This *Hapta Hendu* is preemptively equated with the Vedic *Sapte Sindhu*. (meaning the land of the seven rivers). Both these terms, *Sindhu* and *Hendu*, are derived from the name of the river *Sindhu*, ('The Indus river' - the word 'sindhu' literally means 'river' in Sanskrit). It is most probable that originally the name of the river was *Xindhu* in pre-Vedic language, the way it is still pronounced in the Assamese language; the sound /x/ pronounced as /ch/ in the Scottish word '*Loch*' or German word '*Bach*'. That way *Hapta Hendu* may be equated to *Xopto Xindhu* in Assamese. It may be noted that the Assamese language still retain some correspondences of pre Vedic and Indo European languages which are not found in later Sanskrit language. Assamese culture also bears some strange correspondence with the Persian culture which indicates its ancient pre Vedic ties. It was most likely that the original *Xindhu* sound shifted to *Sindhu* in the later Vedic Sanskrit language. According to the linguist Dr. Suniti Kumar Chatterjee, the /x/ sound was there in the pre-Vedic Sanskrit language. This /x/ was

probably lost with Panini's 'Sanskritization' (5th BCE) process of the pre-Vedic language. There was sound shift in the Persian language too. While the original /x/ sound shifted to /s/ in Sanskrit, in the Persians language /x/ shifted to /h/. and thus the Persians called the river *Hindhu*.

When Darius of Persia conquered the Indus valley in 515 BCE, he mentioned the land as *Hi-in-tu*. This shows the gradual evolution of the word *Hindu*. The word *Hindu* was sometime used by the Persians for the river and sometime for the territory. Gradually, the term *Hindu* was used by all foreigners for the people living on the east of the Indus river, *Xindhu/ Hindhu/ Sindhu*.

Although both these words, *Hindu and Hinduism*, were coined and given by foreigners, the *Hindus* have taken both these words very passionately as their own. Since that time, the *Hindus* have been trying not only to define but also to defend the meanings of these two words for the last two hundreds and more years to the world audience. In the process the meanings of these two words have gone through various changes.

There were various problems in defining what *Hinduism* or its analogues, especially *Hindu Dharma* was. The word *Hinduism* is an English word. When the word *Hinduism* was first coined and used by the British around 1830 CE, they used it to describe specifically the beliefs and practices of those residents of India who had not been converted to *Islam* or *Christianity* and did not practice *Judaism or Zoroastrianism*. Thus the word *Hinduism*, as was first used, would mean to include all other religions of India including *Buddhism, Jainism, Sikhism* etc. However, defining an overarching term '*Hinduism*' was not easy.

So the *Hindus* tried to debate, define and redefine the term *Hinduism* for what it would or should mean, and defend the same. Raja Ram Mohan Roy, who is rightly called the Father of Indian renaissance, was one of the earliest Indians who tried to define and defend *Hinduism*. He tried it by forming a new religious organization called *Brahmo Samaj*. His definition of *Hinduism* obviously did not include *Buddhism, Jainism, Sikhism* and others. Following Raja Ram Mohan Roy, others tried to define and defend *Hinduism* by forming various other organizations such as the 'Back-to-the-Vedas', the *Arya Samaj*

by Dayanand Saraswati and others. Swami Vivekananda who is credited with not only of raising the awareness of *Hinduism* to the western world but also of bringing it to the status of a major world religion during the late 19th century, did not actually like the term *Hinduism*, and used to call it as the *Vedantists*.

All these definitions were rather high level philosophical definitions of *Hinduism* that tried to define what *Hinduism* 'should be', and disregarded what 'it is' in reality, and did not include the various practices of the common people of the street. To the outsiders, and outside of philosophy, *Hinduism* remains as a confusing and allusive array of gods, mystics, gurus, sadhus, holy cows, temples and beggars. What was needed an overarching definition of *Hinduism* if it is to cover all.

The great Indian scholar, philosopher, statesman and former president of India, Sarvepalli Dr. Radhakrishnan, tried to explain for the Westerners, in easily understandable terms, the classical *Hindu* thought. He came up with an overarching definition of *Hinduism*, as described in his popular work, "*The Hindu View of Life*". He tried to define *Hinduism* broadly thus:

"*Hinduism* is not a definite dogmatic creed, but a vast, complex, a subtly unified mass of spiritual thought and realization. Its tradition of the godward endeavor of the human spirit has been continuously expanding through the ages." ..... "Hinduism does not believe in bringing about a mechanical uniformity of belief and worship by a forcible elimination of all that is not in agreement with a particular creed. It does not believe in any statutory methods of salvation. Its scheme of salvation is not limited to those who hold a particular view of God's nature and worship.".. "The theist and the atheist, the skeptic and the agnostic may all be *Hindus* if they accept the *Hindu* system of culture and life." In essence, what he said was that *Hinduism* is not one religion but an umbrella of many religions. Thus his view is quite opposite to those of Raja Ram Mohan Roy, *Arya Samaj*, Vivekananda and others.

We find similar view of *Hinduism* by that of the eminent Sanskrit scholar J.A.B. van Bitten in the 1986 Encyclopedia Britannica: "In principle, *Hinduism* incorporates all forms of belief and worship without necessitating the selection or elimination of any. The *Hindu* is

inclined to revere the divinity in every manifestation, whatever it may be, and is doctrinally tolerant ... *Hinduism* is, then, both a civilization and a conglomeration of religions, with neither a beginning, a founder, nor a central authority, hierarchy, or organization.”

However, the arguments continued since such broad definitions of *Hinduism* was not acceptable to many of the reformed religions such as *Buddhism*, *Jainism* and *Sikhism* and many other sects of *Hinduism* such as the *Bhakti* movement and the *Ramakrishna Mission*. The later, in fact, preferred to isolate itself from *Hinduism*, and recently declared itself as a non-*Hindu* minority religion. So basically, the *Hindus* (Indians) could not come up with a single definition of term *Hinduism* that could include at least *Buddhism*, *Jainism* and *Sikhism* as well. So when the dusts settled, we have these religions (*Buddhism*, *Jainism*, *Sikhism*) separated from *Hinduism*.

### (Part II: *Hindutva*)

Up to this time, *Hinduism* was being defined based on ideologies. And in spite of the different ideologies of India: *Hinduism*, *Buddhism*, *Jainism*, *Sikhism*, *Islam*, *Christianity*, *Zoroastrianism* and others, nobody saw any problem in building India as a secular nation based on the Indian constitution. That was what the founding leaders like Gandhi, Nehru, Patel and others believed. Nehru wrote in his '*Discovery of India*', (written in prison) "Though outwardly there was diversity and infinite variety among our people, everywhere there was that tremendous impress of oneness, which had held all of us together for ages past, whatever political fate or misfortune had befallen us. The unity of India was no longer merely an intellectual conception for me: It was an emotional experience which overpowered me. The essential unity had been so powerful that no political division, no disaster or catastrophe had been able to overcome it...This cultural inheritance of the ancient Indian past, as well as what followed it in later years, is not confined to any one race that inhabited India or came to it. It is the common heritage of all of us, to which every race in India contributed..." In this, Nehru truly expressed the voice of the Indians and millions of Indians still

passionately support the views of Nehru and other liberal leaders.

However, in the early twentieth century, some *Hindus* decided to think otherwise and decided to give *Hinduism* a new political and martial twist. For this they coined a new word *Hindutva*. In 1923, V. D. Sarvakar, a revolutionary *Hindu*, the originator of *Hindutva* ideology, wrote a paper titled '*Hindutva: Who is a Hindu*' (written in prison) where he tried to define what *Hindutva* would be. The paper investigated the causes of the downfall of the political powers of the *Hindus* since the downfall of the Maurya empire, and tried to seek remedial measures. It was this paper that set the ideas and objectives of *Hindutva* in motion.

For the causes, Sarvakar plainly declared that it was *Buddhism* which was the culprit for India's political downfall. It was as if the *Hindus* have suddenly woke up, one thousand years after the disappearance of *Buddhism* in India, and suddenly realized that it was *Buddhism* which was the cause of all the past and present calamities of India. So the *Hindutva* ideology that evolved, was basically an anti-*Buddhist* martial ideology where the *Hindutva* propose to build a new political and military *Hindu* nation opposed to *Buddhist* ideas and values. It was as if *Hindutva* was trying to oust *Buddhism* one more time from the land of its birth that already ousted it more than 1000 years ago. In this new *Hindutva* nation *Buddhists* would, obviously, be second class citizens. For contradictory reasons, the new *Hindutva* nation would also be devoid of the *Muslims* and *Christians* in nation building. Thus the *Hindutva* India would not be a secular India.

There were many other contradictions and distortions of facts, and one does not need to be scholar to see that the Sarvakar's paper was written not only with obvious distorted views of history but also with distorted views of *Buddhism* and its impact in India. Three major Indian kings, Asoka (3rd BCE), Kaniska (2nd CE) and Harsa (7th CE) who were able to unite a major part of India and build big Indian empires, were also those who predominantly patronized *Buddhism* and ruled India through the *Buddhist* law of universal brotherhood. It was primarily with the disappearance of *Buddhism* from India that the country could not stand united, and fell prey to foreign invasions.

The scholarly view of the impact of *Buddhism* in India is very

positive, quite opposed from what *Hindutva* is proposing now as can be seen from the quote below from a prominent *Buddhist* scholar and historian, D. C. Ahir: “Buddhism dominated the Indian scene for more than 1000 years, from Asoka (3rd BCE) to Harsha 7th CE). And those 1000 years were the greatest in Indian history. The name and fame of India rose to the highest peaks in those centuries, and in the realm of art and literature, learning and piety, Indian achievement reached heights still unsurpassed. But, alas, later Buddhism declined in India, and ultimately disappeared from the land of its birth.”

Regarding, Sarvarkar, it may be mentioned here that his political career was quite eventful and colorful. In 1948, he was arrested and placed on trial for the murder of Gandhi. Despite numerous and damning ties that were revealed between himself and Nathuram Godse, the assassin, Sarvarkar was acquitted in 1949. With the fresh rise of *Hindutva* movement in recent times, Sarvarkar's fame has also rose posthumously. In 2003, BJP prime minister Atal Bihari Vajpayee unveiled a portrait of Sarvarkar in the Central Hall of Parliament. The portrait now sits directly across from that of Gandhi as if raising Sarvarkar to the equal status of Gandhi.

All this shows that the popularity of the *Hindutva* ideology although it was based of distorted views. The original paper written by Sarvarkar was read just prior to starting of the RSS, and as such this paper is considered the founding document of the RSS that trains the youth to understand the *Hindutva* ideology, the predominant form of *Hindu* nationalism in India today. The Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP) adopted it as its official ideology in 1989. It is championed by the *Hindu* nationalist volunteer organization Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh (RSS) and its affiliate organizations, notably the Vishva Hindu Parishad, along with the older term Hindu Rashtra (Hindu nation).

Regarding the disappearance of *Buddhism* in India, the country of its birth, many scholars were puzzled and many tried to explain the possible reasons. Lin Yutang, the eminent Chinese scholar, writer and the author of the famous classic *The Wisdom of China and India* spent some time on the subject and commented, “One cannot help being curious about the fact that the *Hindus* have rejected *Buddhism* as the

*Jews* have rejected *Christianity*. One should have thought that a nation would have embraced the teachings which seem to other nations their most important contribution to the world and the highest manifestation of their spirit. Yet this is not the case. The only clue I can find seem to lie in the fact *Jesus* attacked the established priestcraft of His time, as *Buddha* rebelled against the teachings and the sacerdotalism of the *Brahmans* ”....” It seems that the established priesthood was too strong for the revolutionary teachings and the *Brahmans* felt an injured pride in the presence of *Buddha*. ....Yet this cannot be the whole explanation.” .... “Probably both *Judaism* and *Hinduism* had older, truer and deeper roots in their racial consciousness, and that *Buddhism* and *Christianity* had those universal, idealistic qualities which detracted from their national character.”

Sarvarkar's comment on *Buddhism* seems to support this view of *Hindutva* nationalism. Regarding *Buddhism*, he commented, “The (Hindu) leaders of thought and action grew sick of repeating the mambos and jumbos of universal brotherhood....So the leaders of thought and action of our race had to rekindle their Sacrificial Fire to oppose the sacrilegious one and to re-open the Vedic fields for steel, to get it sharpened on the altar of Kali.”

While these comments are unfortunate and surprising, yet it is not fully understood why the *Hindutva* is opposed to *Buddha's* teachings of *universal brotherhood* which were similar to those of *Jesus Christ* based on which the whole west is immensely benefited in their progress in the modern world civilization and in conquering the world. But that was not the case. In contrast, the *Hindus* have characteristically rejected *Buddhist* principle of *universal brotherhood* and apparently accepted the Laws of Kautilya (*enemy of thy enemy is your friend*). Along with that the *Hindus* also have accepted *varnasramadharma*, the caste system.

Thus the dominant reason for the demise of *Buddhism* was the constant and persistent opposition to *Buddhism* by the *Brahmanical* system armed with its *varnasramadharma*, the caste system, and many a times with violence. Believing in universal brotherhood, *Buddhism* refused to recognize the superiority of the *Brahmin* caste, and as a result by the

12th CE, *Buddhism* has completely been wiped out of mainland India. It was in the absence of *Buddhism* that the subsequent downfall of India and dominance by foreign power of the country occurred; it was mostly due to India's lack of unity caused by the re-emergent caste system in India since the Gupta age which has been playing havoc in India making it the only country in the world with a caste system based on religion.

### **References:**

1. *Hindu View of Life* – Dr. S. Radhakrishnan
2. *Discovery of India* – Jawaharlal Nehru
3. *The Wisdom of China and India* – Lin Yutang
4. *Himalayan Buddhism* – Dr. D.C. Ahir (1993)
5. *Hindutva – Who is a Hindu?* - (Article) V.D. Sarvakar (1923)
6. *Essentials of Hindutva* – (Book) V. D. Satvakar (1921)
7. *The Significance of the X Sound in Assamese Language* – Dr. Rajen Barua
8. *The Author: Dr. Rajen Barua is an engineer by profession and a freelance writer by passion. He lives in Houston, Texas. He is the author of the book, 'Buddhism in Assam'.*  
*rajenbarua@gmail.com Whats App # 1 713 677 9162*

## **Universal Approach to Yoga Philosophy in the Context of Indian Philosophical Heritage**

Dr. (Mrs) Mukta Biswas

Yoga philosophy, one of the most developed systems of Indian philosophy constitutes an integral part of rich heritage of India. The origin of *yoga* is untraceable and lost in antiquity. *Yoga* postures depicted on seals, stones and statues discovered among the relics of the Indus Valley civilisation indicate that it was prevalent in India even before the advent of Aryans. The word *yoga* is used in various senses. It means spiritual unification, i.e., the union of the soul with absolute, concentration of the mind and complete suppression of the mental modes. In the *Amarakosa*<sup>1</sup> and the *Mahabharata*<sup>2</sup> the word *yoga* is used in the sense of means. In most of the Vedic texts the concept of *yoga* has been clearly mentioned. In the *Rgveda*,<sup>3</sup> the term *yoga* has been taken in the sense of yoking or harnessing, achieving the unachieved and the like. The sense of yoking is used in many later Vedic works also e.g. *Satapathabrahmana*<sup>4</sup> *Taittiriyabrahmana*<sup>5</sup> etc. In the *Gayatri* hymn of the *Rgveda*, Visvamitra meditated on the glory of the Sun for the illumination of his understanding, *bhargodevasyadhimahi*.<sup>6</sup> Here, it is not only a prayer but an intellectual meditation. The meaning of *yoga* as meditation is echoed in the *Samaveda*<sup>7</sup> and *Suklayajurveda*<sup>8</sup> too. With the growth of religious and philosophical ideas in the *Rgveda*, the word *yoga* which is originally applied to control of steeds began to be applied to the control of senses. In the Upanisadic literature *yoga* is spoken of as restraint of the senses through which the final realization can be achieved.<sup>9</sup> The *Srimadbhagavadgita* defines *yoga* as the higher state of mind from where, a person is never shaken even by



the greatest pain or misery. That state free from all pain and misery is *yoga* according to *Gita*. Yoga is also defined in the *Gita* as skill of preserving the equanimity or equality of the mind<sup>10</sup>. Yoga according to Patanjali's definition is the final annihilation of all the mental modes.<sup>11</sup> According to Patanjali, *yoga* means an internal discipline by which the mind is progressively stilled and taken up into the stage of *samadhi*. This concept of *yoga* has a great impact on the life and works of contemporary Indian philosophers like Swami Vivekananda, Rishi Aurobindo, Mahatma Gandhi, Radhakrishnan, Rabindranath Tagore and others. They emphasized the importance of *yoga*. Sri Aurobindo, one of the greatest mystic philosophers of the twentieth century, maintains that *yoga* is a process by which an individual transcends from the empirical to the trans-empirical level. It raises the ordinary human mind to the higher and wider modes of consciousness. In brief, *yoga* transforms ordinary human personality into a supermind. In this paper an attempt has been made to highlight Patanjali and Sri Aurobindo's view in the context of Yoga philosophy. Aurobindo's concept of *yoga* had an immense impact on Indian mind, impressed the public opinion in western countries and influenced the leaders of various civil, political and human rights movement. The Yoga System of Sri Aurobindo is called *Supramental Yoga* or *Integral Yoga* or *Yoga of Self-Surrender*. It is a system of spiritual practice with the aid of which a *sadhaka* may ascend to the level of trans-empirical reality and also descend to the level of life and matter of divinise them. According to Sri Aurobindo, the supermind is the higher level of existence, which is beyond matter, life and mind. It has the capacity for growing upwards and coming face to face with *Saccidananda Brahman* and descending down to the level of matter, life and ordinary mind and divinising them. A direct link is established between *Saccidananda Brahman* on the one hand, and the state of ordinary human existence on the other, through the super-mind.

It is to be noted that besides *Patanjali Yogasutra*, there are numerous works on Yoga namely *Sivasamhita*, *Devibhagavata*, *Hathoyogapradipika*, *Yogasastra of Dattatreya*, *Gherandasamhita*, *Satcakranirupana* etc. There are numerous Upanisads affiliated to Yoga namely *Nadabindu*, *Yogatattva*, *Mauktika*, *Yogacudamoni* etc. Moreover, numerous Tantra works and works by Gorakhnatha also deal

with the philosophy of Yoga. Yoga philosophy, an ancient school of thought, has a perennial value for the human beings in all ages and in all spheres of life. Yoga aims at making human personality healthy, normal and balanced by removing its physical and mental disorders. It considerably increases an individual's physical fitness and mental energy. The higher and pure consciousness is aroused in an individual through Yoga. An individual is able to rise to higher state of existence by following the methods of Yoga. In the present modern scientific age, life is replete with tensions and stresses. The prolonged suppression of emotions like anger, fear, despair etc. results in various mental disorders. Modern medical science also accepts that emotional disturbances lead to physical and mental ailments. According to Patanjali, physical health and mental health are equally important for the normal development of personality. Nonetheless, mental health is more important than physical health because it is the mind, which can give appropriate orientation to personality development. It has been found by modern psychiatrists that certain types of physical disorders are due to mental causes. For instance in some cases indigestion, constipation, headache, affections of the heart and kidneys are caused by certain types of affections of the mind. Persons living in advanced societies are fast losing meaning of their lives. Despite the fact that they live in the midst of crowds they have a deadful feeling of loneliness and isolation and despite the fact that they live in the midst of material abundance, they have a feeling of boredom, worthlessness and aimlessness. Many of them suffer insomnia, free floating anxiety, hypertension, split personality and so on. There is high incidence of mental ill health in industrially advanced societies.

According to Patanjali, the mental modes are the sources of sufferings. The main causes of sufferings are nescience or ignorance (*avidya*), feeling of individuality (*asmita*), love (*raga*), disgust (*dvesa*) and will to live (*abhinivesa*).<sup>12</sup> The concept of *Avidya* is accepted by almost all the schools of Indian philosophy as the root cause of sufferings. According to Yoga, *avidya* consists in mistaking the non-eternal for the eternal, the impure for the pure, the unpleasant for the pleasant and not-self for the self.<sup>13</sup> Due to *avidya*, one forgets the real identity of anything. On the otherhand *avidya* is the cause of *asmita*. self-esteem, egoism, the sense of the supreme importance of I is the result of *avidya*. in the

*Yogasutra*, *asmita* is defined as erroneous identification of oneself with the instruments of body and mind.<sup>14</sup> With such an identification, everybody wants to assert himself and dominate the objective world. If one fails to do so, he or she gets frustrated. The third kind of sufferings is *raga* which is defined by Patanjali as the desire for an object which yielded pleasure in the past and is remembered in the present time.<sup>15</sup> It arises from recollection of pleasurable memories. Anything that is pleasant and agreeable to one mind becomes attached to that. The thirst and the hankering after pleasure or the means to get it preceded by a remembrance of the pleasure, who has enjoyed it is called *raga* or attachment. *Dvesa* is the fourth kind of sufferings. According to Patanjali *dvesa* is the anger towards an object which yielded pain in the past and is remembered in the present time.<sup>16</sup> It is not only aversion to painful things but also anger towards them. The anxiety wish to removal or the means to overcome preceded by remembrance of the pain is called *raga*. The last kind of sufferings is *abhinivesa* or fear for death. People want to enjoy every moment and tries to avoid the painful feeling of death. Yoga philosophy defines *abhinivesa* as the instinctive love of life and dread of death.<sup>17</sup> Vacaspati Misra in his *Tattvavaisaradi* defines that *abhinivesa* is the fear of death. This fear is common to both the men and animals, wise and ignorant.<sup>18</sup> It is possible for an individual to reduce those five sufferings of his mind through the practice of yogic concentration. Yoga advocates control over the body, the senses and the mind. A sound mind needs a sound body. Sensual and passions distract the body as well as the mind. To overcome them, Yoga advocates the eightfold path of discipline (*astanga yoga*)<sup>19</sup> consisting of abstention (*yama*), observance (*niyama*), posture (*asana*), regulation of breath (*pranayama*), withdrawal of senses (*pratyahara*), attention (*dharana*), meditation (*dhyana*) and concentration (*samadhi*). Patanjali describes the usefulness of practicing the *yogangas*. He says that through the performance of the *yogangas* and with the dwindling of impurity, there comes about the radiance of wisdom, which develops us to the vision of discernment.<sup>20</sup> *Yama* is the first limb of *astanga yoga* which means abstinence. It involves the conscious effort on the part of a practitioner to refrain from doing things that keep his mind involved in the discriminate struggle for survival and satisfaction within the existing scale

of values in life. The *yamas* are five in number, namely *ahimsa* or non-violence, *satya* or truthfulness, *asteya* or non-theft, *brahmacharya* or continence and *aparigraha* or non-acceptance.<sup>21</sup> *Ahimsa or non-violence* is regarded as an important vow in Patanjali's *Yogasutra*.<sup>22</sup> In the view of Patanjali *Ahimsa* or non-violence does not only means abstinence from killing animals or human beings, but also restraining from injuring others physically, verbally and mentally. *Satya* or truthfulness is a great virtue and accepted by all the people. According to Patanjali through the practice of truthfulness, the practitioner gets the power of attaining the fruits of work for himself and for others.<sup>23</sup> The third kind of *yama* is *asteya* or non-theft.<sup>24</sup> The next rule in Patanjali's code of social conduct is *brahmacharya* or continence which is actually observed in spiritual discipline. The Yoga philosophy accords high value to *brahmacharya* or continence.<sup>25</sup> Here, aspirants are asked to practice continence for the attainment of ultimate goal. The fifth and the final *yama* is *aparigraha* or non-accumulation. Through the practice of non-accumulation, the practitioner becomes non-attached to the worldly things even to the body itself.<sup>26</sup> The second *yoganga* of Patanjali's *Raja yoga* is *niyama* or observance.<sup>27</sup> *Niyama* consists of *sauca* or cleanliness, *santosa* or contentment, *tapah* or austerity, *svadhyaya* or self-study and *isvarapranidhana* or surrendering to God. *Sauca* means purity. It has two aspects. One is internal and the other is external. Yoga refers not only the external cleanliness, but also internal cleanliness. Internal *sauca* or purity of mind occupies an important position in yogic discipline. Hence, it is necessary on the part of the practitioner to be pure by mind. When the impurities of mind viz. pride, jealousy, hatred etc. are completely washed away, then the is said to be internally pure.<sup>28</sup> The second type of *niyama* is *santosa* or contentment. Discontentment leads to suffering. In the Yoga philosophy, it is said that contentment culminates into the best type of happiness.<sup>29</sup> The third type of *niyama* is *tapas* which traditionally means austerity. *Tapas* has its spiritual value. Through the practice of austerity, the body and senses have got the resistance power.<sup>30</sup> The fourth kind of *niyama* is *svadhyaya* or self study. One should read such books which is beneficial and will help one to realize the transitoriness of the world.<sup>31</sup> *Isvarapranidhana* means surrendering to God. Patanjali in his *Yogasutra*

declares that through surrendering to God, the practitioner attains the supra-conscious ecstasy.<sup>32</sup> *Asana or posture* is the third step of *astanga yoga*. It means different postures of the body. Yogic *asanas* may produce physical well-being of an individual. If one regularly practices *asanas* he or she may be free from physical ailments and fill in all circumstances.<sup>33</sup> The fourth limb of Patanjali's Yoga is *pranayama* means control of breath. Patanjali in his *Yogasutra* declines that by throwing out and restraining the breath, mind becomes controlled.<sup>34</sup> The last outer aspect of the Yoga, according to Patanjali is *Pratyahara* or withdrawal of the senses. Patanjali says that when the senses are restrained from their external objects is called *pratyahara*.<sup>35</sup> The fifth step of Raja Yoga is *dharana* or concentration. Patanjali in his *Yogasutra*, defines that holding the mind on a particular object is called *dharana* or concentration.<sup>36</sup> The next aspect of the main discipline of Yoga is *dhyana* or meditation. Patanjali defines that *dhyana* is the uninterrupted flow of *citta* towards the object of meditation.<sup>37</sup> *Samadhi* or contemplation the final and last step in the practice of Yoga is the ultimate tranquil state of mind. It leads to the realization of the inner self, which is not separate from the universal soul.<sup>38</sup>

Patanjali's view on *yoga* that it is the complete suppression of all mental modes and that it has the *kaivalya* of the *sadhaka* alone for its aim which can be attained by *yogangas*, is not acceptable to Sri Aurobindo. He aims at the liberation of the cosmos i.e., the liberation not only of the spirit but also of the matter, life and mind from the laws of necessity. Sri Aurobindo had direct intuitive vision of the ultimate reality and he records his spiritual experience in vivid detail. Certain contradictions and inconsistencies, which are found in some of the Vedantic scriptures, were resolved and reconciled by Sri Aurobindo in his Supramental Yoga. According to Sri Aurobindo the spiritual progress of entire humanity may be achieved through the method of Supramental Yoga. In his view, the spiritual ascent of all mankind is the ultimate goal of the Supramental Yoga. According to Sri Aurobindo human beings may attain perfection by following the spirit but rather it means the perfection of the entire personality both physical and spiritual. It is necessary, therefore, that the body of an individual must undergo transformation so that it may perform its functions in accordance with the highest spiritual of the human personality. In his

view, the body of an individual must be ultimately divinised. The actions of an individual may become divinised when the body becomes divinised. The Vedic seers speak of *jyotirmayadeha* through its spiritual transformation.

Sri Aurobindo also believed that the human body could be divinized and it could be made luminous through *adhyatmayoga*. Sri Aurobindo laid stress on the quietness and peace of mind for practising Supramental Yoga. In his view, silence and equanimity of mind are most important prerequisites for practicing Supramental Yoga.

In modern age, the advancement of science has made tremendous material progress but there is rapid decline in moral values in human beings. The moral principles are essential for a sound health. It may also be noted that the moral principles laid down in Yoga philosophy enable a person to be a good human being and to be an embodiment of character, nobility and humility. Many individuals try to reach their final goal of affluence and power by ignoring ethical principles while adopting their means. The technologically advanced nations of the world are engaged in developing the science of mechanized warfare for mass annihilation of life and property of weaker and less developed nations. Many philosophers and scientists are getting deeply concerned to find the destructive and pernicious effects of mechanized warfare on human beings. In 1955, Einstein and Russel expressed a deep concern over the possibility of a nuclear holocaust. The Russel-Einstein appeal cautioned mankind in the following word, "we appeal as human beings to human beings. Remember your humanity and forget the rest. If you can do so the way lies to a new paradise; if you can not, there lies before you the risk of universal death." It is not suggested here that mankind should completely arrest the development of modern civilization and revive the atmosphere of *yogic sadhana*. It maybe emphasized that the yogic view of life may give a new orientation to the development of human civilization. Human beings may be able to rediscover the deeper significance of human existence if the development of people is regulated by the basic principles of Yoga philosophy. In today's ever-changing, fast moving world with its frenetic pace of life and mental pressure more and more people are turning towards ancient ways to relieve stress and regain balance in their lives and thoughts. Studies have shown that

people practising *yoga* have experienced dramatic increases in lung capacity improved ability to handle stress and reducing the body weight, cholesterol and blood sugar levels.

In conclusion, it can be said that the concept of Yoga philosophy presents a novel, optimistic, exhilarating and ennobling life-view, which may save mankind from its present state of aimlessness. Philosophers like Patanjali and Sri Aurobindo have brought out the spiritual value of Yoga philosophy in the midst of the masses and used it as an effective weapon to fight against several social evils and to bring about communal harmony in the society.

## REFERENCES

1. *yoga samnahana upaya dhyana samgati yuktisu*, Amarakosa. 3.3.22
2. *eko hi yoga bhaved badhaya*, Mahabharata, XII
3. Rgveda. I.34.9
4. *Satapathabrahmana*, XIV. 7.1.11
5. *Taittiriyaabrahmana*, I.5.1.3
6. *Rgveda*, III. 3.9.10
7. *Samaveda*, I. 2.10.3
8. *Suklayajurveda*, I. 14
9. *Kathopanisad*, II.6.11
10. *Srimadbhagavadgita*, II. 48
11. *Yogasutra*, 1.2
12. *Ibid*, 2.3
13. *anityasuciduhkhanatmasu nityasucisu-khatmakhayatirvidya*, *Ibid*, 2.5
14. *drgdarsanasaktyorekatmate vasmita*, *Ibid*, 2.6
15. *sukhanusayi raga*, *Ibid*, 2.7
16. *duhkhanusayi dvesa*, *Ibid*, 2.8
17. *svarasavahi viduso'pi tatha rudha' bhinivesah*, *Ibid*, 2.9

18. *Tattvavaisaradi*, II. 9
  19. *yamaniyamasanapranayamapratya-haradharanadhyanassamadhyo' stavangani*, *Yogasutra*, II. 29
  20. *yoganganusthanadasuddhiksaye jnanadiptiravivekakhyateh* *Yogasutra*, II. 28
  21. *ahimsasatyasteyabrahmacaryaparigraha yamah*, *YS*, II. 30
  22. *ahimsapratisthayam tatsannidhau vairatyagah*, *Ibid*, II. 35
  23. *satyapratisthayam kriyaphalasrayatvam*, *Ibid*, II. 36
  24. *asteyapratisthayam sarvaratnopasthanam*, *Ibid*, II. 37.
  25. *brahmacaryapratisthayam viryalabhah*, *Ibid*, II. 38.
  26. *aparigrahasthairyai janmakathanta-sambodhah*. *Ibid*, II. 39
  27. *saucasantosatapahsvadhyayesvara-pranidhanani niyamah*, II. 32
  28. *saucatsvangajugupsa parairasamargah*, *Ibid*. II. 40
  29. *santosadanuttamh sukhalahbah*, *Ibid*. 11.42.
  30. *kayendriyasiddhirasuddhiksayattapasah*, *YS*, II. 43.
  31. *svadhyayadistatasamprayogah*, *Ibid*, II. 44
  32. *samadhisiddhirisvarapranidhanat*, *Ibid*, II.45
  33. *sthirasukhamasanam*, *Ibid*. II. 46
  34. *tasminsati svasaprasvasayorgativicchedah pranayamah*, *Ibid*, II. 49.
  35. *svavisayasamprayoge cittasya svarupa-nukara ivendriyanam pratyaharah*, *Ibid*, II. 54
  36. *desabandhascittasya dharana*, *Ibid*, III. 1.
  37. *tetrapratyaikatanata dhyanam*, *Ibid*, III.2
  38. *tadevarthamaranirbhasam svarupa-sunyamiva samadhih*, *Ibid*, III.3
- (Lecture, delivered in 'Indian Philosophers' Day' 2018, Dept. of Philosophy, J.B. College)

# Moral Justification of Euthanasia

Arotee Neog

Euthanasia is one of the topics of Medical Ethics. The term 'Euthanasia' is derived from two Greek words 'Eu' and 'Thanatos'. The literal meaning of the term is good and peaceful death. But now the term has been translated as mercy killing in which killing of person say A by another person say B makes the death peaceful and such killing is not to be considered as murder, because B takes the life of A for the sake of A. This understanding of euthanasia emphasizes two features: 1) it deliberately takes the life of a person, 2) the life taken for the sake of that person who has been suffering incurable painful disease and there is no hope for his life. Generally such type of death is desired by the patient himself or his/her family members. So it is called desired death.

Regarding the moral significance of euthanasia it may be mentioned that in 4th century B.C. doctors took oath to Hippocrates, the father of Medicine that in any situation they would never give medicine to their patients that might take the life of their patients. So the physicians who took Hippocratic oath did not support euthanasia.

It is generally believed that euthanasia started in Greece and Rome around 5th century B.C. Socrates, Plato, Stoic philosophers accepted moral permissibility of euthanasia. Plato was sympathetic to the process of euthanasia. For him if a person becomes inefficient to serve the state due to his disease, mercy killing should be applied to him. Similarly the stoic philosophers also accepted euthanasia in which there is no hope for life. For them a quality life is better than simply a life. Utilitarian thinkers Mill and Bentham also supported euthanasia while Immanuel Kant strongly opposed it. The term 'Euthanasia' was first used in a medical context by Francis Bacon in 17th century that refers to an easy painless death.

Generally there are three forms of euthanasia: 1) Voluntary

Euthanasia 2) Non Voluntary Euthanasia and 3) Involuntary Euthanasia

Voluntary euthanasia is carried out by a doctor at the request of hopelessly ill patient or patient's legal representatives for the patient himself/herself. When a patient knows that there is no hope for his/her life due to incurable painful disease then he/she may ask his/her doctor to end his/her life. After consulting the family members and the members of health care team the doctor may kill the patient by administering lethal injection or overdose drugs or by withdrawing life-sustaining systems. The features of such type of euthanasia are 1) killing of a hopelessly ill patient for the sake of the patient. 2) It has been done at the request of the patient himself/herself.

Non-Voluntary euthanasia is applied to a handicapped infant who cannot choose between life and death. This type of euthanasia is also applied to a person who may not be handicapped but due to severe illness or due to unconscious state he fails to understand the distinction between life and death. Here mercy killing is not requested by the patient because of his/her unconscious state or too young to speak.

Involuntary euthanasia is a very rare form of euthanasia. Such type of euthanasia is applied to a person without taking his/her consent or against his/her will. It is known as involuntary as there is no scope to take consent of the patient. It is assumed that the patient would request for mercy killing if he/she would be able to get the scope to give consent about the matter.

From the standpoint of methods adopted for practicing euthanasia, it may be divided into active and passive. When a doctor brings about the death of a patient by administering lethal injection or gives overdose drugs it will be active euthanasia. When a doctor allows the patient to die by withdrawing life-sustaining treatment then it will be passive euthanasia. In case of active euthanasia the doctor actively brings about death, so it is an action. Here death is directly intended, so it is a case of killing. In case of passive euthanasia death occurs, so it is not an action but an omission. Withdrawing life-sustaining treatment from a patient is not killing but letting die. Here death is not directly intended but merely foreseen.

Many thinkers make distinction between active and passive euthanasia. For them to kill a patient by putting lethal injection or overdose

drugs is worse than allowing a patient to die by withdrawing life-sustaining system. But these are only two methods to relieve a patient from his/her painful state. A doctor can take any one of them to perform his responsibility. So from moral standpoint there is no distinction between active and passive euthanasia. Besides these two there are two more types of euthanasia.

- a) Indirect form: In this form of euthanasia a doctor may provide treatment to reduce pain of the patient. Such treatment may have side effects that may lead to speedy death of the patient. It is not a murder, but euthanasia as the intention of the doctor is not to kill but to relieve him/her from painful state.
- b) Assisted suicide: In this type of euthanasia a patient who is going to die needs help to kill himself/herself and ask for it. At his/her request the required drugs may be kept within his/her reach.

The motive behind all these forms of euthanasia is to save the patient from his/her unbearable pain.

The problem of euthanasia concerns with the notion of rights and liberty. The patient has right to live and right to die. He/she has also liberty to make decision whether to continue treatment or not. In case of non-voluntary euthanasia, the patient is incapable of making any rational judgment as he/she has no self-consciousness. But in case of voluntary euthanasia the patient is self-conscious rational being. So it is debatable whether mercy killing is morally justified or not. In this context, Peter Singer observes certain arguments against mercy killing. i) Naturally each self-conscious being has fear of death. ii) All self-conscious beings have will to live. They may not want to end their existence iii) All self-conscious beings have right to live of their own. iv) The life of self-conscious being is self-controlled. If we have any respect for this self-controlled life of man then killing will be not morally tenable. However, Peter Singer tries to refute these arguments from another standpoint. a) Voluntary euthanasia is applied only at the request or consent of the patient. b) Though man normally desires to live, due to unbearable painful disease compels man to desire death. In case mercy killing may be applied. c) One of the characteristics of rights is that man can sacrifice his rights at his own will. A hopelessly ill patient may sacrifice his/her right to live. Finally, self-controlled life of a self-conscious being indicates that he/she may decide

himself/herself whether he/she will live or die. So to respect the power of self-control of human being mercy killing may be supported. But before practicing euthanasia we are to look whether the life of patient is hopeful or not. Mercy killing may be supported only if there is no hope for life. If there is any chance of recovery from the disease extreme care should be taken to the patient. If there is any doubt regarding recovery mercy killing should not be carried out.

In the context of moral justification of euthanasia we are to consider certain criteria under which it can be applied:

1. There must be unbearable suffering, incurable disease and no hope for recovery on the part of the patient.
2. Request for euthanasia should be voluntary.
3. Euthanasia should be practiced only by a doctor as a last resort.

Regarding the legalization of euthanasia it may be said that voluntary euthanasia is legal in some countries of the world. Non-voluntary euthanasia is illegal in all countries. Involuntary euthanasia is usually considered as murder and it is also illegal in all countries.

The courts of Netherland legalized euthanasia on the following grounds:

- 1) It should be carried out by a physician
- 2) The patient has to explicitly request for euthanasia.
- 3) There must be unbearable condition on the part of the patient and no reasonable alternative to save the patient from his/her unbearable part of the doctor.
- 4) The physician has to consult with another independent professional who agrees with his judgment.

#### **Legalization of euthanasia in India:**

On March, 2018, the Supreme Court of India legalized passive euthanasia by means of withdrawal of life support to patient in a permanent vegetative state.

It is generally believed that a doctor as a human being should not take the life of other person, because he is not able to give life. But from the standpoint of mercy for the hopelessly ill patient euthanasia is not unjustified killing. Actually it helps those who have been suffering from incurable disease for a long time. Prolonging the life of a patient suffering

from incurable painful disease may cause suffering to the patient, patient's family and ultimately to the society. In such a situation euthanasia is morally justified and in expert hands of a skilled doctor it may be a means to relieve a severely ill patient from his/her unbearable painful life.

#### References:

1. Helga Kushe, 'Euthanasia' (ed) Peter Singer, A Companion to Ethics p.294.
2. Peter Singer, Practical Ethics, p195
3. Ibid, p 196
4. Rachel James, 'The Morality of Euthanasia' (ed) Daniel Bonevac, Today's Moral Issues Classic and Contemporary Perspectives, p364
5. Ibid, p 365
6. Ibid, p 369

## Interfaith Dialogue and Comparative Religion: For a Better world Order

(In the context of Religious Pluralism)

Dr. Jyotirmoyee Devi

The word 'dialogue' is derived from the Greek word 'dia' which means 'going through' and 'logos' means principles and significant cohering realities. In its etymological meaning 'dialogue' stands for conversation between individuals, groups and communities to go through their own respective logos. Therefore 'interfaith dialogue' means a practical activity of listening and sharing of others' faith by means of dialogue.

'Interfaith dialogue' is the recent development of religion in the field of comparative study of religion. Religious dialogue is the very important aid to challenge the problem of religious pluralism. Dialogue may be regarded as an ongoing process that involves mutual discovery and working with others so that empathy grows and strengthened the relations.

Inter faith dialogue helps one to find out the basic ideologies of all faiths, teaches to adjust with newer situations, resolve conflicts among the followers of different faiths. According to Ursula King dialogue seems to be primarily a very practical activity of listening and sharing and at its best, it might imply an in depth participation in another mode of thinking, believing, praying or worshipping."<sup>1</sup>

It is important that the aim of the supporters of Interfaith dialogue is better acquaintance with other faiths in the hope of eradicating misunderstandings and false views that caused animosity or enmity.

Comparative Religion is the comparative study of the beliefs, values, symbols, cults, practices and institutions of the religions of the

world. A. C. Bouquet defines Comparative Religion as “a survey and comparison of the great religions of the world”. But as a very sensitive study comparative study of the religions is not an easy task. Religions of the world both agree and differ together in many important points. In this context of real comparative study K. N. Tiwari observes that “factual comparisons with point of real similarities and differences must be brought about in making a real comparative study of the religions of the world”.<sup>2</sup>

There is a danger that becomes serious when comparative study of religions is undertaken due to ignorance of theologians with regard to the psychology of believers. To avoid these dangers, a special kind of scientific attitude i.e. all sorts of preferences for or against any religion must be avoided. To be a scientific study comparative study of religion is not only the study of bare externals like rituals, methods of prayer, ceremonies etc. but also of the inner faiths and involvements of the followers of religions. In the comparative study of religions mutual understanding of believers of different religious faiths leads to common ground of recognition among religions. Y. Masih observes about the phrase ‘mutual understanding as “understanding of men belonging to different faiths taking full cognizance of their conviction, commitment and existential decisions involved in their practice and beliefs.”<sup>3</sup> According to Vander Leeuw<sup>4</sup> the student of comparative religion should be firmly rooted in the beliefs and experiences of his own religion, and the mutual comparison of religion ‘is possible only by thus beginning with one’s own attitude to life.’<sup>5</sup>

For the practice of interfaith dialogue three considerations are of utmost importance, i.e. cognitive, affective and objective. The cognitive aspect covers two components i.e. the participants in a dialogue are well acquainted with their own religious traditions. Another aspect is that their aim is to acquire sufficient knowledge of others’ religion. For a meaningful exchange of different religions these prerequisites must be fulfilled.

The second one i.e. the affective attitude is that a sympathetic attitude towards others religion is indispensable to achieve the true understanding of the same.

The third point i.e. the objective aspect as mentioned by E.J. Sharpe in the context of his discussion of attitude of the Christian towards other religion. According to Sharpe, there are four kinds of dialogues.<sup>6</sup>

the first one is known as the discursive dialogue as “a shared quest for intellectual clarity and understanding.” The second one is the human dialogue as an encounter on the level of a common humanity. The third one Secular dialogue that is shared involvement in a secular situation. The fourth one is the interior dialogue that is common quest for ultimate reality or God. Of these four types of dialogues as mentioned by E.J. Sharpe, the first and the second type express attitudes whereas, third and the fourth type refer to goals of interfaith dialogue.

There are four Guidelines for dialogue of the ‘*British council of Churches*’ as that

1. *dialogue begins when people meet each other*
2. *dialogue depends upon mutual understanding and mutual trust.*
3. *dialogue makes it possible to share in service to the community*
4. *dialogue becomes the medium of authentic witness.*<sup>7</sup>

Regarding the implications of interfaith dialogue it is important to realize that in this age of globalization, we share a common humanity and we must learn to move towards greater mutuality by taking part in different dialogues. Today due to the influence of inter religious encounter and dialogue each religious tradition requires new kind of reflective theologies that meet the challenge of religious pluralism. In this context Ursula King observes that “the experience of religious pluralism and inter faith dialogue invites us to a global vision which requires a new mode of theologizing.”<sup>8</sup> Interfaith dialogue can lead the participants to realize that each religious tradition has more or less valuable glimpse of the total vision of ultimate reality. And dialogue can help the participant to learn to complement each other’s insight and disclosure of the Divine.

Among the World Religions, Christianity, Judaism and Islam are of the Semitic group. Likewise, Confucianism, Taoism, Shintoism are of the Far Eastern group and the Hinduism, Buddhism, Jainism and Sikhism are of the Indian Group of religions. Besides these main groups there are also some sub-group of religions. Comparative Religion aims at representing all religious faiths in the way that all the respective members can recognize themselves in its description. Religious Pluralism holds that



there are many ways to the same ultimate goal. As John. Hick observes, “it is not appropriate to speak of as religion a being true or false, any more than it is to speak of a civilization a being true or false. For the religions, in the sense of distinguishable religiocultural streams within human history, are expressions of the diversities of human types and temperaments and thought forms.”<sup>9</sup> But the problem arises due to the heterogeneous views of participants of different religions. Religious pluralism is an ideology which holds that there are many ways to reach the ultimate reality. Ursula King observes this problem of Religious pluralism as that, by acknowledging our situation of religious pluralism not only as a fact, but by theologically reflecting on it and by engaging in dialogue with others and within ourselves as individuals and communities, we can enlarge that vision, strengthen it and perhaps feel at home in more than one vision of faith.”<sup>10</sup>

In Summary, comparative religions contribution to interfaith dialogue lies in its information on the religions it studies and helps to gain knowledge necessary for any interreligious encounter. But in relation to interfaith dialogue comparative religion remains a preparatory stage .that aims at acquiring knowledge of different religions. Religion has played an important role in developing a more harmonious form of relationship not only amongst individuals and communities but also among nations especially in the widest context of global vision. We cannot deny the fact that there is variation in religious traditions, in the form of worship, plurality of beliefs etc. But the need of the hour is to bring a common platform where we meet together and have an interfaith dialogue for a better human relationship and World order. Comparative Religion, Interfaith dialogue are the possible strategy on the basis of which we can achieve the ideal social conditions in a global society, Interreligious dialogue also referred as Interfaith dialogue, is that the believers of different faiths coming to a mutual understanding and respect that allows them to live and co-operate with each other in spite of their differences. Dialogue as observed by Ursula King is linked to openness and tolerance but it only develops at the deepest level if it is transfigured by love.<sup>11</sup>

#### References:

1. Balasubramanian. R and Thomas V.C (Ed), Perspectives In Philosophy, Religion And Art, P-143, 1993.

2. Tiwari K.N., Comparative Religion, P.3, 1990.
3. Masih Y, A Comparative Study of Religions P-11, 1990
4. Leeuw Vender Gerard, a Dutch historian and Philosopher of religion.
5. Religion Today, A Vedanta Kesari Presentation, Pub by Sri Ramakrishna Math, P-113
6. Sethi Singh Amarjit and Pummer Reinhard (Ed) Comparative Religion, Vikas Publishing House, New Delhi P-8.
7. Balasubramanian. R and Thomas V.C (Ed), Perspectives in Philosophy , Religion And Art, P-147, 1993
8. ibid P-149
9. Hick H.John, Philosophy of Religion, P-112
10. Balasubramanian. R and Thomas V.C (Ed), Perspectives in Philosophy , Religion And Art, P-148, 1993
11. ibid P-160

—x—

# Vedantism in Sri Aurobindo's Political Thought

Dr. Sumitra Purkayastha (retd)

Sri Aurobindo is well known as a yogi striving for *purnayoga* who is not only a spiritual leader but also a political leader. He actively participated in the freedom struggle of India from the British rule and had undergone imprisonment for a long time. His political idea has its roots in the philosophy of Upanisads and Vedanta. The highest ideal of Vedanta is moksa which is the union of the individual soul with Brahman, the Ultimate Reality. This final teaching of the Vedanta is being reflected in Sri Aurobindo's political ideals also. He has shown how being united with the highest reality, man attain freedom from all kinds of bondage. He politically fought for India's freedom. But his concept of freedom did not mean political freedom only but freedom from all types of bondage. This write-up will be an attempt to show how Sri Aurobindo's political thought is actually based on Vedanta, the philosophical teachings of the Upanishads, and his notion of freedom is rooted in the Vedantic notion of freedom, nay, *moksa*.

Sri Aurobindo's political ideals are best expressed in book, *Bande Mataram* which comprises his writings on politics. Sri Aurobindo who is not only a political leader but also a spiritualistic preacher has founded his political views based on the teachings of the Vedanta. The Vedanta is the foundation of his political ideals. In the series of articles under the title, "Doctrine of Passive Resistance", included in the *Bande Mataram*, he designed his plan of action in the light of Vedanta for fighting in India's freedom from the British rule. Sri Aurobindo is of the opinion that aspiration for freedom must be from the core of the heart. The word bondage is meant for physical bondage not for internal bondage. He fights for awakening manhood in the nation which cannot be attained without following Vedantic ideals. The teachings of Vedanta is man's freedom from

this worldly happenings and to become one with Brahman, the Ultimate Reality. So he tries to establish political Vedantism in his ideal of political freedom.

According to the Vedantic ideal the whole of man's life aims at the Divine consciousness and this is the goal of life that proceeds towards development and aims at realisation of Divine consciousness. The process of development which aims at realization of Divine consciousness appears as struggle of life in this world. Thus it appears that so far as the Vedantic view is concerned, negation of life is not desired for the teaching of Vedanta. According to the Vedantic teachings man is a spirit in himself so he is not the finite being as existed in this world. The spirit is nothing but Brahman. Man must try to go beyond this limited existence and to become one with Brahman. Thus we find that the doctrine of Vedantism is that man is not dissociated from God. Man will find God within himself. As man realizes the existence of God within himself, within his soul, so salvation is nothing to be attained from some external sources.

Sri Aurobindo throughout his political carrier as a freedom fighter has tried to preach India the ideal of Vedanta i.e. freedom is not something of a foreign ideal, it is rooted within the very core of man's heart. "And the freedom of the soul is the realization of god within himself and this is the ideal of Vedanta."<sup>1</sup> So he says that not only man's freedom can be attained within himself but also nations' freedom is within the reach of nation. Thus it follows that the freedom of the nation from some foreign rule is not different for the freedom of the soul.

Sri Aurobindo aims at the application of Vedantic ideals in politics and with this view he maintains that the sole objective of political movement is Swaraj or national freedom. This can be attained at by passive resistance which can be regarded as the final *sadhana*.

According to him Swaraj or national freedom should be the only goal of India. Swaraj here means complete freedom without any limitation or reservation. He maintains that Swaraj or complete freedom is inherent within each and every human being. God has given man this feeling of Swaraj, which on the other hand is the main preaching of the Vedanta. This kind of freedom does not commit to any kind of boundary whatsoever. The Swaraj is the main inspiration that has been invoked within us by

God. He maintains that while striving for freedom in India's freedom movement one should not forget this feeling of inner freedom or Swaraj which is designated by him as *Paresh-Pathar*, the alchemic stone. So he says that, "We shall condemn ourselves to the fact of the man who in the eagerness of picking up pebbles on the sea shore threw away the alchemic stone which God had for a moment given into his hands."<sup>2</sup> Man must not be ignorant about precious thing he possesses within himself since time immemorial. Ans that feeling of the possession of the precious thing i.e., Swaraj can break all the boundaries of imprisonment

He is so much after Swaraj that according to him all the phases adopted for attaining freedom viz. village samiti, boycott, swadeshi, arbitration etc. have worth only for Swaraj. So while doing any of the above mentioned phase one must not forget that the aim is freedom only which is like attaining the goal by the loving touch of God called Paresh Pathar and that cannot be attained by boycotting foreign goods, creating village samitis etc. Because for him Swaraj is the direct revelation of God which aims at, "not mere political freedom but a freedom vast and entire freedom of the nation, spiritual freedom, social freedom, political freedom"<sup>3</sup>

Sri Aurobindo while preaching for spiritual freedom does not ignore the necessity of political and social freedom. According to him, without political freedom the soul of man will be crippled and cannot aim at higher form of freedom i.e. spiritual freedom. Again only a large hearted free and genius man can attain social freedom. Such a freedom cannot be given by the society. It can be attained by man's intellect and nobility of the human soul. A selfish man cannot attain social freedom. Because such a man always hankers after petty ends. He tries to attain superiority by way of caste, wealth etc., to his fellow man. As a result he cannot have the feelings of brotherhood with his fellows. On the other hand, political bondage narrowed down man within a narrow circuit. In such a narrow circuit man can have no higher ends in view, he will hug only after superiority of caste, wealth etc. As soon as man attains political freedom his heart will find a wider horizon and he forgets about all kinds of lesser ambition. Political bondage makes a man slave who cannot be noble and broad minded. A

slave cannot take service at his willing self devotion, since a slave is bound to give service as prescribed or ordered by his master. In such a degraded situation of political bondage society is bound to be degraded and it is idle to think about any kind of higher spiritual ideals as preached by the Vedanta. It is true that a few mighty spirits may lift themselves from such a degraded situation but the mass people will remain within the sinking position of degradation.

Sri Aurobindo argues that a selfish man who remains indifferent to the conditions of his brothers cannot attain salvation. A man who does not become affected by the cries of sufferings of man around him, he who only tries for his relation ignoring the sufferings of the oppressed and those who are sacrificing themselves to the greed of others is actually stumbling block his own ways of salvation. "He is forgetting that god is not only in himself but in all these millions"<sup>4</sup>

According to Sri Aurobindo, God has placed India in the eternal fountain head of holy spirituality. But as India is politically not free so its spirituality becomes weaker and weaker. As soon as India will get political freedom every man of India will be endowed with that spirituality and he will set his foot in the stars of heaven. He is of the opinion that only by the revealed Swaraj, India will attain political freedom and the holy spirituality.

"Nationalism is not a mere political programme" says Sri Aurobindo. He maintains that India does not aim at political materialism. Cultural and spiritual ideas of a nation are what India sought for. By nationalism he does not mean an 'ism' which helps to safeguard the interest of one nation by ignoring the interest of other nations. Nationalism for him is a religion that has come from God. This is in fact the religion of one's own (*svadharmā*). In such a concept of nationalism one must think himself as an instrument of God. His idea of nationalism is the basis of his political thought which proceed through internationalism and its goal is ultimate human unity.

Sri Aurobindo in his discussions on politics has elaborately discussed about the different human organizations viz. state, nation etc. . He shows how there are the different stages of human approaches towards a final goal, i.e., internationalism. His concept of internationalism has its bearings with the ultimate realization of man where there is no difference

of caste, creed, higher, lower etc. All are equal and striving for the ultimate realization of the Vedantic ideal i.e., the spirit of all men are the same Brahman so there persists a feeling of universal brotherhood. According to him, the State is an organized group which develops for the survival, growth, efficiency and self assertions of individuals. Again, he says that the State has no soul but an individual has a soul. He maintains that the existence of a soul in man is responsible for morality. This sense of morality in turn develops his social responsibility. And without the individual growth there cannot be real and permanent good of all. In this sense, State has importance as it tries to assure the intellectual and moral development of man, nay, the whole community. He finds the idea of Nation is far more basic than the idea of the State. According to him if the State is not based on nationality it is bound to be artificial, mechanical and will perish. Because, in his opinion there is a Nation soul not State soul. Thus his political thought begins with the concept of nation and nationalism which proceeds through internationalism and its goal is ultimate human unity. There is no contradiction among these three ideals. Nationality is the religion, he says, the religion of one's own (swadharma).

According to him there must be the process of transition from nationalism to internationalism. The idea of internationalism is the attempt of the human mind and life to grow out of the national idea and form and even in a way to destroy it in the interest of the larger synthesis of mankind. Actually, the idea of internationalism was born of the thought of the eighteenth century and it took some kind of voice in the first idealistic stages of the French Revolution. However, the idea of internationalism that had been developed out of the French Revolution was rather a vague intellectual sentiment than a clear idea seeing its way to practice; which is a complete and self-conscious nationalism and not internationalism. In the nineteenth century the idea of internationalism developed in a modified form finding nationalism as a narrow spirit of the past. He says that, nationalism is, "a maleficent corporate egoism characteristic of narrow intellects and creative of arrogance, prejudice, hatred, oppression, division and strife between nation and nation, a gross survival of the past which the growth of reason was destined to destroy." <sup>5</sup>

Sri Aurobindo while discussing about the concepts of State, Nation,

Internationalism has tried to establish that the fundamental idea is that mankind is the godhead to be worshipped and served by man. The respect, the service, the progress of the human being and human life are the chief duty and chief aim of the human spirit. And this cannot be attained by the ideas of State, Nation, etc., which are still guided by some sort of narrowness.

To sum up, we can make it clear that Sri Aurobindo is of the opinion that man is spirit in himself, he is not coward, he is divinity within himself. Man as a spirit is eternally free; freedom to man cannot be bestowed by some foreign ruler. Man must be in quest of complete freedom or purna swaraj. He should develop within himself the feeling of internationalism with the idea that each and every man is the godhead to be worshipped. Thus it can be seen that Sri Aurobindo tries to transform politics into an effective vehicle of the teachings of the Vedanta. Rabindranath Tagore rightly says, "It was Sri Aurobindo and none else who had the courage to preach the noble teachings of the Vedanta in politics to ensure India's rebirth." <sup>6</sup>

### Notes and References

1. Samar Basu, *Glimpses of Vedantism in Sri Aurobindo's Political Thought*
2. *Sri Aurobindo*, Vol-I, p.699
3. *Ibid.*, p. 699
4. *Ibid.*, pp. 700,701
5. Sri Aurobindo, *Social and Political Thought*, Vol-15, p. 526
6. Samar Basu, *Glimpses of Vedantism in Sri Aurobindo's Political Thought*, p. 36

# Ethical Relativism and Practical Ethics

Dr. Panchami Bhattacharya Bora

Applied ethics or Practical ethics is the last addition to moral philosophy in the eighty decade which, it covers a wide area. The traditional moral philosophy was confined mainly to the formulation of substantive theory, i.e. of deciding what is good or right, but practical philosophy specially concern with the analysis of the specific issues of the human life, that is the practical problems of human being and tries to give solution of such problems. James M. Brown has advanced the four following thesis.

- (a) Applied ethics is the application of ethical theory.
- (b) There is one body of sound well grounded ethical theory waiting to be applied to practical problems.
- (c) Non-philosophers supply the problem and philosophers supply and apply the theory.
- (d) Professional ethics is just ordinary ethics applied to the profession of question.

These four theses is called by Caplan as ‘the engineering model of applied ethics’.<sup>1</sup> Applied ethics gets highly popularity in the writings of Peter Singer through his two books – (1) Applied ethics, (2) Practical ethics. Along with the revival of applied ethics, the striking development in moral philosophy is extending the scope of morality from the relations between humans and non-humans, Animals and environment. Peter Singer said that, an ethical issue as relevant if it is one that any thinking person.

must face the issues which are confront us in our day today life is, terrorism, various problems in the field of medicine, Euthanasia, Embryo experimentation, abortion, suicide etc. and environment, profession and several others. Some issues are very controversial. But a philosopher may be able to suggest something useful about whether an issue is acceptable to run or not. Because of the reasoning and analysis that philosophers practise really can make a difference than that of common people. In the modern days the development in Science and technology in general, and bio-technology and medical sciences in particular have thrown many other ethical challenges such as surrogate motherhood, rights of artificially created animals in laboratories, cloning etc. The moral issues about man-nature relationship has arisen because of serious problems of pollution, Deforestation and possibility of exhausting natural resources. The threat of nuclear weapons and fear of extinction of human race and destruction of the planet also have given rise to serious ethical issues. All these issues faced by the contemporary society have given rise to the extension of the scope of applied ethics or practical ethics day by day. That is why Peter Singer defines practical ethics as –“... To Practical issues like the treatment of ethnic minorities, equality of women, the use of animals for food and research, the preservation of the natural environment, abortion, euthanasia, and the obligation of the wealthy to help the poor.” p. 1.

Now there is a question arise in our mind that “Is practical ethics relative?” To answer this question at first we have to define the ethical relativism. Ethical relativism means there is no any universal theory of morality. The concept of right or wrong, good or bad, depends on the society, individual etc. The moral laws are very to one individual to another individual and one society to other society. The concept of right or wrong is different according to time and space. The famous applied ethical thinkers Peter Singer also discussed these matter very elaborately in his famous work ‘Practical Ethics’. At first, in the beginning of his this book he attempts to clarify the meaning of practical ethics as what ethics is not.

There is a question arisen in our mind that, “Is practical ethics relative?” To answer this question we have to discussed firstly about the meaning of the term relative or relativism. Relativism is the theory which means what

our judgements with regards to any knowledge are relative. In the case of ethical relativism it is the view about the absence of absolute knowledge of any moral ideas. That means there are various types of relativism in philosophy. They are mainly cognitive relativism, Ethical relativism, Cultural relativism etc. According to Cognitive relativism there is no any universal truth about the world. The ethical relativism is the doctrine that what is believed in an practised is right and valid for the people who believe in an practised it. Cultural relativism holds the view that there are different moral rules in various societies. Frankena the modern moral thinker said that there are three types of relativism. 1) Descriptive relativism, 2) Meta-ethical relativism and 3) Normative relativism. The first relativism holds the view that basic ethical believes of various people and societies and different and confusing in nature. The meta-ethical relativism is of the view that regarding basic ethical judgements no objectively valid way of justification. The normative relativism is based on the normative principle. For these type of relativism what is right or good for one individual or society is not right or good for another individual or society. Again Frankena holds the view that, what is really right or good in the one case is not so in another.”<sup>2</sup> So, ethical relativism holds the view that the concept of right or wrong is changed according to individual and society. The concept of morally good or bad and right or wrong are vary on the basis of time, space and individuals.

The famous practical ethician Peter Singer doesnot support the concept of ethical relativism. There are various thinkers who support that ethics is related to a society. It is true from the standpoint of one meaning but from the other standpoint is false. That is why Peter Singer says that, “The fourth, and last claim about ethics that I shall deny in this opening chapter is that ethics is relative or subjective.”<sup>3</sup> Peter Singer elaborately explain this point by giving some practical examples. If we asserted that the idea ethics is related to the society one happens to live in. This is true on one sense and false in another. For example, it is true that as we have know that actions that are right in one situation because of their good consequences. It may be wrong in another situation because of their bad consequences. For example, casual sexual relation may be wrong when it

leads to the existance of children who is not prepared for brought up and cared for and not wrong when it doesnot lead to reproduction at all. But this is only a superficial form of relativism. While it suggest that the applicability of a specific principle like above example may be relative to time and place. As it is not applicable in our Indian society. It is immoral.

The more elementary form of relativism became popular in the 19th century when data on the moral beliefs and practices of far-flung societies began pouring in. It is not surprising that to some the new knowledge suggested not merely that the moral code of 19th century Europe was not objectively valid. But that no moral judgement can do more than reflect the customs of the society in which it is made. The Marxists adopted this form of relativism to their own theories. They said that the ruling ideas of each period are the ideas of its ruling class, and so the morality of a society is relative to its dominant economic class, and thus indirectly relative to the economic basis. That is why they refuted Bourgeois morality to objective universal validity. But this creates a problem. The problem is if all morality is relative then what is speciality of communism. The other Marxists Engels tries to answer this problems. According to him, the morality of a society divided into classes will always be relative to the ruling class, Although the morality of a society without class antagonisms would be a ‘really human’ morality. This is no longer relativism.

‘Ethics is always relative in a particular society’ – This common sense view of ethics always confused us because, one society may approve one customs but another society may disapprove the same custom. For example, slavery. In this case we have no basis to choose between this conflicting views. Indeed on a relativist analysis there is really no conflict – when we say slavery is wrong we are really only saying that our society dis-approves of slavery and when the slave owners from the other society say that slavery is right they are only saying that their society approves of it. Then we cannot argued obviously we could both be speaking the truth. At last we can say that the relativist cannot satisfactorily account for the non-conformist. There are many difficulties in ethical relativism. So, we can say that when we say one theory is right or one interpretation is right

then it will be supported by many. But relativism is not supported by all and this is the witness of it. Relativism cannot distinctly explain the ethical term good-bad, right-wrong with their actual meaning. Peter Singer rejected relativism as a unreasonable theory.

**Referemce :**

1. Brown James. M. "On Applying Ethics" in evans J.D.G. (Ed) moral philosophy and contemporary problems, Cambridge CUP 1987. p.81-82
2. William K. Frankena, 'Ethics', p. 109
3. Peter Singer, Practical Ethics, p. 04.

## **Degradation of Values and Its Impact on Society**

Nibedita Bezboruah,

For a holistic development of each and every human being in all spheres—physical, mental, psychic and spiritual, one needs a peaceful atmosphere. Science and technology have made our life easier, comfortable and charming but whole mankind is suffering from bareness of values. In order to save our culture and humanity from erosion, we must inculcate values of life inherent in the message of our culture. Values elevate human life to its highest experssion, its highest capacity. Values are the standards to judge the right or wrong, good or bad, just or unjust. They are what we use to guide our interactions with others, with our friends and family, in our business and professional behaviour. Values are those characteristics in human beings that provide them motivation and guidance throughout their lives. All great civilizations have been built on the edifice of certain fundamental human values namely honesty, piety and justice. Our culture is changing under the impact of modern age. New values are coming up; the age old customs, values, tradition are breaking down. Everybody has accepted by now that change in unavoidable, change is necessary in life to keep us moving, to keep us growing. We can say that certain changes in culture are taking place due to demand of the situation. But the change we see in moral values in people is not positive but negative. Humanity and morality are two sides of same coin because individual without morality no longer a true human being but a beast. Ethics are primarily to help a person to live a just and righteous life. Crisis of value is affecting an individual, group, community, or the whole society.

House is the first learning environment for the child and parents

are the first teacher who make maximum impact on the personality of the child in the formative years of life, which remains all through the life. But in these days, quest for more money and better living, parents have to work longer and harder, spending lots of time in office and workplace. Consequently they have not much time to spend with their family especially with their children. So the present generation of children is very much unaware of their own culture. Nowadays, parents impose their desire and dreams on their children. Consequently mental stress rises exponentially leading to the act of suicide and state of depression. Every child is special. Every child has a special talent. So parent should provide care, love and help in enhancing their mental strength so that their confidence in themselves will increase. Parents should not force but rather encourage them because they are the future of our country. Realizing the need and importance of value, family should impart value to its members, so that it will help them to think right, to feel right kind of emotions and to act in the desirable manner.

Today our society is seeing a terrible amount of lack of value and it is due to the change of the lifestyle of people. We cannot say that modernization destroy our values. It is true that we can notice certain changes in our values but this is not in negative direction only. Some changes are beneficial for our society and culture and some others are dangerous. Few centuries ago “Sati Pratha” was abolished and widow remarriage was approved. These changes were the major achievement of Indian society. Now, a girl of our country is no more restricted to home and a woman to a housewife. Girls are getting opportunities for their better education and life style, same as the boys. These changes are empowering our girls and woman. In case of marriage, the changes are visible. Nowadays younger generation choose their life partner themselves, so younger generation has freedom of choice in contrast with the old culture of Indian society. Freedom is necessary but it should be in a limit. The younger generation is crazy about being modern and in their journey of modernization they are more attracted towards western culture. Regarding this they have accepted some freaky ideas of western culture. Why should one imitate western culture for bad things? We should take good things from western culture, their work culture, their dignity of labour etc, not

pub culture. Modernization is necessary but it should be in a way so that we are able to preserve our own culture and values.

Although the country has made rapid progress in various areas like scientific technology, economic infrastructure etc. but its value system has declined. This trend of decline in human values does not only pose serious threat to the future course of development of the country but even for its survival and respect. Modern value crisis is mainly due to the excessive overplaying of the importance of material values of life and consequent downplaying of other values like the moral, aesthetic and spiritual. The process of Modernization, Westernization and Materialism is eroding the core of human values. No one is talking about the duties and responsibilities of individuals and groups, towards each other and towards the collective whole. For example, in medical ethics a doctor should do his best to do good for the patient. A good and noble profession where one really requires the trust of people has been turned into a business. Again farmers use chemical fertilizer and pesticide excessively to grow more crops in a shorter time period which is dangerous to the environment as well as health of living beings. The world today is over-exploiting all natural resources without bothering about the own future generations. Deforestation, water and air pollution, excessive use of natural fuels and other resources is result of the human greed. Profit is given priority over conscience. Similarly, the rising rate of cheating and unfair means is seen among students in examination due to parental expectation, academic record or better grade and future employment. With time, definition of professionalism, emotion, respect, values all have changed and are changing so fast. With a few exceptions, people now run after name, fame and fortune without giving any thought to right or wrong, good or evil, moral or immoral. But humans are blessed with brain to think better. Therefore, we should realize that our prosperity lies in living in harmony with each other. In fact both at personal as well as social life, the human values of truth, non-violence, love, fellow feeling, justice and honesty appear to be fast disappearing and are being replaced by corruption, favoritism, injustice, thirst and greed for power and money. We are at a transition time during which it is essential that the values are maintained and nurtured. These values influence our thoughts and actions and motivate us to progress on



a right path. These values contribute towards all round development of society and the country. Values are guiding principles that shape our world outlook, attitudes and conduct. The impact of moral crisis is not only witnessed but also experienced by everyone everywhere. We can see the alarming degradation of moral values among people. Today's society is running towards material contentment and in doing so it has started losing the human values. Honest people are now pushed to the wall. Simplicity and etiquette were thing of the past. There is erosion of social, moral, cultural, economic, political values at all level. The erosion of values has led to spread of selfishness, unlimited greed, corruption, violence, frustration and crisis of character. We ourselves are to be blamed for this. Our existing environment including family system, education system and media including newspaper, T.V. etc. is presenting a skewed picture and misguided priorities. Today, education has a very limited purpose for the students. Their only aim is to get good marks in the examinations and to use their marks sheets for getting good jobs. They get mere bookish knowledge required for passing the examination and do not develop any value for upliftment of the society. Modern human society seems to be valued on the basis of material things and its position. Society respect those people who have money and power, but show least concern for his moral character. From all these, today's generation get the impression that money is everything. Again when we see the parents, they are also neglecting their responsibility of developing right attitudes and behaviour in their children. Parents give more importance only to their academic achievements-good marks so that their children get admission in a reputed college and finally good job and handsome salary. Our media and the cinema too are always presenting us the stories which show that men with values are suffering in life. Children are now exposed to so much information which in many ways have molested them of their innocence and have deprived them of a pure and healthy childhood. Politicians, who are the ruler and law makers, are always in breaking news for their involvement in various scam and scandals. Everything is polluted, so youth is increasingly getting inclined towards violence, social evil and lack of respect towards would around them. Their respect for teachers, parents, and society in general is vanishing. In such an environment, from where will one get the inspiration for

developing values? No one is caring to teach the excellence of Indian Culture and spirituality. If the society is to be saved from these degenerating tendencies, we should promote value based education to build character in children through spiritual, moral and ethical values. We want that education by which character is formed, strength of mind is increased, heart is mellowed, intellect is expanded and one acquires an integrated personality because our hope lies in the proper upbringing of the youth. In past 10-15 years, our culture has changed a lot. These changes were very much necessary. Indian culture has an immense power to incorporate changes, keeping its other values intact. With technologies spreading all over the globe, we can learn different methodologies and cultures from different parts of the world. We should incorporate them in our culture too, but in a civilized way so that we can also preserve our own culture. Traditional values are to be preserved with add on values from modern experience. But we should no forget our rich cultural heritage, tradition and values. We should pay respect to our values with reasonable modifications in them.

#### **References :**

1. Philosophy and Science of Value Education in the Context of Modern India—The Ramakrishana Mission Institute of Culture, Gol Park, Kolkata.
2. The Human Values—A Voyage from “I” to “We” – M.L. Dewan, Ashok Kini Hosdurg, Pradeep Nayak.
3. Tradition and Truth - Writings in Indian and Western Philosophy - S.P. Banerjee.

—x—

# Prospect of Social Peace and Harmony in the Practical Vedanta of Swami Vivekananda

Niranjan Haloi

Swami Vivekananda is widely acknowledged as one of the greatest religious minds and a staunch exponent of Hinduism. His deep conviction in the spirituality of Vedanta Philosophy, his penetrating insight and cogent logic proved the excellence Hinduism before elite audience of the world in the Congress of World Religion in America. Vivekananda got his spiritual thought and ideals from his Guru Ramkrishna Paramhansa who was a famous advocate of Neo-Hinduism. As a worthy disciple of Ramakrishna, Vivekananda spread his Guru's spiritual message throughout the world. Vivekananda preached that if modern man follows the Vedantic truths in the light of Ramakrishna's spiritual experience, then there will be no problem left for humanity<sup>1</sup>. He was of the opinion that an individual can acquire an ideal social nature if combines in himself the spiritual ideals of India with the secular ideals of the West. Today our society (both in India and the world at large) is facing so many social problems like immorality, corruption, broken homes, militancy, extortions, violation of human rights, communal and ethnic violence, casteism, exploitations, war, conflicts, environmental degradation, etc. due to rise of gross sensualism and unabated materialistic tendency. In this paper an attempt is made to address these multifarious social problems which are disturbing the social peace and harmony in the light of Vivekananda's spiritual ideal implicit in his "practical Vedanta".

The basis of Vivekananda's spiritual thought is chiefly Vedanta Philosophy. He preached and spreaded the divine insight in the world inherited by his Guru Ramakrishna. The divine insight which Ramakrishna inherited to his dear disciple Vivekananda (then Narendra Nath Dutt) was Advaitic (Non-Duel) in nature. On theoretic ground Ramakrishna

accepted Sankara's abstract spiritual thought, but he was basically a humanist and applied Advaitic wisdom for the solution of human and social problems. Collective or social liberation was the end and objectives of his philosophy and he sought Vivekananda to do so. He wanted himself from the selfish thought of pursuing individual liberation (Mukti) but his mentor Ramakrishna refrained him from such selfish path. He (Ramakrishna) said, "Sivam Atmani Pasyanti na Pratimasu", i.e. the Absolute (Siva) is pervaded in all human beings. Vivekananda followed his Guru's verdict and devoted himself for the cause of betterment of humanity.

Vivekananda took the mission of reforming Hindu religion by eradicating pre-judices and superstitions. Though he supported Vedanta philosophy, he did not follow Sankara's view of Advaitic philosophy blindly. He conceived an unique view of Vedanta philosophy which is his own. His view of Vedanta is categorized as "Neo-Vedantic Philosophy". Sankara's view of Vedanta is known as unqualified or Abstract Monism. In his view only Brahman is real; it is indeterminate, attributeless and the world is unreal. Vivekananda put forward a different version of the Vedanta known as the "Practical Vedanta". He envisaged a new perspective of seeing that the world is also real as it is the expression of the real Brahman. To denote it separately from Sankara's view of Vedanta it can be termed as Synthetic Vedanta<sup>2</sup>. Vivekananda's Vedanta Philosophy can also be termed as 'Concrete Monism' as he viewed Brahman both as indeterminate (nirguna) and determinate (Svaguna). Like his Guru Ramakrishna, Vivekananda argued that there is no difference among the different systems of Vedanta such as Advaita, Dvaita, Dvaitadvaita, Suddhadvaita, etc. there should be no antagonism among these different paths of Vedanta philosophy; till the reaching of last end (Moksha) all the systems are complementary to each other. The last end is to attain the knowledge of Non-Dualism of the ultimate reality (Brahman)–'Tat tvam asi'. There is no difference between Brahman and Jiva (Atman). Vivekananda incorporated a new vision that in the spiritual life of an individual nothing is so great than merging with the whole. Knowledge of Non-duality is the essence of Vedanta philosophy.

In the Advaita Vedanta of Sankaracharya, though non-dualism is the main ideal, in practical life due to acceptance of "Adhikarbheda niti" the

difference among the men could not ignore; and that is why a Sudra people was not entitled to enter a shrine. Vivekananda minutely observed the difference between theory and practice in Sankaracharya's thought. He visualized it as a seer contradiction of Sankara's theory. Man is recognized as the "son of immortal" (Amritasya putra) in Indian philosophical tradition; therefore, there should be no difference among the man due to their birth. So he argued against casteism which helps in growing the problem of untouchability. He also pointed out the way of its eradication which is love.

Vivekananda had a very strong attraction towards the moral teachings of Buddha. He discovered newly the universal heart of Buddha in practical life in the light of Vedanta philosophy. The protests declared against casteism in the history religious movements of India Buddha has a prominent place as he vigorously declared equality of men through his teachings. Sankaracharya though acknowledged the equality of men in theory, in practical life he failed to show the universal heart full of love. So, Vivekananda had much more attraction towards teachings of Buddha than that of Sankaracharya and Vivekananda tried his best to synthesis the ideals of two great thinkers in his Neo-Vedantic philosophy. In his own thoughts, Buddha was—"the Breaker of Castes, destroyer of privileges preacher of equality of all beings."<sup>3</sup> Like Buddha, Vivekananda himself was overwhelmed by the sufferings of all beings, specially of men. He said that a person who sees Shiva (God) in the poor, in the weak and in the distressed really worships Shiva (God).

Vivekananda wanted to present the teachings of Vedanta to the common man in a simple and easy manner so that they may be inspired by those. For that he wanted to make free the Vedanta Philosophy from any kind of religious and metaphysical doctrine. Of course, question may be raised that if all those doctrines are disrobed from Vedanta will there remain anything worthwhile or not. Vivekananda opines that Vedanta philosophy is a system of philosophical thought full of scientific outlook tinged with psychological and moral elements.

Vivekananda could accomplish synthetic unity among the different systems Vedanta philosophy. According to him Dualism, Non-Dualism or qualified Non-dualism are the three ways of attaining knowledge of Non-

difference. For a general reader, the different systems of Vedanta are opposed to each other; for Vivekananda it is not real view of Vedanta philosophy. Dvaitavada, Advaitavada and Visistadvaita are the description of the same Absolute Reality, therefore, all are equally true. In his own terms—"one is good, other is better and again another may be best, but the word bad does not enter into the category of our religion."<sup>4</sup> According to him, the reason that the Absolute (Brahman) is described in different forms is the difference in the level of human mind. For a philosophy of Religion all these will have to be included to constitute comprehensive truth and satisfy all these different types of human mind. According to Vivekananda these three types of Vedanta philosophy are men's three levels of spiritual development.

Like Sankaracharya, Vivekananda admits that Brahman as the infinite Existence, Infinite Knowledge and Infinite Bliss is the only reality. Brahman is indeterminate, attributeless, beyond space, time and causality.

It is one and non-dual. There is no other existent things except Brahman. God, Nature, World nothing is existent, only an infinite existence is real where from different names and forms arises. He said that the waves of the sea is not different from the sea, difference only in name and form. Likewise, Brahman and jiva are non-different.

According to Vivekananda the nature of Brahman as indeterminate, attributeless entity is the knowledge received through negative perspective. He opines that in addition to negative perspective there is also a positive one. Viewed in the negative perspective the world is the creation of Maya. Maya is nothing but a cosmic ignorance, when ignorance disappears true knowledge dawns. According to Vivekananda, the world of things are not completely negated in the bosom of Brahman; in a special sense, all these things are true.

Thus Vivekananda's practical Vedanta is different in certain aspects from Sankara's Vedanta. Sankara's Vedanta philosophy is Metaphysical, other-worldly; on the otherhand, Vivekananda's Practical Vedanta is life oriented, action oriented. Vivekananda wanted to fulfill Sankara's philosophy. He argued that the concept of Maya in the Vedanta System does not indicate the non-existence or unreality of the world. Till the attainment of the true spiritual knowledge the world is quite real and

existent. If we suppose the world as self-existent, it is false; but if it is taken as the expression of the Brahman it is real. The world is not negated in Vedanta philosophy. In Vedanta philosophy the ideal of renunciation means viewing the object of the world as expression of God. He said, "The whole world is full of the Lord, open your eyes and see him. This is what Vedanta teaches."<sup>5</sup>

Vivekananda's vedantic thought exerted a spiritual movement which recognizes the divine nature in all kinds of being, high or low and helps in attracting human concentration for realization of the divine nature of man. He applied the Upanishadic wisdom in practical life to make a shift in the attitude of man's mind. His spiritual movement also achieved a lofty end which helped a lot in forming the conception of Indian Nationality among the depressed masses of India before independence.

In Vivekananda's interpretation of Vedanta, collective liberation gets much more emphasis than individual liberation. It is one of the great contributions of Vivekananda's thought.<sup>6</sup> He argued that when we consider all being to be one, in that case the concept of individual liberation is not acceptable; the actual liberation will be possible only when all are elevated. Vivekananda gave emphasis on the issue of material or economic development along with spiritual upliftment, as spiritual upliftment is directly related with economic well-being of man. For a starving man, worship of God is meaningless.

Vivekananda argues for the possibility of a universal religion which may help in bringing about social peace and harmony. He earnestly stressed on minimizing the apparent religious difference as it may pose a threat to humanity, lead to hatred, indiscriminate killings and violence. He viewed all religions as essentially one. According to him, "universal religion about which philosophers and others have dreamed in every country already exists. It is here, if the priest and other people that have taken upon themselves the task of preaching different religions simply cease preaching for a few moments, we shall see it there."<sup>7</sup> According to Vivekananda, the root of violence in the name of religion is due to religious bigotry, sectarianism, fanaticism, which are like horrible demons, breakers of social peace and harmony.

Vivekananda is widely acknowledged as a world-class thinker

especially on Hindu Religion and Philosophy. His interpretation of Vedanta philosophy explores the universal human and spiritual values like love, compassion and non-violence which are regarded by the whole world as the potent tool for sustaining social peace and harmony. Pondering over the destruction of world war, Bertrand Russell asked a question—"Has man a future?" and in reference to the question Arnold Toynbee commented significantly as follows: "at this supremely dangerous moment in human history the only way of salvation for mankind is in the Indian way ... It is already becoming clear that a chapter which has a western beginning will have an Indian ending, if it is not ended in self-destruction of the human race... The emperor Ashoka's and Mahatma Gandhi's principle of non-violence and Sri Ramakrishna's testimony to the harmony of religions. Here we have the attitude and the spirit that can make it possible for the human race to grow together into a single family and in this Atomic Age, this is the only alternative to destroying ourselves."<sup>8</sup> The above quoted paragraph reflects the eternal relevance of Vivekananda's Vedantic thought and wisdom in reference to social peace and harmony.

#### References:

1. Sharma, Dr. Nilima, "Twentieth Century Indian Philosophy", 1999, Page-10.
2. Tezarananda, Swami,—"Swami Vivekananda and his Messages." Published in Swami Vivekananda Centenary Memorial Volume". Page-1563, editor, R.C. Majumdar.
3. Dutta, T.S. -"A study of Philosophy of Vivekananda", 1982, page-160 (Quoted from Complete works of Vivekananda, Vol-1, page 424-425, 14th Edition.)
4. Ibid - page 169.
5. Ibid - page 176
6. Ibid - page 181
7. Sen, Gautam, "The Mind of Swami Vivekananda, 2007, Page-21.
8. Ibid - page 156.

# Relevance of Religion in Present Society

Bibha Rani Goswami

Religion is a growing, dynamic and broad concept which can be realized but cannot be defined in its completeness. It is not such a discipline which is mere belief, conviction and faith, but it is a principle of unification and harmonization of the whole personality of human beings. Though different thinkers put forwarded different definitions of religion from different perspectives, a holistic definition cannot be found till now. The term 'Religion' is derived from the word 'relegere' signifies 'to bind together'. So from the etymological standpoint religion is a binding force which puts individual beings together in agreement in a group, which unites human life as well as social life. At the dawn of human civilization people have immense faith in a power beyond himself that satisfies not only his emotional needs but also guides him to lead a good life. Religion implies the spirit of devotion to the perfection of human life. All human beings try to attain the ideals of life i.e. Truth, Beauty, and Goodness. Search for the attainment of these ideals is nothing but the search for God or Perfect Being. In broad sense religion is a way of life, the art of living through right action, a code of conduct which regulate man's life. It helps man to achieve the highest goal of human existence and to lead a life of peace and happiness. In social phenomena religion manifests itself in various ways-domestic, economic, political and so on.

Individual life and social life are inseparable. Good of the individual depends upon the good of the society and vice versa. Religion is inborn tendency of man. It helps the individual to develop his moral character and indirectly supplies the foundation for the society. Without the bond of religion society would be collapsed. The study of human history would be incomplete without the study of religion because true history of man is the

history of religion. (Max Muller) In the history of mankind no such widespread, impressive thing is found than religion. Religion gives us an interpretation of the meaning of the universe in terms of its values for human life. Religion also can be regarded as an attempt of human being to satisfy inner urge or spiritual hunger and thirst. Spirituality is the core of religion which can be attained through the path of knowledge, action, devotion and concentration. It helps in developing moral character and supplies basic fruits for the development of society, helps man to establish cosmic harmony and a centre of human fellowship through different religious institutions. Religious institution not only unites different categories of people but also helps the poor and needy people economically as well as educationally. It helps in social unity, harmony, social development and integration. In this regard we can mention the name of Sankardeva, pioneer of Assamese society who established EK SARANANAMA DHARMA by means of which he tried to evolve social harmony and unity through NAMGHAR. Moreover it tries to establish understanding, co-operation, goodwill, friendship among people which are the basic key words of social peace in which there will be no conflict and war.

The contemporary world is full of anxiety and tension. The modern civilization leads the social framework to a deep crisis and conflict. Due to the technological advancement and scientific development today's society are mainly concerned with material comfort, it neglects moral and spiritual values.. It provides an easier life to man, helps man to reach on the Mars, to fly in the sky and so on. But human being seems to be unhappy inspite of such achievement because only material comfort is not sufficient for leading a good life. It requires spiritual development which springs from religion. Though material wellbeing is one of the ends of life it should be earned through right way without violation of peace and harmony in the society. Because utility of something depends upon its practicability and the mode of appliances. If scientific development is taken from moral and religious standpoint, it will be boon for us rather than curse. For this religious sentiment is essential because from a truly religious life our control over minds and intellect can be achieved by means of which we are able to minimize our control over the forces of nature coming from scientific development. To be a civilized, noble, ideal and rational society it must be

based on religious and moral values i.e truth, right conduct and love All religions provide us moral foundation to build up a harmonious society where a coercion of mutual trust, respect, and tolerance exist.

In today's society we observe that religion becomes the tool of political leaders. They use religion for their personal benefit. Nowadays it is seen that the believers and practitioners' of every religion deviate from their good motives. As a result social evils like religious riots, communalism crop in and that leads to disintegration of social framework. Religious fundamentalist make use of this conflict amongst different community to fulfill their own aim. Moreover today's society is divided into many parts on the basis of religion and innocent peoples are killed in the name of religious fundamentalism. This is the situation that is prevailing in the present scenario affecting different societies. Why this confusion takes place in very advanced societies in 21st century? The proper way to tackle these imbalances we must go back to our religious roots and find out reasons. In order to maintain peace and harmony in the society political involvement in the religion and religious institution should be prohibited. Religion helps to establish national integration in society and it also helps to preserve social, cultural and political harmony in society. According to religious thinkers such situation can be removed through the reward for spiritual values, the love of truth and beauty, belief in brotherhood among all human beings

Any problem of life can be solved if there is a harmony or unification between theory and practice which is proved by M.K.Gandhi through India's struggle for Independence. This is also applicable in case of religion. Religion helps people to lead a peaceful and harmonious life, but if it is practiced wrongly on the basis of wrong interpretation and misunderstanding it will affect negatively, If religion is taken as a personal quest, personal effort and sacrifice it would be most effective weapon for eradicating violence and tyranny of today's' society

In religion there is no distinction of cast, creed and color and there is no fundamental difference amongst the religions. All religions are based on truth and love. Different religions are the different ways of achieving the same goal i.e. the realization of ultimate reality, attainment of liberation through the service of humanity. Therefore in truest sense, religion

is the worship of mankind. If we accept that all religions are true then there will be no room for religious persecution. Different religions are the different stages on our journey to realize the ultimate truth. The motto of all religions is the realization of the true nature of man; Man is both religious and moral being and the co-relation between religion and morality is one of the essential ingredients for the development of today's society. Just like without water soil has no fertility in the same way without morality no religious life is meaningful. Religion is the ideal foundation of morality. These two are inseparable for a complete and integral development of the individual. In every society, every individual finds opportunity and facility for their own development; and for self development self sacrifice sympathy, tolerance are essential which are found in the very nature of religion Therefore religion is able to fulfill our hope i.e. establishment of peace in the present disturbed society

#### **References:**

1. Pal Jalandhar: The Moral Philosophy of Gandhi
2. Suda J.P: Religions in India
3. Dutta.Dr.D.K: Social, Moral and Religious Philosophy of Mahatma Gandhi

# The Principles of Non-violence

Dipak Chandra Borah

The principal of Non-violence is based on the belief that man's supreme happiness consisted in the realization of his oneness with the rest of the creation . The principal application of non-violence in life is satyagraha or soul force. The practical application of non-violence is not new; only its importance is stressed in relation non-violence. True democracy means village industries, primary education through crafts, removal of untouchability, communal harmony, prohibition and non-violent organization of labour . Gandhi remained firm on this principal because he was sure that in human relationship truth could not be realized by any other means . Non-violence means humanistic attitude towards life . Gandhi said, "Non-violence means is the greatest force at the disposal of mankind . It is the mightiest weapon of destruction devised by ingenuity of man . Destruction is not the law of the humans . Man lives freely by his readiness to die, If it need be at the hands of his brother, never by killing him. Every murder or other injury, no matter for what cause committed or inflicted on another is a crime against humanity. "

Gandhi's religion was the religion of humanity based on the conviction that every man has in him the spark of love . He was never tired of saying that truth and non-violence could lead to the establishment of a world without hatred, wars and all kind of conflicts . The path of non-violence advocated by Gandhi rises above all artificial barriers of caste, religion and nationality and yet raises the dignity of man in spheres of life .

The spiritual discipline which Gandhi suggested can be adopted by all individuals, all communities and all nations the world over . Gandhi had a wider aim in preaching his philosophy of love. He frankly said "My mission is not merely brotherhood of India humanity, my mission is not merely freedom of India . But through realization on freedom of India

hope to realize and carry on the mission of the brotherhood of man . Gandhi also claimed no status but that of a servant of India and in serving India he tried to serve humanity at large .

Through Gandhi was a true nationalist, but he was also a true internationalist . Gandhi advised non-violent nations to organize themselves into a world federational league . He laid down principles for ideal international organization, such as non-violence freedom from colonialism, equal representation of all nations, general disarmament and a small international police force to keep order in the absence of universal belief in non-violence .

Gandhi truly belonged to all time and all mankind . His life as a whole was a teaching to the successive generations . Gandhi followed his character as simplicity, the quest for truth, gentleness shall continue to be cherished by mankind for ever .

Dr. Rajendra Prasad has compared the life of Gandhi with the river Ganges which serves all who seek to make use of her . " If we want peace and happiness and to live as human beings we must follow the path chalked out by Gandhiji for in it lies our own good and that of the world." Gandhi used all his energy for the uplift of humanity . Gandhi belonged not to India but the whole world . The Gandhian method of non-violence is the best theme for a peaceful society over the world .

# Gandhian Religion : A Solace in the Strife-Ridden World

Juri Hussain

Mahatma Gandhi, whom all Indians fondly call 'Bapuji' needs no introduction. Although he was not an academic philosopher, we find in his writings a different sort of philosophical thinking which cannot be matched with any other contemporary philosopher. In his philosophy a unique trend is reflected where he touched every aspect of human life including social, political, moral and religious. In this paper an attempt has been made to analyse and evaluate the Gandhian concept of religion. The method applied here is descriptive and analytical.

Before analysing his concept of religion, we have to be clear about certain concepts related to religion. Generally dharma and religion are used as synonymous terms. But in the Indian context, there is a subtle distinction between these two concepts. Dharma is derived from the Sanskrit root 'dhri' meaning 'to hold together'. It may be regarded as the basic principle that governs the whole universe. On the other hand, religion is usually understood as having devotion to a higher power or principle. As Gandhi was well aware of this distinction, he tried to see religion in the light of dharma. Dharma is the way of life, the ideal of life. So, in a sense, it is more comprehensive than religion.

Again, in Gandhi's opinion, religion and morality are inter-connected concepts. Gandhi stated that morality is the essence of religion. He did not support any religious principle which is opposed to morality. For him, religion without morality is nothing. Religion is the moral foundation of a good life. A religious life consists in leading a virtuous life. The age old virtues accepted by traditional Indian philosophy were also accepted by Gandhi. However, he adds some more virtues and interprets them in the light of his own experience. These virtues are—Non-violence (Ahimsa), Truth (Satya), Non-stealing (Asteya), Non-acceptance (Aparigraha),

Celibacy (Brahmacharyya), Fearlessness (Abhaya) and Faith in God (Isvara-Viswasa). There is a special significance of practicing these in Gandhian philosophy. He stated that these virtues should not only be practiced outwardly, but also in thought, speech and action.

The concept of God eventually comes when we discuss about religion. Gandhi believed in a personal God of the Vaisnava type. Yet he held that God is indescribable, unknowable, one and eternal. This is because there was a leaning towards the Advaita concept in Gandhi's thought. Gandhi stated that God can be apprehended as the inner voice of man kind. It is the all pervading Reality, though known by a thousand names, it is same to all.

Gandhi gave several arguments for the existence of God, viz., the causal, the moral and the pragmatic. Out of these, however, the moral argument seems to be the best one for Gandhi. He said that conscience best represents the Divine in man. It is the inner voice that makes man aware of the good and the bad.

While giving the description of God, Gandhi first stated that 'God is Truth'. But later on, he reversed his position and stated that 'Truth is God'. The reason for this reversal was the realization reason could reject anything except Truth. Truth is the only force that could unify even conflicting ideas and ideals. The word Truth has no double meaning. But the word God is ambiguous. It may have different connotations for different people. It may be polytheistic, monotheistic or even dualistic. Thus, one of the major reasons of strife among people is religion. Gandhi very well understood that fact and so he tried to remain detached from the ritualistic aspect of religion. Due to this fact he rarely visited temples though himself being a man devoted to God. He realized that the conflict among people arises not due to the main beliefs of religion, as all religions preach the same principles. It is the religious practices or rituals that render people to fight with one another. So, Gandhi searched for such a principle that can unite people belonging to different religious faiths. This principle cannot be God, because though at first sight it seems that God can unite people, but in deeper level it is one of the causes of strife among people.

To remove these conflicts from the minds of people, Gandhi stressed on the principle of Truth. For him, Truth is God as well as it is Love. It is



Love for fellow-being, love for the poor and the weak, and at large it is love for mankind and love for the whole world. This love represents the divine element in man. This love has the power to remove the bad and the evil from this world. It can lead man towards the good or the Truth. Truth is that principle which can bring out the best in man.

If this Gandhian ideal of Truth can be followed, then there will be no conflicts, no discord, no strife among people. This Truth is a principle which can unite people following different sets of ideas and ideals. It has the power of binding people together. Thus, the Truth of Gandhi can pave the way for universal brotherhood. Then this world would be place to live peacefully with one another. There will be no conflict, no disorder, and no disobedience. There will be perfect equanimity among people in the entire world. It would be the Ramrajya of Gandhi's dream.

#### **Bibliography :**

1. *Gandhian Spiritualism* -Mohit Chakrabarty
2. *Gandhi and His Disciples* –Jayant Pandya
3. *Contemporary Indian Philosophy* - B.K. Lal
4. *Gandhi and His Religion* -Dr. (Lt. Col.) P.A. Raju
5. *Gandhi-His Life and Thought* -J.B. Kripalani.

## **Human Personality in Tagore's Philosophy**

Jadumoni Dutta

#### **Introduction-**

It is the personal man who really face this world, fall in simple ,more and more complex situation, tried to get rid of it and struggling in life which is endless in nature. The world remains a riddle for him, life is continuously paradoxical for common man. Man has to run his level best until death of his physical body for fulfillment of his sensory needs. Till death he is waiting to realize the deeper meaning of life, the greater symphony of the universe, because he has no leisure in the busy schedule of his daily life. His life is dedicated towards acquisition of material things as much as he can in the short span of life to satisfy himself, his own self or ego. He has no time to spreading his consciousness, no time to attempt a deeper insight. In fact he has no time to make an insight on himself. The personal man is following a monotonous routine of his daily life with some pre-conditional imposition with him, loading the burden of necessary and unnecessary things and thus finally lost somewhere and no more anywhere. He has no time to ask even 'Who am I'. Common people moves in a world of acquisition ,where they are far away from touching their own personality, the beauty of living in a creative world. They became the savage of the instruments developed by the scientific world, a matter of great attraction for common people. What really the personality they bear? What is the representation of a personality which is perfect, a divine personality- the fullest expression of human being.

The objective of this paper is to discuss on Rabindranath Tagore views on human personality. The method is descriptive in nature.

## Discussion and Analysis-

Tagore is very much concerned about the existence of personal man and his manifestation. Tagore himself represents a personality of high status. He tried to make a link in between personal man to supreme person. Discussing about the scientific outlook of life Tagore mentioned that science is the logic of reasoning which is quite apprehensive to the sanity of the poet and philosophers. Tagore interestingly believe that the world belongs to the personality of man, not of to the analyzable reasoning which fails to realize the oneness of the consciousness. Science is not following the right direction and therefore criticizing the attitude of standard of creation adopted by science and the attitudes of the modern moralists Tagore remarked in Personality as-

“The world is not atoms and molecules or radio-activity or other forces, the diamond is not carbon and the light is not vibrations of ether. You can never come to the reality of creation by contemplating it from the point of view of destruction .Not only the world but God himself is divested of reality by science, which subject him to analysis the laboratory of reason outside our personal relationship and then describe the results as unknown and unknowable. It is mere tautology to say that God is unknowable. When we leave altogether out of account the person who can and who does know him. It is the same things as saying that food is uneatable when the eater is absent, Our dry moralists also play the same tricks with us in order to wean away our hearts from their desired objects. Instead of creating for us a world in which moral ideals finds their natural places in beauty, they begin to wreck the world that we have built ourselves, however imperfectly.”

Tagore admitted that in today’s world science has developed so many facilities to man and therefore it has great attraction for man. But science doesn’t represent the whole personality of man, it is far away from hearing the sound of the soul of man. Man is a unique creature over and above of all, it has its own expansion beyond scientific rules and regulations. The individual mind can expand upto a universal mind, the finite being can be a infinite being by its expression. Science is not dealing with that kingdom of man’s soul, fails to realize the concert of world mu-

sic. Science is dealing with the finite within space and time.

Tagore pointed that the man has that finite aspect of his personality has carried the flame of infinite aspect of his personality too. Ordinarily we think that there is contradiction of the infinite and the finite but the infinite and finite are one just like a song and its singing are one. For Tagore absolute infinite is timelessness, a music which devoid of all definite tunes, it is eternal is nature quoting Ishopanishat Tagore mentioned in Personality as –

“He who knows that the knowledge of the finite and infinite is combined in one, crosses death by the help of the knowledge of the finite and achieve immortality by the help of the knowledge of the infinite. Again quoting Upanishad Tagore write as ,

“Therefore Upanishat says : They enter the region of darkness who pursue the transitory. But they enter the region of still greater darkness who pursue the eternal. He who knows the transitory and the eternal combined together crosses the steps of death by the help of the transitory and reaches immortality by the help of the eternal.’

Here Tagore unfold the highest peak of human personality, the divine personality dwells in man’s nature. This relational world for that personality is individual as well as universal. That elevated personality has the realization of the transitory nature of the worldly things in one direction and from the other direction he realized that no absolute reality at all lasting forever.

The reality is not sealed in our individual personality but in an infinite personality. Tagore agreed with the tune of Ishopanishat about the immortal being which represent the infinite divine personality. The transitory and the eternal is harmoniously reflected in the divine personality of man where the perfect truth is perfectly reveals in that personality. He has the knowledge of Brahma, the joy of living with Brahma, Tagore describes Brahma as a positive quality which act upon all time, Brahma as negative quality is inactive upon that divine personality. The limitation has to be crossed by the joy of unlimited.

Tagore has large appeal to the expression of man's life which is not suppressed by the boundary of scientific outlook towards life, not only through by the finite consciousness but with the consciousness of the infinite which bloom the divine personality of man. For Tagore human life is like a total poem with in all its aspects of expressions. Man's life trends from mortality to immortality, from ordinary personality to Divine personality which is the real journey of human life . Tagore believed that man's work is a process of his enunciation, which is essentially a part of life's fulfillment. So let it express, let life express towards its goal. Tagore described it in a delightful manner in Personality as,

“Let us live, let us have the true joy of life which is the joy of the poet in pouring himself out in his poem. Let us express our infinity in everything around us, in works we do, in things we use, in men with whom we deal, in the enjoyment of the world with which we are surrounded. Let our soul permeate our surrounding and create itself in all things, and show its fullness by fulfilling needs of all times. This life of ours has been filled with the gifts of the divine giver.”

The Divine personality is a deathless personality. That personality can harmonized all contradictions. He is kinship relation to the supreme person as that supreme is reflected upon him. He has the innermost solitude of the consciousness, the whole heart of the world with him. It is through him reality is expressed. He conquered the desires of selfishness filling his heart with love to all. The purpose of the supreme person is expressed through him. The flourish and emergence of that divine personality is profoundly claimed by Rabindranath Tagore for the sake of man's real nature, love, peace, harmony, freedom and humanity in mankind.

Tagore believes is totality, himself represent that total expression. Tagore consider insight is much more fundamental than analysis for Man. Man is primarily a lover, than has much more as he can exceeds himself. Man is the angle of the surplus of this creation. Man is within the boundary of this universe but his thoughts can make him boundary-less . Tagore is the presenter of this new theory where he found immense soul potentiality of man in its fullest expression – the representation of a complete man, the divine personality. Expecting such an elevation from ordinary man by

removing the frail of the self – ego Tagore expressed in Gitanjali as ,  
 “Where the mind is without fear and the head is held high;  
 Where knowledge is free  
 Where the world has not been broken up into fragments by  
 narrow domestic walls  
 Where words come out from the depth of truth;  
 Where fireless starving stretches its arms towards perfection;  
 Where the clear stream of reason has not lost its way into the  
 dreary desert sand of  
 Death habits ;  
 Where the mind is led towards by thee into ever-widening  
 thought and action –  
 Into that heaven of freedom, my father, let my country awake.”  
 -XXXV, Gitanjali.

Tagore believed that there is unbreakable relation in between man, the divine principle of unity and the world. The principle of unity is the prime creative principle which consists of the divine mystery of existence. The multi cellular life on the planet has the magnificent quality of perfect co-ordination and inter relationship in its functions which Tagore describes as the ‘Divine Principle of Unity’. Only divine personality is able to realize that principle of Unity which is the essentiality of creation in the ever emerging truth of evolution. The fragmentary nature of creation is reflected in the pluralists views where they are unable to heard the melodious tune of the greater unified symphony of the universe. The Universe is a great design beyond doubt. To understand the real tune of the Universe Tagore attempt to build the cradle of the shining human personality where the foundation is in the form of creative, dynamic and ever-growing enlarge personality. Creativity means for Tagore of the capacity of expression of new and original visions, it doesn't necessarily means of construction of new things. Man possesses the dynamic character along with that creativity where his bodily growth not only indicates the body itself but enlargement of his vision also, the inner growth of the personality. Man by born carried the flag of his freedom, but his real freedom is not engaged only in the mind-body freedom, the spiritual freedom represent his real freedom.

This real personality also bears the character of expression of joy in its expression and activities. Joy is the delight. The realization of truth, good and beauty is itself the expression of joy. These element of Divinity is fully present in the divine personality in the holistic philosophy of Rabindranath Tagore.

### References-

1. Tagore, R: Personality, Macmillan India Ltd, New Delhi 1st ed, Reprint 2001
2. Tagore, R: Creative Unity, Vishv Books Pvt Ltd, New Delhi
3. Tagore, R : Gitanjali, Machmilan publishers India Ltd, edition 1987

## ‘Benefits of Yoga’

Madhuchanda Kaushik

Yoga is a traditional method of meditation developed by the saints of ancient India. They practiced yoga as an effective method of controlling their mind and bodily activities. An ancient form of exercise which evolved thousands of years back in the Indian Society and is being practiced continuously since then. It includes various forms of exercises to keep a person in good shape and to get rid of various forms of diseases and inabilities. It is also considered as a strong method for meditation which helps in relaxation of mind and body.

People generally think that yoga is a form of exercise that includes stretching and folding of body part but yoga is much more than just exercise. Yoga is a way of life or Art of living through mental, spiritual and physical path. It allows to achieve stillness and to top in to the consciousness of inner self. It also helps in learning how to rise above the pull of mind, emotions and lower bodily needs and face challenges of day to day life. Yoga works on the level of one’s body, mind and energy. Regular practice of yoga brings positive changes in the practitioner – strong muscles, flexibility, patience and good health.

Yoga comes from the Sanskrit word, ‘yuj’. It means to join, connect or unite. It is the union of individual consciousness with universal consciousness. Yoga is 5000 years old Indian philosophy. It was first mentioned in the oldest sacred text – The Rig veda. Yoga is being practiced in the Indian Society Since thousands of years. A person doing yoga will move from one posture to the other called Asana. Yoga benefits people who practice it regularly. The form of exercises performed in yoga is called as ‘Asana’ which are capable of bringing about stability of body and mind. Yoga Asana are the simplest and easiest way to reduce our excess weight

and keep fit. Yoga originated in ancient India thousands of years ago, long before the first religion or belief system was born. It is believed that Shiva is the first yogi or Adiyogi and first guru. According to the studies, yoga was being practiced under direct guidance of a Guru and its spiritual value was given a lot of importance. Sun was given the highest importance during Vedic period and that's how Suryanamaskar was invented later on. However, Maharishi Patanjali is known as the father of modern yoga. He did not invent yoga as it was already there in various forms. He assimilated it into the system. He saw that it was getting quite complex for anyone to understand it in any meaningful way. So he assimilated and included all aspects in to a certain format yoga sutras. The role of breath is very important in the practice of Asana or yoga positions. Breath is a vital force and our body requirement of oxygen changes depending on our actions. If we exercise than we require more oxygen hence the breathing becomes faster and if we are relaxing then our breathing becomes relaxed and deep. In yoga the focus is integrated onbreath which indulging in slow movements as well as while doing complete Asana. Yoga promotes smooth and relaxed inhalation and exhalation during the practice. Traditional classification of yoga include four main paths including karma yoga, Jnana yoga, Bhakti yoga and kriya yoga.

**Karma yoga :**It is also known as 'Discipline of Action' in the western culture. This form is one the four essential pathways of yoga. This teaches to perform one's duty withoutgetting attached to the fruit or reward by doing selfless activities and duties. This is the main lesson which is being thought to karma yogic. It is for those who seek union with God. It can be also practiced in our routine life by conducting one's duty in a sincere manner without expecting the reward. This is the path of spiritual development. A life of individual is governed by his karma cycle where in if a person has good thought good actions and good words he or she will lead a happy life where as if a person has had thoughts, bad actions and bad words, he will lead an unhappy and difficult to lead such a selfless life as human beings are prone to fruits of labor they do. These are reason way we are facing problems like high stress, mental illness and depression.Karma yoga teaches to get rid of all the materialistic path and lead a happy and content life.

**Jnanayoga :**It is also known as the 'wisdom yoga' . It is a very difficult and complex path among all. This teaches a person to merge with the inner self by practicing various mental techniques by meditating in to deep conscience mind and conducting self questioning sessions. It tells an individual to differentiate between permanent conscious and temporary materialistic world. This path teaches to steady the mind and emotions by focusing on 6 fundamental virtues – calmness, control, sacrifice, tolerance, faith and focus. It is often advised to practice Jnana yoga under the guidance of a competent guru to achive the goal and to perform it in the best way.

**Bhakti yoga :** Also known as 'spiritual or devotional yoga'. It is associated with divine love as it is the greatest pathway to spiritual enlightenment through love and devotion. In this path an individual sees God as the supreme expression and embodiment of love. Its main features are to chant the lords name, singing his praise or bhajans and engaging in worship and ritual. It is the easiest and the most popular one. Bhakti yoga leads to the purification of mind and heart and can be achieved by numerous mental and physical yoga practices. If also gives courage in adverse situations. It is basically developing compassionate feeling and focusing on purifying inner self with pure divine love.

**Kriyayoga :**It is the physical practice where in several body postures are performed though meditation techniques of energy and breath control or pranayama. In this, the development of body, mind soul takes place.By practicing the kriya yoga the entire human system is energized in a short time.All the internal organs such as the liver, pancreas etc are activated. Necessary hormones and enzymes are secreted to keep body healthy. The blood absorbs high amount of oxygen and becomes decarbonized quickly which helps in general well being and number of psychosomatic diseases are avoided. Though more circulation in the head, the brain cells are energized, the working capacity of brain is enhanced and the memory becomes sharp and a person does not get tired easily.

Yoga is a practice that works on eight level of development in the areas of mental, physical, spiritual and social health. When the physical health is intact, the mind is clear and focused and there is no more. Yoga is an art which connects our body, mind and soul together and makes us strong and peaceful. Yoga is necessary because it keeps us fit, helps burst

stress and maintains out overall health. A healthy mind can concentrate well and do everything. Yoga is important because by practicing yoga you are being benefited on the following points.

**Inner peace :** yoga helps achieve inner peace and fight against stress and other problems. Yoga increase the peace level in an individual and makes him become more joyful resulting in more confidence.

**Healthy :** A healthy person can achieve and do more work than an unhealthy person. Life now a days is very stressful and there is lot of pollution us. This is a cause of numbers health issues. Just 10-20 minutes of yoga each day can help regain your health. Better health means better life.

**Activeness :** people now a days feel lazy, tired or sleepy. Due to which they miss out most of the fun in life and are not able to complete their work correctly. Being active keeps you aware of the things happening around you and also helps you complete your work more efficiently and quickly. And one way to achieve this is by practicing yoga regularly.

**Flexibility :** people now a days suffer from joint pains face difficulties while bending or touching their toes. Regular practice of yoga help in relieving these pains. The effect can be seen in few days of practicing.

**Increase Blood Flow :** yoga helps make your heart healthy and makes it work more efficiently by increasing blood flow in your body and veins. It helps in keeping your body oxygenated.

**Power to Concentrate :** Yoga helps your body calm down and relax which means there is less stress and one can concentrate and focus quickly on his work. That is why children and teenagers are encouraged to do yoga because it helps them concentrate better on their studies.

Yoga in this modern time provided as the best solution for the sufferings of the modern man due to his or her dependency nature on modern technology and sedentary behaviors. Though the development of science and technology simplify life it also has an adverse effect on our life. In this modern times, physical labor is highly reduced which makes the modern man change his lifestyles. The change in lifestyle creates competition for survival which leads to suffering from stress both psychological and physical. Yoga provides a solution to such problem with the systematic exercises that it provides to those who are practicing.

Yoga helps to live in harmony with our environment, it helps us to give recognition for ourselves, the natural environment. We are living and help us to peaceful interact with the society to which we belong. Yoga is significance in modern life in “improving postures, increases the intake of oxygen enhances the functioning of the different system of our body such as the respiratory, digestive, endocrine and reproductive and excretory system”.<sup>1</sup> Yoga is highly suggested for people in “competitive, stressful working atmospheres, which is characteristic of modern life. Yoga is a tool to get rid of the deceptive curtain that positions in the middle of us and vibrant energy of life”.<sup>2</sup>

Yoga aids in controlling a person’s body, mind and soul. It brings the physical and mental discipline together to soothe the body and mind. It also aids in managing stress and anxiety and keeps you relaxed. Yoga asana are known to develop vigor, flexibility and confidence. A yoga session mainly comprises of breathing exercises, meditation and yoga asana that stretch and strengthen various muscle groups. It is a good substitute for avoiding medicines that are harmful for our mental and physical health. One of the main benefits of practicing yoga is that it helps manages stress. Stress is common these days and is known to have devastating effects on one’s body and mind. Due to stress people develop serious problem like sleeping disorder, neck pain, back pain, headaches, rapid heart rate, sweaty palms, dissatisfaction, anger, insomnia and inability to concentrate. Yoga is known to be really effective in curing these kinds of problems over a period of time. It helps a person in managing stress by meditation and breathing exercise and improves a person’s mental well being. Regular practice creates mental clarity and calmness thereby relaming the mind.

Yoga is only partially understood as being limited to Asana. But people fail to realize the immense benefits yoga offers in uniting the body, mind and breath. Yoga can be opted and practiced by any age group and any body size. It is possible for any one to start. The size and the fitness level do not matter as there are modifications for every yoga asana according to different people.

The modern life style is complex and filled with tension. As a result, people in urban areas are busy with work schedules to full fill what life demands survival. The modern man is living in a competitive environment

due to technological progress. In the current lifestyles especially in urban industrial society the work style, eating habit and family life structure is completely changed. The extended family structure in this society is unthinkable and administering the nuclear family structure itself is hectic due to the huge demands it requires. This lifestyle brought stress to the individual which leads to different types of diseases. Therefore, practicing yoga is significant in controlling health problems resulted from modern life situation. Yoga is holistic which provide physical, psychological, social and spiritual benefits.\*

### References :

1. Anita. Need and Importance of Yoga in Healthy Living An International Indexed online Journal. Global International Research Thoughts, 2014.
2. Farhi D. Bringing Yoga to Life. The everyday practice of Enlightened Living. Harper Collins Publisher, Australia, 2005.

## Concept of Soul in the Meno

Dr Ranjit Bhattacharyya

*Meno* is regarded as the earlier dialogue of Plato. It is also known as the Socratic dialogue. It attempts to determine the definition of virtue. It tries to find out the meaning of virtue comprehensively, not partially. The first part of the *Meno* is written in the Socratic style. At the very beginning of this dialogue, Meno is reduced to confusion or aporia. In response to Meno's paradox, Socrates introduces positive ideas such as the immortality of the soul, 'knowledge as recollection' etc. Socrates presents the two concepts namely immortality of the soul and 'knowledge as recollection' by giving a mathematical query to a slave boy and he tried to prove that there is a necessary connection between immortality of the soul and recollective knowledge.

In Plato's *Meno* the two main speakers are Socrates and Meno. They discuss human virtue. What is the definition of virtue and whether it can be taught or not. The other members who participated in the conversations are one of Meno's slaves and Anytus who happened to be the Athenian politician.

In the *Meno*, it is seen that Meno is visiting Athens from Thessaly with a number of servants attending him. Meno who is young, good-looking and well-born is a student of Gorgias, a famous sophist whose views on virtue had great influences on Meno. At the beginning of the dialogue Meno claims that he has shared his views for several times on the topic of virtue in front of common people.

The most important feature of the dialogue is that Socrates applies his method of questioning to a slave boy to establish his idea of recollection. He wanted to justify that some knowledge are inborn and

those knowledge can be recollected by the soul. But for that, we need some proper investigations.

At the beginning of the dialogue, Meno requested Socrates to tell him about virtue. He wanted to know from Socrates whether virtue could be taught or not. Socrates is of the view that *he does not know what virtue is, and neither does anyone else he knows*<sup>1</sup> (Meno, 71b). Meno replied that, according to Gorgias, virtue is different for different people. For example, what is virtuous for a man is to conduct himself in the state and to help his friends. His duty is to injure his enemies, and also looks after all the while that he personally comes to no harm. Meno says that virtue is also different for female. Her duty is to engage in the household activities. She should have obedience towards her husband. He says that *children (male and female) have their own virtue, and old men whether free or slaves have their own virtue*<sup>2</sup> (Meno, 71e). Socrates' position is that there must be some virtue which are common to all human beings

Socrates is of the opinion that human virtue does not depend on the gender or age of a person. He tries to make Meno understand the fact that *virtues are common to all human beings; temperance and justice are two virtues which are present even in kids and old men*<sup>3</sup> (Meno, 73b). Meno told Socrates that the capacity to rule (Meno, 73d) is a virtue common to men. Socrates then replied to Meno that *ruling in a proper way cannot be a virtue of a man who is a slave, because then he would no longer be a slave*<sup>4</sup> (Meno, 73c-d).

Socrates points out a mistake that Meno is doing wrong by making a long list of virtue without trying to find out common mark or characteristic present in the virtues. Socrates remarks that *Meno makes many out of one, like somebody who breaks something*<sup>5</sup>. (Meno, 77a)

Meno is of the opinion that virtue is the craving for good things and it is the power to get those things. Socrates replied that this may raise a second problem. According to Socrates, *there are so many people who are unable to identify evil*<sup>6</sup> (Meno, 77d-e). Then a very crucial

problem was discussed. The problem is that there are many people who are always in confusion regarding good and evil. They often seem to take good for the evil or evil for the good. Socrates asks Meno to think seriously *whether good things should be attained virtuously in order to become really good*<sup>7</sup> (Meno, 78b). Then, Socrates leads to another question. The question is whether virtue is one thing or many in number.

It is seen that in the *Meno* a satisfactory definition of virtue cannot be found. Socrates very strongly and confidently believes that instead of a list of number of virtues, it is always better to try to find out a single definition of virtue. Socrates says that *it must contain all and only those terms which are genuine instances of virtue, and must not be circular*<sup>8</sup>.

It is clear that Meno is a follower of Sophist and therefore, his definition of virtue is subjective. But Socrates is a believer of universal or objective knowledge which will be common to all. For this reason, Socrates tries to find out a universal definition of virtue.

### Paradox of Meno

Meno asks Socrates *how someone will try to find out a thing when he does not know what it is? Even if someone is about to get the thing, or close to it, how will he know that it is the thing he didn't know?*<sup>9</sup> (Meno, 80d 1-4). According to Socrates, a man cannot search for what he knows or for what he does not know. Because *he cannot search for what he knows since he knows it and it is not necessary to search for what he does not know, since he does not know what he is to inquire about.*<sup>10</sup> (Meno, 80e)

Socrates replied to the paradox of Meno with the help of an ancient story. According to that story, souls are immortal and have learned everything before entering into the human body. The souls have contact with real things prior to birth, man has only to recollect those things in the embodied state. This type of recollection needs the Socratic method of



questioning or dialectic method. According to Socrates, the questioning is not teaching. Socrates demonstrates his popular method of questioning by interrogating a slave boy who is devoid of the basic knowledge of the concepts of geometry.

Socrates then begins a very influential dialogue of western philosophy regarding the argument for innate knowledge. By drawing geometric figures (like square, triangle etc.) in the ground Socrates demonstrates that the slave is initially unaware of the length that a side must be in order to double the area of a square with two-foot sides. The slave boy guesses first that the original side must be doubled in length (four feet), and when this proves too much, that it must be three feet. This is still too much, and the slave is in a confusing state of mind.

Socrates claims that *before he got hold of him the slave (who has been picked at random from Meno's entourage) might have thought he could speak well and fluently on the subject of a square double the size of a given square*<sup>11</sup> (Meno,84c). Socrates comments that *this numbing he caused in the slave boy has not harmed him and has even benefited him*<sup>12</sup> (Meno,84c).

After that, Socrates draws a second square figure by using the diagonal of the original square. Each diagonal cuts each two foot square in half, yielding an area of two square feet. The square composed of four of the eight interior triangular areas is eight square feet, double that of the original area. Socrates gets the slave boy to agree that *this is twice the size of the original square and says that he has spontaneously recollected knowledge which he learned in his past life*<sup>13</sup> (Meno,85d). Socrates is quite satisfied that new beliefs came into the slave boy's mind.

After witnessing the example, Meno tells Socrates that Socrates is correctly presenting his theory of recollection. Socrates replies that *he thinks that he is right, but he also says that this is just a myth. One thing he is ready to fight for as long as he can, in word and in action is that man shall become better, braver if men believe that it is right*

*thing to look for what one doesn't know...*<sup>14</sup> (Meno, 86b)

The demonstration given by Socrates justifies the fact that the slave boy has the capacity to learn a geometrical truth, because *"he already has the knowledge in his soul."*<sup>15</sup> In this way, Socrates made Meno understand that learning or education is possible by recollection. Socrates also proves Meno's paradox to be false. Meno wants to establish that learning is impossible, but the experiment which was made on the slave boy shows that learning is possible.

Then Meno asks Socrates to return to the original question. The question is that how virtue is acquired, or can virtue be taught? Socrates is of the view that virtue is knowledge, and it is agreed that, if this is true, virtue is teachable. Then they turn to the question whether virtue is really knowledge or not. Socrates is in some doubt regarding this question. because, if virtue were knowledge then there should be teachers and learners of it, but there are no teachers and learners of virtue.

When the conversation between Meno and Socrates was going on, Anytus<sup>16</sup> reached that place. He was the son of Anthemion, who earned his fortune with intelligence and hard labour. Socrates says that Anytus is well-educated and he has the efficiency to participate in the conversation. Socrates told Anytus that the sophists are teachers of virtue. Anytus is horrified. He says that he neither knows any, nor cares to know any. Socrates then questions him why men do not always produce sons of the same virtue as themselves. Socrates gave examples of other remarkable male figures, such as *Themistocles*<sup>17</sup>, *Aristides*<sup>18</sup>, *Pericles*<sup>19</sup> and *Thucydides*<sup>20</sup>, and he doubts whether these men produced sons who are equally virtuous to themselves. Anytus was very offended and he accused Socrates of making false and damaging statements about the sophists. He warns Socrates to be careful enough at the time of expressing such opinions. Socrates told Anytus that he does not realize what is the meaning of making false and damaging statements about someone. By saying so, Socrates again started continuing his dialogue with Meno to search for the definition of virtue.

## SOME OBSERVATIONS ON THE DIALOGUE :

In the *Meno*, it is seen that Plato's arguments not only suggest the existence of a soul, but also need the soul to be in close contact with the body, on the one hand, and able to acquire knowledge of the Forms, on the other. The recollection argument in the *Meno* shows that the senses play an essential role in the slave-boy's recollection. Although Plato does not yet attribute sense- experience to the soul, it is evident that even if one's beliefs about ethical or mathematical notions are innate, in this life they are not realized until one uses perception. In other words, although Plato states that it is the soul that is in contact with the beliefs when disembodied, he also needs the soul, when embodied, to start from the senses and reach knowledge. Hence, although the soul is something distinct from the body; capable of existing in an independent way, it is still operating along with the body; the body is the recipient of any sensory stimulus, which the soul categorises through recollection. Thus, the importance of the uses of the senses within the recollection argument lies in the fact that the senses show that a particular relation is required between the soul and body.

If the hypothesis that recollection as a process necessarily starts from a sensory stimulus is correct, then, the gap between the body, through which the senses are realized, and the soul, that recollects, cannot be a wide one. Plato through the recollection argument argues for a soul that is in contact with the both with this sensory world and with a world before/ after death. This is not achievable if we are talking about a completely immaterial soul that happens to be placed in a body. The question then of how the soul relates to the body, that is found in the *Meno* discussed as well as in the *Phaedo*, Plato is set to solve in the *Republic* and the *Timaeus*.

### Notes and References

1. Reeve, C.D.C, A Plato Reader, P-60-61
2. Ibid, P-61
3. Ibid, P-63
4. Ibid,P-63

5. Ibid,P-67
6. Ibid,P-68
7. Ibid,P-69
8. Jane Mary Day, Plato's *Meno* in Focus, Routledge,1994,P-19
9. Reeve, C.D.C , A Plato Reader, P-71-72
10. Ibid, P-72
11. Ibid, P-77
12. Ibid, P-77
13. Ibid, P-79
14. Ibid, P-80
15. <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Meno>, accessed on 25.06.2015 at 10.00 p.m.
16. Anytus, son of Anthemion, was an ancient Athenian politician. He served as a general in the Peloponnesian War,
17. Themistocles was an Athenian politician and general
18. Aristides (520s – c. 467 BCE) was an Athenian statesman and military commander who gained the honorific title 'the Just' through his consistent selfless behaviour in public office
19. Pericles (495–429 BCE, whose name means "surrounded by glory") was a prominent statesman, famous orator, and general (in Greek 'Strategos') of Athens during the Golden Age of Athens.
20. Thucydides (c. 460/455 - 399/398 BCE) was an Athenian general who wrote the contemporary History of the Peloponnesian War between Athens and Sparta

### Bibliography

1. Gail Fine, "*Inquiry in the Meno*", in Richard Kraut, The Cambridge Companion to Plato, Cambridge University Press, 1992, ISBN 0-521-43610-9
- 2..Charles Kahn, "*Plato on Recollection*", in Hugh H. Benson, A Companion to Plato, Volume 37, Wiley-Blackwell, 2006, ISBN 1-4051-1521-1.
- 3.Gail Fine, "*Knowledge and True Belief in the Meno*", in David

Sedley, *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy: Volume XXVII: Winter 2004*, Oxford University Press, 2004, ISBN 0-19-927712-5

4. Robin Waterfield in Plato, *Oxford World Classics: Meno and Other Dialogues*, Oxford University Press, 2005, pxliv. ISBN 0-19-280425-1

5. Dominic Scott, *Plato's Meno*, Cambridge University Press, 2006, ISBN 0-521-64033-4

## Spirituality in Sankaradeva: A Philosophical Study

Dr. Malaya Borah

Sankaradeva's spiritualism is influenced by the concept of Lord Vishnu depicted in the Rgveda, Mahabharata and Upanisads. His fundamental teaching is influenced by Bhāgavata Purānas in harmony with Gita. Though Vaisnavism is flourished in the Vedic period, in Assam the Neo-Vaisnavite faith is flourished by the initiative of Sankaradeva in the 15th century.<sup>1</sup> According to Sankaradeva, God is considered as the supreme reality. He also claimed that the same God is also regarded as the Absolute or Brahman.<sup>2</sup> His philosophical thought is based especially on Vedanta philosophy.<sup>3</sup> In other words, it is said that Sankaradeva's religio-philosophy is established through the important signification of monism of Vedanta and devotionism of the Gita and Bhagavata.<sup>4</sup> Sankaradeva developed his philosophy and religion for the sake of one's spiritual and social upliftment.<sup>5</sup>

### ***Brahman* or God, Soul and the World:**

In Sankaradeva's philosophy, there is a synthesis of metaphysical absolutism and personal theism.<sup>6</sup>

According to Sankaradeva, *Brahman* is the Supreme Reality.<sup>7</sup> The embodied form of Brahman is Vasudeva Krishna.<sup>8</sup> He is also considered as Narayana or Vishnu or Bhagavān, the highest God which is depicted in the Bhagavata Purānas and Gitā. For him, God is considered as the creator, preserver and destroyer of the world. God is Eternal, Omnipresent, Omniscient, One and the ultimate truth.<sup>9</sup> According to Sankaradeva, God is considered as Pure Consciousness – *Saccidānanda* – *sat* (truth), *cit* (consciousness) and *ananda* (bliss).

*Brahman* (the Absolute), *Paramātma* (the Supreme Soul), and *Isvara* (God) indicates the same Reality in Sankaradeva's philosophy.<sup>10</sup>

According to Sankaradeva, Reality is both 'Saguna' and 'Nirguna'. In Sankaradeva's philosophy, Krishna is considered as the ultimate reality that possesses both the 'Saguna' and 'Nirguna' aspects.<sup>11</sup>

According to Sankaradeva, the world and individual souls are as real as God because they are the manifestations of God.<sup>12</sup> Again, according to him, the world and the individual souls are not considered as God's *Lilā* or play only, they are also His parts.<sup>13</sup>

Sankaradeva considers God as the ultimate reality of soul and matter. They cannot exist without Him. They exist in him and not separable. Though they emerged from *paramātman*, they are not identical with *paramātma*. They have independent existence, but related.<sup>14</sup>

Sankaradeva insists that it is easy to conceive God as Love than to conceive Absolute as Truth. His religion and philosophy is suited to all the peoples who belong to different caste, creed or colour.<sup>15</sup>

Like the āstika schools of Indian Philosophy, the concept of individual self and the absolute self is found in Sankaradeva's philosophy. The individual soul is known as *jivātma* (embodied soul) and the Absolute soul is *paramātma* (disembodied soul). Individual soul or individual consciousness is considered as the part of God.<sup>16</sup> It is depicted in *Brahma sūtra* and also in *Bhagavadgītā*. According to Sankaradeva, God is the inner controller of one's self.<sup>17</sup> It is also depicted in the *Brihadaranyaka upanisād*-

“He who dwells in the earth and is within the earth, whom the earth does not know, whose body the earth is, who controls the earth from within - he is your Self, the inner controller, immortal.”

Again, it is mentioned,

“He who dwells in all beings and is within all beings whom the beings do not know, whose body all beings are, who controls all beings from within-he is your Self, the inner controller, the immortal.”<sup>18</sup>

According to Sankaradeva, though individual souls are real, they are dependent upon God for their existence. Due to ignorance and *karma sanskara* they get the fruits of their actions and also bound in the cycle of birth and death.<sup>19</sup> In this stage of bondage, the *jiva* experiences pain and

pleasure. According to Sankaradeva, God is considered as witness consciousness of the *jivas*. He insists that through *bhakti* or devotion, one is able to realize the exact relationship of the *jiva* and Absolute consciousness.<sup>20</sup>

According to Sankaradeva, when the ego is removed, *māyā* is disappeared and intellect or *buddhi* is free from illusory knowledge, then one sees the *Brahman*.<sup>21</sup>

### **Māyāvāda:**

*Māyāvāda* is considered as a philosophical doctrine in Indian philosophy. Vedanta system gives importance on this doctrine for explaining the relation between *Brahman* and the world. Sankaradeva regards *māyā* as the active principle of creation. For Sankaradeva, *māyā* is not considered as unreal because God's creation is possible only with the cooperation of *māyā*.<sup>22</sup>

Sankaradeva considers God as the controller of *māyā* and it is possible through His power of consciousness and *jiva* is considered as under the pressure of *māyā*. The attainment of *jñāna* through *bhakti* is the way to get rid of *māyā*.<sup>23</sup>

According to Sankaradeva, *māyā* does not indicate the world as a mere *vivarta* of *Brahman*, it actually indicates the world as the *parināma* of *Brahman*.<sup>24</sup>

### **Liberation:**

According to Sankaradeva, the supreme end of life is liberation of the self. Liberation means freedom from suffering. For him, devotion to God is the only way to liberation. In other words, when an aspirant purified his mind and followed *bhakti yoga* then he can attain liberation. *Gitā* asserts *bhakti yoga*, *jñāna yoga* and *karma yoga* as a means to liberation but Sankaradeva gives superiority on *bhakti yoga*.<sup>25</sup>

Devotion or *bhakti* means worship, prayer, faith, love, purification of mind and selfless service to persons. According to Sankaradeva, God realization is possible only through devotion. Devotion is considered as a kind of spiritual intuition or insight.<sup>26</sup>

Sankaradeva again said that *bhakti* is considered as superior than

moksa or liberation. Bhakti is defined itself as mukti by Sankaradeva. In Bhakti-ratnakara, Sankaradeva says-

“Though the state of liberation is all happiness, yet *Bhakti* is superior to *mukti*, in as much, the latter is devoid of joy inherent in the service to the Lord, while the bliss of *Mukti* is inherent in the former (*bhakti*). Therefore, according to him, liberation is inherent in *bhakti* and comes automatically taking its own course.”<sup>27</sup>

Sankaradeva’s *dharma* is known as *Bhāgavata dharma*, *Mahāpurūsiya dharma* or *eka sarana nāma dharma* which emphasized the surrender of self to Hari or God and through *sravana* and *kirtana* one is able to purify one’s mind.<sup>28</sup> Sankaradeva regards *sravana* or hearing as the first stage in the spiritual enlightenment. Hearing about the divine life of Krishna and hearing religious discourses from the learned people purifies the mind from all evil deeds and thoughts. Similarly, *kirtana* or recitation of the name of God removes all the miseries and sufferings and also develops loving devotion for God.<sup>29</sup>

*Bhakti* or devotion to God is attained only if one knows to love and respects one’s fellow worshippers or other human beings.<sup>30</sup>

The other values of life such as *dharma*, *artha*, *kāma* and *Mokhya* are subordinate to *bhakti*. Bliss and spiritual enjoyment is possible only by *bhakti*. It removes the I-consciousness.<sup>31</sup>

The attachment of the mind of the worshipper or the devotee to God is considered as *Prema-bhakti*. Sankaradeva emphasized particularly *dasya* type of *bhakti*. The servanthood of a worshipper or a devotee and God as a master is given importance in Sankaradeva’s philosophy.<sup>32</sup>

According to Sankaradeva, without devotion, liberation cannot be considered as goal. Devotion is considered as a way as well as a goal.<sup>33</sup>

According to Sankaradeva, liberation or moksa can be attained even in this life also. This is considered as *Jivan-mukti*. Sankaradeva, in his *Kirtan*, says –

“He who sees Vishnu in the entire world gets salvation forthwith even while alive of all the means by far the best is to deem all creatures as one’s own self.”<sup>34</sup>

Like *Upanisads* and *Gītā*, Sankaradeva also emphasized *niskāma bhakti*. *niskāma bhakti* is necessary for the individual and social development and also for the attainment of ultimate goal. When one is able to free oneself from all the desires and the sense of I-consciousness, then he attains supreme bliss.<sup>35</sup>

Sankaradeva’s Advaitism is considered as both theistic and humanistic. He teaches all to remain grateful to the maker of all, the personal God.<sup>36</sup>

From the above discussion, it is found that in Sankaradeva’s philosophy spiritualism is embedded in his conception of *Brahman* or God, the world, soul, *māyā*, liberation and *bhakti*. His philosophy followed monotheistic faith which believes that there is only God of worship. In Sankaradeva’s philosophy, for purifying one’s mind and freedom from desires *sravana-kirtana* or *bhakti* is given emphasized. *Prema-bhakti*, which is advocated by Sankaradeva, is necessary for God’s realization. For this reason, his philosophy and religion attracts the devotees of all races and his ‘God as Love’ provokes universal spirit among the people and developed the qualities of love, kindness etc. which help to grow the spiritually and socially developed society.

### Notes:

<sup>1</sup> Sharma, Nilima (ed.): *The Philosophy of Sankaradeva*, Vol. I. P. 1-6.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid. P. 33.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid. P. 99.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid. P. 144.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid. P. 6.

<sup>6</sup>Chaliha, Dr. Anjana: *Papers on Vedānta & Mahāpurūsiyāism*. P. 105-106.

<sup>7</sup>Sharma, Nilima (ed.): *The Philosophy of Sankaradeva*, Vol. I. P. 25.

<sup>8</sup>Ibid. P. 165.

<sup>9</sup>Ibid. P. 25-26.

<sup>10</sup>Chakrabarty, Dr. Amalendu (ed.): *Prācyā-Prajñā*, Volume III. P. 166.

<sup>11</sup>Chaliha, Dr. Anjana: *Papers on Vedānta & Mahāpurūsiyāism*. P. 105.

- <sup>12</sup> Sharma, Nilima (ed.): *The Philosophy of Sankaradeva*, Vol. I. P. 27.
- <sup>13</sup> Ibid. P. 39.
- <sup>14</sup> Barua, Birinchi Kumar: *Sankaradeva Vaishnava saint of Assam*. P. 87-88.
- <sup>15</sup> Ibid. P. 96.
- <sup>16</sup> Chakrabarty, Dr. Amalendu (ed.): *Prācyā-Prajñā, Volume III*. P. 162-163.
- <sup>17</sup> Sharma, Nilima (ed.): *The Philosophy of Sankaradeva*, Vol. I. P. 166-167.
- <sup>18</sup> Sharma, D. S.: *The Upanishads, an Anthology*. P. 211-213.
- <sup>19</sup> Sharma, Nilima (ed.): *The Philosophy of Sankaradeva*, Vol. I. P. 32.
- <sup>20</sup> Chakrabarty, Dr. Amalendu (ed.): *Prācyā-Prajñā, Volume III*. P. 163.
- <sup>21</sup> Sharma, Nilima (ed.): *The Philosophy of Sankaradeva*, Vol. I. P. 169.
- <sup>22</sup> Ibid. 72-80.
- <sup>23</sup> Neog, Maheswar: *Sankaradeva*. P. 46.
- <sup>24</sup> Chaliha, Dr. Anjana: *Papers on Vedānta & Mahāpurusiyāism*. P. 139-140.
- <sup>25</sup> Sharma, Nilima (ed.): *The Philosophy of Sankaradeva*, Vol. I. P. 32-34.
- <sup>26</sup> Ibid. P. 172.
- <sup>27</sup> Barua, Birinchi Kumar: *Sankaradeva Vaishnava saint of Assam*. P. 95.
- <sup>28</sup> Sharma, Nilima (ed.): *The Philosophy of Sankaradeva*, Vol. I. P. 139-140.
- <sup>29</sup> Ibid. P. 175-176.
- <sup>30</sup> Chaliha, Dr. Anjana: *Papers on Vedānta & Mahāpurusiyāism*. P. 119.
- <sup>31</sup> Sharma, Nilima (ed.): *The Philosophy of Sankaradeva*, Vol. I. P. 142.
- <sup>32</sup> Barua, Birinchi Kumar: *Sankaradeva Vaishnava saint of Assam*. P. 98-99.
- <sup>33</sup> Chaliha, Dr. Anjana: *Papers on Vedānta & Mahāpurusiyāism*. P. 97.
- <sup>34</sup> Barua, Birinchi Kumar: *Sankaradeva Vaishnava saint of Assam*. P. 94.
- <sup>35</sup> [https://attributetosankaradeva.org/teachings\\_spiritual.htm](https://attributetosankaradeva.org/teachings_spiritual.htm)
- <sup>36</sup> Chaliha, Dr. Anjana: *Papers on Vedānta & Mahāpurusiyāism*. P. 94.

### **Bibliography:**

1. Barua, Birinchi Kumar: *Sankaradeva Vaishnava saint of Assam*. Chandan Dey for Bina library, Guwahati. 1994.
2. Chaliha, Dr. Anjana: *Papers on Vedānta & Mahāpurusiyāism*. Department of Philosophy, J. B. College, Jorhat. 2016.
3. Neog, Maheswar: *Sankaradeva*. National Book Trust. New Delhi. 1967.
4. Sharma, D. S.: *The Upanishads, an Anthology*. Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay. 1964.
5. Sharma, Nilima (ed.): *The Philosophy of Sankaradeva*, Vol. I. Sri Krishna Prakashan, Guwahati. 2008.

### **Journal:**

1. Chakrabarty, Dr. Amalendu (ed.): *Prācyā-Prajñā, Volume III- A* Research Journal of the Sankaradeva Institute of Culture International. Chandrakanta Das, GS of SICI, Guwahati. 2000.

### **Other Source:**

1. [https://attributetosankaradeva.org/teachings\\_spiritual.htm](https://attributetosankaradeva.org/teachings_spiritual.htm)

# Educational Ideals of Rabindranath Tagore

Pompy Bhuyan

Rabindranath Tagore was the first Indian who wanted to introduce a totally scientific system of education, which can make a real human being. He was the humanist and he wanted to uplift the human values and cultures through proper education curriculum. He wanted a system of education, not hired from the western country but which had deep roots in the Indian soil and its glorious culture.

Tagore observed, "The best and noblest gifts of humanity cannot be the monopoly, of a particular race or country". Tagore said, before we are in a position to stand in comparison with the other cultures of the world or try to cooperate with them, we must bare our own culture on a synthesis of all the different cultures we have. True Culture brings fulfillment from the depths of the self to the aptitudes of a man as a whole; under its influence man spontaneously attains an all-round fulfillment and the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake and the enthusiasm for unselfish action become natural. True culture sets greater store by natural courtesy than mechanical observance of custom and convention. A cultured man will rather injure than humiliate himself. To be envious of others success is to humiliate himself. As a messenger of freedom of mind and peace, Tagore has expressed his feelings in the following verses.

"Where the mind is without fear  
And the head is held high,  
Where knowledge is free.  
Where the world has not been broken in to  
Fragments by narrow domestic walls...  
Into that heaven of freedom, my father  
Let my country awake"

## TAGORE'S VIEWS ON DIFFERENT ASPECTS OF EDUCATION:

The aim of education, according to Tagore, is creative self-expression through physical, mental, aesthetic and moral development. He stressed the need for developing empathy and sensitivity and the necessity for an intimate relationship with one's cultural and natural environment. He saw education as a vehicle for appreciating the richest aspects of other cultures, while maintaining one's own cultural specificity.

**1. Meaning of education:** Education is short of the highest purpose of man, the fullest growth and freedom of soul. To the child, the environment will provide an ever-ready back ground for its spontaneous activity. Our true education is possible only in the forest through intimate correct with nature.

**2 Freedom of mind:** The objective of education is the freedom of mind, which can only be achieved through the path of education.

**3. Children as children:** It is a mistake to judge by the standards of grownups. Adults ignore the gifts of children and insist that children must learn through the same process as they do. This man's most cruel and most wasteful mistake. Children's subconscious mind is more active than their conscious intelligence.

**4. Discipline and Freedom:** Living ideals cannot be set into clockwork arrangement. Tagore wrote, I never said to them; don't do this, or don't do that. . . . . I never punish them. An ideal school is an Ashram where men have gathered for the highest end of life.

**5. Living contact between the teacher and the taught:** In teaching, the guiding should be personal love based on human relations. In education, the teacher is more important than the method. The teacher is Guru. He is to guide and stimulate the students. He remarked, a teacher can never truly teach unless he is still learning himself. A lamp can never light another lamp unless it continues to burn in its own flame. So a teacher must always be teacher

## Shantineketana and Viswa Bharathi

As an alternative to the existing forms of education, he started a small school of education in 1901. Later this school was developed into a university and rural reconstruction centre, known as Viswa Bharati, where he tried to develop an alternative model of education that stemmed from his own learning experience. Students at Shantineketana were encouraged to create their own publications and put out several illustrated magazines. The children were encouraged to follow their ideas in painting and drawing and to draw inspirations from the many visiting artists and writers. The main characteristics of the Shantineketana School are the following.

- It is a community school where there is no distinction of caste and creed.
- Co-educational and residential institution.
- It is a self-governing institution – has a dairy farm, post office, hospital and workshop.
- It is based on the concept of freedom of the mind.
- Mother tongue is the medium of instruction.
- It is studied in natural surroundings and it provides for manual labor.
- There is well-equipped library.

Rabindranath Tagore envisioned as a learning centre where conflicting interests are minimized, where individuals work together in common pursuit of truth and realize that artists in all parts of the world have created forms of beauty, scientists discovered the secrets of the universe, philosophers solved the problems of existence, saints made the truth of the spiritual world organic in their own lives, not merely for some particular race to which they belong, but for all mankind

### **EDUCATIONAL AIMS OF TAGORE**

Tagore believed in 'Simple Living, High Thinking', so educational aims are set on the bases of Indian Culture and Traditions. He viewed that Indian students should realize the Indian culture as an inseparable part of the cultural heritage of the whole humanity. But to grasp the reality, the children must be made aware first of their own culture. So, the function of

education should be the transmission of the age-old spiritual edition of our land to enable them to achieve greater height in future. Tagore's own educational system had its implication in the field of natural education. For him education should take the children nearer to nature and being a spiritualist, Tagore added, in close proximity to God.

The three cardinal principles of Tagore's educational philosophy are :-

- (1) Freedom
- (2) Active communication with Nature and man
- (3) Creative self-expression

Children enjoy absolute and unrestricted freedom in the mind, nature and reality. The process of acquisition of knowledge thus becomes a joyful one in contrast with what is being done in regular schools. This process gears up their spirit of curiosity and a feeling of joy to discover them. He advocated wholeness of life and education and states education is a permanent adventure of life. Tagore also said that an education divorced from the streams of life and confined within the four walls of the classroom becomes artificial and lost its value. Education leads from freedom from ignorance and ignorance is one of the root causes of our poverty. Tagore felt that education life cannot be separated from the economic life of people. He also fulfills this aim in his Shantineketana to reconstruct the educational curricula. So, for this he introduced crafts in his curricula, which leads to different life activities. Tagore attached great significance to the moral values and ethics in education. Accepting the intellect of the people of West, it would be a great degrading to forget our moral wealth of wisdom. Stressing on the importance of mother-tongue, Tagore considered that foreign language makes the learner alienated and lifeless from the living world of freedom and joy. So, education should be intervened with life and society.

According to him, there are three sources of knowledge: **Nature, Life and Teacher**. Education is based on these three sources. Among them Nature can be considered as the generous donor but the sensitivity of the child and its respective power are to be enkindled by independent and creative thinking and this hard job belongs to the teacher. He wanted



to introduce education system, which was related with the truth and life. So, he prepared a curriculum that would help the student to improve their faculties of mind and improve their knowledge. Nature is a source of inspiration and revolution for the child, it teaches him for the first lesson of freedom and gives him immense delight and enables him to find his own solution to the problem he faces. Tagore gave a message of mankind, brotherhood, internationalism and service to humanity. A child according to him, should be given full freedom so that he may learn by Nature, love as well as affection. Education should aim at harmony with our life and education i.e. existence. Tagore implemented all his views regarding education in his school called Shantiniketan which is opened in a natural surrounding i.e. natural environment. As a whole, Tagore's main aim of education is to prepare the individual for the service of community. Rabindranath Tagore has been one of the topmost educationists of India. His name will ever shine like a star in the galaxy of the educationists who contributed handsomely to the cause of education.

Tagore was fully dissatisfied with the prevalent system of education at that time and called the schools as factories of rote learning. Then he advocated the principle of freedom for an effective education. He said that the children should be given freedom so that they are able to grow and develop as per their own wishes. A man through the process of education should be able to come out as a harmonious individual in time with his social set-up of life. He suggested creative self-expression through craft, music, drawing and drama. It was therefore, the endeavour of Tagore to create positive and mind-nourishing surroundings for his children to enable them to enjoy their freedom and develop their natural faculties. The establishment of Shantiniketan fulfilled the desired goal of Tagore in the educational front. Tagore's education marked a novel blending of the ideas of the East and West. The spiritualism of Indian philosophy and progressive outlook of the western people were blended together to give rise to an educational philosophy which marked its distinction in comparison to other educationists of India.

### **Works Cited :**

- 1) Basu AN. An Aspect of Tagore's contribution to Indian education. Educational India, 2006.
- 2) Joshi Sunitha. Great Indian Educational Thinkers, Delhi Scholarly Books, 2000.
- 3) Thankachan TC. Philosophical and sociological bases education, Kottayam: v publishers, 2007.
- 4) Lal B.K. Contemporary Indian Philosophy

**“A teacher can never truly teach, unless he is still learning himself. A lamp can never light another lamp, unless it continues to burn in its own flame”**

**Rabindranath Tagore**

# Satyagraha : Mahatma Gandhi

Nitumoni Dutta

Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi affectionately called as 'Mahatma' and father of Indian nation was not academic philosopher but he has stressed some fundamental ideas for the regeneration of man and the reconstruction of society and politics. His philosophy is based on the concept of the unity and existence.

In 1919, the British government came up with Rowlatt act which took away the right to free speech and expression of Indian revolutionaries and nationalists. The act empowered the British Executives such as Police to arrest or detain anyone with a warrant. Thus, judicial procedure was almost suspended, again which took away the right to justice.

Gandhi decided to start a movement on pan India basis against Rowlatt act. His demand was from the government to withdraw this act.

Gandhi established a Satyagraha Sabha with Indian National Congress for this purpose. Satyagraha was not originally coined by Gandhiji. Before him, the idea of Satyagraha was found in religious books like the Upanisads, the Ramayana, the Mahabharata and many others. It was also practised by Indians as well as westerners like Prahlad. Raja Harishchandra, Socrates, Plato, Ashoka and others. Harishchandra and Prahlad were his ideals as they suffered a lot to uphold truth without slightest ill will towards others. He was equally influenced by the life of Jesus Christ and Socrates who were Gandhi holds, the pestles on Satyagraha. Gandhi was also influenced by Tolstoy, Ruskin. The philosophical spirit behind Satyagraha was not Gandhi's exclusive innovation. But his merit lies in explaining the concept with some originality and widely applying it in various spheres to establish justice in society. Satyagraha theory influenced Nelson Mandela's struggle in South Africa under Martin Luther King, Juniors and James Baul's campaigns during the civil right movement in the United States and many other social justice and similar movements. Gandhi for

the first time applied the Satyagraha in South Africa to stop the discrimination of the white class against the black. In India he applied it to solve the local problems of Champaran.

Satyagraha is a compound of the Sanskrit words Satya and Agraha. Satya means truth and Agraha means clinging or holding fast. In other words Satyagraha means clinging or holding fast to truth. Satyagraha means persistence in truth. Satyagraha is the force of truth which never yields to untruth. Truth express itself, governs and conquers the untruth in all its forms. It is the cardinal virtue for mankind to adhere to it firmly for the removal of evil or untruth.

The world rests upon the bedrock of Satya or truth. Asatya means untruth, also means non-existent and satya or truth also means that which is.

For Gandhiji, Satyagraha went far beyond mere passive resistance and became strength in practising non-violent methods. In his words,

“Truth implies love and firmness engenders and therefore serves as a synonym for force.

Gandhi distinguishes Satyagraha from passive resistance, while passive resistance does not carry law for the opponent, Satyagraha is based on love and it abandons any form of hatred. A satyagrahi never applied physical forces under any situation. Passive resistance is more pragmatic whereas satyagraha is more idealistic in their prospects to oppose or resist injustice.

Gandhi suggests some moral vows to be observed by every satyagrahi. These vows are - Ahimsa, satya, Asteya, Brahmacharya and Aparigraha. A satyagrahi must accept truth and non-violence is the highest ideals of life and never resort to any deed contrary to them. A satyagrahi must practice Brahmacharya that is abstention from sexual passion and must have control over his desires. Asteya means non-stealing but in the Gandhian framework it means not possessing things disproportionate to one's material requirement. This is somewhat similar to Aparigraha or non-possession. That is without giving up lust for possession one cannot renounce selfishness. As long as one remains selfish one cannot be a satyagrahi. These moral ideals have been propounded in Jainism and Yoga system of Indian philosophy. Gandhi accepted these ideals for a satyagrahi.

Besides these moral ideals he also takes fearlessness as another prerequisite for a satyagrahi.

### **Discipline for Satyagraha**

Besides these vows, Gandhi also proposed many measure of discipline for making Satyagraha a powerful method.

(i) Humility - stressing the need for humility, Gandhi himself wrote-

“Truth without humility would be an arrogant caricature. He who wants to practise truth knows how hard it is. The world may applaud his so-called triumphs, little does the world know his falls. A truthful man is a chastened being. He has need to be humble. A man who wants to be the whole world including one who calls himself his enemy knows how impossible it is to do so in his own strength. He must be as mere dust before he can understand the elements of Ahimsa.”

Gandhi was of the opinion that one who cultivates truth, non-violences, celibacy and other vows must be humble. An humility one is able to perceive truth been in the midst of dangers. It helps to avoid any indifference to the source of all life.

The life of a satyagrahi must be one of unbroken cycle of sacrifice. For this the person must live not for the satisfaction of the senses but only for the service of God. His life then becomes a symbol of sacrifice.

A satyagrahi must be a person of prayer. Prayer means “an earnest desire to be filled with the spirit of truth. This desire should be prevent all the twenty four hours. But our souls are too dull to have this awareness day and night. Therefore we offer prayer for a short time in the hope that a time, will come when all our conduct will be one continuously sustained prayer. Meditation is a form of personal prayer which every religion subscribes to. For Gandhi meditation consisted in closing the eyes and ears of the mind to all else except the object of one’s devotion.”

Fasting is another means for sustaining the morale of the satyagrahi. Fasts can be undertaken only in obedience to the inner will. Gandhi said that it requires complete self purification.

Satyagraha does not depend upon physical or brute force. It is based on moral force, the forces of truth and justice, the force of self-purification and self-suffering, love and service, courage and discipline.

Gandhi says, purity of means is based upon the recognition of the supremacy of moral law. He believed that evil must be resisted and eliminated but resisted through means that are inconsonance with morality, not with hate, violence.

Gandhi emphasises that a satyagrahi must be a believer in God. A satyagrahi has no other stay but God and one who has any other stay or depends on any other help cannot offer satyagraha, because he may be a passive resister a non co-operator but he cannot be a true satyagrahi.

### **FORMS OF SATYAGRAHA :**

Satyagraha does not mean simply non co-operation or civil disobedience for the resistance of injustice. Gandhi’s contribution to Satyagraha lies in the fact that he has brought it on a social plane. Throughout his life Gandhi tried it on the mass scale in different forms. There are –Negotiation, Arbitration, Agitation and demonstration, Economic boycott, non co-operation, Civil disobedience, Direct action, fasting.

**Gandhi’s philosophy of means and ends :** Gandhi states that it is means rather than ends that provide the standard of morality. Although we can choose our ends, we donot have much control over it. The only thing that is completely with our control is the means with which we approach our various ends. It is not the end that we can work with but only means. The progress towards the goal will be in exact proportion to the purity of the means, Gandhi gave satya the highest importance and said that Ahimsa is the means to reach the satya which is the end. The pursuit of satya leads to the recognition oft he needs for Ahimsa to a point where we hold to Ahimsa as the immediate, tangible part of the ultimate truth. Gandhi sometimes also equated satya with Ahimsa. They are like two sides of a coin. It is impossible to disentangle and separate them. But at other times, Gandhi clearly distinguished between the two.

Gandhi emphasized mostly on Ahimsa for it is without our reach but he constantly maintained that satya is superior to Ahimsa, if a comparison must be instituted between inseparable concepts. He infact distinguished between positive and negative meanings of Ahimsa and satya,

but regarded Ahimsa negative in relation to satya. This because of his identification of satya with reality—the derivation of satya from sat.

Thus, Satyagraha became the great movement in the pursuit of truth in the midst of oppression and structural violence. It helped in the removal of segregation laws in South Africa and was independence for India in a unique way unknown to the world. Satyagraha is a movement based on truth, soul forces and aimed at changing the opponents heart through self-suffering. It was based on love and was completely free from any desire to defeat or degrade the opponent. There was no room for untruth in it. Satyagraha is the most powerful and permanent weapon to solve social, political, economic as well as religious problems.

**Reference books :**

1. Religion and Gandhian Philosophy- Manisha Baruah
2. Gandhi and Truth – JOY KACHAPPILLY
3. Contemporary Indian Philosophy – T.M.P. Mahadevan, G.V. Saroja
4. Contemporary Indian Philosophy – Basant Kumar Lal.
5. Contemporary Indian Philosophy – Rama Shankar Srivastava.

—x—

## Swami Vivekananda's Treatment of the Vedanta Philosophy in the Light of Physics

Rosemin Akhtara

Swami Vivekananda is a great exponent of Vedānta philosophy, who makes a remarkable attempt to analyse how some of the conclusions of modern physics are consistent with the ideas of ancient Vedānta. He admits that Vedāntic thought is consistent with physics. His concept of Practical Vedānta is the direct reflection of his practical outlook. His explanation of the ancient truths of Vedānta becomes acceptable to modern scientists and rationalists. Swamiji realises that science is not contradictory to the eternal spiritual principle and it is the foundation of Indian culture. Both science and eternal principles of Dharma are concerned with Truth. The world of modern physics is moving towards a knowledge which can lead towards the final unity in the universe and this unity is defined by Vedanta, the philosophical and metaphysical portion of Vedas, as the very basis of all existence and the ultimate goal of all knowledge. And Swami Vivekananda is the first remarkable figure who has given this unifying message to the Western world of science and technology.<sup>1</sup>

Vivekananda can be regarded as the foundational figure of a new 'holistic' science that can integrate modern physics and ancient spiritual speculations. He gives emphasis on the unification of Western science and Vedantic school of Indian philosophy. In the words of Vivekananda, "Science is nothing but the finding of unity. As soon as science would reach perfect unity, it would stop from further progress because it would reach the goal. Thus, chemistry could not progress further when it would discover one element out of which all other could be made. Physics would stop when it would be able to fulfill its service in discovering one energy of

which all the others are but manifestations. And the science of religion would become perfect when it would discover Him, who is the one the only Soul of which all souls are but delusive manifestations. Thus is it through multiplicity and duality, that the ultimate reality is reached. Religion can go no further. This is the goal of all Science.”<sup>2</sup>

Vivekananda makes a great attempt to preach Vedānta in the light of Western science. He aims at to make the mystical and intellectual Vedanta ‘practical’ and to solve the problems of life. By the term ‘practical’ Swamiji means attainable by all people in the walks of life. The new profile of Vedānta which was given by Swamiji has come to be known as Neo-Vedānta, which leads to the relation of the ordinary life to spiritual *sadhana*, science to religion, matter to mind, the World to God and man to Brahman, the supreme Reality. Vivekananda, by admitting the relevance of the relation between science and Vedanta holds, “Science has proved to me that physical individuality is a delusion, that really my body is one little continuously changing body in an unbroken ocean of matter, and Advaita(unity) is the necessary conclusion with my other counterpart, soul.”<sup>3</sup>

Vivekananda admits the primacy of consciousness over matter. In 1961 Noble physicist Wigner asserts that the description of quantum mechanical process is not possible without explicit reference to consciousness. This statement really brings modern physics almost at the door of Vedānta. Regarding the concept of Māyā Vivekananda holds that Māyā is a statement of fact. Like Advaita Vedānta, Vivekananda also accepts Māyā as a power of the Creator. But, in Advaita Vedānta, Māyā is that power which creates illusion, which was not accepted by Vivekananda. He conceives Māyā as a fact about the nature of the world.<sup>4</sup> He defines Māyā in the words, “What you call matter or spirit or mind or anything else you may like to call them, the fact remains the same, we cannot say that they are, we cannot say they are not. . . . A fact yet at the same time, not a fact. This is a statement of facts, and this is what is called Māyā.”<sup>5</sup> Vivekananda identified Māyā with space, time and causation, (Desha-kala-Nimitta) though this concept was developed by Sankara.<sup>6</sup> According to him, one particular attribute which can be found in time, space and causation is that they cannot exist in isolation from

objects. It is not possible to have an idea of space without colour or limits or any connection of the things around. Though Vivekananda follows Sankara’s concept of Māyā, but he gives a modern logical interpretation.

Vivekananda, long before Einstein, clearly stated about the relativity of space and time. Swamiji holds that the one particular attribute one finds in time, space and causation is that they cannot exist separate from things. If there is an attempt about colour or limits or any connection with the things around-just abstract space. Similarly, it is not possible to have any idea of abstract time. Time depends on two events as well as space has to be related to outside objects and the idea of causation is also related with the idea of space and time.<sup>7</sup> Here, Vivekananda comes very close to those of Einstein.

Again, Vivekananda also viewed on the contradictory nature of the phenomenal world. In the words of Vivekananda, “This world has no existence’ what is meant by that? It means that it has no absolute existence. It exists only in relation to my mind, your mind and to the mind of every one’s else.”<sup>8</sup> Here, we can refer to Fritjof Capra, an American physicist. In the words of Capra, “To another pair of opposite concepts which is even more fundamental, that of existence and non-existence. This pair of opposite, too, is transcended by the atomic reality. We can never say that an atomic particle exists at a certain place, nor can we say that it does not exist. Being a probability pattern, the particle has tendencies to exist in various places and thus manifest strange kind of physical reality between existence and non-existence.”<sup>9</sup>

Moreover, another common aspect of physics and Vedāntais that of unity between the microcosm and macrocosm as well as man and the Ultimate reality. The microcosm contains in it the entire potentialities of the macrocosm. It is the view of the modern science that the world is homogeneous and each atom is composed of the same material as well as the whole universe also. Similarly in the Vedanta also atoms are defined as invisible. Though, the atoms are invisible, they can grasp the whole power and potency of the universe and that exactly what the Vedānist admits about Atman. In the similar way man is the most representative being in the universe, the microcosm, a small universe in himself. Thus, it leads us to admit the resemblance between the principle of the identification of

macrocosm and microcosm and the basic unity of man and the Ultimate Reality. This principle of identification belong to modern physics and Vedānta philosophy.<sup>10</sup>

Again, Vivekananda brings to light the consistency between ancient Indian cosmology and modern science. Swamiji points out to a question –what is Prana? He Spandan himself admits that Prana is Spandan or vibration .And he compares this with Wave forms, because the motion is going in wave forms like- rising again, falling again.<sup>11</sup> Vivekananda, by referring to the Gita and the Vedānta, also defines individual self as Vibhu and in the light of physical evolution Swamiji preached that the bodies of different animals are really one, though there are differences , but in reality they are the different expression of the same series. In the words of Vivekananda, “The sum total of the energy remains the same, whatever the forms it may take. If you want a mass of energy at one end, you have got to put it in at other end; it may be in another form, but the amount of energy that should be produced out of it must be the same.”<sup>12</sup> Here, Vivekananda finds conformity with infinite energy. He defines soul as infinite and explores that all the creatures of the world from the lowest worm to the greatest saints all have this same infinite power, that is, the soul. They only differ in their degree of manifestation. Vivekananda was concerned with the Cartesian division of mind and matter where he found the root of western thinking about God and the universe. God is defined as the self-evolving cause of the universe, which is not different from Him. In western thought, this principle is defined as ‘naturalism’ and naturalism is the foundation of science and rationalism.

In this way, Vivekananda’s scientific treatment of the Vedānta philosophy is very significant. According to him, the Vedānta admits that the universe, with all its lives, have emerged from pure consciousness. He holds that Newton and Galileo are ‘Prophets of physical science’ and Upanisadic Rishis are ‘Prophet of spirituality’ and then very firmly explores that “the whole universe mental and material will be fused into one.”<sup>13</sup> Swamiji apprehended this holistic and mystical aspect and modern science would turn from matter to the transcendental consciousness, which is the hidden aspect of human being. It is the source of all existence.

In this way, this paper is a humble attempt of the exploration of the consistency between the different branches of science and the Vedānta philosophy and discloses how science is significantly approaching the conclusions of Advaita Vedanta system. Along with Swamiji there are many other thinkers who give emphasis on the assimilation of modern science and Indian philosophical speculations. In the words of Fritjof Capra, “ The dance of Shiva symbolizes not only the cosmic cycles of creation and destruction, but also the daily rhythm of birth and death which is seen in Indian mysticism as the basis of all existence. At the same time, Shiva reminds us that the manifold forms in the world are maya- not fundamental, but illusory and ever-changing.-as he keeps creating and dissolving them in the ceaseless flow of his dance”<sup>14</sup> Besides Vivekananda, many western physicists like Heisenberg, Schrodinger and many others have been aware about the parallelism between physics and the Vedānta philosophy. Thus, Swamiji insisted that Vedantic speculations are consistent with modern science. His scientific exposition of the Vedantic thought is the appreciation to the attempt of the unification of these two, which leads us to accept the that the development of Physics and the philosophy of Vedanta are indeed interconnected.

#### Notes and references:

1. Jitatmananda, Swami. *Modern Physics and Vedanta*. Paras Prints. Mumbai.p.8
2. Ibid.p.8
3. Ibid.p.32
4. Lal, Basant Kumar. *Contemporary Indian Philosophy*. Motilal Banarsidass publishers private Limited. Delhi.p.5
5. Jitatmananda, Swami. *Modern Physics and Vedanta*. Paras Prints. Mumbai.p.60
6. Ibid.p.61
7. Ibid.p.61
8. Ibid.p.61
9. Capra, Fritjof. *The Tao of Physics*.Flamingo An Imprint of Harper Collins Publishers.London.p.166
10. Jitatmananda, Swami. *Modern Physics and Vedanta*. Paras Prints.

Mumbai. P.p.87-88

11. Vivekananda, Swami. *Advaita Vedanta The Scientific Religion*. Published by Advaita Ashrama. Kolkata. p.11
12. Ibid. p.24
13. Jitatmananda, Swami. *Modern Physics and Vedanta*. Paras Prints. Mumbai. p.156
14. Capra, Fritjof. *The Tao of Physics*. Flamingo An Imprint of Harper Collins Publishers. London. p.270

## Understanding Maya in Vivekananda's Philosophy

Pinki Borah

The foundation of Vivekananda thought lay primarily in Vedanta. But Vivekananda was not simply re-interpreting Vedanta. He got himself acquainted with the wisdom contained in Shankara system of knowledge, in Upanisads, in Gita, in Buddha and other. Endowed with logical and rational way of looking at the world, he developed an outlook for world society which combined the best in all system of thought.

Swami Vivekananda devoted three whole lecture on Maya in his series of talks on Jnanayoga in London. Vivekananda spoke about maya in refreshing new way or direct way. To understand his approach to maya one must first take a look at the classical approach to Maya.

Maya is an ancient word and it is accepted by all the schools of Indian Philosophy. But the way the non-dualist Advaitins talk about maya that is unique, different from the other school. In general the schools of Hinduism the Tantra, the Vaishnavas they all accept maya as the power of God. The power of God to create and it is a real power and God creation with maya is a real creation. This is the way that understood the other schools. But the approach to maya in Advaita Vedanta is unique.

The unique approach to maya in Advaita Vedanta is encapsulated in the central teaching of Advaita Vedanta-

Brahma Satyam Jagat Mithya

Jivo Brahmaiva Naparah

It means Brahman alone is real. It is the only truth, the world is unreal, and there is ultimately no difference between Brahman and Individual self.

So this is the unique formulation of the non-dualistic school of Advaita Vedanta. In Advaita point of view the maya is nothing but ignorance. Ignorance of our true nature. In Advaita Vedanta maya has two function-

i) Avarana - It obscure the reality ( Brahman), it veil the reality. It is known as Avarana.

ii) Vikshepa- it means error, it projects the reality as it is not . It is known as Vikshepa.

For example-I see a snake by mistake it's a rope. I did not know rope as a rope, it is veil or avarana and next what happen because I did not know the rope as a rope I mistaken for a snake. This is projection or Vikshepa.

So Ramakrishna (teacher of Vivekananda) explain about maya with the help of his beautiful example, he says one of the function of maya is Avarana. He give the beautiful story from Ramayana, where Rama, Sita and Lakshmana around to the way of forest exile. Here Rama is Paramatma ( the Supreme Self), Lakshmana is Jivatma ( the individual self) and Sita is the veil of Maya. So she is in between Rama and Lakshmana. And Lakshmana can seen Rama only if Sita graciously step aside and lets him see. So that's Ramakrishnan beautiful example on maya. Again he speak about the example of Cobra which has poison in his mouth. Little bit of that poison is enough to knock out the mouse or a frog, but all of his poison is in mouth of Cobra , it does not do anything to the Cobra. Its the power of the Cobra. So Ramakrishna says maya is the power by which all we are diluted, we are trapped in Samsara, but the entire power is willed by God, but God is not trapped by maya.

It is true that Vivekananda has borrowed the doctrine of Maya from Advaita Vedanta, but his conception of Maya is not exactly similar to that of Sankara. Like Advaita Vedantins Vivekananda also believes that maya is a power of the creator that makes creation possible.

According to Vivekananda the whole world is going towards death; everything dies. All our progress , our vanities, our reforms, our luxuries , our wealth, our knowledge, have that one end-death. That is all that is certain. Cities come and go, empires rise and fall, planets break into pieces and crumble into dust, to be blown about by the atmospheres of other planets. Thus it has been going on from time without beginning. Death is

the end of life, of beauty, of wealth, of power, of virtue too. Saints die and sinners die, kings die and beggars die. They are all going to death and yet this tremendous clinging on to life exists. Somehow, we donot know why we cling to lie; we cannot give it up. And this is Maya according to Vivekananda.

Nature can hurl a thunderbolt of any magnitude to any distance. If a man do one small part as much, we praise him and laud him to the skies why ? Does not nature do infinitely more than any human being can do ? – and nature is dull, insentient. Why should it be glory to imitate the dull, the insentient? The force of gravitation can pull to piece the biggest mass that ever existed; yet it is insentient. What glory is there in imitating the insentient ? Why should we praise him for imitating nature, imitating death, imitating dullness imitating insentience? Yet we are all struggling after that. And this is Maya.

The senses drag the human soul out. Man is seeking for pleasure and for happiness where it can never be found. For countless ages we are all taught that this is futile and vain, there is no happiness here. But we cannot learn ; it is impossible for us to do so, except through our own experiences. We try them and a blow comes. Do we learn then ? Not even then. Like moths hurling themselves against the flame, we are hurling ourselves again and again into sense pleasures, hoping to find satisfaction there. We return again and again with freshened energy; thus we go on, till crippled and cheated we die. And this is Maya.

In our desire to solve the mysteries of the universe, we cannot stop our questioning, we feel we must know and cannot believe that no knowledge is to be gained. A few steps and there arise the wall of beginningless and endless time which we cannot surmount and the whole is irrevocably bound in by the walls of cause and effects. We cannot go beyond them. Yet we struggle and still have to struggle. And this is Maya.

The mother is nursing a child with great care; all her soul, her life, is in that child . The child grows, becomes a man, and perchance become a blackguard and a brute, kicks her and beats her everyday; and yet the mother clings to the child; and when her reason awakes , she covers it up with the idea of love. She little thinks that it is not love. That it is something which has got hold of her nerves, which she cannot shake off; however



she may try, she cannot shake off the bondage she is in. And this is Maya.

What you call matter or spirit or mind or anything else you may like to call them, the fact remain the same; we cannot say that they are, we cannot say that they are not. a fact yet at the same time not a fact; awake and at the same time asleep. This is a statement of fact. If you aren't confused by quantum mechanics, you haven't really understood it and this is what is called Maya.

True it is that we are all slaves of Maya, born in maya, and live in maya. Is there then way out ,no hope? That even our so called trailing, beauty is but a prison house and that ever our intellect and mind are prison house.. One the one side , therefore , is the bold assertion that this is all nonsense, that this is Maya, but along with it there is the most hopeful assertion that beyond maya, there is a way out. At every step we are knocked down, as it were, by maya and shown that we are bound; and yet at the same moment, together with this blow, comes the other feeling that we are free. Some inner voice tells us that we are free.

With all this terrible fact before us, in the midst of sorrow and suffering, there is a still small voice that is ringing through all ages, through every, country and in every heart. We see, then, that beyond this maya the Vedantic philosophers find something which is not bound by maya. This idea is in some form or other the common property of all religions. But with the Vedanta , it is only the beginning of religion and not the end.

The goal of all nature is freedom and freedom is to be attained only by perfect unselfishness. Freedom is never to be reached by the weak. Throw away all weakness. Tell your body that it is strong, tell your mind that it is strong and have unbounded faith and hope in yourself. We have seen that it is the subjective world that rule the objective. Change the subject and the object is bound to change; purify yourself the world is bound to be purified. Our limitation is play just the fun of it. You were never bound. We are all acting our parts in this play of our own invention.

Thus Maya is a statement of the fact of this universe ,of how it is going on. Maya is not a theory for the explanation of the world; it is simply a statement of facts as they exist. That the very basis of our being is contradiction, that everywhere we have to move through this tremendous contradiction. Vivekananda says this is Maya..... Maya is no delusionary

force that conceals any reality; rather it is the name of all the contradictions that we see around. It is a simple statement of fact about this Universe. This world which ancient thinkers called Maya in terms of delusion is not so according to Vivekananda.

#### **References:**

Vivekananda, Swami, *The Complete Works, Vol-II*, 12th edition Advaita Ashrama, Publication Department,2013.

Vivekananda, Swami, *Universal Ethics & Moral Conduct*, Advaita Asharma , Ashrama Publication Department, 2001.

Vivekananda, Swami, *Inspired Talks*, Second Edition, Published by the Ramakrishnan Mission, Mylapore , Madras, 1910.

Nagrath, Radhika, *Swami Vivekananda: The known Philosopher, The Unknown Poet*, Towards Freedom,2013.

Nikhilananda, Swami, *Vivekananda A Biography*, New York Ramakrishnan, Vivekananda Centre,1953.

Roy, Jashobanta and Debashish, *Rediscovering Swami Vivekananda in the 21st Century Discourse*, Towards Freedom, 2013

Sen, Gutama, *The Mind Of Swami Vivekananda*, Jaico Publishing House,1975.

Sharma, G. Ranjit, *The Idealistic Philosophy of Swami Vivekananda*, Atlantic Publishers & Distributors,1987.

Srivastava, Ram Shankar, *Contemporary Indian Philosophy*, Munshriram Monoharlal Publisher Pvt. Ltd., 1965.

# Concept of Man in Rabindranath Tagore's Philosophy

Polly Rajkhowa

Rabindranath Tagore is an important figure of India in the literary as well as in the philosophical world. He is a great novelist, writer, philosopher, painter, patriot, humanist and above all a Universalist. He has written many books, essays, poems etc. and those are the sources of his philosophical ideas. His contributions to the field of art, music, literature, religion, education, politics, and social reforms etc. are noteworthy. However, Tagore has not given a systematic philosophy but the world view behind his works and his ideas are complex as well as original. He does not state his philosophy in the academic manner. His philosophical thoughts are scattered in his literary works. He doesn't write a systematic philosophical treatise but authored many essays and lectures in which he depicts his philosophical worldview in a poetic way. In his philosophical ideas, the concept of man occupies a significant position. Through his poetry, he strives to communicate his vision of reality. He has developed spiritualistic humanism that connects ancient Indian philosophical ideas with western ideas and has given them his original twist. In this paper, an attempt has been made to discuss Rabindranath Tagore's views on man and to show that whether he can be regarded as a humanist.

Generally, man is said to be the highest creature on earth. Unlike the other animals, man has the power of reasoning. Man can make his life worth living by using his reason. Rationality distinguishes man from other animals and makes him essentially and fundamentally a progressive being. The concept of 'man' has occupied an important place in both ancient Indian philosophy and in contemporary Indian philosophy.

But, there is an insignificant difference between man as depicted in ancient Indian philosophy and in contemporary Indian philosophy. Ancient philosophy gives much importance to the spiritual nature of man rather than his physical nature. The ancient thinkers emphasise on values that is super natural and other worldly. But, contemporary philosophers believe in philosophy to be essentially tied up with life. Their attitudes towards the world is very much positive, optimistic and dynamic. These philosophers of India deal with the problem of man's nature and destiny in an integral and comprehensive way and take full account of man's spiritual as well as physical existence. They are traditional, they reinterpret the classical Indian thought and reveal to us the essential truths of the past in a new form and with a new orientation. It shows great appreciation of the values of life, viz; individual, social and national. Its appreciation of the values of life and the cultural stream are influenced by the ancient Indian and the western philosophers. Contemporary thinkers are highly influenced by the Upanishads and the teachings of the Bhagavad Gita. They believe that man is essentially spiritual. He is to realise his inner spirituality and freedom. They also have given importance to man's existence in the world and to the fulfilment of his entire being, viz; his empirical i.e. physical as well as spiritual personality. Thus, it is seen that contemporary Indian thinkers are equally concerned with both the natures- spiritual and physical. There are various conceptions about the nature of man in the history of philosophy. Most of the Indian thinkers have given importance to both man's physical and spiritual nature. This spirituality, they do not mean in metaphysical sense which is beyond life and death, but it is a guiding principle that leads human existence from particularity to the fullness, it implies a change in one's attitude to the world, one can move away from his egoistic nature towards the world which is the source of our own sufferings and happiness. As Rabindranath Tagore is a Contemporary Indian thinker so that he shows the nature of man in the same way to some extent like his contemporaries which can be found in his different works.

The concept of man has a distinctive role to create a plan for good living as well as for the development of the whole world, which may be said the central theme in Tagore's philosophy. He believes that man has a nature and this nature is man's truth which is regulative. He is very

much concerned with the problem of man and his destiny. He is deeply connected with the humanity, tried to establish an all comprehensive view of life. Tagore is a firm believer in the evolution of man to a higher destiny. Man is closely related with the universe and he holds that the evolution of mind and spirit makes man superior to animal. He is superior to all living creatures of the world not only with regard to his spiritual nature but also in respect of his physical organism. He believes that man in his very being unites spirit and nature. Man is a physical, moral and spiritual being and society is the expression of both moral and spiritual aspiration of man, which belongs to his higher nature. Man has an inner power within him which enables him to realise his unity with the whole of mankind, with nature, and also with God. This inner power of divinity that latent in man, which is characterized by him as the Universal Man. He has preached for the exaltation of the spirit of man. It is possible for man to realise the supreme personality through love in his life-time. He stresses the ideal of human unity.

Regarding the nature of man, Tagore says that there are two important factors of man; firstly, the physical nature which he received from evolution and secondly, the spiritual nature which makes him unique and gives to him some amount of freedom. Man's physical nature includes his biological, physiological and psychological aspects and spiritual nature is the realization of the Divinity, the real nature that is present in that physical nature. The physical nature of man is called the finite aspect and infinite aspect is his spiritual nature, according to Rabindranath Tagore. It is through the infinite aspect of man that impels him to go beyond. Thus, he says that the best way of describing man's nature is that man is finite-infinite. He combines himself the physical nature with the spiritual nature. "He is earth's child but heaven's heir." Tagore describes this clearly through these lines, "At one pole of my being I am one with the stocks and stones. There I have to acknowledge the rule of universal law. That is where the foundation of my existence lies... But, at the other pole of my being I am separate from all. There I have broken through the cordon of equality and stand alone as an individual."

Nothing is impossible for man. He may attempt and fail, but even

failures prompt him to make renew efforts. Again, this spiritual nature of man along with the different functions of the mind like feeling, memory, imagination etc., reveal some power or energy that cannot be valued by his biological functions. This energy is named as Surplus energy or Creative energy by Tagore with the help of which man can employ for cultivating knowledge for the sake of knowledge, to give a shape to man's civilization, makes man conscious of his own self, or he can utilise his surplus energy in different artistic creations.

Man is aware of the fact that he is not only a physical being, so that he is to transcend his physical nature, to develop his inherent spirituality where he will have full freedom of creation, where he will come in touch with the infinite. Rabindranath Tagore does not agree with the thinkers who do not believe in the reality of the finite self. He says that the finite self represents the self which lives and moves in the world. "Tagore says that a rejection of the finite self will naturally mean a rejection of the Infinite self also, because it is in and through the finite that the Infinite is sought to be realised. If the finite self is rejected, self would become content less and hence there would not remain any basis even for the Infinite self."

Rabindranath Tagore lays emphasis on three aspects of man's finite nature. Firstly, he says that in his finite existence man shares some qualities and characteristics of the animal world. He is determined, have desire, motive, self-satisfaction attitude, some instinctive and mechanical ways of action and behaviour like other animals. Secondly, even in his finite existence man possesses certain peculiar characters that distinguish him from other living beings. Thirdly, the finite nature of man itself gives evidence of the spiritual potentialities of man. They are not always ego-centric, they aim at the realization of some social good. It also trying to transcend itself.

Like other Indian thinkers, Tagore also believes that the ultimate aim of human being is to attain perfection or self-realisation. It is the realisation of unity, the realisation of Divinity, it is the realisation of the Universal within. He emphasises on the cultivation of the divine power in Man. There is an element of divinity present in every man. If the divine elements like conscience, free will, reason etc. are used in the right way, man can bring down heaven to this earth. Man has a self-awareness,

which reveals to him the fact that he has a capacity of going beyond himself, towards higher and higher regions.

According to Tagore, death plays a distinctive role in order to attain the ultimate destiny. Normally, we all believe that death is the state where all our activities puts an end. But, Tagore maintains that death is not the end of one's life, it is not even the negation of life, and it is a positive aspect of life which gives to life a significance and a value. Man is afraid of death because he is not able to perceive its real meaning and takes it differently and putting an end to what his life stands for. But, if all are understood the real meaning of the word death, then it shall find it to be a stage that gives to life an onward direction. For Tagore, death serves another human and spiritual purpose also. It is a supreme lesson in 'giving away'. He said that life can realise its proper function only when it gives up its narrow egoistic outlook. Death gives away life itself, puts an end to whatever man considers as his 'own' in life. Thus, death may be an end of this life but, it is not the destiny of man, it is a phase, a stage of his existence. Thus, death has an essential place in the spiritual process of the extension of consciousness.

The ultimate destiny of human being is the realisation of immortality, of complete freedom. Man as a spiritual being tries to get freedom from the bondage of the world. The embodied state is a state of bondage as all its powers are body-determined. As we go on unfolding the powers and the freedom of the soul by rising above the bodily and trying to realise our essential affinity with all, we are progressing towards immortality, towards the realisation of complete freedom. This is the state in which man rises completely over his egoistic life and has a realisation of the essential unity of everything. He feels one with nature, one with everything. It enables man to rise above even the distinction between pleasure and pain, and good and evil, because these distinctions arise only when we believe in the distinction between me and thou or between mine and yours. This is the feeling of the presence of 'Him' all round, this is the realisation of Divinity and this is the ultimate human destiny. Thus, it appears that Rabindranath Tagore in his view in man tries to show that finite man is not an end in itself. Finitude of man always has an appeal to the Infinite and that can be realised in this life. His humanism is universal because it deals

with the analysis of the universal nature and creative existence of man. He believes that human beings can fulfil their potentiality and find freedom and fulfilment through love and knowledge only if they succeed in connecting their narrow self with the universal Being. The most central theme in his philosophy is the human being, his or her potential and the question of how this potential can be reached. It is the human mind that reveals the meaning and significance of things. His humanistic attitude pervades all aspects of his thoughts and his philosophy would not be completed without making a mention of his humanistic beliefs. The humanism of Tagore is the application of the belief that feeling anything as human, in the human way, a source of joy.

#### **Bibliography:**

1. Chakrabarti, Mohit: *Rabindranath Tagore: Diverse Dimension*, 1990, Atlantic Publishers & Distributors, 4215/1, Ansari Road, Darya Ganj, New Delhi-110002
2. Lal, Basant Kumar: *Contemporary Indian Philosophy*, 1978, Second Edition, Motilal Banarsidass Publishers Pvt. Ltd. Bungalow Road, Delhi- 110007
3. Raju, P. T. and Radhakrishnan, S: *The Concept of Man*, 1960, First edition, Ruskin House, George Allen & Unwin Ltd. Museum Street, London
4. Srivastava, Ram Shanker: *Contemporary India Philosophy*, 1983, Second Edition, Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers Pvt. Ltd., Post Box 5715, 54, Rani Jhansi Road, New Delhi-110055
5. Tagore, Rabindranath: *The Religion of Man*, 2017, eighth impression, Rupa Publications India Pvt. Ltd 2005, 7/16, Ansari Road, Daryaganj, New Delhi-110002
6. Tagore, Rabindranath: *Sadhana: The Realization of Life (1915)*, New York. The Macmillan Company.

#### **Articles:**

1. Anayet Hussain, F.M: "Universal Humanism of Tagore", Asian

- Journal of Social Sciences & Humanities, Vol- 4(2), May 2015.
2. Khurana, Monika: “Tagore’s Philosophy on Humanism”, International Journal of Advance Research, ISSN (o) 2395-4396, Vol- 3, Issue 4, 17.
  3. Shurma, Arup Jyoti: “Humanistic Philosophy of Tagore”, Kritike, ISSN- 1908-7330, Vol- 6, No- 1, June 2012.
  4. Aruna, M. Josephine: Tagore’s Philosophy of Life- A Study of Sadhana, Rupkatha Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities, ISSN- 0976- 2935, Vol- 2, NO- 4, 2010 (special issue on Rabindranath Tagore, edited by Amrit Sen).
  5. Rani, Anju: Humanism of Rabindranath Tagore, International Journal of English Language, Literature and Translation Studies, 2015.
  6. Hazarika, Mauchumi: Humanism in Contemporary Indian Philosophy with Special Reference to Rabindranath Tagore, International Journal of Current Research, Vol- 5, Issue 12, Dec- 2013.

## অসমীয়া শিতান

---

i. Rabindranath Tagore, *Sadhana*, p.69

ii. Basant Kumar Lal: *Contemporary Indian Philosophy*, page No. 64.

## কুৰুক্ষেত্ৰ ৰণত শ্ৰীকৃষ্ণৰ ভূমিকা

ড° অঞ্জনা চলিহা

ভাৰতবৰ্ষৰ সভ্যতা-সংস্কৃতিৰ উত্থানৰ অমৰ সাক্ষৰ বহন কৰিছে মহাকাব্য মহাভাৰতে। মহাভাৰত সম্পৰ্কে এষাৰ কথা আছে এইদৰে—

“আচক্ষু কবয়ঃ কেচিৎ সম্প্ৰতি আচক্ষতে পৰে।

আখ্যাস্যন্তি তথৈবান্যে ইতিহাসং ইমং ভূবিঃ।।

—আগতে কোনো কোনো কবিয়ে ইয়াক কৈছিল, বৰ্তমান কোনো কোনোৱে কৈ আছে, আৰু ভৱিষ্যতেও পৃথিৱীত কোনোবাই এই ইতিহাস ক’ব।”

মহাভাৰত ৰচয়িতাজনে নিজে কোৱা এষাৰ কথা, “ধৰ্মে চ অৰ্থে চ কামে চ মোক্ষে চ ভৱতৰ্ঘভঃ যৎ ইহাস্তি তৎ অন্যত্ৰ, যৎ ন ইহাস্তি তৎ ন কুত্রচিৎ।” ধৰ্ম, অৰ্থ, কাম, মোক্ষ (এই চতুৰ্গ সাধন সম্পৰ্কীয়)ৰ যি কথা এই শাস্ত্ৰত আছে, হে ভাৰতশ্ৰেষ্ঠ, তাক অন্যত পাবা, কিন্তু যি ইয়াত নাই সি অন্যত নাই—

গীতাৰ বক্তা ভগৱান শ্ৰীকৃষ্ণই মহাকাব্য মহাভাৰতৰ কৃষ্ণ। কিন্তু সেই কথাত পণ্ডিতসকলৰ মাজত যথেষ্ট তৰ্ক দেখা যায়। বহুতেই গীতাক মহাভাৰতৰ অবিচ্ছেদ্য অংগ বুলি ক’বই নোখোজে। তেখেতসকলৰ মতে মূল মহাভাৰতে গঢ় লোৱাৰ বহুত পিচত গীতাৰ অন্তৰ্ভুক্তি তাত ঘটিছে। গীতা এখন সুকীয়া স্বতন্ত্ৰ শাস্ত্ৰ। এনে সিদ্ধান্তৰ সমৰ্থনত যথেষ্ট সৰল যুক্তিকে পোৱা যায়। যিহেতুকে ইমান উচ্চ-আধ্যাত্মিক শিক্ষাৰ ধৰ্ম আৰু দৰ্শনৰ গ্ৰন্থ এখন এনে সৈন্যসমাৱেশৰ কোলাহলৰ মাজত ৰচিত হ’ব পৰাটো সম্ভৱ নহ’ব, ভাৰতবৰ্ষত তেনে অন্য তত্ত্বগধুৰ ধৰ্মদৰ্শনৰ গ্ৰন্থসমূহ ৰচিত হৈছিল ঋষিসকলৰ নিৰ্জন তপোবনতহে। তদুপৰি মহাভাৰতে বৰ্তমান একলাখ শ্লোকৰ আয়তন কেইবাবাৰো পৰিৱৰ্তন, পৰিবৰ্তন আদি ঘটাব পিচতহে পাইছে, আদিত ২৪০০০ শ্লোক হৈ আছিল, ইত্যাদি কথাইও গীতা মহাভাৰতৰ পৰা বেলেগ বুলি কোৱা কথাৰ সমৰ্থন দিয়ে। সেইদৰে মহাভাৰতৰ মূল কাহিনীভাগ বহুতেই ৰূপক বুলিহে ক’ব খোজে। সেইবিলাক কথাকে আমি যুক্তিৰ খাটিৰত সত্য বুলি মানিব পাৰো, কুৰুক্ষেত্ৰ সমৰৰ ঐতিহাসিক সত্যতাকো অস্বীকাৰ কৰিব পাৰোঁ, কিন্তু এটা কথা ক’ব খোজোঁ যে গীতাই

দিয়া শিক্ষাৰ ৰূপায়ণকে মহাকাব্যখনে দেখুৱাইছে। নানান আখ্যান উপাখ্যানেৰে মহাভাৰতে গীতাৰ তত্ত্ববোৰে ব্যাখ্যা দিছে, সেই কথাৰ উপলব্ধিও কোনো কোনো পণ্ডিতে কৰিছে আৰু আমাৰ উপলব্ধিও তেনেধৰণে অৰ্থাৎ গীতাৰ বাৰ্তাৰ ৰূপান্তৰ ঘটিছে মহাভাৰতত। মহাভাৰতৰ পটভূমি বাদ দিলে গীতাৰ কথা দুৰ্বোধ্য হ'ব।

গীতাত শ্ৰীকৃষ্ণই কোৱা বহু শ্লোকৰে উদ্ধৃতি যুগ যুগ ধৰি গ্ৰন্থবোৰে ধৰি ৰখাৰ মাজত বিশেষ এটা শ্লোকে এই উদ্ধৃতিৰ ক্ষেত্ৰত সংখ্যাধিক্য পাব- সেইটো হৈছে চতুৰ্থ অধ্যায়ৰ—

যদা যদাহি ধৰ্মস্য গ্লানিৰ্ভবতি ভাৰত  
অভূতানম্, অধৰ্মস্য তদাত্মানং সৃজামাহম্।  
পৰিত্ৰাণায় সাধুনাম্ বিনাশায় দুষ্কৃতাম্  
ধৰ্ম সংস্থাপনাৰ্থায় সম্ভবামি যুগে য়াগে।।”

এই শ্লোকতে যেন শ্ৰীকৃষ্ণই কৈ দিছিল - কি হ'ব যুদ্ধৰ পৰিণতি। ধৰ্মৰ প্ৰতীক পাণ্ডৱসকলৰ জয় হ'ব আৰু অধৰ্মৰ প্ৰতীক কৌৰৱসকলৰ পৰাজয় নিশ্চিত। মহাকাব্যখনে এই বাৰ্তাৰ ৰূপায়ণ দেখুওৱাৰ উপৰিও গীতাৰ বহু গুৰুত্বপূৰ্ণ কথা বা প্ৰত্যয়ৰ প্ৰয়োগ বাৰম্বাৰ দেখুৱায়। ৰণৰ শেষলৈ বিজেতাসকলে যুদ্ধজয়ৰ আনন্দ উৎসৱ দেখুওৱাৰ পৰিৱৰ্তে বৈৰাগ্য বা “নিষ্কামকৰ্ম”ৰ আদৰ্শহে দেখুৱালে। ৰণজয়তে কাহিনীৰ সামৰণি নঘটাৰ মৰ্হৰ্জিনে কথা আৰু পিচলৈ বহুত টানিছে, আৰু ইমান ঘোৰতৰ যুদ্ধৰ বৰ্ণনা থকা শাস্ত্ৰখনৰ ফল “শান্তিপৰ্ব” বুলিছে, অৰ্থাৎ শাস্ত্ৰখনে যুদ্ধ শিকোৱাৰ পৰিৱৰ্তে শান্তিৰ বাৰ্তাহে বিলাইছে। তাকে বুজিব নোৱাৰি অৰ্জুনে কৃষ্ণক গীতাত সুধিছিল, “লক্ষ্য যদি পৰা শান্তি, তেনেহ'লে মোক কিয় এই ঘোৰকৰ্মত নমাৰ খুজিছা?” পাণ্ডৱপক্ষৰ প্ৰধান নায়ক যুধিষ্ঠিৰক ৰাজ্যলাভৰ পিচত পিচলৈ নিষ্কামকৰ্মৰ আদৰ্শেৰে চালিত হোৱা পোৱা যায়—স্বৰ্গাৰোহণৰ সময়ত তেওঁ হৈ পৰিছিল গীতাৰ দ্বিতীয় অধ্যায়ৰ সেই “স্থিতপ্ৰজ্ঞ”জন—“সুখেষু বিগতস্পৃহ, দুঃখেষু অনুদ্ভিগ্নমনা”। গীতাৰ অন্য এক শিক্ষা “স্বধৰ্ম”, মহাকাব্যখনৰ বহুজন নায়কৰ মুখতে শুনা যায়। ভীষ্মৰ মুখত শুনা গ'ল যেতিয়া পৰশুৰামে ভীষ্মক কৈছিল কাশী ৰাজকন্যা অম্বাক বিয়া কৰাবলৈ, ভীষ্মই কৈছিল যে স্বৰ্গৰ ৰজা ইন্দ্ৰ আহি ক'লেও তেওঁ “স্বধৰ্ম”ৰ পৰা আঁতৰিব নোৱাৰে। ভীষ্মৰ বাবে ইয়াত স্বধৰ্ম হ'ল তেওঁ চিৰকুমাৰ হৈ থকাৰ প্ৰতিজ্ঞা পূৰণ কৰা।

“স্বধৰ্ম”ৰ কথা ধৰ্মব্যাপ্য, ৰজা জৰাসন্ধ আদিৰ মুখতো শুনা যায় যে তেওঁলোকে স্বধৰ্ম পালন কৰি আছে, একো অধৰ্ম কৰা নাই।

সেইদৰে গীতাত বৰ্ণ ধৰ্মই এক বেলেগ অৰ্থব্যঞ্জনা লাভ কৰিছে। কৃষ্ণই কৈছিল,

“চাতুৰ্বৰ্ণং ময়াসৃষ্টং গুণকৰ্ম বিভাগসঃ”—বৰ্ণ ইয়াত জন্ম ভিত্তিক নহয়, গুণ আৰু কৰ্মভিত্তিকহে। এই কথাষাৰ ব্যাখ্যা আমি যুধিষ্ঠিৰৰ মুখত শুনো অজগৰ (নছচ) যুধিষ্ঠিৰৰ সংবাদত য'ত যুধিষ্ঠিৰে “জন্মতে ব্ৰাহ্মণ নহয়, গুণৰ দ্বাৰাহে হয়” কথাষাৰ সম্পৰ্কে কৈছে।

অৰ্জুনৰ ৰথৰ সাৰথিজন ঈশ্বৰ নহয় মানুহহে বুলিও হয়তো বহুতেই ক'ব। বংকিমচন্দ্ৰইও তেওঁৰ “কৃষ্ণচৰিত্ৰ”ত কৃষ্ণৰ ঈশ্বৰত্ব অস্বীকাৰ কৰি তেওঁক এজন “আদৰ্শ মানুহ” বুলিহে কৈছে। কুৰুক্ষেত্ৰৰণত কৃষ্ণৰ ভূমিকা অকল যুদ্ধৰ বৰ্ণনা থকা পৰ্বকেইটাত সীমিত নহয়, আগৰ পৰা পিচলৈকে আছে। অৱশ্যে কৃষ্ণৰ আগজীৱনৰ কথা মহাভাৰতত নাই। ভীষ্ম, দ্ৰোণ, কৰ্ণ, কৌৰৱ, পাণ্ডৱসকলৰ জন্মৰ কথা, শিশুকালৰ কথা থকাৰ দৰে কৃষ্ণৰ সেই মাধুৰ্য্যভৰা গকুল-বৃন্দাবনৰ লীলা মহাভাৰতত বৰ্ণিত হোৱা নাই। প্ৰথম তেওঁক দেখা পোৱা গৈছে পাঞ্চালৰাজ্যত, দ্ৰুপদ নন্দিনীৰ স্নায়স্বৰ সভাত আৰু জনা গ'ল তালৈ কৃষ্ণ আৰু বলোৰাম পঞ্চপাণ্ডৱক লগ পোৱাৰ আশাৰেই গৈছিল। অৰ্জুনে লক্ষ্যভেদ কৰি দ্ৰৌপদীক লাভ কৰাৰ পিছত হোৱা ৰজাসকলৰ লগত বিবাদৰ কৃষ্ণই মধ্যস্থতা কৰি মিতমাত কৰায়, পেহীয়েক কুন্তীক দেখা কৰি দ্বাৰকালৈ যায়গৈ। পঞ্চপতিৰ লগত দ্ৰৌপদীৰ ভাগ বটোৱাৰা আদিত তেওঁ উপস্থিত নাছিল। কিন্তু সভাপৰ্বত কৃষ্ণ, যুধিষ্ঠিৰ, অৰ্জুন আদিৰ বাবে অপৰিহাৰ্য হৈ পৰিছে।

মহাকাব্যখনৰ নায়কসকলৰ ভিতৰত দুৰ্যোধন বুলিলেই নিন্দনীয়, যুধিষ্ঠিৰ বুলিলেই প্ৰশংসনীয়, আৰু কৃষ্ণক পোৱা গ'ল সদায় তেওঁৰ লগত মহিমা কীৰ্তন জড়িত হৈ থকা। কুৰুক্ষেত্ৰ ৰণত অৰ্জুনৰ ৰথৰ সাৰথিজনে পালন কৰা ভূমিকাৰ লগত তেওঁ গীতাত দিয়া উপদেশৰ সংগতি নাই বুলি কিন্তু ক'ব নোৱাৰি। মহাকাব্যখনৰ সামগ্ৰিক শিক্ষাই হৈছে ইন্দ্ৰিয়সম্ভোগ বা পাৰ্থিৱ সুখৰ প্ৰতি অনাসক্তিৰে, মানসিক সাম্যৰস্থৰ এক উচ্চতৰ স্তৰলৈ আৰোহণ কৰা। মহাভাৰতৰ কিছুমান আখ্যান উপাখ্যানে যে গীতাৰ তত্ত্বকে ব্যাখ্যা কৰিছে তাত সন্দেহ নাই। চতুৰ্থ অধ্যায়ৰ ১১ নং শ্লোকত কৈছে,

“যে যথা মা প্ৰপদ্যন্তে তং তথৈব ভজামি অহম্।  
মম বৰ্ণানুৱৰ্তন্তে মনুষ্যাঃ পাৰ্থ সৰ্বশঃ।।”

অৰ্থাৎ, “যি মোক যেনেকৈ ভাৱে তেওঁক-মই তেনেদৰেই গ্ৰহণ কৰো, সকলো দিশতে মানুহে মোৰ পথকেই অনুসৰণ কৰে।” মহাকাব্যখনত দেখা গ'ল- কুন্তী, অৰ্জুন, বিদূৰ, দ্ৰৌপদী আদিয়ে মিত্ৰভাৱে বিচৰা কৃষ্ণ সদায় তেওঁলোকৰ মিত্ৰ হৈ থাকিল আৰু দুৰ্যোধন, শিশুপালহঁতে শত্ৰুতাৰ ভাৱেৰে লৈ তেনে প্ৰত্যুত্তৰেই পালে। এনেই অৰ্জুনৰ দৰেই শিশুপালো আছিল কৃষ্ণৰ পেহীয়েকৰ পুতেক ভাই। যুধিষ্ঠিৰৰ ৰাজসূয় যজ্ঞত

ভীষ্ম যুধিষ্ঠিৰ আদিয়ে কৃষ্ণক প্ৰথম অৰ্ঘ্য দিওৱা কথাটোত শিশুপালে ঘোৰ প্ৰতিবাদ কৰি কৃষ্ণক বহুত ককৰ্থনা কৰিছিল। কৃষ্ণই তেওঁক বধ কৰি যুধিষ্ঠিৰৰ ৰাজসূয় যজ্ঞৰ সম্পাদন নিষ্কণ্টক কৰে। সেইদৰে কৃষ্ণই তেওঁৰ লগত আগৰে পৰা শত্ৰুতা কৰি থকা মগধৰাজ জৰাসন্ধক ছল কৰি ভীমৰ দ্বাৰা বধ কৰায়। জৰাসন্ধই শিৱপূজাত বলি দিবলৈ বন্দী কৰি থোৱা ৮৬ জন ৰজাক মুকলি কৰি দিয়ে। সেই ৰজাসকল নিজ নিজ ৰাজ্যলৈ উলটি গৈ যুধিষ্ঠিৰৰ ৰাজসূয় যজ্ঞলৈ পাৰ্যমানে সহায় আগবঢ়ায়। শ্ৰীকৃষ্ণই তেওঁৰ মিত্ৰ পাণ্ডৱশ্ৰেষ্ঠ জ্যেষ্ঠজন যুধিষ্ঠিৰক ৰাজাধিৰাজ পতাৰ কামতো গীতাৰ বাণীৰে সাৰ্থকতা দেখুৱাইছিল। অৰ্জুনে গীতাত “শিষ্যস্তেহহম্ সাধি মাং তাং প্ৰপন্নম” বুলি কৃষ্ণত শৰণ লৈ যেতিয়াই তেওঁৰ শিষ্যত্ব গ্ৰহণ কৰিলে তেতিয়া অৰ্জুনক সকলো পাপৰ পৰা ৰক্ষা কৰাৰ দায়িত্বও কৃষ্ণই ল’লে।

মহাভাৰতৰ মোক্ষধৰ্মৰ নাৰায়ণীয় খণ্ডত আকৌ গীতাৰ সাৰাংশ আছে য’ত নাৰায়ণে নাৰদক দিয়া উপদেশৰ কথা পাওঁ, যিখিনি নাৰদে ব্যাসক দিছিল। গীতাৰ—

“ইমং বিৱস্বতে যোগং প্ৰোক্তবান অহম্ অব্যয়ম্।  
বিৱস্বান মনবে প্ৰাছ মনুৰিক্ষাকৱেহৱব্ৰীং।।” IV ১

ভগৱানে বিৱস্বতক, বিৱস্বতে মনুক, মনুৱে ইক্ষাকুক কোৱা এই যোগৰ ধাৰাটো নাৰায়ণীয় খণ্ডত আৰু অলপ দীঘলকৈ টনা আছে। তদুপৰি ভীষ্মই দুৰ্যোধনৰ আগত কৃষ্ণৰ মহিমাৰ্কাৰ্তন কৰোতেও আমি গীতাৰ কৃষ্ণকে দেখা পাওঁ।

যুদ্ধ নিশ্চিত বুলি জানি অৰ্জুন কৃষ্ণৰ সহায় ল’বলৈ দ্বাৰকালৈ গৈছিল। গৈ দেখে দুৰ্যোধন একে উদ্দেশ্যতে আগতেই গৈ শয্যাত নিদ্ৰিত কৃষ্ণৰ মূৰৰ শিতানত আসন এখনত বহি আছে। অৰ্জুন গৈ বহে কৃষ্ণৰ ভৰি পথানত। কৃষ্ণৰ নিদ্ৰাও আছিল আচলতে কপট নিদ্ৰাহে, টোপনিৰ ভাও ধৰিছিল, স্বাভাৱিকতে সাৰ পালে প্ৰথমে ভৰিৰ ফালে থকাজনক দেখিব। অৰ্জুনক দেখি মাত লগায়। কথা পাতোতে দুৰ্যোধনেও নিজৰ উপস্থিতিৰ জাননী দি মাত লগায় যে তেওঁ অৰ্জুনতকৈ আগতেই আহি বহি আছে, আৰু অহাৰ উদ্দেশ্য দুয়োজনে কয়। কৃষ্ণই কয় যে যিহেতুকে অৰ্জুন কনিষ্ঠ সেয়ে তেওঁ প্ৰথমে অৰ্জুনক নিৰ্বাচনৰ সুবিধা দি সুধিব, এক পক্ষই পাব সাত অক্ষৌহিনী নাৰায়ণী সেনা আৰু আনপক্ষই পাব অস্ত্ৰহীন কৃষ্ণক। যুদ্ধত তেওঁ অস্ত্ৰ নধৰে বুলি সংকল্প লৈছে।

অৰ্জুনে ক’লে, “মোক তোমাকহে লাগে” আৰু নাৰায়ণী সেনা পালে দুৰ্যোধনে। দুৰ্যোধন অতি সন্তোষেৰে উলটিল, অৰ্জুনৰ মুৰ্খামি দেখি তেওঁ অধিক সন্তুষ্ট।

ইয়াৰ আগতেও কিছুমান ঘটনাত শ্ৰীকৃষ্ণৰ যুদ্ধসম্পৰ্কীয় ভূমিকাৰ কথা পোৱা যায়। বাৰবছৰ বনবাসত পাণ্ডৱসকল থাকোতে কৃষ্ণ পাণ্ডৱ শিৱিৰ ওলাইছিলগৈ আৰু

তেওঁলোকক উলটি গৈ যুদ্ধ কৰিব লগা হ’লে কৰিব লগা কামৰ কিছুমান প্ৰস্তুতি শিকাইছিল। তাৰ মাজতে এবাৰ দুৰ্যোধনে চক্ৰান্ত কৰি দুৰ্বাসা ঋষিক সশিষ্যে পাণ্ডৱৰ আতিথ্য গ্ৰহণৰ বাবে পঠাইছিল, ভাবিছিল আতিথ্য দিব নোৱাৰি দুৰ্বাসাৰ শাপত পাণ্ডৱ নিৰ্মূল হ’লে যুদ্ধ নকৰাকৈয়ে তেওঁ নিষ্কণ্টক হ’ব। যুধিষ্ঠিৰৰ উপাসনাত সন্তুষ্ট হৈ সূৰ্যই দ্ৰৌপদীক দিয়া অক্ষয় ৰক্ষন পাত্ৰৰ আহাৰে সহস্ৰজনক খুৱাব পাৰিলেও দ্ৰৌপদীয়ে খোৱাৰ পিছত আৰু নোৱাৰে। সেই কথা জানি দুৰ্যোধনে দুৰ্বাসাক পলমকৈ যাবলৈ কৈছিল যাতে দ্ৰৌপদীয়ে খোৱাৰ পিচত অতিথি শুশ্ৰূষা কৰিবলৈ অসমৰ্থ অৱস্থাত অগ্নিশৰ্মা ভোকাতুৰ ঋষিজন পায়গৈ। দুৰ্বাসা আহিব বুলি খবৰ পাই যুধিষ্ঠিৰ, দ্ৰৌপদীয়ে কৃষ্ণক স্মৰণ কৰে আৰু কৃষ্ণ গৈ দ্ৰৌপদীৰ চৰ্মৰ অৱশিষ্ট অন্নৰ খুদ কণ খাই ভোক গুচাৰ উগাৰ মাৰিলত সিফালে দুৰ্বাসাৰো সশিষ্যে উদৰ পূৰণ হয়। আহাৰৰ আৰু প্ৰয়োজন নাই বুলি পাণ্ডৱ শিৱিৰলৈ নাহিল। তেতিয়াও শ্ৰীকৃষ্ণই তেওঁৰ অলৌকিক মহিমাৰে ভক্ত পাণ্ডৱকে ৰক্ষা কৰে।

গীতাৰ আন এষাৰ কথা—

“ত্ৰিবিধং নৰকস্যইদং দ্বাৰং নাশনমাত্মন।

কামঃ ক্ৰোধস্তথা লোভস্তস্মাদেতদ্ৰয়ং তাজেং।।”

কাম, ক্ৰোধ, লোভক নৰকৰ দুৱাৰ বুলিছে, ৰজোগুণৰ সন্ততি বুলিছে, মহাভাৰতেও তেনে কথাই শিকাইছে, বনপৰ্বত যুধিষ্ঠিৰে দ্ৰৌপদীক কৈছে—

“ক্ৰোধে পাপ, ক্ৰোধে তাপ, ক্ৰোধে কুলক্ষয়।

ক্ৰোধে সৰ্বনাশ হয় ক্ৰোধে অপচয়।।

জপ-তপ সন্যাস ক্ৰোধীৰ অকাৰণ।

ৰজোগুণে ক্ৰোধী বিধি কৰিল সৃজন।।

(কাশীদাসী মহাভাৰত, ৩৯০ পৃষ্ঠা, অক্ষয় লাইব্ৰেৰী,

বেণী মাধৱ শীল সম্পাদিত, ১৩৯৩ সাল)

পাণ্ডৱসকলৰ বাৰবছৰ বনবাসৰ পিচত অজ্ঞাতবাসৰ বছৰটো বিৰাটৰজাৰ ঘৰত পাৰ কৰোতেও কৃষ্ণ তালৈ গৈছিল, কৃষ্ণৰ ভাগিন, অৰ্জুনৰ পুত্ৰ, অভিমন্যুৰ লগত বিৰাট কন্যা উত্তৰাৰ বিবাহ সম্পন্ন কৰে আৰু আলোচনাত অংশগ্ৰহণ কৰি কৃষ্ণই কৌৰৱৰ লগত সন্ধিৰ বাবে দূত পঠোৱাৰ পৰামৰ্শ আগবঢ়ায়। পাণ্ডৱৰ ন্যায় প্ৰাপ্তি অৰ্দ্ধৰাজ্য দি দিলে আৰু মিছাতে যুদ্ধৰ প্ৰয়োজন নাই। দ্ৰুপদ ৰজাৰ পুৰোহিত গৈছিল সেই প্ৰস্তাৱ লৈ, কিন্তু দুৰ্যোধনে নামানিলে। তাৰ পিছত কৃষ্ণই আকৌ নিজে দূত হৈ যাবলৈ ওলাল। যুধিষ্ঠিৰে ভাল নাপাইছিল, কৃষ্ণক কিজানি অধৰ্মী দুৰ্যোধনহঁতে অপমান কৰে বুলি।



কিন্তু কৃষ্ণই কৈছিল যে ভৱিষ্যতৰ মানুহে কিজানি মোকেই দোষ দিয়ে, কৃষ্ণ থাকিও কিয় যুদ্ধখন বন্ধ কৰিবলৈ চেষ্টা নকৰিলে বুলি। এইখিনিতে কৃষ্ণচৰিত্ৰৰ এটা দিশ মনলৈ আহিছে যে সৰ্বশক্তিমান হৈও তেওঁ লোককলংকৰ কথাটোৰ পৰা আঁতৰি থাকিবলৈ চায়। স্যামন্তহৰণ কীৰ্ত্তনতো সত্ৰাজিতে তেওঁৰ স্যামন্ত মণি হৰণ কৰাৰ কলংক দিয়াত সেই কথা যে মিছা তাক দেখুৱাবলৈ মণি বিচাৰি আনিছিল।

যুধিষ্ঠিৰে ক'লে, “যোৱা যদি, আমাক অৰ্ধৰাজ্য নিদিলে পাঁচখন গাঁও দিলেই হ'ব বুলি ক'বা।” সেইদৰে কৃষ্ণই গৈ কৈছিল আৰু দাস্তিক দুৰ্যোধনে পাঁচখন গাঁওহে নালাগে বেজীৰ আগৰ মাটিও নিদিও বুলি ক'লে। কৃষ্ণক বন্দী কৰিবলৈকে চক্ৰান্ত কৰিছিল। গীতাত বিশ্বৰূপ দেখুওৱাৰ দৰে এইবাৰো তেওঁ অলৌকিক ঐশ্বৰ্য্য প্ৰকাশ কৰি দেখুৱালে যি ৰূপ আনকি অন্ধৰজাইও দেখা পাইছিল।

কৃষ্ণ উলটি গৈ পাণ্ডৱসকলক যুদ্ধ যাত্ৰালৈ সাজু হ'বলৈ কৈ দ্বাৰকালৈ যায় আৰু সময়ত যদুবংশৰ সাত্যকী আদি ভালেকেইজন বীৰেৰে সৈতে আহি কুৰুক্ষেত্ৰ পায়হি। শ্ৰীকৃষ্ণ অৰ্জুনৰ বথৰ সাৰথি হ'ল আৰু পাণ্ডৱসকলে গম পালে যে কৌৰৱৰ সেনাপতি হ'ব অশ্বথামা। ভীষ্ম আৰু দ্ৰোণৰ অৰ্জুনৰ প্ৰতি বিশেষ স্নেহ আছে বুলি সেনাপতিৰূপে ল'বলৈ দুৰ্যোধনে তেওঁলোকৰ আনুগত্যত সন্দেহ কৰিছিল আৰু দ্ৰোণাচাৰ্যৰ পুত্ৰ অশ্বথামা, যিজন চিৰঞ্জীৱি বুলি খ্যাত, তেওঁকে সেনাপতি পাতে। সেই কথা শুনি যুধিষ্ঠিৰ বিষণ্ণ হৈ পৰিছিল, মৃত্যুহীন সেনাপতিয়ে কৌৰৱৰ জয় নিশ্চিত কৰিব বুলি। সেই কথা শুনি শ্ৰীকৃষ্ণই যুধিষ্ঠিৰক নিশ্চিত থাকিবলৈ কৈ অৰ্জুনক লগত লৈ বিনা অস্ত্ৰে এপাক কৌৰৱ শিৱিৰৰ পৰা আহিব খুজিলে। যুধিষ্ঠিৰৰ অনুমতি লৈ গৈ কৌৰৱ শিৱিৰত মাজৰাতি সোমাই গ'ল আৰু তাত ক'লেগৈ যে মোক যুধিষ্ঠিৰে আকৌ পঠাইছে, যুদ্ধ বন্ধ কৰি দুই পৰিয়ালৰ সকলোটি মিলাপ্ৰীতিৰে থাকিব লাগে আৰু অশ্বথামাক লগে লগেই মাতি আনি, “যুধিষ্ঠিৰে কি কৈছে তুমি মন দি শুনা”, বুলি তেওঁৰ হাতত ধৰি কাণত ফুচফুচাই ক'লে, “ধানত চাউল থাকে পতানত কি থাকে কোৱা, অন্নই সকলোকে জীয়াই ৰাখে।” আকৌ মূৰ দাঙি ভীষ্মলৈ চাই ক'লে, “মই দূত হৈ আহিছোঁ, দুয়ো ঘৰে মিত্ৰতাৰে থাকিব লাগে।” আকৌ অশ্বথামাক আলিঙ্গন কৰি কাণে কাণে ফুচফুচাই ক'লে, “ধানত চাউল থাকে, পতানত একো নাই, অন্নই সকলো।” লগে লগে মূৰ তুলি দুৰ্যোধনক ক'লে, “ৰাজ্য দিবা বুলিয়েই আমি দুজন আহিছিলোঁ, দিব নোৱাৰিলে আৰু কি কৰিবা, যুদ্ধই হ'ব।” আকৌ অশ্বথামাক চাপৰি গৈ কাণত মুখ লগাই ক'লে আগৰ সেই ধান আৰু পতানৰ কথাষাৰ—“ধানত চাউল থাকে বুলিয়েই সকলোৱে জানে, পতানত কি আছে সেইটো কিয় নোকোৱা, বাৰু যাওঁ” বুলি কৃষ্ণ,

অৰ্জুন যাবলৈ ওলাল, দুৰ্যোধনে ক'লে, “ধৰ্মৰাজক কোৱাগৈ প্ৰভাততে যুদ্ধ হ'ব। দুইজন যোৱাৰ পিচত দুৰ্যোধনে অশ্বথামাক খুবকৈ সোধে, কাণে কাণে কৃষ্ণই কি কৈছিল। অশ্বথামাই কৃষ্ণই কোৱা কথাষাৰ ক'লত দুৰ্যোধনে কোনোমতেই বিশ্বাস নকৰি অতি বেয়া শব্দেৰে ককৰ্থনা কৰে, এই কপটীয়া ব্ৰাহ্মণ সেনাপতিৰ যোগ্য নহয়, ই কথা লুকুৱাইছে, শত্ৰু পক্ষৰ লগত মিত্ৰিৰালি কৰিছে ইত্যাদি বুলি তেওঁক সেনাপতি ভাঙি দলে বলে গৈ ভীষ্মক সেনাপতি বৰণ কৰে। এইদৰে এক সামান্য কামেৰেই কৃষ্ণই দুৰ্যোধনৰ মনত সন্দেহৰ বীজ সুমাই দি যুধিষ্ঠিৰৰ শংকা দূৰ কৰি অমৰ বীৰজনক সেনাপতি ভাঙিলে। কৃষ্ণক ঈশ্বৰ বুলি নমনা সকলোও এই প্ৰসংগত তেওঁৰ বিচক্ষণতাক মানিবই লাগিব, ৰাজনীতি দক্ষ, কূটনীতিজ্ঞ, চতুৰ ব্যক্তিজন আছিল এজন মনস্তত্ত্ববিদ যি ভালদৰেই জানিছিল যে ব্যক্তি এজনৰ মিত্ৰৰ লগত যদি শত্ৰু পক্ষই হলিগলি কৰে বা গোপনে কথা পাতে তেতিয়া সেই ব্যক্তিৰ মিত্ৰতাত ই পক্ষৰ সন্দেহ হ'বই।

পিচদিনা ভীষ্মৰ সেনাপতিত্বত কৌৰৱ পক্ষৰ লগত ৰণ দিবলৈ অহা মহাৰথী অৰ্জুনৰ বথৰ সাৰথিৰ ভূমিকাত শ্ৰীকৃষ্ণক দেখা গ'ল।

অৰ্জুনে কৃষ্ণক বথখন দুইপক্ষৰ মাজত ৰাখিবলৈ কৈছিল যাতে তেওঁ সমবেত যুঁজাৰসকলোকে দেখা পায়। কৃষ্ণই সেইমতে অৰ্জুনৰ দৃষ্টিলৈ গোটেই যুদ্ধক্ষেত্ৰখন আনি দিয়ে। অৰ্জুন বিষণ্ণ হৈ যুদ্ধ নকৰো বুলি গাণ্ডীৰ পেলাই দিয়া অৱস্থাতে কৃষ্ণই ভগৱদ্গীতাৰ উপদেশেৰে অৰ্জুনক যুদ্ধত অৱতীৰ্ণ হোৱাৰ মানসিকতা আনি দিয়ে। কৃষ্ণই যুদ্ধৰ পৰিৱৰ্তে শান্তিয়েই বিচাৰি আছিল, কিন্তু কাপুৰুষৰ দৰে অন্যায়ে, অধৰ্ম, সহ্য কৰাও অন্যায়ে বুলি শিক্ষা দিয়ে। অন্তৰৰ বিশুদ্ধতাৰে ফলাকাংক্ষ্যা ত্যাগেৰে ক্ষত্ৰিয়ৰ স্বধৰ্ম পালন কৰাৰ উপদেশ দিয়ে।

ইয়াৰ পিছত ওঁঠৰ দিনৰ যুদ্ধত কৃষ্ণক দেখা গ'ল সম্পূৰ্ণ পাণ্ডৱৰ পৰিত্ৰাণকৰ্তাৰ ৰূপত। ককাক ভীষ্মৰ প্ৰতি অন্তৰৰ স্নেহ-ভক্তিৰ দুৰ্বলতাৰে অৰ্জুনে ভীষ্মক বধ কৰাৰ পৰিৱৰ্তে ভীষ্মৰ বীৰত্বত অৰ্জুন বধ হ'ব বুলি আশংকা কৰি, এদিন কৃষ্ণই চক্ৰ লৈ ভীষ্মক আক্ৰমণ কৰিবই খুজিছিল, অৰ্জুনে হাতত থাপ মাৰি ধৰি কৃষ্ণই অস্ত্ৰ নধৰোঁ বোলা সংকল্প সোঁৱৰালে। দুৰ্দান্ত বীৰ গংগাপুত্ৰ ভীষ্ম, যি পৰশুৰামকো পৰাস্ত কৰি থৈছিল, কোনোমতেই নিহত নহ'ব যেন দেখি কৃষ্ণই পৰামৰ্শ দিলে পাণ্ডৱসকলক ভীষ্মৰ মৃত্যু কেনেকৈ হ'ব ভীষ্মকে সুধিবলৈ। ভীষ্মই ক'লে যে নপুংসকৰ আগত তেওঁ অস্ত্ৰ নধৰে। ইতিমধ্যে অস্বাই তেওঁক ভীষ্মই বিয়া নকৰোৱাৰ প্ৰতিশোধ ল'বলৈ তপস্যাবে দ্বিতীয় জন্মত দ্ৰুপদ ৰজাৰ ঘৰত নপুংসক ৰূপে শিখণ্ডী নামলৈ জন্ম লৈছিল। কৃষ্ণই শিখণ্ডীক আনি ভীষ্মৰ আগত বহুৱায়। ভীষ্মই ধনু শৰ এৰে আৰু সেই সুবিধা গ্ৰহণ

কৰিবলৈ কৃষ্ণই অৰ্জুনক প্ৰৰোচিত কৰি ভীষ্ম বধ কৰায়।

তাৰ পিছত দ্ৰোণ পৰ্বতো দেখা যায়, যেতিয়া কৃষ্ণই দেখিলে যে কৌৰৱ পাণ্ডৱক অস্ত্ৰবিদ্যাৰ শিক্ষাদাতা গুৰুজনক কোনোমতেই পৰাস্ত কৰিব পৰা নাই, ভীম, অৰ্জুনো আন কি মূৰ্চা যোৱাৰ অৱস্থা তেতিয়া শ্ৰীকৃষ্ণই লোৱা ভূমিকা কেনে আছিল? তেওঁ ক'লে,—

“শুনা দ্ৰোণ, আমাৰ বচন—

অশ্বখামা পুত্ৰ তব আজি হয়ে পৰাভৱ  
ভীম হস্তে হইল নিধন।।

(পৃঃ ৮২২ কাশীদাসী মহাভাৰত)

দ্ৰোণাচাৰ্য্য অস্ত্ৰ হৈ পৰে আৰু কয় যে অশ্বখামা “চিৰঞ্জীৱী” বুলি জন্মতে ব্যাসে কৈছিল, ব্যাসৰ বচন লৰচৰ হ'ব নোৱাৰে। কৃষ্ণই আকৌ ক'লে যে ভীমে অশ্বখামাক বধ কৰিলে, হয় নে নহয় ভীমক সোধা। মই মিছা কোৱা নাই, কৃষ্ণই মিছা কোৱা নাই মানে অশ্বখামাক ভীমে মৰাটো সঁচা, কিন্তু সেই অশ্বখামা আছিল ৰজা ভগদত্তৰ হাতীৰ নামহে। তেতিয়া দ্ৰোণাচাৰ্য্যই সত্যবাদী, ধৰ্মৰাজ যুধিষ্ঠিৰক মাতি সেই কথা ক'বলৈ ক'লে, যে আপুনি মিছা ক'ব নালাগে। সঁচা কথাই ক'ব এইদৰে, “অশ্বখামা হত ইতি গজ” যুধিষ্ঠিৰে ক'ব নোখোজাত ভীমে কয়গৈ, “মোৰ হাতত আজি অশ্বখামা নিহত হ'ল।” দ্ৰোণই কয়, যুধিষ্ঠিৰে ক'লেহে বিশ্বাস কৰিব। কৃষ্ণই যুধিষ্ঠিৰক টানকৈ ক'লে, “অশ্বখামা হত ইতি গজ”, বুলি ক'লে মিছা কোৱা নহয়, আৰু তেনে নকৰিলে দ্ৰোণৰ হাতত পাণ্ডৱ শেষ হ'ব। যুধিষ্ঠিৰে তেতিয়া সেইদৰে কয়গৈ। দ্ৰোণই কেইবাবাৰো সুধি যুধিষ্ঠিৰৰ পৰা একে উত্তৰ পাই আৰু ইফালে “ইতিগজ” উচ্চাৰণ কৰোতে ভীমে (কৃষ্ণৰ নিৰ্দেশতে) বাৰে বাৰে বাদ্য বজাই দিয়ে, “ইতি গজ” শব্দ দ্ৰোণৰ কাণলৈ নগ'ল। পুত্ৰশোকত দ্ৰোণই কান্দিবলৈ ধৰিলে, চকুৰ পানী ধনুৰ গুণত পৰি সৰ্পৰ আকৃতি লয়, কৃষ্ণই অৰ্জুনক কয়—সেয়া সাপে খুটিব, সাপদাল মাৰা, অৰ্জুনে কাঁড় মাৰে, কাঁড় দ্ৰোণৰ ডিঙিত লাগে, দ্ৰোণ অচেতন হৈ ৰথত পৰি যায় আৰু সেই সুযোগতে দ্ৰুপদপুত্ৰ ধৃষ্টদ্যুম্নই তৰোৱাল লৈ ৰথত উঠি দ্ৰোণৰ শিৰচ্ছেদ কৰে। (দ্ৰোণ আৰু দ্ৰুপদৰ পুৰণিকালৰ শত্ৰুতাতে দ্ৰুপদে যজ্ঞ কৰি দ্ৰোণহস্তা পুত্ৰ কামনা কৰি যজ্ঞস্থলীতে ধৃষ্টদ্যুম্নক লাভ কৰিছিল)।

দ্ৰোণপৰ্বতে কৌৰৱৰ সপ্তৰথীয়ে অভিমন্যুক অন্যায়াভাৱে বধ কৰাৰ প্ৰতিশোধ ল'বলৈ অৰ্জুনে প্ৰতিজ্ঞা কৰিছিল, সপ্তৰথীৰ অন্যতম প্ৰধান ৰূপে শিৱৰ পৰা এদিনৰ বাবে পাণ্ডৱক পৰাস্ত কৰাৰ বৰ লৈ বেছত ভীম আদিক সোমাবলৈ নিদি বাট বন্ধ কৰি

ৰখা দুৰ্যোধনৰ ভনী জেঁৱাই জয়দ্ৰথক সূৰ্যাস্তৰ আগত বধ কৰাৰ। জয়দ্ৰথ লুকাই আছিল, বেলি মাৰ গ'লে জয়দ্ৰথক বধ কৰিব নোৱাৰিলে অৰ্জুনে আত্মহত্যা কৰিব। তেতিয়াও পাণ্ডৱমিত্ৰ কৃষ্ণই তেওঁক ঐশ্বৰিক মহিমাৰে অসময়তে বেলিটো ঢাকি আন্ধাৰ কৰি দিয়ে। অৰ্জুনৰ আসন্ন মৃত্যু দৰ্শন কৰাৰ আনন্দত জয়দ্ৰথ ওলাই আহে—অৰ্জুনে জয়দ্ৰথক বধ কৰে, কৃষ্ণই ঢাকি থোৱা বেলিটো উলিয়াই দি সূৰ্যাস্তৰ ভ্ৰম আঁতৰ কৰিছিল।

দ্ৰোণৰ মৃত্যুৰ পিছত কৰ্ণ পৰ্ব। কৰ্ণৰ প্ৰতিজ্ঞা- অৰ্জুনক বধ কৰা। কৰ্ণৰ সমান বীৰ নাই- জন্মতে বুকুত অভেদ্য কবচ আৰু কাণত অলৌকিক শক্তিৰ কুণ্ডল আছিল। অৰ্জুনক বধ কৰিবলৈ প্ৰতিজ্ঞা কৰি থোৱা কৰ্ণৰ পৰা অৰ্জুনৰ পিতৃ ইন্দ্ৰ দেৱতাই ইতিমধ্যে কবচ আৰু কুণ্ডল দান ভিক্ষা মাগি নিছিল দাতা কৰ্ণৰ পৰা। কিন্তু কৰ্ণৰ পিতৃ সূৰ্য দেৱতাৰ নিৰ্দেশত কৰ্ণই ইন্দ্ৰৰ পৰা অব্যৰ্থ একঘাতিণী অস্ত্ৰ প্ৰতিদানত লৈছিল। সেই শৰ অৰ্জুন বধৰ বাবে থৈ দিছিল। কিন্তু দ্ৰোণপৰ্বতে কৰ্ণৰ লগত এদিন যুদ্ধ দিবলৈ অৰ্জুনক ৰখাই শ্ৰীকৃষ্ণই ঘটোৎকচক পঠায়। হিড়িম্বা পুত্ৰ ঘটোৎকচৰ দ্বাৰা অলেখ কৌৰৱসেনা নিহত হৈছিল—আৰু উপায়স্বৰ হৈ কৰ্ণই একঘাতিণী অস্ত্ৰপাত ঘটোৎকচত প্ৰয়োগ কৰে, সেইদৰেই কৃষ্ণই অৰ্জুনক সেই শৰৰ পৰা ৰক্ষা কৰে।

কৰ্ণপৰ্বত দুৰ্দাস্ত কৰ্ণৰ আক্ৰমণত এদিন যুধিষ্ঠিৰ তিষ্ঠিব পৰা নাছিল। কৰ্ণই কুন্তীক দিয়া আশ্বাসবাক্য “অৰ্জুনৰ বাহিৰে অন্য পাণ্ডৱক বধ নকৰে”—কথাযাৰৰ বাবে যুধিষ্ঠিৰক প্ৰাণে নামাৰিলে। কৃষ্ণই অৰ্জুনক ক্ষন্তেকলৈ লৈ যায় আহত যুধিষ্ঠিৰক খবৰ কৰিবলৈ। কৰ্ণক তেতিয়াও বধ নকৰাকৈ তেওঁৰ কাষলৈ যোৱা অৰ্জুনক যুধিষ্ঠিৰে তিৰস্কাৰ কৰে, অৰ্জুনৰ গাণ্ডীৰক তিৰস্কাৰ কৰে। নিজ সংকল্প মতে অৰ্জুনে গাণ্ডীৰ নিন্দাকাৰী যুধিষ্ঠিৰৰ শিৰচ্ছেদ কৰিবলৈ উদ্যত হয়। কৃষ্ণই থাপ মাৰি ধৰে। তেতিয়া অৰ্জুনে তেওঁৰ সংকল্পৰ আনটো বিকল্প “আত্মহত্যা” কৰিবলৈ ওলায়। কৃষ্ণই আত্মশ্লাঘা আৰু আত্মহত্যা একে বুলি শিক্ষা দিয়াত অৰ্জুনে আত্মপ্ৰশংসা কৰি ক্ষান্ত হয়। এইদৰে অৰ্জুনৰ সাৰথিজনে সদায় পাণ্ডৱক ৰক্ষা কৰি থাকে। এই প্ৰসংগত দেখা যায় নিজৰ গুণ বখনাৰ সমান পাপ নাই। সেই নৈতিক শিক্ষাও দিয়ে।

কৰ্ণৰ শৰে এবাৰ অৰ্জুনক ভেদি শেষ কৰিব যেন আশংকা কৰি কৃষ্ণই ৰথখন ভৰদি তললৈ নমাই দিয়ে, শৰ ওপৰে ওপৰে গ'লত অৰ্জুন ৰক্ষা পৰে। কৃষ্ণই অৰ্জুনক সময়ৰ শৰ মাৰিবলৈ নিৰ্দেশ দি থাকে। কৰ্ণই অভিশাপ পাই আছিল পৰশুৰামৰ পৰা ব্ৰহ্মাস্ত্ৰ প্ৰয়োগৰ মন্ত্ৰ পাহৰাৰ, ৰথৰ চকা মাটিত পোত যোৱাৰ। অৰ্জুনক ক্ষন্তেক সময় বিচাৰে ৰথৰ চকা তুলি লোৱাৰ, ধৰ্মযুদ্ধৰ নিয়ম মানি চলাৰ-গাণ্ডীৰত দিব্যাস্ত্ৰ সাজু কৰি থোৱা অৰ্জুন ৰ'ব খুজিছিল কৰ্ণৰ অনুৰোধত, কিন্তু কৃষ্ণই আগৰ কৰ্ণহঁতে কৌৰৱ পক্ষৰ পৰা

কৰা সকলো অন্যায় অধৰ্ম সোঁৱৰাই দি অৰ্জুনক সুবিধা গ্ৰহণ কৰিবলৈ তৎপৰ কৰিলে, আৰু অৰ্জুনৰ শৰৰ দ্বাৰা কৰ্ণ বধ হ'ল।

তাৰপিছত এশ কৌৰৱৰ একমাত্ৰ অৱশিষ্ট দুৰ্যোধনক দ্বৈপায়ন হৃদত লুকাই থকাৰ পৰা উপিয়াই আনি বধ কৰা হয়। ভীম দুৰ্যোধনৰ গদাযুদ্ধত কৃষ্ণই সোঁৱৰাই দিয়ে ভীমৰ প্ৰতিজ্ঞা — দুৰ্যোধনৰ উৰুভংগ কৰাৰ। কৃষ্ণৰ প্ৰবোচনাত কঁকালৰ তলত নীতি বিৰুদ্ধভাৱে গদাৰে কোবাই ভীমে দুৰ্যোধনক বধ কৰে।

এইদৰে দেখা গ'ল, বহু নীতি বিৰুদ্ধ কামো যুদ্ধত কৃষ্ণই পাণ্ডৱসকলৰ দ্বাৰা কৰালে।

এই গোটেই কুৰুক্ষেত্ৰ যুদ্ধখনত সামগ্ৰিকভাৱে কৃষ্ণই লোৱা ভূমিকা দেখা গ'ল, দুষ্টক দমন আৰু শিষ্টক পালন। যিটো আছিল ভগৱানৰ অৱতৰণৰ মূল উদ্দেশ্য। কিছুমান নীতি বিৰুদ্ধ কাম কৰিও কৃষ্ণই পাণ্ডৱৰ জয় নিশ্চিত কৰাৰ এটা প্ৰধান কথা আছিল, তেওঁ দ্ৰৌপদীৰ ওচৰত কৰি থোৱা সংকল্পৰ যোগেদি বান্ধ খাই থকা কথাটোও। অজ্ঞাতবাসৰ অন্তত উদ্যোগপৰ্বতে আছে মুক্তকেশী দ্ৰৌপদীয়ে খঙে বেজাৰে তেওঁ পাহৰিব নোৱাৰা কুৰুৰাজসভাত পোৱা লাঞ্ছনাখিনিৰ কথা কৃষ্ণক কৈছিল আৰু তাৰ প্ৰতিকাৰ একো নহ'ব নেকি বুলি কান্দি কাটি। তেতিয়া কৃষ্ণই তেওঁৰ ভক্তা, সাধ্বী দ্ৰৌপদীৰ আগত এই বুলি সংকল্প লৈছিল যে “তোমাক এনেকৈ লাঞ্ছনা কৰা কৌৰৱবিলাক সসৈন্যে সবান্ধৱে মৰি শেষ হ'ব, সিহঁতৰ পত্নীবোৰৰ চকুৰ পানীৰে নৈ বব, আকাশ খহি পৰিলেও, পৃথিৱী বসাতলে গ'লেও, হিমালয় লৰচৰ হ'লেও মোৰ কথাৰ লৰচৰ নহয়।” এইয়াৰ কৃষ্ণৰ সংকল্পক দেখা পোৱা যায় কুৰুক্ষেত্ৰ ৰণত কৃষ্ণই লোৱা ভূমিকাত এক ভীষণ প্ৰতিজ্ঞাৰূপত যি প্ৰতিজ্ঞা ৰক্ষাৰ বাবে তেওঁৰ আনবোৰ সংকল্প (যুদ্ধত নিজে অস্ত্ৰ নধৰা আদিও) তুচ্ছ হৈ পৰিছিল।

এইখিনিতে আমি মহাকাব্যখনৰ দুই প্ৰধান চৰিত্ৰ কৃষ্ণ আৰু ভীষ্মৰ কথাৰে “সত্য” ৰক্ষাৰ কথাটো অলপ আলোচনা কৰি চাব পাৰোঁক।

আক্ষৰিক অৰ্থতে সত্য ৰক্ষা কেতিয়াবা নৈতিকভাৱে সুবিবেচিত নহবও পাৰে। যি সত্য কল্যাণপ্ৰদ সেই সত্যহে অনুসৰণ কৰিলে ভাল। কল্যাণৰ লগত যুক্ত হোৱা সত্য (ঠিক আক্ষৰিক কেতিয়াবা নহবও পাৰে) হয় “সেইটোৱেই আচল কথাটো”—ঠিক সেইদৰেই যে সত্য ৰাখিব লাগিব, সেই অৰ্থত দেখা ভীষ্মক, যিজনে পিতাকলৈ বিমাতৃৰূপে সত্যৱতীক আনি দিবলৈ যাওঁতে সত্যৱতীৰ পিতৃ ধীৰৰাজৰ ওচৰত যি কেইটা প্ৰতিজ্ঞা কৰিছিল সেই কেয়োটা তেওঁ আখৰে আখৰে পালন কৰি থাকিল। বিয়া নকৰাই চিৰকুমাৰ হৈ থাকিল, ৰজা নহ'ল আৰু হস্তিনাপুৰৰ ৰাজসিংহাসনত য়েয়েই বহিব তেওঁৰে অনুগত হৈ থকাৰ প্ৰতিশ্ৰুতি তেওঁ ৰক্ষা কৰি থাকিল। পৰিৱেশ পৰিস্থিতিৰ

লগত তেওঁৰ সত্যৰক্ষাৰ পৰিণাম সকলোৰে বাবে কল্যাণপ্ৰদ হ'ব নে নহয় সেইবোৰ তেওঁৰ সত্যৰক্ষাৰ বাহিৰৰ কথা আছিল। ভীষ্মৰ এনে আক্ষৰিক সত্যৰক্ষাৰ বাবেই তেওঁ ভায়েকলৈ ধৰি অনা, অন্যৰ বাগদত্তা কাশীৰাজকন্যা অম্বাৰ দুইকুল হেৰুওৱা অৱস্থা হৈছিল। ভীষ্মই চিৰকুমাৰ হৈ থকাৰ প্ৰতিজ্ঞা নাভাঙিলে আৰু তেওঁ হাতত ধৰি অনা বাবে আগতে বন্দৱস্ত হৈ থকা ৰজা শাল্বই অম্বাক গ্ৰহণ কৰা নাছিল। তেওঁৰ সেই সত্য ৰক্ষাৰ বাবেই কুৰুৰাজ শ্ৰেয়সী সন্তানৰ যোগেদিহে ৰক্ষা কৰিব লগা হৈছিল। ধৃতৰাষ্ট্ৰ আৰু পাণ্ডু আছিল বিচিৰীৰ্যৰ শ্ৰেয়সী সন্তানহে। হস্তিনাপুৰৰ ৰজাৰ অনুগত হৈ থকাৰ সংকল্প ৰক্ষা কৰি তেওঁ ৰাজসভাত দ্ৰৌপদীৰ লাঞ্ছনাৰো নীৰৱ সাক্ষী হৈ বৈছিল, ভীষ্মই ৰক্ষা কৰা এনে সত্য হৈছে উকা সত্য, য'ত কল্যাণৰ আদৰ্শ নাই আৰু কল্যাণৰ আদৰ্শযুক্ত থকা সত্যক (বুদ্ধদেৱ বসু, শীতাংসু চন্দ্ৰৱৰ্ত্তী আদি) বহু লিখকে এক বহল অৰ্থৰ সত্য বুলিছে, য'ত “ঋত” নামৰ ঋকবেদৰ আদৰ্শ শব্দটো তেওঁলোকে প্ৰয়োগ কৰিছে। বৈদিক ঋতৰ ৰখীয়া বুলি কৈছিল বৰুণ দেৱতাক আৰু এই পণ্ডিতসকলে মহাভাৰতৰ কৃষ্ণৰ সত্য ৰক্ষাত ঋতৰ কথা দেখা পাইছে।

কৃষ্ণই “যিটো কৰা উচিত, অৰ্থ সত্যত আৰোপ কৰিছিল। প্ৰয়োজন সাপেক্ষে প্ৰচলিত নীতিৰ পৰা ফালৰি কাটি হ'লেও তেওঁ কল্যাণপ্ৰদ সত্য বা ধৰ্ম ৰক্ষা কৰিছে। নৈতিকতাৰ সাধাৰণ আদৰ্শকে সাৰোগত কৰি থাকিলে সদায় হিতসাধন নহবও পাৰে। সেয়ে কিছুমান বিশেষ আদৰ্শ, পৰিস্থিতি বিশেষে তেওঁ গ্ৰহণ কৰিছে, যাক আপদধৰ্ম বুলি কৈছে। মহাভাৰতৰ শান্তিপৰ্বত ভীষ্মৰ মুখেতে “আপদধৰ্ম”ৰ কথা শুনা গৈছে যে কিছুমান পৰিস্থিতিত মিছা কোৱা বা মিছাত চলা বাঞ্ছনীয়, কিন্তু নিজে তেওঁ সাধাৰণ অৰ্থৰ সত্যৰ পৰা কেতিয়াও বিচলিত হ'বলৈ নাচাইছিল। কিন্তু শ্ৰীকৃষ্ণই ধৰ্ম প্ৰতিষ্ঠাৰ বাবে অধৰ্মীসকলক বিনাশ কৰিবলৈ প্ৰয়োজনহ'লে সত্যৰ পৰা আঁতৰিব লগাও হ'ব পাৰে বুলি আপদধৰ্ম মানিছিল। ৰাজসভাত বিবস্ত্ৰা কৰিব খোজা ভক্তা দ্ৰৌপদীৰ কৃষ্ণক কৰা প্ৰাৰ্থনা তেওঁ পাহৰিব নোৱাৰিছিল। দ্ৰৌপদীৰ ত্ৰাণকৰ্তাৰ ৰূপতেই তেওঁৰ ভূমিকা পালন কৰি গ'ল। কৃষ্ণই এঠাইত কৌশিক নামৰ এজনৰ সত্য কোৱাৰ পৰা হোৱা অহিতকৰ ঘটনাৰ কাহিনী এটাও কৈছিল। কৌশিকে সত্যৰ পৰা কেতিয়াও আঁতৰি নাযাব বুলি সংকল্প লৈছিল। অৰণ্যত কৌশিক বহি থাকোতে এদিন এদল মানুহে ডকাইতৰ পৰা পলাই গৈ হাবিত লুকাই থকা গম পাইছিল। ডকাইতদল আহি কৌশিকক সোধে মানুহ এখিনি অহা তেওঁ দেখিছিল নেকি, কৌশিকে সঁচা কথা কয়, মানুহখিনিয়ে সেই অৰণ্যতে আশ্ৰয় লৈ আছে বুলি। ডকাইতে লগে লগে মানুহখিনি বিচাৰি উলিয়াই হত্যা কৰে— সত্য ৰক্ষক কৌশিক এইদৰে নৰহত্যাৰ কাৰণ হ'ল। এই শিক্ষা শ্ৰীকৃষ্ণই দিয়া।

(Refelctions and variations on the Mahabharata ed. by TRS Sharma, Sahitya Akademi, 2004, P. 115)

কৃষ্ণৰ মতে ধৰ্ম অৰ্থত সত্য কি তাক কেৱল বেদাদি শাস্ত্ৰৰ দ্বাৰা জানিব নোৱাৰি, পৰিণাম ভাল দেখুওৱা কামহে হ'ব ধৰ্ম বা সত্যৰ বক্ষক।

দুষ্কৃতিকাৰীৰ বিনাশ, সাধুৰ পৰিত্ৰাণৰ লগত তেওঁৰ অৱতৰণৰ উদ্দেশ্য আছিল ধৰ্মসংস্থাপন। শৰশয্যাতে বেদনাকৃষ্ট হৈ পৰি থকা আহত ভীষ্ম ইচ্ছামৃত্যু বৰ প্ৰাপ্ত আছিল বাবে উত্তৰায়ণলৈ বৈ আছিল মৃত্যুক বৰণ কৰিবলৈ। কৃষ্ণই যুধিষ্ঠিৰক কয় ভীষ্মৰ লগতে বহুখিনি প্ৰাচীন প্ৰজ্ঞাৰ তথা ধৰ্মৰ শিক্ষাৰ বিদায় ঘটিব। সেয়ে তেওঁ ভীষ্মৰ পৰা ৰাজধৰ্ম, সমাজধৰ্ম আদিৰ শিক্ষাখিনি ল'ব লাগে। ৰজাক ভীষ্মৰ কাষলৈ লৈ যায়, ভীষ্মক তেওঁৰ মহিমাৰে শৰাঘাতৰ বেদনাবোৰ নাইকিয়া কৰি দিয়ে আৰু ভীষ্মই যুধিষ্ঠিৰক দিয়া ধৰ্ম শিক্ষাৰেই মহাভাৰতৰ শাস্তিপৰ্বৰ বহু ঠাই জুৰি আছে। অৰ্থাৎ গীতাত কোৱা ভগৱানৰ অৱতৰণৰ উদ্দেশ্য পূৰণকে কৃষ্ণই কুৰুক্ষেত্ৰ যুদ্ধৰ ভূমিকাত পালন কৰা দেখা গ'ল— দুষ্কৃতিকাৰীৰ বিনাশ, সাধুৰ পৰিত্ৰাণ আৰু ধৰ্মসংস্থাপন।

0000

## বৈষ্ণৱ দাৰ্শনিক মধ্বাচাৰ্যৰ জীৱন আৰু দৰ্শন

ড° গিৰীশ বৰুৱা

‘মহাভাৰত তাৎপৰ্য নিৰ্ণয়’ নামৰ গ্ৰন্থত মধ্বাচাৰ্যই তেওঁৰ জন্ম কলি যুগৰ ৪৩০০-ত হৈছিল বুলি লিখিছে। কোৱা হয় যে কলি যুগ আৰম্ভ হৈছিল, ৩,১০১ খ্ৰীঃপূঃত। এই হিচাপত মধ্বৰ জন্ম হ'ব ১১৯৯ খ্ৰীঃত বা ১১২১ শকত। কিন্তু তেওঁ যিহেতু ভাগৱত পুৰাণৰ কথা উল্লেখ কৰিছে, সেয়ে তেওঁৰ জন্ম এই সময়ৰ পাছৰ।

মধ্বাচাৰ্য ৭৯ বছৰ জীয়াই আছিল। তেওঁ অচ্যুতপ্ৰক্ষৰ শিষ্য আছিল। ১২৭৬ খ্ৰীঃত (শক ১১৯৮) তেওঁৰ মৃত্যু হয়।

কোৱা হয় যে মধ্ব বায়ু দেৱতাৰ এক অৱতাৰ। তেওঁ মধ্যগেহ ভট্টৰ পুত্ৰ আছিল। এই মধ্যগেহ ভট্ট উদিপিৰ ওচৰৰ ৰজতপীঠত বাস কৰিছিল। এই ঠাই শ্ৰীংগেৰিৰপৰা ৪০ মাইল দূৰত অৱস্থিত। এই ঠাইতে এটি শংকৰ-মঠ আছে। তেওঁৰ পিতৃৰ স্থান ৰজনপীঠ, বৰ্তমানৰ কল্যাণপুৰ।

মধ্বই দ্বিজ হোৱাৰ পাচত পূৰ্ণপ্ৰজ্ঞ নাম লয়। তেওঁৰ আন এটা নাম আনন্দতীৰ্থ।

মধ্বই দক্ষিণ ভাৰতত বিস্তৰ ভ্ৰমণ কৰে। তেওঁ বিষ্ণুক আৰাধনা কৰিবৰ বাবে ধনুকোটি আৰু ৰামেশ্বৰমলৈ যায়। তেওঁ ৰামেশ্বৰমত চাৰিমাহ কাল থাকে। তাৰ পাচত তেওঁ উদিপিলৈ ঘূৰি আহে। এইদৰে তেওঁ দক্ষিণত বহুত মানুহক তেওঁৰ বিশ্বাসৰ ফলীয়া কৰে।

মধ্বই উত্তৰ ভাৰতলৈও ফুৰিবলৈ আহে। তেওঁ গংগা পাৰ হৈ হৰিদ্বাৰলৈ যায়। তাৰ পিছত বদৰিকালৈ যায়। তাতে তেওঁ ব্যাসক লগ পায়। তাতে তেওঁক ব্যাসে শংকৰাচাৰ্যৰ ব্ৰহ্মসূত্ৰ ভাষ্যক খণ্ডন কৰি এখন ভাষ্য লিখিবলৈ পৰামৰ্শ দিয়ে। তাৰ পাছত তেওঁ পুনৰ উদিপিলৈ ঘূৰি আহে। তাত তেওঁ বহুতো শংকৰপন্থীক নিজৰ মতলৈ আনে। শেষত তেওঁ নিজৰ গুৰু অচ্যুতপ্ৰক্ষকো নিজৰ মতলৈ আনে।

কোৱা হয় যে শ্ৰীংগেৰি মঠৰ মুৰব্বী পদ্মতীৰ্থই মধ্বক শাস্তি বিহে। তেওঁ আনকি মধ্বৰ কিতাপ-পত্ৰবোৰকো লুকাই পেলায়।

জীৱনৰ শেষ পৰ্যায়ত মধ্বই আৰু এবাৰ উত্তৰ ভাৰত ভ্ৰমণ কৰে। এইবাৰো তেওঁ ব্যাসক লগ ধৰে।

মধ্বই সৰ্বমুঠ ৩৭ খন গ্ৰন্থ লিখে। যেনে, (১) ঋগ্-ভাষ্য, (ঋগ্বেদৰ ১ম মণ্ডলৰ ১ৰ পৰা ৪০ সূক্তলৈ), (২) ক্ৰম-নিৰ্ণয় (ঐতৰেয় ব্ৰাহ্মণ, ঐতৰেয় আৰণ্যক আদি কেনেকৈ পঢ়িব লাগে তাৰ আলোচনা), (৩) ঐতৰেয় উপনিষদ ভাষ্য, (৪) বৃদাৰণ্যক উপনিষদ ভাষ্য, (৫) ছান্দোগ্য উপনিষদ ভাষ্য, (৬) তৈত্তিৰীয় উপনিষদ ভাষ্য, (৭) ঈশাৰাস্য উপনিষদ ভাষ্য, (৮) কঠ উপনিষদ ভাষ্য, (৯) মুণ্ডক উপনিষদ ভাষ্য, (১০) গাণ্ডুক্য উপনিষদ ভাষ্য, (১১) প্ৰশ্নোপনিষদ ভাষ্য, (১২) কেনোপনিষদ ভাষ্য, (১৩) মহাভাৰত তাৎপৰ্য নিৰ্ণয়, (১৪) ভগৱদগীতা ভাষ্য, (১৫) ভগৱদগীতা তাৎপৰ্য নিৰ্ণয়, (১৬) ভাগৱত তাৎপৰ্য নিৰ্ণয়, (১৭) ব্ৰহ্মসূত্ৰ ভাষ্য, (১৮) ব্ৰহ্মসূত্ৰ অনুভাষ্য, (১৯) ব্ৰহ্মসূত্ৰ অনুব্যাক্ষ্যান, (২০) ব্ৰহ্মসূত্ৰ অনুব্যাক্ষ্যান নিৰ্ণয়, (২১) প্ৰমাণ লক্ষণ, (২২) কথা লক্ষণ, (২৩) উপাধি খণ্ডন, (২৪) মায়াবাদ খণ্ডন, (২৫) প্ৰপঞ্চ মিথ্যা অনুমান খণ্ডন, (২৬) তত্ত্বোদ্ভোত, (২৭) তত্ত্ব ৱিবেক, (২৮) তত্ত্ব সংখ্যান, (২৯) বিষ্ণু তত্ত্ব নিৰ্ণয়, (৩০) তত্ত্ব সাৰ সংগ্ৰহ, (৩১) কৃষ্ণমৃত মহাৰ্ণৱ, (৩২) যতি প্ৰণৱ কল্প, (৩৩) সদাচা স্মৃতি, (৩৪) জয়ন্তী নিৰ্ণয়, (৩৫) যমক ভাৰত, (৩৬) নৃসিংহ নখ স্তোত্ৰ, (৩৭) দ্বাদশ স্তোত্ৰ।

এতিয়া আমি ওপৰৰ গ্ৰন্থবোৰৰ কেইখনমানৰ ওপৰত অলপ আলোচনা আগবঢ়াব খুজিছোঁ।

তেওঁৰ মহাভাৰত তাৎপৰ্য নিৰ্ণয় এখন উল্লেখযোগ্য গ্ৰন্থ। এই গ্ৰন্থত ৩২ টা অধ্যায় আছে। এইখন এখন কাব্যগ্ৰন্থ। প্ৰথম অধ্যায়ত কোৱা হৈছে যে চাৰি বেদ, পঞ্চৰাত্ৰ শাস্ত্ৰ, মহাভাৰত, ৰামায়ণ আৰু ব্ৰহ্মসূত্ৰ এই কেইখনেই প্ৰামাণিক উৎস-গ্ৰন্থ। এই গ্ৰন্থকেইখনক বিৰোধিতা কৰাটো অৱৈধ। বৈষ্ণৱ পুৰাণবোৰ পঞ্চৰাত্ৰ শাস্ত্ৰৰ বিবৃতিৰ বাহিৰে আন একো নহয়। অৱশ্যে এইবোৰকো প্ৰামাণ্য গ্ৰন্থ ৰূপে মানিব লাগিব। বেদ, মহাভাৰত, পঞ্চৰাত্ৰ আৰু বৈষ্ণৱ পুৰাণবোৰৰ বিৰুদ্ধাচৰণ নকৰালৈকেহে মনু আদি স্মৃতি গ্ৰহণযোগ্য।

মধ্বৰ মতে বৌদ্ধশাস্ত্ৰবোৰ অসুৰবোৰক বিভ্ৰান্ত কৰিবৰ বাবে বিষ্ণুৱে ৰচনা কৰিছিল। শিৱয়ো শৈৱ শাস্ত্ৰবোৰ একে উদ্দেশ্যেৰেই বিষ্ণুৰ পৰামৰ্শত ৰচনা কৰিছিল।

মধ্বৰ মতে যিবোৰ শাস্ত্ৰই আত্মা আৰু ব্ৰহ্মক একে বুলি কয় সেই সকলোবোৰেই অসত্য। তেওঁৰ মতে বিষ্ণুহে আচল ঈশ্বৰ। এই বিষ্ণুক নাৰায়ণ বা বাসুদেৱ নামেৰেও জনা যায়। জগত প্ৰক্ৰিয়া এক সত্য প্ৰক্ৰিয়া। দেৱতা আৰু ভাল মানুহেহে ঈশ্বৰৰ বৰত মুক্তি লাভিব পাৰে। অৱশ্যে ইয়াৰ বাবে জ্ঞানৰো দৰকাৰ। সৰ্বসাধাৰণ মানুহ জন্ম-মৃত্যু চক্ৰত পতিত হয় আৰু নীচ মানুহবোৰ নৰকলৈ যায়। অসুৰ আৰু মুক্ত জীৱৰ জন্মান্তৰ

নাই। অসুৰবোৰে কেতিয়াও মুক্তি লাভ কৰিব নোৱাৰে।

মধ্বই মুক্ত জীৱৰ ক্ষেত্ৰতো পাৰ্থক্য দেখিছে।

মধ্বৰ মতে ঈশ্বৰৰ প্ৰতি নিষ্কাম সেৱাই মোক্ষ লাভৰ উপায়। ইয়াৰ বাবে ভক্তিৰ দৰকাৰ। আনকি মুক্ত অৱস্থাতো ভক্তিৰ দৰকাৰ। অন্যান্য ধৰ্মীয় কামে মানুহক নৰক-গমনৰপৰা ৰক্ষা কৰিব নোৱাৰে। কিন্তু অতিশয় পাপী জনেও ভক্তিৰ বলত নৰক-গমন ৰোধ কৰিব পাৰে। ভক্তি বিনা যিকোনো ধৰ্মীয় কামেই পাপ কাম। ভক্তিয়ে পাপক মানুহক স্পৰ্শ কৰাৰ পৰা বিৰত কৰে।

মধ্বই দেখুৱাইছে যে মহাভাৰতৰ সাধুটো ৰূপকধৰ্মী। মহাভাৰতৰ যুদ্ধ হ'ল ভাল আৰু বেয়াৰ মাজৰ সংগ্ৰাম। ইয়াত পাণ্ডৱসকল ভালৰ প্ৰতিনিধি আৰু কৌৰৱ সকল বেয়াৰ। ইয়াত বিষ্ণুৰ মাহাত্ম্যও প্ৰদৰ্শন কৰা হৈছে। মধ্বই ৰামায়ণ আৰু ভাগৱত পুৰাণৰ আধাৰত মহাভাৰতৰ কথাবোৰ ব্যাখ্যা কৰিছে।

তেওঁৰ 'ভাগৱত তাৎপৰ্য নিৰ্ণয়'ত মধ্বই দেখুৱাইছে যে ভাগৱতেও দ্বৈতবাদৰ কথা কয়। তেওঁৰ 'গীতা তাৎপৰ্য'খন গদ্যত লিখা। অৱশ্যে মাজে মাজে পদ্যতো লিখিছে। ইয়াত তেওঁ শংকৰাচাৰ্যৰ অদ্বৈতবাদী ব্যাখ্যাক খণ্ডন কৰিছে। তেওঁ 'গীতা ভাষ্য'ত মধ্বই দেখুৱাইছে যে শাস্ত্ৰবোৰ যিহেতু অপৌৰুষেয় সেইবাবে সেইবোৰ প্ৰামাণ্য-গ্ৰন্থ। ইয়াত তেওঁ দেখুৱাইছে যে মানুহে কৰ্ম আচৰিব লাগে বেদৰ বিধিমেতে আৰু নিষ্কাম ভাবে। কৰ্ম কৰাৰ একমাত্ৰ লক্ষ্য হ'ব লাগে অধিক জ্ঞান আৰু অধিক ভক্তি লভিবৰ বাবে। কৰ্ম কৰিব লাগে ভগৱানৰ সন্তুষ্টিৰ বাবে।

মধ্বই কয় যে মানুহৰ এটা জীৱনতে সকলোবোৰ কৰ্মৰ ফলপ্ৰাপ্তি ঘটিব নোৱাৰে। সেয়ে কোনো এটা জীৱনত মানুহে এটাও কৰ্ম নকৰিলেও তেওঁ ফলৰ হাত সাৰিব নোৱাৰে। গতিকে কৰ্ম এৰি থকাটো উচিত কথা নহয়।

মধ্বই নকয় যে পবিত্ৰ স্থানত মৃত্যু হ'লেই মানুহে মুক্তি লাভ কৰে।

মধ্বৰ 'ব্ৰহ্মসূত্ৰ অনুব্যাক্ষ্যান' এখন চমু গ্ৰন্থ। ইয়াত তেওঁ ব্ৰহ্মসূত্ৰৰ তৰ্কীয় অৱস্থানক ব্যাখ্যা কৰিছে। ইয়াত তেওঁ দেখুৱাইছে যে ওঁ-কাৰে ব্ৰহ্মকে বুজায়। ওঁ-কাৰে গায়ত্ৰী মন্ত্ৰৰো তাৎপৰ্য বহন কৰিছে। তেওঁৰ মতে যিসকলে ব্ৰহ্মক জানিবলৈ ইচ্ছা কৰে তেওঁলোকে ঈশ্বৰক সন্তুষ্ট কৰিব লাগিব, কাৰণ তেওঁৰ অনুগ্ৰহত হে ব্ৰহ্মক জানিব পৰা যায়। তেওঁৰ মতে ঈশ্বৰৰ ইচ্ছাতে জগত সৃষ্টিলৈ আহে আৰু ধ্বংসগামী হয়। ঈশ্বৰে জ্ঞানীক মুক্তি আৰু মুৰ্খক জ্ঞান দিয়ে।

মধ্বৰ মতে বন্ধন সত্য। বন্ধনৰ অসত্যতাক প্ৰমাণ কৰিব নোৱাৰি। মানুহৰ আচৰণো সত্য।

‘কথা-লক্ষণ’ত মধ্বই বাদ আৰু বিতণ্ডাৰ মাজত থকা পাৰ্থক্যৰ বিষয়ে আলোচনা কৰিছে। তেওঁৰ মতে বাদ হ’ল অৰ্থপূৰ্ণ বাদানুবাদ আৰু বিতণ্ডা হ’ল অনৰ্থক তৰ্ক। সাধাৰণতে গুৰু আৰু শিষ্যৰ মাজতে বাদৰ সৃষ্টি হয় যি কিছুমান বহুসমূলক বিষয়ক প্ৰাঞ্জল কৰি তোলে। আকৌ ই দুই শিষ্যৰ মাজৰ তৰ্ককো সামৰে যি তৰ্কই যুক্তিৰ আধাৰত প্ৰকৃত সত্যক উদ্ঘাটন কৰে।

বাদ আৰু বিতণ্ডাৰ উপৰি আৰু এবিধ তৰ্ক আছে যাৰ নাম জল্প। জল্প হ’ল অহংকাৰ আৰু দম্বৰ ভিত্তিত কৰা তৰ্ক। ইয়াত মাত্ৰ যুক্তিৰ বাবেই যুক্তি দিয়া হয় নিজৰ আধিপত্য বিস্তাৰ আৰু পাণ্ডিত্য দেখুৱাবৰ বাবে। যশস্যা অৰ্জনো ইয়াৰ অন্যতম উদ্দেশ্য।

বিতণ্ডাত সাঁচা যুক্তিবোৰ খণ্ডন কৰা হয়। ইয়াত যি যুক্তিৰ অৱতাৰণা কৰা হয় ই আচল যুক্তি নহয়, আপাত যুক্তিহে।

মধ্বৰ ‘তত্ত্ব সংখ্যান’ এখন সৰু গ্ৰন্থ। ইয়াত মাত্ৰ এঘাৰটা শ্লোকহে আছে। ইয়াত দুবিধ পদাৰ্থ আছে বুলি কোৱা হৈছে। এই দুবিধ পদাৰ্থ হ’ল স্বতন্ত্ৰ আৰু পৰতন্ত্ৰ। একমাত্ৰ বিষুৎহে স্বতন্ত্ৰ। পৰতন্ত্ৰ পদাৰ্থ দুবিধ। অস্তিত্বশীল আৰু অস্তিত্বশীল নোহোৱা। অস্তিত্বশীল পদাৰ্থক ভাব-পদাৰ্থ আৰু অস্তিত্বশীল নোহোৱা পদাৰ্থক অভাৱ-পদাৰ্থ বোলা হয়। অভাৱ পদাৰ্থ তিনিবিধ; নাগ-অভাৱ, ধ্বংস-অভাৱ আৰু অত্যন্ত-অভাৱ। ভাব পদাৰ্থ দুবিধ; চেতন আৰু অচেতন। চেতন পদাৰ্থবোৰ দুবিধ : দুখযুক্ত আৰু দুখ বিযুক্ত। দুখযুক্ত পদাৰ্থ দুবিধ : মুক্ত আৰু বদ্ধ। বদ্ধ পদাৰ্থ দুবিধ : যিবোৰ মুক্তি প্ৰাপ্তিৰ যোগ্য আৰু যিবোৰ যোগ্য নহয়। যিবোৰ যোগ্য নহয় সেইবোৰ আকৌ দুবিধত বিভক্ত : যিবোৰ ইতিমধ্যে নৰকত আছে আৰু যিবোৰ নৰকলৈ গৈ আছে।

জড় পদাৰ্থবোৰ তিনি ভাগত বিভক্ত : নিত্য, অনিত্য আৰু নিত্য-অনিত্য। অকল বেদবোৰহে নিত্য, অনিত্য পদাৰ্থ দুবিধত বিভক্ত : সৃষ্ট আৰু অসৃষ্ট। মহৎ, অহম, বুদ্ধি, মন, ইন্দ্ৰিয়, তন্মাত্ৰ, ভূত—এইবোৰ অসৃষ্ট (অসংশ্লিষ্ট)। জগত আৰু জগতত থকা বস্তুবোৰ সৃষ্টি। পুৰাণ, সময় আৰু প্ৰকৃতি নিত্যানিত্য। যি ক্ষেত্ৰত স্বৰূপতঃ পুৰাণ, কাল আৰু প্ৰকৃতি নিত্য, কিন্তু সিহঁতৰ পৰিণামবোৰ অনিত্য।

মধ্বৰ ‘তত্ত্বোদ্ভোত’খন অলপ ডাঙৰ গ্ৰন্থ। এইখন গদ্য আৰু পদ্য উভয়তে ৰচিত। ইয়াত কোৱা হৈছে যে মুক্ত জীৱবোৰ ঈশ্বৰতকৈ বেলেগ। নিম্বাৰ্কই কোৱাৰ দৰে বেলেগ আৰু অভেদ দুয়ো হ’ব নোৱাৰে। তেওঁ ‘কৰ্ম নিৰ্ণয়’ নামৰ গ্ৰন্থত কৰ্মৰ স্বৰূপ আৰু বৈদিক কৰ্মৰ ওপৰত আলোচনা আছে। তেওঁ কৈছে যে পূৰ্ব মীমাংসা দৰ্শনত এই বিষয়ে সবিশেষ পোৱা যায়। তেওঁৰ মতে পূৰ্ব মীমাংসাই ঈশ্বৰক অকল স্বীকৃতি নিদিয়াই নহয়, ই ঈশ্বৰৰ ধাৰণাক সজোৰে প্ৰত্যাখ্যানো কৰিছে। মধ্বই নিজে কিন্তু ঈশ্বৰক বিশ্বাস

কৰিছিল। তেওঁৰ মতে ইন্দ্ৰ, অগ্নি আদি দেৱতাসকলে বিষুৎ বা নাৰায়ণৰ বিভিন্ন ৰূপ।

মীমাংসা দৰ্শনৰ মতে যক্ষ-কাৰ্য লক্ষ্য হ’ল স্বৰ্গ প্ৰাপ্তি। কিন্তু মধ্বৰ বাবে নহয়। মধ্বই কৈছে যে মানুহৰ চূড়ান্ত লক্ষ্য হ’ল জ্ঞান আৰু ঈশ্বৰৰ বৰ লাভ। তেওঁৰ মতে যজ্ঞ-কৰ্ম সম্পাদন কৰিব লাগে কোনো কামনা নোহোৱাকৈ। সেইবোৰক কেৱল বৈদিক বিধি বা ঈশ্বৰৰ আদেশ বুলিহে সম্পাদন কৰিব লাগে। এনে কৰ্মৰ প্ৰয়োজন আত্ম-শুদ্ধিৰ বাবে। আত্ম-শুদ্ধিৰ মাজেৰেহে ঈশ্বৰৰ প্ৰসাদ বা আশীৰ্বাদ লাভ কৰিব পাৰি।

মধ্বৰ মতে জগতখন কাৰ্য-ধৰ্মী। ইয়াৰ এক সচেতন কাৰণ আছে। এই সচেতন কাৰণেই হ’ল ঈশ্বৰ। এই ঈশ্বৰ এক সৰ্বজ্ঞ আৰু সৰ্বশক্তিমান কাৰণ। মধ্বৰ মতে ভাগৱত পুৰাণেও কয় যে ব্ৰহ্ম সগুণ। ব্ৰহ্মক নিৰ্গুণ বুলি কোৱা মানে তেওঁ বেয়া গুণ ৰহিত।

মধ্বৰ মতে ভ্ৰমত দেখা বস্তুটো ইন্দ্ৰিয়-প্ৰত্যক্ষৰ ভিত্তিতে ৰচিত হয়। কিন্তু ভুল ব্যাখ্যাৰ বাবে আচল বস্তুটোৰ ঠাইত আমি অন্য এটা বস্তু দেখোঁ। যেতিয়া ভুল ভাগে তেতিয়া আমি মূল প্ৰত্যক্ষলৈ ঘূৰি যাওঁ। ভ্ৰমাত্মক বস্তুটোও আচল বস্তু। কিন্তু অন্য ঠাইত থকা বস্তুটো বৰ্তমানৰ পৰিস্থিতিত থকা যেন লাগে। ইয়াত জড়িত ‘মিথ্যা’ কথাটোৱে বস্তুটোৰ অস্তিত্বহীনতাক বুজোৱা নাই। বস্তুটো ক’ৰবাত নিশ্চয়কৈ আছে, মাত্ৰ বৰ্তমান পৰিস্থিতিত নাই। বৰ্তমানৰ পৰিস্থিতিতহে ই ‘অসৎ’, একেবাৰে ‘অসৎ’ নহয়। আচল জ্ঞানলৈ ঘূৰি অহাৰ সময়ত প্ৰত্যক্ষটোহে খণ্ডিত হয়; সামগ্ৰিক ৰূপে ভ্ৰমাত্মক বস্তুটোক নশচাৎ কৰা নহয়।

মধ্বই দেখুৱাইছে যে সকলোবোৰ বৈদিক কথাই ঈশ্বৰৰ গুণকে বখানিছে। কেৱল বেদৰ মাধ্যমেৰেহে ঈশ্বৰক জানিব পাৰি, প্ৰত্যক্ষ, অনুমান আদি প্ৰমাণেৰে নোৱাৰি। বেদসমূহ মানৱ-সৃষ্ট নহয়। সেয়ে বেদবাক্যবোৰ সৰ্বসাধাৰণ বাক্যতকৈ বেলেগ। বেদ নিজে নিজে অস্তিত্বশীল। ঋষি সকলে বৈদিক বাক্যবোৰ কেৱল প্ৰকাশহে কৰে, সৃষ্টি নকৰে। সেয়ে বেদ তৰ্কাতীত আৰু অব্যৰ্থ। বেদবোৰ অপৌৰুষেয় হোৱা বাবে সেইবোৰত কোনো অৰ্থ-দোষ নাথাকে।

মধ্বৰ মতে সকলোবোৰ জ্ঞান স্বতঃপ্ৰামাণ্যমূলক। কেৱল অসত্য জ্ঞানহে বাহ্যৰোপিত। বিশেষকৈ বৈদিক জ্ঞান নিত্য। বেদবাক্যবোৰৰ অৰ্থ ইতিমধ্যে নিৰ্ণয় কৰা থাকে। সেয়ে আমি বেদবাক্যৰ ওপৰতে চূড়ান্তভাৱে নিৰ্ভৰ কৰিব লাগিব, আনকি ঈশ্বৰৰ অস্তিত্বৰ বাবেও। অনুমান আদিয়ে ঈশ্বৰৰ অস্তিত্ব সাব্যস্ত কৰিব নোৱাৰে, কাৰণ একে অনুমানৰ দ্বাৰা ঈশ্বৰ নাই বুলিও ক’ব পাৰি। জগতৰ স্ৰষ্টা আছে বুলি ভাবিলে স্ৰষ্টা নাই বুলিও ভাবিব পাৰি। আমি ঈশ্বৰক স্ৰষ্টা বুলি ভাবোঁ মানৱ-স্ৰষ্টাৰ আৰ্হিত। কিন্তু মানুহৰ দেহ আছে। ঈশ্বৰৰ সাধাৰণতে দেহ নাই বুলি ভবা হয় বাবে তেওঁ স্ৰষ্টাও

হ'ব নোৱাৰে। সেয়ে ঈশ্বৰৰ অস্তিত্বৰ বাবে অনুমানৰ ওপৰত নিৰ্ভৰ কৰিব নোৱাৰি। মধ্বৰ মতে সকলো অনুমানেই আপেক্ষিক।

মধ্বাচাৰ্যই আত্মাবোৰৰ মাজত গুণগত আৰু পৰিমাণগত উভয় পাৰ্থক্যকে মানি লৈছে। দুটা আত্মাৰ ক্ষেত্ৰত কোনো ক্ষেত্ৰতে মিল নাই। আনকি মুক্তি অৱস্থাতো আত্মাই এই পাৰ্থক্য মানি চলে।

মধ্বই ঈশ্বৰৰ আত্মা আৰু দেহৰ মাজত পাৰ্থক্য নাই বুলি কয়। সেইদৰে ঈশ্বৰ মুক্ত আত্মাৰ পৰাও বেলেগ। মুক্তাত্মা ঈশ্বৰতকৈ তল খাপৰ।

ঈশ্বৰ হ'ল জগতৰ নিমিত্ত কাৰণ। জগতৰ উপাদান কাৰণ ঈশ্বৰ নহয়, প্রকৃতিহে। ঈশ্বৰে প্রকৃতিৰপৰাই জগতক সৃষ্টি কৰিছে।

মুক্তাত্মাই চাৰি বিধ আনন্দ উপভোগ কৰে : সালোক্য, অৰ্থাৎ ই ঈশ্বৰৰ লোকত অৱস্থান কৰে। সামীপ্য, অৰ্থাৎ ই ঈশ্বৰৰ ওচৰতে থাকে। সাক্ষ্য, অৰ্থাৎ ইয়াৰ বাহ্য ৰূপটো ঈশ্বৰৰ দৰেই হয়। সাযুক্ত্য, অৰ্থাৎ ঈশ্বৰৰ দেহত সোমোৱা আৰু ঈশ্বৰৰ আনন্দত অংশ লোৱা। কিন্তু আত্মাই ঈশ্বৰৰ আনন্দৰ ভাগ আংশিক ৰূপতহে পায়। ই ব্ৰহ্ম-প্ৰকাৰত্ব অৰ্থাৎ ঈশ্বৰৰ সমান হ'ব নোৱাৰে। তাৰতম্য তেতিয়াও থাকি যায় (দ্র. মধ্বৰ 'গীতা ভাষ্য')।

কিছুমান আত্মা সদায় আন্ধাৰত ডুব গৈ থাকে। সিহঁতে কেতিয়াও মুক্তি লাভ কৰিব নোৱাৰে।

মধ্বই জগতৰ সকলো বস্তুকে দহটা পদাৰ্থত অন্তৰ্ভুক্ত কৰিছে। এই দহটা পদাৰ্থ হ'ল : দ্ৰব্য, গুণ, ক্ৰিয়া, জাতি, বিশেষত্ব, বিশিষ্ট, অংশী, শক্তি, সাদৃশ্য আৰু অভাব। এই সকলোবোৰ পদাৰ্থই হৰিৰ অধীন। সেয়ে তেওঁৰ মতবাদক কেতিয়াবা 'স্বতন্ত্র অস্বতন্ত্র-বাদ' নামেৰেও জনা যায়।

মধ্বৰ মতে জীৱ ভগৱানৰ দাস। জীৱ সেৱক, ব্ৰহ্ম সেৱা। জীৱই প্ৰভুৰ সমান হ'বলৈ গ'লে প্ৰভুৱে তেওঁক দণ্ড বিহে। সেয়ে মধ্বই উপনিষদৰ 'অহং ব্ৰহ্মাস্মি', 'তত্ত্বমাসি' আদি কথাবোৰৰ বেলেগ ব্যাখ্যা কৰিছে।

জীৱ চিৰকাল অপূৰ্ণ হৈ থাকে। ই কেতিয়াও পূৰ্ণতা লাভ কৰিব নোৱাৰে। একমাত্ৰ ব্ৰহ্মহে পূৰ্ণ। তেওঁ জীৱ আৰু জগতৰপৰা একেবাৰে বেলেগ। জীৱৰ মুক্তি সম্ভৱ হয় ভগৱানৰ প্ৰসাদত।

### মধ্বাচাৰ্যৰ জ্ঞানমীমাংসা

ৰামানুজৰ দৰেই মধ্বাচাৰ্যই প্ৰত্যক্ষ, অনুমান আৰু শব্দ জ্ঞানৰ এই তিনিটা প্ৰমান

মানি লৈছে। তেওঁৰ মতে ঈশ্বৰক কেৱল শাস্ত্ৰৰ মাধ্যমেৰেহে জানিব পাৰি।

মধ্বই কৈছে যে জ্ঞানে জ্ঞাতা আৰু জ্ঞেয় উভয়কে প্ৰকাশ কৰে। তেওঁ জ্ঞানৰ স্বৰূপ-প্ৰামাণ্যক বিশ্বাস কৰে।

মধ্বৰ মতে জগতত থকা বিভিন্ন বস্তু আৰু ঘটনা অনুসৰি বেলেগ বেলেগ মানসিক ধাৰণা আছে। ধাৰণা এক নহয়, বহু।

আমি ওপৰত কৈ আহিছোঁ যে মধ্বই তিনিবিধ প্ৰমাণকহে মানি লয়। তেওঁ উপমান নামৰ প্ৰমাণক অনুমানৰ ভিতৰত ধৰে। লগতে তেওঁ প্ৰত্যক্ষ আৰু অনুমানৰ সীমাবদ্ধতাৰ কথাও দোহাৰিছে। এই দুই প্ৰমাণেৰে বিশ্বব্ৰহ্মাণ্ডৰ ৰহস্য ভেদ কৰিব নোৱাৰি। উদাহৰণ স্বৰূপে প্ৰত্যক্ষ জ্ঞান ইন্দ্ৰিয়ৰ ওপৰত নিভৰশীল। অনুমানেও আমাক একো নতুন কথা ক'ব নোৱাৰে। ই কেৱল জ্ঞান সাঁচানে মিছা তাকহে প্ৰমাণ কৰিব পাৰে আৰু বিশৃংখলিত জ্ঞানিক তথ্যবোৰৰ মাজত শৃংখলা বা সামঞ্জস্য স্থাপন কৰিব পাৰে।

মধ্বৰ মতে সত্তাৰ আচল জ্ঞান লাভৰ বাবে আমি বেদৰ ওপৰত নিৰ্ভৰ কৰিবই লাগিব। তেওঁ বেদৰ প্ৰামাণ্যক বিশ্বাস কৰে। কিন্তু পৌৰুষেয় শাস্ত্ৰক প্ৰামাণ্য বুলি লোৱা নাই। বেদক অপৌৰুষেয় এই বাবেই বোলা হয় কাৰণ এইবোৰ কোনেও ৰচনা কৰা নহয়।

মধ্বৰ মতে জ্ঞাতা আৰু জ্ঞেয়ৰ মাজৰ সম্পৰ্ক অপৰোক্ষ হ'লেহে আচল সত্যক জানিব পাৰি। এনে জ্ঞান ভুল হ'ব নোৱাৰে। আনকি ব্ৰহ্মাত্মক প্ৰত্যক্ষতো আমি পোৱা তথ্যবোৰ সত্য। মাত্ৰ বস্তু এটাৰ সামগ্ৰিক দৃষ্টি আমাৰ চকুত নপৰা বাবে আমি ভুল কৰোঁ। এটা বস্তুক অন্য এটাৰ দৰে দেখাৰ বাবে ভুল হয়। জগতৰ ক্ষেত্ৰতো এয়েই ঘটে। জগতক জগত ৰূপে নেদেখি অন্য ৰূপে দেখিলেই জগত অসত্য বুলি আমি ভুল কৰোঁ। আচলতে জগত অসত্য নহয়।

### মধ্বাচাৰ্য আৰু শংকৰাচাৰ্য

কোৱা হয় যে মধ্বাচাৰ্য শংকৰাচাৰ্যৰ জন্মগত শত্ৰু আৰু কোৱা হয় যে শংকৰাচাৰ্যৰ শিষ্যসকল বৰ অত্যাচাৰী আছিল। তেওঁলোকে মঠ-মন্দিৰবোৰ ভাঙি পেলাইছিল, গৰু-ম'হ মাৰিছিল, শিশু আৰু তিৰোতাক হত্যা কৰিছিল। শংকৰাচাৰ্যৰ দৰ্শনক বিৰোধিতা কৰা প্ৰজ্ঞাতীৰ্থক জোৰকৈ তেওঁলোকে অদ্বৈত বেদান্তৰ পথলৈ আনিছিল। কিন্তু তাৰ মাজতে অচ্যুতপ্ৰেক্ষ নামৰ এজন দাৰ্শনিক নিজৰ বিশ্বাসত অটল হৈ আছিল। তেঁৱেই আছিল মধ্বাচাৰ্যৰ গুৰু।

কোৱা হয় যে মধ্বাচাৰ্যই শংকৰৰ দৰ্শন নিপাত কৰিবৰ বাবেই অৱতাৰ লৈছিল। তেওঁ শংকৰৰ দৰ্শনক লোকায়ত দৰ্শনৰ লগত একে বুলি কৈছিল। এই দৰ্শন আনকি

লোকায়াত, জৈন, পাশুপত আদি দৰ্শনতকৈও ভয়াৱহ আছিল।

প্ৰথমতে মধ্বই শংকৰাচাৰ্যৰ দৰ্শনত দীক্ষিত হৈছিল। লাহে লাহে তেওঁ নিজস্ব দৃষ্টিভংগী পোষণ কৰে। তেওঁৰ এই দৃষ্টিভংগীৰ শংকৰ পন্থৰ সম্পূৰ্ণ বিপৰীত হৈ পৰে। তেওঁ এজন এজনকৈ শংকৰপন্থী পণ্ডিতসকলক তৰ্কত হৰুৱাবলৈ ধৰে। বিশেষকৈ তেওঁ অনন্তপুৰত (দ্বিবান্দ্ৰম) থাকোতে শ্ৰীংগেৰি মঠৰ শংকৰপন্থীসকলৰ লগত অবিৰত ভাৱে বাগযুদ্ধত লিপ্ত হৈছিল।

শংকৰাচাৰ্যৰ অদ্বৈতবাদক মধ্বই সমূল্যেঃ প্ৰত্যাখ্যান কৰিছে। তেওঁ কৈছে যে যদিও ঈশ্বৰ মানুহত প্ৰতিফলিত হয় তথাপি এই প্ৰতিফলনত মূল ঈশ্বৰজন প্ৰতিফলিত নহয়। এই প্ৰতিফলনত যি 'উপাধি'ৰ (চৰ্ত) সৃষ্টি হৈছে সি়েই মানুহ আৰু ঈশ্বৰক বেলেগ কৰিছে। পানী পানীত মিলাৰ দৰে আত্মা ব্ৰহ্মত মিলাৰ কথা ক'লেও ইয়াৰো পাৰ্থক্য আছে। পানী পানীত মিলিলেও পানীৰ মাজত পাৰ্থক্য আছে। অন্ততঃ পৰিমাণৰ ক্ষেত্ৰত। ঠিক তেনেকৈ জীৱ আৰু ব্ৰহ্মৰ মাজতো পাৰ্থক্য আছে। সেয়ে মুক্তিত আত্মা মাত্ৰ ভগৱানৰ ওচৰলৈহে আহে, ভগৱানৰ লগত এক হৈ নাযায়। মুক্তিত মাত্ৰ আত্মাই নিজৰ দুখাত্মক অৱস্থাবোৰহে ত্যাগ কৰে। মোক্ষাৱস্থাত কোনো আত্মাই দুখ ভোগ নকৰে।

মধ্বই শংকৰৰ তিনিবিধ সত্য যেনে, পাৰমাৰ্থিক, ব্যৱহাৰিক আৰু প্ৰতিভাষিকক বিশ্বাস নকৰে। তেওঁ কয় যে জগত যদি প্ৰকৃততে অসত্য তেন্তে মানুহৰ ইয়াৰ প্ৰতি অনুৰাগ কিয় থাকিব? ব্ৰহ্মকে কেতিয়াও একমাত্ৰ অস্তিত্বশীল সত্তা বুলি ভাবিব নালাগে। ব্ৰহ্ম-অভিজ্ঞতাই জগত-অভিজ্ঞতাক নুই কৰিব নোৱাৰে। জগত অসত্য হ'লে অসত্যক জনা হ'ব যিটো অসম্ভৱ।

নিজস্ব প্ৰভাযুক্ত ব্ৰহ্মক অজ্ঞানে কেনেকৈ ঢাকে এই কথা মধ্বই বুজা নাই। তেওঁ শ্ৰুতিৰ আধাৰতে শংকৰৰ অনিৱৰ্চনীয়বাদক প্ৰত্যাখ্যান কৰিছে। তেওঁৰ মতে প্ৰত্যক্ষ, অনুমান আৰু অৰ্থাপত্তিৰ ভিত্তিতে ইয়াক সাব্যস্ত কৰিব নোৱাৰি। গতিকে জগতখনক অনিৱৰ্চনীয় বুলি কৈ উৰাই দিব নোৱাৰি। ('ন চ বাধ্যং জগদ্ ইত্যত্র কিঞ্চিন্মানম্'— 'তত্ত্বোদ্যাত')। যদি জগতখন মিছা হয় তেন্তে যি যুক্তিৰে ইয়াক মিছা বুলি কোৱা হৈছে সেই যুক্তিও মিছা হ'ব। যদি ব্ৰহ্মহে এক মাত্ৰ শুদ্ধ-সত্তা হয় জগত নহয়, তেন্তে জগত ব্ৰহ্মতকৈ বেলেগ হ'বলৈ বাধ্য।

জ্ঞাতা, জ্ঞান আৰু জ্ঞেয়ৰ মাজত যিহেতু পাৰ্থক্য আছে সেয়ে সত্তাবোৰৰ মাজতো পাৰ্থক্য আছে। আত্মাকে সাধাৰণতে জ্ঞাতা বুলি ধৰা হয়। যদি আত্মা আৰু ব্ৰহ্ম একে হয় তেন্তে নিৰ্গুণ ব্ৰহ্মৰ লগতে আত্মাক একে কৰা হ'ব আৰু তেতিয়া আত্মা জ্ঞাতা হ'ব

নোৱাৰিব কাৰণ নিৰ্গুণ কিবা এটা জ্ঞাতা হ'ব নোৱাৰে। আত্মা যদি জ্ঞাতা নহয় তেন্তে ই জড় সমান হ'ব। তদুপৰি জগতৰ বস্তুবোৰ যদি অলীক হয় তেন্তে জ্ঞান সম্ভৱ নহ'ব। কাৰণ জ্ঞানৰ বাবে জ্ঞেয় অপৰিহাৰ্য।

মধ্বৰ মতে কাল আৰু প্ৰকৃতিও প্ৰকৃত কাৰণ। কাল আৰু প্ৰকৃতিক সময়ৰ দ্বাৰা সীমাবদ্ধ কৰিব নোৱাৰি।

এইদৰে সকলো ক্ষেত্ৰতে জগতখনক সত্য হিচাপেই দেখা যায়। কোনোও চকুৰে দেখা জগতখনক অসত্য বুলি ক'ব নোৱাৰে। বহুতে ক'ব খোজে যে আমি দেখা সূৰ্য আৰু চন্দ্ৰ সত্য নহয়, কাৰণ চন্দ্ৰ আৰু সূৰ্য আমি দেখাতকৈ বহুত ডাঙৰ। কিন্তু সেইবুলি জগতৰ সকলো বস্তুকে অসত্য বুলি ক'ব নোৱাৰি। চন্দ্ৰ-সূৰ্যক সৰু যেন দেখায় যিহেতু সিহঁত দুটা আমাৰপৰা বহুত দূৰৈত আছে। গতিকে জগতখন অবিদ্যা জাত নহয়। জগতখনক যাদুকৰৰ যাদুৰ লগতো তুলনা কৰিব নোৱাৰি, কাৰণ যাদুকৰে নিজৰ যাদুৰ সৃষ্টিক দেখা নাপায়, যি ক্ষেত্ৰত ঈশ্বৰে তেওঁৰ সৃষ্টিক দেখা পায়। গতিকে জগত যাদুকৰৰ মায়া নহয়।

মধ্বই কৈছে যে আচলতে ব্ৰহ্মসূত্ৰৰ দ্বিতীয় খণ্ডত অদ্বৈতবাদকে খণ্ডন কৰা হৈছে। তদুপৰি ব্ৰহ্মসূত্ৰৰ বৌদ্ধবাদৰ খণ্ডনে অদ্বৈতবাদৰ খণ্ডনকে বুজায়। অদ্বৈতবাদীসকল আচলতে ছদ্মবেশী বৌদ্ধবাদী। কাৰণ নিৰ্গুণ ব্ৰহ্ম আৰু শূন্যৰ মাজত কোনো পাৰ্থক্য নাই। ব্ৰহ্ম নিত্য আৰু স্ব-প্ৰকাশিত হোৱাৰ দৰে শূন্যও নিত্য আৰু স্বপ্ৰকাশিত। ব্ৰহ্মও জড় নহয়, শূন্যও নহয়; ব্ৰহ্মৰ গাতো পাৰ্থক্য নাই, শূন্যৰ গাতো নাই। ব্ৰহ্মও দুখত নমজে, শূন্যও নমজে; ব্ৰহ্মও বন্ধন-প্ৰাপ্ত নহয়, শূন্যও নহয়। গতিকে উভয়েই এক অন্তঃসাৰশূন্য অস্তিত্ব। উভয়েই অচিন্ত্য।

অদ্বৈতবাদী সকলে ঈশ্বৰক বিশ্বাস নকৰে। তদুপৰি সকলোবোৰ আত্মা যিহেতু একে, এতেকে বদ্ধ আৰু মুক্ত জীৱৰ মাজত পাৰ্থক্য নাথাকিব। আকৌ ব্ৰহ্ম যদি সকলো আত্মাৰ সৈতে একে তেন্তে আত্মাৰ দুখে ব্ৰহ্মকো চুব।

গীতায়ো কয় যে ঈশ্বৰে নিজকে আত্মাতকৈ বেলেগ বুলি দেখে। এতেকে মায়াবাদৰ প্ৰভাৱ গীতাতো নাই। ইয়াৰ আধাৰতে মধ্বই এটা শ্লোক ৰচিছে। শ্লোকটো এই :

“পলায়ধ্বং পলায়ধ্বং ত্বৰয়া মায়াদানৱাঃ।

সৰ্বঞ্জো হৰিৰ্ভায়াতি তৰ্কাগম দৰাৰিভেদে।।”

(‘তত্ত্বোদ্যাত’)

ইয়াৰ অৰ্থ হ'ল : এয়েই উপযুক্ত সময় যে মায়াযুক্ত দানৱবোৰ পলাব লাগিব, কাৰণ সৰ্বঞ্জ হৰি আহিছে। তৰ্কবাদী সকলক ভয় খুৱাবৰ বাবে।



মধ্বই শংকৰাচাৰ্যৰ নিৰ্গুণ ব্ৰহ্মৰ ধাৰণাক প্ৰত্যাখ্যান কৰিছে। তেওঁ কয় যে ব্ৰহ্মৰ অসীম সংখ্যক গুণ আছে। তদুপৰি ভেদহীন ব্ৰহ্মৰ ধাৰণাকো তেওঁ প্ৰত্যাখ্যান কৰিছে। তেওঁৰ মতে ‘সত্যং জ্ঞানং অনন্তং ব্ৰহ্ম’ এই কথাবোৰে যদি এক নৈৰ্ব্যক্তিক ব্ৰহ্মৰ ধাৰণা দিয়ে, তথাপি এইবোৰ কথা দ্বৈতবাদী ধাৰণাবোৰৰে অন্তৰ্ভুক্ত।

মধ্বই শংকৰৰ মায়া, মিথ্যা, অনিৰ্বচনীয় আদি সকলো ধাৰণাকে প্ৰত্যাখ্যান কৰিছে। তদুপৰি ব্ৰহ্মক সৎও নহয় অসতো নহয় বুলি কোৱাটো তৰ্কশাস্ত্ৰৰ মধ্য-বিলোপ সিদ্ধান্তৰ পৰিপন্থী। অনিৰ্বচনীয় কথাটোৱে ‘সৎও নহয় অসতো নহয়’ এই কথাটো নুবুজায়। ই মাত্ৰ পৰিস্থিতিটো যে জটিল তাৰহে আভাস দিয়ে।

মধ্বই কয় যে দ্বৈতবাদ কেৱল ব্যৱহাৰিক জগততে নাই, পাৰমাৰ্থিক জগততো আছে। স্বৰূপ সত্তাত অভেদ আৰু তটস্থ সত্তাত ভেদ থকা কথাটো মানি ল’ব নোৱাৰি। ভেদ যদি তটস্থ লক্ষণত থাকে তেন্তে স্বৰূপ লক্ষণতো থাকিব। যদি জগত আৰু ব্ৰহ্মৰ মাজত কেৱল অভেদ সম্পৰ্কহে বৰ্তমান তেন্তে প্ৰকাশিত জগতৰ কথা ভবাই অসম্ভৱ হ’ব। অভেদ বস্তুটো পুনৰুক্তিমূলক।

অনন্তিত্ব মানে শংকৰাচাৰ্যই শহা পছৰ শিং বা বাজী তিৰোতাৰ সন্তান নহয় বুলি কোৱাটোও অবাস্তৱ কথা, কাৰণ অনন্তিত্ব মানে আচলতে শহা পছৰ শিঙৰ নিচিনা বস্তুকে বুজায়।

মধ্বই ওপৰৰ কথাবোৰ বেদৰ ওপৰতে ভিত্তি কৰি কৈছে। তেওঁৰ মতে কোনো বেদেই কোৱা নাই যে আত্মাবোৰ ঈশ্বৰৰ সৈতে একে। তথাপি বেদ-উপনিষদত অভেদ সম্পৰ্কীয় বহুত কথাই পোৱা যায়। কিন্তু এই কথাবোৰ ভেদবাদৰ ওপৰত থকা কথাবোৰতকৈ তল খাপৰ, কাৰণ ভেদবাদৰ কথাবোৰকহে অন্যান্য প্ৰমাণৰ দ্বাৰা সাব্যস্ত কৰিব পাৰি।

আমি ঈশ্বৰৰ লগত একে হোৱা হেঁতেন ঈশ্বৰৰ প্ৰতি আমাৰ আসক্তি নাথাকিলহেঁতেন। ঈশ্বৰ আৰু মানুহৰ মাজত পাৰ্থক্য আছে বাবেই মানুহৰ ঈশ্বৰৰ প্ৰতি আসক্তি আছে।

সকলো বস্তু যদি একে হয় তেন্তে গৰু, ম’হ, মানুহ আদিৰ মাজত পাৰ্থক্য নাথাকিলহেঁতেন বা সেইবোৰক পাৰ্থক্যমূলক ভাবে প্ৰত্যক্ষ কৰাও সম্ভৱ নহ’লহেঁতেন। আমি যিহেতু বস্তুবোৰক পাৰ্থক্যমূলকভাৱে দেখো সেয়ে ভেদ বিদ্যমান।

আত্মা আৰু ব্ৰহ্মক যেতিয়া একে বুলি ভবা হয় তেতিয়া ব্ৰহ্মৰ গুণখিনি আত্মায়ো অধিকাৰ কৰিব লাগিব। অৰ্থাৎ তেতিয়া আত্মা সৰ্বজ্ঞ, সৰ্বশক্তিমান, দুখ আৰু দোষ ৰহিত হ’ব। এই কথা অসম্ভৱ। সেয়ে আত্মা আৰু ব্ৰহ্ম একে নহয়। ‘যাক জানিলে

সকলোকে জনা যায়’ এই শ্ৰুতিবাক্যৰ অৰ্থ হ’ল জ্ঞানত এটা সময়ত মাত্ৰ এটাহে বিষয় থাকে, একাধিক বিষয় নাথাকে। সেয়ে একে সময়তে আমি বালিছন্দা আৰু ৰূপ একেলগে নেদেখোঁ। এটা দেখিলে আনটো নেদেখি। অৱশ্যে এটা নিৰ্দিষ্ট বস্তুত সেই বস্তুটোৰ শ্ৰেণী বা জাতিটোকো দেখা যায়।

এটা বস্তুক দেখিলে আনবোৰ দেখা নাযায়। তাৰ দ্বাৰা এই কথা নুবুজায় যে অন্যবোৰ বস্তু অস্তিত্বও নাই। সেইদৰে ব্ৰহ্মক জনা মানে অন্যবোৰ বস্তুৰ অস্তিত্বহীনতাক নুবুজায়।

### মধ্বাচাৰ্য আৰু ৰামানুজাচাৰ্য

ৰামানুজ আৰু মধ্ব উভয়ে জ্ঞানৰ তিনিটা প্ৰমাণ মানি লয়। এই তিনিটা প্ৰমাণ হ’ল প্ৰত্যক্ষ, অনুমান আৰু শব্দ। ৰামানুজৰ দৰে তেওঁও কয় যে পূৰ্বমীমাংসা আৰু উত্তৰমীমাংসা একেটা দৰ্শনেই। ৰামানুজৰ দৰে তেওঁও ঈশ্বৰ, আত্মা আৰু প্ৰকৃতি এই তিনি সত্তাক মানি লয় আৰু এই তিনি সত্তাক নিত্য বুলি ধৰে। অৱশ্যে আত্মা আৰু প্ৰকৃতি ঈশ্বৰৰ ওপৰত নিৰ্ভৰশীল।

ৰামানুজৰ ধৰ্মীয় দৰ্শনে মধ্বক বাৰুকৈয়ে প্ৰভাৱিত কৰে। কিন্তু দুয়োৰে মাজত তফাৎ আছে। মধ্ব এজন দ্বৈতবাদী দাৰ্শনিক, যি ক্ষেত্ৰত ৰামানুজ অদ্বৈতবাদী, যদিও তেওঁৰ অদ্বৈতবাদ ‘বিশিষ্ট’। মধ্বৰ মতে অদ্বৈতবাদ মিথ্যা, দ্বৈতবাদহে সঁচা। তেওঁৰ মতে জগতৰ বস্তুবোৰ দ্ৰব্য ধৰ্মী, অন্যহাতে ৰামানুজৰ মতে বিশেষণধৰ্মী। তেওঁ ৰামানুজৰ অপৃথকসিদ্ধি ধাৰণাটো প্ৰত্যাখ্যান কৰিছে। তেওঁ আত্মা (চিৎ) আৰু প্ৰকৃতিক (অচিৎ) ভগৱানৰ শাৰীৰ বুলিও ধৰা নাই। প্ৰকৃতি আৰু আত্মা ভগৱানৰ গাত নাথাকে, ইহঁত ভগৱানৰ ওপৰত নিৰ্ভৰশীলহে। ৰামানুজৰ দৰে মধ্বইও আত্মাৰ বহুত্বক মানি লৈছে। যদিও সকলো আত্মাৰ স্বৰূপ একেই। কিন্তু দুটা আত্মাৰ মাজত প্ৰভেদ চকুত লগাকৈ থাকে। প্ৰতিটো আত্মাৰে নিজস্ব বৈশিষ্ট্য আৰু ব্যক্তিত্ব আছে। আনকি মুক্তিতো আত্মাই এই পাৰ্থক্য বজাই ৰাখে। এই আত্মাবোৰৰ মাজত জ্ঞান আৰু আনন্দৰ ক্ষেত্ৰতো তাৰতম্য আছে। এইটো মধ্বৰ মত, ৰামানুজৰ নহয়।

মধ্বই ঈশ্বৰৰ দেহ আৰু আত্মাৰ মাজত পাৰ্থক্য অনা নাই, ৰামানুজে আনিছে। মধ্বৰ মতে ঈশ্বৰেই জগতৰ একমাত্ৰ নিমিত্ত কাৰণ। তেওঁ প্ৰকৃতিৰপৰা জগতৰ উদ্ভৱ কৰাইছে। অন্যহাতে ৰামানুজে ঈশ্বৰক নিমিত্ত আৰু উপাদান এই দুয়ো কাৰণৰ অৰ্থত লৈছে।

মধ্ব আৰু ৰামানুজ উভয়ে ব্ৰহ্মৰ নিৰ্গুণত্বৰ তাৎপৰ্য দিছে এইদৰে যে তেওঁৰ কোনো বেয়া গুণ নাই। তেওঁক নিৰ্ধাৰণ কৰিব নোৱাৰা অৰ্থতো নিৰ্গুণ শব্দটো ব্যৱহৃত হৈছে।

দ্রব্য হিচাপে গুণবোৰ ব্ৰহ্মৰ গাতে পৃথক কৰিব নোৱাৰাকৈ থাকে (অপৃথক সিদ্ধ)। মধ্বই এই কথা মানি লোৱা নাই। তেওঁৰ মতে গুণবোৰক দ্ৰব্যৰপৰা পৃথক কৰিব পাৰি। দ্ৰব্য মাত্ৰ গুণৰ আধাৰ বা আশ্ৰয়হে।

### মধ্বাচাৰ্য, নিম্বাৰ্কাচাৰ্য আৰু বল্লভাচাৰ্যৰ বেদান্তৰ তুলনা

যদিও তিনিও জনেই মূল বেদান্ত পুথি ব্ৰহ্মসূত্ৰৰ ব্যাখ্যা দাঙি ধৰিছে তথাপি তেওঁলোকৰ মাজত দৃষ্টিভংগীমূলক পাৰ্থক্য আছে। শংকৰাচাৰ্য আৰু ৰামানুজৰ দৰেই তেওঁলোক তিনিজনেই তিনিটা বেদান্ত শাখা গঠন কৰিছে। মধ্বই গঠন কৰিছে দ্বৈতবাদী বেদান্ত, নিম্বাৰ্কেই গঠন কৰিছে দ্বৈত-অদ্বৈতবাদী বেদান্ত আৰু বল্লভে গঠন কৰিছে শুদ্ধ অদ্বৈত বেদান্ত। তেওঁলোকৰ এই দৃষ্টিভংগীৰ পাৰ্থক্য বেদান্তৰ মূল বিষয়সমূহ যেনে ব্ৰহ্ম, মায়া, আত্মা, মোক্ষ, জ্ঞান, প্ৰমাণ, সত্যতা, মিথ্যা ত্ৰ আদিত ওলাই পৰিছে।

বহুতো কথাত তেওঁলোক তিনিওজনৰ মাজত মিলো আছে। যেনে, মধ্ব আৰু নিম্বাৰ্কে উভয়ে ঈশ্বৰ, আত্মা আৰু প্ৰকৃতি এই তিনি সত্তাৰ অস্তিত্বক মানি লৈছে। দুয়োজনেই আত্মাক আনবিক বুলি ধৰে। অৰ্থাৎ আত্মাৰ আকাৰ অণু সদৃশ। উভয়ে আত্মাৰ বহুত্বক স্বীকাৰ কৰে। দুয়ো কয় যে আত্মা নিত্য। উভয়ে ভগৱান যে ব্যুহত প্ৰকাশিত হয় এই কথা মানে।

ওপৰৰ কথাবোৰত উভয়ৰ মাজত মিল থাকিলেও কিছুমান ক্ষেত্ৰত আকৌ পাৰ্থক্য বা দ্বিমতো আছে। যেনে, মধ্বই কয় যে মুক্তি ভক্তিৰ দ্বাৰা সম্ভৱ। অন্যহাতে নিম্বাৰ্কেই কয় যে ই সম্ভৱ জ্ঞানৰ দ্বাৰা। মধ্বই ঈশ্বৰক কেৱল নিমিত্ত কাৰণ বুলি ধৰে, নিম্বাৰ্কেই ঈশ্বৰক নিমিত্ত আৰু উপাদান উভয় কাৰণ বুলি ধৰে। এই ক্ষেত্ৰত বল্লভ নিম্বাৰ্কেৰ লগত একমত।

মধ্বই কয় যে আত্মা ঈশ্বৰৰ অধীনত থকা এক অংশ আৰু ঈশ্বৰৰপৰা ই বেলেগ। নিম্বাৰ্কেই আত্মাক সসীম বুলি মানে। ই ঈশ্বৰৰ ওপৰত নিৰ্ভৰশীল যদিও ঈশ্বৰতকৈ বেলেগ। কিন্তু ঈশ্বৰৰ শক্তি হিচাপে ই ঈশ্বৰৰ সৈতে থাকে। বল্লভৰ মতে আত্মা হ'ল ঈশ্বৰৰ অংশ যদিও ই ঈশ্বৰৰ সৈতে থাকে। ইয়াৰ সীমাবদ্ধ প্ৰকাশৰ বাবে ই ঈশ্বৰতকৈ বেলেগ।

## গান্ধীৰ দৰ্শনত সত্য আৰু অহিংসাৰ ধাৰণা

শ্ৰীঅসীম স্বৰ্গীয়াৰী,

জাতিৰ পিতা ৰূপে খ্যাত মোহনদাস কৰমচাঁদ গান্ধী আছিল এজন সমাজবাদী আৰু মানৱতাবাদী দাৰ্শনিক। তেওঁ নিজৰ জীৱনত কোনো দাৰ্শনিক তত্ত্বৰ প্ৰয়োগ কৰা নাছিল। গান্ধীয়ে নিজৰ জীৱনো কিছুমান মৌলিক আদৰ্শৰ লগত সামঞ্জস্য ৰাখি চলাইছিল। তেওঁৰ সন্মুখত উদ্ভৱ হোৱা যিকোনো সমস্যাক তেওঁ নিজৰ নৈতিকতাৰ আদৰ্শৰে সমাধানৰ চেষ্টা কৰিছিল। মহাত্মা গান্ধী এজন প্ৰকৃত কৰ্মযোগী আছিল। ভগৱদ গীতাত উল্লেখিত —‘কৰ্মই ধৰ্ম’ কথাষাৰে গান্ধীৰ জীৱনত গুৰুত্বপূৰ্ণভাৱে প্ৰভাৱ বিস্তাৰ কৰিছিল। গীতাৰ আদৰ্শৰে গান্ধীয়ে বিশ্বৰ মানৱক উদ্বুদ্ধ কৰাৰ চেষ্টা কৰিছিল। গতিকে, দেখা যায় যে গান্ধীজীয়ে যদিও দৰ্শনৰ সমস্যাৰাজিক তত্ত্ববিদ্যাৰ দৃষ্টিৰে পৰ্যালোচনা কৰা নাই, তথাপি তেওঁৰ সত্য, অহিংসা, মানৱতাবাদ আদি ধাৰণাবোৰৰ দৰ্শনৰ জগতত এক মহৎ তাৎপৰ্য আছে। সেয়ে সাম্প্ৰতিক কালৰ ভাৰতীয় দৰ্শনত তেওঁকো এজন দাৰ্শনিকৰূপে স্বীকৃতি দিয়া হৈছে।

### সত্য সম্পৰ্কে গান্ধীৰ মতবাদ :

গান্ধীদৰ্শন ভাৰতীয় সংস্কৃতি তথা পৰম্পৰাৰ ওপৰতে প্ৰতিষ্ঠিত। সত্য, অহিংসা আৰু ঈশ্বৰ, এই তিনিটাই হৈছে গান্ধীদৰ্শনৰ মুখ্য ধাৰণা।

সাধাৰণ বিশ্বাস অনুসৰি সত্য হৈছে মিছা কোৱাৰ পৰা বিৰত থকা আৰু কোনো গোপনীয়তা নৰখা। কিন্তু, গান্ধীজীৰ মতে, সত্যৰ এনে ৰূপ হ'ল আংশিক। গান্ধীৰ সত্য সম্পৰ্কীয় ধাৰণা সাধাৰণ ধাৰণাতকৈ ব্যাপক আৰু গভীৰ। গান্ধীৰ মতে সত্যই হৈছে ঈশ্বৰ, ঈশ্বৰেই কেৱল মাত্ৰ বাস্তৱ, বাকী সকলোবোৰ সীমাবদ্ধ আৰু অবাস্তৱ।

গান্ধীয়ে প্ৰথমতে ‘ঈশ্বৰেই সত্য’ বুলি মত পোষণ কৰিছিল কিন্তু পাছলৈ গান্ধীজীয়ে নিজৰ মত সলনি কৰি কয় যে ‘সত্যই ঈশ্বৰ’। তেওঁৰ নিজৰ মত পৰিৱৰ্তনৰ আঁৰত যথেষ্ট কাৰণ আছে। প্ৰথমতে, গান্ধীজীয়ে ‘সত্য’ শব্দটো ‘ঈশ্বৰ’ৰ নিচিনাকৈ অনেকাৰ্থক ভাৱে গ্ৰহণ কৰা নাই। ঈশ্বৰক বিভিন্নজনে বিভিন্ন অৰ্থত বৰ্ণনা কৰে। কোনোবাই ঈশ্বৰ এক বুলি কয়, আকৌ কোনোবাই দ্বৈত বা কোনোবাই ঈশ্বৰ বহুত

বুলি কয়। বহুতৰ মতে, ঈশ্বৰ নিৰ্গুণ আৰু বহুতৰ বাবে ঈশ্বৰ সগুণ। কিন্তু গান্ধীজীৰ মতে ‘সত্য’ বুলি ক’লে সকলোৰে কাৰণে একেই। ই কেতিয়াও পৰিৱৰ্তিত নহয়। দ্বিতীয়তে, গান্ধীজীয়ে কয়, ঈশ্বৰক যুক্তিৰে স্বীকাৰ বা অস্বীকাৰ কৰিব পাৰি। ঈশ্বৰবাদীসকলৰ বাবে ঈশ্বৰ অস্তিত্ব আছে আৰু নিৰীশ্বৰবাদীসকলৰ বাবে ঈশ্বৰ কোনো অস্তিত্ব নাই। কিন্তু, গান্ধীজীৰ সতে ‘সত্য’ক ঈশ্বৰবাদী আৰু নিৰীশ্বৰবাদী সকলোৱেই মানি লয়। সত্য হ’ল সৰ্বজনীন আৰু ব্যাপক। সত্যৰ ওপৰত গান্ধীজীৰ অগাধ বিশ্বাস আছিল। সেয়ে গান্ধীজীয়ে মানৱ জাতিক অন্ধ ধৰ্মীয় বিশ্বাসৰ পৰা সত্যলৈ পৰিৱৰ্তিত হ’বৰ বাবে কৈছে। তেওঁ কৈছে—“I do not care for God if He is anything but truth.”<sup>1</sup>

সত্য হৈছে নিত্য আৰু বিৰোধমুক্ত, সেয়ে গান্ধীয়ে সত্যক ঈশ্বৰৰ সৈতে একে বুলি কৈছে। এইক্ষেত্ৰত গান্ধীজীয়ে কৈছে—“ঈশ্বৰৰ প্ৰকাশ যিহেতু বিভিন্ন, সেয়ে ঈশ্বৰৰ সংজ্ঞাও অসংখ্য আছে, সেইবোৰে মোক আশ্চৰ্য আৰু আনুগত্য মিশ্ৰিত ভাৱে আৱৰি ৰাখে আৰু এক মুহূৰ্তৰ বাবেও বিমোৰত পেলায়। কিন্তু মই ঈশ্বৰক সত্য ৰূপেই উপাসনা কৰো।”<sup>2</sup> আকৌ তেওঁ আন এঠাইত কৈছে—“অহিংসা আৰু সত্যৰ ওপৰতে মোৰ ধৰ্ম প্ৰতিষ্ঠিত। সত্যই হৈছে মোৰ বাবে ঈশ্বৰ আৰু তেওঁক উপলব্ধি কৰাৰ পথত অহিংসাই হৈছে এক উপায়।”<sup>3</sup>

এইখিনিতে এটা প্ৰশ্নৰ উদয় হয়—যদি সত্য নিত্য তেন্তে গান্ধীয়ে সত্যৰ ওপৰত বিভিন্ন পৰীক্ষা চলাই সত্যৰ ৰূপান্তৰ সাধন কৰিবলৈ কিয় বিচাৰিছে? ইয়াৰ উত্তৰত ক’ব পৰা যায় যে যদিও এজন ব্যক্তিৰ হৃদয়ত সত্য আৰু ভুল একেলগে থাকে, এজন অজ্ঞ লোকে সত্যক সহজে উপলব্ধি কৰিব নোৱাৰে। সত্যৰ পোহৰ পাবলৈ হ’লে, আন্ধাৰৰ আৱৰণ আঁতৰাব লাগিব। গভীৰ চিন্তা আৰু পৰীক্ষাৰ দ্বাৰাহে — অজ্ঞান আন্ধাৰ আঁতৰ কৰিব পাৰি।

সত্য বিশুদ্ধ আৰু মানুহ হ’ল অশুদ্ধ। কিন্তু ধ্যানৰ সহযোগত অশুদ্ধ মানুহে বিশুদ্ধ স্তৰত উপনীত হ’ব পাৰে। সত্যৰ পথ অনুসৰণ কৰি মানুহে লোভ, শত্ৰুতা, হিংসা আদি মনৰ দুৰ্বলতা তথা অনুভূতিবোৰ জয় কৰিব পাৰে। সেয়ে আমাৰ সকলো ধৰণৰ কাম-কাজ সত্যকেন্দ্ৰিত হোৱা উচিত। আমাৰ জীৱনত সত্যহে অপৰিহাৰ্য্য হ’ব লাগে।

গান্ধীৰ মতে, ‘সৰ্বোদয়’ৰ ৰূপতেই ‘সত্য’ মানৱ সমাজত প্ৰকাশিত হয়। ‘সৰ্বোদয়’ শব্দটো গান্ধীয়েই প্ৰথমে ব্যৱহাৰ কৰে। ইয়াৰ অৰ্থ হৈছে মানৱ মনৰ সকলো ধৰণৰ উন্নতি সাধন। এই উন্নতি কেৱল অৰ্থনৈতিক উন্নতি নহয়। এই উন্নতি হৈছে

নৈতিক আৰু আধ্যাত্মিক উন্নতি দুয়োটাই। নৈতিক উন্নতিৰ সাধনেহে অৰ্থনৈতিক উন্নতিৰ সাধন কৰিব। গান্ধীজীৰ মতে, শত্ৰুৰ অন্তৰতো সত্য থাকে। নিঃস্বার্থ প্ৰেমৰ দ্বাৰা শত্ৰুৰ অন্তৰ জয় কৰিব পাৰি।

**অহিংসা সম্পৰ্কে গান্ধীৰ মতবাদ :**

আক্ষৰিক অৰ্থত ‘অহিংসা’ শব্দৰ অৰ্থ হৈছে হিংসা কৰাৰ পৰা বিৰত থকা। হিংসা কৰাৰ পৰা বিৰত থকা মানে কাকো আঘাত নিদিয়া বা হত্যা নকৰা। এই ‘অহিংসা’ৰ অৰ্থ বিভিন্নজনে বিভিন্ন ধৰণে দিয়া দেখা পোওঁ। জৈনসকলে ‘অহিংসা’ শব্দৰ অৰ্থ অতি কঠোৰভাৱে গ্ৰহণ কৰিছে। তেওঁলোকৰ মতে যি কোনো প্ৰাণীকেই আঘাত কৰা বা হত্যা কৰাটো হিংসা আৰু এই ‘আঘাত কৰা’ আৰু ‘হত্যা কৰা’ ধাৰণাটো জৈনসকলৰ বাবে মহাপাপ। হিন্দুসকলৰ ‘অহিংসা’ শব্দৰ অৰ্থটো জৈনসকলতকৈ কিছু পৰিমাণে শিথিল। হিন্দুসকলৰ মতে আহাৰ আৰু পূজাৰ বাবে কৰা প্ৰাণী হত্যা হিংসাৰ ৰূপ নহয়। সেয়ে তেওঁলোকে আহাৰ আৰু পূজাৰ বাবে প্ৰাণী হত্যা গ্ৰহণ কৰিছে। কিন্তু মহাত্মা গান্ধীয়ে ‘অহিংসা’ শব্দৰ ক্ষেত্ৰত এক মধ্যম পন্থা অৱলম্বন কৰা দেখা যায়। গান্ধীজীয়ে হিন্দুসকলৰ পূজা আৰু আহাৰৰ বাবে কৰা প্ৰাণী হত্যা সমৰ্থন কৰা নাই। লগতে জৈনসকলৰ দৰে সকলো অৱস্থাতে, হোৱা হত্যা পাপ বুলি স্বীকাৰ কৰা নাই। গতিকে গান্ধীজীৰ অহিংসাৰ ধাৰণা আনৰ ধাৰণাতকৈ কিছু পৃথক।

মহাত্মা গান্ধীয়ে অহিংসাৰ দুটা দিশ আছে বুলি কৈছে। এটা হৈছে সদৰ্থক আৰু আনটো হৈছে নঞৰ্থক। আনক হত্যা কৰাটো বা আঘাত কৰাটো হিংসা। গান্ধীজীৰ মতে, হিংসাৰ বিপৰীত হ’ল অহিংসা। গান্ধীজীয়ে লগতে কৈছে যে হিংসাৰ অৰ্থ কেৱল আনক হত্যা কৰা নহয়—আনক দুখ দিয়াও একপ্ৰকাৰ হিংসা। ক্ৰোধৰ বশৱৰ্তী হৈ স্বার্থপৰ মনোভাৱেৰে আনক অপকাৰ কৰাই হিংসা। এনে কামৰ পৰা বিৰত থকাটোৱেই অহিংসা।

গান্ধীজীয়ে অহিংসা পালনৰ ক্ষেত্ৰত জৈনসকলৰ সৈতে একমত আছিল কিন্তু জৈনসকলৰ দৰে কঠোৰভাৱেও অহিংসা পালন কৰাৰ কথা কোৱা নাছিল। গান্ধীজীৰ অহিংসাৰ নঞৰ্থক দিশ অনুসৰি তেওঁ কৈছিল যে কিছুমান ক্ষেত্ৰত হিংসাও অপৰিহাৰ্য্য। আমাৰ দৈনন্দিন জীৱনত খাওঁতে, উশাহ লওঁতে, ফুৰাচকা কৰোতে কিছু হিংসাত্মক কাৰ্য্য ঘটিয়ে থাকে। গান্ধীজীয়ে কৈছিল নিজৰ দেহৰক্ষাৰ কাৰণে কিছু পৰিমাণে হ’লেও অন্যদেহৰ ওপৰত আঘাত পৰে। সেয়ে তেওঁ কিছুমান ক্ষেত্ৰত হত্যা অনুমোদনো কৰিছিল। তেওঁ এই সম্পৰ্কে এনেদৰে কয় যে—আমাৰ নিজৰ শাৰীৰিক পুষ্টিৰ বাবে আমি শাক-পাচলি, জীৱ আৰু অন্যান্য বস্তু ব্যৱহাৰ কৰো, শৰীৰৰ বাবে অনিষ্ট বা

আমাৰ আহাৰৰ বাবে অনিষ্ট কিছুমান প্ৰাণীক আমি ব্যাধিনাশক ঔষধেৰে হত্যা কৰিব লগা হয়। কিছু বিশেষ পৰিস্থিতিত অন্য জীৱৰ লগতে মানুহ হত্যা কৰাৰো প্ৰয়োজন আহিব পাৰে। যেনে - যদি কোনো ব্যক্তিয়ে প্ৰাণে মৰা বাবে আন এজন ব্যক্তিৰ পিছ লয় তেন্তে সেই ব্যক্তিজনে নিজৰ জীৱন ৰক্ষা কৰিবৰ বাবে আনজন ব্যক্তিক হত্যা কৰিলে সেয়া পাপ নহয় বুলি গান্ধীয়ে কয়। আত্মৰক্ষাৰ বাবে অন্য ব্যক্তি বা জীৱৰ হত্যা গ্ৰহণযোগ্য বুলি গান্ধীজীয়ে কয়। গান্ধীজীয়ে লগতে এইটোও কয় যে দুৰাৰোগ্য ৰোগত ভুগি থকা ব্যক্তিজনক ঔষধ দি কষ্টৰে জীয়াই ৰখাতকৈ তেওঁক জীৱনৰ পৰা মুক্তি দি দিয়াতো দয়াহে, অন্যায় নহয়। (গান্ধীজীৰ এই ধাৰণা বৰ্তমানৰ প্ৰায়োগিক নীতিশাস্ত্ৰৰ ‘কৃপাহত্যা’ (Euthensia) ৰ ধাৰণাৰ লগত মিল আছে।) গতিকে দেখা গ’ল যে গান্ধীৰ অহিংসাৰ ধাৰণা জৈনসকলৰ অহিংসাৰ ধাৰণাতকৈ পৃথক।

গান্ধীজীয়ে কোৱা নঞৰ্থক দিশটোত থকাৰ দৰে আমি জীৱৰ প্ৰতি কেতিয়াবা হিংসা কৰাটো আচলতে হিংসা নহয়। কিন্তু তেওঁ লগতে এইটো কথাও স্পষ্ট কৰি দিছে যে কোনো বিশেষ পৰিস্থিতিত যেনে - খং, অহংকাৰ, ঘৃণা, স্বাৰ্থপৰতা, অসৎ অভিপ্ৰায় আদিৰ বশৱৰ্তী হৈ কোনো জীৱৰ অনিষ্ট সাধন কৰিলে তাক অহিংসা বুলি নকয়। সেয়া এক প্ৰকাৰৰ হিংসাত্মক কাৰ্য হ’ব। গতিকে ‘অহিংসা’, খং, অহংকাৰ, ঘৃণা, স্বাৰ্থপৰতা আদিৰ পৰা মুক্ত।

গান্ধীজীৰ অহিংসাৰ নঞৰ্থক দিশতকৈ সদৰ্থক দিশটো বেছি গুৰুত্বপূৰ্ণ। কিয়নো অহিংসাৰ সদৰ্থক দিশটোৱে কেৱল জীৱক আঘাত দিয়া বা হত্যাৰ পৰা বিৰত থকাটোৱেই কেৱল অহিংসা বুলি নকয়। ইয়াৰ উপৰিও সকলো জীৱৰ প্ৰতি সদৰ্থক মনোভাৱ থকাটোকহে অহিংসা বুলি গান্ধীজীয়ে ক’ব খোজে। সদৰ্থক অৰ্থত ‘অহিংসা’ শব্দৰ অৰ্থ হৈছে প্ৰেম। সকলোৰে প্ৰতি আমাৰ যেতিয়া প্ৰেম ভাৱৰ উদয় হ’ব তেতিয়া কোনোধৰণৰ হিংসাত্মক কাৰ্যৰ উদ্ভৱ নহ’ব। কিন্তু মনত প্ৰেম ভাৱৰ উদয় হোৱাতো ইমান সহজ নহয়। অহিংসাৰ অভ্যাসৰ বাবে মনটো ক্ৰোধ, ঘৃণা, প্ৰতিশোধ, হিংসা ইত্যাদি সকলোবোৰ অসৎ প্ৰবৃত্তিৰ পৰা সম্পূৰ্ণৰূপে বিৰত থাকিব লাগিব। এইবোৰে প্ৰেমৰ ভাৱ জাগ্ৰত হোৱাত বাধা প্ৰদান কৰে। গান্ধীজীৰ মতে, প্ৰেম হ’ল এনে এটা শক্তি, যিটোৱে মনটো পবিত্ৰ কৰি মানৱক উন্নত কৰে আৰু প্ৰেমে উপকাৰিতা, ক্ষমা, উদাৰতা, সহানুভূতি, দয়া ইত্যাদি সৎ প্ৰবৃত্তিবোৰ সামৰি লয়।

গান্ধীজীয়ে কৈছিল অহিংসাৰ পথত দৃঢ়ভাৱে আগবাঢ়িব হ’লে অপৰিসীম নৈতিক সাহসৰ প্ৰয়োজন। এই পথ অৱলম্বন কৰিলে সকলো প্ৰকাৰৰ অন্যায় নিপীড়ন আৰু নিৰ্যাতন সহ্য কৰিব পাৰিব লাগিব। নিৰ্যাতনকাৰীক প্ৰেমেৰে হৃদয় পৰিৱৰ্তন কৰি

তেওঁৰ আধ্যাত্মিক উৎকৰ্ষ সাধনত ব্ৰতী হয়। গতিকে অহিংসাই শত্ৰুক অস্ত্ৰ আৰু শক্তিৰ পৰিৱৰ্তে প্ৰেমেৰে অস্ত্ৰৰ পৰিৱৰ্তন কৰি জয় কৰিব বিচাৰে।

গান্ধীজীয়ে এইটো কথাও স্পষ্টকৈ বুজাই দিছে যে অহিংসা সবলৰ কাৰণেহে, দুৰ্বলীৰ কাৰণে নহয়। গান্ধীজীৰ মতে, হিংসা, দুৰ্বলতাৰ পৰিচায়ক। দুৰ্বল মনোভাৱ পোষণ কৰা ব্যক্তিৰ মনত শত্ৰুৰ পৰা ক্ষতি হোৱাৰ ভয় থাকে সেয়ে তেওঁলোকে সহজতে হিংসাৰ প্ৰতি আকৃষ্ট হয়। দেখাত হিংসাত শক্তি থকাৰ দৰে লাগে কিন্তু ই প্ৰকৃততে ভয়ৰ পৰা উৎপন্ন এক ভ্ৰম। গতিকে আমি অহিংসাৰ সাধনা কৰা উচিত। গান্ধীজীৰ মতে, অহিংসা সকলো মানুহেই অভ্যাস কৰিব পাৰে। শিশু, পুৰুষ, নাৰী, বৃদ্ধ সকলোৱেই সকলো সময়তে যিকোনো পৰিস্থিতিত অভ্যাস কৰিব পাৰে। অহিংসা অভ্যাসৰ বাবে নিৰ্দিষ্ট সময় বা পৰিস্থিতিৰ প্ৰয়োজন নহয়। মাথো অহিংসা অভ্যাসৰ বাবে আৱশ্যক হৃদয়ৰ বিশুদ্ধতা আৰু উদ্দেশ্যৰ আন্তৰিকতা। গতিকে সমাজ, জাতি আৰু অন্যান্য সকলোৱে অহিংসা নীতি গ্ৰহণ কৰিব পাৰে।

কিন্তু অহিংসা অভ্যাসৰ কাৰণে এটা চৰ্তৰ প্ৰয়োজন। সেইটো হৈছে ঈশ্বৰৰ ওপৰত অগাধ আৰু দৃঢ় বিশ্বাস। ঈশ্বৰৰ ওপৰত থকা বিশ্বাসে মানুহৰ অন্তৰত এক আভ্যন্তৰীণ শক্তিৰ সঞ্চাৰ কৰে আৰু ফলত উপলব্ধি কৰিব পাৰে যে—সকলো মানুহ মুখ্যতঃ একে। গতিকে ঈশ্বৰৰ ওপৰত থকা বিশ্বাসেই অহিংসাৰ আটাইতকৈ গুৰুত্বপূৰ্ণ চৰ্ত।

গান্ধীজীৰ মতে, সত্য আৰু অহিংসাৰ মাজত এক অবিচ্ছেদ্য সম্পৰ্ক আছে। সত্যক লাভ কৰাৰ ক্ষেত্ৰত একমাত্ৰ পথ হৈছে অহিংসা। গান্ধীৰ ভাষাত অহিংসা আৰু সত্য হৈছে একেটা মুদ্ৰাৰে দুটা পিঠি। সত্য হৈছে শ্ৰেষ্ঠতম নীতি আৰু অহিংসা হৈছে শ্ৰেষ্ঠতম কৰ্ম। সত্যৰ অবিহনে অহিংসাৰ মূল্য নাই আনহাতে অহিংসাৰ অবিহনে সত্য অসত্যত পৰিণত হয় (“Truth without non-violence is not truth but untruth”—Young India, Vol. II)।

সহায়ক গ্ৰন্থ :

- ১) ড° জ্যোৎস্না ভট্টাচাৰ্য - সমসাময়িক ভাৰতীয় দৰ্শন
- ২) দিব্যজ্যোতি ফুকন - সমকালীন ভাৰতীয় দৰ্শন।

## লোকমান্য বাল গংগাধৰ তিলকৰ গীতা বহস্য : এক আলোকপাত

বশ্মিৰেখা সন্দিকৈ

লোকমান্য বাল গংগাধৰ তিলকৰ দৰ্শনৰ প্ৰতি অমূল্য অৱদান হ'ল 'গীতা বহস্য'। সাতশ শ্লোকৰে সংস্কৃত ভাষাত পদ্যাকাৰে ৰচিত শ্ৰীমদ্ভাগৱত গীতা মহাভাৰতৰ ভীষ্ম পৰ্বৰ অন্তৰ্গত যাৰ ৰচক হ'ল মহৰ্ষি ব্যাসদেৱ। যথার্থতে পাৰ্থিৱ জীৱনৰ অঞ্জতাৰ পৰা মানৱক উদ্ধাৰ কৰাই গীতাৰ উদ্দেশ্য। তিলকে সম্পূৰ্ণ অনাসক্তিতে গীতা অধ্যয়ন কৰি ইয়াৰ প্ৰত্যেকটো অধ্যায়ৰে বিশদ আলোচনা কৰিছে। তিলকৰ এই গীতাৰ দৰ্শন সম্পৰ্কে তলত আলোচনা কৰা হ'ল।

গীতাৰ প্ৰথম অধ্যায় 'অৰ্জুন-বিষাদযোগ'ত মোহগ্ৰস্ত অৰ্জুনৰ কাতৰ ভাৱ আৰু শোকাকুল বচনৰ বৰ্ণনা কৰা হৈছে। মহাবীৰ তৃতীয় পাণ্ডৱ অৰ্জুনে শত্ৰুপক্ষ কৌৰৱ সেনাক পৰ্যবেক্ষণ কৰি ভাবিলে যে তেওঁ যিসকলৰ লগত যুদ্ধ কৰিবলৈ প্ৰবৃত্ত হৈছিল, তেওঁলোক সকলো আত্মীয় আছিল। পলকতে অৰ্জুনৰ মন মোহাচ্ছন্ন হৈ বিষাদ আৰু দুৰ্ভাৱনাৰে পৰিপূৰ্ণ হল। ক্ষত্ৰিয় হিচাপে যুদ্ধ কৰা তেওঁৰ কৰ্তব্য, অথচ মনৰ দুৰ্বলতাই কৰ্তব্য পালনত বাধা দিলে। তেতিয়া তেওঁ আধ্যাত্মিক গুৰু শ্ৰীকৃষ্ণৰ শৰণাপন্ন হৈ সেই সমস্যাৰ সমাধান বিচাৰিলে। ভগৱান শ্ৰীকৃষ্ণই বুজনি স্বৰূপে অৰ্জুনৰ মাধ্যমেৰে সমগ্ৰ মানৱ জাতিক কৰ্তব্যৰ সম্পৰ্কে শিক্ষা প্ৰদান কৰিছে।

ভাগৱত গীতাৰ মুখ্য ভাগকেইটা হ'ল—কৰ্মযোগ, জ্ঞানযোগ আৰু ভক্তিয়েোগ। ভগৱান শ্ৰীকৃষ্ণই অৰ্জুনক বিপথগামীতাৰ পৰা উদ্ধাৰ কৰিবলৈ বুদ্ধি বা জ্ঞানক আত্মোপলক্ষিৰ এটা মার্গ বুলি কৈছিল। সেয়েহে বহুতো পণ্ডিতে মত প্ৰকাশ কৰিলে যে গীতাত কৰ্মতকৈ জ্ঞানক অধিক প্ৰাধান্য দিয়া হৈছে। কিন্তু তিলকৰ মতে গীতাই কৰ্ম অনুমোদন কৰিছে। জ্ঞান বা ভক্তি মাৰ্গেৰে পৰমেশ্বৰৰ লগত মিলিত হোৱাত সক্ষম হ'লেও সেই সিদ্ধপুৰুষে কৰ্ম কৰিয়ে থাকিব লাগে। পৰিণামৰ প্ৰতি নিৰাসক্ত কৰ্মৰত যোগীক কৰ্মই বন্ধনত লিপ্ত কৰাৰ নোৱাৰে। তিলকৰ মতে এয়ে গীতাৰ শিক্ষা। গীতাত

পৰম পুৰুষ শ্ৰীকৃষ্ণই কৈছে—

“সন্যাসঃ কৰ্মযোগশ্চ নিঃশ্ৰেয়স কৰা বুভৌ।

তয়োস্ত কৰ্ম সং ন্যাস্যাৎ কৰ্মযোগো বিশিষ্যতে।।”

অৰ্থাৎ, কৰ্মৰ ত্যাগ আৰু সেৱাৰ মনোভাৱেৰে কৰ্মৰ অনুষ্ঠান এই দুয়োটাই কল্যাণ কাৰক। কিন্তু এই দুয়োটাৰ ভিতৰত কৰ্মৰ ত্যাগতকৈ সেৱাৰ মনোভাৱেৰে কাম কৰাৰ আদৰ্শ অধিক ভাল।

বহুতো পণ্ডিতৰ মতে কৰ্মই মানুহক বন্ধনপাশত আৱদ্ধ কৰে। কিন্তু তিলকৰ মতে গীতাই তেনে কোনো কথা কোৱা নাই। মোক্ষলাভৰ কাৰণে কৰ্মও এটা মার্গ বুলি স্বীকৃতি দিছে। তিলকে কৈছে যে, ব্যৱহাৰিক কৰ্মৰ ফলত আমাৰ যি আসক্তি হয়, তাক ইন্দ্ৰিয় দমনৰ দ্বাৰা আত্মজ্ঞান প্ৰাপ্তি হৈ সম্পূৰ্ণ সিদ্ধিলাভ কৰিবলৈ সক্ষম হয়।

তৃতীয় অধ্যায়ৰ আৰম্ভণিতে অৰ্জুনে শ্ৰীকৃষ্ণক সুধিছে—

“জায়সী চেৎ কৰ্মনস্তে মতা বুদ্ধি জনাৰ্দন।

তৎ কিং কৰ্মণি যোৰে মাং নিয়োজয়সি কেশৱ।।

ব্ৰামিশ্ৰেণেৰ বাক্যেন বুদ্ধিং মোহয়সীব মে।

তদেবাং বদ নিশ্চিত্য যেন শ্ৰেয়োহহমাণ্ণুয়াৎ।।”

অৰ্থাৎ, হে জনাৰ্দন, যদি তোমাৰ এই মতেই হয় যে কৰ্ম অপেক্ষা বুদ্ধিয়েই শ্ৰেষ্ঠ, তেন্তে হে কেশৱ! মোক (যুদ্ধৰ) নিষ্ঠুৰ কৰ্মত কিয় লগাইছা? (দেখাত) সন্দিক্ষ কথা কৈ তুমি মোৰ বুদ্ধিক ভ্ৰমত পেলাইছা। এই কাৰণে তুমি এনে এটা কথা নিশ্চিত কৰি মোক কোৱা, যাতে মোৰ শ্ৰেয় অৰ্থাৎ কল্যাণ প্ৰাপ্তি হয়।

এই প্ৰশ্নৰ উত্তৰত ভগৱান শ্ৰীকৃষ্ণই চতুৰ্থ অধ্যায়ত “কৰ্ম কোনেও ত্যাগ কৰিব নোৱাৰে” ইত্যাদি কাৰণ দৰ্শাই কৰ্মৰ সমৰ্থন কৰিছে।

আকৌ পঞ্চম অধ্যায়ৰ আৰম্ভণিতে অৰ্জুনে প্ৰশ্ন কৰিছে যে—

“সন্যাসং কৰ্মনাং কৃষ্ণ পুনৰ্যোগং চ শংসসি।

যচ্ছেয় এতয়ো ৰেকং তন্ম ব্ৰহ্মি শুনিশ্চিতং।।”

অৰ্থাৎ, হে কৃষ্ণ। তুমি এবাৰ সন্যাসক আৰু এবাৰ কৰ্মসমূহৰ যোগক উত্তম বুলি কৈছা। এতিয়া নিশ্চয় কৰি মোক এটা মাৰ্গেই কোৱা, যি এই উভয়ৰ মাজত যথার্থতে শ্ৰেয়, অৰ্থাৎ অধিক প্ৰশস্ত।

তাৰ উত্তৰত ভগৱানে কৈছে—

“নিয়তং কুৰুকৰ্ম ত্বং কৰ্মজ্যায়ো হ্যকৰ্মণঃ।

শৰীৰ যাত্ৰাপি চ তেন প্ৰসিদ্ধে কৰ্মনঃ।।”

অৰ্থাৎ, তোমাৰ কৰ্তব্যৰূপে যি কাম নিৰ্ধাৰিত কৰি দিয়া আছে তাক তুমি কৰি যোৱা। কাম নকৰাকৈ থকাতকৈ কাম কৰা বেছি ভাল আৰু কাম নকৰাকৈ থাকিলে তোমাৰ শৰীৰ ধাৰণ কৰি থকাটোৱেই সম্ভৱ নহ'ব।

গীতাৰ দ্বিতীয় আৰু তৃতীয় অধ্যায়ত সন্যাসযোগ আৰু কৰ্মযোগৰ বিস্তৃত বিৱৰণ পোৱা যায়। গীতাই এই দুই মৰ্গক স্বতন্ত্ৰ আৰু দুয়োটা মৰ্গৰ দ্বাৰা মোক্ষপ্ৰাপ্তি সম্ভৱ বুলি কোৱা হৈছে। কিন্তু কিছুসংখ্যক পণ্ডিতে কৰ্মযোগ স্বতন্ত্ৰভাৱে মোক্ষ লাভৰ মৰ্গ নহয় বুলি মতপোষণ কৰে। তেওঁলোকৰ মতে, সন্যাস বা সাংখ্যই চৰম অৰ্থাৎ মুখ্যনিষ্ঠা আৰু কৰ্মযোগ হৈছে সন্যাসমৰ্গৰ পূৰ্বসুৰ। কিন্তু এই মতত আপত্তি দৰ্শাই তিলকে কৈছে যে কৰ্মযোগ সন্যাস বা সাংখ্যযোগৰ পূৰ্বসুৰ হ'ব নোৱাৰে, কাৰণ কৰ্মৰ পৰা কেতিয়াও মুক্তি নাই। সন্যাসৰ দ্বাৰা মোক্ষলাভ সম্ভৱ যদিও কৰ্মযোগৰ দ্বাৰাও মোক্ষপ্ৰাপ্তি হয়। সেয়েহে গীতাই কৰ্মযোগক সন্যাসযোগৰ পূৰ্বসুৰ বুলি কোৱা নাই।

তৃতীয় অধ্যায়ত এটা শ্লোকৰে শ্ৰীকৃষ্ণই মোক্ষ লাভৰ দুই মৰ্গ স্পষ্ট কৰি দেখুৱাইছে। শ্ৰীকৃষ্ণই কৈছে—

“লোকে আশ্বিন দ্বিবিধা নিষ্ঠাপুৰা প্ৰোক্তন ময়া নয়।

জ্ঞান যোগেন সাংখ্যানাং কৰ্মযোগেন যোগিনাম্।।”

—হে নিষ্পাপ অৰ্জুন, মই ইয়াৰ আগতেই এই কথা দেখুৱাই আহিছো যে আত্মক উপলব্ধি কৰিবলৈ চেষ্টা কৰাসকল দুই প্ৰকাৰৰ। কিছুমানে প্ৰাকৃতিক জগতৰ স্বৰূপ বিশ্লেষণ কৰি দাৰ্শনিক জ্ঞানৰ সহায়েৰে আত্মক বুজিব খোজে আৰু আন কিছুমানে ভক্তিসহকাৰে কৰা কামেৰে।

আকৌ ত্ৰয়োদশ অধ্যায়ত তেওঁ কৈছে—

“ধ্যানে নাত্বনি পশান্তি কেচিদাত্মচামাত্মনা।

অনোসাংখ্যেন যোগেন কৰ্ম যোগেন চাপৰে।।”

অৰ্থাৎ, কিছুমানে ধ্যানৰ বলেৰে পৰমাত্মাকে নিজেই নিজৰ ভিতৰত দেখা পায়, আন কিছুমানে জ্ঞানৰ অনুশীলনৰ দ্বাৰা দেখা পায়।

গতিকে দেখা গৈছে যে ওপৰৰ দুয়োটা শ্লোকে দুটা স্বতন্ত্ৰমৰ্গ নিৰ্দেশ কৰিছে— কৰ্মযোগ আৰু কৰ্মসন্যাস বা সন্যাসযোগ। গীতাৰ কিছুসংখ্যক সাম্প্ৰদায়িক টীকাকাৰে কৰ্মযোগক যি গৌণ স্থান দিয়াৰ চেষ্টা কৰিছে, তিলকৰ মতে সি নিতান্তই সাম্প্ৰদায়িক আগ্ৰহৰ পৰিণাম। তিলকে কৈছে যে, সন্যাসমাৰ্গীয় টীকাসমূহেই এনে বিভ্ৰান্তিৰ সৃষ্টি কৰে আৰু টীকাকাৰ সকল সাম্প্ৰদায়িক আগ্ৰহৰ পৰা মুক্ত নহ'লে গীতাৰ প্ৰকৃত বহস্যৰ জ্ঞান লাভ কৰাটো সম্ভৱ নহয়। কৰ্মযোগ আৰু কৰ্মসন্যাস এই দুয়োটাই স্বতন্ত্ৰ ভাৱে

সমানেই মোক্ষপ্ৰদ যদিও তিলকে কৰ্মযোগ শ্ৰেষ্ঠ বুলি অভিহিত কৰিছে। কৰ্মযোগৰ শ্ৰেষ্ঠতা সম্পৰ্কে গীতাত বিভিন্ন শ্লোক পোৱা যায়। বিশেষকৈ দ্বিতীয় অধ্যায়ত ভগৱানে কৈছে—

“বুদ্ধিয়ুক্তো জহাতী হ উভে সুকৃত দৃষ্ণতে।

তস্মাদ যোগায় যুজ্যস্ব যোগঃ কৰ্মস কৌশলম।।”

অৰ্থাৎ, যিজন মানুহে কেৱল ভক্তিভৰা সেৱাৰ নিমিত্তে কামত প্ৰবৃত্ত হয়, তেওঁ এই জন্মতে কৰ্মৰ সকলো ভাল-বেয়া ফলৰ পৰা নিষ্কৃতি পাব পাৰে। গতিকে যোগত প্ৰবৃত্ত হ'বলৈ চেষ্টা কৰা। যোগেই হ'ল সকলো কাম কৰাৰ আচল কৌশল। এইদৰে গীতাৰ ঠায়ে ঠায়ে ভগৱান শ্ৰীকৃষ্ণই অৰ্জুনক কৰ্মযোগৰ শ্ৰেষ্ঠত্ব প্ৰদৰ্শন কৰিছে।

১৮ অধ্যায়ৰ উপসংহাৰত কৰ্ম কেনে হোৱা উচিত সেইসম্পৰ্কে ভগৱানে পুনৰ্বাৰ কৈছে—

“এতান্যপি তু কৰ্মানি সংগং ত্যজ্বা ফলানি চ।

কৰ্তব্যনীতি য়ে পাৰ্থ নিশ্চিতং মতমুক্তমম।।”

অৰ্থাৎ, একো আসক্তি নোহোৱাকৈ আৰু একো ফলৰ কামনা নকৰাকৈ এই সকলো কৰ্ম কৰিব লাগে। হে পাৰ্থ, কেৱল কৰ্তব্য কৰ্ম বুলিয়েই এই কৰ্মসমূহ কৰিব লাগে। এইটোৱেই মোৰ চূড়ান্ত অভিমত।

আকৌ কৈছে—

“তস্মাদসক্তঃ সততং কাৰ্য্যং কৰ্ম সমাৰে।

অসক্তো হ্যাৰেণ কৰ্ম পৰমাপ্নোতি পুৰুষঃ।।”

অৰ্থাৎ, ‘গতিকে কৰ্মফলৰ প্ৰতি কোনো আসক্তি নৰখাকৈ কেৱল কৰ্তব্য বুলি ভাবি লৈ সততে কামবিলাক কৰি যোৱা। যিজনে আসক্তি নোহোৱাকৈ কামবিলাক কৰি যায় তেঁৱেই পৰমার্থ লাভ কৰে।’ দেখা গৈছে যে, ভগৱান শ্ৰীকৃষ্ণই আসক্তিহীন কৰ্মকহে প্ৰাধান্য দিছে আৰু ইয়াক গীতাত ‘নিষ্কাম কৰ্ম’ বুলি অভিহিত কৰা হৈছে।

ভগৱান শ্ৰীকৃষ্ণই অৰ্জুনক কৈছে যিসকলে কৰ্মত্যাগ কৰে বা বৰ্জন কৰে সেইসকলৰ মোক্ষপ্ৰাপ্তি সম্ভৱ নহয়। গীতাৰ অষ্টাদশ অধ্যায়ত ত্যাগৰ তিনিপ্ৰকাৰ ভেদৰ কথা কোৱা হৈছে—সাত্বিক ত্যাগ, ৰাজসিক ত্যাগ আৰু তামসিক ত্যাগ। তিলকৰ মতে দৃঢ় মনোবল নাথাকিলে যি কৰ্মত্যাগ কৰা হয়, সেইটো গীতাৰ মত অনুসাৰে তামস বা মিথ্যাচাৰ বুলি ক'ব লাগিব।

ভগৱানে কৈছে—

“নিয়তস্য তু সংন্যাসঃ কৰ্মনো নোপপদ্যতে।

মোহাতস্য পৰিত্যাগপ্তামমঃ পৰিকীৰ্তিত।।”

অৰ্থাৎ, বিহিত কৰ্তব্য কৰ্মসমূহ কেতিয়াও বৰ্জন কৰিব নালাগে। যদি কোনোবাই ভ্ৰমবশতঃ তেনে বিহিত কৰ্ম বৰ্জন কৰে, তেনে বৰ্জনক তামসিক ত্যাগ বোলা হয়।

তিলকে কৈছে যে, এনেপ্ৰকাৰৰ কৰ্মত্যাগ মানুহৰ কাৰণে কেতিয়াও শ্ৰেয় হ'ব নোৱাৰে। তেওঁ কৈছে যে এনে দুৰ্বল মন চিত্তশুদ্ধিৰ দ্বাৰা পূৰ্ণ কৰিবলৈ হ'লে নিষ্কাম বুদ্ধি বৃদ্ধি কৰিবলৈ যজ্ঞদান আদি গৃহস্থ আশ্ৰমৰ শাস্ত্ৰসন্মত কৰ্ম মানুহে কৰিবই লাগিব। চমুকৈ ক'বলৈ গ'লে তিলকে বৈদিক ধৰ্মৰ কৰ্ম-কাণ্ডত থকা চতুৰ্বৰ্ণক স্বীকাৰ কৰিছে।

যদি কোৱা হয় যে মন বশত থাকিলে শাস্ত্ৰত বিহিত কৰ্ম কৰিলে চিত্তশুদ্ধি নষ্ট হোৱাৰ কোনো সম্ভাৱনা নাই, কিন্তু মোক্ষ লাভৰ কাৰণে অনাৱশ্যক ব্যৰ্থ কৰ্ম কৰি দেহক অনাহকত কষ্ট দিয়াৰ মানে নাই, তেন্তে ক্লায়কেশ ভয়ত অৰ্থাৎ দেহৰ কষ্ট হ'ব— এই ক্ষুদ্ৰ আশংকাত কৃতকৰ্ম ত্যাগ ৰাজসিক। ত্যাগৰ কৰ্মফল এনে ৰাজস কৰ্মত্যাগত পোৱা নাযায়।

১৮ অধ্যায়ত ভগৱানে সিদ্ধান্ত কৰিছে যে নিঃসংগ বুদ্ধিৰে কেৱল কৰ্তব্য বুলি কৰ্ম কৰাই প্ৰকৃত সাত্বিক কৰ্মত্যাগ।

“কায়মিত্যেৰ যৎকৰ্ম নিয়তং ক্ৰিয়তে অৰ্জুন।

সংগং ত্যত্বা ফলং চৈৰ স ত্যাগঃ স্বাত্ত্বিকোমতঃ।।

অৰ্থাৎ, হে অৰ্জুন যেতিয়া কোনো এজনে আসক্তি বৰ্জন কৰি, সকলো কৰ্মৰ ফলৰ কামনা পৰিত্যাগ কৰি কেৱল নিজৰ কৰ্তব্যৰূপে বিহিত বুলিয়েই কোনো এটা কাম কৰে, তেতিয়া সেই কৰ্মৰ লগত জড়িত ত্যাগকে সাত্বিক ত্যাগ বুলি কোৱা হয়।

কৰ্ম মায়াজগতৰ হ'লেও কোনো অজ্ঞাত কাৰণত পৰমেশ্বৰেই সৃষ্টি কৰিছে। সেই কৰ্ম পৰমেশ্বৰ অধীন কাৰণে তাক পৰিহাৰ কৰা মানুহৰ সাধ্য নাই। গতিকে নিঃসন্দেহে ক'ব পাৰি যে, বুদ্ধিক নিঃসঙ্গ ৰাখি কেৱল কৰ্ম কৰিলে মোক্ষৰ বাধা নহয়। সেয়েহে ভগৱানে কৈছে যে এই জগতৰ মুহূৰ্তকালো কৰ্ম বাদ দি থাকিব নোৱাৰি। কাৰণ এক মুহূৰ্তৰ কাৰণেও মানুহ কৰ্মৰ পৰা মুক্ত নহয়। সূৰ্য্য, চন্দ্ৰ আদিয়েও নিৰন্তৰ কৰ্ম কৰিয়ে আছে।

আকৌ কিছুসংখ্যক পণ্ডিতে কয় যে সমস্ত কৰ্ম মায়াজগতৰ- গতিকে অনিত্য। সেইকাৰণে ব্ৰহ্মজগতৰ নিত্য আত্মাৰ তেনে কৰ্মত লিপ্ত হোৱা উচিত নহয়। কাৰণ পৰমব্ৰহ্ম যদি নিজেই মায়াৰ দ্বাৰা আবৃত হৈ থাকে, তেন্তে এনে মায়াৰ জগতত মানুহে কাম কৰাত কি আপত্তি থাকিব পাৰে? ব্ৰহ্মজগত আৰু মায়াজগত—সমস্ত জগতৰ যেনেকৈ এই দুইভাগ আছে, তেনেকৈ মানুহৰো আত্মা আৰু দেহ ইন্দ্ৰিয়াদি —এই

দুইভাগ আছে। আত্মা আৰু ব্ৰহ্মৰ সংযোগত আত্মা ব্ৰহ্মত বিলীন হৈ যায়; আৰু এই ব্ৰহ্ম আত্মা ঐক্যৰ জ্ঞানৰ দ্বাৰা বুদ্ধিক নিঃসংগ ৰাখি কেৱল মায়িক দেহ ইন্দ্ৰিয়ৰ দ্বাৰা মায়াজগতত ব্যৱহাৰ কৰিলে মোক্ষৰ কোনো প্ৰতিবন্ধক নহয়। এই দুই ভাগৰ মাজত আপোচ কৰিব পাৰিলে কোনো ভাগ উপেক্ষা বা বিচ্ছেদ কৰাৰ দোষ নাথাকে। ব্ৰহ্মজগত আৰু মায়াজগত পৰলোক আৰু ইহলোক এই দুই ভাগত কৰ্তব্য কৰাৰ ফলতে মানুহৰ শ্ৰেয় লাভ হয়। ঈশো উপনিষদত এই তত্ত্বই প্ৰতিপাদিত হৈছে।

উপৰোক্ত আলোচনাৰ পৰা এই কথা স্পষ্ট হৈ পৰিছে যে, গীতাৰ সাৰমৰ্ম হৈছে নিষ্কাম কৰ্ম। কিন্তু ইয়াত প্ৰশ্ন হয় যে এনে কৰ্ম কিয় কৰিব লাগে? তাৰ উত্তৰ পোৱা যায় তৃতীয় অধ্যায়ত। ভগৱানে কৈছে—

“কৰ্মনৈব হি সংসিদ্ধি মাস্তিতা জনকাদয়ঃ।

লোক সংগ্ৰহ সেৱাপি সমপশ্যন কত্মহসি।।”

অৰ্থাৎ, কৰ্তব্য কৰ্মসমূহৰ অনুষ্ঠানৰ দ্বাৰাই জনক আদি ৰজাসকলে পৰমসিদ্ধি লাভ কৰিছিল। গতিকে জনসাধাৰণৰ মংগলৰ কাৰণে হ'লেও তুমি তোমাৰ কৰ্ম কৰা উচিত।

গতিকে পৰাৰ্থে যিজনে কাম কৰে তেওঁৰেই সাধুসকলৰ মাজত শ্ৰেষ্ঠ। সমাজৰ ৰক্ষণৰ কাৰণে সেয়েহে শাস্ত্ৰই চতুৰ্বৰ্ণৰ সৃষ্টি কৰিছে। ব্ৰাহ্মণৰ জ্ঞান, ক্ষত্ৰিয়ৰ যুদ্ধ, বৈশ্যৰ কৃষি; গোৰক্ষা, ব্যৱসায়-বাণিজ্য আৰু শূদ্ৰৰ সেৱা—এই চতুৰ্বৰ্ণৰ এটাও বিলুপ্তি হ'লে সমাজৰ বিনাশ হ'ব পাৰে। গীতাৰ মতে সামাজিক শৃংখলা ৰক্ষাৰ কাৰণে নিজৰ বৃত্তিগত কৰ্মসমূহ সম্পাদন কৰাটো প্ৰত্যেক শ্ৰেণীৰ মৌলিক কৰ্তব্য।

তিলকৰ মতে ভাগৱত গীতাত কৰ্মযোগৰ ওপৰতে গুৰুত্ব দিয়া হৈছে। কৰ্মযোগক গীতাৰ বীজতত্ত্ব বুলিব পাৰি। নিষ্কাম কৰ্মৰ দ্বাৰাই মোক্ষ লাভ কৰি পৰমাত্মাৰ সান্নিধ্য লাভ কৰিব পাৰি। সংক্ষেপে ক'বলৈ গ'লে কৰ্মই জগত আৰু জগতেই কৰ্ম। ভগৱান শ্ৰীকৃষ্ণই অৰ্জুনক কৈছে—মোতকৈ শ্ৰেষ্ঠ আৰু একো নাই, সূতাত মণিবিলাক গাঁথি থোৱাৰ দৰে এই সমস্ত জগত মোতে গঁথা আছে। অৰ্থাৎ ভগৱান শ্ৰীকৃষ্ণৰ চৰণত মন প্ৰাণ সমৰ্পিত কৰি কৰাই কৰ্মই মোক্ষলাভৰ পথ প্ৰস্তুত কৰি তুলিব। সেয়েহে অস্তিম অৰ্থাৎ অষ্টাদশ অধ্যায়ৰ ৬৫ আৰু ৬৬ তম শ্লোকত পুনৰ ভগৱানে কৈছে—

“মন্মনা ভৱ মদ্ভক্তো মদযাজী মাং নমস্কুৰ।

মামৌৰেষ্যসি সত্যংতে প্ৰতিজনে প্ৰিয়োহসি মে।।

সৰ্ব্বধৰ্মান পৰিত্যজ্য মামেকং শৰণং ব্ৰজ।।”

অৰ্থাৎ, মোতে অৰ্পণ কৰি মোৰে ভক্ত হৈ মোৰ নিমিত্তেই যজন পূজন কৰা, প্ৰণামো মোকহে কৰা। আন সকলো ধৰ্ম (ইয়াত অন্য দেৱ-দেৱীৰ পূজা কৰাৰ কথা

বুজাইছে) ত্যাগ কৰি মোতে শৰণ গ্ৰহণ কৰা।

গতিকে ক'ব পাৰি যে গীতাই সমাজত সমন্বয়ৰূপী একেশ্বৰী তত্ত্বৰ প্ৰকাশ কৰিছে।  
লোকমান্য বাল গংগাধৰ তিলকৰ মতে নিষ্কাম কৰ্মই গীতাৰ প্ৰাণকেন্দ্ৰ। তেওঁক আধুনিক  
ভাৰতীয় দৰ্শনৰ প্ৰকৃত কৰ্মযোগী বুলিব পাৰি।

সহায়ক গ্ৰন্থপঞ্জী :

- ১) গীতাৰহস্য - বাল গংগাধৰ তিলক
- ২) শ্ৰীমদ্ভাগৱদ্গীতা - ৰাধানাথ ফুকন (অসমীয়া অনুবাদ)
- ৩) আধুনিক ভাৰতীয় দৰ্শন - জ্যোৎস্না ভট্টাচাৰ্য্য।

## About the Contributors

On Friendship

Dr. Manjulika Ghosh  
Former Professor of Philosophy  
and Emeritus Fellow University  
of North Bengal Darjeeling-  
734013, West Bengal

Sachindranath and Suresh  
Chandra on Wittgenstein:  
Mysticism, Transcendentalism  
and God

Soyam Lokendrajit  
Department of Philosophy,  
Manipur University  
Canchipur, Imphal-795003  
Manipur

Anviksiki : The epistemology  
of Indian Philosophy

Dr. Anjana Chaliha  
Former Principal & HoD,  
Philosophy Dept., J.B. College

The Concept of Freedom in  
Sartre

Dr. Punyeswar Bora  
Former Vice Principal,  
D.K.D. College, Dergaon

Hindu, Hinduism & Hindutva

Dr. Rajen Barua  
Engineer, Writer & Buddhist  
Scholar, Heuton Town, USA

Universal Approach to Yoga  
Philosophy in the Context of

Dr. Mukta Bishwas  
Professor, Department of Sanskrit,  
Gauhati University

Indian Philosophical Heritage  
Moral Justification of Euthanasia  
Interfaith Dialogue and

Dr. Arotee Neog  
Ex Academic Vice Principal &  
HoD Philosophy, J.B. College



Comparative Religion:For a Better world Order	Dr. Jyotirmoyee Devi Retd. Prof.& HoD Philosophy, D.C.B.Girl's College, Jorhat.	Human Personality in Tagore's Philosophy	Jadumoni Dutta Assistant Professor, College,Charing ,Sivasagar
Vedantism in Sri Aurobindo's Political Thought	Dr. Sumitra Purkayastha Ex-In-Charge, P.G., Dept. of Philosophy, J.B. College, Jorhat	'Benefits of Yoga'	Madhuchandra Kaushik Ex Student of J.B. College
Ethical Relativism and Practical Ethics	Dr. Panchami B. Borah Vice-Principal, Ex-HoD & P.G. In-charge, Deptt. of Philosophy, J.B.College	Concept of Soul in the Meno	Dr. Ranjit Bhattacharya Assitant Professor Deptt of Philosophy, J.B. College
Degradation of Values and Its Impact on Society	Nibedita Bezbaruah HoD, Dept of Philosophy J.B. College, Jorhat	Spirituality in Sankardeva: A Philosophical Study	Moloya Borah Jorhat
Prospect of Social Peace and Harmony in the Practical Vedanta of Swami Vivekananda	Niranjan Haloi Asst. Prof. Dept. of Philosophy D.K.D. College, Dergaon	Educational Ideals of Rabindranath Tagore	Pompy Bhuyah Assistant Professor Deptt of Philosophy, J.B.College
Relevance of Religion in Present Society	Bibha Rani Goswami Associate Prof. Philosophy Dept. Women's College, Tinsukia	Satyagraha : Mahatma Gandhi	Nitumoni Dutta Assistant Professor, Department of Philosophy, J.B.College
The Principles of Non-violence	Dipak Chandra Bora HoD, Deptt. Philosophy S.M.D. College, Charing	Swami Vivekananda's Treatment of the Vedanta Philosophy in the Light of Physics	Rosemin Akhtara Research Scholar, Centre for Studies in Philosophy Dibrugarh University
Gandhian Religion : A Solace in the Strife-Ridden World	Juri Hussai, Assistant Professor Department of Philosophy, J.B. College (Autonomous), Jorhat, Assam	Understanding Maya in Vivekananda's Philosophy	Pinki Barah Assistant Professor, Centre for Studies in Philosophy, Dibrugarh University, Dibrugarh-786004 Email- pinkiborah03@gmail.com

Concept of Man in Rabindranath  
Tagore's Philosophy

Polly Rajkhowa  
Research Scholar (Ph.D.) Centre  
for Studies in Philosophy  
Dibrugarh University

কুৰুক্ষেত্ৰ ৰণত শ্ৰীকৃষ্ণৰ ভূমিকা

ড° অঞ্জনা চলিহা  
প্ৰাক্তন অধ্যক্ষ আৰু মুৰব্বী অধ্যাপক,  
দৰ্শন বিভাগ, জগন্নাথ বৰুৱা মহাবিদ্যালয়

বৈষ্ণৱ দাৰ্শনিক মধ্বাচাৰ্যৰ জীৱন আৰু  
দৰ্শন

ড° গিৰীশ বৰুৱা  
প্ৰাক্তন উপাধ্যক্ষ, মুৰব্বী অধ্যাপক,  
ডিকেডি কলেজ, দেৰগাঁও

গান্ধীৰ দৰ্শনত সত্য আৰু অহিংসাৰ  
ধাৰণা

অসীম স্বৰ্গীয়াৰী  
প্ৰাক্তন ছাত্ৰ, জগন্নাথ বৰুৱা মহাবিদ্যালয়

লোকমান্য বাল গংগাধৰ তিলকৰ গীতা  
ৰহস্য : এক আলোকপাত

ৰশ্মিৰেখা সন্দিকৈ  
প্ৰাক্তন ছাত্ৰী, জগন্নাথ বৰুৱা  
মহাবিদ্যালয় (স্বতন্ত্ৰ)