

THE CONCEPT OF MAN AND THE IDEA OF DEVELOPMENT: A STUDY IN CLASSICAL HINDU THOUGHT

By

Subrahmanya Bharati Konale

Dissertation submitted in part fulfilment
of the requirement of M. Phil Degree.



DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY

North-Eastern Hill University

Shillong-793014

September 1986

Ther's

DS
2-9-522
K011

NEHU Library
Acc 102173
Acc. by 1/15/90
De 10/90
Cl. 2/10
Sub in
Cat. B
Transcribed by B

C O N T E N T S

	<u>Page</u>
CERTIFICATE	
Acknowledgement	i
Preface	ii
CHAPTER - I	1-17
INTRODUCTION	.
CHAPTER - II	18-30
CREATION	
CHAPTER - III	31-63
CONSTITUTION OF MAN	
CHAPTER - IV	64-94
TYPES OF MAN	
CHAPTER - V	95-125
IDEA OF DEVELOPMENT	
CHAPTER - VI	126-144
PURUSHARTHA	
CHAPTER - VII	145-155
CONCLUSION	

(Notes are given at the end of every chapter)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

It gives me immense pleasure to express my gratitude to Prof. M.Miri, who has taken enough pains to guide me through all the stages of my work. My sincere thanks go to Prof. K.J.Shah who has inspired me and kindly introduced me to Prof.M.Miri. I thank Dr.K.H.Bhat who has brought me back to academics from my pre-occupations in social work.

I thank all the teachers of the Department of Philosophy for their valuable discussion and suggestions during the course of my work.

I remember Dr.V.N.Deshpande with gratefulness, who has inculcated in me an interest in human aspects of Philosophy.

I thank the staff of NEHU Central Library for having taken pains to get some rare books from other libraries and also the CIEFL, Shillong for having allowed me to use their library.

I express my inability to acknowledge the valuable assistance given by my friends and many teachers of NEHU by names.


20/9/86
SUBRAHMANYA BHARATI KONAIE

Shillong,
29 September 1986.

PREFACE

This dissertation examines the concept of man and the idea of development in classical Hindu thought. Here I wish to point out that I have used the term "classical Hindu thought" for the ideas that have developed in the Upanishadic tradition. It does not, therefore, relate to a fixed historic period generally used for the term 'classical!'

There are, at least, four words for 'man' in Sanskrit tradition: Purusha, Nara, Manus, Manava.

Purusha: m. a man, male, human being; the height or measure of a man; the personal and animating principle in men and other beings, the soul or spirit; the Spirit as passive and a spectator of the Prakriti or creative force; the supreme being or soul of the universe.

Nara, m. a male person; the primeval Man or eternal Spirit pervading the universe (always associated with Narayana, both are considered either as god or sages).

Manus: m. a man; f. a woman

Manava, mf. descended from or belonging to man or Manu, human being, man.

Of these, purusha and nara are used largely in a normative sense. The terms manus and manava refer to biological and social man. In this dissertation, by and large, I have used the term 'man' in the latter sense of the Sanskrit tradition.

I also wish to make clear that I have used the term 'development' in a some what broader sense than what it means in modern usage in the Social sciences. In Hindu ethics the term 'development' stands for progress toward the unknown, unseen ultimate goal of life.

INTRODUCTION

Nature of Human Inquiry.

The present exercise is a humble effort at understanding the concept of man and the idea of his development in classical Hindu thought.

If Jijivisha, the aspiration to live, marks out the living beings from the non-living objects, Jijnasa marks out man from the other living beings. Jijnasa or the spirit of inquiry is one of the fundamental faculties of man. This has made man dive deep into the ocean and fly high in the sky to know what and how is that and where. This inquiry is not limited only to see things here or there. In trying to understand what is sensed man has always been seeking to know the reality of, and even beyond it. "What is that which persists when the body is dead? What is it which lives and persistently creates even though the body may go into a state of sleep?" inquires Kathopanishad.¹ "What is the real root from which the tree of life springs again and again eventhough knocked and cut down by the dark cutter death?" questions Brhadaxanyakopanishad.² "Whence verily are all these creatures

born " Prashnopanishad³ asks. Mundakopanishad wants to know "What is that which being known everything else is known" ?⁴

Some went in search of a primordial substratum of things. For some all existence and appearances are merely the projection of human mind. For some others all are material existences irrespective of human perceptions. On one side the philosophers went on inquiring after the meaning of all they saw and heard. On the other side the scientists advanced their investigations in search of facts. While the achievements of science have benefitted man in no mean proportions one is forced to pause and pose, if there will be any man in the future to enjoy these benefits for the darker side of the scientific advance is that the man is now running the risk of total self annihilation than at any time before. This sort of distortion of human inquiry into a tool of self destruction is the cumulative effect of prolonged unidirectional inquiry about the nature of the world disconnecting it from the man who inquires about it and disconnecting the man from his ancestry, contemporary and posterity. The inquiry has not only been non-human but also inhuman.

Man as an object of Human Inquiry.

It must have been to preempt this possible danger to the very existence of man from this kind of extrovert inquiry that has brought man to the present predicament where every one looks at every other one with fear and suspicion instead of love and faith, that our sages had given clarion call "Atmanam Viddhi" (know the self) to all the seekers of knowledge in the world.

It is not that man had not been the subject of man's reflections and speculations elsewhere in the world. Socrates told "know thy self"⁴. Plato dealt, at length, the nature of man and postulated the perfect man the man, the universal whose imperfect images we the particular imperfect men are in his world of ideas. "Though man possesses reasons and is therefore quite distinct from other beings of nature, he is" for Aristotle "like them a hylomorphic being (composed of matter and form in union) who is subject to change and who has arisen as the result of a long process of evolution".⁵ In the Biblical mind the problem of God hovered around God's relation to man.

" Lord,

: 4 :

What is man
That then takest knowledge of him
On the sin of Man,
That throw smallest account of him ?
Man is like unto a breath;
His days are like a shadow
That passeth away "Psalm 144:3-4"⁶

P.T. Raju writes "The Greek formulated the search of meaning of man in search of a thought, the Hebrews formulated the search of meaning as God's thought in search of man⁷. In the traditional educational system of China the beginning of the first primer read, "Man's nature in the beginning is good".⁸ "By nature people are near one another but through practice they have become apart" said Confucius⁹.

The Christianity begins with the understanding of man as a creation of god in his own image. So god created man in his own image, in the image of god^{He} created him.¹⁰
Islam has the message of brotherhood of man. Marx tried to find the meaning of man in the material basis of the historical

determinism and his concerns was the liberation of mankind. The flight of man in the capitalistic exploitation and communistic oppression is the root of existentialist philosophy.

And then, there are a number of reductionists, psychological, economic or physical who try to find the meaning of man either is his perceptible behaviour, economic activities or the physico-chemical processes going on in his body.

Modern Concept of Development.

We can see that the whole history of human thought is impregnated with the thoughts on the nature, the problems and the goals of human life. But the modern concept of development excludes man. Otherwise the emergence of gigantic machines that throw millions out of jobs, impoverish and starve them would not have been hailed as a development marker, nor an economy that had to sever the artistic hand of the Dacca muslin weavers would not have been idealised. A system in which the scientist Sakheraw and his wife had to face the state machinery's intolerable laws of retribution

for his conviction in human freedom and dignity can never be called an ideal if development means man's. Now the countries which foster the multinationals to sell the killer drugs in poorer countries while their sale is banned in their own, are called developed countries. Countries where millions are tortured in concentration camps by force is considered a developed country. Countries following these paths are called the developing countries. It is seen that such disregard for, distortion and destruction of human dignity is becoming a part of the developmental process in these developing countries. The development is making man more and more dependent and helpless on one side. On the other side their development without direction has made those, whose bellies are full, to advance into starwars.

In fact, the root cause of this sort of distortion and destruction of the dignity and rather the very existence of man in the development process lies in the very idea of modern development, which measures development in terms of the accumulation of material products, power of coercion economic, political or military. Even the social scientists and sociologists who profess to guage developments in terms

of human comfort have their indicators of development in these very material markers.

Development and Man.

If we really mean that development means anything to man we must first try to understand what man and man's development mean to man. Every community of man has its own intellectual and cultural history in which it has developed a philosophy of life of its own which is the result of the reflection on the experiences of the people through the ages. The development planners and executives must base their planning and execution in conformity with these cultural understanding and aspirations of the people for whose development the plans are meant, lest, not only there may not be no reception but also obstruction and even where it is implemented by force or hypocrisy in sugarcoated pills, it becomes indigestible causing many a time almost irreparable harm to the fundamental social cohesion shackling the very atmosphere making it unsuitable and uncomfortable for the living of man. The present practice of ignoring, disregarding and many a times, suppressing the traditional aspirations as form of conservatism, reactionism or superstitions in

our pride of being educated in the modern system is very dangerous to health of whole humanity. This does not mean that the windows and doors be closed and there should be no scope for diffusion of thoughts. "I do want growth, I do want self determination, I do want freedom, but I want all these for the soul. I doubt if the steel age is in advance upon the flint age. I am indifferent. It is the evolution of the soul to which the intellect and all our faculties have to be devoted ...I am as great a believer in the free air as the great poet. I do not want my house to be walled on all sides and windows to be stuffed ... I want the cultures of all the lands to be blown about my house as freely as possible. But I refuse to be blown off my feet by any. I refuse to live in other people's houses or as an interloper, a beggar or a slave...Mine is not a religion of the prison house. It has room for the best among God's creation. But it is proof against insolence, pride of race, religion or colour". These words of Gandhiji in his reply to Tagore along with Tagore's own words". "Parasites have to pay for their victuals by losing the power of assimilating food in natural form are more meaningful in the present context of our development mania and development malady*.

As such an idea of development possible only if we study the concept of man and his development in the native thought the writer is interested in this present exercise of unearthing the concept in Hindu thought.

Sources.

Hindu thought is a continuity, for it is the thought of a living people who have lived for ages as Hindus in changing times and situations. These thoughts have found expressions in the variety of literature that developed from time to time and continued to be read, practised and reflected upon even in the present day. The earliest are said to be the Vedas. Mantras look at the wonder world with hope gratitudes and love. Brahmanas deal with the Yajnas which are based on the active relationship of the spirits of nature and man in the maintenance of the Rta, the principle of the cosmic order. Aranyakas search for the meaning and interpretation of the Yajna ceremonies. Upanishads which specialise in philosophical reflections contemplate and deliberate on the significance of the self that is Man in his relationship with himself the world and the Brahman the infinity. These four together constitute the Vedas. According

to Dr. Radhakrishnan "The brahmacharin reads the Mantras, the grhastha attends the Brahmanas the Vanaprastha discusses the Aranyakas and the sanyasin studies the Upanishads"¹². The wonder at the world finally culminates into a deep knowledge about the self of man who inquires. This knowledge of the self is said to be the key to the knowledge of the world too. In fact this search for truth and reality is a continuous process from the Mantras to the Upanishads. The inquiry begins placing the self in the world in the Mantras, continues in the Brahmanas entering into a relationship of Yajinik reciprocity with the world rather than the spirits behind the various world phenomena called Gods finally placing the world itself in the self. Man now views everything in terms of man.

Upanishads, Brahmasutras and the Bhagavadgita form the Prasthanatraya. While Brahmasutra presents the same Upanishadic inferences in the aphoristic forms, Shrimadbhagavadgita transforms them into a philosophy of life organising them on the basis of their applicability to different aspects of life'.

The Shatdarshanas, 'Mimamsa, Nyaya, Vaisheshika, Sankhya yoga and Vedanta' discuss the reality from different angles and aspects, the substratum, the process, the product

the action, the reason, the feeling, the matter, the matter and consciousness and the pure consciousness. The Buddha and Jaina dasshanas turn to conscience from consciousness. The Charvaka or the Lokayata holds the thought in check from soaring beyond the ground.

In the puranas man looks for descent (Avatara) and grace (anugraha) to be saved while in the Itihasas he believes in the effort of and ascent of man. Even God becomes man here. While mysteries and miracles dominate Puranas the Itihasas stress on human actions and responsibility.

The Dharmashastras, (Smritis) Arthashastra and Kamasutras formulate the code of conduct based on the findings of the inquiries in the Upanishads, the symbolic manifestations of the Purana and the ethical discussions of the Itihasas. The Kavyas and the Natya Shastra represent the same in pleasant aesthetic capsules. These then percolate into the social fabric in the form of folk literature, the parables, the maxims, riddles, songs and a variety of forms.

For a thorough understanding of the life of an Indian, as represented through his activities, which are the manifestations of his decisions governed by his thought which in

turn is a reflection of the General Indian thought, one has to go through this whole range of literature. But Upanishads and the Geeta are the sources where these thoughts are presented clearly in their pure and applied form. Therefore the present study mainly concentrates on Upanishads and Geeta.

The Adequacy of the Sources.

"Is there any concept of Man in the Upanishads ?" This is the first question one has to ponder over before taking up any exercise of searching for the Hindu philosophy of man in them, as the Upanishadic metaphysics is called metaphysics of Brahman and the ethics, the ethics of renunciation or retirement from life by many admirers and critics of the Upanishads. But this pessimism vanishes, the moment one undertakes the study unbiassed by any preconceived and prejudiced notions such as, the Upanishads are other-worldly, for one comes across discussions on different aspects of life of man in almost all the Upanishads. Upanishads talk of the birth of man" tato manushyoajayata."¹³ They talk about the common characteristic of man and animals. "Pranam ¹⁴
deva anuprananti manushyah pashavascha. Ye pranohi bhutanamayuh"

(These devas, men and animals breath alongwith life breath and breath is the life of all (living) beings). They refer to man as a distinct class "tasmatcha deva bahudha samprasutah, sadhya, manushya, pashavo vayamsi"¹⁵ (From him also the gods are born in manifold ways, the celestials, the men, the cattle, the birds....). They speak of the human form" "sa eva esha purusha vidha eva"¹⁶ (This verily is the human form) They discuss of human generation and the pro-creative process" purushehaya ayam adito garbho bhavati vadetad retas tads arvebhyo angebhvastejah sambhutcan atmani evaatmanam vibharti tadvathastriyam sinchaty athaina-ijenavati tadetad prathamam janma"¹⁷ (In man indeed this one first becomes a sperm, that which is semen is the vigour come together from all the limbs. In self indeed one bears self. Then he sheds this in a woman. He then gives it birth. That is its first birth")tam strigarbham vibharti"¹⁸ (the woman bears him as an embryo).

There is the primordeal man or the man the universal "purusham samudhrityamurchayat"¹⁹ (... he drew forth a man and gave him a shape). Then came the empirical and particular man"...(tabhyah purusham anayat"²⁰....(From them he brought a man). The physical objective description of man is also

given"...Yatha satah purushat keshalomeni" (like the hairs on the body of a man). They prescribe learning and teaching of the truth about man and humanity. "...manusamcha swadhyaya pravachanamcha..."²² Man is asked to live an active life of hundred years doing work " - Kurvenneveha Karmani jivishet shatam samah"²³. There are innumerable references to different parts, constituents or aspects of man like body, life, mind, intelligence etc., Different kinds of happiness possible for man are compared, "manusha anandah te ye shatam manushah anandah"²⁴ Man's aspiration to become all, that to develop is reflected in"... (tadahuh yad brahma vidyaya sarvam bhavishyanto manushya manyante kim u tad brahmavet, vasmad tadsarvam bhavam iti"²⁵. Yajna valkya is asked what serves as the light of man. "Kimivotiravam purusha iti". Then there is the final question as to the ultimate reality of man" Koyam atma iti vayam upasmah Katarah sa atma vena pashyati, shrnoti...."²⁷

Man is discussed from his birth to death and even beyond death. How then can we agree with those who say that Upanishads do not discuss man. If one discusses chairs and says that chairs are made of wood of which the tables and

benches are also made and discusses the nature and property of wood the subject of discussion is still the chair itself and the discussion on wood forms only apart of the discussion of chair itself. Similarly in the case of the Upanishads the discussions of the world, the gods and that of Brahman form parts of their inquiry into the reality of man. The central figure all along is man.

Terminology:

A little discussion is necessary regarding the use of different words that may be said refer to man. First of all there is the word 'manushya' which even in common sanskrit and many Indian languages means "man". "Manushya" - man is the descendant of Manu, the first man. The word also has the sense manute iti manushyah" (one who thinks, measures or discriminates). It also means that man possesses manas, mind. "Manava" is another word derived from the same root as that of "manushya" and used to refer to man.

Nara is another word that is used to mean "man".

'Purusha' also refers to man, Purushavidha eva" (of human form only). At places it is used to denote the



ultimate substratum of man the Brahman and at other places it is used to refer to the spirit of man. It is also used to denote an intermediate stage between the formless Brahman and the empirical man. It is also used to refer to the essence of man. But at many places it simply means man.

'Atman' is often translated into English as "soul" giving an impression of rather a different kind of substance living in or occupying the body. This translation has led to confusion. Atman is used in an impersonalised pronominal sense to refer to the man. Though sometimes it refers to the essence of man it generally refers to man in general. The specific level of meaning is determined by the level of operation in different contexts.

Apart from these, pronouns like *Yah* or *Sah* also refer to man. These meanings are to be understood according to the context in which they are used in the texts.

The Schemes of the Study.

Any thing or class of things is distinguished from others and identified as one on the basis of a name:form function complex "nama, rupa karmani". We have just discussed about different words or names given to man. Now to know

about the forms and functions one has to understand about how the referred form has come about of what materials it is made, how the different constituents are related to one another and how the whole thing is placed in relation to other things in terms of its structure and function and disposition, and what the end of it is.

Man is to be studied in his different states of existence. As man is not merely a material lump, as he is endowed with mind and is a thinking being, it is not enough if we study man just in terms of physics chemistry or biology. It is quite essential to study his thoughts, aspirations and his efforts to fulfil those aspirations. Knowledge of human action will be possible only when one studies the motivating *behind the action. By mere observation of the observable* factor, behaviour the action cannot be understood.

Notes

1. Kathopanishad II.5.4.8
2. Brhadaranyakopanishad III.9.2.8
3. Prashnopanishad I .2.
4. Mundakopanishad I.13
5. Quoted by P.T.Raju in "Concept of Man" p.92.
6. Ibid., p.134
7. Ibid., p.136
8. Ibid., p.177
9. Ibid., p.178
10. Ibid., p.27
11. Quoted by K.J.Shah in Indian Philosophical Quarterly Vol.XI
No.1, January, 1984.
12. Dr. Radhakrishnan in the Principal Upanishad p.48
13. Brhadaranyakopanishad I.3.1
14. Taittimyopanishad II.3.1
15. Aitareyopanishad II.1.7
16. Taittiriyopanishad II.2.1
17. Aitareyopanishad II.1.1
18. Ibid., II 1.3
19. Ibid I.1.3
20. Ibid I 2.3
21. Mundakopanishad I.1.7
22. Taittriyopanishad I.9.7
23. Ishopanishad.2
24. Taittiriyopanishad II.8.1
25. Brihadaranyakopanishad I.4.9.

26. Ibid., IV.3.2

27. Aitareyopanishad III.1.1.2

CHAPTER - II

CREATION

Common Origin of Man and World

The inquiry about man begins with the inquiry about the origin, cause, and creation of man. The question is posed in Prashnopanishad "Whence are all these creatures¹ born ?" Svetasvatara questions "What is the cause ? Brahman ? Whence are we born ?"² Man wants to know his origin. "There was nothing in the beginning. This was surrounded by death, hunger for hunger is death"³. "In the beginning this was being (Sat) alone one only without a second"⁴ "Atman was this one only in the beginning"⁵ "Non existent was this one in the beginning"⁶ "It was only being alone in the beginning"⁷ "It was not existent, not non-existent neither existent and non-existent"⁸ These are the Upanishadic answers to the questions "What was there in the beginning ?

On a first glance these answers seem to be contradictory to one another and confusing. But a little reflection over these statements will remove this confusion and drive home the truth of these statements.

Brahdaranyaka which says that there was nothing in the beginning and that it was hunger or death, further says that "he" made up his mind, "let me become self-conscious" (Tanmanoakuruta atmanvi syatn).⁹

Then there is a series of statements like: "He divided himself into three parts (Satredhatmanam vyakuruta)¹⁰ He desired (*sot akamayata)¹¹ "He thought (saikshata)¹² and so on. In Brahmana the same Upanishad says "In the beginning this was only the self in the purusha form". Now if there is none in the beginning who is he that made up his mind, desired and did the things mentioned above ?

The only one becomes conscious of the self in reference to a second thing. Thus the production of water (apo'ajan ayate)¹³ makes the one conscious of the self (atman)¹⁴ Where from does the water come if there was nothing ? It has to come from what was there. There can be no effect without a cause, no production without a raw material. Certainly the water is not produced out of nothing, but from the "Existing". Upanishad is very clear, "From him thus worshipping, water was produced"¹⁵. Because it was produced from the onething that existed, it was called 'arka', the extract, (tadeva arkasya arkatvam).¹⁶

Taittiriya says, "Non-existent verily was this in the beginning. Therefrom verily was existence produced. That mode itself self-consciousness"¹⁷. The same upanishad describes this non-existent of the beginning as "If we consider the all pervading Brahman as Non-being then it is nonbeing. If one takes it to be non-being or non-existent then it is non-existent. But the so called non-being is or the non-existent consists of this (Brahman) itself"¹⁸. From this it is clear that something has not come out of nothing. There was a conscious principle. Then why was it called non-existent or non-being ? It was called non-existent because it had no existence in the form of gross matter which is knowable through our sensus. It was existent in the sense that there was a conscious principle. The words existent, being, non-existent and non-being are used to convey the same thing but in different meaning situations. It was non-being in the sense that there was no other thing to be conscious of its existence. It was being and existent because it was able to be self conscious of its existence. It was non-existent from the point of view of objective cognition because it was alone and there could be no subject-object consciousness in which sense we normally cognize existence. But in its capacity to be self conscious it was existent.

To avoid confusion the Subala Upanishad tries to put this state of existence beyond the categories of existence and non-existence used in our day to day discourse "not existent, not non-existent, neither existent and not non-existent"¹⁹.

Chandogya takes up the issues with a straight question. "How can being be produced from non-being ? Any one reply, is ". On the contrary, my dear, in the beginning this was being alone, one only without a second.²⁰ This confusion of referring to the same as both non-existent and existent is due to the fact that we try to understand it without knowing how the words are operating at different levels and situations. This can be understood, in the light of the concept of 'Abhava' in Indian logic. Quoting Aruni from Panchadashi Dr. Radhakrishnan clarifies the confusion, "Previous to creation all this was one being only without a second. Name and form were not. This is the statement of the son of Aruna". He does not have being as other things have being. He is his own being. Being is God. Being is above all conceptions and conceptual differentiations. It is prior to all things. All other things, are from being, live in it and end in it. What is other than being is nothing.

Indian logic recognizes four kinds of non-existence or abhava. There is the absolute non-existence or atyant-abhava, anything self contradictory like the son of a Barren woman. (Vandhya putra) is inconceivable and impossible. Barrenness and motherhood contradict each other. The real excludes the absolute non-existence. When non-being, asat, is said to be the root of existence asat does not mean absolute non-existence but only prior or antecedent non-existence or prag-abhava or potential existence. The world is non-existent before its production. It was existent potentially or as a possibility though not as an actuality. Creation is not out of absolute non-existence but out of prior non-existence or the world of possibility. This type of non-existence has no beginning but has an end when the possibility is actualised....."²¹

Yajnavalkya tells Paingala that "it is ever free, indeterminate..."²² Matri comes up with a clear categorical statement calling it Brahman, "verily in the beginning this world was Brahman, the infinite one...infinite in every direction...in-comprehensible is that supreme self, Unlimited, unborn not to be reasoned about, not to be thought of (unthinkable), he whose self is space. At the dissolution of all he alone remains awake. Thus from that space be

he awakes this world which consists of thought only. By him alone is all this meditated on and in him is it dissolved. He is the that luminous form which gives heat in the Yondersun, the wonderful light on the smokeless fire, as also the fire in the stomach which digests the food. For thus it has been said. He who is in the fire, and he who is here in the heart and he who is yonder in the sun-he is one. He who knows this goes to the oneness of the one.²³

Atareya identifies this with the self "What was there in the beginning was self and the self alone and nothing else"²⁴. He thought "let me now create the world"²⁵. It is a principle that can think. It is a conscious principle.

The purpose of all these is to show that the Upanishads are insistent that creation begins not from nothing in the sense of any absolute void, nor from any gross material empirically perceivable, but from a conscious principle which is capable of becoming self conscious. The whole process of creation begins with the pure consciousness becoming self consciousness. Thus the root cause of creation efficient

as well as constitutive - is a conscious principle. The same idea is expressed in the tree analogy in Bhagavdgita,²⁶ Katha,²⁷ Shvetashvatara²⁸ and Maitri²⁹ upanishads. It is this common constitutive root that decides man's relation with man, other living beings, non-living objects nature as manifested in the gross sensible form and immanent spirits of nature and God.

Process of Creation.

Before entering into a discussion of creation of man it is necessary to understand what is involved in the process of creation. Brhadaranyaka says, "so vet. aham va va srshtirasmi aham hidam asrkshiti, tatah srshtira bhavat..."³⁰ (I am indeed all this creation for I produced all this. Therefore became the creation"...) The creation is within the creator. It is not that the creator creates something outside himself for there is nothing beyond the creator, who is infinite and indeterminate. It was in the beginning undifferentiated, "tadd^{eta}hed tarhey avyakrtam asit"³¹. It became differentiated by name and form (tan nama rupabhyan eva vayakuruta). Brahman indeed was in the beginning. It

knew itself only as "I am Brahman that became all."³²
The process of creation is one of "extracting out" of
the self.

It is an internal differentiation of the self.
This process of internal differentiation continues: He
made three parts of the self "Satredhaatmanam vyakuruta³³
Triniatmane kuruta iti"³⁴. This differentiation brings
forth both gross and subtler elements. Chandogya says
that the one ~~is~~ generates the many "tadaikshata, bahusyam
prajaveviti"³⁵.

What is the nature of this differentiation or
srsti. It is said that Brahman the source is not differ-
entiated into names and forms.³⁶ The world is said to be of
a three fold character namely name, form and function
(nama, rupa karma)³⁷. It shows that the created is differ-
entiated and the creator is undifferentiated. But we have
seen already that creator and creation are the same. There-
fore the creation is a process of internal differentiation
of the undifferentiated into the world which is of the

differentiated form. This differentiation is in the nature of name, form and function. Again in identifying a differentiated part as distinguished from other differentiated parts the name, form and function are not separable. It is the same one self which is identified as particular name, form and function. It is the self alone which is the three at the same time. It means that it is simultaneously one and many, the creator and the created. The creator and creation are inseparable. This idea of creator and the created are two forms of the same reality" Brhadaranyaka and Maitre tell "dve vara Brahmanorupe murtam chaivamurtam cha".³⁸ (There are two forms of Brahman, the formed and the formless). Maitri says that this world was in the beginning is undefined and it is defined after Prajapati or the Lord of creation performed austerities and said Bhuh, Bhuvah and Suvah. This is the gross form of Prajapati. Again creation is also associated with the two forms of Brahman entitled Kala and Akala or the time and the timeless."³⁹ "This embodied time is the great ocean of creatures"⁴⁰. The process of creation is within time while the creator is timeless. Thus creation is not simply a spatial differentiation. It is also temporal. Creation therefore is a spatiotemporal differentiation within an infinitum called Brahman which is beyond the categories of space and time but is perceivable spatiotemporally through the creation or the gross differentiated forms.

Thus we can conclude that the Hindu theory of creation is not a magic materialisation of the various objects of the universe but a gradual evolution of a world of multiplicity out of the unity by the will of the unity. But this evolution of differentiated world called srshti is only a part of a wider scheme called Srshti-Chakra involving three phases, Srshti, Sthithi and Laya meaning formation, maintenance and dissolution in cyclic fashion.

Creation of Man.

The Aitareya account of creation of man begins with the creation of the human spirit by the primal being out of waters, ⁴¹ arka, or the extract from the only being in the beginning. This purusha is like an egg out of which ⁴² different organs have developed by being brood over. This is the Hiranyagarbha or Viraj or Virat. This purusha or the universal man finds an abode in a purusha, the man, the physical or particular which is gross and perceivable through the senses while the former purusha is only ideal and is not perceivable through the senses. The origin of

this idea can be traced to the Rgvedic concept of creation of population from the "virat purusha" "(tasmāt Virado aīyata)"⁴³ .

A mere physical manifestation of the ideal or spiritual man with all the gross organs is unable to operate or is inactive. It becomes active only by the entrance of the self. "Sa etameva simanam Vidaravitwa dwara prapadyata..."⁴⁴ (After opening that very and (of the head) by that way he entered). "...saesha iha previ-⁴⁵shta anakhagrebhyah". (He entered in here even to the tips of the nails). This is the first man created. He is the complete man, complete with the conscious self, the ideal of man and the particular physical man. A mere conscious self is not man. A mere idea of a man is also not a man. A mere physical body is also not man. To be a man one should be all these three simultaneously.

Once there is the first man there comes the problem of propagation. The very process of creation begins with the will, "ekoham bahusyam" (I am one, let me become many). It is the same will that continues to operate in the propagation of life of any living beings; so is the case of man too.

Brhadaranyaka talks of propagation through sexual differentiation and procreation". He desired a second. He became as large as a woman ~~and~~ a man in close embrace. He caused that self to fall into two parts. From that arose husband and wife.⁴⁶ The whole Hindu concept of marriage is based on the idea that man and woman are nothing but parts of the same unity, willed by the self for the purpose of procreation. Aitareya goes a step further giving details of the process of insemination and fertilisation for the continuation of life.⁴⁷ The birth of a child is not treated as the entry of a new individual but another birth of the same person to whom the offspring is born, which is again the basis of the Hindu concept of society or the man-man relationships.

What is important to note in the Hindu concept of birth is that it is not an accident or chance but the continuity of the manifestation of the primary will for creation meaning progressive differentiation in the self. Svetasvatara rules out, time, inherent nature, necessity, the elements, the womb or the persons being the cause of

: 30 :

creation and it says that it cannot be even a combination of these, and even the soul (differentiated self) cannot be the cause but it is the power of Divine self (the cosmic self) is the ruler of the causes.⁴⁸

Notes

1. Prashnopanishad I.1
2. Shvetashvataropanishad I.1
3. Brhadaranyakopanishad I.2.1
4. Chandogyopanishad VI . 2.2
5. Brhadaranyokopanishad I.4.1
6. Taittiriyaopanishad II.7.1
- 7.
8. Subalopanishad I-1.
9. Brhadaranyakopanishad I.2.1.
10. Ibid., I.2.3
11. Ibid., I.2.4
12. Ibid., I.2.4
13. Ibid., I.2.1
14. Ibid., I.2.1
15. Ibid., I.2.1
16. Ibid., I.2.1
17. Taittiriyaopanishad II.7.1
18. Ibid., II.6.1
19. Subalopanishad I.1
20. Chandogyopanishad V.2.2
21. Dr. Radhakrishnan in the Philosophy of Upanishads p.448
22. Paingalopanishad I.2
23. Maitri Upanishad VI.17
24. Aitareyopanishad I.1.1
25. Ibid I.1.1.

26. Bhagavadgita XV.5
 27. Kathopanishad II.3.1
 28. Shvetashreataropanishad III.9
 29. Maitri Upanishad VI.4
 30. Brhadaranyakopanishad I.4.5
 31. Ibid I.4.7
 32. Ibid., I.4.10
 33. Ibid., I.2.3
 34. Ib-id., I.5.3
 35. Taittiriyanopanishad II-6.1.
 36. Brhadaranyakopanishad I.4.7
 37. Ibid., II.6 1 to 3.
 38. Ibid., II.3.1
 39. Ibid., VI.16
 40. Ibid., VI.17
 41. Aitareyanopanishad I.1.3.
 42. Ibid., I.1.4.
 43. Rgveda X.90
 44. Aitareyanopanishad I.3.12
 45. Brhadaranyakopanishad I.4.7
 46. Ibid., I.4.2
 47. Aitareyanopanishad II.1.1.
 48. Shvetashreataropanishad I.2 to 3.
-

CHAPTER - III

CONSTITUTION OF MAN

Identity of Man.

The account of creation of man shows that man is only a multilevel manifestation of the will for differentiation of the same being. Therefore, man does not have an autonomous constitution. Man is constituted by the one and the only being, Brahman. But the Brahman as the only being is not called man. Man is Brahman with name., form and function. It is this name - form-function complex, called "man", that we try to understand, in seeking to know the constitution of man.

Nama, rupa and Karma is the three fold character of the created world. Name is a verbal denotation, form is a conceptual apperception and function is the self expression. All these three are one in the self. It is the three fold character of the self itself. The source of these three are Vak, (the speech) Chakshu (the conceptual frame work) and atma (the self).¹ Chakshu does not refer to the mere physical eye, as there is the practise of qualifying the word chaksu with Charma when the physical eye is referred to. This is

more clear when Krishna says to Arjuna that "he gives divya Chakshu²". Krishna does not remove the charma chakshu and replace it with a divya chakshu by grafting. It simply means he gives Arjuna a divine insight or conceptual framework. The perception is always connected with the mind. It is the mind that perceives not the physical eye³. Physical eye is only an aid at the gross level. Therefore the form of man does not mean only the physical form of the body and the limbs. The form refers to the concept of man denoted by the name "man". As creation is a continuous process of differentiation at different levels there is no end to the study of different levels. Still for a fair understanding of man at his operational level it will be necessary to study at least at a few levels.

Man is not an assemblage of a few parts into a complex machine. It is a self developed system in which different organs have developed from an undifferentiated embryo even at the gross level. Therefore studying only parts disconnecting it from the whole will be meaningless. Therefore at every level of differentiation the unity is also realised.

Purusa Prakrti

Man is indeed unique; but at the same time he is complex in form and function. Our sages ask us to inquire into the reality of the self (jijnasitavyah) and seek after it (anveshtavyah)³. Man is prone to attend only to things outside himself. This is due to the propensity of the senses to cling to the objects of the sense. Once these objects of the sense are disconnected man begins to think about himself. His inquiry turns inward from the outward. Therefore, the upanishadic injunction to keep out the objects of sense before beginning the inquiry into the self.

As life sustains on food man eats food; for he is no more man if there is no life and there is no life without food. This eating of food is called Atmayajna or self maintenance. This enables man to understand two aspects of himself: as Bhokta and the Bhukta; the eater and the eaten. This gives a two dimensional constitution of man as Prakrti and Purusha. Purusha is the consciousness abiding in the gross (Purushashchetapradhanah) Prakrti is the gross nature. It is also the later. (Prakrtamannam bhukta eti) Purusha is the enjoyer of the food. (sa eva

bhokta). The food is called the elemental or the gross self (Bhutatma hi annam) and the doer is the Purusha (asyakarta Pradhanah). Therefore that which is to be enjoyed, consists of three qualities and the enjoyer is the person who stands within. Purusha is the enjoyer and Prakrti the enjoyed. Abiding in it he enjoys.³

The fourteen fold concept of Man including the four forms of antahkarana, the five organs of sense perception and the five organs of action is also explained as a development in Prakrti in its course of manifestation. The four forms of antahkarana are buddhi, adhyavasaya, sankalpa and abhimana (intellect, involvement, will and self love). The doer is the elemental self he who causes to act by means of the organ is Purusha. (Karanaih karavitavyah purushah) And it is this elemental self which takes up the manifold forms and not the purusha.⁴

The physical body is born of sexual intercourse (shariramidam maithunadevobhutam) "It is built up with bones smeared over with flesh covered with skin, filled with faces, urine, billes, phelegm, marrow, fat, grease and also with many diseases like a treasure house full of

wealth.⁵ It is purely biological in character. It is subject to gunas or qualities of tamas, kajas and sattva. Because bhutatma or the biological man is filled with these gunas he attains manifold forms.⁶

Bhagavadgita deliberating on this matter says that all beings born of womb are made up of two parts the primordial nature or prakrti and the conscious seed the purusha. These prakrti born qualities bind the deha and the dehin, the body and the embodied together.⁷

The taking of the form by bhutatma is not simply by the gunas. The prakrti born bhutatma takes form only when overcome by the Purusha. (asubhutatmantah-purushanabhi-⁸
bhuto gunair hanyamano nanatvamupaiti).

When we say that the Prakriti and the purusha, the doer and the enjoyer together constitute man, the question arises as to whether they are two different things coming together to form the man. Shvetashvatara says "No, he who has the qualities and is the doer of the deeds that are to bear fruit, is the enjoyer. Karta and bhokta are the same. Assuming all forms characterised by the three gunas treading these paths, he the ruler of the vital breaths wanders

about according to his deeds"⁹. It shows that these two are only two levels of simultaneous manifestation of the same.

The analogy of two birds we come across in Rgveda and other Upanishads, "Two birds, companions always,, united cling to the self same tree. Of these one eats the sweet fruit and the other looks on without eating"¹⁰. along with the Katha reference to two selves that drink the fruit of Karma in the world of good seeds sometimes leads to confusion about the unity of the doer and the enjoyer in the self. This confusion is cleared well by Dr.Radha Krishnan in his commentary on the analogy "our being in time is an encounter of empirical existence and transcendent reality. The eternal in itself and the eternal in flux are the companions. The world is the meeting point of that which is eternal and that which is manifested in time. Man as an object of necessity a content of scientific knowledge is different from man as freedom"¹². In both the cases the man is the same. The purusha is the same. It only refers to the same at two levels of unmanifested and manifested simultaneously.

Bhagavad Geeta talks of three purushas, the perishable,

the imperishable and the supreme. The perishable purusha is the matter or the gross. The imperishable is the one dwelling in them and the supreme is called the Paramatma or the supreme self. These three are not three different things exclusive of each other. It is made clear further on "The Jivatma, (the so called individual self) is only a part of the whole eternal portion of Myself". The exclusive difference at the same objective level is ruled out. This internal and progressive differentiation can be understood only by analytical insight 'Jnana chakshu'.

Once again coming back to our Maitri discussion, the prakriti is said to be the highest form (Param rupam) of the self for the life consists of food. If one does not eat food he becomes a non-thinker, non hearer and he is a non-enjoyer. If one eats he becomes full of life. Therefore it has been said "From food, verily are creatures, whatsoever dwell on earth are produced, more over by food verily they live and again into it they pass". It is called food because it eats and it is eaten by the creatures" (advate' atti chabhutani tasmadannam tad uchvate). All these show that one should not neglect the significance of the

body or prakriti or the bhutatma or the biological level of manifestation while the reality at the unmanifested level is stressed. Both the aspects are equally important.

But this stress on food should not lead to the other extreme of limiting man to a "material" definition. Therefore, though the food is called the life of the living beings, the eldest born, and the physician and it is shown that all the subtler elements have grown out of food it is also said to be born of Vishnu the substratum or the all supporting. This is the special feature of the Hindu concept of the material basis of Man. Here the material basis itself has its basis in an unmanifested non-material conscious principle.

Sthula-Sukshma-Karana.

Paingala Upanishad belonging to Shukla Yajurveda is in the form of a dialogue between Yajnavalkya and his pupil Paingla. Here man is viewed in a three dimensional perspective. Man is a complex of gross, subtle and causal bodies (sthula, sukshuma karana dehabodhavapurvakam) Shveta Shvatara says that the embodied self according to his own

qualities chooses (assumes) many forms gross and subtle.²¹
The gross body is formed by orderly organisation of minutest parts of the quintuplicated great elements (pancha-mahabhuta) in their individual and collective aspects. The skull, the skin, the intestine, the bones, the flesh and the nails are parts (of the character of earth; blood, sweat, saliva urine and the like are of the character of water; hunger thirst, heat, swooning, sex impulse and the like are of the character of fire (Tejas) movement, lifting, breathing and the like are of the character of air(vayu) and lust, anger and the like are of the character of the ether²². The combination of these becomes the gross body.

The life principle, the functions of which are prana, apana, vyana, Udana and samana with the minor functions of naga, kurma, Kykara, Devadatta and Dhananjaya, is created out of rajasa and non-quintuplicated state. The heart, the anus, the navel and the limbs are made the seats (of the vital airs). Out of the remaining fourth part of the ether and other elements, in the rajasa (dynamic) character, organs of action were created. Its variants are the vocal organs, the hands, the feet, the excretory and

the generative organ. Their functions are articulate expression, grasping movement, excretion and (sex) enjoyment.²³

In the same way out of the totality of the three parts of the great elements in their sattvic (rhythmic) character he created the inner sense. Its various forms (modifications) are the mind, understanding, thought and self-sense (manas, buddhi, chitta and ahankara). Determination, conviction, memory, love and dedication (anusandhana) are its functions. Throat, face, navel, the heart and the middle of the eye brow are the seats. Out of the fourth part of the great elements in their sattvic character he created the organ of perception. Its various forms are ear-skin, the eyes, the tongue and the nose. Sound, touch, shape taste and smell are its functions. Directions, Air, the sun, the moon, Vishnu, the four faced Brahma and Shiva²⁴ are the deities presiding over the inner sense.

These gross and subtle bodies were not capable of moving or functioning without him. He desired to make them all conscious. Piercing through the macrocosm and the cranium of the individual souls situated in their crests he entered

them all. Then, they, though non-conscious by nature, were engaged in their respective functions, as if they were endowed with consciousness.²⁵

One is a man only when all these three are together or when the absolute self finds this multilevel expression.

Vishwa-Tajasa -Praina-Atman.

Mandukya presents a four level analysis of man, "soyam atma Chatushpat,²⁶ Vishwa,Tajasa,Praina and Atman are the four levels corresponding to the four states of existence, Jagrat(waking) swapna (dreaming), sushupti (deep sleep) and turiya (absolute or cosmic consciousness).

The waking state is the normal operational state of man. In this state one accepts the universe as one finds it without reflection. It is also called Vishwanara. It is called sthulabhuk meaning the enjoyer of the gross. All the human activities take place at this level.²⁷

Tajasa is active in the dream state. It cognises the internal objects and enjoys the subtle objects.²⁸ Though the dream state is distinct from waking state, this state

is said to be dependent on the predispositions left by by waking experience (praviviktabhuk). This shows that the gross influences the subtle.

The third level is that of Prajna corresponding to deep sleep state where one does not have any desire what-soever and does not see any dream what-soever. This is the state of one's being a mass of cognition full of bliss', enjoying bliss through consciousness²⁹. The bliss is not a state of ignorant merriment and pleasure enjoyed through senses but through consciousness or wisdom. While at the Vishva level it is life of outward moving consciousness, in Tajasa level, life of inward moving consciousness, in prajna level consciousness enjoys peace and has no perception either external or internal.

Though it is said that in the sleeping state there is the enjoyment of peace, this sleeping state itself is fleeting and temporary. It is not ultimate. Therefore evidently there is a fourth state which is ultimate. It is called Turiya. In this the man is said to be in the state of ultimate cosmic consciousness and it is called the Atman level. Turiya is not that which cognises the internal nor that which cognises the external, nor which

cognises both of them, not a mass of cognition, not cognitive, not non-cognitive, unseen, incapable of being spoken of, ungraspable, the essence of the knowledge of the one self that into which world is resolved, the peaceful, the benign, non-dual. He is the self.³⁰

Vishwa and Taijasa are conditioned by cause and effect but Prajna is conditioned by cause alone.³¹ Vishwa and Jaijasa refer to the gross and the subtle levels. Both these are the effects of cause, at the causal level. But these effects are inoperative as they are only the effects, disconnected from the causal. They are operative because they are one with the causal body. Therefore they are said to be the cause-effect complex. At the Prajna level one is detached from the gross and subtle level; Prajna is only the causal level independent of the gross and subtle.

Further the Vishwa and Taijasa are said to be conditioned by cause and effect because at these levels human behaviour is influenced by external stimuli. The experiences are of the nature of response to external stimuli. Even in dreaming state experiences are said to be dependent on the predispositions of the waking state. In sleeping state

it is only the self which is rather both the cause and effect and as such is said to be conditioned by cause alone.

The Turiya state cannot be described by words or imagined by mind for it is said to be beyond Buddhi and manas. The experience is however described as Shantam Shiyam and Advaitam. It is peace. It is grace. It is oneness. Here all the mental agitations are stilled and there is no more mind. In the waking stage mind is active and motivating. In dream it is restless with agitations and in deep sleep it is latent. But in all these three stages the truth or the reality is said to be unknown or not realised. What is that truth. The truth that is not realised is the truth of the one's being one with the universe in Brahman or the only ~~one~~ which is absolute consciousness.

What is the relationship between Prajna and Turiya ? Prajna is said to be independent of cause-effect duality. But here it is viewed as cause. Still individuality is maintained. But in Turiya it is not viewed as the cause. It is free from all phenomenal relationships but is in a state of absolute ^{uncon}normal unity. As Gaudapada says, that

the Vishwa, Tajisa and Prajna are not three different things altogether, it is the one who is known in the three states "eka eva tridha smritah".³² The fourth one again is actually not a fourth distinct from the three. It is the one in which all the three participate.

In Vishwa and Tajasa it is said that there is objective consciousness. While in Prajna the objective consciousness is absent, its seed is said to be present. Thus the empirical consciousness is present in the three states; in Turiya it is said to be transcendent consciousness which is non-empirical and free from its interruptions and alterations.

A question that crops up here is, is man still man in the state of Turiya ? If Turiya is transcendence does he not transcend his manhood too at this stage ? Again one must realise here that this transcendence is not physical transformation. The only transformation is in the level of consciousness. He can still be in this empirical world; only he is not influenced by empirical dualities. His activities are now guided by the oneness of the Being. He sees all in himself and himself in all.

Panchakosha.

Paingala gives a five level expression of man or a five dimensional concept of man. Man is said to be made up of five sheaths or koshas (Panchakosha). They are Annamaya, Pranamaya, Manomaya, Vijnananamaya and Anandamaya kosha.

What is brought into being only by the essence of food, what grows only by the essence of food that which finds rest in earth full of essence of food, that is the sheath made of food. That alone is the gross body or Annamaya kosha.

The five vital airs along with the organs of action constitute the sheath made of the vital principle of Pranamaya kosha. The mind along with the organs of perceptions is the sheath of mind or Manomaya kosha. The understanding along with the organs of perception is the sheath made of intelligence or Vijnananamaya kosha. These three sheaths of life, mind and intelligence together form the subtle body. The knowledge of one's own form is the sheath of bliss or Anandamaya kosha. That is the causal body.

In Bṛhadaranyaka we find the earliest reference to

the five sheath view of man. They are anna, prana, manas, yak and avyakrta. Anna stands for gross matter, prana for life, manas for consciousness, yak for speech and avyakrta for the undifferentiated. The avyakrta is said to be the causal sheath.

Taittiriya gives a detailed account of Panchakoshas. Here the Panchakoshas are the same as those of Paingala, Anna, Prana, Mana, Viinana and Ananda. The Vak and Arvyakrta of Brhadaranvaka correspond to the Viinana and ananda of Taittiriya.

Taittiriya discusses the interrelationships among them and suggests a progressive linkage among them: the earlier referred being the body and the one following being its self, of the earlier one all taken in the order of Anna, Prana, Mana, Viinana and Ananda. It thus says that what is produced by food is the body and the life is the self. The life is the body and mind is the self. The mind is the body and the intellect is the self. The intellect is the body and the bliss is the self.

Panchakoshas are not five cases made of material substances. It refers to the physical, vital, mental,

intellectual and the beatific aspects of Man. When we look at a man what is seen is his body. It is made up of food or the material things. It grows as food is eaten. It is reduced once eating food is stopped; This can be analysed into compounds, elements, molecules and atoms. But we do not call this body a man. If it is so even a dead body having the same shape and physico-chemical composition should have been called a man. It is called a man only when it is living, and life inhabits it. Without life there is no man. We cannot think of a man with only life, without a body. Therefore life and body both are the essential constituents of a man. Thus the life is the indicator that makes man distinct from lifeless matters. Man is thus a living organism. In the level of the body, Man is one with all the gross material objects. At biological level he is among all other living beings.

Life symbolises, growth, movement and activity. Therefore the pranamaya kosha is symbolised through the vital airs with the organs of action. In these man is like all living beings. But man is not a mere living being. He is more than that. He has an inner organ; mind. Mind is the organ of perception. Of course a point can be raised here

as to whether the mind is the organ of perception or it is the ear, the charma ^{chaksu} / ~~the~~ tongue and nose that are the organs of perception. It is true these latter are organs of perception; but they are, without the mind, only material bodies. They can perceive only because of the mind. Many times we say that we cannot see or hear somebody talk because our mind is elsewhere. When mind is not applied we do not perceive any external objects. They are all only aiding the mind in perceiving. It is in this sense that the mind is called the essential base of perception. This faculty of perception is peculiar to animals. Even though plants do have life, and the consequent properties of growth movement and activity, we do not know of the plants having minds. We do not know of plants not responding to similar stimuli under similar conditions differently. But in animals, especially the higher animals, it is very clear that this faculty of attention, or mind is present. Thus mind is the characteristic that puts man high up in the hierarchy of living beings.

But man is not a mere animal too. He is still more. He is rational. He has the power of discrimination and discretion. This is the intellectual plane. It is Vijnana.

He does not accept something just as perceived. He reflects on it. He makes his own judgements. While mind is only perceiving, buddhi or the intellect infers. The mind acts as a bridge between the external objective world and the internal buddhi. Mind is the gateway that allows the external objects to reach buddhi. It is also the gateway to carry out the instructions of the buddhi to the physical organs of action.

Panchadasi ascribes deliberation to the mind and decisions to the intellect, "manovimarsharupam syad buddhijnischayatnika".

Brhadaranyaka uses "vak" for "Vijnana". It seems that the word "vak" is used because speech is "expression". Expression symbolises the judgements of man, and judgements being in the domain of intellect, the Vijnanamaya kosha is referred to as "vak".

This intellectual faculty makes man higher than animals in the scheme of creation or evolution. But all these four levels taken together or separately do not give a complete picture of man. Man kept apart from the totality

of reality cannot be complete man. The identity of any differentiated part is based on nama rupa, karma, and nama-rupa-karma, is, by nature, differentiated. Difference is meaningful only in locating a thing in a totality as related to other parts. But this differentiation presupposes a common level of totality wherein all the differentiated parts participate in oneness of the totality. It is this aspect that is called Ananda or Bliss. In this level the individual is one with the supreme. Ananda is a level of Non-duality or advaita. The attempt of man to progressively understand man culminates in Ananda for after this no more inquiry is possible as the distinction of the inquirer and the inquired is lost.

In an earlier statement Taittiriya states that everything has originated from self. In a series of Progressive transformations the self becomes the person. "From self verily the ether arose, from ether air, from air fire, from fire water, from water earth, from earth the herbs, from herbs the food and food the person".

Now starting from the person it goes back to trace the original nature of man in the self that was the

only Being in the beginning, through progressively understanding man at different levels of body life, mind, intellect and bliss.

Thus Upanishads give a total picture of man as consisting of these five aspects, material, vital, mental, intellectual and universal. Therefore all these together constitute man.

Thus we find that the Upanishads understand man as a multidimensional being, but always care is taken to see that man is not taken as an assemblage of different independent units like the parts of a machine. All these are the simultaneous expressions of the same at different levels. Man is a multilevel being or in other words it is a multi-levelled manifestation of the one and the same self. The moment we try to reduce him to any one level he is no more man.

Man indeed is a harmonious union of apparently diverse faculties, physical, vital, psychological the intellectual and the beatific bliss, when investigated from outside and he is the pinnacle of development of one

self into a system of diverse faculties fulfilling the sole purpose of the self to be many. The same thing viewed from different angles give different pictures of the same.

Characteristic significance of Intellect.

In spite of the fact that all these constituents are the necessary constituents of man, certain faculties can be said to be more significant and characteristic of his being man as compared to other beings. Though the body consists of physical matter and obeys physico-chemical laws, the vitality makes it different from the non-living being, the psychological from the plants and the intellectual from the animals. Therefore the intellect is considered to be very significant.

Maitri says "inner sense governs the external sense"³⁵. It further says, "Man sees by mind, hears by mind and all that we call desire, will, doubt, belief, disbelief, resolution, irresolution shame, thought and fear - all these is but mind itself"³⁶. Aitareya says that intellect is primary to mind. Describing the mental states it has to say, "sensation, perception, ideation, conception, understanding insight, resolution, opinion, imagination, feeling, memory, volition,

conation, the will to live, desire, self control, all these are different names of intellection³⁷". The above two statements confuse us for many of the things attributed to mind in the former are attributed to intellect in the latter. The confusion is cleared when we know that Maitri makes only two-level analysis of man as inner and outer and all the inner faculties are put together under "mind" while Aitareya analyses it in still differentiated levels and makes a distinction between mind and intellect and says that it is intellect that controls the mind at a subtler level.

Manu says that Food, sleep, fear and sex are common to man and animals but dharma is peculiar to man. Dharma according to Manu is that which is held (observed and practised) and which holds (preserver) all the living beings (the born) and protects if observed and destroys if destroyed. This shows that dharma requires a purposeful practise which involves a decision to practise and this decision is in the domain of the intellect. Chandogya says that "All these centre in will, consist of will and abide in will"³⁸. Intellect is better than will. It is only when a man thinks that he wills.

Aitareya says that "All (man) are led by the intellect. Intellect is the support of all. Intellect is the final reality". To stress the prominence of intellect, Kaushitaki says", Just as a chief enjoys his own or as his own (men) are of service to a chief, even so this sense of intelligence enjoys those (other) selves even so the (other) selves are of service to that self (of intelligence) ...so also he who knows this striking of all evils attains pre-eminence, sovereignty and over-lordship over all beings, he who knows this yes he who knows this". While Kaushitaki agrees that it is Prana that holds all these selves bodily together it asserts" but it is the intelligence self that controls the self as a whole.

Thus in Hindu thought the characteristic aspect of man is considered to be the intellect. This is so not only because it marks him out from other beings, but also because man will be crossing beyond the realm of "operational man" if he is completely in the Ananda stage. It does not mean that the aspect of Ananda is not necessary. It is there. But what is pronounced in man as a man is the intellectual faculty or what is called rationality. Thus when the upanishads say that the intellect is the final

reality what they mean is that as a man intellect is the final reality. Upanishads do not stop at the intellectual level but proceed further. Here they go to the ultimate reality where the reality as man is no more distinguishable from the reality as the Brahman. Thus the basic reality is Ananda but the human reality at the operational level is that of intellect. But this human reality is meaningful in the wider reality, the Brahman reality and intellect is meaningful in the light of Ananda.

Interrelationships of the Constituents.

By no single faculty of man is capable of living a life. The living of a life is compared to the movement of a chariot. Maitri says that the self is the mover of the body chariot.⁴¹ Katha elaborates this simlie. "Atmanam rathinam vidhhi, shariram rathameva tu; buddhim to sarathimviddhi, manah pragraham eva cha" "indriyani hayanyahuh vishayanstheshu gocharan atmendriyamanoyakatam bhoktetyahurmanishinah".⁴²

Paingala also gives the same. The self is called the lord of the chariot, the body the chariot, the intellect the charioteer, the mind the reins, senses the horses, the objects

of the sense the paths. The enjoyer is the one composed of the self combined with mind and the senses. This is only to indicate that the life is a whole where all the aspects participate as one whole and not as different units though the roles played by them are different...

Man, God, World.

The Taittiriya question "For who indeed could live, who could breathe if there were not bliss in the space⁴³ ?" take us further to the understanding of man's relationship with other men and the world as a whole. An individual self and the cosmic self are said to be both simultaneous and one. Thus the Mandukya explains that in the Turiya state the individual is the Atman which is nothing but the Brahman. The cosmic self is present in Viraj, Hirnyagarbha and Ishwara, corresponding to Vishwa, Tajasa and prajna of the individual in the jagrat, swapna and sushupti states. If Vivekananda calls it the super conscious state, Ranade prefers the word pure self consciousness to denote the same. Though they differ in words they mean the same thing: one's being conscientious of one's identity with the cosmos or the cosmic self. Brhadaranyaka says that this self is indeed

indeed Brahman, "sa valavam atma brahma"⁴⁴ ... Further⁴⁵ it says that he is the maker of all. He is the world. Here the self is identified with both the Brahman and the world. This is completely in agreement with the theory of creation which says that all the multiplicity is evolved out of the one and the only thing in the process of one becoming many.

The interrelationship of man, world and the God in Hindu thought is governed by this theory of creation. The one and the only eternally existent pure conscious reality without a second, becoming active by a will to become many this world of nama, rupa, karma differentiation comes into existence in this gross form empirically sensible. Man also is a product of the same evolutionary process evolved out of the same non-gross substratum. Brahman, thus there is an underlying unity of the self of the man, the primordial self and the world in Brahman. God in Hindu thought does not convey a reality with a limited sense bearing a particular name, form and function. He has thousand names, thousand limbs and thousand eyes. The thousand here does not actually connote a number. It only shows that the God is the whole that contains the whole of this differentiated world in itself.

God is said to be responsible for srshti, sthithi and Laya. Srsthi, is creation, Sthithi is preservation and maintenance and Laya is dissolution. Srsthi is a process in which one becomes many, the causal become the subtle and gross. Sthithi is a process or a state in which this manyness in the subtle and gross form is operating and laya is process and state in which the gross manyness is dissolved into and reverted back to the original causal oneness. This is the srsthi chakra or the cycle of creation.

The causal oneness operating in the subtler and gross levels as manyness is this world. Man is a part of the same manyness. The idea of part and whole is also understood in two different ways. When our idea of wholeness is limited by the part we think the real whole as a complex of many wholes. But what we call as part and whole are taken to be one when our idea of wholeness is determined by the whole. As a matter of fact the objective world is neither whole nor part. It is our conceptual framework which makes us perceive it as a whole or part as one or many. When we look at the levels of fingers we say that there are ten fingers. But when we think of the man we call that there is one man. We touch a finger and say that this is

little finger, ring finger etc. when our conceptual framework is narrower. When the conceptual framework is broader we touch the same finger and say that this is a man. Therefore it is our conception that defines our perception. This is what is meant by saying that the inner sense governs outer sense. Mahabharata says that eyes see by the mind and not by the eyes "Chakshuh pashyati rupani⁴⁶
manasa, na tu chakshusha".

Thus sometimes we talk of man as a distinct unit, sometimes of mankind as a unit, sometimes of the whole world as a unit and so on. When our idea of oneness is expanded the narrower identities are lost. Therefore at deeper levels of thought man realises this unity of Man, world and God in Brahman; the eternally existent causal Being.

This unity of man and world is expressed in Taittiriya"
"who is here in the person and who is yonder in the son are
⁴⁷
one". Ishopanishad says, that it is within all this and
⁴⁸
it is also outside this. Kenopanishad says that by which
speech is expressed, mind thinks, eyes see, ears hear and
⁴⁹
life breathes is Brahman. Brahadaranyaka makes it more
clear when it says that this self is the world of all beings.

The interrelationships of all the beings and this world and the relationship of mankind as a whole with the beings of the world is brought out in the fifth Brahmana of the second chapter of Brhadaranyaka. This knowledge is called Madhuvidya.

Earth is the honey of all beings and all the beings are honey for the earth. Similarly, water, fire, air, sun, direction, moon, lightning, cloud, space, dharma, existence, mankind, and the individual self are all said to be the honey for all beings and all beings are honey for these things. All these are the self and are Brahman.

A very significant aspect of this Madhuvidya is that it gives the idea that the self is as such only in relation to these objects. (The list is only symbolic and not exhaustive)...

A man is called so by virtues of his having body, semen, speech, breath, eye(sight), ear (hearing) mind, light, sound, space, dharma, truthfulness (existence) and humanity.

There can be no body without earth (gross matter), no semen without water, no speech without fire, no breath without air, no eye(sight) without sun, no ear(hearing)

without quarter, no mind without moon, no light without lightning, no sound without cloud, no space in the heart without space, no dharma (law abidedness, without dharma (law)) no truthfulness without truth, no humanity without mankind, no self without the self. Without going into the exposition of the correspondence of the pairs of things materialy let us try to understand the logic of this argument: If one does not breathe he is not a man. If there is no air then he cannot breathe. It shows that for one to be a man air is a necessary part. If there is no sun (light) there can be no sight; without sight the eye is not eye at all. It is eye because of its function (Here name and form is not complete identity as name form and function together constitute the identity of an entity).When there is no sun and no light there is no function of seeing and there is no eye. If there is no mankind then there is no humanity.(Human form). If there is no humanity (or human form) then there is no man. Thus one is a man because of all these beings of the world. There can be no man without all these beings of the world. All these are so related that all these find their unity in one another. Like honey which seems to be only one thing is actually a combination of all the other things which go to the making of it, the individuality of anything comes from all the things including the thing itself.

So also in the case of man, his individuality is the product of all the beings. It is finally said that the individual self is the lord of all beings the king of beings. As all the spokes are held together in the hub and felly of a wheel just so in this self all beings, all gods, all worlds, all breathing creatures, all these selves are held together. Thus in an individual man is held the whole world together. Man is an indispensable and inseparable part of all the things and so also all things are indispensable and inseparable parts of man.

Thus even in the so called differentiated state of existence manyness logically implies oneness of the manyness even in the level of each apparently different individual ones.

This concept of the relationship of the individual and all beings, and their totality the cosmos, guides the ethics of human behaviour in Hindu thought.

:

Notes

1. Brhadaranyakopanishad I.6.1
2. Bhagavadgita
3. Maitri Upanishad VI.8
4. Ibid., III.3
5. Ibid., III.4.
6. Ibid., III.5
7. Bhagavadgita XIV.5
8. Maitriupanishad III.3
9. Shvetashvataropanishad V.7
10. Ibid., IV.6
11. Kathopanishad I.3.1
12. Dr. Radhakrishnan in the Principal Upanishads p.733.
13. Bhagavadgita XV 16,17.
14. Ibid., XV.7
15. Ibid., XV.9
16. Maitriupanishad VI.11
17. Ibid., VI.11
18. Maitri Upanishad VI.12
- 19.
20. Paingalopanishad II.2.
21. Shvetashvataropanishad V.12
22. Paingalopanishad II.2
23. Ibid., II.3
24. Ibid., II.4

25. Ibid., I.11
 26. Mandukyopanishad 2.
 27. Ibid., 3
 28. Ibid., 4
 29. Ibid., 5
 30. Ibid., 7
 31. Gaudapada quoted by Dr.Radhakrishana in the Principal Upanishads, p.699.
 32. Ibid., p.697
 33. Paingolopanishad II.5
 34. Taittiriopanishad. II 1-5.
 35. Maitriupanishad VI.1
 36. Ibid., VI.30
 37. Aitareyopanishad III.2
 38. Chandogyaopanishad VII.4.2
 39. Ibid., VII.5.1.
 40. Kaushitakiupanishad IV.20
 41. Maitri Upanishad III.4
 42. Kathopanishad I.3. 3 and 4. Paingalopanishad IV,1-3.
 43. Taittiriopanishad II.7.1
 44. Brhadaranyakopanishad. IV 4.5
 45. Ibid. IV,4-13
 46. Mahabharata Shanti Parva 311-17
 47. Taittiriopanishad III.10.4
 48. Ishopanishad 5.
 49. Kanopanishad I.5-9.
-

CHAPTER - IV

TYPES OF MAN

Deva-Asura.

Beings are characterised as devas and asuras and so are men. Shankara says that it is a distinction of life, not of beings. He says that they become gods when they shine under the influence of thoughts and actions as thought by the scriptures and become demons when they are influenced by their natural thoughts and actions based (only) on perception and inference and directed to visible (secular) ends. Bhagavadgita elaborates these characters. "Fearlessness absolute purity of heart, engaged and fixed in jnanayoga, charity, control of the senses, Yajna, study of the self, sublimation of the gross body into subtler forms, straightness of mind body and senses, nonviolence in thought word and deed, truthfulness, geniality of speech, absence of anger, renunciation of the idea of identification of doership with limited embodied form, tranquility of mind, refraining from malicious gossip, kindness to beings, not being engrossed in pleasures, mildness, abstaining from idle pursuits, sublimity, forgiveness, fortitude, external purity, absence of malice, and the absence of feeling of glorification are the marks of one who is naturally endowed with divine virtues.

"Hypocrisy, arrogance, pride, anger, harshness, ignorance, are marks of one who is demoniac."

"The virtues which are conducive to liberation or freedom are divine and the ones conducive to bondage are demoniac. "

"The demoniac do not know which activities are to be persisted in and which to be desisted from. Hence they possess no purity, nor good conduct nor truth. They say that the world is without any foundation and altogether false without a controlling principle and what else is this for, than for the gratification of sensuous desires, With this view, these cheap minded people, having lost their self engage in cruel activity aimed at destruction of the world possessed by hypocrisy, conceit and arrogance and given to insatiable passion and adopting false doctrine due to ignorance take to action with impure vows. Giving themselves to endless cares terminating only in death and given to the enjoyment of sensuous pleasures they believe that the highest limit of joy to consist only this. Held in bondage by a hundred ties of desires, given over to passions and anger they strive to obtain by unlawful means, hords of wealth for the enjoyment of sensuous pleasures. "

Thinking, "This has been won by me to-day, the ambitious, I shall realise now, this wealth is mine already, that will be mine again. This enemy has been already killed by me, I shall kill others too. I am the lord, I am the enjoyer, I am the perfect, I am the powerful and happy. I am wealthy and high born. Who else is like unto me ? I shall perform Yajnas, give alms and rejoice" thus deluded by ignorance, bewildered by numerous thoughts, enmeshed in the web of lust and addicted to enjoyment of sensuous pleasures men of the demoniacal nature fall into the foulest hell. Self important, stopped growth, filled with intoxication of wealth and honour performing nominal sacrifices for show and contrary to prescribed rules, given to egoism, violence, insolence, passion and anger, hate Me that dwell in the bodies of the others as well as their own."³

These two characters are mainly based on one's understanding and attempting to realise the underlying oneness of all the apparently different beings and the opposite. If one's thought, word and action are conducive to the realisation of this truth which means liberation from bondage in the narrower identity into the wider infinite identity, then one's character is divine. If the thought, word and deed are accentuating the bondage within the narrower identities then they are demoniac.

Sattva-Raja-Tama.

"Men are also said to be of three categories according to the preponderance of the three nature born qualities of Sattva, Rajas and Tamas which bind the soul to the body"⁴. Binding here does not mean that two things called soul and body are brought and tied together. It means only that the self is operating at the gross level.

"Sattva being immaculate is said to be illuminating and flawless which binds through self identification with happiness and wisdom. Rajas, being of the nature of passion as born of cupidity and attachment binds the soul through attachment to actions and their fruits. Tamas being the deluder of embodied being as form of ignorance binds the soul through error, sloth and sleep"⁵.

Based on these qualities as seen through their faith, penance, yajna, knowledge and actions the doer or the man, the agent is also classified into three groups. The man who is freed from attachment unegoistic endowed with firmness and vigour and unaffected by success and failure is sattvika. The man who is passionate, greedy, desirous of gains in action, given to violence and of

impure conduct, affected by joy or sorrow is Rajasa. The man lacking in self control, and piety, vulgar, arrogant, deceitful inclined to rob others of their livelihood, slothful, despondent and procrastinating, is Tamasa.

"The reasoning and the firmness of man are also of three qualities. The Sattvika reasoning can judge, right action, right cessation of action, what must be done or not done, what is fear and fearlessness, and what is bondage and liberation.

Rajasa reasoning fails to judge correctly the dharma and adharma, dos and don'ts.

Tamasa reasoning judges adharma as dharma and always takes the perverse meanings.

The firmness by which one controls life, and mental vital and physical activities through yoga is Sattvika. The firmness in desire for gains, held in pursuit of dharma, kama and artha is Rajasa. The firmness by which a man does not give up dreaming, fear, grief, despondency and arrogance is Tamasa.

The joy which terminates the sorrows, one's own wisdom is Sattvika. The joy that comes out of the union of senses and the sense objects and which ends in sorrow is Rajasa.

The illusory joy derived out of sleep, indolence,
and errors is ⁶ Tamasa".

Fundamental Basis of Difference.

What is fundamental to the nature of a man ? If nature of guna is fundamental, then by changing nature all other things can be changed as they are then derived from nature. Then what is nature ? Is it the body composition? Body is made up of food. Food is classified into three types. But the Gita account of three types of food says that the one called sattvika food is liked by the sattvikas. Then if it is the food that makes a man sattvika. Rajasa or tamasa, all those who are eating similar food, should have the same qualities, mechanically. But it is not so. Further there is an aspect of human like and dislike or attitude towards a thing seems more basic than the thing liked. This attitude is subtler than the food or the liked object. The same thing can be said as to the relationship of attitude and action. If action is fundamental to attitude then there should be an action first and then the attitude. Without the concept of action

there cannot be an attitude towards that action. But in choosing an action, there must be a previous propensity for a particular type of action. If the action is fundamental then the same action should be liked by all. But it is not so. Different people like different types of action placed in similar situations. Thus attitude of man is fundamental in selecting a particular type of action. Considering one's mode of reasoning and attitude we have to see which is fundamental. If attitude is fundamental to reasoning then all that one likes should be judged right and one does not like should be judged wrong. If it is so the reasoning has no work to do except to justify one's own attitude towards an action. Then the dharma or adharma of an action is judged by the attitude. Rather likes and dislikes becomes synonymous with the right and wrong. But we know that the reasoning is there to judge our actions and attitudes. This leads us to the conclusion that reasoning is fundamental to our attitude, for it is reasoning that judges the rightness or wrongness, and dharma and adharma of our attitudes, words actions, and experiences.

Now about reasoning. Man is called a rational animal. Man is marked out because of intellect or ability to think and measure or discriminate. Is reasoning the ultimate

governor of human behaviour⁹. If we look at the nature of reasoning, and discrimination, we find that reasoning always involves a comparison with an accepted standard. What is this accepted stand^{nda}ard and how is a standard accepted? Of course this accepted norm is called reality or truth. How is this reality or truth conceived. Does a particular mode of reasoning make us understand the reality. If it is the mode of reasoning that gives the reality or truth, there must be many realities or truth corresponding to different modes of reasoning. This goes against the very idea of the reality or truth. The truth must be one. In fact reasoning does not help us to reach the reality. The function of reasoning is only to judge if the given is in conformity with the truth. When we say that something is true what we say is simply that it is conforming with the truth. Even in all the theories of truth what we try to do is to understand the nature of relationship of the given proposition or statement with what is already accepted as truth or reality trying to know if it is a relationship of coherence, correspondence or participation etc.

This truth being one, what may differ is only our vision of truth. It is our vision of truth that may differ and it is on this difference in our vision of truth, that

our mode of reasoning depends because the very nature and function of reasoning and is to assess the degree of similarity identity or unity of the given with this one truth and our access to the truth is our knowledge of this truth. The truth denoted by terms like Atman, Brahman, Atman-Brahman identity and unity, Brahman and its manifestation etc. is said to be not achievable through discussions and study etc. "navamatma pravachanenalabhyah..."⁷

Let us look at what the different Upanishads say of the unknowability of this reality. "That from which our speech turns back along with mind, being unable to comprehend its fulness, is ultimate reality"⁸. "That where the eye is unable to go, where neither speech, nor mind is able to reach what conception can we have of it except that it is beyond all that is known and beyond all that is unknown"⁹ "He who thinks he knows does not know and he who knows he does not know really knows"¹⁰. "The self is not in the first instance open to the hearing of man but that even having heard him many are unable to know him, wonderful is the man if found who is able to speak about him in accordance with the instruction of a teacher."¹¹

Why is he unknowable ? "Atman is the great Being who knows all that is knowable, who can know him who himself

knows¹²". "That by whom everything is known how could he himself be known ? It is impossible to know the knower¹³"

All these discussion about unknowability is based on the supposition that the process of knowledge involves a subject who knows and an object which is known. How can a subject know the subject is the problem. How can the subject be the object of knowledge ?

Knowledge is not possible in the sense that nothing remains outside the subject. It refers to a metaphysical state in which one is oneself and all is oneself. This state of being is called self consciousness or super consciousness. Yajnavalkya says that the self consciousness is possible. This process is called realisation. This knowledge is of a different level altogether and is called mystic knowledge or sukshmadarshana or samyag darshana. Brahadaranyaka says that realising this self is the same as mystically apprehending the glory of the self within us as though we are distinct from him.¹⁴ "That atman derives its being from Brahman, subtracting the infinity of the Atman from the infinity of the Brahman, the residue is even infinite".¹⁵

This is only to show that self consciousness or super-consciousness of Vivekananda is of a different order. It

belongs to the level of Ananda. In the level of Jnana the comprehension is imperfect. It is due to this imperfection in comprehension of the truth that the gunas arise. The degree of perfection of comprehension of the self of the level of the knowledge of the self determines the specific gunas. The gunas therefore are not three compartmentalised states. It is a progressive process. The moment one attains the superconscious or self conscious state the gunas cease to exist.

Varna

Krishna says in Bhagavadgita "Chaturvarnjan maya srshtam guna karma a vibhagasha".¹⁶ The people belonging to the four varnas are created by me based on the nature and function". Further he says that the duties of Brahmana Kshatriya, Vaishya and Shudras are divided according to the qualities born of their respective natures.¹⁷

"Control of mind, control of senses, undergoing hardships for the sake of the duty, purity, forgiveness, straightness of mind and body, knowledge of the world, knowledge of the self, belief in resistance are the nature born functions of Brahmana Prowess, majesty, firmness,

bravery, ingenuity not running away from battle, generosity, rulership are nature born Kshatra functions. Cultivation, cow protection, and commerce are the nature born Vaishya function. Nursing is the nature born functions of shudra."

Varna classification is said to be one of the significant aspects of social structure. Therefore it is necessary to go into this concept in detail. Varna is derived from the root Vr. meaning to choose, to select and accept. Not influenced by the distorted view that varna is equivalent to the caste system as practised at present in the country let us try to find the concept of Varna in the Upanishadic thought.

Brhadaranyaka says that verily in the beginning this was Brahman, one only. Being one there was no differentiation. Then he draws out of himself the Kshatra power. Therefore there is nothing beyond Kshatra. Therefore Brahmana sits below the Kshatriya in Rajasuya. On Kshatrahood alone the honour conferred. Nevertheless Brahmana is the source of the kshatra. Therefore even if the king attains supermacy at the end of it he resorts to the Brahmana as his source. Therefore he who injures the Brahmana strikes at his own

source. He becomes more evil as he injures one who is superior. Yet he did not flourish. He created the Vaishya. He did not still flourish. He created Shudra varna as Pushan, the nourisher.¹⁹

The oft quoted famous stanza, of Purusha sukta in Rgveda, which is also found in Subala Upanishad forming a part of Shukla Yajurveda says that the face was Brahmana, Kshatriyas were made from the arms, and from the thigh and feet were born Vaishya and Shudra. Here while Kshatriya²⁰ was made and the Vaishya and the Shudra are born, Brahmana was. Face or mouth is the symbol of the whole man (mukham²¹ pratikam) as it is through the face we identify the whole man. The organs of the man are formed on differentiation within the whole. Similarly there was the Brahman first out of which on differentiation were created Kshatrya, Vaishya and Shudra.

Manusmrti also lends support to the same view when it says that as fire can be used either for burning dead in the cremation or for a Yajna, so is Brahmana whether he is a scholar or not,²² showing that Brahmanas can be put to any use or it is from Brahmanas according to the need

different varnas are created. Of course the meaning of creation itself is internal differentiation. This is exactly what is conveyed by Krishna also when he said the four varnyas are created bby him.

Thus the origin of Varna shows that Kshatriya, Vaishya and Shudra are all chosen from among the Brahmana only. The society as a whole is Brahmana. It is said that among men Brahma existed as Brahmana. Brahma is totality. Therefore the totality of man is Brahmana. Therefore it is the totality of men that chooses Kshatra Vaishya and Shudra by the process of internal differentiation. Thus every one chosen to be a Kshatriya, Vaishya or Shudra is basically a Brahmana.

What about those who are not chosen to be either Kshatriya, Vaishyaas and Shudra. How are they called. They are still Brahmanas. They are not Brahmanas because they are chosen to be Brahmanas. They are Brahmanas because they are a part of the totality as the chosen ones are. Are they chosen to be not chosen ? Again what is the basis of this choosing ? It is the work to be done and the nature of the individual. Is this nature a chance ? This is to be considered at two levels. At he level of cosmic unity it is not a chance. At the level of separateness it looks

like a chance. As for the natures and different works corresponding to them we have already seen what is given in Bhagavadgita. There does seem to be confusion about the function of the shudra. Paricharyatmika is interpreted as service of the others. It is equated to slavery of others. The confusion arises mainly because of our wrong understanding of the concept of society. Human society in Hindu thought is not a few individuals and groups entering into a contract. Even the marriage is not contract. It was the divine will or the will of the self to multiply for which the self divided itself into two, man and woman to procreate. Man and woman are only apparently two but actually they are one and procreation is the will of their unity. The development of human family is a process of progressive evolution out of the same. It is not many entities forming a compound. It is expansion and multiple specialisation and differentiation of the one. Here every apparently different individuals or groups are working for the whole and not for that particular individual group. Paricharya actually means moving around. The idea of movement is symbolised by linking him with the feet in Rgveda. But as those moving around are within the self, the feet establish an active dynamic interrelationship

among the apparently different parts. This motion is vitality. The Shudra stands for vitality of the society. Vitality is maintained by proper nourishment. Upanishadic function of Shudra is nourishment as he is called Pushan. The Upanishad does not simply give the word "Pushan" and leave it for us to interpret. It categorically states that he is Pushan because he nourishes all, whatever is there.²³

It is sometimes said that Shudras of the classical Hindu conception are the same as the "slaves" of Plato-who are aliens and not truly part of a society at all. But such a comparison involves a total distortion of the Hindu view.

The Hindu Varna system does not divide the whole human race into different city states or groups. Hindu Varna system speak of the Kshatriya as the ruler of the self. It does not think of Kshatriya as a warrior against an outsider for its concept of society encompasses all that is. Rather we will find that it does not only encompass the human race but all that is. As such there is no place for slavery, or one becoming the ruler of the other or slave of the other. The very basis of Hindu philosophy is elimination of this otherness. Therefore here Shudhra

is a part and parcel of this society. Even the idea of nursing as duty of the shudra is to be understood in the context of the Hindu concept of nursing. In the Hindu concept of nursing it is a maternal function and not slavish function.

When we say that the varnas have developed out of Brahman, Brahmana forming the substratum of the society and the totality of the society, a question arises as to the number of Varnas if they are three or four. Once the specialisations begins, there are left those who are not specialised. It is not that they have no work. They are expected to have the knowledge of functions of all the Varnas. Manusmriti says that Brahmana should know the professional knowledge of all and train them. When Manu discusses the age of Upanayana of Brahmana he points out two types of Brahmanas²⁴. In general Brahmana Upanayana rites are to be performed at the age of eight years but for the Brahmanasakamas the rites are to be conducted at the age of five years. If all are essentially Brahmanas, this distinction implies that those who are not already absorbed into the Kshatriya, Vaishya, Shudra categories, have the duty

of continuously preparing people for the professions connected with the K $\frac{3}{4}$ V-S scheme. This requires the knowledge of everything and training people in everything; thus the educating and thinking in all the professions, becomes a profession of this class of Brahmins; and, unfortunately, they are the ones who come to be referred to as Brahmana.

Therefore Brahmana is one who is friend of all.²⁵
Thus it is also identified as one varna making the number of Varnas four.

These are four, from these four varnas further generation is born either by sanskara or sankara, the inbreeding or hybridisation; thus many jatis are evolved ; but the varnas are four and there is no fifth,²⁶ 'jayate iti jato'. It is jati because it is born. The jatis born of in breeding of Varna are generally ^{known} by the same names. But varna and Jati are not the same. Manu says that though born as Shudra (jati) he can acquire Brahmanahood (varna) and so also Kshatriya and Vaishya, and vice versa.

Further it is said that by purity, marriage, being soft spoken, humble, and staying with Brahmana one can move from one Varna to another varna.

Then the four varnas are Brahmanas representing the common source always educating and preparing the specialised persons for the running of the society, the Kshatra, the power of the society, the Vaishya, the production and Shudra the nursing and nourishment of the society.

"Yet he did not flourish then created a further excellent form Dharma ... that which is dharma is truth"²⁸. The differentiation will flourish only when the Truth prevails. As we know that the Truth is the oneness of all these. Dharma means that which holds. ~~Therefore what holds~~. Therefore what holds all is Dharma and that is the Truth and that is the oneness. It is this realisation of the oneness that is the basis of Varna system.

But in general Hindu Traditional thought Brahmana is said to be superior. Why is Brahmana superior ? Here the different levels in which the word Brahmana is used must be understood. Brahmana is superior when it is understood in the sense of the totality. Brhadaranayka says "... therefore there is nothing higher than Kshatra. Therefore at the Rajasuya Brahmana sits below the Kshatriya.

On kshatrahood alone does he confer this honour. But Bra-
hmana is nevertheless the source of the Kshatra. Therefore
even if the king attains supermacy at the end of it he
resorts to the Brahmana as his source. Therefore he who
injures the Brahmana strikes at his own source. He becomes
more evil as he injures one who is superior²⁹". Brahmana
who is superior is that source out of which all are evolved

Vajrasuchika Upanishad belonging to Samaveda says
that of the four varnas Brahmana is pradhana meaning the
chief, or the main or the substratum. It asks who is this
Brahmana ? Is he the individual (differentiated) life ?
Is he the body ? Is it the class based on birth ? Is he
knowledge ? Is he the deeds ? Is he the lawabidedness ?
It says that none of these is Brahmana". He who after
directly perceiving, like the amalaka fruit in the palm of
one's hand, the self, without a second, devoid of distinction
of birth, attribute and action devoid of all faults such
as the six infirmities and the six states, of the form of
truth, wisdom, bliss and eternity that is by itself, devoid
of determinations, who functions as the indwelling spirit

of all being, who pervads the interior and exterior of all like ether, of the nature of bliss, indivisible, immeasurable, realisable only through one's experience and who manifests himself directly and through the fulfilment of his nature, he comes rid of the faults of desire, attachment etc. and endowed with qualities of tranquility, etc. rid of the states of being, spirits agreed, expectation, bewilderment etc. with his mind unaffected by ostentation, self sense and the like, he lives. He alone who is possessed of these qualities is Brahmana. This is the view of the vedic texts and tradition ancient love and history. The accomplishment of the state of Brahmana is otherwise impossible..."³⁰

Thus we must make a distinction between Jati Brahmana and Varna Brahmana. While jati is based on birth varna is based on choice and corresponding specialisations needed for the maintenance of the totality. In spite of birth in any Jati the Varnas may be different. Varnas are not arbitrary division. It is by choice and evolution by biological process, education and associations. While genetic inheritance of qualities is an established fact in normal conditions, acquisition by education, and associations is equally valid in developing ones interest skill and aptitude. Hindu

thought takes both these cases and evolves a normal general system based on births allowing and showing the ways of interprofessional mobility irrespective of birth. On the other hand giving a unitarian organic ^{concept} ~~aspect~~ of society it gives for total development of personality in subtle and gross level but always realising the identity at causal level.

Thus accepting the truth at the three levels makes it so scientific and a non exploitative competition free harmoniously developing organic system.

Ashrama.

If Varnas help us to spot an individual on a horizontal plane in the society the Ashramas help us to spot them in a vertical plane in life. After Balya or childhood man takes up a life of activity. The nature of the activity of an individual in one's different stages of life is divided into four phases. It can be called the four stages of development of oneself. They are called ashramas. The four ashramas are named Brahmacharya, Grhastha, Vanaprastha and Sanyasa. These are said to be in a chronological order. It is also said to be the stages of development of an individual

Raghuvamsha says "Having Education in childhood, enjoyment in youth, Contemplation in old age at the end one should leave the body by Yoga."³¹ Atharvaveda says that a brahmachari should go to a teacher for study.³² Yogadarshana refers to brahmacharya as one of the Yamas. Atharvaveda tells that Brahmachari protects by tapas. Brahmacharya includes mainly two aspects: education and training to become vidya snataka and vrata snataka. Vidvasanataka is one who has mastered the mantras or thoughts. Vratasnataka is one who knows the self. The idea is that Brāhmachari has to live a disciplined life and get education. The word brahmacharya used for this stage is very significant. It gives a specific meaning and purpose for education. Education is not mere feeding with information and training in skills for livelihood. By birth the child is like any organism relishing and revelling in food and play. He is to be initiated into a way of life and conduct that broadens the vision and lead to the attainment of Brahman namely the realisation of oneness. During Brahmacharya, a life of celibacy is prescribed that he can have a healthy procreative life later. According to Dayananda Saraswati, this life should be upto an age of 40 years. But some say that this age is not rigid. It is till the completion of education. The samavartana or return

from Gurukula, the teacher's home, is on the completion of education, the duration of which may change from person to person.

What is the meaning of Vidya. Dayananda Saraswati writes in his Rgveda Bhasya Bhomika "Vidyateviti Vidya" Vidya is that which is there. It is also said 'Sa Vidya Ya Vimuktaya' Vidya is that which liberates. Ishopanishad says "Vidyaya amrtam ashnuते".³² By Vidya one gets immortality or deathlessness. Immortality or deathlessness does not mean a biological life forever in the same body. Deathlessness means life. The same Upanishad says "Avidyaya mrtum Tirtva Vidyaya amrtam ashnuते". One crosses death by Avidya and attains life by Vidya. These are two aspects of learning, Avidya and Vidya. Those who resort only to Avidya enter darkness and those who resort to Vidya alone enter into still greater darkness.³³ Avidya is that which helps us to overcome death. Avidya is the learning in the physical sciences by which man makes himself free from diseases that cause death, and comfortable. But mere overcoming death is not life. Life is that which is lived. Being not dead means living. Living involves not only knowledge of gross but of subtle aspects too. Therefore one has to get the knowledge and experience of the gross subtle, and the causal for living a meaningful life. The stress given on the combination of

both aspects of learning shows that education is aimed at a balanced development of personality. Avidya and Vidya are referred to as work and wisdom. B.M.Barua says "Avidya meaning the normal run of life based on the procreative institution of marriage is treated as a means of preventing physical discontinuity, and Vidya, meaning the leading of chaste life, practice of austerities and the pursuit of higher knowledge as means of realising immortality of soul.³⁴

The brahmacharya includes not merely reading and gathering information but a way of life. Tapas or practical involvement of oneself is another important aspect of brahmacharya. It shows that education is not merely objective but also subjective. But what is education for ? Is education meant only for intellectual exercise ? No, education must prepare a man for life. Therefore on completion of education one is to take up life. Brahmacharya is a stage in which one equips one self with the required, information, attitudes, aptitudes, skill and above all a right vision of human life, so that one can lead a life happily and comfortably.

Along with the concept of Brahmacharya and education the idea of Gurukala is also necessary. Kula stands for the

clan. The Hindu system recognises two types of Kulas, one, the kula of one's own birth and the other the kula of the Guru. There is a word called Guru parampara meaning Guru's lineage. Guru means teacher. One has to join a Gurukula or become a member of the Guru's clan. Here the beginning of education starts with breaking up of ethnocentric bias. The students belonging to various kulas by birth join together becoming members of one kula: gurukula. This is how education starts with a practical experience of realising the oneness of humanity beyond the kulas of their birth. The Guru and his spouse are to be taken as one's own parents. All the members forget their individual identities of clan of births and experience a unity. This experience of Unity in multiplicity is also symbolised in the word brahmacharya as the fundamental unity of multiplicity of the universe is called Brahman" ekatve satin, natiam nanatve sati chaikata achintyam brahmano rupam kastad veditum arhati".³⁵ Though this unity in multiplicity and multiplicity in unity which is the form of Brahman is unconceivable it should be realized. This is the kind of knowledge of living or participation.

Chandogya talking of the importance of Brahmacharya says that what is called yajna is Brahmacharya. It is by the

this brahmacharya that one attains what one wants. By brahmacharya, one obtains the self. It is by brahmacharya one obtains the protection of the self. It is by brahmacharya one attain freedom³⁶. The gods conquered death by brahma charya³⁷".

After Brahmacharya Ashrama being equipped there with Avidya and Vidya, the knowledge skills, and the way of Brahma conduct, one enters the next stage called grhastha ashrama. Grahastha means one who is at home. This is the phase of production and reproduction. In the Brahmacharya stage one learns about Brahma the infinite eternal reality, lives the way of life of Brahma and in grhastha exercises the Brahma will of creation of differentiation into multiplicity. That is why Brahdaranyaka equates the procreative process with the Vajapeyayaga. It is said that the procreation should be done in this spirit.

It is said that a man is born with three types of indebtedness called Devarna, Pitrna and Rshirna. This grhasthashrama is said to be utilised for freeing one self from these three rnas. Let us examine the meaning of these rnas. The birth of a man is possible because of the nature, the ancestors and the wisdom and knowledge. The indebtedness

due to the participation of nature is called devarna. Deva is the subtler aspects of nature here which are said to control it. The ancestors including parents are called pitr. The indebtedness to them is pitrrna. The knowledge has come through the seers. Therefore the indebtedness due to the knowledge which has brought about the birth is called Rshirna. One has to free oneself from these three Rnas. One has to free oneself from Devarna by Yajnas, Pitrrna by karma and Procreations and Rshirna by learning and teaching.

The duty of a grahastha is further elaborated in the convocation advice given in the TaithiViva to the Brahmachari who returns home after completion of education
“...speak the truth, practise dharma, Don't err in the self study, Having brought to the teacher the wealth which is pleasing him, the procreation should not be discontinued. Dont err in truth, dharma, skills, prosperity, study, teaching and the duties to gods, and fathers³⁸”. The driving forces of grhastha-shram is said to be Putraisharna, Vittaishana, and lokaishana; namely the desire for offspring, desire for wealth and desire for popularity. It is said that if any one wants to be free without fulfilling the three obligations to one's community it is a sin.

Manusmrit says that when the grhastha sees that his hair is turning grey he should retreat to the forest. The third part of the life should be spent in the forrest. That is called Vanaprastha Ashram. During this stage one transfers the cares and responsibilities to the son and tries to be free from the possible attachment to the world developed during grhastha Ashrama being deluded by the differentiated form and forgetting the fundamental unity of the self and the world in Brahman. Therefore in Vanaprastha one retires to the forest and meditates on the Brahman.

This finally leads to Sanyasa, the fourth stage where one identifies oneself with the Brahman and moves about in the world. Sanyasa is not renunciation of action. Sanyasa is renunciation of the desire for the fruits of action for one's own defferentiated self. It is not a meaningless work which does not bring result. Every action has a result. Every action is done with a purpose. In the stage of Sanyasa one does for the sake of the cosmic self. As far as the necessity of action is considered Krishna says though for a realised soul there is no need of working, the world will be misled if one does not work. That is why he says one should not create doubts in the minds of the ignorant who

are attached to work,⁴⁰ for it is the normal course of things in the world that they initiate or imbibe what the great men do. Krishna says that not a single moment passes without work. At least for the maintenance of the body one has to work. Shankaracharya, a strong advocate of Jnanamrga, also criticizes austerity, fasting that leads to the death. The creation being the will of the Universal self, anything goes against it is against the Dharma. Any attempt to commit suicide is decried in strongest words in the Upanishads.⁴¹

Sanyasa is a stage where one is not forced to work by the material conditions and needs but one works out of one's free will to work. Thus Sanyasa is the stage of final attainment in the scheme of life of an individual.

Maitri says that purusuit of duties prescribed for the stage of life to which each one belongs is the rule for ones own duty; if a man says that he does not belong to any stage of life for he is one who is practising tapas, it is not proper;⁴² for tapas is essential for success in each stage of life.

But Yajnavalkya says that though~~t~~ one has to pass through all the stages, if one wants to take up Sanyasa

one can take it up at any stage.⁴³ This should not be taken as a general prescription for all. It is only in special cases as he himself puts the condition that it is for those who have this spirit of detachment. In Hindu thought detachment is only detachment from the ignorance of taking multiplicity as true and actually involves eliminating the otherness which causes attachment.

But Mahanirvana Tantra is very categorical in saying that one who become a monk giving up father, mother, child, wife, kinsmen and relative⁴⁴ becomes a great sinner. And one has to pass through all the stages before renunciation.

Notes

1. Hrhadaranyakopanishad I.3.1; Chandogyopanishad I.2.1
Bhagavadgeeta - XVI.6.
2. Quoted by Radhakrishann, The Principal Upanishads p.155.
3. Bhagavadgeeta XVI . 1-18.
4. Ibid., XIV .5
5. Ibid., XIV .6-8
6. Ibid XVIII 26-40
7. Kathopanishad I.3.3
8. Taittiriyanopanishad II.4
9. Kenopanishad I.3.
10. Ibid, II.3
11. Kathopanishad I.2.7
12. Shvetashavataropanishad III.19
13. Brhadaranyakopanishad II.4.14
14. Ibid., II.4.5
15. Ishopanishad (in-vocation)
16. Bhagavadgeeta IV.13
17. Ibid., XVIII-41
18. Ibid., XVIII.42-44
19. Brhadaranyakopanishad I.40.11-13
20. Subalopanishad I.1.
21. Brhadaranyakopanishad I.5.2
22. Manusmriti I X-317 and 318.
23. Brhadaranyakopanishad I.4.13
24. Manusmrit II.36-37.

25. Ibid., II-35,57.
 26. Ibid., I.4
 27. Ibid., X.65
 28. Brhadaranyakopanishad, I.4.14
 29. Ibid., I.4.11
 30. Vajrasuchika Upanishad 9.
 31. Raghuvamsha of Kalidasa I.8
 32. Ishopanishad 11.
 33. Ibid., 9.; Brhadaranyakopanishad IV.4.10.
 34. B.M.Barua quoted in the Principal Upanishad p.575.
 35. Quoted by Dr.Radhakrishnan p.576
 36. Chandgyopanishad VIII.5.
 37. Atharva Veda II.5.14
 38. Taittiriyanopanishad I.11.1
 39. Manusmrit VI.1-2
 40. Bhagavadgeeta III-26.
 41. Ishopanishad 3.
 42. Maitri Upanishad IV.3
 43. Jabalaupanishad 4.
 44. Mahanirvanatantra quoted in the Principal Upanishad p.897.
-

CHAPTER - V

IDEA OF DEVELOPMENT

Aspirations in Prayer.

The development or progress always implies an advancement in a desired direction as compared to a mere change. The desired direction implies an aim or goal. It implies aspirations for achievements and accomplishments in life. The scriptural prayers are the best sources to understand the aspirations of man.

Kenopanishad prays, "May my limbs grow vigorous, my my speech breath, eye, ear as also my strength and all my senses"¹. Taithiriya prays, "May my body be vigorous, may my tongue be exceedingly sweet May I hear abundantly with my ears"². The invocation in the beginning of Prashna says, "May our ears hear the auspicious, May our eyes see the auspicious, May our body be strong and steady and the life be of use for the divine."³

The above three prayers show that our seers prayed for strong and healthy body. But the strong and healthy body is not an end in itself. For them body was an instrument for working for something more. Another famous saying reads

as "Shariramadyam khalu dharmasadhanam". Body is the first in the practise of dharma. It shows that a good physique was considered essential for the performance of actions.

Taittiriya prays for intelligence "Medhaya sprnotu"⁴. It also prays for material wealth in cloth and cattle, food and drink.⁵ The importance of wealth in Indian thought more emphatically expressed in Vasistha's advise to Rama when he says that he does not find any difference between a poor man and a dead man and this world has for its root wealth and asks him to acquire wealth. But what is this wealth for ? Taittiriya says, "Don't deny residence to anybody, that shall be the rule. Therefore in any way whatsoever one should acquire much food"⁶. The acquiring is for giving.

Man wants happiness. What is the standard of happiness ? The standard of human happiness is said to be that of a youth, a good youth, well read, prompt in action steady in mind, and strong in body with the whole [^]earth full of wealth for him". Here the happiness includes the physical health, knowledge, ability for action and wealth. Of course one's aim should be to achieve Brahmananda which is 100^{Times} the human bliss. This shows that the prayer is for a balanced development of all ⁷faculties of a man.

Development of one in that of all.

The famous gayatri prays for the development of the intelligence of us all.

Another Yajurvedic prayer prays for the stability of the government, water, light, knowledge, energy and of the nation. "Dhruyante raja ... rashtram dharavataṁ dhruyam".

The prayers are addressed for the welfare of all "lokasamasta sukhino bhavantu". Let all the worlds be happy. The prayers are not meant for only one individual.

The whole range of prayers find their fullest expression in Yajurvedic prayer. "Let the Brahmins (the whole society) be of the nature of Brahman, and the nation have the powerful kshatriyas, let there be cows with udders full to yield plenty of milk, bulls to carry loads and horses that fly on the wings of the wind. Let the womenfolk known for their wisdom, stabilise the life in the towns and villages. Let such children be born in the nation who attaining the youth should always return victorious on chariots. Let there be masters of assemblies who are excellent in debates, Let the monsoon carry clouds and shower where needed.

Let trees be laden with fruits and vegetables, medical herbs be in abundance. Let the nations have development and welfare."⁸

The prayer asks for a stable, secure and progressive social life with the whole society informed by the Brahman character. The word used here^{is} not Jati Brahmana. It is the society as a whole. To make it clear the Vedic seer qualifies the word Brahmana with brahmavarahas and this is not limited only to nation but can apply to the totality for the uses 'aabrahman' while for other he uses aaarashtre".

This shows that all the prosperity and wealth prayed for is not to be a wealth in the individual level but at the national level. But this national level is to be in harmony with the Brahman level or the level of totality.

The prosperity is asked for the whole. The individual has to take his share only. Isopanishat asks us to enjoy what is left by him.⁹ The Bhagavadgita says that one should take only what is left of Yajna.¹⁰ Eating for the sake of only the individual is sin.

While the life of mere sensual gratification is decried in words, "What decaying mortal here below would delight in a life of contemplation of pleasures of beauty and love when

once he has come to enjoy the taste of the kind enjoyed by the unaging immortals". "What is the use of satisfaction of desires in this foul smelling and unsubstantial body which is merely a conglomerate of bone skill, muscle, marrow, flesh, semen, blood, mucus, rheum, foeces, urine, wind, bile and phlegm, afflicted with desire, anger, covetousness, delusion fear, despondency, envy, separation from what is desired, union with the undesired, hunger, thirst, old age, death, disease, sorrow and the like ?"¹² "What shall we do with the progress if it does not bring us to the eternal"¹³, the due importance of the material wealth and skill is not neglected. Taittiriya warns not to err in truth, law, the skills of production and prosperity¹⁴. Svetasvatra prays "make us not suffer us in our babies, or in our sons, make us not suffer in our lives or in our cows or in horse, kill not our powerful warriors, so that may offer to thee our oblations for ever and ever"¹⁵. Yainavalkya wants both wealth and victory. Here victory refers to the victory in the debate on spiritual knowledge. Knowledge is not mere verbal in Indian tradition. Therefore victory implies the spiritual attainment.

What is desired is not the wealth, but wealth for the sake of wealth, attachment to wealth alone, and the

wealth not earned. Yajnavalkya refuses to take the wealth offered till he completes his instructions which is his duty. Ishopanishad says that those who worship only the unmanifest enter greater darkness and so do those who only worship the manifest. One who knows both the unmanifest and ^{the} manifest, ^{crosses death through the manifest and} 16 ^{and} attains life eternal through the ^{un}manifest. Commenting on this Dr. Radhakrishnan writes", to be absorbed in the world around without turning to the principle at the base is one extreme; to be absorbed in the contemplation of the transcendent infinite indifferent to the events of the manifested world because they are likely to disturb inward serenity and self complacency is another extreme. This ^{verse} ~~verse~~ asks us to lead a life in the manifested world with a spirit of non-attachment, with the mind entered in the unmanifest we must live in this world without being choked by it. We must centre our thoughts in the eternal remembering that the eternal is the soul of the temporal".¹⁷

Thus we see that what is aspired for is a life here in this world with prosperity but always conscious of the reality of oneness. Shanti and Samrdhhi, peace and prosperity are the two things that is aspired for.

Responsibility for Development:

Human life can be said to operate broadly in three spheres. They are: the self, the gods, and the beings. The self is the one who acts, the gods are the spiritual forces behind, that are responsible for the maintenance of natural order or operations (Rasva gopa) and the world at large which consists of all the individuals of the internally differentiated parts of the universe. These are called Atman, Deva and Bhuta.

The all is Brahman. It is this all that is differentiated and the Self apparent is one of such differentiated level. There are things which are perishable. There are forces or spirits that operate the nature according to the laws of nature. The Self is called Atman. The beings are called Bhuta and the spirits that operate phenomena of nature are called Devas. Accordingly all the goings on in the world involve these three. So also when we take a man, he also operates in these three spheres. There is a relationship among the three and how they are related is important. Let us examine how a phenomenon involves these three spheres: Subala gives different examples. It says that eye is in the sphere of the self, the objects of sight are in the sphere of the world of beings, and, Aditya is



in the sphere of the divine. We say 'I see an object.' When we say "I see" actually it is the eye that forms a part of the 'I' that sees. Because I do not say, 'my eyes see it', but I say that I see it, the eyes also form a part of 'I' or the self. Therefore the eye is said to be of the sphere of self. The object of sight is of the sphere of the world and the sight is possible through the light of the sun. Therefore the sun is of the sphere of the divine. Only I cannot see the object. The object by itself cannot be seen. The light by itself cannot cause the sight. The subject is there. The object is there. But there is a third thing that makes the subject able to view the object. That is deva. It is the divine principle.

Bhagavadgita says that the I-ness is Adhyatma (Svabhava) adhyatmam), Perishableness is Adibhuta (Adhibhuta ksharobhava) and purusha is adhidaiva. Here the purusha is called adhidaiva because finally it is the divine principle at the level of substratum of divinities. Purusha here is the universal self.

Any normal human activity involves these three spheres. All the three are necessary. But the question is as to who is responsible for the sight. Is the sun, or the divine principle that aids sight? Suppose there is a crop failure. Who is responsible? Is it the physical condition of soil, climate etc.

Or is it the divine principle that causes timely rain or is it the man who cultivates. In fact all the three are necessary. Now one may blame the physical and geo-climatic conditions. Some can attribute it to the unseen cause, or fate or divine principle, though some will surely take the responsibility on themselves. These are the three approaches to a problem. Holding the geo-climatic conditions responsible for the crop failure is Adhibhoutika. Holding God, or luck or such things responsible is adhi-daiyika Holding one's own self, responsible is adhyatmika.

If the object of sight is far one can go near it. If it is missing one can search for it. If the sun is not there, the moon, can give light. If moon is not there a torch can give light. But if the self is not there there can be no sight. This self cannot find any excuse either in material conditions or the divine principle that makes experiences possible. Brhadaranyaka says that by self alone the man works. ²⁰ Mundaka says that "whatever world a man of purified nature thinks of in his mind and whatever desire he desires, all these worlds and all these desires he attains ..."²¹ Talking of the highest knowlege of the self Katha says that the self can be attained (known) only by the one whom the self chooses. ²² The self cannot be known by

instruction, intellectual power or hearing.

Bhagavadgita clearly tells that it is for the self to develop self and not let the self to be degraded. The self is the friend and the self is the foe of the self.²³ The self that has not ^{own} ~~own~~ the self will work as if it is one's own enemy. The winning of the self here means the self must be able to feel completely one with the expressions of the self at different levels, of mind, senses and the body. If they are at conflict then one-self will not be able to command them in operation unitedly and as such there will be conflict and harm to the self itself.

Thus the responsibility of developing the self lies on the self itself, That is, Hindu thought is basically adhyatmika. While accepting the role of daiva and bhuta the divine force and the material conditions, it does not allow a man to be bound by divinistic or materialistic determinism. In that way it holds the man free to do what he likes.

Freedom to Fulfill the Responsibility:

But Dueschen writes "Since the entire universe, so far as in general it has any resistance is only the manifestation of the atman, there can be as little question in

the Upanishads as with Spinoza of a freedom of will within the range of nature. Such a freedom would assume a different character of Atman. The standpoint of the Upanishads therefore is a rigid determinism.²⁴"

This is due to a wrong understanding of Atman as a substance different from the self. Atman is the self itself. The self manifests itself by its own will. Maitri says "He fetters himself by himself".²⁵ Prashna says he enters into this by the action of his will.²⁶ Therefore the Rta is in accordance with the will of the self.

Bhadaranyaka says that "Man is a conglomeration of desire, will and action as his desire is so is his will, as is his will so is the action that he performs, as his action is so is the fruit that he procures himself."²⁷ Desires are the results of Triguna. If desire controls the will, then the gunas will control a man's action and he is not free. Mukti-kopanishad says that the river of desire runs between the banks of good and bad, but by the effort of our will, we should compel it to move in the direction of good.²⁸ The desire born of trigunas can be controlled and directed by the will. The will need not be controlled by the desire.

This shows that there are two states of a man being free and determined. At times he is free and at times he is determined. Then it is necessary to find out when one is free and when one is determined and which is fundamental.

Ranade explains this contrast between freedom and determinism "as sharers in the continuity of nature, we are like it, subject to necessity, but we are free from it as soon as by virtue of the knowledge of our identity with the atman, we are set free from the continuity of nature. That the Atman is exempt from the constraint of causality."²⁹ Bṛhadāranyaka says "...They all men, Gods and father cannot act otherwise than is in harmony with nature."³⁰ While Chandogya says "after having known the soul and those true desires his part in all worlds is a life of freedom."³¹

What is the nature of the relationship between freedom and determinism. Freedom is of two types. Freedom from bondage is only a negative concept. The positive concept of freedom is freedom to that is freedom to be, freedom to do, freedom to have and freedom to become. If it is to be freedom it also must be freedom to, not to be, not to do, not to have and not to become. If there is only one option then it cannot be freedom. Freedom implies the freedom to choose, and to choose

not to choose as well. Therefore always freedom operates in duality.

When there is only unity the freedom is only potential and not operative. Thus the very creation is the operation of freedom. It is only when in spite of the duality one can realise the unity, the unity becomes the operation of the freedom to be unity. Therefore the unity in multiplicity is the operation of this freedom to be. If we talk of freedom that is not operative, then there is no means to understand it and one can have no knowledge and as such no discussion is possible. Therefore the freedom we talk of is the freedom that is intelligible to man. . . If there is only one level of existence in operation then we are not sure of the freedom to be in the other state. Therefore the "simultaneous" existence at two or more levels is the proof of the freedom to be.

Once we know that two levels are simultaneous how is it that one identify oneself with the one or the other, or both ? This identification is not a change in reality, but in ones awareness. It is a psychological condition rather than a metaphysical condition for the metaphysical condition is what it is. Therefore mind is called the cause of freedom and determinism. "Mana eva manushyanam"

Karanam bhavati bandha mokshayoh;.. Bandhaya vishayasangin
moksho nirvishayam sm³²rtam". Mind is the cause of bondage
and liberation for mankind; bondage if it is bound to objects,
freedom from attachment to objects, is called liberation.

Thus it is said there is freedom when we know the
self only. If we do not know the self there is no freedom
at all.³³ The knower of the self have all his desires fulfilled
and can obtain any world he may seek and we have seen that
it is he who chooses to know can know the self.³⁴

Thus we know that it is the self which is responsible
for development of the self and the self has the requisite
freedom to be responsible. What are the instruments that the
self has to use in its developmental activities. The three
instruments are called Trikarana and they are the mind,
speech, and body called manas, vak and kaya.

Once it is established that to be, to do, to have and
and to become... is the responsibility of the self and the
mind, word and body are three instruments, we have to see
how to achieve. Man cannot escape the responsibility claiming
excuse on the ground of materialistic and divinistic determinism.

Paths of Achievement: Jnana-Bhakti-Karma

Man is said to have three paths called Jnana, Bhakti and Karma; Realisation, Love and Action. Are these three independent paths converging in the attainment of the objectives or does one come after another are they different manner or aspects of the same path ? Jnana is a state of mind, love is an attitude or disposition and Karma is the manifestation in the objective world. Taking intelligibility as an essential factor for meaningful discussion, we can say that even Jnana and Bhakti have to manifest in Karma if it is to be intelligible. Therefore the Karma becomes the sole means of achieving the development of man. Though one's understanding of Karma may be different according to different visions of reality, Jnana, Bhakti, and Karma can be called as different levels of the path. The knowledge that a path leads to the desire destination, the urge to reach the destination and the moving on the path towards the destination; these three together make the path meaningful for a man. So many roads and lanes lying around are meaningless if one does not know, where it leads. A mere knowledge of where it leads does not motivate a man unless there is a disposition in him to love to go to that destination. Mere knowledge and desire to go will not be enough.

One has to go: Going may be by rolling, limping, hopping, walking, cycling, driving or flying but going is necessary to reach that place. Similarly action is necessary to achieve development. That is why Krishna says that not a single moment passes without work. "Na kashchit kshanamapi³⁵ jatu tishatyac karmakrit". Karma is not only necessary but also unavoidable in this world. If anyone tries to attain things for one's physical needs only by contemplation then he is either a fool or a hypocrite.³⁶ Even the maintenance of the body is not possible without Karma.

Karma

The man is asked to lead his whole (100 years) life doing work or Karma.³⁷ Here it is necessary to understand the nature of Karma as Karma theory is termed a deterministic theory by some. This has to be understood together with the concept of time. The time continuum is divided into three sections called Bhuta, Varthamana and Bhavishyat, meaning past, present and future. According to Karma theory the past Karma influences the present of the individual. It logically leads to the conclusion that the present influences the future as the past and present are only relative and no definite instance in time is termed as past as such.

It is a continuously operating principle.

Karma thus has a deterministic connotation and must have it. But the degree and kind of determinism vary. Different types of Karma have different effects of different degrees.

The effects of Karma of the past life are called prarabdha karma or the inherited, and those of the karma of the present are called Sanchita Karma or acquired. Prarabdha Karma decides the given of the current life. But this does not incapacitate the one to exercise his free will to act in this life. As we have discussed earlier man is a multilevel expression. If he identifies himself with the material physical level naturally the given will take its course following normal laws of cause and effect operating in the material world, that is to say, a rigid deterministic behaviour would follow. If he identifies himself with the inner levels of the self he can change the course exercising his free will undisturbed, and uninfluenced by the effects of the previous Karma and try to do Karma

that would bring the desired result. That is why it is the mind that links the inner and outer levels. The bondage of the freedom from the effects of Karma depends of on the mind turning inward or outward (antarmukha^h or bahirmukha).

The Karma of the present is classified into two groups called uttara and dakshina. The Karma meant for the life here is called dakshina karma. The dakshina karma are again of two types called ³⁸ ishta and purta. Ishta Karmas are agnihotra, tapas, satyam, vedanam upalambanam, athithyam and vaishwadevam. The purta karmas are the digging of wells, ponds, and lakes, building of temples, giving food, and shelter. The former are the normal works to be done as an integral part of the cosmic order and the latter are the public utility works done to fulfil special needs. The uttara karma are the works meant for spiritual realisation at the subtler level. The Prajapati is symbolised as a year consisting of Uttarayana and dakshinayana, a month consisting of bright and dark fortnight, and as a combination of day and night.

Further there are two types of Karma, one is the Karma that binds and the other is the Karma that liberates. Even Shankara does not denounce work for the

sake of maintaining the body. Shankara is against fasting that kills. Shankara says that Jnana is superior to Karma only because Jnana has the power to discriminate.

Regarding the nature of Karma that binds, Bhagavadgita tells that it is the Karma done for purposes other than Yajña³⁹. The nature of binding by Karma is that once an action is done it leads or forces him to a seemingly endless chain of actions out of which one finds it difficult to come out as the end sought for is never reached. Bhagavan Satya Sai Baba in the course of one of his discourses gave a very beautiful analogy to drive home this point. A man with ring-worm has an itching sensation. He starts scratching to be relieved of itching and gets the pleasure of scratching. He gets pleasure. But the more he scratches the more the disease is aggravated. The more the disease is aggravated the more one wants to scratch. Again the disease increases. Thus it leads to an endless chain of actions. So is the Karma done for sense gratification. Senses are never gratified. Therefore man has to search for a perennial source of joy. It is possible only when he comes out of this chain of sensuous actions by using his wisdom. To

come out of this action chain one has to take up another kind of action. The action that helps man to come out of the action chain is called the liberating action . This is the action guided by the wisdom and not by the senses.

It is also necessary to discuss the concept of Nishkama Karma, the disinterested Karma for without the knowledge of this concept, Nishkama karma, the Hindu concept of Karma will be incomplete. Kama, in brief is desire. Krishna says to Arjuna. "Your work is to work only, but never to the fruit thereof. Let not the fruit of action be your object nor let your attachment (to) be inaction. Arjuna, perform your duties dwelling in Yoga relinquishing attachment, and ^{being} equanimous to success and failure." ₄₀

Krishna asks Arjuna to work but not to be attached to the fruits. What does it mean? While every Karma has a corresponding result, does it mean that man's action should be purposeless? If it is purposeless does it have any meaning at all? The confusion here arises from equating purpose and attachment. Krishna does not deny the purpose in action. He only asks one to be disinterested in the result. He only asks the doer to be equanimous as between success and failure. If one is not equanimous, on the achievement of a result one will

become complacent, thus leading him to inaction. If one fails it will lead to dejection and despair and thus worrying which will again lead to inaction. Further in both these states if one loses equanimity, and gets excited, one cannot think properly and what he will do will be a reaction rather than an action, which will bind him in the chain of action and reaction, thus being unable to come out of the vicious circle, the purpose will be lost. It is only when one is equanimous one can continue with action guided by wisdom. Thus man will neither become inactive or reactive but always be active. That is why one is said to be of steady wisdom and intellect when he is not overcome by emotions attached to pleasure and pain corresponding to success and failure of action. Instantaneous emotions and desires are not purpose. Purpose has an intellectual sanction while desires and emotions may not have intellectual sanctions. As we have found in the beginning that man is an intellect dominant person, the idea of a prescription for intellect dominance is in conformity with the same. Once again the idea of nishkama Karma is nothing but actions guided by intellect or the inner faculties in contrast to the actions guided by outer senses. These again corresponds to the actions that liberates and binds.

Why is such an action called Yoga. Yoga means union. In Karma the three instruments are only united. But in Yoga all the five levels are working in union. Even in yoga the work is carried out with the mind, word and body only. But here the mind, word and body, the Trikaranas are in union with the intellect and the inner self, and thus one might say that in yoga the whole man is involved. Otherwise man is divided or, at least, ^{at} pretentively so. The split personality causes conflicts among the body (senses), mind and intellect. Such a conflict causes only mental strain which is against the basic aspiration of man to be happy.

Yajna.

The action for the purpose of Yajna is said to be the one that does not bind. ⁴¹ Then what is Yajna? Yajna was created with the creation of mankind. By Yajna one can multiply and it is that which yields our ⁴² desires. Brhadaranvaka calls the process of creation itself a yajna. ⁴³ Chandogya calls the whole life of man a yajna. The whole life is divided into three parts, the first 24 years, the second 44 years, and the third 48 years, representing Brahmacharya, Grahastha and Vanaprastha and Sanyasa ashram as taken together. The first part is meant for learning. So the morning libation is done with Gayatri which represents the wish for knowledge. Vasu symbolising endurance is ⁴⁴ with this.

Man wants a full life. Therefore he wishes that he may have the power of endurance for the whole life. This prepares him physically, mentally and intellectually. This is what Brahmacharya does. During Brahmacharya, one living a life of celibacy and austerities and learning the scriptures and the wisdom of the seers, prepares himself. Gayatri means that which protects the one who sings (gatarinthryate iti gayatri). The meaning of the mantra is asking for the development of intelligence.

The next 44 years are the midday libation; which is offered with the Thrishtubh hymn consisting of 44 syllables. This part is connected with Rudra, related to weeping. This is the reference to gyhashtashrama in which man is prone to attachment to the world. If a man gives up his life at this stage everyone around him weeps.

The third libation is connected with Jagati connected with Aditya which takes everything to itself. It is in this stage of life namely Vanaprastha and Sanyasa, one tries to cut one's attachment to limited things and gets attached to all and live with the realisation that the one is all and all is one. Thus the whole life of over 100 years itself is called Yajna.

Even the daily activities of a man is called Yajna. When one hungers and is thirsty and does not enjoy it is Diksha, the initiation; when he eats, drinks and enjoys it is Upasada; when he laughs, eats and engages in procreative activity he joins chant and recitation. The austerity alms-giving, uprightness, non-violence, truthfulness, are the gifts to the priests. Procreation is new birth and death is Avabhrta or final bath.

Chandogya says that which purifies is Yajna. Bhagavad-gita's use "sarve apveti yajnavido yajna kshapitakalmashah" means that all these knowers of yajna^{is} purified of the pollution by the yajna.⁴⁶

"Foster the Gods through this (Yajna) and let the gods foster you. Thus forstering one another you will attain the highest good"⁴⁷. Yajna is an action based on a reciprocal (in the strict sense of the term it is not exactly reciprocal but a combination of reciprocity and cyclicity) relationship between the man and the divine powers behind the nature for yajna brings about the realisation of unity of the multiplicity in the cosmic self consciousness (adhiyajna aham eva atyra).⁴⁸

Holding it binding on the divine powers, the forces behind nature, to yield to the Yajnik activities the man,

who wants to enjoy the things provided by them (the bounty of nature)without giving anything Yajnik offerings in return is called "thief". Thus while it holds man as the responsible agent of his achievements it calls it a perverse understanding to believe that he is the doer himself of all the activities he carries on with his mind, word and body (organs of action) for any accomplishment constitutes of five aspects, 'adhishtana, karta, karana, cheshta, and daiya' namely, the material world which is the base on which all activities take place, the agent, the instruments (the mind, word and body), the activities and the divine powers or the subtler forces behind nature.

While the knowledge, the object of knowledge and the knower are the inducers of Karma, the organ of action, the activity and the doer are the threefold constituents of the action.

Manu says, "Adhyapanam brahmavajnah, pitryainastu tarpanam, homodaiyo, balirbhuto, nrvaina athithipujanam." Five kinds of Yajnas are enumerated here to be performed by a man. They are called Brahmavajna, Pitryajna, devavajna, bhutavajna and naravajna. Brahmavajne is teaching, pitryajna the plasing of elders, daiyavajna is homa (the fire sacrifice), bhuta vajna is offering to the beings, and naravajna is worshipping the atithis.

Brahman is the unity of all. This unity is the Yogic knowledge that is knowledge of conscious participation. This must continue. This knowledge of unity must be transmitted from generation to generation. This is possible by teaching. Thus teaching is called Brahmajna. Teaching implies learning too. This also fulfils one's obligation to the rshis or the seers who have given us knowledge freeing us from the rshi rna or indebtedness to the seers. This ensures the preservation and continuity of knowledge in the society. While we talk of teaching, two more concepts are also necessary to understand the process of teaching. The two words used for two kinds of teachers are Acharya and Upadhyaya. Acharya is one who teaches by practising (Acharate iti acharyah)⁵¹. He teaches by example. He teaches the science of life. Upadhyaya imparts information. His teaching is informative. These correspond to Karma Yoga and Sankhya yoga, yielding yoga and Jnana, namely the participant understanding and the objective knowledge, which are the knowledge of unity and multiplicity.

Pitrvajna is pleasing the parents and elders. This is meant to fulfil the obligation to the elders and to free one self from the indebtedness to the forefathers. It is said that by procreation one fulfils this obligation. This

ensures the continuity of generation. Pitryajna makes one realise the unity of the ancestry and the posterity in the self. This is the identity of unity across time.

Daiva yajna is homa. Homa is ritually the sacrifices offered in fire. The fire is said to be the mouth of the devas. So we offer food and everything through the fire. When things are put into fire it converts them into simpler substances to be absorbed into the universe cleaning and enriching the cosmos what in modern terminology is called recycling of resources. The burning of things in fire is also a symbolic of the fact that all matter is convertible to subtler energy forms, thus asserting that the energy and matter are only two levels of existence of the same things; for it is also believed that the things converted into subtler forms will be returned in the gross forms again in nature.

The words 'Svaha' and 'Idam na mama' used in the homa are also very significant in understanding man's relationship with nature. 'Svaha' means burning of the sense of self. Homa also means the burning of the sense of self. "Idam na mama" means 'This is not mine'. It means that one should not have a sense of ownership. One not only has to relinquish the sense of ownership, but

also give up the "self sense". It is said that all these things belong to the Lord of the Universe. "Ishavyam idam sarvam"⁵². The whole process of Homa is explained in "Brahmarpanam, brahma havir brahmagnam brahmana hutam, brahmaina tena gantavyam, brahma karma samadhina."⁵³ This means that Yajna is an activity in the Brahman (the unity) in which the offerer, the offerings, the offered, the medium (fire) the final destination are all Brahman or the same unity itself, that is it is all an internal activity of one self. While through Brahmayajna one gets the knowledge of unity, through Pitryajna one participates in the unity across time and in devayajna, one participates in the unity of forms (both of matter and energy) and functions across space. This is of very much significance from the point of view of ecology.

Bhutayajna comes next. It is in this yajna one offers food and shelter to the living beings. Whenever one eats food one is expected to give food to other living beings too. It is also called Prani yajna (prani is one which has prana or life). This idea of a man's being a part of the living continuum is not limited to the beings living at present only. If we look at the Shradha ritual performed at the Tirthas (religious pilgrimage centres) we see that during the symbolic offering to the dead ancestors one has

to offer not only to ancestors in the human species, namely one's own parents or fore fathers, but also to all the dead beings including even the flies and ants. Here one's identity with living beings in the unity across both time and space.

Narayana is atithipoojana. The wor atithi is often translated as guest. It does not completely convey the meaning of atithi. Atithi is one who does not come with any appointment. Atithi is any man coming without any invitation or appointment. The idea of atithipoojana shows that one's relation with other men is not just a matter of mutual transaction not of narrow family associations. One has to serve the whole mankind realizing one's identity with mankind.

A man is expected to perform these five Yajnas daily and these are called five great yajnas. These five yajnas correspond to man's identity at different levels as man, living being, being (matter and energy), in and out of space and time and finally the level of pure consciousness.

Now, of these Yajnas, Jnanayajna is said to be superior to Dravyayajna (and all other forms) for all actions and in knowledge. Let us take any action for example. A man eats sugar. He enjoys its ⁵⁴sweetness. He gets energy. Once

the sugar is finished, that the enjoyment of sweetness is lost, the energy is spent up in a while. The sugar, the eating of sugar, the sweet feeling, the energy that it has given are no more. But the knowledge that it has given, i.e., that sugar is sweet and it gives energy to work remains. The material, the taste, and the action are no more but the knowledge is permanent and it guides out life in the future. Therefore in the Yainik concept of Man's developmental process, knowledge is considered to be superior to other forms of development.

Karma (Yajna) is that which adds to the process of creation. It is bhutabhavodbhaya⁵⁵kara, that brings about the multiple beings. It is meant for multiplication of human race and providing for their needs. Therefore one has to understand that whatever goes against the process of creation is not Yajna. Yajna is the action performed for the development of man. Yajna recognises the unity of man with the cosmos. Therefore any scheme of development of man cannot be done in isolation from the cosmos of which he is an integral part. All the productive creative activities are called Karma. But only those activities which are done by understanding the essential unity of man with the cosmic nature is yajna and that which does not conform to this man-nature cycle of relationship is the path of decay and destruction and sin and not development.

What is important in the Yajna concept of development is that it ensures continuity of life by providing for its ^{sustenance} ~~some time~~. Needs are not limited only to the subsistence but also to the fulfilment of desires of different levels. But Yajna concept of development makes it clear that if the likes and dislikes do not conform to the laws of the nature-man relationship cycle it leads to destruction.

All beings are evolved from food (materials), production of food is dependent on rain (symbolic of natural material transformations according to laws of nature symbolised as divine powers). "The rains are caused by Yajnas (the Yajnik actions of maintaining the ecocycle). Yajnas are born of human actions. Human actions are born of the unity's expression in multiplicity (Brahman) and this is born of the eternal unity.⁵⁶" This is how Bhagavadgita describes the ecocycle. The one who does not follow this wheel set in operation lives a sinful life destroying himself. Therefore the ones who enjoy what is left of the Yajna are free from sin and those who enjoy considering only of their individual existence suffer due to the sin (of breaking the cycle).⁵⁷

Yoga-Kshema.

It is here that the Hindu concept of development is very significant. In the modern conflict of order and

change what is ignored is the destructive aspect of change. Though of late, people have started experiencing the destructive results, we are not attending to what is truly responsible for these. Man has desires and the likes. He wants to fulfil them. He goes on finding ever new ways and means to own, master and exploit the bounty of nature to fulfil his desires. In this he ignores the fundamental order that keeps nature going and tries to break the order. He only wants to take but not give. He sees change as opposed to order. But in the Hindu concept of development or preferred change the change and order are not in conflict. They are in harmony.

Here we say Yoga Kshema, Kshema is order and Yoga is development and both are always taken together. We believe the continuity of order that ensures a continuous development. Order is not status quo or stagnation. It believes in Yoga, the development in harmony unifying the constituents identifying the unity, not allowing the self annihilation of the human race itself by destroying the very order of the system which makes man a man. Here people believe in drinking the milk of the cow feeding it regularly thus maintaining the dynamic order of the cow feeding man and the man feeding the cow. It does not believe in killing the cow for the enormous fat and protein it gives in the immediate present, thus losing a steady and perennial source finally leading to

impoverishment and destruction of the self. So our theory of development is that life survives on life and not that life survives on death. We believe that the change has two directions, one is the destruction and the other is development and we also believe that the development of the self is in the development of the whole and not in the destruction of others, for the self and the others are one.

Notes

1. Kenopanishad invocation
2. Taittiriyaopanishad I.4.1
3. Prashnopanishad invocation.
4. Taittiriyaopanishad I.4.1
5. Ibid., I.4.2
6. Ibid., III.10.1
7. Ibid., II.8.1; Brhadaranhakopanishad IV.3.33.
8. Yajurveda 22.22.
9. Ishopanishad 1
10. Bhagavadgeeta III.13
11. Kathopanishad I.1.28
12. Maitri Upanishad I.3
13. Brhadaranyakopanishad IV.4.22
14. Taittiriyaopanishad I.2.1
15. Shvetashvataropanishad IV.22
16. Ishopanishad 14
17. The Principal Upanishads p.577.
18. Subalopanishad V
19. Bhagavadgeeta VIII.3 and 4
20. Brhadaranyakopanishad I.4.16
21. Mundakopanishad III.1.10
22. Kathopanishad I.2.23
23. Bhagavadgeeta VI 5 & 6.
24. Quoted by Ranade in Constructive Survey of Upanishad p.208/209.
25. Maitri Upanishad III.2.

26. Prashnopanishad III.3
27. Brhadaranyakopanishad IV.4.5
28. Muktikopanishad II.5 and 6; Quoted in Constructive Survey of Upanishad.4
29. Ranade in C.S.U.
30. Brhadaranyakopanishad III.8.9
31. Chandogopanishad VIII.1.6
32. Maitri Upanishad VI 34.11
33. Chandogyopanishad VIII.1.6
34. Ibid VIII.2.10 ; Mundakopanishad III.1.10; Brhadaranayako-panishad III.1.15.
35. Bhagavadgeeta III.5.
36. Ibid.III.6.
37. Ishopanishad.2
38. Chandogyopanishad V.10.3.
39. Bhagavadgeeta III.9
40. Ibid., II.47 and 48
41. Ibid III.9
42. Ibid III.10
43. Brhadaranyakopanishad I.2.6.
44. Chandogyopanishad III.16
45. Ibid., IV.16.1
46. Bhagavedgeeta IV.30
47. Ibid. III-11
48. Ibid., VIII-4
49. Ibid.,
50. Manusmriti
51. Ibid.

52. Ishopanishad 1
 53. Bhagavadgeeta
 54. Ibid., IV.33
 55. Ibid
 56. Ibid., III.14-15
 57. Ibid., III.16
 58. Ibid., III-16.
-

CHAPTER VI

PURUSHARTHA

Dharma, Artha, Kama, Moksha.

All the traditional Hindu rituals begin with a Sankalpa (resolve) to perform the particular ritual of Yajna or worship for the accomplishment of the fourfold Purushartha called Dharma, Artha, Kama, Moksh. This shows that the Purushartha is the purpose and objective of human action. 'Artha' means meaning. It also means purpose. Meaning and purpose are not exclusive, In an action, it is always the purpose that gives a meaning to it. Without purpose action is not an action but only a happening. Thus Purushartha is the meaning of man in terms of the purpose of his actions.

Dharma is considered to be the law by which the universal constituents are held together. Artha is wealth. Kama is desire and Moksha is liberation. Now let us try to understand them in detail.

Dharma is derived from the root 'dhr'. 'Dhr' means to hold and sustain. Dharma is that which holds or sustains. It is called dharma because it sustains, dharma sustains the living beings, the destroyed dharma destroys and the protected (practised) dharma protects (nourishes). Dharma is the principle which is found in the contribution of an action to the maintenance of the universal order.

According to Rgyeda¹ the first Dharma was the performance of Yajnas. We have seen that Yajnas are the actions done for the maintenance of the eco-cycle or the universal harmony among all the beings making the world suitable and well provided for living beings perennially.

Brhadaranyaka says that after the formation of the Varnas "an excellent form, dharma is created. The kshatrahood of the Kshatriya is dharma. There is nothing higher than dharma. Therefore a weak man hopes to become a strong man by dharma as done by the kings; dharma is truth. Therefore one who speaks truth is said to speak dharma and one who speaks dharma is said to speak the truth. Verily both are the same. ² "Shankara says that which is known and which is practised are justice inayamanam anushtiyamanam eha tad dharma eva bhavati." "Manu says, Dharma and adharma are for discretion in action."⁴

It is said above that Kshatrahood of Kshatriya's is dharma. Kshatriya is a Varna. Varna is an internal selective differentiation having a specific name-form-function-identity. It is this name-form-function of Kshatriya that is Kshatrahood. This is only an example. It means that the name-form-function-identity of an entity chosen by the totality is the dharma of that entity.

So what is important in the idea of dharma is the conformity of individual preference to social (of totality) selection. An individual alienated from the totality

(society) is weak. By identifying with the totality the weaker becomes stronger. A single grass is weak. But the single grass in unity with the totality of a broom becomes stronger. Any individual organ of the body of a man is weak by itself. It is strong by the virtue of its being an organ of the whole always in identity with the whole performing actions as an organ of the whole. Therefore all the sub-systems are the development of the universal system. Therefore, the subsystems are meaningful only in the total system. If any subsystem functions detrimentally to the whole system it is no more a subsystem of the same and as such its action is called adharma.

Dharma is Satyam. Satyam is called truth. Here truth is not taken as a property of statement but as a state of affairs as it exists. Dharma is that which makes it exist as it is.

Dharma is not simply happenings. It is performed. Performance is not a mere physical observance but observance accompanied by knowledge. If this factor of knowing is excluded then there is no question of moral judgement. Because dharma and adharma are words used in moral judgement, it implies knowing in action.

Svadharma is said to be superior, even when inadequately pursued, to Paradharma performed well. It is said

that even death in Svadharna is preferable and Paradharna is frightening. What is Svadharna? Does Svadharna mean one's own desire? Dharma means that which is totality conforming. Therefore Svadharna means the duties of an individual as chosen by the totality as against the individual preferences in conflict with the totality selection. If individual preferences are not in conformity with the social requirements and selection it would result in the disintegration of the totality or deformation of the society leading to disordered and chaos. As such the social harmony and equilibrium is lost. Then the man will no more be what he is for he is what he is by the virtue of his being a subsystem of the total system. "Satyam Vada, Dharmam Chara³*is the advice.*

Artha means wealth. Brhadaranyaka says "Would that I had wealth, then I would perform actions"⁵ A subhashita says 'dhanad dharmah' dharma from the wealth. Artha is therefore considered to be a means. As far as the importance of artha is concerned. Vasistha asks Rama to earn wealth and says that he finds no difference between a wealthless man and a dead man."⁶ But Kathopanishad says that the way of wealth is where many mortals sink.⁷ This is not against the importance of Artha. This only warns man not to be limited to Artha. It only tells about the slippery

nature of the way of Artha.

Kama is ordinarily understood as desires. The desires may be of two kinds. It may be intellect born or sense born. The desire in an action is Kama. This is more aesthetic. Kama is said to be at the root of this world. "Samsara mulam Kamah." These are called putraishana, Vittaishana and lokaishana, the desire for offspring, wealth and honour among people. Further it is said that a desire is not satisfied by the enjoyment of object of desire as the black smoke increases by adding more offering to the fire. The very cause of creation is Kama.

The Dharma, Artha, and Kama, which come under Trivarga is connected with one's being found in the differentiated world system. But Moksha is freedom. It is freedom from all bondages. It is freedom from the three gunas. It is freedom from three mas. Is this state of freedom contradictory to the other three, is a big question that has been discussed by many. Many say that it is a purushartha of altogether different order. Some have called this running away from life. Some have called it a negation of life.

But on closer examination these conclusions will be found baseless and half baked. Moksha is freedom indeed. But this freedom leads to what?

Freedom is always freedom from and freedom to. It is freedom from bondage and ignorance. Freedom is the freedom to be, to do, to have, and to become. Moksha is this becoming what is to be from what is being. On the other hand, Dharma is being because being is Satya and Satya is Dharma. The principle of Dharma is to sustain the whole manifest differentiation in one. But differentiation is having what one wants to have, i.e., fulfilment of Kama. But as there was only one without a second this coming into being of multiplicity is also the fulfilment of Kama. As artha implies the wealth or means for doing. Therefore having is through doing. But at the same time for doing one must have. Thus becoming is nothing but being, doing and having in the same time.

Inter-relationships of the four.

These four are the four determinants of any man. A man is being, doing, having, and becoming. In this way, Dharma, Artha, Kama and Moksha are the four determinants of man's life.

Dharma stands for the sustenance of man as an integral and organic part of the universal system. It stands for the participation of the individual in the unity of the universal. Artha is wealth that is the means to do what is desired, Kama is to have the desired. Moksha

is becoming one with the oneness freed from the illusion of the manyness. It is not freedom if one is pushed to oneness without the freedom to be many. It is not Dharma if the many are discreet, it is Dharma because manyness is held in the unity of the essential oneness. It is not artha if it does not serve as a means to do what one desires. Kama is not Kama when one is not able to do nor does not have the means to attain. Kama is said to be 'Atmakamata' the desire for self, that makes one attain Brahmanhood or Moksha and again Kama is Samsaramula that is the root cause of this differentiated world. Therefore Moksha is not the negation of life. It is the fulfilment of life and fullness of life.

Therefore, Dharma, Artha, Kama and Moksha are always taken together and each action of man has these four aspects of it and all these four aspects equally apply only when the essential unity is realised. When the essential unity is not realised, there is no Dharma, without dharma, the unity of the multiplicity there is no doing; because doing is there because of one's being, without doing there is no artha, for wealth is that which is means to doing and without doing there is no having; that is there is no Kama without Artha. Without Kama there is no creation, without creation there is no liberation. ✓

Some say that Moksha is of a different order from the other three as it is connected with not this world while Dharma, Artha, and Kama are connected with this world. This is due to a confusion that Moksha is running away from life like suicide. Suicide is obviously a negative concept, and is decried in unequivocal terms in Upanishads. Therefore Moksha is not loving death nor suicide nor escape from life. Moksha is only giving a right meaning to life as it gives life a direction towards freedom where one is free to choose rather than feel one to be thrown into the current predicament by chance or accident.

Brahmanahood is not running away from the social fabric. Brahmana is in the state of freedom to choose and being in readiness to choose any profession. That is why it corresponds to Moksha. Kshatriys corresponds to Dharma because it is the Kshatriyas duty to maintain the social cohesion. Vaishya stands for Artha, the wealth, that is production, the doing. Shudra corresponds to Kama for it is in him there is the desire to nourish. This does not mean that Kshatriya, Vaishys and Shudra have no Moksha. As we have seen in our discussion of Varnashrama that essentially all are Brahmana and as such every one is participating in Moksha as far as they do not think that they are thrown into their profession by chance, or by their individual choice, but think that they are participating in the unity of the totality have chosen the occupation or the particular level of differentiation.

Athithi, Pitr, Matr and Acharya called the four Devas also correspond to these four purusharthas. Athithi is an apparently different one, and by the feeling of oneness with this apparently different one is the Dharma aspect. Pitr stands for Artha, who stands for earning in Hindu tradition. Matr stands for Kama, the desire out of which nourishment is her profession. Guru corresponds to Moksha for the removes ignorance and frees one from the bondage.

Four Ashramas also correspond to these four purusharthas. Brahmacharya corresponds to Dharma where one gets trained to have the life of Brahman which is in the nature of the multiplicity in unity. Grhastha stands for Artha as it is here that one is responsible for production and reproduction. Vanaprastha stands for Kama, what is called as 'Atmakama'. Does it correspond to Shudra Varna? Yes, Nourishing is done because of one's desire to find one in all. So is the case with Vanaprastha, the Sanyasa corresponds to Moksha and Brahmanahood and Acharya. It is said that Guru is the supreme Brahman.

On the one hand at the Samashti or totality level and on the other hand at the Vyashti or the level of individual these fourfold purushartha give meaning to human life.

The Invariable Necessity of all the Four.

Is only Kama sufficient for man's life. Are only the desires the end of human life? Only Kama cannot achieve the object of Kama. Therefore Kama becomes meaningless without the Artha. Are artha and Kama sufficient? Bhagavadgeeta says that if there are only Artha and Kama one will take to acquisition of wealth by unlawful means⁹. Mere desires without means lead to death. Only desires and means, leads to ignorance of law which causes conflict between the individual men as well as different subsystems of the universal order, thus leading to the destruction of the Universal order making it impossible for one to fulfil one's desires. Therefore wealth and pleasure is an impossibility without conforming to the law. Wealth and pleasure is possible only within the framework of law of operation of unity in multiplicity. Therefore Artha and Kama operate only within Dharma. Thus Dharma, Artha and Kama are inseparable from each other.

The next question is if Dharma, Artha and Karma are sufficient ends for a man's life. It is said by these advocates of Trivarga, that one can conveniently pursue Artha and Kama within the framework of Dharma without a desire for Moksha. This idea has come with the notion that the Moksha is other worldly and not connected with this life or the three purusharthas, or it is conn-

ected to these three, negatively.

Therefore first of all it is necessary to understand if the concept of Moksha or Sanyasa are asocial or social, suprasocial.

Bhagavadgita says, "Know him as Nitya Sanyasi who
neither hates nor desires". On Brahmanirvana which is
equivalent to Moksha it has to say "On the attainment of
Brahmanhood one is freed from the duality and the one is
engaged in the welfare of all as one's own self." In a
particular state of attainment one totally identifies one's
welfare with that of all. Can it be called severing one's
relation from the society? Is it asocial? It is not at
all asocial. It is not limited to social even it
transcends the social. The only difference is that the
idea of society is not a contrast or conflict between the
individuals but a unity of the individuals in a wider
whole. This unity is not a mere assemblage or sum total
of the individuals. It is more than the sum total of the
individuals. Therefore it is called transcendence. This
is a state where one identifies the common good with the
individual good.

What is really asocial is to disconnect an individual
from the social whole and allow one to pursue wealth and
pleasure indifferent to the pain and pleasure of other as in

a capitalistic system.

It is only when we try to discuss only one aspect ignoring the basic vision or the world view of the society that we fail to grasp the realtion in the right perspective. The four Varnas and Ashramas are chosen by the whole and not by the parts and as such the moment the idea of being the self of the wholeness is missing, Dharma becomes only a bondage and the occupations not a willing choice leading to the type of communistic oppression, where individual freedom is at stake.

If the individual freedom is allowed without the idea of oneness then it leads to exploitation at the individual levels.

Therefore society has to transcend this conflict of individual desires and the social control and this transcendence is the idea of Moksha or freedom from this individual and individual^{and individual} and whole conflict. Moksha transcends both. Here the individual-individual difference is sublimated into individual whole in Dharma^{and} finally ~~it~~ the individual whole difference is also transcended in being self of the whole. Thus moksha shows the way.

It is in this idea of freedom and bondage, that the relationship of Moksha (Apavarga) to Trivarga is found. Dharma binds the Artha and Kama within a social norm. It becomes a bondage for individual. Why should one individual

not pursue anything one desires? Why should one be bound by the Dharmik code? Why should one accept a particular social function? Why should the one not choose another? Why should one conform to a position and function assigned by the society? Is it because one is thrown into that position by chance? Is it because of fate? Has one no right to decide what one wants? Is one not free? It is this question of freedom that is fundamental in man. No man wants to be bound and enslaved either by an individual or by the society manifested in state. It is the fundamental nature of man always to be the chooser and the determiner. One does not want to be determined by others. The moment the otherness is experienced one is determined by the others to that extent. Complete sublimation of this duality by eliminating the otherness (not others) of the apparently others, realising the oneness of the whole in the self is the only solution to this problem. It is why one wants to become Brahman . That is the goal of every one. That is why Varnadeva declares, "I am all". This sense of unity of all in the self will turn the conflict of rights into a harmony of duties in the society.

When Brhadaranyaka says that Brahma is not dear for the sake of Brahmanhood, nor Kshatriyahood for the sake of Kshatriyahood but for the sake of the self all are dear it means that one does not accept Brahmana hood or Kshatriyahood because one is thrown into Brahman or Kshatriya character but because it is the self which has chosen to accept different roles through differentiation.

If Moksha is not taken into account then Artha and Kama will suffer from this major weakness of a sense of slavery. Has Artha or Kama any meaning in slavery. Can one pursue Artha and Kama in disordered society when individuals are at conflict? While the pursuit of Artha and Kama becomes meaningful only within the framework of *Dharma*, Dharma becomes meaningful only in Moksha where one is free to decide. Otherwise Dharma is a bondage. Dharma becomes a willing choice only if it conforms to Moksha. Therefore Artha-Kama has meaning only within the framework of Dharma and Moksha. It is the determinism of dharma willed through Moksha that makes the pursuit of Artha-Kama possible. If there is nothing to desire, nothing to choose, nothing to will and nothing to act freedom is meaningless. Therefore Moksha is meaningful is the presence of Artha-Kama. It is in that state of Moksha that one can pursue Artha-Kama ^{be} completely meaning fully.

About this state of "the self is all" the Chandogya says, "... one who sees this, who thinks this, who understands this , he has pleasure in the self he has delight in the self, he has union in the self; he is self ruler, he becomes one who acts freely in all the worlds. But they who think differently from this are ruled by others, they have perishable worlds, they are not free to act in all the worlds." "... atmaivedam sarvamiti, sa va esha evam pashyamnevam manvana evam vijnanan atma-ratir atmakrida atma-mithuna atmanandah sa svarad bhavati tasya sarveshu lokeshu kama charo bhavati; atha ye nyathato viduh, anya rajanaste kshayvaloka bhawanti tesham sarveshu lokeshu akamacharo bhavati"¹²

From this, two things are clear. One is that Moksha is not a state of any physical transformation but a state of or a kind of knowledge, or vision of reality, for it says "one who knows this", "one who understands this", "one who sees this". This seeing is not the physical seeing but a vision at a subtler level.

Secondly, this is a state of self-governing and free action. Further, it says that one who does not know this is ruled by others and is not free. It makes these two distinctions autonomy (sva-raj) and heteronomy (anya-raj).

The Dharma is the law of the being of the unity in multiplicity that is to say it is being in space and time. Moksha is becoming Infinity; that is transcending finiteness of space and time. Transcendence is neither transportation nor transformation it is realisation. Therefore, this transcendence of space and time does not exclude space and time, it includes space and time. Thus in the state of transcendence one is participating in the spatio temporal world but is , at the same time, conscious of one's infinite reality. Therefore this is explained as Satyam, Jnanam and Anantam Brahma. It is the spatio temporal existence, it is knowledge (pure consciousness), it is infinity and it is the highest developed. It is also called Sat-Chit-Ananda. The Being in time-consciousness and Bliss. In all these concepts the Sat is not excluded. This is referred to in Maitri¹³ as Sakala Kala and the Akala the spatio-temporal and the Non-spatio-temporal. Kala means parts indicating the spatial extension. The very concept of time in Hindu thought is always born of spatial event and as such time is called Kala, meaning that which has Kala or parts. To have parts indicates spatiality. Or in other words, it indicates the multiplicity viewed from within the space-time matrix. Further, it says that this Time is that which has physical existence or spatial extension "vigrahavan esha kalah".

Man performs actions for the fulfilment of the four-fold Purushartha as is understood from his 'Sankalpa' in all actions. Here he wants to achieve something which he has not achieved or possess. He wants an improvement. Therefore these four are said to be the objects of development. We see that this Purushartha concept of development derives its meaning in the unitary and organic identity of Man and all or the whole or the totality found in the concept of Man involving the theory of creation, constitution, position, relation, name and function of Man. If man has to continue as man it is only this concept of Man and his development, that will be conducive to such continuation. The moment we take man as separate and independent of the whole there is always the possibility of conflict leading to exploitation of both other men, living beings and the rest of nature destroying the cosmic eco-cycle thus resulting in self annihilation. In the concept of Dharma which makes even the weak stronger, "the might is right theory" is discarded in favour of "the right is might theory". Moksha discards the "survival of the fittest" theory in favour of "the development of all as one's own self."

Now the question is if it is realisable or not. Let us look at this problem of realisability from another angle as to what would happen when it is not realised. When these

four are not realised in simultaneity, the enjoyment of Artha and Kama even if it is within the framework of Dharma or Satya (the law of empirical existence) it would not be enjoying but suffering for one suffers from the sense of being condemned to do what one does as it is only in Moksha one transcends this and becomes the chooser, the determiner and the self ruler. Sometimes Moksha is said to be the highest only in this sense that in Moksha only one fully realises all the other three.

Moksha is not idleness nor passivity, nor inactivity. Freedom from the bondage to activity is not inactivity. It is freedom to act freely on one's own will.

But an objection can be raised that this freedom is also determined because one is forced to think in a state of oneness and not free to think in a state of multiplicity. But knowing that Sat is not out side Ananda, or Ananda does not exclude Sat, the objection loses ground. It is the expression of this freedom that one is both Kala and Akala.

While actual realisation is the realm of mysticism what we can show here is only that this is the only concept that fulfils human aspiration for happiness and development. Therefore the ethics that this concept demands of man is to strive incessantly for the welfare of all taking them to be one's own self.

Thus the Purusharthas give a complete picture of man's ideal of development which resolves the conflict involved between individual and individual and the individual and society and combines material, emotional and aesthetic in an intellectual harmony making life realistic, good and beautiful, Satyam, Shivam and Sundaram.

Notes

1. Rgveda I-164-59
 2. Brhadaranyakopanishad I.4.14.
 3. Quoted by Dr.Radhakrishnan in the Principal Upanishad P.170.
 4. Manusmriti I.26
 5. Brhadaranyakopanishad I.4.17
 6. Quoted by Dr.Radhakrishnan in the Principal Upanishad P.536.
 7. Kathopanishad I.2.3
 8. Manusmriti II.44
 9. Bhagavedgeeta XVI-12.
 10. Ibid.V.3.
 11. Ibid. V.24.
 12. Chandogyopanishad VII.25.2
 13. Maitri VI.15.
-

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSION

Man.

The process of modern development of the western model taking place in our country has resulted in serious inequalities and insecurities, socially, politically, economically and ecologically causing great harm to human dignity and freedom threatening harmony and happiness of the nation. This, it is felt is due to the fact that the concept of development that is being implemented is not in conformity with the idea of development of the man, whose development is sought for. Thus a necessity is felt for studying the Hindu concept of Man and his development as the concept of development will not be clear without the concept of Man. As Upanishads and Bhagavadgita discuss the concept of man at philosophical levels. These two are referred to as the main sources of these thoughts.

The concept of Man and his development involves his identity, origin, creation, constitution, nature, function, relation, position, aspiration, means, and responsibility.

In Hindu thought identity has three aspects called name *rupa*, and Karma or name form and function. *Rupa*

exists in time and disappears in time, while Karma continues in a cause and effect chain but nama remains permanent.

In the beginning there was conscious principle, one alone without a second; which is both the efficient and material cause of creation. The contradictions in the statements it was existent and non-existent is due to the different levels of perception and comprehension and the corresponding descriptions as that is beyond mind and words.

The creation is a process of willed internal differentiation of forms and functions at different levels. It is the manifestation of the will of the one to be many. It is one becoming many within the oneself. Therefore, it is also an evolution, the evolution here is not a process of adaptation to external stimulus but manifestation of an internal will. Man is the culmination of this evolution for creation or srshti is only one part of the Srshti Chakra or creation cycle consisting of Srshti, Sthili, laya, or generation, operation, and dissolution, meaning differentiation of the one into a multiplicity and, the operation of the multiplicity again to dissolve in unity. The life of man is part of this operational multiplicity which has to terminate in dissolution in unity.

Man is a multilevel manifestation of reality. The constitution of man is this simultaneous multi-level expression. At every level there can be differentiation into many forms and functions. This manifestation is studied as of consisting different number of levels, and accordingly all divisions are grouped in the different levels. At the first look we can find two levels as a conscious and a gross one called Purusha and Prakriti. The conscious level and the gross level are further analysed and different levels are found within. Though this analysis has no limits, the three level approach of Sthula, Sukshma, Karana, the four level approach of ^{Vishva} Sthula, ^{Taijasa} Sukshma, ^{Prajna} Karana and Atman, with corresponding jagrat, swapna, Sushupti and ^{turiya} Prajnana states, of consciousness and 5-level approach called Panchakosha Vidya, Annamaya Kosha, Pranannaya Kosha, manomaya kosha, Vijnanamaya kosha, and Anandamayakosha, meaning the physical, biological, (vital) psychological, intellectual and the Bliss sufficiently bring out the constitution of Man. These different levels are not exclusive. They are mutually inclusive of one another.

An operational man is well explained as a moving wheel with the one original source as its felly, the three gunas as its types, the five elements, five organs of perception and five organs of action and the mind forming the sixteen ends; the twenty eight ashakti or disabilities, nine inversions of tushti or satisfaction, the eight inversions

of siddhis or perfection, the ten organs of perception and actions and their objects as the counterspokes, and the prakrit with its eight causes of five elements, manas (mind) buddhi (intellect), ahankara (self-sense), the dhatu with eight constituents of the body, aishwarya or the lordships with its eight forms, the bhavas or the eight conditions, the devas (the gods with their eight classes and the atmagunas which are also eight forming the six sets of eight, and the desire for Karma as the single rope with the paths of Bhakti, Jnana and Karma or Dharma, Adharma and Jnana with causes the delusion caused by the two causes of good or bad works, or likes and dislikes.

The three instruments of the operation of a man are the mind word and deed called trikaranas.

Of the different faculties of man what is characteristic of man as distinguished from other brings is his intellect or rationality but he is not a man by intellect alone. He participates in the identity of all the gross objects ^{at} his Physical plane, with all living beings at the biological plane, and all the animals at the psychological plane ~~are one~~ and in the ultimate reality at the Atman level being himself of the nature of bliss.

The co-ordination of the different levels of man is explained by the Chariot-simile with the self as the owner and intellect as the Charioteer, Mind as the reins, sense organs as the horses etc.

The definition of man is incomplete if we take only the apparent man. Man is man because he is a part of the whole unity of Brahma manifested in the apparent multiplicity of the world. Man and the world participate in each other in the Unity of Brahman.

The position of man and his relation to other beings in the world is based on the vision of reality and theory of creation as everything seen apparently as many are intrinsically the one manifesting itself in multiplicity in accordance with the creative will for differentiation. Thus a man has a relation of oneness with all the other beings, of the world either man, living being or non-living objects. This is the Unity of the Brahman which is Pure consciousness. Once this unity is felt there is no question of distinction in position for it is a unity of consciousness which is beyond social, spatial dimensions like higher or lower, and central or periphery. In such a situation every one is a centre and every one is a periphery.

The distinctions arise because of the three gunas Sattva, Rajas and Tamas. According to these three gunas four Varnas are formed. One important conclusion that this finding draws is that Brahmana is the whole society out of

which the three Varnas of Kshatriya, Vaishya and Shudra are chosen. Varna means the chosen. Birth, education, and association are the three things which are considered as determinants of Varnas. Though birth is in normal cases a contributing factor because of the genetic inheritance of qualities this is not always a deciding factor. Education and association are equally important and can decide the Varna irrespective of birth. There is no relationship of master and slave. The relationship in strict sense is not a relationship but the realisation of unity where there is no place for subordination or exploitation. The Brahmana Varna is recognised as a fourth Varna though it comprises the whole including Kshatriya Vaishya and Shudra and the ones who are not chosen, but continue to keep them trained and educated in all the professions and be friendly to all being ready to shoulder any responsibility that calls for ^{are referred to as Brahmana.} Varna and Jati are different though Jati has a role in deciding Varna. The Varna system therefore assures security excellence and dignity to human individuals.

The Brahman takes up education and training while Kshatriya takes up the maintenance of law or dharma, the vaishya cares of production and Shudra, nursing and nourishment.

Purushartha:

The aspirations of man is expressed in the form of Purushartha which is fourfold called Dharma, Artha, Kama and Moksha. Dharma is the law of the universe, while, Artha is the means of achieving a purpose, and Kama is the desire for Truth, goodness and beauty and Moksha is the freedom in which one is free to exercise one's will not forced by the others for in Moksha one overcomes the otherness itself in finding one's real identity of being the only self and the will of the self in the process of creation.

Regarding the inter-relationship of the four I am of the view that four together form the Purushartha. Neither anyone can be removed from this set of four nor can anyone be made a subject of the other. Though they are four each has in it the other three in the sense that each cannot operate without the other.

Dharma is the law that holds all together. Once this dharma is lost then the man is no more man as he is no more a part of the whole in which unity only he is a man. If his other pursuits sever him from the world and Brahman then the other pursuits are meaningless to him. Artha even taken as wealth is meant for work in this world. Kama is fully realisable only with Artha in the framework of Dharma. Dharma being the being in time the Kama suffers from lack of freedom in the absence of Moksha which makes one free to pursue Kama, simultaneously resolving the individual-individual-

society conflicts making way to a society free from exploitation and state control where the human activity is not motivated by rights and competition born of the otherness but by sense of duty and love born of the oneness.

Development:

The development is basically a transcendence which is neither transportation nor transformation but a realisation that alters only the attitude which determines the nature of action and enjoyment. The nature of action is of two types called ishta and poorta, the former consisting of the Yajnas and the latter works of public utility. The Yajnas ensure the development at physical, material, psychological and intellectual levels always contributing to the maintenance of the order in cosmic ecosystem so that it provides for the welfare of all as the destruction of this cosmic ecosystem would result only in annihilation of all the developmental process right from the creation, implying the the self annihilation. The Yajnika system demands of man not to be greedy but always being assured of his due when he remains active in fulfilling his duty to the totality.

While the doer, the instruments of the action, the action, the objects of the action and the divinity (destiny) are equally and together necessary for an accomplishment the

responsibility for the accomplishment lies on the self. When this significance of self and self identity with the world in its unity in Brajman^w is not realised in action and the action is guided solely by the otherness of the multiplicity of the spatio-temporal world one is thrown into an unending chain of happenings of the laws of nature, which can be overcome only by intellect and knowledge of the reality.

One has to live a long life here with all the material welfare and social status, but not alienated from the whole but being one with the totality, nor behind of another thus resulting in inequality as individual independent being different from society can develop being indifferent to the society, ~~thus~~ always there ~~will be~~ *being* the developed, developing, underdeveloped and the undeveloped. But if we accept the ideal of unity instead of equality and uniformity one cannot feel developed as far as there is another who is not developed which makes it imperative for the one so called developed share his achievements with so called underprivileged as his development will be incomplete even if one man remains undeveloped and as such makes him to endeavour for the development of all as one's own self, not entertaining the feeling of donor and receiver impairing the very notion of equality and dignity of man.

As the ideal of equality (fraternity and liberty) accepts the multiplicity as a fundamental reality, in its effort to bring about equality by effecting uniformity always has the scope for any individual to be either ahead or behind.

Applications of the Concept:

Therefore the solution to the present inequalities, insecurities and attack on the dignity of man lies in the unity of mankind and the totality as a whole and it is only by maintaining this order of the totality through Yainik actions man can be assured of a perennial provision in this empirical world which is the manifestation of the will of the eternal one to be many.

In concrete terms such a development plan will envisage the motivation of the people to think for themselves, analyse their needs and requirements and jointly endeavour for the fulfilment of aspirations of all taking care to see that any institution of development does not deprive anybody of the opportunity of working for the fulfilment of the one's development keeping in mind it is not merely the material goods one needs but the work. Therefore when a new machine is introduced it is not enough to see as to how many jobs it creates and how much goods it produces, but it is necessary to see how many men it deprives of their work and how far it helps them to do their work.

NEHU Library
Acc. No. 102173
: 155 : Acc. by [Signature]
Date 1/8/90
Class by
Sub Heading by
Category

Another important conclusion ~~is not to~~ exhaust a source but to maintain a replenishable source and also to plan to fulfil needs from the produce of a replenishable source.

As man is also beyond space and time any scheme of development should not be planned keeping only the here and the present. The repercussions of the implementations of a scheme beyond here and present should be kept in mind.

As man is a unique multilevel expression of the same reality any stimuli at one level will have its impact at other levels. As such any development planned at one level of man, like physical, vital, psychological, individual, communal etc., without considering its impact at other levels ~~it~~ is fraught with the possibility of doing harm at other levels either instantly or in the course of time.

Finally, the development should not be viewed as any change but only a change that helps in the realisation of the unity of the multiplicity of levels and identities should be considered as development.

Thus we find that the Hindu concept of Man and his development gives an ideal philosophy of development which has the potential to solve the present development maladies, exploitation, and oppression and bring about a life of peace and prosperity and health and happiness to the man kind and all the beings as a whole.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Brown, W.Norman , Man in the Universe, Calcutta, Oxford IBM
1966
Publishing Co.,
- Chakravarti, S.C. The Philosophy of the Upanishads, Calcutta.
1935
- Creel Austin B. Dharma in Hindu Ethics Calcutta, FIRM LLM Pvt.Ltd.,
1977
- Deussen, Paul The Philosophy of the Upanishads, Delhi, Oriental
1972
Publishers.
- Gandhi, R.C. I am Thou, Pune: Indian Philosophical Quarterly
1984
publications.
- Gaunguli, K.M. The Mahabharata of Krishna Dwaipryana Vyase,
1973
Delhi, Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers Pvt.Ltd.
- Gokhale, B.G. Indian Thought Through the Ages Bombay, Asia
1961
Publishing House.
- Hiriyanna, M. Outlines of Indian Philosophy, Bombay, George Allen
1973
and Unwin(India).
- Joshi, C.N. Atman and Moksha, Ahmedabad, Gujarat University Press.
1965
- Kanal, S.B The Ethics of Vedanta, Moga, Deva Samaj Pratashan.
1974
- Kane, P.V. History of the Dharma Shastra(5 Volumes) Bhandarkar's
1932-1962
Oriental Research Institute.
- Keith, A.B. The Religion and Philosophy of the Ved and Upani-
1976
shad, Vol.21 and 31. New Delhi, Motilal Banarasdas.
- Mahadevan, T.M.P Invitation to Indian Philosophy, New Delhi, Arnold
Heineman Publishers(India).

Maitra, S.K. The Ethics of Hindus, New Delhi, Asian Publica
1978 Services, (India).

Radhakrishnan, S. The Principal Upanishads, London, George Al
1974 and Unwin Ltd.

Ranade, R.D. Constructive Survey Upanishadic Philosophy, I
1926

Raju, P.T. The Concept of Man, London, Allen and Unwin.

Shah, K.J. Article in Indian Philosophical Quarterly, Vol.
Poona.

Sanskrit :

Aitareya Upanishad 5th edn.

Bhagavadgeeta 23rd edn.

Bṛhadāranyaka Upanishad 3rd edn. Geeta Press,

Chandogya Upanishad 6th edn. "

Isa Upanishad 7th ed. "

Kena Upanishad 5th edn. "

Mandukya Upanishad 5th edn. "

Mandukya Upanishad "

Prashna Upanishad "

Svetasvatara Upanishad 3rd edn. "

Taittiriya Upanishad 4th edn. "

