

おはよう

享月 日 期 日

# 9・11テロ1周年を前に問う

## 敵への「ギフト作戦」巡り論議

論座9月号

9・11テロとは何だったのか。アフガン空爆は正しかったのか——事件1周年を前に、テロとアフガン攻撃の意義を問い返そうとする論者が月刊誌で出始めた。「論座」9月号では、東工大教授の橋爪大三郎さんと、京都大学助教授の大澤真幸さんという2人の社会学者が対論。大澤さんが示す「ギフト作戦」というユニークな提案への評価を軸に、議論している。



大澤真幸さん



橋爪大三郎さん

橋爪さんは、9・11テロ後の世界秩序を回復するために戦争がいかに意味があるかを強調してきたという。「戦争をしなければならぬ場合の危険」のほろがはるかに大きいからで、「戦争の不可避性」を考へるべきだという立場だ。さらに国際法として「テロに対抗して戦争を起す」といい、「先例になつたとして、米

大澤さんもギフト作戦が「アメリカの基本的な正義感に反する」ので、「なかなか受け入れられない」とは認めつつ、自分たちの「社会システムをつくっている基本的な論理」を愛さない限り、根本的な解決にはならな

「それこそがアメリカの悪の図式を裏づける」ため効果はなく、逆に「テロリストにとって最も害切になる行為」をしなければテロリストを除去できないと論じる。国際政治的に言えば唐突感はあるが、それは具体的に、テロ国家への「大幅な経済援助、贈与」つまりギフト作戦となる。橋爪さんは、第2次大戦後に日本を占領した米

ギフト作戦の発想は、対人関係か、人類学が扱う共同体間の力学には応用できるが、「21世紀の国際社会に持ち込むのはかなり乱暴」とする橋爪さんの批判に、大澤さんは、冷戦以降「国際関係に人間関係のような愛情や憎悪の論理が短絡的に直結するようになった」と反論している。

### Civilizational Dialogue: Hinduism and the World Conference Proceedings

July 12<sup>th</sup>, 2002  
The Sasakawa Peace Foundation

## Welcoming Address

### The Honorable Dr. Aftab Seth, Ambassador of India, Japan:

I am honored to be invited to deliver a welcoming address at the Sasakawa Peace Foundation Seminar on Civilization Dialogue: Hinduism and the world.

May I, first of all, say a word about the term 'Hindu.' I would like to recollect the words of the great preacher and scholar Swami Vivekananda who explained to the world the teachings of his master Ramakrishna, which in turn, were based on the essence of the philosophy of the Vedanta. Vivekananda reminded us that the word Hindu was the Persian pronunciation of the word which is the ancient name of the river Indus and which was used to describe the people living on the other side of the *Sindhu* or Indus river, that is the Indians. Vivekananda therefore preferred to use the word 'the Vedanta' in describing the philosophy and beliefs of the civilization centered in the Indus and Gangetic plains of Northern India. Similarly, the great scholar Sir Monier Williams described this philosophy as "Indian wisdom", rather than Hindu wisdom in his famous eponymous book, published in the 19th century.

What then is this "Indian wisdom" that Vivekananda and Monier Williams speak of? Does it have any relevance in the world today?

I think, the essence of Indic civilization and the great religious and philosophical traditions that have flourished there, is the "inclusive" orientation; this is somewhat different to the other great tradition of religious and spiritual movements, the Abrahamic, which have their origins in the territory of Palestine and the Arabian peninsula. The Indic tradition gives complete freedom to the individual to choose forms of worship and the freedom to believe in deities of choice, whether one god, or two, or several thousand. This system of thought, is marked by an absence of dogma or a rigid religious text, and instead has a remarkable flexibility, which attracts those with an eclectic and tolerant bent of mind. This freedom of choice, in fact, means that the individual is elevated to a high pedestal; the individual may express himself in a manner how is either abstract or concrete, either artistic or nihilistic, or spiritualistic or materialistic.

This freedom of choice of action, in terms of seeking of knowledge of oneself and of the enlightenment that comes with such knowledge, is an important characteristic of the Indic civilization. This stress on individualism, in fact can sometimes be carried to an extreme, which might almost seem blasphemous, as Tagore's *Geetanjali* in which he expresses dualist philosophy by saying that if man needs God, God also needs man and I quote poem 56 of the *Geetanjali* "Know this O God, that because we exist, God head has been conferred on you." This is echoed in the words of the great Austrian poet Rainer Maria Rilke who said "God what will you do when I die, I am worried."

The essence of this Indian philosophy then is tolerance and universality, as can be found in the verses of the medieval exponents of Vedanta who spoke not in classical languages but in the vernacular of the common people. These were sages and saints like Nanak and Kabir. As Kabir said "I am neither in the temple nor in the mosque. I am neither in the Kaaba (the black stone of Abraham in Mecca) nor on Mount Kailash (revered by the Hindus). I am beside you and within you." The same words resonate in the Mahabharata which says "As different streams, having their sources in different places, all mingle through water in the sea; so oh Lord, the different paths which man takes through different tendencies, various though they appear, crooked or straight, all lead to Thee." This universal approach is also common to the Shinto tradition of Japan, which is equally pluralistic and devoid of dogma and doctrine and the assertion of infallible truths. In Japan too, material and spiritual existence were inseparable as Lord Krishna said in words that resemble Japanese ideas, "I am

in every religion as the thread through a string of pearls. Wherever thou seest the extraordinary holiness and extraordinary power raising and purifying humanity, know thou that I am there."

Flowing from this universalism in the Indic tradition is an abhorrence of all that is intolerant, and consequentially a constant search for unity of all peoples, irrespective of race and color. In the 19th century, at his famous address at the Parliament of Religions on 11 September 1893, Vivekananda said the following: "Even in politics and sociology, problems that were only national twenty years ago, can no more be solved on national grounds only. They are assuming huge proportions, gigantic shapes. They can only be solved when looked at in the broader light of international grounds. International organizations, international combinations, international laws are the cry of the day." The same abhorrence of narrow nationalism was expressed by Tagore as he heard the drum beat of war in Germany and Japan in the early 20th century and I quote "The nation with all its paraphernalia of power and prosperity, its flags and pious hymns, its blasphemous prayers in the churches and the literary mock thunders of its patriotic bragging, cannot hide the fact that the Nation is the greatest evil for the Nation." Japan too has not been devoid of scholars who saw the dangers of narrow nationalism and bigotry and I quote Yokoi Shonan the great scholar of the Meiji period who said the Japanese spirit is untutored and unsystematic and therefore for us to criticize foreigners as barbarians ignorant of the way, is surely a great mistake. This will only make us enemies. Heaven and earth is broad and the brightness of the sun and moon can be seen everywhere. Ah! How sad it is to see such narrow-minded thinking at work; it will surely lead our country astray."

I believe that today there is an imperative need to seek inspiration from these sages of India and Japan, in order to overcome the bigotry and fanaticism inherent in a narrow view of human beings and mankind.

There is yet another reason why Indic philosophy, which has its parallels in Japan, is of vital importance in the world today and that is the desperate need to find a balance between human and non-human nature.

In this context, the Indic civilization and characteristics referred to earlier, are noted for the fact that almost 2,400 years before Western psychologists like Freud, began to explore the subconscious, Indian thinkers of the generation of the Buddha and earlier had gone deeply into the psychology of the human being, and had pursued vigorously the quest to unravel the mysteries of the subconscious. They had reached the conclusion that all phenomena could be explained in terms of the universal principal that living and non-living beings were permeated by the same life forces and that, therefore, all nature, mountains, rivers, stones, animals, plants and human beings had to live in harmony with each other. The Japanese Buddhist terminology for this harmony is '*eshofuni*'. This concept has its origin in ancient Japanese Shinto belief, where respect for nature and the blessings that nature showers upon us, have always been deeply ingrained in the national psyche.

One of the greatest personalities of the 20th century who saw this essential unity of all natural and living phenomena was the Nobel laureate and famous poet, Rabindranath Tagore. Tagore visited Japan for the first time in 1913. Here he found an echo of his noblest thoughts and his love of beauty in the civilization that he witnessed, and he put his feelings in these words and I quote "the same stream of life that runs through my veins, night and day, runs through the world and dances in rhythmic measures. It is the same life that shoots in joy through the dust and the earth in numberless blades of grass and breaks into tumultuous waves of leaves and flowers."

This width of vision of Tagore, the voice of India, is equally well expressed by the great Japanese Confucian scholar of the 17th century Fujiwara Seika who talks of the same

universal spirit. "We too hold to the belief that good faith is inherent in our nature, that it moves heaven and earth, penetrates metals and rocks, and pervades everything without exceptions; its influence is not just limited to contact and communication between neighboring countries. Customs may differ in countries a thousand miles apart, but as to good faith every quarter of the world must be the same, for this is the very nature of things. It will be seen that therefore that men differ only in secondary details, such as clothing and speech. Countries may be a thousand or ten thousand miles apart and differences may be found in clothing and speech, but there is one thing in all countries which is not far apart, not a bit different: that is the singularity of good faith." So, this sense of wonder at the universe and acceptance of its basic unity is essential, as is the necessity to encourage personal exploration, as Plato put it, "the beginning of philosophy is to feel a sense of wonder." The RigVeda is replete with this sense of wonder, expressed about natural and human creation.

I would conclude by saying that the message conveyed down the centuries by the sages of India and the sages of civilizations like Japan, which worships beauty and aestheticism in all its many forms, is that universal tolerance for one's fellow human beings and for one's physical environment, is the most vital necessity for ensuring a harmonious life for human beings on this planet. As Rabindranath Tagore said "Life is a continuous process of synthesis and not of addition. Our activities of production and enjoyment of wealth attain the spirit of wholeness when they are blended with a creative ideal. Otherwise they have the insane aspect of the eternally unfinished, they become like locomotive engines which have railway lines but no stations, which rush on towards a collision of uncontrolled forces or to a sudden breakdown of an overstrained machinery."

Let us not allow our headlong rush to development to lead to a breakdown in the systems that support and sustain life on this earth. Let us as teachers and students remember what Mahatma Gandhi, the greatest apostle of peace that the world has seen for many centuries, said, "we may utilize the gifts of nature just as we choose, but in her books the debits are always equal to the credits." Let us try and keep our individual books of life in perfect balance. In so doing, we shall be paying homage to the wisdom of the saints and sages of India and Japan, who preached universalism, tolerance and respect for human and non-human nature.

## Session 1    What is Hinduism?

---

Chairman:  
Dr. Daisaburo Hashizume

### Part 1: India and Indian Civilization

---

Speaker:  
Mr. Chaturbedi Badrinath  
Discussant:  
Dr. Tamotsu Aoki

### Part 2: Hinduism and Buddhism

---

Speaker:  
Dr. Lokesh Chandra  
Discussant:  
Dr. Yasuaki Nara



## Part 1

**Mr. Chaturvedi Badrinath:** First of all, my salutations to you. I feel very greatly honored by being invited by the President of the Sasakawa Peace Foundation, Mr. Akira Irayama, to associate myself with this undertaking. I am also very grateful to His Excellency Dr. Aftab Seth for suggesting my name to be associated with this undertaking. Yesterday I asked Mr. Minoru Kayamori, who with others has been looking after us, what the meaning of his name Minoru was. He said it meant 'growing.' There is a Sanskrit word that is used in the context of all kinds of human relationships—'saha'. May I, on this occasion, coin a new word? An Indo-Japanese word: 'saha-menuru'. Growing together. Every dialogue, whether it is between two individuals, two societies or nations or religions, is an act of growing together. That is, if it is genuine dialogue at all.

Has any one of you heard a lecture the opening sentence of which is "The suggested subject of this lecture does not exist"? The concerns of Indian philosophy are the concerns of human life everywhere. Indian philosophy is not 'Hindu' philosophy. There has been, from the sixteenth century onwards, no greater wrong understanding than the notions that there is something called 'Hinduism'; that 'Hinduism' is a religion, which is a world-denying and other-worldly religion; and that the civilization of India is fundamentally Hindu religious civilization. This wrong understanding has a long history. Equally long has been the history of the notion that two other religions also arose in India, Buddhism and Jainism, to which Hinduism was mostly antagonistic.

Another seriously wrong understanding has been that Indian philosophy is really not 'philosophy', in the sense in which Greek philosophy, and then the whole of western philosophy, is philosophy. It is at best religious mysticism, mysterious, ethereal, and irrational; of interest mostly to those young men and young women who, disenchanted with their own civilizations, seek solace in Indian spirituality, Hindu or Buddhist.

However tiresome, and eventually wholly unproductive, the journey into the history of these thoroughly wrong notions may be that it is undeniable that they have seriously kept Indian thought from being seen as of the greatest relevance to our troubled times. But I do not propose to take you on that journey this morning.

Rather, I would like to take you on a different journey, where you will see in the concerns of Indian philosophy and thought your own concerns, personal as well as collective. I have used the plural we because there are here with me a few of those who made the greatest contributions to laying the foundations of sane living, personal and social. Of them, three are women, extraordinarily brilliant, and simply marvelous. As this lecture proceeds, we will hear their voices.

In its inquiry into the human condition, Indian philosophy raises those very questions the answers to which we all seek in the diverse situations of our lives. And this is done nowhere more realistically than in the Mahabharata in the light of the concrete human situations as they are experienced.

The main concern is with the universal foundations of human relationships, dharma. The foundation relationship of the self with the self and the relationship of the self with the other. Life, from the beginning to the end, is manifestly a complex system of relationships, through which human life is lived. And the quality of life, personal and social, will depend upon the quality of relationships. The Mahabharata shows that it is not until one's relationship with myself is right, that my relationship with the other can be right. If I am disturbed in my relationship with myself, I will be disturbed in my relationship with others. To be at war with myself, is to be at war with everyone else. To be at peace with others, I have first to be at peace with myself. This clearly applies to a society or to a nation as well. A

society that is not at peace with itself will never be at peace with any other society. Also, and clearly so, just as life is a system of human relationships: relationships are a system of energies. The absolutely central concern of all Indian thought is dharma. The question has always been: "What is dharma?" and not "What is Hinduism?"

The inquiry into dharma is a universal inquiry into the foundations of relationships, of the self with the self and of the self with the other. That inquiry is at the same time an inquiry into the nature of energies, personal and collective, which flows into these relationships. And just as those energies flow into many channels, and have diverse expressions, and many colors; human relationships have many different expressions, and many different colors, too. After all the complexities of human life have been taken into account, analyzed honestly, and faithfully to human realities, the Mahabharata says, in the voice of *Bhishma*:

शिक्षकदककश्च इकथरकुका केशिखपा द०००००

षड लषक० शिक्षकलाषटव्रड ल केश बडर डुन्नपषडअडककडूर १०९-१०अअ

*All the sayings of dharma are with a view to nurturing, cherishing, providing more amply, enriching, increasing, enhancing, all living beings: in one word, securing their prabhava. Therefore, whatever has the characteristic of bringing that about, is dharma. This is certain.*

ककज ॥ककन० केशिखपाकगटकेसड ॥क डखक००००० शितकडअ

षड लषकन० ककज ॥कलाषटव्रड ल केश बडर डुन्नपषडअडककडूर १०९-११अअ

*All the sayings of dharma are with a view to supporting, sustaining, bringing together, and in their togetherness upholding, all living beings: securing, in one word, their dharma. Therefore, whatever has the characteristic of doing that, is dharma. This is certain.*

वडगालकदककश्च इकथरकुका केशिखपा द०००००

षड लषकनडगालकलै००००० ल केश बडर डुन्नपषडअडककडूर १०९-१२अअ

*All the sayings of dharma are with a view to securing for all living beings freedom from violence, ahimsa. Therefore, whatever has the characteristic of not doing violence, is dharma. This is certain.*

Conversely, whatever has the characteristic of depriving, starving, diminishing, separating, uprooting, hurting, doing violence, debasing and degrading, is the negation of dharma. Whatever brings that about is, in one word, *adharma*.

Furthermore:

Whatever has the beginning in justice, that alone is called dharma: whatever is unjust and oppressive is *adharma*.

This is not 'religion'. It is 'foundation'—independent of any particular religious faith. At the same time, perfectly consistent with these three attributes of dharma as the universal foundation of human living, the Mahabharata adds:

*If one dharma is destructive of another dharma, then it is wickedness in the garb of dharma, and not dharma. Only that is dharma truly, which is established without denigrating*

and opposing another dharma.<sup>1)</sup>

*In case there is conflict between one dharma and another, one should reflect on their relative weight, and then act accordingly. What does not denigrate and obstruct the others, being dharma.<sup>2)</sup>*

Here, and this is of utmost importance, in a coherent next step, the Mahabharata is saying to us that human relationships, personal and collective, are to be independent of beliefs. Beliefs there are many; and the choices in believing equally diverse. But the foundations of relationships, of one's self with one's self, and of one's self with the other, are universal. Thus, dharma is not a doctrine among other doctrines, and nor yet another 'system of belief' among many existing systems of belief, one contending with another. To say it differently, dharma is the very flow of life in which all living beings are united and which Indian civilization set out to understand.

Now, for the next few minutes, what I propose do is a very brief tour of what dharma covers. The questions are many because in the living of life the questions are many. With dharma as the guiding light began the journey of Indian philosophy some four millennia ago.

What is happiness? What is unhappiness? What is health? What is sickness? In what relation does the mind exist with the body?

What is pleasure? What is pain? What is the nature of sexual pleasure? What kind of energy is sex? What are the conditions in which it flourishes, and what are the conditions in which it dies?

What is dharma? What are those foundations upon which all human relationships everywhere are based? Who determines what those foundations shall be? Or are they given as inherent in human life itself?

Are they subject to the varying conditions of geography and history? Is dharma circumscribed by the vastly varying situations of a person's life, so that, for example, there is one dharma for normal conditions, and another in times of distress? Is there one dharma for the scholar devoted to learning and teaching, another dharma for the householder, a different dharma for the king, and a separate dharma for one who would maintain services?

What is the importance of money and of material prosperity to human happiness and dignity? In what way do both lack of money and the unending greed for more affect one's relationship with one's self and with the other's? Is wealth necessarily a value? In what measure is material wellbeing itself a foundation of human order? In order that there be a sane society, and freedom from the violence of acquisition, to what abiding principles as dharma must the acquisition of wealth and its consumption be at all times everywhere subordinate? What must a just and a rational economic system be like? By what principles must the king, now the state, be governed in relation to wealth? What shall be the just principles of taxes as the main resource of state revenues? And in what ways must those revenues be spent to create the welfare and the good of the people? In case there is a conflict between dharma as the ethical foundation of relationships and material prosperity, which of the two shall have, in principle, precedence over the other? In what state of being will material concerns cease to have the hold over the mind that they indisputably have?

Since prudence is intimately associated with the acquisition of wealth and with the keeping of it, as it is with the art of governance, indeed with most situations of life, there is in the Mahabharata a good amount of prudence-literature. They all focus on self-interest as the

1) *Vana-parva*, 131.11

2) *ibid*, 131.12, and 13

spring of all human actions. Many of the prudence-maxims focus on trust and trusting which is so very central to all relationships, personal and social, and on the problems connected with it. They discuss the danger when trust is wrongly placed and they discuss even the greater danger when nobody trusts anybody. There is also the focus on the relationship between the strong and the weak: on the attitude the weak should have towards the strong as a means of self-preservation, and the attitude which the strong must have, equally in their own interest, towards the weak and the poor.

There is a discussion in the Mahabharata that of the four ends of life which one has primacy in actual reality? In one answer to this question, it is maintained that it is sexual impulse, *kama*, which governs most human conduct. Primacy is assigned to human sexuality to which everything else in actual practice is shown to be subordinate. But this is only one of the positions taken in the Mahabharata, although a dominant one. Sexual energy, *kama*, and its varied manifestations are explored in great depth from different angles. What is also examined is the question, "Between the man and the woman, who derives the greater sexual pleasure?" Assigning primacy to sexual impulse and to its workings, the bounds within which it is to be kept nevertheless if it can be kept within any prescribed bounds at all are explored systematically. What is explored in the main is the question whether *kama* is just physical appetite as hunger and thirst are or is it even in its physicality, a state of togetherness between a man and a woman in the first place?

I do feel totally frustrated that there are many stories related precisely to this question, of living, human situations. We have to cover that ground to understand what is being said. The statement alone is not sufficient. However, that is all that can be done this morning. Indian thought emphasizes that sexual impulse is not merely a physical appetite but it is a state of togetherness, *saha*.

There is also the question, what is the relation between dharma and *kama* above all? What does it mean to say that sexuality should be subject to dharma? It clearly means that in sexual relationships let that togetherness be something that enhances, cherishes, deepens, enriches which supports but does not uproot. So then sexual relationships have to avoid uprooting, debasing and degrading the human worth because that would be *adharma*.

In the context of human sexuality, but not in that context alone, what be examined are desire and its workings. Desire, in being a human attribute, and therefore to be acknowledged with respect, can also lead to its tyranny and violence—the tyranny of desire. The Mahabharata acknowledges the evident psychological force of desire, *kama*, that permeates all life but at the same time it examines the greater need for its disciplining, if desire is not to become self-destructive and become destructive also of the other, which it so easily can. Does self-discipline mean self-denial? The Mahabharata examines them as two different paths, the latter, if turned into a principle, being quite as destructive as self-indulgence.

One of the main concerns not merely of the Mahabharata, not of Indian philosophy, but of human beings everywhere, what is the question of human freedom, *moksha*, forms another substantial part of the Mahabharata. It is only in freedom that one can be fully human. But what is freedom? In the first place, freedom is freedom from. So what is *moksha* freedom from? That freedom gained, what still remains to be gained is freedom into.

The question of human freedom is seen in yet another light. Most of human drama takes place between the opposites of every kind—birth and death, pleasure and pain, attraction and repulsion, happiness and suffering, prosperity and adversity, confusion and clarity, gain and loss, laughter and tears, joy and sorrow—all conceivable opposites within which human life is lived. What Indian thought is trying to point out is that we as human beings are not to be a dangling man or the dangling woman between one and the other, dangling perpetually, then he must seek freedom from the workings of the opposites. It is a



necessity for ordinary human sanity as well.

Then there is the question of determinism. Is man truly free? Or is he controlled by some outside force, over and above the individual, governs a person's destiny? There is no ideology on this question between free will versus determinism. After this has been analyzed, what is being suggested by Indian thought, especially in a work by Yoga Vashishta who says, "Get over this concern with determinism." is, "It is given to man that what is broken, what is loosened, what is scattered, what is disturbed, what has been destroyed. Consider that a new beginning."

I would like, in the next few minutes, to examine the methods of Indian thought. Let me just mention only one or two. From the time of Aristotle onwards, Western thought has been dominated by the law of the excluded middle—that is the logic of either, or. Everything is divided, either, or in these two irreconcilable polarities. Indian thought is suggesting that this is not being true to human life. Therefore, it is not either, or, which is often doing violence to human life, but "this, as well as that". Now, there must be no conclusion here—Indian thought is not saying that there is no area where either, or does not exist. Of course it does. But to apply it as a fundamental principal of logic, and to apply it to everything else in life, that creates violence.

We know that modern science is absolutely rooted in either, or—until the development of quantum physics. The belief was that matter was either particle, or wave. Around 1915 or so, a French scientist<sup>3)</sup> who was also a prince demonstrated experimentally that matter is both a particle and a wave.

It is a human tendency that when one is faced with something very shattering, disturbing, we tend to make a joke out of it. At the Göttingen University where it all began, the joke was that on Monday, Wednesday and Friday, matter acts as a particle. On Tuesday, Thursday and Saturday, matter acts as a wave. And on Sunday, when the university is closed, matter is very quiet.

So again, they tried to show that on certain days, it was either this or that. Then came the announcement of Professor Heisenberg. He shattered even this belief very rudely. He said there is absolutely no certainty when matter will act as a wave or a particle—his famous theory of uncertainty.

We have to see how much this framework of either, or has devastated so much of human life in personal terms or in collective terms. It is applied to truth—either your truth, or my truth. Which? It will be decided by who is more powerful.

In this, it is important for me to say that in the Upanishads it is suggested that in every statement about reality, add *neti*—and repeat it twice—*neti neti*. Now, unfortunately, the word '*neti*' has always been translated, wrongly, as 'not this, not this' which completely misses its proper meaning. Composed of two words *na+iti*, it clearly means 'not yet the end', 'not yet complete'. *Neti* does not mean 'not this', but 'not this alone'. Something more remains to be said. In its inquiry into the human condition, the Mahabharata applies this discipline of *neti neti*, "it is not this alone: it is not this alone", even more rigorously. The discipline of *neti neti* is quite as much an ethical discipline, in the service of truth, as it is an intellectual discipline in the service of knowledge.

Judgments about other people are so final. "Oh, he is a Hindu, that explains it. Now we know." "Oh, he is Muslim." "Oh, he is an Indian, now we know." Yes, to all the judgments about the national characteristics, about individuals, all the judgments even about yourself, add *neti*. Yes, maybe. But I am not this alone.

Permit me to narrate this interesting incident. At a party, I met a gentleman who

explained to me that his best friend was his tailor. When he saw a puzzled look on his face, he explained this helpfully. You see that my friends who have taken my measurements long ago are still measuring me by the same measurements, whereas I have changed. My tailor takes my measurements afresh each time I go there to have a trouser or a shirt made. So he is my best friend. I was that, yes, ten years ago. But I am not that alone.

The second and most important part of the method of Indian thought is not to fragment one human attribute from another. This fragmentation has been a great source of violence all over the world, to ourselves and to others. For example, let us take money or wealth. The Mahabharata shows, what is evident everywhere, that human life is lived not so much on the basis of thoughts and ideas but on the basis of feelings. This obsession with Logos has been a major source of unrest and violence. So much of life is lived on the basis of feelings. Attraction and repulsion or *raga* and *dvesa*, which dominate human life throughout are feelings. Love is a feeling and so is hatred. Some say that hatred is even a stronger feeling than love: hatred occupies a person's inner space far more strongly than love. Friendship and compassion are feelings just as hostility and cruelty are feelings. Trust is a feeling and distrust is a feeling. Joy is a feeling and sorrow is a feeling. Freedom of every variety is a feeling. The quality of one's life will depend on the quality of relationships that we form. The quality of relationships will form upon the qualities of energies that flow into them.

This separation from knowledge from character is also something that has done great harm. There is a story, and with it I will end, of an ordinary housewife who was an extraordinary woman. There was a scholar and ascetic called Kaushik. He had mastered all the four Vedas, and their six accessories. Veda actually means knowledge, not actually religious books. Its root meaning is *vedu*, to know.

He had also acquired some great powers because he was given to asceticism. So every day he would go and beg for food. One day he arrived at a house where he had never been before and he gave a call. He heard a woman's voice from inside that said, "Please wait." He waited and he waited but nobody came out. He was made to wait for a very long time until a woman came out with a tray of food.

Before this, another event had taken place. This Kaushik was sitting under a tree, studying a book. The droppings of a bird up above in the trees soiled his hair, his book and his clothes. He was so furious that he looked up and so great was the power in his eyes that bird was burned to ashes. It was after this event that he went on his daily rounds.

When the woman came out after making him wait, he was furious. "You ignorant woman, you have insulted me and made me wait. If you didn't want to give me food, why did you say 'please wait'?" The woman said very respectfully, "I did not insult you. Neither did I mean to insult you. When you came, my husband had just returned from a long journey. He was very tired and he was hungry and I was attending upon him." "Oh, for you, your husband is more important than a scholar on your doorstep asking for food. You are a very ignorant woman. You have insulted me." Then the woman said once again, "Venerable sir, I did not mean to insult you. But neither am I that little bird that you could reduce to ashes with your anger." Now Galshaka was totally amazed at her pre-knowledge of that event. Then she said, "There is only one enemy of human beings and it resides in their hearts. It is called anger. And from anger comes arrogance. You may have mastered knowledge but you have not yet mastered yourself and therefore your knowledge is all worth nothing."

Then, in five or six verses, she said what is a true scholar, who is a true Brahmin. Then she said, "I am an ignorant housewife, what do I know about these great things? I suggest that you travel to Meiktila and seek a meat seller named Dharma Veyadha. He will give you instructions about what dharma is. Now this man was about to explode. "I, a Brahmin, a scholar, to learn what dharma is from a meat seller?" But he controls himself.

By that time, he was sufficiently humbled by the woman. So he goes to Meiktila then there is a long long discourse. If someone asked me what should I read about Indian thought that I can relate to my own life, I would say read this conversation between this meat seller and this arrogant scholar<sup>4)</sup>.

The main point was that the woman was saying that knowledge and character must be integrated. If knowledge and character are not integrated then we will all act wrongly and this teaching comes from a woman in the Mahabharata. Women are portrayed as the natural teachers of mankind. I think they are portrayed also as the natural teachers of mankind.

These things require time, they have to be discussed slowly. Many questions arise, which would have arisen already in your mind. I sincerely hope that if even in the slightest way, I have been able to convey to you something which is of universal significance, and which can be the true basis of any conversation—whether between two individuals or two civilizations—no one will feel more gratified than I.

**Professor Tamotsu Aoki:** I have not heard before of the difference that exists between Indian philosophy and Indian religion. Krishna is the Son of Shiva. Krishna is a god that appears in many important Hindu rituals and one of the most popular gods in South Asia. In the same way, Dharma is a concept that appears in many cultures of Hinduism and Buddhism. However, it is believed that the God is one and many. Shiva God appears in the variety of forms. This multiple nature of Hindu Gods make very difficult to understand the religion from outside of the Hindu tradition. I am under the impression that this diversity, which is one and many at the same time, is a great characteristic of Indian civilization.

As I said, this is something, which is perhaps very difficult for us Japanese to understand. However, at the end of your paper, Professor Badrinath mentioned the word “feeling.” I was wondering, was it ‘feeling’? It’s not ‘feeling’ singular, it was ‘feelings’ plural? However, when it is translated into Japanese, it is difficult to render the plural form. You would use the word ‘jocho’ [情緒(じょうちょ) n. emotion] or you would use another word ‘kanjo’ [感情(かんじょう) n. feeling(s); emotion; sentiment] which more or less means feeling.

So, it is possible to render this concept into Japanese. However, once it gets translated into Japanese you lose the plural form. Even with the word Dharma, there is something similar to that. Once you translate that into English, and since English tends to determine everything and make it either singular or plural, I suppose inevitably you don’t get a correct translation either in English or in Japanese.

I think these concepts are particularly Hindu or Sanskrit, and it is absolutely difficult to be translated into other languages. We should remember this.

We are said that we are Asians, but we must recognize the fact that we have to converse and communicate through one foreign language, English, which is not originally Asian, this makes things in Asia more difficult. What we do for this reality? Communication?

I have been studying Theravada Buddhism in Thailand and there they call dharma as dharma and there they translate it into principle or law of existence. And you mentioned also karma that you translated as sexual energy. Well, what is sexual energy? It is in another word togetherness—it is the coming together of the two. And you said of one more concept of *Moksha*, freedom. What is freedom? It is the self and the other coming together and being united so that you have wholeness and these relationships that are the very foundation of this philosophy. This is as a whole very interesting and important, but very difficult way of fundamental thought of human being. I should say Professor made a very clear explanation of the almost impossible thinking of the human universe for us. Thank you so much for it.

4) *Vana-parva*, 205-213

## Part 2

**Professor Lokesh Chandra:**

*Roar, lion of the heart  
And tear me open.*<sup>5)</sup>

Dialogue is the Greek *dia-logos* or piercing the logos to reach the trans-logical realm. It is the emergence of a catalyst that breaks through its territorial, civilization and cultural entrapments. I make a distinction between culture, the soft power of human perceptions, and civilization—the more material aspects of human achievement. Dialogue frees us to function in a universal ambience. It is a quest of the highest values that are not encumbered by limits. It is human aspiration to reach the top of the value-hierarchy. It is unhindered and constant recreation of ourselves whereby we grow into citizens of this earth as well as citizens of heaven. It is the opening up of constantly emerging ‘illusions’ that go on fading out so that the future lives in cultural autonomy, and scientific freedom.

Dialogue is an ancient Indo-European concept of carefully organized conversation, with open minds, of all participants. It contrasted philosophical positions and intellectual attitudes. Plato perfected the philosophic dialogue by 400 BC. The Upanishads in India are again a system of dialogue between the sage and his disciple to reveal the mystery that underlies externalities. Today the direction of dialogue has become a prerogative of European thought. To quote Professor Wilhelm Halbfass of the University of Pennsylvania, “The medium, the framework of any ‘dialogue’ seems to be an irreducibly Western one...the global openness of modernity is still a parochially Western, European horizon.” Further on he says, “The meeting and ‘dialogue’ of the cultures and religions of the world coincides with their trivialization.” To where will this trivialization lead? Professor Halbfass is again blunt, “The Europeanization of the earth continues to be inescapable and irreversible.” In the present bilateral dialogue, the minds of India and Japan seek to renew their historic dialogue to win back self-hood, to renew conceptual horizons and historical understanding, and to be creative in the domains of science and technology. Self-questioning has to dissolve into creativity in both pure and applied sciences.

The basic problems concerning globalization and the elusive challenges of Westernization to Asian cultures are realities that should not be underestimated. From the beginning of the 19<sup>th</sup> century Europe has been an organized whole of determinate and complex knowledge as against the nebulous universalism of Asia that in the ultimate all is one. The philosopher E. Husserl said that Europe alone could provide other traditions with a universal framework of meaning and understanding. For this, they will have to ‘Europeanize themselves.’ Professor Halbfass says that Asians have “begun to respond to it (Europe) in being overrun and objectified by it.” The present dialogue has to consider the future of our cultures, to ensure healthy economic and social orders, to provide new thoughts and new solutions to trans-national tasks, to see that the trust vacuum gives us real Insight into creative innovations. Can or will European civilization galloping at top speed reduce us into passive mind mass? We assemble here to find the wisdom and courage to break through the present, and ask, “To whom does the coming century belong?”

The civilization and cultural plane came into the world with man. It created new realities. It brought light in the darkness of existence. It permitted calculated action in opposition to the immediate pressure of urges. It became creativity, language equipped with

5) *Prince Louis de Broglie*



meaningful impulses, and a memory to go with them. The cultural dimension is the cement without which everything else falls apart. Humans wish for a land to call home and are yet curious about foreign lands. There are unlimited possibilities of adaptation to changing demands.

Cultural capacity can and should undergo a completely new evolution on a meta-plane. The fateful fallacy that 'man' is no longer dependent on biological foundations and is being apart from nature will not function. The criteria of fitness have to be decided by life and nature. The freedom of civilization cannot devour its children. We cannot go on legitimizing 'eco-taxes' and grave all regeneration.

Modern science has looked deep into the atom and it has looked deeper into the human mind. This deeper understanding is what feeds the new mind. With this deeper insight the knowledge of nature has become a part of new humanism. Outdating the notion of 'two cultures' the whole of human knowledge fuses into a single, magnificent humane culture. Culture embraces all the values man has created, and gives meaning and content to life. Sri Aurobindo has said, "When we have passed beyond knowing, then we shall have Knowledge. Reason was the helper; Reason is the bar... Transform reason into ordered intuition; let all thyself be light." It is the revitalization of each sentient being, a journey to the truth that we ourselves are the light. It is to care for what is noble, for what is gentle, to create a society where hate, greed and envy die because there is nothing to nourish them. The new world is marked by a growing interpretation of all lives by every other, the coming together of cultures and peoples to accomplish common and contradictory purposes. A new sociology of ultimate concerns asks, "does my life and other manifestations of life share a meaning?" It helps us gain a feeling of belonging to the universe in which man exists as an organism and lives as a personality in a symbolic cultural world.

An encounter of the 'two cultures', the scientific and the humane, will restore the normal vision, and will be the bedrock of a 'science of understanding' in the new century. As they ascend, they will converge. They will give new meaning to the ancient perception that quantity (measure) and quality (value) coexist at the root of nature. Human endeavors cannot afford to be humanistically irresponsible. We need an integrating centrum of human consciousness and action. We need to envision the world in beauty and nobility, devotion and dedication to Cosmic Humanism. In this we can develop societies that will discover their inner selfhood, to illuminate the interrelatedness of all. In an organic cosmic order there is no isolated system: no person and no aspect of him/her is an island.

Humankind has to envision the emergence of a new level of awareness that will make life harmonious within ourselves and outside with the world, in silence, in wordlessness, to shake off the dust of the world. He who holds to the perennial can manage human affairs without cultural, political, spiritual and social pollution. Moderation and slowing down are antidotes to over-growth, rush and exploitation of nature, human and self. Are men empty vessels to be filled through development? Are they a solitary moon suspended in the empty blue? Humans have to wash their ink stone of its profane words, with their thoughts lost somewhere along the way and their hearts moved, defilements vanished, leaving body and soul transparently pure.

*You dance inside my chest,  
Where no one sees you,  
But sometimes I do,  
And that sight becomes this art.<sup>6)</sup>*

6) Mowlana Jalaluddin Rumi

Humans are in a unique position within the universe because of their ability to transmit cultural values from one generation to the next. We can keep out the as yet little perceived micro-level pollutions of both affluence and effluence. We have to devote attention to an original and greater reality though which the life and work of humankind is governed.

The emergence of a world without frontiers will have to avoid the historical misfortune of a tortured image of regimentation. Cultures have to remain 'timeless moments', elusive dreams un-hemmed by space, eternal wanderers in search of the meaning of existence. The intellectual horizons should remain open, with agents of the secret police in prison. Seven decades of the 20<sup>th</sup> century have looked upon dogmas as their sole blueprint, their exclusive dictionary, and their only support. To borrow the terminology of Chinese intellectuals during the period of 'thousand weeds' in 1957, "The thunder clap has been loud, the raindrops small. The 'eyebrows' of time are undergoing re-structuring." Though certain rigid structures continue with a new manner of arrangement, they are gradually yielding place to a new coexistence of distinct parts in a whole. The new human order eagerly awaits a living textbook.

The emerging world society will predominantly be a Eurocentric model, an imperialism of abstractions and rationalizations of human relationships, social functions, economic schemata, and radical leveling of the cultures into a global civilization (rather than cultures), with neutralized systems. These principles and prejudices unexpressed but implicit, may lead to pathological leveling down of traditions, to the impoverishment of sustaining cultures. The communication between peoples of different cultures has been founded on Western orientalisms. By these disciplines, the West has mediated with them. The non-European cultures have NO disciplines to observe the European religions, languages, histories and societies. Were we to give a systematic exposition of Eurocentric culture, after critical reflection from within our traditional views, the West may revise its self-understanding. Otherness, alteration, helps to resolve conflicts and contradictions. Do Indian, African, Iranian, Arabic, Chinese, Japanese and other thinking see the peculiarities and potentials, virtues and dangers in European culture? While such an approach is of critical interest to us, it is equally relevant for Europe. The science of Europology, studied with the criteria of non-European traditions, will be a fruitful enquiry. This overdue re-appraisal of European conceptions of social and humanistic sciences, and of European judgments will be relevant also for the self-image of Europe. The non-European traditions will have to clearly define their ideations, comparable with European research methods. Such a dialogical understanding will be a true mediation of intercultural enrichment.

The Taoist sage Chaung-tze gave the name 'hundred schools' to the flourishing of philosophical speculation in China during the third and fourth centuries BC. The dawning century can likewise be realized in the motto, "Let a hundred flowers bloom, a thousand thoughts contend." It is the *Ta t'ung hsiao I* 'grand unity, minor differences'. Dew, water of a river, waves of the ocean: still a single substance water. I am reminded of Enku, the Japanese sculptor of a hundred thousand chips of Buddhas, who died at a temple chanting prayers, ringing a bell and fasting. Some tall oak and cherry trees entwined with the wisteria vines now stand at the spot where he attained nirvana. People living in the village say that these vines will bleed identities? Or will the delicate frontiers of our minds feed the streams of this century with the offerings of dreams, drifting like heaven's gift over the skies of the mind, raining love and song to worship living beings.

The birth of a new order is an expression of time ever flowing onwards. Time is never-ending rhymes without reason. The 20<sup>th</sup> century is gone. Secularization has left wounds in the emptiness of the soul. The Soul abhors a vacuum. It has flowed onward to the essence of life, to new value-centers in many principles of being. Today humankind seeks to create



newer and ever individualized eyes. Latin metaphysics speaks of eternity as *nunc stans* 'a standing now', of time as *nunc fluens* 'a flowing now'. The now's can meet in the message and mission of cultural universalism, vibrating to the silent raptures of live diversities, to become a convergence of shared plentitude, un-shorn of multiplicity. The destinies of the East and West are no longer closed systems. The East and West will be harmonized in the microcosm of ourselves alone.

This dialogue summons us from thought to awakening awareness, from dogma to dialogue, from ideology to ideas, so that tiny pebbles gathered on the shoreline of life become fine like pearls, and when we carry these pebbles back home to our hearts, intertwined with them will be the Sea of Consciousness in our sleeves. Leafing through thousands of years a hymn invokes us to the stillness and emptiness of the mind that allows the greater world to enter into our personal world. Reflecting over dialogues that have failed us, and tortured our deeds to exhaustion, we seek renewing glistening waters in the rhythms of the universe, in the flow of civilization, evolving humans into a growing wholeness of an inner unity and constant change. At the peripheral point of the fading century with its accelerated accumulative, concerned only with outer man, oriented to pollution, the dawning century has to call a halt to this lash of inequity, so that our inner systems can offer better choices of all-round potential, a deep perception of the art of living, cosmic interplay overshadowing engineered constructs, to bring into being new value symbols that are non-additive and in service to humankind everywhere. Creative symbols have to maximize human 'knowing', to become aware of a common spiritual awakening, and to bring harmony beyond contemporary values. We need an integrative catalyst of the creative process in the wholeness of value systems, and remember Hegel's words, "Beware the cunning of reason."

Mankind is a cosmic emergence, to be discovered and experienced. Man is akin to moss and grass that cover the soil, shrubs and trees that beautify the plains and the hills, the singing birds and buzzing insects, the crawling, running and flying animals. Man has gradually mastered the forces of energy, and domesticated plants and animals. Conscious of his consciousness he is the time-binder. He has created a hierarchy of existents, layering them into three kingdoms of the mineral, vegetal and animal. Above them he stands observer and master. The long path of history is his power and capacity to change the earth. Today he realizes that "To be is to be related." The 'logic of feeling' is close to life than the 'logic of strict intellection'. The future of life lies in working and growing together in a relation of loving unity of humans, humans and other sentients, humans and nature.

The catalytic fact of the 20<sup>th</sup> century is uncontrollable development, consumerist society, political materialism, and spiritual devaluation. This inordinate development has led to the 'second reality' of the perception that biologically Transcendence is a part of human life. As the century opens it dawns with imperative vigor that the 'first reality' of enlightened rationalism and the 'second reality' of the Beyond have to be harmonized in a worthy state of man. The de facto values describe what we are, they portray the 'is' of our ethic, they are *est* value (Latin '*est*' means 'is'). The ideal values tell us what we 'ought to be' are *esto* (Latin '*esto*' means 'ought to be'). Both have to be in the ebb and flow of consciousness.

The dawned twenty-first century demands new structures of thought, spirituality, and nature harmonizing in the beauty of life, in the immensity (*virat*) of the cosmos that envelops us in its embrace of Divinity (not God), and in the open natural spaces of the unknown:

*What I shall never knowing  
I must make known  
Where travelers never went  
Is my domain.*

No shadows of dogma, no imprisonment in the deadening certainty of Revelation, no cutting down the venerable oak-trees of centuries for bushes, no verdicts of suicidal decisions donning lineaments of religion, no drowning the flow of time, no omnipotence of God that strangles the flux of time, choice and *punya*.

Bio-diversity is the supreme law of the land. There are over a hundred thousand species of flora and fauna in India alone, more than a lakh of forms of plant and animal life in our country. Likewise the spiritual life has to divine the several meanings, the fuzzy wisdom of nature, the light of the Many, and to image the sacrament that enshrines the Multiple, the Changing, the Silent. Let us not wound the years with 'The Only True One.' The One has to become the Many. Theo-diversity is an inescapable corollary to the astounding discoveries in science and their universal applications in technology. Theo-diversity alone will ensure the ascension of humanity to light and nobility that makes joy not an attribute of the spirit, but its essential nature (*sac-cid-ananda*). Our century seeks a creative and imaginative reflection on the spiritual destiny of humankind, away from the disembodiment of the human at the altar of mono-centric theism. Theo-diversity will lead us to the spontaneity of the foundations of the mind, bring light to eyes long blind and we may say:

*I observed  
The designing of gods.*

Our world has been conditioned by two major currents of theism, one emanating from the agricultural and the other from pastoral civilizations. We will have to analyze their etiology and teleology, their origins and purposes, to comprehend their historic impact, as well as their relevance to an emerging world where the role of environment is getting modified. Today humanity seeks music of the creative and the Many, rather than that of the frozen and the One, in the inexhaustible riches of Joy standing at the threshold of an archetypal world, that is, on the threshold of the *Dharmadhatu*.

The three great traditions of Judaism, Christianity and Islam crystallized in arid zones. The desert is a vast stretch of sand, in its imperial majesty of the immense, and overwhelming in its logic of the ONE: all that the eyes see is ONE monotone. It is boiling in the day and freezing at night with man feeling its oppressive extremes of temperature. It is violence incarnate, violence sans end. It leaves its deep impress on the mind: rigidity, fixity and obstinacy.

Indic religions arose on the banks of rivers with waters flowing. Flow symbolized change and evolution was a prime component of its inner dynamics. The flow of waters was sacred (Chand. 3.1.2, Kaus. 4.10). This flux of change was integral to dharma. The waters flowed because of the banks of rivers. If there were no banks the waters would not flow, they would slush into marshes. Inner ethics are the banks of the spiritual universe.

The desert with its endless and un-varying landscape sublimated the immensity of the One Vast Sand into The One Ultimate. The Single Highest became the crowning extreme. Extremism is inbuilt in monotheism. The prophet Isaiah comforted his companions in exile that Jahweh is not merely the God of Israel, but "The Only God" that doeth all things...He is the one, perfect, immutable. When some one asked what God did before the world was created, St. Augustine answered, "He made a hell for the inquisitive." Monotheism is a theological term, and Theodore M. Ludwig says that it cannot include other traditions, except Judaism, Christianity and Islam.

Polycentrism emphasizes the principle of the many, and merges divine reality with the world. It is a plurality of divine forces functioning in life and nature. It calls for a new paradigm: *para* 'beyond' + *digm* 'to show.' A seeing beyond, the epic of the multiple vision

wherein life is not sin, but sanctity. Lord Buddha speaks of his pre-incarnations in the Jatakas when he was born as a king, a sage, a bird, an animal, an aquatic animal and so on. Thus Buddhism proclaims that all living beings are capable of the highest Bodhisattva or Enlightenment, and as such are 'potential Buddhas' in Sanskrit *Buddhankura* 'Sprouting Buddhas'.

Polytheism has many centers of being and becoming, and thus owns both the temporal and spatial dimensions. Time and space can condition existence and transcendence. Monotheism arose in the arid zone of the earth where the featureless desert inscribed its monotone, its one recognition and gave a determinate focus. The-inhabitable landscape dictated: life and nature were divorced from the Divine. The desert imbued with its tyranny of burning sands could not be a holy place. It was a registration of anomaly.

It gave the Absolute of an unchanging beyond, of The One, as it was itself One unchanging. Hardly a person is seen in the arid expanses. It invoked de-humanization in the euphemism of the Divine Revelation. Polytheism is a product of agricultural landscapes wherein a place is imbued with significance, where man finds food for his body from the green fertility of the land, water from a well, lake or river to quench his thirst, the wood, forest or tree to share its 'growing' with him, and the height of a hill or peak to uplift his being.

Frontiers create barriers in human understanding. An unchanging holy domain, rooted in the immutable word, in wordiness worked out in painstaking detail in rigid theological structures, breeds a closed sacrum, which has to be defended with all one's might. Subject to the exigencies of power, it has to own aggressiveness and the vitality of violence.

Instead of frontiers, this century needs open horizons, where people are 'sculptors of themselves', to invoke the light and lyricism that lives in our life. As the great poetess of Kashmir Lallesvari says, "From the outward enter into the most inward part of they being. The beyond and within has to be a flow."

The ever-new science and technology and the ever-perennial faith are two modes of one certainty, that is the wholeness of man, his courage to be, his share in being. We seek meaningfulness in living and learning, in faith and vigor, in the dynamic and divine, in exciting dimension and organic essence, in response and resonance and man-in-nature, whole in reflecting and loving.

With an emerging world order of many centers, mono-centric theology, polity or economy cannot contribute to human well-being. Professor David L. Miller says, "Thinking mono-theistically about the deepest matters of the heart and spirit cannot put man in touch with life." We have to be both human and divine, in our many ways, with our minds becoming more like the expanding universe. As the river is bounded with banks, so that it can flow, so have our minds to be embanked by values of continuity and change, unhampered by mono-centric dogmas.

In the darkest night, man searches for light. In his deepest need, he seeks a dawning consciousness. He aspires to repaint the world canvas, to revalue what is in the primal sources of the eternal process. Out of the real and the imagines is born the Realm of the Future wherein man rises above himself, as a dynamic bearer of culture. He crosses the River of Today and ferries across to the Other Shore of unborn tomorrows. We are Eternal pilgrims. In the worlds of poet Tagore:

*The traveler has to knock at every alien door to come to his own,  
And one has to wander through all the outer worlds  
to reach the innermost shrine at the end.*

**Professor Yasuaki Nara:** I appreciate Professor Chandra's speech. I felt it was exactly what I wanted to say myself. As you age, people tend to become more conservative—not in a political sense—but in a cultural sense. So when I look around myself, European civilization and culture don't quite fit my feelings. Whatever is Asian, including Japan, India and China—I feel very close to the cultures of this region. Professor Chandra's speech revolved around dialogue and he compared European civilization with Asian civilization.

The unique god is a European concept. As opposed to that, Asians would tend to hold a polytheistic view of the world and find the divine in a wide variety of things. I can see the working of dharma at the root of this polytheistic experience. There is a big problem inherent in these expressions, these words Hinduism and Buddhism. There are many different versions, ways you can interpret these concepts. I am very much against the trend of opposing Buddhism and Hinduism. If you put both doctrines of the same plane and compare them, it is possible. But what is called 'Buddhism' and 'Hinduism' is totally of different character. In Buddhism, as you know, was founded by Buddha, there is a unique doctrine. And there is what is called a *sangha*, a community. It also possesses a universal that may be taken anywhere in the world. So it is often labeled as 'World Religion'. It lacks however the daily/agricultural rites and ceremonies without which social life of believers does not become possible. So Buddhism fundamentally remains as high level of religious ideas, practices and ethical way of living in India.

As opposed to that, Hinduism in principal is the same as Japanese Shintoism. It does not have a founder, unique doctrine and an Order. There are not only a great many of religious ideas and practices such as kami, Shinto gods with vast application, impurity, purification, all sorts of daily rites but traditional customs, social structure and ways of thinking. In the olden days people who lived as Shintoists, as we now so regard them, were not aware of the concept of religion. It is a typical example of the so-called 'Folk Religion'. Perhaps it is better to understand that Shintoism is the basis of life, a kind of world, on which Japanese people live and create tradition.

Hinduism in principal belongs to this type of religion, though it has a very important aspect of universality as a 'World Religion'. Hinduism is the world in which Indian people have lived, living and will live. The high level of religious concepts, philosophy and practices are included in it. Dharma therefore is to understand ranging from religious truth to ethical cords, particular rule of castes and even social customs and laws. As Professor Badrinath has mentioned, it is better not to think of dharma as merely a religion.

Buddhism is a religious movement that took place in this Hindu world. I would like to put this question to the Japanese. Would you feel strange if I put it to you that Buddha himself was a Hindu? Maybe that is too far fetched? But perhaps it could be said that he belonged to that world. Buddha was not an alien that came from Mars or a far, far planet. He was born on this planet and into the world of Hinduism. He was born and died as a Hindu so Buddhism was born in the Hindu world. So Buddhism versus Hinduism? Such a contraposition is rather wrong because it is a very dogmatic way of seeing two different things. Instead, we see Hinduism as a cultural background against which many things have been born.

Regarding polytheism, I am not anti-Christian, or anti-West. Instead, for more than thirty odd years I have been involved in the Zen Christian colloquium and I have learned a lot from Christians. But when it comes to religion in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, monotheism, if it continues to have intolerant attitudes it will not be sustained. Krishna, Shiva, there are many divine gods in Hinduism. The one absolute reality underlines all deities. The aspects of this absolute reality are represented by Krishna, Shiva and many other local deities. Differences of faith have never caused conflict. Religious tolerance of Indian religions rests on this.



**Professor Badrinath:** It was very interesting what Professor Aoki said whether the word 'feelings' I was using in the plural could be translated in the Japanese. It is true that these are feelings. Love is not 'a feeling' but 'feelings' in the plural. A cluster of feelings, some of them are often quite confused. Similarly with trust, or aggression, or friendship, they are feelings. I found that very interesting. And that is exactly what I meant by using the plural when talking of them. Love is not one-dimensional. There are so many colors, sounds, to it. It cannot be a singular thing.

One thing that I thought I could supplement is about the question of freedom. Freedom is freedom from. It is a strange paradox. Human beings everywhere are creatures of history. I am a product of history. I am, in a sense, what my context, the history of my family, of my society, has made me to be. My identity in a sense is my history. But the paradox is that the very thing, without which we cannot be, turns into our prison. History and memories turn into our prisons. History can be the greatest prison of all if we cannot free ourselves. If you relate this with history, then the question will be "Yes, of course I am my history, but am I my history alone?" To the statement "I am my history", add *neti, neti*. I am not my history alone. If I were my history alone, I would not be able to respond to people with another kind of histories. This is not a doctrine or even a complicated theory. Persons are transcending their history, all the time everywhere. That is how friendship is possible.

Permit me to tell a story about Swami Vivekananda when he went to this Parliament of Religions in 1893. Some of the delegates were assigned to the host-families where they could go and stay. He was assigned to a family, the Lyons. He arrived there with considerable luggage. This elderly couple, John and Emily Lyon, had already staying with them some friends from the south of America. As everyone knows, color prejudice is the strongest in the South of America. It was so then, as I believe it is now. They were quite worried about what would be the reaction of their friends and guests to this brown man in the strange dress of a monk. John said to his wife these words, "Emily, I don't care if our Southern friends leave, but this man stays here. And he stays here as long as he wishes." Now Emily Lyon had already made the same decision that Vivekananda stayed there. This is only one example of how made a decision that in a moment transcended their history and responded to a particular individual on the basis of some inner feeling.

For uniting myself with myself—leave aside the other—I have to transcend my history, transcend myself. This question of *Moksha* is to be seen in a radically different light. When I am talking to you, I am not carrying my baggage of being an Indian, being a Chaturvedi born in a certain family and my whole past. I am responding to you in this moment as I am to you, as an individual—as you are to me. You may dislike me, but that not as an Indian. You may like me, but that also not for that reason, instead, for some thing that is as to me. And I am not my history alone, just as you are not your history alone.

**Professor Daisaburo Hashizume:** How do we transcend our history? Would you respond to Professor Nara?

**Professor Chandra:** The question of culture is getting intertwined with politics, so too economics and new terms like globalization. Japan has seen the effects of globalization and so South Korea. The other parts of Asia may witness them in the coming five years.

To me, existence and transcendence have always been one. As the lady said, *dharma*, *artha*, *kama* and *moksha* are expressions of human life and are integrated somewhere at the root. They are integral parts of life.

The questioning of the sovereignty of states under the norms of globalization, and under the doctrine of human rights emerges from the specific background of the ultimate one

reality. I am opposed to the concept of a one ultimate reality or a supreme being. This concept is derogatory if not destructive of human life, of plant life, of the whole of nature itself. The human dimension, the dimension of nature and the divine are all parts of human existence. We will have to be concerned with the processes of dehumanization of human beings, mechanization of humanity, leading to the desecration of national structures.

As there is bio-diversity, so there should also be theo-diversity. There has also to be diversity of states, and of economic systems. Life is divine. Plurality or multiplicity is divine. To put content into the terms polytheism and plurality, the positive word theo-diversity has been used. Gods have to be diverse for human beings to live in peace. The One, on the contrary, needs a stick to control the universe.

**Professor Hashizume:** You talk about the ultimate one reality and how it is damaging. For those of us who are used to Christian civilization, that calls for much discussion. As far as I have understood this, we must actually strengthen diversity, which is a part of a life philosophy.

**Question:** The Indo-Pakistani conflict around Kashmir, is it a conflict between two religions? You said that even gods need to be diversified but from that perspective, regarding Muslim Pakistanis, is it because they don't recognize the diversity of god and religion—is that the reason why the Kashmir conflict arose? And to what extent do you think philosophy contributes to the world and to world peace?

Regarding the conflict with Muslims, the concept of diversity converging into one seems to me to be something diametrically opposed to Muslim thinking and may sound insulting to Muslim ears. Within the context of resolving conflict with Muslims, how do we express Hindu thinking in a way that is not insulting to Muslim ears. Those who say that Hinduism is not a religion and can bring together but the moment you pronounce that word I think you alienate some people and I would like to know how you feel about this issue?

**Session 2    Panel Discussion: Indian Civilization and Japan**

Chairman:

Dr. Daisaburo Hashizume

Discussant:

Mr. Chaturbedi Badrinath

Dr. Lokesh Chandra

Dr. Yasuaki Nara

Dr. Tamotsu Aoki

**Professor Badrinath:** Human life, this huge undertaking called civilization dialogue, is first about understanding myself—which we often don't do—and then understanding the other. For that, it had to be a different mode of perception, at least in Indian tradition. A few people gather together and there is conversation. Often it is in the night. If I may, in passing, make just this remark. For so many years I have been hoping that someday, somewhere in the world, somebody will organize a seminar in the night. Which will be after dinner, where people sit together—maybe on the floor—and there will be a flow of conversation. Night is the time of peace, of quiet, of self-reflection. In the night, people even speak slowly. The sounds of words are different.

According to the whole of Indian thought, violence, conflict and violence, so dominant a part of human life, are owing to the absolutist view of truth—which is akin to monotheism in religion. That absolutist view of truth is that "This alone is the truth." And very soon, it comes to "My truth is the truth, and your truth is downright error. And since I like you very much, I will first try to persuade you to my truth. And if that fails, I will try to ram it down your throat. I may, if I can, even kill you, for I will think that you are blessed in being freed from a false sense of truth!"

Science also got infected with this absolutist view of truth. Indian thought, for the most part, is a relativistic view of truth, which means that truth is not absolute about which only one statement may be made. Truth is seen from very many angles, from different perspectives and situations. In the Jain philosophy, there is this characteristic view of *anekanta*: *aneka*, 'many', *anta*, 'the end', the many-sidedness of truth. Now the Buddha did not agree with the Jain 'seven-points-of-view' of perceiving truth, and proposed 'the-four-alternatives', the *catushkoti*, perception truth.

*Anekanta* suggests that to every statement, you have to add, 'true in sense'. No statement is true unconditionally. It both is, and is-not—a sense. You can say, "Look, all this is mystical." There should be, either I am here, or I am not here. It would make no sense to say, "I am here and I am not here." But consider this. Yes, I am here in a visible sense. But it is perfectly conceivable that just when I am talking with you, a part of my mind is somewhere else. This is a common human occurrence, physical presence and emotional absence. There can be physical presence and spiritual absence. So, truth is not one-sided and there are other possibilities. When combined with the monotheism of religion, the view that there is one truth, one God, one book, and only one way—it is our way, and then the way is open to conflict and to violence.

I would like to suggest is that for the diversity of life to be acknowledged, the diversity of the perceptions about life must be acknowledged. The diversity of perceptions is not only of the other, but of the self as well. At age 25 I had certain perceptions about my self. Today, I may have very different perceptions of my self. Both of them are right. I was right, and then I am right now. Also I could have been wrong then, and I could be wrong now. This leads to acceptance of other possibilities. This is the very crux of all dialogue, of all conversations. If I insist there is only one possibility, there is no conversation, for then I insist that you listen, and accept, what I say. And that is it.

If you want to understand a person, how do you go about it? When can I say I understand you? I may have knowledge about when you were born. How many brothers and sisters you have. What school you went to. I may have your telephone number. But can I say I know you? The understanding of another person revolves around two things. The first is: what are your concerns. What occupies you, what drives you? The second is, what is the nature of the conflicts that have come into your life. Not a catalog of the conflicts, not a list, but the nature of the conflicts. If I know these two things, I can say yes, I understand you.

Later I would say, what are the concerns, let us say, of the people of Japan. Not only



collectively, but even individually. What is it that occupies you in your life energies? What kind of questions, what kind of aspirations?

We have to renounce the absolutist view of truth. This is being done gradually. Even in religion and certainly in science. We have to give up this monotheistic view of religion. Once we do that, we get onto a more human ground and we will find that your concerns are no different from my concerns and it is on that ground that we meet.

**Professor Nara:** There is a crab on a slope that crosses on a slant. He says to the slope that you are totally flat. In other words, if you are looking at a slope, it could be going up, down or be totally flat depending on where you are standing. It all depends on your own perspective and you cannot say which is wrong and which is right. In the world, what we actually do is do away with the differences.

When we are thinking and putting that thought into words it must depend on some sort of perception.

When we talk about all this from an Eastern perspective, we think in our head and whatever comes out as words could be different with ten different people. That is normal and they are all right. When we talk about the slope going up, that is only partial reality. But in the western countries, reality, truth should be expressed verbally.

The general thinking of the West is that whatever does not come out verbally is not reality or truth. In the East, it is totally the reverse. Whatever is the truth or reality cannot be put into words and so we should not try to force such a thing into words. That is why we get different answers. When you do not trust words, it is what happens in the East. It is why Japanese do not want to be more argumentative.

There is an old advertisement that says "Men drink Sapporo beer in silence", without any word of appreciation. That is the closest to reality. Let us look at reality from a religious point of view. Let us look at it from the perspective from ten different people. If there are ten people, they will all be different and we must be aware of that when we are discussing reality.

In the teaching of Buddha, it is said, "There is only one truth and there is nothing second to truth". *Satya* (truth) is unique. There is only one truth but it does not express itself verbally. Different people will interpret truth from different angles. That is why we get different opinions even concerning truth. People wrongly insist whatever they think is only absolute truth. If we have ten different people, we get ten different absolutes. The plurality of the absolute is never absolute.

When we think about diversity and when we speak what we think through words, the conclusion is that when we express truth verbally, we have to be very careful because we could go into an unnecessary discussion by looking only at the surface of words.

We have a saying in Buddhism from a long time ago: uselessness of a religions discussion or debate on its own doctrine. Which side wins, is the shame of *Shakyamuni*, Buddha. In other words, with the diversity of words, when we try to get one definition of truth, we must be very careful.

**Professor Aoki:** Almost thirty years ago I was at a Buddhist temple in Bangkok. What was thought during my training term as a monk was that this *Hinayana* sect of Buddhism ordained as a theravade Buddhist monk has all sorts of doctrines that were given not verbally, but that you can only understand the doctrine after you reach a certain level of training. For example, you sit down when you are being trained and you learn how to breathe and you understand what Buddha was saying in this initial step of thought. Whatever Buddha taught us cannot be understood without training of your body and mind. At that time I was still young and I loved to go to debates every thing, so I asked about all sorts of Buddhist

teachings to my elders. However, when I began to talk on the matters concerning the teachings, my teacher said it was really no use discussing such things.

There are two kinds of religion, the written religions and the verbal religions. Christianity, Islam, Judaism—all these religions have their doctrines put into one book. They are the textbook religions. When you come to Hinduism, Buddhism and Shintoism, these are religions that cannot be understood by reading one book. There is no one book that will tell you what the essence of Buddhism.

In the Bible, the very first words are "In the beginning was the word and the word was God." When you come to Buddhism and Hinduism, you do not have such texts as we find in Christianity, Islam and Judaism. Words come after we are spiritually trained. Actually, "Buddhism" in the beginning was the deed and the deed was Buddha. As we think of the world today, we live in a world where there are too many words. Over expression with words. Everything comes in words in our societies. Even if we don't understand, we are flooded with words that try to explain these words. When there troublesome things in word come to me, I really get the meaning of the way my elders taught in Thai Buddhist temple.

By the way, when we turn our attention to that when we talked about monotheism and polytheism. But my question is do these really exist? In Japan we have Shinto religion, which is a belief in all the gods in the nature and myth. So this could be called a polytheistic religion. But when we go to the Shinto shrine, you may find a lot of different gods under different names. But when we pray to specific things to these gods, it is always the one wholeness of god in mind. The Shinto Gods are so many but it is tended to be one when prayed for by the people. One and many is the essential nature of Shinto worship, I think.

Buddhism actually denied polytheism originally. They denied gods because Buddha himself was human being and enlightened one by himself. He had reached Nirvana and was liberated from the world of Karma. So basically it is your own effort, which is human effort that will bring you freedom. So it is different from Christianity, Islam, and also from Hinduism.

Is Christianity really a monotheistic religion? Who is the Virgin Mary? And you have St. Joseph. In the churches of the west, you have the statues of the Holy Mother Mary and the cross and candles that people light themselves. This is polytheism itself, no? In Buddhist temple you find many different gods surround and protect the Buddha. Maybe these surrounding deities seem to be the gods in Hinduism. In Hinduism, it is sometimes mentioned in the people that Buddha is one god of gods in Hinduism.

In the Mediterranean culture, there is a strong devotion to the Virgin Mary. This is another example of where words have gone before the actual interpretation.

When we look at India, I think polytheism exists in the shape of Hinduism that seems to be a real polytheism. If you go to Hindu temples you see lots of statues of gods. In the tradition of Judaism and Christianity and Islam, what we call the monotheistic religions, the most extreme of all of them is Islam. They do not allow icons and statues and they pray to the god of Allah. In Christianity you see various different sculptures and statues but Islam forbids all of this.

When we look at the Kashmir conflict, when we put religion at the center of this, I think we will have a totally wrong interpretation because religious conflicts followed after territorial and border issues. It has always been a political conflict but today it has surfaced as an Islamic and Hinduist struggle. Religion has become a political conflict and that is very unfortunate.

When we talk about monotheism and polytheism for particular religions, I think we can go astray. For example, Islam in Indonesia has a nature of being polytheistic. Where do you find the real true Muslims? If you go to Mecca you might find them but in Saudi Arabia and

Iran, do we really have monotheism there? Or do we have indigenous religions as well?

In the period of the Shah, 20 or 30 years ago, it was still Persia so it was not an Islamic country but still Pagan. After the Khomeini revolution, it is still the current government of today. If we look at the European mass media, they always talk about Islamic fundamentalists. The original fundamentalists like the American Southerners, the Methodist Radicals. After the Khomeini revolution, it was the Western media that called it fundamentalist.

We should not define religions from our own perspectives. I accept Buddhism and we live hand in hand with Shinto in Japan. They are totally different but the Japanese people believe both of them put together. Do we call this polytheism?

**Professor Hashizume:** To Professor Badrinath, you were saying absolutism should be avoided and it is because monotheism is absolute that there is no dialogue and that is leading to problems. If you look at the world today, that perception seems right. But we are here today to engage in a dialogue. Personally I would like to see you embrace the monotheistic concept as well. About half of the world population goes along with monotheistic beliefs. It may be a fallible way of thinking but if you say from the very first that monotheistic belief is not as good or beneficial as polytheistic belief, I think you are shunning dialogue from the first. If monotheistic beliefs are so widespread, I believe there must be a reason for it. I believe we must engage that as well if there is to be a real dialogue.

What is the rationale behind monologue? Monotheism doesn't usually talk about diversity. Instead, it talks about complexity. People from polytheistic backgrounds see the world as diverse while people from monotheistic backgrounds see the world as a complex place. All monotheistic beliefs have in them a belief in the end of the world. That is why the rationality of this world and the rationality of the monotheistic faiths and the complexity of the world can coexist. The complexity of polytheistic cultures is expressed in diversity and they feel that because the world is so diverse there will not be an end to the world. I don't believe you can say that one is better.

**Professor Badrinath:** You see, this again indicates how, if our minds are occupied with words that have already acquired, over a long period of usage, fixed the meaning, then they will dominate all our perceptions. This dichotomy between poly- and mono-theism has been a standard debate for a long time. It was a standard debate between Christian missionaries and what they thought was Hinduism. It was in fact a one-sided debate because the Hindus were largely absent. I have written a book called *Finding Jesus in Dharma: Christianity in India*. It is a highly researched piece of work on the issues that came up when Western Christianity was introduced in India in the Sixteenth Century. Even now, many in Europe do not know that Christianity flourished in India at least three centuries before it started in Europe. It was in Kerala in 52 A.D. that St. Thomas arrived. These are now acknowledged facts. Earlier there was some skepticism, but now they are accepted as historical facts.

I would suggest is that if we get off this monotheism versus polytheism debate, and if we return to the central question, that the meanings of the words are also metaphorical, are symbolical, then we will understand more creatively. For example, we will understand the so-called multiplicity of gods in the Hindu fold. They are not deities; they are symbols. Symbols of aspects of human energy. It is not polytheism. It would be completely wrong to describe it that way.

Let us take the god Shiva. What is the meaning of the word Shiva? The etymological meaning of the word Shiva is 'goodness'. Shiva is therefore the symbol of goodness, benevolence. How is this goodness expressed? Generally there is a notion, and it is not only so now but also centuries ago, that 'goodness' has something to do with the clothes that a

man wears. So if I am in a natty three-piece suit and a grand shirt than I am a 'good' person. This notion of goodness, that it has anything to do with the clothes a man wears, Shiva discards. So in a dramatic way, he starts dressing himself in a most outrageous fashion—just to make a point. A second aspect of a good person is where one lives. I am sure that in Tokyo, too, there are certain addresses that indicate one's class. So the question, "Where do you live, sir?" and the answer will indicate that man's class. A 'class' then is identified with 'goodness'. Shiva rejects that Shiva as a symbol. He starts living in all sorts of places, even on a cremation ground, on those places that are out of bounds.

Thirdly, good people keep good company. I know kings, and generals, and princes and the chief executive officers of huge corporations, so I am a good person. I am keeping good company. Now Shiva rejects that, and that is the most important part. So he keeps company with dwarves and disfigured. They form the entourage of Shiva. See the symbol here. What is being said, in metaphorical language, is that he keeps the company of those who have been dwarfed by the personal experiences of their life, who are disfigured by life. We are hurt, we are dwarfed in some way. All of us are disfigured in some way by your life's experience. Shiva keeps company with us. So you see, this you can take up with reference to *Kali*, with *Durga*, with all of them. This is not polytheism. These words, 'polytheism' and 'monotheism', have created lots of misunderstanding. The so-called gods and goddesses are symbolical.

What you said is most important. It is the complexity part. Indian thought is perfectly sensitive to the complexity of life. Because life is lived at so many levels of consciousness, there cannot be any one statement about reality. In that sense we have to go beyond that. I am certain that those who are outwardly monotheists or absolutist are open to other possibilities because they are open to complexity. I am very glad that you introduced this notion of complexity because human situations are complex; so there cannot be any one judgment about them. But also, merely because they are complex does not mean that we cannot understand them. At the bottom of life, there is also a great simplicity. That is what makes the joy of life possible.

So my prayer to you is that let us free our minds of these usages, of these words that have for centuries acquired a definite meaning, because these meanings do not quite represent the reality.

**Professor Aoki:** At the bottom of the complexity you were trying to say that you find simplicity. I think that is similar to the Dharma concept. I would like to ask why you find so many different gods, personalities and deities in the Hindu religion. Also, the relationships of the gods are different. Gods do get redrawn and become different gods. However, they all come from one single source. I would like to understand your opinion on where this came from.

**Professor Badrinath:** If there are gods and goddesses, they are so with a small g, not with a capital G. Let us examine this in detail. Each one of them is a metaphor for complexities of life. Let us take *Durga*. In every Bengali home, in October around *Puja* time, resounds the sound of the *Durga-stuti*, 'the adoration of *Durga*'. If you really examine what the *shloka*s there say, you will find them having a certain structure. "To that energy that manifests itself in all beings, in the form of..., to that energy my salutations again, and again and yet again." And the blank is filled, in each *shloka*, with human attributes, which, with each subsequent *shloka*, keeps changing. They all are human attributes. Thus, "To that energy that manifests itself in all beings, in the form of... motherhood... faith... resolution... intelligence... hunger... thirst... desire, my salutations". They also include confusion, *moha*. Confusion also is being acknowledged as a natural part of human life.



About confusion, permit me. My computer-ji, if I may use an honorific with my computer, got so imbued with the spirit of the Mahabharata that it has started creating new words. The word was 'confusion' and I found it turned into a new word, 'funfusion.' I thought there is a definite teaching here. That is, confusion can also be fun. So when in confusion, have fun. Confusion is not something to be dreaded or be afraid of. Confusion, in this *Durga-stuti*, is also perceived as the manifestation of energy. It is a part of human life, and let us bow our heads to it as well.

These gods are all symbols, and Shiva particularly so.

**Professor Chandra:** Friends, the discussion is going on in a language called English but we are talking about concepts that have developed in Sanskrit. Sanskrit has a transparency of its own that English has lost. During the passing of centuries most European languages lost the etymological foundations, the original meaning of words. For instance, in the European languages there are four words for god. In the Germanic languages, *Gott*, God and so on. In the Romance languages, *Dieu*. In the Slavonic languages, *Bog*. In Greek, *Theos* or *Theos*. All the four words are significant if you take them to their etymology.

In Greek, *Theos* is originally *Theos* that goes back to Vedic word *dhishnyah* or the Supreme Illumination, the Enlightenment. It is the most ancient formulation of the divine because our religions are concerned with man, rising to the divine heights. Every day, every Hindu is supposed to read the gayatri that is an invocation to the Sun, that is we seek illumination.

The other word, God, or *Gott*, is from the Sanskrit root *hu*, to invoke. Wisdom has to be invoked.

So the word God is from the Sanskrit *hu* and the Indo-European *gheu* is Pagan as one who is invoked. When the Bible was first translated into the Gothic language—the first Germanic language into which the Bible was translated—the question arose as to how a Pagan word for God could be used? What Professor Chaturvedi has been saying is that metaphor is inherent in the word itself.

Coming to *Dieu*, or *Deus* in Latin, it is the shining Divine. The root *Div* means to shine, the *Deus* is the shining of the mind, the illumination of the mind. There is no element of the monotheistic God in the theological sense.

Instead of employing the words monotheism and polytheism, we should use the words 'Revelation' and 'Realization'. Revelation is the condescension of God unto you through an intermediary, which is a prophet. Realization is the ascension of the human being, as in Zen Buddhism, One ascends to one's divine being, one's divine persona. These two words, Revelation and Realization make concepts clearer. The intermediary in Revelation is more important than the Ultimate Divine. The intermediary prohibits any symbolic interpretation of the Ultimate Divine. In this scheme, the human being is immaterial. Accepting a point of time as sacred, and defining all the previous times as Barbarism, is crucial to the religions of Revelation. In the religions of Realization, the individual stands paramount. When *Bodhidharma* came to China and had a conversation with the Emperor, the Emperor was so infuriated by his pride and arrogance. *Bodhidharma* had to flee the Chinese capital for life.

The fourth Slavonic word, *Bog*, is from *Bhagavan*. *Bhaga* is the one who gives humans their due. He is the one from whom you seek the due. It is not his condescension but the ascension of a human being.

All the four words in European languages come from a Pagan period when 'God' had not dominated the scene. European terminology is not appropriate to discuss Hinduism or Buddhism. The modern usage of European words has acquired specific meanings in the last fifteen hundred years.

Our discussions are under the oppressive patronage of the English language, a Christian language. It is even more repressive than the socialist regime of the Soviet Union. We knew we were being oppressed but here we are willingly submitting to an invisible oppression.

Terminology has to be new to give a new direction to the dialogue. H.G. Wells wrote a famous book 'The Open Conspiracy'. As a part of the conspiracy, special institutions were established at Cambridge and Oxford—for example the Rhodes Fellowship. Some of the most influential politicians in the United States, India and other parts of the world have been beneficiaries of the Rhodes Fellowship. In this, they have projected a specific political theory couched in cultural terms.

To culture and politics another element of economy has been added under the name of globalization. The Downsizing of Asia is a part of globalization. We will have to develop a new terminology to discuss without injuring the sensibilities of anyone.

**Professor Hashizume:** We go back to etymology. Out of what was mentioned, I would like to pick up a few things for your discussion. Japanese people, ever since we have accepted Buddhism over 1000 years ago, have seriously followed the Buddhist philosophy. The Indian philosophy, Indian thinking is what Japanese people have made a serious effort to understand. Unfortunately, the language used was the Chinese language so therefore we had some problems. The conclusion is that Japan and India are similar from a certain point of view. As Professor Aoki mentioned, the collectiveness of the divine, the Buddha or gods of India have come to Japan and have changed their shape into the Japanese gods but they are the same gods. What this means is that the way of thinking and values of the Indian and Japanese people are very similar.

On the surface they are similar, but the essentials are probably different in some ways. For example, when we take Dharma, maybe the Japanese people are not aware of some of the principals between Japan and India.

**Professor Nara:** Let us look at the relationship towards these gods. We talked about monotheism and polytheism. The level of our worshipping these gods has been discussed at various levels.

In the West there have been local or folk religions and the gods that came out of these religions are of the similar character to those in Asia and Japan. From the very beginning, did we have the Christian God or the Buddhist Dharma or the Tao in Taoism? These are the so-called high-level religions.

It is true that in history the Christian God appeared or developed but it was not something that anyone made. In India amongst the various gods was born a belief in high-level gods. If you ask me why I cannot tell you why it happened. If we look at these gods from an analytical point of view, the belief in gods has grown from local religions to reach to very high supreme spiritualism.

As Professor Aoki mentioned, there is the dual level in the Christian culture, the worship of the Virgin Mary is an example. When we turn our attention to Buddhism people say it is more polytheistic but it is really the belief in dharma. With the development of Buddhism, there existed various different levels of gods. It looks polytheistic. But Dharma as the religious symbol is crucial and all forms of worship and doctrinal ideas are allied to it. At the same time a great many of objects of worship such as bodhisattvas, Hindu-origin gods and even local deities are accommodated entailing variety of the Buddhist pantheon ranging from existential level to folklore level.

Now let us talk about the gods in Japan. The Japanese gods are folkloric gods.

Buddhism was imported into Japan amongst these folkloric gods. Professor Hashizume said that unfortunately the Chinese language came in between Japan and Indian Buddhism. Apart from it being fortunate or not, Buddhism that came into Japan was in fact a Chinese version, a Chinese characteristic.

I think it would not be right to connect the Chinese Buddhism with the Indian Buddhism. What was imported to Japan was Sino Indian Buddhism especially so with Zen that is 100 percent Chinese culture.

When we look at Chinese culture that came into Japan, that is Buddhism that came into Japan, China was above Japan in the cultural level so everything came into Japan as if water coming down. From that point of view, we have accepted different cultures very easily. Of course, if it were totally unacceptable it would have been rejected. It has actually changed over the years to settle into Japan as the Buddhism practiced in Japan.

From that point of view, the Buddhist pantheon that evolved over the years, from a religions level, we have the folklore level and together with that we have a very high level Buddhism in Japan.

Buddhist scholars talk about 'satori' or 'gedatsu' i.e. realization and religious faith but the general people think of Buddhism as where you go for funerals and where you go for religions ceremonies. So there is a difference in the levels of religions and culture.

**Professor Aoki:** What professor Nara said, I completely agree with. However I have mentioned earlier, the national Shintoism that developed and formed strongly with the establishment of modern Japan as nation-state takes its roots also from animism, that the same sort of worship in nature you can find all over Asia. A faith which finds gods anywhere and everywhere. That is a very universal way of worship that could be found in the almost whole of the Asian and European continents basically. The basic religious feeling of the people is not monotheism that is a later development. And it is very important fact this basic feeling is very common among people in all over the world, I suppose. It is a very tolerant and friendly not among people but also the nature and environment which, I think, truly important for them.

**Professor Nara:** Professor Aoki mentioned a new direction in this dialogue. Even in polytheism I believe there are some things central that are not to change and high-level doctrines. Myself being a Buddhist monk, I do think the actual religious customs and beliefs, more or less folkloric or Shintoistic, which has entered into the day to day life of the people is valuable. There is a tendency to think that the religion of the people is worthless. From the perspective of the Zen Buddhist, high-level faith is essential. In addition to that, I think that worships of the people and the beliefs of the people are also valuable and I put the highest value to the Buddhist faith but at the same time I don't want to say that the religion of the people should not be taken into account. The religion of Asia is 'this and that.' The religion of monotheism is 'this or that.'

**Professor Chandra:** Many issues have been raised, including how dharma should be translated. It was translated as 'ho' into Chinese and subsequently into Japanese. The word for dharma 'ho' stands not only for dharma but also for ritual, as ritual was the dominant element in the Confucian system. Most of the Buddhist terminology developed in the Han dynasty. For example the word for monastery was the word for a government office. The transcription of words during the Han period followed the transcription prescribed by the state for translating foreign names of Central Asia. During the Han period, the Chinese had active relations with Central Asian states for procuring horses. In 111 BC, four commanderies

were established on the borders of China. Large armies resided in these commanderies, and they used to bring horses from what is now the Uzbek Islam. Buddhism came to China as part of the state. The first Buddhist monastery in China was the White Horse Monastery. The white horse symbolized the emperor in Buddhism.

The Chinese language does not lend itself to the complexity of Buddhist thought. Many of the sutras translated from Sanskrit into Chinese are approximations. They are not exact translations like Tibetan. But the Chinese had a living tradition of Indian teachers who explained the texts to them. The Chinese texts are one of the reasons that there is a difference between the Japanese and Indian perception of Buddhism. The interaction of India and Japan was through intermediaries—first China, and then Champa for dance and music.

The first constitution of Japan was consecrated by Shotoku Taishi using a Sanskrit manuscript of the hymn for supreme victory. Probably it came from Champa.

**Question 1:** Hinduism is believed to be a national response and I have a rather primitive question about the cosmos and the human. Who is believed to have created the cosmos and men in your religion? Also, in your faith there are many gods. Who created so many deities in India?

**Professor Badrinath:** Your question is very interesting, about who created these hundreds of gods and goddesses. Of course, human beings did. And the human imagination is something extraordinary. As I was saying, all of them are metaphorical. Language has got to be metaphorical. If it is too literal, we miss the meaning.

May I narrate to you a story? In the Mahabharata, there is a sage called *Devala*. He had a daughter. Her name was Suvarchala. When she came of age, he asked her, "Dear daughter, what kind of man would you want as your husband?" She said, "I want as my husband a man who is blind and who is also not blind."

The father thought, "What kind of mad talk is this!" He said, "You must be crazy". She said, "Please do not get angry. You asked me a question and I gave you an honest answer."

He said, "I am not getting angry, but if that is the kind of man you want for a husband, you will remain unmarried for the rest of your life because such a man does not exist in this world—who is blind and not blind."

The father was a great scholar, but, with apologies to scholars who tend sometimes to be very literal, he has taken too literally what the daughter had said. The next day, a young man arrives at her house and says, "My name is Svetaketu. I believe I am the man you are looking for as your husband." She says, "Please explain yourself." He says, "I am blind, that there is no doubt. That I am not blind, of that there is no doubt either." She got quite interested and asked him to explain further. Svetaketu then lists the things of the world to which he is blind. And he lists the things of the world of which he is intensely aware—which he intensely sees. She says to him, "Will you go to my father and ask for my hand formally?" And they get married. They live a happy life—and have brilliant conversations.

Trust me. For a few moments you can take me to be a reliable guide and I will not mislead you. In one of their conversations, Suvarchala asked, "What is the relationship between a letter and a word? And what is the relationship between a word and a sentence? Where does the meaning really lie? Are meanings fixed for all time or do they change?" Her point of view really is that the meaning does not lie in words alone. That is true in all languages of the world.

Let us take the word 'darling.' It is a word of endearment, affection, love. But spoken in a particular tone, it can be sarcastic, an instrument almost of aggression. So the meaning is not in the word but in the tone, in the look, in the entire context. Meaning is metaphorical, not



merely literal. This is of utmost importance in all human relationships.

Please do not misunderstand Suvarchala. She was a brilliant woman. She knew of course that some words must have a definite meaning. Tomato cannot also mean potato, if it did, I cannot go and buy vegetables. Airport cannot mean railroad station. But, in the deeper things of life—when she said that blind and not blind—she was referring to something else. She was saying that she wanted a man who could ignore certain things in life but who was intensely aware of certain others.

So you see, about these gods and goddesses, the whole trouble has been that Christianity and Christian missionaries—more so than Islam—took it literally that they were 'deities' that they are put to sleep in the evening and woken up in the morning. But they are symbolical.

Let me ask you, "What the flag of a country is?" Outwardly, it is nothing but a piece of cloth with some colors and patterns on it. But that is not all a flag is. It is a symbol: of a people, of their history, of their sovereignty, of their emotions. And we know that many people have died protecting the dignity of the flag of their country. A flag is a symbol. If we can understand this, then I think this multiplicity of Indian gods and goddesses can be great fun. The whole trouble is that we no longer have a sense of fun, a sense of laughter. The way to look at this, I submit to you, is to see how fertile human imagination can be, how very productive. But to concentrate on only one thing is to invite violence.

**Professor Hashizume:** How do you evaluate the science and democracy that evolved out of Christianity? Was Christianity a benefit in accepting Democracy?

**Professor Badrinath:** On the contrary, science did not develop out of Christianity but in opposition to it. Science was no part of Christian theology, or of attitudes. Christianity was saying, "This is the truth." Science was saying, "It has to be examined. It has to be investigated. And that has to be done in empirical terms. It cannot be done merely as a theological belief." Science was in determined opposition to the Church. In the beginning, some of the scientists were put to death. Galileo, the father of modern science, barely survived because he had a friend in the Pope and the Pope did not want to harm him. The Pope asked Galileo to make a retraction, just for the sake of form, which Galileo did and regretted.

Indian thought demonstrates how the Indian mind was scientific from the Upanishads onwards. The Upanishad was rooted in empirical reality and proceeds from there. To India, modern science in fact imposes no challenge. Of course, Indians can also be thoroughly irrational. They can be madly irrational. But then, what is rational and who decides what rational is?

**Professor Chandra:** Democracy is a Greek word. It means power of the People, *demos* and *kratos*. Democracy essentially is the gift of the Roman state to 19<sup>th</sup> century Europe. The evolution of the British Parliament as a democratic institution goes back to the early 19<sup>th</sup> century after the Greek and Latin classics were rediscovered. The monuments of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, like the Brandenburg Gate, the Champs d'Elysees, are monuments in Greek architecture. Most of the political formulations of the 19<sup>th</sup> century were invented in Greek times. The difference is that the Greeks had city-states, but nation-states evolved out of city-states in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. For example, the unification of Germany under Bismarck. This process went on and on. Feudalism too was part of the Roman heritage of Europe.

**Question 2:** About Kashmir, I may put the problem briefly in perspective. Before 1947, there

was no partition. We lived together. It was a united India. When Independence was granted, unfortunately there was this idea put forward of Muslims as a nation and Hindus as a nation. India never accepted this and wanted to be a secular country. When we have more than 140 million Muslims today, even after partition. India has the second highest numbers of Muslims of any country in the world, much more even than Pakistan. So India has never accepted this aspect of partition whereas Pakistan has been founded as a Muslim republic.

When Independence was to be granted, all the kingdoms were given the option of whether to join India or Pakistan. The kingdom of Kashmir, the Maharaja acceded to India that was legally approved by the then Governor-General. But Pakistan has not accepted this and sent in tribal invaders in 1948 and has been trying ever since 1965.

If we are to divide India again, what do we do with its 140 million Muslims? Another partition is not in the interest of anybody so we do not accept the partition of India based on religion. Because Pakistan does not accept this and has been trying territorial expansion. Pakistan's attempt has been to annex Kashmir and because that has not succeeded, it has been trying to use violence. For the last 12 or 14 years, unfortunately it has taken the form of terrorism.

**Professor Chandra:** You know Kashmir is a bilateral problem. As the representative from India pointed out, the Indian point of view is clear, that we do not accept partition on religious grounds. Even when the partition took place on religious grounds we did not subscribe to it. The Muslims in India who opted for India stayed on in India. On the contrary, Pakistan said no Hindu would live in Pakistan. Today there are around 200,000 Hindus living in Pakistan under very dire circumstances.

For internal political reasons, Pakistan wants to keep the issue alive. Pakistan is run by the higher class. India is governed by the middle class and it has a very wide base. In Pakistan a middle class has not been formed. So long as Pakistan is governed by dictatorship, by persons of the rich oligarchy, the problem will remain. Someday Pakistan will have a vibrant democracy, and the interests of the middle class will be peace between the two nations. The illegal trade figures between the two nations are tremendous. The Pakistan ambassador once told me that if our ladies could come to India they would buy all your saris. I said please send them. We would be happy because they will be our friends. They will come from the highest families in Pakistan, and contribute to closer relations between the two countries.

It is a complicated problem and it may not be solved only through a dialogue. With the passing of time, with a strong middle class emerging in Pakistan, whose interest lies in peace and not violence, the problem will be solved.

**Question 3:** You haven't had any military attacks on the parliament or coup d'etat. Why?

**Professor Chandra:** India's freedom is rooted in democracy. The constitution was framed from 1947-1950. As soon as it came into force, there were elections. The outcome of the elections depends on the people. In India we have not had a coup for the simple reason that democracy is very strong and no army can afford to bulldoze, or override the will of the people. They know it will assert itself. In India, democracy is not just an externality but it is deeply rooted.

**Professor Badrinath:** Again, if you study the Mahabharata, there is a four-line *shloka*. Translated, it says:

*That assembly is no assembly which does not have in it elders.  
Those who do not speak according to dharma are no elders.  
That dharma is no dharma which is not rooted in truth,  
and that truth is no truth which is full of deviousness or cunning.*

These four lines can be inscribed at the gates of any parliament in the world. I think the *shloka* about parliament could even be inscribed at the entrance of the Diet in Japan. This is not religion; it is the roots of all democracy. Democracy is not merely elections. That is merely the outward form of it. The philosophy is that authority must be subject to law and that law is not what the state decides it will be, but it must be rooted in truth and the welfare of the people.

In the Mahabharata, there is a long discussion on the foundations of law and governance. It is not theology. It is not religion. We move onto a totally different ground. The fundamental principle is that the state is not sovereign, dharma is. That dharma is sovereign means that nothing which degrades, uproots, separates, does violence, can ever be a good foundation of law. In India the roots of democracy are very, very deep, for at least three millennia. If you see the history of the west, you see democracy does not have these kinds of roots.

It is also true, though, India is a huge country. Monier-Williams once advised the Christian missionaries coming to India that, "India is a whole universe in which you can find every kind of human tendency represented—and sometimes in their extreme form." Now, don't quote me. I would say that India is not a country. (Well, of course it is.) It is a state of being. It is a whole universe where the human problems are being created, discussed, and analyzed. But all are subject to the principle of dharma.

**Professor Hashizume:** We have come to the time we have to close our session. Indian democracy has a very deep root but the conflict between India and Pakistan is coming to a dangerous place. Both countries have nuclear weapons and we are very concerned, as the country where the atomic bomb was drop, I would like to ask the Indians whether there is anything we can do, as Japanese to help.

**Professor Badrinath:** Once again, trust me. Indians and Pakistanis belong to the same stock. We have the same habits of using the language, the same sensibilities. What is common between them is that language has become an art form. Rhetoric has become a substitute for real substance. Rhetoric is a great art form both in India and Pakistan. I can assure you, my Japanese friends, that the Indians and Pakistanis will totally exhaust themselves by the rhetoric of war, but there will be no war.

**Professor Aoki:** There are many things I would like to ask about contemporary India, including the very troubled and serious *Ayodhya* issue. I am very interested in the *manu* doctrine that Professor Badrinath talked about, the *manu* scriptures. As we go through 'global civilizations', if such a thing is to be born, I feel that these laws should be reflected upon, and how we create them in new form for the 21<sup>st</sup> century human being, it will become very beautiful and variable. Looking at the deep rootedness of democracy in this cultural investigation would reveal, I feel it could be in some basic part based on the law found and interested in ancient India.

**Professor Badrinath:** I am deeply struck, in the three days I have been here, with the deep elegance of the Japanese people. Elegance is not always of clothes but also the elegance of

attitudes and the elegance of manners. And elegance is a part of truth and of goodness. Hence, the formula, "*What is true, is also good. And what is good, is also beautiful.*" I think the Japanese people are very beautiful people.