VOL. XVII. No. 5. MAY 1921. WHOLE No. 191.

19 JUL 1922

ॐ

The Jaina Gazette.

The highest object of life we take to be, to form a manly character, and to work out the best development possible, of body and spirit—of mind, conscience, heart and soul. This is the end; all else must be regarded as the means. Accordingly that is not the most successful life in which a man gets the most pleasure, the most money, the most power or place, honour or fame, but that in which a man gets the most manhood, and performs the greatest amount of useful work and of human duty.

—*Smiles.*

The Presidential Address.*

OF

Prof. A. Chakravarti, M.A., I.E.S.,

GENTLEMEN,

I thank you heartily for the honor you have done me by asking me to preside over this Conference. It is certainly a great privilege to me to be of some service to the Jaina Community in South India. It is my great desire to wake up this small and interesting body of men, in order that they may also gird up their loins and march onwards to that goal of intellectual eminence and literary importance which were the precious possession of their forefathers.

---

* The Second Annual Session of the Jain Mahasabha; Arni, 22nd and 23rd May, 1921.

But my optimism received a rude shock of late. Our Community sustained a great and irreparable loss. Two of our benefactors are snatched away from us by the cruel hand of Death. Mr. A. P. Chandranatha Nainar of Mel-Malayanur who devoted all his attention and resources for the elevation of the Jains in South India passed away during the year. It is a great loss to the Community, for the regeneration of the Jains here depended a good deal on his earnestness and enthusiasm for the welfare of the Community. The institution which he started—the hostel for Jain Students at Tindivanam—will I hope, have the support of all the generous members of the Jaina Society. Further many such institutions are needed in order to meet the growing demands of the Jaina students. I appeal to the rich land-lords and merchants to provide such educational facilities for our young men.

The other loss was in the person of Kumar Devendra Prasada of Arrah. He was the hope of the Jains throughout the land. This loss is not merely local but continental. He was the guiding spirit of the Central Jaina Publishing House, Arrah. Through his exertions many an important work was thrown open to European Scholars. It is very difficult to think of anybody who will be able to take his place.

Both of them were my intimate friends. The personal loss to me is very great. They had been not only my friends but inspirers of faith and hope in moments of despair. They have departed, but the duty of continuing their work lies with us. May we have the capacity and courage for the task.

Gentlemen, if you would only know the sublime philosophy and the sweet and noble doctrines contained in the Religion which you have inherited from your forefathers and which you profess to follow now, you would not stay any longer self-satisfied and self sufficient in that intellectual lethargy which is the peculiar malady of the present-day Jains. India has entered into the career of progress—political and industrial. The different communities which go to build up the nation have caught that spirit and are preparing to move onwards. There is a general scramble for power and wealth. Everybody wants to avail himself of the educational facilities that exist and asks for more. There is a general national longing to gain a place in the Sun. It is a hopeful sign of the times, for, intellectual unrest is a necessary and desirable mark of

a growing nation. The Community which is apathetic and forgets the call of duty will be stranded on the path of progress and finally go to the wall. To avoid such a calamity you have to be on the alert and move with the moving pilgrims towards the national goal.

Jainism is one of the several important *Darshanas* of Indian thought. It had a flourishing existence at the time when Gautama Buddha began to preach his Religion. It is clear from the Buddhistic records and from the warning given by Buddha himself to his disciples to beware of the existing religion of Nirgrantha Jnataputra or Mahavira that Jainism is much anterior to Buddhism. That it is an off-shoot of Buddhism is an historical heresy which no student of history would care to subscribe to. Oriental Scholars who have done some research work in the field tell us that this Religion has a hoary history of its own. It is probably as ancient as the most ancient faiths of the Aryans. I would not care to emphasise the historicity of the Jaina Darshana had it not been for the fact that even educated Indians readily accept unfounded historical statements far remote from truth. I am not one to believe that the value of a thing depends upon the length of its life. A lily of a day may be fairer far than an oak of hundred years. Defence of a religion on the score of historicity is not in itself a sound argument. It must be judged on its own intrinsic merits. The capacity of its philosophy to offer satisfaction to our intellectual doubts, the purity of its ethics to sustain our ideals and aspirations in life are the necessary standards by which a Religion would be judged. Even according to this test Jainism is second to none.

In ancient India there were several philosophico-religious schools or *Darsanas*. These are mainly eight in number-Sankhya and Yoga, Nyaya and Vaisheshika, Mimamsa and Vedanta, Bauddha and Jaina. All these religious schools of thought have this in commun—that the world of Samsara is intrinsically evil and misery and the goal of life is to escape from it. The ancient thinkers lost that naive and simple faith of the Vedic Aryans. Religion was no more the convenient commerce with the Gods. During the Upanishadic age mainly through the initiation of the Kshatriya thinkers religious consciousness was turned inwards. The outer world with all its Kaleidoscopic change was relegated

to an insignificant place in the scheme of reality. There was an earnest desire to unnavel the knot of human death and fate

"And look—a thousand Blossoms with the day
Woke—and a thousand scatter'd into clay:"

"Think, in this battered Caravanserai
Whose Doorways are alternate Night and day
How Sultan after Sultan with his pomp
Abode his Hour or two and went his way."

Thus they were aware of the uncertainties of the world around.

"One thing is certain, and the Rest is Lies;
The flower that once has blown for ever dies."

Perplexed by the unending cycle of births and deaths, weighed down with the ennui of life, the ancient Indian thinker approached the Sphinx of reality with undaunted courage and faith. There were not wanting philosophers of weariness of the type of the Persian Sufi. There were schools such as the Lokayathas the Charvakas or the Barhaspathyas who were grossly materialistic. Uncertain of the unborn tomorrow and the dead yesterday they were mostly concerned with the sweet to-day. They boldly preached the pleasures of the present. The goal of life for them consisted in enjoying the worldly pleasures.

"Why all the Saints and Sages who discuss'd
Of the two worlds so learnedly are thrust
Like foolish Prophets forth; their Words to Scorn
Are Scatter'd, and their Mouths are stopt with Dust."

Hence they asked their followers to "make the most of what we yet may spend, before we too into the dust descend." For fools there is reward neither here nor there. They did not recognise the Paradise beyond the present. Hence the elements of bliss were of such stuff as loaf of bread and flask of wine.

Such materialistic schools of thought were condemned as Nastika Schools by Indian thinkers. They are born of intellectual despondence and metaphysical bankruptcy. The Astika Schools were the ones mentioned early. These were at one in their common belief in the World beyond, in the possibility of reaching it. They are all attempts to describe the path to the great hereafter. "The other-worldliness" which is sometimes considered to

be a philosophical weakness is just the kernel of Truth in all the Astika Darsanas. I need not repeat that Jaina Darsana is no mean member of that body of Astik Darsanas.

Let me say a few words as to the exact place which it occupies among the systems of Indian thought. Sankhya Darsana starts with the assumption of two kinds of reality *Chetana* and *Achetana*, *Purusha* and *Prakriti*. *Prakriti* or *Pradhana* is the primeval substance from which the whole Cosmos is evolved. It is not only the stuff that constitutes the stars and planets of the heavens but also the bodies of living beings. Nay. The Sankhya system curiously attempts to derive Buddhi and Ahankara and such like psychological principles from the same non-thinking *Prakriti*. The thoughts and emotions which agitate our minds, the ideals and aspirations which spring in our hearts, the conduct of living beings in general are all the outcome of this *achetana prakriti*, with its three *Gunas*, *Sattva*, *Rajasa* and *Tamasa*. Thus attributing all changes in the living and non-living to *pradhana* the Sankhya thinker described *Purusha* as the eternal spectator of this Cosmic Drama. Each individual human being is thus a duality. The inner Purusha is living in the tabernacle of his body which is a modification of Prakriti. Samsara or the Cycle of births and deaths with its misery and evil is but the result of the mighty causation; and Liberation from Samsara consists mainly in the differentiating knowledge of Viveka Jnana. This Viveka Jnana means the realisation of the *purusha* as distinct from *prakriti* as free from the *prakriti gunas* that lead to Samsara and evil. This Kapila Darsana being a rationalistic system of thought repudiates the popular conception of the Creator and the theory of creation. Hence it is technically known as Nir-Iswara Sankhya, as distinguished from Yoga which is Se-Iswara Sankhya. This latter accepts the metaphysical foundation of the former but supplements it with the conception of Iswara to satisfy the popular religious demands. It mainly consists in prescribing certain methods of Yoga or Self-Realisation leading to Samadhi.

Nyaya and Vaiseshika are mainly logical systems. This logical aspect we are not concerned with here. The philosophy and religion therein are relevent to our purpose. They recognise many of the Sankhya doctrines. They accept the reality of the material world and individual souls. But they explain these as

due to the creation by an Iswara. In many respects these systems may be said to be the foundation of popular religions.

The other two schools are much more important for us. The Mimamsa of Jaimini is a struggle to revive the dignity and importance of the Vedic Sacrifices. Probably it represents a strenuous struggle to retain the Brahminical rituals. This system is also at one with Sankhya in denying the existence of an Iswara or a creator. The Ultimate existence is *Sabda* which is eternal. The Vedas are the *Sabda*. They are not due to any person divine or human. This *veda apaureshia* is the ultimate standard of conduct. What is enjoined therein is to perform certain sacrificial rites or *Yagas*. These rites are binding on human beings. The Swaraga or heavenly bliss is obtained by the help of the occult potency or Apurva which is the result of sacrifice. Philosophically it is realistic and pluralistic and religiously it is a bare ritualistic system.

The most popular of the Darsanas is Vedanta. It is mainly of two kinds—*Advaita* and *Visishtadvaita*. The former is associated with Sankara and the latter with Ramanuja. According to Sankara's Advaitism the whole world including things and persons is a manifestation of the absolute *Brahman*. Brahman is the only and the ultimate reality and everything else is but a shadow of this. Starting with the Sankhya dualism of Purusha and Prakriti, the two fundamental principles of reality according to that system, Sankara proceeds by integrating all the Purushas into one Brahman and by converting the Prakriti into Maya, a kind of real-unreal something of which the world is constituted. At the touch of the magic-wand of his philosophy the concrete world of things and persons is transformed into a shadow-show, behind which lies hidden the only and ultimate reality the quality-less and absolute Brahman. Starting with the ostensible object of explaining the concrete world of things and persons Advaitism in the hands of Sankara ends into an empty abstraction which offers neither philosophical satisfacti n nor religious consolation. No wonder Sankara is very often accused as a veiled Buddhist.

Ramanuja's School tries to avoid the extremes of Advaitism on the one hand and the popular Puranic religion on the other hand. It stands for the reality of the concrete world of things and persons. Things are not empty shadows and personality is not self-delusion. Recognising the reality of the concrete world

it tries in a fairly satisfactory way to explain the same by associating it with the Brahman. The term Brahman implies in this system two aspects—the soul and the body of the Highest. The former is the transcendental *Chetana-swarupa* of which the concrete world of persons and things is the body. The whole world is thus contemplated to be a Purusha or *Purushotama*.

Now let us see in what respects Jaina Darsana resembles the above systems. It is at one with them in believing that the world of Samsara is the result of Karma or evil and that the *summum bonum* of life consists in obtaining Nirvana or liberation from Karma. It differs from the other systems in its Moksha Marga or the Path of Salvation. It vehemently repudiates the principle of Vedic sacrifice which is elevated to a philosophical principle by the Mimamsikas. Its uncompromising antagonism to animal sacrifice even in the name of religion permeates all its departments of metaphysics and ethics. It is the religion of *Ahimsa par excellence*. In this respect we must note an important distinction between Jainism and Buddhism, which latter is also known as the Religion of Ahimsa. Strangely the principle of Ahimsa in the hands of the Buddhists has degenerated into grotesque religious camoflouge. Protesting against the shedding of blood in the name ef God and Religion the Buddhist would not utter even a murmur of disapproval when animals are slaughtered for his own purpose. It is for the purpo e of repudiating this claim of the Buddhists that it is no sin to purchase meat in the market that the author of *Kural* remarks.

தினற்பொருட்டாற் கொல்லாதுலகெனின் யாரும்
விலைபொருட்டா லூன்றருவாரில்.

Metaphysically Jainism is distinct from Buddhism in as much as it maintains the reality of the world and human personality.

In these respects Buddhism more resembles Advaitism than any other system. The same author praises the principle of Ahimsa as being superior to Vedic sacrifices.

அவிசொரிந் தாயிரம் வேட்டலி னொன்ற
னுயிர்செகுத் துண்ணுமை நன்று.

In the definition of a Brahmin he expresses the same idea.

அந்தண ரென்போ ரற வோர்மற் றெவ்வுயிர்க்குஞ்
செந்தண்மை பூண்டொழு கலான்.

Except Buddhism and Advaitism all the other systems are realise in as much as they accept the reality of the external world and

human personality. Jainism also is realistic in its philosophy, for it repudiates the Buddhistic and Advaitic suggestion that the world is a shadow and human personality an empty dream. It resembles the Sankhya system in maintaining the distinction between *Purusha* and *Prakriti*, Chetana and Achetana things. But it differs from the same in maintaining that the *Purusha* is not an impotent spectator tied down to a chariot of *Prakriti*, but a powerful and an active agent to make or mar his own spiritual destiny. It resembles the Nyaya and Vaiseshika systems in believing the atomic constitution of the physical world but it rejects their crude suggestion that the world is created by the fiat of a Will. It resembles Mimamsa in its emphasis on conduct as an important means of Salvation. But, conduct here does not mean performing Yagas but a sacrifice of a more sublime and personal nature, the sacrifice of destroying one's own Karmic dross by the fire of *Tapas*. It resembles the Vedanta in maintaining that the whole living world has the devine spiritual principle Atma but it rejects the suggestion that the individual Atma is an illusory existence. Again it resembles Vedantism in maintaining the idea of godhood as absolute freedom from Karmic *Upathi*, but does not accept that the Paramatma in that state is without qualities. On the other hand the Paramatma has an infinite number of qualities. Again while the Vedic systems emphasise one or the other of faith, knowledge and conduct, Jainism alone maintains that these are individually and severally inefficient as means of Salvation but when they are present in their form conjointly they constitute the *Moksha Marga*. Belief without knowledge would be blind and and knowledge without conduct would be impotent and useless and conduct without both would be aimless. Hence the *Moksha Marga* or the path leading to liberation is constituted by Right Belief, Right Knowledge and Right Conduct. In the words of Umaswami, "*Samayk Darsana Jnana Charitrani Moksha Margaha.*"

The Religion that stands for peace, harmony and love contributed a good deal to the culture and civilisation of the land. In ancient and medieval India there were many followers of this faith going about the country carrying the torch-light of civilisation. What is the condition of the present day Jains? Educationally they are extremely backward. They have not availed themselves of the opportunities offered by the Government for

Secondary and Higher Education. A community which is thoroughly unacquainted with the Science and Literature of the West will not be fit to survive in the struggle for existence. Is the condition of the Jains any better in respect of indigenous Indian literature ? Their forefathers enriched the Tamil Literature by their Classical Contributions. Their works even now serve as standards of literary beauty and grandeur. Their contributions to the Canarese Literature are equally important. In the field of Sanskrit and Prakrit they held a very eminent place. But it is a very deplorable thing to see that the people at present are incapable of understanding many of the works. It is highly regretable to note that many valuable works are fast disappearing out of existence on account of the ignorance and carelessness of the Jains. It would be a great national calamity if such works are not conserved in time because many a gap in Indian history awaits to be filled in and many an aspect of Indian thought remains to be elucidated through the discovery of the Jaina history and literature to the learned world. I would therefore earnestly appeal to the many Jains assembled here to collect and preserve all the available manuscripts, Tamil, Canarese, Sanskrit and Prakrit so that they may not be lost to the world utterly. Once there was at least the tradition of having a library of sacred literature in every temple in every village. But even the practice of collecting of such Agamas in places of worship is fast dying out. The old world notion that the sacred books should not be published to the world though quite foreign to Jaina faith and tradition is still clinging to the minds of some persons. Even the Tirthankaras who were the fountain source of all the Sacred Wisdom did not hesitate to reveal the Truth to the world without any restriction; for they went about preaching the Law to all irrespective of distinction of birth and rank. It is a strange irony of fate that the very same Truth is kept as a devine secret which ought not to be revealed. If the Jains are to be true to the teachings of their religion they must try to publish all the available books for the benefit of the literary world. In this respect there must be a central publishing organisation to control and issue authoritative editions of important Jaina works belonging to the different departments of literature, philosophy, Science, and Religion. Such an organisation implies the co-operation of the wealthy merchants and learned pundits. I take this opportunity

to mention the fact that there are many valuable historical and scientific works in palmyra manuscripts the publication of which the Government may very well subsidise and thus place them within the reach of scholars.

In conclusion I appeal to you, gentlemen, that you should concentrate all your energies and resources for the education and progress of your community. You should not and cannot afford to indulge in the political vagaries which happen to be the fashion of the day. Immediately you must strive hard to establish hostels for students similar to the one at Tindivanam in places like Arni and Conjeevaram finally you must try to establish a large hostel in Madras City for the benefit of Jain students desiring to have university education. The necessity of such institutions cannot be too much emphasised. Poor as the community is in South India to supply this want is not beyond its means. If you really care for the intellectual and political advancement of your community, if you cherish the welfare of your brethren as a desirable ideal, then you will forget all your individual differences and private factions and heartily co-operate to attain the desired end.

The Place of Jainism in the System of Indian Philosophy.

WITH all their commendable zeal for bringing to light what lies in the almost impenetrable darkness of the Past, the antiquarians are sometimes apt to engage themselves in the impossible task of fixing definite dates,—A.D's or B.C's——, for events or social phenomena which admit of no such thing. Scholars, for example, have contended about the point of time, when for the first time rationalistic criticism began to be applied to the system of Vedic rituals. Some of them have regarded those vedic hymns which show the existence of rationalism and philosophising, side by side with the vedic ceremonials and polytheism, as interpolations of a later date,——as if philosophy must have suddenly taken its birth at a certain, determinable point of time or on a given fine morning. Equally hot and animated has been the dispute among the scholars, regarding the priority of Jainism and Buddhism,——some holding that the former originated from

the latter and was later in origin while others contending that Jainism had a pre-Buddhistic existence. With all due deference to the sincere spirit with which they carry on these discussions,—we venture to submit that not a small part of such disputations is not only valueless, though highly interesting, but is grounded on a misconception of the nature of philosophical development in a country.

For if critical spirit is one of the distinguishing features of human nature, it is certainly not unsafe to hold that some sort of rationalism and philosophising is ever present in a society,——present, even when the society seems to wallow hopelessly in its system of unmeaning rituals. Indeed, Ritualism itself seems to have been in its inception an advance of a crude form of Rationalism upon the beast-like stupor of social infancy. A spirit of criticism, an inclination to go beyond the customary morality and evolve ever higher and higher ideals, is present in every stage of society, though it may lack in eloquent utterance.

It is thus impossible to find out the birth-date of philosophy. Even the germs of the different schools of philosophy must have been present long before their so-called founders. It is erroneous, for example, to suppose that Buddhism and Jainism began with Buddha and Vardhamana (Mahavira). No,——the fundamental and essential principles of these two systems had been germinating long before those two great personages. It was their glorious mission to give utterance to those principles, to hold up before the world their attractiveness and grandeur and above all, to popularise them. That was, we think, what they did and no more. As regards their fundamental problems and principles, the two systems might be said to have existed long before Buddha and Vardhamana saw the light of day; both the systems are old,——indeed, as old as the Upanishads.

The allegation that Jainism and Buddhism have no records, contemporaneous with the Upanishats and cannot, for that reason be said to be as old as the latter, need not detain us. The Upanishats did not break with the Vedas openly and had accordingly by far the largest number of followers. The non-Vedic systems must at first have been timid and must have been long waiting for the opportunity to express themselves. But as systems of thought they must have existed at the time of the Upanishats. It is ridiculous to suppose that when thinking men began to think out their

religion, they found out only one line viz., that of the Upanishats. No,——the thought was free and it must have found out the non-orthodox lines too, and certainly, the Upanishadic doctrines cannot be said to be of easier approach than the others so that the former might necessarily have been thought out earlier.

If we now suppose the orthodox and the non-orthodox systems to have evolved and developed side by side we can well expect a number of common principles and problems among them. It is therefore always advisablew hen studying any particular system of Indian philosophy, to compare it with the other prominent systems that have prevailed in the land.

Jainism, though little studied and appreciated in Bengal has a really glorious place among the philosophical systems of India. The Jain Philosophy moreover is a complete system. It contains all the branches of Philosophical Knowledge. The Vedanta does not teach you logic. The Vaiseshika does not give you rules of conduct. But Jainism has its logic, its metaphysics, its ethology, its theology and so on. It is certainly a brilliant system of ancient thought. The study of Indian philosophy is incomplete, if this system is lost sight of.

The plan of our studying Jainism is thus indicated. It would as we say, be a comparative study. This is, no doubt, a very difficult task, involving as it does a *thorough* knowledge of all the Indian systems. But we mean to touch here only the fundamental problems.

By way of just describing the Jaina position, we propose the following comparative estimate. Save and except the so-called philosophical system of Jaimini, most of the prominent Indian systems either expressly or impliedly criticise the implicit faith in the ritualistic Vedas. Indeed all philosophy is a continuous struggle of Reason against Faith. From the standpoint of this principle, let us take the Indian systems one by one and judge their main problems. It must, however, be borne in mind that the evolution of Indian philosophy in the undermentioned way is only logical and not chronological.

The extreme opposition to the never ending systems of apparently meaningless Vedic rituals is of course embodied in the iconoclastic Charvaka doctrines. In every society there must be some protestant non-conformists and even the ancient Vedic society was not an exception to the rule. Indeed it was not—as

it never is—very difficult to attack in scathing terms, the simple practices, inculcated in the Vedas. The thinking and philosophising mind can not long remain satisfied with them. And the first outburst of criticism would simply consist in unrelenting ridicule of sacrificial inculcations. This is Charvakism—a ruthless negativing of the Karma-Kanda of the Vedas. It is a system of denials. Like the sophism of Greece, it seldom tried to establish any consistent theory of the Universe as a whole. Its business was to destroy, to criticise, to negative,—yes, "to bury" and "not to praise."

If the Vedas believed in a supermundane existence, the Charvaka thinkers cast doubts on the doctrine. Reference is made to such an agnostic position in 6—second Valli of the Kathopanishat.

Here mention is made of thinkers who did not believe in a future life. The same Upanishat attacks the atheistic doctrine in the 6th Valli—12.

Again in the first Valli (20) Kathopanishat makes mention of thinkers who did not believe in a supermundane existence.

Thus if the Vedas emphasised on the sacrificial rites, these non-conformists repudiated their usefulness and held out their ludicrousness. Even the Upanishats which claim to be orthodox and to form a part and parcel of the Vedas themselves, criticise the Vedic rituals. Thus to take one of the many instances.—

"But these symbolic rites, which consist in the performance of the lower mysteries, as that taught by the eighteen, are verily like rotten boats (dangerous to the sailors.) The fools who think this to be the highest and rejoice therein, suffer again and again, birth, old age and death."

But the Upanishats criticised the Vedas in order to establish and give to the world something higher and far more noble while the atheistic Charvakism never attempted to go beyond the lighter and easier task of criticism. It was essentially a negative theory without a positive counterpart; its business was to hold up to ridicule the Vedic inculcations. It was no doubt the birth of rationalism, the full growth of which we are to find in the other systems of Indian Philosophy.

Jainism along with the Charvaka atheism rejects the Karma-Kanda or the Vedic sacrifices. It openly disavowed the authority

of the Vedas and denounced in the tone of atheism, the sacrificial rites.

This much Jainism has in common with Charvakism. But then, like Atheism it was not a negative theory. It aimed at system-building. Above all, it discards the loathsome sensualistic hedonism of Charvakism. The Charvaka theory, while rightly questioning the utility of the meaningless rituals did not attempt to go deeper but emphasised upon the sensual side of the human nature. It criticised the Vedic rites,—it may almost be said,—simply because they kept in check the sensual impulses and prevented by means of artificial barriers, their unbridled gratification. But if Ritualism is to be criticised, the criticism certainly ought not to proceed from this spirit. Ceremonies stifle the growth and development of our rational nature. This is the right standpoint of criticism. Extreme sensualism ignores this and Jainism, as a rationalistic system like Buddhism, takes its departure from Charvakism.

The next system of Indian philosophy which can be conveniently taken up here for comparison with Jainism is the renowned system of the Buddhists. Like Atheism, Buddhism rejects the Vedic ceremonies. But its criticism of sacrificial rites is based on a more rational basis. According to Buddhism, our miserable existence is due to Karma. What we are is accounted for by what we do and did. We suffer births and rebirths because we hanker after pleasure and enjoyment, which are but unsubstantial phantoms, ever luring the incautious human beings. If we are to end our pains in this world we must break the fetters of our Karma. Now—we shall go beyond the realm of Karma, if we oppose good Karma to bad Karma, the spirit of renunciation to the spirit of self-gratification, Ahimsa or non-killing to Himsa or a spirit to kill animals. The Vedic sacrificial rites are to be abandoned because they not only involve the killing of many harmless creatures but also they are believed to lead the devotees to heavens and other desirable spheres and are thus directly or indirectly the causes of our miserable births and rebirths. Thus according to Buddhism we are to practise Ahimsa and renunciation, if we are to transcend the realm of Karma. This is its fundamental principle. The Vedas are to be repudiated because they are not only imbued with a spirit of Himsa but are also direct or indirect hindrances to the Nirvana. In an equally firm spirit Buddhism attacks

the sensualism of the Charvaka school, though it joins with it in attacking the Vedas. If we are to turn away from the Vedic rites, we must be very careful not to plunge into Hedonism. To practise austerity and abstinence,—yes, that is how the fetters of Karma are to be sundered according to the principle of the Buddhist philosophy.

In common with Buddhism, Jainism also has it that the cause of our painful existence here, is to be found in the Karma-ties. Like Buddhism it also rejects the authority of the Vedas on the one hand and the sensualistic doctrine of Charvakism on the other. With equal emphasis it also holds out Ahimsa and Virati as normative principles of human conduct. Indeed its insistence on the practice of these is perhaps far more strict and unrelenting. But then Jainism, avoids the initial weakness of the Buddhistic system.

For on examination, it will be found that the beautiful ethical edifice of Buddhism rests on a shaky basis. We are to reject the authority of the Vedas,—good. We are to practise Ahimsa and renunciation,—good. We are to break the fetters of Karma,—good. But for all the world, what are we? what is our goal? the summum bonum? To all these questions, Buddhism has a grim and awful answer,—*We are not*. Are we then toiling and moiling in shadows and is abyss, the final goal? Are we to practise strict renunciation and deprive ourselves of the ordinary pleasures of life, simply because the woeful extinction and eternal silence may be drawn nearer? This life is a system of unrealities and the so-called next, no better. Certainly such a soul-denying nihilism cannot satisfy the ordinary minds. The wonderful success of Buddhism was not so much due to its metaphysical nihilism as to the diluted asceticism of its so-called "middle-path." The ordinary man feels that he is. That he is a reality and not an unsubstantial shadow,—this is, as it were, felt by all men.

It is Vedantism as gloriously depicted in almost every line of the Upanishats that holds out soul as the permanent, uncreated reality. The soul is; it exists as a reality, uncreated and eternal. It may seem to undergo births and rebirths, feel pain and pleasure but infinity and eternity of power, knowledge and bliss are its,—in its essentiality.

This is the first principle of Vedantism and Jainism also agrees with Vedantism in emphasising on the eternity and infinity of the self.

It is thus that Vedantism and Jainism go hand in hand in opposing the metaphysical nihilism of Buddhism and insisting on the permanent reality of the soul. But here the two systems part. The Vedantin is not satisfied merely with positing the soul but he goes farther and boldly identifies it with the cosmic soul. According to the Vedantic systems, the world with all its conscious and unconscious contents is but the manifestation of one and the self-same reality. "I am He." The cosmic force is He. I am not a separate and independent reality; the cosmic force outside me, which seems to oppose me, is not a separate and independent reality. There is but one fundamental reality and you, I and all conscious creatures as well as all the material things and forces are to be identified with this one real of reals.

Very sublime and grand, as it undoubtedly seems, the Vedantic principle of identity is hardly realised by ordinary human minds. They accept that the human soul is a reality but certainly it is too much to ask them to forget all differences between man and man and between mind, matter and other elements. It is certainly not irrational in a thinker to hold that he, as a reality, is different from his neighbour as a reality and from unconscious things and forces as realities. We say,—such a view is not irrational; we may say even that it better satisfies the ordinary intellect of the majority of humanity. Hence it is common and hence Vedantism is departed from.

The next great system of Indian thought which we propose to take up in this connection is the renowned system of Kapila. While agreeing with the Vedanta that the soul is uncreated and eternal, it refuses to ignore the plurality of souls. Unlike Vedanta, it posits an unconscious Cosmic force, acting in seeming harmony with the Purusha or the self. Thus according to the principle of the Sankhya philosophy, the soul is uncreated, eternal, infinite and there is an infinite number of such souls. The second great principle of Kapila is that there is an unconscious force, independent of and not identical with the self,—though acting in apparent harmony with it for the time being. Our liberation lies in separating the self from the influence of the foreign force.

Now Jainism also as we have seen, accepts the eternity and the infinity of the self. In harmony with the system of Kapila it also posits the existence and reality of the foreign force, fettering the free natured self. Like the Sankhya the Jaina theory also, accepts the plurality of souls. And lastly both the Sankhya and the Jaina systems agree in holding that our salvation lies in emancipating the pure self from the clutches of the foreign force.

At the same time it must be observed that there is in every ordinary human heart an almost innate desire to find out something higher, nobler and more blessed than itself. A devout man wants that there be some Being, a God, Lord or Paramatman, who would present himself before him as an eternal type of perfection. There is an innate tendency in man to posit some transcendent moral Ideal, an all highest Being in whom power, knowledge and blessedness inhere in their perfection. If religion involves the belief in an awe-inspiring Divine Being, we may almost say that religious consciousness or fervour is innate in man. We feel ourselves finite, limited and cut-short in all ways, viz., in our power, knowledge and moral blessedness and we are driven accordingly to keep before our minds some Lord or God in whom all that we strive for attaining are found in their perfect and pure glory.

Now whatever the intelligent commentators might say it may be safely said that the Sankhya philosophy makes no provision for the reality of such a moral Ideal or perfect Being. It is the Yoga philosophy which tries,—with what consistency and cogency we need not consider here—to supply this want of the heart. The Yoga system admits with the Sankhya, the reality and the plurality of the souls but it goes further and posits the existence of an eternal Ideal,—the Paramatman or the Lord of the lesser self's. In this respect the Jain philosophy is one with the Yoga system. Like the latter Jainism believes in a Paramatman or Lord, —the Arhat, as he is called. He is not the Creator but is the eternal type of perfection, the highest moral and spiri ual Ideal; we are to contemplate his infinitely perfect nature and to see him with our mind's eye. His company is enlightening, ennobling, elevating and invigorating. All this is common to both Jainism and the philosophy of Patanjali.

The next system of Indian philosophy which can be considered in this connection, is the great system of Kanada. The logical

evolution of the Vaishesika philosophy may be conceived in the following way. In the Sankhya and the Yoga systems whatever is different from the self or the Purusha is thrown in the abysmal womb of Prakriti. According to them whatever seems to be energising and consequently real is to be understood as potentially contained within the cosmic force. Thus space, time and the material atoms receive no special attention from Kapila and Patanjali,—they are all to be considered as evolutes of Prakriti. But certainly this is not easy to grasp. Ordinary minds feel that these are self-existent, independent reals. Even Kant could not always stick to his celebrated doctrine that space and time are but the intuitions of our mind. Even he sometimes seemed to acknowledge a sort of extramental existence and reality for them. Again,—from Democritus down to the renowned scientists of the present day,—all feel the necessity of acknowledging the self-existence and eternity of material atoms. But the philosophical systems of Kapila and Patanjali would never allow self-existence and eternity to space, time and material atoms. However difficult may the conception be, you are to consider that space,—time and atoms,—so different in their nature, significance and functions—have come out of one and the same primordial Prakriti.

It is the Vaiseshika philosophy which takes account of the self-existence and eternity of Atoms, Space and Time. According to the positivistic Charvakism, perhaps they are to be ignored. Buddhistic nihilism, in flagrant contradiction to what we feel, would make them unreal. The Vedanta also apparently gives no better account. The Sankhya and the Yoga systems, as we have seen, would make them potentially contained within the inconceivable Prakriti. It is the philosophy of Kanada that gives permanence, reality and independence to them. Jainism also like the Vaiseshika philosophy upholds the self-existence and eternity of Atoms, Space and Time.

Such are the delicious fruits of reason, which we find in the various systems of Indian philosophy. As for the *process* of reason, we are to go to the Nyaya philosophy. Here we meet with all the intricacies of the logical principles. It is the philosophy of Gautama that contains extensive treatment of the laws of thought. As a rich store of all the world's philosophical doctrines, Jainism also can boast of much useful logical matter. In this respect it has many principles in common with the Nyaya system. Lest

however the study of Jaina logic appear to be superfluous after that of the Nyaya doctrines, we take care in mentioning here that the Jaina logic has its own peculiarities as well and in the celebrated doctrine of Syadvada or *Sapta Bhangi-Nyaya*,—it has a principle of which it can fitly be proud and of which the system of Gautama is quite innocent.

It is thus that we propose to indicate the position of Jainism among the systems of Indian philosophy. Some, indeed, have tried to identify it with Buddhism. Lassen and Weber, for example, denied the independent origin of Jainism. As early as in the 7th Century, Huang Tsang found reasons to suppose Jainism to be an off-shoot from the religion of Buddha. Both Buhler and Jacobi, on the contrary, affirm the independent origin of the Jaina system and even hold that it was prevalent before Buddha. We dont feel inclined to enter into these antiquarian disputes. We have ventured to uphold the view that both Buddhism and Jainism existed from long before their reputed founders. They certainly did not owe their origin to Buddha and Vardhamana, though they are both anti-vedic and anti-ritualistic in spirit as the Upanishats themselves are. This explains why Huan Tsang identified the two systems. When he came to India, Buddhism was still the prevalent religion. Its main doctrines, as we have seen, were *Ahimsa* and *Renunciation*. With these doctrines as weapons for offence and defence, Buddhism fought successfully against the Vedic Ritualism. And whatever system was to oppose the Vedas, must have and could not but have these doctrines: for the very reason that the Vedic sacrifices were characterised by *Himsâ* and a desire for increasing the account of human enjoyment, here and hereafter. Now Jainism also repudiated the authority of the Vedas; and it also upheld *Ahimsâ* and restraint. Accordingly, in its outer aspect, Jainism looked like Buddhism. Both of them rejected the Vedas and inculcated Ahimsa and abstinence. This outer aspect of both the religions might of course make a foreigner believe in their identity. But this does not prove that philosophically they were the same. Rules of conduct may be the same or similar in two philosophical systems though their metaphysics are strictly contradictory of each other. The salvation of man lies in renouncing the ordinary pleasures of life and living a strictly austere and abstemious life,—well, this for example, is declared by all the systems of Indian philosophy

without exception,—though their metaphysics are different from each other. Both Cynicism and Cyrenaicism in Greece, at a certain stage of their development, recommended the absolute renunciation of the world although the fundamental principles of the two systems are as different from one another as the North Pole is from the South. It is not safe accordingly to conclude the identity of Buddhism and Jainism from the fact that they prescribe and recommend similiar rules of morality. The seeming identity of Buddhism and Jainism is due not to the fact that one owed its origin to the other but rather to the spirit of criticism and rationalism with which they boldly questioned the utility of some of the apparently cruel and inhuman rites of the Vedic School.

Indeed coming to the metaphysics of the two systems we find that one is strictly opposed to the other. If, for example, Buddhism denies all reality, Jainism would say there are realities and an infinite number of them. The former says:—The soul is not; The Atoms are not; Space, Time, Motion are not; and God is not. Jainism, on the contrary, would vehemenly affirm their reality. According to Buddhism, we vanish into Non-existence when we attain Nirvana, while according to Jainism, our true existence begins only then. Even the conceptions of Karma are not of the same nature in the two systems.

For these reasons, we do not think it justifiable to regard Jainism as an off-shoot from Buddhism. A much closer connection can be seen to exist between Jainism and the Sankhya philosophy. Both the systems reject the Vedantic theory of identity and emphasise the doctrine of the plurality of souls. Besides the souls, both of them admit the existence of Non-soul. Still, it is not safe to attempt to deduce the one from or to reduce it to, the other. For the similarity between the two systems, on examination, will be found to be more in outward appearance than in reality. The very first thing that attracts our attention is that while in Sankhya, the principle of the Non-soul is one, in Jainism it is five fold, the first of which, again, the Pudgala (matter) comprises an infinite number of Atoms. Thus, if Sankhya is strictly dualistic, Jainism is undoubtedly pluralistic. Differences between the two systems do not end here. A more important difference will perhaps be observed when we say that while Kapila's system is very near to idealism, Jainism, dangerously approaches

materialism.* The first question that arises in the mind of the student of the Sankhya is, what is Prakriti? Is it a material principle or an ideal one? It is certainly not grossly material in the first instance. What we call material bodies are but the last of its system of evolutes. What, then, is it? It is vaguely described as the unity or the equilibrium of three opposing tendencies, the Gunas. As far as experience goes, matter, as we ordinarily conceive it, cannot be such a principle of unity. A principle which is unity in plurality, which can subsist and hold its own among a plurality of warring attributes, must be psychical in nature. Intuition says this and experience and metaphysical observation corroborate it. If then Prakriti is to carry on its process of systematic evolution, though it is marked by three seemingly opposing characteristics, it must be held to be of a spiritual nature. The apparent oppositions of the three Gunas are but the three different ways of expression of the self-same spiritual Prakriti. No definite evolute can come out, if it be held to be a dead field of warfare among the essentially different Gunas. The process of evolution is explicable only if Prakriti be spiritual in nature.

Coming to the evolutes themselves, we find that the first one is *Mahat-Tatva* or intelligence,—not material Atoms, stones or some other form of gross matter, but something of a psychical nature. The next evolute also is something psychical viz., *Ahamkara* or self-consciousness. Then come the senses, the five essentialities and gradually the elements. This process of evolution would seem unmeaning and arbitrary, if Prakriti be regarded as a purely Material force. For *Mahat-Tatva* and *Ahamkara* are undoubtedly spiritual principles and if,—as according to Kapila himself,—the cause must be of the same nature with the effect, the evolving Prakriti must be spiritual like its evolutes. We cannot explain in the light of the materialistic conception of Prakriti why these two psychical principles intervene before the grosser material elements are evolved.

If, however, Prakriti be conceived as a spiritual potentiality it must in order to fully realise itself, *determine* what it is to do (the function of Buddhi), *know* itself (that of *Ahamkara*) and

* It should, however, be noted that the present writer does not mean hereby that the Sankhya is idealistic and the Jaina philosophy, materialistic.

then go on evolving out of itself, step by step, the grosser means of its self-realisation, viz., the Senses, the Essentialities, the Elements. Thus a better and more consistent explanation of the process of evolution is obtained if Prakriti be regarded as spiritual and if, consequently, the evolutes be conceived to be but the means of its self-realisation.

This idealistic conception of Prakriti seems to be inevitable and not wholly unknown in ancient times. Thus, an unmistakeable attempt is made to spiritualise the Prakriti and thereby, as it were, to Vedantise the Sankhya philosophy in this remarkable passage of the Kathopanishat, 3rd Valli, 10-11.

"Higher than the senses are the objects; higher than the objects is the mind; higher than the mind is the intelligence; higher than the intelligence is the great being; higher than the great being is the unmanifested; higher than the unmanifested is the soul. There is nothing higher than the soul; it is the limit,—the final goal."

Far different, however, is the case with the Jaina philosophy. Here the principle of the Non-soul is not only more than one but all such principles are unpsychical. It is possible, as we have seen, to spiritualise the Sankhya principle of the Non-soul but on no account, the Jaina ones. These principles are Material Atoms (the Pudgala), the two principles of Motion and Rest (Dharma and Adharma). Time or the principle of mutation (*kala*) and Space (*Akasa*), — all, either matter or conditions (*Sinequa non*) of matter. Even the soul in Jainism is regarded as an *Astikaya* i.e., something possessed of magnitude. It is supposed to have *Lesyas* or Paints and it is held to be extremely light and to have an upward tendency. All this is obviously against the spirit of the Sankhya metaphysics. And if the philosophy of Kapila, as we have seen, has a tendency to-wards Idealism, The Jaina philosophy seems sometimes to go very near to Materialism.*

It is thus that we see that Jainism is essentially different from the Sankhya and not derivable from it. Nay, in some respects the two systems are almost contradictory of each other.

* Here again the writer feels it necessary to remind the reader that it is not his theory that the Sankhya is idealistic or the Jaina philosophy materialistic.

The soul, for example, in the Sankhya is changeless and absolutely passive; in Jaina philosophy, however, it is capable of infinite development and perfection and it is infinitely active. We must accordingly regard the Arhata philosophy as a system of rationalism, originating from a spirit of criticism, going deeper than Sophism and developing like the other philosophical systems of India, its own ideas, problems and principles.

It may be said that the Jaina philosophy and the Vaiseshika philosophy are most similar and that the one can be easily reduced to the other. The theories of atoms, space, time and motion and the theory of the soul, are almost the same in the two systems. Yet, the point of difference is no less promiuent. Notwithstanding its pluralistic doctrines, the Vaiseshika philosophy takes a monistic turn by evolving a theory of God, while Jainism is nothing if not pluralistic to the core.

To conclude. The Jaina philosophy, no doubt, holds certain principles in common with Buddhism, Vedantism, the Sankhya, the Nyaya and the Vaiseshika systems but this does not disprove its independent origin and free development. If it has some similarities with the other Indian systems, it has its own peculiarities and marked differences as well.

Svarajya.

THE denotation of *Svarajya* is nothing actually describable as it is merely an ideal. Its cannotation, however, is manifold, being as many understandings or misunderstandings as there are brains to entertain the idea. It may mean self-govern nent, for literally *sva* = self, and *rajya* = Government; or self-determination as some take it to mean; or inner purification as Mr. C. R. Das or M. Gandhi hold it.

Anyhow it implies a very large majority of truly contented, peaceful, *independent* citizens. Contentment and peace are the effects of independence; of the absence of pain, fear and misery in our hearts. Independence means our not depending upon others for anything, except their goodwill and co-operation on the path of Peace, Joy and Independence. One should not beg, borrow, expect or even accept anything from others. The acceptance must be minimum if one is to be equal and independent in, an honest,

lasting way. Man's desires *must* not be more than what HE ALONE can achieve mostly.

Begging or borrowing are out of question. GIVE is the word. We should practise this to one on a lower level. An equally independent man will not accept; to such a one an offer is waste and insult, an immoral temptation. Acceptance even will be rare and almost regretfully exercised. Thus alone the world may be saved from its mad and mammon-whipped rush to discontent, disorder and chaos.

Humanity is crying for the rising Sun; but sets its face persistently to the West. We want simplicity; but run after sensations. We desire an agricultural democracy or monarchy, but run after Urban plutocracy. We aim at divine peace, but pursue Satanic worldly struggle.

The leader of non-co-operation, Gandhiji, insists on non-violence as a *sine quâ non* His Lieutenant M. Mahomed Ali at Mangalore avows his difference from him as to non-violence. He believes in violence and as a Mahomedan will use it. *Vide* the *Independent* for 9th April 1921). Unless there is real and lasting Hindu-Mahomedan unity, there is no hope for a free and powerful India. The Amir is reported to have entered into a pact with Soviet Russia, and has undertaken not to enter into political relations with India without Bolshevik consent. If this be true, the possible, or even probable consequences to India are sure to be of grave import. Hindus, Mahomedans, Sikhs, Jainas, Christians, Parsis in India owe it to themselves and the country to take dispassionate, unprejudiced, considered, honest view of the whole situation, and then to declare and discuss it freely and with the most cordial toleration of all degrees and kinds of differences of opinion. There is no Indian who does not want Home Rule or *Svarajya*. Indeed the Government itself has it for its express goal. As a matter of fact the Parliament has laid down a more complete form of self-Government for India than was demanded by the nation in the Congress-Muslim League Scheme.

Our goal is great. It needs sacrifices. It needs merit on our part. The merit has to be real. The sacrifices have to be of the many corroding vices which have destroyed our character, and of the passions which have deluded us into a horrid, hollow, deceitful life, by which we hurt our own selves, take delight in doing harm to our own brethren and avowed friends. Reliability has to return

to the words and deeds of Indians. Sincere transparency has to replace crooked duplicity. Belief in our own souls has to be restored. The anti-material character of soul has to be realised. Money and matter have to be realised as lifeless fetters to bind the soul to pain, weakness, and slavery. Joy, Peace and Power have to be visualised as of soul's essence. The transitory character of the world, and the eternal sovereignty of the soul have to be seen before we can even understand the lofty meaning of non-violence (*Ahimsâ*), as I think, Mahatma Gandhiji has employed it in his phrase "non-violent non-co-operation."

When we see this height of non-violence, then we will realise that there is such a thing as eternity, and that, despite all seeming lawlessness, there is a settled order in nature, which secures ultimate and certain triumph to Justice, Right, Good, and defeat to Tyranny, Wrong and Bad.

Thus the best life is that which is lived *at any cost* in conformity with this eternal law of Love and Goodness. This is the first step to *Svarajya*.

J. L. JAINI.

Patriotism and Loyalty.

PATRIOTISM is love for one's country. Loyalty is willing obedience to the laws of the State. Ordinarily of course they are neither contradictory of, nor even contrary to, each other. They are really supplements. The whole system of Law, Rights and Duties on which all Governments from the crudest to the most refined are based, will be nowhere if there is no Loyalty and Patriotism. But in extraordinary circumstances the interflag of these two codes of conduct is not free from difficulty. The reason of this is two-fold. The feelings of the masses may be narrow, apathetic or selfish; or corroded or vitiated by the passions of anger, pride, deceit and greed, hatred, fear, ridicule etc. This lessens Patriotism and in some instances kills it. Or again, some foreign or home clique usurps the reins of Government more or less partially and forcibly and exercises it violently and in a lawless and disorderly manner. This negatives loyalty and turns law-abiding, peace-pursuing citizens into a lawless mob of rash anarchists.

Unfortunately this condition of affairs is just beginning to appear in India. There is a kind of patriotism and loyalty; and also a kind of negation of both. People, honest and self-less and also otherwise, are arrayed on both sides. There are pure, intelligent, self-sacrificing patriots who believe in the desirability and even the necessity of maintaining the British connection with India. There are equally pure, intelligent, self-sacrificing Indians who honestly believe the English to be *perfide* and an intolerable life-sucking pest for India. Thus the Patriotism of one set is clear Disloyalty; and that of the other clear Treason to the country in the eyes of their opponents. But, on the whole, the leaders have mutual respect and courtesy for each other, as all citizens must possess in any decent democracy. But the masses are untrained, unrestrained and for them any difference of opinion is a sure and irresistible cause to let loose all their floods of narrow prejudice, untried condemnation, wholesale abuse etc., etc. They forget that mental or spoken condemnation, however vehement and violent it may be, cannot alter Truth. Black remains black for nations as well as for individuals. Untruth can never be white-washed into Truth by either the coercion of the Government or by the unreasoned mobfury of the masses. Politics ultimately is a game of force; and the masses in any country believe in no other argument. Therefore it will be easy to see that the highest level of politics is the lowest plane of morality, as the highest level of morality is the lowest plane of Religion, and the highest of Religion the lowest of spirituality. There must be a few virtues and habits, almost instincts, in the *masses*, classes and leaders of a country, before it can be said to touch even the A B C of Politics. In addition to the two primary political instincts of Patriotism and Loyalty, one may say that the following also are essential.

Non-violence or *Ahimsa*, generally. A natural reluctance, almost hesitation to hurt, even under provocation, in any form the vitality of a living fellow-being by word, deed or thought. This includes a host of other virtues and is a *sine qua non* of any form or degree of collective freedom. E.g., non-violence negatives and excludes all trace of hatred and contempt; hasty passionateness; uncharitable imputations or insinuations even against one's enemy; narrow pride or conceit in one's own wisdom, truth, strength or rectitude; fanaticism of any kind; social boycott or threat of it; encroachment of any kind upon the personal

freedom, honour or good name of anyone; security of the proprietary and professional interests of the people, and a host of other similar virtues.

Strict Truth. A tolerable democracy needs a majority of its members to think, speak and act the Truth.

Honesty. A member of a good democracy will never covet, tolerate or take anything which does not belong to him as of social, moral and legal right.

Chastity. The instinct of coition is as almighty and sacred as it is universal. Men and for obvious reasons specially women, in a democracy will loathe to be unchaste.

Simplicity. Plain living and high thinking, curbing of one's desires, being elated with contentment with little are the marks of a true and simple democrat.

It may be said that this standard is too high or unattainable. If I even agree, I insist that it is an Ideal and a Goal. It must dominate our human follies and frailties in a very considerable number of our sisters and brethren, if we really and soberly desire *Svarajya* or self-rule. Otherwise self-rule will be the blackest and most chaotic form of selfish misrule or no-rule.

I fear most of the above 7 virtues,—Non-violence, Truth, Honesty, Chastity, Simplicity, Patriotism and Loyalty—are conspicuous by their absence. Indeed it may be the painful truth that lying and hypocricy are almost universal. Truth for men and chastity for women have grown unfashionable. People practise these with shy blushes. So much the worse for us. Humanity cannot be sound, if several nations are unsound. A nation cannot be sound, if its peoples or parts are unsound. A People and a family are unsound, if the families or the members of a family are not alright.

To me it occurs that India is suffering from this unsoundness in most of its limbs. Individual Indians, families, communities all seem to have gone to pieces. Our ambition is "thick-sighted," almost blind. We have the word God on our lips, but God alone knows, to what non-God our deluded legs are marching us double-quick!

J. L. JAINI.

Jain Literature Society, London.

ACCOUNTS FOR

(the year ending December 31st, 1920.)

As Dr. F. W. Thomas, President, is at present away from England, only accounts and no report are being issued for the past year.

The interest on money deposited at the Bank amounts for the year 1920 to £8 5s. 2d., £1 14s. has been spent on printing and Stationery, and £25 has been paid away in respect of the translation of the **Pravacanasara**.

Further sales of Mr. Jaini's "Outlines" realized 7s. 4d., and £2 5s. 10d. has been paid off his advance of £45.

BALANCE SHEET AT 31st December, 1920.

Capital & Liabilities.	£	s.	d.	Assets.	£	s.	d.
Special Funds	150	0	0	Bank Deposit Account ...	175	0	0
General Account	63	12	3	„ Current „ ...	37	19	8
Amount Advanced	42	14	2	Cash in Hand	5	2	2
"Outlines of Jainism" ...				"Outlines of Jainism" ...	38	4	7
	£256	6	5		£256	6	5

January, 1921, Examined and found correct.

Hon. Sec. H. WARREN, 84, Shelgate Road, London, S. W. 11.

G. H. SHEPHERD, Chartered Accountant (Hon. Auditor) 15, Larkdale Street. Nottingham, 19th January, 1921.

Notes and News.

Hiralal Jain High School, Pahari Dhiraj, Delhi.

The Last Anniversary of the School came off on the 23rd and 24th April. Lala Rishab Das, B.A., Vakil, was the President, Jain Dharm Bhushan Brahmchari Sital Prasadji, Babu Mitter Sain and Pandit Makhan Lal Shastri also graced the occasion with their presence and gave instructive lectures. The President's closing remarks were simply excellent and were much appreciated.

The school is now preparing students for the M.S.L.C. Examination of the Punjab University. Commercial classes have been started, and there is a hostel attached to the school. Instruction in the tenets of Jainism is especially attended to. Pandit Lala Ram Shastri, a well-known Jain Pandit, is in charge of religious teaching. Seth Paramanand Jain, M.A., lately Senior Professor of Mathematics, Murray College, Sialkot, has been appointed Principal of the School, and he is assisted by a number of very efficient teachers.

A new building for the school will be ready within a year or so on the excellent plot of land given with Rs. 81,000 cash, about a year ago by the revered wife of Seth Hiralal, after whom the institution is named. The progress made so far is phenomenal, and the school deserves well the help of all charitably-disposed gentlemen of all places in the country, who, it is hoped, will come forward with all they can do for it, especially on occasions of marriage, birth, etc.

* * *

Mr. Inderlal of Delhi writes :—With regard to the antiquity of Jainism various interpretations have been put by ignorant persons. Some say it is an off-shoot of Buddhism, whilst others hold it was founded by Lord Mahavira, who, according to Jainism, was the last of the twenty four Tirthankars (prophets). But Shriman Jain Dharma Bhushan, Brahmchari Sital Prasadji has, on page 14 of his booklet 'Jain Dharma Ka Mehtav' clearly established the fact on the authority of the Hindu Purans that Jainism is almost as old as Brahmanism.

Bhagwat Puran is an authentic Hindu Shastra, and from Skanda (chapter) 5 Adhyaya (para) 306 and Skanda 2 Adhyaya 7 page 76 of Commentary on Bhagwat Puran by Saligram published at the Venketeshwar Press, he quotes the following extracts.

In the beginning of the universe fourteen Manus were born. Brahma at first created Swayambhoo Manu (the first of the fourteen Manus) and Satya Rupa. Satyarupa became the wife of Swayambhoo Manu. They had a son Priyevrit by name. Priyevrit's son was Agninidh, and Agninidh's Son was Nabhi. King Nabhi married Maru Devi. They were blessed with a Son, Lord Risheb Dev, who founded the Digambara form of Jainism.

According to this Puranic description, Lord Risheb Dev, the

founder of Jainism, was the fifth in the line of the first Manu whom Brahma had created in the beginning of the universe.

This Puranic description of the origin of Jainism differs from the Jain version only in that the Jains affirm that the fourteen Kulakars (Supernatural beings) were born in the beginning of the universe, not by the creation of Brahma, but spontaneously by the Laws of Karma.

In Shatipurv Moksh Dharma part of Mahabharata (see Sloka 20 of Adhyaya 263) Lord Risheb Dev is stated to have been the founder of Jainism, and not Lord Parshwanath or Lord Mahavira.

* * *

Mr. A. Chandranath of Mannargudi writes:—Sri Mahavira Jayanti, the birth-day of Lord Mahavira was celebrated at Mannargudi on the 20th April with great eclat and devotion. Jain devotees from Tanjore, Tiruvalur, Kumbakonam, Vedaraniam and other places were present on the occasion. In the evening the Temple of Sri Jinesvara was profusely illuminated and *abhishekam* was performed to the image of Lord Mahavira. Mr. Rajaram Mudaliar of Tanjore delivered an interesting and instructive speech on the Life of Mahavira. Such grand celebrations conducted with enthusiasm and sincerity by the worshippers of the Ideal through the idol would stir the hearts of the people towards Self-realisation and understanding of Truth.

* * *

Our Correspondents write from several places that the 17th of April was observed by the Jains as a day of mourning for the death of Kumar Devendra Prasad. Puja was performed to Jain images in the name of the deceased. Condolence meetings were held and appreciative speeches were given of all the work that Devendra Prasad has done. As a mark of respect to the departed Soul several men and women of Sri Silapuri (Thirupparambur) fasted that day. We are glad to note the sincere and sympathetic feelings of the Jainas. If the Jainas really feel grateful to Devendra Prasadji let them show their gratitude to him by helping the cause of the publication of the Jaina Works—which was the special Mission of his life.

* * *

The Second Anniversary of the Jaina Mahasabha at Arni was celebrated with great enthusiasm on the 22nd and 23rd May 1921

On the 22nd morning Prof. A. Chakravarti, the President-elect and Svasti Sri Nemisagara Varniji were taken in procession along the principle streets of the town amidst loud shouts of *Jaina Dharmaki Jai.* In the afternoon at about 3 o'clock the members of the Brotherhood, the numerous Jains from the various villages, and the distinguished President went in procession to the Theatre Hall. After the formal election of the President, the Session began with a Mangalacharan. Pandit Kuppusami Sastri of the local Jain Sanskrit Patasala read his welcome address in Sanskrit. Prof. A. Chakravarti rose up amidst loud cheers to deliver his interesting and instructive address, which is printed elsewhere. We wish to draw the attention of our Readers to the learned President's appeal to the Jainas to establish educational institutions to impart secular and religious education to Jains, to establish Libraries where ancient manuscripts may be collected and kept for reference, and to publish rare Jaina works.

Sri Nemisagar Varniji spoke in Kanarese on "Samyak Charitra" which was very elaborate and most interesting. Sriman Santhiraja Sastri of Mysore also delivered his speech in Kanarese on "the Relation between Jainism and other Religions."

On the 23rd morning the meeting began at 9. Mr. T. Authy Nainar, Editor of Dharmaseelan, Madras, read a welcome address in Tamil Verses composed by Vidwan Arumugam Servai. Then Mr. Appasawmi Sastriar of Vedur spoke on "Jiva Parinamam" and Mr. Santiraja Sastri on "Nitya Suka."

Two resolutions, one expressing condolence on the death of Messrs A. P. Chandranatha Nainar and Kumar Devendra Prasad and the other requesting the Jainas to establish Patasalas in several villages, were unanimously passed.

After the President's concluding remarks the Anniversary came to a successful end.

* * *

Jain Hostel at Tindivanam:—A business meeting of the Committee of Management of the Institution was held on Saturday 28th May 1921. Prof. A. Chakravarti presided. The Report of the working of the hostel, its income and expenditure from 4-7-1920 to 30-4-1921 was read by Mr. P. Parsvanatha Nainor and unanimously passed. The Report says that out of 12 Students residing in the Hostel 3 have appeared for the

S.S L.C. Examination while the rest are studying in the Secondary and High School Classes. The general health of the Students has been satisfactory under the supervision of Mr. Doraiswami Pillai.

The Library attached to the Hostel contains a fair collection of religious and secular books which the students are well utilizing.

For the maintenance of the Hostel the members of the family of the late Chandranatha Nainor have given to the Institution Rs. 5000 worth of land.

During the course of the year an income of Rs. 1074 has been received out of which Rs. 894-12-8 have been spent.

The balance amounts to Rs. 88-7-4 in cash and Rs. 90-12 worth of things. Some liberal hearted gentlemen have promised future help. We wish the Institution all success.

* * *

We have published elsewhere a learned article on the "Place of Jainism in the systems of Indian Philosophy" from the pen of Mr. Harishadya Bhattacharya M.A., LL.B. It is an impartial attempt to compare Jainism with the other systems of Indian thought. The essay proves that the Jaina system of Philosophy, though resembling other systems in several points, is yet essentially different and independent in its nature. We recommend the article to our readers for calm and critical study.