

## PHILOSOPHY AND PSYCHOLOGY OF JAINAS

"While granting due credit to Hindu metaphysics and the mysticism of the Orient in general, we are yet inclined to look for the development of a Western Psychology that will harmonize with the conditions of life in the Occident, at the same time tending to promote the spiritual welfare of the race as a whole." This statement seems to whisper in my ears that "Hindu" metaphysics has not been able to offer the right solution of the various intricate problems of life that are staring in the face of the Western thinker. By "Hindu" is meant, of course, the special phase of Vedānta philosophy that has been presented to the people of the West during the last four years.

I am glad that the truth in Vedānta has come to the shores of this country. It would have been much better, however, if the *whole* truth lying back of the different sectarian systems of India had been presented, so that a complete instead of a partial view of India's wisdom might have satisfied the craving of deep students. But the history of the religious and philosophic progress of the world shows that sectarianism takes a long time to be transmuted into universalism, and so we shall have to wait.

Besides "Hindu" or Vedic metaphysics, there are systems in India not based on the Vedas and Upaniṣads, and are therefore classed as heterodox by the Vedists, who, however, it must be admitted to their credit, do not consign them to the "uncovenanted mercies of God", as some Christian sects have

done. These are the Buddhist and the Jaina systems. Much has been written and spoken on Buddhism, but very little on Jainism. In this article, therefore, I intend to present a short sketch of the latter, in the hope that Hindu metaphysics may receive proper consideration in the Occident.

‘Jaina’ means a follower of Jina, which is a generic term applied to those persons (*men and women*) that have conquered the lower nature—passion, hatred, and the like—and brought into prominence the highest. The Jaina philosophy, therefore, bases its doctrine on the absolute necessity (for the realization of truth) of conquering the lower nature. To the underdeveloped or insufficiently developed observer, it is the conquering of the lower nature; to the fully developed, it is the realization of the perfect.

There lived many such Jinās in the past, and many will doubtless yet be born. The philosophy of the Jainas, therefore is not essentially founded on any particular writing or external revelation, but on the unfoldment of spiritual consciousness, which is the birthright of every soul. Books, writings, and scriptures may illustrate, wholly or in part, this truth; but the ultimate fact remains that no mere words can give full expression to the truths of Jainism, which must be felt and realized within.

I have been often asked, “What is the origin of the universe, according to the Jaina view?” We might as well ask: What is the origin of Being? What is the source of God? etc. Philosophy in the primitive state (logically, not chronologically) postu-

lates an external, simple substance from which it attempts to explain the multiplicity of the complex. Philosophy in this sense assumes various forms. All of them attempt to interpret the law of causation, and in that attempt many, fatigued after the long mental strain, stop at some one thing, element, or principle (physical or metaphysical) beyond which they have not mentally the ability to go. Some (for instance, the Ionic philosophers) called it water, fire, or air.

The Sāṅkhya philosophy, in India, tried to explain evolution and even cosmic consciousness and the growth of organs, etc., as proceeding from the simple substance called *Prakṛti*, or primordial matter. Modern science evolves all life from the simple protoplasm. In tracing every effect to a cause, when these philosophers stop at something they contradict themselves by not extending and applying the law of causation to what they call the "first principle". Dr. Paul Deussen, Professor of Philosophy at the University of Kiel, in Germany, very truly says, with reference to Causality ("Elements of Metaphysics"). "As space and time are without limits, so also the net of causality is necessarily without beginning or end," and he gives the following demonstration :

"(a) If it were not without beginning, we should have to assume a first state of things. In order that this state might develop, a change would have to occur in it, which change would itself again be the effect of a foregoing change," etc.\*

\* This is the rock on which splits the cosmological argument, which confounds the metaphysical principle of salvation (God) with the physical principle of creation.

“(b) The chain of causality is without end, inasmuch as no change can take place at any time without proceeding as an effect from its sufficient cause.”

Jaina philosophy, therefore, is not the doctrine of illusion, nor of emanation, nor of creation. It is rather the doctrine that teaches the inexpugnability of various properties inextricably combined in a thing. Hence, the affirmation of only one property would be true so far as one side of the question is concerned ; but it becomes false when it rejects other sides—implying thereby that the very existence of that particular side depends on the existence of other sides. Jainism emphasizes at the same time the fact that at any particular moment it is impossible to express in words this complexity of truth (though possible to realize it in consciousness), for words always take for expression more moments than one.

This teaching is also known as the doctrine of manysidedness (अनेकान्तवाद). For instance, the universe is eternal as well as non-eternal. If the manifestations, modifications, developments, and activities are left out of consideration, what remains of the universe is eternal. If merely those modifications, etc., are taken into consideration, that side of the universe (which is not a different *thing* from the universe, but only a different *aspect*) is non-eternal. That is the only way of coming to a correct understanding and definite knowledge.

Śaṅkarācārya, commentator of the Vedānta-sūtras, has fallen into a great error when he states

that the Jaina doctrine should not be accepted because "it is impossible that contradictory attributes, such as being and non-being, should at the same time belong to one and the same thing ; just as observation teaches us that a thing cannot be hot and cold at the same moment." The Jainas do *not* teach that a thing can be hot and cold at the same moment. But they *do* teach that a thing cannot be hot absolutely and cannot be cold absolutely ; it is hot under certain definite circumstances, and cold under others. The Jainas do *not* teach that being and non-being (of itself) should at the same time belong to one and the same thing. What they teach is that in a thing there is being (of itself) and non-being (of other things), which means that a thing can be fully known only by knowing what it is and what it is *not*. Śāṅkara, in fact, creates a man of straw, imputes to him certain imaginary doctrines, and by refuting them he knocks him down. That is his glory.

Let us now see what the Jainas have to say about the Vedic systems of philosophy. Guṇaratna Sūri, the commentator of a Jaina work on "Comparative Philosophy", says :

"Although the various schools of philosophy, through sectarian bigotry, differ from and contradict one another, still there are certain aspects of truth in them which would harmonize if they were joined [into an organic whole]. For instance, the Buddhists advocate momentariness of things ; the Sāṅkhyas maintain eternality ; Naiyyāyikas and Vaiśeṣikas believe in independent eternalities and non-eternal-

ities, being and non-being, community and difference, and eternality of the Word. The Mīmāṃsakas affirm eternality and non-eternality, separateness and identity, being and non-being, community and difference, and the eternality of the Word. Some postulate either Time, Nature, Necessity, Karma, or Puruṣa as the origin of the Universe; and the Monists, who advocate the doctrine of Word-Brahma-Gnosis, believe in their identity. The different aspects of truth accepted by these sectarians, when related to one another, all together become one *grand truth*; but, if they do not join hands, they contradict one another, and in so doing they are changed into 'the flower of the sky' [which is not a real thing, but an illusion of the mind]."

The Jaina philosophy teaches that the universe—the totality of realities—is infinite in space and eternal in time; but the same universe, considered from the standpoint of the manifestations of the different realities, is finite in space and non-eternal in time. Particular parts of the universe have their cyclic laws corresponding to the laws of evolution and involution. At certain periods Arhats, or great Masters (Saviours of mankind), are born, who through love, sacrifice of the lower nature (not of the real Self), and wisdom, teach the true doctrine. Referring to that part of the world known as Bharata-Khaṇḍa (India), the last Arhat, Mahāvira, was born in 598 B.C., in a town called Kuṇḍagrāma, in the territory of Videha. He lived seventy-two years and reached Mokṣa (the perfect condition) in 526 B.C.

The Jaina philosophy also teaches that each soul (Ātman) is a separate individuality, uncreated, and eternal in existence; that each individual soul has lived from time without beginning in some embodied state, evolving from the lower to the higher condition through the law of Karma, or cause and effect; that so long as the Karmas (forces generated in previous lives) have not been fully worked out, it has, after physical death, to form another body, until through evolutionary processes it unfolds its absolute purity. Its full perfection is then manifested. This perfection of the individuality is the Jaina Nirvāṇa or Mukti. The individuality is not merged into anything: neither is it annihilated. The process of this development, or salvation, may be said simply to consist in right realization, right knowledge, and right life, the details of which are many.

I will now say a few words about Jaina Psychology. There are five Gateways of Knowledge, all unfolding through the laws of evolution and Karma. The first is the senses. In the lowest form of life, there is only one sense—that of touch. In higher forms of life, there are two, three, four, and (as in animals, birds, fish and men) five senses. Through the senses a limited form of knowledge is unfolded. The second source is study and reading. The third is Avadhi, or the psychic faculty, through which finer and more subtle things are known. The fourth is mind-knowing, by which the mental processes of others are known and understood.\* The fifth is

---

\* This is not to be confounded with telepathy, or direct thought-transference, in which a conscious relation has to be established between the agent and the recipient, since in genuine mind-knowledge the developed man knows the mental activities of others without their trying to communicate them to him.

Absolute Knowledge, in which all limitations of body and brain are removed. This state is not a loss, but rather the acme, of consciousness.

All these stages come to the ego not of themselves but through persistent effort and exercise of free will, or rather by making the will freer and freer. Personality is the mere physical but subtle gathering of excretions through which the individuality becomes unfolded. Personality is therefore changing every moment; the individuality is for every moment the particular stage of unfoldment of the ego itself, and is consequently the bearer of the sins and sorrows, pleasures and enjoyments, of mundane life. In absolute perfection this bearing nature is thrown off like a husk, and the ego dwells in divine and eternal bliss. It is not destroyed, nor is it merged into another ego or in a Supreme Being; and if the question be asked whether in this state of Mukti (deliverance) there is one ego or a plurality of egos. I would answer in the words of the Jaina Master: "That Atman by which I experienced myself and my essence through self-realization—that I am: neither masculine, feminine, nor neuter; neither one, two, nor many."

Now I come back to the quotation with which I began this article. The Vedānta metaphysics teaches that salvation comes through knowledge (of Brahman). It is not the potential that through effort and conquest becomes the actual; and we are further taught that that which is is real *now*. On the other hand, Jainism teaches that from the ideal and transcendental standpoint you *are* Brahman; but its



eternality, the real Mukti, comes from work and knowledge together, not from one alone. Through work and knowledge, Jainism says, the individual develops and unfolds the potential ; therefore, the statement, "I am Brahman," would be interpreted by a Jaina to mean—I am Brahman only inherently, or in embryo ; I have the capacity or the actual possibility of Brahman ; what I am implicitly must become explicit. There is a vast difference between the implicit and the explicit. Those who do not recognize this difference would never make an attempt to become rational and free.

The doctrine of the Jainas known as Syādvāda or Anekāntavāda, it is proper to affirm, in the words of a writer in America—

"is competent to descend into the utmost minutiae of metaphysics and to settle all the vexed questions of abstruse speculation by a positive method (not merely asserting *na iti, na iti*, not so, not so)—to settle at any rate the limits of what it is possible to determine by any method which the human mind may be rationally supposed to possess. It promises to reconcile all the conflicting schools, not by inducing any of them necessarily to abandon their favourite 'standpoints', but proving to them that the standpoints of all others are alike tenable ; or, at least, that they are representative of some aspect of truth which under some modification needs to be represented ; and that the Integrity of Truth consists in this very variety of its aspects within the relational unity of an all comprehensive and ramifying principle."

## JAINISM

Any philosophy or religion must be studied from all standpoints, and in order thoroughly to grasp the ideas of any religion or philosophy, know what it says with regard to the origin of the universe, what its idea is with regard to God, with regard to the soul and its destiny, and what it regards as the laws of the soul's life. The answers to all these questions would collectively give us a true idea of the religion or philosophy. In our country religion is not different from philosophy, and religion and philosophy do not differ from science. We do not say that there is scientific religion or religious science ; we say that the two are identical. We do not use the word religion because it implies a binding back, and conveys the idea of dependence, the dependence of a finite being upon an infinite, and in that dependence consists the happiness or bliss of the individual. With the Jainas the idea is a little different. With them bliss consists not in dependence but in independence ; the dependence is in the life of the world, and if that life of the world is a part of religion then we may express the idea by the English word, but the life which is the highest life is that in which we are personally independent so far as binding or disturbing influences are concerned. In the highest state the soul, which is the highest entity, is independent. This is the idea of our religion. The first important idea connected with it is the idea of the universe. Is it eternal or non-eternal ? Is it permanent or transi-

tory ? Of course there are so many different opinions on the subject, but with these opinions I am not concerned in this lecture ; I am only going to give the idea of the Jaina philosophy. We say that we cannot study any idea unless we look upon it from all standpoints. We may express this idea by many symbols or forms ; we have expressed it by the story of the elephant and the seven blind men who wanted to know what kind of animal the elephant was, and each touching a different part of the animal, understood its form in so many different ways, and thereupon became dogmatic. If you wish to understand what kind of animal an elephant is, you must look upon it from all sides, and so it is with truth. Therefore we say that the universe from one standpoint is eternal and from another non-eternal. The totality of the universe taken as a whole is eternal. It is a collection of many things. That collection contains the same particles every moment, therefore as a collection it is eternal ; but there are so many parts of that collection and so many entities in it, all of which have their different states which occur at different times and each part does not retain the same state at all times. There is change, there is destruction of any particular form, and a new form comes into existence ; and therefore if we look upon the universe from this standpoint it is non-eternal. With this philosophy there is no idea, and no place for the idea of creation out of nothing. That idea, really speaking, is not entertained by any right-thinking people. Even those who believe in creation believe from a different standpoint than

this. It cannot come into existence out of nothing, but is an emanation coming out of something. The state only is created. This book in a sense is created because all the particles are put together, having been in a different state. The form of the book is created. There was a beginning of this book and there will be an end. In the same manner, with any form of matter, whether this form lasts for moments or for centuries, if there was a beginning there must be an end. We say that there are both preservation and destruction in the many forces working around us. All these forces are working every moment in the midst of us and around us, and the collection of these entities is called by the Jainas 'God'. The Brāhmanas represent it by the syllable Om (ॐ); the first sound in this word represents the idea of creation, the second of preservation and the third of destruction. All these are energies of the universe and taken as a whole they are subject to certain fixed laws. If the laws are fixed why do people bow down to these energies? Why do they consider the collective energy as a god or as God? There is always an idea of the power to do evil in the beginning of this conception. When railroads were first introduced into India ignorant people who did not know what they were, who had never seen in their lives that a car or carriage could be moved without the horse or the ox, thought that there was some divinity in the engine, some god or goddess, and some of them would even bow down before the car; and even to this day you will find in some parts of India, among the pariahs or low class that there

are people who entertain this idea. So to these energies in our primitive state we are liable to attribute personality, and after a long course of development we symbolize our thoughts in the form of pictures, and explain them in that way to make them more intelligible to others. In the ancient times there was not rain but a rainer, not thunder but a thunderer, and in that way personality is attributed, or living consciousness and character, to those forces. There may be conscious entities in these forces as there may be living entities on the planets, but these forces themselves are not living entities. This, however, expresses the idea in the beginning; these energies were classed as creative, preservative and destructive, and these three entities were considered to be component parts of one entity called Brahma by the Hindus. Really, creation in this is in the sense of emanation, preservation is used in the sense of preserving the form, and destruction in the sense of destroying the form. The idea of matter is something that can be handled or perceived by the senses, and the energies must be material energies, as cohesion, magnetism, electricity, gravitation; but to consider these God would be the most materialistic idea, and therefore the Jainas discard this idea so far as the Godhead or Godlike character is concerned. They of course admit the existence of these energies, that they are indeed to be found everywhere, but they are subject to fixed laws which cannot be interfered with by any person, not that these energies consciously influence our destinies with regard to good and evil. To say that they do

so influence us is only to show our ignorance with regard to their laws. These energies collectively we call substantiality. There are innumerable qualities and attributes in matter itself, and they manifest themselves at different times and ways. We are not able without further development to know what energies are inherent in matter, and when any new thing comes to view we are surprised, and whatever is surprising, is considered to be something coming from divinity ; but where we understand scientific principles the surprise is removed and it is all as simple as the daily rising and setting of the sun. Thousands of years ago the different phenomena of nature were considered in different parts of the world to be the working of different gods and goddesses, but when we understand science these phenomena become simple and the idea of these beings as characters of the highest spiritual power goes away. *What is the God of the Jainas ?*, you will ask. I have only told you what he is not. I will now tell you what it is. We know that there is something besides matter ; we know that the body exhibits many qualities and powers not to be found in ordinary material substance, and that the something which causes this departs from the body at death. We do not know where it goes ; we know that when it lives in the body, the powers of the body are different from what they are when it is not there. The powers of nature can be assimilated to the body when that something is there. That entity is considered by us the highest, and it is the same inherently in all living beings. This principle

common to all of us is called divinity. It is not fully developed in any of us, as it was in the *saviours of the world*, and therefore we call them divine beings. So the collective idea derived from observations of the divine character inherent in all beings is by us called God. While there are so many energies in the material world and in the spiritual world, and putting those two energies together we give them the name of Nature, we separate the material energies and put them together, but the spiritual energies we put together and call them collectively God. We make a distinction, and worship only the spiritual energies. Why should we do so? A Jaina verse says, "I bow down to that spiritual power or energy which is the cause of leading us to the path of salvation, which is supreme, which is omniscient; I bow down to that power because I wish to become like that power." So where the form of the Jaina prayer is given, the object is not to receive anything from that entity or from that spiritual nature, but to become one like that; not that that spiritual entity will make us by a magic power become like itself, but by following out the ideal which is before our eyes we shall be able to change our own personality, it will be regenerated, as it were, and will be changed into a being which will have the same character as the divinity which is our idea of God. So we worship God, not as a being who is going to give us something, not because it is going to do something to please us, not because it is profitable in any way; there is not any idea of selfishness; it is like prac-

tising virtue for the sake of virtue and without any other motive. *Now we come to the idea of soul.* The ordinary idea of soul substance is that in order for a thing to exist it must have form, it must be perceived by the senses. That is our ordinary experience. Really speaking it is the experience only of the sensuous part of the being, the lowest part of the human entity, and from that experience we derive conclusions and think that these conclusions apply to all substance. There are substances which cannot be perceived by the senses ; there are subtler sensations and entities and these can be known only by the consciousness, by the soul. Such a substance, which cannot be seen, heard, tasted, smelled or touched, is a substance which need not occupy space, and need not have any tangibility, but it may exist, although it may not have any form (and that substance does not require any space, is intangible and cannot be seen). Sight is an impression made on the nerves of the eyes by vibrations sent forth from the object perceived and this impression which we call sight, if there are no vibrations coming out of the object, is of course not produced ; but if this substance influences us in certain ways, the implication is that there is something moving or producing vibrations, and these can not exist unless there is some material substance which is vibrating. The very fact that something is moving in some way and influences us in some peculiar way implies that there is something material about this. If there are no vibrations, the substance is not material. It need not exist in a form which will give us the



impression of any colour, smell, etc. There is nothing which can partake both of the attributes of soul and of matter ; the attributes of matter are directly contrary to those of the soul. While one has its life, in the other it does not become the other. How can that soul live in matter when its attributes are of a different nature ? By our own experience we know that we are obliged to live in surroundings which are not congenial to us, which are not of our own nature. People feel that they are not related to their surroundings, there must be some reason for their being obliged to live in those surroundings, but there must be a reason in the intelligence itself ; it cannot be in the material substance. We know that this is a fact, because intelligence cannot proceed from any thing which is purely material. No material substance has given any evidence of having possessed intelligence ; it might have done so when there was life in it, but without this it has no intelligence. That intelligence is, we are quite sure, influenced by material things, but it does not arise from the material things. Persons of sound intelligence take a large dose of some intoxicating drink and the intelligence will not work at all. Why should this material thing influence the immaterial, the soul ? The soul thinks that the body is itself and therefore anything which is done to the material self is supposed by the real self to be done to itself. That is where the Christian scientists and the Jaina philosophy will agree ; that if the soul thinks that the body is its real self, anything done to the body will be considered by the

soul to be done to the soul, and therefore what happens to the body will be felt by the soul; but if the soul for a moment thinks that the body is not the self but altogether different and a stranger to the soul, for that reason no feeling of pain will exist; our attention is taken away in some other direction and we do not know what is passing before us. This shows that the self is something higher than the body. Still under ordinary circumstances the soul is influenced by the body, and therefore we are to study the laws of the body and soul so as to rise above these little things and proceed on our path to salvation or liberation, which is the real aspiration of the soul. There is power of matter itself, but that power is lower than the power of the soul. If there was no power at all in the body or in matter, the soul would never be influenced by it, for mere non-existence will never influence anything; but because there is such a thing as matter, when the soul thinks that there is a power of the body and a power of the matter, these powers will influence it. Bodily power as we see it is on account of the presence of the soul. There is a power in matter, as cohesion, etc., and this will work although the soul does not think anything about it. If the moon revolves around the earth there are some forces inherent in the earth and moon. What I mean to say is that the influence of these material powers on the soul powers depends on the soul's readiness or willingness to submit to these powers. If the soul takes the view that it will not be influenced by anything it cannot be so influenced. This

being the soul's nature *what is its origin?* Everything can be looked upon from two standpoints, the substance and the manifestation. If the state of the soul itself is to be taken into consideration, that state has its beginning and its end. The state of the soul as living in the human body had a beginning at birth and will have an end at death, but it is a beginning and an end of the state, not of the thing itself. The soul taken as a substance is eternal; taken as a state every state has its beginning and end. So this beginning of a state implies that before this beginning there was another state of the soul. Nothing can exist unless it exists in some state. The state may not be permanent, but the thing must have a state at all times. If therefore the present state of the soul had a beginning, it had another state before the beginning of this state, and after the end of this state it will have another state. So the future state is something that comes out of or is the result of the present state. As the future is to the present so the present is to the past. The present is only the future of the past. What is true with regard to the future state is true with regard to the past and present states. The acts of the past have determined our present state, and if this is true the acts of the present state must determine the future state. This brings us to the doctrines of rebirth, transmigration of souls, metempsychosis, reincarnation, etc., as they are variously known. First take incarnation, which means literally becoming flesh, and really speaking that which is matter is always matter, and that which

is spirit is always spirit or soul. The spirit does not become flesh. If reincarnation means to become flesh there can be no reincarnation, but if it means simply the life in flesh for a short time, then there is reincarnation. Reincarnation means also to be born in some state again and again. Metempsychosis means in the Greek only change ; that the animal itself, body and soul, everything together, is changed into the human being and the human being, body and soul, is changed into some other being, and that is altogether changed into some other thing and so on. That is the idea of metempsychosis. Transmigration of souls is, especially in the idea of the Christians, the idea of the human soul going into the animal body, as if this were a necessity. But that is not the real idea ; the real idea is simply going from one place to another or, from one body to another, but not necessarily going from the human body to the animal body, but simply travelling. It implies the idea of form. Nothing can travel unless it has form and occupies space and is material ; so in our philosophy we reject all these terms if that is the idea connected with these terms, and use the idea of rebirth ; that is, the soul is born in some other body, and birth does not imply the same conditions applying to the human birth. There are certain conditions in which human beings are born ; the seed itself takes several months to ripen and then there is the birth. This may be due to certain acts or forces which are generated by human beings. These are in a condition to be observed by beings whose forces will take them to some other planet,

and we say that there is another condition of birth there. There is no necessity for gestation and fecundation. The Karmic body has in itself many powers, and has a force to take to itself another body, which is in the case of the human beings a gross body, but in the case of other beings a subtle body is generated, and this body is changeable so far as its form and dimensions are concerned, therefore if the forces generated while we live any kind of life are of different kinds then in the case of some being it may be necessary that he should be born in the human condition, and pass through the actual conditions which must be obeyed if the human being is to be born, while if the forces generated are different in their character he may be born on some other planet where birth is manifested in a different way, without any necessity of the combination of the male and the female principle. There are so many different planes of life that the mere study of the human life ought not to be made to apply to all the affairs of life. We have studied only a few forms of the life of animals, human beings, etc., but that is only the part which under the present development of our science, of our eyesight even, we are able to study. We are not able to study other forms of life, innumerable in the universe, and therefore we ought not to apply the laws thus discovered to all forms of life. Our study is introspective because our idea is that the soul is able to know everything under the right circumstances. The knowledge acquired in these conditions is of a sounder nature and of a more correct kind because

the obstacles which come in the way of science are not there. Science has to commit mistakes and think they do not ; still knowledge is derived from inferences which we draw from certain premises which may not be right or if the premises are right the inferences may be wrong. We do not mean to say that there are always mistakes in the knowledge which is acquired through sensation or through matter, but sometimes it is possible, and while it may be correct knowledge in many cases we cannot rely on that. The highest knowledge is immediate knowledge, derived by the soul without the assistance of any external thing, and the knowledge of liberated souls, and also the knowledge of human beings who are just on the point of being liberated, or have passed through the course of discipline, mental, moral and spiritual, and have nearly exhausted past forces, at the same time, generating spiritual forces, and on account of discipline and spiritual evolution have become receptive. The soul sees everything when this state is arrived at ; it knows everything, is fully conscious and consciousness itself means first of all that it knows itself, and to know one's self means that it is something, some reality, and there can be no reality unless it can distinguish itself from other realities. Only the one universal thing could not know itself, because knowledge implies comparing one with another, and if that is not done there is no individuality. We say therefore that the soul in its highest existence knows that it is perfectly separate from other things so far as experience and knowledge are concerned, but

in so far as its nature is concerned, so long as there is a sense of separateness there is no occasion or opportunity for the soul to rise higher because when the soul thinks that it is living a different existence for its own sake it is considering its own self to be different from another person, and thinks that this is its own and a part of its nature, its own being, and therefore anything done in regard to these surroundings will benefit or injure its own nature. It even thinks that its very life consists in doing good and in loving other souls and taking active measures for carrying into effect the very plan of that soul. Then it comes higher, and ultimately reaches the highest condition. The condition of the soul, 'as I have said, is the highest in which there is perfect consciousness, there is infinite knowledge and infinite bliss ; we express these three ideas in Sanskrit as existence infinite, bliss infinite and knowledge infinite. That condition of the soul cannot be described by us because description is something which proceeds from a finite mind and when the soul becomes infinite no finite mind can fully express the conditions of that infinite state. The attributes we give therefore to that condition of the soul are always full of comprehension. We shall always leave out many things ; we have not the power to express all our thoughts. How can we express, then, this state of a soul which so far as its power and knowledge are concerned is infinite ? The Jainas have studied the nature of the soul and the universe from these standpoints and have derived a beautiful principle, and so far as this is concerned

there is this difference between this country and other countries and other religions, they can understand all these from these standpoints. The Bible says, "Thou shalt not kill," and Jainas practise universal love so that this also means that we should not kill any beings. If we say that the Bible does not mean that we take away a part of the Bible. Why should we interpret the laws of any religion from the narrowest standpoint? We should take into consideration the nature, attributes and working of all things. We cannot derive laws which are to be applied to the whole universe simply by our observation of a part of the conscious nature of the universe. If you wish to state correctly the nature of the universe you will study the nature of all the different parts of the universe and then the laws will be applicable to all parts of it. We think that we are superior to other things because our tenants who live on the ground floor are inferior to us, but we have no right therefore to crush those tenants, who later on will acquire the right to inhabit the second and third floors and finally the highest floor. One living on the highest plane has no right to crush those who live on the lowest plane. If one thinks that he has a right to do this, that he has not sufficient strength to live without destroying life, our philosophy says that it is still a sin to destroy life, and it remains only to choose the lowest form, the less evil. We will in business take such a kind of business as will yield the most profit and will cause us to lose the least, in which we have the less liabilities; and the highest condition will be that in



which we have no liabilities and no creditors, the state in which we may live without any creditors or in a perfectly free condition. That is the liberated condition. The idea of Karma is very complicated. I have told you something of it in my former lectures. The one chief point is that that theory is not the theory of fatalism, not a theory in which the human being is tied down to some one, bound down by the force of something outside himself. In one sense only will there be fatalism, if we are free to do many things, we are also not free to do other things, and we cannot be freed from the results of our acts. Some results may be manifested in great strength, others very weakly ; some may take a very long time and others a very short time ; some are of such a nature that they take a long time to work out, while the influence of others may be removed by simply washing with water and that will be the case in the matter of acts done incidentally without any settled purpose or any fixed desire. In such a case with reference to many acts we may counteract their effects by willing to do so. So the theory of Karma is not in any sense a theory of fatalism, but we say that all of us are not going to one goal without any desire on our part, not that we are to reach that state without any effort on our part, but that our present condition is the effect of our acts, thoughts and words in the past state. To say that all will reach the perfect state merely because some one has died that they might be saved, merely from a belief in this person, would be a theory of fatalism, because

those who have lived a pure and virtuous state and have not accepted a certain theory will not reach the perfected state simply for that reason and no other. The faith in saviours is simply this, that by following out the divine principle which is in our own selves when this is fully developed we also shall become Christs, by the crucifixion of the lower nature on the altar of the higher. We also use the cross as a symbol. All living beings have to pass through or evolve from the lowest, the monadic condition, to the highest state of existence, and cannot reach this unless they obtain possession of the three things necessary: *right belief, right knowledge and right conduct*. The *right belief*, really speaking, is not that there is no passing through forms after death, but the soul keeps progressing always in its own nature without any backward direction at all. We have expressed this in clear language without any parables or metaphors, but when we preach these truths to the ignorant masses, some story or picture might be necessary for them, and after that the explanation of the real meaning, as we have an allegory in the *Pilgrim's Progress*. It is just like reaching the Celestial City in that book, but we must all understand that these things are parables. Others may need music to assist their religion, but when we understand the esoteric meaning which underlies all religions there will be no quarrelling and no need of names or of forms, and this is really the object of all religions.