CHAPTER V

THE PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION

To know the philosophy of religion, we should first see the etymology of religion, the concept of religion and the sources of religion. We should also know the methods of religion. Then we can deal with the philosophy of religion, with its ramifications. The subject will not be complete unless we take into consideration Gandhi's contributions to religion.

Let us take the above points one by one and deal with them in details.

1. The Etymology of Religion-

The derivation of the term, religion, will be of some help to us in the understanding of the concept of religion given by Gandhi. Tarapada Chowdhury gives the conception of religion by giving the etymology of religion. He states: 'The conception of \textit{dharma} has been of profound significance in Indian thought of all times and its etymology is a pointer to its connotation. In vedic times,
in its variant form dharman (Vṛdhānta, to hold, to support) meant "prop" or support and "law" or "ordinance"; later it naturally developed the senses "innate property of a thing", "customary law," "religious injunction" and "duty". All those meanings it has ever continued to have, so that dharma has been understood and interpreted as that which supports the universe as well as the society. "Dharma is supreme in this world", (and) "The most potent refuge."\(^1\)

Joseph Gaer, in this connection, observes: 'The word (religion) itself, it is believed, comes from the Latin "religere", which means "to be involved." ... From this belief that life had purpose in general, in which the individual was involved, arose the institution of religion.'\(^2\) In this connection, Jung observes: 'Religion, as the Latin word denotes, is a careful and scrupulous observation of what Rudolf Otto aptly termed the "numinosum", that is, a dynamic existence or effect, not caused by an arbitrary act of will. On the contrary, it seizes and controls the human subject which is always rather its victim than its creator... The numinosum is either a quality of a visible object or the influence of an invisible presence causing a peculiar alteration of consciousness. This is, at least, the general rule.'\(^3\) He further observes: 'Religion appears to me to be a peculiar attitude of the human mind, which could be formulated in accordance with the original use of the term "religio" that is, a careful consideration and observation of certain dynamic factors, understood to be "powers" spirits, demons, gods, laws, ideas, ideals or whatever...
name man has given to such factors as he has found in his world powerful, dangerous or helpful enough to be taken into careful consideration, or grand, beautiful and meaningful enough to be devoutly adored and loved.\(^4\) Jung's view of religion signifies that religion deals with powers either good, or bad, benevolent or malevolent. But once we entertain them in our mind, they take the possession of our mind and the whole activity of life is directed accordingly.

Swami Sivananda by giving Latin roots define religion thus:

'The word "religion" comes from Latin roots *re*-back, *ligare* to bind. The mind which is wandering in the sensual objects of this world is fixed to the soul, the original source or abode. Without religion there cannot be any real life.'\(^5\)

2. Gandhi's Concept of Religion

The above quotations with reference to the derivation of the term, religion, will be of some help as they shed some light on the understanding of Gandhi's concept of religion, which we now discuss. He defines religion, in part, thus. 'By religion, I do not mean formal religion, or customary religion, but that religion which underlies all religions, which brings us face to face with our Maker.'\(^6\) In this definition of religion we see that Gandhi defines religion negatively and positively. By negatively defining it, he rules out the idea of any formal or customary religion. He is not satisfied in giving the definition negatively, though it is of importance that he throws the search light on the pitfall in the definition of religion. Positively, he means that religion
should bring us face to face with our Maker. This insinuates that religion should be such as it should help the development of man, bringing him towards God. The word 'Maker' hints that Gandhi aims at the perfection of life which may not be realized in one life. So this definition, though short, gives Gandhi's deep outlook on life.

He again defines religion negatively, 'religion which takes no account of practical affairs and does not help to solve them is no religion.' In this definition, Gandhi lays stress that religion should not merely deal with extramundane points otherwise it will be weird, and be a matter of mere speculations and thus will not give the ballast in one's life. He again defines religion, partly, in this way: 'Let me explain what I mean by religion. It is not the Hindu religion which I certainly prize above all other religions, but the religion which transcends Hinduism, which changes one's very nature, which binds one indissolubly to the truth within and which ever purifies. It is the permanent element in human nature which counts no cost too great in order to find full expression and which leaves the soul restless until it has found itself, known its Maker and appreciated the true correspondence between the Maker and itself.' This definition, though reiterates certain salient points given in the other definitions, gives the depth, not only of Gandhi's life but the depth of the subject too. It gives many things but we will see one thing which is of great importance in understanding the meaning of the definition more perfectly. The words 'which binds one indissolubly to the truth within and which ever purifies' give
us the truths of two kinds, one within and the other without. If one does not realize the truth within, the one will not have any capacity to cognize the definition perfectly.

Again, Gandhi defines religion, in part, in this way also:

'Religion should pervade every one of our actions. Here religion does not mean sectarianism. It means a belief in ordered moral government of the universe. It is not less real because it is unseen. This religion transcends Hinduism, Islam, Christianity, etc. It does not supersede them. It harmonizes them and gives them reality.'

Now we see here that this definition does not smack of any sectarianism. It aims at the large synthesis. This large synthesis will widen not only the horizon of the mind but also the horizon of the heart. The latter if not realized, the former loses its importance and in some cases it will either spell priggery or make the one braggart.

R.R. Diwakar's impression of what Gandhi understands by the term, religion, is noteworthy. Diwakar observes: "He (Gandhi) has given his own definition of religion. It is that deep and ardent hunger in the man's soul which earnestly and constantly seeks union with the universal soul, with God. The human spirit calling to the spirit which eternally pervades everything is the essence of what Gandhi called 'religion.'"

Now let us see how S. Radhakrishnan defines religion. He states: 'Religion is not so much a revelation to be attained
by us in faith as an effort to unveil the deepest layers of man's being and get into enduring contact with them. This definition does not rule out a revelation in one's life, but it lays more stress on the unveiling of the deepest layers of man's being, not only so, but it also lays stress on getting into enduring contact with them. The definition given is quite characteristic of the man who has defined it. It is born from his mode of life. It requires an understanding of what are the deepest layers of man's being. They can be, from the view of the author, the different 'koshas' (layers), with reference to feeling, mind, intellect, and the one beyond the intellect ('Turiya') and at last to be one with one's deepest self. It is to go from the gross body to the subtle and subtler ones and then concentrate on one's deepest self. The deepest self of the one is not different from the perfect self as the maxim, 'That thou art' ('Tat Tvam Asi') teaches us. Ultimately the author comes to the perfect self i.e. God, the Maker, to whom Gandhi refers, in his definition of religion; every activity of a man of religion must be derived from his religion, because religion means being bound to God, that is to say, God rules your every breath.

Radhakrishnan again observes: 'Dharma (religion) gives coherence and direction to the different activities of life. It is not a religious creed or cult imposing an ethical or social rule. It is the complete rule of life, the harmony of the whole man who finds a right and just law of his living. Each man and group, each activity or soul, mind, life, and body, has its
The last part of Radhakrishnan's view of religion, 'Each man and group, each activity of soul, mind, life, and body has its dharma,' is deepened when Gandhi observes, in the above paragraph, 'Every activity of a man of religion must be derived from his religion.' The one point notable in Radhakrishnan's view of religion is "It (religion) is the complete rule of life, the harmony of the whole man." When he refers to "the harmony of the man," he refers to the higher self coupled with the lower one of man. The lower self is not discarded from his consideration. The lower self is controlled and is made an integral part of the whole life. Gandhi, elsewhere, observes that if any one minds to place the one right angle of a square (of life) aright, the others will take care of themselves. That one right-angle of a square is none but religion. Next we come to Schleiermacher's view of religion.

Schleiermacher's view of religion expressed by Otto Pfleiderer runs thus: 'Religion, he (Schleiermacher) showed, is neither knowing nor doing, neither metaphysics nor morals, neither dogma nor worship, but it is our pious feeling in so far as we become conscious in it of the connection of our life with that of the All; or, as it is expressed in Schleiermacher's System of Doctrine, it is our 'feeling of absolute dependence,' in which we take ourselves along with all else that is finite, and refer ourselves to the one infinite cause of the universe. The doctrines connected with religion are secondary products of reflection about the feelings and means of expression for the communication of them to others; but they do not belong in them-
Otto Pfleiderer further states, as Schleiermacher is improved by Hegel: 'Schleiermacher, however, did not yet carry out logically the fruitful thought of the "development" of religion, seeing that he removed the founder of Christianity to a position above the plane on which the historical humanity moves, and he carried him back to a miraculous origin, thereby opening to super-naturalism the entrance anew into the system of doctrine. This defect was amended and corrected by the Hegelian philosophy of religion. The strength and merit of the Hegelian philosophy lay in this, that it applied the idealism of the Kantian subjective philosophy to the historical life of humanity, and has understood that life in the light of a development of the spirit in conformity with law. Thereby this philosophy made an immense impression upon its contemporaries, who believed they found in it the word that solved all riddles.

So Schleiermacher's view is helpful in some respects to understand the conception of religion propounded by Gandhi as he lays stress more on the development of heart than on the brain in the understanding of religion. Schleiermacher's view to a certain extent, is also not helpful to understand Gandhi's view on religion perfectly as it is not useful in solving the riddles of life. So Schleiermacher's view improved by Hegel is of greater importance to us in understanding the kernel of Gandhi's view. Hegel's logical Idealism is helpful to understand Gandhi's conception of religion, as a whole, but it does
not carry us to our goal of understanding Gandhi's conception of
religion, as Hegel's logical Idealism is not without defects.
Hegel's Logical Idealism will carry us through the field of mind
and will bring us to the border of Mind but will not be helpful
to us to enter the subtler field of Mind, while Gandhi's concep-
tion of religion aims at that. It does not mean thereby that
Hegel is not at all helpful to us. Without Hegel's philosophy
of mind, Gandhi's conception of religion will be of little avail.

At this stage James' view of religion is noteworthy as he
talks of 'religion in the acutest sense.' W. James believes
religion is 'the keynote of the universe sounding in our ears,
and everlasting possession spread before our eyes.' He
further states: 'Once more, there are plenty of men, constitu-
tionally sombre men, in whose religious life this rapturous-
ness is lacking. They are religious in the wider sense, yet in
this acutest of all senses they are not so, and it is religion
in the acutest sense that I wish, without disputing about words,
to study first, so as to get at its typical differentia.'

Mr. Abu Sayeed Ayyub quotes the definitions of religion
given by James and Whitehead. They are worth noting. Mr.
Ayyub observes: 'Religion has in fact been defined as "the
belief that there is an unseen order and that our supreme good
lies in harmoniously adjusting ourselves thereto" (James).
Religion has also been defined as "what the individual does with
his solitariness" (Whitehead). In contrast, morality could be
described as what the individual does with his society.'
E. Caird's definition of religion is helpful in understanding the importance of Gandhi's one. It also sheds some light on our understanding of the life of Gandhi. E. Caird (Evolution of Religion, Glasgow, 1894, 1:81) observes: 'A man's religion, if it is sincere, is that consciousness in which he takes up a definite attitude to the world, and gathers to a focus all the meaning of his life.'

From the viewpoint of Caird's definition of religion, it seems that Gandhi has a definite outlook on his life and a definite attitude to the world and gathers to a focus all the meaning of his life' to the Makers of the world, God. About religion, I quote further from the Encyclopaedia refered: 'In other words there is that which is of supreme personal significance, whether it concerns the self (1) alone or (2) in its relation to others, or (3) in its relation to a higher Power.'

The single definition of religion as religion will not bring us to the core of the definition of religion as 'A survey of the numerous definitions of religion would be more informing than any new one that might be proposed.'

So, the above survey of the numerous definitions given by Gandhi and others will bring us round to the definition of religion. Rather, we should say that it brings us to the substance of the definition of religion and not to the definition as such. The clear cut definition of religion cannot be given. In this connection, C.C.J. Webb (Group Theories of Religion, 1916, p.59) observes: 'I do not myself believe that Religion can be defined.'

Professor Whitehead defines religion as world loyalty. Religion as world loyalty does not go far from the moral plane. It has no moorings in God. The world loyalty is the effect of religion; it is not religion itself. The Jains give the defini-
tion of religion that helps us in our difficulties and it has the spiritual side. Herbert Warren chiefly from notes of talks and lectures given by Virchand R. Gandhi defines religion, from the point of Jainism, thus: 'Religion is the act of bringing one's own life up to an accepted standard of excellence morally and spiritually... and "religion is the only thing that can afford true consolidation and peace of mind in the season of affliction and the hour of death."'

Aldous Huxley, in his conception of religion, emphatically says that it is a system of education by means of which one can make desirable changes in one's own personality and remove obnoxious things from the society. It also heightens consciousness, by means of which one can establish more adequate relations between oneself and the universe of which one is the part.

The above definitions show that the one single definition of religion is not enough to show the outlook of Gandhi on religion. All these above definitions collectively and not singularly each, give the meaning of the definition more perfectly than a single one can. These definitions of religion, given by Gandhi, not only give the kernel of religion but they also insinuate the scope of religion. These definitions lay stress on the purification of mind and the development of heart. B. Pattabhi Sitaramayya, in this connection, observes: 'Mere knowledge counts for nothing with him (Gandhi) for his aim is the combination of perfect purity with perfect learning.' Sitaramayya further observes: 'If true religion is a heart grasp not a brain one, it cannot be alien to anyone but must be evolved by each out of
himself, as it is always within us all.*27 P. Spratt observes

*He (Gandhi) required a liberal, individualistic religion, and
one according to his own tastes.*28 This shows that Gandhi
was an independent thinker in religion. Spratt, with reference
to the relation of religion and ethics, states: *He was concer­
ned about ethics, that product of independent and individualistic
thought, and maintained that ethics and religion are one.*29

Briefly, religion, defined by Gandhi in his characteristic
different ways, gives the salient features to us. His defini-
tions of religion remind us that religion cannot be sectarian;
it transcends all the religions of the world; it has relation
with the Maker of the world; it teaches that man should evolve
from within and move towards his Maker; it is not without morality,
nay, religion and morality are, in some respects, one; it takes
into account the practical affairs and solves the problems of the
practical life. Gandhi's view on religion lays stress that
religion is a heart-grasp. If the heart is not purified,
religion cannot be understood in its essence. The second thing
notable is that religion is always within us. It does not
depend on the formalities. The third thing notable in his view
about religion is *if we want to do anything in the right manner
and anything that is going to persist, there should be the
religion evolved from within. Every one can evolve it relatively,
so there cannot be the same phase or grade of religion for all.
I mean there are grades or stages in religion comprehended within
one religion and the different levels in religion will appeal to
the persons having the corresponding levels in them. In this
connection Gandhi observes: 'In reality, there are as many religious as there are individuals.' Gandhi further observes: 'I do not share the belief that there can or will be on earth one religion. I am striving, therefore, to find a common factor and to induce mutual tolerance.'

Again briefly, not only the persons evolve gradually, but also religion, comprehended by the people, in course of time, evolves. So, the definition of religion, if given, will be tentative. The numerous definitions, collectively and not singularly, will give the substance of the definition with the differentia insinuated, not pointedly but in a round about way, in which the subjective part of the definition should not be deleted, i.e. the one who gives the definition should not be forgotten in the picture of the reader of the definition. Some times, the subjective part of the reader plays not an insignificant part in comprehending the definition given as there may be the various interpretations of one and the same definition. The subject is still further discussed in this chapter under the caption of 'The Nature of Religion.'

3. The Sources of Gandhi's Religion

The principal sources of Gandhi's religion are three
(1) his home atmosphere
(2) some men
(3) some books.

At home, he got a very good atmosphere to nurture the religious attitude in him. His mother used to observe 'Vrata' and used to undergo some penance, e.g. (1)'Chaturmas' i.e.
one meal a day and a fast on an alternate day and no food to be taken without seeing the sun in the rainy season. (2) 'Chandra-yana vow.' The mother's observation of vows led him onward to observe vows.

His nurse, Rambha, dispelled the fog of fear in his young age when he used to fear darkness on going into the dark room. He was unable to enter the dark room but the got courage when his nurse advised him to recite the name of God while entering the dark room. The good seed sown in his childhood grew in strength when he came of age.

His father used to recite verses from the Gita. When his father was ill at Parbander, he got some one to sing 'Duhas' (couplets) and 'Chepais' (quatrains). At this time, Gandhi, being thirteen years old, was enraptured by that reader's reading. Sometimes, Gandhi himself read some portions from the Ramayana before his father. When he was at Rajkot, he got the atmosphere for toleration for other faiths as his father used to be in the company of persons of various faiths. His father had Muslim, Parsi and Jain friends. The Jain 'Muni' (recluse) used to pay visits often at this house and used to take 'Gochari' (meals) and his place. Thus, early in his life Gandhi got the atmosphere for having respect for other faiths as his father did.

Gandhi learnt nothing about religion when he was at school. At 'Haveli' the sacred place pertaining to Gandhi's faith, he learnt nothing about religion. When he was a student in England, he came in contact with two Theosophist brothers who used to read Sir Edwin
Arnold’s Translation, *The Song Celestial* (The Gita). They asked him to help them with the original in Sanskrit. But he was dismayed at his ignorance in Sanskrit. But he took interest in the study of the Gita. The verses in the second chapter of the Gita made a good and lasting impression on his mind. Madame Blavatsky’s *Key to Theosophy* stimulated the desire of Gandhi to read books on Hinduism. Then he read the New Testament. The sermon on The Mount went straight to his heart and he tried to put the lesson in practice with such a zest that the Christians envied him. He used to quote the commandments from the Gospels, while talking with the Christians and used to ask in this manner: ‘Was it not said in the Sermon On the Mount and The New Testament?’ At his putting thus, those Christians who came in touch with him blushed at his zest for translating the Christian faith into his life. He was considered a devout Christian by a multitude of Christians and some wrote books about Gandhi’s observation of the Christian faith and gave the title, as *The Cross Moves to the East.*

Gandhi came in contact with Shrimad Rajachandra (otherwise called Raychandbhai) who had a burning zeal to get nirvana (salvation or Absobation). Gandhi marked the concentration of Shrimad Rajachandra’s mind on the path of his evolution. He noticed that whenever Rajachandra was not engaged in his business in his shop and could get leisure even for some minutes, he used to pay his attention and become rapt in meditation, even amidst the din and bustle of the Zaveri Bazaar in Bombay. Shri Rajachandra initiated Gandhi truly in Hinduism. But for his influence,
Gandhi might have been a Christian. Gandhi frankly said that he owed to him a good deal with reference to his religion. Gandhi observes: "Three moderns have left a deep impress on my life, and captivated me: Raychandbhai (who is also called Rajchandra) by his living contact, Tolstoy by his book, The Kingdom of God is Within You, and Ruskin by his Unto This Last." About Tolstoy's book referred, Gandhi states: "Tolstoy's The Kingdom of God Is Within You overwhelmed me. It left an abiding impression on me. Before the independent thinking, profound morality, and the truthfulness of this book, all the books given me by Mr. Coats seemed to pale into insignificance."33

Besides Tolstoy's book, the above referred one, Ruskin's 'Unto This Last' made a lasting effect on Gandhi. He states: 'I believe that I discovered some of my deepest convictions reflected in this great book of Ruskin, and that is why it so captured me and made me transform my life.'34

Some European thinkers are of opinion that the sources of Gandhi's religion are Tolstoy's The Kingdom of God Is within You, The Sermon on The Mount, and Ruskin's Unto This Last. But they are not exclusive. Tolstoy's book refers to Christ. Gandhi says elsewhere that there are better examples of sacrifice and love in the Hindu religion than the one in Christ (cf. The first line p. 116 Gandhi's Autobiography, 1959) So, these are not the sources of Gandhi's religion. The authentic sources are Tulsidas's Ramayana, the Upanisads (particularly, the Ishopanishad) and the Gita.

Spratt gives us a good list of Gandhi's reading. 'He studied
Tamil and Urdu, and read the Bible, the Quran and the Gita, and also Carlyle, Huxley, Bacon, Tolstoy, Ruskin and Plato. He began translations from Carlyle and Ruskin, but was unable to complete them. He further states: in addition to his old favourites, a life of Garibaldi, Thoreau, Emerson and a number of Indian authors. He seems to have been impressed by Carlyle, who taught him the lesson that the French gained nothing through their revolution. Spratt continues the list: Gandhi's Christian friends gave him Dr. Parker's "Commentaries" and Pearson's "Many Infallible Proofs," neither of which made much impression, and Butler's "Analogy" which though dull seems to have had a little more effect. He read Sale's Quran, and Washington Irving and Carlyle on the Prophet, and something on Zoroastrianism. Maitland and Kingsford's "The Perfect Way" and "New Meaning of the Bible" pleased him. Gandhi read also Max Muller's "India: What can It Teach Us", and some translations of the Upanishads.

So, the above list shows that Gandhi read far and wide.

Briefly, the sources of Gandhi's religion are the Bhagavat, The Rāmāyana, The Gita, The Isopanishad. He got his beliefs from these sources and his belief, got the collaboration from other works and his understanding of religion quickened and deepened due to his vast reading of the religious books of other faiths and some wellknown masters in the field, both Eastern and Western.

4. The Methods -

Gandhi's methods of religion are born from his observation
of religion, not sectarian but universal. He pursued his Maker
i.e. God in the observation of religion and did service to the
world in the light of what he realized in pursuing God, or perfe-
tion. In his methods, besides comparison we shall see (1) reason
and intuition, (2) faith and the inner voice. This is supplement-
ed with attitude. We shall see how he came to these methods and
discuss how far these methods are true and in what respects they
are true.

To understand Gandhi's methods of religion, his conception
of man's abilities to follow religion is helpful to us. He
observes: "And if we are imperfect ourselves, religion as
conceived by us must also be imperfect.... Religion of our
conception, being thus imperfect, is always subject to a process
of evolution and reinterpretation.... We must be keenly alive to
the defects of our own faith also, yet not learn it on that
account, but try to overcome those defects. Looking at all
religions with an equal eye, we would not only not hesitate, but
would think it our duty, to blend into our faith every accept-
able feature of other faiths."38

(i) Reason:

Gandhi observes: "My Hindu instinct tells me that all religions
are more or less true. All proceed from the same God but all
are imperfect because they have come down to us through imper-
fected human instrumentality."39 In these quotations we see
that, because man is an imperfect being, his conception of religion
will be imperfect and as these will be evolution in him, his
interpretation of religion may vary. Gandhi says elsewhere that
if his two interpretations of some fact vary, the latter one, chronologically, should be given weight. This shows that man should think and he should not be guided by any authority blindly. Gandhi values the authority of the Sacred literature of the world but does not take it blindly. That which is against man's reason, he will not take and he asks us not to follow it even if it is written in the 'Shastra' (the Authoritative books on the Sacred Lore). In this connection he states: 'That which is opposed to the fundamental maxims of morality, that which is opposed to trained reason, cannot be claimed as Shastra no matter how ancient it may be (revered).'

When a man quotes from the Shastras before others, the others are tempted to believe what the man quotes before them. Gandhi here throws a search-light upon it and says that even the Shastra should be measured or tested by the truth of the statement. In this connection he observes: 'I exercise my judgment about every scripture, including the Gita. I cannot let a scriptural text supersede my reason. Whilst I believe that the principle books are inspired, they suffer from a process of double distillation. Firstly, they suffer from a process of double distillation. Firstly, they came through a human prophet, and then through the commentaries of interpreters. Nothing in them comes from God directly.'

He further observes that in Hinduism we have got an admirable foot-rule to measure every Shastra and every rule of conduct, and that is truth. Whatever falls from truth should be rejected, no matter whatever it comes from. Unless he shows that (--that it is consistent with truth), all the authorities that he may
cite in support of it are to Gandhi irrelevant. He states also: 'I reject any religious doctrine that does not appeal to reason and is in conflict with morality. I tolerate unreasonable religious sentiment when it is not immoral.' The above quotations show that Gandhi lays stress on reason and he lays more stress on morality than on reason. He lays stress on truth also. If there is any fact that cannot be fathomed and may not be brought under reason, but if it is moral, will not take any objection against it. When he lays stress on truth, he does not mean that it should be only cognized through intellect but should be fathomed by heart. Some thinkers think otherwise. They lay stress more on intellect than on heart. They consider that heart is blind. Any thing based on heart is considered by them as unscrupulous. Gandhi lays stress comparatively more on heart than on reason because without the purification of heart, the man cannot see what is truth in the argument. The immoral man may justify his statement or his impious desire by giving reason and he cannot be brought to the right path even though one may argue with him day and night. Only by evolving through heart the immoral man will cognize truth. Only then and then, he will be on the right path. In this connection, what Gandhi observes is notable. 'My reason follows my heart. Without the latter it would go astray. Faith is the function of the heart. It must 
( better-reinforced) be enforced by reason. The two are not antagonistic as some think. The more intense one's faith is, the more it what's one's reason.... I have not put my reason in cold storage.' Gandhi again observes: 'And experience has shown, that in every case where there is an appeal to reason, any inference drawn
from the writings of a great person, however illustrious he may be, is irrelevant and calculated to confuse the issues at stake.... Thus, for instance, have not the so-called Christians distorted the undiluted message of Jesus? Have not sceptics drawn opposite deductions from the identical sayings of Jesus? Similarly, have not different Vaishnavite sections drawn different and often opposite deductions from the same texts in the Bhagavadgita, and is not the Bhagavadgita today quoted in support even of assassination?45

(ii) Intuition:

If a man feels that he is right but cannot give the reason for it, it seems that his statement is based on his heart. The intuition has affinity more with the heart than with the brain. There are two types of intuition. When a man works for many years in one field, he has the intuition based on intellect, e.g. the General says to the captain that the captain should follow the particular scheme. Then the captain asks him the reason for it. Then the General says that he cannot give the reason for it; however, the captain should follow his (the General's) scheme. The other type of intuition is based on heart. On the purification of one's heart, one may have intuition. Such an intuition is sometimes called revelation. The truth can be said either it is revealed or intuited. Such a truth may not be the final truth, it may be a relative one. It may be that one may not value the relative truth and may deride it. But, it has its own value as we, imperfects, cannot have the final Truth. The relative truth, degree by degree, will bring us to more truth
in the direction of the final Truth. Gandhi observes: "But as long as I have not realized this Absolute Truth, so long I hold by the relative truth, as I have conceived it. That relative truth must, meanwhile, be my beacon, my shield and buckler. I have given the two types of intuition but Mr. T.R.V. gives us four types of intuition. He states: 'Four are the varieties of intuition: (1) the sensuous (indriya-nimitam); (2) the mental (mānasa. pratyakṣa) which is consequent on the preceding sensuous intuition, having for its object the point-instant immediately following that of the sensuous. The need for admitting this rather ghostly function is the same that prompted Kant to formulate his schematism of the categories, i.e. to find a MUDUS VIVENDI between perception and thought; (3) The direct intuition (self awareness, SVA-SAMVEDANA) of consciousness and the mental states as pleasure and pain, etc. These are neither non-cognized as in the Bhaṭṭa view nor cognized by another state in the Nyāya; (4) The yogi pratyakṣa is the non-sensuous intellectual intuition of the saint, who by the power of concentration (bhāvanā) perceived things as they are with the utmost clarity." It seems to me that Gandhi follows the second type of intuition about which I talked earlier and the fourth type of intuition given in the above quotation. Sometimes reason is conducive to intuition. C.E.M. Joad observes: "As in Aristotle's ethics, reason is reduced to the role of planning the steps which are necessary to give effect to our intuitions." Sometimes it seems that intuition supersedes reason but it is not so. It should be better said that intuition is based on reason though it is not identical with reason.
(iii) Faith:

As intuition is sometimes beyond reason, faith is beyond reason; though, it may not be unreasoned faith. Gandhi observes: 'But you must not misunderstand my position. I believe in Faith also in things where Reason has no place.' He further observes: Who does not feel that there are mysteries impenetrable by reason? Do not the daily and so-called sudden transformations of the character of those who worship in faith incontestably show that there are things that reason cannot understand or explain?

F.H. Bradley's idea on faith is notable. He observes: 'Faith does imply belief, but more than this, it implies also will. If my will is not identified with that which I hold for fact, I have not faith in it. Faith is both the belief in the reality of an object, and the will that that object be real and where either of those elements fails, there is no faith.' He again observes: 'Faith implies the rise in thought, but not that only, it implies also the rise of the will to the object, which is not seen but thought.'

Faith is connected with experience also. They are supplementary with each other. To strengthen faith, experience is necessary. In the end, faith depends on experience, however little it may be. One who has faith in something, sooner or later, he will experience it. There is no doubt in faith. It does not mean thereby that the man who has faith becomes as if he is dead like a log. The one, who has pure faith, is conscious of one's intellect and knows that there is something transcendent to intellect and that
something is faith. Wherever the intellect cannot fathom, faith can do. The base of intellect is brain while the base of faith is in heart. It is the experience of the world that it is a fact that the strength of the heart (i.e., feeling) is a thousandfold to that of intellect. The man of faith has an indefatigable energy. He stands as a rock against the difficulties manifold. There is no polemics in faith. One's faith cannot be another's one. Due to faith, there is the development of inner knowledge and self-consciousness and hence there is the inward purification of mind while due to intellect, there is the development of outward knowledge and it is the worldly knowledge. The intellectual giants are seen sometimes bankrupt in character while those who have faith cannot be bankrupt in character. (cf. Navjeevan, 6-10-1929).

This does not mean that it is easy for the persons having faith to be Celibate or to be a man of sound character; but having faith, he will try his utmost to develop himself in his character and have his onward relative progress, degree by degree, and thus, in course of time, due to habits he will be a giant in character. A novice in any field of search has more faith than he has knowledge and he advances in his field due to faith in him. Here his faith outstrips his knowledge and his faith becomes a handmaid for the development of his intellect. A question then arises in us: how can we get such a faith as described above? One can get the faith, better I should say, develop the faith by devotion to a good cause and good company. It is said in the Gita: What cannot be achieved by good company?

(iv) The Inner Voice -

Gandhi's method in religion not only contains reason, faith, intuition, experience
but also the inner voice. He states: 'For me the Voice of God, of conscience, of Truth or the Inner Voice or ' the still small voice' mean one and the same thing. I saw no form. I have never tried, for I have always believed God to be without form. But what I did hear was like a Voice from a-far and yet quite near. It was as unmistakable as some human voice definitely speaking to me, and irresistible. I was not dreaming at the time I heard the Voice. The hearing of the Voice was preceded by a terrific struggle within me. Suddenly the Voice came upon me. I listened, made certain that it was the voice, and the struggle ceased. I was calm.'

This shows that whenever there is a difficulty on the path of Gandhi's life, he used to refer to his Voice within. If the difficulty is great, there is a struggle within and the voice answered. It is like this, as Jesus used to say: 'Knock and you will get'. Then Gandhi used to determine what to do in the light of his inner voice. Gandhi gives the occasion on which he heard that voice. He again states: 'the date and the hour of the fast were fixed. Joy came over me. This was between 11 and 12 midnight: I felt refreshed and began to write the note about it which the reader must have seen.'

One may think that the voice heard by Gandhi must be the result of his heated imagination and must have been due to the struggles of the day. But he declines it to be so. He again observes: 'For me the Voice was more real than my own existence. It has never failed me, and for that matter, any one else.'

He further states: 'I shall lose my usefulness the moment I stifle the still small voice within'. This shows that Gandhi absolutely depends on his inner voice. To have the 'still small Voice within'
one must undergo the discipline of the mind. The dross of one's heart should be purged. In this connection Gandhi observes: "Having made a ceaseless effort to attain self-purification, I have developed some little capacity to hear correctly and clearly the still small Voice within." It does not mean that only Gandhi or a man of his rank can have the Inner Voice. Anybody who has purged the dross from his heart can have it. Gandhi further observes: "My firm belief is that He reveals Himself daily to every human being, but we shut our ears to the 'still small Voice.'" Gandhi also states: 'And every one who wills can hear the Voice. It is within every one. But like everything else, it requires previous and definite preparation.' In these quotations, Gandhi has made clear that anyone, who wills to hear the Inner Voice and has the purity of heart, can hear the Inner voice and guide himself accordingly, on the path of his evolution to his perfection.

(v) Attitude -

The last but not least in importance is the point, whether religion is theoretical or practical. Religion is theoretical in the sense that it deals with dogmas, pertaining to the self, world and God. The theoretical aspect of religion makes the mind broad, whets the reason. Without the theoretical side of religion the practical side of religion cannot be understood and its importance cannot be conveyed in a full sense. The theoretical side or the contemplative one is considered relatively of more importance than the practical one in philosophy by Aristotle.
lays stress not only on the theoretical aspect of philosophy, but also on the practical one. Socrates, Plato and Aristotle were under the influence of Indian Mysticism either directly or indirectly, through the Orphic religion or cult. Their philosophy is not bereft of the practical side. Though they take the practical side into their consideration, they lay stress more on the contemplative one.

Some modern European philosophers do not take the practical side of philosophy into their consideration at all, and consider only the theoretical or the contemplative one as the only one to be thought of. But there are some others who consider the theoretical or the contemplative one as the principal one and the practical one as the subordinate one. In that case the theoretical or the contemplative one is predominant. In India religion and philosophy are almost one though there is some difference between the two. Gandhi lays stress on the practical side of religion. If religion is not practical, he will reject it. If religion does not deal with practical affairs, it pales away into nothingness. Even in the East, i.e. in India, there is the difference between Philosophy and religion. There is the philosophy of Religion too.

With reference to the religion, whether it is theoretical or practical, from the point of the methods of religion, Hegel comes to our help in giving us a right perspective to the case. He says that philosophy is neither theoretical, nor practical. Though it is not theoretical, it is not practical, too, because all the while the philosopher does not practise his ideas. So, Hegel
lays stress neither on theory, nor on practice; neither subordinately on the one, nor predominantly on the other, but he lays stress on ATTITUDE . The one must have the attitude all the while and the one can maintain it by habit. If we go deeper into Gandhi's idea of practice of religion, he believes his meaning in Hegel's sense that all the while one should have the attitude. Gandhi maintains attitude for all the time of his life. His attitude was of becoming God, i.e. evolving higher and higher and drawing himself nearer and nearer to perfection. Due to this attitude he was sometimes ridiculously called as 'God intoxicated,' by those persons who could not understand him aright.

Briefly, Gandhi's method in religion is quite characteristic of his life. His method was born of his experience. His method was born in his life, in his becoming. So he made use of reason, faith, experience, intuition, the Inner Voice and lastly Hegel's term 'attitude.'

5. What is Philosophy of Religion?

The philosophy of religion has not only to study the facts but to UNDERSTAND and EXPLAIN them. The philosophy of religion ultimately is not apart from philosophy itself as both study truth, in their different norms. The philosophy of religion is apart from any sectarian and theological view, though it comes very near to them. The philosophy of religion in explaining any fact rationally is not dogmatic whereas the sectarian and theological views are not sometimes without dogmatism. To know the philosophy of religion, in details, we will deal with

(i) problem and scope

(ii) the Nature of religion and its relation to other activities. Let us now deal with them one by one.
(1) Problem and Scope -

The philosophy of religion seeks to solve the problems. Some of the problems are (1) What is religion? and (2) How are we to define its essential nature and function?

'Religion,' Edwards observes, 'MEANS to be TRUE as well as effective, and effective because true.' In its own view, it contains supra-sensible knowledge and is progressively purified and made adequate and thus realized by the practitioner.

Gandhi has, by the purification of his lower nature, made the truth accessible which was rationally explained. This knowledge is suprasensible so it cannot be demonstrated but can be explained. And Gandhi has done so.

With reference to the essential nature of the philosophy of religion, Edwards observes: 'The essential nature of religion will only reveal itself to us when we have surveyed its psychological and historical development and studied the infinitely varied forms of expression which the religious spirit of man has from time to time assumed.' Gandhi has studied the essential nature of religion by taking a historical survey from the Upanisads down to the poets of Gujarat. He has also studied the religion psychologically both in himself and in the inmates of his Ashram.

With reference to the function of religion, Gandhi has traced principles, laws and factors at work in the development of religion both socially and individually and has laid stress that they do not differ materially much.
With reference to the scope of the philosophy of religion, it rests on the data it finds. Gandhi finds the data in the phenomena of his own real experience and endeavours to pass beyond it in order to find the laws and principles. So Gandhi's task becomes two-fold; first, it becomes historico-psychological and second, the metaphysical investigation of the relation of religious experience to the real truth and nature of things. In the scope of the philosophy of religion, Gandhi takes into consideration his dreams, subtle desires and instincts, ruthlessly particularly to himself.

(ii) The Nature of Religion and its Relation to other Activities-

The problem of the essential nature of religion may be approached in two ways: (a) we may ask what religion is in itself alone? and (b) its inner nature in relation to other forms of activity, or types of behaviour.

(a) The Nature of Religion -

History gives the diverse meanings of religion and thus there is a contradiction in the meanings of religion, so to set out for the essential character of religion seems foredoomed to failure. Religion, both subjective and objective, is not static, but it is ever growing and dynamic, still, however, there must be religion in general to which all particular religions and all types of religious experience are organic. A variety of opinions, with their different shades, are there with reference to the universal element in religion or with the principle of religion. John Morley says that there are ten thousand definitions of religion.
A brief reference to some of the more famous and representative theories of the nature of religion makes the point more clear. This subject is stated in the point 'Gandhi's conception of Religion' in this chapter. Here we state it from the different point of view.

Some restrict to one aspect of the psychical nature of man. Of these, some stand for thought as the essential nature of religion. They say that religion is the knowledge of the Absolute Idea or absolute knowledge involving the ultimate unity of both the finite and the infinite. Hegelian description of religion laying stress on logical unity, system and coherence, obscures the valuational attitude. Some, e.g. E.B.Taylor, lay stress on belief as the unique element in religion. E.B.Taylor lays stress on the belief in spiritual beings. Max Müller lays stress on perception, rather on "apperception" of the infinite as the unique element in religion.

Some define religion in terms of feeling or emotion. Schieir-macher is notable for his famous formula, "The essence of religion consists in a feeling of absolute dependence on God." Thus he has saved religion from the barren intellectualism on the one hand and bare moralism on the other. He rules out the idea or knowledge with reference to the nature of religion when he says: 'Ideas and principles are all foreign to religion." He lays stress on the mystic inwardness or the immediate awareness of God. We can oppose it by saying that religion can never be MERE feeling as feeling has some idea content. The life of feeling bursts forth both in
thought and action. Thus to speak of the feeling of dependence on God is to give the feeling an idea-content, however vague it is. Thus it is conceded that religion cannot be pure feeling to which ideas are foreign.

Others have laid stress on moral will in religion. Kant's definition of religion is "the recognition of all our duties as divine commandments." Matthew Arnold's dictum: "Religion is morality touched with emotion." All these give us the partial truths about the nature of religion.

Some define religion in terms of the idea of value. They are far better than those who talk of religion in terms of feeling. Herbart, Lotze and Ritschl have made value as the dominant note in their philosophical discussions. Harald Höfdding is the notable philosopher who strikes the note of value in giving the nature of religion. But he is led astray by the analogy he draws between the religious postulate of the conservation of value and the scientific postulate of energy. Conservation of value lacks in the man both individual intimacy and warmth.

Others, again, think of taboos with reference to religion. M. Salomon Reinach thinks of taboos. But religion can never be a system of taboos. It has not only the negative element but also has the positive one as we find in "He that loseth his life shall find it," and "I came that ye may have life, and have it abundantly." Thus religion contributes to self-realization or expansion of personality.

We can make out what Gandhi says about the nature of religion from
the point previous to this one. It seems that religion has relation with the Maker of the world, it teaches that man should evolve from within and move towards his Maker; it is not without morality. Gandhi lays stress in religion on the heart grasp. If the heart is not purified, religion cannot be understood in its essence. Religion is always within us. Every one can evolve relatively. He says that religion itself evolves.

We may now sum up our own view of the nature of religion.
Religion involves a subject and an object and a relation of subject to object. The subjective side consists of psychical functions, viz. thought, feeling and conation. On the objective side, it has reference to a trans-subjective divine reality. In efforts of the man towards the realization of religion in him, not only the mind evolves but also there is the purification of the heart. In the words of W.E. Hocking, "Religion is anticipated attainment," it gradually lifts up into a suprasensible world or order, which is not only transcendental but also immanent, a "beyond which is within," wherein values coincide with reality. As there is the closer and closer intimacy with reality through worship, devotion and service, there is the emotional response bursting itself into the volitional reaction. Corresponding to the purification of heart, the mind can apprehend reality wholly. Religious loyalty brings self denial, discipline, even asceticism wholesome, but in the long run, it blossoms even into the expansion of personality which affects not only the individual life but also the collective one.
The Relation of Religion to Other Activities

Now our query assumes two forms: first, what is the relation of religion to the non-religious or secular in general? Second, what is its relation in particular to certain special aspects of life and culture, namely (1) morality, (2) art (3) science and (4) philosophy? This requires a separate point for our discussion. So we shall deal only with the first query now.

The Relation of Religion to the Non-religious or Secular

When religion becomes institutionalized and thus departmental, other things in contrast become secular or profane, and they become cut off from the province of religion. The very essence of religion consists in making other things as sacred. When religion becomes institutionalized, the danger crops up for religion in losing contact with the remainder of life or the life as a whole. Then the things which fall outside the sphere of religion become acutely secularized. This introduces a dualism into life. It is not in harmony with the true genius of religion itself, for religion aims at nothing less than the unification of life as a whole.

Some believe in worldly wisdom. They say religion should not meddle with business as "business is business." Such thinkers revaluate, from their worldly wisdom, a profession or a trade or a business. The essence of religion consists in making the whole of life sacramental. It means the all inclusiveness of religion. Schleirnacher expresses this thing very nicely. "In the words of Schleirnacher," a man's special calling is the melody of his life,
and it remains a simple, meagre series of notes unless religion, with its endlessly rich variety, accompany it with all notes, and raise the simple song to a full voiced harmony. The value and the power of religion are revealed in overcoming the resistance which is offered by the range of the secular interests when they are transmuted by religion. In this case there is not only a conflict between the Bad and the Good, but also between the Good and the Best.

In the end, religion cannot rest satisfied with any ultimate dualism of sacred and secular. The course is in this way; we move from the natural to the spiritual and return to the natural which is gradually transmuted and becomes in the end united to the spiritual in the holy partnership. Thus the circle of life is made complete.

Gandhi unites the sacred and secular elements of life under religion and does not think in terms of the air-tight departments of religion and secular interests. He considers every thing within the scope of religion, even politics too. He has transmuted diligently much of the ore of his life into the effulgence of the sacred life.

6. The Relation of Religion to Special Aspects of Life -

We have dealt with the first query in the preceding point; now we deal with the second query referred to in the last point. The special aspects of life related to religion may be stated as (i) morality (ii) art (iii) science and (iv) philosophy. Let us deal with them one by one, in details.
Morality is the side of life which is popularly regarded, not without the sense of truth, as nearest to religion. Both religion and morality claim to be the whole of life. When they became differentiated, they still walked side by side acting and reacting on each other and their mutual advantage. Both claimed authority. Though they seem to be co-equal, they are not so as religion assumes the more authoritative tone and is more fundamental of the two. The moralist came to resent the interference of the priest and the ethics to reject the interference of the theological dogma. Morality did not like the leading strings of religion and claimed autonomy and freedom. Men used to think that they could be good without being religious. Comte, J.S. Mill and Spencer claimed that ethics as a NATURALISTIC science, is independent of religion. Gandhi used to say that though Charles Bradlaw did not believe in religion, he was morally good. Some thinkers went for and claimed that all that is of real worth in religion is in morality so religion is merely an appendage so it should be dropped. They considered religion as nothing but morality touched with emotion and so they dispensed with the service of religion.

Though religion and morality are kindred, they are not identical. Schleiermacher's protest stands against the one sided and narrow morality and he loudly claims that the mystical side of religion as direct awareness of God can never be ruled out by morality. In this connection, Bradley observes that reflection on morality leads us beyond it. It leads us, in short, to see the necessity of a religious
point of view. He tells us that morality is imperfect, and imperfect in such a way as implies a higher, which is religion. He says tersely that morality issues in religion.63

The similarity and difference between religion and morality may be broadly stated thus. Both are concerned with the Absolute Good,- good without qualification. But religion is more comprehensive inasmuch as it includes all the values, namely, the Beautiful, the True and the Good. The religious experience encloses within its scope things hoped for and unseen, and they become substantiated as the man evolves in the spiritual sphere. The field of morality is the field of battle, so morality lives in the arena of human effort and conflict, while religion faces victory and peace and gets peace. We remember in this connection, "In quietness and in confidence shall be your strength" (Isa XXX.15) and "Peace I leave with you. My peace I give unto you" (John XIV.27). In a word, religion and morality cannot be equated. Religion has its characteristic inner life which it cannot surrender to morality. And yet there is no antagonism between the two, as they interfuse and interpenetrate in a normal experience, as the result is an ETHICAL religion, in which the "gift" and the "task" aspects of life become complimentary aspects of the one spiritual life.

Sushil Kumar De observes: ' The ethics... is not divorced from religion. Morality is regarded as necessarily religious and religion as necessarily moral.'64 Gandhi tersely observes that he was confirmed in his opinion that religion and morality were synonymous.65 Rashdall, stating that morality and religion are closed connected, hints that the closeness of the connexion has
varied at different stages of moral and religious development.66

Morality is certainly necessary to religion. If religion is without morality, it will not appeal to us. It should be put on a shelf. The ideal good, which to religious insight, is a fact which should be progressively translated into a realized fact, both individually and collectively. So, it is recognized that religion and morality, though logically separable, are but the two moments in the one life. The emphasis put on "the social gospel" in Christendom presently, arises from the conviction that the supreme religious values can be translated into the "marketable commodity" in real life. Otto Pfleiderer observes that if religion tears itself away from morality, then its symbolical representation of the transcendental principle of unity becomes an empty form, a mere image mythology and ceremonial worship. He adds that religion, robbed of its moral content, becomes perverted into a caricature of the truth and from this proceed pernicious superstition, magic, and fanaticism-religious malformations or deformities by which the moral life of individuals and of the community is injured and suppressed.67

Equally true is it that religion is necessary to morality. Morality can never be self-sufficient. It is merely a phase of the spiritual life which points beyond itself. It raises problems which can only be solved if we traverse the sphere of morality and enter the field of religion. To doubt that the universe is buttressed up by divine purpose is to suffer collapse in the moral enterprise, sooner or later. It is religion alone that can give the worth-
whileness to moral effort as it alone breathes life into it. It alone brings us into touch with the ultimate sources from which moral energy becomes 'replenished and reinforced'. In stating the importance of religion with reference to morality, Bradley remarks that morality, the process of realization, thus survives within religion. He adds that it is only as mere morality that it vanishes. 68

Otto Pfleiderer says that morality outgrows the advance of religion when he states that in the course of time, however, this immediate unity of religion and morality must necessarily become looser and be dissolved. A conservative characteristic belongs to religion; it clings to the traditional which is held by it as sacred and revealed by the Deity. Morality, on the other hand, advances unceasingly forwards; its circles widen, the wants of life become more numerous. Then the old morals and dogmas transmitted under religious sanctions no longer apply, they are found to be adverse to their purpose, and to be a hindrance to the rational order of society. 69

To sum up, though morality is within religion, morality, sometimes, basing on the needs of the society, looking to the historical process of the society and keeping the rational ends in sight, can take its course; when religion is sullied or degenerates into superstition. But in that case, it should not lose its kernel, the ideal principle of morality. In a sense, the scope of religion is wider than that of morality, as it includes morality. But religion can never override morality. Religion and morality are complementary with each other. The one without the other is only in name.
Only theoretically they are different from each other and each has a characteristic being, but in practice they are one: they are the obverse and reverse sides of the one and the same coin, as Gandhi maintains.

Religion can never be merged in morality, nor morality in religion. Religion and morality are copartners in the spiritual enterprise of life, and we can safely add that religion with remain the predominant partner, as the husband is in the family life of both husband and wife.

(ii) The Relation of Religion to Art -

Art at its best is a superb expression of ideal Beauty. Its function is to embody beauty in forms, colours and sounds. Truly, art is the offspring of the marriage of the spiritual with the sensuous. It seems that there are two opposing trends, one stands for "Art for art's sake" and the other, "Art for life's sake." Now these two trends are in the opposite camps and revolt against each other. The puritanic revolt against a merely aesthetic and sensuous religion, and the artistic revolt against the tyrannical interference of external standards are justified to a certain extent. The reaction from aesthetic religion may lead to the other extreme of undue hardening and impoverishing of the human spirit. The Persian music is of this type as against the Indian music. We may agree with pleasure with the artistic demand for autonomy if it is relative, not absolute, autonomy.

There is no discord among the ultimate values, the Good, the Beautiful, the True. If the work is truly artistic, the work of the qua
artist may be MORAL, but it cannot be really immoral. The true art, being an interpretation of reality from a certain point of view, is essentially religious, as reality is both beautiful and good. Beauty, being an absolute value, is a fundamental attribute of God. Art interpreting reality reveals God or Godness by embodying itself in a sensuous form, colour, and sound, and thus brings us into closer touch with the eternal. So we know that the classical music ever appeals to us while the romantic music lease has a very short base of life and exhilarates us spasmodically.

Hence religion needs art. It might also be shown that art needs religion which can lead men to an ultimate fount of all creative inspiration. Hegel has given us the importance of the spiritual essence in the sensuous frame. In the words of Hegel, "the beautiful is essentially the spiritual making itself known sensuously, presenting itself in sensuous concrete existence, but in such a manner that that existence is wholly and entirely permeated by the spiritual, so that the sensuous is not independent, but has its meaning solely and exclusively through the spiritual and in the spiritual, and exhibits not itself but the spiritual."70

Gandhi liked the classical music very much and in the Sabarmati Ashram, people thronged together to take advantage of that music. Though Gandhi passed away, the music classical still survives him in his Ashram. Truly, that art lives long which helps us to soar in the spiritual sphere and brings us very near to the ultimate values.

(iii) The Relation of Religion to Science -

The relation of religion to science crops up some queries in
us: Are not religion and science absolutely independent of each other? Is there any interaction between them? Can one be merged into the other? and thus lose its characteristics? Do they retain their characteristics even after their merging into each other? What is there left for religion to do? Can it serve any useful purpose that cannot be served as well or better by science? All these queries and their related ones require the deep penetration into the present topic. And we cannot ignore; how does Gandhi look at science from the religious point of view?

Some say that religion and science contradict each other. But this is a wrong view as they do not fall within the same universe of discourse. The element of truth is that science and religion respectively adopt completely different attitudes or methods of approach to reality. Hence, the error lies in elevating the difference of attitude and method into mutual hostility and incompatibility. Their different methods are not contradictory, but really speaking religion and science have a necessary division of labour and thus they become supplementary to each other.

Religion deals with the thing qualitatively whereas science deals with the thing quantitatively. The perfect pattern and goal of all scientific judgment is the mathematical equation. Its ideal is severe, unimaginative, unemotional accuracy. So it becomes successful in having the mechanical view of things which answers its purpose best, as the simplest and most amenable to accurate measurement. Science cannot express the quality or value of the thing, e.g. it cannot give the charm of the rainbow. If it analysis the rainbow, it can merely give the woof and the texture and thus it
will give the dull catalogue of common things. Science cannot give *give the total meaning of the thing. *the inner beauty of the thing.

But the true scientist recognizes that his viewpoint is an artificial restriction, justified only for a special purpose. He knows truly that his point of view is partial and provisional and by no means final or comprehensive. It can only give us the grammar or anatomy of the universe; it cannot give, nor does it dream to give an interpretation of its inner meaning, which is only done by religion.

When the respective spheres of religion and science are thus defined, it becomes very easy to establish a harmonious relation between them. There is the interaction between science and religion. The enormous contributions made by science can be ignored by religion, only at its peril. The new scientific knowledge should be assimilated by religion, and theology should be modified where it is necessary to be done so. As experience is ultimately one and indivisible and knowledge is one organic whole, the interactions of science and religion are therefore bound to be intimate. They cannot be kept apart as it were in air-tight compartments.

But we repeat that the synthesis of the scientific and religious attitudes in one harmonious view of life can never be attained without full recognition of the methodological differences. There lies also a certain sense of tension between them, when the new knowledge of the certain fact throws us over-board and asks us to remove the conflict perpetrated for a short while.
Briefly, they cannot be simply merged the one into the other. Religion must retain its independent standpoint and unique insight, however bold science is in its methodology.

Gandhi takes the full advantage of science fully so that he knows the limitations of science. He is not against the scientific inventions, but he is very careful in taking the advantages of them, so that he may not be the slave of scientific inventions. Gandhi says that his faith can never be shaken in religion, even though he may be floored by scientific devices or logical accuracy. He believes strongly that the scientific viewpoint should be supplemented by the ethical, the artistic and most of all, the religious points of view, as science deals with the part abstracted from the whole while religion deals with the thing as a whole and that also wholly.

(iv) The Relation of Religion to Philosophy

Philosophy takes interest in things mainly intellectually as science does. Philosophy differs from science in that each of the special sciences abstracts one aspect of experience from experience as a whole, whereas philosophy takes into account 'the concrete totality of interests' or the inclusive experience. Both philosophy and religion seek to interpret experience as a whole, in the light of ultimate conceptions. But they differ in the intellectual side; philosophy is more thorough and deliberate in its method of inquiry, while religion is more intuitive. Moreover, religion is richer in variety of experienced content; it embraces vivid emotional reactions and earnest volitional activities coupled
The general conclusions which we arrive may be thus summed up: religion not being departmental pervades all interest and includes all life into its sphere, yet it cannot surrender its self-identity and supremacy by losing itself in all other interests. It has its own unique contribution to human experience. It occupies a central position in life which no other interest can do so. This is particularly with religion not sundry, but the one which has higher developments.

7. **Gandhi's Contribution to Religion.**

Gandhi's contribution to religion is manifold. The most salient points of his contribution may be enumerated as the following - (i) religion related to politics, (ii) religion related to economics (iii) Sarvadharma Samānatva (iv) non-attachment and (v) no dependence on the religious authorities, nor on the tradition. Let us take these subpoints one by one and go into the details of each.

(i) **Religion related to Politics** -

Gandhi considers that his patriotism is for him a stage in his journey to the land of eternal freedom and peace. Thus it will be seen that for him there are no politics devoid of religion. They subserve religion. Gandhi lays stress that politics bereft of religion are a death trap because they kill the soul.71

Gandhi emphatically says that the political life must be an echo...
Gandhi's politics concern themselves with internal growth, but being of a universal nature they react upon the external in most effective manner. Mr. Gokhale taught Gandhi that the dream of every Indian who claims to love his country, should be not to glorify in language but to spiritualize the political life of the country and the political institutions. Gandhi did so. Gandhi says that he has presented non-cooperation in terms of religion because he enters politics only in so far as it develops the religious faculty in him.

In a word, we may say that as the breathing machinery is to the human body, so is religion to politics.

(ii) Religion related to Economics -

Religion is closely related to economics. As we think of both soul and body with reference to our self, so we should think of economics. By religion, we get ideas with reference to soul, by economics, we get ideas about money. And here we have to think more of political economy than of personal economy. Gandhi has thought of rural economy within the scope of the political economy. When we wish to buy Khadi, we should not buy the uncertified Khadi, but we should buy the certified one, not because that by the certified khadi we get the pure khadi or the unadulterated one. The certified khadi, sold through the institution, has the aim of political economy, while the uncertified khadi sold by the individual or a group of individuals has the aim of personal economy.
Economy should be based on non-violence. We cannot build non-violent society on a factory civilization, but it can be built on self-contained villages. Rural economy eschews exploitation altogether and exploitation is the essence of violence. Before we become non-violent, we should be rural minded.

(iii) Sarva-Dharna Samanatwa -

Gandhi's attitude towards religion and religious tensions may be summed up in one word which he often characterised as SARVA-DHARMA SAMANWAYA. It is an inclusive approach or synthesis of all religions. Shree Vinobaji, one of the most honoured of the disciples of Gandhi, paraphrased the above term, with an attitude of equality towards all religions, as Sarva-Dharmi-Samanatwa.

Gandhi had to face conflicts between Hinduism and Islam, Hinduism and Sikhism, Islam and Sikhism, Hinduism and Christianity and between sections of Hinduism itself. He resolved the conflicts by his attitude of Sarva-Dharnama-Samanwaya.

R.R.Diwakar remarks that Gandhi's vow of 'SAVRA-DHARMA-SAMANATVA' is not to be found in any of the older disciplines. At one stroke, it eliminates the idea of superiority and inferiority of religions that feed the pride of some and make some 'lower' in the eyes of others. It calls for equal respect for each other's religion. It does not feed religious hatred or jealousy. Above all, it cuts at the very root of all tendencies for proselytisation, which is a contagious malady among many enthusiasts of religion by declaring that all religions lead to God, for all of them have ingredients of
truth in them. It lays stress that without the idea of conversion each religion can learn from the other.  

(iv) Non-attachment -  
------------
Gandhi has developed non-attachment by reading mainly the Bhagavad Gita and by practising the teaching of the Bhagavad Gita, The sermon on the Mount, and the vows. He has not only developed non-attachment personally but he affected others also. The members of his Sabarmati Ashram got strength for the development of non-attachment from him. Really he is the fountain of that virtue. We can see from his manner of living, from his dress and from his speech that he is the embodiment of non-attachment. The daily prayer and occasional fasts also helped him to develop non-attachment.

(v) Non Dependence on the Religious Authorities, nor on the Tradition -  
------------------------------------------
Gandhi has no dependence on the religious authorities, nor on the tradition. His interpretation of the Gita proves this point. R.R. Diwakar observes: 'his interpretation of it in terms of non-violence is quite novel in the history of exegesis. It throws new light not only on the Gita but on the whole story of Mahabharat and the intentions of Vyasa, the author.'  

Some learned men proved to Gandhi that untouchability had been maintained from the past and that the Upanisads gave strength to it by their corroboration. Gandhi argued that the sin becoming old does not cease to be a sin. With reference to the Upanisads, Gandhi said that there are portions in the Upanisads that both the disputants and protagonists can quote to prove their points, so he
said that the Shastras should be interpreted in the light of truth. So truth should be a measuring rod and the authority of the Shastras become nullified, if it goes against truth.

Gandhi says with reference to the tradition that we should not suffer from the limitations of the tradition but we should take the strength of the tradition, shorn of its limitations.

So Gandhi is not slave to religious authorities, nor to the tradition, although he makes the best use of both of them, and quotes freely from the shastras of both Hindu and the other religions.

Briefly, Gandhi has contributed to religion severally, but for want of space, a few topics are selected. Others require only to be mentioned. They are Toleration, Religion transcending reason but not irrational, Faith, and Gandhi’s contribution to vows. These topics, one way or the other, are discussed in the chapters, the earlier ones and the following ones.

To Conclude- in this chapter, the etymology of religion leads us straight to understand Gandhi’s concept of religion, which is not given at one time but we have to gather it from his numerous expressions about religion. The sources of religion as the Westerners think are not so but they are all Indian. The methods of religion play their their part for our fuller understanding of what religion is. Gandhi has used almost all the methods, viz. reason, faith, experience, intuition, the inner voice, and ‘attitude’ (Hegel’s term). The philosophy of religion gives the scope of religion. It gives also the nature of religion, which is a total psychological one and not its one aspect only. The relation of religion to the
non-religious or secular helps us to know that there should be the unity of religion, so the secular becomes sacred in the sphere of religion. Thus we can know the full scope of religion. The relation of religion to morality, art, science, and philosophy gives us the penetration into the subject that call forth other ideas related to the subject in us. The relation of religion to morality teaches us that they are obverse and the reverse of the same coin. But of the two, the predominant part is played by religion.

The relation of religion to science removes the general wrong impression that there is the contradiction between the two. Really-speaking, there is the harmony between them, as each has its own sphere of activity. Religion and science are supplementary with each other. The wrong idea about art that "art is for art's sake" is removed, as the true art is not without the supreme values. We learn that through the sensuous frame shines the soul. This is the idea of the true art. Gandhi has contributed severally in the field of religion. They are his original contributions. We have seen some topics discussed and the others are only mentioned due to the lack of space in the thesis.

To know the philosophy of Religion further in depth, we should know its core, which is none other than mysticism.