Before we know whether Gandhi is a mystic or not, we should know what mysticism is, as European thinkers have spun cobwebs round about Indian Mysticism. Mysticism has been a characteristic contribution of the East to the world at large, from time immemorial. In this connection Sir Radhakrishna observes: 'Palestine gave morality and monotheism, Greece art and philosophy, Rome order and organization, and the East mysticism and a gift for worship.'

Let us see mysticism etymologically. There are two German terms for mysticism—(1) Mystizismus, (2) Mystic. Rufus M. Jones observes: "It would be conducive to clarity to restrict the word 'mysticism' to the latter significance, namely as an equivalent for the German word MYSTIC, and as designating the historic DOCTRINE of the relationship and potential union of the human soul with Ultimate Reality, and to use the term 'mystical experience' for direct intercourse with God." In this connection, Sir Radhakrishna observes: 'Etymologically considered, the mystic is one who closes his eyes to all external things and keeps silent about the divine mysteries into which he has been
To understand whether Gandhi is a mystic or not, we should
know mysticism in all its aspects, so we should know first, the
definition of mysticism, four marks with reference to mysticism,
the four characteristics of mysticism, the criteria of mystical
experience, the epistemological view of mysticism, mysticism with
its negative and positive aspects, pessimism and optimism, the
types of mystics and mystics from the different walks of life.
Then we can ascertain whether Gandhi is a mystic or not.

Let us now take these points one by one and go into the
details of every one.

1. The Definition -

The definition of mysticism cannot be given, still, however,
the definitions given by some authors will, as a whole, shed light
on what mysticism is. Mysticism is the direct, secret and incommu-
nicable knowledge of God received in contemplation. It can also
be defined as an attitude of mind in which all other relations are
swallowed up in relation of the soul to God. In the words of
Plotinus, often quoted- we may say briefly mysticism is " the
flight of the Alone to the Alone." Professor Srinivasachari says
about mysticism that it is an attitude of mind which consists in
spiritual quest of man for union with God culminating in unitive
experience. Prof. R.D. Ranade defines mysticism thus : "Mysticism
denotes that attitude of mind which involves a direct, immediate,
first hand, intuitive apprehension of God." (Miss) Evelyn
Underhill observes: "Mysticism, in its pure form, is the science of ultimates, the science of union with the Absolute, and nothing else, and that the mystic is the person who attains to this union not the person who talks about it. Not to know about but to Be, is the mark of the real initiate." Again, she negatively and positively states: "Mysticism, then, is not an opinion; it is not a philosophy. It has nothing in common with the purport of occult knowledge. On the one hand it is not merely the power of contemplating Eternity; on the other, it is not to be identified with any kind of religious queerness. It is the name of that organic process which involves the perfect consummation of the Love of God; the achievement here and now of the immortal heritage of man... it is the art of establishing his conscious relation with the Absolute."

Dr. Inge very clearly shows that with regard to mysticism, there is no difference in mystics of different faiths and culture. With reference to this, Sir Radhakrishnan quotes Dr. Inge (Freedom, Love and Truth), 1936 pp 25-26: "Mysticism is singularly uniform in all times and places. The communion of the soul with God has found much the same expression whether the mystic is a Neoplatonic philosopher like Plotinus, a Mohammedan Sufi, a Catholic monk or a Quaker. Mysticism, which is the living heart of religion, springs from a deeper level than the differences which divide the churches, the cultural changes which divide the ages of history." These definitions show that the mystic seeks the communion with God and attains it in some degrees. The mystics have the direct knowledge of God. Mysticism establishes the deeper unity running under the different religions and the cultural changes in different folks of the world. Thus mysticism is the heart of religion and will be
of immense help in establishing the unity between the different peoples of the human race. The clime and the age cannot make mysticism out of date. Evelyn Underhill states about Indian Mysticism thus: 'Indian mysticism founds its external system almost wholly on (a) Asceticism, the domination of the senses, and (b) the deliberate practice of self-hypnotization, either by fixing the eyes on a near object, or by the rhythmic repetition of the mantra or sacred word. By these complementary forms of discipline, the pull of the phenomenal world is diminished and the mind is placed at the disposal of the subconscious powers.' I should say with meekness that Miss Evelyn Underhill, so highly erudite a scholar in the field of mysticism and who has given wonderful material with regard to mysticism fraught with psychological insight and deep penetration, fails to understand Indian Mysticism properly. In the above quotation, instead of '(a) Asceticism, the domination of the senses,' there should be 'Asceticism, the domination over the senses.' Besides that mistake, which may be a grammatical one, she makes an error in saying '(b) the deliberate practice of self-hypnotization.' Whereas it is not so, as the unitive life is formed by the habitual concentration in the personal God immanent in the mystic. The other point notable as an error in her thought is that she says 'the mind is placed at the disposal of the subconscious powers.' This is not so as the mind is not placed at the disposal of the subconscious powers but the subconscious powers are transfused with and ordered by the effects of the deep contemplation of the mystic, with reference to the Immanent God in him. The Indian Mysticism is not, out and out, 'the deliberate practice of self-hypnotization' as it
contains the core of the terms, used by her in her said book, Recollection, Quiet, 'The Unitive life' in the Indian Characteristic way. S.N. Dasgupta's observations about the knowledge of the Western scholars with reference to Indian (i.e. Hindu) Mysticism is noteworthy here. 'Both on the continent and in America, Hindus are associated with mysticism, but, so far as I know, the subject of Hindu Mysticism has as yet received no systematic treatment, either in the way of general introduction, or in the way of a comprehensive account.'

S.N. Dasgupta, covering the various types of Indian Mysticism, defines mysticism thus: 'Mysticism is not an intellectual theory, it is fundamentally an active, formative, creative, elevating and ennobling principle of life.' He continues: 'Mysticism means a spiritual grasp of the aims and problems of life in a much more real and ultimate manner than is possible to mere reason. A developing life of mysticism means a gradual ascent in the scale of spiritual values, experience, and spiritual ideals.'

S.N. Dasgupta gives the importance of mysticism in relation to religion thus: 'Mysticism is the basis of all religions—particularly of religion as it appears in the lives of truly religious men.' Mysticism is not dead but is alive.

In this connection, MacNicol observes: 'That mysticism has not yet died out of India is evident when we hear the old cry for the One echoing through the writings of Swami Vivekananda: 'Where is there any more misery for him who sees this Oneness in the Universe?...this Oneness of life, Oneness of everything.'

The above definitions with regard to mysticism deal with its various phases and they collectively, not singularly, shed light on what mysticism is.
2. The Four Marks with reference to Mysticism (William James)

William James has given the four marks with reference to mysticism, in his book 'The Varieties of Religious Experience.' The four marks are (1) ineffability, (2) noetic quality, (3) transiency, (4) passivity. In 'ineffability,' the author lays stress more on feeling than on intellect which is the strain of many scholars on mysticism. He observes: 'In this peculiarity mystical states are more like states of feeling than like states of intellect.'

In the case of 'noetic quality,' the author talks of the truth, the depths of which cannot be measured. This truth is above the reason. Sometimes it is called the reason of reasoning. That shows that reason alone cannot plumb the depths of the truth. The author points out clearly: 'They are states of insight into depths of truth unplumbed by the discursive intellect.'

With reference to 'transiency,' the author is of opinion that mystical states cannot be sustained for a long time. He mentions that they may last for half an hour or an hour. Though they may not last for a long time, the recurrence of those states helps the man on the path of evolution. Thus though transient, they are not futile. The author observes: 'Mystical states cannot be sustained for long. Except in rare instances, half an hour or at most an hour or two, seems to be the limit beyond which they fade into the light of common day.... but when they occur it is recognized and from one recurrence to another it is susceptible of continuous development in what is felt as inner richness and importance.'

Sometimes, the mystical states continue for less than an hour, as not the duration but the intensity is the factor which is of importance in these mystical states. The last mark of mysticism given by the
author is 'passivity'. He observes in this connection: 'when
the characteristic sort of consciousness once has set in, the
mystic feels as if his own will were in abeyance, and indeed some-
times as if he were grasped and held by a superior power.'\textsuperscript{16} This
shows that the mystic is passive, but really he is not so. Out-
wardly, he seems to be passive, really he is active within. He
is alert within, in enjoying his experience. Mere passivity will
not bring the mystic to plumb the depths within. His attention is
riveted within to see, rather I should say, to be in the company of
the Divine within him. The author says in the end: ' These four
characteristics are sufficient to mark out a group of states of
consciousness peculiar enough to deserve a special name and to
call for careful study.'\textsuperscript{17} With reference to the above four
marks given about mysticism, Miss Evelyn Underhill observes:
'I think that we have already reached a point at which William
Manes's celebrated "four marks" of the mystic state, Ineffability,
Noetic Quality, Transiency, and Passivity (varieties of Religious
Experience p. 380) will fail to satisfy us. In their place I
propose to set out, illustrate and I hope, justify four other
rules or notes which may be applied as tests to any given case
which claims to take rank amongst the mystics.'\textsuperscript{18} Though she
brushes aside the four marks of mystical states given by William
James out right, she, later on, seems to give credit to the first
two marks of mystical states namely (1) Ineffability and (2) Noetic
Quality. She mentions favourably: 'William James considered
"ineffability" and "noetic quality" to be the constant characteristics
of the contemplative experience.'\textsuperscript{19} This shows that those two
states have some truth to be considered by the students of mysticism.
3. The Four Characteristics of Mysticism (Evelyn Underhill)

These characteristics are the notable ones as they are very comprehensive and thus require a careful study of them. So I quote them in her own words.

1. True mysticism is active and practical, not passive and theoretical. It is an organic life-process, a something which the whole self does, not something as to which its intellect holds an opinion.

2. Its aims are wholly transcendental and spiritual. It is in no way concerned with adding to, exploring, rearranging, or improving anything in the visible universe. The mystic brushes aside that universe, even in its supernormal manifestations. Though he does not, as his enemies declare, neglect this duty to the many, his heart is always set upon the changeless One.

3. This One is for the mystic, not merely the Reality of all that is, but also a living and personal Object of Love; never an object of exploration. It draws his whole being homeward, but always under the guidance of the heart.

4. Living union with this One—which is the term of his adventure—is a definite state or forms of enhanced life. It is obtained neither from an intellectual realization of its delights, nor from the mostacute emotional longings. Though these must be present, they are not enough. It is arrived at by an arduous psychological and spiritual process the so-called Mystic Way—entailing the complete remaking of character and the liberation
of a new, or rather latent, form of consciousness; which
 imposes on the self the condition which is sometimes inaccurately
called "ecstasy," but is better named the Unitive State.20

Later on she adds a corollary to these four characteristic
marks or rules of mysticism. "As a corollary to these four rules,
of mysticism, it is perhaps well to reiterate the statement already
made, that True Mysticism is never self-seeking. It is not,
as many think, the pursuit of supernatural joys; the satisfaction
of a high ambition. The mystic does not enter on his quest because
he desires the happiness of the Beatific Vision, the ecstasy of
union with the Absolute, or any other personal reward.21

If we analyse the above four rules pertaining to the mysticism
along with a corollary based on them, it seems clear that not only
the intellect but also the emotional longing or feeling play the
secondary part to the spiritual process engrafted with the psy-
chological one. One should mark that there is an arduous process,
spiritual and psychological. Because it is psychological, one
can notice the progress within and thus one cannot have doubt as
to whether the one is on the right path or not. This gives us a
very notable aspect of European mysticism that some authors give
a psychological process in the evolution of European Mystics. This
aspect helps the one to study the Indian Mystics, here notably
Gandhi, who admits that he has not studied Psychology and that makes
it difficult for the students of mysticism to study his case. Still
however one can fill up the gaps in the study of Gandhi as a mystic
by the help of the study of European authors who have given the
spiritual process of the mystics engrafted with the psychological
one. From the above discussion of the rules of marks of mysticism given by William James and Evelyn Underhill, we can have the criteria of mystical experience.

4. The Criteria of Mystical Experience -

Mysticism will be more clear to us if we bear in mind the Criteria of Mystical Experience. Briefly they are -

(1) Its Intuitive Character  (2) Its Intellectual Aspect

Let us go into the details of these criteria, one by one.

(i) Its Intuitive Character

It is one of the foremost point which is considered by most of the authors on mysticism. Some mystics are born with intuition and some others by a special training pertaining to concentration train it and by a prolonged habit of concentration gain it. This intuition, though above reason, never contradicts it. It has the relation more with heart than with head and depends mostly on the purification of heart.

(ii) Its Intellectual Aspect -

Though subordinate to the intuitive aspect, nevertheless, the intellectual aspect plays its part notably. The experience of the mystic may not be expressed in words and he has to take the help of symbols and his expression is thus symbolic, yet he has the clear thought in his mind of what he has envisaged. The words have limitation in expressing the thing which is unearthly. The Introvert mystic, by his habit of living within dominantly, has then powers- powers of mind, namely
analysis. By his knowledge of Reality envisaged, he has the clear cut analysis of the thing and thus he is bereft of attachment to the worldly things, so he can distinguish the chaff from the corn. Later on in the discipline, the Introvert mystic, first getting the advantage of his introvert position, then finding naturally the limitations inherent, of his position, enters into the field of the Introextrovert position spontaneously and now develops the powers of synthesis in him. Corresponding to his depth or the magnitude of his past introvert position, he becomes Introextrovert. Thus all introextrovert mystics are not of the same strength as they vary corresponding to the depth or the magnitude of their past introvert positions. Thus the full fledged character, which is the Introextrovert one, has both the powers of mind, the analysis and the synthesis. The Introextrovert (character of the mystic) has two moments, namely (1) extrovert and (2) introvert but he is above these two types of character and past the limitations inherent in them. These mystics' intellect, as it gets source and strength from within, is a notable one among the philosophers. The Indian mystics, Yagnavalkya, Sankaracharya, Kabir, Jnaneshwar, Vivekanand and such others, and the European mystics, Plotinus, St. Augustine, Dante, St. Teresa, William Law and such others are proofs beyond doubt. It is also true that all mystics are not philosophers as all philosophers are not mystics.

(iii) The Moral Aspect -

Another criterion of mysticism is the individual capacity for the moral development, along with the moral development of the society; as the particular, as a rule, is not apart from the universal.
The particular cannot grow all by itself but always in the company round about it. The universal never lives apart from the individual. So both the universal and individual goodness coalesce into one and are conditioned by each other. The real individual goodness certainly springs forth into the universal one, and thus the individual mystic gets the strength and backing of the hosts of mystics on the path of evolution. He is never all alone. Just as the policeman is not all alone but he has the backing of the government after him; similarly, the mystic is not all alone, but he has the backing of the Moral Government after him, provided that he feels one among the members of that government and takes the responsibility inherent in that government. It is a well-known fact that Gandhi appealed to the Moral Government (above the Political one) and invoked for its help, when he was tried in the court, for his civil disobedient movement. We all know now that his cry was not in wilderness. Plotinus insists that the vision does not remain unfruitful. It does fructify. Besides the above three criteria of the mystical experience, there is the Emotional one.

(iv) The Emotional Aspect:

Some thinkers are of opinion that mysticism has nothing to do with emotions. But emotions give strength to the pursuit of one's goal. Here, the God Immanent in the mystic. The emotions are the reservoir of strength. The strength of the lower emotions is made right-channelled when they are directed to God. When Spinoza said that the emotions should be transmuted into the form of Love to Gov, he rightly believed what a true mystic is. So the mystic has a 'plenitude of finer emotions'. Tulindas, Surdas, Tukaram, Mira,
and such other mystics are evident proofs of true mysticism. They had ennobling emotions of strong nerve. It is said that the Gopies though they had the base emotions, transmuted their emotions by directing them to Krishna, and thus got heaven, i.e. they had their development in their evolution.

These four criteria of mystical experience help us to know Gandhi as a mystic. He has the intuitive character and can foresee as 'the coming events cast their shadows before,' in the different walks of life. He had the penetrative intellect and could analyse the maladies social, economical and political. His intellect had the base of the moral life. He used to consider even the saying from the sacred literature of the Hindus, namely 'Shastras' unauthoritative, if it is against morality. So he fought against untouchability, even though it is backed by the Hindu Shastras. Lastly, he had the emotional aspect. His heart was full of the milk of human kindness not only to the members of his family, but to the nations of the world and to mankind as a whole. Nay, the milk of human kindness was even to all the sentient beings, seen or unseen. How deep was the well of kindness in his heart! He was never stern, though he was strict in discipline. He was strict to himself but he was generous to others and full of pity to the sinners of hard stuff.

Besides the above criteria of the mystical experience, mysticism is not without universality and validity.
5. The Epistemological View of Mysticism:

Now let us take the epistemological point of reality of mystical experience. The cumulative experience of the mystics of the East and the West would prove that there is a certain amount of universality and validity in their mystical experience. They have the same teaching about the Name of God, the figure of their keen devotion, however differently they may word Him. Augustine says, "That which Is." Platinus says, "The One," "the Suppliant of true life." St. Bernard says, "the energetic Word," Dante says, "Eternal light." Ruysbroek says, "the Abyss." St. Catherine of Genoa says, "Pure Love." (Poor symbols of perfection at the best!) All men have got the same 'Deiform faculty' which enables them to 'see good face to face.' There is no difference between the quality of god-realization in some, as contrasted with the quality of god-realization in others. It is true that there may be physical, mental and temperamental differences in the individuals, but there is no difference in the quality of their mystical or intuitive realization, as the base for all the individuals is the Immanent God within them. This element of universality unequivocably confers upon mystical experience objectivity, necessity and validity. This objectivity conferred by mystical experience is of a transcendent order, in comparison with any other kind of human experience just because it is 'Deiform.'

6. Mysticism with its Negative and Positive Aspects:

To know mysticism truly, one should dispel the cobwebs of ignorance, wrong notions woven by the speculative philosophers who have no insight into this subject. Those who are opposed to mysticism
have touched the fringe of the subject and never divide into the depth of the subject. Mere speculation will never give an iota of wisdom which is in the womb of mysticism. It requires the penetration of the clear intellectual insight based on the moral life. Mysticism is not apart from religions. It is one of the evolved forms of religion. Religion first is primitive or sensuous. The man of this form of religion thinks and sees contradiction in his thinking, so his religion takes the form of the reflective one. And when the reflective man goes into the depth of religion, he becomes mystical. So religion, in course of time and experience may take three forms,—primitive or sensuous, reflective, and mystical. Mere speculation will not bring one to the third form of religion, namely mysticism. Sir Radhakrishnan rightly observes: 'Religion in the mystic sense is not a mere speculation of reason or a feeling of dependence or a mode of behaviour. It is something which our entire self is, feels, and does; it is the concurrent activity of thought, feeling, and will.' Mysticism is not illogical, unaesthetic and unethical. Sir Radhakrishnan further continues; 'It satisfies the logical demand for abiding certainty, the aesthetic longing for repose, and the ethical desire for perfection. In the great mystics, the rśis of the Upanisads Buddha, Saṁkara, and hundreds of others, holiness and learning, purity of soul, and penetration of understanding are fused in an harmonious whole.' Mysticism is not instinctive. Sir Radhakrishnan further adds and makes it quite clear: 'The mystic or the intuitive consciousness is not to be confused with the instinctive. It is not a flight to unreason or a glorification of ignorance and obscurity. It assume the indivisible oneness of
of human life, whose apprehensions cannot be contrary to reason.

Again, mysticism cannot be identified with naturalism and dogmatism. Sir Radhakrishnan definitely observes; 'Mysticism is opposed to the naturalism which categorically denies the existence of God and the dogmatism which talks as if it knew all about Him. ... In mystic religion God is not a logical concept or the conclusion of a syllogism but a real presence, the ground and possibility of all knowledge and values.'

Mysticism is not without its fanatics. Though India is well known for mysticism from time immemorial, true mysticism cannot be seen in thousands of mendicants spread all over India. They are few and far between, but they are three. Their line is unbroken. True mysticism is the inner vein of Hinduism. The views of the fanatics of mysticism should be borne in mind as they are leading wayside, i.e. not to the true path of mysticism. Sir Radhakrishnan remarks and probes the ignorance of the fanatics thus: 'Mysticism has its fanatics who lock upon the real as spiritual freedom and contrast it with the actual in its bondage, declaring that birth is an error of the soul and our chance of liberation lies in shaking off these shackles. The theory of māyā (illusion) has been interpreted in this negative sense so as to lead support to the doctrine that man's life has no real meaning, that it is a mistake of the soul, an error that has inexplicably crept into being. Since the real is the supreme Brahman, the only thing to do is to get away from all existence, celestial or terrestrial. The illusion is real to itself and it binds us so long as we rest in it. Our true aim should be to get rid of the error and thus of life. Moksā or
release is the extinction of the individual, his annulment in the Absolute. Since the world is an illusion, it is a waste of energy to spend labour and heroism in battling with its merely illusory events. The above lengthy quotation gives the arguments of the fanatics of mysticism. These fanatics of mysticism are in India. So in order that one may not be led astray, I quoted that lengthy quotation. Their ethic of 'quietism and resignation' may show the pilgrim of the path of God a short cut but it is an illusory path, because we are enabled to enter in some measure into the peaceful being of the Absolute which knows nothing of errors and illusions and is tirelessly at rest. Exclusive absorption in a super-historical goal will bring one lethargy in one's life as the one will consider all temporal things as fragib and fleeting. He will then cease from activity as he has the superficial knowledge of mysticism. He then cannot attain his goal even as the somewhat liberated soul, the mystic has to work along the world soul to lift the mankind from its dross life. It is said in the Bhagavadgita: 'Man does not attain to the state of being without work by undertaking no work, nor does he reach perfection by simply shunning the world.' No imperfect being can cease from activity (either outer or the inner) if he desires to tread the path of evolution to perfection. In this connection, the Bhagavadgita says: 'Do thou thy allotted task; for action is superior to inaction; with inaction even life's normal course is not possible.'

7. Pessimism and Optimism:

The imperfect mysticism sees the meaning of life (activity) as
a cipher, as it meditates on the suprahistorical ideal and considers births and rebirths an error. Such a mystic is sad, and is without joy in his life. No doubt, there is a stage on the path of the true mysticism that one considers the world and the worldly things fraught with no meaning. The imperfect mysticism lives in this stage for ever considering it as the only form of mysticism true. But the true mystic makes that stage as a foil for establishing his mind in Spirit, as the modern Christianity has made the pessimistic outlook the foil of its doctrine of redemption and salvation, in opposition to the early Christianity which stood for the pessimistic outlook. Without detachment to the world and the worldly things, the pilgrim on the path of evolution cannot bring his mind back to his soul in perfection, i.e. the God Immanent in him. Even Kant's view was fallible when he saw that there is an irreconcilable and insoluble dialectical contradictions between the world of sense and the world of reason, coming to the conclusion thereby that duty and inclination can never go together. Due to his false view, Schopenhauer concluded wrongly that the substance of the world is the irrational will ever in contradiction with the rational idea and consequently there is an evil which cannot be controllable and is everlasting. Such a view makes the nerve of pessimism strong in a reader, who is not able to come to the right point and breaks his head on the irretrievable pessimistic outlook. But this does not mean that there is a shallow optimism that the evil is defeated easily, controlled and made it as a means for our development. It has its own strength. It will give a sustaining challenge to the good whereby slowly and slowly shall the good recover from the path of perdition. It is rightly
said in the Bible,* Thir whosoever will save his life shall lose it; but whosoever shall lose his life for my sake and the Gospel's the same shall save it. For even the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many.*30 This certainty of faith makes the pious man strong against the evil and the worst evils of the world can be overcome for the good purposes of God. This becomes first internally in the mystic, and with this strength he goes to the society to meet the evil externally, pivoting his mind in God within. The relevant passage from the Bible gives strength to this idea. It runs: 'We know that all things work together for good to them that love God. If God be for us, who can be against us? I am persuaded that neither death, nor life, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God. As sorrowful, yet always rejoicing; as poor, yet making many rich; as having nothing, and yet possessing all things.'*31 Looking to the distance between what is actual and what ought to be, the mystic is always in a certain respect critical and polemical.

Briefly, pessimism has the inner contradiction and cannot live longer even on its own ground. Otto Pfleiderer represents this thing very beautifully. He observes: 'In short, pessimism as a philosophy breaks to pieces on the inner contradiction that it denies the rationality of the world and yet assumes the rationality of its judging about the world, which is yet also a constituent element of the whole, or that it denies the tendency of the world to the good, and yet in its own forming of ideals it proves actually the existence and activity of that very tendency.'*32 The opposition of the reality and the ideal is sharp enough to bring
us to pessimism but if this bubble is probed into with wisdom, we can see that it merely plays a starting point challenging the good in us within. Otto Pfleiderer remarks truly: 'The opposition of reality and Ideal, of the world and the kingdom of God, is indeed not denied, but it is no longer the whole truth, but only one side of it, the starting point, which is to be, and can be, raised to unity. From this point of view even the evil of the world loses its painful sting, and transforms itself into a co-operating means for the bringing forth of the good.'

We have seen above the true mysticism which has optimism and not pessimism. The pessimistic outlook is only a phase in the life of a mystic and never the whole. The mystic's life is a whole of which there are two moments: (1) pessimism and (2) optimism. Pessimism sometimes precede optimism, as pessimism, in that case, becomes a foil to optimism.

8. The Types of Mystics:

There are various types of mystics; but, among them, the Introvert and the Introextrovert types are predominant. The introvert mystics, to make their hearts pure, turn away from the world and seek the solitude. Pessimism with reference to the worldly life is their most potent instrument. They turn away their minds from the worldly objects and worldly relations in order to pivot attention on their personal God within. The God immanent is the centre of strength in them. To be in touch with the God immanent, they seek solitude and live amidst Nature. They like the scenes of Nature, the sky, the river, the sea, the forest, the mountain, the clouds,
the hills, and a long colonnade of trees. Nature is the balm for their lives. Gandhi gave the advice to the man who was very sensual and who had carnal desires, to look upward to the sky and see the scenes of Nature and keep his mind engaged in them. So the introvert phase of mysticism has its own strength as it becomes a remedy against the carnal desires. The introvert mystic restrains his senses as the tortoise does and he does not give food to them only to conquer them. The introvert mystic does not want that his body should be a house of restless passions and thus he does not want to be an instrument of Satan. The introverts establish the institution of monastery and try to lead a celibate life. Their vision, as they are on the path of evolution, is not without truth, though it may not be a whole truth. The life of an introvert mystic is an ascetic life. The extremes of asceticism are full of faults and thus asceticism is devalued. If asceticism is used as a discipline for a more perfect life and becomes a constituent moment of the whole life, it has then its special benefits for a man of discipline on the path of Yoga. Sir Radhakrishnan observes truly: "Asceticism is associated with all religions and represents a basic need of human nature. It is the outgrowth of the demand that the highest religion requires the surrender of the individual claim and identification with the universal life..... The essential quality of asceticism is the denial of the individual desires, which is a part of religious life. Asceticism is training, and a religious man is in training all his life." So the introvert mystic has its strength and limitations. The one who trains oneself on the path of introvert character enjoys the strength, however limited it may be. There is no fear for him for suffering from its limitations as he,
after getting strength of it, will evolve from that phase of character or position. He meets or feels limitations of his introvert position and thus, in degrees, he becomes an introextrovert. This state of introextrovert is not the combination of 'introvert' and 'extrovert'. The extrovert becomes on the path of Yoga the introvert, degree by degree, and has the characteristic strength of his position and after getting the strength of that position in full, he becomes onward introextrovert, slowly, degree by degree. And corresponding to his strength, he mixes with the society and does service to the society at large, and to the societies in particular. Then his position is full of strength (no doubt in that case, relative to his place in the ladder of evolution), shorn of limitations of the introvert character. Thus the introextrovert mystic has a higher synthesis of the two moments, namely extrovert and introvert. The introextrovert mystic has the introextrovert character and his introextrovert character is not a combination of the introvert and the extrovert, put in the juxtaposition, but it is the higher synthesis, shorn of the limitations of extrovert and of introvert. Thus if we name the extrovert position as 'one', the introvert position should be numbered as 'two' and the introextrovert one should be numbered as 'three'. Within 'three' there is the cardinal 'two' and within the cardinal 'two' there is the cardinal 'one'. If there is no 'one', how can there be the cardinal 'two' and if there is no cardinal 'two', how can there be the cardinal 'three'? Thus the one who is the introextrovert never hates the introvert, as he considers the introvert as his brother on the path of the evolution in which there is a series of grades.
steps. The introvert never hates the extrovert as the introvert leads the extrovert to the position of the introvert. Only those who do not know the nature of evolutionary steps deride at the introverts and the extroverts, but those who are evolved from the lower steps of evolution to the higher ones have sympathy with the evolutionists on the lower wrungs of the ladder of evolution, because they have evolved from one position to the next higher one with travail and tribulation, by undergoing a strict discipline of life, a considerable period.

9. Mystics from the different walks of life:

There were mystics enjoying dominantly ecstasy, namely Bilvamāngal, Tulsidas, Dhanurdas, Augustine and others. There were mystics who were dacoits and robbers in their early lives, namely Valmiki, Angulimal, Namdev, Thirumangai and others. There were carefree, wealthy and healthy youths, namely St. Antony, St. Francis, St. Teresa and others. There were hunters like Kanappa and ignorant persons like Burnadet. There were poets like Marsinh Mehta, Mira and others. In India, in the medieval times S'āmkara was an outstanding mystic. Besides the above ones, there is a host of mystics from the time immemorial to the contemporary one, among whom there is Gandhi as the Introextrovert mystic. So his mind as an introextrovert mystic should be studied carefully, in order to make the best use of his mind.

Briefly, those, who want to be mystics or at least study mysticism should have their attitude critical and polemical in order that they may have strength, shorn of the limitations of the particular stages.
in mysticism. Mere speculation to study mysticism will be of no avail as it can be learnt only by practice. This requires particular training that affects not only one's mind but one's whole being.

At this stage a query may arise as to whether Gandhi can be considered as a mystic or not.

10. Is Gandhi a Mystic?

In a sense he cannot be considered as a mystic for he did not live a secluded life. He did not require seduction as he did not meditate on something as the mystics in general do. Looking to the definitions of Mysticism given by R.D. Ranade, Evelyn Underhill and S. Radhakrishnana, the mystic has an extra-ordinary love for God. Gandhi was sometimes branded by his critics by calling him as 'God-intoxicated.' Gandhi had an extra-ordinary attitude to God. His heart was burning with the love for God. God was all in all with him. By being in communion with God, he had the 'inner voice.' With him, the inner voice was a great thing of importance. He would stake or risk his life on it. This evidence shows that he is a mystic.

Looking to the types of Mystics, I have endeavoured to show that Gandhi was introextrovert. The introextrovert character includes the introvert character which is largely possessed by mystics who are in the habit of meditation on God immanent in them. So Gandhi is such a mystic that he had no limitations of the mystics in general. Gandhi had the strength of mystics shorn of their limitations.

So in a narrow sense of Mysticism, Gandhi is not a mystic but in a broader sense of the term—mysticism as the depth of religion—he
can be considered as a mystic.

To conclude, mysticism cannot be learnt by reading the information on mysticism but by practising it. On the strength of purification of the heart, mysticism can be understood, degree by degree. Mysticism requires deeper study as some thinkers on philosophy have spun cobwebs of ignorance round about it. Notably, the Indian mysticism is not understood a-right by most of the Western thinkers. Though Gandhi is not a mystic in the narrow sense of the term but, in another broadly sense, he is, if mysticism is considered as the depth of religion.

By Mysticism, we can make our hearts pure and thus make us fit for understanding and experiencing Truth, both in Theory and Practice.