Chapter - IV

Beyond the Limits of Education

Philosophy is the unseen foundation of a civilization. What we call western civilization today is essentially the civilization of the Greeks. Socrates devoted his time and energy for single purpose i.e., "Know thyself". This simple idea what Greeks left to their successors became the entire infra-structure of the Western culture. Such a thinking led to the development of various branches of knowledge, the knowledge of body and mind, various needs, logic, ethics, politics etc. Like Greeks, Romans followed suit and added the lofty concept of law to the great edifice of knowledge, raised by the Greek culture.

The word "philosophy" has been used since the period of Socrates as a theory that is much related to the understanding of man—his essence and existence. It has been used in different contexts as "life-philosophy", "political philosophy", and "educational philosophy" etc. and is not confined to a single branch of knowledge. In the words of Rene Descartes: "Philosophy, is like a tree, of which metaphysics is the root, physics the trunk, and all the other sciences the branches that grow out of this trunk."¹ William James declares that philosophy deals "with the principles of explanation that underlie all
things without exception, the elements common to gods and men and animals and stones, the first whence and the last whither of the whole cosmic procession, the conditions of all knowing, and the most general rules of human conduct." In this context, the philosophical concepts of the Upanishads cannot be ignored at the cost of academic curricula.

In Indian interpretation darsana i.e. philosophy is explained as drushyate yathartatattwamanene, means by which the real knowledge is attained. So the thinking that finally culminates in the knowledge of the real can be properly called darsana or philosophy. Here philosophy embraces everything including the aim and the object or the systems and the processes of human activities. Like the philosophical aspect of human life there is also a philosophical aspect of education. There lies substantial link between the philosophy of man and the philosophy of education.

The importance of philosophy in the field of education during the upanishadic period was kept in high order. Life and education were inseparable. J.Sarmah remarks: "The Upanishadic seers made no distinction between philosophy of life and philosophy of education. They considered them both to be co-ordinated and co-related. They converted the gurukula into a higher institution of educational experiment, intellectual speculation and research."
That is how the world of philosophy is wide open for all the branches of learning. The upanishadic seer-poets well understood that both educational system and philosophy were born out of human inquisitiveness. William K. Frankena puts this idea in the following lines: "In a real sense, philosophy and thinking about education arose together; philosophers at once set themselves up as teachers and critics, and education gave them a profession and problems to think about."  

Once Sir Francis Bacon, one of the earliest scientific thinkers, proclaimed all knowledge was his province. Houston A. Baker Jr. compared the present situation and wrote: "Sir Francis could not have heard the faintest beat of our contemporary drummers when he made the remark, for today's academician proudly asserts that all of a particular province is his knowledge and is prone to scathing denunciations of intruders."  

Knowledge is the primary component of education because it treats ignorance as bondage and captivity, and knowledge as deliverance and illumination. It does not stop at knowing the truth. It makes truth the wisdom through its practice and application and converts wisdom into power. This process of transformation in a single word is called "Education". In the metaphoric language of Wittgenstein it is a thread composed of "the overlapping of many fibres". Upanishadic philosophy is linked by thousands of such threads of man's cognitive inquiry which come out in the form of dialogue.
Developed by different schools of thought the Upanishads do not give a single system but a series of systems according to its philosophical speculation. In the words of R.D. Ranade "The Upanishadic systems of philosophy rising one over another like Alps and Alps." The doctrines of the Upanishads contain the subject of the Universal Soul, creation, transmigration and final beatitude. The fundamental questions that go to the root of the matter in the Upanishads make it clear that there is no distinction between the seer (drasta) and the seen (drishya) as in Kena; good (Śreyas) and pleasure (Preyas) as in Katha and higher knowledge (Parāvidya) and lower knowledge (aparāvidyā) as described in Mundaka Upanishad.

In the process of inquiry Kena begins with the questions of the pupil: "By whom willed and directed does the mind light on its objects? By whom commanded does life the first, move? At whose will is this speech uttered? And what "god" or power is it that prompts the eye and the ear?" The questions of the pupil assume that there is a sharp distinction between life, sense and mind at the surface. They do not seem to be interdependent. To search into the source means to inquire into a Because and not confined to a Cause. Like other Upanishads Kena is an inquiry into a Because, Because of what does life move, the senses perceive and so on and so forth. To understand the distinction Kena uses the demonstratative symbol, "that" the symbol of eye, which is seen by the eye and by which the eye sees i.e., seer and seen both are identical.
In Katha Upanishad Naciketas' third wish reveals: "There is this doubt in regard to a man who has departed, some say he is and some that he is not. (1:1:20) Naciketas has no doubt about life after death as he had already said that a mortal ripens like corn and like corn is born again. He still inquires the possibility of life after death. Acceptance and denial of this possibility are the two opposite schools of thought i.e., spiritualism and materialism. One believes in life-eternal and another in life-perishable. If every birth is a re-birth and life after death is a death before death then with this unending process a cause is an effect and effect a cause. Here comes the question of Sreyas or a good life. Good life is an immortal life. N.A. Nikam interprets this problem in the following words: "But immortality is never free in human culture from myth; and the immortal life is conceived to be always fresh and young; therefore it is appropriate for the Katha Upanishad to conceal the truth about immortality in the form of a myth and symbolise such a life that can talk face to face with death in the person of the young Naciketas and his never-ceasing spirit of inquiry."²

The upanishadic seers shaped the vedic theories so systematically that there was no gap between theory and practice in their life. In the third chapter their curriculum and method of teaching have been discussed. The present chapter will analyse the most important
doctrines they taught to their students in order to
make their life more meaningful. Ranging from cosmol-
ogy to liberation they analyse Ṭātmā and its relationship
with Brahmā, immortality of soul through rebirth and
reincarnation, rebirth, its relationship with Karma and
Jnāna, caste according to labour and capabilities,
hundred years plan for four āshramas and four ultimate
ends of life.

These concepts and theories had a prominent
place in the upanishadic teaching. Their hundred
years plan with four ultimate ends of life had its prop
in their immortality of soul and rebirth. Their concept
of Karma and Jnāna depended on their theory of liberation.
To make society better-run they discovered caste according
to labour and potentiality. The upanishadic teachers drew
their conclusion in the algebraic formula by setting up an
equation between Brahmā as X and Ṭātmā as the manifest
symbol.

Before coming to such complex doctrines it is
necessary to examine critically some of the so called
philosophical drawbacks for which the early European
orientalists thought Upanishads as "the work of a rude
age, a deteriorated race, and a barbarous and unprogr-
essive community."9

Beyond good and evil:

R.C. Zaehner in his Introduction to the Hindu
Scriptures writes that the Upanishads are incomprehensible
to the modern readers. The former editor of the book, Nicol Macnicol went so far as to say, "the Upanishads are themselves witnesses how foolish and how futile their thinking often was as well as some times so wise and so discerning." Again Zaehner quotes Late Professor Franklin Edgerton's *The Beginnings of Indian Philosophy* where he has criticised the Upanishads in an unusual manner. For Franklin the Upanishads are "the dry bones of the vedic rituals cult frequently rattle about in them in quite a noisy fashion and seriously strain our patience and our charity."¹⁰

The Western orientalists cannot be blamed for such an assessment of the Upanishads. They studied the Upanishads as it were available to them through the source of the missionaries. In a very difficult period in a difficult manner they studied and gave their views without any interdisciplinary study of Indian scriptures. Like the Western scholars, the Indian scholars too have such confusions inspite of their background study of the Indian scriptures. There is no hesitation to accept that the Upanishads still remain pessimistic, indifferent towards ethics, other-worldly, negative and there is less of philosophy and more of mysticism in it. How far these charges are justified, it should be examined critically following the upanishadic texts in the light of the upanishadic period and their situation.

John Mackenzie has observed: "In Hindu thought the goal is represented as for most men so distant and
the way to it as controlled by forces that are in a very real sense alien to most, that we feel justified in maintaining that Hindu thought is pessimistic in the extreme."\(^{11}\) While criticizing, for the critic it is necessary to deal with the distinction between ethics and social philosophy of man as reflected in the Upanishads. S. Gopalan explains the reason of this misunderstanding. He says: "often the organic and reciprocal relationship between the two is lost sight of; so it has been a source of a number of misunderstandings and misinterpretations. Furthermore, the highly idealistic tone of the Hindu social philosophy has often been misunderstood as presenting a pessimistic outlook on life."\(^{12}\)

Perfect happiness or happiness unmixed with sorrow is a day dream. So making oneself free from suffering is not possible. If we want to ignore the darker side of our life we have to transcend the world. Besides, human life is controlled by external forces and our goal is far from our situation. Life seems to be sandwiched between the two.

But the charge of pessimism does not prove that Indian philosophers dwell in the miseries of life for ever often protesting life is not worth living. In the words of Max Müller:

They simply state that they received the first impulse to philosophic reflection from the fact that there is suffering in the world. They
evidently thought that in a perfect world suffering had no place, that it is something anomalous, something that ought at all events to be accounted for, and if possible, overcome. Pain, certainly seems to be an imperfection and, as such, may well have caused the question why it existed, and how it could be annihilated. But this is not the disposition we are accustomed to call pessimism.

Explaining again the reason of pessimism and the philosophy of the removal of pain Max Müller suggests the role of an individual. Our destiny is not our character but our character is our destiny. We suffer for our own character. Max Müller justifies the pessimism in Indian Philosophy thus:

If, therefore, all Indian philosophy professes its ability to remove pain, it can hardly be called pessimistic in the ordinary sense of the word.... The cause of all suffering having been discovered in ourselves, in our works and thoughts, whether in this or in a previous existence, all clamour against divine injustice is silenced at once. We are what we have made ourselves, we suffer what we have done, we reap what
we have sown and it is the sowing of good seed, though without any hope of a rich harvest, that is presented as the chief purpose of a philosopher's life on earth.\textsuperscript{14}

He clearly shows that Upanishads, on the one hand, present a bleak picture of life and on the other hand evolve means for the dissipation of the evil strain and the attainment of the good by an act of self-discipline and transcendence.

What pessimism means to us today was not known to the upanishadic philosophers. They knew nothing about "negative thinking", though to find a word for the Supreme being they used the process of neti, neti or "not this, not this". That way, Maitreyi cannot be branded pessimist when she forgo all material prosperity in order to know the Truth. The critics of the Upanishads do not care and consider the age, nothing about the situation when these were written, nothing about the socio-cultural conditions of that particularly turbulent epoch.

The second charge against Upanishads is that it is indifferent towards ethics. J.Mackenzie criticises that the philosophical ideas of the Hindus, if logically applied, leaves no room for ethics.\textsuperscript{15} Going "beyond good and evil" is again a dangerous concept. Generally it is argued that it may afford an excuse for a moral wrong-doer and increase and encourage many intellectually lazy and morally corrupt people. When the
Absolute being is shown to be beyond good and evil in Vedānta and the reality of the world as illusion or Maya there is no difference between the ideal and the actual.

Strongly putting the Upanishads into test Geoffrey Parrinder affirms: "the Upanishads are treatises and speculations about religious philosophy, and not systems of ethics. They are concerned with interpreting the universe, the world soul and the human soul, and they hardly go beyond this to tackle the problems of moral and social conduct." A.B. Keith expresses his views in a similar manner. To him: "In comparison with the intellectual activity of the Brahmins the ethical content of the Upanishads must be said to be negligible and valueless.... There are, here and there, moral maxims enunciated, but these are of no consequence and rise in no way above popular morality. On the contrary... the possession of knowledge makes a man independent of all morality." Keith again is sceptical about the morality that the Upanishads teach. He holds the view: "The defect of the Upanishads is that they render morality in the ultimate issue valueless and meaningless. We may reasonably assume that any complete metaphysic must seek to explain as essential ingredients of existence, truth, goodness, and beauty, and we may safely conclude that a system which like that of the Upanishads, regards beauty and goodness as nothing but hollow mockeries, is defective and essentially unsound in its theoretic basis." Such an interpretation is
not warranted by a close study of the ethics enshrined in the upanishadic texts.

Keith did not see any moral value in the Upanishads. He saw in it a passive compassion and resignation:

Yājñavalkya declares that the husband is dear to the wife not for his own sake but for the sake of the self, and applies the same principle to the other relations of human life, to the wife, to children, to riches, to other men, to the gods, and the universe, he is doubtful concerned mainly with a metaphysical doctrine, but not only is the selfish conclusion obvious to ordinary minds, but it is essentially connected with the teaching itself, for on ultimate analysis the aim of the self turns out to be the annihilation of every human desire and activity, an ideal which renders all active philanthropy idle, and which has caused the chief virtues of India to take the form of resignation, passive compassion, and charity.¹⁹

Did not young Nachiketas in the House of Death refuse the offer of the greatest earthly pleasures and instead requested Yama to teach him the secret of immortality? When one goes up and up, the people and the world appear small. There morality remains insignificant. That's why in the Upanishad it is said: "Not
for love of the husband is a husband dear, but for love of the soul a husband dear. Not for love of the wife is a wife dear, but for love of the soul a wife dear."

(Br.2:4:5)

In defense of the argument a passage from the Brhadāranyaka (5:2) can be quoted. Prajapati conveys three da to the three categories of people, where all the virtues are kept together, ie.,

- dama - Self-restraint
- dāna - Self-sacrifice
- dayā - Compassion

Metaphorically it is told to the gods that they are by nature unruly and so are asked to practise self-restraint, men are by nature greedy, so they should distribute their wealth to others, and the demons by nature are cruel, so they should have compassion or should be kind to all. No ethics can teach with such beautiful examples as it is told through a parable.

There is no reason to believe that Upanishads are totally free from ethics or indeferent towards good and evil. The Taittirīya Upanīṣad gives a list of students' duty as follows:

Speak the truth, practise virtue, and treat parents, teacher and guest, as gods, one should take the model of Brahmins who are apt, devoted and lover of virtue.(1:11)

Mundaka clearly inspires the people to work hard:
One who sports with the spirit, one who is absorbed and deeply interested in it, and at the same time one who is full of activity. (3:1:4)

The invocatory verse of the Katha says:

Let us protect each other,
Let us enjoy together, let us do heroic deeds in unison and may our study make us illumined,
May there be no dislike between us.

It never encourages an immoral life. Instead it advocates a strong, happy, healthy, vital life, the full term of which would be either 100 years (Isa. 2) or 116 years (Chānd. 3:15:1-7) through a life of ascetic.

Gopalan does not think the concept of going beyond good and evil in any way encourages evil doers and is fraught with dangerous consequences. He argues:

It would be an insult, nay sacrilege to Christ if his ethics were condemned for the monstrocities of the inquisition, for the black deeds of the Popes against which Luther or Zwengli led a relentless war, for the sinking of the Lusitania or the bombing of the civil population during the last Titanic struggle. It would be equally an insult to condemn Hindu ethics because some sects are given to sakti pūja or to human sacrifices. The rule that a moral doctrine shall be judged by its highest manifestation and not by its lowest, is a rule which must
apply to all traditions and cannot be restricted to one tradition only. Ethics places before us ideals of how we ought to be and if in practice people fall short of these and are what they are, who can be held responsible for this? A Manu or a Christ does not deserve to be condemned for their so-called admirers' delinquency any more than the framers of the penal code for the atrocities of a gang of thugs or dacoits.20 Therefore, without denying the obvious fact that ethical life has significance in society, Gopalan treats morality following the Indian Philosophy and its personal aspect. He says: "Society or the social atmosphere by itself cannot make for morality. Morality is a matter of one's inner development and society is the preparing and testing ground for the inner development. It is hence insisted that even when the individual is living in society, he must have concern for his inner development."21

It is not convincing that the upanishadic teachers were very much indifferent towards the ethical conduct of the students. They taught their students how they should lead a life in the society. The teacher in the Kathopanisad said: "He who is not free from bad conduct, who is not tranquil, not composed, not of peaceful mind cannot obtain 'Him' by intelligence (alone). (1:2:24) Again the same Upanishad declares: "He who is devoid of reason, is
unmindful, and impure, does not reach that goal of final bliss but undergoes transmigration and reincarnation."

(1:2:6)

Before entering the Gurukula, as an order, every student took the vow before his teacher:

\[
\text{anena dhātena āhorātrān saññadāhāmi,} \\
\text{ṛtam vadiyāmi, satyam vadiyāmi,} \\
\text{tamāmavatū, tadvaktāramavatū} \\
\text{avatu mām, avatu vaktāram.}
\]

I will pursue my studies day and night without break, I will make an endeavour to find the truth and speak it, I will always try to see spiritual truth and adhere to it. (Tait.1:1:1) Here two things are important for the students. He should be sincere and unceasingly continue his studies and seek the truth and speak the truth without fear.

Above all the question of ethics comes when there exists an unethical system in a state. Chāndogya gives an example when king Āsvapati Kaikeya claimed:

\[
\text{na me steno jana pade na kadaryo na madvapah,} \\
\text{nanahitagnir nāvidvam, na svairi svairini} \\
\text{kutah (5:11:5)}
\]

In my kingdom there is no thief, no miser, no drunkard, no man without a sacrificial fire; no ignorant person, no adulterer, much less an adulteress.

This may be the reason to resent that ethics was not much discussed in the Upanishads. Moreover the supra-ethical mysticism of the Upanishads is in one way
attractive and the other way terrifying, for which the European orientalists brand it defective in its essence and appeal, comparing it with the Christian mysticism. When one says in mystic language "I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me," he is no less a mystic than the teacher in the Upanishads. Being mystic the upanishadic teachers made a golden bridge between their meditation and administration. So Janaka (Br. 3:4), Pravāhana (Br. 6:2), Asvapati (Chāṇḍ. 5:11:24) and Ajatasatru (Br. 2:1), being kings and philosophers adjusted beautifully to this world and for the other world too. They were simply no armchair philosophers.

The Upanishadic Cosmology:

Unlike the materialistic school, the upanishadic school never thought life as "the mechanical resultant of the antecedent co-ordination of material forces." Radhakrishnan aptly remarks:

Life emerges when the material conditions are available, which permit life to organise itself in matter. In this sense, we may say that matter aspires for life, but life is not produced by lifeless particles. So also life may be said to be aspiring for or be instinct with mind, which is ready to emerge when conditions enable it to organise itself in living matter. Mind cannot be produced from things without mind. When the necessary mental conditions
are prepared, intelligence qualifies
the mental living creature.\textsuperscript{23}

The system of life like the system of creation convince us, inspite of the mystic answer given by the scientist, that the world came into being as a result of meaningless chance. Radhakrishnan resented the scientific theory saying that by interpreting the fragmentary relics of far remote times, science tells us how this earth in which we live was gradually adapted to be a place where life could develop.\textsuperscript{24} He said:

It cannot be argued that when material particles are organised in a specific way, life arises. The principle of organisation is not matter. The explanation of a thing is to be sought in what is above it in the scale of existence and value and not below it. Matter cannot raise itself. It moves to a higher level by the help of the higher itself. It cannot undergo inner development without being acted upon by something above it. The lower is the material for the higher. Life is the matter for mind and form for physical material: so also intellect is form for the mind and matter for the spirit. The eternal is the origin of the actual and its nisus to improvement. To think of it as utterly transcendent or as a future possibility
is to miss its incidence in the actual. We cannot miss the primitordiality of the Supreme. Though this sounds Aristotelian in implication it reminds us of the inadequacy of the materialist account of the genesis of life.

Before initiating a discussion on the upanishadic cosmology it is necessary to discuss in nutshell the beginning of creation according to vedic literature. According to the Vedas when the Supreme Spirit (Vishv Karmā) began to evolve the cosmos Ritam and Satya were born of blazing tapas and thence was born night, and thence Samudra, the ethereal ocean and Aranava the earthly ocean.(Rg. 10:190:1)

The vedic term "ritam" in Latin is "rectus", from which the word "right" or "straight" is derived. The vedic god is regarded as ritam which means righteousness. Ritam represents the basic truth, harmony, system or eternal moral order of the entire universe. Modern science traces the creation from the gaseous or nebulous state whereas Vedas shows it as an evolution of the ethereal space or Ākāsa before explaining the planetary evolution. Samudra and Aranava begot time, time begot year, months and days.(Rg. 10:190:2) In another verse of Rigveda (10:72) it is said that in early stages when creative forces were to be generated, and to convert Asat or void into Sat or primordial matter, the Lord of the Universe like a blacksmith blew well his furnace. When Asat was converted into Sat it led to
generate Asha, pervading forces—this in turn raised Paribhuh or potentiality all over. It was this raised potentiality, which created the condition of expansion and started the creation. When high potentiality was created it led to integration all over by energy particles. Untill this stage the conception of matter is uniform homogeneous like sheet of water. At this stage with dancing like motion every violent particle of energy got united with each other. The united particles make atoms, molecules etc. At this stage the matter became heterogeneous. Then by these particles greater and various creations were generated through the substance of sun.

We find a similar description in the words of Dr Schmid Burgk:

The cosmic material was originally densely packed and very hot. Because of the high temperature, the atoms had been broken down into nuclei and electrons; even earlier, the nuclei of the atoms had been reduced to their elements, the protons and neutrons. During the hottest moments, the first few fractions of microseconds of the 'big-bang', not even individual protons and neutrons could exist, but only what they are made up of, the quarks.
In the vedic concept of creation Prajāpati remains the central invisible reality which is the cause of the visible creation of the entire universe. So in a wellknown vedic hymn it is said:

Prajāpatiscarati garbhā
antarājayamano bahudhā vijāyate;
Tasya yonim paripasyanti dhirān
tasmin hatusthu bhuvannanivisva.

Prajāpati remains in the centre of all things; it is unborn; but it manifests itself in the multifarious universe; the wise know the secret of this reality, because all the orders of the (visible) universe are built on it.

I. C. Sharma refers to a five-membered theory of the universe called in Sanskrit Prajāpatyabaleśa Pañcanarvā Viśvavidyā. He says: "there are various dynamic manifestations of the Prajāpati like earth, moon, sun, parameṣṭhi (the galactic centre), and Svayambhu Prajāpati, the centre of the numberless universes, of which our universe is just a branch. The earth (Pṛthvi) revolves around the sun in its orbit as Krāntivṛitta (the path of revolution). It is worth noting here that the word Vṛitta, from which has been derived the word vṛtti, which means a tendency, shows the dynamic nature of the vedic terminology. The moon (chandra) revolves around the earth on its
orbit, called the Daksavritta. The sun with all its planets revolves around its centre of gravitation called Paramesthi. The orbit in which it revolves has been designated Āyatavritta. Thus numberless solar systems are revolving around Paramesthi, the galactic centre. The Paramesthis are also numberless and are revolving around Svayambhu Prajāpati, the universal centre, on their orbits. The orbit of the Paramesthi of our universe is called Āndavritta."

With this vedic background now we can discuss the upanishadic cosmology. It is strange to note that as Hesiod in his "Theogony" asked "who made all this, and how did he make it?" The teacher in Svetāsvatara begins with the question, "From whom are we born? In whom do we live and have our being?"(1:1) The Mundakopanishad explains: "just as a spider creates and retracts its thread, as the herbs and trees grow upon the surface of the earth, just as from a living person the hairs of the head and the body grow, similarly, from this immutable Brahman does all this universe spring"(1:1:7); and "just as from a fire well-lit thousands of scintillations arise, and into it are resolved, similarly, from this immutable Brahman manifold beings come into existence and into it are merged."(2:1:1) This may be considered to be the search after the substratum or advent of cosmogony of Upanishads. The theories propounded in the Upanishads can be classified into two major groups: 1. the
The impersonalistic theory includes all the elements as the substratum of things and abstract ideas as not-Being. The personalistic theory speaks about the origin of creation from the Ātman.

Impersonalistic Theory of creation:

The impersonalistic theory regards water as the life-force. The Brhadāranyaka tells us, "In the beginning, water alone existed; from water was born Satya or truth; Satya produced Brahman; Brahman originated Prajāpati, and Prajāpati gave birth to the gods; these gods meditated on truth alone." (5:5:1) It is clearly mentioned in Thalesian fashion that there was no personal being or no Ātman before the existence of water. Brahman was a product of water through Satya or truth. Both Brahman and Ātman can be interpreted in the line of truth which existed alongwith water, the source of life-force. Similarly Manu and Moses regarded water as the first product of God where the spirit of God move upon the face of the primeval water. (Gen.1:1)

Secondly in Chandogya the teacher Raikva teaches king Janaśruti that air is the final absorbent of all things: "When fire is extinguished it goes to the Air, when the sun sets it goes to the Air, when the moon sets it goes to the Air, When the waters dry up, they go to the Air: thus verily is Air the final absorbent of all things whatsoever. (4:3:1-2) Here Raikva seems to advocate that when there was nothing but fire, the sun, the moon set in the air or space.
And the air had dried up the water and the earth came out. The Greek philosopher Anaximenes spoke that air was both the beginning and end of all things.

Thirdly the Kathopanishad declares that "Fire, having entered the universe, assumed all forms." (2:2:9) The Chāndogya tells us that Fire was the first to evolve from the primal reality, and that from Fire came water, and from water the earth. (6:8:4) It seems to have the Heracleitean concept that fire is for all things and all things for fire.

So life comes out of water. (Br. 5:5:1) World rose out of air including fire and water (Chānd.4:3:1-2), fire took different forms (Kaṭh 2:5), from fire came water and from water the earth. So at the time of dissolution the earth is dissolved in water, and water in fire. (Chānd.6:8:4)

Fourthly space as advocated by Pravāhaṇa Jaivali is the substratum of all things. In reply he said: "All these beings emerge from space and are finally absorbed in Space; Space is verily greater than any of these things; Space is the final habitat." (Chānd. 1:9:1) The same Upanishad supports the same theory in another passage: "Space is, indeed, higher than fire. In Space are both the sun and the moon, the lightning and the stars. It is by Space that man is able to call... In Space and after Space are all things born. Meditate on Space as the highest reality. (7:12:1) It is until Philolaus that the notion of space as the "arche" was
unknown to the Greek world, though Thales, Anaximenes, Heracleitus and Empedocles partially highlighted some
of the major concepts like water, air, fire, earth etc.

Fifthly the Upanishads teach the theory of Not-being. The Taittirīya asserts: "at the beginning of all things what existed was Not-being. Of it was born being. Being shaped itself of its own accord. It is thus that it is called well-made or self-made."(2:7) The Brhadāraṇyaka also says: "in the beginning, there was nothing whatsoever in this world. By death or hunger was everything covered, for hunger is, indeed, death. Death made up his mind, 'let me have a self', and the worshipping, he began to move. From him, thus worshipping, water was produced.... The froth of the water became solidified, and became the earth. Death toiled on the earth, and as a result of his toil, fire came forth."(1:2:1-2) Both death and hunger are identified with the origin of the elements like water, earth, and fire which spring from Not-being. The Chāndogya connects the theory of Not-being with the myth of universal egg. It describes:

In the beginning this world was merely non-being. It was existent. It developed. It turned into an egg. It lay for the period of a year. It was split asunder. One of the two eggshell-parts became silver, and the other gold.
That which was of silver is this earth. That which was of gold is the sky. What was the outer membrane is the mountains. What was the inner membrane is cloud and mist. What were the veins are the rivers. What was the fluid within is the ocean.

Now, what was born therefrom is yonder sun. When it was born, shouts and hurrahs, all beings and all desires rose up toward it. Therefore at its rising and at its every return shouts and hurrahs, all beings and all desires rise up toward it. (3:19:1-3)

It is interesting to note that there is corresponding myths in the Orphic cosmogony of Greece. In the words of Ranade:

Chronos and Adrastea produced a gigantic egg which divided in the midst, and with its upper half formed the sky, and with the lower the earth, and how out of the egg came Phanes, the shining God, containing within himself the germs of all the other gods. It is interesting to note that behind Chronos and Adrastea, as we have
them in this myth, are ideas of time and necessity respectively. May we venture to make a suggestion that the word Adrastea, seems very much to be the Greek counterpart of the Sanskrit "Adrishta".30

There is nothing to dispute about the development of an egg from an existent non-being as said in the Upanishad. However, as it has been stated, the egg is splitted into a white part and yellow part which turned into the earth and sky respectively. It seems quite unscientific. Because after the egg gets splitted it can never assume a spherical shape as the earth has, rather it would take a flat shape which is not exactly the shape of the earth. Secondly the yellow part cannot become the sky or the space factor since the sky or space is really colourless. The different colours of the sky are due to the fact of various reflection and refraction processes of light rays coming from the sun through the gaseous atmosphere.

However the modern black-hole theory of the origin of the universe as given by Prof.S.Chandrasekhar (being a Hindu has the myth of Hindu philosophy behind his mind, a race-memory, the myth of Brahmānda that is Brahma's egg) states that we are staying in the interior of a black-hole with a big-bang (the earth). And our solar system could be one of the metabolites of this infinite universe which is really endless and
beginningless in nature. If our solar system has evolved by some laws of thermodynamics from a black hole and the infinite universe, this concept of the origin of the universe can be superficially connected to the theory of the cosmic egg.

Sixthly, the theory of Being makes us question how could Being come out of Not-Being, existence from non-existence? Chandogya denies the fact and establishes that Being alone existed at the beginning. The Upanishad said: "This primeval Being thought, let me be many, let me produce; having been thought thus to itself, it produced fire. Fire thought, let me be many, let me produce; and it produced water. Water thought, let me be many, let me produce; and it produced the earth (food or matter)."(Chānd.6:2:1-4)" The primeval Being, then, thought, verily, I am now these three deities. Let me enter into them by my ātman, and unfold both name and form. Let me make each of them three-fold and they became three-fold."(Chānd. 6:3:2-3)" It thus comes about that what we call the red colour in a flame belongs really to fire. Its white colour is that of water and its black colour belongs to the earth. Thus does vanish the flameness of a flame. The flame is indeed only a word, a modification and a name, while what really exists are the three colours. What we call the red colour in the sun, is really the colour of fire, its white colour is the colour of water, its black colour is the colour of the earth. Thus, verily, vanishes the sunness of the sun. The sun is only a word, a modification and a name. What really exists is the three colours.
Thus, likewise, does depart the moonness of the moon, and the lightningness of the lightning. What really exist are the three colours only." (Chāṇḍ. 6:4:1-4) The primeval reality as Being is one without a second, though it is with three fold prakṛti of fire, water and earth.

To explain it more clearly it can be put this way. In the beginning, in some distant point of time, the entire universe existed in a state of paramanu or atoms. The present universe where the earth exists and where we live in the family of sun and moon was non-being or asat. Before this universe was non-being, one alone, without second existed. And in the Atharvedic term it was Hiranyagarbha, the divine inflatus. Hiranyagarbha can be better translated as the womb of life. Through a question the vedic teachers explain the riddle of the universe as such:

In the beginning was Hiranyagarbha
(Golden Womb)
The seed of elemental existence,
The only Lord of all that was born
He upheld the heaven and earth together
to what God other than Him, could we dedicate our life? (Athrv.4.2.7)

From Hiranyagarbha heat generated. The atoms of ether came closer in various proportions and formed molecules. Out of the chemical union and contraction heat became gaseous and condensed and the whole mass became luminous
vapour. This self-luminous vapour in vedic term has been called Prajāpati, the lord of all creation. The evolution of the creation has been described in the Rigvedic (10:121:1) verse as:

Then even nothingness was not, nor existence, there was no air then, nor the heavens beyond it. What covered it? Where was it? In whose keeping? Was there then cosmic water, in depths unfathomed? Then there was neither death nor immortality, nor was there then the torch of night and day, The One breathed windlessly and self-sustaining. There was that One then, and there was no other.... But, after all, who knows and who can say whence it all came, and how creation happened? The gods themselves are later than creation, So who knows truely whence it has arisen?31

Seventhly the theory of Prāṇa which meant breath i.e., life-force or cosmic-force is the root of all things. The Chandogya (1:11:5) describes Prāṇa through which all these beings enter and it is from Prāṇa that they originally spring. The final absorbent of all things one in the macrocosm and the other in the microcosm, the one being air, and the other Prāṇa. (4:3:4)
The truth of Upanishads reveals that what is in the body is in the universe. Science affirms that the principle that works in atom is the same principle that works in the universe. The principle that works in our material world is the same principle that works in our spiritual world. Two phrases tell the same thing in the Upanishads, *athađhyebatam* and *athađhyatma* which means that whatever principle works in macrocosm, the same principle works in microcosm. In *Garudapurāṇam* it is clearly mentioned: *Brahmānde ye guṇāh santi sarire te byabasthitah* which means whatever exists in the macrocosm, exists in the microcosm.32 Sanatkumār told Nārada with an example that just as all the spokes of a wheel are centred in its navel, similarly all these beings, and, in fact, everything that exists is centred in Prāṇa. (Chānd.7:15:1)

Coming to the Universal soul one has to find an all-pervading Breath that exists everywhere and in him. This cannot be confined to the concept of monotheism, as monotheism generally recognises a God and creator as distinct from the created things. This concept of soul is being experienced by Satyakāmā Jābala from nature; the very theme which Yajnavalkya imparted to his beloved wife and student Maitreyi. That is the lesson Śvetaketu learnt from his father Uddālaka with various similes and metaphors in the form of legends and stories.

The same Universal breath or Prāṇa created the world with all its beings out of the material cause, so in Rigved (10:129) as in the Old Testament water became
The first material cause.

The Personalistic theory of Creation:

The personal element of creation begins in the *Prasnopanishad* where the teacher Pippalāda advocates that the creator desired to create a pair called *rayi* and *prāṇa* or matter and spirit (1:4) which corresponds to Aristotle's matter and form. It affirms the duality of primary existence. In support of this indication, there are supporting elaborations as cited from the Upanishad:

\[
\text{tasmaī sa havāca praśā-śamo vai}
\]

\[
praśā-patiḥ, sa tapo'tapyata, sa
\]

\[
tapas taptvā as mithunam uṭpādayate,
\]

\[
raṇiḥ ca prāṇam ca, ity etau me
\]

\[
bahudhā praśā Karisyata iti.
\]

The lord of creation, verily, was desirous of offspring. He performed austerity. Having performed austerity, he produced the pair, matter and life, thinking that they would produce creatures for him variously. (Prasn.1.4)

The world consists of *bhūr* or earth; *bhuvas* or atmosphere and *svar* or Sky. The earth has its support in the sky. (Chānd.1.9.1) There is no beginning and no end of the universe. (Svātā.5:13) The sun is regarded as the supreme. (Br.2:1:2) According to Mundaka creation is derived from the *aksara*, the imperishable from which emanated *prāṇa*, *manas* or mind, the sense organs, the firmament, air, light and water in an evolutionary
sequence.(11:1:3-9) The series is slightly altered in the Taittirīya where the first principle is ātman from which came the firmament, air, fire, water, earth, plants, food and finally the Purusa, composed of food and sap.

(11:1:3) Brhadāranyaka explains differently and speaks of the origin of the world with the duality of sex.

(1:4:1-4) The Aitareya elaborates that at the beginning there was nothing but the Ātman. Ātman created the four worlds, viz., those of the super-celestial region of waters, the heavens with their celestial lights, the mortal earth, and the subterranean region of waters. Then he created a Purusa and brooded over it as a result of which various sense organs and their corresponding functions were created. Finally he created the deities or the guardians of the worlds and created food for them.(1:1-3)

Taittirīyopanishad also speaks of an emanative theory of creation from the Ātman. It maintains that "from the Ātman, verily, emanated space, from space air, from air fire, from fire water, and from water the earth."

(2:1)

The Mundaka speaks of an emanative and theistic theory of creation. It advocates:

In the beginning, there existed a divine and formless person who was without and within, unborn, without breath and without mind, pure and higher than the highest immutable. From him were born life, mind, sense organs, space, air, light, water,
and earth, the supporter of the universe....
From him also were born gods of various
descriptions, angels, men, beasts, birds,
the in-breath and the out-breath, rice and
barley, penance, faith, truth, celibacy,
and religious law.... He was similarly
source of all the oceans and mountains,
the rivers of every kind, the herbs and
their essence, whereby the inner soul
dwells in beings.(2:1:2-3,7,9)

The Svetasvatara opens with paradoxical opinions:
"Some people say, that it is Time, others Nature, others
Necessity, others Chance, others the Elements, others
Yet the Person, still others the Combination of these,
and yet a few others the Atman, which is the source of
all things whatsoever."(1:2) Time cannot be considered
the first principle because God is declared to be the
"time of time".(6:2,16) So like time, Nature cannot be
independent as it depends on God.(5:5) Nor can we give
importance to Necessity and Chance as the source of the
universe because of their fatalistic characteristics.
The Elements too are God's work, so they cannot be the
explanation of creation.(6:2) That way Purusa or the
person cannot be regarded as the origin of all things
because it is free from the prakrti or nature. So
Svetasvatara declares God who is called Isa (1:10,3:1;
4:13; 5:1; 6:2,17), or Hara (1:10); or Rudra (3:2; 4:5:21,
22), or Siva (3:11; 4:14,6,18; 5:14), or Mahesvara(4:10;
6:7) as the source of the creation.
In Taittirīya the source of the universe is described to be Brahman: "where from these beings are born, by which being born they live, into which on return they enter—that is to be known as Brahman." (3:1)

The Chandogya holds: "Verily, this whole world is Brahman. Tranquil, let man worship it as that from which he was born, as that into which he will be dissolved, as that in which he breathes." (3:4:11) So also in the Mundaka Brahman is compared to a spider, which sends forth the threads and draws them in again. (1:1:7) The Upanishad further says that living beings in their numerous kinds issue forth from Brahman and enter into It again. (2:1:1)

The same thing is said of the ātman in the Māndūkyopanishad: "The Ātman is the cradle of the universe, for he is the creation and the end of living beings." (6)

At the time of the dissolution of the universe, all things return to their respective causes in the same order in which they had been originated. When all of them dissolve into Brahman, there remains no distinction among them whatsoever. This shows that nothing perishes, in the true sense of the term. (Chand. 6:9-10)

Brahman regulates all the aims of the creatures, until finally the whole is lost in It, which is the beginning. (Svēts. 4:1) It is, indeed, the Lord in whom the universe is lost and reappears. (Svēts. 4:2) The Upanishad compares "the Lord who many times spreads forth one net after another in space and again draws it in, "to a spider." (Svēts. 5:3; 6:10; Mund. 1:1:7)
This theory behind the origin of the universe appears to have enough scientific logic. The word Divine, interpreted in the Vedas as eternity, gives the idea that the universe is an infinite living system. It talks about the eternity of the Soul from which the entire space arises and space gives birth to air which is a composition of various gases like hydrogen, oxygen, nitrogen, carbon dioxide etc. This theory says from air fire arose and that appears quite logical when space is filled with a number of gas particles which are in a continuous dynamic process there might have caused friction among these gas particles resulting in fire. Since hydrogen has been scientifically proved to be a combustible gas and Oxygen is the supporter of combustion fire would have originated in space by the union of oxygen and Hydrogen resulting in the formation of water. However, the creation of earth from simple water appears to lack logic because once water is formed it will exist in three forms, solid, liquid and gas. The solid form of water cannot be the component of the earth because by mere heating the solid state changes into liquid. However, the birth of the earth might have taken place from the same fire by a continuous fusion process of the gas particles present in the atmosphere, which can, in fact, lead to the germination of several elements that are found on the earth surface. When atmosphere, consisting of hydrogen, oxygen, nitrogen and water vapour etc., exists on the surface of the earth that could obviously give birth to herbs and food as mentioned in the Upanishads.
And from food semen must have been created because semen is just a metabolite of food in plants or animal body which in turn can give birth to *purusa* or person.

Like creation there is dissolution of the creation. *Svetasvatara* explains the theory of the periodical re-creation and recurring dissolution in the following words: "That which He created, He then takes back again, becoming one with the being of being; in order then.... to begin afresh the work rich in the gunas, apportioning to each their attributes. Where they are not there action comes to nought. In the event of the exhaustion of actions, He, in reality, continues another, different from what He has created. (4:3-4)

The modern thermodynamics also ascertains that the organic and inorganic creation cannot remain as it is. Ultimately it will return to the original source. Sir James Jeans explains:

Energy cannot run downhill forever, and, like the clock-weight, it must touch bottom at last. And so the universe cannot go on forever; and sooner or later the time must come when its last erg of energy has reached the lowest rung on the ladder of descending availability, and at this moment the active life of the universe must cease. The energy is still there, but it has lost all capacity for change; it is as little able to work the universe as the water in a flat pond is able to turn a water-wheel. We are left with a dead, although possibly a warm, universe--
heat-death. 33

It is obvious that Upanishads enshrine an enquiry into cosmology as a part of the quest for truth. In one sense, education is the process of investigation into the nature of the true, the beautiful and the good. This triad of quest has given rise to three interconnected disciplines—logic and philosophy, aesthetics, and ethics, and all other discourses have to be founded on these three cardinal disciplines. Before the separation of the field of knowledge, before specialisation, philosophy encompassed all the disciplines as a cerebration or reflection on the nature of the ultimate. Cosmology came first as an explanation of the genesis of matter and being. This inevitably led to the search for the cardinal cause, the source of Being and the primary cause of the entire world with all the objects with their attributes. Naturally Upanishads designed the discourse as a quest of the first cause.

However the picture of the universe depicted in the Upanishads is not quite so clear, but it certainly encompassed the stars, the different spheres of being, the planetary system with the sun at the centre, and the world. Astronomical knowledge must have been extremely limited to provide accurate cosmography. The occasional references to different spheres of being or different worlds of habitation may have been derived from the myths, and therefore are highly imaginary, not based on any astronomical observations.
What counts most in any ideology is not the structure of the universe or its constituents, but the genesis of the universe itself because this alone can impart meaning to life, or invest human existence with any significance. This is the reason why so many theories of genesis are proposed and discussed, though these theories have no verifiable contents. In no case not even today, scientists can formulate a theory of genesis with directly verifiable contents in spite of the vast data of facts brought to light with space probes, pictures sent by satellites and astronomical observations with the telescope. So the theorists of a remote age of Upanishads cannot be accused of having produced theories which are not verifiable and highly imaginary in their nature.

Yet the speculation about genesis in the Upanishads have their logical bearings, their subtlety of postulational technique is quite amazing, considering the foundation on which they had to work. Of all the theories there is one of emanation from the formless, radiant, nuucleus, the primordial stuff, named as "Brahman" or the Primary Being. This primordial being is given no qualifying attribute, rather it is pictured as unqualified and nonqualifiable stuff. So one cannot attribute neither life, nor vitality nor power, nor any mass to it since these are the different forms of evolutes or emanations from this primal stuff.
Some commentators have come to the conclusion that this theory has a tinge of animism. Others call it a theory of spiritualism in a very nascent form since the Primal Cause, whatever may be its substance, is essentially nonmaterial or spiritual. There is no need to enter into a controversy as to the nature of this primordial substance. If we accept this theory without any reservation, we may safely suppose that the primordial stuff is essentially neutral, and being neutral it can neither be described as spiritual, animistic nor as material. The forms that issue forth manifest qualities, attributes according to their composition, but the primary source has neither of the qualities and may have been essentially neutral in nature.

It has philosophical implications which have often been dropped out of reflection in the discourse on cosmology. The tentative character of this theory lends a vagueness and ambiguity to this discourse, but its implications in the structure of this ideology are apparent. The highest form of being which has emanated from this Primordial Being is very close to reflecting the essence or the quintessence of this being. The highest form is more real than other constituents of reality. Which is the highest form? As the texts are explored it is not difficult to say that man with his reflexive consciousness and creative imagination is the highest in the order of beings as emanations from that supreme Being. This surely is an implication that
puts man at the top of the hierarchy of beings. This cosmology or the theory of genesis brings man back into the centre of the world. In Vedic age gods like Agni, Indra, Varuna were believed to be the world creators, the controller of elemental forces, the real designer of the universe and the master of human destiny. But in their new pictures they are relegated to the background, man is put in the right place and he is supposed to be the master of his own fate and the maker of his destiny.

Another important implication is seen in the attitude of reverence towards life in any form whatsoever or even a respect for all objects that make up the environment. This has remained a very prevailing sentiment in many religious orders that emerged from attempts at reform within the fold of Hindu faith. If all the beings or objects have evolved from the same source or partake of the supreme being, all to some extent incorporate the essence. The difference is a difference in degree, not in kind. Such an implication does not only seem conclusive, but also sane and objective in creating the required attitude towards the world. If all the objects under different names and form partake of the same essence, man can be said to have inhabited a highly congenial space. He is not in a hostile environment where beings and objects conspire against his existence; he does not inhabit a landscape peopled by alien and strange objects and creatures. Here is within the entire cosmic perspective a space open to objects that holds
communion with one another with man at the apex of the creation.

What is the significance of this cosmological account in the life of man, its bearings on the existence of human beings on the earth? No doubt, all the bearings are value-laden; they are not facts in the sense that the greenness of grass is a fact. Each of the implications may lend some force and strength to ordering of objectives for our realisation. As all the creatures have sprung from the same source, all may live in congruence in a congenial atmosphere. Any imbalance can be due to the denial of place to a created being. Only in mutual dependence the world as a place of prosperity and peace can be sustained. If a species is destroyed, it will impair the environment for the survival of others. It is not a place for the survival of the fittest, but a world for all to survive together, strive together and man must place out his living according to such a scheme of harmony among beings and their fearful coexistence as the condition for his survival.

The implication of this theory may not appear irreconcilable with proposals for the ecological balance, nonviolence, respect for life and even with a form of evolutionism under the new provenance. Any kind of conflict is to destroy the balance and will be contrary to the very purpose of life and the teleology of the evolution of such a variety of forms.
This theory further provides an ideational basis for setting up norms for decent life, for laws of equal privilege for all and for ensuring protection to all forms of being. The thinkers of the Upanishads have spent some time on explaining how the beings arose, how the world was made. The principal objective of this discourse is not essentially metaphysical or inspired by the pursuit of truth; the entire discourse is motivated by an ideological search for the meaning of life.

What is the purpose of the emanations of life? This is not very explicitly stated. The authors don't work out a teleological scheme, perhaps that would have demanded either an anthropocentric disposition which may appear wholly incredible or a presumption not warranted either by facts in the showing or any imaginative account of the ontological status of man. What is assumed is that the primordial source is the cause of the evolution of all the living and non-living beings. Why does the emanation take place, seems to be an in comprehensible question to be matched with any logically valid answer.

But the theory of emanation is opposed to any deistic cosmology as prevails in Christianity or other forms of Indian theology. No God creates the world out of nothing or as a product of his will. In such a case so many logical problems may have cropped up making the thesis partly incredible and partly illogical.
Then in such a case created beings are likely to be assigned a very low status in the scheme of things. The position of man will be tantamount to the position of a puppet, subordinated to the divine will. To circumvent all these problems the genesis by evolution or emanation seems to be a more plausible answer.

Reality of the World:

After knowing the source of the universe can we suspect this world a positive blank or absolute nothing, or unreal or illusion? The universe which springs from, sustained by, and absorbed in Brahman cannot be unreal.

Upanishads affirm this universe as the revelation of the grandeur and glory of Brahman (Mund. 2:2:7), which is immanent in as well as transcendent to the universe. (Chānd. 3:12:6) Yājñavalkya explains to his wife Maitreyī in the similar way. He tells her that all the Worlds, the creatures, everything, including the Vedas, came out of the Ātman or the Brahman (Br. 2:4:6), so it is immortal. (Br. 2:5) Answering to Uddālaka Ārūni, Yājñavalkya said that the Ātman or Brahman is the puller of the air, the earth, the water, the fire, the space, the heaven, and everything else. (Br. 3:7) So the universe originated from Brahman; the truth from truth, and is true, since truth comes out of truth and not error or illusion or falsity or unreality out of truth and reality.
Mundaka explicitly describes the physical world as real. In a verse it is told: "As a spider sends out and reabsorbs its thread, as the earth sends forth the herbs, as the hair of the head and the body spring from the living man, similarly does the whole of the universe proceed from the imperishable. (1:1:7) So it cannot be believed that a magician coming forward and waving his hand to produce this vast world. In spite of such strong evidences it cannot be ruled out that for the first time Svetasvatara used the word "māyā" for nature or Prakṛti and God as mayin. (4:10) But the same Upanishad declares the fire, sun, wind, moon, the starry firmament, water, the thunder-cloud, the seasons, the seas as the Brahman, from which all the worlds are born. (4:2, 4:11, 13-17)

Transcendent and immanent God:

It has been a common comment that the vedic version of God is polytheistic with a pantheistic tinge. Max Muller coined a new word i.e., "henotheism", from this concept. But a number of references suggest that the vedic version of God is monotheistic. Atharva Veda strongly emphasises that God is only one and the only one. (13:4:20) He is the one Adorable who is the only Lord of all the luminous worlds. (2:21:1) So He is called neither the second, nor the third, not yet the fourth. He is neither the fifth, sixth nor the seventh, neither the eighth ninth nor yet the tenth. (13:4:16-18) He is one but the wise call Him Indra —
God of Supreme power, Mitra - the Friend of all, Varuna - the most Desirable Being. Divya - the Shining one and Garutman - the mighty soul; the sages describe the one Being in various ways calling Him Agni - self refulgent one, Yama - the Ordainer of the world and Matarishwan - the energy of the universe. (Rg. 1:164:45) He is Aryama - the Administrator of justice; Varuna - the only Observer of our choice; Rudra - the Chastiser of evil doers; Mahadeva - the Supreme Divinity; Agni; Surya - the Impeller of all; Mahayama - the Greatest Administrator of justice. (Athrv. 13:4:4-5) Again in Yajur Veda it is said: Verily He is Agni; He is Aditya - the Imperishable; He is Vayu - the Mover of all the universe; He is Chandrama - All Blessful Being; He is Shukra - the Holy one; He is Brahma - the supreme Being; He is Apah - All pervading and He is Prajapati - the Lord of all creatures. (32:1)

The vedic God in the Upanishads became a God of different attributes. There are different arguments and interpretations in the entire Upanishads to prove his existence, starting from cosmological to transcendental and from personal to impersonal concept of the Absolute.

The Upanishads have propounded various arguments for the existence of the Absolute. Taittirīya gives the cosmological proof of the Absolute. Is this whole creation possible without a creator? So it is said: "from which all these beings came into existence, that
by which they live, that into which they are finally absorbed, know that to be the eternal verity, the Absolute." (3:1) The Chandogya summarises the whole theme in a single word called tajjalān which means, from the Absolute that the world has sprung, it is into it that it is dissolved, and it is by means of it that it lives. (3:14:1) The upanishadic philosopher kept the Absolute in the supreme station. The power of Absolute is described in the following lines:

"Before Him the sun does not shine, before Him the moon and the stars do not shine, before Him the lightening does not shine; far less this earthly fire. It is only when the Absolute shines first, that all these objects shine afterwards. It is by His luminosity that they become luminous." (Kath. 2:5-15) The parable of Nyagrodha tree of Chhāndogya (6:12) discussed in second chapter tells us how the subtle and unmanifested things remain subtle and unmanifested. The Phenomenal appearances indicate the noumenal existence.

Regarding the physico-theological argument for the existence of the Absolute the Upanishads clearly mention that the personal and impersonal aspects of the Absolute are under the design and the argument from order. R.D. Ranade argues: "Those who believe in God believe in design. Those who believe in an impersonal Absolute believe only in order." Upanishads argue that though the self exists yet "an impersonal bond which holds the river of existence from flowing by, neither night nor day neither age nor death, neither
grief nor good nor evil, are able to transgress this eternal bond of existence. (Chānd. 8:4:1; cf. Br. 3:8:9)

Regarding the personal concept of God Svetasvatara never hesitates to call Him Rudra, beside whom there is no second, and who rules the worlds with his powers, stands behind all persons, creates all the worlds, and, in the end of time, rolls them up again. He has his eyes everywhere, and his face everywhere; his hands and feet are also omnipresent. He creates the men of earth and endows them with hands. He creates the fowl of air and endows them with wings. He is the only God who has created the heaven and the earth. (3:2:3) Describing more eloquently the same Upanishad says about God:

Some sages discourse of inherent nature; Others likewise, of time. Deluded men!

It is the greatness of God in the world
By which this Brahma-wheel is caused to revolve.

He by whom this whole world is constantly enveloped
Is intelligent, the author of time,
possessor of qualities, omniscient.
Ruled o'er by Him, (his) work revolves — This which is regarded as earth, water, fire, air and space!
Of Him there is no ruler in the world,
Nor lord; nor is there any mark of Him. (6.1-2,9)
Brihadāranyaka describes God as Antaryāmin which means God lives inside and governs the universe from within. (3:7) In the same Upanishad God is described as the Soul of Souls. He is both the formed and the formless, the mortal and the immortal, the stationary and the moving. (2:3:1-6) Through a simile and a metaphor it explains: "just as the spokes of a wheel are held together in the navel and felly of a wheel, similarly in this Supreme Soul are centred all these beings, all gods, all worlds, all the individual souls — the Supreme Soul is the king of them all" (2:5-15) and used the metaphor "just as little sparks may come out of fire, even so from the Supreme Soul all prāṇas, all worlds, all gods, all beings come out. This is to be mystically expressed by saying the Supreme Soul is the verity of verities; the prāṇas, as well as other things mentioned along with them, are verities, of whom the Universal Soul is the supreme verity." (2:1:20)

In spite of various arguments in favour of the Absolute the Upanishads remain as the book of the paradoxical ideas on God. Both Śvetāsvatara and Brihadāranyaka declare God as being present in fire, water, in the herbs and plants. Ātman is immanent in us from top to toe respectively. The Chhandogya speaks the parable of salt melting in water like that the subtle Ātman too is immanent in the universe. (6:13:1-3) Whereas the Kathopanishad, like Plato, argues God is like the celestial Sun who is the eye of all the universe and is unaffected by the defects of our
vision (2:5:11) It speaks of the transcendental spirit of the Absolute. He is described in the Upanishads both transcendent and immanent. (Svētās, 3:14) It is clear from the arguments that the upanishadic philosophers believed in not more than one God in Brīhadāraṇyaka both Śākalya and Yājñavalkya propounded the only God "whose body the earth is, whose sight is fire, whose mind is light, and who is the final resort of all human souls." (3:9.1-10)

Some philosophers are, in fact, confused on the concept of the Absolute Brahman. German philosopher Hegel speaks of the upanishadic Brahman as characterless nothingness, an empty power, without wisdom and without activity - a unity into which all existences pass as into a dark and eternal night. The upholders of such a Brahman are described as revelling in the "region of unbridled madness." Edward Caird holds that the upanishadic Brahman was "an abyss of a negative infinitude...a unity which was no principle of order in the manifold differences of things, but merely a gulf in which all difference was lost." And Prof. Pfleiderer says: "Brahman is an indeterminate abstract Being, which is hardly distinguished from nothing; an abyss which swallows up all finite being."

In the Upanishads the ultimate source of the universe is an impersonal Brahman who is explained in the light of saguna or nirguna Brahma or having qualities and beyond qualities. No concept is adequate to describe the dignity of Brahman, so He is an impersonal entity.
The Upanishads describe the ultimate reality which is unmanifested as Brahman. Brahman is described as life-giving prāṇa or breath, vāyu or wind, or ākāśa or space. He is also described as cit or pure consciousness, ānanda or bliss, or ananta or eternity. Brahman is both immanent and transcendent. He is Saguna, (with characteristics) and nirguna, (without characteristics). Saguna Brahman can be explained as honey is the essence of beeswax and oil is the essence of sesame seeds. (Chând. 6:9ff.) To give a sense to Brahman for our common language these examples are given. According to the Mundaka, "this whole world is Brahman" and the Brahman is the "hidden mover...within all that moves, breathes, and winks". (2.2:1-2) The Brahman is the very "beingness" of all beings. So in the Chandogya Uddālaka Āruṇi teaches his son, Śvetaketu - "Thou art That!" (6:9:4, 6:8:7, 5:16:3)

According to the Vedas, Purusa i.e., Brahman is both immanent and transcendent. The Vedas proclaim: "Purusa possesses a thousand heads, a thousand eyes, a thousand feet; He encompasses the earth on every side, and stands ten fingers breadth beyond. Such is His greatness, and Purusa is more than this: one quarter of Him is all existing beings, and His three quarters are immortal in the sky." (Rg.10:90; Yajur.31) The Upanishads explain in a similar way: "Brahman is immanent everywhere, the universe that He manifests occupies only a quarter of Him" (Chând.3:12:6) Brahman cannot be interpreted only in accord with the pantheistic doctrine because in panthaism God is only immanent, not transcendent.
The major older Upanishads claim Brahman is everywhere, and nothing is independent of Him. (Kath. 2:2:9-10; Prasna 1:4-5; Mund. 2:2:11) Brhadāranyaka holds:

"He who, dwelling in the earth, yet is other than the earth, whom the earth does not know, whose body the earth is, who controls the earth from within - He is your soul, the inner controller, the immortal." (3:7:3)

Isa describes Him as bright, pure, unpierced by evil, wise, intelligent, self-existent, and eternal. (8)

According to the Mundakopanisad, Brahman is said to have been understood by the wise as eternal, all-pervading, omnipresent, exceedingly subtle, imperishable, and as the source of all beings. (1:1:6) So it is said:

"I bow to Brahman who is in fire and in water, who permeates the whole universe, who is in the annual crops as well as in the perennial trees." (Svetās. 2:17) The same Upanishad declares: "I know the mighty Person who is of the colour of the sun, and beyond darkness. Only by knowing Him does one transcend death. There is no other way for reaching there." (3:8) The Brahman is the fountain-head of the universe. According to the Taittiriyopanisad "Brahman is that of which all these being are born, that by which when born they are sustained, that into which or return they enter. Desire to know that. That is Brahman." (3:1; Chānd. 3:14:1) In the Aitareya we read that "Brahman thought that He should reveal the worlds and He revealed these worlds." (1:1-2; Chānd. 6:2:3-4) The Isopanisad says: "Whatever there is in this universe, all this is enveloped by Brahman. (1; Gita 9:4) The Chāndogya declares: "All this is, verily,
Brahman."(3:14:1)

Chāndogya (14:1:4) describes Brahman with the unity of the Ātman, Atharva Veda relates Brahman with Time or Kāla. (19:53:8) The Svetāsvatara (1:3) describes Kāla as the First Principle. "Brahman is knowledge and bliss."(Br. 3:9:28) "Bliss is Brahman." (Tait.3:6) "The blissful immortal that gleams forth is Brahman."(Mund.2:2:7) "The Infinite is bliss. One must desire to understand the Infinite."(Chānd. 7:23:1) "He who knows the bliss of Brahman—from which all speech together with the mind, returns, unable to reach It—fears nothing."(Tait.2:9) "From bliss indeed, all creatures are born, when born they live by bliss, on return they enter into bliss."(Tait.3:6) "The united mass of knowledge, which has become on in the state of deep-sleep, is possessed of bliss and enjoys bliss."(Māndū.5) "During the time of deep sleep when every thing is resolved, the ātman which is obscured by ignorance attains to the nature of bliss." (Br.4:3:21-22) "Those who experience Brahman as abiding in the ātman, to them is eternal bliss— to no others." (Kath. 2:2:12-13) "When man is overcome with brilliance, then that god (mind) sees no dreams; then here in this body arises this bliss."(Prasn. 4:6) "By knowing the peaceful Brahman, one goes to infinite peace."(Svātas.4:14)

In spite of Brahman's paradoxical attributions the Isopanisad in its Shāntipātha says: "That (Brahman)
is full; this (the world) is full. From the full (Brahman), the full (the world) comes. The full (Brahman) remains the same, even after the full (the world) is taken from the full (Brahman). This unitary vision of Brahman tells us clearly that there is neither inside nor outside of Brahman.

The concept of "I'm Brahman," or "aham brahma asmi" is much debated because of its self-styled declaration of God. The Upanishads make it clear that as long as there is no self-realisation a person has no right to identify himself with Brahman. (Br. 4:4:23)

Indian philosophy teaches that man is essentially divine. In upanishadic language man is "Amrutasya Putraḥ" or the son of immortality. That way man has every right to identify his soul with the Over-soul or the universal soul. Max Muller makes it more explicit when he says:

"If people conceive God as a kind of Jupiter, or even as a Jehovah, then the idea can only be considered blasphemous... But after the Deity had been freed from its mythological character, after the human mind, whether in India or elsewhere, had once realised the fact, that God was all in all, that there could be nothing besides God, that there could be one Infinite only, not two, the conclusion that the human soul also belonged to God was inevitable."
"Brahman" is finally posited as the uncused cause, both formal and material. The enquiry seems to be more logical than empirical. "Brahman" needs to be defined, illustrated, made comprehensible. We have a number of metaphors to explain the nature of Brahman in relation to human experience, as the source of being, as the sustenance of becoming. Since it is the logical limit of human thought, explaining the nature of this Entity generates contradictions. It is formless yet sustains forms, it is without attribute and yet it generates all attributes of all the things and objects. It is the knower and the known. All such definitions point up to the fact that the ultimate reality partakes of all the attributes and yet remains unqualified.

The concept of Brahman is not derived from any empirical investigation of the grounds of existence, rather the quest is conducted according to the principles of logic. Causality as a form has been common to all logical undertakings whether the philosopher seeks to explain the nature of the world, the structure of the universe or the functions of existence. The principle of causality remains the main plank and conceptual basis for all scientific investigations. Similarly, science in search of the ultimate form of matter has arrived at the equivalence of mass and energy which in more vitalistic language can be represented as matter and life. Upanishadic concept of Brahman is the limit of Being and becoming, the process of genesis that supplied
its own material. In a sense the seers had to begin their teaching with their first discourse on the origin of the world and the origin of life. They had little knowledge about the topography of the visible universe. But the pursuit of ultimate reality led them to the concept of Brahman which means encompassing, creative urge, and infinite potentiality as well as the manifest actuality. In the dawn of civilization, this search seems thoroughly logical and provides a key to the formation of discourse. The students were taught how to think on very abstract issues and as such upanishadic texts provide the training ground for logical reflection. The educational importance of this discourse cannot be underestimated though the outcome may not be so gratifying.

Anatomy of the Soul:

Upanishads hold that the Soul or the Self is an individual substance, eternal and all-pervading. It cannot be identified with body, senses and mind. It can be explained with the shining of the moon. Moon appears to be the source of light, but in reality moon light is but a reflection of the sun, so the body, senses, mind are the reflections of the Atman and Atman is an independent entity. Chāndogya (8:7:1-3) clearly mentions that the Self is free from evil, old age, death, grief, hunger and thirst.

In an interesting parable of the Chāndogya both gods and demons went to Prajāpati to enquire about the true nature of the Self. Indra on behalf of gods and
Virochana on behalf of the demons went to Prajāpati to learn the truth. They initiated the dialogue that Self is the image which we see either in water or in a mirror. A mirror or water simply reflect the physical body not the real self. Then Prajāpati asked Indra to dress himself and see how he looks in a mirror or in water. Indra saw the shadow of his own body in the water. Now the question comes if the Self is not the body, can it be the self in dream? We may be happy in a dream but in real life may be unhappy. Dream state cannot be the real state of the Self. Again Indra approaches Prajāpati to clear his confusion. Prajāpati suggested that the self is the consciousness in deep sleep. But during deep sleep the consciousness of neither the self nor the objective world remain though Self exists. In the words of Brahmakrishnan:

The true self is the absolute self, which is not an abstract metaphysical category but the authentic spiritual self. The other forms belong to objectified being. Self is life, not an object. It is an experience, in which the self is the knowing subject and is at the same time the known object.

Self is open only to self.39

The self exists in four states for the four kinds of self, Vaisvānara, the experiencer of gross things, Taijasa, the experiencer of the subtle, Prājña, the experiencer of the unmanifested objectivity, and the Turīya, the Supreme Self. That is what in the Māndūkya appears to be the analysis of the four kinds of
consciousness, waking, dream, deep sleep, and illumined consciousness.

From the parable of Indra-Virochana it is explicit that when Prajapati means by the self the subject of all seeing, both Indra and Virochana wrongly understood the Self as the person that is seen, not the person that sees. Dr. Radhakrishnan explains this parable in his note: "The person seen in the eye is the figure imaged in the eye, and they ask whether the image that is seen in the water and in the mirror is the self. At this stage the pupils confuse the true self with the body."40

Soul is a subtle conscious entity which remains concealed in the mind. (Athrv.10:8:18). It has no physical form but possesses a subtle body which comprises five Prānas, five senses of touch, smell, taste, sight and hearing; five subtle elements of water, earth, ether, fire, air; mind and intellect. (Sānkhya 3:9) Chandogya speaks "He is my self within the heart, smaller than a corn of rice... smaller than a millet seed or the kernel of a millet seed. He also is my self within the heart, greater than the earth, greater than the sky, greater than heaven, greater than all these worlds." (3:14:3)

Svetāsvatara explains the infinite nature of the self as: "This living self is to be known as a part of the hundredth part of the point of a hair.
divided a hundred fold, yet it is capable of infinity. It is not female, nor is it male; nor yet is this neuter whatever body it takes to itself, by that it is held. (5:13:9-10) Again in the same Upanishad the self is described as: "subtler than the subtle, greater than the great is the self that is set in the cave of the heart of the creature. (3:20) Chandogya explains human soul in the following language: "Verily, what is called Brahman, that is what the space outside of a person is. Verily, what the space outside of a person is. That is what the space within a person is. Verily, what the space within a person is." (3:12:7-8) 

Inspite of such a lofty definition for a common man the Upanishads describe the self as the size of rice or barley grain (Br. 5:6:1; Kath. 1:2:20) or as the size of a thumb (Katha. 2:2:12) or as the size of a "Span" (Chand. 5:18:1) The Māndūkya tells that all is Brahman, the Atman (self is Brahman, so the self has four parts. The first part of Brahman is the Vaisvānara self who is the waking self having seven limbs and nineteen mouths, through which the self experiences the external world. The second part of Brahman is the tājasa self through its seven limbs and nineteen mouths awake in the dream state experiencing the subtle objects within the mind. The third part of the Brahman is the Prājña self or deep slumber, complete withdrawal of consciousness. Only after awaking from slumber one remembers that he or she had a
deep sleep. The final part of Brahman is in the state of *turiya*. (Mandu. 2-6) In this state the self remains a *sākṣi* or witness of the three previous states. But this state requires another consciousness to record the experience of the Turiya.

What seems quite evident is the search for something imperishable that leads to the definition of the self and the soul in abstraction from the body. The search terminates in the positing of the soul as the essence of the selfhood of a person. It is not identified with consciousness though consciousness may be a manifest phenomenon of the soul either in its awareness of the world or the operations completely internal to itself like dream and rememberance. It exists even when a man is in a state of dreamless sleep. When consciousness is sublated as in deep sleep, the soul persists as a witness. Ultimately the search leads to the positing of an imperishable essence which cannot be identified with any function of the mind or the outcome of the operation of senses.

These are all but the symbolic expressions of the soul. A few more examples can be cited in this context. Soul has no attributes. It is devoid of sound, touch, colour, taste and smell. (*Katha* 3:5) It is beyond all sensible qualities. So it cannot be perceived through the external sense-organs. It is devoid of pleasure and pain. So it cannot be perceived through manas or the internal organ. (*Kena* 1.5). It is
Jadunath Sinha explains the concept of the soul following the Upanishads. He says:

The Ātman is beyond the categories of space, time and causality. It contains space but is not spatial; it contains time but is not temporal; it contains causality, but is not subject to the law of causality. It is spaceless, timeless, and causeless. It is the ultimate reality. It is the noumenon. It is beyond the categories of the phenomenal world. So it cannot be comprehended by the intellect which can know only phenomena bound by space, time and causality. The intellect can give only categorized knowledge. The Ātman is beyond all categories. So it is beyond the grasp of the intellect.

Sinha's statements are meant to show that the soul is the creative self which remains unaltered in spite of all the changes, fluctuations and alterations in the state of consciousness. It operates through consciousness that makes experience possible. It is the knower, so it cannot be known though its functions partly reveal its potentiality. Neither can we comprehend it if we limit it to some of the functions.
So Upanishads say: "The Atman is the seer but is not seen; it is the hearer but is not heard; it is the comprehender but is not comprehended; it is the thinker but is not thought." (Br.3:8:11) The Atman is the saksin or witness (Sveta. 6:14) the paridrastr or seer (Prasn.6:5), the vijnat or knower. (Br.2:4:14)

Here how can a knower be known and subject can be an object of knowledge? The Upanishads declare it as Bhuma or infinite, where one cannot see any other thing, one cannot hear any other thing or one cannot comprehend any other thing. (Chand.7:24:1) So it is a non-dual philosophy where except atma nothing exists. For where there is duality as it were, there one smells another, there one sees another, there one thinks of another, there one understands another. Where, verily, everything has become the Self, then by what and whom should one smell, then by what and whom should one see, then by what and whom should one hear, then by what and to whom should one speak, by what and on whom should one think, by what and whom should one understand? (Br.2:4:14) In such case atman is bound to be unknowable.

Our sense-organs are created in such a way that except the outward external objects, we cannot see or comprehend the innerself. It can be realised through Yoga (Katha. 2:3:11) or through the supra-intellectual or Prajñana alone. It is even beyond the area of manas or mind and buddhi or intellect.

Jiba or the self, in its physical aspects, has five sense organs of sight, hearing, touch, smell and
taste and five organs of action like mouth, hands, feet, excretory and generative organs. Every individual has five elements or complexes: the material outer complex is called the annamaya kosa; the vital complex is called the pranamaya kosa; the mental complex is called the manomaya kosa; the knowledge complex is called vijnanamaya kosa, and finally the bliss complex is known as anandamaya kosa.

Again life and matter are organised into the gross physical body, or sthula-sarira; mind and life into the subtle body, or suksma-sarira; intelligence into the causal body, or karana-sarira. Inspite of the clear distinction Kathopanishad states that this Atman(soul) is not to be attained by instruction, nor by intellect, nor by much learning."(1:2:23) The Taittirīya says, Before whom (Supreme Essence) words and thought recoil, failing to reach It."(2:4)

The Hindu psychology tells about the three states of human life on earth. They may be called the three qualities i.e., Sattva, Rajas & Tamas. These may be narcissistic type. Krishna explains in Gita:

Sattva, Rajas, and Tamas - so are named
The qualities of Nature - "Soothfastness," "Passion," and "Ignorance". These three bind down
The changeless spirit in the changeful flesh. Whereof sweet "Soothfastness," by purity
Living unsullied and enlightened, binds
The sinless Soul to happiness and truth;
And Passion, being kin to appetite
And breeding impulse and propensity,
Binds the embodied Soul, O Kunti's Son!
By tie of works, But Ignorance, begot
Of Darkness, blinding mortal men, binds down
Their souls to stupor, sloth, and irowsiness.
(14:5-9; cf.17:4-22)

The *sattva* speaks of a higher type of narcissism
where a man is free from aggressive and other passions
and stands for the ego ideal. In him or her the outward-
directed libido or attachment to body is weak because
the libido is mainly directed upon the ego.

The *rajasik* type persons take interest in
passion and are driven by the selfish motive, so
they may be considered as lower type of narcissist.

The *tamasik* type of persons are with low inten-
tions and motives, so they may be considered worst type
of narcissist who can be enlisted in the Freudian Id.
In Mahabharata (Bana.211:5-8) it is clearly stated that
the sattvik may be influenced by worldliness, and rajas
are described as "agreeable in speech, thoughtful,
free from envy, industrious in action from an eager
desire to reap its fruits and of warm temperament."
and tamasik is "given to day-dreaming, idle, full of
anger and haughtiness."

There are at least five ascending steps for
the self or the soul for the spiritual pilgrimage.
The first step of the self is to realise the importance
of the self within. (Br. 2:4:5) The second step the Being or "I" which is within me must be identified with the self that is neither my body nor senses nor intellect. (Br. 4:4:12) In the third step the self realises that it is identical with the Absolute. (Br. 2:5:19) In the fourth step the self realises that if I am the self, and the self is the Absolute, then it goes without saying that I am the Absolute. (Br. 1:4:10) The final step eliminates all distinctions and include "All". (Chānd. 3:14:1) So the Upanishad says: "Verily, in the beginning this world was Brahman (Br. 1:4:10-11) Brahman is the supreme reality, who can be known through meditation and spiritual experience. The idea of Brahman itself in human mind indicates that he acts within us, so he is known. The "World-architect" of Plato and the "World-mover" of Aristotle are nothing but other names for Brahman to whom Rigveda describes as Hiranva-garbha (10:121:1) or "the golden germ which enters creation after the first action of the creator." The world is simply the manifestation of Hiranva-garbha.

The upanishadic teachers made an earnest enquiry into the ultimate reality by identifying the self with the over-self i.e., Ātman with the Brahman. The most famous dictum reveals "tat tvam asi, tat means "that" stands for Brahman, tvam means "You" the Ātman or the individual soul. Identifying Brahman with fire and other natural phenomena made philosophers like Johannes Hertel to think of Brahman as a pantheist sees the world. They forget the idea that the soul ultimately merges with the Over-soul.
If the whole world is Brahman (Satapatha 10:6:3; Chand. 3:14:1), my soul is Brahman the person who sees through my eye, the ātman is Brahman. (Br. 1:4:10)

The Chandogya tells us that "the Self which inhabits the body is verily the Brahman, and that as soon as the mortal coil is thrown over, it will finally merge in Brahman." (3:14:4) The Svetāsvatara explains: "The individual Self flutters like a swan in the wheel of Brahman considering itself and its Mover as separate entities; but it is only when it becomes one with it that it becomes immortal." (1:6)

The Brihadāranyaka tells: "he who worships the deity as separate from himself is merely the beast of the gods". (1:4:10) In the Taittiriya an identity is established between man and the sun. (2:8) In Chandogya the instruction which Aruni imparts to Svetaketu, reveals absolute identity of the Self and Brahman. (6:8:7) Such non-dual entity of soul and over-soul is identical with each other in the writings of William Law who says:

Though GOD is everywhere present, yet
He is only present to thee in the
deepest and most central part of thy
soul. The natural senses cannot possess
God or unite thee to Him; nay, thy inward
faculties of understanding, will and memory
can only reach after God, but cannot be the
place of His habitation in thee. But there
is a root or depth of thee from whence all
these faculties come forth, as lines from
a centre, or as branches from the body of the tree.
This depth is called the centre, the fund or bottom of the soul. This depth is the unity, the eternity -- I had almost said the infinity -- of thy soul; for it is so infinite that nothing can satisfy it or give it rest but the infinity of God.\textsuperscript{44}

Brahman is a part of everything so everything is a part of Brahman like waves are parts of the sea and rays are the parts of the sun. Brahman is the first being. Here Brahman does not create but becomes a creation by himself. In the words of Radhakrishnan: "It is not a making of something out of nothing. It is not making so much as becoming. It is the self-projection of the supreme."\textsuperscript{45}

"Brahman" is a logical construction of the ultimate reality, reached through stages of abstractions from the facts in perception of the knowledge which is based on human experience. The empiricity of this concept cannot be defended or defined, since it is shown to be formless, attributeless and ultimate in every respect. If all the beings are arranged in a hierarchy then this being comes to occupy the apex. All other beings can be ordered in a graduated scale though no such hierarchy is so explicitly pictured in any Upanishad. This concept yet has a number of connotations, and the significance of it is brought out in several concepts in Svetāsvatara, Katha Prasna Kena Upanishad.
Brahman is defined as the source of animation that pervades the entire cosmic plane and imparts motion, life, and impetus to all the beings. Neither the sun nor the moon in their effulgence impart light to the objects; nor do the stars shine when there pervades the darkness of non-being. Fire has no strength unless it is sustained by this ultimate reality. All effulgence of all incandescent objects, life of all living beings, proceed from the fullness of Brahman which is the inexhaustible.

It is not just a static source of all kinesis, it is also the principle that operates through all the functions in every sphere of cosmic change. Though in itself it is changeless, perpetual, unamenable to all influences it can influence the course of action as it initiates all change. The history of the living beings, the history of the evolution of all objects, the history of mankind are actuated by this principle of renewal, growth and decay. Whatever is the cause of life stands also as the cause of death.

It is the inexpressible; therefore, no effort to depict it or signify its essence in language is likely to succeed. It is described as the pure consciousness where an individual consciousness is stripped bare of its constructs. It is the unalloyed joy which an individual attains in a state of meditation when one's mind is withdrawn from the world, from the reminiscences that compose the web of memory, from the internal consciousness of selfhood. It is
the supreme fullness of "being" as the ultimate truth and nothing can affect its existence which shines in itself.

This attempt has its final outcome in identifying Brahman with Atman, the Universal Soul with the individual soul. This identification seems to be contrary to all the religious expetion of human beings as subordinate, a creature eternally marked by littleness. This is why in all religions of the world except in Buddhism man is depicted as a little being, as a helpless creature at the will of the maker, as an insignificant being incapable of achieving his own salvation. But here is an ontological equation that dispenses with the littleness of man.

It may be borne in mind that Brahman as a concept does not constitute the crux of vedic ideology but in Upanishads it is centrally located and all discourses converge on this concept. If there is a point of convergence any unification of discourse in the Upanishads inspite of their diachronic composition and varied objectives, it is achieved by the recurrence of this concept or by a thematic homogeneity covered by the presence of this logical postulate.

The identification between Brahman and Atman has a number of resonances in the text and that is why it has been discussed for the comprehension of this ideology. This elevates human essence above all other beings and invests his life with a rare sublimity.
The mystery of the creative process is thus internalised by positing human soul as the principle of animation in the gross physical body. The world picture in the Upanishads is not as gay as it appears in Vedas. There are streaks of despair; man encounters a number of stumbling blocks and contingencies in his earthly passage from life to death. His capacities may not be equal to the challenge of the world. But there is the consolation of an inner light emanating from the essence of an unfading soul. Once a man has achieved self realisation he can tap native resources of inner strength, use creativity and intelligence to overcome all the obstacles. Finally, this identification makes man valiant enough to steer across the stormy voyage of life, countering all temptations and getting over the pitfalls. Ideology often creates a false consciousness; but it may serve certain ends inspite of its falsity. The positing of Atman is not mythic or imaginative; it is founded in logical investigation.

Life-Eternal and Reincarnation:

The basic structure of the world-view is given in Hindu scriptures in three terms. 1. Samsara or the cycle of rebirth, 2. Karma or action or moral retribution; 3. Moksa or release or liberation. These three terms are interlinked. Samsara tells that each one lives a series of lives in various forms, either in this world or elsewhere. Behind our birth is our Karma that is action which causes this process of rebirth.
But one may desire to take birth in better circumstances or can escape from the cycle of rebirth. To escape from rebirth is called *Moksa* or *nirvāṇa*.

The main difference between Judeo-Christian faith and upanishadic thought is that one believes in Judgement after death and the other believes in death after birth and birth after death. There lies a long discription in the Upanishads regarding the succession of lives. (Br. 4:3:37-38; 4:4:1-5, 9; Katha 1:1:5-6) The idea of rebirth can be explained in the examples of Radhakrishnan following the Upanishad.

As a grass-hopper, when it has come to the end of a blade of grass, finds another place of support, and then draws itself towards it, similarly this self, after reaching the end of this body, finds another place of support and then draws himself towards it. As a goldsmith, after taking a piece of gold gives it another, newer and more beautiful shape, similarly does this self, after having thrown off this body, and dispelled ignorance, take another, newer and more beautiful form, whether it be of the manes, or demigods or gods or of Prajāpati or Brahma or of any other beings. (Br. 4:4:3-5)
Death is nothing but a change of body and in every change the soul takes a new body according to its knowledge and conduct. (Br. 4:4:2)

Though the soul taking its new body is inevitable yet in the Upanishads the ways of the soul to different regions indicate that soul takes its way according to its good and bad \textit{Karma} or action.

The Upanishads affirm that the ignorant reach a sunless demoniac region after death. (Isa. 3, Katha. 1:1:3; Br. 4:4:11) The soul that did good will go to the region of sorrowless, through the air, sun, and moon. (Br. 5:10:1) Like Rigveda (10:19:1) the Chāndogya Upanishad too believes in two ways open to the dead, the light and the dark. The pious people will enter the path of light and cease from the human cycle of birth and death. Chāndogya says that the ethical people go to the world of fathers by a smoky way and they are born again. (4:15:5-6) Good people get good birth and bad the miserable. (C.U.5:10:7) Jalāl-uddīn Rūmī, nicely describes the cycle of rebirth in the following lines:

I died a mineral and became a Plant,
I died a plant and rose an animal,
I died an animal and I was man.

Why should I fear? When was I less by dying?

Yet once more I shall die as man, to soar with the blessed angels; but even from angelhood...
I must pass on. All except God perishes. When I have sacrificed my angel soul, I shall become that which no mind ever conceived. O, let me not exist! for Non-existence proclaims, To him we shall return.\textsuperscript{50}

The Upanishads depict life as a renewal through rebirth and reincarnation. It does not reject life with the view that a long-continued life of a person is injurious to the environment.

Before coming to such an important doctrine it is necessary to see whether the concept was there in earlier literature of Upanishads or it grew only in the period of the Brāhmaṇas and the Upanishads? No western orientalists deny the fact that the Vedas are the oldest monuments earlier than that of Greece and Israel.\textsuperscript{51} Yet they are reluctant to accept that there is reference to the doctrine of reincarnation or rebirth in the Vedas. Albert Schweitzer was not free from such notion. He commented: "The hymns of the Rigveda knew nothing as yet of a cycle of rebirth."\textsuperscript{52} For them this doctrine must be an afterthought and grew during the period of Brāhmaṇas and Upanishads. As we have stated earlier that Vedas are the source for all the important doctrines developed in the Upanishads. It won't be out of context to discuss whether the concept of reincarnation was there in the Vedas earlier to the Upanishads.
Being the fountainhead of Brahmanas and Upanishads, the Vedas cannot escape from such an important doctrine like rebirth or reincarnation. A number of Rigvedic verses indicate that the concept of rebirth was very much there in it. According to its Karma the soul returns to human form, so in the Rigveda it is mentioned: *mitra jayate punah* (10:85:19) Mitra is born again, *punah punar jayamena* (1:92:10) the Dawn (Usás) is born again and again; *na asyah vaasmi vimucamna avrtam punah* (5:46:1) I seek neither release nor return; *iivo mrtasya carati svadhabhir amartyo martyena sa yonih* (1:164:30) The immortal self will be reborn in a new body due to its meritorious deeds. Max Muller himself translated the 32nd verse of the Rigveda (1:164) as: "Taking many births he has entered upon misery." 53

A.B.Keith54 like Max Muller did not overlook the doctrine of transmigration in the Rigveda (10:14:4) Besides these passages, there are many more references in the same Veda which speak on rebirth in its different verses. (1:164:38; 10:16:3; 1:154:5; 10:14:2; 10:16:3). Inspite of such explicit references it is not convincing how the western orientalists totally deny the reference of rebirth in the Vedas.

However the doctrine of rebirth which comes down from the Vedas becomes more important in the post-vedic literature. In Katha Nachiketas visited the house of death and Yama the Lord of death granted him three wishes. One of his wishes was to know
whether the soul exists after death or not? While replying to his father Nachiketas said: "Man ripens like corn, and like corn he is born again." (1:1:5-6)

It can be compared with the gospel of St. John who says: "unless a corn of wheat falls into the ground and dies, it remains alone; but if it dies, it produces much grain." (2:24)

Soul, like a king, is welcomed by all the elements and at the departure wait for a send-off. Brihadaranyaka describes the death and birth of a man in the following manner: "As on the approach of a king, the policemen, magistrates, charioteers, and governors of towns wait upon him with food, and drink, and tents, saying 'he comes, he approaches, similarly do all these elements wait on the conscious self, saying this Brahman comes, this Brahman approaches; and again, as at the time of the king's departure, the policemen, magistrates, charioteers, and governors of towns gather round him, similarly do all vital airs gather round the soul at the time of death." (4:3:37-38) The same Upanishad describes stepwise when death comes to the threshold of a person: "When the vital airs are gathered around him, the Self collecting together all the portions of light moves down into the heart; and when the 'person in the eyes' has turned away, then he ceases to know any forms. He becomes concentrated in himself, that is the reason why they say he is not able to see; he becomes at one with himself, that is the reason why they say he is not able to speak, or hear, or know."
Then the tip of his heart is filled with light and through that light the soul moves out either by the way of the eye, or the head, or any other part of the body. As the Self moves out, life moves after it; and as the life moves, the various vital airs depart after it." (4:4:1-2) His law of Karma follows the soul immediately after his death. Brihadâranyaka explains with different examples. "And as a caterpillar, after reaching the end of a blade of grass, finds another place of support and then draws itself towards it, similarly this Self, after reaching the end of this body, finds another place of support, and then draws himself towards it. And as a goldsmith, after taking a piece of gold, gives it another newer and more beautiful shape, similarly does this Self, after having thrown off this body and dispelled ignorance, take on another, newer, and more beautiful form. This Self, then, as his conduct and behaviour has been, so does he become. He whose works have been good becomes good: he whose works have been evil becomes evil. By holy works, he becomes holy; by sinful works, sinful. It is for this reason that they say that a person consists merely of desire; as his desire is, so is his will; as his will, so his work; as his work, so his evolution." (4:4:3-5)

The upanishadic eschatology gives more importance to immortality than transmigration. The Kathopanishad (1:2:18-19) states that the soul is not born, nor does it die, it is not killed with the killing of the body.
The killer who thinks he has killed, or the killed who thinks he is killed, neither knows the truth.

The next important literature available after Upanishad was the Bhagavad Gita (2:20:22) where the entire doctrine of Vedas and Upanishads are squeezed:

Never the spirit was born; the spirit
Shall cease to be never;
Never was time it was not; End and
Beginning are dreams!
Birthless and deathless and changeless
remaineth the spirit forever;
Death hath not touched it at all,
dead though the house of it seems!

Nay, but as when one layeth
His worn-out robes away,
And, taking new ones, sayeth,
"These will I wear today!"
So putteth by the spirit
Lightly its garb of flesh,
And passeth to inherit
A residence afresh.55

J. Bruce Long seems to disagree with the concept of Gita and writes: "The succession of finite births has traditionally been regarded by Hindus pessimistically, as an existential misfortune and not as a series of 'second chances' to improve one's lot, as it is often viewed in the West. Life is regarded not only as 'rough, brutish, and short' but as filled with misery.
(dukkha). Thus, the multiplication of births within this 'vale of tears' mainly augments and intensifies the suffering that is the lot of all creatures."56

In existential philosophy "non-being" which means "nothingness" is an inseparable part of "being". Our existence itself indicates that we may not exist and death may come at any moment. This threat comes from non-being. Rollo May describes the situation: "Without this awareness of non-being—that is, awareness of the threats to one’s being in death, anxiety, and the less dramatic but persistent threats of loss of potentialities in conformism—existence is vapid, unreal, and characterised by lack of concrete self-awareness."57 This threat of non-being, Freud describes, is due to "death instinct". In May’s understanding Freud’s concept of death instinct is an ontological truth. It cannot be a psychological theory, rather it was too "pessimistic".58 He explains: "It is also an error to see the 'death instinct' only in biological terms.... The unique and critical fact, rather, is that the human being is the one who knows he is going to die, who anticipates his own death."59

The Upanishads believe in the continuity of life after death. Yama assures Naciketas that though this question remains a mystery for him and for gods, soul remains after the death of the physical body. It evolves through various lives according to the previous Karma. The Aitareya Upanishad substantiates the fact that the birth of a son to a man is itself his rebirth.
This again confuses us whether we are born after death or born again while alive?

The concept "death" is an illusion in Indian scriptures. The immortality of the soul ascertains that one can be one with Brahman even while in life, i.e., Jīvanmukti. The Muniaka and the Brihadāranyaka respectively cite two examples of immortality of soul; liberated Souls in their final merge in the Absolute. "Just as rivers which flow into the ocean, disappear in it after having thrown away their name and form, similarly, the sage after having thrown off his name and form enters the highest heavenly Person."(3:2:8) "His breath does not expire; being Brahman himself, he goes to Brahman; as a serpent may throw off his slough, even so does the sage casts off his mortal body."(4:4:5-7)

The Upanishads support the immortality of the soul and discard the heavenly life. As heaven is a temporary abode of the soul it cannot be a better place to live in heaven till the fruit of action is exhausted.

To understand life-eternal one has to know that the body is a continuous biochemical reaction process which supplies energy. Life is just a form of energy and as long as this biochemical process continues, body assures life or spirit. When this biochemical process ceases this supply of energy also ceases. The bodily
ingredients which constitute the biochemical process in the body are the atoms of the various elements such as carbon, hydrogen, nitrogen, sulphur, oxygen, calcium, potassium, iron etc. Death is an atomization of this bodily ingredients and every atom persists in nature after death in one form or another it proves the immortality of soul. Since body is going to mix with an infinite system after death, the probability of rebirth of a life with absolute acquackrecy is given the equation \( \frac{1}{\infty} \approx 0 \) one upon infinity which is equivalent to zero but not equal to zero. Therefore when a person dies the possibility of his taking rebirth is very little or negligible. Reincarnation cannot be discarded since life is just a form of energy and it can change from one form to another according to the fundamental law of physics that is law of conservation of energy.

Law of Karma:

There is an unending battle between the school of Karma(action) and the school of Jnāna(Knowledge). It is still a conflicting statement whether action leads us to knowledge or knowledge leads us to action. We live in the world of action. Life means action. Our very inaction itself is a kind of action; so escaping from action is also a deliberate action. That way action by nature is a binding force. Upanishads say that good actions lead us to heaven but cannot make us free from the cycle of birth and death. To be immortal one has to free himself from the action and inaction. Bhagavad Gita although much
later to the Upanishads made it clear that it is
the way of non-attachment to the fruit of our actions
we can free ourselves from the action. To understand
the law of Karma it is necessary to establish the
life-eternal. Upanishads see life more closely from
within, it is necessary to believe in a life-eternal.
In an eternal cycle of an unending journey from lies
to truth, from darkness to light and from death to
life two most important concepts help us understand
the entire system of the pilgrimage of the soul. They
are the law of Karma or the law of compensation, and
the law of reincarnation.

The doctrine of Karma is one of the pillars
upon which the entire philosophy of India rests. It
has its practical aspect on man and his destiny. It
gives a real consolation to the distressed and serves
as an incentive for the right conduct in human life.
R.K. Garg explains the importance of Karma as follows:

The doctrine of Karma is a logical,
metaphysical, and moral principle. As
a logical principle, it stands for the
strict causal necessity between actions
and their effects; as a metaphysical
principle, it espouses the immortality
of the soul; and as a moral one, it
explains the diversity in the destiny
of men regarding their births and
fortunes. 60
Etymologically **Karma** means work, deed, action, activity. All activities both physical and psychological are included in the domain of action. Both physical and mental action originate first in the mind before manifesting into physical action. This mental action is called **Karma**. It breeds and grows in consciousness. **Karma** has two-fold effects—tangible and intangible. The intangible action moves from one body to another through a subtle body. The soul cannot accumulate any fresh action when in subtle body. Scholars unanimously accept that **rta** of the Rigveda (1:1:8, 1:23:5, 1:24:9, 1:123:13) is the origin of **Karma** theory. Till the time of Upanishads the theory of **Karma** took a long route from the Vedas, the Brahmanas and the Āranyakas to become a fullfledged theory.

An important question in philosophy is whether freedom of the will is granted to man or man is simply a puppet in the hands of God? Upanishads clearly distinguish will, desire, action and fruit of the action and their inter-relationship. The Brihadāranyaka speaks clearly that as his desire is, so is his will; as is his will, so is the action that he performs; as his action is, so is the fruit that he procures for himself. (4:4:5) In spite of these wordings man has his limitations. In the words of R.D.Ranade: "Like a falcon to whose foot a string is tied, he can only fly in the limited sphere described by the length of the tether, but he is bound beyond that region. Similarly, man may vainly imagine that he is free to do any action he pleases, but his freedom is the freedom of the tethered falcon."
Once man understands his limitations and sincerely tries to know the Ātman, he will be free. The Chandogya tells the same thing that once we know the Ātman then there is freedom for us in all the worlds, (8:1:6) and we can obtain any object we please. (8:2:10)

A problem is a problem if it is not understood. Once we understand the problem it becomes a solution. So once we understand the Ātman as a part of the Brahman there will remain no problem.

Man is born free so is his will. If his will is determined by the greater will God, he cannot be responsible for his good and bad action. If God interferes with the human will, man becomes a puppet in His hand. Wordsworth in his "The Excursion" aptly writes:

And that unless above himself he can
Erect himself, how poor a thing is man!

Man must be free to act. So man is the master of his will and his motives. In Astādvāyi (1:4:54) Pāṇini clearly mentions: Swatantrah Karta, the human agent is free. To understand the sequence of action the Brhadāranyaka (4:4:2-5) analysed Karma into four stages, i.e., desire, will, action, and result. The first stage leads to the second, the second to the third, the third to the fourth, and the fourth again to the first. Thus action is determined by the will which is determined by the desire which again is determined by the previous deeds of the individual.
In Kathopanisad, we are told that there is always a conflict between the good and the pleasant in the way of choice, and the fools, unable to resist the temptations of earthly pleasures, choose the pleasant, whereas the wise discriminate between them and choose the good. (1:2:1-2) So the wise become free by knowing the truth but the fool remain foolish because of their ignorance. The Chandogya likewise tells us that it is only when we have known the atman that there is freedom for us in all the worlds; but if we have not known the atman, there is no freedom for us at all. (8:1:6) The Brhadaranyakopanisad asserts:

When the soul departs, the prāna follows; when the prāna departs, all the organs follow. Then the soul has particular consciousness. It is followed by knowledge, actions, and past experience. Just as a leech supported on a straw goes to the end of it, takes hold of another support, and contracts itself, so does this individual soul contract itself after destroying this body, removing ignorance, by a separate movement. Just as a goldsmith takes a small bit of gold and gives to it a newer and fairer form, so the soul after destroying this body and removing ignorance fashions a newer and fairer form as of the manes or the celestial minstrels, or the gods, or Virāt, or Hiranyakarṣa, or other beings...
As it does and acts, so it becomes; by doing good it becomes good, and by doing evil it becomes evil — it becomes virtuous by virtuous acts and vicious by vice. The man is made of desires only. As he desires, so he wills; as he wills, so he acts; as he acts, so he procures." (4:4:2-5)

So the doctrine of Karma is not a vicious circle which needs to be overcome by praying or confessing. If we think man to be an autonomous being, the law of Karma cannot be a blind mechanical law, rather the law of causation, the law of compensation or the law of retribution. If Newton’s law of motion says every action has its equal and opposite reaction, then there is nothing to deny that every effect has its cause so that there can be equal balance between a cause and an effect. This principle can be applied to both good and bad action, one to reward and another to punishment. So say the Upanishads: "As you sow, so you reap" (Chând.3:14:1) "as you do and behave, so do you become."(Br. 4:4:5)

Hindu mind does not accept the mind of a child as a tabula rasa or a blank piece of paper as advocated by the empiricist Locke. Nor do they accept the innate idea of rationalists like Decartes. Like Kant, they accept both views and synthesise the idea that some ideas are already in mind before our birth that is called prârabhâ and some ideas we get through our experiences that is sanchitakarma. Karma can be classified as follows:
Karma

Arabdha Karma or anārabdha Karma

Prārabdha

Saṃchita Kriyāmāṇya Āgāmi

Prārabdha is the accumulated karma of one's past lives. Escaping from it in any case is impossible. One has to pay pie by pie till the good and bad karma are exhausted. Anārabdha Karma is the store house yet to be opened for the past present and future action of a person. It has been subdivided into saṃcita, kriyāmāṇa, and āgāmi. The karma which one had accumulated in past lives and is still in stock is called saṃcita. The karma which one is accumulating at present is known as kriyāmāṇa or saṃcīyamāṇa or vartamāna. Āgāmi karma is that which one will accumulate in future. There is no control over the prārabdha action but through knowledge one can burn the anārabdha action to ashes says Gita. 

(4:37)

The doctrine of karma tells how different abilities are displayed by different individuals and according to the abilities and aptitude of the mental faculties the upaniṣadic teachers teach the pupils so that the pupils can shape their habits, hobbies; belief and behaviour.

Brhadāranyaka tells about the pre-determined factors of the mental capacity of a person. The socialists of today may not appreciate this idea but
they have to admit that IQ is not the same with everybody. Two examples can be cited here from Chandogya, one of the demon king Virocana (8:7:4) and another of Satyakama.(4:4:5) The demon king Virocana went to Brahmaloka for brahmajñana and was taught by Brahma himself, yet he did not realise the ātman as his mind was not endowed with the capacity to grasp the same. In case of Satyakama he was accepted and admitted in the gurukula because he came out of a good heritage where there was no place of untruth.

Many critics link the law of karma with the concept of "fate". The philosophy of India never accepted fatalism as a life philosophy because man is the maker of his destiny. Fate is nothing but another name of deeds committed in a prior state of existence. Parrinder rightly remarks: "But the teaching is not necessarily fatalistic, you can improve your lot. Karma will work itself out and you can accumulate good karma that will ensure a happier lot in the next round of rebirth." The Hitopadesa too admits: "Fortune comes to a man who is energetic as a lion, but cowards think that it is given by fate; by winning over this fate, he ought to act with his own power, because no blame will attach to him if he fails in his efforts."

(Mitra 31) The Upanishads advocate as we sow, so we reap. The Brhadāraṇyaka says: "A man becomes good by good actions and bad by bad actions."(3:2:13) The Prasnopanishad declares that "good actions lead to the good world, and evil to the evil world.(3:7) The
Svetasvatara contends: "Whoever has qualities, and is the doer of actions that bring recompense, he is the enjoyer, surely, of the consequences of whatever he has done. Assuming all forms, characterised by the three qualities, treading the three paths, he, the ruler of the vital breaths (the individual soul) roams about in accordance with his actions. (5:7)

So the Bhagavad Gita describes our body as the Ksetra or field where we sow the seeds of our desire and reap the fruits of our lives. (13:1:2, 6) The Brhadaranyaka says: "Now the man who does not desire, he who is without desire, who is free from desire, whose desire is satisfied, whose desire is the soul—his breaths do not depart. Being very Brahman, he goes to Brahman. On this point there is this verse: 'When all the desires that dwell in the heart are renounced, then a mortal becomes immortal and obtains Brahman in this very life. And as the slough of a snake might lie on an ant-hill, dead and cast away, even so does his body lie. Being verily bodiless he becomes immortal; his vital spirits are merged in Brahman, and become pure light" (3:5:1) Upanishads donot say that we cannot break the chain of rebirth. It is possible if we become desireless and realise Brahman as the supreme reality (Mund. 2:2:8) through proper education.

The concept of immortality, a theory of incarnation or rebirth, the law of action, the invariability of causal relationship are the precipitatives of the quest for reality. But concepts like the
immortality of soul and rebirth and similar concepts are produced to lead man away from the apparent threat of chance, accident, and contingency. On the whole Upanishads encode a philosophy of education for realizing complete manhood.
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