

## Swami Vivekananda's Perceptions of History : Beyond Marx (II)

ASISH K. ROY

**E**lucidating his concepts of creation and evolution, Swamiji thus addressed the Hindus of Jaffna, Sri Lanka '... the question of creation, that is nature, Prakriti, Maya is infinite, without beginning. It is not that this world was created the other day, not that a God came and created the world and since that time has been sleeping; for that cannot be, the creative energy is still going on. God is eternally creating'.<sup>18</sup>

According to Swamiji, this is how the 'creative energy' is working:

It is that creative energy which is working all around us, day and night, stops for a second, the whole thing will fall to the ground. There never was a time when that energy did not work throughout the universe.

But central to the whole phenomenon of creation is the law of cycles, *Pralaya*. Explaining the concept of *Pralaya*, he says that 'our Sanskrit word for creation, properly translated, should be projection and not creation. For the word creation in the English language has unhappily got that fearful, that most crude idea of something out of nothing, creation out of non-entity, non-existence becoming existence... Our word, therefore, is projection'.<sup>19</sup> And he offers a fascinating elucidation of the phenomenon of projection:

The whole of this nature exists, it becomes finer, subsides; and then after a period of rest, as it were, the whole thing is again projected forward, and the same combination, the same evolution, the manifestation appear and remain playing, as it were, for a certain time, only again to break into pieces, to become finer and finer, until the whole thing subsides, and again comes out. Thus it goes backwards and forwards with a wave-like motion throughout eternity. Time, space and causation are all within this nature. To say, therefore, that it had a beginning is utter nonsense. No question can occur as to its beginning or its end... it means the beginning and the end of one particular cycle; no more than that.<sup>20</sup>

Swamiji thus concludes that human society as a whole is just a passing phase in the cycle of evolution since it is in a constant flux. He challenges the concept of linear progress. All progress proceeds by successive rise and fall and there is no progress in a straight line. A straight line infinitely projected, must end in a circle. It returns to the starting-point.

Swamiji subscribes, to some extent, to the Darwinian formula of evolution. But at the same time, he lays great emphasis on Patanjali's conception of the *filling-in* of nature, which, according to him, presents the final solution of the causes of evolution. He firmly holds the view that the Darwinian concept of evolution is relevant insofar as

the evolution on the lower plane is concerned and, as such it is atheistic in its spirit. 'The basic idea is that we are changing from one species to another and that man is the highest species'.<sup>21</sup> The Vedantic cosmology has two opposing phases—'evolution' and 'involution'. To sum it up, evolution is the phase of expansion, in which all sorts of complexities mushroom out of simplicity, while involution is the phase of contraction, in which complexities revert back to the original simple stage, that is, the starting-point. Thus, the Universe (*Brahmānda*) initially assumes the appearance of the Cosmic Egg out of *Māyā* and it automatically dissolves itself into *Māyā*. This process goes on *ad infinitum*.

#### Dialectics of Hegel and Marx

In this context it would not be out of place to highlight very briefly the Dialectical Idealism of Hegel and the Dialectical Materialism of Marx as contradistinguished from Swamiji's concept of 'projection' regarding the evolution of human society. Hegelian dialectics is an interpretive method, originally used to relate specific entities to the Absolute Idea in which an assertable proposition (Abstract) is necessarily opposed by its apparent contradiction (Negative), and then both are reconciled at a higher qualitative level (Concrete). Hegel's conceptualization of the negation of the negation, which he calls *Aufhebung* (sublation), is a process which goes on *ad infinitum*. It must be noted in this context that Hegel never used the terms—thesis, antithesis and synthesis. On the contrary, his formulation of the Triadic logic proved to be conveniently well in place to suit his personal designs.

In the Scheme of the Hegelian Dialectical Idealism the first proposition is

Law or the 'external realisation of Right', that is, a system of rules for regulating the outward relations. Ernest Barker offers a somewhat lucid explanation of Hegel's labyrinth of the progression of Dialectical Idealism. He observes that Law or external realization of Right, is the mark and constituent force of the State in the lower or cruder form in which it first appears. The counter-proposition of Law is Morality or the internal realization of Right. In other words, it is the system of rules made by the individual conscience for the control of its inward self. The clash between the proposition of Law and the contradiction of inward Morality results in a reconciliation in the form of what Hegel calls *Social Ethics*—which harmonizes the whole of life both inward and outward. Barker further explains that the vehicle of this Social Ethics is the higher form of the State, which, in turn, is merged with the Folk, the operative organ of the eternal consciousness.

The first identification of State-Folk, already merged with the State in its higher form, is followed conveniently by the merger of the State with a specific form of the State—the institution of the Prussian monarchy, thus completing the identification of the Mind of the Folk with the mind of a Prussian King. Summarizing Hegel's meticulous charade, Barker comments that 'the essence of the higher form of State consists in its being a higher and reconciling unity, and that unity is best secured in an active individual, in the will of a decreeing individual, in monarchy. . . . Finally, by deifying this Folk-State-Monarch—by making the Folk-State God's organ, and the Monarch, through it, God's commissary—it makes the amalgam absolute: absolute both within and without. . . .'<sup>22</sup>

In other words, as has already been

pointed out, the formulation of Hegel's triadic logic is meticulously designed to curry favour with his contemporary Prussian Monarch. But in the process, he exposed himself as an erratic as well as a 'failed' philosopher. Barker, thus, sums up the paradoxes in Hegel's Dialectical Idealism, in other words, his contemporary German Romanticism:

We can even argue that Hegel himself was untrue to his own ideas when he became a political absolutist. He failed to see that the sovereign thing in political thought . . . is the *process* of thought itself, as it works its way between rocks of thesis and antithesis. Distrusting, or rather forgetting, the *process*, . . . he turned instead to an *organ* or instrument: and for the natural synthesis of debate he substituted the artificial synthesis of a 'decreeing individual'.<sup>23</sup>

Thus, Hegel's own formula of 'negation of negation' (sublation)—the process, which he himself proclaimed, is irreversible and would go *ad infinitum*, and it contradicts his own dialectical thought process. Launching a blistering attack on Hegel's dialectical method, Karl Popper says that 'the whole development of dialectic should be a warning against the danger inherent in philosophical system-building. It should remind us that *philosophy* should not be made a basis for any sort of scientific system and philosophers should be much more modest in their claims. One task they can fulfil quite usefully is the study of the critical methods of science'.<sup>24</sup>

Strangely enough, in Hegel's Folk-State-Monarch-God equation he consciously admitted that his 'God' ultimately is the Prussian Monarch—the concrete Absolute. On the contrary, the central concept of Swami Vivekananda's analyses of the Vedantic knowledge is Brahman—the

highest Reality or the *Sat-Chit-Ānanda*—epitomized in its purest existence and bliss. The Vedantic Brahman is the highest Reality and the highest Truth and is revealed in mystical realizations.

To drive home his perception of God, Swamiji asserts that 'what do I mean by the use of the English word God? Certainly not the word as ordinarily used in English—a good deal of difference. There is no other suitable word in English. I would rather confine myself to the Sanskrit word *Brahman*. He is the general cause of all these manifestations. What is this *Brahman*? He is eternal, eternally pure, eternally awake, the almighty, the all-knowing, the all merciful, the omnipresent, the formless, the partless. He creates this universe'.<sup>25</sup>

Elsewhere, enlightening about God, he points out that 'there are two ideas of God in our scriptures—the one, the personal: and the other, the impersonal. The idea of the Personal God is that He is the omnipresent creator, preserver, and destroyer of everything, the eternal Father and Mother of the Universe, but One who is eternally separate from us and from all souls; and liberation consists in coming near to Him and living in Him. Then, there is the other idea of the Impersonal God, where all those adjectives are taken away as superfluous, as illogical, . . . In the Vedas it is not the word "He" that is used, but "It", for "He" would make an invidious distinction, as if God were a man. "It", the impersonal, is used, and this impersonal "It" is preached. This system is called Advaita'.<sup>26</sup>

Elaborating the relations between Man and the Impersonal Being, Swamiji says ' . . . We and He are one. Everyone is but a manifestation of the Impersonal, the basis of all being, and misery consists in thinking of ourselves different from this Infinite, Impersonal Being; and liberation consists in

knowing our unity with this wonderful Impersonality. . . .<sup>27</sup>

### Marxian view

Now, let us turn to Marxism, very briefly, and also by skirting the labyrinth of his apocalypse, to understand how he sought to outsmart Hegel in the use of the tools of dialectics. In his own words: ‘The mystification which dialectic suffers in Hegel’s hands, by no means prevents him from being the first to present its general form of working in a comprehensive and conscious manner. With him it is standing on its head. It must be turned right side up again, if you would discover the rational kernel within the mystical shell’.<sup>28</sup> Simply, what Marx did is that he substituted the process of Matter for Hegel’s formulation of Mind and put forth his conception of dialectical materialism.

In Marxism, the dialectical method of historical study became intertwined with historical materialism—a concept emphasizing the primacy of the material way of life over all forms of social consciousness and the secondary, dependent character of the ‘ideal’. In other words, the ideal is nothing else than the material world reflected by the human mind and translated into forms of thought. The economic ‘base’ of society supports and influences the ideological ‘superstructure’ which encompasses culture, religion, politics and all other aspects of social consciousness. Many critics of this postulation, among other things, argue that this is an oversimplification of the nature of the human society. They argue that the influence of ideas, culture and other aspects of what Marx called the superstructure are invariably as significant as the economic base to the

changes in the course of history of human society.

However, at some stage, there was some compromise in this Marxist deterministic status, when Friedrich Engels came out with a proclamation in one of his letters: ‘According to the materialist conception of history, the *ultimately* determining element in history is the production and reproduction of real life. More than this neither Marx nor I ever asserted. Hence if somebody twists this into saying that the economic element is the *only* determining one, he transforms that proposition into meaningless, abstract, senseless phrase.’<sup>29</sup>

In fact, this assertion of Engels creates another logical problem for the consistent claim of Marx that the history of human society is one of class conflict. Thus, critics argue that the conclusions drawn by Marx do not ultimately match with his conceptual framework based on historical materialism. Peter Singer, somewhat tentatively, seeks to gloss over this dilemma in Marxism by suggesting that Marx saw the economic base as ultimately *real*. In support, Singer comments that Marx believed that humanity’s defining characteristic was its means of production and the growing contradictions within result in class conflict. This, as far as Marx was concerned, was the “goal of history” and the whole gamut of superstructure acts as the “tools of history”.<sup>30</sup>

Karl Popper, an ardent critic of Marxism, has a contrary view to offer. He argues that ‘The Marxist theory of history, in spite of the serious efforts of some of its founders and followers, ultimately adopted this soothsaying practice. In some of its earlier formulations (for example, in Marx’s analysis of the ‘coming revolution’) their predictions were testable, and in fact

falsified. Yet, instead of accepting the refutations, the followers of Marx reinterpreted both the theory and the evidence in order to make them agree. In this way they rescued the theory from refutation; but they did so at the price of adopting a device which made it irrefutable. They thus gave a “conventionalist twist” to the theory; and by this stratagem they destroyed its much advertised claim to scientific status.<sup>31</sup>

Popper further exposed the paradox of Marxism by way of disarming his critics when he writes that ‘Hegel thought that philosophy develops; yet his own system was to remain the last and highest stage of this development and could not be superseded. The Marxists adopted the same attitude towards Marxian system. Hence, Marx’s anti-dogmatic attitude exists only in the theory and not in practice of orthodox Marxism, and dialectic is used by Marxists, following the example of Engel’s Anti-Duhring, mainly for the purposes of apologetics—to defend the Marxist system against criticism. As a rule, critics are denounced for their failure to understand the dialectic, or proletarian science, or for being traitors. Thanks to dialectic, the anti-dogmatic attitude has disappeared, and Marxism has established itself as a dogmatism which is elastic enough, by using its dialectic method, to evade any further attack. It has thus become what I have called reinforced dogmatism’.<sup>32</sup>

It would not be quite out of place to mention Bertrand Russell’s comments. He observes in his *History of Western Philosophy* (George Allen & Unwin Ltd., USA, 1945) that Marx’s belief in progress as universal law is unscientific. He comments that Marx professed himself as an atheist, but retained a cosmic optimism which only

theism could justify. One point should be made loud and clear in this context that notwithstanding the differences of opinion over the precedence of Mind over Matter between Hegel and Marx, both of them were conscious exponents of a totalitarian political system—anomnicompetent Society-State, ‘which embraces the whole life: and just as Plato would have his “republic” control theology and aesthetics as well as economics, so the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics aims (aimed) at providing a new form of faith and a new style of worker’s art and literature, in addition to regulating all economic life, agricultural as well as industrial’<sup>33</sup>. Curiously enough, Hegel’s contraption of the ‘General Will’ and Marx’s will of the proletarian society in the event of the negation of the State are nothing but the two sides of the same coin.

Marxism has also been criticised for its sweeping views on stages of history, class analysis and the arbitrary conceptualizations of social evolution. Jean-Paul Sartre, originally a Marxist, and later turned out to be an exponent of existentialist violence and the concept of the ‘new proletariat’ (the damned of the earth), put forth the idea that the ‘class, as conceived by Marx is not a homogenous entity and could never launch a socialist revolution. According to Sartre, Marx himself admitted that his theory could not explain the complexities of the ‘Asiatic’ social system, where the majority of world’s population lived through thousands of years.<sup>34</sup>

### **Back to square one**

The foregoing analysis inevitably brings us back to square one. It has already been thrashed out that the *weltanschauung* of Marx’s historical materialism was myopic insofar as his analyses of the Asian society,

in general, and the Indian society, in particular, are concerned. The syndrome of this intellectual opacity has all through been reflected in his works. Somewhat casually, he prescribed a wrong panacea for a malaise the epidemiology of which was strange to him. Marx consistently held the view that the 'Asian system' like India would never be able to come out of the 'semi-barbarian' and 'semi-civilised' morass unless the country was sufficiently 'Europeanised'. According to him, the break-up of these primitive stereotype forms was the *sine qua non* of 'Europeanisation'. And it was the introduction of the British rule that would cause a social revolution in India. Marx held that the social revolution had a dual aspect: one, the destruction of the primitive Asiatic society, and, two, the introduction of the Western science and cultural values in that society.<sup>35</sup>

Assuming that Swami Vivekananda was not much familiar with the writings of Karl Marx, especially on the effects of the British colonial rule in India, he had expressed his mixed reactions towards the pros and cons of the British rule in India. Hailing the 'revolutionary' effects of the British occupation of India, Swamiji says that 'Everybody knows how much the world owes to India's spirituality, and what a potent factor in the present and the past of humanity have been the spiritual powers of India. These are the things of the past. I find another most remarkable phenomenon, and that is that the most stupendous powers of civilisation and progress towards humanity, and social progress, have been effected by that wonderful race—I mean the Anglo-Saxon. . . . I see the same Anglo-Saxon powers working here with all their defects, but retaining their peculiarly characteristic good features, and I believe that at last the

grand result is achieved. The British idea of expansion and expression is forcing us up. . . . In India we *think*—but unfortunately sometimes we think so deeply that there is no power left for expression. . . . The backbone of Western civilisation is—expansion and expression. This side of the work of the Anglo-Saxon race in India, to which I draw your attention, is calculated to rouse our nation once more to express itself, and it is inciting it to bring out its hidden treasures before the world by using the means of communication provided by the same mighty race. The Anglo-Saxons have created a future for India, and the space through which our ancestral ideas are now ranging is simply phenomenal'.<sup>36</sup>

Almost in the same vein he highlighted another aspect of the fallout of the British rule in India, when he declared that 'Materialism brought by the Britishers had come to the rescue of India in a certain sense, by throwing open the doors of life to everyone, by destroying the exclusive privileges of caste by opening up to discussion the inestimable treasures which were hidden away in the hands of very few'.<sup>37</sup>

#### **Dark and brutal aspects of the British rule**

On the other hand, Swamiji came down heavily on the dark and brutal aspects of the British colonial rule in India. He lashes out that the growth under the British period was lopsided and favoured only the privileged classes. It excluded the toiling masses like the peasants, labourers and other downtrodden classes of the society. The self-sufficiency of the Indian countryside collapsed due to the imports of cheaper British machine-made products. As a result, traditional economic pursuits of people were

destroyed and they were thrown out of employment. Huge exploitation and plunder of raw material by the British rulers resulted in the pauperisation of the masses. India with an area much smaller than the United States contains twenty three hundred millions of people and, of these, three hundred millions earn wages, averaging less than fifty cents per month. In some instances, the people in whole districts of the country subsist for months and even years, wholly upon flowers (*Mahuā*), produced by certain tree which, when boiled are edible.<sup>38</sup>

He spoke with sheer disdain that the British colonialists were guilty of the immeasurable misfortunes of the Indians. He noted with disgust that India would have resources, sufficient for a population five times greater than she had, if its entire output were not exported.

In his characteristic humour Swamiji said that under the British colonial rule another socio-cultural metamorphosis had put the Indian upper castes in its vice-grip. He said somewhat sarcastically: 'What shall I say of India? Let alone her Shudra class, her Brahmins to whom belonged the acquisition of scriptural knowledge are now the foreign professors, her Kshatriyas the ruling Englishmen, and Vaishyas, too, the English in whose bone and marrow is the instinct of trade, so that, only the Shudra-ness—the beast-of-burdenness—is now left with the Indian themselves'. Then he regrets that 'A cloud of impenetrable darkness has at present equally enveloped us all. Now there is neither firmness of purpose nor boldness of enterprise, neither courage of heart nor strength of mind, neither aversion to maltreatments by others nor dislike for slavery, . . . but what we have in India are only deep-rooted envy and strong antipathy

against one another, morbid desire to ruin by hook or by crook the weak, and to lick dog-like the feet of the strong. . . . What to speak separately of the distinct Shudra class of such a land, where the whole population has virtually come down to the level of the Shudra?'<sup>39</sup>

With utmost regret Swamiji says that 'No religion on Earth preaches the dignity of humanity in such a lofty strain as Hinduism, and no religion on Earth treads upon the necks of the poor and the low in such a fashion as Hinduism'. He said that there was not such a shameful idea as to laying blame on others for this kind of degeneration and degradation of the Indian society. 'There is no fun to put blame on the foreigners, whether Mohammedans or Christians, for our own fault. . . . Think of the last six or seven hundred years of degradation when grown up men by hundreds had been discussing for years whether they should drink a glass of water with the right hand or the left, whether the hand should be washed three times or four times.'<sup>40</sup>

Swamiji defended the Vedic religion against the later degeneration as a result of the evil practices introduced into the religion by the diverse elements of the society. He wrote to Alasinga to the effect that 'Religion is not at fault. . . . But it was the want of practical application, the want of sympathy . . . the want of Heart'.<sup>41</sup> Contrary to Marx, who thundered that religion is the opium of the people which creates a sort of sedative state for the oppressed class of the society, Swamiji declared that to other nations of the world religion is one among the many occupations of life. There is politics, there are the enjoyments of social life, there is all that wealth can buy or power can bring, there is all that the senses can enjoy; and among all these various

occupations of life and all this searching after something which can give yet a little more whetting to the cloyed senses—among all these, there is a little bit of religion. But here, in India, religion is the one and the only occupation in life'.<sup>42</sup>

Vivekananda was vehemently opposed to any oppressive and exploitative sanctions of any religion. But at the same time he opined that absolute social equality was impracticable. 'Absolute equality, that which means a perfect balance of all the struggling forces in all the planes, can never be in this world. Before you attain that state, the world will have become quite unfit for any kind of life, and no one will be there. We find, therefore, that all these ideas of the millennium and of absolute equality are not only impossible but also that, if we try to carry them out, they will lead us sure enough to the day of destruction. . . . Absolute non-differentiation is death. So long as this world lasts, differentiation there will and must be, and the millennium of perfect equality will come only when a cycle of creation comes to its end. Before that, equality cannot be'.<sup>43</sup> In the same vein he says that differentiation, infinitely contradictory, must remain, but it is not necessary that we should hate each other; it is not necessary therefore that we should fight each other.

### **Problems of India and their solution**

Addressing the problems in India, Swamiji says, 'The problems in India are more complicated, more momentous, than the problems in any other country. Race, religion, language, government—all these together make a nation. The elements which compose the nations of the world are indeed very few, taking race after race, compared to this country. Here have been the Aryan, the Dravidian, the Tartar, the Turk, the Mughal,

the European—all these nations of the world, as it were, pouring their blood into, this land. Of languages the most wonderful conglomeration is here; of manners and customs there is more difference between two Indian races than between the European and the Eastern races'.<sup>44</sup>

In the face of these bewildering diversities in India how the way out for her national unity could be conceived? Swamiji offered a possible solution when he explained that 'The one common ground that we have is our sacred tradition, our religion. That is the only common ground, and upon that we shall have to build. In Europe, political ideas form the national unity. In Asia, religious ideals form the national unity. The unity in religion, therefore, is absolutely necessary condition of the future of India. There must be the recognition of one religion throughout the length and breadth of this land. What do I mean by one religion? Not in the sense of one religion as held among the Christians, or the Mohammedans, or the Buddhists. We know that our religion has certain common grounds, common to all our sects, however varying their conclusions may be, however different their claim may be. So there are certain common grounds; and within their limitation this religion of ours admits of a marvellous variation, an infinite amount of liberty to think and live our own lives. . . . This is the first step; and, therefore, it has to be taken'.<sup>45</sup>

With the vision of a prophet Swamiji declares that how in Asia, and especially in India, race differences, linguistic difficulties, social difficulties, national difficulties all melt away before this unifying power of religion. To the Indian mind there is nothing higher than religious ideals, this is the keystone of Indian life, and we can work in

the line of least resistance. Therefore, according to Swamiji, the first plank in the making of the future of India, the first step that is to be hewn out of that rock of ages, is this unification of religion. Precisely, it was the religious eclecticism that was preached by Sri Ramakrishna, and the standard bearer of which was Swami Vivekananda. He discovers the sublimity of man and particularly of men in the lower rung of the society, who are most despised and most persecuted and exploited in the Indian society. Swamiji had a burning conviction that Vedanta had the exclusive quality to be the universal religion of man. Therein lies the strength enough to invigorate the whole world; the whole world can be vivified, made strong, energized through Vedanta, which will call with trumpet voice upon the weak, the miserable, and the downtrodden of all races, all creeds, and all sects to stand on their feet and be free. Freedom, physical freedom, mental freedom, and spiritual freedom are the watchwords of the Upanishads and the Vedanta.

Presently, our Mother Earth is riven by incessant merciless violence and wanton destruction, which may be termed as **Polistaraxic** violence, be it organised by a group or outfit or by a 'Lone Wolf'. *Polis* means a community, and *taraxic* signifies a violent act of upsetting, which unifies a variety of concepts and assumes a promiscuous character, thereby including practising criminal gangs, mafia of all sorts and more importantly, the religious fundamentalists and cultists, who may perpetrate all sorts of *Polistaraxic* violence, at the back of which works an anomic state of mind. This violence takes on the shape of a vicious cycle. In the process of violence and counter-violence is created what is termed in Political and Military Sociology is

the cycle of 'Blowback', letting loose the carnage of the innocent civilians and their properties. Day by day omnicidal potentials are lurking before the face of humanity.

What is, then, the way out of this bizarre tragedy of human civilization? Swamiji was a little pessimistic whether total elimination of the forces of evil could ever be possible. The world would be moving on with its weal and woe through eternity. Wanton materialism, religious fundamentalism and mindless persecutions of all dimensions and degrees have been the order of the day. In his Address at the World's Parliament of Religions in Chicago on 11 September 1993, Swamiji declared that 'sectarianism, bigotry, and horrible descendant, fanaticism, have long possessed this beautiful earth. They have filled the earth with violence, drenched it often and often with human blood, destroyed civilisation and sent whole nations to despair. Had it not been for these horrible demons, human society would be far more advanced than it is now. But their time is come and I fervently hope that the bell that tolled this morning in honour of this convention may be the death knell of all fanaticism, of all persecutions with the sword or with the pen, and of all uncharitable feelings between persons wending their way to the same goal'.<sup>46</sup>

In fact, almost more than a century ago Swamiji declared this with a vision of a prophet. But how is the redemption of the suffering humanity to be brought about? Swamiji stresses over and over again through his life and teachings that it is through the spiritual discipline of Vedanta, through its universality of tolerance, love and harmony, peace and enlightenment, renunciation and selfless service. This is also echoed in the prophetic writing of Arnold Toynbee, when he declares that 'in the past,

intolerance had gained the mastery where higher religions of Judaic origin had been in the field, while “live and let live” had been the rule where the Indian ethos had been paramount’.<sup>47</sup>

Swamiji puts forth in a nutshell the ethos of Vedanta when he says that ‘each soul is potentially divine. The goal is to manifest this Divinity within by controlling nature, external and Internal. Do this either by work or worship or psychic control or philosophy—by one or more or all of these—and be free. This is the whole of religion. Doctrines or dogmas, or rituals, or books, or temples, or forms, are but secondary details.’<sup>48</sup> He says quite

emphatically that when the tremendous modern theories of evolution and conservation of energy and so forth are dealing death lows to all sorts of crude theologies, what can hold any more allegiance of cultured humanity but the wonderful, convincing, broadening, an ennobling ideas that can be found only in that most marvellous product of the soul of man, the wonderful voice of God, the Vedanta? At this juncture our crisis-ridden world must pass through a revolution, not *a la Marxist* style, but only a pure Vedantic revolution. The spirituality of Vedanta could be the beacon light for the future emancipation and progress of humanity. ■

#### NOTES AND REFERENCES

- 18 Ibid., p. 24.  
 19 Ibid., p. 25.  
 20 Ibid.  
 21 *Complete Works*, op. cit., Vol. 5, p. 290.  
 22 Ernest Barker, *Principles of Social and Political Theory*, Oxford University Press, Paperback edition, 1961, pp. 21-22.  
 23 Ibid., p. 23.  
 24 Karl Popper, *Conjectures and Refutations : The Growth of Scientific Knowledge*, Basic Books, New York, 1962, p. 316.  
 25 *Lectures from Colombo to Almora*, op. cit., pp. 25-26.  
 26 Ibid., pp. 31-32.  
 27 Ibid., p. 32.  
 28 For further details, see Karl Marx, *Capital : Afterword to the Second German Edition*, 1873, Vol. 1.  
 29 See [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Criticism\\_of\\_Marxism](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Criticism_of_Marxism)  
 30 Peter Singer, *Marx : A Very Short Introduction*, Oxford University Press, 1980, p. 449.  
 31 Karl Popper, *Conjectures and Refutations*, op. cit., p. 49.  
 32 Ibid., p. 449.  
 33 Ernest Barker, op. cit., p. 34.  
 34 Robert Conquest, *Reflections on a Ravaged Century*, Norton & Co., pp. 47-51.  
 35 Asish Kumar Roy, *Communism in Asia*, op. cit., p. 4.  
 36 *Lectures from Colombo to Almora*, op. cit., p. 396.  
 37 *Complete Works* (1989), Vol. III, op. cit., p. 294.  
 38 Ibid. (1989), Vol. III, pp. 482-483.  
 39 Ibid. (1989), Vol. V, p. 15.  
 40 Ibid. (1989), Vol. III, p. 465.  
 41 Ibid., p. 167.  
 42 *Lectures from Colombo to Almora*, op. cit., p. 6.  
 43 *Complete Works* (2013), Vol. 1, op. cit., p. 138.  
 44 *Lectures from Colombo to Almora*, op. cit., pp. 214-215.  
 45 Ibid., pp. 215-216.  
 46 *Complete Works* (2013), op. cit., Vol. 1, p. 24.  
 47 Arnold Toynbee, *A Study of History*, Oxford University Press, 1954, Vol. VII, p. 438.  
 48 *Complete Works* (2013), Vol. 1, p. 24.