

## THE VISION AND MISSION OF ŚRIMADBHAGABATĪTĀ

DR. NIRMAL KUMAR ROY

*Śrimadbhagabatġitā* is considered as *Sāstra* having immense importance for each and every individual all over the globe. Listening to this one may immediately react and say that *Gītā* takes its birth, develops and come to an end centering the problems of a particular individual, Arjuna. It is a well known fact that each and every individual is unique. So it is quite illogical to maintain that *Gītā* is equally important to each and every person of society. In reply to this reaction it can be said that in fact here Arjuna is not a particular unique individual, he is a representative of all of us. Our Prime Minister is not an individual; he is the representative of all Indians. Likewise Arjuna is a representative of all individuals living in society. We all are Arjuna, so whatever is true to Arjuna is equally true to us. The problem of Arjuna is not unique, it is common problem, and it is the problem of you and me. So the solution to the problem i.e. the teaching of the *Gītā* is also common. If we suffer from same type of disease then same type of doctor, same type of prescription and medicine are effective for all of us. In reality the disease we all, without exception, suffers from is technically called *bhavarāga*. *This disease* is of the same nature, i.e. selfishness, envy, fear, anger and so on. Thus it is seen that the teaching of the *Gītā* is equally important to each and every individual of our society.

Here again one can find problem and say that Arjuna is a warrior and *Gītā* is a teaching all about why Arjuna should face the war. But we are not warrior; we do not face any war. So what is the reason for claiming that the problem of Arjuna is common to all of us? But if we carefully analyze the whole *Gītā* then we can understand that here the term 'war' is not used in the literal sense, rather it is used in a technical sense. It is important to note that all commentators of the *Gītā* accept this view. Here 'war' stands for the war of life. No one can deny the fact that each of us, all most in each and every moment has to face war of our life. Here the enemy lies within our mental world. Our selfishness, anger, jealousy, ego etc. stand for enemy of our life. They are called *Śadaripū*. We are constantly engaged in fighting with them. We the ordinary people most of the time fail to win over our enemy. The *Gītā* strongly advises us to make Śrīkriṣṇa, the God, as the driver of our life- chariot if we are to win over our enemy as it was done by Arjuna. The instance we come across in

our day to day life teaches us a lot. Instance shows that Arjuna wins the war due to God and, Duryadhana, on the other, gets defeated and ultimately ruined because he does not care for God.

Netaji declared “Give me blood I shall give you freedom”. In the same way Krishna in the *Gītā* declares that if one makes Him the driver of one’s life then He promises to provide him a number of important things. If we ponder over the *Gītā* then it shows that it assures to offer the following directions:

- a) It assures to cure us from our mental problems through proper counseling and thereby it leads us to regain our original states.
- b) It assures to transform us into *sura* from *asura*.
- c) It offers to transform our society from hell to heaven.
- d) It claims to make the whole world into temple or mosque or church.
- e) It assures to transform all our activities into worship.
- f) It assures to provide us the *mokṣa*, the highest *purasārtha* of human life.

Let us explain the first claim made by the *Gītā* is that it is all along a comprehensive counseling. It makes us mentally fit and sound through proper counseling. At the end of the teaching of the *Gītā* Arjuna himself admits that now he is free from his *moha*. The modern psychologists are of the opinion that in fact we all are psychological patients. None of us is mentally hundred percent balanced and fit. The differences among different persons are of difference of degree but not of kind. At present the psychologists claim that all criminals are mentally perverted. No person who is mentally balanced and sound can commit any crime. From this it follows that, thief, robber, cheater, murderer all are psychological patient. Keeping this in view today the jails are called the centers for reformation. As all criminals are patients they need treatment. But punishment that is usually given to them is not treatment. The proper treatment suggested by the psychologists is counseling. Here one may not agree with the psychologists. He may claim that, in fact, it is not the mental perversion, but the external adverse situational compulsion that leads one to commit crime. For example, poverty compels one to resort to the path of stealing. But this view cannot be accepted. Our close observation shows that most of the thieves are not poor at all. In some cases they are the owners of corers of rupees. For

example, a great number of political leaders and many others belong to this category. So far as our discussion goes it shows that all thieves are not financially sound. At least some of them are forced to stealing owing to their poverty. But this view cannot falsify the above claim of the psychologists. Because we have come across instances of some persons who died out of starvation but did not resort to stealing. Besides this argument I think that it is more logical to accept the observation of the psychologists, who are the experts in this field. We may be educated but it is true that we are naive in this field. So far as the problems of hearts are concerned the experts, where we all are laymen. If we do not agree with the observations of them then it seems ridiculous. The same is equally true in the case of the problems of our mind.

Kriṣṇa claims that all men are perverted and we like to be cured under the treatment of Srikrīṣṇa. Here one may say that if I am a patient of mental problems then it is more practical and logical to go to a psychiatrist of our mundane world. Thus, it is important to note that all diseases we suffer from are of two types i.e. mundane and spiritual. So far as the first type of disease is concerned we have to go to the doctor of our mundane world, but as far as the second type of disease is concerned we have to go to the doctor of the spiritual world. The psychological disease referred to by the *Gītā* is a spiritual disease. So we have to go to the doctor of the spiritual world if we like to be cured from this disease. Let us explain the nature of the disease concerned. We all know that psychological patients are otherwise called abnormal. But what does the term ‘abnormal’ exactly mean? The person who is not normal is called abnormal. One may ask: what does it really mean when we say that a man is normal? I think the implication of this statement so far as the spiritual world is concerned is deep rooted and far reaching. I think the Bengali meaning of the term ‘normal’ will help us to understand the implication in question. The Bengali meaning of the same is *svābhābika*. It means that when a thing belongs to its own or real state then it is called *svābhābika* or normal but if it is otherwise then it is called *asvābhābika* or abnormal. If we are to understand the same with more clarity then we have to proceed further. All the things of this world possess two kinds of properties or attributes, one is essential and the other is accidental. The former one is real and permanent but the latter one is unreal and impermanent. The former one is the own property of the thing concerned but the latter one is imposed from outside and in that

sense it is a borrowed property. Since the accidental property is borrowed it, in the true sense of the term, is not the own property of the thing concerned. We know that when we boil an egg it becomes hot. But this hotness of this egg is not the real property of eggs; it is an accidental property of the egg. Here egg borrows the property of hotness from hot water. But the hotness of the water is also not the own property of the water itself. It is borrowed from the hot- pot concerned. Again the pot itself is not hot. So here hotness is an accidental property. Pot here borrows the property of hotness from fire. But what is about the hotness possessed by fire? Hotness is the real property of fire. Because fire does not borrow hotness from anything else, fire itself is hot. As long as fire continues to exist it remains hot. Likewise water by its nature is cold. Coldness is the real property and therefore is the essence of water. The real property of a thing may be covered by the unreal or accidental property. The sun, for example, is self-illuminating by nature. More clearly to say self- illumination is the real or original property of the sun. As long as the sun remains it continues to be self- illuminating. But the self- illuminating real nature of the sun may be covered by cloud, the accidental property which is otherwise called imposed or borrowed or unreal property. So the natural condition of the sun, i.e. the illuminating state is the normal condition of it, since it is its own condition, *svābhābika*. As long as the sun remains in its self- illuminating state the sun is said to be in its normal state.

Srikrīṣṇa claims that no man is normal in the sense already mentioned. All men have deviated from their original or normal condition. We become deviated from our original or real state, *svabhāba*. But it is already discussed that one thing or being becomes deviated from its own nature, *svabhāba* only when it comes in association with some accidental or imposed properties. So it clearly implies that we have already become associated with some accidental or imposed properties. If we are to regain our normal property or normal state then first of all we have to throw away our imposed or accidental properties. So here the most pertinent question is: what is our real property and what are our imposed or accidental properties? In reply to this *Gītā* says that man by the very nature is soul who is beyond birth and death. It can neither be slain nor be burnt, nor be wet nor even be dried out. *Nainam chindanti śastrāni*

*nainam dahati pāvakaḥ /Na cainam kledayāntyāpo na śosayati marutaḥ //*<sup>1</sup> It further maintains that soul is ever pure, ever free and blissful. Soul cannot be the subject of sufferings and bondage. Body, sense organs, mind, intellect, selfishness, anger, fear, envy, greed, sense of attachment, violence etc. on the other, are the accidental properties of us. All these are accidental properties simply because they are not permanent, they come and go. Kriṣṇa says that the body of one, for example, is as temporary as one's dress. One puts on a new dress in the place of old one. Likewise one assumes a new body by leaving the old one. "*Vāsāmsi jīrnāni yathā vihāya navāni gr̥hnati naro' parāṇi /Tathā sārīrāṇi vihāya jīrnānyanyāni samyāti navāni dehī //*"<sup>2</sup>

It is said that our body is of two types, one is gross and another is subtle. Generally it is said that subtle body consists of sense organs, mind and intellect. At death our gross body is destroyed. But our subtle body does not destroy; it transmigrates with soul to another new body. This subtle body is destroyed and becomes dissociated from soul only in the state of liberation. As our body, gross as well as subtle, is accidental all the properties of them are also accidental. Our mind is subtle body; consequently, all the mental properties like selfishness, greed, jealousy, etc. are accidental properties. We all are the subject of these mental properties. So it is established that we are not normal. Keeping this in view Kriṣṇa says that if we like to be normal and cured then we have to follow the prescription made by Him in the *Gītā*. But here the question comes how through the teaching of the *Gītā* mentioned above our problems are solved? In fact our problems are the problems of suffering. But how does the knowledge about the fact that we are different from our body and mind help us to remove our sufferings? The answer is very simple and clear. Why am I not affected by your problem? Because I know that I am different from you. Likewise the moment I come to know that I am different from my body and mind I cease to be affected by the problems of my body and mind. If we ponder over the same then we can understand that all the problems we actually suffer from are either

---

<sup>1</sup>Nainam chindanti śastrāni nainam dahati pāvakaḥ /Na cainam kledayāntyāpo na śosayati marutaḥ //<sup>33</sup> 2/23, Śrīmadbhagabatgīta

<sup>2</sup>*Vāsāmsi jīrnāni yathā vihāya navāni gr̥hnati naro' parāṇi /Tathā sārīrāṇi vihāya jīrnānyanyāni samyāti navāni dehī // 2/11, Śrīmadbhagabatgīta.*

the problems of our body or the problems of our mind. So if we are not affected by the problems of our body and mind then we become completely free from sufferings. This is how the teaching of the *Gītā* mentioned above cures us from all the problems we suffer from. Here one may raise question: How can I come to know that I am really different from my body and mind? The fact that I am different from my dress is established by the fact that my dress can be separated from me. But neither my body nor my mind can be separated from me. Then how can I claim that I am different from my body and mind? In response to this it can be said that inseparability does not imply identity. My nose is inseparable from my head but it does not mean that my nose is identical with my head. We all know that head is one thing but nose is another thing. Besides this, at death body becomes separated from me and in the state of liberation mind gets destroyed and thereby it becomes separated from me. But the problem is yet to be resolved. One may argue that the fact that we are affected by the problems of our body and mind substantiates the fact that we are not different from our body and mind. If A is really different from B then A cannot be affected by the problems of B. Ram is not affected by the problems of Shyam simply because Ram is different from Shyam. Likewise had we been different from our body and mind then we would not have been affected by the problems of them. But a little reflection shows that this objection is not as sound as it appears to be.

We all know that a mother is different from her child but in spite of this she is affected by the problems of her child. The hunger of a child turns to be the hunger of a mother. The sufferings and the pleasures of a child become the sufferings and pleasures of a mother. In fact a mother gets affected by the problems of her child because she identifies herself with her child. I think this view can be substantiated by another good example. A lover is affected by the problems of his beloved because he identifies with his beloved. But the same person was not affected by the problems of the same lady before their relation was made. The same is true in the case of our body and mind. In reality we are different from our body and mind but due to ignorance we identify ourselves with our body and mind and thereby the problems of our body and mind turn to be the problems of our own. So when we realize the truth taught by the *Gītā* that we are actually soul and therefore we are different from our body and mind then we will cease to be affected by the problems of them. It is something like the

same lover is not affected any more by the problems of the same beloved if their relationship is broken. The *Gītā* in fact breaks our relationship with our beloved called body and mind through proper counseling.

The view that we are different from our body and mind has been challenged by the materialists like the *Cārvākas*. I think a great number of scientists also agree with them. According to the *Cārvāka* School, perception is the only *pramāṇa*. The other *pramāṇas* like inference, testimony, etc. have been refuted by them. The *Cārvākas* argue that the existence of a thing can be admitted if it is perceived, but soul cannot be perceived, therefore, it cannot be admitted. The proof for the existence of the soul is dependent on inference and testimony. But the validity of inference and testimony both has been denied by them. But I think this view of *Cārvāka* School can strongly be countered. If they deny what is not perceived then they cannot admit even what is perceived. If one cannot admit the existence of his father of his father of his father simply because he could not see him, then he cannot establish the existence of his own which is very much the object of our perception. The refutation of the existence of the father of the father of his own hither leads to the refutation of the father of his own father, again the refutation of the father of his own father, in turn, implies the refutation of his own father and the negation of his own father ultimately leads to the refutation of his own existence though his own existence can be perceived. In fact the denial of our past leads to the denial of our present, since our present takes its birth in the womb of the past. To deny the past amounts to deny the cause; and to deny the cause is to deny the effect.

Thus the position of the *Cārvāka* School is proved to be self- suicidal. If the *Cārvākas* are asked why they do not recognize the validity of inference? In reply they say that because sometimes inference gives us wrong knowledge. If so then on the same ground the validity of perception can also be refuted, since perception like inference also sometimes gives us erroneous cognition. It is our common experience that sometimes we perceive snake in the place of rope, we see Ram as Shyam and so on. I think the objection that can be raised against the validity of perception, in this regard, is stronger. The erroneous cognition rendered by inference is not universal and permanent. The inference of one on a thing may be wrong but the inference of another on one and the same thing may be right. Today the inference of one thing

may give us wrong knowledge but tomorrow the inference of the same thing may give us right knowledge. But sometimes the perceptual erroneous cognition becomes universal and permanent. For example, we know that the sun is thirteen million times bigger than the earth. But our perceptual cognition without exception shows just opposite to it. Again we know that the earth is moving, but our perceptual cognition of all of us always says that the earth is static. It is worthy to note that these erroneous perceptual cognitions are rectified by our reason or otherwise called inference or argument. In the same way the validity of testimony also can be established. If the authority of testimony is denied then our practical life will be at stake. Our life runs smoothly on the basis of our testimonial knower. The existence of soul is established by inference and testimony so it cannot be denied.

Here again one may ask that if one realizes that he is different from his body and mind then will he cease to take food and water in order to preserve his body? The answer is that he must continue to take food and water till his death. But his outlook will be completely different. Vivekananda, Ramkriṣṇa, Aurobinda and Buddha, all of them used to take food and water till their ultimate departure from this world. The outlook of them towards their body and mind and the outlook of us towards our body and mind are completely different. We think that we are for our body and mind, our body and mind are not for us. But the seers of the truth think that they are not for their body and mind, but their body and mind are for them. More clearly to say the body and mind is the end for us and we are nothing but the means to them. But the seers, on the other hand, consider their body and mind to be the means for them, the souls. I think this view has been expressed very beautifully in the 13<sup>th</sup> chapter of the *Gītā*. In this chapter our body and mind have been described as *kṣetra* and our soul has been described as *kṣetrajña*. *Idaṅ sariraṅ kouteya kṣetramityabhidhīyate/ etad yo betti taṁ prahū kṣetrajña iti tadbidda*<sup>3</sup>. This outlook has a great implication. We know that our ethical ideology is determined by our metaphysical concept. For example, the ethical or moral theory of hedonism of *Cārvāka* School necessarily comes from its metaphysical theory of materialism. And the moral theory or ideology plays a vital

---

<sup>3</sup>*Idaṅ sariraṅ kouteya kṣetramityabhidhīyate/ etad yo betti taṁ prahū kṣetrajña iti tadbidda*//, 13/1, *Śrīmadbhagabatgīta*

role in restoring discipline and peace in our society. If people living in a society believe that they are identical with their body and mind then it is quite natural that they will give prime importance on satisfaction of their physical as well as mental needs. Such people also will hold that there cannot be any soul other than their body and mind, there cannot be any God, heaven or hell, merit and demerit. In this circumstance people will be greedy, selfish and after all immoral. They will be inclined to satisfy their personal interest at any cost. In this society there will be no room for sacrifice and helping tendency. From this we can easily conclude that this type of society can never be peaceful and healthy. But if people of one society believe in just the opposite metaphysical theory that they are souls and therefore different from their body and mind then positively their moral ideology will be completely of a different type which leads to establish a society full of happiness and peace. We, the ordinary people, are controlled and guided by our body and mind. But the truth-seers, on the other hand, are not controlled by their body and mind, rather their body and mind themselves are controlled and guided by them. The body and mind of them turn to be instrumental for ensuring the wellbeing of our society.

The above view can be substantiated following the Sāṃkhya philosophy. The *Gītā* also takes the help of the Sāṃkhya metaphysics particularly in the 13<sup>th</sup> and the 14<sup>th</sup> chapter. The Sāṃkhya system admits two ultimate realities, *pūrūṣa* and *prakṛti*. According to this school *pūrūṣa* is conscious but inactive, *Prakṛti*, on the other hand, is active but unconscious. For purposeful creation both action and consciousness are required. Therefore the Sāṃkhya School holds that both the *pūrūṣa* and *prakṛti* taken together give birth to the world. *Prakṛti* is the material and *pūrūṣa* is the efficient cause of this world. The process through which the world is created is called evolution. *Prakṛti* consists of three *guṇas*, *sattva*, *rajas* and *tāmas*. *Prakṛti* is ever changing. This change is of two types- homogenous (*sajātiya*) and heterogenous (*vijātiya*). Evolution is taken place due to the heterogenous change. This heterogenous change is taken place when *pūrūṣa* comes in contact with *Prakṛti*. Through evolution the world is produced in the following sequence: *mahat*, *ahaṅkāra* or ego, five organs of sensation, five organs of action, mind, five subtle elements (*tanamātras*) and five gross elements (*mahābhutas*). It is worthy to note that here *pūrūṣa* stands for soul. So as far as the theory of creation propounded by Sāṃkhya

philosophy is concerned the whole world is created out of *Prakṛiti*. This clearly implies that our body and mind are also created from *Prakṛiti* and as they are created they are also destroyed. But we are *pūrūṣa* or soul which is eternal. This soul is neither created nor destroyed. In our discussion mentioned above it is already stated that according to the *Gītā* soul is eternal which can neither be slain nor be burnt and so on. Thus it is seen that we are different from our body and mind. Sāṃkhya philosophy holds that as body and mind are produced out of *Prakṛiti* they assume all their properties from *Prakṛiti*, more specifically to say from the *guṇas* called *sattva*, *rajas* and *tāmas* of *Prakṛiti*. The Sāṃkhya philosophy observes that the three *guṇas* of *Prakṛiti* give birth to properties like avarice, dissatisfaction, desire, selfishness, ignorance and so on.

So far as our discussion goes, it is seen once again that all the properties like, greed, selfishness, fear, attachment etc. are the properties of body and mind and we have already seen that we are neither body nor mind. This implies that these properties are nothing but the accidental properties of us by which our real properties are covered as the real property of the sun i.e. the self-illuminating nature is covered by the deep cloud. If the sun is to regain its real nature then the accidental property, i.e., the cloud must be kept aside. Similarly due to the imposition of the accidental properties our real nature is covered. If we are to regain our real nature then our accidental properties must be removed. Exactly this is what is taught by the *Gītā*.

The fact that we are different from our body and mind can also be established by one of the important texts of the Vedānta philosophy called *Drik Drisya Viveka*. It is important to note that there is a controversy among the scholars regarding the author of this book. Some think that the author of this book is Sankarāchārya. Some, on the other hand, hold that the author of this book is Vidyaranya Swami, the author of another important text of Vedānta school, namely, *Pancadāsi*. However, there is no doubt about the profoundness of this book. This book attempts to prove through various arguments that we are different from our body and mind. But here we do not have the scope to deal with all the arguments. We shall here deal with only the first argument embodied in the first aphorism. This first argument states that the seer and the seen must be different. Suppose I see the sun, it implies that the sun is different from me. I see you it shows that you are different from me. From this we can surely

conclude that there must be a difference between the seer and the seen. Now let us go to our body and mind. No one can deny the fact that as I see the pen so I see my body. So here my body is seen and I am the seer or witness. As the seer and the seen must be different so I must be different from my body. The same is equally true in the case of my mind. Like body my mind also can be known. Question is how can my mind be known? In response to this it is said that our mind can be known not in the same way in which our body and the pen are known. Both the pen and my body are external things, more clearly to say they are in the external world. But my mind is not external at all; it is in my internal world. The process through which the mind is known is called introspection. It is worthy to note that to know mind amounts to know the different mental states like pleasure, pain, desire, anger, greed and so on. No one can deny the fact that we can know all our mental states. Thus it is seen that our mind can also be known. Following the same logic it can be concluded that our mind is also different from us.

The *Naiyāyikas* offer one strong argument to substantiate the view that we are different from our body and mind. Suppose a striking event was taken place in my life twenty years back and I remember the same even today. Now, this phenomenon of memory cannot be accounted for if we think that we are nothing other than our body and mind. We all know that our mind is always in flux. Almost in every moment one thinking is replaced by another, one desire replaces another, experience of enjoyment turns into the experience of bitterness. But we think that our body is permanent. Our close observation shows that this is not true. Like mind, our body is also ever changing. Our body is composed of cells and neurons. But all most in every moment some old cells are replaced by some new. In this circumstance, our memory cannot logically be accounted for if we agree with the view that we are nothing but our body and mind. The possibility of my memory in question presupposes that there must be an unchanging permanent agent in me. The agent who witnessed the event twenty years back and the agent who remembers the same today must be one and the same. But neither our mind nor our body can stand for this agent. My body and the mind of twenty years back and my body and mind of today are completely different. During the long period of twenty years mental states have been replaced by new mental states. Likewise all the cells of my body of twenty years back have been

replaced by new ones. In this circumstance, neither my present body nor my present mind is in a position to remember the event occurred twenty years back. My body and mind of twenty years back are no more remembered today as same. Thus it can easily be concluded that if we agree with the view that we are nothing other than our body and mind then the phenomenon of memory and recollection cannot be accounted for. In this situation the only remaining option is to accept the view that I am soul which is beyond cage, birth and death. It is purely unchanging and eternal as it is stated by the *Gītā*. So my memory is taken place due to my soul. Being unchanging and eternal my soul of twenty years back who witnessed the event and my soul of today who remembers the same is absolutely one and the same.

The knowledge called *pratyābhijñā* (recognition) also cannot be accounted for if we do not agree with the view of the *Gītā* that we are soul. Suppose I see Devadutta today in a marriage-party and say that this is that Devadutta whom I saw in Baranasi ten years back. This knowledge consists of two pieces of knowledge one is perceptual and the other is memory. So far as the memory part is concerned we must depend upon the permanent and unchanging soul recognized by the *Gītā*. I think if we do not agree with the view of the *Gītā* then the possibility of our fundamental kinds of knowledge like perceptual knowledge, inferential knowledge and so on cannot properly be accounted for. Each and every kind of determinate cognition necessarily includes some elements of memory. At first let us deal with the case of perception. Suppose we perceive a table. At the initial stage we know the table simply as something without its name, genus etc. This cognition is described as indeterminate. But in the immediate next stage we identify the object seen as a table and thereby the cognition which was indeterminate in the earlier stage turns as determinate one. Here comes the question of the necessity of a permanent soul. It is already stated that no memory is possible without permanent and unchanging soul. More or less the same is true in the case of inference. We all know that the inferential knowledge necessarily presupposes the knowledge of the probans (*linga*) and the knowledge of invariable concomitance (*vyāpti*). The former one is derived through perception but the latter one is remembered. In the case of inferential cognition of fire in the hill, for example, one first sees smoke coming from the hill and subsequently remembers the invariable concomitance between smoke and fire. Thus it is seen that inferential cognition like

the perceptual one also depends upon memory. The knowledge called *upamiti* is also depended upon memory. In the case of this cognition the two different knowledge, the knowledge of similarity and the knowledge of *atidesvākya* (as the cow so the *gavaya*) are presupposed. The first one is derived through perception and the second one is remembered. Thus we see that all sorts of cognition necessarily depend upon memory, and memory, in turn, necessarily depends upon the unchanging and permanent soul. This clearly implies that unless and until the view of the *Gītā* that we are not impermanent body and mind, rather we are permanent and eternal soul, is accepted, the possibility of no cognition can be accounted for.

I think this above view of the *Gītā* that we are soul, not body and mind, has to be accepted due to another reason. If we disagree with the view of the *Gītā* and hold that we are only body and mind then the concept of moral as well as legal responsibility and punishment cannot be accounted for. In our day to day experience we see that one commits a crime of raping and murdering today but the court-verdict of his punishment of death sentence comes fifteen years later. If we hold that we are body and mind then following the same logic stated above it can be said that the person who commits the crime today and the person who will be punished fifteen years latter are completely two different persons. It implies that one person commits crime and another person is punished. It is like something that Ram commits crime and for that Shyam is punished which is completely ridiculous, illogical and unjustified. All these things can be logically and properly accounted for if we accept the view proposed by the *Gītā* that we are soul.

Let us discuss the second promise made by the *Gītā* mentioned above. In the second promise *Gītā* says that if we make Kriṣṇa the driver of our life as it was done by Arjuna then He will transform us as *sūra*, *risi*, *muni*, a true *yogi* from *asūra*, beast and sinner. Swami Vivekananda and Rabindranath Tagore also say the same. Swamiji says religion is the manifestation of the divinity already in man. Tagore says that religion transforms us into an infinite I (*bado āmi*) which is variously called by Tagore as a universal I, a *jivan-devata*, *moner-manus* and so on from a finite I (*chhoto āmi*) which is self- oriented. Swamiji believes that man by the nature is divine. *But* our divine nature remains hidden due to our ignorance. True religion leads to manifest our hidden divine nature by the way of removing our ignorance.

According to all the *sāstras*, in essence man is divine. *Upanishad* describes man as *Amṛitasya putra*. Advaita Vedanta says “*Jivo Brahmaiva Nā Aparah*”. Caitanya Caritāmṛita says the same in different places in different ways. It says “*Iswar Swarup Bhakta Tār Adhithān / Bhakter Hridaye Kriṣṇer Satata Bistrām*”<sup>4</sup>. Caritamṛita further says “*Brahma Ātma Bhagabān kriṣṇer Bihār/ A Artha Nā Jāni Murkha Artha Kore Ār*”<sup>5</sup>. It again says “*Advay Jñan Tattvabastu kriṣṇer swarūp/Bramha Ātmā Bhagaban-Tin Tār Rūp*”<sup>6</sup>. The Bible says “The Kingdom of God Is Within You”. The Sufi Islam says “*Anal Haq*”. Tagore says “*Āmar Hiyar Mājhe Lukiye Chhile Dekhte Āmi Pāini Tomāy Dekhte Āmi Pāini*”. He further says “*Simār Mājhe Asim Tumi Bājāo Āpan Sur/ Āmār Madhye Tomār Prokāsh Tāi Ato Madhur*”. Swamiji clearly says “*Yatra Jiva Tatra Shiva*”, “*Nara Rūpe Nārāyana*”.

Apparently this view cannot be accepted. In our day to day life we come across so many heinous activities done by man. If man is taken as God then these activities cannot properly be accounted for. In response to this objection it is said that it is also equally true that we come across so many godly activities in our society performed by man. The living example of this type of activities is the activities of Vivekananda, Buddha, Mother Teresa and many others. In fact man possesses two types of properties. One divine and another is devil. The *Gītā* says the same particularly in the sixteenth chapter entitled ‘*Daivasur Sampad Yoga*’. The *Gītā* says that man possess altogether twenty six godly properties. “*Abhayam sattvasamśuddirjñāna yogavyavasthitih / Dānam damaśca yajñāśca svādhyāstapa ārjavam* //”<sup>7</sup>. “*Tejah kṣamā dhṛtiḥ sancamadroḥ nātimānitā / Bhavanti sampadam daivīmbhijātāsya bhārata* //”<sup>8</sup>. *Gītā* also says of some devilish properties. “*Dambho darpo’bhimānaśca krodhaḥ pārūṣyameva ca/Ajñānam cābhijātasya pārtha sampadamāsurīm*”<sup>9</sup>. Here one may argue that if we possess devilish and Godly

---

<sup>4</sup> *Ādililā, Prathama parichheda*

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid*

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid*

<sup>7</sup> “*Abhayam sattvasamśuddirjñāna yogavyavasthitih / Dānam damaśca yajñāśca svādhyāstapa ārjavam* //, *Śrimadbhagabatgīta*

<sup>8</sup> “*Tejah kṣamā dhṛtiḥ sancamadroḥ nātimānitā / Bhavanti sampadam daivīmbhijātāsya bhārata* //, *Ibid*

<sup>9</sup> “*Dambho darpo’bhimānaśca krodhaḥ pārūṣyameva ca/Ajñānam cābhijātasya pārtha sampadamāsurīm* //, *Ibid*

properties both then it is logical to say that we are partially devil (*asūra*) and partially divine (*sūra*). Then the above views mentioned that we are divine or god cannot be accepted. In order to counter this argument it is said that though we possess both the devilish and godly properties yet both of them are not our own properties. Only the latter one is our own property (*svabhāva*). But the former one is our accidental or imposed property which is otherwise called borrowed property. But whatever is borrowed cannot be our own. So it is clear then that our devilish property being borrowed cannot be our own property. And we cannot be known by any property which is not our own. Only the divine property is our own since it is not borrowed. This is the reason why we are called divine.

I think the fact that we are divine can be proved from our day to day experience. What does it actually mean when we say that we are god? It means that we possess godly properties. John Hick in *The Philosophy of Religion* says of some property of God. He says that God is Omnipotent, Omniscient, Infinite and Loving. If these properties are seen to be possessed by man then we should agree with the above view that man is divine or god. But if it is otherwise then the above view cannot be accepted. The first three properties, I think are closely inter-connected. So let us examine these three properties taking together. Apparently we may think that man is completely devoid of these properties. But our close observation shows that man does possess these properties to a great extent. Man has discovered and invented so many unbelievable things. Computer, television, mobile, airplane, all these are the epoch making inventions. If we go to the medical science then we can see that at least some of the inventions are as good as that of God. The creation of body and organs is the activity of God. But today different fundamental organs are seen to be produced and replaced in human body by men themselves. The robotic man performs so many important activities more efficiently than man himself. The most striking invention by man in this regard is the invention of cloning. Today medical science is in a position to give birth to thousands of Sachin Tendulkar out of his cells. This invention shows that the capacity of man is not less than that of God. Now let us go to the fourth property mentioned above. So far as the fourth property is concerned God is described as Kind and Loving. In Hinduism also God is called *Dinabandhu*, *Karunasindhu*, *Patitapaban* and so on. It is worthy to note that the love of God is

described as unconditional. To designate the unconditional love of God a special term 'agape' has been used. Here one may argue that the love of God cannot be unconditional since He does not show His kindness to any person. He shows His kindness and love only to His true *bhaktas*. This implies that He wants *bhakti* in return for whatever He does for his *bhaktas*. In response to this we can say that God does a lot for all of us. He gives, for example, food, water, fire, air and so on to all persons without judging whether he is a sinner or virtuous. But it is also true that some special kindness is reserved only for His special *bhaktas*. We have to keep in our mind that this is done by God not because He wants something from us in return but He does so for our own upliftment and perfection. When a teacher evaluates the answer scripts of the students then he may give same marks to all students if he likes. But he does not do so because he knows that if he does so then it will be injustice to the students who are more laborious and meritorious. When a student comes to know that marks will be rendered on the basis of performance then automatically he will be more careful of his study which leads him to be enriched and perfect. Due to the same reason God does not show undue kindness to all of us. One may say, whether man possess this property of loving.

Apparently one may think that this property of unconditional love cannot be possessed by man because man by the very nature is selfish. Whatever he does for others he necessarily wants something in return. He does not go forward even a single step without thinking of his own profit. I think this view again cannot be accepted. We come across so many people in our society who had been engaged in selfless social work throughout his life. Swami Vivekananda, Gautama Buddha, Mother Teresa and many others are the living example of the same. All of them had served the society throughout their life hoping nothing in return. Thus it is seen that man possesses all most all the godly properties. So it is not unreasonable to say that man is god or divine. Here one may say that with it the matter is not disposed of. He may continue to argue that what is said above is true only for a few persons. It is not true for most of the persons. Only a few persons are great scientists who have discovered or invented the unbelievable inventions mentioned above. But a great number of people are either most ordinary in their intellect or idiot. Likewise, most of the people we come across in our society are highly self oriented and selfish. So majority of the

people do not possess any godly properties. It implies that only a few persons are god but the rest ones are not god. But the above views claim that all men are god. How can these views be accepted? This objection appears really to be very sound. But I think this objection can also be countered like the earlier ones. This problem will be easily solved if we try to understand the very sense in which we are said to be god by the different religious texts and the truth-seers. *Svetasvatara Upanishad* says “*Sarbavyapinam atmanam khire sarpiribarpitam. Atmavidya tapamulam tad Brahmapanisodparam, tadbrahmapasisod iti*”<sup>10</sup>. The same Upanisad further says “*Anaraniyān mahata mahiyān ātma guhayam nihitasya jantah*”<sup>11</sup>.

Swamiji in his *Complete Works* says that religion is the manifestation of the divinity already in man. The careful analysis of the above concept implies that we are potentially divine. This means that we are divine in un-manifested form. More clearly to say the divinity is there within us in the hidden form. I think some examples will help us to make this idea clear. We know that the fire is there in the matches-stick in the hidden form. The potentiality of fire is there in the matches stick. No one can deny this fact. But if one says that there is no fire in the matches-stick since it does not burn then it seems ridiculous. Obviously it will burn when it gets collided with matches’ box and its potentiality will turn into actuality. The same is true in the case of man. Divinity is already there in all of us in the potential form. But unless and until that potential divinity turns into actuality it cannot serve the function of god. The potential divinity underlying Buddha and Vivekananda were turned into actuality, and this is the reason why they could serve the society selflessly as good as God. Like God they loved the whole world unconditionally. This is why Vivekananda could say from the very core of his heart “*The whole world is my family*” and “*My sisters and brothers of America.*” But we are yet to be turned into god, more clearly to say the potential divinity within us is yet to be turned into actuality. This is the reason why like Vivekananda and Buddha we do not serve our society without thinking of our self interest. The moment our potential divinity will turn into actuality each one of us

---

<sup>10</sup>*Sarbavyapinam atmanam khire sarpiribarpitam. Atmavidya tapamulam tad Brahmapanisodparam,tadbrahmapasisod iti*”, 1/16 *Svetasvatara Upanishod*.

<sup>11</sup> *Anaraniyān mahata mahiyān ātma guhayam nihitasya jantah*” 3/20, Ibid

will become a Vivekananda or a Buddha and we also can love and serve the society without thinking of the interest of our own.

One may say that how can our potential divinities are turned into actuality? The answer is very clear. For this we have to be collided with the matches' box called Kriṣṇa. In fact God is a touch-stone. Whatever comes in contact with a touch-stone it turns into gold? Likewise whoever comes into the contact of God he will turn into God himself. Keeping this in view Swamiji beautifully says that religion is the manifestation of the divinity already in man. *Gīta* says “*Abhyasena tu Kounteya vairagyena ca griyate*”. *Gītā* actually attempts to convert us from *asura* to *sura* following the path of *yoga*. The *yoga* that is generally believed to be prescribed by the *Gītā* is called *Karma yoga* or more accurately *niskāma karma yoga*. But this is not the whole truth. The *Gītā*, in fact, prescribes for the integral *yoga*. By ‘integral *yoga*’ I mean the combined whole of all *yogas*. *Gītā* believes that *yoga* is complementary to the other *yogas*. No *yoga* is possible in isolation from all other *yogas*. There is a controversy among the scholars regarding which *yoga* has principally been prescribed by the *Gītā*. But the popular notion is that *Gītā* actually recommends for the *karma yoga*, since it starts and ends with the same advice to Arjuna, i.e. the advice to face the war in disinterested manner. However this fact cannot be denied that *Gītā* has rendered stress upon the assimilation of all *yogas*. The *Gītā* primarily teaches Arjuna to follow *niskāma karma* (disinterested action) particularly in the 2<sup>nd</sup> and the 3<sup>rd</sup> chapter. But in the immediate subsequent 4<sup>th</sup> chapter Kriṣṇa advises Arjuna to resort to the path of *jñāna*. Again in the 12<sup>th</sup> chapter Arjuna has been advised to be a true *bhakta* (devotee). Besides this the same advice of following all *yogas* simultaneously has been reflected in almost in all chapters of the *Gītā*.

In the 47<sup>th</sup> aphorism of the 2<sup>nd</sup> chapter Kriṣṇa says, “*Karmaṇaiva hi samsiddhimasthitā janakādayaḥ / lokasaṁgrahamevāpi saṁpaśyan kartumarhasi* //<sup>12</sup>. It further says, “*Duḥkheṣvanud vijñamanāḥ sukheṣu vigatasprahaḥ / Vītarāgbhayakrodhaḥ stithadhīrmunirueyate* //<sup>13</sup>. Here it is said that a *karma yogi*

<sup>12</sup>“*Karmaṇaiva hi samsiddhimasthitā janakādayaḥ/lokasaṁgrahamevāpi saṁpaśyan kartumarhasi* // 2/47, *Śrīmadbhagabatgīta*

<sup>13</sup>“*Duḥkheṣvanud vijñamanāḥ sukheṣu vigatasprahaḥ/Vītarāgbhayakrodhaḥ stithadhīrmunirueyate* // 2/56, *Ibid*

necessarily will be a *sthitaprajna*, a *muni*. *Gītā* again says, “*Anāśritaḥ karmaphalaṃ kāryaṃ karma karoti yaḥ / Sa sannyāsī ca yogī ca na niragnirna cākriyaḥ //*”<sup>14</sup>. This aphorism also clearly endorses that a follower of a *niskāma karma* is a true *sanyāsī*. A true *muni* or *sanyāsī* is nothing but a real *sura*. Thus *Gītā* proposes to make us *sura* if we properly follow *niskāma karma*. But in this process obviously we are in the need of the *path* of *jñāna* and the *path* of *bhakti*. Proper performance of *niskāma karma* necessarily presupposes the fulfillment of some conditions. A true *niskāma karmi*, first of all, must give up his sense of ego, the sense of his agent ship. Secondly he must offer the fruit of his action to God. As far as the first condition is concerned he has to be a real *jñāni*. He must know that he is not a true agent. No action can be done by him. All actions those are thought to be done by him are actually not done by him, they are done by his body, senses and mind, in a word by *prakriti*. *Gītā* in this context says, “*Prakrteḥ kriyamānāni guṇaiḥ karmaṇi sarvaśaḥ / Ahaṃkāravimūḍhātmā kartāhamiti manyate//*”<sup>15</sup>.

So only a real *jnani* knows the truth and thereby surrenders the sense of ego or agent ship. In this context *Gītā* says, “*Tattvavittu mahāvāho guṇakarmā vibhāgayoḥ / Guṇa guṇeṣu vartantā iti matvā na pajjate //*”<sup>16</sup>. True knowledge, I think, gives birth to two children at the same time- one is *niskāmakarma* and another is *bhakti*. The knowledge about the fact that the ultimate real agent is God and we are nothing but the instruments at the hands of Him leads to the destruction of our ego and thereby makes us a real *karmayogi* or *niskāma akarmi*. If we come to know that we are not real doer then how can we expect the fruit of our action? And if we do our actions barring the hope of fruit then our actions will turn into *niskāma* and thereby we become a real *karmayogi*. Again we also come to know that the real doer is God Himself and this knowledge leads to the surrendering of the fruits of our action to the feet of God. This is why Kṛiṣṇa advises us to surrender all things to Him. He says, “*Yat karosi yadaśnāpi yajjuhosi dadāsi yat/Yat tapasyasi kaunteya tat kuruṣva*

---

<sup>14</sup> “*Anāśritaḥ karmaphalaṃ kāryaṃ karma karoti yaḥ / Sa sannyāsī ca yogī ca na niragnirna cākriyaḥ //* 6/1, Ibid

<sup>15</sup> “*Prakrteḥ kriyamānāni guṇaiḥ karmaṇi sarvaśaḥ / Ahaṃkāravimūḍhātmā kartāhamiti manyate //* 3/27, Ibid

<sup>16</sup> “*Tattvavittu mahāvāho guṇakarmā vibhāgayoḥ / Guṇa guṇeṣu vartantā iti matvā na pajjate //* 3/28, Ibid

*madarpanam* //<sup>17</sup>. This whole thing makes us a true *bhakta*. So the project of the *Gītā* is to make us a true *karma yogi*, a real *jnāni* and an ideal *bhakta*. This type of person is a perfect *sura*.

Now let us deal with the 3<sup>rd</sup> promise made by the *Gītā*. In this promise *Gītā* says that if we make Him the driver of the chariot of our life then He will turn our whole society into heaven from hell. Society is nothing but a group of people living together in a particular state or country. Whether a society will be a hell or a heaven it purely depends upon the activity of the individuals living in that society. If the individuals are good then it is quite natural that the society also will be good but if they are otherwise then it is also true that the society will be a bad one. At present our society turns into a hell because most of the people living in our society are of devilish nature. What are the devilish properties and what are the divine properties have already been mentioned following *Gītā*. In fact a sharp gap is made by us between our religious life and secular life. This sense of gap creates all the problems. We make a distinction between a *sanyāsin* and a *grihi*, a householder. We hold that all the activities of a *sanyāsin* should be religious. But this is not true in the case of us. We think that as long as we are in a temple we should be religious; all actions performed in a temple should be religious actions.

The moment we come out of temple we become secular persons and all our activities also become secular. So long as we remain in a temple we do nothing wrong, we do not have any ill thinking, we do not lie, do not cheat others, we only think of God, we pray to Him. But when we, the same persons, come outside of the temple or mosque we become ill persons having all sorts of ill thinking and ill feeling. Herein lies the problem. The *Gītā* removes this gap by transforming all persons into *sanyāsin*, by making the whole world a temple and transforming all actions of all persons into worship. We see that *Gītā* is taught to Arjuna the representative of all of us, neither in a jungle nor even in a temple, rather it is taught in the battlefield. From this anyone can easily conclude that the teaching of the *Gītā* is not meant for a *sanyāsin* living in a jungle or a worshiper staying in the temple or

---

<sup>17</sup> “*Yat karosi yadaśnāpi yajjuhosi dadāsi yat/Yat tapasyasi kaunteya tat kuruṣva madarpanam* //9/27, Ibid

mosque or church, but it is meant for a householder. It is worthy to note that *Gītā* does not suggest for *karmasanyāsa* (sacrifices of *karma*) as it is generally advised by *Advaita Vedānta*, it suggests for *phalasangyāsi* (sacrifices of fruit). *Gītā* states that sacrifices of *karma* is impossible. We cannot remain without work even for a single moment. We cannot live without respiration; we are ever engaged in the process of the same till our death. Our heart-beat and our blood circulation are going on without any break. Even our effort for not doing any action is also one type of action. So in no way *karmasanyāsa*, i.e. the sacrifice of action is possible. Kant says “ought to imply can.” Since *karmasanyāsa* is impossible it cannot be moral. And as it is not moral it is meaningless to say ‘you should follow the path of *karmasanyāsa*’. *Gītā* says, “*Na hi kaścit kṣaṇamāpi jātu tiṣṭhyakarmakṛt /Kāryate hyavaśaḥ karma sarvaḥ prakṛtijaguṇaiḥ //*<sup>18</sup>. *Gītā* categorically says that our action is not the cause of our bondage, the cause of our bondage is the fruit of our action. So we should not sacrifice our action, we should sacrifice only the fruit of our action. If any action is done without the desire of fruit then that action turns into a *yoga* which leads to the attainment of *Mokṣa*. *Gītā* says, “*Karmaṇaiva hi saṃsiddhimāsthītā janakāyaḥ / lokasaṃgrahamevāpi saṃpāśyan kartumarhasi //*<sup>19</sup>”.

And the persons who are interested in sacrificing the action are not true *yogi* according to the *Gītā*. A true *yogi* according to it is one who sacrifices only the fruit of his action. In this context *Gītā* says, “*Anāśritaḥ karmaphalaṃ kāryaṃ karma karoti yaḥ /Sa sannyāsi ca yogī ca na niragnirna cākriyaḥ //*<sup>20</sup>. The *Gītā* teaches that the whole world is a temple. The place where God lives is called temple. But in fact God lives in the whole world, so it implies that the whole world is a temple. Isonisod says, “*Isabasyam...*”) *Vedānta* says “*Sarbhāṃ khal...*” *Caitanyachiritmṛita* says

---

<sup>18</sup>“*Na hi kaścit kṣaṇamāpi jātu tiṣṭhyakarmakṛt /Kāryate hyavaśaḥ karma sarvaḥ prakṛtijaguṇaiḥ // 3/5, Śrīmadbhagabatgīta*

<sup>19</sup> “*Karmaṇaiva hi saṃsiddhimāsthītā janakāyaḥ / lokasaṃgrahamevāpi saṃpāśyan kartumarhasi // 3/20, Ibid*

<sup>20</sup> “*Anāśritaḥ karmaphalaṃ kāryaṃ karma karoti yaḥ /Sa sannyāsi ca yogī ca na niragnirna cākriyaḥ // 6/1, Ibid*

“*Kriṣṇa ak sarvāsrāy Kriṣṇa sarvabham/ Kriṣṇer śarīre sarvva biswer bisrām//*<sup>21</sup>”. It further says “*Kriṣṇamayī Kriṣṇa yar*”<sup>22</sup>.

The implication of this is far-reaching. It has been already mentioned that the temple is considered by us a holy place since God lives here. Keeping this in mind we turn to be a good man as long as we stay there in a temple. Here we do nothing wrong, we say nothing wrong, even we think nothing wrong. Now if the whole world is a temple then it implies that we are always in a temple. Since we are always in a temple, we have no scope even for a single moment to do anything ill, to say anything foul, and to think anything evil. All this necessarily leads us to be a good person. We cannot but be a good person. *Gītā* also teaches us to consider all persons as gods. We ill behave with others because we see them as means. Again we do so because we undermined them. But if we know the truth that all men are god then we cannot ill behave with them. On the contrary we shall respect them; we shall love them as we do with God Himself. Now if we ponder over the whole thing then it can be understood that in such situation our society cannot but be a heaven. In this society the whole world stands for temple, all people are turned into *sura*, all of them are considered as god; one loves and shows respect towards others, no one can even think of committing any crime. This type of society, no doubt, is as good as heaven.

Another important issue to note in this regard is that the most fundamental difference underlying between the two kinds of man- *sura* and *asura* is the difference of unselfishness and selfishness. The latter is highly selfish. He has no room for others. He knows none other than himself. He can do anything for the satisfaction of his own personal interest. He does not hesitate to fulfill his own interest sometimes even at the cost of death of others. He can hardly be distinguished from the ferocious beasts. The heinous activities have done by the men of this nature make our society a hell. But the man of *sura* nature, on the other, is purely unselfish. He has room for the whole world other than himself. He knows no interest for himself. He is concerned with the interest only for others. His only aim is to do the work for the wellbeing of

---

<sup>21</sup>“*Kriṣṇa ak sarvasray Kriṣṇa sarvabham/ Kriṣṇer śarīre sarvva biswer bisrām//*, Caitanyachiritmrita, *Adi Lila*. 1<sup>st</sup> parichhed

<sup>22</sup> “*Kriṣṇamayī Kriṣṇa yar...*” Ibid, p, 53

the whole society (*vahuyāna hitāya vahuyana sukhāya*). We know that a mother becomes happy through scarifies for her children. The pleasure and happiness of the children, in fact, become the pleasure and happiness of mother. The sufferings and pains of the children turn to be the sufferings and pains of the mother herself.

Likewise, the man of *sura* nature enjoys through scarifies for others. He does not, in reality, have any pleasure or suffering of his own. The pleasure and suffering of others become the pleasure and suffering of himself. Keeping this in view the *Ishopanishad* beautifully says, “*Tena tyaktena bhunjitha*”. Someone says that the exact difference between the man of *asura* and *sura* nature is that when the former closes his eyes he sees only the sufferings and pains in his mind and when he opens his eyes he only wants and wants from the world, but when the latter closes his eyes he sees only full of pleasure within and when he opens his eyes he thinks what can he give to the world. Thus it is seen that how and why the activity of the man of *sura* nature makes our world a heaven. Thinking of the importance of the work of social wellbeing the *Gītā* says, “*“Karmaṇaiva hi saṁsiddhimāsthītā janakāyaḥ / lokasaṁgrahamevāpi saṁpaśyan kartumarhasi//”*<sup>23</sup>. If we hold the hand of God then *Gītā* promises to turn all our day to day activities into *pujā*.

So far as our discussion goes it is seen that the whole world is a temple since God lives in the whole world. Now in these circumstances all our activities quite naturally become worship or *pujā*. First go to the case of a woman. The very first activity that is done by a woman in the beginning of the day is the sweeping of the house. Now if she knows that the whole world is a temple then it necessarily implies that the house she sweeps is also a temple. In a broader sense, all activities meant for God are nothing but *pujā*. As this act of sweeping is meant for cleaning the temple of God it must be a *pujā*. The next activity of a woman is cooking. She cooks for her children, husband and for herself. It is also seen in our foregoing discussion that all men are god.

---

<sup>23</sup> “*Karmaṇaiva hi saṁsiddhimāsthītā janakāyaḥ / lokasaṁgrahamevāpi saṁpaśyan kartumarhasi //, 3/20, Śrimadbhagabatgīta*

This shows that her children, her husband and even she herself are god and goddess. She can consider her children as Gopala, she can look upon her husband as Kriṣṇa, and she can think herself as Radha. If so then the cooking for themselves turn to be the cooking for God, and the cooking for God is nothing but *pujā*. In this way whatever she does she does for God. In the same way a teacher will think that he or she teaches Gopalas. A person working in an office will think that he or she serves the customers in the form of god. Thus all our activities become *pujā*. It is worthy to note that if any action becomes *pujā* then it must be perfect and also gets the touch of our love and affection. This type of action is otherwise called service or *sevā* which gives rise to peace in our society. Thus all Narens of the world transform into Vivekananda, all Siddharthas become Buddha and all Ratnakaras will ultimately convert into *Risi* Valmiki.

Now let us deal with the last promise of the *Gītā*. In the last promise *Gītā* says that if we catch the hands of God then He will render us *Moksa*, the ultimate *Pūrūṣārtha* of us. We know that we have four *Pūrūṣarths* in our life. These are *Dharma, Artha, Kama and Mokṣa*. *Moksa* is considered as the highest *Pūrūṣārtha*, the *sumum bonum* of human life. There is a controversy among the scholars regarding the exact nature of the state of *Moksa*. But all of them unanimously accept that *Moksa* is a state of permanent devoid of suffering. It implies the absence of the cycle of birth and death. At the state of *Moksa* we go back to our original state of immortality. By the very nature we are immortal since we are *Amritasya Putra* as it is stated by the *Upanishad*. Unlike Nyāya-Vaisesika School *Gītā* and Vedānta hold that *Moksa* is a state of permanent bliss. Brahman, as it is stated by Vedanta, is *Cit- Sat- Ananda*. We are either Brahman or the part and parcel of Brahman. So we are also *Sat- Cit- Ānanda*. This is the exact reason why we look for *ānanda*. Whatever we look for we look for *ānanda*. We cannot look for anything which does not give us *ānanda*. So *ānanda* is the ultimate goal of our life. But no worldly thing can provide us *ānanda* in the true sense of the term. Actually the world is full of suffering. Gautama Buddha rightly says *Sarvaṃ dukṣaṃ*.

Here one may does not agree with Buddha. He may say one enjoys a lot out of his drinking. Those who are fond of sweets get enormous pleasure when they eat sweets. So is the case of meat and so on. But if we ponder over the case then we can

understand that the observation of Buddha is perfectly right. The drinking necessarily damages our lung. The eating of sweet gives birth to the most dangerous disease called sugar which is otherwise called the mother of all other disease. Likewise eating of meat gives rise to the disease of heart. In this way all worldly things ultimately become the cause of our suffering. As long as we cling to the worldly things we continue to be affected by the pain and suffering. That is why the attachment (*triṣṇā*) towards the worldly things is considered to be cause of our pain and suffering. In fact there is no bliss in the world, world is the locus of suffering. So no wise person seeks for *ānanda* in the world. To look for *ānanda* in the world is as unwise as to look for coldness in the fire. If we are to get coldness then we have to go the proper locus of the same, i.e. ice or water. Similarly, if we are to avoid suffering and attain *ānanda* then we have to go to the abode of *ānanda* leaving the worldly things. And this permanent abode of *ānanda* is Brahman or God. This is why God is considered as the ultimate destination of us. Only God can provide us real *ānānanda*, i.e. *Mokṣa* removing all sufferings and pains. In this context *Gītā* says, “*Sarvadharmān parityajya mamekaṁ saranam brajā /Ahaṁ tvā sarvapāpēbhya mokṣayiṣyāmi mā śucaḥ* //”<sup>24</sup>.

### ***Gītā* as a Possible Solution to the Crisis:**

We are running through different types of crisis but among them the most acute and burning crisis today is the crisis of the pandemic called Covid-19. But I like to disguise the pandemic into two kinds-natural and social. Covid-19 belongs to the first category and almost each and every human being belongs to the second category. Here the question which immediately arises is why man is considered as a pandemic? I think man is considered as pandemic for the reasons that most of the properties belonging to covid-19 also belong to human being. If X, for example, is an animal having similarities with a cow then obviously X is said as a cow. Likewise human being has similarities with Covid-19. This is the reason why man is considered as a pandemic like Covid-19. The similarities found between Covid-19 and human being are the following :( 1) The most striking feature of Covid-19 is that it kills numberless persons. Man is also seen to kill millions of people. It is a common phenomenon that

---

<sup>24</sup> *Śrīmadbhagabatgītā*, 18/66

one political group kills the man of another political group, one religious group very often is seen to kill the people of another religious group. Even one individual kills another individual. War is taken place due to man. Each and every war takes the lives of enumerable persons. The first and the Second World War are the living witness to it. I think man is some steps ahead than Covid-19 in this regard. Covid-19 kills only the human being but the war created by human being kills all beings. Covid-19 does not destroy any house or building but the war destroys all. The former does not increase the natural pollution rather it decreases the same. But the later increases the natural pollution to a great extend. (2)The second feature of Covid-19 is that it creates panic among human beings. This feature also belongs to human being. One man is panic to another man, one political group is panic to another political group, even very often one religious group becomes a panic to another political group. One country is a panic to another country. China, for example, is panic to India and India is panic to China. Pakistan is panic to India and the vice versa.

### **Bibliography:**

1. Radhakrishnan, S: *The Bhagavad-Gītā*, Harpercollins Publishers, 2011.
2. Srinivasachari, P.N: *The Ethical Philosophy of the Gītā*, Ramkrishna Math, Madras, 1986.
3. Aurobindo, Sri: *Eassys on the Gītā*, Sri Aurobindo Ashram Publication, Pondicherry, 2001.
4. Gandhi, Mahatma: *The Bhagavad-Gītā*, Jaico publishing House, Mumbai, India, 2010.
5. Prabhupada, A.C. Bhaktivedanta swami: *Bhagavad-Gītā as it is*, Bhaktivedanta Book Trust, Mumbai, 2001.
6. Tilak, B.G.: *Gītā Rahasya*, Kesari Press, Pune, 2016.
7. Lal, R.B.: *The Gītā in the Light of Modern Science*, Somaiya Publications. Pvt. Ltd. Bombay,1970.