

## VEDANTA

It must perforce be evident to almost all scholars that no one may be able to what has been so well spoken about on Vedanta up to now. It has been the life- breath of religion and philosophy in this country for countless years. However it seems that in the opinion of this Congress it is a perennial subject for reiteration and refreshment rather than for exposition of novelties likely to be discovered in the system. That being so, I venture to ask myself what is Vedanta and which is the Vedanta ?

Vedanta for most has been identified with the Advaita-vada of Śrī Sankaracharya , obviously because teaches us to give up the diversity and betake ourselves to the One Ultimate Reality, knowing which one can know all. Its direct appeal to the mind yearning for liberation has been immense despite its call for renunciation of the world and its lures and with it its sorrows.

There have been other eminent thinkers and theologians who saw in the Upanisads not merely a philosophical absolute monism, but also a religious Godhead (monotheism), validly discovered through the selfsame pramana, the Sabha. The necessity to resolve a dualism between monism and monotheism was foreseen. A question arises : was this dualism only a result of the pramana usage – reason vs revelation? This was not so. Both were revelation, Vedic. Therefore , some of these scholars rejected the monistic texts and claimed a dualistic tradition for the texts. A different set of theologians following the Upanisads discovered that there are texts which synthesized the identity or monistic texts and the dualistic texts (called difference texts), and these area the most significant if we have to accept the whole literature of the Veda as the highest authority for proving the existence and nature of the Highest Brahman.

Undoubtedly all accepted the name Sariraka for the Vedanta (sutra) sastra, though it is Visistadvaita alone that emphasized the Sariri (Self-nature ) of Brahman , that Ultimate One and God as such.

There have been other schools trying to mediate between the two extreme positions adopted by Śrī Sankara and Śrī Madhva, who were not fully prepared to accept the Ramanuja-solution of Sarira-Sariri-bhava theory of Samanvaya of all texts.

The Organismic Theory propounded by Visistadvaita establishes the monistic as well as the monotheistic whilst yet retaining the excellences of mystical devotion and experience of dualism. Broadly speaking I wish to approach the whole subject from a very old but unused standpoint. I refer to the threefold classification and analysis that we meet with in the Upanisads and the Bhagavad Gita as well.

I refer to the three – fold classification and analysis that goes by the name adhi- daiva, adhyatma and adhibhuta aspects. These form a trinity, a triplicity if you please, of the study of any great spiritual literature. These three will have to be considered. These three grant us knowledge of the essence- aspect of the whole of Reality as considered from (1) the speculum of the Divine, (2) from the speculum of psychology of the individual soul, and (3) from the speculum of Nature. The conception of a three- fold reality reveals three levels also, though it perhaps would be necessary to think of them as not equal to one another: For a science of Nature the external world would be important, though this is surely of secondary importance to man from his own psychological standpoint, which is inner. Above both nature and man is the Eternal or the Luminous Reality. The Veda speaks of three worlds in integration, the Svar (divine), the antar (human or inner), and Bhuh (outer); though in terms of Nature Svar is said to be the sky. Antar as mid- air (antariksa), and bhuh (the earth or prthvi).

In respect of the analysis of Nature we have to take into account the three approaches: on the lines of science, on the lines of psychology and on the lines of transcendental vision. In Vedanta we seek to view Nature itself from the standpoint of the Ultimate Brahman or Revelation. As Spinoza would say, it is the speculum of eternity that makes one regard Nature itself as an attribute of God, and identical with that supreme essence. For example, this expression is identical is identical with the Upanisadic standpoint which affirms without qualification: Sarvam khalu Idam Brahma: All this verily is Brahman. Surely this vision of nature is different from what one

perceives through the individual's psychological vision, for Nature is a constant passing away and an illusory phenomenon when it appears to be permanent and indeed we know how the permanence has been shown to be an illusion by Bergson and the Buddhists, whereas impermanence or change has been shown to be an illusion by the Mayavadins.

Though reality could be envisioned from the standpoint of Nature of time, space and causation, it would show multiplicity is seeking interrelationships however external (?) in order to reveal a system of interconnected individuals and particulars, through some superior or divine principle—a principle of integration or organic homism,

Though *adhibhuta* conception of reality is a pluralistic conception where division is predominantly active in every direction, but a pluralis, that seems to be stemming out of an integrating Oneness—called the Divine Force – and working under the direction of a supreme Godhead. Science may be aware of laws only, not of a law-giver, but there is hardly any doubt that a transcendental Deity in the sole intelligence utilizing subordinate intelligences, forcing them to, do His cosmic as well as supracosmic and sub-cosmic work. It was a great intuitional philosopher (Bergson) who declared that it is not the unity that is seen as the goal of pluralistic expression but the identity of impulse pushing all towards a plurality that is also a unifying activity in the diverse. So far as Nature is concerned all processes seem to be imposed on it and spontaneously originating from it or within it. Hence the emphasis on God's existence and proof for it become paramount.

Roughly we can identify the *adhi-daiva* view to be that of *advaita*, whereas the Visistadvaita is the *adhyatma* view.

These three ways of looking at Reality even through the revelation Pramana of Vedanta may yield three different phases of the same Reality as seen through creation of Nature is the Isvara and His multiplicity-constituted world. Another may say that the One Divine is the Self and the whole universe including both the sentient and the insentient as constituting His body from the psychological pluralistic point of view

adopted by the revelation, and the third kind of teachers may regard the Whole to be Brahman alone – the One Existent - ekam eva.

Attempts have not been wanting on the part of philosophers to reconcile these three revelation standpoints by nyaya (non-revelational logic). The equations of Nature with Self and Self with god, may reveal a gradual enlargement of the principle of explanation of the lower or less vast by the larger or wider and more inclusive or less vast by the larger or wider and more inclusive and comprehensive concept of Reality. Here we have an extension of the meaning of the word 'vyapti' which seems to be a cardinal principle of inferential reasoning.

Early enough it was discerned clearly that though explanation by god is an ideal explanation, yet it is through the psychic being or Self that any fruitful and intelligible explanation could be made. Not only would it be an intimate and human explanation though not logical or intellectual, but it would be really capable of helping the individual to solve his pressing problem of liberation (moksa). Thus it is through discipline of one's inner power of meditation and steadiness and control of mental modifications, that one begins to understand the meaning and significance of the adhyatma sastra and antaryami Brahmana of the Upanisads. God's experience as Self is the result of this devotion. This is an inner discovery and attainment which leads to the inner step of the divine worlds above the terrestrial and the change. Man's inner destiny becomes fixed; one goes beyond the world's mortality. This experience becomes central and imperative whatever kind of Vedanta one follows. The kingdom of God is within and one's spiritual essence is one with Him.

The *Adhi-daiva* conception or perspective will reveal how the Vedanta Sutras take up the question of the nature of Brahman or God. It emphasizes that that from Brahman all things take their rise, in which they live and move and have their being and finally into whom they all of prove by means of causal logic that operates in way in the realm of sense (stimulus and response, ), or invariable concomitance (vyapti) of the inductive or deductive logic of the finite mind. The source or pramana for this knowledge is undoubtedly the Sastra given- datum-given by the Divine (adhi-daiva), got

through illumination or revelation and preserved scrupulously in the Veda. All other pramanas or sources of knowledge have to submit to this supreme infallible Veda in so far as supra-sensory knowledge is concerned. Of course the sruti has itself to be understood or construed by the principles of context, intention and purpose, beginning and conclusion (tat-tu samanvayat).

Though this poses the problem of language and the necessity to take into account both the Yoga (etymology) and *rudhi* (use, *lokavyavahara*) yet there are special problems of value, to be entertained. The hierarchy of value to be entertained. The hierarchy of values which dictate at higher levels also existence and realities. The meanings of these terms become significant in the context of psychic being and standards of existence and living in human societies. Thus the human being confronted by the transcendental reality discovers at once a communion that reveals a wide disparity between the human and the divine or rather finiteness and the infinite. Many theories have been propounded to explain the possibility of union between these widely disparate levels which is what is aimed at in Yoga, by stilling the movements of *manas* or *citta* uniting it with the Ultimate. All Vedantas accept that individual soul is perfect in essence but that it had a 'primordial' fall owing to beginningless ignorance *avidya* (*karma-*) or *Maya*. However it must be remembered that there are some passages which speak of two birds (*dva-suparnau*) of which one is the Lord (*isa*) and the other is *anisa* that eats the fruit whilst the *jna* and *Isa* and non-eater condition by looking up or seeing the Lord. This would evidently strike one's *Samkhyan* passage which describes the *Purusa* who takes interest in Nature as *ajna*, *anisa*, *asakta* and suffers but contemplating on the *Isvara* (of Yoga) realizes *jnana*, *istva*, *saktitva* and *vairagya*.

The Godhead is always perfect whereas the individual soul has to pass through the entire *praktic-vikrtic* processes, the descent or plunge into in

1 My studies on *Samkhya Karik*

conscience and ascent towards perfect divine consciousness or potentialities of the Prakrti that can become a vehicle of delight for the soul ascending towards knowledge

(*jnana*), power (*sakti*), lordship (*aisvarya*) and renunciation of the lower for the higher self-knowledge or divine gnosis. Or else the whole process is bound to be what it had been shown to be, a vast meaningless play of delusion and self-delusion, *Maya* in one word. But if *Maya* means also *jnana* and *vayunam*, then it is knowledge of the vast Universe of God opened up to the individual soul or purse which reveals God as both without and within it. The solitary being whose religion is something which he does with his solitariness as Whitehead said, may be content to go inward and experiencing the dialectical frenzy of polar opposites in Nature – the *dvandvas*- give up the effort to perceive *jnana* in *ajnana* or truth in false head – *poyninrajnana*, as the Alvar Satakopa stated- and condemn all practical experience as undivine. But once the *adhi-daiva* view emerges then man feels that the Divine is as much outside as within, in *adhibhuta* as in *adhyatma*. It will be clear that *Maya* may be a statement of fact, the brute fact of human misery, death, disease and so on, and to get out of it is absolutely necessary. To get out of it, by renouncing it is one way ; whether one could do it before one has exhausted his pilgrimage of discovery or *anubhava* of Nature or *Maya* is another question - for that getting out is likely to be also a *Maya*.

*Maya* in Vedanta has played the role of an explanation of the facts of contradiction or opposites curtailing each other. The co-existence and even dialectical frenzy of particular proposition claiming universality is logical *Maya*, and a transcendence of these by a higher level experience of the Brahman is called for. It is not the synthesis of opposites or/ and o propositions which is the Hegelian version that is being attempted, though this is about the most beautiful *lila* or play of becoming, emergence of novelty and so on in our external world and within our organism ,and everywhere. However the popular version of *Maya* has been explained as a play for God and folly for man. This intriguing concept has come to stay to explain not so much the illusoriness of the world , its promises of pleasure and power and *jnana* and beauty turn into their opposites. It is this perplexity, this indeterminability or defeatism that prompts one towards escapism and pessimism. The whole problem is not that there are no identifications and illusions in the world of experience : they are indeed innumerable, but the contrary experiences are also available – that expectations of pain, disease danger and poverty, that expectations of also falsified in the world. This the poet has shown – not the poets of

gloom but the poets of bloom. Maya seems to present a problem of wonder, of miracle, of growth due to a higher order of being which interpenetrates and instigates the processes of the lower orders, or our order of being. But for this Maya, man would hardly think of any higher order of reality, nor for that matter would there be religion at all. No wonder the wonder of paradoxically- a paradox – is the which is above and beyond the orthodoxy and heterodoxy- is the doxy which combines opposite abstractions made by reason, making non-sense of sense of and sense out of non-sense. Rightly perhaps we can see that there is none such.

Skillful analyses of this concept have discerned in it (i) power, (ii) knowledge, skill, (iii) ability, (iv) activity, that omits other than that omits other than what one concentrates on, (vi) wonder – perplexity – paradoxically, (vii) unpredictability and so on. Conspicuous among these analysers have been the Mayavadins (including the Yoga Vasista psychologists) and the refuters of the Mayavada who had claimed that it is reality whose polyphasic character is revealed, and it is Isvara's power (mama Maya, my power as Lord Krishna said). It is a godly power that is taken to be ungodly or anti-godly. Therefore a correction was made by the critics of Mayavada (teachers of world-illusoriness) by posing that Maya is verily the divine power, shakti, inherent in the Divine Absolute Principle. Thus in the Agama Vedantaas this latter aspect is emphasized, and Sakti seems to be more fully appreciated as both Maya and Isvari. However one great thinker of this sampradaya, Yamunacarya had expressed that Maya is the yavanika or curtain that is the veil of Sakti (Śrī), which creates charm and wonder.

In the Nigama Vedanta so to speak, the negatives, human-relational and paradoxical nature of Maya seems to have gained ground, and Sankara's great stress on the illusion and veiling (*adhyasa*) as characteristic of Maya is an expression of this. For Vedanta in its Nigama aspect has always enunciated this message of deliverance from Maya, the paradoxicality, and illusion. Man can cross over misery; rebirth and karma could be overcome. Man can pass from non-existence (*maya*) to existence (*sat*), from darkness (*tamas*) to light ( *jyoti*), and from mortality (changeable-ness) to immortality (*amrtatvam*). This is by means of realizing that Maya is not to be our main concern even if it be attainment of all skills (*siddhis*), for one must pass beyond it-for there is death or

kala, time, which reveals that all these are evanescent or moving towards non-existence. God, the transcendent, the Para, must be realized. There is at the back of this Maya a supreme power of God who leads one beyond to the essence of existence or eternity. Existentialisms are indeed searching for that which makes existence existence. Such is the concept of Śrī; in the Veda mantra Śrī Sukta one could see how under the concept of Divine Mother the Divine leads one to that which transcends the *preyas* the worldly good, and bestows on those who; have renounced love for them the highest abode of Bliss. She is the Sreyas of the Kathopanishad, and is the heart of the Divine. She is the compassion equally dwelling in every heart-*Isvari sarva bhutanam hrddese tistati*-even like the Divine krsna who had declared *Isvarah sarva bhutanam tistati*. But it is a compassion that makes one see her Maya to be a powerful instrument, veiling the bad and using one to the good, rather than what it has appeared to the ignorant non-liberation seeking individual, (the asura tansic being seeking mere pleasure,) that which makes one see the bad as good and good as bad, even like the Kauravas were made to see in the construction of the Sabha by Maya-an asura. The bliss that is attained by

<sup>2</sup> I do not wish to dilate on the Sakta aspect other than of Śrī for they tend to blur the sense of transcendence which the concept of Śrī as Sreyas Karini implies. It is said to be Satvika Agama, the others reveal the other aspects of rajas and tamas

seeing the *satyuasya satyam, rtasya rtam*, through the grace of Śrī, seated in the very heart of the Divine Absolute Godhead, having all the correlative phases of that one Divine, Transcendent-immanent interpenetrating and interlinking all, is beyond description.

The Agama emphasizes the Bliss of Brahman whereas the Mayavedanta emphasizes even like the Buddhas and Samkhya the miserly and delusiveness of the processes. It is however necessary to see that both are necessary concepts, the Ananda Brahman and His created world is undoubtedly a call to experience the Divine through the Divine, a call to behold God's eyes, *divaya drsti or divya darsana, - adhi-daiva*. The call to transcend proceeds from the contemplation of the universe through human and subhuman vision which reveals only sorrow, gloom, transience, conflict, hatred and

loneliness even when one is in society. From nonexistent (past) existent (Present) arises, and proceeds towards non-existence is a factual statement of all originations and deaths- *pragabhava and pradhvamsabhava* are mediated by a present existence. This is Buddhist counter to Sat Karya - *pragabhava and uttarabhava*.

### **THE CALL TO EXPERIENCE AND**

### **THE CALL TO RENOUNCE OR TRANSEND**

The more we begin to hold these two- fold points within one view., the *adhyatmika and adhidaiva*, the more clearly can we perceive their integrality or unity. Even the *adhibhuta* would become meaningful in the context of the Divine. They would bring together the divine and the human and in the process would reveal the concrete dynamism of the divine evolution, operating through love of God for man, and love of man for God mediated by the ever present catalytic activity of Śrī.

It is to the analysis of Śrī that Abama paid more attention. The Śrī Vaisnava or Visistadvaita of Ramanuja has mentioned that Śrī has two other aspects, as Bhu, as Nila and I *akaratraya sampanna*, whereas Śrī Aurobindo has proposed the fourfold forms of Sarasvati, Kali Lakshmi and Mahesvari. But it is clear that whatever may be the status all are one in so far as they lead the individual through *siksa* (education or training or yoga) to the Ultimate Experience of the Divine as All-Bliss, in which all souls participate as heirs to the infinite fortune and all this as indwelt by the Divine.



### **ADHYATMA VEDANTA**

The most important aspect of the psychological approach seems to be the connection that man has with a body. His human demand or desire is to be living in the body for ever, its characteristic deteriorability and mortality notwithstanding. The desire for embodied existence is one aspect and that means that it is assumed by the soul that the body is the instrument of human pleasure and also is its abode (bhogopakarana and

*bhogayatana* ). This is of course the consensus of human opinion (*lokayatika*). Further the hedonistic impulse found practical defeat of the pleasure impulse. The body as it became as enfeebled was subject to pain and privation of organs one by one by one became a distressing fact. Experience dictated the withdrawal from the body ; 'grapes indeed have become sour' for the human being. It became a burden. One the ass carried the man now the brother ass has to be carried along by the man- to use St. Francis's apt description of the body. This frustration egged on some to spire for he perfection of the body, but it produced, as *hath yogis* know, the opposite effect on others, who began to discard their bodies even as instruments of freedom, for even the freedom to pleasure was not granted by them. It is a long cry to perfecting the body either by *rasayana* or alchemy or *asana* etc Experience forces the individual to return into itself- this is the culmination of the Samkhyan pilgrimage and Neosamkhyan *siddha*-doctrines. This is a case of the return of the prodigal, concerned-losing and a finding or regaining. But it required courage to declare that the relation itself is a nightmarish one, though logical minded men tried to call it delusive and impossible. Modern philosophers have spoken about parallelism etc., between tow absolutely different substances such as mind and matter.

One thing was certain. Vedanta has held that it is wrong to identify the soul with 'its body' for this is the cause of delusion that transfers sensations and emotions to the soul from the body. It is the body that suffers and has pains and all polar opposite experiences- the soul is just a witness and is neither bound nor suffers. It is always free. *Dehatmabhrama* is about the greatest single starting- point of the generalization of the *bhrama* theory. Its strength lies in this psychological analysis. The body is pregnant with misery, and the soul's rest or life in the body is a kind of hell- fire which the soul has to get out of. More logically Samkhyans argued that it is the body that falls away after full enjoyment by the Purusa or full display and/or exhaustion of its own powers of enticement and seductability. **Real pleasure outside of oneself is the great delusion, which is most difficult to overcome. That one can get it even within oneself as one is, isolated from the Transcendent is another delusion.**

Some have boldly declared that it is an adventure into externality which reveals the power and greatness of the individual and his potentialities but at the same time, remembering the widely extended misery in all its myriad forms, they had accepted that the soul having enjoyed all of extended misery in all its myriad forms, they had accepted that the soul having enjoyed all of externality had to return or yearns to return to its disembodied state. This is the Samkhyan psychology of *anubhava and mumuksuva*.

They discerned however that the gross body was but a grossening of a subtle body which along with the soul moves from body to body ; that is, when one body dies it resorts to another so as to run its, round of *anubhava*, or to use the conventional way it moves according to its activities (*karma*) to the proper or appropriate body to attain its desires. However it is seen that evil activities produce deprivations or weakening of the instruments of enjoyment or organs and *manas* itself. Thus the thirsts of causal body which has the desire and ego to pursue the pleasure- hunt have to be finally quenched. It is when the soul withdraws from *ahamkara* that it is freed from the whole process of experience of Nature. And nature is said to include according to Samkhya the *adhidaiva* , *adhyatma* and *adhibhuta* ill, ill from gods, body, and elements. It is only in a deprecatory sense that these terms are used by Samkhya. Liberation or *moksa* is possible only when all the three bodies are given up (*pretya*)—which is preliminary to emancipation. However the sense of freedom arises already in the deeper levels. Firstly the causal body is lost, then the subtle body and lastly the gross body. This almost suggests the Buddha's way of first putting an end to the arising of the cause, when the effect would wither away of its own accord. That is the reason why one is said to be *finally* liberated when the physical gross body. This almost suggests the Buddha's way of first putting an end to the arising of the cause, when the effect would wither away of its own accord. That is the reason why one is said to be finally liberated when the physical gross body falls down. This of course is a point of great dispute between the Vedantas. Jivanmukti is of the deeper mental levels but not of the outermost level. Mukti final and complete, which cuts off all rebirths, into *prakti* is only when all the bodies fall away from the self or soul, which wings its way into eternal beatitude. Jivanmukti is a kind of advance emotion of liberation though not liberation itself. This concept however has been given a very meaningful connotation by Śrī Aurobindo who holds that the liberated soul is

full of real and full freedom through divine potency even in the three bodies of matter, life and mind, and this is due to its own celestial organization of the forces of matter, life and mind in terms of super mind (*vijnana*) and which indeed transforms them into instruments of divine felicity, and facility.

However this existence of a spiritual being apart from anybody is difficult to conceive of, though some seers have always held that there is a non-prakrtic body, without any of the three gunas, which is used by the soul when anything, that the Universal Divine may ordain, has to be done. It is held that these bodies are *satya*, real, and not products of *karma*. They are divine material, *rayl 3*. The souls can remain without bodies of any kind whatsoever, *prakrta or aprakrta*, and remain 'absorbed in the love of the one central Divine Being who is the Lord of all worlds states'.

The Visistadvaitic conception of the souls being themselves the bodies of God raises certain speculations not canvassed by the ancient thinkers. The soul *qua* body of God is defined differently by Ramanuja – it is a spiritual definition not a materialistic definition, organic or inorganic. The One Divine supports, controls and enjoys for its own purposes exclusively the souls, and Nature, and as such they are the bodies of God. In this sense we can see that all the infinite number of souls are bodies of the One, and utterly exist in and through that One in all their being. The One is with each one of the many and inseparably (*aparthak siddha*). This it is that makes for that fellowship with God, one of spontaneous love and union. With regard to Nature this is not the case, for the bodies of respect to the Divine, Nature may be in inseparable relation of body but not with respect to the many of the One, the souls. This brings out into relief the psychological experience of oneness and even mergence of the many in the One in exceptional mystic conditions, but one retains one's divine bodyness of God all the same. In fact the *Mandukya*

<sup>3</sup>Rayl : Primordial Matter – In Telugu rayi = stone ?

intimates that the soul's three levels of waking, dream and sleep are splits of the one integral consciousness known as the Fourth state, when the Divine within (Godhead) is as it were withdrawn.<sup>4</sup> The integrality of the individual consciousness is maintained by

the Divine consciousness, from its sensible to the supersensible, from the unconscious, subconscious, conscious to the super conscious are possible only when the divine consciousness regulates these threefold consciousness, as *jagrat, svapna*, and *suspti or, visva, taijasa and prajan*. Psychologically, the aim of the individual soul is to integrate his entire being through a basic dedication to the Highest One or Brahman or Isvara. Further, this is achieved only by the purification of all the sense-organs and *manas*, and the motor organs by renunciation of pleasure of fruits and by inner discipline and restraints called *ahimsa, aparigraha, asteya, satya* and *brahmacarya, sauca* and surrender to God (*yama, niyama*). Others counsel the performance of the five *mahayajnas*, whilst still others initiate their members into counseled *vihita karma as dharma* and included all *yagas* and *yajnas* under this category. Provided these are done for the purpose of pleasing the Divine or attaining the Divine and not for self-enjoyment they produce not only purity but also realization of the One in all the many and consequently bestow the oneness of all the many (harmony of the community of divines souls).

<sup>4</sup> Living teaching of Vedanta—Complete works of Dr. K.C.V..Vol 2 Aspects pf bhakti – complete Works of Dr K.C..V.Vol 7

### **ABHIBHUTA VISION**

The perspective on Nature undoubtedly has been subsumed under the all - embracing concept of Divine Reality as also the almost universal principle of Organismic holism.

The natural condition of plurality that breaks up the unities or aggregates presents a special appeal to those who deem that one can proceed from part to the whole, and there is supreme freedom to arrange or rearrange the patterns of Nature in any way according to the constructive and creative genius of the Divine Creator. The pluralistic analysis is not by any means invalid. It is about the only way that finite minds can gather and weld their fragmentary pieces or units or items of experience or

knowledge into a unity or system. Dvaita Vedanta emphasizes this aspect of world's plurality and the pluralism of souls undergoes unification, continuation and division and reintegration in the world-process which is truly created again and again. This whole universe is formed and supported or upheld by God's omniscience. The enormous variety and creative emergence of all aggregates owe their existence to the Divine Godhead, known as the omnipresent supporter, Vishnu.

The whole reality is a creative manifestation of the Divine Godhead's power and the existence of the universe depends on Him alone. God is the sole independent, all the rest are dependent on Him (*paratantrya*).

If we can treat Samkhya and Yoga as the psychological truths expounded by the Vedanta, Dvaita would become the Vedantic exposition of Vaisesika-Nyaya systems. In the light of the Upanisads it can be seen that all these three systems of Veda could be viewed as aspects of the Vedanta. An integral exposition of the Vedanta would require a just synthesis of the three major aspects or perspectives or rather the Divine perspective on the other two.

It is clear that Vedanta has a living dynamism, provided we could restore it to integrality. It was Śrī Aurobindo who pointed out that Vedanta and the Veda are based on the logic of the infinite and the logic of the finite cannot do justice to it. However the Vedantas whilst paying homage to the Infinite had descended to explain all the infinite on the basis of their finite logic, relational, governed by the laws of contradiction and square of opposition, *vyapti* and so on. Veda became more important than Veda, and if philosophy means *vada* we have indeed quite a good crop of works on their three kinds of conclusion form about the same premises.

An integral Vedanta should provide for the acceptance of reality of all levels of experience providing for the subsumption of the lower levels under the vaster higher levels, providing for the ascent and evolution of the individuals at lower levels to higher levels and ultimately assure beatitude for one and all in the One.

Pluralism becomes meaningful in the One, even as oneness becomes meaningful in plurality, and this is achieved by the realization of the Organismic nature of both the plurality and Oneness, in evolution as in liberation, in individual perfection as well as social harmony. Society can become a Brinda of God and God, the *atma or sariri* of the Society. The play of these would provide a wonderful realization of Ananda, in and through super consciousness and sense of attainment of all that existence seeks and finds.