
Acharya Bhikshu : A Revolutionary Visionary

(DOCTRINE AND PHILOSOPHY)

YUVACHARYA MAHAPRAGYA

ACHARYA BHIKSHU :
A REVOLUTIONARY VISIONARY
(DOCTRINE AND PHILOSOPHY)

YUVACHARYA MAHAPRAGYA

Translated by

A. L. SHAH

Associate Professor
Department of English
University of Rajasthan
Jaipur



JAI TULSI FOUNDATION
JAIN VISHVA BHARATI CAMPUS
LADNUN 341 306 (INDIA)

Published by

JAI TULSI FOUNDATION
Jain Vishva Bharati Campus
Ladnun 341 306 (India)

© JAI TULSI FOUNDATION

First Edition
FEBRUARY, 1994

Typesetting at
Computer & Printing Services (Jaipur) Pvt. Ltd.
Jaipur, India

Printed in India by
Jaipur Printers Pvt. Ltd.
M. I. Road, Jaipur-302 001
Phone : 373822, 362468

Foreword

The sacred occasion of 'Bhikshu Chetna Varsh'. The inner urge to present Acharya Bhikshu in a wider context. It resulted in a series of activities grounded in religious austerity, meditation and observance of religious rites. Along with that it was decided to acquaint the people with the ideas and experiences of Acharya Bhikshu, which were to be presented in everyday language in the modern context, and in a simple and natural style. To implement the above decision it was thought to have four booklets written on him and to prepare an anthology of Bhikshuvani (Acharya Bhikshu's teachings). The work was allotted to the following monks and nuns :

1. **Kraantdarshi Acharya Bhikshu**
(Siddhant aur Darshan)
(*Acharya Bhikshu : A Revolutionary Visionary (Doctrine and Philosophy)*)
– YUVACHARYA MAHAPRAGYA
2. **Acharya Bhikshu ki Anushashan Shaili**
(*Acharya Bhikshu's Style of Discipline*)
– SADHVIPRAMUKHA KANAKPRABHA
3. **Aise the Bhikshu**
(*So Great was Acharya Bhikshu*)
– MUNI MOHAN LAL (AMET)

4. **Acharya Bhikshu ke Vicharon
ki Prasangikta**
(Relevance of Acharya Bhikshu's Philosophy)
– MUNI MAHENDRA KUMAR
5. **Bhikshuvani**
(Thus Spake Acharya Bhikshu)
– MAHASHRAMAN MUDIT KUMAR

The books got ready. They were read out to me, which convinced me that written in the simple language they would prove useful in understanding Acharya Bhikshu's ways of thinking. At the same time 'Jai Tulsi Foundation' decided to make Acharya Bhikshu's ideas available to speakers of different languages. The original Hindi texts are ready and it is hoped their translations into other languages would be undertaken.

The principles expounded by Acharya Bhikshu are extremely useful for a religious revolution. They can also play an important role in offering solutions to the many ongoing controversies in the field of religion. From the above point of view making these principles accessible to the people is not only necessary and topical but also a solution to the problems relating to religion. I firmly believe that by studying them readers will see a ray of light amidst the darkness of religious confusion.

Rajaldesar
October 25, 1993

– Acharya Tulsi

BACKGROUND TO THE REVOLUTION OF IDEAS

Acharya Shree has composed a song in the context of the Year of Bhikshu Awareness. I feel it essential to go into the depth of its thought. I was fascinated by one of its verses :

सत्य शोध के क्षेत्र में हो मानस आग्रह मुक्त ।
सत्य साधना क्षेत्र में हो मानस आग्रह युक्त ॥

Generally, absence of insistence (आग्रह) is desirable, but on occasions insistence is preferable. This is in accordance with the doctrine of manifold aspects (अनेकान्त). This verse contains the philosophy of life that Acharya Bhikshu lived. It is difficult to come across an individual who is as insistence-free as Acharya Bhikshu. There is no insistence anywhere in his life. He endeavoured to explore truth and whatever he experienced he expressed it. He wrote : "I experienced it and so I accepted it. But if a learned sage or preceptor does not find it appropriate he may amend it." What an excellent example of non-insistence!

In his life Acharya Bhikshu had to face the issue of a door (किवाड) and a small door (किवाडिया) of a small hollow space (ताखी) in the wall. Acharya Bhikshu said : We should not open a door. Doors usually had hinges whose insides could not be seen. Therefore there

was a possibility of small organisms being killed in it. Hence the restraint : A door should not be opened. On the other hand, ताखी (a small hollow space in the wall), which is called ताखा in Marwar and टोडिआली in the Thali region was closed with किवाडिया (a small door without hinges). Food was kept in a ताखा . When monks went for alms, the small door was opened and the food put in the ताखा was served them. Owing to the small size of the किवाडिया it was possible to inspect it and wipe it. And that is why the opening of a किवाडिया was allowed. This was laid down by Acharya Bhikshu. Several doubts were raised against this ruling both from within the order and from outside. In order to allay these doubts Acharya Bhikshu wrote "किवाडिये का चोढालिया". He firmly defended his precept and finally wrote : "I don't see any offence in opening a किवाडिया. I have allowed it because I find it harmless. And if you experience any sinfulness in opening it, ignore my precept. If you like, you can change it."¹

Here is a learned preceptor who allows alteration of his own rulings! Inconceivable, isn't it? Such an attitude cannot be attributed to a person who is insistent and who does not adore truth.

Acharya Bhikshu was free from insistence in the field of research of truth. At the same time, when it came to conducting oneself truthfully, he was

-
1. मोने तो कवाडिया से दोष न भारे, जाणे ने सुध व्यवहार ।
जो जिसके दोष कवाडिया में जाणों, तेमत बहरो लिगार रे ॥
(श्रद्धानिर्णय री चौपाई 16/51)

uncompromising. To come across a man so steadfast in truth is rare. He would not worry even if he had to sacrifice his life for the sake of truth in day-to-day life. He never vacillated even in the face of adverse circumstances. Jayacharya has described his resoluteness in these words:

मरण धर सुध मग लहयो

One who is scared of dying cannot insist on truthful conduct. Acharya Bhikshu was intimidated : "You will not get food and water; you will not get any place to live in; you will have to face hostility in its horrible manifestations." But none of these threats succeeded in daunting his soul. And mind you, it was not just a show of intimidation; it appeared in concrete forms. But none of these deprivations – no shelter, no food and water, no clothes – could act as impediments. Abuse was showered on him without rhyme or reason, just like rain without clouds. Even living in the midst of all these, Acharya Bhikshu lived a life of joy and bliss. No insistence in the theoretical discussion of truth, while all insistence in the practice of truth – became the two governing maxims of his life.

Acharya Bhikshu regulated *Terapanthi* sect by prescribing norms and specifying the forms of discipline. At the same time, he allowed freedom of thought and patronised debate and discussion. He gave every one the right to accept a principle when it was intelligible to him, otherwise he had to subject it to debate and discussion. I still remember the occasion of the Sardarshahr *Maryada Mahotsava*. At three o'clock in

the morning, in the presence of the Acharya, the community of monks would get engrossed in deep thinking and analysis. An association or organization which does not enjoy freedom of discussion and argument will not be able to live with truth.

A very dear disciple of Acharya Bhikshu, Veniramji, went to him and said : "Maharaj, our monks paint their pots with vermilion. It is not proper because it causes desire."

Acharya Bhikshu : "It is essential."

"In that case why not paint the pots in tile colour," asked Veniramji.

The Acharya said, "Your aim is to paint the pot. There is a tile which is lying close by but its colour is not pleasing. There is another tile which is lying a little away whose colour is good. Which one will you make use of ?"

"Maharaj, the one whose colour is pleasing," replied Veniramji.

"If you choose the one whose colour is pleasing, what is wrong with vermilion ?" remarked the Acharya.

The argument appealed to him and his problem was solved.

In this way freedom of thinking led to several solutions.

Discipline and reasoning appear contradictory but actually they are not so. Believing the eternal (नित्य) and the ephemeral (अनित्य) contradictory, Dharmkirti, Adi Shankaracharya, Dr. Radhakrishnan and Dr. Hiriyanna

among others refuted the doctrine of manifold aspects (अनेकान्त). In fact, there is no inconsistency between the permanent and the ephemeral. They express the real nature of matter. Acharya Bhikshu has made use of the doctrine of manifold aspects in managing the organisation. He held in high esteem both discipline and freedom of discussion.

If one of the aspects of his life is firmness in upholding truth, the other is the attitude characteristic of a person who is firm in upholding truth. Acharya Vinoba, in his Introduction to *Saman Suttam*, has written the following:

“I admit that the Geeta has greatly influenced me. Apart from the Geeta, no one has exercised a greater influence on me than Mahavir. The reason is that Mahavir’s instruction is fully acceptable to Baba and the instruction is : Be firm in upholding truth. Today it is such a person who has risen to greatness. Even Baba was presented by Gandhiji as an individual who always insisted on truth (सत्याग्रही) but Baba knew who he was. He knew that he was not one who insisted on truth but one who understood and practised truth. Every human being has a portion of truth, which is why human life is meaningful. Therefore the element of truth that we come across in religions, sects and all human beings should be grasped. We should understand and practise truth (सत्याग्रही). Next to the Geeta, Baba has been influenced by this lesson, the lesson given by

Mahavir. I have said 'next to the Geeta.' But when I consider both of them, I do not find any difference between them."

The Year of Bhikshu Awareness should become a year of understanding the inner self of Acharya Bhikshu. Let his standpoint of accepting and insisting on the truth be imbibed. Let it be an occasion to assess and appreciate the principles propounded by him in the light of the doctrine of manifold aspects (अनेकान्त). Let the doors of debate and discussion be opened. Immediately the background to the revolution of ideas will unfold itself.

A Model of Universal Religion

It was several years ago when Acharyashri was on a visit to Jaipur. He met Dr. Sampurnanand, the then Governor of Rajasthan. He said, "Acharyashri, the word *dharmanirpeksha* (secular) has misled the common people. We should, therefore, have a different translation of 'secular state'." Later on, while walking through Uttar Pradesh, Acharyashri came to Lucknow where he again met Dr. Sampurnanand, who was then the Chief Minister of Uttar Pradesh. Again they discussed the same topic but did not change the translation of the word 'secular'. Shri Rajiv Gandhi as Prime Minister came to Anuvrat Bhawan to meet Acharyashri. Acharyavar said to him, "The Constitution of India interprets 'secular state' as *dharmanirpeksha rajya* which is not correct." On the Prime Minister's desire to know the correct interpretation of 'secular state',

Acharyavar suggested the expression *sampradaya / pantha nirpeksha rajya* (non-sectarian state).

Acharya Bhikshu has very explicitly explained *sampradaya nirpeksha dharma*. According to him *dharma* is not equated with any sect, creed, mode of worship or dress style. It is spiritual in nature; it is purity of soul. *Dharma* has two aspects : practical and spiritual. Practical *dharma* is linked to sect, creed, mode of worship or dress style. But spiritual religion transcends the bounds of any country, age etc.

A general requirement of practical religion is that a religious man should engage himself in religious practice only after carefully ensuring that the ground he sits on is clean and devoid of any sentient being. Marudeva deviated from the norm. She was riding an elephant in an open seat. With the cessation of all physical consciousness she became a liberated soul. Chakravarti Bharat saw his real self and became omniscient while sitting in his glass palace, wearing regal robes. These events and life stories confirm the plausibility of these two aspects of religion.

Practical religion has an organisational aspect. In this form religion gets institutionalised. The spiritual form of religion is quite individualised. The practical manifestation of religion is never universal. It follows diverse ways. As an outcome we have multiplicity of sects, modes of worship and dress styles. Some thinkers have conceived of a single religion and a single government for the world. But there cannot be a single

practical religion. It will always have diverse faiths and diverse arguments which cannot be integrated. They cannot be linked in the same chain.

The non-sectarian universal religion propounded by Acharya Bhikshu is spiritual or inner religion. He said that a person's pure or unblemished actions performed in any place or time constitute religion. Pure or unblemished actions are characterised by good soul-tint, good affective state of the mind. This is also the meaning of *dharma*. An earthbody is not a follower of any sect. It is not a Jain or a Buddhist or a Vaishnav or a Christian. Even then it has the element of religion in it. This precept of Mahavir is at the bottom of the concept of universal religion. A good affective state of the mind becomes religion irrespective of the class or location of a sentient being. An earthbody, on account of his good affective state of the mind, secures for himself the tenure of the higher level being, i.e., a human being. A good affective state of the mind is the religion of an earthbody. What religion is it ? It is universal religion.

Actually, religion cannot have two aspects. If religion is truth, it cannot have two forms because truth is indivisible. Truth is the same for every one; similarly, religion will also be the same for every one and that religion will be the good affective state of the mind.

There is one truth but there have come into being several scriptures. Kumaril raised a question : What text can be held to be authentic when there is a multiplicity of phraseology ? How can inter-scriptural

differences be explained when the propounder is omniscient. Conversely, if there are differences among scriptures, how can the propounder be omniscient ? Again, Kumaril asks : If religion is truth, how can there be differences, and if there are differences, how can religion be truth ? In order to solve this riddle, we will have to subscribe to the concept of "One Truth" and "One Religion". As different propounders wrote different scriptures, they came out with different concepts of religion. Acharya Bhikshu's universal religion is the same for all. Every being is capable of good pursuit. One of the properties of *Kshayopasham* (attainment of purity through the destruction cum suppression of certain, *karmas*) is that it is present in every being of the world. *Kshyopasham* is related to *nirjara* (dissociation of *karmas*). Every being is capable of *nirjara*. Where there is *nirjara*, there must be religion.

In Acharya Bhikshu's time there was prevalent a principle in Jain tradition which said : A person with wrong insight cannot devote himself to the attainment of salvation, nor can he devote himself to religion. Acharya Bhikshu did not give recognition to this principle. He said : A person may have true spiritual insight or false spiritual insight; he may be entitled to the first stage of purification (प्रथम गुणस्थान) or the fourth or the fifth stage of purification, but every one is equally entitled to good affective mental state and good soul-tint. He further said that we cannot restrict good affective mental state and good soul-tint only to those who have true spiritual insight, thereby excluding people

with false insight from possessing them. He established this principle by citing several events and examples. He wrote :

Emperor Shrenik's son, Megha Kumar was an elephant in his previous birth. How was he born a human being ? The answer is that he limited the period of the cycle of birth and death. But how did he do this ? Without *nirjara* (dissociation of karmas) the period of the cycle of birth and death cannot be limited.

Religion has two aspects: *sanvar dharma* (in which there is cessation of new *karmic* bondage) and *nirjara* (dissociation of old *karmic* bondage). The practice of *sanvar dharma* is possible at a higher stage, while any one can practise *nirjara*. There was an ascetic who did not have true spiritual insight. He practised austerities and through that he attained *Vibhangaagyan*. *Vibhangaagyan* is extra-sensory perception which cannot be attained without good end, good soul-tint and good intention. Good end, good affective mental state and good soul-tint constitute religion. It is pure or unblemished conduct. It results in *nirjara* or purification of the soul.

In the modern age fanaticism has become rampant and is giving rise to agitation and conflict. The so-called religious people spread unimaginable frenzy in the name of religion. They would say that there is no religion independent of sect. Acharya Bhikshu did not devalue sect. He recognised its value in proportion to its usefulness, but he did not put any worth on sect shorn

of religion and never let sect get the better of religion. The nucleus of his thought was *agam* - Mahavir's discourses. Mahavir found fault with the attitude of those who said : Come to my sect and you will be liberated, otherwise not. The recognition of religion beyond sect is no ordinary, intellectual feat.

Acharya Bhikshu in his exposition of universal religion quoted Mahavir :

1. A man has scriptural knowledge, but is devoid of right conduct.
2. A man has right conduct, but is devoid of scriptural knowledge.
3. A man has both scriptural knowledge and right conduct.
4. A man has neither scriptural knowledge nor right conduct.

One who does not have scriptural knowledge, i.e., one who has false insight but who has right conduct is partly devoted to the pursuit of salvation. This is the manifesto of spiritual religion. A person who is not a follower of Jainism or who does not have true spiritual insight, and yet leads a life of right conduct and propriety, is partly devoted to the pursuit of salvation. This acceptance is the acceptance of the liberal spirit of religion.

In support of the claim that a person having false attitudes is capable of right conduct Acharya Bhikshu cited the example of Ashruta Kevali who had never heard or learnt anything about religion but who by his

inner cleanliness and purity succeeded in the sublimation of consciousness and in becoming omniscient (केवली), thus attaining the highest stage in spiritual development.

Marudeva had gone to Rishabh to meet him as her son, not to listen to his preaching and she got liberated. She was riding an elephant in an open seat. "Marudeva has become liberated" - this revelation of Rishabh stunned every one. The universal aspect of religion is not contingent on external factors. Sect, mode of worship etc. are tradition-bound. The non-sectarian aspect of religion has not been properly understood. Therefore there is so much intolerance in religious matters. If we had known and understood the universal aspect of religion, we would not have witnessed so much sectarian frenzy.

Acharya Bhikshu gave due recognition to sect and tradition. He never disregarded sect. He was fully familiar with the utility of sect, but he never considered it proper to put religion within the bounds of sect. We should place these two aspects of religion in perspective. Sect should become a means to understand and practise true religion, but it should not imprison religion within its folds. It is true that a layman does not feel attached to his faith without such external associations as 'our sect', 'our code of conduct', 'our dress style' and 'our identity.' But what actually happened was that man got so much imprisoned in a particular sect, code of conduct and dress style that he was unable to see religion beyond the bounds of these associations. This one-sided attitude to religion was what Acharya Bhikshu argued against.

He propounded the universal aspect of religion. Its defining feature is : If a person with a false attitude performs spiritual practices, it is in accordance with the sayings of *Arhat* and is a means to the path of salvation.

Ends and Means

The topic of ends and means has been much discussed in this century. In politics there came into being two opposite camps : Marxism and Gandhism.

Marx said : “Ends justify means. If you can use good means, well and good, but you are not to worry about bad means to achieve your ends – so much so that even violence can be used.”

Mahatma Gandhi insisted on good means. He said : “Independence of India is my goal, but on condition that I get it through non-violence. Otherwise I wouldn’t mind living under foreign rule”. Commenting on Marx’s principle he said :

You maintain that there is no relationship between ends and means. You are greatly mistaken. Under this misconception people who call themselves religious have been guilty of sinful actions. This amounts to sowing seeds of *dhatura* – the thorn apple (a poisonous plant) – and expecting to reap a plant bearing fragrant flowers. I can cross the sea by ship. But if I think of sailing in a bullock-cart, the cart as well as I will be drowned. ‘Your devotion should be according to the god you worship’. This saying is worth reflecting upon. People have misinterpreted it and so they have been led astray. A means is a

seed and an end is a tree. Therefore the seed and the tree are related in the same way as the means and the end. By worshipping the devil I cannot gain the reward of devotion to God. ²

The debate about 'ends and means' is an old one. Acharya Bhikshu had pondered upon it a great deal. During his time different conceptions of religion were prevalent : Man is sovereign. He should be protected at any cost. It is not sinful even if we have to kill other animals in our attempt to save man.

When such is the thinking of the people, there cannot be any scope for us to consider the issue of good means. It is surprising that even among the Jain sects known for minute analysis of nonviolence the view that it is not sinful to do violence to save man got deep-rooted. Acharya Bhikshu reflected on it. He felt that this conception was not right. Violence is after all violence, be it for saving human life or for any other purpose.

Acharya Bhikshu propounded the principle of good means to counteract this conception. He said :

If the end is good, the means too should be good.

There is no separation between ends and means. Both are one and the same things.

That which is a means during the course of practice becomes indistinguishable from the end at the stage of achievement. Ends and means cannot be separated.

Means will always be consonant with ends. That which runs counter to the end cannot become means.

2. Hind Swarajya, Gandhiji, Navjeevan, Ahmedabad, pp 55-56, 1973.

For making a pot, soil is the material and the potter's wheel is the means. A spindle can be a means for spinning cotton wool, but it cannot be a means to make an earthenpot. If the means is not appropriate to the end, we will never be able to attain the end. The principle of ends and means in nonviolent behaviour can be compared to the principle of cause and effect in logic. How can the use of force or temptation be possible in the conduct of a religious activity ? The contribution of force and temptation has been immense in distorting religion. The means to the religion of nonviolence is change of heart. And where there is a question of change of heart, the use of force and temptation is undesirable. Force is in consonance with state authority, and wealth agrees with economic power. But neither has any place in spiritual power.

In his concluding remarks Acharya Bhikshu said :
"Where there is force, there is no religion; where there is temptation, there is no religion. The means to religion is change of heart. You cannot reap mangoes by watering the poisonous thorn apple plant."

Great religious heads and religious authorities have laid down the principle that Christian princes and missionaries should not take resort to force or violence in their attempt to convert people to christianity.

Acharya Bhikshu argues : "If use of force leads to religious conduct, Chakravarti Bharat, who was very powerful, would have got an announcement made in his empire that no one would kill any other person. But he did not do it. If you can make a person religious by using

force, why did Kal Sokarik not become nonviolent ? Shrenik, the king of Magadh, got him dumped into a dry well and he went on making buffaloes of soil and dirt and killing them.”

Someone asked Acharya Bhikshu : “There is a child killing ants with a stone. He cannot distinguish between violence and nonviolence. A person comes and tells him not to kill ants, but it has no effect on the child. Then he snatches the stone from the child’s hand. What did it achieve ?”

Acharya Bhikshu said : “Nothing. At first the stone was in the child’s hand and then it came to be in the possession of the man. It would have been a religious activity only if the child’s heart had undergone transformation and as a result of it he had given up violence.”

At one time it became a practice with some Jains to go to a butcher, pay him five to ten rupees and get the goats released. They would feel that they had done a great deed in the cause of nonviolence. When this practice reached its extreme it became the cause of the transformation of the principle of nonviolence. Acharya Bhikshu explained it and said : “Temptation is not a means to nonviolence. Are you releasing the goats by giving money or are you encouraging the butcher to kill more goats, he asked ?”

The use of force and temptation corrupted the pure form of nonviolence and made it appear hideous. Nonviolent behaviour is arduous. You cannot acquire it without practising sacrifice, austerities, compassion and

sense-control. Therefore easy paths were invented. One person would say to another : You undergo fast and when you complete I will be there to help you break your fast with delicious dishes. These paths never appealed to Acharya Bhikshu. What happened was people lost their hold on religion because of temptation.

The main premise of Acharya Bhikshu's religious revolution was purification of means. If he had not explained the principle of the purification of means, we would not have had an occasion to understand the meaning of right religion. It cannot force a man to be nonviolent, because the use of force is not the right means to nonviolence. We cannot tempt a man towards nonviolence by offering him riches because temptation is not the right means to nonviolence.

To express his rejection of force Upadhyay Vinay Vijayji wrote : "The *Tirthankaras* had infinite power. Did they force anyone to be religious ? They just gave right discourses on religion. Those who followed them turned religious.

"If Tirthankar Mahavira had used force, his son-in-law, Jamali, would not have gone astray; he would not have propagated false beliefs. The use of force may be acceptable in politics. But even there the best government is that where there is least use of force."

Some religious teachers came to believe that there is no sin in killing beings having only one sense to nurture man^s in fact they considered it as having the sanction of religion. Acharya Bhikshu refuted this belief. Hospitality

is a social obligation. To relate it to religion is to lower the status of religion. What is religious in killing one being in order to bring up another ? One life is the life of another life is a natural canon; it cannot be made a religious canon. Religion says : Don't kill any being. If we start identifying conventional religion or social duty with religion, religion of the self or religion for salvation, then we are changing the definition of religion altogether. Religion lies in the sanctity of soul, moderating passions and abating violence.

Some scholars have taken violence to be religion if used in order to defend religion. Acharya Bhikshu refuted it. He said religion is nonviolence. It cannot be defended by violence. In this context Mahatma Gandhi's view is worth mentioning : "Defending a creed through violence, is not defending religion. Religion is an individual's achievement. It is for him to keep it and for him to lose it. Defending the community is not so much a matter of religion as of sect."³

Religion and Duty

Acharya Bhikshu reflected upon religion (धर्म), nonviolence (अहिंसा), kindness (दया) and charity (दान) from the point of view of salvation (मोक्ष). Therefore it is not possible to make a correct appraisal of his concept of *dharma* without understanding the concept of *moksha*. Western philosophers have not given much thought to these concepts. Some philosophers have no doubt done

3. Navjivan Pustak 15, p. 1382.

some thinking on God and souls, but *moksha* has not been a subject of serious thinking in the west.

The path of salvation : Different views

The main objective of Indian philosophy has been salvation. Salvation means liberation from all bondage, all bodies, gross or subtle. There are several elements (तत्त्व) in the list of ways and means to achieve salvation, one of them being *dharma*. According to Sankhya philosophy, *dharma* is a means to achieve heaven, not to achieve salvation. The means to achieve salvation is knowledge. Actions (कर्म) cannot get us salvation because actions, good or bad, cause *karmic* bondage. Good actions lead to heaven and bad actions lead to hell, and both heaven and hell are sources of pain.⁴

According to the Nyaya School it is the knowledge of metaphysics (तत्त्वज्ञान) which leads to salvation.

The Vaisheshik school has assigned a role to *dharma* in the contemplation of salvation. Kanad holds that what makes spiritual well-being and salvation possible is *dharma*.⁵

In Buddhist philosophy the Arya eightfold path (आर्य अष्टांगिक मार्ग), has been called the path to achieve release from bondage (निर्वाण).⁶

4. Sankhyakarika 44.

धर्मेण गमनमर्ध्वं गमनमधस्ताद् भवत्यधर्मेण ।

ज्ञानेन चापवर्गो विषययादिव्यते बंधः ॥

5. यतोभ्यदयनिः श्रेयससिद्धिः स धर्मः वैशेषिक दर्शन 1/112

6. धम्म पद 20/2-3

Jain philosophy has recommended three or four paths to salvation: (1) true spiritual insight (सम्यक दर्शन), (2) correct knowledge (सम्यक ज्ञान), and (3) right conduct (सम्यक चरित्र);⁷ or, (1) knowledge (ज्ञान), (2) spiritual insight (दर्शन), (3) right conduct (चरित्र), and (4) austerity (तप).⁸

Way to worldliness (संसार का मार्ग) : Way to salvation

Acharya Bhikshu explained nonviolence, kindness etc. on the basis of the concept of the path of salvation. That is why in his works we come across again and again sentences like : This is the path of salvation; this is the way to worldliness. If we look at the path of salvation through the ways of the world, we will have a distorted view of the former. Our vision should, therefore, not be coloured. We should try to understand a phenomenon as it is. Kanad has defined *dharma* in a very comprehensive sense. Jain *acharyas* have regarded agriculture and business as means to prosperity (अभ्युदय).⁹ Acharya Bhikshu said that prosperity is achieved by the ways of the world. There cannot be a path to salvation without knowledge, true spiritual insight and right conduct.

7. तत्त्वार्थ भाष्य 1/1

8. उत्तराध्ययन 28/1-2

9. आदि पुराण पर्व 16/79-180

The motive of prosperity

Acharya Bhikshu's view is also endorsed by the exposition of Jamboodwip Pragyapti (a Jain canon). In the commentary (वृत्ति) on the maxim "(पयाहियाए उवदिसइ)"¹⁰, Shantycharya has regarded occupations like agriculture as means to livelihood and prosperity and, therefore, salutary to wisdom (प्रज्ञा).¹¹ Earning a living leads to prosperity.

If employment is easy to get, crimes like theft will not proliferate in society. Lord Rishabh, in order to keep society free from crimes, promoted skills and crafts for livelihood.¹² Manusmritikar has also made a distinction between actions leading to prosperity and those leading to spiritual attainment.

Acharya Bhikshu wanted to decide on the definition of religion. Although several definitions of religion had been extant in the past, he felt the need for a new one. Words like service (सेवा), cooperation (सहयोग), sympathy (सहानुभूति), charity (दान) and beneficence (परोपकार) were creating a misunderstanding about the concept of religion.

10. जंबूद्वीप प्रज्ञप्ति वृत्ति पक्षस्कार/3

11. कर्माणि च कृषिवाणिज्यादीनि जघत्य मध्यमोत्कृष्ट भेद-भित्तिनि प्रजाया हितकराणि निर्वाहाभ्युदमहेतु त्वात् ।

12. जंबू टी. 2 वक्षस्कार - कमाथुपायेन प्राप्रसुखवृत्तिकराय चोर्यादिव्य-सनासलिरपिनस्यात् ।

Take the use of the word 'service'. Irrespective of the form of service, being of service was considered religious. Acharya Bhikshu analysed this belief. He said 'service' can be understood at two levels : the social and the spiritual. To be of service at the social level is a social duty or social religion (समाज धर्म), while service which helps purify the soul is *atmadharma* or *moksha-dharma* (spiritual religion). It manifests through right knowledge, true spiritual insight and right conduct.

A man is working. Another man joins him. This is called cooperation. Cooperation is collective labour. Suppose a man is trying to lift a heavy log of wood. Another man comes and helps him lift it. This is cooperation, an activity which involves collaboration

Sympathy - syn + pathos - is sharing another person's emotional state. You happen to see a miserable man and become miserable, or you happen to see a happy man and become happy. This is sympathy. In social psychology two kinds of sympathy have been recognised. One is active sympathy. An example of active sympathy is : you happen to come across a starving man, you feel pained and so you feed him. The other is passive sympathy. You happen to meet a starving man and you say to him, "I am sorry you are starving." What you have done is you have just expressed your sympathy in words. Pity, mercy and compassion are some of the realisations of sympathy.

Charity is donating food, clothes etc. to the poor.

Beneficence means doing good to others.

These five words have mixed up society and religion, and social duty and spiritual religion so much so that it is beyond the competence of a layman to determine what religion is. There are certain duties which are associated with a man as a social being. So in the context of society this is a matter of duty. It becomes a matter of religion when such a social individual works for self-realisation or salvation.

Acharya Bhikshu analysed these five words and made a distinction between social duty and आत्म धर्म or spiritual duty. Do not make the statement "Service is religion" as if it is complete in itself; let it be interpreted in relative terms. Service which nourishes the body is a social duty, while that which nourishes the soul is spiritual religion. Service is duty; it is also religion. Religion is duty but all duties are not religion. Acharya Bhikshu states : ए संसार तणो किरतब जाणो. Worldly duty means social duty. Why has there been an erosion of the sense of duty towards society in the Indian psyche for the past ten to fifteen centuries ? This can be a good subject for research. A social human being should be alive to his duty towards his society. But why is it that we are gradually losing this sense of duty ? It is because we started measuring social duty in terms of religion, or rather every social duty came to be considered religious. Hasn't this belief blunted social awareness ? Some people have faith in religion, while others do not have it. Now how can a person who does not believe in religion observe social obligations which are looked upon as religious obligations as every social obligation is a religious

obligation. In this way religion has been so much associated with utility that it has lost its identity. Some ancient preceptors gave a deep thought to it and drew distinguishing lines between religion and duty. But it was Acharya Bhikshu who made those prominent.

Lord Rishabh initiated six occupations in order to earn a living. They are : defence, business, agriculture, education, commerce and craft. According to his best judgment he made arrangements for people to make a living. At that time Lord Rishabh was a king and so he initiated the said occupations.¹³

Acharya Hem Chandra was faced with the puzzle : Occupations like agriculture and commerce are sinful and lead to Karmic bondage. Why, then, did the Lord initiate them ? The Acharya's answer was : "Yes, the Lord knew that occupations like agriculture are sinful. Even then he initiated them because he considered it His duty to look after the welfare of the people and to be compassionate towards them."¹⁴

The views of some modern Jain scholars on religion and duty are worth contemplating :

13. आदि पुराण पर्व 16/179-86

अतिर्मपि, कृषिर्विद्या, वाणिज्यंशिल्प मेव च ।
कर्माणी मानी षोढास्यु, प्रजा जीवन हेत वे ॥
लत्त वृत्तिर्पजानां स, भगवान मति कौशलात् ।
उपादिशत प्रागो हि स तदासीज्जमदगुरुः ॥

14. त्रिष्टि शलाका पुरुष चरित्रम 2/971

एतच्चसर्व सावधमपि लोकानुकंपया ।
स्वामी, प्रवर्तयामास, जनन् कर्तव्य मात्मनः ॥

The word *dharma* (religion) is mainly used in two senses: one aimed at refinement and elevation of the individual, called *Atma-Dharma*, and the other as social duty. Manusmritikar has employed *dharma* in these two senses.¹⁵

In the eighth and ninth centuries this situation became so unbearable that the Buddhists had to leave this country, and the Jains were allowed to stay only when they almost surrendered to the Brahmins at the social level.¹⁶

The *Varna* system was propounded by King Rishabhdev and not by Lord Adinath. It is common knowledge that King Rishabhdev created the *varnas* of *Kshatriya*, *Vaishya* and *Shudra* on practical grounds and on the basis of profession. This was the social order of those days, not the religious order.

When King Rishabhdev attained omniscience (केवलज्ञान,) and became Lord Adinath, he did not say anything about the *varnas*. Then he only talked of the redemption of living beings. Bharat, the King of kings, also created the *varna* of *Brahmans* in order to honour those from among the *Kshatriyas*, *Vaishyas* and *Shudras* who accepted nonviolence and *anuvrata*. This step taken by Bharat was an improvement upon the administrative system and even in the system everybody was free to accept the vows and become a *brahman*. In these

15. जैन धर्म और वर्ण व्यवस्था, पृ. 11, 13

16. जैन मंदिर और हरिजन, पृ. 2-14

circumstances it cannot be considered appropriate to interpret religious privileges through the social system propounded by the kings.

In Vedic *Smritis* social structure was also ordained. The conventionally determined sections of society like *Brahmanas*, *Kshatriyas* were recognized on the basis of birth, and their rights and duties were fixed by the *Smritis*. Moreover, by giving *Brahmanas* and *Kshatriyas* boundless protection they strengthened the foundations of the state in the name of religion. It was, therefore, essential for the *smritis* to be amended from time to time as the need arose. And this did happen. On the other hand, in Jainism there is nothing like fixed religious rights and duties of a person on the basis of his *varna*. Everyone has been asked to keep himself away from the five unwholesome *karmas* and to abide by the five great vows irrespective of the *varna* he belongs to.¹⁷

The concept of charity encouraged begging. In reality no householder is entitled to charity. Ravishankar Maharaj, a great Gujarati saint, went to Bihar. At that time Bihar was in the grip of a terrible famine. Several people said : "Give us bread." Maharaj Ravishankar said : "You will get bread but not for nothing. Work and get bread in return." This is a healthy social obligation. Jaiprakash Narain has made a revealing distinction between the conceptions of a charitable person and a beggar. Ramrajya belongs to both, the king and the

17. जैन मंदिर और हरिजन, पृ. 4

beggar. If there are no beggars, he says, how will charitable people having lofty thoughts be able to demonstrate their generosity and nobility and set up a record of Hindu ideals in human nature ?¹⁸

Kaka Kalelkar has also succeeded in distinguishing between charity and parting with possession. His thinking comes very close to Acharya Bhikshu's thinking. True religion lies not in charity but in parting with possessions. Making money by indulging in anti-social activities and then spending a small portion of it to help miserable people and thereby calling oneself pious is nothing but deceiving oneself as well as society. True religion lies in controlling the senses for the purpose of social service, living a life of simplicity based on hardwork and feeling one not only with the whole society but the whole universe. This is real bliss.¹⁹

Explaining the principles of the Quran Maulana Masudi has made a statement which deserves serious thought. He says : "People and the government both should contribute in the Bhoodan movement. But if people who give away their land in this cause cherish the feeling that they are doing charity, the movement will not yield desirable results. The word *daan* (charity) should be interpreted in its original traditional sense. People should be clearly told that they are not giving charity but are giving the poor what is theirs."²⁰

18. जीवन साहित्य, अक्टूबर 18

19. गांधीवाद-समाजवाद, पृ. 185

20. दैनिक हिन्दुस्तान, 28 मार्च, 1953, पृ. 3

Acharya Bhikshu said two hundred years ago : "To give alms to a beggar is not religion." At that time it created a stir. In the present age there is a strong feeling among thinking people that begging is a social crime. The very fact that there are beggars shows that there is something wrong with the system. A society in which some are beggars and some others are charitable persons cannot be considered a welfare society. And to encourage begging is worse. Engage a beggar in a job, and give him food to eat. This attitude can be included in the list of social duties.

It is impossible to understand the propriety of charity. In fact the practice of charity in India has encouraged the tendency among people to live as parasites.

Acharya Bhikshu has differentiated between the concepts of charity and parting with possessions. That person alone is entitled to charity who has self-restraint, who does not cook for himself, who owns nothing, who has totally given away all his wealth, who is immersed in self-realisation and who is unattached. To give charity to him is tantamount to parting with possessions (त्याग) and sharing food with a guest is enacting a *vrata* (vow). While expounding the concept of charity his argument was : Why is it that feeding a beggar by treating him as your brother is not thought religious, while feeding a beggar as a beggar is thought religious ? Acharya Bhikshu demolished this misleading conception. Look at the paradox, he said, that first we turn a social being into a beggar, then give him something in charity and

feel that we have earned religious merit. It is not only doubly wrong but three times wrong. It implies that the fabulously rich need not practise any austerities at all. All that they have to do is to accumulate wealth, give some of it in charity and be called pious. They just have to earn money by hook or by crook, feed some poor people, add a pious act to their account and go to heaven. Acharya Bhikshu vehemently attacked this misapprehension. People felt ill at ease. When we do not go deep into religion, what happens is that a great ideal of dogmatic thinking prevails, which gives rise to misapprehensions.

In olden times the word 'religion' was also used in the sense of procedure and system. On this basis even duty was called religion. Lord Mahavir has propounded ten types of religion :

1. **gramdharma** – code of conduct for village management
2. **nagardharma** – code of conduct for a municipality
3. **rashtradharma** – national code of conduct
4. **kuladharmā** – family code of conduct
5. **ganadharmā** – code of conduct for a group of monks and nuns
6. **sanghadharma** – code of conduct for a religious order
7. **papashanadharmā** – common code agreed upon by all sects
- 8-9. **charitradharma** – meant for the aspirants for salvation to purify their souls

10. **astikayadharmā** – The nature of *panchastikaya*
(acceptance of five out of six
elements)

In this classification *gramdharmā*, *nagardharmā*, etc., are different from *atmadharmā*. India's tragedy has been that here social religion and national religion could not develop. If they had developed, society would have been conducted on the basis of social religion and the nation would have been governed on the basis of national religion. Spiritual religion is used for self-realisation. It is because of this confusion that neither society and the nation were properly managed nor *atmadharmā* could grow commendably. Acharya Bhikshu illustrated the validity of this situation through an anecdote:

One morning a man came to a shop carrying a *paisa* and asked the shopkeeper if the latter could give him jaggery for one *paisa*. The shopkeeper saluted the *paisa* and took it. He felt happy that the trading had started in the morning with a copper coin. The next day the same person came with a rupee coin and asked for change. The shopkeeper saluted the rupee coin and gave the person the change. He was happy that the first thing he saw that day was a rupee coin.

The third day the person came with a false coin and asked the shopkeeper for change. The shopkeeper was happy to see the same customer again that day. He took the coin in his hand and found that it was a false coin, a copper coin plated with silver. He said to himself : "The first thing in the morning I have seen is a false coin."

Then the customer said : "Shahji, why have you got angry ? The day before yesterday I came with a copper coin and you saluted it. Yesterday I came with a silver coin and you saluted it. Now this coin is made of copper and silver both, so you should salute it twice."

The shopkeeper replied : "You fool! The day before it was only copper, which was all right; yesterday it was only silver, which too was all right. Neither of them was false. But this one is false, a mixture of copper and silver. It is of no use."

Social duty has its own worth and so has spiritual religion. If each performs its role in its own sphere, their values will be revealed. But if they get mixed and indistinguishable, they will lose their value.

Mahatma Gandhi said, "For me there is no politics independent of religion. My religion is universal and tolerant; it is not a religion of superstitions and ostentation. Also it is not a religion that hates and fights. We should relinquish politics which is devoid of ethical principles."²¹

"For me politics without religion is crap and is always unacceptable. Politics is related to nations, and anything that is related to the welfare of nations is a subject in which people who are of religious bent of mind should take interest."²²

21. Young India, 27 November, 1927, P. 391

22. Young India, 18 June, 1925, P. 214

According to Acharya Bhikshu social duty and religion should not be mixed. Mahatma Gandhi considered politics without religion crap. Do these two views not move into different directions ? Many thinkers maintain that the social system and the state system should be conducted through religion so that they maintained their sanctity. We do not disagree with the element of truth of this line of thought but this is not the whole truth. The mixing of religion and social or state duty is not in reality a solution to the problem. The solution is this : Society should be conducted through social religion and the nation through national religion. It is not necessary that they are managed or administered through religion, but they should be influenced by it. Mahatma Gandhi has also accepted this point regarding the influence of religion : "I don't believe that spiritual principles have an independent domain. On the contrary, they manifest themselves through everyday activities of life. Thus they influence the economic, social and political fields."²³

The following can be a list of national duties :

1. to remove poverty
2. to provide employment
3. to provide education
4. to provide medical facilities
5. to provide economic development
6. to provide basic amenities - a house, clothes and food
7. to maintain law and order

23. Young India, 3 December, 1925, P. 304

These duties can be performed through the rules and regulations of the state religion and not through the principles of religion. In the absence of the full development of state religion, digging wells, setting up hospitals, *dharmashalas* etc., became religious activities and only the rich arrogated to themselves the right to conduct them. Performing a duty was linked to the prospect of getting to heaven and given the status of religion. Consequently, the fulfilment of needs depended upon the mercy of the rich. The consciousness of national duty could not be associated with it. It is of course expected that moral awareness be linked to every social and national duty, but these duties are not to be performed in the name of religion or in the hope of being religious so that the discreteness of the social and state objectives on the one hand and religious objectives on the other is not affected.

Social religion will be the same for every member of society. In the same way state religion will be the same for every citizen. But the religion that involves worship or devotion will not be the same for every one. When there are so many different sects and concepts, by which religion will society and the nation be governed ? This poses a conundrum. History can bear witness to the fact that states governed by their own religion have treated inhumanly those who belonged to different religions or sects. Religious fanaticism coupled with the madness of power can prove more terrible than atomic weapons. Therefore society and the country should be governed by morality and a code of conduct. But even this

arrangement is not absolutely innocuous. Morality and a code of conduct are optional. They cannot be made obligatory like laws. If they are made binding, they will become laws and will cease to be manifestations of religion. Therefore, the best choice is that management of society and the nation is influenced by morality and a code of conduct, with a check on the infiltration of perversities and whims into them so that they may not become instruments of oppression and exploitation in the hands of people.

Acharya Bhikshu's Insight into Linguistic Analysis

One of the aspects of truth is existence. Every substance exists in its own form. Existence is truth because existence does not come to an end. It belongs to all ages - present, past and future. The other aspect of truth is practical knowledge, that is to say, to know a substance as it is, to understand its reality. The first is objective truth. The second is subjective truth. Every philosopher has tried to reach out to truth.

Acharya Bhikshu was a bright star in the firmament of philosophy. He was not a student of philosophy. He was a seer and therefore philosophy blossomed through his thinking and speech. He expounded both language and metaphysics in depth. Language philosophy claims priority over metaphysics in importance. Even science recognises that determination of language should precede any exposition. Does our language represent what we want to say? In this connection Jain philosophers proposed निक्षेप, the philosophy of the use of language.

Acharya Umaswati writes : The range of a substance is determined by निक्षेप (elimination).²⁴ According to Jinbhadragani, a person who does not interpret meaning through निक्षेप (elimination), नय (standpoint) and प्रमाण (verification), the three procedures recommended by the philosophy of the use of language, will find illogical substances logical and vice versa.²⁵ Acharya Bhikshu used the निक्षेप procedure and propounded a theory. He made an insightful contribution in explicating nonviolence (अहिंसा,) compassion (अनुकम्पा,) and charity (दान,). The *agams* mention these concepts and so do the commentators who came after Mahavir. But hardly has any acharya given as learned an interpretation of these concepts based on Agams as Acharya Bhikshu.

The principles and philosophy of *Terapanth* are not at variance with Jain philosophy. The biggest evidence that Acharya Bhikshu had in his support was the *agam - Jinwani*. On the basis of the *agam* he gave a theoretical explanation of nonviolence and compassion. On account of his natural inborn talent, he suggested such new elements as are not found even in ancient canonical literature.

Nonviolence is a negative term. It has two aspects: absolute and relative. A *sutra* about absolute nonviolence occurs in a verse by Acharya Haribhadra. According to

24. तत्त्वार्थ भाष्य 1/5 नामस्थापनाद्रष्य भावतस्सन्वासः ।

25. विशेषावश्यक भाष्य 2293

अस्थं जो न समिक्खई, निक्खेव नयप्पमाणओ विहिणा ।
तस्सा जुत्तं जुत्तं जुत्तं जुत्तंमजुत्तं व पडिहाई ॥

the nonconventional standpoint(निश्चय नय,) the soul itself is nonviolence or violence. One who is spiritually aware(अप्रमत्त) is nonviolent, while one who is spiritually unaware (प्रमत्त) is violent.²⁶

An untinted soul devoid of the passions of attachment and hatred is nonviolence. This is the positive form of nonviolence. The other aspect of nonviolence is found in the *Acharanga Sutra* : सव्वे पाणा न हंतव्वा. That is the negative form of nonviolence. Mahatma Gandhi writes : For the continuance of human life killing of some life is inevitable. Which is why the highest religion has been defined by a negative term - nonviolence. This word is trapped in the chain of killing. In other words, violence is in a natural sense unavoidable for keeping alive. Therefore a devotee of nonviolence always prays that he be released from the bondage of this body.²⁷

In the *manusmriti* the metaphor of slaughter-house has been used for the means to satisfy the needs of daily life and five *yagyas* have been prescribed for its purification.

T. L. Vaswani has also posited these two aspects of nonviolence. "Treat all beings as you treat yourself and do not harm anyone." In these words is inherent the two-meaning principle of nonviolence - positive and

-
26. हरिभद्र कृत अष्टक 7 श्लोक 6 की वृत्ति
आया चेव अहिंसा, आया हिंसति निच्छओ एस ।
जो होई अप्पभन्तो, अहिंसओ, हिंसओ इअरो ॥

27. C. F. Andrews : Mahatma Gandhi Ke Vichar 4/138

negative. In the former the focus is only unity : See yourself in all others. The negative meaning lies in : Do not harm any one. Seeing oneself in all others amounts to refraining from harming others. This sense of non-hurting others originates from the vision of the one in many.²⁸

Nonviolence and Compassion

Acharya Bhikshu established that nonviolence and compassion are one. His famous dictum is : A sentient being's living is not compassion nor is its dying violence²⁹ killing is violence and not- killing is compassion.²⁹

Not-killing is at the same time nonviolence, compassion and granting of freedom from fear (अभयदान). Acharya Hemchandra's exposition of अभयदान resembles that of Acharya Bhikshu :

भवत्यभयदानं तु, जीवानां वधवर्जनम् ।
मनोषाक्कायैः करणकारणानुमत्तैरपि ॥³⁰

छह काय मारण रा त्याग रे, कोई पचखै आण वैराग ए ।
ए अभयदान कह्यो जिनराय रे, धर्मदान में मिलियो आयए ॥³¹

Mahatma Gandhi's view is also not different from that of Acharya Bhikshu : Nonviolence is absence of

28. दैनिक हिन्दुस्तान, 28 मार्च, 1953, पृ. 4

29. जीव जीवै ते दया नहीं, मरे ते हिंसा मत जाण ।
मारणवाला नै हिंसा कही, नहीं मारै तो दया गुण खाण ॥

30. Trishashti Shalaka Purusha Charitam 1/1/157

31. Anukampa ki Choupai

animosity towards a sentient being. It begets freedom from fear to any living being howsoever small it may be.³²

Acharya Bhikshu did independent thinking on compassion (दया) and sympathy (अनुकम्पा). He wrote a book : *Anukampa ki Choupayi*. In this book we come across the spirit of a language philosopher and the use of analytical vibhajyavadi (विभज्यवादी) style.

He said : You consider compassion or kindness as spiritual religion, which is not proper. Compassion has two forms :

- (1) worldly or social
- (2) transcendental or spiritual

Philosophy of language has a branch called "positivism" according to which truth is of two types :

- (1) universal
- (2) individual

In the language of *nyaya* school the first is generic truth and the other is specific truth. When we say "cow", we mean "all cows". This is generic truth. When we say "white cow" we distinguish between "a white cow" and "a black cow". This is specific truth. The word "man" includes "all men" of the world. This is generic truth. But "tall man", "white man", "black man" belong to specific truth. Generic truth and specific truth should not be identified with each other. Acharya Bhikshu states

32. Navjeevan Pustak 20, P. 1822

that we get milk from a cow, a buffalo, आक and थोर (poisonous plants). But आक milk cannot take the place of cow's milk. Cow's milk is nutritious, while आक milk can cause death.³³ The moment an adjective is used before *milk*, its specific truth becomes manifest. Cow's milk is easy to digest while buffalo's milk is difficult to digest and increases cholestrol. आक and थोर milk is used for medicinal purposes and cannot be used as food. Similarly, an adjective can be used before compassion : which compassion is worldly and which is transcendental?

In philosophical thinking linguistic analysis is of great importance. Language is a means of communication. Its aim is to transmit one person's thoughts to another. If we fail to use language appropriately, the listener will understand something different from what we actually wanted to convey. The relevance of निक्षेप system lies in the fact that it enables the speaker or the writer to use language in such a way that the listener or the reader gets the same meaning as the speaker or the writer wanted to convey. Acharya Bhikshu has used the निक्षेप system in explaining compassion or kindness. According to निक्षेप system everything has at least four stages or modes. The name

Anukampa 8/2-3

33. गाय भैंस आक थोर नो, ए च्यारूं ई दूध ।
 तिम अणुकम्पा जाणण्यो, राखै मन में सुधि ॥
 आक दूध पीछा थका, जुदा करे जीव काय ।
 ज्यं सविध अणुकम्पा कियो, पाप कर्म बंधाय ॥

of a thing is one of its modes. A thing is given a name which identifies it. Another is स्थापना, a process of knowing a thing with the help of its features, its shape. The third mode is substance. It is an object's past and future state. The fourth mode is भाव. It is an object's present state.

There are two aspects of भाव निक्षेप

1. Worldly compassion - compassion accepted by society
2. Transcendental compassion - compassion aimed at salvation

In this way kindness (दया), charity (दान), service (सेवा) and religion (धर्म) also have two aspects each :

1. Worldly kindness - kindness accepted by society
2. Transcendental kindness - kindness aimed at salvation
1. Worldly beneficence उपकार – beneficence accepted by society
2. Transcendental beneficence – beneficence aimed at liberation
1. Worldly charity - charity accepted by society
2. Transcendental charity - charity aimed at liberation
1. Worldly service - service accepted by society
2. Transcendental service - service aimed at liberation
1. Worldly religion - religion accepted by society
2. Transcendental religion - religion aimed at liberation

Compassion which is motivated by passion and attachment is worldly compassion, while compassion

that is devoid of them is transcendental compassion. As a social animal man lives in society, so he acts according to worldly compassion. Acharya Bhikshu did not object to it. What he meant to say was we should not mix one with the other. In order to make his point clear he used the following expressions again and again :

1. Ways of the world, path to salvation
2. Worldly beneficence, beneficence for salvation
3. Worldly duty, duty of liberation
4. Worldly kindness, other worldly kindness

To put it in a nutshell, he said : ज्ञानी हुवै ते न्यारा जाणै

An enlightened person does not mix worldly duty with aspiration for salvation; he makes a separate assessment of each one of them. If only Acharya Bhikshu's philosophy of language had been comprehensive ! In that case its comprehensiveness would have incorporated solutions to social and sectarian problems.

The awakening of this sense of discrimination is very essential - let social tendencies operate at the social level, and let religion aim at individual spiritual practice. But what happened was that religion was transformed into a social or sectarian entity. The result was that there was neither pure socialism nor pure religiosity. Sprinkling sugar and flour around ant-holes is being considered kindness, while kindness is being ignored while exploiting a person. This is a distorted form of kindness.

The original meaning of kindness is getting rid of cruelty. A kind person cannot be inhuman towards anyone, be he his servant, his official, his neighbour or a foreigner. He cannot get in the way of anybody earning his livelihood. Rather than being kind in this way, people consider feeding ants with flour more important. Therefore, Acharya Bhikshu said again and again : Discriminate. Try to understand the true meaning of a word. Which kindness ? Which compassion? Which religion ? Don't just get stuck in compassion, kindness and religion as if they were only names.³⁴ Without understanding the philosophy of language, our understanding of reality cannot be authentic. Those who have tried to explore truth have realised the importance of linguistic analysis. Therefore, before we attempt to understand Acharya Bhikshu's thoughts, it is essential to understand linguistic analysis.

Those who have delved deep in understanding the nature of kindness based on nonviolence are not different from Acharya Bhikshu in the spirit of their thinking. Lord Buddha said : "O Bhikshu! There are two kinds of compassion - material and religious - the religious compassion being superior."³⁵

Anukampa ki Choupai, 8/1-4

34. भौले ही मत भूलण्यो, अनुकम्पा रे नाम ।
कीण्यो अन्तर पारखां, ण्यूं सीझे आलम काम ॥
दया दया सहू को कहे, ते दया धर्म छै ठीक ।
दया आलेख ने पालसी, त्यानें मुगत नजीक ॥
35. **Anguttar Nikay, P. 95**

Mahatma Gandhi has inquired into kindness very minutely. He says: "Kindness towards living beings does not just consist in not killing little insects like ants. We should of course not kill them. But we should also not hurt or offend any human being.

If people say religion lies in saving a bedbug even if it involves killing a man, I doubt it; also if someone says it lies in saving a man even if it involves killing a bedbug, I doubt it. I would like to find a way to come out of both these predicaments. That will be real kindness.³⁶

Vandittu is a popular prayer of Jain religious practice. One of its verses says : "I deplore the act of kindness done towards a happy or miserable intemperate person if it is motivated by attachment (राग) or animosity (द्वेष).³⁷

36. Navjeevan, 24.11.1921, P. 1522

37. सुहिए य दुहिएसु य, जा में अस्संजएसु अणुकम्पा ।
रागेण व दासेण व तं निंदे तं च गरिहामि ॥



PRICE Rs. 40.00
US\$ 4.00