

**THE CRISIS OF WORLD AND KRISHNA PURE MONISM:
A LONG ESSAY**

Gopal Chowdhary is a freelance writer and has been JNU Scholar. He has published two books- *The Political Auditing: A Manifesto for Rescuing Democracy* and *The Greatest Farce of History*, and has published a paper on *Popular Institutional Model of Political auditing* wherein a model for political auditing has been developed.

THE CRISIS OF WORLD AND KRISHNA PURE MONISM: A LONG ESSAY

Gopal Chowdhary



ACADEMIC EXCELLENCE
Delhi - 110 059 (India)

Published by

ACADEMIC EXCELLENCE

(Publishers & Distributors)

Saraswati House, U-9, Subhash Park,
Near Solanki Road, Uttam Nagar, New Delhi - 110059
Ph. 011-25333264, 9911242336
e-mail # rkgpost@gmail.com
www.aegop.com

The Crisis of World and Krishna Pure Monism: A Long Essay

Copyright — Author

1st Edition, 2017

ISBN : 978-93-83246-34-2

[All rights reserved. No part of this book can be reproduced in any manner or by any means without prior permission of the Publisher.]

PRINTED IN INDIA

Published by *Rajkumar for Academic Excellence*, Delhi Laser typeset at *Shivalaya Enterprises, Delhi* and Printed at *Sagar Print World, New Delhi*

Preface

In the history there seems to be palpable attempt to undermine the idea, spirit, subject, content in favor of matter or form. The centrality of object at the cost of subject has not only undermined the well being and progress of mankind at the cost of human beings but also obstructed the coherent progress of sciences. The history of philosophy in general and that of positive sciences dominated by matter or form centric view, particularly after diehard or rather maverick materialist approach laid the foundation of hollow discourse of materialism which logical progression is postmodernist view of multiplicity of subjects or narratives.

If one juxtaposes this materialist view with overall growth of humanity and resultant imbalances, abnormalities and crisis, one but cannot miss how Spirit, content, subject or idea or Reason or Dharma has been torpedoed to provide room for the materialism. The social, political and cultural manifestation of this lopsided or rather myopic view is for everyone to see. Moreover, the overall historical growth seems to have been manipulated in such way that one reinforces other. The resultant effect is for everyone to see: the world in crisis or crisis has become synonym for the world. Even tribal transformation of humanity to modernity and post modernity seems to have been permanently frozen into neo-tribalism of crass nationalism, bigotry, xenophobia and otherness bordering on hatred and mutual hostility.

The way the empiricist, the rationalist and the idealist

have been attacking the subjectivity or undermining the idea or will or spirit or Dharma, speaks of the intended prejudice for the materialism. The scienticism, the sociology, and psychologism have been attacking it from rear; empiricists have been demolishing it from front. The subjectivity or idea or spirit or Dharma has been finally razed to the ground by postmodernist with the 'multiplicity of subjectivity'.

If objectification of subject is juxtaposed with resultant objectification of women, nature, 'other', knowledge and idea or Reason or Dharma, it would certainly validate the hypothesis of the essay. The main hypothesis of the essay is as to how objectification of subject on the plane of scientization of philosophy and violation of Krishna pure monism-one has become all and inherent knowledge and , and its subversion by muses have led to the crisis of world. They have tried to erase, using Derrida terminology, this knowledge and on its trace tried to build wrong corpus of knowledge or just subverted it at best and at worst it has been reduced to mere means. Whereas postmodernists have given 'epistemological break (to knowledge)to reek in their multiple narratives and objectification of subject; the idealists, deterministic idealist and materialist, rationalists, structuralism and neo-structuralism, existentialist and neo-existentialist as well as phenomenologist have made it epiphenomena of perception, thinking, intuition, sense and nature.

The objectification of subject or consciousness or spirit in sciences seems to be cause and effect of objectifications of the Woman, Nature, Other, Knowledge and Reason or Idea or Dharma. The difference and otherness has been created just to violate the one having become all. This crisis seems to be conspicuous by the paradox of freedom flummoxing the philosophers, thinkers, ontologists, phenomenologist, existentialists and neo-existentialist, moderns and postmodern as well as the muses and scientists and spilling over to the praxis. The metaphysical loneliness and resultant

illusory freedom seems to have been projected onto ontological ground finally flooding the praxis. The moment freedom whether metaphysical or ontological is sought the bodily, natural and the worldly constraints turn freedom into fetter. The only way out from this paradox of freedom is transcendence and knowledge but both have been cancelled by the postmodernists. What remains is the vast and chaotic plane of immanence with Cartesian instantaneous cogito to reek in illusory freedom. The crisis of world seems to have germinated from the failure of this coordinate of being and freedom.

From Rousseau lamenting injunction of 'Men are born free but found in chain everywhere' to Nietzsche gloom, "To be free is, precisely, to abolish ends"; and resultantly finding freedom in nihilism. British School of psychologists classification of negative and positive freedom to Hegelian Affirmative freedom finding its manifestation in the differences created within whole and Kantian freedom seeking it in self based universal reason as contrasted to Nietzschean freedom finding its reality in atomism to Sartre helplessness: men is 'condemned to be free', and finally, ontologists and structuralism have cancelled the subject; and the poststructuralist have found solace in Nietzsche atomism as their ideal of freedom or being or consciousness as free entity conditioned as they are with social whole and consequent rejection of any tangible freedom. Not surprisingly the postmodernism and post-postmodernism have settled for freedom in escaping the multiplicity and differences arising out of social wholes and its consequent meaninglessness .

When one has become all or creator has become creation, the plurality and difference is transitory which appear to have been assigned the permanent value. The transitory value has been given permanence, while the permanent has been dislodged from discourse, conveniently tucked to the abstract. This seems to be real narrative of the crisis of the world. Plurality,

difference, otherness and multiplicity is not the negation of monism or one ; it is rather its affirmation. Plurality and multiplicity is a transitory phenomenon as one seems to have appeared plural due to the dynamics of oneness, not against it, and it is likely to lead to the unity since for the sake of unity plurality has become plural. In fact plurality is meant for unity but to the cynics, tyrants, Leviathan, World Spirit and postmodernism and post-postmodernism, any call for unity slides into uniformity, xenophobia and reactionary nihilistic vibe.

Plurality, multiplicity, difference and otherness are predicated on one and these are not originary phenomena. In spite of one having become all, latter has been validated while assigning former to the abstract or out of social scientific enquiry leading to the intellectual cud chewing; and existential monism—reality is one—and ontological monism-truth is one—has been relegated to the unfounded scepticism. While plurality, multiplicity, difference, appearance and other which has originated from one are the new truth or the post truth or the new reality, the Truth and the One very conveniently has been shunted out from any meaningful inquiry and study. The resultant outcome is postmodernism and post-postmodernism, and crisis and the crisis only reality to boot.

The evolution of humanity in general and the cultural and social formations particularly have proved beyond the doubt that difference, plurality and otherness have been simulated just to pander to the vested interests resting in the lower nature of human beings.

The book proposes the reinvent of Krishna pure monism emancipating credo to come out from this multiplicity, difference, plurality and otherness which have evolved from one.

Gopal Chowdhary

Contents

	Preface	5
Section I	Prologue	11
Section II	Knowledge is Inherent	89
Section III	Paradox of Freedom	141
Section IV	What is Krishna Pure Monism	164
Section V	Epilogue	223
	Bibliography	233

I

Prologue

It is very difficult to decide whether the world is in crisis or the crisis is the synonym for the world. The crisis of world or the world in crisis can be deduced from the hordes of evidence littered around every realm of the humanity. The policy papers, the research papers, the academic journals, various books and newspapers chronicle the lurking crisis in no uncertain terms. The natural, physical and the social sciences seem to be betraying this crisis by default, though they have been trying their best to seek solace in the deceptive theories of “theory of everything” “unified theory”, ‘End of history’, ‘End of Freedom’, Postmodernism or post-postmodernism.

Even if one may not agree with this contention, it would be rather impossible to disapprove the positing about the world in crisis. This reality soon turns into spectre haunting the mankind when one realizes world sitting on the keg of weapon of mass destruction in the form of nuclear arsenals, and the revival of competing and contesting cultural identities, leading to the looming silhouette of ‘Clash of civilizations’ overshadowing multiculturalism and peaceful existence.

Not so long ago Husserl, in his Vienna Lecture, talked about European Crisis in terms of identity and division faced by the continent. Since then, the crisis seems to have spilled over to the world and taken it in grips. It can be verified from the plethora of crisis prefixes and suffixes dotting the narratives, major fields and realm of human society and activities.

The historical evolution of the natural sciences and social sciences appear to hit the plateau or the state of stagnation, if to be more precise. This has manifested clearly in the hollowness and rather scholastic gerrymandering of the postmodernism and post-postmodernism, 'theory of everything' or 'Unified theory' and futile search for 'God' particle' which is already there-Nothingness. In fact, this in the core of matter seems to be very smart or rather calculative strategy to ward of the inability on the behalf of both streams of the natural or physical sciences and the social sciences in engaging the current realities and presenting, if not universal then viable narratives of the phenomena, problems, mysteries and conundrums facing the humankind. No major invention and positing of social and economic theory have been come to the fore so far; whatever may have been it may be lateral but certainly not vertical one.

When it comes to situation in the social sciences, the same aura of diffidence and consistent efforts to hoodwink the inability to find the real reality or the narrative of current realities seems to be pervading with the aplomb of seemingly great debate and discourse. However, there exists a very thin line of difference of the diffidence and hands off approach to the phenomena that characterize the natural and social sciences. While the former is indulged in the unending labour of approaching natural or physical reality or the phenomena through 'Unified Theory' or 'Theory of Everything', the latter is seeking solace in positing the inevitability of 'no one or the universal narrative' being ascertained to any reality or the phenomena.

This diffidence and scholarly gerrymandering is best exemplified in the praxis of the puzzling realities, unresolved questions, conundrums, long unresolved issues not finding any resolution, and it is best summed up in the scientific and scholastic manifestations of the theory of everything et la, postmodernism and post-postmodernism, 'End of the Freedom', crisis of the

democracy, democratic drift, collapse of communism, failure of capitalism or liberal or the neo-liberal philosophy to tackle the basic problem of justice and equality. James Mensch sums up the postmodern crisis: "The striking feature of post-modernism is its distrust of the subject. If the modern period, beginning with Descartes, sought in the subject a source of certainty, an Archimedean point from which all else could be derived, post-modernism has taken the opposite tack."

The modernity, though Bruno Latour, in his long essay, "We have hardly been Modern," have questioned even the current reality as hardly modern way back at the fag end of 20th century, sought unity in subject to anchor it in single foundation. The postmodernism razed the subject and dissolved it into multiplicity as Nietzsche announced it no uncertain terms in his various philosophical treatises and essays.

There seems to be apparently nothing unique about it, however what makes it so is rather diffident attempt to conceal the utter failure at finding the real reality or the universal narrative about the hordes of phenomena or the problems facing the modern world reeking in the hollowed postmodernism and post-postmodernism one. The situation is not less diffident in the field of the natural or physical sciences that we have been unable to find the cause of creation or how world came into existence. The confusion and uncertainty regarding the Boggs Higgins experiment to find the God's particle or creative agent best exemplifies it. The hollowness of postmodernism and post-postmodernism, the conservative totalitarianism and hands off approach of 'End of Freedom', crisis of democracy, problem of freedom, equality and justice and the forced finding of the common grounds of 'sociologism' and 'psychologism' betray the crisis in no uncertain terms.

Can this inability to arrive at the real 'reality' or arrive at the universal narrative or meta narrative or inevitability of not one narrative or the multiple narrative

can be modern or scientific or postmodern or the post-postmodern? It is said rather viewed as axiomatic that there is not one narrative but multiple narratives; in fact it is the competing of the multiple narratives that is being understood as the reality of the phenomena afflicting the society and its social, political and cultural formations. In other words it has climaxed to the apparently hollowed compromise of Sociologism Vs Psychologism or slithered further down the diffidence of 'History has no meaning' or 'End of Freedom' and crass materialism and commercialism that liberal philosophies have been reduced, to have become the high templates of the modern era.

These all approaches and theories and views seem to be betraying the utter failure to decode the current reality and if that is not enough, these are couched in very generalist and figurative sense and term. The overall evolution of western thought and scholarship and the socio-political formations in particular and that of the world in general approximate to what Camus summed up few decades back:

"The contemporary revolution believes that it is inaugurating a new world when it is really only the contradictory climax of the ancient world. Finally the capitalist society and the revolutionary society are one and same thing to the extent that they submit themselves to the same means—industrial production and the same promise. But one makes its promise in the name of formal principles which it is quite incapable of incarnating and which are denied by the methods it employs. The other justifies its prophecy in the name of only reality it recognizes and ends by mutilating the reality." (Albert Camus, *The Rebel*, p.237)

In the economic term world has not gone beyond the industrial production and it has been the only mode of production for quite a long time. Albert Camus has mentioned it and Gandhiji too underlined the dark belly of industrial production positing that it would not lead to the freedom and prosperity as it is based on the crass

profiteerism, unlimited greed and passion for material acquisitiveness. He put forward the idea of 'Trusteeship' which is a sort of co-operative federalism for obvious reason there were few takers.

During last two centuries when Industrial production, modern centralized bureaucracy, government system, modern military industrial complex created on the debris of the feudalism have remained unchanged. The only change that has been factored into it is that these have been globalized with some hollow and superficial sprinklings of liberal coatings. The mode and nature of economic activity—Industrial production and its political economy, capitalism and socialism has remained same. How could one expect to tackle the problem faced by modern age with that of the ideology, system and mode of production of 17th or 18th century?

The philosophical blinkers in the form of positivism, empiricism and idealism and Rationalism vs pragmatism a la scepticism and Epicureanism have razed to ground the 'lofty heights of reason and ethics' of Kant. Camus has also underlined this and exposed the Hegelian effort to undermine it through determinist idealism that grounded action and ethics in paraxial objectification. Metaphysical revolt that 'We are alone', backed by the scientific community inability to find any existence has further created the ground for the bondage and easy prey for the authoritarianism, a new form of subjugation. The 'we are alone' revolt is nothing but disjointed world view and negation of the Krishna pure monism. The universe is packed with life and creature like anthropoid or unlike them. Human inability to find does not mean that we are alone. We are not alone, this loneliness is but the disjointed world view.

Despite the raising of new gods on the hollowed and myopic ground of contradiction and subterfuge, replacing the Kingdom of God via chimera of 'Death of God' or the morality or reason, and the motley avatar of communism and maverick capitalism, the world

situation remains where it has been: Crisis of the world, world in crisis and the efforts to deal with the crisis lead to further crisis. Even the liberal philosophy riding the victory credo over the communism has not appeared to make any substantial change to the ground reality. The voices of axiological unification in context of harass of values and degradation of morality authenticate the hypothesis as well as validate the all round crisis gripping the world.

The Theme of Tribalism

The tribalism in the garb of modernism and postmodernism seems to be vying for the attention riding on the vain attempt to save the fossilized capitalism and left over of the totalitarianism by torpedoing the further progression and any prospect for the alternative through the 'End of freedom', no universal narrative of any reality, 'crisis of democracy' and steadfast faith in their respective gods as only choice for mankind. Bruno Latour way back in 1990s has underlined this disguised credo of tribalism when he avers, 'we are hardly modern'. The logical conclusion of this assertion is that if we are not modern, then we are modern tribal.

Bruno Latour has provided very succinct critique of modernity proving it not even pre-modern. Latour's terming our world pre-modern is actually very sombre; in fact it is continuation of tribalism fringed on cusp of modernity. The refrain of postmodernist and post-postmodernist is just an alibi for hiding the tribal edged existence of modern world. While present is being postponed to the future, past is denied and future is being presented as future dream as Camus has averred in the context of communist and nihilist revolution. However, it sums up the predicament of the modernity.

Latour mentions four contradictions on which modernity is based and ironically these four unravel it. These are: Naturalization, socialization, deconstruction and the fourth is called as cancelled or crossed out God.

These four contradictions also unravel the modernity on which Bruno Latour has proved that it is hardly modern or at best it can be said to be pre-modern. Moreover, every entity and concept has been transformed into hybrid and purification is denied.

The reality is that referent is cancelled and de-contextualized and what remains is text and meaning is sought within text as dictated by outside. Then what remains is not quasi-object or quasi-subject of Latour but mere phantom or propaganda or distant and ambiguous kingdom of God that too with crossed out or cancelled God. This is the position of deconstruction. Other contradiction is naturalization wherein everything has been naturalized and British school of Psychology or psychologism and sociologism best sums it up. The Marxist, phenomenologist and ontologists has easily fallen prey to this naturalization.

Modern tribalism with its attendant values of the herd instinct, edger raze like binaries of 'Us vs Them', increasing xenophobia, exclusiveness, cultural hostility, closed group mentality eclipsing the openness, diehard nationalism and ethnicity bordering the tribalism of the yore, hedonism and crass profiteering; instead of veering towards the internationalism, leading to the exclusiveness and hatred, disharmony, violence and antagonism. It seems that human civilization transition from tribalism to the modernity has been reverted back to it or it has never been so. It seems the geographical extent of the tribes has been transformed into nation states and for guarding this untenable turf, pseudo discourses and claptraps of democracy, freedom, liberty, socialism or communism or Fatherhood and Brotherhood of world, the Kingdom of God or kingdom of new god or liberation have been grafted.

It is ironic that all the new discourses and their paraxial reality, whether be it totalitarian or libertarian or liberal, or those in between characterizing the current realities of the world has the tribal footprints in the form

of personal heroism, xenophobia, contempt and deep-rooted animosity fuelled by ethnicity and hardcore nationalism. These surface more often than not in the internal and external aggression, subjugation and the undercurrent tension running down.

It seems that the transition of human society from the tribal society to modern or civilized one has been frozen permanently in the hypocrisy and sham of pseudo freedom and liberty, collective good and universalism, while these expletives seem to be front for the continued indulgence in the tribalism with the cover of totalitarianism, libertarianism and crass individualism and liberalism. These seem nothing but the tribalism in its modern avatar.

As the end is known by its means, the end is future while the means reflect the present reality, it is means that connote the ends. The end of democracy, liberalism, freedom and globalization that has been built on the debris of totalitarianism of yore (socialism or communism) is betrayed by its means—increasing inequality, lack of social and economic justice, concentration of wealth in fewer and fewer hands, more than half of the world population living in poverty and deprivation, overt and covert civil wars and strife afflicting the most part of the world. The tribal credo of might is right is still operating through the veneer of economic and political power and subjugation, accrued through the exploitative, greed based and highly unjust political and economic institutions and mechanism.

How could it be different when the world and its muses were grounded on the hollowed ‘unity of mankind through Alexander world campaign’ or aggression, colonization and crass loot on the pseudo discourse of civilizing the uncivilized world. However, the commonality of Indo-European, Indo-Persian and Indo-German in terms of the language, culture, myths, gods, philosophical traditions prove this theme of unity running undercurrent the deeply divided hostile world of today.

Despite this clear theme of unity, the world and its power today is busy in trampling over these templates of unity and raking up the divisive, exclusive and xenophobic agenda riding on the hallowed credo of vanity, racial and cultural superiority which are just ploy to put forward the hegemonic agenda.

There seems to be palpable attempt to undermine the idea, spirit, subject, content in favour of matter or form. There seems to be vested interest at work in this regard as matter or form or materialism is very convenient and can be used for justification of the unjustifiable. The centrality of object at the cost of subject not only undermines the well being and progress of mankind at the cost of human beings but also obstruct the coherent progress of sciences. The history of philosophy in general and that of positive sciences dominated by matter or form centric view, particularly after diehard or rather maverick materialist approach laid the foundation of hollow discourse of materialism which logical progression is postmodernist view of multiplicity of subjects or narratives.

If one juxtaposes this materialist view with overall growth of humanity and resultant imbalances, abnormalities and crisis, one but cannot miss how Spirit, content, subject or idea or Reason or Dharma has been torpedoed to provide room for materialism. The social, political and cultural manifestation of this lopsided or rather myopic view is for everyone to see. Moreover, the overall historical growth seems to have been manipulated in such way that one reinforces other. The resultant effect is for everyone to see: the world in crisis or crisis has become synonym for the world. Even tribal transformation of humanity to modernity and post modernity seem to have been permanently frozen into neo-tribalism of crass nationalism, bigotry, xenophobia and otherness bordering on hatred and mutual hostility.

The way and manner in which empiricist, rationalist and idealist have been attacking subjectivity or undermining the idea or will or spirit or Dharma speaks

of the intended prejudice for materialism. The scienticism, the sociologism, and psychologism have been attacking it from rear, empiricists have been demolishing it from front. The subjectivity or idea or spirit or Dharma has been finally razed to the ground by postmodernist with the 'multiplicity of subjectivity'.

If objectification of subject or consciousness is juxtaposed with resultant objectification of Women, Nature, 'Other', Knowledge and Idea or Reason or Dharma, it would certainly validate the hypothesis of the essay. The main hypothesis of the essay is as to how objectification of subject on the plane of scientization of philosophy and violation of Krishna pure monism-one has become all and inherent knowledge and , and its subversion by muses have led to the crisis of world. They have tried to erase, using Derrida terminology, this knowledge and on its trace tried to build wrong corpus of knowledge or just subverted it at best and at worst it has been reduced to mere means. Whereas postmodernists have given 'epistemological break (to knowledge)to reek in their multiple narratives and objectification of subject; while idealists, deterministic idealist and materialist, rationalists, structuralism and neo-structuralism, existentialist and neo-existentialist as well as phenomenologist have made it epiphenomena of perception, thinking, intuition, sense and nature.

The objectification of subject or consciousness or spirit in sciences seems to be cause and effect of objectifications of the women, Nature, Other, knowledge and reason or idea or Dharma. It may be digression from philosophy but certainly it is certainly in domain of the applied philosophy (again this philosophy after having poached by Sociology, psychology, Political science has been objectified) Krishna followed. In another time and another continent, this manifested in Plato, Aristotle and height of Greek and Roman Period, to some extent in European Renaissance as well as Persian culture until usurped by two modern cultures that appropriated its

high ideals and philosophy to subvert it for furthering the vested interest.

Related with it is the scientization of philosophy that has direct relation with objectification of subject. Plato initiated advertently or inadvertently, intentionally or unintentionally as Deleuze & Guattari, in *What is Philosophy?* and Karl Popper, *The Open Society and its Enemies*, have rightly said, the great game of transforming the philosophy into exact science which is alibi for marginalizing the subject and philosophy, was inaugurated by the father of philosophy. The lofty and ennobling height of Idea notwithstanding, his justice, Republic, education all appear to be resisting the change despite accepting the fluidity of reality. His endeavour to freeze change as reflected in his conception of stratified social order, education and Republic was the beginning of the marginalization of subject and his urge to shape philosophy on physical or natural sciences motif as reflected in his attempt to social engineering and breeding of certain type of person or class of person that would serve the interest of state and society.

Undoubtedly, the project of transforming philosophy into science, initiated by Plato, Aristotle and disciples of Plato and his Academy carried forward the task of marginalization of subject and scientization of philosophy. It was later picked up by Cartesian mechanism, structuralism, phenomenologist, metaphysics, existentialist, rationalists, modernists and postmodernist, and the fate of philosophy was sealed along with subject. The post-modernism and post-postmodernism that propped up on the debris of philosophy and subject as rendered by neo-existentialist and neo-structuralism made clarion call of the demise of subject, philosophy and God as well.

As Derrida has mentioned in, *Difference & Writing*, that term metaphysics began to take shape and it found its full manifestation in Aristotle who termed it as metaphysics. The very philosophical narrative of Plato

and Aristotle gives clear indication of preference for the society, state and collective, while Socrates communitarianism was relegated to background. The history of philosophy can be viewed as unabated struggle between subject, a vulgar concept as termed by Husserl and object started since Plato. Husserl has termed subject as vulgar concept as he was about to pulverize it and did it with all myopic aplomb. The fragmentation of philosophy and its appropriation by various social sciences has been co-habiting with fragmentation and pulverization of being and killing of self, poaching of soul with unconsciousness, death of God or denial of infinity and reincarnation of gods or finitization of the infinity.

The plane of immanence is undoubtedly vast and chaotic as Gilluleuz and Guattari have observed. But to surrender to this chaos choice. Problem arises when one considers oneself separate from it. It is like paradox of sea and wave. For a wave which is part of sea the vastness and chaos of sea is normal and part of existence. But when a wave having parted from seas looks back at it, it is really chaotic. Here as it is in case of immanence and transcended otherness is added violating the Krishna cogito of oneness or monism. If an infinite being that is human being at generic level and even at individual level infinite but perceived as finite due to identifying with mortal body while cancelling the immortal soul.

As it has been observed and even conceded by Kant that we cannot know about noumenon from which phenomenon comes, however it seems to be preposterous in the sense that one can know phenomenon which derives its being from noumenon but cannot know it. If phenomenon can be known which derives its being from noumenon, then noumenon is revealed in phenomenon. It is as clear as being comes into being from non-being or nothingness, so nothingness can be known from being.

However, the philosophy has been fragmented into metaphysics, ontology, phenomenology, logic and poached by psychology, sociology and political science,

communication theory, as Gileuz and Guattari has observed, even advertising; and these fragments are in competitive mode of sciencitization. Then how could it be accepted that being comes out from non-being, thing from nothing and goes to nothing. But modern science and metaphysics or fragmented parts of philosophy could not accept it just as modern scientist could not accept that matter comes from energy and vice versa until Einstein found it. That is why they are zealously and unceasingly breaking the particles to find the God's particle or constitutive substance of the universe. They have found nothing and ultimately they would find nothingness as the constitutive element.

The psychologism, inserted via what is derisively called 'British School of Psychologist' led by Burke, Hume and their followers, entry in philosophy as predicate of existential problem has stymied the case of philosophy. The modern psychologists and psychological theories that has been appropriated from philosophy, has led to the postmodernist credo of multiplicity of subjectivity or fragmentation of subject. It has led to split and fragmentation of subjectivity and the world. Even Husserl, later on veered around this position: "Fact minded sciences give rise to fact minded people" as David Carr has maintained in 'The Crisis of European Sciences and Transcendental Phenomenology'. The actualization or scienciticism of philosophy and other humanities and psychologism and sociologism have led to the virtual eclipse of philosophy.

Philosophy in general has been appropriated, subverted and trivialized. The combined onslaught of psychologism and sociologism with theologising philosophy & philosophizing theology led to the virtual eclipse of philosophy. It is another matter that he (Husserl) has replaced it with structure centric sciences giving rise to structure minded people who have further subverted the science in general and philosophy and subjectivity in particular. At world level it started with

subversion of Renaissance and high ground of Greco-Roman by Christianity through Christian teleology and historicism of Judaism.

This can be understood with human analogy. Suppose one person wishes to build a house. Before building a house, it is nothing and nowhere. Then it is constructed with all human efforts and materials. It is there. But if person from another world or say our world Eskimo land comes and asks from where building has come into existence. It came from nothing, before being built it was nothing. So it may be said it came from nothing or nothing. When it is bulldozed, where does it go? Into nothingness. So is case with human and world of human. But it would not be accepted. So keep on chewing the cud or churning the particles in search for God's particle or constitutive substance of creation till eternity.

However, the fragmentation of subject has been laid on the plane of immanence with co-ordinate of consciousness but has to be epiphenomenon of structure or some other deterministic factor. As it is based on the epiphenomenalism of consciousness and denial of transcendence, the chaotic plane of immanence has established being on very chaotic ground. However, this has been seen from other's perspective and self has been thrown into this chaos. Other exists till transcendence is not factored into. How can there be other when consciousness makes it as own when it is conscious of it. At the point of when it is considered as lost, it is one with entity it is conscious of.

Consciousness, an infinite entity encased in finite body is opaque and translucent, how come it cannot be synthesized with other as Sartre has contended. How come one's consciousness cannot be one with other without losing each other individuality when it is opaque and translucent and universal? The question as to whether individual consciousness loses itself by merging with other or meets each other as two individual identity is secondary. But if one begins and ends with

epiphenomenalism of consciousness, then 'hell is other' and one's consciousness cannot have oneness with others, then it is not possible.

The primary issue is that they do meet even if mind is in discordant state. Suppose there is one person who greets other but not greeted back, both would suffer remorse or guilt of different sort—one may feel humiliated and other may be feeling complacent. But each consciousness touches other though in discordant way. In Indian tradition and in general social milieu it is said Pranaam (Pran+Ayam). It means when one person sees other, the pran or consciousness comes out to meet other. When one does the greeting with folded hand and says Pranam, it means consciousness is given rest when it comes out to meet each other. Can it not be assumed that they have become one after greeting each other?

Another example of oneness of consciousness can be cited when one sees his or her adversary in some grim situation. The first reaction is feeling of empathy, consciousness gets agitated by other pathetic situation, then to cool or rationalize the agitated consciousness one thinks he or she is adversary, there is no need to get disturbed. The first reaction of a person who sees even his or her enemy in trouble, there is empathy but soon the ruffled consciousness is soothed with the fact he or she is enemy. This proves oneness of consciousness.

It rather seems to be shallow to surmise that consciousness forms a subject and object relations in interaction with other. If consciousness is translucent, opaque and universal, how could it form subject object relations? If consciousness is conscious of other consciousness, it becomes other without losing itself; it implies it is co-joined with it—neither loses their individuality but a sort of synthetic relations are formed. But here can be inserted many doubts and objection. If a person looks at other, there is formed a subject and object relation and when the person looked at end looks back he also form subject-object relations; object

becomes subject and subject becomes object.

But again it can be asked how a subject can be transformed into object by other until one allows it. Moreover, a subject is subject and an object is object, how could it be transformed into other by mere looking at. Even if from subject point of view it may be conceded that he may consider other as object but other may resist or simply refuse to be so. For example staring by one is generally countered by counter staring balancing the subject object continuum, if it is formed. Moreover, in case of consciousness this subject-object relations is not applicable as it is universal, translucent and opaque caged in a finite and mortal body. A consciousness is subject and object both and it may be transformed into subject and object without any corresponding change in its constitution by its very nature being opaque.

As Sartre says if God is consciousness and He cannot go outside the totality as it has an ensemble of 'interiority' preventing him to go outside. But the question remains as to how could a totality have an outside? The totality is itself its outside and inside. How could transcendence be transcended? How come 'interiority' can prevent him from going outside when He pervades outside as well as inside. For him there no inside and no outside. This seems to be self-contradictory proposition.

However, Bergson, in *matter and memory*, made an noble attempt to restore the position of parity to the spirit or subject or consciousness that realist and materialist have taken to the secondary position. Bergson rightly proves memory is the intersection of spirit and matter. The matter is nothing but image of its being in the consciousness. The very existence of matter finds its being or manifestation in the being of consciousness, it is not other way as modernist and postmodernist, Deconstructionist, structuralism or metaphysics, phenomenologist, existentialists and their neo-versions see.

Earlier, Fichte too tried to give centrality to the subject. Inspired by Kant, Johann Gottlieb Fichte developed at

the end of the eighteenth century a radically revised and systematic version of transcendental idealism, which he called *Wissenschaftslehre* of "Doctrine of Scientific Knowledge." Perhaps the most characteristic, as well as most controversial, feature of the *Wissenschaftslehre* is Fichte's effort to ground his entire system upon the bare concept of subjectivity, or, as Fichte expressed it, the "pure I." During his early career Fichte erected upon this foundation an elaborate transcendental system that embraced the philosophy of science, ethics, philosophy of law or "right." and philosophy of religion.

He provided centrality to the subject devising his formula of Pure I-I= I . The I must posit itself in order to be an I at all; but it can posit itself only insofar as it posits itself as limited. Hence it is divided against itself, as it also posits itself as unlimited or "absolute". Moreover, it cannot even posit for itself its own limitations, in the sense of producing or creating these limits. The finite I (the intellect) cannot be the ground of its own passivity. Instead, according to Fichte's analysis, if the I is to posit itself at all, it must simply *discover* itself to be limited, a discovery that Fichte characterizes as a 'check' or *Anstoß* to the free, practical activity of the I.

Such an original limitation of the I is, however, a limit for the I only insofar as the I posits it as such. I does this, according to Fichte's analysis, by positing its own limitation, first, as a mere "feeling," then as a "sensation," then as an "intuition" of a thing, and finally as a "concept." The *Anstoß* thus provides the essential occasion or impetus that first sets in motion the entire complex train of activities that finally result in our conscious experience both of ourselves as empirical individuals and of a world of spatio-temporal material objects. But this was not acceptable as he was criticized for putting too much premium on empirical I and thus making philosophy self-centered. Fichte self got entangled in vast and chaotic plane of immanence as he just missed the real self- as pure consciousness that

remains observer without being identified with its mediation of this plane of immanence.

Husserl, Sartre and Derrida disapproved Bergson without giving any substantial or convincing argument, while rejecting Fichte self-centred phenomenology out rightly. If subject or consciousness is not there, what is matter? It is undoubtedly matter still but like no-thing or for that matter any insignificant thing, visible or invisible, existing or non-existing. It is consciousness or subject or spirit that gives matter its being matter. Even if object-oriented ontology granting independent existence to matter, for consciousness it is just null.

But they start with assumption of epiphenomenalism of consciousness or subject. However, the real test for them was as to what happened after death. As body dies, with it consciousness is consummated as 'it is always of other'. But they have failed to see that body dies because consciousness leaves it, literally speaking as well as metaphorically. Though they have tried to wriggle out from the trap of phenomena of death by contending that with the death of 'In-itself' consciousness just disappears as latter is shadow like entity of former. The consciousness is because of Being-in-itself, as they contend, and it is in turn a sort of predicate of "In-itself? But how can 'In-itself' or being-in-itself' die or wear out its time? It is in itself contradictory as in-itself or being-in-itself can never die and if it dies, it is not in itself or it would never come again. It is finished for good, neither seems to be true.

Despite Bergson showing vividly, through intersecting mechanism of memory as to how matter gets its being from consciousness or spirit and through its image matter attains its being matter. Even brain and spinal cord provides transit and pathway role, it is spirit or consciousness that though memory gives matter hood to the matter. Sartre, Husserl and Heidegger and even Derrida could not give convincing refutation to his contention. However, they reinforced the materialistic

determinism making consciousness or spirit epiphenomenal. As they have to give primacy to the matter, the Deconstructionist despite differing from existentialist and phenomenologist argues that meaning is in the text but determined by outside. It is outside that gives meaning to the text or narrative or phenomena. Derrida too reinforces the Marxist determinism that Marx derived from upturning the Hegelian spirit or consciousness.

Sartre and others attacked Bergson from behind after failing to take him on from front as they contend that memory fails to provide link of past with present. They were so desperate to grant epiphenomenalism to the consciousness or spirit that they failed to see that present is the image of the past, if not exact but then customized and refined certainly. As per Krishna pure monism it is only inside or spirit or consciousness that pervades and provides being to the animate and inanimate. There is no outside only inside that has become outside. There is no centre or periphery but it is centre that has become periphery by decentering.

Since matter or body is given primacy over spirit or consciousness, the image that are formed are considered because of body or matter or acting as its predicate. Hence, they cannot find any link between past and present or could not find as what happened after death or Nietzsche 'nauseating eternal recurrence'. It is through image of past, or the desire or unfulfilled search for satisfying the objects of senses that are link to past or becomes or the cause of eternal return. Even Freud unconsciousness is the memory compressed as the repressed desires.

In fact, Bergson pulled the rug of dualism and materialism when he established matter as mere of image of consciousness . It is not perception and knowledge that constitute the dualism, it is the ontological fragmentation of being that is behind it. But the realism and idealism both stuck to their respective version of dualism. In respect of ontology, phenomenologist and

even metaphysics, perception is main source of knowledge as it has mechanism of its own, the subject has no choice but perceive what perception throws out, they discard memory as part of perception, not otherwise. Bergson has shown how memory through association and past experience becomes the constitutive factor in perception.

Since Kantian idealism is stuck up in sense and as there is 'no possible transition from sense to understanding' (Bergson), it is lost in sense and sense objects. 'The mistake is due to our believing that perception and memory are pure knowledge, whereas they point to action.' Bergson has rightly said that philosophers, psychologists and the metaphysics have not given adequate attention to the action. It is within the realm of action that everything whether perception, reflection and knowledge happen. It is in the plane of action these find manifestation. But they could not see through as to how Hegelian spirit was botched up in action which Hegel saw as objectifying the subject or spirit. Where as in Krishna pure monism action liberates the subject from the objectifying streak of phenomenal world if ego is not inserted in the infinite dynamics of action and hooked to its result.

The materialist as well as idealists and rationalist regard perception as elementary operations of mind and memory as part of perception. They consider consciousness as merely duplication of an external reality or inert matter which intellectual construction or reflection is consciousness. However, there is a relation of perception with action and memory with conduct. Bergson has rightly pointed this gaping hole: 'perception gives us 'things-in-itself'. (My) Consciousness of matter is then no longer either subjective as it is for English idealism or relative as it is for Kantian idealism. It is not subjective for it is in things than in me. It is not relative because the relation between the 'phenomenon' and the 'thing' is not that of appearance to reality but merely part to whole. The 'mistake is to set up homogenous space as a real or even

medium prior to extension....Memory is spirit, not a manifestation of matter".

Knowledge apart from being down graded to the perception, understanding or bracketed with sensory experience coming out of sense organs, has been trivialized and now it has been reduced to 'Middle Kingdom' at best and then finally meted out with 'epistemological break'. Knowledge is inherent or within as Krishna pure monism implies. And phenomenal world is like 'inverted tree which roots are above and branches and leaves are downward. It means that cause of phenomenon is above (consciousness pervading the whole universe)and beyond, and it can be known though knowledge which is transcendental.

As phenomenal world is representation of consciousness or subject, it has no reality or foundation of its own. That is why, as per Krishna pure monism, the phenomenal world is transitory, temporary and hence illusion. The only reality is consciousness or subject and phenomenal world but its mere representation. Much before the "Copernicusian revolution" in the form of centrality of subject or consciousness that Kant ushered in western philosophy during continental renaissance to be grounded by the determinist idealism of Hegel and trivialized by mechanistic Cartesian cogito of 'I think therefore I exist', Krishna anticipated foundational nature of subject in his pure monism. However, it courted the same fate of "Copernicusian revolution" when Indian social elites (Brahmin) performed the hara-kiri act of Hegel and neo-Hegelian which crisscrossed its trajectory from Cartesian mechanistic cogito to materialistic determinism of Marx and neo-Marxist, rationalist, phenomenologist, ontologists, structuralism and neo-structuralism, existentialist and neo-existentialist, Deconstructionist and neo-Deconstructionism having settled in modernity finally got uneasy abode in postmodernist and post-postmodernist.

Consequently, phenomenal world got primacy over subject or consciousness making later epiphenomenal. The logical outcome of this objectification of subject has come to the fore: fractured reality, fragmented being, multiple narratives contesting for dominance, Monad, object-oriented ontology, existentialist and phenomenologist putting cart before horse, Deconstructionist getting deconstructed by the determinist agenda of meaning decided by outside despite it being within.

To deny the continuity of knowledge, existence has been put before essence whereas middle kingdom of knowledge acts like referee between the two. Moreover, the existence has been given primacy over essence just to deny the continuity of knowledge and justify the 'epistemological break'. It is akin to putting tree before seed and result is that mere operation of immanence has threatened the existence and existent. As Latour has rightly pointed out the cleverness of Sartre in putting existence before essence which dynamics work on chicken-egg syndrome as it is difficult to ascertain which follows or precedes. Like Creator or God it is process, hence any preceding or following thesis would be rather absurd. In Krishna cogito of oneness or monism Swadharma is essence in ontological sense. Swadharma is constitutive as well as constituted of karma or actions and which is nothing but existence. So whether existence or action emanates from Swadharma or essence or vice versa it hardly matters as both simultaneously act upon and influence each other.

The subtext of this is that synthesis which is fundamental mode of enquiry of pure monism through which phenomenal world is assigned proper perspective, has been replaced with analytical approach of breaking phenomena into parts and seeking meaning into it. On this credo logic and rationalism have been puncturing every reality. As phenomenal world is representation of consciousness or subject and subject is only witness to

this projection or decentred centre or de-territorialised territory of subject, to speak in post-Deconstructionist language, synthesis is fulcrum which sanitizes this obverse reality. But along with the 'epistemological break' synthesis seems to have been given permanent break.

However, the question remains as how synthetic world and its reality as permeated by all pervading consciousness or subject could be known through analytical mode of enquiry? The phenomena and substance which as the representation of consciousness is the synthetic reality and could be negotiated with synthesis not with analytical credo. Even sciences in general and physical one seems to be immersed in such fallacious approach which is self-contradictory. The search for God's particle or constitutive factor of universe which is but objective presence of creator becoming creation or universe, through breaking how come the constitutive element could be known when *Mahat tatva* or primordial substance has itself become universe?

However, the fundamental mode of enquiry in both natural or physical sciences and social sciences is analytical which breaks the phenomena or matter in parts and from parts it seeks co-relation with whole. If part gives the truth of whole, then it is scientific and logical and if they do not, it would be termed as untrue or unscientific or illogical. This basic mode of enquiry seems to be wrong as it violates Krishna pure monism of synthetic world. As its basic premise is: it is creator that has become creation; it is super consciousness that has been distributed as consciousness and it is substance (*Mahat Tatva of Smakhya*) that has transformed into material world or natural world. Then how can the constitutive reality or matter be decoded from analysis or breaking. Instead of analytical or breaking of phenomena or particle, if they are enquired into synthetic mode, one could come near to finding it. But it would not be allowed as it is intended collateral of objectification of the subject.

Osho, the most under-rated philosopher, concludes that the existentialism (as well as other postmodernist social theory) has been posing a question that is itself an answer. This seems to be standard procedure of western philosophy questioning everything without finding answer to it and the unanswered questions have become philosophy. That has rather proved to be bane of philosophy in general. While East or India has mystified and subverted all the philosophical legacy, the West made philosophy an unanswered question or unresolved conundrum along with its being reduced as apologist of certain socio-political system and structure as developed in western countries. Post modernism and post-postmodernism or theory of everything or end of history is the logical manifestation of this.

However, the master of monism, Spinoza, despite being master could not help but further objectify the subject as he avers that the subject-object are placed on same continuum of substance. In this endeavour he further objectified the subject or consciousness when he put them on same scale of continuum thus not only further objectifying it though putting it in same bracket as in object but also subjectivising the object. However, he could not help much as he seems to have become unintended party to the fallacy of monistic determinism that Bertrand Russell underlines while putting monistic theory of truth to analytical caesarean. The objectification of subject is not ethical and is in fact grave crime as it 'eliminates human agency (women, other)'. In this regard, John Wahi (1938) says: "The more a man feels himself to be spirit, the more, at the same time, he feels himself to be body". However, if it is reversed more one feels oneself as body, less he or she would feel the Spirit. This also proves the primacy of subject or spirit over body.

The basic assumption of Krishna pure monism is that creator has become creation. It is one that has become all. Certainly it is not naturalism as naturalism is based on premise of the subjective world being proto-type of

nature. The cynic would ask whether it is extension of one or part of whole: it transcend both going beyond both and including both. The phenomenal world is appearance and it is dialectical. The world is action and it is in action that everything churns up. There is no other: whatever appears as other is only appearance. The reality can be known through knowledge, and knowledge is inherent to be attained in reference to action and conduct. Freedom and existence is materialized during action if done with keeping the consciousness basic nature- that is mere observer and not involved in doing as doer but witness of the doer ship.

The hither to civilization and cultural progression seems to be systematic creation of other and difference which is violation of Krishna pure monism. The plane of oneness or cogito of oneness is there enveloping the whole world; it is inherent manifesting in many ways at generic as well unit level. But the historical evolution has been marked by persistent creation of other and the objectification of subject. At generic level-nation, society, community, group, organization- the otherness and difference has been bedecked with to create oneness among their own group, society, community and nation. To feel oneness and solidarity among themselves, other is created, invented, assumed and while more often than not it comes out due to interplay of innate tendencies and natural forces.

Problem with pure monism in general or for that matter any theory or perspective is that it has been put to analytical breakings while cancelling synthesis and transcendence. Whether be it humanity or sciences analytical perspective has become reigning reality. The classical example of this is that rational approach to any phenomenon wherein it is broken or unravel first and then meaning is sought for the whole. In sciences, it is perceptible in breaking of particles to search for constitutive factor of universe or what is termed 'God's particle'.

It is not coincidental that ever since matter has been given primacy over spirit or subject, it has direct bearings on social and cultural fields. But unfortunately action, the moving force of human existence has not been given enough attention, Bergson more than one century back underlined this lacuna; while Krishna three thousand years ago declared action as primary force of ontology. He propounded action based phenomenology and axiology. But the philosophy, phenomenology, ontology and metaphysics has been too enamoured with plane of immanence, ever since Cartesian cogito of 'I think therefore I exist' became paradigmatic reality in philosophy to give action the required attention.

The basic premise of Krishna Pure monism is that knowledge is inherent in phenomena and substance. The being and its essence soul is knowledge form and meaning are entwined with them and even whole creation has meaning. It is another matter that if meaning is sought no meaning would find as they are themselves meaning. Much later, Vivekanand postulated that 'knowledge is within'. After that structuralism and post-structuralism in general and Deconstructionist-Derrida particularly veered round this position. But Deconstructionist could not come out of the bracket of neo-Marxist determinism when Derrida averred 'meaning is within text' but this is determined by outside. However, it is but logical that for decoding meaning one has to go outside or beyond, transcending it to know it. But Derrida seems to be sneaking Marxist deterministic bias when he concludes that meaning though in text yet it is determined by outside.

This axiom of Krishna pure monism can be culled from its exposition of Dharma, or reason or idea that guides phenomena and substance in general and its exposition of Samakhya, or epistemology in Gita when he says 'this knowledge (Samakhya) is as ancient as creation when 'from light (sun) it passed over to Vivaswan, Manu and his descendent. After it was untraceable (vilupt) and Krishna

revived it. In modern time, Derrida got this exposition in critique of phenomenologist like Husserl and Heidegger when he stumbled upon the trace and erasure of knowledge. His trace theory and erasure, from hindsight, reinforces Krishna pure monism premise of knowledge being inherent in phenomenon and substance.

And this premise is based on another premise of Krishna pure monism that it is 'One or creator that has become all or creation' (Uddhav Gita or Ekadesh Sakndh of Bhagavat). As to how creator could be known when it has become creation? The same question when Udhav asked to Krishna in Udhav Gita or Ekadesh Skandh of Bhagvat, Krishna says how and in what capacity one can tell about it. Much later Jeb reinforced this when he said how could we ascertain God's eye when he has become eyes of all.

As knowledge is inherent in phenomenon and substance, the meaning of everything is to be found in them. But again there is a catch here: if meaning is sought in it, it may slip as it is itself the meaning. Then how can meaning be found in the meaning? This conundrum flummoxed the existentialist and postmodernist when they seek meaning in life, they are unable to find it. Hence, they concludes that life has no meaning. Knowledge about phenomena and substance is ingrained in it as physicist has proved that matter and meaning are the same, so is knowledge or meaning and phenomena. It can be confirmed from evolution of ideas and muses. Gliluez and Guattari also confirm it when he talks about same phenomenon seen from different planes.

Objectification of Subject

Virginia R Dominguez in, *People as Subject; People as Object*, says "Concern with objectification is both new and old. In the works of Hegel (1967[1807]), Marx (1978[1867]) Dilthey (1961[1910]) and Luckas (1971), we find theoretical, philosophical discussion of subject-object relations, of the disputed identities of subject and object,

of the objectivity of Nature, and of the relationship between objectification and alienation.” Though few scattered and passing references have been observed regarding objectification of subject, the objectification was grounded in respect of subjugation of women.

There are two types of thinking on objectification in the feminist discourse. While on the one hand are Simone de Beauvoir's *The Second Sex* (1970) which is an excellent early example of objectification of woman or subject, and Gyatri Spivak's *In Other World: Essay in Cultural Politics* (1987) is very recent example of women as a other, as object are juxtaposed with man as subject. De Beauvoir's portrayal of 'the social self' where the subject/self has or needs an object/other to be itself; it is this part of her work that has been a foundation of much of the feminist discourse that is termed as second wave.

A second and related large corpus of discourse focus on actions and attitudes on the part of men indexing and perceiving women as sex objects. However, Milton Singer (1991) has argued that it is possible semiotically to represent the self as subject, but that 'this is a more difficult problem than the semiotic representation of the self as an object.' Whereas Umberto Eco (2014) has out rightly denied the inclusion of sign-creating subject within the semiotic representation of empirical subjects being either among the possible referents of a message or text or presupposed by the statements. Dominguez (1989) maintains that this has to be viewed as an elements of the conveyed content. The issue affects all, not just handful. Nevertheless, the fact is that objectification takes place all the time because of language and in language, because of power struggles and in struggles for control.

Joost Van Loon (2012) rightly observes that objectification is not only a dirty word but also a dirty practice. A sort of violence, even if metaphysical as Derrida terms it as such. However, many critical social scientists would immediately flounce around any

endeavour at objectification as it is considered as bracketing and degrading (human) agency. Through explanation of Martha, Loon shows how the works of radical feminists such as Dworkin and Mackinnon, the term (sexual) objectification (in pornography) has become associated with a negative process of degrading and dehumanizing the women (subject). While Nussbaum points that it is crucial as to how objectification process could be unified in view of its treatment of a thing which not a thing. 'That No-thing' has been granted subjectivity. Hence, it is, for Nussbaum as well as most feminist critics, objectification can be done to subject only, not to objects as things are already object. It is in this respect that Spinoza monism tripped as he contended that both-subject as well as object can be objectified, according him, as they are on same scale of continuum of substance.

However, radical feminist endeavour to conceive new subjectivity for women which is based on style and fluid identity has further objectified the women. While postmodernist radical feminist first urges to pronounce death of man and on its deathbed craft new man with multiple identity and local narrative has further complicated the case for the subjectivity.

As for Herman, the main concern of Heidegger was the equating the Being with 'Presence at hand' or *vorhandensein*. The metaphysical trick from Plato's Cave, which Derrida (1974) later dubbed as the 'metaphysics of presence', enabled the western metaphysical tradition since Plato to assume that there is a thing as 'being-as-such' or worse that 'the thing' is a 'being-as-such. "Instead of being-as-such or *Vorhandensein*, Heidegger posited a notion of being as a relationship between entities that enables us to 'be there'. Harman usefully explains that, this, thus, means that for Heidegger, tools are not mere example of objects among others {as Arendt (1958) maintains in her critique of Heidegger that form the core of the human conditions.} Instead all objects are tools because it is their readiness

to hand that become object.

That Tools enabling property allows one to 'do things', hence they facilitate to be. Latour (2005) reinforces Heidegger's theme when he contends 'action is already overtaken' implying in order to be, one has to be enabled, which means 'is' has already been enabled. Foucault's Nietzsche (Foucault, 1977) might have been pointing at a very similar proposition when he recommended that humans should stop thinking historically in terms of *ursprung* (source or origin) instead should proceed with a more realistic notion of *Herkunft*, which translation in English is origin. However, its usage in Germany points to the greater resemblance with a place one comes from. it is rather a 'pointing back towards' or a 'descent' than a vantage point.

However, If being is understood in terms of tools or separate object having its own being as Harman's object-oriented ontology (OOO) has proposed, then the assumption that subjects and objects exist as independent could be done away, 'in the first place could be dismissed as it implies that subjects and objects have to be created. However, in contrast to the 'critical' reading of objectification stemming from a legacy of Plato's Cave, objectification should not be seen as process granting 'no-thing' to object-like qualities; it is not a process by some—no-thing becomes 'as if' it is not object, like the shadows on the wall appeared to Plato's hapless prisoners 'as if' they were the things themselves. If we take this in 'critical' sense, then objectification remains just a deception and nothing more as it would be a synonym for simulation- a force denying the engagement between signification and realisation (Baudrillard, 1993). They would be prisoners of mythology, self-referential products' "stolen language." (Barthes, 1993).

However, this deception grounds the subjectivity into object even if it being matter of wrong perception. It is for this reason that Harman's object-oriented ontology (OOO) keeps both subject and object in their respective proper

sphere. It provides object or matter a being through consciousness, despite it being independent of subject's consciousness. It's being is not annulled when it is not in the domain of consciousness. However, OOO cancels any possibility of the objectification of subject as it starts with separate being and existence of subject and object having its origin in consciousness but object having its existence independent of latter. It also reinforces the pure monism as both are interchangeable like matter and energy but having their being from one point-consciousness.

Despite the fact that in action or during the work the subject may be grounded to being mere object, but it is only matter of misplaced perception. This tricky issue has got Hegel flummoxed to the extent that he was forced to conclude that action or work reduces subject to mere object. The tool enabling property facilitates the being to do the work, hence it is granted being. Heidegger and Latour too seems to have faced the tricky or unfathomable dynamics of action that grounded the Hegelian idealism in objectification of the subject. The action liberates, as Krishna pure monism posits and certainly would not objectify the subject if ego is not put before body and not entangled with consequences or result.

So far as Heidegger and Husserl intentionality and instrumentality are concerned, they have objectified being making it instrument and intention of non-being. It is not hand but the tools are primary and it is intention or intentionality that moves the being not the being's intention. As the primary mode of human reality as per phenomenologist is 'thrown in the world' and being-in-the-world or being-with-other, so the existence is determined by intentionality and instrumentality. For example, it is tools and intention of other that determines the phenomenology. Later this gave rise to psychologism and sociologism that have been incubating since Plato.

This is just contrary to the position held by Krishna cogito of oneness or monism. The world and life is extension of human reality (consciousness) not vice

versa. For example, tools are extension of hand and creativity is that of mind, not otherwise. The being is not thrown in the world, it is his karma or action and wishes and desires that brings him to the world. He is not thrown but chooses to come here by his desire and non-satiated thirst for life, it is not nauseating eternal recurrence as Nietzsche sees it; it is eternal or unceasing willing, desires, wishes, infatuation with sense objects that force being to come eternally.

How existentialist has trivialized existence is self evident and neo-existentialist has built on this trivialized being adding to further trivialization. It can be also illustrated from how idealists too become rather unsuspected victim of abstraction and wilful straying from universalism and finally getting struck up in postmodernism and post-postmodernism along with neo-existentialists, neo-Marxists, phenomenologist and ontologists as well as deconstructionist. And about postmodernists and post-postmodernists, Latour has rightly put question to their being hardly modern, has trivialized the being, existence, killed soul, cancelled God and hence this crisis.

However, in Plato's cave shadow could be ignored only as his subject was ironically freed from his or her bondage to come out of this situation and could enter the real world. Since violence was used to liberate the subject from his or her bondage, leading him/her into the world and enabling him/her to persuade those left behind upon return about the real world existing beyond the shadows, implying thereof the subject to be heroic and totalitarian so that he or she could indulge in a priori violence to distinguish between the real object and simulacrum.

Marx, in his early critique of Feuerbach (In the German Ideology, Marx & Engels, 1969) exposed the hidden idealism in this version of materialist philosophy. Feuerbach's materialism was a 'beobachtender materialism', a 'spectatorial materialism'. Against this, Marx has proposed a paraxial materialism, in which

realisation is not matter of perception but of action. It is another thing that the action instead of liberating the subject from stupefying effect of world spirit when transformed into state and society, made it mere objective reality of material forces and economic relations. Leaving aside some huge problems regarding Marx's own conception of praxis that especially in their earlier writings can be traced to 'unfinished business' regarding his inherent Hegelianism, the lesson is clear." Any form of materialism that relies on an ontology of perception remains a form of idealism and generates a philosophy that remains self-referential, and most problematically from an ethical standpoint, self-valorising."

However, Marx, apart from making phenomenology end guided hence determinist and objectifying the subject or consciousness by viewing it mere shadow of productive forces and relations, was not original in this respect as earlier works bears it. Heidegger argues that a critique of the ontology of perception, which is the ontology of *vorhandensein* and the crux of what he referred to as 'the western metaphysical tradition', goes as far back as Pre-Socratics, against whom the cave was initially dug out as a form of rhetorical critique. Likewise, Aristotle's version of empirical philosophy may have had some inconsistencies in terms of its own metaphysics; it does pose some critical footnotes at the 'perceptionist' bias of Platonic tradition.

Epicurus and Lucretius were also quite 'praxiological' in their philosophical orientations if only because they drew so much attention to physiology of thinking, something that Nietzsche imitated even though his corporeality of thinking was less driven by enjoyment and pleasure and more by discomfort and irritation. Finally, Spinoza's monism and Leibniz's Monadology were equally making significant inroads into developing a non-perceptionist alternative to the western metaphysical tradition, before these roads barricaded by Kantian and Hegelian thought police of the modern

allegedly 'post-metaphysical'. (Habermas, 1994)

However, Marx endeavour to make consciousness the conditioned reality of material forces as propelled by historical development has already stymied the case of subjectivity. Even though his professed aim was to rectify the dialectical imbalances that Hegel primacy of spirit has resulted into, he despite giving primacy to matter was unable to achieve anything but further objectification of subject. Hegel world Spirit after sliding down to history and becoming the mere reflection of historical force has already been transformed into objectified entity of these forces. The subject has been already reduced to mere appendage of state and society spirit and has to find its freedom and salvation in it. Marx further cemented this objectification by locating this world spirit of society and state in economic relations and material forces.

Nevertheless, the general idea behind the subject/object distinction is that subjects act and objects are acted upon. In many languages, this can be traced back to a grammatical structure pointing toward mood and transitivity (Halliday, 1985). This separation of subject and object is not in itself problematic. Surely, one should be allowed to make a distinction between different modalities of 'being'. For example, Spinoza (1677) used the term attributes and distinguished between modalities of thought and extension. However, both were still attributes of same substance. With subject and object as a priori categories, the underlying assumption is not the unity of substance but duality of essence," (Loon)

The a priori that is non-empirical separation between subjects and objects as essentially two different substance, as Loon observes, makes two mistakes simultaneously: assumes subjectivity and objectivity caused by something belonging to the 'being' of an entity and this 'essence' is an absolute modality of being- one either being active or passive. The first is related to the Kantian rejection of Leibnizian Monadology which has been termed as unjust, and is relegated to generic fallacy

of 'rationalism'..... For Spinoza both 'extension' and 'mode of thought' were attributes of substance (or Monad), not two different substances. If the issue is forced and equated with mode of thought with subject, it is considered imperative to find a way to dismiss Spinoza's logical premise of these two not of a different substance because there is one substance and are only different attributes of substance. However, Kant's separation of 'reason' from 'intuition', implies two different substances: reason consisting of a conceptual abstraction, a purely cognitive process, while intuition still relating to experience, and thus encountering the objects.

However, this 'generic fallacy of rationalism' seems to be rather consequence of taking wood for the tree. As for Spinoza, the extension and mode of thought which he considers the attributes of substance (Monad) means it is available to substance only if consciousness or subject provides it being conscious of it . If consciousness is conscious of this attributes, then it is not Monad or substance as latter has no cognition about this. Kant separation of intuition and reason does not imply two different substance but one as intuition is empirical while reason gives perspective to actualized phenomena . It seems to be more generic fallacy of scienticism or actualization than that of fallacy of rationalism.

Latour's (1993) categoral dismissal of Heidegger's criticism in 'We have never been modern', blaming Heidegger for forgetting being has stymied the case of phenomenology. Latour is undoubtedly right in this regard as phenomenology has forgotten beings, concerned as it as it has always been with objects. However, this 'concern' has been termed as having practiced in a rather limited fashion, having in terms of only one type of activities: perception. Classical phenomenology simply copied the Kantian notion of 'sense' as sense experience, which is cornerstone of synthetic thought. Sense-experience, however, is then already subsumed under the cognition, becoming

'purely mental' activity.

However, Heidegger's point against classical phenomenology has been taken as having forgotten the question of Being-as-process, then the issue is viewed on similar grounds as Alfred Whitehead's philosophy of Organ (Whitehead, 1978). Being becomes an unfolding in time, a process that is irreducible to the (emergent) beings that are being processed and a concern for Being means a non-exclusive concern: sense is not the province of thought but of experience (Dewey, 1925). For something to make sense, we need to follow some 'thing' in unfolding of its being and see ourselves as part, thus unfolding, that is, as part of 'the thing'. Thought becomes an afterthought that enables a specific form of sense-making, namely that of synthetic abstraction. It neither 'fixes' the essence of thing nor its 'concept'; it merely adds to virtualization.

It is maintained that the rejection of a priori separation of subjects and objects would logically follow the rejection of the ontological primacy of perception. Thinking 'Being-as-process' leads one away from experiencing in terms of perception of phenomena and instead results into 'think in terms of 'events', like as having brought about by the Sun, as an emergent not like something to be uncovered. A process-oriented mode of thinking being refuses to separate between entities and forces that move these or other activities, but instead conceives of both in terms of monad (Whitehead, 1978). This is what has been termed as the basis of Whitehead's notion of prehension: through prehension occasions get actualized, prehension not taking place in addition to the entities but the entities existing in the prehension.

In fact, the ontological primacy that has been given to perception is behind this fallacy of putting horse-subject- behind cart that is object. The perception is but presence of past memory and it is mere its cognition. The primacy is just primacy of consciousness which provides objectivity to object but this has been interposed to give predictive value to subject while giving the object

subjectivity. It is not entity that exist in prehension but it is existed by former

This misnomer gets the fallacious sanction from what is termed as William James once making a simple but understood as effective psychological intervention, by questioning the pre-supposition of the existence of consciousness as such and pointing out the impossibility to be conscious-as-such. This so because one cannot be conscious of nothing (although one can be conscious of nothingness, which is not 'no-thing'). Moreover, consciousness has independent being as it is not thrown into or conjoined with any object, though it may seem so, it is just observer and not identified with it. However if it gets identified with phenomena it might give rather deceptive knowledge about whether subject or predicate. Other or objects gets its being because of consciousness. A stone is not stone until consciousness makes it so. Even if stone is independent being, as per Harman's object-oriented ontology, it is consciousness that makes it so. If consciousness is not conscious of stone, a rock or stone would be there but without being of rock or stone. It is consciousness that makes a rock, not otherwise.

It is further contended since objectification is the process making 'the real' actualised, primacy of active subject from metaphysical point of view cannot be worked out. It has been considered as a major stumbling block for the phenomenology that it has to assume more often than not the starting point of the individuated general human being perceiving 'a' world as emerging, thereby forcing to adopt not only a cognitive understanding of the reason but also assume thought emerging from perception. Hence Knowing has always been bound to sense perception imitated by the unique character of the perceiving subject. But who actualizes the 'the real' has been left out from consideration that is subject or consciousness.

However, this sense guided perception is bound to hit wall of reason as it is without its judgemental property. And thoughts emerging from such perception is as

volatile as dream and usually no real value, hence the actualised which is already 'real' appears otherwise. Hence, objectification snatches the primacy of active subject from a priori position. It is on the same ground that Kant sense-guided reason has grounded down the centrality of subject.

Nevertheless, Don Idhe tried to maintain, in the face of critique of the anthropocentrism by phenomenology, that phenomenology has not been necessarily idealist as understood. For example by embracing the body (as Merleau-Ponty has undertaken) it becomes mere 'materialized' or perhaps even 'actual' (Idhe and Selinger, 2003). Whereas it is clear that placing body before the subject enables them to understand other forms of sense perception than those of observation, that is, the dissociation of the 'eye' and 'the I', it still remains a human body that is supposed to be locus of perception.

In other words, the choice has been limited between two different understanding of the reality-the first treating it as 'Split from the beginning' into two substances: subject and object; and as the one substance with different attributes: subjective and objective. For the first, the object remains unintelligible. Latour (2002) rightly asks why those who believe nothing intelligible can be said about things as such (objects) continue to talk about these things. However, it is maintained that there is a sense of 'objective intelligibility' if understood as the emergence of occasions (time) as 'prehension', actualising the enabling (object's 'doing things') as coming onto being. As attributes, subjective and objective merely reflects the doubling of virtuality of actually things which can be different at the same time.

Even if one assumes that subject and object are split from beginning or one substance dividing into object and subject, subject primacy cannot be denied as in any case as object get their very being from subject or consciousness. The primacy that is given to object over subject is self contradictory and certainly can be termed

as rational fallacy. As there have been persistent tendency of objectifying the subject right from the very beginning of human civilization, it is just another link in age old chain.

Meanwhile, the objectification of subject keeps getting cemented in praxis. Levinas, in *Totality and Infinity*, comes to conclusion that there is no other, it is ego that permeates in other. Other is infinite but it has been viewed as such to justify totalitarianism and authoritarianism, while in Krishna pure monism it is one that appears as other. However, Levinas like neo-structuralism further builds the theorem on Husserlian phenomenology and Heideggerian ontology for justifying the subjugation of subject by other. It is same as in the Hegelian Spirit which after taking shape of world Spirit plunges into mere object through 'infinite dynamics of action'.

As M Henry (1975) maintains " Expression such as 'subject objectifies himself', 'the ego objectifies itself' are partially incorrect. Moreover, they mean to say to the representation but not the being of ego." This is so because "In the Hegelianism, subjectivity is conceived as being of itself deprived of all reality that action is imposed on it as the task of transforming its pure thought into being and of making something of itself."

Action liberates the subjectivity of its possible objectification if consciousness does not identify with body involving in work and getting tied to the action and its outcome. As Krishna pure monism postulates action can objectify the subjectivity only when it is done with egoism of doer ship and tied up with result. Action has its own reality and being, and it can liberate and bind the subjectivity depending upon whether body is put before consciousness or identified with it.

Moreover, Kantian centrality of subject got lost in the sense guided perception and knowledge, and in binary of pure and empirical reason, while Husserlian phenomenology and Heideggerian ontology resulted into

further cementing of philosophy as science and marginalization of subject. Derrida has underlined this grand game of transforming philosophy into science and objectification of subject which was started from Plato, Aristotle, found its eco in Hegelian Spirit but lost in action. Kant halted this by ushering into 'Copernicusian revolution' which reinstated subject as centre but tried to reason out subjectivity in the prism of pure and empirical reason and knowledge arising out of the deceptive senses which not only lost the case for subject but also raked up the sciencitization of philosophy. His procrastination in respect of God and Soul led to further drying the well of philosophy and putting into it the tablet of exact sciences.

However, the most irreparable damage of subject as subject was done when Greek logo got hooked to Cartesian instantaneous fleeting cogito which was further authenticated by Husserlian phenomenology and Heideggerian ontology. After discarding the Scholastic-Aristotelian concept of being as rational animal due to inability to define the "rational "and 'animal', Cartesian cogito limited being to mere thinking thing, a mind: "A thing that doubts, understands, affirms, denies, is willing, is unwilling, and also imagines and has sense perceptions"(Descartes). Transforming mind into substance and equating with soul, and limiting being to the thinking or thoughts which are chaotic and without any foundation, left the subjectivity at the mercy of vast plane of immanence.

Nevertheless, would Levinas and others deny Edmond Jabes' postulation : "All faces are his, that is why He has no face"? Or It is the creator that has become creation or as the Creator does creation without being conceited of His doer ship or Karta, that is why He is not seen. That is why Krishna pure monism exhorts that one should, like creator does his work or perform action without the feeling or conceit of doer ship. Just as creator is not attached, entangled and visible, only His creation or

works are available not him, in such way man should do his work. Such work would be consecrated or Ygna, it means it would not bind him or objectify his subjectivity.

There is difference between Kantian 'good for good sake' or 'action for action sake' and Krishna Karmayoga or doings without the feeling of doer ship: the former only ethical person can initiate and later anyone. Though end result would be same: an ethical society and 'life would be ygna or sacrifice or auto-consecration. Though his philosophical assertion has been misinterpreted and subverted by theological philosophers, it would be akin to 'Kingdom of God' but here and now, not there in far away distant time as interpreted by theological scholarship as well those who has proclaimed 'Death of God' on the pretext of Ideal society or classless society as distant as 'Kingdom of God' that would be in the distant horizon. For time being, face the guillotine or genocide, fratricide, gallows or penitent for earthly as well as heavenly kingdom of God as Albert Camus derisively posits in Rebel.

The finitization of infinite and infinitization of the finite is what may be termed as 'Metaphysical violence'. Derrida has rightly termed the efforts of Husserlian phenomenology and Heideggerian ontology as metaphysical violence as it cannot but objectify the subjectivity. The transformation of being as monad (only spiritual material) and limiting to it to mere thoughts or to the immanence without transcendence or limited by action is also violence. Being or subject is not limited by action but by ends or result that have been considered one and same thing. As per Krishna pure monism action liberates but the end or result desired binds it. Action are as infinite as thoughts but like latter it is not chaotic, it is the end or its desired outcomes are the bondage making infinite finite. This is also a sort of metaphysical violence. It is in the coordinate of action and desired end (action has its own dynamics but if it is tagged with end that is in future making action and actor finite) that

freedom of being is compromised.

Such approach may seem rational but if one goes deeper, it would unravel the irrationalism a la Marx's or Hegel's realm of freedom which is determined or shaped or controlled by the matter or end dominated rather end obsessed action or spirit. Using the determinism of class interest or the social and historical situations as propounded by Marx, M. Scheller and K. Mannheim developed this concept under the name of 'sociology of Knowledge' or 'sociologism'. This doctrine has evolved as the theory of the social determination of the scientific knowledge.

The sociology of knowledge is based on the assumption that all scientific thoughts and particularly on social and political matters does not ensue in vacuum but 'socially conditioned atmosphere'. The unconscious or sub-conscious elements, which are again by-product of the socio-political forces, influence or rather shape them. 'The social habitat of the thinker determines a whole system of opinions and theories which appear to him as true or self-evident.' These appear as logically and otherwise true without having made any assumption, despite the fact there has been assumption behind these opinions and theories.

This unravels when one thinker or theory is juxtaposed with another one having been mooted or formed in different socio-political milieu. The theory or perspective too would proceed from a system of seemingly certain assumptions, but obviously different ones. The difference might be unbridgeable and with gaping hole that these two systems emanating from the same assumptions and unconsciously or subconsciously formed in different socio-political milieu that these two could not be reconciled or bridged intellectually. 'Each of these different socially determined systems of assumptions is called by the sociologies of Knowledge a total ideology'. Even Derrida has authenticated this rather deterministic credo by asserting that meaning is within

text dictated from without.

Even in respect of linguistics or aesthetics or politics or philosophy it explains or sums up the hitherto history of idea and material development. This leads to, if past regression or future regression, to infinity or nothing if whole history of idea and material development is put under erasure. Be its source or origin of knowledge or matter or civilization may lead to the position contradicting neo-Marxist, rationalist, humanist and pragmatist. However, 'epistemological break' has to be given permanent break as it is just a ploy to prove ones thesis while bracketing predecessor or sequential one.

The knowledge or matter or life or being comes from primordial being as all idealist have nodded and rationalists have consented with pinch of scienciticism of one substance which Krishna called 'Mahat Tatva' which translates into substance or Primordial being. One becomes Purush (consciousness) and other Prakrit (Nature), consisting of conscious world and material or natural one. This is not dualism as One has transformed into two and from unity of difference point of view they are but one.

Coming to Derrida's Erasure which put everything under its flattening juggernaut, every language or expression or idea or development is just resurrection of traces. Krishna has said that in Gita, (Chapter 3, stanza 4) the knowledge about as how to meet phenomenology or life was revealed in yore but it got lost and it again revived. His theory of transmigration and Prarabdha (action based essence) is also based on this trace or vilupta (invisible) phenomenon. If we put trace or trace under erasure or vilupta (invisible) theory under erasure, it would reveal that time, space, spirit and matter are infinite entity.

The cynics and zealots of sciencitization and objectification would raise their temper but the question

how could a finite being can make out or know the infinity until and unless it becomes infinity itself by submerging its finite into infinity. The same question was asked to Krishna by Uddhav and he replied how could an infinite being, that is soul can prove its infinity that is itself infinite. But how can it be known as knowledge itself has been reduced to a mere means. As some believes (Nietzsche, empiricist and British school of Psychologists) knowledge is a mere means. They say, "It is something new in history that knowledge wants to be more than a means." (Nietzsche, Gay Science)

Schopenhauer erroneously has linked cause and effect with willing (Über die vierfache Wurzel des statzes vom Zureichenden Grunde) with the assumption that only will that exists. Schopenhauer seems to have endorsed a primordial mythology as he believes in the simplicity and immediacy of the will, whereas willing is actually such a will practised mechanically that it almost escapes the observing eyes. Nietzsche too seems to have mechanised the will which should not be the case. If Schopenhauer will is primordial mythology, then Nietzschean and neo-structuralist is mechanical and modern mythology.

In one aspect, law of causality is intricately related with power of understanding or knowledge. Hence Krishna postulation that knowledge is all stands vindicated. Knowledge would further validate the fact that it is same phenomenon that is cause of its effect. With spatial-temporal interactions, the same phenomenon becomes cause of its effect. The seed of effect is in cause and vice versa. Schopenhauer has proved this through various precepts in 'The World as Will and Idea'. The role of reason comes later on when this understanding is institutionalized and established.

Time, space and reason or dharma or idea is the subjectivised object of the subject. In Kantian pure reason it is latent or un-manifested, but when will or idea or spirit acts upon it, it becomes manifest. The phenomenal

existence is manifestation of this. Though it is apparent, fleeting in nature, yet it appears real in phenomenal existence. Such reality led Kant to assert that "if we abstract from our mode of inwardly intuiting ourselves ... then time is nothing." Our very selfhood seems to consist of temporal relations

As James Mensch has observed both Levinas and Heidegger share this approach, attempting to interpret human existence in terms of its temporality. This is the point of Heidegger's account of Dasein, involving "the repeated interpretation ... of the structures of Dasein ... as modes of temporality" (SZ, p. 17) Levinas also embraces this task in terms of a different account of our existence—one focusing on one's embodiment and relation to the Other.

However, the interpretation of these as modes of temporality yields, correspondingly, a different account of time: for Heidegger emphasis on the determination of one's selfhood through his or her choices, while Levinas's focus is dual. "It concentrates, first of all, on the structures of our embodiment—those, for example, of our bodily sensibility. In taking these as modes of temporality, Levinas privatizes time; for him, the privacy of the body embraces more than our mortality—more than the fact, which Heidegger stresses, that no one can die for you. Temporality, understood in terms of this privacy, becomes diachronous—i.e., non-synchronizable. The result is the temporal alterity of individuals and, hence, of the Other".

As time and space is dependent on subject and when subject ceases to be phenomenal, both disappear for the subject. As per pure monism it is time and space that contains and in turn contained by individual. Though Schopenhauer and his followers view world as Idea and Will, it appears that they have taken law of causality as essence of phenomenal world. The will as manifestation of Idea get entangled with law of causality as these are influenced by natural forces or speaking in Krishna pure

monism term , Sat (goodness), Raj (passion) and Tam (Darkness or inertia) or in general term by lower and higher law of nature. Once after willing, the material manifestation is guided by law of nature or above mentioned triad forces . And this could be best negotiated by Karma theory or Karma yoga or law of causality.

To see the being (Das-sien) being-in-the-world different from being is fallacious it is one but; seems to be different due to its changing condition in the world. Despite change, it remains one and indivisible. The being, being, being-in- the-world, being-in or being-in-itself-this compartmentalization of being defeats the nature and structure of existence and existent. This is the basic premise of Krishna pure monism. The being is one but when seen in backdrop of vast and chaotic immanence of thoughts and transcendence of other is perceived as different modes.. “All the action takes place in time by interweaving of the forces of nature but man (being) lost in delusion considers himself actor.(Bhagvat Gita Ch.3 stanza 27)

However, the modern and postmodern or existentialist and neo-existentialist or post-existentialist have taken this compartmentalization or fragmentation of being as very basis or denying or marginalizing or objectifying the subject. The structure of being with its roots lying in nature is the main raison de tire for seeing being in such fractured way. One would not fail to find that this philosophical stratification and compartmentalization has its route in Heraclitusian positing of fluid nature of phenomena. He failed to see the basic premise that even flux is apparent and this apparent fluidity underlines the constancy of phenomena. Later on Plato built his philosophical proposal in backdrop of this fluidity but he unlike Krishna did not see constancy amidst the fluidity of phenomena. That is why he tried to resist change in socio-economic progression through his reactionary and anti-change philosophy- a deterministic idealism (Popper).

Heidegger falls in same fallacy as Husserl whose phenomenon is limited to immanent and immanence. His immanence becomes immanent and phenomena has to negotiate the being and its nuances without being transcendental. The same position exists in matter of being, time and space. Krishna position that time dissolves in being and being in the infinite(Udhav Gita). Husserlian phenomenology and hermeneutics view being as compartmentalized and fragmented entity. This has resulted into chicken egg syndrome vis-a-vis the being and its structure as well as the being of understanding and understanding. The being that understands is the being of understanding as well the being that understands.

The being of understanding and understanding does not happen in sequential way in time and space but it happens simultaneously. The being that understands and that is understood is same and whatever difference or in whichever horizon it occurs is the same. The understanding and listening or phenomena and its knowledge are part of same being. Due to temporal and spatial conditioning, it appears in sequential way of following and preceding.

For a knowledge or understanding to be consummated, three constituents are imperative- knower, knowable and knowledge. If one is missing, other won't happen: if knowable is missing, knowledge cannot happen and if knower is missing, despite knowable presence the knowledge cannot happen. Similarly if knowledge is crossed out, there would not be knower and knowable. Hence such understanding is transitory and phenomenal, but there is knowledge inherent in phenomena and substance , otherwise it would have not happened. The epiphenomenalism of knowledge appears because of the soul being knowledge form itself. Since soul has been disapproved or cancelled, the knowledge has lost its primacy and have been degraded to mere 'means'.

Similarly being that is afraid of some frightful things or possibilities, it is not that fear or its structure is there that causes fear. The being interprets it in way or understands in a manner that causes fear. For example, the fear caused by ghost on tree is the being interrelating or understanding it as ghost and when it sees that it is not ghost but a rag stuck in branch giving the illusion of ghost, and the moment it is understood that it is rag that appeared as ghost, the fear is gone. It is just philosophical version of Freud libido theory which posits it is libido inside that gives rise to sex and related neurosis. If it is so how come a libido differentiates between incest and normal relations? If libido is a structure that determines the destiny of being then why incest and altruism happen? It is akin to equalitarian proposition that rules out equality on biological basis or Darwinism.

Husserlian renditions of human existence and phenomenology seems to be Cartesian redo of mechanization of consciousness or subject reducing to mere co-ordinate of immanence (I think therefore I exist). The subject or consciousness or Das-sien or Being-in-world or Being-in and other beings are nothing but one being got stuck up in flux or fluidity of life. As Krishna has said when man due to delusion identifies with fast changing phenomena of life, his mind gets split. This multiplicity or fragmentation of being is due to this delusion.

Being, time and Space are infinite and constant as Einstein has averred that energy and matter are not only infinite but at some time they seem to be one. The finite transformation of these infinite entities are but violation of pure monism. It is finite mind that sees finite in the infinity. It is human being after thinking itself as independent and free entity that provides the finite perspective. It is conventional wisdom and naivety on the side of convenience that divides the being, time and space.

As Husserlian and neo-existentialist or postmodernists basic premise is based on Cartesian

mechanical reductionism of existence and life- 'I think, therefore I am' or exist', it has led to positing the theory of absurd, gestalt, monad, existentialism, neo-existentialism, postmodernism and post postmodernism. I fear therefore i am afraid or i drink water therefore i am thirsty is as trivial as the situation you breathe therefore you live. Existence is not limited or guided or characterized by a mere mechanical and reflexive action of being. Moreover, consciousness is not always of other, consciousness is more often than not self-conscious of other. Even if consciousness is consciousness of other, the consciousness is self-aware of this. Moreover, consciousness when not of other is aware of this that there is no other. It is for this reason J G Fichte whose formula: Empirical I stands the Pure I-I and who in continuation of Kant's philosophy made self-consciousness the foundation of philosophy.

When consciousness is itself existence, how can it always be conscious of other, it is also conscious of existent and existence. What Husserl is trying to prove that it is other that makes consciousness the conscious, consciousness is just means for other or it is other that consciousness is predicated of? It is another way of objectifying the subjectivity that Heidegger without any doubt posits, "Being is the objective presence of nature."

This naturalisation, objectification and distinctiveness of being by Husserl and Heidegger is just projection of their structural and neo-structural approach to the subjectivity. This sneaking of objectification into subjectivity has been further used to achieve the fragmentation of being. This rather trivialization, mechanization and objectification of being has been behind the existentialist and neo-existentialist, modernist, post-modernist and post-postmodernists inability to find meta-narrative or real narrative about any phenomenon.

The same folly seems to have gripped the natural or physical sciences as reflected in their futile search for

'theory of everything' or 'unified theory' and consequent search for 'God's particle'. The breaking or compartmentalization of being or particles is not to yield anything, except nothingness. The ultimate conclusion that life is absurd and meaningless, reality is non-reality and there is no meta-narrative or there are competing meanings or narratives posited by neo-existentialist and postmodernist authenticates this.

The undercurrent theme of being and its world as objective presence of the nature has been behind this endless vacuum, absurdity, multiplicity or reality and narratives. As per Krishna pure monism, the being is consciousness permeated by super consciousness. "Know that Prakriti, nature and Purusha, Spirit is both without beginning and that temporal changes and gunas, conditions, come all from nature. (BG, chapter 13, Stanza 19., trans. By Juan Mascaró, Penguin Books)

"Nature is the source of all material things: the maker, the means of making, and the thing made: Spirit is the source of all consciousness which feels the pleasure and pain" (ibid, stanza 20). The spirit in man when in nature feels the ever-changing conditions of nature. When he binds himself to the things ever-changing, a good or evil fate whirls him round through life and death. But the Spirit Supreme (infinity of which the man is extension) in man is beyond fate. He watches, gives blessing, bearer of all feelings. He is called Lord Supreme and Supreme Soul. (ibid, stanza 21, 23) He who knows in truth this Spirit and knows nature with its changing conditions, wherever he may be he is no more whirled round by fate. (ibid, 22)

Again the discourse on Time and Space reflects this objectification of subject or being and pulverization of being or consciousness. The being, time and space is infinite and without beginning and end; later two infinity emanates from former one. As the time and space are extension of being or their very being is dependent on the being or consciousness, they are infinite. Death of

man does not put brake on it as 'Time (as well as space, Krishna thinks time and space one) in man and man in Super consciousness (Udhav Gita).

Time and space, some considers time and space as separate, while others includes space in it, are subject centric and emanates from it. Where is time and space when one closes one's eyes or one dies? It may be that collective or social time and space remains but it's being is dependent upon unit of society. The vertical division of time in second, minute, hour, day, week, month, year, decade, millennium as well as horizontal of present, past and future are artificial division of human mind and has been done for convenience. Husserl terms the thesis of time as infinite as vulgar interrelation. For Heidegger even subject is vulgar as it implies subjectivity and since time has subjective predicate, it would be naturally vulgar.

However, Derrida's semiology that has given rise to post-structuralism posits that meaning is in text. While structuralism pioneered by Saussure seeks meaning outside the (Con)text. Derrida sees the meaning within text but shaped by outside and while Saussurian position is that that meaning is outside the text. This gave rise to post-structuralism that took in grip the humanities and linguistics subsequently. It has also influenced the natural and physical sciences. Moreover, it led to marginalization of the subject as subject has no role, he gets the meaning as guided by inner or outer structure of text or context. It proved to be deterministic theory a la Marx and neo-Marxist.

Beyond the question of whether meaning is in text or outside that later on settled for psychologism and sociologism, there is another perspective of subject's creativity. While seeking meaning in text or outside it, the writer or subject is automatically geared to find the meaning beyond the inside and outside the text. It seeks meaning from both as it is located beyond outside and inside or both. The subject has been left from this, as he, according to them, is monad and he finds meaning what

inner or outer structure detects. It reinforces Platonic idealism and how subjectivity is still put under Derrida's Eraser and it is still un-erased as reflected from constant struggle between subjectivity and objectivity to obtain primacy over each other.

If analyzed from onto point of view as well as ontologically, the meaning is neither in text nor outside it but it is in creators or subjects or writers or discourse creativity or in knowledge which is in-built or inherent. Even if the subject loses its subjectivity it remains what it is-subject. Hegel misplaced the action as objectifying the subjectivity where it is liberating if body and ego is not identified with it and end not put before it. However, the creative process once started maintains its independence operating under its own law. It may be termed Krishna' Dharma or Kant's reason or Plato' Idea and it's autonomy and process remains independent having its own dynamics and principals. The same thing is about action or Karmas: they have their own law and process.

Once one does the work, these law and process start taking its shape independent of doer: it is no longer in control of him. This perhaps might have led Hegel to believe that action objectifies the subject. That is why one of the basic tenet of Karma theory or Causality is that one should not be attached to the result. It is attachment with result not action that objectifies the subject as Hegel believes. This becomes the foundation of ethics and ethical conduct that Krishna pure monism posits.

The writing or discourse has some analogy with creator or creation. The most fundamental is that once process is started, the creator or subject control is replaced by the creative law and process as per pure monism. As the Mahat Tastva (Substantive element) from which World has originated in the form of Purush (Consciousness) and Prakriti (Nature) (Samakhya by Ishvar Krishna in The Sourcebook of Indian philosophy), the consciousness like Nature has also its own nature, law and rules that comes into effect when it interacts with

them. Once the process starts be it consciousness or Nature, they lose control over it, and the related law and force take the control. However, it is not structuralism or neo-structuralism that may appear as consciousness or subject is both operative and constitutive factor.

After Kant's 'Copernicus revolution' of putting subjectivity or spirit or consciousness back into primacy, Hegel stymied its case by manipulating world spirit finding its freedom in historical forces and state and society. Hegelian Spirit got stupefied in the dynamics of action which according to Hegel objectifies the subject. His dialect of thesis, anti-thesis and synthesis subverted for justifying the determinism and collectivism at the cost of subject. His dialectics that he borrowed from Heraclitus who seems to have misunderstood or misappropriated dialectics of Krishna pure monism became the basic tenet of historical materialism or economic determinism of Marx, who replaced the idea with matter, was based on faulty premise. Heraclitus missed the point that even this flux is subject to further change and even if changes occur, it remains same or likely to revert back to thesis. The thesis may not lead to anti-thesis and bypassing it may lead to synthesis. Even synthesis may be worse than thesis. Their failure of their respective abstract idealism and crass materialism proves it.

The logical conclusion of this objectification of subject has been Leibniz's positing being as 'monad'—non material spiritual prototype of universe with god pre-ordained destiny, having no outlet and it's like abode with closed doors and windows. Moreover, the consciousness has been reduced to a machine that is dependent on others, 'Every consciousness is of something or somebody.' Thus it has been made subservient to other; it is other that makes consciousness a consciousness. But how can consciousness be conscious of other without being consciousness of it? If one is conscious about a tiger, the tiger consciousness is aware that it is tiger, only then its perception is

consummated.

That consciousness is always conscious of other can be contradicted with mirror analogy. Even mirror can be called a mirror even if it is not reflecting anything. A mirror does not cease to be mirror if there is none to look at and even then mirror is mirror of itself. It is one of function that it reflects whatever comes to it, but it does not mean mirror is predicated on other for being mirror. To reduce a phenomenon to its function and structure is nothing but to trivialize it and in nutshell to subvert it. It is another matter that Husserl has no other option than to reduce phenomenology to 'objectification of nature and Cartesian Cogito'.

Derrida rightly questions the Husserlian thesis of 'consciousness is always of other' as it has been posited to deny independence to the subjectivity or consciousness. The main purpose seems to be objectifying the subject otherwise it is just ridiculous to think that it is other that makes a consciousness. It is akin to posit that a mirror is mirror only when other is reflected in it, otherwise it is not mirror: the mirror is mirror because of other. Along with subjectivity or consciousness, God or infinity is also denied but on whose deathbed new god or multiple gods are created. How could infinity or God could be denied while god or finiteness is affirmed? This contradiction validate the hypothesis of agenda of marginalizing subjectivity and ignoring God or infinity.

However, Derrida deconstruction and socially predicated meaning in the text led to the discourse of post-structuralism and later on percolated to other fields and get ossified in psychologism and sociologism. As meaning is in text but determined by outside, naturally it is determined by extraneous factors. This is determinism of Marx et la as discourse or text has no individuality it is guided and shaped by extraneous factors. The binary seems to be proposed for justifying this outside the text or deterministic hypothesis. This

binary is nothing but dialectical projection of reality. This binary can be bettered through knowledge as Krishna pure monism maintain, but even knowledge has been doubted as knowledge is pure or impure or empirical or inferential. This all seems to have been done just to prove the respective points.

Derrida's *Grammatology* but fails to rectify this error as his binary reductionism is based on deterministic proposition of one determining other viz day night, north south and likewise. If seen from pure monistic perspective, it is the day that stretches into night, happiness into sorrow, north into south and likewise. It is same phenomena on same continuum but with time and space and some natural forces, that is what has been termed as structural and erroneously as determining forces transforming it. To say that it is first of the binary that determines other is just Marxian determinism and reductionism. It is same two points on the scale that looks apart, and perceived differently.

However, while dealing with dialectics, Derrida again betrays the deterministic approach to reality: it is outside that shapes or determines the inside. He carries forward the deterministic or materialist or Marxist or totalitarian approach to reality, initiated by Plato, religiously followed by Hegelian idealism, and later on the fate of subjectivity was sealed by Cartesian Cogito which was further cemented by Husserlian phenomenology and Heideggerian ontology. Nietzsche declaration of death of God, birth of multiple god and positing of centre everywhere provided the fertile ground for dislocating the subjectivity, and enshrined the collectivism as new god banishing the subject with objectivity and its structure.

Even Derrida's contention that writing is present absence while speech is present presence does not hold much tenacity as even while writing absence is present (as the thing written about is not present, though its absence is presented in writing), not absent, even if it

appears so, it is apparent, not real. Even speech may not be present-presence as some absence in form of written script or narrative can be mixed. The post of presence and absence can be shifted through the prism of subjectivity and objectivity and this could be more apparent than real.

Subjectivised time and distance or space also disapproves the objectification thesis in the sense that 'in sync with finiteness of Infinite Spirit or consciousness or subject, the infinite time and space has also been made finite'. Even Levinas positing of others providing temporality to subject has not helped much in this regard. He contends that others provide temporality and being, to some extent it seems working. Suppose one visits old place, finding everything intact but only he or she has changed and only absence is others providing temporality. Suppose others are also simulated and brought forth, would time and space would be same. There is no possibility as it is subject or consciousness that has provided temporality to phenomena not otherwise.

The past, present and future all are subjective interpretation of infinity of the consciousness providing temporality. However, the automotive or primacy or independence of thought that Cartesian Cogito gives and its influence on Husserlian phenomenology and Heideggerian ontology is disapproved by Krishna pure monism in the sense that if one is aware of any automotive or involuntary thoughts, they lose their independence or existence. If a thought is suppressed or stopped, it would continue to haunt, but if one becomes aware that this is thought, its intensity and overall effect would be calmed down. On other hand, if one is unconsciously moving one's feet, if someone points or even self becomes aware, it ceases at once.

Even Hegel and Husserl later on realized this aspect of senses: but it could not find enough attention. Had they applied to their respective works, their phenomenology would have crashed to naught. There is

eye for seeing, one sees what one wants to see. Even if structure of perception forces itself on self, It is sensibility or will of self as shaped by memory to see or perceive anything, that actually happens. While passing through market place or crowd, one sees what one wants or wishes to see. There are many things that miss the eyes. That is why Krishna pure monism has averred that it is not eyes that see, it is not ear that listen but their sensibility that self puts into sees or listen to the things or voices. But the structuralism and postmodernists, in their unmediated zeal for ossifying and marginalizing the subjectivity has made philosophy run on scientific lines. Derrida has noted that term metaphysics validates this agenda of sciencitization of philosophy.

Even if Derrida seems to be making centre de-centre and vice versa taking his inspiration from Nietzsche who has turned centre as multiple centres which is in sync with his 'eternal return of beings'. Derrida, after placing the meaning outside the text, toes the neo-Marxist line of determinism and by de-centring the centre he becomes the unsung hero of neo-structuralism and postmodernism. However, despite taking Husserlian phenomenology and Heideggerian ontology to the task of missing the wood for tree, he seems to have taken forward the postmodernism credo of making being a mere cog wheel in structural realities.

Nietzsche's 'eternal return of beings' does not prove the death of God and reincarnation of god, though it has been devised to do so, yet it shows eternal conditioning (Sansakar) of being by his desires, wishes, actions and his attachments. Since the avatar of postmodernism—Nietzsche had to deny God, subject and soul so that new god could be consecrated, objectification of subject through structure or natural forces established and soul replaced by unconsciousness, it was but natural to plot eternal return of being. But the eternal return of being is making of being, not of any structure or natural forces, as Krishna pure monism avers. It is the self condition of

being by its desire, wishes, wrong perception and knowledge that forces it to 'eternal return'. Both metaphorically and otherwise, the endless desire, selfish willing, going after sense objects and attachments would lead one to eternal return to hell like situations in life as well as it would lead to willing of more desires and sense objects that would lead to more and more returns.

As per Krishna pure monism, one could be free from eternal return in this life and beyond, it depends upon being as it is his willing, desires, wishes, and selfish cravings that lead him to eternal sorrow, helplessness and hell like situation. It does not mean one should not will or desire, but it must be controlled and optimum, and this must be left to the law of action or its dynamics, otherwise one would be entangled in vicious circle of willing and desiring. And non-fulfilment of these would lead to sorrow, helplessness, ennui, and absurdity in this life, and if this willing and desiring is not controlled and optimized, then it would lead to eternal return.

Moreover, Husserlian and Heideggerian thesis of being as objectification of natural process is denied in case of handicapped person of various disabilities. For example, a person without both hands uses legs as hands and vice versa, a blind person uses the function of eyes though ears and skin and likewise. So it is structure of seeing that results into vision or its being that sees or does want to see?

Derrida has rightly said that metaphysics is west centric and it is a sort of violence, however, this has become dominant discourse so far. This metaphysical violence of marginalization of the subject and the scientization of philosophy found its first manifestation in Plato and dominated Greek Dialectics and idealism which seems to be misunderstood or distorted version of Krishna pure monism.

Socrates paradox 'virtue- all virtue is knowledge 'virtue is sufficient for happiness', 'No one desires evil' and 'no one errs or does wrong willingly or knowingly'

and 'I know that i know nothing or Socratic Method which Aristotle termed as that of inductive and reasoning, hence scientific was neglected for Plato absolutist idealism and stratified justice (Karl Popper). There is palpable similarities between Krishna Samkhya or Epistemological theory but it was neglected (Plato's *Apology*). The sophists and Romans too preferred Plato. Later on it found some echo during Renaissance in the thinking of Hobbes and Locke but got subverted for use in the marginalization of subject and propagation of the absolutism.

After one of the modern cultures (religion) taking over and appropriating the Greek and Roman idealism and closing down the Plato academy, the philosophy was fragmentized in theological and atheism and divinity, and the subjectivity was further trampled down. "The truth of philosophy does not depend upon its relation to the actuality of the Greek or European event. On contrary, we must gain access to the Greek or European eido, through an irruption or a call whose point of departure is variously determined by Husserl and Heidegger. (Derrida, *Writing and Difference*, p 397, Endnote). "It remains that, for both irruption of philosophy is the original phenomenon which characterizes Europe as 'Spiritual Figure'(ibid).

"For both the word philosophia tells us that philosophy is something which, first of all, determines the existence of Greek world. Not only that, the philosophia also determines the innermost basic feature of our Western-European history, the often heard expression 'Western European philosophy is, in truth a tautology.' Why? Because philosophy is Greek in its nature, Greek in this instance means that in origin the nature of philosophy is of such a kind that it first appropriated the Greek world and only in order to unfold." (Heidegger "What is Philosophy?")

Though when Renaissance dawned dispelling the

'Dark Age', hope arose in the form of Hobbes and Lock and Kant's reason and his 'Copernicusian revolution' reinstated the centrality of subject but it was lost in his zeal for making philosophy an exact sense and denial of infinity or God and Soul. And with Cartesian Cogito that modern era began, mechanization of the subject or being and scientization started running in full steam which was further consolidated by Husserlian phenomenology and Heideggerian ontology. The rest is history.

This was the foreground of what Derrida termed as 'Logocentrism' of fragmentation of philosophy in metaphysics (the term proves the scientization of philosophy) Logic, Phenomenology, Ontology, and later on it was subverted with 'Psychologism' and 'sociologism'. The Cartesian Cogito which is springboard of Husserlian phenomenology and Heideggerian ontology fails to explain the primacy of objectivity over subjectivity. This is more galore in case of handicapped person with both hands amputated who uses legs for the activities performed by hand. Similarly, deaf uses eyes for listening through lip reading and so forth and so on.

Even Derrida fails to escape the tentacles of violence. Writing is a violence, metaphysics is violence so is life and existence. If seen from theo-philosophically violence is very name of life, here violence is that the being perpetrates while living. The metaphysical violence is there: the literal violence is there: writing is violence, so is speech which conceals as well as reveal a lot of violence.

Krishna pure monism do accept the inevitability of violence: it is real, hard and unmitigated. One cannot escape the violence of life: it is the reality. But Krishna pure monism maintains that it is there because other is invented, violence done is equivalent to violence occurred while eating when teeth accidentally cut the tongue? Is it violence? Who has done violence to whom? Are not tongue and teeth are part of one reality as we all are? When the whole creation is creator having manifested in it and hence who does violence to whom

or is it violence at all?

Marxist and neo-Marxist tacit approval to God's death, to 'consecrate new god (of state and ideology) by existentialist and neo-existentialist which later came to be known as postmodernism or post-postmodernism coincide with killing of subject which Husserl declared as vulgar concept and rechristened it as Being through objectification of subject. This has been done as bluntly as happened in the case of demise of God and Soul. But it is another matter that on demise of God have mushroomed many gods of all ilk. One but cannot help to surmise that rather off-handily that the demise of God has coincided with mushrooming of all type of gods-totalitarian, absolute monarchical, military industrial, 'earthly Kingdom of God' and so on and so forth as rightly summed up by Camus.

The 'absurdity' or meaninglessness is in subject or consciousness or in being it is not objective reality. Had it been not so, everyone would have felt same absurdity and meaninglessness in life which is not the situation. The absurdity and meaninglessness is projection of reality perceived as such. For existentialist and neo-existentialist, life is absurd and meaningless, but it is not so for subject or being or consciousness. The being could find meaning or purpose even in absurdity and meaninglessness, but subject is not given attention as it is just subjective reality of the objectivity. This nihilistic and mechanistic view emerged from Marxist and neo-Marxist penchant for determinism or collectivism, more so their socio-economic reductionism, and Freud's natural or instinct reductionism. The logical culmination of this deterministic philosophy has been rise of sociologism and psychologism.

As if fragmentation of being is not enough of metaphysical violence, the subjectivity uncertain theory of objectification was propounded 'which is compensating for uncertainty about how to positively relate to others by downplaying their subjective attributes. (Journal of

Experimental Social Psychology, Volume 48, Issue 6, p 1234-46.)

However, M Henry (1975) contention that “Man is not essentially an historical being. He is always the same” is anticipated by Krishna in Gita when, in argument with Arjun, says there has not been any time that you or he or for that matter anyone has not been on this earth. As Kierkegaard says that each generation finds itself confronted with the same task as the preceding generation..... what is historical are the cultural or human objects and different human attitude related to it. But the ontological basis which founds both objects and attitudes is indifferent to this evolution; the latter always presupposes the ontological foundation.”

Soren Kierkegaard mentioned Krishna’s Karmayoga or action without being too attached to the result, one can meet the world-historical sien, of course without expecting any result (Unscientific postscript) Kierkegaard rightly says that how can be a historical world without subject or individual. World historical is past and future, but consciousness or subject is just ‘is’. It is this ‘is’ that was and will be, though it is fleeting. So first the ethical becoming subjective and then world historical”.

Again coming to ‘middle kingdom of knowledge”, how can a finite capture or grasp infinity except by losing its finiteness into infinity. Only by becoming infinity that a finite being know or be or exist without any issue. This can be proved by the inability of capturing or portrayal of a scenic beauty by eyes or camera. If one tries to capture the scenic beauty, it would be just impossible to capture it in totality until one is identified with it. But once one becomes the infinite, how could it be described? The same paradox Krishna underlines when Udhav asks about the infinite Soul or Spirit.

He maintains that how could one describe it and who would do it and how? He further elucidates it through the example of Hansa. When the seer and seen becomes

one, who and how discourse about it may be possible? This conundrum is not such that it is bothering only modern philosophers and thinkers; it has been of the concern right from Krishna time, Plato, Socrates and successive thinkers. This has been at the centre of Socrates Paradox and even Plato and Aristotle could not solve the paradox concerned they were with transforming philosophy into science. The successive philosophers and thinkers have been terming it as Socrates paradox. The very terming it as paradox betrays the diffidence and ignorance of the western philosophical scholarship. The Socrates Paradox is just inability of western philosophical scholarship to look beyond scienticism.

The modern logic having its roots in Logocentrism that Derrida mentions, along with Psychology and Sociology has upstaged philosophy displacing it from its high ground, appropriating its most of tools and technique grounding it to mere mind, while disrobing it of Soul and God. However, the most adverse affect apart from that of ‘British school of psychologists’ has been putting emphasis on analytic mode of inquiry while sidelining synthetic one. While former approaches the subject through breaking it, the latter synthesizes it making enquiry wholesome. But if intention is to disapprove any truth or reality or universal facts, it can be done with the help of analysis. Since the ghost of scientization that gripped the philosophy from the yore-during Plato, it has not been exorcised and its grip is getting tightened, further suffocating it.

The analytical approach may help one in exact or physical sciences, even in these it is doubtful as evident in Boggs Higgins experiment being undertaken in Europe regarding search for creative substance or God’s particle. They have not found any substantive conclusion nor there is possibility of finding such as analytic or breaking would lead to nothingness or zero or something like that. Then it would give rise to age-old debate as world had come out of nothingness or

super substance (Mahat tava)

Nevertheless, the modern logic which has usurped and rather subverted the foundation of philosophy while denying its relevance, seems to be akin to sceptics of the yore. The sceptics and modern logic has some structural similarities in the sense that former doubts everything, while later breaks everything and razes all concept on the ground of crass logic reminding one of toddler logic. The preference of analytics over synthesis best sums up it. If everything is broken into parts and then meaning is sought, it is simply impossible to find any meaning or truth. Moreover, synthesis is denied as it is considered not pertinent to it. A phenomenon cannot be broken like substance for arriving at the truth, even though to know the truth behind the creation or creative substance or God's particle, incessant breaking of particle is being undertaken. It has led to micro particles and ultimately would lead to nothingness because a thing before coming into its being is nothing then it becomes thing. But modern sceptics could not accept it.

The crossed out transcendence provides the security from the tyranny of immanence because there is no escape from it without transcendence. It is not realized that only transcendence can provide the security from immanence, but it is cancelled or crossed out. As Krishna maintains (Gita, chapter 3, stanza42) in being beyond senses and sense organs is mind, beyond mind is intelligence and beyond that is Soul. But along with God, Soul has been crossed out and merged with consciousness. Even knowledge is a sort of transcendental action: to know one has to go beyond the things or phenomena to know it. In knowing one goes beyond the things to be known. As Latour has said knowledge is middle kingdom when subject and object meets or indulge in dynamic relationship.

But in their zeal to be modern, postmodern and post-postmodern, they have betrayed being pre-modern as Latour has proved in the last century. Apart from what

Latour has proved that we are hardly modern or pre-modern, forget being postmodern or post-postmodern, in fact our human civilization has been frozen into pre-modern or in the zone between tribalism and modernity. As Latour has said that God and soul has been crossed out and in their place various sort of gods and consciousness has been put into place. Everything thing from nature to nurture has been turned into hybrid and purification is denied. The symptom is conspicuous by their presence: Fanaticism, fundamentalism, extremism, bigoted nationalism, religious orthodoxy, growing hatred among different cultures and civilizations, xenophobia, violence, cruelty and indulging in war or war like acts for vanity. These are symptoms of tribalism, certainly not that of modernity.

Before God everyone is equal but it is more for the sake of saying than having any paraxial value. Moreover, after cancelling of God or crossing Him out, various gods have been resurrected thereby removing any basis or foundation of equality. What Nietzsche means by lighter man will be over man or higher man with no ego or subdued ego. But the problem is that lighter or higher man can be so higher or lighter that he or she may lose identity or its very being.

Life is just 'is' and this sums up its all etymology, reality and prospect. It has no 'was', 'if', 'but'. There is continuity or monistic string in 'is' as it 'was' that has become 'is' and it will become 'will'. And this 'is' *sat* (truth), *Chit* (without any alternatives or if and buts) and *anand* (bliss). It is continuity at generic level and unit or individual level, it may appear discordant or broken but it is matter of perception or perceiving or projecting ones fractured subjectivity. At generic level even human being never dies, though an individual life terminates at certain point.

This phenomenal world is just 'is', however this 'is' is constantly shifting as it is a process. Day leading to night, night to day, happiness becoming sorrow. Even in body everything is changing incessantly but consciousness

remains same. It never changes otherwise it would not have remembered the changing dynamics of body from childhood to till old age or death. But consciousness is beyond change, it remains as it is otherwise remembrance would not have occurred to it. (Gita chap 1, stanza 1),

There is infinitesimal gap between what one wills and what happens. There is infinite possibility and there is infinite gap in the sense of certainty of actualizing of that possibility. Since we consider us finite being in this infinity, the problem starts with this. Asceticism is the most easiest way to solve this. But how can an assumed finite can attain infinity without thing in itself or without having complete faith over Him. Even for asceticism it is very difficult feat as finite acts like gravity in pulling down to it from infinity. There is constant struggle to maintain the connection with One.

The other way, that has been most conventional is mediation by mediating agency such as cultural organization and their agent. What Latour has termed these mediating agency as hybrid one wherein purification is not allowed. They have transformed it into quasi-human and quasi-god entity, while God has been crossed or cancelled. Such pre-modern perspective has been factored into every aspect of reality and it has been termed modern or postmodern. Latour has proved its pre-modern nature exposing preposterous cleverness of modern civilization.

Sartre while discussing nothingness in, *Being and Nothingness*, almost concedes the existence of soul though indirectly. How could he accept after cancelling God. Kant also did the same. "There is an infinite of realities which are not only objects of judgements but which are experienced, opposed, feared etc by human being and which in their inner structure are inhabited by negation, as by a necessary condition of their existence. We shall term them negatites." (The translator note says a word coined by Sartre with no equivalent

word in English. However, in Sanskrit, it is 'Neti Neti.. ...') Kant caught a glimpse of their significance when he spoke of regulative concept (the immorality of soul), types of synthesis of negative and positive in which negation is the condition of positivity.

The glimpse of soul: "The being by which Nothingness arrives in world must nihilate nothingness in its being and even so it still runs the risk of nothingness as a transcendent in the very heart of immanence unless it nihilates nothingness in its being in connection with its own being. The being by which nothingness arrives in the world is a being such that in its being, nothingness of its being is in question. The Being by which nothingness comes to the world must be its own nothingness." Sartre, *Being and Nothingness*, p.23.

The Being of consciousness is the consciousness of being (Sartre, *ibid* para 3rd, p.23). It proves the independence of soul. Soul is conscious of consciousness, it is consciousness of the consciousness. Heidegger and Husserl considers consciousness as conscious of something. They are of view that consciousness is always conscious of other, without it consciousness cannot happen. Hence, they make it secondary phenomenon as Sartre has commented but misses that it can be conscious of the consciousness itself. But Sartre can not absolve himself from the blame of degrading soul to mere consciousness, soul has been cancelled and its quality has been bequeathed to the consciousness.

One can ask as who is conscious of fact that he is conscious of something? Even consciousness is conscious of itself and that is soul. This also proves that consciousness is on the same continuum as soul. "Without facticity consciousness could choose its attachment to the world in the same way as the soul in Plato's Republic choose their conditions. "I could determine to be born 'a worker' or 'to be born a bourgeoisie'. But on the other hand, facticity cannot

constitute me as being a bourgeoisie or being a worker” (Sartre, *ibid* p.83).

“Any study of human reality must begin with the Cogito. But the Cartesian ‘I think’ is conceived in the instantaneous perspective of temporality. Can we find in the heart of cogito a way of transcending this instantaneity? If human reality were limited to the being of the ‘I think’, it would have only the truth of an instant. And it is indeed true with Descartes the cogito is an instantaneous totality, since by itself it makes no claim on the future and since an act of continuous ‘creation’ is necessary to make it pass from one instant to other” (*ibid*)

Sartre says: “The Being of human reality is suffering because it rises in being as perpetually haunted by a totality which it is without being able to be it, precisely because it could not be the in-itself without losing itself as for-itself. Human reality therefore is by nature an unhappy consciousness with no possibility of surpassing its unhappy state.” This is again defeatism as how could there be unhappy consciousness until and unless its unhappy recipe that is having the pseudo freedom of controlling every human reality and phenomenon whereas the reality is that human has no control over 95 per cent of body activities which are involuntary.

Against Sartre position of ‘the being of human reality is suffering’ or consciousness primary nature is unhappiness, it can be stated it is neither unhappiness nor happiness as it is just observer or witness to phenomenon. The problem arises when it identifies with phenomena. Krishna pure monism position is that the primary nature of consciousness is beyond both, that is transcendental position. It is self that makes consciousness suffering as it get identified with plane of ‘vast and chaotic’ immanence. Only Sartre does not seem to be infected with this fallacy but it has given rise to the whole corpus of philosophy of absurd with Nietzschean unhappy suffering self getting misperceived as the ‘eternal

recurrence’ and resultant nausea.

Sartre trivializes soul as consciousness, whereas it is conscious of consciousness and knowledge form. Perhaps it might have been done to cancel soul with its inaction that has been attributed to it. It is not inactive or dud but it is aware of it, despite not doing anything it is witness to all acts and values that being undergoes. It is certainly not passive act. It is like black smiths moulding bed where everything happens or like sky; It is acting since its primary nature is being witness or observer, as it is consciousness that pervades the phenomena not otherwise, it is acting but without feeling of doer ship, it is different form of action. The problem arises because consciousness is misunderstood as the consciousness of being.

Even though consciousness pervades not only all the being, but whole universe, yet it is substantive, indivisible and immortal despite being entombed in mortal body. The being for itself or being in itself or being in the world all are mode of consciousness that it appears to forming only because of its association with being and phenomenal world. The consciousness of being and being of consciousness are same even though they appear different. The anguish or bad faith or lack of freedom arises because of this misplaced notion, and Sartre along with Husserl and Heidegger could not come out of this tricky relationship between being and consciousness.

Extension and addition which is quality of matter or substance is not only available to consciousness as it is opaque, but it is all pervading and infinite also. In association with finite body and pervading whole body or whole universe, it gets appearance of addition or extension which is not its real being. Consciousness has no being; it is itself its being and non-being or it is beyond being and non-being. Everything is available to consciousness, it is being or ego that lacks everything available since ego and mind is felt as such only when it is lacking something. The structure of ego and mind or

self is lack and desire is its effect. So "chaotic plane of immanence" is vast and because it is identified with consciousness. It is mind and ego or self which is like immanence is imminent to itself. But when seer is viewed separate from the scene and is sought to transcend, it becomes chaotic; if it is considered just as it is, it is just any plane.

Knowledge is again enough to know this but even knowledge like that of consciousness or soul or infinity or God has been at the best given being and at the worst it has been cancelled. The fragmentation of self which is projected onto fragmentation of reality or narrative is as dud as opponent of pure monism that has pervaded the staid rationalist. Knowledge is not 'middle kingdom', conventional knowledge may be middle kingdom where seer and scene meet, but the pure knowledge is kingdom itself- infinite and transcendental like soul that is itself knowledge form and observer.

Cultural Crisis

The cultural crisis, as self evident in the form of hostility among different cultures and rather universal penchant to prove their respective one-upmanship and self-carved superiority from the history and higher civilizing and moralizing culture and morality, seems to be cause and effect of this overall crisis having enveloped the world reality. It is the culture-not one but all so far evolved in the history of human being, that has been conjoint victim of creating other, exclusiveness, and objectifying others. However, this metaphysical and otherwise violence as well has been perpetrated through logo centrism of interpretation or misinterpretation.

All the Prophets and anthropoid gods have exhorted the human beings with same pure monistic and oneness goal. But this has been interpreted in such way as to leading to the carving of separate groups and organizations (religion) and creating separate enclosures like tribal at the best and animals at the worst. The scores

of Prophets of all cultures that descended to the earth for ameliorating the conditions of particular race, nationality, time and space has been universalized; while those who advocated for universal fatherhood and brotherhood has been limited to finite space, time and denominations. Spinoza pointed out this contradiction in his work *Ethics* and proved through wide chasm between what various Prophets and gods preached and what has been interpreted by their followers.

It is said that the world morality and ethics as grafted onto it by the European morality inheriting Greco-Roman moral templates of master-slave perspective that later on transformed into master-slave colonies or colonialism, followed by cultural hegemony of West leading to the world in crisis after crisis. The negotiating of one crisis without striking at the routes have been leading to the crisis after crisis. In reaction to cultural hegemony of Greco-Roman master-slave morality, various denominations in general and one of the cultures has rebutted this hegemony with their own brand of morality and culture leading to universalization of this hegemony ensnaring the whole world in their reactionary and other worldly utopia.

What is ominous that this lopsided cultural tussle has been overshadowing the political and social organization of the world. The East or Orient in general and Krishna pure monism in particular would have acted as balancing or countervailing force had it not been subverted by the social elites (Brahmanism or priestly caste) for their vested interests of subjugation, hegemony and exploitation of the Indian society.

There seems to be rather coincidental similarity of Hinduism or Brahmnical subversion of Krishna pure monism and grafting of Greco-Roman master slave morality by Christianity. There seems to be continuation of this subversion of Krishna ontological monism with Varna-based or caste based highly stratified, unjust, inhumane and exploitative system in the different time

and space in the form of subversion of modern cultural formations in general and Christianity in particular by their respective clergy or priestly class which did away Greek and Romans 'cordial and equal relation with their gods' as was case during Krishna time when due to Brahma theory and pure monism, god and humans were on same scale of existence, not hierarchical and stratified as introduced by Brahmanism which later might have found its echo in Christianity introducing Master slave relations. This might have happened independently or influenced by each other but the coincidence is very conspicuous. Further study and research in this regard might lead to some new insight.

The way one major cultural formation finished high ground of Greco-Roman culture with supplanting the transcendence with immanence in the form of 'idea of history and the punishment' (or judgment). The transcendence that manifested in Greco-Roman culture was though with different milieu and concept, it retained the figures of Brahma theory or cosmology or cogito of oneness to be in symbiotic relation with god and nature, and felling its last vestiges in the demise of the Moor of Spain found a quite similarity in Brahmanism (Priestly class or caste or social elites) subverting Krishna pure monism with polytheism, pantheistic system and paganism in India.

The problem of the cultural evolution of mankind is that whatever culture has evolved, whether it be tribal or modern civilized culture which seems to be tribal in the disguised form (both of West and East) is justified on the historical reason; and civilizing the world though hollow rather misplaced universalism of brotherhood and fatherhood in way bordering on tribalism of yore. Since a particular culture has evolved in a particular way, it cannot be justified on the historical ground.

The monism when translated to the monotheism of the modern cultural formation, got subverted with the vested interest. As it was done in the yore, when Krishna

pure monism, after having been transformed into monotheism was turned into an icon of polytheism and attendant primitivism. The same seems to have been happened in the respect of modern cultural formations (religions). The message and Messengers have been the same pure monism of Krishna but when converted into monotheism, it is characterized with new form of idolatry and the primitivism disguised in the modern symbols and narratives.

The problem with cultural field seems to be somewhat same as in the philosophical realm, in the sense that when lofty heights of Kantian reason and ethics was virtually demolished by the idealists and empiricist in unison, despite the rebellious protest by Camus, this could not be restored for obvious reason. Everyone has its own goose to roast. As Hegel removed the ground beneath the Kantian reason and ethics by grounding spirit to historical forces and finding its liberating manifestation in state and society, it led to the diluting of the two basic premise of reason: God and the immortality of soul and misplacing the dynamics of action. The same was done by the later day idealist and revolutionary who after having proclaimed 'the death of God', invented new god of ideals and obscured dreams on which altar they sacrificed the present as very succinctly Camus has underlined it.

The cultural crisis seems to be not less ironic and lamenting as reflected in the world having been divided in hostile formations and groups. While in India the idolatry and polytheism with its dogmatism and blind alley of fatalism has been entrenched by replacing Krishna pure monism and monotheism, other major cultural formations have replaced idolatry with another form of idolatry of symbols, messiahs and prophets, social codes and judgment, prophecies and redemption.

Gilles, Deleuze, and Felix, Guattari (1994) rightly observes that there was partial surmounting or transcending to immanence by modern religions. "Can

we speak of Chinese, Hindu, Jewish or Islamic or Christian philosophy? Yes to the extent that thinking takes place on a plane of immanence that can be populated by figures as much by concepts. However, this plane of immanence is not exactly philosophical but pre-philosophical..." But this pre-philosophical has been frozen where it has been, while it has been given thematic fluidity by nominal or rather figurative concept of Fatherhood, Brotherhood and Family hood (all world is family). It is not surprising that the Fatherhood's paternity is granted to only their own sons and daughters, rest are stepsons to be baptized and evangelized with force or lure. Brotherhood is conceded to their own brethren, rest are infidels or kafirs to be wiped out or forced to join their ilk. Similarly Family hood has been limited to highly stratified and hegemonic social system (caste).

The main problem in respect of the cultural realm, as is the case in every realm, that the God or reason or Dharma—the immediate reality has been transformed into the mediate one, and the horde of mediators and mediating agencies have crowded therein just to sub serve their interests as Latour has succinctly diagnosed as everything-idea, institutions and organizations have been turned into hybrid and purification is denied.

The cultural formations based on same knowledge of oneness of Krishna pure monism as manifested in the Fatherhood, Brotherhood and Familyhood have been objectified through misinterpretation and reducing it to symbols and conventional objects. Jesus 'love thy neighbor' or 'Akhalaque' of Prophet was but affirmation of Brahma theory or oneness of knowledge in different time and place but has been transformed into a natural ground (object) for contesting superiority and vanity.

In place of traditional or primitive idolatry new form of idolatry has been instituted with hollow grounding of universal brotherhood, fatherhood and family hood which is misreading of Krishna pure monism. It is ironic that while idolatry and paganism has been denounced and

purged with all types of violence, mayhem and series of crusades, new cultural formations have come up on its debris, replacing old ones with new form of idolatry and paganism. Only symbols have changed with hollow appropriated discourses of universalism not grounded in praxis; temples and idols have replaced another ones with symbolic and superficial changes. The Kingdom of God has remained otherworldly goal and dream, while Kingdom of new gods has been shoved into just to cover up the injustice, inequality, oppression and suppression of the people as Camus has observed, and Pascal very succinctly sums up in *Penses*.

Schopenhauer maintained that Christianity marked metaphysical and political anti-Judaism. He argued that Christianity constituted a revolt against the materialistic basis of Judaism, exhibiting an Indian-influenced ethics reflecting the Aryan-Vedic theme of spiritual "self-conquest." This he saw as opposed to what he held to be the ignorant drive toward earthly utopianism and superficiality of a worldly Jewish spirit: While all other religions endeavor to explain to the people by symbols the metaphysical significance of life, the religion of the Jews is entirely immanent and furnishes nothing but a mere war-cry in the struggle with other nations.

However, other cultural formations (religion) are not less guilty. While one cultural formation destroyed many ancient cultures, and damaged many subtleties of Orient, that of Family hood and Buddhism were lost in self inflicted obscurantism and abstracts respectively. The controversy started ever since entry of another culture on the ground of who is God and who is Son of God and the counterstrategy by other has led to further fragmentation and objectification of subject (human being) in praxis.

The discourse of light that all prophets and gods imparted has been blown out with expediency. The moment Truth or Light or Reason or Idea or Dharma is bound by limitations of denomination, culture or particular

symbol, it ceases to be so and becomes stale and obsolete. Instead of Light, it becomes a lamp or candle when it is limited or bound with the time and the space. And it is in the nature of a lamp or candle that it contains darkness in its womb with a lot of smoke as collateral. It cannot enlighten its own backyard, how can provide light to the whole world? This is the problem of the world wherein Truth or Light or Reason or Dharma or idea has been monopolized and baptized by limiting it to the time and space.

“We misinterpreted Krishna, we thought Krishna is saying that he is God. We did not know he represents our future, he is speaking from our side ...he is our future.. voice of all possibilities—we worshipped him, we could not understand him. Jesus was put on cross, we could not understand him. Mansoor was amputated as Muslims could not understand him as he said, he is ‘Akhalaque’ (I am Brahma). Till now we the people of world have made two types of mistakes: if did not understand them put them on cross or started worshipping them. In both situations, we don’t realize that the person is indicating about the hidden potentiality of human beings.” (Osho or Rajneesh, ‘Timeless Truth’, *Psychology of Bhagvat Gita*, Part-iv, p17-18).

“This “bearer of glad tidings” died as he lived and taught—not to “save mankind,” but to show mankind how to live. It was a way of life that he bequeathed to man: his demeanor before the judges, before the officers, before his accusers—his demeanor on the cross. He does not resist; he does not defend his rights; he makes no effort to ward off the most extreme penalty—more, he invites it.... And he prays, suffers and loves with those, in those, who do him evil.... Not to defend one’s self, not to show anger, not to lay blames.... On the contrary, to submit even to the Evil One—to love him....’ (Nietzsche, *The Anarchist*, 35 th para)

This rather sums up the cultural glass ceilings when the Messengers have been sacrificed at the altar of ritualistic and superstitious Godhood, making it

impossible to have the access without the mediating agencies (cultural organizations), and the message has been distorted, subverted and manipulated for the vested interests of the respective social and political elites of the respective cultures. And these interests have been and still being awarded with all the power, pelf and prestige for keeping society and culture stagnant and moribund.

God is immediate but has been transformed into mediate entity by society and its institution. It seems to have been done with sole purpose of acting as mediating agency for the immediate reality. Hence, there are found litany of institutions and interests locked in power struggle and competing hostility. This type of staggered and layered approach has led to characterize every walk of human society-be it politics, economics, or any other field. The postmodernist and post-postmodernists for their part have built up multiple gods and subjects or fragmented self on the ‘Death of God’ and the canceled soul.

Nietzsche, in *Will to Power* and *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*, proclaimed the ‘Death of God’-perhaps that God wrested from Greek gods who were in friendly relation with them on equal footing and Brahma theory or Krishna pure monism’s Creator that has become creation, and put on higher podium as Master and Upper Brahma. In fact he might have intended to put the existence in proper perspective wherein there would be no Master God or Higher caste God but men-gods or all is Brahma. But the cultural formation denounced it as heretics and the free-thinkers saw it as opportunity to shove in their own gods-ideology, state, civil society, technology.

Cultural formations, though earlier helped state and society to get stabilized and consolidated, seem to have become source of crisis by objectifying the subject and giving subjective primacy to the object. Almost all cultural formations (religions) have been interpreted in such way as to accentuate the divide and otherness. The messages of respective Prophets and gods have been

distorted accordingly just to provide this misinterpretation the credibility and authenticity that is always lacking. The universalism, fatherhood, brotherhood and Family hood as ingrained in these messages and precepts are being used just to justify violence, dogmatism and one-upmanship.

However, the problem is rather generic as existence and existent is infinite and any finality or judgement can be ascertained only when it has achieved its finality. Since existence and existents are infinite, no theory or perspective can be final and whatever has been mooted is temporary. However, the universal or infinite knowledge that is inherent in Spirit or consciousness and phenomenal world as posited by Krishna pure monism has been made denominative, subverted and appropriated for vanity . And the result is that on this fragmented, limited, subverted and appropriated universal knowledge that is inherent, world has been navigating so far. Hence the crisis of world, or world in crisis or crisis has been crisscrossed as crisis of crisis.

The interpretation of inherent knowledge or logo of oneness whether in philosophical, or cultural or social realm and grounding to history or convention has matched the overall objectifying grand plan. When this logo of oneness manifested in cultural realm, for example 'love thy neighbor' or the Prophet's 'Akhalaque' or Krishna's Brahma theory got objectified into organizational denomination or fixed entity or an objective being entombed in immanence without transcendence. The inherent knowledge of pure monism, in philosophy, is not being re-territorialized on itself after being de-territorialized in different milieu, speaking in Gilueleuz's term or conceptual plane, has led to fragmentation of being and objectification of subject. Consequently, the human being has been reduced to an object, an extension for the consummation of history.

Section - II

Knowledge is Inherent

The knowledge or truth or reality or narrative or whatever other nomenclature for it may be, is inherent in phenomena and substance as averred by Krishna's Samkhya and in ancient tradition as mentioned in Gita. Krishna has said three thousand years back in BhagvadGita and Udhav Gita 'Know that everything in this world of made of conjoining of Prakriti (nature) and Purush (consciousness or soul which is knowledge form)'.

The inherence of knowledge in phenomena and substance can be further validated with what physicists have come to conclusion that matter and energy are given and fixed and are more often than not interchangeable. The total volume of matter and energy are constant, any change or variation are only nominal while both maintain their inherent character. The knowledge or meaning about matter are built in the matter itself. Matter is what its meaning is and its meaning is what matter is . That is what Karan Barad (2007) has come to conclusion:

"Matter and meaning are not are not separate elements. They are inextricably fused together and no event, no matter how energetic, can tear them asunder. Even atoms, whose very name means 'indivisible' or 'uncuttable' can be broken apart. But matter and meaning cannot be dissociated, not by chemical processing or centrifuge or nuclear blast matter are found to be capable of exploding deeply entrenched ideas and large cities. Perhaps this is why contemporary physics makes the inescapable entanglement of matters being

known, and doing, of ontology, epistemology, and ethics of fact and values so tangible, so poignant..”

Neils Bohr and Heisenberg- two great pioneers of the quantum revolution in physics- respective interpretation of Quantum physics—complementarity and uncertainty — constitute the nucleus of so called Copenhagen interpretation of quantum mechanics. The Heisenberg uncertainty principle says that there is a necessary limit to what can simultaneously be known about certain pairs of physical quantities such as the position and momentum of a particle. What he means not that there can't be any knowledge about a particle's position and momentum, rather a trade off between how well one can know both quantities at once: the more one knows about particle's position, the less knowledge about its momentum and vice versa.

As to What are its implications for understanding human thoughts process, Bohr uses his notion of complementarities to contemplate the limitation process of thinking. When diffraction and interference were first discovered, they were thought to be physically distinct and identified by different terms: diffraction referred to the bending of waves, and 'interference' referred to their overlap. Some physicists maintain this historical distinction and while other deny. In his famous lectures (1964) the Nobel laureate physicist Richard Feynman suggested dropping the distinction, since there is only one basic phenomenon at issue: physically speaking diffraction and interference are one and the same; they both have to do with the fact that when waves overlap, their amplitudes combine.

Techno science and Nature-cultures are now commonly used terms in the science studies literature. As Donna Heraway (1997) explains: “Techno science extravagantly exceeds the distinction between science and technology as well as between nature and society, subjects and objects, and the natural and the artifactual

that structured the imaging time called modernity—Like all the other chimerical condensed word formed that are cobbled together without benefit of hyphen in hyperspace of the new world order; in the world techno communication promiscuously fused and transgenic quality of its domains by a kind of visual onomatopoeia.”

This validates the thesis of Krishna pure monism and its axiom that knowledge or meaning is inherent and it is one that has become all. Kantian position that knowledge about phenomenon can be known as it is within the purview of correlation between being and thought but noumenon cannot be known as it is beyond it, can be disapproved both empirically as well as speculatively. If one goes through chronicle of all invention and discovery, it would be found all inventions and discoveries happened on trajectory of failure of thoughts and being co-ordinates. The example of Madam Quarry or Einstein or Newton or for that matter any inventor/discoverer—all testify that they got their breakthrough from beyond the being and thought co-ordinates. It is *noumenon* of Kant that has become phenomenon with all meaning and knowledge. If phenomenon can be known why not *noumenon* as former is speculative and empirical manifestation of latter.

The metaphysical movement of object-oriented ontology (OOO) also, from hindsight, proves that knowledge or meaning is within and inherent in phenomenon and substance. Object-oriented ontology is a metaphysical movement rejecting the privileging of human existence over that of nonhuman objects. Specifically, object-oriented ontology opposes the anthropocentrism of Kant's Copernicusian Revolution, whereby objects are viewed as conforming to the mind of the subject and, in turn, become products of human cognition. In contrast to Kant's view, object-oriented philosophers maintain that objects exist independently of human perception and are not ontologically exhausted by their relations with humans or other objects. Thus,

for object-oriented ontologists, all relations, including those between nonhumans, distort their related objects in the same basic manner as human consciousness and exist on an equal footing with one another.

Object-oriented ontology is often viewed as a subset of speculative realism, a contemporary school of thought that criticizes the post-Kantian reduction of philosophical enquiry to a correlation between thought and being, such that the reality of anything outside of this correlation is unknowable. Object-oriented ontology predates speculative realism, however, and makes distinct claims about the nature and equality of object relations to which not all speculative realists agree. The term “object-oriented philosophy” was officially coined by Graham Harman (1999), the movement’s founder, in his doctoral dissertation..

Since then, a number of theorists working in a variety of disciplines have adapted Harman’s ideas, including philosophy professor Levy Bryant, literature and ecology scholar Timothy Morton, video game designer Ian Bogost, and medievalists Jeffrey Jerome Cohen and Eileen Joy. In 2009, Bryant rephrased Harman’s original designation as “object-oriented ontology,” giving the movement its current name.

This affirms Krishna pure monism and its main premise that meaning or knowledge is inherent in subject as well as in object. If the matter and energy are constant and given, so is their meaning and knowledge which is inherent. So is the case about being and phenomenal world. As M. Henry, in ‘Philosophy and Phenomenology of Body’ has proved:

“Man is not essentially an historical being. He is always the same. Everything profound in him—and by this we make no evaluation of an axiological order but rather designate what must be considered as original from ontological point of view—remains identical to itself and is found in all eras. It is because it rests on ontological

foundation and because it refers to ontological power that ethics in turn exhibits the permanence peculiar to it, that each generation, as Kierkegaard says, finds itself confronted with same task as the preceding generation..... What is historical are the cultural or human objects and different human attitudes related to it. But the ontological basis which founds both objects and attitudes is indifferent to this evolution ; the latter always presupposes the ontological foundation”.

This is what Krishna posited when he averred in dialogue with Arjun that there has been no time when ‘You and I’ have never been in this world and there will be never a time when ‘you and I’ will not be. He posited permanence of being and action based phenomenology that is called Prarbdh theory entailing that it is one’s action or karma that decides his existence. While past actions or karma decides the present, the action being performed whether with egoism and with debilitating urgency of controlling its result that is called Karmaphal or result would decide the future.

Soren Kierkegaard affirms Krishna pure monism when he says: “.....There is meaning even in a doctrine of transmigration; but the doctrine that a man may be born with his second nature, a social nature involving a reference to a temporally dated historical fact, is a veritable non plus ultra of absurdity. From the Socratic point of view the individual has an existence prior to his coming into being and remembers himself, so here recollection involves is his pre-existence, and not a recollection about his pre-existence. His nature (his one nature, for here there is no question of a first and second nature) is determining in continuity with itself.....”

“ Apollonius was no content like Socrates to remember himself as being before he came into existence (the eternity and the continuity of the consciousness is the fundamental meaning of Socratic thought) but was quick to make an advance; he remembered who he was before he became himself. If this fact has been naturalized,

birth is no longer merely birth, but is at the same time a new birth. So that one who has never before been in existence, is born a new being born the first time. In the individual life the hypothesis of naturalization is expressed in the principal that the individual is born with faith; in the life of race it must be expressed in proposition that the human race, after introduction of this fact, has become an entirely different race, though determined in the continuity with the first. " (ibid)

Krishna posited about knowledge being inherent and infinite when in reply to a query of Arjun, in Gita, as to how he came to know about this Knowledge (Samkhya), he said it came from light (sun) to Vivasvan to Manu (King) Ichavaku (Manu's Son) and downward. It became untraceable (lupt) before being remembered and revived by him (Krishna). Here light symbolizes the knowledge itself. It is not coincidence that in every civilization and culture, the light has been used as metaphor for knowledge inherent property. Even this authenticates the knowledge being inherent and universal.

The thinking or philosophical tradition or development of world can be categorized in two broad categories: Samkhya or epistemology and or Karma yoga or causal. All the philosophical developments even the poaching sciences of psychology, anthropology, political science etc can be broadly categorized under it. The unity of world or pure monism most aptly is reflected in categorization of all philosophy under these two broader categories of knowledge as it is inherent in existence and phenomenal world. The categorization of philosophy in Western or non-western or in oriental and occidental are artificial classification propelled by cultural formations to gain superiority index.

Knowledge about ontology and phenomenology has been inbuilt in existence and phenomenal world. This is amply clear from prevalence of two streams of knowledge - Samkhya or Gyanyog or epistemology and Karma yoga or causal law or cause and effect as mentioned by Krishna

in Gita. Hegel has termed these as 'figurative' but this misnomer seems to have crept in due to subversion and appropriation of this knowledge by social elites (Brahmanism) and theological philosophers. Even if so, it cannot be denied that the rest of world in general and western philosophy in particular have been built the 'concept' and developed theories on these figures.

If the hitherto overall philosophical development or existential and phenomenological knowledge of world is analyzed it would be proved that knowledge is inherent, and world ideational growth has veered round two broader categories- Samkhya or Epistemology and Karma yoga or causal theory or action based phenomenology. Before going for this comparative analysis of hitherto philosophical or conventional knowledge and civilizations and cultures based on that, it would not be non-contextual to mention that there has been rather competitive tendency to claim it their own while rejecting preceding or other one. Appropriation and misappropriation, supplanting and supplementing of idea and culture is but its logical outcome. Moreover, this has been basis for terming other as uncultured, lacking in culture, a-historical and claiming superiority over it.

The pure monism or logo of oneness or one inherent knowledge permeating the being and phenomenal world has been interpreted or misinterpreted in such a way giving rise to difference and dissonance. The knowledge is one and same but it has been decoded in way as resulting into divergent view, perspective and theory. It is in this co-ordinate of knowledge and its interpretation or misinterpretation, its appropriation and misappropriation that all sciences, theories, perspectives, ontology, phenomenology, epistemology can be put into perspective.

Derrida seems to be hinting at that when he posited trace and erasure theory. Derrida's Erasure could be put to unearth many frauds, shams, appropriation of knowledge, philosophies, civilizations and cultures, and

even scientific investigation. Particularly its use could unearth many shams and frauds leading to the current crisis. The problem is that one theory or stream of knowledge is erased and on its traces are restructured other one but the erasure considers it as their theory, knowledge, civilization, invention and subverted it by their subjectivity and vested interest. The most of the problems be facing the world and leading to the crisis like situation emanates from this.

It seems to have started form ancient period when Babylonian after appropriating and supplanting proto-Sanskrit-speaking Civilization that was extension of Harappa and Indus civilization, made it their own as Gordon Child in *What Happened in History?* and Claudius Ptolemy in *Ancient History Encyclopaedia* has chronicled. That is why there are many similarities of idea, culture, law, organizational pattern, trade relations and social code between Indian and Babylonian. Apart from Law and organization pattern, there is subtle similarity between Hammurabi and Manu Code. Later on many appropriated and supplanted subtleties became basis for Greco-Roman civilization and culture.

Same appropriation and supplanting allegation has been made in respect of Greek philosophy. It has been maintained, even western historians and philosophers have seconded it that Plato Idea, Socrates paradox, Pythagorean Theorem and philosophy, Aristotle Logic, Heraclitus flux theory have been influenced by the Indians. Though it has been substantiated from comparative analysis of related works of Greek and Indian philosophy, yet it seems to be figurative and nominal. Even Hegel, Spinoza and other Western philosophers have also directly or indirectly indicated but with condescending attitude. World philosophers in general and western philosophers and historical philosophers have put scepticism in form of putting this appropriation to Indians and bracketing them as uncivilized and a-historical culture and civilization

reeking in eschatology and fatalism. They have made their history, civilization and culture as scientific while bracketing Indians with mystic Orients.

As Felix Glileuz and Guattari has said: “.... Nevertheless philosophy was something Greek....always brought by immigrants”. Hegel and others hinted at it. The immigrants brought philosophy, but they were termed barbarians and given inhuman treatment probably just to cover the act of appropriation and show the originality of thoughts. Otherwise there seems to be no place or cause for unabashed hatred for immigrants termed or tagged as ‘barbarians’ so that they could not be thought to have brought forth wisdom and knowledge from their parts of the world.

There is enough ground for it, even if it is disapproved on many not so subtle grounds. There were trade relations among Greeks, Ionian, Persian, Arab, Turk, Egypt with India and particularly with Greeks, as Herodotus has mentioned, political and social relations with Indians. Even in ancient history which has been termed as mythology: Yayati-forefathers of Yadu, Madhu and Krishan and legendary king son was married to Greek. Some maintains one of the branches of Yadavas-ancient Indian ruling class migrated to Greece. Even Some Greek historians have attested to it. Even Greeks along with Turks, Arabs, Chinese participated in Mahabhrata war (see Bhandarkar’s Mahbhrarata).

However, this is beyond the area and scope of essay and even Indians themselves have subverted and pulverized their historical and philosophical legacy just to sub serve the interest of social elites (Brahmin), the author has studied this aspect in *The Greatest Farce of History*.

Nevertheless, Derrida’s trace and erasure theory validates the thesis of knowledge being inherent in existence and phenomenal world. The same knowledge has been erased and then on its traces other theory and

perspective has been resurrected tweaking one or two propositions. Derrida has analyzed all existing knowledge, theory and perspectives and have come to conclusion leading to trace theory or perspective. And it has not been contradicted or opposed so far, proving its validity. Krishna has attested to it in ancient time when in dialogue with Arjun he reveals how this knowledge (gyan)-Samkhya or epistemology - has been untraceable (Vilput) and he revived it with adding action oriented phenomenology or Karmyoga or cause and effect theory.

In modern times, Felix Glileuz and Guattari has affirmed it when they say: "Absolute de-territorialisation does not take place without re-territorialisation on the concept. The concept is not object but territory. It does not have an object but a territory. For that very reason it has past form, a present form and perhaps, a form to come. Modern philosophy is re-territorialized on Greece as form of its own past. German philosophers especially have lived the relationship with Greece as a personal relationship. But they indeed live it as the reverse or contrary of Greeks, the symmetrical inverse: the Greeks kept the plane immanence that they constructed in enthusiasm and drunkenness, but they had searched for the concepts with which to fill it so as to avoid falling back into figure of East." (p101)

It may be contended that as modern philosophy is re-territorialized on Greece as form of its own past and Greece philosophy failed to be re-territorialized on knowledge being inherent and ancient Indian philosophy tradition, hence it lost its transcendence just to save its immanence which finally proved fatal for it. The concept that was mooted in its fear of not 'falling back into figure of East' led Plato and Aristotelian to the totalitarian and reactionary project as mentioned by Karl Popper, Crossman and others. Socrates concept was reduced to Socrates Paradox and was subjected to ancient guillotine. Later on two modern cultures upturned this concept while felling it with subversion and pulverization.

However, it was conceded that, "What we deny is that there is any internal necessity to philosophy whether in itself or in the Greece. Nevertheless, the philosophy was something Greek- although brought by immigrants."..... "What philosophy finds in Greeks", said Nietzsche, "is not an origin but a milieu, an ambience, an ambient atmosphere: the philosophers ceases to be comet."

The problem has been that the cogito of oneness, after getting trivialized by Cartesian cogito' instants deluding the subject, has first been fragmented, transformed into multiplicity and given colour according to one's subjectivity. On top of it, this fragmented multiples have been assigned the semblance of universality. This has happened laterally and horizontally. In philosophical and cultural field, it has been more perceptible. With Plato, it started and Hegel, Kant, Spinoza, Husserl, Heidegger and Sartre further built over it. In *Critique of Pure Reason* (1781) despite his explicit dissent from Leibniz account of perception as confused thinking, Kant contrasted a realm of things as they are in themselves, or noumenon, with a realm of appearances, or phenomena. The former are unknown, and indeed unknowable, though it seems clear that Kant later on doubted his conviction.

The fragmentation of cogito of oneness has been laid on the plane of immanence while transcendence has been denied or cancelled. The plane of immanence which is chaotic and vast establishes being on very chaotic ground. However, this has been seen from other's perspective and self has been thrown into this chaos. Other exists till transcendence is not factored into. How can there be other when consciousness makes it as own when it is conscious of it. At the point of when it is considered as lost, it is one with entity it is conscious of. While Cartesian cogito is grounded on shallowness of 'I think therefore I exist' or on plane of immanence which is 'vast plane of chaos', Hegel borrowing from Plato who in turn de-territorialized it without re-territorializing on inherent knowledge, finally lost World Self in action

which he considered as objectifying.

Even appropriation and misappropriation, supplanting and supplementing, if seen from point of view of the unity of difference, point to the cogito of oneness and theme of unity. The ancients after originating in one place –whether Africa or India (recent finding of fossil in Indian Narmada valley dating beyond 80,000 years indicates the probability of India being dispersal point instead of Africa) and dispersing to different parts of world provides the ground for unity. The differences and diversity that has come to characterize the different cultures, civilization, nations, races etc are nothing but due to different milieu or ambience they were exposed to, consequent upon settling in different parts of the world. If this milieu or ambience is isolated, what would remain would be oneness of mankind.

Same can be posited about the knowledge as Nietzsche has said about philosophy not originating from Greece but finding milieu therein. If the milieu or ambience is isolated from all stream of philosophy or knowledge, it would lead to inherence and oneness of knowledge. The most succinct example is again Greek philosophy or Roman or Persian or Arabic or Chinese or even modern philosophy which has been fragmented, like being or subject, into Metaphysics, Logic, ontology, phenomenology and poached by sociology, psychology and political science. This is the lateral mapping of knowledge. If seen horizontally, it would come to idealism, realism, empiricism, determinism, liberalism pragmatism, humanism, modernism, postmodernism and post-postmodernism.

If the evolution of idea of mankind is analyzed after isolating the milieu or ambience in which they have evolved, it would come to what has been posited in preceding part: these all can be put under the two broader category of knowledge that Krishna pure monism presented: Gyanyog or epistemology and

Karmyoga or causal or cause and effect. The earliest philosophy coming to fore in this regard is: Eleatic relating to a school of philosophy founded in Elea in Greece in the 6th century BC by Xenophanes, Parmenides and Zeno. It held that one pure immutable Being is the only object of Knowledge and the information by the senses is illusory.

Meyer, great authority on Greeks, has described the beginnings of philosophy as a rational counter-current against the movement of the mysteries and dogmatism. Krishna posited his pure monism in same backdrop of mysticism and dogmatism rampant in ancient Indian society. Cicero in *De Natura Deorum* and Philodemus in *De Pietate* mentions that Antisthenes was a monotheist. He expressed his monotheism as there is only one 'according to nature, the truth, although there are many 'according to convention'. This is linked with equalitarianism of the school of Gorgias and contemporary of Alcidas and Lycophron.

As Martin Heidegger has commented: "... We must not overlook the fact that for Greeks, who were the first to develop this initial understanding of being as a branch of knowledge and to bring it to dominance, the primordial understanding of truth was also alive, even if pre-ontologically, and it even held its own against the concealment implicit in their ontology—at least in Aristotle." (p. 25).

Frater Taciturnus has commented that Greek Philosophy believes in the continued strivings for learning. But Greek philosophy had relation to ethics. The systematic idea is the very subject-object of the unit of thinking and being existence is on the contrary precisely their separation.

" It is by no means follow that existence is thought less; but it has made space and put space between subject and object; thought and being. Objectively understood, thinking is pure thinking which corresponds in just such an arbitrarily objective way to

its object, which object is therefore itself, and the truth the corresponding of thought with itself. This objective thinking has no relation to the existing subjectivity, and while the difficult question always remains of how the existing subjects gain admission to this objectivity, where subjectivity is pure abstract .”

So called Pantheistic system often called to mind, maintains Kierkegaard, abrogating freedom and distinction between good and evil. But it is not only pantheistic system we should say this: mere to point would be to show that every system must be pantheistic just because of its finality. Existing must be annulled in the eternal before the system can bring itself to a close: there must be no existing remainder not even a such as tiny little dangling appendage.

Krishna has categorically asserted in Gita that whatever epistemological and ontological knowledge he is sharing is given, original and has always been in some or other form, sometimes as he told to Arjuna, it appears to have lost but never lost for the good. But it is indestructible as it is universal and original. The same assertion has been made by Kant in respect of pure reason in *his Critique of Pure reason*. The reason or Dharma or Idea can be suppressed, distorted, subverted, pulverized and twisted for time being, but it cannot be destroyed for good.

After conceding the originality of the knowledge or Dharma or reason, not claiming this as his own, Krishna built up his epistemological and ontological theory-pure monism which is based on Dharama (principled dealings or fair play), Bhagavat—monism and later on monotheism, Vasudev system (a socio-political balancing mechanism), Karmayoga (causal theory or cause & effect) and Gyanyoga (epistemological theory which is but part of monism). Dharma (principled dealings, fair play) like reason or Idea is given and original, one has to tap its source and is transcendental.

In fact Krishna made Dharma along with monism the central tenet of his philosophy around which all his

concepts and theories revolve around. It is, like Kant's reason which is independent of empiricism and worldly limitations. It is for guarding of this independence and purity of Dharma and its manifestation that Krishna mooted the system of Vasudev- a socio-political balancing mechanism to enforce and maintain the social and political equilibrium based on Dharama (Fair play or ethical dealings or Reason).

Kant believed that reason-pure reason in particular, finds its own course and could not be diluted by any force of the world as it is beyond them. But the development of world, its phenomena and general course of events have rather belied this assertion to some extent. Krishna 3000 years¹ ago anticipated that Dharama (reason, Principle or ethics based system) can be presented as Adharama (unprincipled dealings) or it can be mutilated, subverted, pulverized and high jacked to the vested interests. In case of reason or Idea it has been done as it has been put in the backburner, and the empiricists and the idealists have razed it to the ground. He devised some sort of arrangement in this regard in the form of Dharama- reason, fair or just social and political system and Vasudeva- a sort of balancing or level playing mechanism or aligning force which act in sync with Dharma in its praxis. It is the first and last attempt by any muse on the earth to put in praxis his philosophy in his own life time.

Kant believes that reason in general and the pure reason in particular does not need any outside intervention as it has got inherent system of course correction. But this inherent system comes in to operation when reason becomes reigning reality of the world for that we have to wait for another few centuries. And there might be possibility that the crisis of world may not provide that opportunity as it may reach beyond

¹ S. R Rao, Romila Thapar , Garbe who has fixed the date beyond 600 BC. Dwaraka archaeological findings.

its redemption date. When this original knowledge or reason or Dharama (ethical or fair dealings or just or fair play) is used for the subjectivity as happened in the case of Plato and Hegel, it got derailed, misinterpreted and misused, and it seems to be cause and effect of the crisis of the world as muses seem to be groping in dark for finding the way out from this.

Plato's high ground of Idea got strayed when the idealism slithered back to the anti-change and totalitarian scheme (Karl Popper, Crossman). He seems to have taken the height of Idea just to swoon back to the low ground of conservative and highly stratified totalitarian project. As proved by Popper and Crossman this double standard has appealed to the succeeding lines of muses barring Kant who restored its originality, but again it was subverted by Hegel's idealism which sacrificed it at the subjectivity of defending German nationalism and the monarchy.

Hegel and Marx both drawing heavily from Platonic idealism and his dialectics, which is high on form but low on the content side, proved to be disastrous for the world in the form of Nazism, Fascism and communist straitjacket revolution. The hypocrisy, double standard, intellectual jugglery, appropriation, misappropriation and supplanting and supplementing of the ideology, ideas and philosophies that world scholarship is and has been indulging seems to be offshoot of the foundation laid by Plato and Aristotle, picked by Sophists and sceptics which passed it to successive muses of Idealism, Romanticism, socialism and liberalism.

It can be deduced from the current situations as existing in the social and the applied sciences. However, it can be also seen as theme of unity and oneness of the world but the muses and their masters-social and political elites have used it as stick of superiority and vanity, and the tools of civilizing the uncivilized ones. If reason or idea or Dharama is put to space and time, it loses its purity as Kant has underlined in his *Critique of Pure Reason*.

However, Krishna posited a *Vasudeva* like mechanism acting as enforcer of this Dharama or reason and as antipode to getting diluted, Kant was unable to provide any such mechanism. That the practical reason in its operation or in praxis has to find a balance between pure and practical reason where it may or may not achieve it depending upon, among other things, deconstructing the limitations and the conditioning of the time and space.

There is perceptible undercurrent of unity, uniformity and similarities in all major and minor civilizations and cultures. If historical overtones, prejudices and conditioning is subtracted and the vested interests (of social and political elites and their hidden agenda) deconstructed, it would be perceptible to everyone. Many scholars are articulating it and any keen or neutral observer would not fail to see it. What is rather ironic that the diversity and difference, disconnect and dissonance, historical faultiness and clash of cultures and civilization are being accentuated to sub serve the vested interests.

The World Spirit of Hegel was sacrificed at the altar of nationalism and monarchy, losing idea of oneness and universalism that he picked up from Oriental (read Krishna universalism of his pure monism). Perhaps Tacitus and Hobbes missed that same principle should have sounded the formation of commonwealth of commonwealths as was done for the formation of commonwealth. Just like individuals gained the rights and power by surrendering their respective rights to the commonwealth or sovereign, the individual commonwealth by surrendering their respective rights and power to sovereign commonwealth or world commonwealth would have got more power and freedom than what they are currently having. The transition from tribal state of existence or philosophically speaking State of nature to civil society or commonwealth seems to be petrifying in this stage, whereas the logical conclusion would have been transition to the commonwealth of

commonwealths or one world.

For example, Ephors of Spartan—or a sort of Supreme Council— providing a counterbalance to the Kings and which would possess the absolute right to decide any dispute that might arise between Kings and citizens appears to have clear imprint of *Vasudev* system (a socio-political entity to uphold Dharma or reason or fair play in society) though it has larger scope and mandate pertaining to social apart from political one. Even in modern times Machiavelli echoes the need of *Vasudev* like system when he avers, 'A State, like the human body has everyday something added to it which some time or other needs to be put right'.

To avoid such situation, the Romans used to appoint a sort of benevolent dictator to look into the affairs of Ministers Council. However, the dictators used to be appointed only in emergency and held office for limited period. However, this could be turned into permanent situation as Cicero has doubted it might be misused. That is why Spinoza proposed that "sword of such dictators be placed in the hand of not of any natural person but of a civil body whose member would be too many to make possible to divide any of them into Council of state."

Coming to inherence of knowledge and unity of phenomenal world, Plato's transcendence, even though nominal, seems to have been based on Krishna pure monism positing *Karmyoga* or causal theory or *Samakhya Yoga*. It maintains that transcendence provides proper perspective to phenomena and is only route to wade through chaotic and vast plane of immanence. As opposed to immanence, transcendence is very important instrument to deal with phenomenology. Neither sorrow nor happy, beyond light and darkness, there is transcendental reality that is one: day leads to light, light becomes dark, happiness sorrow. Derrida binary pin-points universalism or one reality, if seen from pure monistic perspective.

The all round crisis that has gripped the world proves the failure of the muses and their sciences. Despite their inability to engage with hordes of crises ranging from existential, social, political, cultural, philosophical; they are posing as if they have found answer to all of the problems. It is another matter that the problems of world have remained as they were. The lopsided, myopic and biased approach to their resolution has instead further accentuated the problems of world. The problems of the world at macro and micro levels keep on growing, piling and getting more complex. There is no need to prove this regard as it is self-evident and self-axiomatic.

The problem is in phenomena and matter, one has to just decipher it. The only condition is that one has to be objective and without any vested interest. The phenomenon or matter and knowledge inherent in it would guide one to get at the problem. Instead of unity of the world and the people that is inherent plan of Cosmos as contended by pure monism and it is the main premise on which it is based, world of humans is getting fragmented, xenophobic, exclusive and hostile to each other. One finds at loss when the muses instead of engaging with myriads of problem and crises are beating around the bushes at the best and gerrymandering, intellectual jugglery and busy in finding the scapegoat and exit routes at the worst.

In many cases, with some notable exception of course, the muses instead of solving the problem or providing the insight into any phenomena seem to be providing the exit route to the problem or the problem creator. The examples of social scientist, political scientists and natural scientists, and their theories and the discourse can be cited to substantiate this contention. Some of the most classic example of this sort of intellectual jugglery and hypocrisy are: postmodernism, End of Freedom, Theory of everything or Unified theory, God's particle or creation matter and some other.

However, the Theme of unity and universalism

emanating from Krishna's pure monism was initially picked up by Heraclitus, Sophocles, and Plato. But they did not seem to have fully grasped the essence of his monistic universalism as they mistook the trees for the wood. While Heraclitus proclaimed that 'change' and 'strife' is the essence of reality, but he missed that there is constancy in the fast changing reality of a phenomena and these are more apparent than real. Plato for the most of part blunted and misinterpreted it in his zeal to support and justify the aristocracy, conservative and reactionary social order. His Idea, a pale reflection of Krishna's Dharma was lost in abstracts and reactionary justice of one class, and totalitarian project of anti-change. (Karl Popper, Crossman et la)

Hegel, greatly influenced by Plato and basing his idealism on spirit and its selective onward march for justifying monarchy and German nationalism did not do justice to it. That is why Hegel, Marx, and other philosophers such as Rousseau, Bentham, Green positivists like Comate could not get the essence of pure monism or knowledge is inherent. Krishna pure monism anticipated Kantian reason and ethics in his Dharma (Fair play or just dealings or the principles conduct) and he was validated when Kant put forth his reason and ethics. But Kantian reason and ethics was neglected and sacrificed at the altar of empirical idealism. Had Kant got access to the undistorted and pure form of Krishna pure monism, he would have vouched for system like *Vasudeva*- a balancing socio-political mechanism for enforcing reason and ethics based system.

Reason can be manipulated and tricked, and unreason can be presented as reason. Ethics and ethical system has been ignored and put into backburner. Had he devised a balancing mechanism a la *Vasudeva* with which Krishna enforced his Dharma (Fair play or just dealings), the world scenario would have been different. Similarly Marx showed his penchant for a just and equalitarian society but his penchant for matter and

economic determinism did not allow him to get the real essence of universal monism.

Krishna and pure monism has been subverted, distorted and misinterpreted for the vested interest. Krishna *Dharama* (fair play or just dealings or reason), *Vasudeva* (a balancing and enforcing mechanism of *Dharma* or *Dharama* based system) found its partial manifestation in the Idea and the Philosopher Kings. Though he did not deliberate upon it in discourse style, he put it into praxis. There is every possibility that he might have deliberated upon and like the lost 45 stanzas or verses of Gita (Buhler, GC) might have contained it. Or like his magnum opus –Udhav Gita which contains his universal monism but subverted in ignominy of a mythical document of Bhagavat as Ekadesh Skandh (Eleventh chapter of Bhagavat).

Plato and his successor muses misinterpreted pure monism in 'arresting changes', preserving the hegemony of aristocracy and unequal social order which has been termed as 'anti-change totalitarian project'(Karl Popper, Crossman). As western philosophy and discourse is based on Platonic idealism which high on form and very conservative in content has seemingly led to such deceptive and hollow approach to the problems of the world.

Krishna stated the reason in the form of *Dharma*, and unlike Plato, Hegel, Kant and others did not claim to have invented or propounded the Dharma or Reason, Idea or Spirit. These are the universal and self-axiomatic truth given as original and are inherent. One has not to invent it or propound it as Krishna has presented in Gita regarding this knowledge of Samakhya or Gyan Yoga or epistemological theory. Knowledge is inherent can be substantiated what Jesus said that before Abraham he was there, even though his time was much latter than that of Abraham. The Prophet has also proclaimed in Koran that God or Truth is light.

It means that truth or reason or idea or Spirit is given, it is original and not bound in the time and space: like Dharma, Reason, Idea, Spirit is beyond time and before time. While discussing the transcendental reason, Kant maintains that it is beyond experience or possible experience as the empiricism would dilute its potentiality and purity. The empiricist like Hume could not understand as how anything beyond and above experience could be basis for the truth.

Theme of Oneness

Had Karl Marx gone beyond analyzing the French Revolution “which achieved in Roman costumes and with Roman phrase the taste of time” to Greek and Krishna-Mahabharata period (Peloponnesian war was fought on Republicanism vs. Monarchical forces and principles like Mahabharata war) he would have perhaps commented: Roman empire was founded on Greek costume and phrase and that of Greek in Krishna-Mahabharata credo, phrases and philosophy . In India this seems to have been carried from ancient time when Yadavas in Rig Veda have been termed as Arajnya (Antimonarchical) (Rig Veda, I.54.6, I.108.7; X.62.10) as they used to choose their leader, shunning hereditary or primogeniture (whereby only the oldest descendant is entitled to Crown) blind spot of Monarchy. The Mahabharata war was fought on republican credo even if proto one, represented by Pandvas, supported by Krishna and Yadavas and despite the fact it has not been seen from this angle as it has been subverted as fight between clans or intra tribal warfare by Indian and Western scholarship.

Marx would have further added that French donned the costume and phrase of Roman and Roman that of Greek and Greek that of Krishna-Mahabharata period. “Thus at another stage of development a century before did Cromwell and English draw from the Old Testament the language, the passions and illusion for their own bourgeoisie revolution. When the real goal was reached

when the remodelling of English society was accomplished which supplanted Habakkuk”?(Marx, The Eighteenth Brumaire of Lous Bonaparte)

This would have underlined the theme of unity of running along with a diverse, xenophobic world, based on ‘us vs them’ tribal credo of modern world, simmering hostility and aggressive competitiveness to outdo other characterising the conduct among nations, pulled both side by centripetal and centrifugal forces. The great dream of Fatherhood and Brotherhood has been turned into nightmare of bloody and smoky apparitions of Huntington’s ‘Clash of civilization’ more denied on face value than being followed under the cover ups.

Karl Popper says :‘The conflict between the Platonic-Aristotelian speculation and the spirit of the Great Generation, of Pericles, of Socrates, and of Democritus, can be traced throughout the ages. This spirit was preserved, more or less purely, in the movement of the Cynics who, like the early Christians, preached the brotherhood of man, which they connected with monotheistic belief in the fatherhood of God.” This can be found in orient in general and in ancient India as well between the rationale forces as represented by Krishna and obscurantism.

W. W Tarn, in a paper, has tried to prove that the idea of the unity of mankind can be traced at least to Alexander the Great. By the same line of reasoning Karl Popper extends it to further to Diognes, Antisthenes, and even to Socrates and the ‘Great Generation’ of Periclean age. By the same line of reasoning and in addition to others, it could be extended to the Krishna period or to the Harappa period or Mitanni whose everything Babylonian appropriated making it as their own.

Students of ancient Western philosophy will not fail to note that the Sâmkhya *guGas*, and the dualistic theory of personhood, appear to have echoes in Plato (4th cent. B.C.E.). Plato held that the body is the casing of the soul

though Plato in *Phaedo*, 81 and *Phaedrus*, 250c suggests it is a prison, which the Sâmkhya system does not, and that the embodied soul is composed of three characteristics: an earthy quality geared toward menial tasks that is appetitive (corresponding to bronze), a high-spirited quality geared towards accomplishment and competition (silver), and a reflective or rational portion that is in a position to put in order the constitution of the soul (gold) (*Republic* 3.415, 4.435–42). *Prima facie*, the bronze quality appears to correspond to *tamas*, silver to *rajas*, and *sattva* to gold.

Owing to the antiquity of the Sâmkhya system, it is historically implausible that it was influenced by Platonist thought. This of course invites the contrary proposal, that Plato was influenced by the Sâmkhya system. While Indian philosophers had an important impact on the course of ancient Greek philosophy (through Pyrrho of Elis, who traveled to India in the 3rd cent. B.C.E. and was impressed by a type of dialectic nihilism characteristic of some Buddhist philosophies, promoted by gymnosophists—naked wise people—who resemble Jain monks) (see Flintoff), there is no historical evidence to suggest that Sâmkhya thought made its way to ancient Greece. This suggests that both Plato (4th cent. B.C.E.), and the Sâmkhya system (dating back to the 6th cent. B.C.E. in the Vedas) articulate an ancient Indo-European philosophical perspective that predates both Plato and the Sâmkhya system, *if* the similarities between the two are not purely coincidental.

The main problem is that the knowledge, an universal and infinite property inherent in phenomena and substance or in existence and existent has been towed down to history and has been appropriated by person, culture and society. Moreover, it been has added or subtracted, distorted and presented in such way as sub serving the vested interest. It has been in existence right from ancient period till date. It is true that knowledge has to be put into praxis as only by this one can realize

his goal or mission, or society or nation could fulfil its mission. It has acquired a symbol of status and superiority to be claimed as per convenience, vanity and urge to dominate other. Many civilizations and cultures, Muses and historical personalities have sought unending glory on that. This all has led fragmentation and individualization of knowledge leading to the modern 'epistemological break'.

However, as this knowledge has been circulating since ages and passing through different person, cultures, civilization and time period, it is but axiomatic that it would be distorted and subverted or misinterpreted. As distortion theory of communication posits that if an information is passed though certain number of entity, it got distorted. Hence it is imperative this distortion should be recognized and rectified so that communication could achieve its stated goal. It is for this reason that Derrida seems to have devised the trace and erasure theory and Foucault has hinted going back to 'origin'.

Heraclitus

Martin Heidegger has asked whether it is 'coincidence that in one of the fragments of Heraclitus—the oldest fragments of philosophical doctrine which explicitly treat the logos—the phenomenon of truth in the sense of discoveredness (unconcealment), as we have set it forth, shows through? Those who do not understand are contrasted with logos and with him that speaks the logos and understand.'

It is not coincidence as logos or knowledge is inherent in phenomenal world and it is concealed which has to be discovered. Much before Heraclitus, Krishna posited in Gita and Udhav Gita when he said this knowledge has been forgotten or disappeared (vilupt) and he has just remembered or recovered it. The Logocentrism, the term that was coined by the German philosopher Ludwig Klages in 1920s, referring to the

tradition of “Western” science and philosophy that situates the logos, “the word” or the “act of speech”. It is considered as epistemologically superior in a system, or structure, in which we may only know, or be present in, the world by way of a logocentric metaphysics.

For this structure to hold true it must be assumed that there is an original, irreducible object which the logos represents, and therefore, that our presence in the world is necessarily mediated. If there is a Platonic Ideal Form then there must be an ideal representation of such a form. According to Logocentrism, this ideal representation is the logos. It is the same logo which ideal representation is what Krishna called ancient wisdom or knowledge inherent in spirit or consciousness or subject and matter, which Heidegger has termed as unconcealment or discoveredness.

‘Everything is in influx and nothing is at rest.’ Heraclitus visualized world not as an edifice, but rather as one colossal process; not as the sum total of all things but rather as totality of all events, or changes, or facts. The philosophies of Parmenides, Democritus, Plato and Aristotle can all be appropriately described as attempts to solve the problems of that changing world which Heraclitus had discovered.

Heraclitus world view and his idea of creation was anticipated by Krishna pure monism while explaining the creation through example of fire and rain. Heraclitus and his contemporaries took this example as theory itself, missing wood for the tree. That is why Burnet has to say that the doctrine of universal influx ‘is hardly the central point in the system of Heraclitus. Heraclitus’ fundamental discovery was the abstract metaphysical doctrine ‘that wisdom is not the knowledge of many things, but the perception of the underlying unity of warring opposites’. Burnet further suggests that the doctrine of universal flux was not new, but anticipated by the earlier Ionians.

Heraclitus contention that ‘a universal flux which embraces everything, even the vessels’, the very example of vessel is found in *Uddhav Gita* subverted as *Ekadesh Skandh* and stuffed with myths and mythical artefacts, as is the case with the *BhagvadGita* and *Anugita*. The doctrine of perpetual changes of Heraclitus lead him to devise a mechanism of the apparent stability of the things and hence he moots the subsidiary theory of fire and natural law which is again traceable in the Krishna discourse on creation when Udhav asked how world was created. The reality that the world is not the totality of things but of events or facts is considered as important discovery of Heraclitus whereas it is another manifestation of Krishna pure monism.

The doctrine of fire is also found mentioned in Aristotle’s *Metaphysics*, (984a7, 1067a2, 989a2, 996a9, 1001a15; *Physics*, 205a3). It is considered as important doctrine in the natural philosophy as it is considered as an attempt to reconcile the doctrine of flux with day to day experience of stable things. It is regarded as link with older theories of circulation, leading to the theory of laws and becoming the basis for theory of unity and contradiction of Aristotle.

Heraclitus is also considered as ethical and judicial positivist: ‘All things are, to the gods, fair and good and right; men, however, have taken up some things as wrong and some as right’. Even Plato has attested it (*Theaet*, 1777c). The theory of flux or change must be transition from one stage or property or position to another. In so far as flux presupposes something that changes, this something must remain identically the same, even though it assumes an opposite stage or property or position. This links the theory of flux to that of the unity of opposites. (Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, 1005b25, 1024a24 and 34, 106213 and 1063a25). This seems to have been main basis for the cyclic theory of history or human society or decay of Plato (Book iii and iv of *Law*, 713and *Republic*) and cyclic theory of government of Aristotle

(Metaphysics, 1005b25, 1024a24 and 34, 106213 and 1063 a 25).

According to R. Eisler, Homer's feeling of destiny ('moira') can be traced back to oriental astral mysticism which defines time, space, and fate. Eisler, in his other works said that Hesiod's father was a native of Asia Minor, and the sources of his idea of the Golden Age, and the metals in man, are oriental. He further shows that the idea of the world as a totality of things or the 'Cosmos' goes to Babylonian political theory (*Jesus Basileus*, vol II, 618 f). And the Babylonian political theory, along with other cultural milestones has been appropriated and supplanted from Mitanni and Akkada, extension of Indian civilization (Gordon, *op cit*)

Socrates and Pythagoras

'All that is good in our Western culture has this Spirit (Socrates),....Socrates showed that philosophy is nothing else than conscientious objection to prejudice and unreason.' (Crossman, 118.). Socrates has stood for the autonomy of ethics as expressed in his doctrine of self-sufficiency or autarky of virtuous individuals. The autonomy of ethics (closely related to his insistence that problems of nature do not matter.) is expressed especially in his doctrine of the self-sufficiency or autarky of the virtuous individuals." (Popper) It has been stressed and widely believed that it was Socrates who created the conception of the soul, which had very 'immense influence on western civilization'.

However, soul theory has been existing in India, even before Krishna, it is found in Ashtvakra Gita-dialogue between King Janak and sage Ashtvakra. However, it is not to contend that Socrates appropriated it from there but to affirm the inherence and universalism of knowledge. Since there is no historical proof, whatever is there is not acknowledged or the historical evidence regarding it might have been destroyed. Nevertheless, Pythagorean metaphysical theory of soul is different from

moral or individualistic one of Socrates. (Socrates, *Apology*, 19c). Pythagoreans maintains that that the *nous* is an intelligent principle of the world acting with a specific intention. This is the divine reason regarded in Neo-Platonism as the first emanation of the Divine.

From the *nous* emerges the world soul, giving rise to the manifest realm. Pythagorean further says that the Godhead is the Father, Mother, and Son (Zeus). In the mind of Zeus, the *ideas* are distinctly articulated and become the Logos by which world is created. These ideas become active in the Mind (*nous*) of Zeus. With him is the Power and from him is the *nous*. This theology further explains that Zeus is called Demirgue (*Dêmiourgos*, Creator), Maker (*Poiêtês*), and Craftsman (*Technitês*).^[3]The *nous* of the demiurge proceeds outward into manifestation becoming living ideas. They give rise to a lineage of mortal human souls.

The components of the soul are¹1) the higher soul, seat of the intuitive mind (*divine nous*); 2) the rational soul (*logistikon*) (seat of discursive reason / *dianoia*); 3) the non-rational soul (*alogia*), responsible for the senses, appetites, and motion. Zeus thinks the articulated ideas (Logos). The *idea of ideas* (*Eidos - Eidôn*), provides a model of the Paradigm of the Universe, which the Demiurge contemplates in his articulation of the *ideas* and his creation of the world according to the Logos.

The difference between Platonism and Protagoreanism are: While in Platonism there is inherent natural order of justice in the world such as the original or the first order in which nature was created. Thus past is good and any development leading to new norms which is bad. While In Protagoranism man is the moral being in this world. Nature is neither moral nor immoral. Thus it is possible for man also to improve things..... Protagoras believed in that God who he worked through man (Burnet, 117).

There is fundamental similarity with Samakhya with

one difference: there is no Godhead in Samakhya and in place of God there are Sat (goodness), Tam (inertia or darkness), Raj (passion) - the operating natural forces in spirit and matter (which modern equivalent may be electron, proton and photon). While Protogoreansim has divided soul in three, in Krishna Samkhya, soul is indivisible, permeable and knowledge form. Steering clear of appropriation and appropriated, it may be contended that it is knowledge that is inherent has manifested in different milieu. The main premise of Orphic-Pythagorean theory is that body is the tomb of the soul. (Adam, Appendix iv to Book IX of the *Republic*)

It is believed that Socrates saying 'care for your souls' is an expression of his moral and intellectual individualism. The idea of 'being aware' or 'taking shelter in Soul', a Krishna construct, seems to have manifested in the Socrates idea of 'care for your soul'. However, Socrates concept of soul is more nearer to moral individualism as he explains in Plato's *Crito* (47e/48a) that he means by 'soul' that part of us which is 'improved by justice and depraved by injustice.' Similar things can be deduced from his intellectualism and wisdom (*Crito*, 44d/e and 47b) which is extension of Krishna Samkhya or Gyan Yoga or Theory of Knowledge.

Socrates' eudemonism: Goodness and happiness are identical. This theory is developed, in the *Republic* (580b) in the form of doctrine that goodness and happiness or badness and unhappiness are proportional; and so they must be, if the degree of goodness as well as of the happiness of a man is to be measured by the degree in which he resembles original blessed nature—the perfect idea of the man. It reminds of Krishna pure monism ethics based ontology.

However, the thesis of the appropriation, misappropriation and subversion further merits attention from the fact there is inter as well as intra contradictions between Plato and Socrates philosophy

(See *Republic, Laws, Crito, Apology, Statesman, Phaedo, Timaeus, Meno, Gorgias*) and as well as their commentators, critics and the apologist. "...I contrast especially Plato's *Apology* and *Crito* with his *Laws*. The reason for this choice is that nearly everybody would agree that the *Apology* and the *Crito* represent the Socratic doctrine, and the *Law* may be described as Platonic. It seemsvery difficult to understand how Burnet and Taylor could possibly defend their opinion that Socrates' attitude towards democracy was more hostile than Plato's (Burnet; Taylor). As Popper has said Burnet and Taylor hold the strange view because they are committed to the opinion that the *Republic* is Socratic and not Platonic; and because it may be said that the *Republic* is slightly less anti-democratic than the Platonic *Statesman* and the *Laws*'. (Popper, op. cit.).

"..And it was in Socrates that at the beginning of the Peloponnesian War, the principal of subjectivity of the absolute inherent independence of thought attained the free expression". It is not a coincidence that Krishna has expressed thoughts as very chaotic (chanchal) and difficult to control, having its own dynamics. (*BhagavadGita* or *Udhav Gita* or *Anugita*). However, it again seems to be manifestation of the inherent knowledge in different time, place and milieu.

Plato

There are many similarities between Krishna Dharma(reason or fair play) and Plato Idea pointing possible influence. However, it affirms the inherence of knowledge and its universalism in the cogito of unity of phenomenal world indicating the common origin. This can be discerned in the commonality of Plato's Idea and Krishna Dharma (reason or fair play or an autonomous entity beyond history and time) and also some departures from common point. The idea of justice, Republic and law which has same basis for different construct has been proposed.

Speaking about the care for the soul particularly, it emphasized how this idea should not be considered exclusively as a matter for the history of philosophy. On the contrary, according to the philosopher, this particular form of caring constitutes the “fundamental heritage of Europe”. Plato, in *The Republic*, has already made an analogy between the “soul” and the “polis”, inasmuch as they both consist in a multiplicity of elements which are in a permanent conflict against each other. Both the human being and the state could find a harmony only if their rational part was able to regulate the others. Plato seems to have mistaken the mind for soul as soul is beyond this duality or multiplicity. It is the common folly for attributing duality or multiplicity of mind to soul.

Plato & Aristotle concept of causality seems to have clear imprint of Krishna’s Karma or action theory but it does not go as deep and broadly as Krishna theory does. Plato and Aristotle perhaps missed pure monism tenet that one soul or spirit pervading and permeating the whole world, though apparently it may look many, it is not so ; it is the perception or misperception that leads to such plurality, could be substantiated with Plato’s political theory of the soul i.e the division of the soul according to the class-divided society. “This has provided the basis for developing the myopic theory of many psychologists, including psychoanalysis. “ What Krishna mentions as functional division of society as per their nature and state of mind, Plato, it seems, has projected onto soul and compared *polis* with it.

However, according to Freud’s theory, what Plato has called the ruling part of the soul tries to uphold its tyranny by a ‘censorship’, while the rebellious proletariat animal-instincts, which correspond to the social underworld (perhaps underdog), really exercise a hidden dictatorship; for they determine the policy of the apparent ruler. Due to Heraclitus’ ‘flux’ and ‘war’, the realm of social experience has strongly influenced the theories. However, the misappropriation theory gets minimal validation

when Popper contends that ‘It is simply the internal evidence of the Platonic dialogues which forces us to assume that they are not entirely historical.’

However, Plato and his dialogues and ideas are considered as historical and on that basis greater and robust historical and political tradition is claimed. Plato and his abstracts have been granted historical, political and cultural milestones as he is considered as ‘Christ before Christianity.’ But it seems to have speculative and appropriative input as reflected in inter-contradiction and intra-contradiction between Plato and Aristotle and various concepts. Same doubt has been raised in respect of dialogues between Krishna and Arjun in Gita. Even great personality of Gandhi could not think such dialogue or particularly that aspect ‘nobody kills or killed even when one is doing so’. It is body that kills or get killed not soul as it is observer and knowledge form. Though Krishna historicity has been proved by Dwaraka Findings, and hordes of other evidences, yet it points to the common ground that inherence of knowledge indicates, even manifesting in different time, place and milieu.

‘The soul—the most ancient and divine of all things in motion is the starting point of all motions’. (Plato, *Laws*, 895b) Here Plato seems to having grasped the soul theory but loses when he confuses with mind (Krishna Mann is very fluid (Chanchal). Again Plato’s theory of *anamnesis*—the theory that all knowledge is re-cognition or re-collection of the knowledge we had in our pre-natal is part of the same view: in the past there resides not only the good, the noble, and the beautiful, but also all wisdom. Even the ancient change or motion is better than secondary motion. Here again Plato after having come nearer to knowledge being inherent loses it when he limits this knowledge to prenatal state of human being. However, Karl Popper has affirmed that it has been proposed to sneak reactionary and anti-change agenda in Platonism.

Plato theory of Idea or Forms too validates the knowledge being inherent as for any idea or form there should be original idea or form that project back to it. While Krishna sees the higher form of evolution as logical conclusion of progression, Plato sees it in negative sense: Plato believes that change is not divine and the rest is divine. “We see now that Plato’s theory of forms or ideas implies a certain trend in the development of the world in flux. It leads to the law that the corruptibility of all things in that world must continually increase”.

“We see that Plato aimed at setting out a system of historical periods, governed by a law of evolution, in other words, he aimed at a historicist theory of society. This attempt was revived by Rousseau and was made fashionable by Comte and Mill, and by Hegel and Marx; but considering the historical evidence then available, Plato’s system of historical periods was just as good as that of any of these modern historicists.’ As Popper has rightly observed, Plato tried to reconstruct the ancient tribal society and ethos. Plato was not out to reconstruct a state that might come but a state that had been—the father of the Spartan state, which was certainly not a classless society.

It was slave state, and accordingly Plato’s best state is based on the most rigid class distinctions. It is a caste state. The problem of avoiding class war is solved, not by abolishing classes but by giving the ruling class a superiority which cannot be challenged. “Any meddling or changing over from one class to another is a great crime against the city and may rightly denounced as basest wickedness.” (*Republic*)

Even the naturalist Aristotle does not always refer to the naturalistic version of equalitarianism; for instance, his formulation of the principles of democracy in *Politics* (1317b), is quite independent of it. But it is perhaps even more interesting that in the *Gorgias*, in which the opposition of nature and convention plays such an important role, Plato presents equalitarianism without

burdening it with the dubious theory of the natural equality of all men.

Generally it is understood that it was the Sophist or Protagoras, not Plato who initiated the advent of social sciences when they saw natural and social phenomena as different. But if this could be the basis for the starting point of social sciences, then Krishna could be called the father of social sciences as it was he who provided the momentum for the bifurcation of natural and social as manifested in relative universal monism as reflected in his Dharma or Vasudeva and precepts established in Gita.

It is erroneously believed that it was the sophist or Protagoras who provided momentum in transforming a naïve monism or magical monism to the critical dualism or bifurcation of natural and normative or social law. It was Krishna by propounding and establishing social code such as not believing in superstition or stopping the worshipping of mystical entity such as Indra. His founding of the first monism and monotheist sect proves it.

“There are many intermediate steps in the development from a naïve or magical monism to a critical dualism which clearly realizes the distinction between norms and natural laws. Most of these intermediate positions arise from the misapprehension that if a norm is conventional or artificial, it must be wholly arbitrary. To understand Plato’s position, which combines all three such as biological naturalism, ethical or juridical positivism and psychological or spiritualism naturalism, it is necessary to analyse this. So far the biological naturalism is concerned it has been used for defending the equalitarianism and might is right theory or anti-equalitarian doctrine..... Plato and his disciple Aristotle advanced the theory of the biological and moral inequality”. This is nothing but caste system and stratified varnashrma that Indian social elites propped just to wreck Krishna revolutionary equalitarian social order.

Plato discusses two kinds of equality: ‘...The one of

these.....is equality of measure, weight or number (numerical or arithmetical equality) but the truest and best equality.....distributes more to the greater and less to the smaller, giving each his due measure, in accordance with nature... by granting the greater honour to those who are superior in virtue, and lesser honour to those who are inferior in virtue and breeding, it distributes to each what is proper, according to this principles of rational proportion. And this is precisely what we shall call 'political justice'. And whoever may found a state must make this sole aim of his legislation....: this justice alone which, as stated, is natural equality, and which is distributed as the situations requires, to be equals.' (Plato, *The Law*, 757b-d). Now the casteism has been accepted with all its biological and stratification sub-texts.

The term 'natural right' in equalitarian sense came to Rome through the Stoics and there was considerable influence of Antisthenes on Stoics. The term was popularized by Roman Law (*Institutiones*, II, 1,2; I. 2)). Later it was used by Thomas Aquinas (*Summa*, II, 91, 2).

It is known from Cicero (*De Natura Deorum*) and Philodemus (*De Pietate*) that Antisthenes was a monotheist and believed that there is only One God 'according to nature' or truth, although there are many 'according to convention'. He had in mind the opposite of nature- which , in the mind of a former member of the school of Gorgias and contemporary of Alcidas and Lycophron. "This in itself does not of course establish the conclusion that the half barbarian Antisthenes believed in the brotherhood of Greeks and barbarians."

The monism and monistic tendency has been misunderstood and misinterpreted and the most of time misused. The monistic tendency which first led to the attempt to interpret norms as natural laws has recently led to the opposite attempt, namely, to interpret natural law as conventional. This type of physical conventionalism has been based by Poincare, on the recognition of conventional or verbal character of

definitions. Poincare, and Eddington point out that out that we define natural entities by the laws that they obey: 'The elements (of physical theory).... Can be definedby laws they obey; so that we find ourselves chasing our own tails in a purely formal system'. It may be inferred that the laws of nature are the verbal conventions.

'By nature, no two of us are exactly alike. Each has his peculiar nature, some being fit for one kind of work and some for another ...is it better that a man should work in many crafts or that he should work in one only?... Surely, more will be produced and better and more easily if each man works in one occupation only, according to his natural gifts.' (Plato, *Republic*, 369-70).

Thus the economic principle of division of labour is introduced reminding the affinity between Plato's historicism and the materialist interpretation of history. The same division of labour is found in Gita but it has been distorted and subverted. Plato puts emphasis on the 'oneness' or the individuality of the city, at the same time emphasizes 'manyness' of the human individual. In his analysis of the individual soul and its division into three parts: reason, energy and animal instincts, corresponding to three classes of his state, the guardians, warriors and workers. (See Plato, *Republic*; Gorte, 1857). It reminds the division of three natural operating forces as Sat, Raj and Tam found mention in Gita, udhav Gita and Anugita..

It may sound as 'holism' and it has been interpreted so, but in fact it 'is closely related to the tribal collectivism. Plato was longing for the lost unity of the tribal life. A life of change, in the midst of social revolution, appeared to him unreal. Only a stable whole , the permanent collective, has reality, not the passing individual.' As Popper observes that Plato derived his historicist theory from the fantastic philosophical doctrine that the changing visible world is only a decaying copy of an unchanging invisible world. But this ingenious attempt to combine a historicist pessimism with an ontological

optimism leads to the difficulties. These difficulties forced upon him the adoption of biological naturalism, leading (together with 'psychologism' the theory that the society depends on the human nature of its members.) to mysticism and superstition, culminating in a pseudo-rational theory of breeding.

Many eminent social scientists, including Karl Popper, Crossman, Joad and others have analysed the Plato political-social programme and have come to conclusion that the 'this programme be fairly described as totalitarian. And it is certainly founded upon historicist sociology.'

Joad traces the similarities between Plato's programme and that of Fascism at some length with fundamental difference that 'ordinary man achieves such happiness as pertains to his nature'.and the state is built upon the ideas of 'an absolute good and absolute justice'. Similar views are hold by C. L Stevenson, 'Before the Great War Plato was rarely condemned outrightly as reactionary, resolutely opposed to every principle of the liberal creed. Instead he was elevated to higher rank removed from practical life, dreaming of a transcendent City of God'.'Plato's philosophy is the most savage and most profound attack upon liberal ideas which history can show'.

Plato concept of justice is more nearer to the Varnashram based stratified justice (caste system of India) which implies that justice is keeping to one station and place. His concept of justice does not postulate the equality before law. He demanded natural privileges for the natural leaders. (See Republic, pp369-397 and Laws, 757) Pericles, who was born few years before Plato, view on justice echoes Krishna' concept of justice: " Our laws afford equal justice to all alike in their private disputes, but we do not ignore the claims of excellence. When a citizen distinguishes himself, then he is preferred to the public service, not as matter of privilege, but as a reward for merit; and poverty is not a bar..'. (Thucydides, II, 37.)

Many western social scientists have expressed their concern about the hype and hoopla generated about the greatness of Plato whose political and social programme reeks of totalitarianism and stratified or staggered justice and equality amounting to injustice and inequality. But it has not been acknowledged and Plato is still considered 'Christ before the Christ by the Christian'.

Barker states that Platonic justice is social justice emphasising its holistic nature. His justice formula 'does not touch the essence of what men generally mean by justice' for example 'a principal for dealing with the clash of wills'. Sophists Lycophron's protectionism theory of state and law as 'co-operative association for the prevention of crime' (injustice) and the humanitarian and equalitarian movement of Periclean age was conceived and put in praxis by Krishna at least four or five hundred years ago.

About Rousseau it is said that ' "Rousseau took over the Plato's classification of institution.' It seems however that he was not directly influenced by Plato when he reviewed the Platonic idea of a primitive society, but a direct product of the Platonic Renaissance in Italy was Sannazzaro's most influential Arcadia, with its revival of Plato's idea of blessed primitive society of Greek (Dorain) hill shepherds. Thus Romanticism is historically indeed an offspring of Platonism.

Rousseau's lamentation for 'men born free but found himself in chain everywhere' seems to be more nostalgia for tribal freedom than conventional one that has been attributed to him. Moreover, the chain he seems to indicating is that being tightens around himself like spider that gets entangled in his own subjectivity of desires, wants and wish fulfilment. That is why after shedding tears about men bondage he puts the freedom at the mercy of society or 'collective will.

Kant, Hegel and Marx

Martin Heidegger, in *Being and Time*, has quoted Kant

introduction to transcendental dialectic: "Truth and illusion are not in the object so far as it is intuited, but in the judgment about it so far as it is thought." Then he again quotes the naive rather sceptic realism: "If truth consists in agreement of knowledge with its object, then this object must be distinguished from others; for knowledge is false if it does not agree with object to which it is related, even if it should contain something which might well be valid for other objects."

This is again violation of Krishna pure monism or inherence of knowledge. How can knowledge be false when it does not agree with object to which it is related? Only the judgments or thoughts about it can be false not the knowledge. It is again the seeing the knowledge from the prism of immanence and is nothing but objectification of the knowledge that has been mooted to objectify the subject or consciousness.

However, Kant's denial of immortality of soul refutes his concept of Reason and morality to some extent and at best it seems to be contradictory. Even Hegel has commented that denying immortality to soul would result into a lot of confusion. As annihilation of body would be the end of the thing and there would be no basis for the continuity of being or existence and the collective consciousness and the repository of reason could not be proved. The concept of collective consciousness as posited by modern psychologists such as Adler and Jung comes nearer to Super or Universal Consciousness proving the immortality of soul on ontological level, not on psychological one. Even on psychological level it may create few problems as it is limited to mind and immanence. And it allows transcendence to deal with abnormality only.

Hegel has averred that the immortality of soul provides reason its foundational and characteristic features. The problem is that, as mentioned by Krishna when his cousin and great ascetic Udhav, in Uddhav Gita asked as to how could one know or ascertain about or prove

logically soul as it transcends the subjectivity and objectivity at the same time. When a subject is itself object or subject and object is contained within it or subject and predicate is one, how could it proved logically except empirically which Kant rates as not pure.

As Osho, the under-rated Indian philosopher has rightly observed in *Gita Darshan* that even if death or after life phenomenon is matter of eschatology, theology, religion, the fact cannot be denied that the fear of death or death as inevitable reality has great impact on life. The 'flight or fight' instinct that characterize man and animal alike is just instinct but death or life after death cannot be considered as taboo when it has so much influence on life. The recent experiment and opening of departments in western countries and the emergence of parapsychology as important discipline attests this prospect.

Sartre has said that with death consciousness is consummated and it is the end. With it knowledge or reason is canceled. Kant's denial of immortality of soul is akin to Sartre' naïve assertion of the end of consciousness. Death for being is just like changing of clothes as Krishna has said in Gita, it is just change of covering or in which 'soul is entombed'. The very opening sentence of Krishna's Geeta opens with 'Dharamkshetra Kuruskhetre....', " which denotes the importance is given to the Dharam or reason. It is the Dhrama or reason that has transformed a battle field into arena of Dhrama or reasonable, as it was war for, among other things, the defence of republican forces against that of monarchical ones.

Immanuel Kant has said that duty should be done without any motive, it should be done for duty sake, is similar to what Krishna has posited that one should do his work for work sake without any expectation and reward. Krishna anticipated Kant or inherent knowledge has manifested in case of former when he postulated in Gita, (ch 18 stanz 9) "... When one performs his prescribed duty only because it ought to be done and renounce all

material association and all attachments to the fruit...". Kant averment duty for duty sake without any rewards is comparable with it.

As Rawal's concept of justice is based on Kantian ethical maxim that one would concede to other what one desires for oneself, this also emanates from the pure monism maxim of Krishna that all-everything in this world is manifestation of universal being and all are part or extension of that Super Soul. The crass individualism as well as libertarian liberalism are negation of this basic principle. In fact whole social, political and cultural formations and organizations are based on otherness and a sort of narrowness based on xenophobia and exclusiveness. The moment an exclusive space is created doing away with inclusiveness and oneness, it leads to violation of pure monism of Krishna.

The sociology of knowledge, in agreement with Karl Popper, may be viewed as Hegelian edition of Kant's theory of knowledge. It is so because it continues on the lines of Kant's criticism of what may be termed as the 'passive' theory of knowledge. This pertains to the theory of empiricists and it also includes that of Hume which postulate that knowledge gushes thorough the senses and that error is due to the interference of the material gleaned through sense perception or subjective association with it. The best option is the subject has to be passive and a mere receptive.

It is against this receptacle theory, which Karl Mannheim has termed as 'bucket theory of the mind' that Kant has posited that knowledge is not a collection of gifts received by the senses in the mind like archives. it is dynamic in the sense one must engage in 'searching, comparing, unifying, generalizing' to attain knowledge. This may be termed as 'activist theory of knowledge'. For this he discarded rather shaky ideal of a science having not presupposition or priori. He emphasizes that one has to approach the problem with a system of presuppositions without testing them by the empirical method of science.

Such has been termed as 'categorical apparatus'. Kant considers 'reason' as the categorical apparatus.

While Hegel considers spirit in its subjectivity and objectivity as determining factor of the human progression and development despite grounding it to the history or state and society, Marx has put his all stakes on matter or economic factor misreading Krishna pure monism. Influenced by Plato and Aristotle, they could have gone no farther. While Hegel's spirit was mooted to provide succour to the beleaguered monarchy and German nation, his dialectics was later on used by Marx for proving his materialistic interpretation of history. The thesis, antithesis and synthesis is but on continuum of pure monism. The thesis leads to antithesis and antithesis to synthesis and it is anything but the manifestation of universal monistic onward march of history. Only subjectivity sees it as different or as thesis, antithesis and synthesis, the guiding forces are but one universal forces of causal effects or Karmic manifestation.

Hegel has said in, *Logic*, he had preserved the whole of Heraclitus' teachings. He also said that he owed everything to Plato. It is quite revealing that Ferdinand von Lassalle, one of the founders of the German social democratic movement has penned down two volumes on Heraclitus. "How far the modern historicism of Comte and Mill and of Hegel and Marx is influenced by the theistic historicism of Giambattista Vico's *New Science* (1725) is very hard to say: Vico himself was undoubtedly influenced by Plato, as well as by St. Augustine's *De Civitate Dei* and Machiavelli's *Discourses on Livy*. Like Plato, Vico identified the 'nature' of a thing with its 'origin' and he believed that all nations must pass through the same course of development, according to one universal law. His notions (like Hegel's) may thus be said to be one of the links between Plato's 'Cities' and Toyanbee's 'Civilizations' ".

One of Hegel's greatest achievement, as Caird has said, was the revival of Heraclitean idea of fate, and he emphasized

that this glorious Greek idea of fate as expressive of essence of a person or of nation, is opposed to the nominalist Jewish idea of universal laws, whether of nature, or of morals. The essentialist principle of fate could be drawn from the viewpoint that the essence of a nation could divulge itself in its history. It is not the 'fatalistic' as it does not encourage inactivity and 'destiny' should be not viewed same as 'predestination'. It seems to be opposite of the predestination as the one's fate, be it individual or nation or society is determined by what Krishna has averred by actions/karmas and their result which constitute Prarabdhi (essence made of action or karma).

As Hegel has enlarged this theory to the extent that it has become favourite fixation of the revolt against the freedom and Kolnai has rightly deciphered the contextual relations between racialism (race is the social manifestation of the fate making one the member of a race or caste) and antagonism against the freedom. 'The Principle of Race is meant to embody and express the inner negation of human freedom, the denial of equal rights, a challenge in the face of mankind.'

Karl Popper rightly observes that Hegel, always faithful to his historicism, bases his anti-utilitarian attitude (in distinction to Aristotle's utilitarian comments upon the 'dangers of prosperity') on his interpretation of history: 'The History of the world is no theatre of happiness. Periods of happiness are blank pages in it, for they are periods of harmony.' Thus liberalism, freedom and reason are, as usual, objects of Hegel's attack. The hysterical cries: We want our history! We want our destiny! We want our fight! We want our chains! Resound through the edifice of Hegelianism, through this stronghold of the closed society and of the revolt against freedom".

Hegel did not believe in the unity of mankind. He posited that man's intellectual outfit was constantly changing, and that it was part of his social heritage. Hence the man's reason must coincide with the historical development of his society. This theory and doctrine has

been termed as 'historism' because it views that all knowledge and all truth is 'relative' in the sense of being determined by history. Karl Popper considers the sociology of knowledge or 'sociologism' is closely related or rather identical with it, with one slight difference that 'under the influence of Marx, it emphasizes that historical development does not produce one uniform 'national spirit', as Hegel held, but rather several and sometimes opposed 'total ideologies' within one nation, according to the class, the social stratum, or the social habitat, of those who hold them.'

Nevertheless, Hegel off handily acknowledges the unity of mankind and inherence of knowledge when he avers in *The phenomenology of History*, (p 84) : "... It has been contended that Greek mythological forms (contents) may be recognized in those of India. Similarly the Chinese philosophy as adopting the One as its basis, has been alleged to be the same as at a latter period appeared as Eleatic philosophy and as the Spinozistic System, while in nature of its expressing itself also in abstract numbers and lines, Pythagorean and Christian principles have been supposed to be detected in it. Even his postulation, in *The phenomenology of Mind*, 'World and its reality as inverted reality' was anticipated by Krishna in Gita when he compares the world reality as 'Inverted Tree'.

The pure monism of Krishna finds its manifestation in the form of Republican vs monarchy struggle which resulted into Mahabharata war. This struggle between republican and monarchy led to Peloponnesian war. It is quite interesting, not a coincidence that Greeks participated in Mahabharata war (see Bhandarkar's *Mahabharata*, Romila Thapar's *Early Cultural history of India*). Though It disappeared outwardly, this tendency has been undercurrent in the imperial ambition of Roman, Persian and German. It was mutilated, but it resurfaced after French Revolution and Napoleon Bonaparte provided it new impetus. But anti republican and pro-monarchical forces smothered it and it is yet to

emerge a clear winner. The republican credo is that when One has become all, how the one (monarch) could represent the One having become all, it is all who should represent the reality. It is for this reason that democracy has become reigning reality in praxis.

“Just as reason, when exercised in observation repeated in the medium of the category (of) the movement of ‘consciousness’ as such namely sense certainty, perception, and understanding, ‘the course of reason here, too will again traverse the double movement of self consciousnessIt is the simple ultimate spiritual reality (Wesen) which by coming at the same time to consciousness, is the real substance into which preceding forms return and in which they find their ground” (Hegel, *The Phenomenology of Mind*, 348.)

The self consciousness having separated from universal consciousness is annihilated in any life situation or threatened to be so. In desire or pain or unhappiness, the self consciousness gets subsumed or as Krishna has averred become apparently the things or events it identified with and it is the main problem. The self thus disillusioned continue to get subsumed and get entangled. That is why Krishna posits, if self becomes aware of its entanglement or have knowledge of its separation, then it attains or rather regains universality. This is what is Samkhya or Gyanyoga or his theory of knowledge is.

The self, if separated from universal conscious or soul or acting as self- in-itself and its being is involved in multiple roles and dimensions, it changes its mode as the being faces many trials and travails in real life situations. While in pain, pleasure and other binaries, it identifies itself with these forgetting its universality. The alienation of self from super self or Universal being makes self disillusioned which takes the binaries of self-in-itself and self-for-itself. These are not real but apparently seem to be real. This can be handled with knowledge.

The Western scholar right from Hegel and his

predecessors such as Plato, Aristotle, Heraclitus to Sartre has dealt with ontological basis of self and being based on untenable basis of dualism where self annihilates itself into nothingness. Self whether separated from universal self or being or conjoined it has its own existence. Whatever mutation and change occurs it is apparent and due to false perception. As Krishna has averred it is matter of knowing and all confusions are removed. While Hegel due to his deterministic or collectivist penchant for proving German Nationalism as end of history and monarchy for guarantee of freedom neglected Kantian solution for the problem facing mankind, Sartre and other existentialist considered other as hell not as extension of oneself. This is again the flagrant violation of Krishna pure monism as there is no other; the other is but the extension of oneself but it appears different just as One that has become all . It is again the matter of knowledge and perception.

Self annihilation or negation leads to all type of irrationalities and abnormalities in the society. The self annihilation that all deterministic or collectivist pine for making aggregate or collectivity as end and individual or self as means leads to relations of domination and hegemony as has been proved in praxis in case of communism, socialism, libertarianism, liberalism and existentialism. It is because of this blinkered approach that word has been on downslide.

The similar spirit pervades the works of the Heidegger and Jaspers, both originally followers of the essentialist philosophers, Husserl and Schiller. They gained fame by reviving the Hegelian Philosophy of Nothingness (Hegel, *Selections*, p.100: ‘if I neglect all the determinants of an object, then nothing remains’) which had posited that ‘Pure being’ and ‘Pure Nothingness’ are same and identical. This again seems to be classic example of violating the pure monism misinterpreted via Heraclitus to Hegel.

Nothingness is but obverse side of everything that is

one reality having become everything. While for Buddha the reality is nothing or emptiness, for Krishna reality is everything or Brahma or One having become all. Both are the same view seen from different perspective of phenomenology. Before everything there was nothingness and after that everything goes into nothingness. Even the reality of spirit or subject or soul is as Upanishad injunction says: 'Neti..Neti' meaning not this, not this and at end which remains is real reality or consciousness or soul. Krishna in *BhavadGita* categorically says this when everything is negated what remains the real reality.

Hegel seems to have misinterpreted this into what has come out as philosophy of nothingness. Same folly seems to have gripped the modern physical sciences when they are breaking the particles to know the constituting element of universe, though from inverse perspective. When one has become all, as per Samakhya or inherent knowledge, world has come out from 'Mahat Tatva' (primordial substance) how could that could be known by breaking the particles. This enquiry, however, could give some positive outcome if they devise some sort of mechanism of synthesizing these.

However, Heidegger further seems to be violating the pure monism or knowledge being inherent by cleverly applying Hegelian theory of Nothingness to a practical Philosophy of Life or 'Existence'. In his *What is Metaphysics?* Heidegger says: "The enquiry should be into the Existing or else into—nothing..... Into the existing alone, and beyond it into—Nothingness. Where do we search for nothingness? Where can we find Nothingness? we know nothingness through fear..... fear reveals Nothingness.." Jasper also shares same view of life and existence as irredeemable sin or guilt but couched in the philosophical or psychological jargon as one can enjoy life only in peril or life is nothing or has no meaning. Later on, Sartre and other existentialists further elaborated on this theory of absurd.

The sin and sin based ontology that Christian phenomenology has been following validates this enquiry in nothingness making gaping hole in the pure monism or inherence of knowledge. The original sin of Adam that has become permanent is that he considers himself separate from infinity or One reality. The separation or alienation of being from Being or One or considering oneself other from Brahma or Super consciousness is the original or permanent sin. The moment one considers oneself separate from One reality the sinning both at ontological and phenomenological level begins. The ideology of nothingness that seems to have dominated the modern and postmodernism seems to be collateral of this violation of pure monism.

Despite the fact that West and its muses consider the growth of capitalism due to Reformation, rationalization of society, ethics, law and Calvinism which gave the idea that man was only the administrator of Kingdom of God, the fact cannot be denied that it is the colonization and the desire to dominate arising out of master-slave morality, as Latour has mentioned, that has been behind the rise of capitalism and liberalism and libertarianism .

As Roth has averred that "the Sociology of Domination is the core of economy and the society. The major purpose of work was construction of a typology of association, with most prominence given to the types of domination and their relations to want-satisfaction through appropriation". And it is again paraxial manifestation of master and slave morality that has arisen from early Christian phenomenology subverting the Greek ideal of One reality wherein Greeks and their gods were on same level- all is Braham or One that has become all- and inserting the ontology of Master and Slave (human)- God at higher place and men at lower. And to mediate this church, temple and mosque were built and rest is history.

Same subversion in pure monism happened in India as well when Krishna himself was transformed into God

and others as lesser sinning mortals. This can be understood as phenomenology of Brahmanism (Hinduism) which inserted hierarchical and stratified caste system which seems to be sequel to Christian phenomenology. And rest is history.

Nevertheless, Hegelianism exemplifies as to how inherent knowledge can take different nuances in different place and time and can be distorted, twisted and pulverized just for the vested interest. The Hegelian Spirit after taking the form of world spirit gets objectified in action making spirit the slave of state and society. Marxist phenomenology, despite identifying the rational kernel in Hegelian one, the application of the principle of activity to the theory of knowledge, led to further objectification of subject as it made it pale copy of materialistic forces.

The end result of Marxist phenomenology was communism and totalitarian plan leading to terror and violence and further emasculation of subject and violation of cogito of oneness or pure monism. While the paraxial manifestation of Hegelian phenomenology was the rise of Nazism and Fascism, apart from stymieing the subject and case of inherence of knowledge, that of Marxist phenomenology led to communism and totalitarianism further punching hole in the subjectivity and inherence of knowledge.

Marx action oriented phenomenology, though he criticized phenomenology for subjectivization but he did not mind objectifying the subject by predicating it on matter or economic forces, was bound to court the ordeal that it met as end or result obsessed action plan was put before any action. First time in history the cart (end) was put before horse (action) with such aplomb if it were going to usher in a paradigm shift in human history. The only shift came was end or result or ideology got primacy over action and rest is history as to how it led to deterministic and totalitarian cogito on which plane subject was finished for good metaphorically and literally too.

While Hegelian phenomenology got the spirit or subject objectified in the praxis of dynamics of action, Marxist phenomenology, though action oriented got stuck up in the end marred action programme. While action gets consummated with achievement of end, here in Marxist phenomenology the ends or result to be consummated was already consummated while action through which it was to be factored was consecrated as end. The end result is before us and the rest is history.

Whereas in karma or action based phenomenology that Krishna propounded in yore was based on means or action while end was to be auto-consecration of ethics based Karma or action. As it is cause that becomes effect, the end would in proportion to action and hence there is no need to get obsessed about result. If the result or end is assumed before action it would put in jeopardy all the dynamics of cause and effect. In the Marxist phenomenology the end already decided, the action was but destined to lead to the objectification of subject. The 'classless society' or withering of state that was the end was lost in action leading to totalitarianism, and terror and violence unprecedented in the history of human begins.

Though Hegel and Marx both have presented action based phenomenology, only difference is that while in former case action objectified the subject as mere shadow of state and society, in the latter objectified end has led to the objectified subject; the middle has not been mediated by the 'middle kingdom of knowledge' but by terror, violence and direct action or objectified end. The consequences of both has been Nazism and Fascism, and communism, totalitarianism and state terror reducing the subject mere means to the end. As to Heideggerian and Husserlian phenomenology leading to the hollowing and hallowed ground of post-modernism and post-postmodernism via structuralism and neo-structuralism, the subject is doomed from the very beginning as these two are based on what Heidegger has very frankly termed the consciousness or subject as 'objective manifestation of Nature'.

If the phenomenology of cultural formations (religions) are to be juxtaposed with those of Hegel, Marx and Husserl and Heidegger (ontology of phenomenology), it appears to have further authenticated the objectification of subject and violation of cogito of oneness in the paraxial values that Fatherhood, Brotherhood and Family hood are grounded in. While all three have objectified the subject by limiting it to certain denomination and rituals and symbols, the transcendence has been denied leaving it to reek in vast and chaotic plane of immanence. And the crisis has to happen.

Section - III

Paradox of Freedom

The paradox of freedom that has flummoxed the philosophers, thinkers, ontologists, phenomenologist, existentialists and neo-existentialist, moderns and postmodern as well as muses and scientists alike has percolated to the paraxial ground from metaphysical one. The metaphysical loneliness and resultant chimerical freedom seems to have been projected onto ontological ground finally flooding the praxis. The crisis of world seems to have germinated from the failure of this coordinate of being and freedom.

From Rousseau lamenting injunction of 'Men are born free but found in chain everywhere' to Nietzsche gloom, "To be free is, precisely, to abolish ends"; and resultantly finding freedom in nihilism. British School of psychologists classification of negative and positive freedom to Hegelian Affirmative freedom finding its manifestation in the differences created within whole and Kantian freedom seeking it in self based universal reason as contrasted to Nietzschean freedom finding its reality in atomism to Sartre helplessness: men is 'condemned to be free', and finally, ontologists and structuralism have cancelled the subject; and the poststructuralist have found solace in Nietzsche atomism as their ideal of freedom or being or consciousness as free entity conditioned as they are with social whole and consequent rejection of any tangible freedom. Not surprisingly the postmodernism and post-postmodernism have settled for freedom in escaping the multiplicity and differences arising out of social wholes and its consequent meaninglessness .

The postmodern rather entangling, instead of liberating version of freedom is based on philosophical potpourri of three prominent modernists—Hegel, Kant

and Nietzsche with Marxist view of constant struggle with existence or social whole considered as dominating and undermining freedom arising from Nietzschean atomism endeavouring to anchor freedom in solitude and away from 'herd instinct' into noble morality of over man having disdain for majority. The postmodern and post-postmodern view about freedom appears to be stuck up between Nietzschean atomism bordering on nihilistic view of existential and mundane freedom, and Hegelian differences arising within a whole and its resolution found within whole, with vague Kantian self based subjectivity finding its freedom in self generated reason to be found in sync with universal.

The essentialists and evolutionists have already made freedom the captive of destiny, 'design' and pre-ordained essence, while humanist or those modernist who finds freedom in fact minding sciences often leading to the 'fact minding society' and sciences sans any morality or without any resultant good and bad to existence or mundane social whole have led to a crisis situation where more discourse on freedom has led to its more denial at existential and mundane level. In Deleuze's works, difference and multiplicity is not socially generated but it is the essence and ontological reality. It is ontological fact which brings it nearer to Nietzschean nihilistic atomism. Whereas Heidegger locates freedom in constant absence of being which finds freedom in 'thrownness'.

That is what John MacGraw has hinted in his work, *Postmodern and its Critiques*, way back at the tail end of preceding millennia. "Postmodern find in difference the principle of multiplicity or the irreducibility, that allows it to escape the totalizing vision it associates with necessity and unfreedom. What I want to emphasize that this commitment to difference stems from negative image of freedom." However, he contends that Kantian reason, though locates freedom in self sufficiency of self with reference to reason, is bourgeoisie in the sense its being too individualistic, as Kantian self and thing in itself

and reason as mediator but in absence of affirmation of God and soul it has been rendered too individualistic to invite being termed as bourgeoisie.

While the postmodern accepts Nietzschean atomism as the epitome of freedom and Hegelian difference as mark of true freedom, they abhors the totalizing effects arising out of it and finding freedom within the whole that Hegelianism entails. This contradiction puts postmodern view of freedom in the contradictory and confusing situation. Similarly they aspire for a freedom from rules, regulations, system and authority leading to a view of freedom which is nihilistic and entangling rather negative freedom. This is characteristic of existential as well as mundane freedom as espoused by the postmodernism and post-postmodernism which is negative and myopic.

The Moderns espoused a view of freedom which from very beginning was doomed to be contradictory and conflicting. Be it Kantian freedom assigning independent sphere to individual and thing in itself or Hegelian freedom finding its manifestation in the affirmative action of whole and within that whole only Nietzschean freedom finding its moorings in the nihilistic atomism or Marxian or Neo-Marxists envisioning freedom in classless and stateless society with implied constancy of struggle and violence that such vision entails.

Out of this confused and contradictory strand of freedom that modernists vouch for, the postmodernist has found escape route from the differences and multiplicity of the totalizing system and perceived hostile universe for existential and mundane freedom, which has been termed negative. This can be substantiated from the stand of postmodernist radical feminists, that on death of man and carving of new man, seek freedom in style and multiplicity. Ironically, this new found freedom is more entangling than liberating which can be substantiated from the current state of feminism.

However, When Kant ushered in Copernicusian revolution in the form of providing centrality to subjectivity, it gave new hope for the individual liberty and freedom. But it failed to provide any breakthrough in this regard despite Kant granting self and thing in itself a separate and independent sphere. Apart from Hegel deterministic schema and Cartesian mechanistic cogito wrecking havoc on the centrality of subjectivity through deluding instants of 'i think i exist'; Kantian denial or rather ambivalence in respect of the thing in itself and the soul torpedoed this Copernicusian revolution. In the absence of soul and transmigration this centrality of subjectivity and its alignment with universality, as Hegel has categorically mentioned, rendered this ineffective.

Nevertheless, Kant has sought to resolve individual autonomy with universality through assigning both independent realm, and situating universal reason and individual differentiation within self. Though it has been termed as "Bourgeoisie Humanism", being too individualistic, yet it gives centrality to subject and in reference to reason it seeks to align universality with it. But it could not be realized in praxis due to ambivalence about God and soul. Moreover, it could not envision an external agency or empirical imperative that could help in finding this alignment as Krishna pure monism did in yonder.

Krishna pure monism anticipated Kant in providing centrality to subject or self in reference to Dharma or reason but with God and soul intrinsic part of reason or Dharma. He also put empirical imperative or mediating agency to align it with universality. Postmodern has accepted the centrality of subject but in negative and nihilistic sense as it denies God or soul and conveniently neglect reason or dharma. It is believed that truth is relative and it is up to individual to decide the truth without reference to reason or Dharma.

While Hegel confronts Kantian world by presenting

a reason divided in itself and presents a monist universe entrusting an unified and single sphere, even though it is characterized by internal divisions. The individual is incapable of making any decision raven as is with multiplicity and difference, whatever freedom that individual hopes to aspire, so far as Hegelianism is concerned, can be found within whole. Similarly Hegel denies any autonomy terming it as meaningless as a particular attains its significance only within the whole as the trajectory of dialectics is towards the whole only. Thus any knowledge that is gleaned from operation of self and thing in itself in reference to reason will be momentary as dialectic would render it null as it moves towards whole.

How can knowledge about a phenomena or substance can change when knowledge is inherent in them? It may appear as changing apparently but at substantial level it remains what it is. For example a day even if it changes it remains day, though it may look different in morning or afternoon or evening. Whatever changes are perceived it is false knowledge arising out of sense perception or judgement or finding difference in phenomena and substance. If eyes are moved around a stationary object, the object even if static seems to be moving. Is it true knowledge or false? Even if dialectics leads to change in phenomena and substance, the core or real knowledge remains what it is, only it changes apparently due to interpretation and differences arising out of perception or sense generated idea that in the most of eventualities more apparent than real.

Even if in chemical changes or any substantial changes, the knowledge about changed substance remains what it is, only its property and outer forms undergo changes. Even in transformation of that which is transformed maintain its basic nature even in the changes. The changes that occur in the changed substance or phenomena retain its knowledge as it is because of this that change has occurred. The same can

be said about the being and its life and death phenomena. The being that is conscious of consciousness and observer, that is soul cancelled conveniently along with God or Being in itself, never changes as it is conscious and observing entity. How can consciousness of consciousness and observer change? But the changes that come in body or death that occurs is attributed to it.

Another problem apart from objectifying the subject in disguised and explicit ways undermining the tangible freedom, has been the problem of interpretation as all hermeneutics and epistemologist would agree. The socially conditioned interpretation of phenomena and substance cannot but provide truncated and limited to time and social milieu as it was made in particular period conditioned by particular social conditions. How can it provide a proper perspective and interpretation unless it is shelved of all interrelations and then what remains is the real interpretation. Though Deleuze and Guattari in, *Anti-Oedipus*, did concede that the differences and multiplicity created not arises from social conditions but created of 'itself and liberating no matter what circumstances are', no wonder it is understood as Nietzschean nihilistic atomism.

The knowledge or truth or real narrative can be culled after shelving all interoperations and but not as Derrida does, building on 'traces' but fresh interpretation, of course, not neglecting the underlying principle and motive behind that interpretation. Though Deleuze and Guattari has talked about territorialisation and re-territorialisation it ends up in a sort of 'vicious circle of re-interpreting and interpreting the re-interpreted.

Thus, postmodern freedom is stuck up amidst Hegelian whole and difference & multiplicity, Kantian subjectivity mediated by reason in its alignment with universality, and Nietzsche's nihilistic atomism. The net result is that more one tries to negotiate out of this, more the things get entangled. The most succinct example is that of Deleuze and Guattari attempts to make out the

differences arising within rather than without has made it more complicated. Kant's knowledge in reframing subjectivity or self and its faculties was very cleverly high jacked to dialectics by Hegel as Derrida has mentioned. Nietzsche's atomism with its attendant nihilism led to the negative freedom that has further complicated the case for freedom.

In the modern times Heidegger's attempt to ameliorate the situation has led to cancellation of being of presence as *Da-sien* is not being or subject in any sense as it is always in process of becoming by its very nature of 'thrownness'. Even Sartre, though earlier, appears to having seconded this ossification and objectification of being by summing up its existential and mundane freedom in nothingness in *Being and Nothingness*. Thus being presence seen in conjunction with Nietzsche eternal return has grounded metaphysics in the demise of being or subjectivity, leading to this gloom in multiplicity and difference both self created in case of Deleuze and Guattari or by whole in case of Hegel. If it is juxtaposed with postmodern Marxists who view universe as hostile, the paradox of freedom is complete.

The freedom and liberty is paradoxical consequent upon the dynamism of the whole and part, form and content and universe and unit. It has been made more complex by the protagonist of respective substratum by making their narrative predominant and final over other, and the judgement is generally beyond appeal. This has led to the universal conundrum of freedom from whom and freedom from what as well as freedom within convention or law and beyond it. Another layer of the freedom is freedom from nature or the internal limitation in the form of being-in-itself and being for itself.

The dialectics that Krishna universal monism has posited transcend the limitation of fast changing reality of phenomenon. There is no inherent struggle between the binaries or spirit and matter and what appears as conflict and contradiction is apparent not

real. There is constancy and monism in the change and it is matter of knowledge. To understand a phenomenon one has to go beyond the dialectics through the epistemological and ontological theory he propounded—Gyan Yoga or Samakhya

However, Plato, Aristotle and successive line of the muses down to Hegel and Marx used Heraclitian dialectics to negotiate and understand the phenomena. They seem to have missed the fact that only way out from this contradiction of dialectics is go beyond dialectics and understand its reality though epistemology. The phenomenon does not always result or follow the thesis, antithesis and synthesis as has been posited by Hegel et la. There is every possibility that the thesis may be anti-thesis it might be appearing as that but in reality it may not be that. Or even synthesis may be thesis or anti-thesis as they are on the same continuum of universal monism of the phenomena.

While thesis is one end of the continuum of the phenomena which is followed by the anti-thesis, it again leads to the synthesis. The synthesis in conjunction with time and space acquires the form of thesis, anti-thesis and synthesis. This is again the tremulous dialectics that tricked Hegel, Marx and as well as other schools and muses of philosophy and ethics.

Like British group of psychologists and philosophers such as Hume, Burke and other empiricists, Krishna acknowledged the primacy and importance of senses, but unlike them he did not concede sense dictated perception as reality. He considered such reality as more apparent than real, a sort of illusion that could be corrected only with knowledge. The perception and experience arising out of senses and sense generated reality is temporary, illusory and misplaced. They could be sanitized by the his epistemological theory of Gyan Yoga.

Freedom for being that is bereft of universal Being or

separated from universal Consciousness epistemologically as well as ontologically is untenable and unviable as being can have freedom only in action and for action. If a being wants to do something or be somebody it has been argued that it loses its being, becoming nothing and in fact annihilates itself. This is what modern view of freedom as postulated by existentialist like Sartre whose famous dictum “Man is condemned to be free’. Heidegger also arrives at same conclusion as being is always in process of becoming as its very being is in the ‘thrownness’ and ‘tools’. This also underlines the limitation of freedom when man thinks himself as only actor and reaper/attainer of its result as a matter of right.

Man is condemned to be free because he seeks freedom not in action or means but in result or end which is very complex proposition being factored by many forces and elements—spiritual as well as material. This has been the attitude of modernity towards freedom and liberty, and all the discourses and theories are based on this premise. It is because of this contradiction that despite all big promise and talks and constitutionalism, and institutionalization of freedom and liberty, it has been a scarce entity in real sense of term, in modern times.

The only freedom that men has and can have is in action and not in result or outcome. ‘Man is born free but everywhere he is in fetters’, Rousseau diagnosis was right but his prescription proved to be another fetter for man’s freedom as General will is majoritarianism trampling the minority voice implied therein. The fetters that men find after having born free is because he confuses the means of freedom as end and end as means. This arises because as Krishna Karma yoga or causal theory has averred that men is free to do action and has freedom in doing, and the moment his freedom overarches the end or result, freedom is lost and thus his life becomes series of unending fetters. But irony is that for this omission and commission the man blames society, life and God.

The paradox of freedom is that the moment end is desired while pursuing the means, the freedom becomes fetter and action annihilates the being into nothingness. However, this should not be treated as Nietzschean freedom in 'abolishing end' which is nihilistic approach to freedom. It is perhaps for this that Kant put a schema of action for action sake. In the discourse of freedom in all discipline this aspect of freedom seems to have not found required attention and significance. It is different from cause and effect theory of seeking certainty in the effect which is generally only probability.

Bergson in last century mentioned this lack of significance attached to action and its dynamics at ideational as well as paraxial level. Though Hegel and Marx have paid some attention but seems to have caught off handed by the vast plane of action. This is perceptible from Hegel view of action as objectifying the Spirit grounding it in bondage and unfreedom, whereas Marx views action in inverted sense of its dynamics as he starts with premise of end achieved beforehand. In the continuum of action the end is at the last of its limit but when it starts with last, whole movement and dynamics of action get disjointed, and the net result world has seen in last century in the form of genocide and fratricide.

Even its unending effect is reverberating in the modern and postmodern reality when the postmodernist Marxist have sneaked their view of hostile and cruel universe whom postmodernist banding them with Nietzschean view of eternal willing leading to eternal coming, the will to power providing hollow willing an unfounded substance resulting into gloom and nausea of postmodern world, percolating to existential and mundane freedom, they have found escape or resting ground from multiplicity and difference, that is as per Krishna pure monism is mere apparent, even if it is not so, it is anchored by faulty knowledge (gyan dosh).

While Heidegger has made action an annihilating 'tool' of being, others think that once action is conceived

it is already happened. It is again fallacy of putting the end in the beginning or even before in the conceptual state. Even if an action is considered as consummated, it is not done from its infinite dynamics. Suppose a person is saved from drowning, as quoted in his discourse on *Psychology of Bhagavad Gita* by Rajnish or Osho, might indulge in serial homicide or may become a scientist that might invent a weapon more devastating and deadly than existing nuclear one, and that act might have infinite consequences going on infinitely. Even a small action has vast ramification and unending series of linkages going for infinity.

Nevertheless, being seems to be annihilated itself in action for Heidegger as the primary nature of being is its 'thrownness' and it becomes 'tool', while for Hegel it objectifies the spirit. This is possible only when being is identified with its action and its effect. This premise also becomes shaky when that being is aware or observer of getting grounded in action and that difference establishes the fact that being that is acting is different from that being that is observing it or aware of its activity—that is soul. In fact ambivalence in case of Kant and Hegel, unfounded rejection of these by Nietzsche like approach of modernist towards God and soul, reason, knowledge like substance and constituting element of being and world, provided to postmodernist the fertile ground to weave their objection to existence of these. The modernists were so enamoured of fact and the sciencitization that these constituting elements of being and its world were termed as abstract entity having no foundation.

For a being action is road to freedom, it is free till it sticks to action or the means, the moment being's trajectory of action leapfrogs to end or the result, his being is annihilated and negated, its freedom and whole ontological structure is get disjointed. Consequently, it leads to alienation of being and his revolt against life, society, God and existence. This is akin to when being is identified with vast plane of immanence on the

coordinates of thought. Cartesian cogito is labyrinth of instants in which being gets so entangled that rarely comes out from it, and forgetting its true form and nature.

This sleight of hand approach towards freedom neglecting Krishna Karma yoga or causal theory or ignoring it has led to a situation where freedom and liberty is getting scarcer and hollowed in proportion to its becoming the buzzword of the modernity and the postmodernist. Resultantly, Bentham lost freedom in pleasure pain binary, while Mill frittered away freedom in formalism and crass individualism. Hobbesian freedom got entombed in the absoluteness of Leviathan, while Rousseau and Locke tied its tail with General will and state making it dependent on collectivism.

On the other hand, Hegelian freedom found its manifestation in the difference and multiplicity arising within whole leading to benevolent absolutism of monarchy and German nationalism trampling the liberty and freedom of the masses and ethnic groups, whereas Marxian revolution trampled present freedom and liberty for the obscure and uncertain freedom in future as Camus has underlined, and lost its way in economic determinism.

Sartre like existentialist hollowed the freedom and liberty for their untenable quest for having control over existence and life as independent entity or for end or result as condition for freedom. The existential independence is very tricky, the moment one thinks free the bondage comes in garb of bodily, natural and one's own mind and ego. Only choice available is that of beggars having no choice except what other makes it out to be. Or Krishna way of taking on binary with even mind (sam or balanced). Even if one wills it, the unwilling would come or if one keeps willing in the sense of Nietzschean eternal return as will to power, then it would be eternal willing only in solitude, away from crowd and law and custom into nihilism. The moment other is considered as 'hell', it is negation of self and its universality as per Krishna pure monism.

Despite the fact that Kant' 'action for sake of action' was grounded on high state of mind borderline of a sort of altruism was tricked by Hegel in hollowing freedom through dialectics which render coordinate of self and thing in itself in arriving at any knowledge in reference to reason transitory. Rawal later on revived his credo for freedom, morality and justice, but it could not find favour with new aristocracy and tribalism of twenty first century that is peddling its agenda in the name of freedom, justice and liberty just as twentieth century drowned self or individual centric freedom and system in totalitarian utopianism and a sort of anarchic rebellion.

Kantian morality, his concept of freedom in doing ones duty for the duty sake and conceding freedom and liberty to others as one desires for oneself is modern rendition of Krishna pure monism during Renaissance when Europeans came out of Dark Age or Black period after the Greeks and Romans attaining the imperial glories. As Kant was the product of Renaissance period arising out of the reinventing and revoking the spirit of Platonic idealism and Greco-Roman ideals having substantial influence of Krishna pure monism foundational contribution to the epistemology (Gyan Yoga or Samkhya, Dharma) and ontology (Karmyoga) is clearly perceptible on Kantian reason, freedom and morality. Indians and foreign scholarship not only denied his contribution but also misappropriated and misinterpreted it. However, it can be viewed as theme of unity running across the world. But when this unity is denied, and its current is diverted for the cultural and racial superiority of a class, caste, race, culture or nation, then it is negated beyond redemption.

While Indian scholarship and theological discourse did so by denying his historicity relegating him to the mystical realm, pulverizing, dividing and appropriating his seminal contribution to philosophy-social, political, moral, military, interstate relations, foreigners just misappropriated and misinterpreted denying civilization

status to the oldest and the most developed civilization of the humanity, terming it as unhistorical and 'lacking in cultural experience'.

Kantian postulation of morality and freedom that one would do to other as would to himself is an exemplary rendition of Krishna universal monism—being is extension of Super Being, individual consciousness that of super consciousness and hence there is no other. Even if there is other or other is hell, there may be hell but no other as it is a mere apparent. Whatever reality it may have acquired is based on false premise as Krishna proved in his epistemological and ontological discourse in *BhagavadGita*, *AnuGita* and *Uddhav Gita* subverted as 11th Skandh of *Bhagavat*. The very knowledge that there is no other, as Smkhya or Gyan Yoga or his epistemological theory maintains, but one consciousness or being divided in all creations-spiritual as material. Even matter is not matter, it is spirit here and matter there as spirit is now matter before it being spirit there. This apparently paradoxical conclusion even Einstein reached in case of matter and energy but his being scientist prevented him from going further in this direction.

Krishna pure monism, like 'Socrates Paradox' tricked Hegel and Marx as it did to Heraclitus and Plato, whose great influence both announced in no uncertain terms in dialectics and changeability. Even amidst the change there is constancy as matter turns into spirit or energy and vice versa but it is one that seems other but it is same if seen epistemologically. The fatherhood and brotherhood sums up the modern culmination of Krishna pure monism but again subverted and narrowed down to the extent becoming xenophobic, and creating a world characterized by us vs them leading to all sort of problems. It is just mere negation and violation of Krishna pure monism.

On the level of form of the freedom and morality Kant, Hegel, Marx, Mill, Rousseau, Sartre as well as Christianity and Islam—Krishna pure monism anticipated them or if

it is not acceptable then it will be certainly that knowledge of oneness manifested in different time and place and different Persona. It also validates Krishna pure monism and knowledge is inherent in phenomena and substance, but are lacking in content or gone astray or have been subverted for vested interest. The negation and distortion rather subversion of oneness of Brahma starting from ancient India (whatever be that place that does not matter) manifested in Greece and other part of world and culture.

It has rather become established fact in today's world and among different cultures that they consider other inferior as compared to themselves. It would not be a sort of digression to mention that Krishna and Indian civilization is blamed for having appropriated this seminal contribution of mankind. Well this seems to be the classic example of chicken and egg syndrome but it could be also viewed as theme of unity running undercurrent the world over, but diverted and choked for the superiority and vanity pang.

Krishna date has been archeologically assigned between 1200-1000 BC(S. R Rao, *The Lost City of Dawaraka*, Romila Thapar, Garbe has assigned the date beyond 600 Bc to 1000 BC see *The Greatest Farce of History*) Krishna epistemological and ontological theory might have travelled via Indo-Greek trade in ancient time, Greeks participated in Mahabharata War (See Bhandarkar's *Mahabharata*, Romila Thapar's *The Cultural Pasts: Essays in Early Indian History*). The ancient tradition of Yayati, the most ancient Yadavas King whose descendants were of Greek origin also points it. Even the Greek tradition has confirmed the Indian origin of king or muse.

However, only exception was Socrates who provided pure monism a momentum, but Plato and the gang of thirties buried him under his political and personal agenda. Later on Hegel, Marx, Rousseau, Mill, and cultural organization (religions) built their morality and freedom on this misappropriated foundation of Krishna

pure monism or it manifested in them.

The form and content or means and ends relationship in context of man as well as that of the society and state, as per the Krishna pure monism, plays crucial role in freedom, morality and trajectory of the growth of social political institution. Starting from Individual, its disjointed or diluted relations factor the similar negative and obscurantist effect in community, society and state to larger extent. The attachment or the control of ends or result or outcome results into annihilation of self from itself leading to self-for-itself becoming the self-in-itself. It is in this gap or vacuum that freedom of the self is lost leading to the alienation and disillusionment.

As Krishna has postulated man is free till he does not think himself the doer and not attached to result or end or want to control the end. This aspect has been missed or not given enough attention by the proponents of positive and negative freedom and morality. The proponents of epistemological and ontological theories have rather misread Krishna pure monism. It provides an integrated and whole system of epistemology and ontology which if put in praxis it would metamorphose the world.

In a discourse, in *UdhavGita or Ekadash Skandh of Bhagvat*, with Udhav- who was the great philosopher cum Seer, Krishna, also known as disciple of Ghor Angaris who after leaving the fold of Vedic or Sanatan religion became 23rd prophet of Jaina, says: "Dear Udhav! If you assume the doer of works (karma) and the being (jiva) who face happiness & sorrow as different, and universe, time, knowledge (ved) and souls as non-transitory (Nitya), along with it you think that constantly changing outer forms and their difference result into knowledge, and that knowledge keep on changing due to them, then it would lead to mistake. (thus the controller of world—Soul existence would be denied and it would not solve the cycle of life and death.) If it is accepted, then body and birth & death like changes due to time & other factors

(Sanwatsar aadi kalayavyon) would be eternal, hence it could not be removed as body like substance and time are considered eternal by you." (Chapter 10,Stanza 12)

Krishna anticipates Hegel's difference and multiplicity, he would have certainly disapproved his 'cleverness' with which he did away Kant's Copernicusian revolution', has been very conveniently accepted by postmodernist, when he argues that constantly changing outer forms and their difference are considered to be resulting into knowledge, and that knowledge keep on changing due to them, then it would lead to mistake. It has led to mistake and mistake is that dialectics have been given primacy over knowledge and knowledge has been blunted or cancelled as temporary and has been predicated on difference and multiplicity. Consequently, as Krishna avers, the controller of world-Soul which is knowledge form (gyanswarup), self existent (swa-praksh) and conscious (Chetan) being observer of all realities it is above them. Body and its mind and their existence would be denied and hence the problem of cycle of life and death would remain unresolved.

However, if it is accepted, as Krishna opines, then body and birth and death like changes occurring due to time and other factors would be eternal. Hence it could not be absolved as body and time like substance is considered eternal. Here, Krishna anticipates Nietzsche's folly of eternal return" which has been termed as repetition with difference by Gilulez in his work, *Difference and Repetition*.

" Apart from it, here also the being or subject (Jiva) who is doer and perforce has to face sorrow and pleasure would appear in fetter or in bondage or not free. If he is free, why would be unhappy or feel pain or his action would result in sorrow? Thus, even if problem of pleasure is resolved, the problem of pain or sorrow would remain unresolved. So according to this opinion, the being (jiva) would never attain freedom. When being (jiva) is by nature in bondage, helpless, then he would be unable to enjoy

self work and work for other. It means he would be bereft of work done by self as for other". (Chapter 10, stanza 14-17)

If it is said that those who know how to do the work properly are happy and those who don't know has to face sorrow or unhappiness, such conclusion is also wrong because as it has been seen that big and learned person (those who know to do work properly) never attain any happiness while the fools have never been found unhappy. So if one brags that he would attain happiness through his intelligence or good work, it is vain. (Chapter 10, stanza 18)

" If it is accepted that those persons know as to how attain happiness and how to negotiate sorrow properly, then it has to be also accepted that they don't know as to how overcome the effects of death and they never die" (Chapter 10, stanza 19)"When death is impending how could any luxury or any way out can make them happy? How can a man be happy when he is inching towards slaughterhouse (death)? Can anything or any luxury can make him happy? Never. (Chapter, 10, stanza 20)

This rather sums up the paradox of existential freedom and as well as mundane one. The modern and postmodern discourse on freedom has been entangled in this paradox from which more efforts to resolve it is leading to more ensnarement in this. The crisis of world authenticates it in praxis. The basic premise on which existential and mundane freedom depends such as Soul, knowledge, substance, time, reason (dharma) has been cancelled and in such situation how can it be expected that paradox of freedom would be resolved.

The basic premise of freedom as espoused by pure monism is based on its credo that one or creator has become all or creation. Since God has been cancelled or at best relegated to abstract entity, soul too is denied so are reason and knowledge. So only thing remains is vast plane of immanence and in which freedom is like a tide in ocean.

As Krishna says: ".....Being (jiva) is one. He has been conceived by me (singular me has been interpolated to show him or prove him as anthropoid god) or thing in itself or God, in fact my (form of thing in itself or God) self-from. If the being is decked with self knowledge he is free and if not he is in bondage (not free).Since this lack of knowledge (agyan) is eternal so is the bondage" (UG, 11.5). (Postmodernist or neo-Nietzsche should add this also to multiplicity of explication or attribution that has been given to 'eternal return'.)

The question is that if being and thing in itself are in relation to creation and creator, how could being that is self-form of thing in itself get entangled in ignorance (A-vidya) or lack of self knowledge (it is not ascetic certainly though cynic would vouch for it) leading to bondage and lack of freedom? Krishna elaborates ." (This difference {bhed} is of two types—one is thing in itself is infinitely free as compared to being and other is difference between free being and the being that is in bondage.- being and thing in itself (ishwar) despite in bondage and free respectively are located in body as controller and controlled. Suppose body is like a tree in which heart two birds namely, thing in itself and being nestle around. As both are consciousness (chetan) they are equal and since they have never been separated, they are friend. The reason for such creation is play (not right word it is *Leela*). Despite such similarity the being has to eat the fruit of happiness and sorrow, but thing in itself(Ishwar) does not partake this fruit of sorrow and joy, hence remains unattached and just observer (Sakhsi). Despite non enjoyer the thing in itself is far better in knowledge, aeshwara (cultural and civilization artefacts perhaps), joy or bliss and capability"(UG: 11.6)

"There is one more splendour (Vilakshanntta) that non-enjoyer thing in itself is having: Ishwar (or God or thing in itself) knows its true self and in addition knows world (Jagat; universe) but the enjoyer (bhokta) being neither knows its true self nor anything apart from itself.

Between both while being due to lack of knowledge (avidya) is in bondage (in the sense of 'condemned to be free' or that to the 'eternal return'; will to power is just perpetuate the willing which Krishna pure monism terms as 'sankalp-vilapa' having no basis itself like plane of immanence, it has to be controlled or understood as mere exercise in what has been termed as "projection of mind (Budhi ka vivarta ref UG) while ishwar or thing in itself being knowledge form it is permanently free," (UG: 11..7)

"Dear Udhav! Person (purush) having true knowledge of his self is also free. As person after having woken from dream does not relate to his body any longer, so is person having knowledge (gyani) who is not related to micro (sukshma) body (consisting of mind, intelligence, ego, sense like seventeen elements) and mortal (sthool) body . Whereas person without knowledge are limited to body just as dreaming subject got entangled with body in dream." (UG:11.8)

However since postmodernist have bracketed God, Soul, and cancelled knowledge, there cannot be any ground on which freedom would be rested. Resultantly they did rest it in Hegelians multiplicity and difference while finding the shifting resting place in Nietzschean atomism and related nihilism leading to crisis. This is not only the case, along with them Metaphysics have also been consigned to abstracts. The ground thus ceded by the modernist, structuralism and post-structuralism, existentialist and neo-existentialist, deconstruction provided postmodernist the easiest route to freedom despite it being negative one.

For any grounding of freedom whether be it existential or mundane, these cancelled substances which are constituting factor for being and its freedom have to be de-bracketed and re-established. First thing first: God or thing in itself and the conduct of wise man serves us as a standard of action, with which we may compare and judge ourselves, which may help us to reform ourselves, although the perfection it demands can

never be attained by us. Although we cannot concede objective reality to these ideals, they are not to be considered as chimeras; on the contrary, they provide reason with a standard, which enables it to estimate by comparison, the degree of incompleteness in the objects presented to it. (Kant in refutation of Mendelssohn permanence to soul).

If a similar statement of Krishna from Udhav Gita or Gita can be juxtaposed with Kant' assertion in refutation of Mendelssohn permanence to soul, it would reveal how knowledge is inherent and within phenomena and substance, as well as permanence of knowledge and soul. If knowledge is inherent, it is logically and otherwise permanent with very reason of its being inherent or in-built in it. The variation and difference in knowledge is due to ignorance of subject and so far the dialectical onslaught with which Hegel put knowledge in disarray and bracketing it with impermanence and malleability (to respective interest if not vested interest). Basing his dialectics on Heraclitian lame duck dialectics failing to see permanence in change or sort of unity in difference, and conservative Platonic idealism, about Plato and Heraclitus influence he announced in no uncertain terms, knowledge could not be given more than predicative value at the best and at worst secondary.

The modernist very conveniently put soul as well as knowledge in secondary and tertiary state at the best and at the worst refuted its permanence and hence very existence. Kant in refutation of Mendelssohn permanence to soul missed the point: its being knowledge form with inherent quality of being observer and permeable. His 'Copernicusina revolution' and reason touch stoned subjectivity faltered on his inability to see permanence of soul. The reason and knowledge as well as subject is refuted in this sense. And God along with soul, knowledge, and reason, truth were conveniently cancelled and at the best given abstract value. It is no coincidence that Hegel and neo-Hegelian, as well as

modernist and postmodernist swooned on this to find it as anchoring ground. It is also no coincidence that later on it was cancelled, and its death pronounced along with 'death of God' and cancellation of knowledge by postmodernist, to reek ad nauseum in multiplicity and difference. If the existence of God or thing in itself cannot be proved, it does not mean it does not exist. The problem is the inability to prove and it does not tell anything about the thing in itself or God that cannot be proved.

As One or Creator has become all or creation, how can the One or Creator or God or thing in itself can be proved except in all or creation. The very existence of existent or creation or world validates his reality. As Jeb has commented that God has no eyes as He is eyes of all proves His existence. If we exist, He exists with and within us. As Krishna has said in *UdhavGita* subverted as *Ekadash Skandh of Bhagvat* that we are Brahma or universe, Brahma is without as well as within us. The thing in itself and being lives in body like two birds on a tree. While one is free and observer, other is involved in enjoying the sorrow and happiness. It can be proved but the fact minding society and their muses immersed rather obsessed with scientific validity would be sceptic.

Similarly, Soul has also been cancelled as non-entity and conveniently consigned to theology and eschatology. Like God or thing in itself soul is self-axiomatic. Krishna says that the entity that is aware of the intelligence of waking, mind of half waking and unconscious of dreaming or sleeping state is the soul. While sleeping when mind, intelligence, memory and body are inert who remembers about having slept, it is soul. Soul is conscious about consciousness. It is conscious (chetan), knowledge itself (gyanswarup) and immortal. How can a entity which is conscious and knowledge itself can die? This misnomer has arisen because soul is identified with body.

The existence and immortality of soul can further be

validated by the experience of everybody. Everybody knows that he or she is going to die or body is dying every moment, yet everybody is convinced he or she would never die. Why and how come it is possible that despite seeing death everywhere everybody thinks that death would never touch them? It is projection of soul immortality and its existence. Similarly reason or Dharma and knowledge is also self axiomatic as latter is inherent in phenomena and substance and former is prime mover of the world. The Dharma of wind is blowing and dharma of Sun is shining and likewise everything has its own reason or dharma.

Section - IV

What is Krishna Pure Monism?

Before discussing Krishna pure monism, it is pertinent to start with some of the misnomers associated with monism. Monism is so much distorted that it seems to have lost its meaning and it has become a proverbial play ground for all sort of motives and interests. From modernist to postmodernist, from philosophers to metaphysics, ontologists, phenomenologist, deconstruction to post-postmodernist, monism has been used as ground for justifying their respective views and the counter views. The misnomer about monism can be best illustrated with the Indian parable of one elephant and seven blind men. A group of seven blind men came across an elephant and all seven interpreted it as per their understanding: According to one elephant is like rope, to other it's like tree. While one thinks it's like buffalo, other is sure it's two-legged giant, and so on and so forth.

Hobbesian conception of monism equating power with knowledge not only has subverted the monism but grounded it to the totalitarianism. If knowledge is power, then it implies that power flows from knowledge. Leviathan or power can decide as what is knowledge and what is not. It has been aptly termed as precursor of real politic which Machiavelli et la has used for real politics sans any ethics.

Everyone claims to be monist and monotheist and it has rather become fashion to be so. From Christians to Muslims, from Hindu Shavite and Vaishnava, and Jews

to Bahai professes to be true monist and monotheist. But all these denominations have erected an exclusive veneer which is steeped in the us vs them, faithful and heretics and all types of traditions and rituals differentiating them from other. Moreover, there seems to be competitive race among them as who is real monotheist and pseudo one. Even within one domination, there is entangling web of layered differences between different sects. This very reality defies and negates the principle of monism and monotheism.

Like any other philosophy and ethical perspective, monism has been subjected to philosophical cud-chewing and academic gerrymandering that has rather become a trend lately. One can denounce any philosophy, any ethical perspective logically which may be termed as Ku-turk in Hindi. There is no equivalent word for it in English, it may be nearer to illogic or logic for logic sake. This has been rather bane of logic and philosophy for that it has ceded ground to ethics losing its significance and relevance that it once held. Another bane of philosophy starting from Plato, providing continuity by Hegel and his ilk is propounding or subverting philosophy for vested interest.

The main phalanx of attack on monism is its positing as contradictory relation between parts and whole, form and content and good and bad that refutes the theory. With such logic every philosophy could be refuted in same way that $2+2=4$ could be refuted. It is the cause and effect of the postmodernism which can refute any logic, perspective and philosophy by juxtaposing it with counter reality or multiple versions.

While some of the modernist monistic postulations have led to Leviathan, absolutism, determinism of one sort or other, essence and design, and with multiplicity and difference; others have found it contradictory and too idealist. And the postmodernists have demolished it with all their intellectual resources, denying the very

proposition of one reality and one truth. The centre of attack on monism has been the monist theory of one truth and one reality as Mr. Joachim says ‘..... the truth itself is one and whole, and complete, and that all thinking and all expectations move within its recognition and subject to its manifest authority.....’ (*The Nature of Truth*, P. 178))

F. H Bradley says “Reality is one, it must be single, because plurality taken as real, contradicts itself. Plurality implies relations, and through its relations, it unwillingly asserts a superior unity” (*Appearance and Reality*, p. 344.). Further he shows succinctly as to how every reality is mere appearance. It has been made out that every representation turns a reality into appearance due to operation of sense guided perception and knowledge.

Bradley almost comes near to reinforcing Krishna Brahm theory and knowledge based Samkhya wherein every reality is covered with appearance and ignorance. One has to go beyond appearance to arrive at the reality. He also seems to have seconded Krishna views on time, space, substance and phenomenon which gets its being through consciousness, contrary to the modernist and postmodernist view that consciousness is always of something and hence it is secondary and predicated on substance and phenomena.

While discussing the dissolution of world and being, Krishna says that time in being and being in Super Being gets dissolved. The Soul or consciousness of consciousness remains as it is prime constituting entity of world and it is immortal. It is being that gives timeness to time and temporality to temporal. Heidegger inadvertently comes near to this view when he sees temporality as constituted by relations.

However, Krishna pure monism, like modern monist view, is not grounded in contradictory proposition and difference arising out of relation and property of whole and part. There is no contradiction in the credo of ontological monism-reality is one and logical monism-truth is one. Whatever contradiction and differences

arising within monistic view does not come out from within as viewed by Hegel, but it is mere appearance and is based on analytical view as guided by ‘fact minding people and sciences’.

A whole is whole and certainly is constituted and constitutes the parts and there is no gradation and difference and contradiction in part. A part is as much important and constituting factor of whole as whole is to part. But when part is taken out and viewed in isolation and kept on breaking parts and sub-parts, and then its correlation is sought with whole and if there is some contradiction or false proposition, then monism is discarded. There is no gainsaying the fact that form of idealistic monism that Hegel has propounded has led to its relegation to the background. However, the philosophical fallacy that has developed in respect of monism has spilled over to mundane when almost all religions professing monism and monotheism are following distorted view which contains anything but monism or monotheism.

It is said that if there is contradiction in part, whole would be contradictory and hence there would be difficulty in this view. But the probability of contradiction getting resolved during its being in process of whole has not been given required attention. For example, whole and part binary can be seen in the relation between thing in itself (God) and being. According to Krishna pure monism, it is thing in itself that has transformed into being, non-being and entire universe. Where is whole to be found if not in part-being and non-being? If thing in itself or God is not proved, does it mean that its existence may be denied? Can whole and part can be broken into two entity and can there be found any correlation modernist and postmodernist pitch for? Similarly, if there is some contradiction between pure and empirical knowledge, can knowledge can be cancelled or denied?

In Krishna pure monism, there is no gradation, no contradiction of whole and part, spirit and body or matter

difference, no multiplicity and difference. Whatever difference and multiplicity or contradiction might be there, is mere appearance and arising out of the ignorance. There is no scope for differentiated fatherhood and limited brotherhood as monism and monotheism have to come to mean. It is pure in the sense that it abhors any gradation, difference and contradiction, and if there is any, it is appearance and due to ignorance of 'the real form'.

Krishna universalism is corollary of his pure monism based on Brahma theory and knowledge based (gyanyoga) Samkhya. The internationalist in temporal realm and universalist in spiritual realm, his is class apart from so called internationalist. Since his idea and vision was too advanced and futuristic for the ancient India, it could not get the required attention and engagement. Moreover as it was in direct opposition to the polytheism and dogmatism of Vedic society, and Krishna putting into praxis his universalism by stopping the worship of Vedic gods and doing away the hold of priestly class or caste led to the vindictive subversion, supplantation and supplementation of his ideas and philosophy.

On paraxial ground his universalism took the form of a sort of internationalism that found its manifestation in loose alliance of all kings and kingdoms of ancient India, a sort of rudimentary intra-kingdoms arrangement ranging from Mynamar to Asia Minor or Central Asia (Gandhar, kakyae, Kukuta etc), based on rudimentary democratic and republican credo and collectively or mutually agreed 'Dharma (reason) based political engagement. This internationalism could not be extended beyond Asia Minor.

This has been attested by Greek historian and travellers along with Meghasthanese. They seem to be rather perplexed as to why it could not translate into foreign invasion and world campaign. This is quiet logical query that foreign monographers and travellers could not understand as to why Krishna and his successors could not lead to the world campaign. They

could not understand geographical vastness of ancient India with continental dimension and its limiting societal centripetal forces of castes and its attendant tools.

Krishna internationalism manifested in the form of loose alliance of kingdoms under the aegis of Vasudeva system based on Dharma (reason). Vasudeva was unique mechanism, which was later on subverted as religious and spiritual entity, a sort of balancing force in the social and political domain, an equilibrium maintaining mechanism—strong and decisive which is lacking in modern day UN that comes distant near, a prototype of UN or world body, his long distance military expedition in far East of Anga or Assam from Dwaraka or to Magadh or Vidarbha, establishment of Pandean empire under his influence (Tamil Sangam) in Southern most part of India (modern day Kerala)—these all point to his internationalism.

As to why he or his successors could not take world campaign, the possibility of internal political and social dynamics of ancient India keeping him or his successors tied could not be discarded altogether. Moreover, his social, political and revolutionary agenda kept him too engrossed in ancient India which was even then more than continent size to turn the attention towards world campaign.

Krishna philosophy in general and his unmatched contribution to monism, monotheism, (Garbe) epistemology and ontology seem to have influenced Indian philosophers and theologians and then foreigners ones. Firstly, it was appropriated to sub serve the vested interests of the Indian social elites and their stooge political elites (kings, Rajas and Maharajas) to nullify the revolutionary change and a veritable metamorphosis of social and political scape that Krishna universal monism factored in ancient India threatening their entrenched positions.

Krishna founded first monotheism of the world in the form of Bhagavat after postulating monism much before Buddha, and other self proclaimed proponents of monism (Garbe, *The philosophy of ancient of India*). The extrinsic

part of his monism is his epistemological (Gyan yoga or Samkhya), ontological (Prema Yoga) and casual or cause & effect theory (Karma Yoga) as found in *BhagavadGita*, *UddhavGita*, *AnuGita*, *Mahbhrarata*, *Bhagvat*,² proves that he was the first to propound a monistic philosophy based on Brahma theory, knowledge based Samkhya and action based phenomenology or Karmayoga .

First it seems to have influenced the Greeks, as they were having trade and political relations with India and participated in the Great Mahabharata war fought around 1000BC (S. R Rao, Romila Thapar), and its influence on Heraclitus, Antrax, Plato and Aristotle is clearly perceptible. Plato appears to have misinterpreted his pure/universal monism for propounding a totalitarian philosophy covered under his hollow idealism, justice and democracy or republicanism. Later on as Romans took away Greek philosophy and indigenised it by propounding Stoicism and Sophism.

Socrates among all Greeks reinforced his Samakhya or Gyanyog or epistemology when he averred that knowledge is character. There is nothing else to do as knowledge is enough. If one knows about reality or phenomenon, it is complete and end is achieved. But

² These texts have been subjected to vertical and horizontal subversion and interpolation with Brahamnical injunction and mythological insertion. These text have been compiled with single motive to transform Krishna as god and his philosophy as theological rendition. Apart from these, the text has been covered under larger text such as Mahabharata in which Gita and Anugita have been tucked in, while Udhav Gita has been made part of Bhagvat. Even Mahbhrata and Bhagvat which was originally historical –philosophical chronicle of Krishna and Yadavas (ancient and mediaeval ruling elites) have been subverted as mythological document. While referring these one will have to de-construct it separating mythology from philosophy and history.

Socrates was literally and metaphorically as well finished and his philosophy was buried under the dead wood of plutocracy of Plato hollow stratified justice, aristocracy and totalitarianism despite his Idea like that of Kant's reason reinforcing Krishna's Dharma around which whole universal/pure monism revolves. Plato despite his Idea and high-sounding totalitarian philosophy could not help but to go for Ionised or Greek version of highly stratified and hierarchical castes system of India.

The foundation of the western philosophy and its muse was laid down on Greek theory in general and Plato in particular which has veritable influence of Krishna pure/universal monism. While his universal monism was mystified, appropriated, misappropriated and misused and subverted in his own land—India through intellectual perjury of commentary and interpretation or misinterpretation, it appear to have been equally appropriated, misappropriated and misinterpreted by foreigners. Steering clear of chicken and egg binary as who was anterior and posterior to whom, Greek political and social theory in general and Plato, Heraclitus, Socrates, Pericles and others have misread or rather misunderstood Krishna universal monism, with some exception wherein it has been said to be influenced by the general term of 'oriental influence'.

It is obvious that the muse and founding doyens of western philosophy—Greeks and Romans- were aware of Krishna and his universal monism, as coins found in ancient Greek city state bearing the Krishna image attest the reality, apart from trade links and other political and social relations (even some Greeks took part in the great Mahabharata war (see Vamshvali section of Bhagavat, and Mahabharata). Heliodurus, an Indo-Greek who was the ardent admirer of Krishna, erected a Garur column in central part of India (Vidisha, MP)). Moreover, there is legend that Greeks or Yavana as called in Indian traditions, were the progenitors of ancient Yadava king, Yayati . Moreover, many Greek Kings have issued coins

with Krishna motifs . So it seems to be just impossible that they were not aware of Krishna universal monism , even Megasthenes has attested his republican and democratic credo. (see Megasthenese, *Indica*)

Krishna used to elaborate his philosophical rendition and discourse with percepts, anecdotes, examples and stories in dialogue format. There might be possibility that triad of Brahma, Vishnu and Mahesh might have been inspired from the triad of forces (guna) which seems to be personification of Sat (Goodness), and Raj (passion) and Tam (Darkness). According to Krishna, these three forces are operating forces of matter and spirit which later might have been developed into trinity of Brhama, Vishnu, Mahesh and electron, proton and neutron of matter in modern times.

As Krishna has mentioned in BhagvadGita that this tradition of knowledge has been passed from Manu to his decedents which Upanishads also confirmed by mentioning this knowledge has been initiated or vested with Kings, not with Brahmins. What Brahmins (priestly class or caste) seems to have done that they have inserted the texts and matters that put them in leading position. And this has been done through celestial, mythical, semi human, half man half god, Pandit, Brahmins, River, tree, demons, mountains and all the imaginary stuffs putting historicity and authenticity of treatise like BhagvadGita, Mahabhrata, Bhagavat, Udhav Gita, Anu Gita etc under doubt and skepticism.

Bhagavat or Monotheism, Advait as propounded in Udhav Gita, Samkhya which posited that knowledge is the ultimate reality and once one comes to know things and its causes, the problem is solved or the process of its resolution starts. Theory of creation, the idea of universalism or universal brotherhood, Karmyoga, causal or the cause and effect theory propounded in *BhagvadGita*, Vasudev and republicanism are some of the foundational contributions of Krishna to philosophy in general, and social and political philosophy in particular.

The integration or systematization of Vedic philosophy or Hindu philosophy that was achieved around first millennium AD by Sankar and others has been significantly termed as “Vedanta” betraying the subversive agenda of Indian philosophical scholarship. It seems to be ancient or mediaeval version of ‘End of History’ as propounded by Fukuyama if seen from hindsight. Like ‘End of history’, it seems to have conveyed that it is end of Veda or knowledge or Indian philosophy that is what Vedanta literally means and it is final development or logical conclusion of Indian philosophy.

It seems to be rather ridiculous and preposterous to surmise the end of Veda as the term Veda means the ‘the Knowledge’ and there cannot be any end to the Veda or knowledge. Knowledge is limitless, immortal and infinite like soul or spirit which is itself knowledge form, observer and permeable. To conclude that it is the limit or end of knowledge is just a misnomer. It is akin to Hegel making knowledge predicated on dialectics or Hobbes equating knowledge with power and Nietzschean postulation of knowledge as mere means. No wonder the postmodernist and post-postmodernists taking cue from their predecessors have cancelled the knowledge.

In addition, this endeavour of systemization has been undertaken in synthesizing, harmonizing, or removing the contradiction and confusion arising out of protest or revolt against Vedic system by Krishna and his universal/pure monism. Krishna’s BhagvadGita, Udhav Gita and Upanishad, except Chandoupanishad, which followed Krishna revolt against Vedic rituals and superstition and its polytheism. And it is Krishna philosophical legacy that seems to be main theme of almost all Upanishad (See various Upanishads or their their Mukhya Vakya {main theme}) and was attempted to synthesize and harmonize with Vedic philosophy.

The very act betrays the philosophical appropriation and subversion. Taking together BhagvadGita, Upanishad and Brahm sutra or Vednata Sutra (which later came)

which is the extension of Krishna's foundational philosophy of Bhagavat and Samkhya, seems to be doomed from very beginning. How could Veda and its philosophy based on ritualism and primitive polytheism be synthesized with Krishna's BhagvadGita and Upanishad that is mere explanation of Krishna's philosophy of Bhagavat and Samkhya which rose in revolt against it based on universal monism and establishment of monotheism in the form of Bhagavat? This seems to be nothing but master strategy or deceptive stratagem to appropriate and subvert Krishna's foundational contribution to the philosophy. Ironically, the monism and monotheistic discourse was inserted in Vedas and its succinct proof is that they should not have been in the later or fag end of Rig Veda (Rig Veda, Part X)

Moreover, the Advait (Non-dualism) or Illusionists who consider world as illusion or Maya has not only appropriated, borrowed and distorted Krishna's universal/pure monism but has also trivialized it. Krishna says Maya is creative force of creator and due to this creation looks like an apparent reality. But the illusionist or Mayvadi like Sankara has reduced the whole creation to mere illusion.

It has been maintained by western philosophical scholarship that Indian philosophical tradition has not evolved in systematic way and has been unable to develop school system (*Basham*). It has been alleged that Indian philosophical traditions has been too much concerned with spirit and has lost its moorings in abstract and mythology. This is partial narrative of Indian philosophy. Apparently, Vedanta seems to be streamlining various strands of philosophical discourse that has been permeating from very old time. Nevertheless, it has resulted into further confusion and it has to happen.

Krishna's postulation and philosophical rendition in BhagvadGita is for a man or entity in action who becomes entrapped in the great march of history or the ordinary life in certain direction as decided by the exigencies in

sync with Dharma (fair play or reason) without being attached or involved in the things or activities and their results or the consequences thereof. Contrary to the prevalent ancient Indian tradition, Vedic and pre-Vedic, Brahmanical and non-brahmanical traditions and related literature and philosophical tradition, which anachronism and redundancy have been attested even by Western scholarship terming it 'take it or leave it in manner' stuck up in polytheism and renunciation and ritualism bordering on obscurantism, Krishna postulated universal/pure monism which axiomatic manifestation are Samkhya or Gayn Yoga, Karma Yoga and Bhagavat and its praxis Vasudeva system or socio-political balancing mechanism.

What pre-Krishna philosophy and discourse discussed and debated was taking up life and world as it is and in non-attached way. Apart from polytheism based on ritualism and superstition with attendant magic and mysticism of tribalism rampant in Vedic society and system, there were some traditions as mentioned by Krishnan in BhagvadGita by 'Aakhyan', king Janak-Ashtavakra philosophical dialogue and Yoga Vashist were there. However, these were passive philosophy and taking world as it is. Krishna not only propounded universal/pure monism and monotheism through Bhagavat but also put its paraxial rendition through the system of Vasudeva. In course of time Krishna's universal monism found manifestation in the form of proto republican and proto-democratic political dealings and conducts, and equalitarian social-political order based on the Dharma(fair play or reason).

Krishna conjoined the non-attachment propounded by ascetics and previous philosophical tradition with action oriented philosophy for being as a part in the march of humanity and its social and political formations towards system based on *Dharma* (just or fair play or reason) as the whole creation is extension of same consciousness or *Chaitnay* pervading and

permeating the one and all, sentient and non-sentient beings of the existence. He made knowledge or *Gyan* yoga through his Samkhya supreme reality and knowledge providing answer to the all realities and phenomena of real and apparent world. The reality may look dualistic as it appears in terms of conventional law which is, according Krishna's universal monism, is the same as universal law or social or political manifestation of the super consciousness or *Chaitnay* form which apparently looks different. It is one but its appearance in different forms makes it to see in dualistic term. It is for the same reason Krishna monism has been misunderstood as dualism or dualistic. And this can be ascertained only through knowledge and once the apparent reality is discerned all the difference, conundrums and illusion is removed like light removing the darkness.

Krishna further postulated (Uddhava Gita) under Samkhya that it is Mahat tatva or Primal entity consisting Spirit or *Chiatnay* or Consciousness along with matter is the basis of creation which later on influenced Heraclitus, Protagoras, Plato, Aristotle, Hegel, Nietzsche, Marx, essentialist, totalitarians and even individualist and equalitarian. It is of course with devastating results as both totalitarians and individualist, essentialist and deterministic, communism and libertarianism could manage to see only their part of story due to the exigencies arising out of their living in particular time and space.

Even Einstein later on came to validate Krishna's universal/pure monism when he arrived at the conclusion that energy and matter are the same or the matter or energy is constituted or operated by the electron, proton and Neutron— the modern rendition of Krishna's world in its material manifestation is driven and constituted by the forces of *Satva* (goodness), *Rajas* (passion) and *Tam* (darkness or inertia).

Even the recent scientific experiment being conducted to find the God's particle or the matter that

constitutes the universe seem to have found the 'nothingness' or all-pervading consciousness appearing as nothingness. It is not just coincidence that Buddha has asserted that world has come out from nothingness and would go to it as Krishna postulates that it is creator that has become creation-being, non-being and universe.

In Krishna's pure/universal monism the individual is the end as well as means in the universal march of the monist consciousness as they are the part or the extension of the One Reality. It is through ephemeral existence of individual and material manifestation in the form of sentient and non-sentient beings that it realizes its existence with *sat* (pure being), *chit* (pure consciousness) and *anand* (pure bliss) (*UdhavGita*). This aspect was missed by the totalitarians advertently or inadvertently and the individualist were too dazzled with individuality and the freedom that led to the pessimism of existentialist. Satre et la existentialist came near to it when they realized that man is condemned to be free' but they took the symptoms of the problem as problem itself thus missing the wood for the tree.

The totalitarians on one hand and the liberal philosophy on the other saw only part of the whole reality and any individualistic initiative as degeneration and 'condemned to the sin'. Even the individualists, libertarians, liberal philosophies could not keep themselves from this intellectual and philosophical dishonesty using part for justifying the whole. This rather lopsided and narrow view emerged after the material manifestation and the universal consciousness that is the world, life, humanity, individuals and their social and political formations, began to be seen divorced from each other.

When there is no dualism and whatever the dualism emerges is only apparent not real as it is the extension of same reality, it should not be seen compartmentalized. In the totalitarian or collectivism and the individualistic or liberal or libertarians or individualism scheme of things the whole and the part are not only different but

antithetical to each other. It was assumed by the both streams of collective or totalitarian and individualist that for the good of the whole the part must be treated as end , while latter posited that the whole has no business in the part and whatever it is at minimal level.

The history of humanity, recent, not so recent and current, is testimony to the fact that these two streams of philosophy or ideologies and the political and social formations based on that have led to disastrous, sordid and confusing state of affairs. These two are still driving and dominating the philosophical, ethical, social and political aspect of the current narrative of the world. And the history is being repeated with disastrous effects as all the streams of scholarship, faculties of social sciences and philosophical sects are basking in the hollowed and superficial shadow of postmodernism and post-postmodernism et la.

The pessimism of existentialism, the so called 'Death of God' and the individuality 'condemned to be free' syndrome, and the individual predicament to be condemned to life 'with irredeemable sin' laden world challenged by the collectivist and tribal mentality in the garb of inclusion and common good and universalism, has led to vacuum in world philosophy in general and the western philosophy in particular. After some philosophical gyration it has settled for postmodernism and post-modernism built on the rather shaky shackles of hypocritical inability to find any viable solution or understanding or the real narrative, and political philosophy in general hit the dead-end of 'end of the freedom', 'democratic drift'

The Indian philosophy like its Western counterpart deviated from Krishna's universal monism or Samkhya philosophy with difference that latter denied any superior force and authority or reality, putting matter as prime reality and forces related to the ongoing march of history which found elaboration in the works of Marx, Angels and the communism and other totalitarian ideologies

and streams of philosophy leading to the tyranny of collective. And on the other hand is the pessimistic fatalism of individualist and individualism with unethical 'crass profiteering' of liberal ideology. Contrarily Indian philosophy put excessive emphasis on spirit or consciousness. However, there was another deviation and distortion rather subversion: it was in the form of denial of Krishna fundamental contribution to the humanity and perhaps for the all posterity to come, of universal monism and its appropriation, subversion and distortion by the stakes.

Interestingly, Krishna's postulation of world as material and spiritual realities guided by three forces: Sat (good or creative), Rajas (passionate or sustainers) and Tam (darkness or inertia or destruction) seems to have been picked by the Western scientific scholarship and Einstein et la finding the matter or energy consisting the triad of electron, proton and neutron. The matter and energy interchange revalidates his universal monism. And related with it is the subversion and blatant appropriation of his philosophy, fundamental contribution to the realm of political and social philosophy, Samkhya, karma yoga and monism, and the establishment of first ever monotheist sect in the form of Bhagavat (Garbe, Radhakrishnan) three thousand years back in the remote past when the Greeks were still struggling to come out from tribalism. He not only established a republic of Dawaraka city state but through Vasudev system also acted as balancing or equilibrium maintaining mechanism of social and political realm.

However, this subversion and appropriation found clear manifestation in the form of Vedanta or the End of Knowledge echoing or anticipating Fukuyama's 'End of freedom'. The Indian philosophy reached Plateau and the permanent stagnation after Vedanta and its stratification and subversion and appropriation by Sankara et la. There is similar hands off approach towards the reality and world affairs as is characterized with postmodernism and

post-postmodernism and the “end of freedom” et la. Despite the hoard of differences existing between these two, there is etymological similarity: both seem to be divorced from the inability to understand the prime reality or narrative of Krishna’s Pure/universal monism.

Incidentally Einstein reached near Krishna’s basic postulation that energy and matter or consciousness and its material manifesting or *Purush* and *Prakrit* are but the extension of the super or universal consciousness but missing the tree for the wood. The churning of ‘God’s particles’ or the minutes particle of Boggs Higgins or the creative entity would or might have led to the nothingness or consciousness or the universal consciousness. It is said that the scientists have found a smaller particle than found earlier. The one that pervades everywhere and everything can be seen as ‘God’s particles’ or the constitutive property of the world and the reality. When One has become all, how can the constituting element of universe could be found by breaking particles?

It is the same western philosophical fallacy putting premium on the materialism divorced from the universal monistic proposal that does not allow any positive or the real narrative of phenomena or the reality. While western philosophical endeavour seems to hit the logjam of postmodernism and post-postmodernism fiddling with diverse narratives of reality, Indian philosophy has further stagnated in cesspool of abstracts, spiritual speculation and mysticism which edifice has been erected on the subversion and perversion of Krishna’s universal monism and monotheism.

Coming to the influence of Krishna’s monism and monotheism, Indian, foreign and dominant cultural formations and their social codal ideologies or the philosophy may be seen as validating the inherence and oneness of knowledge and pure monism. Or it can be deciphered as theme of unity taking them in one sphere. However, the other side does not view in this way and thinks its exclusive contribution to the world. The

monism and monotheism as postulated in Bhagavat and establishment of a monotheist sect three thousand years back (Garbe,) has not only been appropriated by the dominant civilizations and cultural formations but internalized as their own looking down Indian civilization for mysticism and polytheism. It is matter of debate whether the internal Indian subversion and appropriation of Krishna’s philosophy and contribution to the social and political philosophy has preceded or followed the external one, but it is undoubtedly established that both have appropriated and subverted his emancipating philosophy.

That is why Krishna has in no uncertain terms exhorted the human beings in the Gita : perform action for *Yajna* or altruism or in the spirit of sacrifice. The *Yajna* does not mean any ritual performance as has been misunderstood or distorted by the stakes to sub serve their interest. One should do it without any interest or result or sacrificing the result to the supreme reality. This would lead to emergence of the better world and the happiness and prosperity.

Albert Camus in *Rebel* inadvertently reached near Krishna’s pure/universal monism but Occidental inherent penchant for materialism, tolerating hell or hell like situations and injustices for future heaven or distant dawn or eternal kingdom and its self-complacent superiority on the assimilation of Greek idealism influenced by Krishna’s pure/universal monism but not getting the crux of his philosophy, did not allow him to fully develop the concept fully. In the ensuing dual of new god of terror and muse of new dream that had replaced the God and his earthly empire- communism and capitalism with hollow dream of freedom and equality, his voice and urge for sanity and freedom to rebel was drowned.

While discussing rebel and rebellion and how it has been subverted by the new god of terror and murder, he provided a flicker of light in the metaphysical and non-

metaphysical darkness of the twentieth century wherein both capitalism and socialism or communism had been gasping for breath in the aftermath of their exhaustive failure to provide the basic freedom, justice and equality and which both major streams of metaphysical and non-metaphysical have replaced—one with new god and other with earthly god of materialism and unethical crass profiteerism.

Monism and Monotheism

However, right from Indians to foreigners there seems to be persistent tendency undercurrent to deny Krishna seminal contribution to monism, monotheism, and philosophy in general which is still continued. Radhakrishnan, modern Indian philosopher says that 'The implicit demand of the religious consciousness for one supreme God made itself manifest in what is characterized as the henotheism of Vedas.' All this crowding of gods and goddesses proved weariness to the intellect. So a tendency showed itself very early to identify one god with another or throw all the gods together. The attempts at classification reduced the gods to the three spheres of the earth, the air and the sky. Sometimes these gods are said to be 333, or other combination of three in number. (See Rig Veda, iii.9.9)

Dr Radhakrishnan says there is vague reference to Samkhya. And even in Upanishads there is no uniformity and unity among thinkers in this regard. (Dr. RadhaKrishnan, *Indian philosophy*, v-2). Winternitz: 'It seems that Pythagoras was influenced by Samakhya.' (Calcutta Review, 1924, p.21). Garbe, in *Philosophy of Ancient India* (p.44:M.B) mentions Samkhya with reference to Parisamkhyan or exhaustive enumerations.

However, Dr Radhakrishnan mentions that 'in the history of thought, there is nothing altogether new. There must have existed philosophical ideas and doctrines affording the necessary materials for the founder'. What new Krishna added that the great Indian philosopher failed

to see was that he conjoined Samkya or Gyan yoga with Brahma theory and devised action based phenomenology or Karmayoga. Through these he postulated pure monism sans any difference, gradation, and contradiction. There is no doubt Brahma theory was there, Samkhya was there and he postulated, what is perceptible in Gita, two way to engage existence and phenomenology- Samkhya or Gyanyoga or epistemology and Karma yoga or action based phenomenology. The third- devotion either added later on is corollary of Smakhya.

It is mentioned that there was mutual borrowing of Smakhya and Buddhism. There cannot be mutual borrowing as Smakhya predates Buddhism, and the Buddhism has been influenced by Smakhya as reflected from many tenets of Buddhism similar to Smakhya with minor modification. Even Buddha has accepted it by acknowledging the previous thinking and tradition (See *Lalitvistarā*). So far Upanishads are considered, except Chand Upanishad which was mentioned as 'Akhyān' by Krishna in BhagavadGita, none was there. Even Krishna in BhagavadGita has said that this knowledge passed from Vivaswan, who got this through light symbolizing knowledge (in BhagavadGita it has been interpreted as sun god) to Manu and then his successor. After that it became untraceable. Krishna revived and re-elaborated it and linked it to Brahma theory, then Gyanyoga or epistemology and Karmayoga or action-oriented ontology.

Franklin Edgerton has observed that 'A study of epic and early materials convinced me that there is not a single passage in which disbelief in Barhma or God is attributed to Samkhya. (*American Journal of Philosophy*, XIV, I.P 8). However in BhagavadGita, Krishna expressly says if you indulge in Vadic rituals, it would keep you entangled or of not much help. It was on the plane of Samakhya that Krishna built his pure Monism which was later turned into monotheism.

Tradition unanimously ascribes authorship of the (Samkhya) system to Kapil. (Svet Upanishad, V.2cp, M. B

Mokshadharmā). Incidentally, the Svet Upanishad appears to have compiled after BhagavadGita as Krishna neither in BhagavadGita nor in Udhav Gita or Anugita or Mahabharata has mentioned about it. Moreover, Max Muller has said there is no reference of Kapil in any other Indian text.

However, in Indian tradition, Varuna is considered as hub of the monotheism and monist tendency. 'Varun is the heaven, Varun the earth, Varun the air, Varuna is the universe and all besides'. (See Rig Veda, iii.9.9). It is maintained that 'The gradual idealisation of the conception of God as revealed in the cult of Varuna, the logic of religion which tended to make the gods flow into one another, the henotheism which had its face set in the direction of monotheism, the conception of Rta or unity of the nature and systemizing impulse of the human mind—all helped towards the displacement of a polytheistic anthropomorphism by a spiritual monotheism. The Vedic seers at this period were interested in discovering a single creative cause of the universe, itself uncreated and imperishable.' (Radhakrishnan, *Indian Philosophy*, vol II p 65). This seems to be justification for denying monotheism and monist credo of Krishna. Even it is accepted that these streaks of monotheism and monism were present among Vedic thinkers, why they did not start monotheism and monism movement as did Krishna?

There is further confusion as each god is considered as creator and granted the attributes of Visvakarma, maker of the world, or Prajapati, lord of creation, how could each could symbolize one? It seems to be post facto justification for monotheism. Moreover, the concept of Viswakarma and the Hiranyagarabha, the golden god 'occurs as the name of the Supreme, described as one Lord of all that exists' is found in the last part of Rig Veda. (See Rig Veda: X. 85.43; X. 184. 4; X. 121.) This points to interpolation and later addition as Krishna has discussed it in *UdhavGita or Ekadesh Skandh of Bhagvat*.

It has been asserted that 'in some of the advanced (or later?) hymns of the Rg-Veda the supreme is indifferently called He or it. The apparent vacillation between monotheism and monism (there is no vacillation in Krishna's corpus of monism and monotheism), a striking feature of Eastern as well as of Western philosophy, revealed here for the first time here (in Veda). The scattered rays dispersed among the crowd of the deities are collected together in the intolerable splendour of the One nameless God who alone could satisfy the restless craving of the human heart and sceptic mind. The growth of religious thought as embodied hymns may be brought out by the mention of typical gods: 1. Dyaus, indicative of the first state of nature of worship; 2. Varuna, the highly moral god of later day; 3. Indra4. Prajapati, the god of monotheists and Braham." (Radhakrishnan, op cit Vol I, p70-71).

It is worth mentioning that these are, particularly Prajapati or Vishwakarma and Braham are interpolation and later additions as these are found at the end of the Rig Veda. Moreover, the very word and etymology seems to have been borrowed from the Krishna corpus of philosophy just to deny his monotheism and monism. The very words and etymology of Prajapati, Vishwakarma and Brahma point to Krishna period and his monism and monotheism, and these are found in various discourses of Krishna such as *BhagavadGita, Udhav Gita, Anugita, Samakhya*. It is said that it was Krishna who might have borrowed from Vedas, but this defence crumbles when these such important aspects are mentioned at the fag end of Rg Veda where it should have been in beginning. It may be further contended that it might be in chronological order, but the chronology and corresponding socio-cultural milieu do not support it. The very language and diction points towards later addition and interpolation of these texts or hymns. (See *Rg Veda* X. 85.43; X. 184. 4; X. 121.)

Thus, henotheism does not seem to be logical

culmination of monotheism and monism as being made out by Vedic thinkers and their supporters. It is what Bloomfield suggests: "Polytheism grown cold in service and unwise in its distinctions, leading to an opportunist monotheism, in which every god takes hold of the spectre and none keeps it." (*The Religion of Vedas*, p.199).

Krishna discusses cosmology in *Udhav Gita* which has been subverted as *Ekadesh Skandh of Bhagavat*. His cosmology and how world was created and what is the creative element— all has been appropriated to Veda or Rg Veda in particular. This seems to have happened during Sutra period, a period when all the Vedas and epics were converted into written format from oral tradition. During this period which is around the beginning of the First millennium AD or the fag end of first millennium BC when the many interpolation and addition was undertaken under the tutelage the famous house of Bhargava Brahmins. (Karve, *Yugant*).

Krishna's whole philosophy as reflected in *BhagvadGita*, *Ekadash Skandh of Bhagavat* or *Udhav Gita* and *Mahabharata*, is based on assumption that it is consciousness or Chaitanya which extension is Individual soul or spirit is the prime mover of life and world. It is also posited as universal consciousness. (*BhagvadGita*, *Udhav Gita*). In *Udhav Gita* he postulates that it is Super Consciousness which he has termed as Mahat Tatava or Prime entity from which world has found manifestation. There has been a lot of controversy as to how could an animate world emanates from inanimate material or matter. But this has been proved inconsequential as from matter such as cow dung a lot of animate entity such as Scorpio and other insects come out. In addition, the Mahat tatv or substance is both matter and consciousness as matter or energy contains each other as has been proved by scientific scholarship.

Moreover, Krishna indicated that it is the prime entity which is both spirit or consciousness and matter. His

assertion has been vindicated by Einstein who was puzzled about as to why and how matter changes into energy and energy transforms into matter and whether both are same. Afterwards Sankara streamlined whole corpus of Hindu or Vedic philosophy by integrating it with later on developments in the form of BhagvadGita, Bhagavat, Samkhya and Upanishads.

A Gough views that Sankar is the generally recognised expositor of true Vedanta doctrine and the doctrine was handed down by an unbroken series of teachers intervening between him and the Sutrakar, and that there existed from the beginning only one Vedanta doctrine, agreeing in all essential points with doctrine known to us from Sankara's writings. He takes upon to prove this view, firstly by comparison of Sankara's systems with the teaching of the Upanishads. Secondly, by a comparison of the purport of the Sutras with that of Sutrakar such as Atreya, Armararthy, Audulomi, Karshagini, Kasakritan, Gaimini, Badri, Badryana. (*Philosophy of Upanishads*, pp. 239 ff)

Max Muller remarks that "even if we could show with certainty that all the Upanishads propound one and the same doctrine, there yet remains the undeniable fact of our being confronted by a considerable number of essentially differing theories, all of which claim to be founded on the Upanishads. Beginning with Sutras, we find that they supply ample evidence to the effect that already at a very early time, viz. the period antecedent to the final composition of the Vedanta-sutras in their present shape, there had arisen among the chief doctrines of the Vedanta differences of the opinions, bearing not only upon minor points of doctrine, but affecting the most essential parts of the system". (*Vedanta Sutra*, introduction, pp xviii)

Sankar's interpretation of Upanishad and Vedas has been accepted because it seems to have trivialised the Krishna's Brahma theory by basing it on Maya or illusion. Everything is illusion except Brahma and hence one

could justify everything. Further he divides Brahma in lower and higher Brahma, contradicting himself as well as Krishna universal monism which posits that everything is Braham and Maya is the material manifestation of Braham (*Udhav Gita or Ekadesh Sakndha of Bhagavat*). This interpretation seems to be in sync with or justifying the hierarchical and unequal social order—castes— of orthodox Brahmanism or Vedic religion or the so called Hindu one.

Another misreading or misinterpretation of Krishna universal monism of which Samkhya is the fundamental doctrine is that *Vedanta-Sutra* (Adhikrana V of First Adhyaya, 5-11) proves through various arguments that Braham which is understood as cause of the world as per the Sutra or Vedanta texts is an intelligent principle and cannot be identified with non-intelligent Pradhan or Mahat (Substance) element which Krishna Samkhya posits that world has emerged from substance or what now come from atom. The argument is that how could an intelligent entity emit form non-intelligent Mahat or Pradhan. Here Sankara and Upanishad thinkers misread Mahat or Pradhan as non-intelligent. The after script is that as that has it rather evolve in Purush or Consciousness and prakriti. Nature In fact, the constituting element is neither intelligent nor non-Mahat or Pradhan intelligent, it is beyond it or both-Supreme Consciousness. If intelligent entity could not emanate from non-intelligent, then how being could be posited to have come out from non-being. The same thing could be said about matter and energy: how could energy could be obtained from matter. This puzzle almost led Einstein to the concept of God or nothingness or non-intelligent or non-sentient being giving birth to sentient or intelligent one.

The fact that Upanishads and their authors or thinkers were involved in expanding or refuting or improving upon what Krishna or his Smakhya postulated is validated from Brihad Upanishad (II,4.5) and VI

Adhikaran (Vedanta-sutra, 19-20) “Self is to be seen, to be heard’. It is considered by Sankar and Ramanuga as the higher Self, not the individual soul. Ramnuga believes that this passage was made the subject of discussion in order to refute the Samkhya being anxious to prove that what is there included as the object of knowledge is not universal self but merely the Samkhya Purush. But the question remains has they been able to achieve the objective? The only achievement that they seem to have attained is confusion and vain attempt to refute the irrefutable Mahat Tatva or Constituting Substance.

The Vedanta literature (Sankara’s Vedanta-Sutra, Adhikaran VII, 23-27) imparts that Brahman is not only the operative or efficient cause (Nimitta) of the world, but the material cause as well. And the world is created through modification (*Sutra* 25). But the question how modification is instilled, they are silent. They could not find the answer as the only purpose seems to be rebutting the Krishna Smakhya. No wonder Ramnugam views this as specially directed against the Samkhya that in addition to accepting the existence of the Highest Lord or Brahma also admit the presence of an independent Pradhan or Mahat (it may be nearer to gross element) acting as ‘an operative cause on which Lord has no substantial control’. It is so because the interaction and operation of three constituting forces- sat, Raj and Tama which may be roughly compared with electron, proton and photon.

The same argument is used in refuting other theories of Samkhya such as the doctrine of world having originated from atom. (Adhikaran VIII, 28). One can have fair idea of about this when one analyses the ‘Anda theory’ that Krishna explains as the origin of the world to Udhav (See *Udhav Gita or Ekadesh Skandh of Bhagvat*) While commentators and sutrakars of Vedanta denies that the result emanating from the interplay of karma theory as guided by natural forces of sat (good), tam (darkness or inertia and rajas (passion) and postulate that it is Lord

that gives the result or fruits of one actions or works. Ironically they readily accept other aspects of the cause and effect or Karma theory of Krishna.

As per Krishna Pure monism, one's action done without attachment and feeling of doer ship as observer, and the dynamics of action that gives result, not God. As God or thing-in itself has become all—animate and in-animate, how can it give result ? It is action and their end result constituting Prarabdh (there cannot be English or any other language translation as there is no word equivalent to it. It may be viewed as essence made of one's action) that gives result. Once creator becomes creation, it loses control over it and it is being's action and Prarabdh that becomes controlling entity, not the God.

Same is the case in respect of Purush (consciousness) and Prakriti (Nature) wherein they consider the latter inferior to former whereas Krishna universal monism and Samkhya do not indulge in such gradation as it would refute his universal monism. They evolved in Purush (conscousne) and Prakriti (nature) not divided as dualist view or rather interrupted it so. Same gradation of lower and higher Braham has been propounded or postulated just to sub serve their vested interest to reinforce stratified and hierarchical Hindu society. It seems this difference and gradation has been inserted just to reinforce the caste hierarchy and stratification thereof.

The subversive agenda of Indian Sutrakars or commentators are confirmed by the selection of Upanishad and certain passages therein. The certain passage has been taken form one Upanishad and followed by other. This has been pointed by Max Muller, Deussen and Gogh.

As Max Muller avers "The Hindu commentators here and there attempt to point out the reasons why the discussion of a certain Vedic passage is immediately followed by the consideration of a certain other. Their explanations rest on the assumption that the Sutrakar in arranging the texts to be commented upon

was guided by technicalities of the Mimansa system, especially by a regard for the version so-called means of proof which the Mimansakar employs for the purpose of determining the proper meaning and positions of scriptural passages. But this guiding principle.... is rendered altogether improbable by a simple tabular statement of the Vedic passages referred by Deussen (p.221) who thinks that selection made by Sutrakars of Vedic passages setting forth the nature of Braham is not in all cases an altogether happy one." (*Vedanta-Sutras*, introduction, p xii, xiv).

" To the Hindu commentators and philosophers the Upanishad came down as a body of revealed truth whose teaching had, somehow or other, to be shown to be thoroughly consistent and free from contradictions: a system had to be devised in which a suitable statements which they make on the various points of Vedantic doctrine. But to the European scholar, or in fact to anyone who is not bound by the doctrine of Sruti, it will certainly appear that all such attempts stand self-condemned. If anything is evident even on cursory review of the Upanishads—and the impression so created is only strengthened by a more careful investigation—it is that they do not constitute a systematic whole. Not only are the doctrines expounded in different Upanishads ascribed to different teachers, but even the spate sections of one and the same Upanishad are assigned to different authorities. "(Max Muller, *ibid*)

" The teachers who are credited with doctrines of Upanishads manifestly belonged to different sections of Brahmanical society, to different Vedic Sakhas; nay, some of them the traditions make out to have been Kshatriyas. And, in the second place, the period, whose mental activities is represented in the Upanishads, was a creative one, and as such cannot be judged according to the analogy of later periods of Indian philosophic development. The later philosophic schools as for instance, the one of which Sankar is the great

representative, were no longer free in their speculation, but strictly bound by a traditional body of texts considered as sacred, which could not be changed or added to, but merely systematized and commented upon. Hence, the rigorous uniformity of doctrine characteristic of those schools.” (ibid)

In respect of “ the question as to the true philosophy of the Upanishad apart from the systems of the commentators....., if we understand by philosophy a philosophical system coherent in all the parts, free from all contradictions and allowing room for all the different statements made in all the chief Upanishads, a philosophy of Upanishads cannot be even spoken of. The various lucubration on Brahman, the world and the human soul of which the Upanishads consist do not allow themselves to be systematized simply because they were never meant to form a system. Sandilya’s views as to the nature of Braham did not in all details agree with those of Yagnavalkya, and Uddalaka differed from both. (ibid)

“Closely connected with the question as to the double nature of the Brahma of the Upanishad is the question as to their teaching of Maya. –From Colebrook downwards the majority of European writers have inclined towards the opinion that the doctrine of Maya, i.e. of the unreal illusory character of the sensible world, does not constitute a feature of the primitive philosophy of the Upanishads, but was introduced into the system at some later period, whether by Badarayana or Sankar or somebody else. (ibid)

M Paul Regnaud remarks that “the doctrine of Maya, although implied in the teaching of the Upanishads, could hardly become clear and explicit before the system had reached a stage of development necessitating a choice between admitting two co-existent eternal principles and accepting the predominance of the intellectual principle, which in the end necessarily led to the negation of opposite principle. (‘La Maya’, in the *Revue de Historie de Religions*, tome xii, No3 (188s)

“It is worth mentioning that with exception of Svetasvetarn and Maitri Upanisads, none of the chief Upanishads exhibits the word, ‘Maya’. The term indeed occurs in one place, in the Brahadaranyaks; but that passage is a quotation from Rik Samhita in which Maya means ‘creative power’. (P. Regnaud, ibid)

The Upanishads no doubt teach emphatically that material does not owe its existence to any principle independent from the Lord like the Pradhan of the Samkhya; the world is nothing but a manifestation of Lord’s wonderful power and hence it is unsubstantial. And again everything material is immeasurably inferior in nature to the highest spiritual principle from which it has emanated, and which it now hides from the individual soul. But neither insubstantiality nor inferiority of the kind mentioned constitutes unreality in the sense in which the Maya of Sankara is unreal.

“We are to see everything in Braham, and Braham in everything. as we are to look upon this whole world as true manifestation of Braham, as sprung from it and animated by it.’ (Gogh, *Philosophy of Upanishads*, pp 243). Max Muller comments that ‘The mayavadin has indeed appropriated the above saying also, and interpreted it so as to fall in with his theory, but.....only by perverting its manifest sense.....” (ibid, p.cxx).

“And where the legends about the primary being and its way of creating the world become somewhat crude and gross, Hirnayagrabha and Virag are summoned forth and charged with the responsibility. Of Virag Mr. Gough remarks (55) that in him a place is provided by the poets of the Upanishads for Purusha of ancient rishi , the divine being out of whom the visible and tangible world proceeded. This is quite true if only we substitute for the ‘poets of the Upanishads’ the framers of the orthodox Vedanta system—for the Upanishads give no indication whatever that by their Purush they understand not the simple old Purush but the Virag occupying a definite position in highly elaborate system...” (Max Muller, *op. Cit*)

Though Max Muller along with Mr Gough agrees that ‘there has been no addition to the system without but only development within, no graft but only growth’, yet the Sankar and mayavadi cannot escape the trivialization and confusion they inserted in the universal monism of Krishna or Braham theory.

It is said that “The doctrine of the Bhagavata represents a fusion of Braham theory of the Upanishad with the belief in a personal highest being—Krishna or Vishnu—which in many respects approximates very closely to the system of the Bhagavata; the attempts of a certain set of Indian commentators to explain it as setting forth pure Vedanta i.e. the pure doctrine of the Upanishads; may simply be set aside. But this same Bhagavadgita is quoted in Badardyaana’s Sutras as inferior to Sruti only in authority. The Sutras, moreover, refer in different places Vedantic positions of the Mahabharata, especially the twelfth book, several of which represent forms of Vedanta distinctly differing from Sankara’s teaching, and closely related to the system of the Bhagavat”. (Max Muller, *ibid*, p cxxvii)

However, Sankar has been eulogised as the great philosopher. ‘The credit of saving Hinduism and Indian culture from chaos and providing them with the keystone that gives Indian philosophy an architectural unity goes to Sankarachrya’. It was Krishna who provided axiology and an absolute Monistic approach as enshrined through Samkhya but has been appropriated to Sankara. (See Vivekcudamani, Aparaksamabhuit Atmabodh, Dasasloka, Sarvavedanta Siddhanta Sar Sangraha) Krishna’s core philosophy of Bhgavat, Samkhya, Karmayoga and others has been appropriated and subverted to suit the exigencies. What is appalling that it has been appropriated without acknowledging it to Krishna or using subverted Gita which is contradictory in itself.

“The philosophy of Vedanta is contained in the Upanishad, Bhagvadgita and Brhamasutra technically known as Prasthanatraya, teaching the same

philosophical truth in mystical, moral and metaphysical forms respectively. These three together constitute the foundation as well as supreme authority. The Upanishads are the pioneer works of Vedanta system. Since they seem to teach apparently contradictory doctrine, a need was felt to attempt to systematise their teachings as a result of which the Brhamasutra and Gita came into existence. The ambiguity which prevailed in the Upanishads and which necessitated composition of Brhamasutra and Gita also found to prevail in the latter two. Consequently, all the subsequent Vedantic Acharyas were obliged to write comments on Prasthanatraya, specially on the Brahamasutra which was regarded as the most systematic exposition of Vedantic philosophy (Bhatt, ‘Adi Sankarachrya: 12th Century Commemoration Volume’)

This very act reveals many imponderable saga of subversion and appropriation. This is further corroborated by the Krishna’s philosophy of Samkhya, Bhagavat, Cosmology, karma theory or Causal theory as contained in Uddhav Gita or Ekadesh Skandh of Bhagavat, Anugita, Bhagavatgita was integrated into Vedas in general and Rg. Veda in particular. (See Rg. Veda X.) The very mention of this important philosophy such as creation, cosmology, monism and monotheism in the later part and at the end of the Vedic text (X.72.3; X. 85.43; X. 184. 4; X. 121; X.190, X.168) further corroborates the fact these all are later additions and interpolation. The philological analysis and very diction of these hymns prove that these were composed approximately around 600 BC and beyond (See Max Muller)

Further comparison of these hymns with Stanza of Udhav Gita or Ekadash Skandh of Bhagavat, Bhagvadgita, Anugita or relevant text in Mahabharata further corroborates this appropriation, misappropriation and subversion of Krishna corpus of philosophy. Water is said to develop into the world through the force of time, samvatsara or year, desire or kama, intelligence or purusha, warmth of Tapas (Rg Veda: X.190; Compared it

with Stanza of Udhav Gita or Ekadesh Skandh) Sometimes water itself is derived from night or chaos, *tamas* or air. (Rg Veda: X. 168, Compare it with stanza of Udhav Gita or Ekadesh Skandh of Bhagavat or Bhagavatgita or Anugita)

The world and its existence is said to be the non-existent or illusion or *asat* which is identified with *as* Aditi, infinite. All that exists is *diti* or bounded, while the *a-diti*, is non-existent. From the infinite cosmic force arises, though the latter is sometimes said to be the source of the infinite itself. (Rg. Veda: X.72.3; compare it with similar Stanza in Udhav Gita or Ekadesh Skandh of Bhagavat) While in earlier part of Rg Veda (iii. 32.80; vii.80) there is mention of several gods such as Varuna, Indra, Agni, Visvakarma vying for the creation of the universe.

In the Nasadiya hymn which is found in the latter part of Rg. Veda (X. 129) there is mention of creation which has been termed as advanced theory of creation. According to this hymn, there was neither existent nor non-existent; the existent had not manifested then. However, it could not be termed as non-existent as it was in the gestation or unexpressed form. The absolute reality cannot be termed as existent or non-existent as it is beyond these categories which His or Its manifestation. Just as one breathed breathless by its own power. (See Aristotle *Metaphysics* of unmoved mover). It is beyond everything and before Sun or moon was existence, it was Absolute Consciousness.

Within the Absolute Consciousness there is affirmation or positing of primal force or I, corresponding to the logical law of identity: A is A which validity presupposes the original self-positing. The positing of I presupposes non-I just as A presupposes there is non-A. However, the 'I' or ego would not have any existence if there is no other and to feel that it is there must be some other or consciousness. The *tapas* or the 'rushing forth' or energy is created which mediates between Absolute

and non-absolute and being and non-being. This is what is what is termed as Purush and Prakriti. The rest of creation results from the interaction between these two forces. The hymn maintains that it is desire or *kama* that is primal force of human being just desire of Absolute or Super Consciousness to create or experience its I-ness has led to creation of whole world. (See Udhav Gita or Ekadesh Skandh of Bhagavat stanza) The hymn seems to be carbon copy of explanation that Krishna gave in question as to how and why world was created.

Even Plato and Aristotle seems to have been influenced by this creation theory of Krishna when Plato says in *Symposium* that 'Eros (Eros in Greek mythology is linked with god of love corresponding to *kama* or desire, the Greeks used to have unique tendency to give Hellenic term to any foreign entity or concept such as Krishna is termed as Heraculus or Mathura or Yamuna or Mehoraba) has been behind the creation of world, whereas Aristotle has posited that the God moves as the object of desire in his works, *Metaphysics*.

However, the Nasadiya hymns of Rg. Veda, which is carbon copy of Krishna theory of creation which he posited in discussion with Udhav, the great ascetic and philosopher who is also his cousin brother (See Udhav Gita or Ekadesh Skandh of Bhagavat) confirms Krishna universal monism as it "overcomes the dualistic metaphysics in a higher monism. It makes nature and spirit both aspects of the one absolute. The Absolute itself is neither the self nor the other, is neither self-consciousness of the type I (being), nor unconsciousness of not-I (non-being). It is higher than both these. It is transcending consciousness. The opposition is developed within itself." (Radhakrishnan, p 75).

As this hymn was incorporated later on taking every tenet or even wordings from Krishna corpus of philosophy of Monism and Samkhya, it created confusion and lack of unity in the text which further authenticate the appropriation or misappropriation theory. It was because

of this that MacDonnell has commented that the hymn is 'the starting-point of natural philosophy which developed into Samkhya system' (*Vedic Reader*, p. 207). In fact, Krishna developed Samkhya which is intrinsic part of his Monotheism and Monist philosophy which in praxis led to the foundation of first ever monotheistic sect- Bhagavat. Garbe has commented that he founded the monotheistic Bhagavat religion and later on got identified with the deity he never founded.

The subversion, distortion and misappropriation of Krishna monism and Samkhya reaches its limit when the one of the leading philosopher of modern India read it: 'The hymns (Nasadia of Rg Veda) form the foundation of subsequent Indian thought. While the Brahamans emphasise the sacrificial ritual shadowed forth in the hymns, the Upanishads carry out their philosophical suggestions. The theism of Bhagavadgita is only idealisation of Varun-worship. The great doctrine of karma is yet in its infancy as Rta. The dualistic metaphysics of the Samakhya is the logical development of the conception of Hiranygrabha floating in the waters.' (S. Radhakrishnan, *Indian Philosophy*, I, p. 86)

It has been maintained by western philosophical scholarship that Indian philosophy in general and political one in particular has not developed any school and systematic theory as has evolved in western countries. How could it develop when there has been unending competency in appropriating and subverting the foundational contribution of Krishna to the realm of philosophy.

It is pertinent to mention that Krishna posited an integrated philosophy of pure/universal monism comprising Samkhya, Yoga, Cause and effect theory, Bhagavat or Monotheism, Vasudev which has been compartmentalized in such way that each part appears disjointed and irrelevant. While Smakhya has been appropriated to imaginary Kapil whom Wheeler and other Indian philosophers and theologians are unable to trace,

yoga has been attributed to Patanjali who has appropriated it making it an independent part where as in Krishna corpus of philosophy it is one of the intrinsic part without which Samkhya or Gyanyoga, Karma Yoga or cause and effect and Bhagavat or his monism would sound hollow.

Related with this is perhaps the reported loss of 45 stanzas of Gita as mentioned by Max Muller and Indian theologians and philosophers which could be accounted with 50 to 60 stanzas of Samkhya which has been attributed to imaginary Kapil or ancient tradition or Rishi or Ishvara Krishna but not Yadvaraj Krishna.

Krishna's monism and monotheism created problem for Vedic as well as non-Vedic heterogeneous sects such as Jainism and later on Buddhism. As Krishna's monism was opposed to the polytheism of Vedic society and its thinkers, and Upanishad period which speculated on Krishna monism and Samkhya, there came a virtual confusion and contradictions. The Buddhism and its negation based theism further added to the confusion. Hence later commentators Sankar et la posited lower and higher Brahma, Sagun Vs Nirgun Brahma, Personalized Ishavara, the forces of Sat, Raj and Tam through which Purush or Primal energy or consciousness or Spirit created the world or Prakriti of Krishna Samkhya into Brahma, Vishnu and Mahesh which not only negated his universal monism but led to appropriation and distortion of his unified philosophy to the Kapil (Smakhya), Yoga to Patanjali, Karma theory to (SunGod) and Bhagavat and Vasudev (to Avatar of Vishnu).

Samkhya or Gyan Yoga or Epistemology and Karmayoga or action based phenemenology

Krishna has mentioned two ways to deal with existence and phenomenology: Gyan Yoga or Epistemology and Karma Yoga or action based phenomenology: 'In this world there are two types of perfection as I told you before , O Prince without sin,

Gyanyog (knowledge), the path of wisdom of Samakhya and Karma yoga, the path of action of the Yoga” . (Bhagvat Gita: III: 3). Rajnish or Osho has commented that if hitherto development of philosophical, ontological, metaphysical and phenomenological theorization is analyzed, all would come under either one or other. These two broad categories are still relevant and it shows what a great philosopher and visionary Krishna was.

It is said in Indian tradition that Samkhya and fruitless Karma or action was in existence before Krishna. It seems to be half truth and moreover, Krishna himself has accepted that knowledge has been in existence since time immemorial and has been passing through kings and seers. As these became invisible (vilupt) in course of time, Krishna revived it. He not only revived but made them systematic and actionable. Before that it was for ascetics and seers as these were passive and mystic. Moreover, Krishna made Samakhya or knowledge and action or karma as Yoga or Yukta or conjoined with life, society and individual. It is on these two premise his pure monism is based.

Though some element of Samkhya was present earlier as reflected in Ahstvakra-Raja Janak Smavad which has been advertently termed as Ashtvakra Geeta, it was in crude form and Krishna synthesized it with knowledge and made it scientific. That is why it is called Gyan Yoga or conjoined with Knowledge (gyan yukta). Garbe holds that the Samkhya is the oldest school. Next came Yoga, Mimansa, and Vedanta and last of all Vaisesika and Nyaya. The Sutra period cannot be sharply distinguished from the scholastic period of the commentators. The two between them extend up till the present day. (Radhakrishnan, p.34.)

In respect of origin of the universe, Krishna's Samkhya or *Gyan Yoga* provides a proposition and theory coming quite closer to the scientific explanation of the modern day. Krishna has elaborated in the (Udhav Gita) that the interaction of *Purush* (*Chaitnya* or Universal

consciousness) and *Prakriti* (material forces as factored by the three forces of *sat*, Tam and Rajas) has led to the creation of the universe.

At subtle level, the *Purush* can be postulated as the multidimensional space and *Prakriti* as time. It is working or operation of these two forces that give rise to the creation of universe. Krishna's Samkhya further maintains that in the beginning, there were three forces—*sattva*, *rajas* and *tamas* were in equilibrium. Due to internal contradiction arising out of its interaction with *prakriti* or time the world or the universe came to existence.

There is similar scientific theory prevalent in the modern day proffering that in the beginning time and multidimensional space were in equilibrium, and when the equilibrium was disturbed, there came into existence the universe. As to why that happened it is not known, only speculative proposition like Big bang, string theory are being put forward. However, Krishna, in an answer to the question posed by Uddhav as to why it happened, has posited that *Purush* or universal consciousness wanted to experience the process and satisfy its being. This has been blatantly appropriated by Sankara and Patanjali (See Sankara's Vivek Chudamani and Patanjali Bhasya). Even the same terms have been brazenly appropriated.

However coming back to Krishna *Samkhya* or *Gyan Yoga* and the creation of universe, it could be inferred that after the space-time or *Purush-Prakriti* imbalances or disturbed equilibrium, the time began to roll out and the multidimensional space started expanding and flowing. This flow and expansion led to the production of gravity and giddies constituting the cause of the visible matter and galaxies. The giddies are invisible energy that is formed when anything flows and it can be experienced during aeroplane ride in the form of bumpy ride or the drags on. However, these can be clearly seen in the flow of waters in the rivers and water canals.

It is these eddies which formation is continuous and

simultaneous giving rise to the formation of the matter and the visible world. The scientist has termed it as creation or the production of matter and the visible world from the vacuum. However, this interaction and interplay of the time and multidimensional space giving rise to the matter and visible world has been exactly what posited by Krishna in the form of interaction of *Purush* and *Prakriti* in his Samkhya philosophy or *Gyan yoga*. This production of eddies and galaxies would continue to take place till the space is exhausted and afterwards the reverse cycle would commence which would then lead to the restoration of the equilibrium between the time and space. This is internal Brahma cycle from which world appears and disappears, created and destroyed endlessly. (See Uddav Gita or Ekadash Skandh of Bhagavat)

It is beyond scope of this long essay to discuss Gyan Yoga or Samkhya or epistemology and Karma Yoga or action based phenomenology comprehensively due to various constraints. However, brief sketch is given to make this relevant.

Samkhya or Gyan Yoga or Epistemology

(Udhav Gita or Shrimadbhagwat: Ekadash Skandh, 14."Before millennia.....or any time ever rolled on....., in all conditions this all that that is seen and seer (drashta those who are seeing), universe and being is, without any alternative (vikalp) or modification with any difference or gradation, only Brahma (Creator) existed. UG 14.3: "There is no doubt that there is no alternative (vikalp) to Brahma (Creator). It is self proved truth and mind and speech cannot know it. Same Brahma seems to have divided in two- the seen world and the seer. 4. Out of them one is called nature. It is nature that has taken the form of cause and effect. Second is called Purush (Soul or being) that is in knowledge form (Gyanswarup). Udhav Gita or Shrimadbhagwat: Ekadash Skandh. Ch. 14.3-4)

BhagvadGita (BG)

: 8.3: *Brahm is the supreme, the eternal. Atman is his Spirit in man. Karma (action without any attachment for end result) is the force of creation, wherefrom all things have their life. BG: 2.48: Do thy work in the peace of Yoga and free from selfish desire (end result)), be not moved in success or in failure. Yoga is evenness of mind- a peace that is ever the same. 49: work done for a reward is much lower than work done in the yoga of wisdom. Seek salvation in the wisdom of reason. How poor those who work for reward. 50: In this wisdom, a man goes beyond what is well done and what is not well done. Go therefore to wisdom: Yoga is wisdom in work. 2:66: There is no wisdom for a man without harmony, and without harmony there is no contemplation. Without contemplation there cannot be peace and without peace can there be joy? 67: For when the mind becomes bound to a passion of the wandering senses, this passion carries away man's wisdom, as the wind drives a vessel on the waves. 68: The man who therefore in recollection withdraw his senses from the pleasure of senses, his is a serene wisdom. (BhagvatGita, translated by Juan MasCaro, Penguin Books)*

The basic premise of Krishna Samkhya or Gyan Yoga or Epistemology is that it is creator that has become creation-animate and inanimate beings and all that is in universe. All is Brahma or One and there is no gradation whether one is lower Brahma or other is higher Brahma. The world is like string of pearl and string is Brahma or One or creator. Since creator has become creation or One has become all, all are modification of One, hence there is no duality. Whatever duality appears, it is mere appearance and the reality can be known only by removing ignorance and getting this knowledge.

As knowledge— the being and soul or Purush is knowledge form and hence within or inherent in phenomena, it can be gained by removing sense guided

perception and wisdom. Whatever fluidity in knowledge and falsity or duality appear due to dialectics, is temporary and mere appearance. It can be gained by conjoining with wisdom (Yoga). It is sense guided perception that has led to conjure the reality as appearance and appearance as reality.

According to Krishna' Smakhya or Gyan Yoga truth can be known only through knowledge. There is no need to do anything in this regard, no efforts or any rigorous endeavour is required. The truth is there, only its remembrance has been lost and one has to just remember it. Krishna Smakhya believes that ignorance is like darkness and one has to light the lamp of knowledge and it would go away and truth would be crystal clear. The same approach to truth and knowledge manifested in Socrates in Greece when he said that knowledge is character and when one has knowledge about anything, one can get freedom from it.

As per Krishna smakhya or Gyan yoga or epistemology, knowledgeable knows that whatever is happening , whatever action-reaction, happiness-sorrow, good-bad occurring it is nature and its forces-sat or goodness, raj or passion, tam or darkness or inertia are doing, and he is just observer. Whereas ignorant thinks that he or she is doing or happening to him, he is centre of universe. While former being aware this reality face all trials and travails , ups and down and other binaries with detachment (Anakta-detachment is not exact word, it is neither attached nor de-attached but just observer) leaving everything to the thing in itself or creator or God surpass all bondage and limitations, latter involved in these with ego of doer ship get entangled and tossed out in the binaries of life. While former leaving everything to the infinity becomes infinite, the latter continues to reek in finite by identifying with body or matter.

Moreover, as cause becomes effect, the action that gives rise to a certain cause would become effect. There is no reason to doubt that action that gives cause would

result into certain effect or result. The being has to just act, the cause would become effect. However, if being gets attached or hooked to result, it would lead to all sort of bondage.

Unlike G. W. Leibniz who distinguishes the divine and human, terming man as finite consequent upon his choosing between alternative and spiritual, nonmaterial building block of universe representing the entire universe, pure monism posits that it is creator (Brahm) which has become creation and hence everything is Brahm. Hence they are infinite but due to ignorance and identifying the body or neglecting soul or outright rejecting it, they are finite. Once being is considered as Brahm or extension of creator, it loses its finite and becomes infinite by merging oneself with Brahm . They are not building blocks of the universe or its representative, but universe itself- a microcosm of universe. And this infinity can be achieved only by knowledge.

Knowledge is sufficient to surpass this limitation arising out of the being identifying with mortal body or matter while ignoring the immortal soul which is of knowledge form and observer of all. Gyan Yoga or Samkhya says that the reality is covered with appearance and being has to just penetrate this appearance and know the reality. The existence is like inverted tree, as Krishna says, and its roots are towards thing in itself and leaves and stem being ward. It is not like Plato cave of shadows wherein being is caged with limitation-while in one chamber of cave one can see everything but not speak, in other one can speak but cannot see through.

There is nothing greater than knowledge, knowledge is purifying, knowledge leads one to Spirit or soul and after having conjoined (yogasth) with it, liberation (from ignorance and finite) comes (BG: Chapter 4, stanza 38). Knowledge is purifying in the sense that it removes the ignorance and disillusion arising out of desires, cravings and insatiate willing. The vast and chaotic plane of immanence render the Spirit in the body as isolated and

disjointed. The moment one desires and does willing, the mind gets disturbed leading to imbalance and inequilibrium. However, if willing is done with not attachment and without any obsession with result, with attendant feeling of being observer, willing won't lead to eternal coming but eternal joy and peace.

It is not to contend that one should not will or desire, it should be balanced and cautious. Even willing should be done in detached way leaving it to thing in itself. As 'sense guided desires or craving lead to attachment for them and from such attachment lust develops and from lust anger arises (due to obstruction or obstacle in its fulfilment) and from anger complete delusion arises and from delusion bewilderment of memory. When memory is lost one falls down in ignorance and darkness.' (BG: Chapter 2. Stanza 62-63). Knowledge prevents this as it leads back to Spirit which is microcosm of universe or infinity and it is itself knowledge form and enlightening. The knowledge restores the infinity to finite being by leading it to spirit. The ocean drop becomes ocean as it has property and qualities of ocean, knowledge restores it to being ocean.

"Just as fire is covered by smoke, as mirror is covered by dust, or as the embryo is covered by the womb, knowledge is covered by lust (desire). And Arjun, like inextinguishable fire this lust is enemy which has covered knowledge from knowledgeable" (BG: Chapter 3 stanza 38-39). This sums up the Gyan yoga or Smakhya or epistemology of Krishna pure monism. One has not to seek knowledge without, it is within. It is just covered by insatiable lust or desire. Here desire or lust is symbolic of all type of subjectivities. Even interpretation of knowledge as guided by subjectivity or vested interest is a sort of lust or desire. Just as to reach knowledge or spirit or soul which is of knowledge form and consciousness at metaphysical level, one has to uncover the dust of desire or lust, at existential and mundane level, one has to uncover the layer of interpretation and

interpolation with which knowledge is covered.

One has not to seek or get knowledge from without but it is within, knowledge is already given or inherent in phenomena and substance. In his cosmology, Krishna has made it clear that 'know that everything in this universe which can be seen, grasped or heard, animate or inanimate is made of Prakriti (nature) and Purush (consciousness)'. Before Einstein found that matter and energy are same, this position of Krishna pure monism was relegated to mystical realm. After that it has become clear that even matter has energy or consciousness or knowledge otherwise how can it be converted in energy or its property and structure can be known. So knowledge is given and inherent and is covered with various elements and it is matter of uncovering that leads to the knowledge.

When One has become all, there is no other, no difference and duality. Whatever duality, difference and otherness is perceptible to our senses and mind, it is projection of illusory reality. The being gets disillusioned of this multiplicity and difference due to identifying with sense guided perception of reality.

BG: 13.1: The body, Arjun, is called the field. He who knows this is called the knower of the field. 2: Know that (suppose) I (creator) am the knower in all the fields of creation: and that wisdom which sees the field and the knower of the field is the true wisdom. 11: A constant yearning to know the inner Spirit and a vision of Truth which gives liberation: this is true wisdom leading to vision. BG 13:30: When a man sees that the infinity of various beings is abiding in the One, and is an evolution from the One, then he becomes one with Brahma. 31: Beginningless and free from changing conditions, imperishable is the Spirit Supreme. Though he is in the body, not his the work of the body, and he is pure from the imperfection of all work. 32: Just as omnipresent ether is pure because intangible, so the Spirit dwelling in matter is pure from the touch of matter. BG:13.33: And even as one Sun gives light to all things in this world so the Lord of field (Knower) gives all

light to his field (BhagvatGita, translated by Juan MasCaro, Penguin Books)

The body or being is like field and who knows this is called knower of the field. The being is just knower and observer of the field that is body being guided by the operation of natural forces and its qualities such as Sat, Raj and Tam (Good, passion and darkness or inertia). Whatever is seen in this world, as Krishna says, it should be known as having constituted of Prakriti or nature and Purush or consciousness or knower. Similarly all the creation is field and the creator or thing in itself is the knower. This is true knowledge and it would keep the being in proper perspective. Just as omnipresent ether is pure because it is intangible, so the Spirit dwelling in matter is pure from the touch of matter. When being sees that the infinity of various beings is abiding in the One, and is an evolution from the One, then he becomes one with Brahma or Infinity. Beginningless and free from changing conditions, the Spirit is imperishable. Though he is in the body, not his the work of the body, and he is pure from the imperfection of all work.

“BG: 14. 5: “Satva (goodness or creative) Rajas (light, fire or passion) Tamas (darkness or inertia) are three constituents of Nature. They appear to limit in finite body the liberty of infinite Spirit.” BG: 13, 19: Know that Prakriti, Nature and Purusha, Spirit, are both without beginning, and that temporal changes and Gunas, conditions., come all from nature. 20: Nature is the source of all material things: the maker, the means of making, and the thing made. Spirit is the source of all consciousness which feels pleasure and feels pain. 21. The Spirit of man when in nature feels the ever-changing conditions of nature. When he binds himself to the things ever-changing, a good or evil fate whirls round through life-in-death. 22: But the Spirit Supreme in man is beyond fate. He watches, gives blessing, bears all, feels all. He is called the Lord Supreme and Supreme Soul. 23: He who knows in truth this Spirit and knows nature with its changing conditions, wherever this man may be he is no

more whirled round by fate. 26: Whatever is born, Arjun, whether it moves or it moves not, know that it comes from the union of the field and the knower of the field. (BhagvatGita, translated by Juan MasCaro, Penguin Books)

Even structuralism and neo-structuralism dittoes the view that it is structure and qualities of natural forces that determine the being and its existence. Even Heidegger agrees that it is nature and natural forces on which being is predicated. However, there is one difference that puts pure monism beyond pale of structuralism and Heideggerain objectification of being. The true nature of being is knowledge form-Soul which is observer and even if it is in body it is not bound with body. That is why pure monism postulates that it is natural forces or Satva or light, rajas or passion and Tam or inertia or darkness operate due to their own dynamics, the Soul remains unaffected. It is the error of identifying soul with body that its limitation is projected on being and hence being seems to be limited and finite.

12: Now I shall tell thee of the end of wisdom. When a man knows this he goes beyond death. It is Brahm, beginningless, supreme: beyond what is and what is not. 13: his hands and feet are everywhere, he has heads and mouths everywhere: he sees all, he hears all. He is in all and all are in him. 14: The light of consciousness comes to him through infinite powers of perception, and yet he is above all these powers. He is beyond all, and yet he supports all. He is beyond the world of matter, and yet he has joy in this world. 16: He is One in all, but it seems as if he were many. He supports all beings: from him comes destruction and from him comes creation. 27: He who sees that the Lord of all is ever the same in all that is, immortal in the field of mortality- he sees the truth. 28: When a man sees that the God in himself is the same God in all that is, he hurts not himself by hurting others: then he goes indeed to the highest path. 29: He who sees that all work, everywhere, is only the work of nature; and that the Spirit watches this work-he sees the truth.

Hegelian Spirit got objectified in action because it is identified with work of nature. When Spirit which is knowledge form and placed as observer, gets identified with various actions taking place due to natural forces, it would be sucked up in variegated dimension of action. Action has vast plane of operation and even if it is consummated, it keeps on going infinitely. If being and its real self become entangled in it, it is bound to get objectified. Perhaps Hegel failed to see this infinitesimal dynamics of action leading him to conclude that action ground the spirit into object.

Karma Yoga or Action based phenomenology

Bhagvat Gita III: 7: But great is the man who, free from attachments (to result or end), and with a mind ruling its powers (sense) in harmony, works on the path of Karma Yoga, the path of consecrated action. 8: Action is greater than inaction: perform therefore thy task in life. Even the life of body could not be if there were no action. BG III 9: 'The world is in the bond of action, unless the action is consecrated, let thy action be pure, free from the bond of desire.

In subsequent stanzas 10, 11, 12, 13, 14 Krishna discusses about sacrifice. This sacrifice has been misused and misinterpreted as to suit their vested interests. The sacrifice means sacrifice of attachment to the work, renunciation of result and lack of doer-ship. If one perform this consecrated action meaning action without attachment to result, it would lead to prosperous life in both world. Krishna said that it is sacrifice (of one's ego, doer-ship and attachment to earthly things) that results into 'supreme good' both for man and his world. But here sacrifice has been misunderstood or misinterpreted as 'ritualistic Vedic sacrifice. 15. Sacred action (action without attachment to result) is described in Ved (knowledge) and these come from eternal, and therefore eternal is ever present in a sacrifice (action without attachment to result or desire of it). 16. Thus was the wheel of law set in motion and that man

lives indeed in vain who in sinful life of pleasure helps not in its revolution (or evolution). 17. But the man who has found the joy of the Spirit and has satisfaction in the Spirit, which in the Spirit has found the peace, that man is beyond the law of action. 18: He is beyond what is done and what is not done and all his works he is beyond the mortal beings. 19: In liberty from the bonds of attachment, do thou therefore the work to be done: for the man whose work is pure (without attachment to result or end) indeed attains Supreme (of joy, peace, happiness or Sat Chit Anand or God or Moksha or liberation)

BG.III. 27: All actions take place in time by the interweaving of the forces of Nature but the man lose in selfish delusion thinking that he himself is the actor. BG.III.28: But the man who knows relations between the forces of nature and actions, sees how some forces of Nature work upon other forces of Nature, becomes not their slave. 29: Those who are under the delusion of the force of nature bind themselves to the work of these forces. Let not the wise men who sees the All (in One and One in all) not disturb the unwise who sees not the All. BG.III.31: Beginningless and free from changing conditions, imperishable is the Spirit Supreme. Though he is in the body, not his is the work of the body and he is pure from the imperfection of all work. BG.III.32: 'Just as omnipresent ether is pure because intangible is the Spirit dwelling in matter is pure from the touch of matter.

34: Hate and lust for things of nature have their roots in man's lower nature. 35: And do thy duty, even if it be humble, rather than another's even if it be great. To die in one's duty is life: to live in another's is death. (BhagvatGita, translated by Juan MasCaro, Penguin Books)

Krishna Karma yoga or action based phenomenology is different from the cause and effect theory as evolved in western philosophy. The latter presumes with absolute certainty the certain cause or action would result into certain effect or end. This theory is followed more in its

effect proving different from what intended. There is infinite gap and possibility between operative cause and its effect. Only probability could be underlined with no certainty in the nature and direction of end or result. The Karma yoga postulates that it is cause that becomes effect and hence only action is enough and its result would certainly fructify in proportion to action consummated. But if end or effect is given unwarranted attention and consideration, it not only adversely affects the result but also actor who gets objectified as Hegel rather inadvertently stumbled upon.

The plane of action or Karma is much more vast and subtle than bubble some plane of immanence. While action or karma has liberating dimension if it is consecrated, as Krishna says, meaning action done without any attachment or consideration for result and bigoted desire, and of course without doer ship with understanding that it is natural forces prodding one to action. It is not the grounding plane of objectification and stupefaction of being or spirit as erroneously believed by Hegel. Neither it is plane of Heideggerian 'tool' and 'thrownness' annihilating and objectifying the being, nor Sartorial one reducing being to nothingness.

It is liberating in the sense that unlike the plane of immanence and Cartesian instantaneous cogito, action is creator of the world literally as well as metaphorically." One should know the nature of action or karma, and also nature of a-karma or non-action and also forbidden karma or action because dynamics of karma or action is very intensive", (BG, chapter 4, stanza 17). The Karma or action are of various types and they are more complex than they appear. Some action may be prohibited in one situation, while not in other situation or place or time. Action done with non attachment and without doer ship are pure action, while even not doing anything one feel like doing it. If one's action is performed without the feeling of doer ship and result, the others' action even if not done actually appear to be happening when one

transcend the doer ship and attachment.

"The being who sees non-action or a-karma in action or karma and who sees in action or karma the non-action or a-karma, he is wise and such yogi is doer of all works or actions. (BG: chapter 4, stanza 18.) When a being sees action in non-action and in non-action the action, such being is liberated and nothing limits him and he becomes one with thing in itself. While doing any work or act, the being sees that it is not done by self and becomes observer of that act with non-attachment, the work does not bind him. Similarly if he does not do any act, he is doing the work. This makes the being free and infinite in the sense even if he is not doing any act, he does all the work as he or she becomes infinite. So far prohibited act is concerned or wrong or immoral act is concerned, it would be decided instantly or at the moment the act is about to happen. He would not do any wrong act, as feeling of being observer of act is intensified and it would guide as what act is wrong or right.

This can be elucidated with very simple example of eating. Suppose one is eating and he is thinking his body is eating while he is observing it without the feeling of doer ship. Such act of eating would not be binding in the sense he would be doing it with all consciousness and there would not be overeating or half eating. Moreover, he would not be entangled by the act of eating. Apart from it, even if he is not eating, he will feel like having eaten as happens in the case of person one loves.

If every unit of society does its duty with consecrated action or action without attachment to result and without the feeling of doer ship, there would be peace, prosperity and happiness. It would lead to symbiotic progress of mankind. As Krishna has said that everyone should do the duty, even if it is be humble, rather than another's even if it be great. To die in one's duty is life: to live in another's is death. This is very categorical aspect of Krishna Karma Yoga or action based phenomenology.

Everybody or everything has its own nature or dharma and they act according to it. A flower has the nature or dharma of flowering, it would flower. However, if a flower decides to be tree, it would lead to its destruction. It would be neither flower that it could have been had it not decided to be tree, neither it would be tree as it could not be tree as its nature and dharma. Similarly if being's nature or dharma is to be artist and he endeavours to become engineer, it would be his death as he would neither become artist that he could have been nor engineer. Even if he or she becomes what is not nature or dharma, it would be certainly suicidal.

This seems to be the reason behind the problem of the modern world wherein meaninglessness and suicidal tendencies are the reigning realities. It is perhaps for this reason that Camus and other existentialists have seen suicide as the only option for the emancipation of mankind. Everyone seems to be what is not his nature or dharma or duty. The result is the crisis of the world. In ancient India, a system in the form of Varnashram was devised to aid the person realize his or her potentiality as per nature or dharma. But it was perverted and subverted to suit the vested interest. Originally it was a horizontal system but was made vertical and closed. In the West also this system is being propped up in the form of keeping a psychologist in every school who would guide the children to realize potentiality as per nature or dharma. But it seems to have lost steam as it is being done at a micro level only which has failed to percolate to the macro one.

Finally, Krishna has made a very categorical statement in BhagavadGita (Chapter 3, stanza 14) that validates his pure monism as well as authenticates that Spirit and matter are the same and are interchangeable like energy and matter. A Spirit is latent matter and a matter is latent spirit. He avers that human being is made of grains, grain from rain and rain from consecrated (without attachment to result) action or Yagna. Here he seems to be presenting the ecology of existence and how

matter and spirit are interchangeable like matter and energy. It might seem contradictory and may validate the crass materialism followed by western philosophy. However, what he intends to prove is that there is no fundamental difference between spirit and matter, both are the same. From matter comes soul and from soul or spirit comes matter. What he means to say is that matter has latent spirit and spirit is latent matter.

Nevertheless, Plato, before that Protagoras, Heraclitus, and later on Hegel, Kant, and Mill seem to have based their main premise on the universal monistic philosophy. Hegel has acknowledged that 'fact' has been provided by Indian tradition. If the theory of idea or form as enunciated by Plato is compared with his Dharma theory, Vasudev and its praxis in the form of establishment of monism and Monotheist sect in the form of Bhagavat, his internationalism in the form of a unique union of the kingdoms, both semi-republic and semi-monarchy that he propped, a sort of suzerainty, his emphasis on knowledge and republicanism, universal brotherhood has its echo in the theories and philosophies of Plato, Hegel, Kant, Marx, Mill and other liberal philosophies. Plato's discussion in dialogue form and elucidating it from precepts are found in Krishna's corpus of philosophy as well. (See Plato Republic and compare it with Gita and Udhav Gita)

The inability to arrest degeneration, corruption and the disastrous effects of oligarchy laid them to the philosophical trap leading to the collectivism and individualism. The collectivist starting from Plato, Hegel, Hobbes, Marx et al. has made society or state or collective the end and individuals means to it. The individualists have vouched for the individuals as end and the state or the society means to further this end.

Had the world scholarship in general and Indian one particular not misunderstood Krishna pure monism, some concrete proposal to sanitize the crisis-ridden world would have emerged. Much before Plato, Kant and Hegel,

approximately 1000 BC, Krishna Dharma (Fair play or Just system) anticipated Idea, Reason or Spirit. Not only that he postulated, articulated and disseminated it, but made it dominant discourse of the time. And what was unique, unmatched and unprecedented in hither to history of mankind that he put this concept of Dharma in praxis by erecting a social-political entity based on it. For putting Dharma in praxis and making it continuous process he devised a balancing-cum-enforcing entity, Vasudev. Along with it, he postulated monism and founded first monotheism of humanity-Bhagavat.

His Dharma which anticipated Kant' reason, Plato Idea, Hegel World Spirit or Schopenhauer world as will, was based on immortality of soul, monism and world as manifestation of Dharma or reason. He founded Samkhya Yoga or Knowledge as the means and end of knowing this reality. The modern philosopher like Nietzsche could not get the complete importance of knowledge when they averred, Knowledge is only means not end to know the ultimate reality (Gay Science). Even the Chinese concept of Yang and Ying which is the dialectical view of world as propounded by Krishna in Udhav Gita later on manifested in Heraclitus and others. It shows world and its idea as one where in 1000 BC this view seems to have found its articulation in Krishna, in Heraclitus and Plato in Greece around 400 BC and then it might have found its way in China.

Plato has confused the Idea with concept as Schopenhauer has mentioned in *The World as Will and Idea*. Krishna Dharma, though its postulation is not to be found in systematic manner or at one place, yet it is dispersed in Gita, Udhav Gita, in Bhagvat, though subverted and in Mahabharata also it has been subverted, does not confuse idea or Dharma with concept. The loss of 45 stanzas in Gita (Muller, Shastri) has certainly something to do with postulation of Dharma. Dharma is Krishna' most basic or rather fundamental concept on which his universal monism is based. Moreover, in almost

every dialogue with anyone where he is discussing larger issue of good and society, there is mention of Dharma. (See Gita, Udhav Gita, Bhagavat, Mahabhrata).

Dharma comes near to essence but not in the sense that essence has been linked to some sort of fate or design. There is no dichotomy of essence and existence as seen by the existentialist and it hardly matters whether existence follows or precedes essence. Dharma has nature or essence and existence in its fold. If Dharma of a flower is to flower or river is to flow, it would do so, it cannot be a tree or lake. It is made of one's action and its result and the collective effect is Prarabdh (net effect one's action) that may come near to existence.

Plato seems to be confusing Idea or Reason or Dharma with concept as he had to justify a highly regimented, hierarchical and conservative society with toppings of high ground of hollow justice and idealism as Karl Popper has aptly mentioned. His justice, ethics and idea seem to be moulded to defend proto-aristocracy system. How Plato neutralized Socrates and torpedoed his epistemological universalism authenticates the mismatch between intention and high ground that he showed in his works. It is further authenticated by the fact that in league with group of 30 he finished Socrates and with him high ground of universal monism that found its manifestation in him underlining the unity of mankind or oneness of world despite apparent differences and artificial barriers of otherness.

On the other hand, Kant's reason was lost in his ambivalence regarding immortality of soul and existence of God making it abstract and unviable. Though later on, he accepted that without these two reason would be not be viable, yet it got lost on the slippery ground of Hegelian dialectics. His idealism notwithstanding, Kant also believed that there exists a world independent of mind and completely unknown by it. This world consists of 'things-in-themselves' which do not exist in space and time and do not enter into casual relations.. Because of

his commitment to realism (minimal though it may have been) Kant was disturbed by Berkley's uncompromising idealism. Despite Kant's explicit dissent from Leibniz, in *Critique of Reason*, in respect of holding view that perception is confused thinking, former contrasted a realm of things as they are in themselves or noumena, with a realm of appearances or phenomena. The former are unknown, and indeed unknowable, later on he veered towards ambivalence.

Modern philosophical handling and position in respect of time, space, will, causality as phenomenal existence seem to be further elaboration of Krishna Samkya or Gyanyoga or epistemology as he posited in dialogue with Udhav in Udhav Gita. In Gita, Krishna posits ontology and phenomenology in classical sense. It starts with Arjun getting struck up in logjam of phenomenology and existence. As a being stuck up in phenomenology and trying to escape the reality, Krishna discusses all available ways to negotiate it. Broadly speaking he posits two stream of metaphysics: Samakhya or Epistemology and Karmyoga or law of Transcendental causality. Along with it, he discusses ethics, cosmology and transcendental psychology.

Knowledge or Gyanyog or Samakhya is the cardinal principle of Krishna universal monism misunderstood as knowledge about otherworld or what Kant has termed as noumena. Knowledge about phenomena as arose in context of time, space and Karma or action is the extension of cause or stimuli. Hence it is influenced by it but it is not final or static; it is of dynamic nature. It keeps on getting refined till it is seconded by reason or Dharma of a particular phenomenon. The empirical impurity gets rectified in the interaction with stimuli, effect and reason or Dharma. It is refined and following the trajectory of trial and error till it reaches the stage of perfect knowledge fine tuned by reason or Dharma.

As being (ego) is sucked up in phenomenology, only fight or flight mode that is wired in him naturally would

not of much help as life does not present such simple options. That is why Krishna three thousand years ago posited two approaches to deal with phenomenology – Samakhya or knowledge, Karmyoga or transcendental causality and third the unconditional faith over thing in itself or Bhaktiyoga or Devotion is corollary of these two. In modern times or even postmodern era these two or three approaches are still prevalent and these are the only possible approach to deal with phenomenology. However, the common link is his Brahma theory san any gradation of higher or lower Braham that he posited in BhagvadGita as well as in Udhav Gita .

The concept of fate and fatality has been discussed and delved in by Cicero and Schopenhauer, and in this backdrop they have developed their phenomenology contesting the fate and fatality. For Schopenhauer, pointed by Cicero as well, fate has no role in causal law or karmayoga and this is what Krishna has posited as 'Prarabdh' (it is difficult to find equivalent word in English. However, it is sum totality of effect of Karma or acts and it decides the future life). Prarabdh is sum of one's past action and it decides the present and future mode of being.

The discontentment and disenchantment arising out of not doing the work or vocation of one's own nature has been termed as main reason behind unhappiness and related problem haunting the world. Krishna has discussed same problem in the context of four personality types decided by own nature. That is Varnashram or social division based on function. The functional division of the society in the four personality type as per their nature-learned, martial , trade or business minded and service oriented class has later on been subverted as birth based highly discriminatory, hierarchical and closed system of caste.

The Varna and Varnasharam that Krishna discusses with Arjun in BhagvadGita with four fold division is four personality types. If there is transgression, it leads to

problem. It is at psychological level or at macro level he posited and then it is linked it as to how it affects the overall condition of the society or at macro level. If everyone follows the nature or personality in pursuing one's vocation, it would lead to happiness, prosperity and all round development of every person, society, state and world at large. It is another matter that this very scientific psychological postulation of Krishna has been subverted and distorted to maintain the hierarchical and stratified social order. This very crucial postulation has been used for maintaining unjust caste system.

Nevertheless, the natural philosophy that enamoured Plato, Aristotle, Stoics, and Sceptics has been cardinal principle for physical and material development of history. The law of Nature and Nature and social contracts are in fact component of universal monism. The principal of reason or sufficient reason or Idea or World as Idea and Will or Dharma that operates behind those external forces, the basic are same—what Kant and Hegel terms noumenon or World Spirit or World as Idea or will. Krishna discusses it when he was positing Samakhya or epistemology and cosmology (‘Smakhya’ by Ishwar Krishna in *Source Book of Indian philosophy*)

Husserlian being-in-the-world is not the being in the world. It is being that pervades this world and when world is pervaded by it, he is not limited by world. But due to contradiction and ignorance or false knowledge it seems to be limited. This is the typical problem of existentialism and post-existentialism. The moment the being considers itself as separate or other or there is compartmentalization of us and them or ‘other is hell’, it loses its universality. Here the Krishna universal monism points the fault lines of existentialism: the moment being is considered apart from world that it pervades, the problem arises. It is in this context he posited Brahma theory or theory that it is super being or super consciousness that has been taken the form of being and world. It is creator that has become creation and it is part and parcel of being. Being is neither

in world nor beyond it, it is the being that permeate the world. (See BhagvadGita, Udhav Gita).

The Cartesian instantaneous fleeting mediation or mechanisation could not see that something can come out from nothing. It has been proved by some existentialist in positing how being can transform in nothingness when he wills something. Though it is existential one, yet there is always possibility that something may emerge from nothing. Cartesian mediation that ‘i think therefore i exist’ lead one to instantaneous delusion and resultant ignorance. Existence and existent could not be reduced to mere coordinate of thoughts and being. When unmanifest the existence exist irrespective of thinking. Thoughts too most of time invading the plane of immanence seem to be rising from nowhere and melting into nothing. Moreover, thinking is mechanical process, a sort of automated process having no fixed predicate. It is more often than not offshoot of sense based perception.

Plato and successive Neo-Platonist have used metaphor of light for elucidating existence or being. The metaphor of light first used by Krishna (BhagvadGita, Udhav Gita and Anu Gita) it is still being used. The brain in vat is a contemporary argument of Indian tradition in general and Krishna pure monism in particular, so are Plato's allegory of cave, Zhuangzi dream of his being butterfly and evil demon in Rene Descartes' Mediations.

Moreover, Yoga is the important part of Krishna pure/ universal monism. Yoga means Yukta or conjoined with knowledge hence Gyanyoga and when conjoined with action or karma it is Karmayoga. He discusses Yoga in reference of knowledge and action. He has elaborated some points as Ashtang Yoga (In Bhagvad Gita, Anugita, Udhav Gita) which is prelude to undisturbed mind where reason and knowledge would find ground. Later on, Patanjali elaborated upon it appropriating his Ashtang yoga, subverting and brahmanizing it (See Panjali's *Yoga Sutra*).

Yoga is one of the primary postulation of (See

BhagvadGita, Udhav Gita, Anugita) and meditation (Dhyan) and Control of breath Krishna universal monism that is a means to be conjoined with universal self or infinity. One can negotiate phenomenology and ontology only when conjoined with infinity and this can be attained through Yoga after calming and soothing the mind firstly by Ashtang Yoga (Prayanam). Only then being can be conjoined with knowledge or Gyanyoga and action or Karma yoga.

The modern social cultural formations, though vouches for Brotherhood and Fatherhood, yet their fraternal and paternal stretch is limited to their own denomination which is violation of pure monism. As whole Universe is extension of that One Infinite Spirit or Consciousness and is permeating and pervading all and sundry, how could be it limited to one or other. It is contradictory in itself.

However, this is not Naturalism as has been erroneously understood by some western philosopher. If it is naturalism, then modern philosophy or metaphysics or phenomenology or ontology could be termed as naturalism by hind sight as it has been built on Cartesian Cogito which naturalizes and objectifies the human existence as intelligent projection of Nature. Husserlian phenomenology and Heideggerian ontology further objectifies the being and human existence by making it as objective manifestation of Nature and its structure.

Section-V

Epilogue

When One has become all or creator has become creation, the plurality and difference is transitory which appear to have been assigned the permanent value. The transitory value has been given permanence, while the permanent has been dislodged from discourse, conveniently tucked to the abstract. This seems to real narrative of the crisis of the world.

Plurality, difference, otherness and multiplicity is not the negation of monism or one ; it is rather its affirmation. Plurality, as Bradley has averred, should lead to unity and it is erroneous to believe that unity would result inevitably into uniformity. Plurality is a transitory phenomena as one seems to have appeared plural due to the dynamics of oneness, not against it, and it is likely to lead to the unity since for the sake of unity plurality has become plural. In fact plurality is meant for unity but to the cynics, tyrants, Leviathan, World Spirit and postmodernism and post-postmodernism, any call for unity slides into uniformity, xenophobia and reactionary vibe.

Plurality, multiplicity, difference and otherness is predicated on one and these are not ordinary phenomena. Just as One has become all and latter has been validated assigning former to the abstract or out of social scientific enquiry leading to the intellectual cud chewing , existential monism—reality is one—and ontological monism-truth is one—has been relegated to the unfounded scepticism. While plurality, multiplicity, difference, appearance and other which has originated

from one are new truth or reality, the Truth and the One very conveniently has been shunted out from any meaningful inquiry and study. The resultant outcome is postmodernism and post-postmodernism, and crisis and the crisis only reality to boot.

Nevertheless, the primacy of one remains behind the plurality, multiplicity, appearance and otherness. But the irony is that this originary concept and its primacy has been conveniently as well as too logically discarded from any inquiry. Among other things, its primacy can be inferred logically without going into their subtlety which is beyond the scope of this long essay. So far origination is concerned, they are not originary as plurality from—, and to—, multiplicity from —, and to—, otherness from—, and to likewise.

The evolution of cultural and social formations have proved beyond any iota of doubt that difference, plurality and otherness have been created to pander to the vested interests resting in the lower nature of human beings.

As the basic premise of Krishna pure monism is that one has become all, it has become imperative that any inquiry in this regard must include thing in itself, soul and knowledge, which have been kept in abeyance for too long. Related with this is mode of inquiry that has been predominantly analytical. The analysis first breaks phenomena and substance into parts and sub-parts and then it correlates it with whole. When one has become all, how can one or all can be known by the breaking credo of analysis. It is possible only by synthetic method which should include some sort of analysis within it.

Similarly, meaning is neither within nor without; it is inherent in phenomena and substance. In fact meaning is what a phenomenon or substance is; if it is sought it would give no meaning or appear meaningless. If meaning is sought in life, it would appear meaningless as life itself is its meaning. The phenomenon or substance is both signified and signifier and it is for this reason interpretation or hermeneutic has become too

important to overshadow the meaning or knowledge.

Resultantly, there has been unending debate among deconstructionist, structuralism and hermeneutics as to whether meaning is within or without. If meaning itself is phenomena and substance, how can it be decided as to whether it is within or without? Herein comes the question of interpretation and hermeneutics which appear to have become predominant and meaning seems to have become contentious issue due to various interpretations. In melee of interpretation and re-interpretations, the meaning has been lost and its interpretation seems to have replaced the very meaningfulness of the meaning. The most convenient way out of this has been the cancellation of knowledge assigning it to 'middle kingdom'.

Had it not been the most feasible solution if instead of cancelling the knowledge, the layers of interpretations and re-interpretations would have been cancelled? As meaning has been lost under the weight of interpretations and re-interpretations, it will be better if these are done away and what remains would be the meaning. Thus what remains after doing away all interpretations would not be Derrida's 'traces' but the meaning itself. However, Derrida has averred in, 'On Grammatology', that 'History and knowledge, *istoria* and *epistémè* have always been determined (and not only etymologically or philosophically) as detours *for the purpose of* the reappropriation of presence'.

On the other hand Krishna has said that knowledge gets 'invisible' (*vilupt*) during the course of time and one has to just revive it discretely. Moreover, knowledge is covered with 'lust' or desire or all type of subjectivity and it would be available only after these coverings are removed. Some communication theories such as distortion theory has maintained that a message after passing through many recipients gets distorted to the extent that very meaning of the message gets changed. It is imperative that knowledge or meaning be restored to

its originality after undertaking such cathartic exercise.

Similarly, reason has also been lost to the caprice of humanity. Reason or Dharma is available as it is the cause that becomes effect. But it has been distorted and subverted for the vested interests. How Kantian reason was hammered down by Hegelian dialectics still seems to be haunting the world scholarship. As Pascal has very succinctly summed up in '*Penses*' that 'Reason is available but can be bent in any direction. So there is no reality.' Had Pascal been aware of Krishna Dharma or reason based system established in ancient India and how a system in the form of 'Vasudeva' was devised so that reason could not be bent in any direction, he would have perhaps reconsidered his postulation about absence of any reality.

If reason can be bent in any direction, it has everything to do with exterior elements and reality remains what reason provides but it appears as if there is no reality. Reason or Dharma remains a constant factor and it is in-built in the universe. The Reason or Dharma of a river is flowing towards sea or Dharma of Sun is emitting heat and energy and if a dam is built on river or clouds cover the sun, the reality is not bent, it appears to be so. Kant seems to have failed to see that reason can be bent in any direction making reality illusory. However, Krishna who not only anticipated Kant but also the possibility that reason or Dharma could be given such contradictory treatment. Hence he devised a paraxial entity in the form of Vasudeva – a socio-political balancing mechanism.

Perhaps Krishna is the first and last philosopher who not only devised a cathartic philosophy but also realized in praxis. That too in his life time. His pure monism with Vasudeva as reason or Dharma enforcing mechanism created a ruckus in ancient Indian society and its reverberation is still shaking the intellectual and the non-intellectual. No wonder for this he was first vilified and when his influence did not weaken he was provided a godhood to prevent any repeat of such cathartic philosophy.

His philosophy in general was subverted, distorted, misappropriated and mystified, and this could be gleaned from his magnum opus Gita, Udhav Gita, and Anugita which is stuffed with theological and mythical interpolation and subversion. Some German and European Indologist scholars have mentioned as how these texts have been subverted with stories, religious injunctions and mythical trashes, and it is very difficult to glean history and philosophy.

Vasudeva was a sort of socio-political mechanism to enforce his Dharma or reason based on pure monistic philosophy. Though it was given a religious colour just to blunt its effect, it was purely paraxial mechanism which was institutionalized by Krishna. This has been mentioned in Bhagavat, a chronicle of Krishna and Yadavas dynasty but again subverted as religious text. For the system of Vasudva and enforcing his reason or Dharma based philosophy Krishna did not mind to go for war with a king of Kurush-area of North-eastern Bihar and Eastern UP sate of India. For establishing this Dharma or reason based system he did not hesitate for participating in the Mahabharata war in which Greeks, Iranians, Mongol, Chinese, Turk also participated. For establishing this system, he put everything atstake.

However, Plato and Nietzsche and their followers also tried to establish a social and political aristocracy in the form of Philosopher king or Superman or Overman or countless gods in place of God. But it could not be realized due to sheer idealism and abstraction. Their intention was good but they seem to have carried too far by their idealism and abstraction. On the other hand, Krishna succeeded in establishing a Dharma or reason or fair play based system through institution or the system of Vasudev. Krishna 'rightful conquest' was successfully used by Roman empire for expanding and holding its fiefdom as Pareto has averred 'on the other hand Rome enjoyed favour and goodwill of the people she conquered because she respected the sentiments of the conquered.'

The other world or *parlok* that Krishna mentions in dialogue with Krishna is same as what Jesus has called as Kingdom of God. This world is not some other world but one that has transformed into Kingdom of God or in sync with infinity or one with Brahma. Krishna in discussion with Arjun, underlines that the two mind is just illusion. Thus to be is the real being of not to be; just play of the mind. As mind is dialectical, so are all phenomena that is perceived by mind sensory perception.

Krishna propounds transcendental ethics: “Sukh Dukhe Sam kritvya.....(Gita, chapter 2, stanza 38). He maintains that it is not act but motive and state of mind that delineates the goodness or badness of act. If one views all binaries of happiness sorrow, victory loss and so on so forth as transitory and happening to body not to self, and not attached to it in respect of result, such person never act in wrong or involve in the immoral activities. As action or Karmas and its dynamics are endless, it goes in infinitesimal way like endless eddying in water when a stone is thrown in a lake. If one with steady mind (that can be achieved through Yoga and practice) and knowledge and without attached to result, sees them as transitory, in such mind of state he can never indulge in immoral act.

The acts or actions or Karmas are not atomic and individual, though it may seem so. They are infinitesimal, though they may appear isolated, atomic and individual but they are part of infinity. We and our actions are part of infinity, the cynics or logical sceptics would ask how come part of infinity would be infinite. What about zero? What would be part of zero? Zero. Likewise, we are part of infinity perceiving us as finite.

So Kantian ethics of ‘good for good sake’ would not be feasible unless the subject or consciousness subjectivity is transcended with knowledge and practice (Yoga). The transcendence of binaries, not entanglement with them, leads to ethics unless subject or consciousness acts without any ulterior motive or

attached to the result. Sartre has said that to be or not to be is real problematic that leads to the split of mind. Here, Sartre agrees with Krishna but he stops here and adds to the confusion of phenomenology making it more confused but more resolute in marginalizing the subjectivity and philosophy.

Krishna pure monism, however, imparts new dimension to the ethics by propounding the removal of any attachment, selfishness and egoism in any act. The act is not bad, the *motive*, attachment and intention is bad. Samakhya or Krishna universal monism version of epistemology or knowledge theory or Gyan Yoga is sufficient to know the nature of phenomenology or existence found its echo in western countries in the form of Eckhart, Plotinus, and Boehm. Plato’ Cave as Latour has observed in *Political Ecology* has two chambers—in one cannot speak but has authority and in other one can speak like philosopher but has no authority. The reality of world can be better understood with inverted tree as Krishna has mentioned. Its roots are upward-thing in itself while its branches and leaves are downward.

Krishna ontology is not structured on absurd and meaninglessness and it is based on action without having any attachment or craving for result. So far the meaning is concerned it has meaning but if one seeks meaning, meaning gives way to meaninglessness just as it happens in case of knowledge when knowledge about the knowledge is sought, it comes to dud. The modern philosophers and thinkers have termed life meaningless and have ordained ‘epistemological break’ based on such logical naivety

Krishna is relative moralist and believes in the relative morals as opposed to moral positivism of Hegel: there is no moral standard but one which exists, that what is reasonable and good implying the morality based on the might is right. Historicist moral theory of Hegel, Marx, Heidegger and other determinists is nothing but other form of moral positivism as Popper has said in, *The*

open Society and its Enemies. Krishna theory and perspective is activist against the historicist. Krishna is the first and foremost empirical social scientist as he tested his theory first and then postulated.

The major assumption of reason and rationalism is that it is 'closely connected with the belief in the unity of mankind'. The basic premise of Krishna pure monism is the unity of not only of the mankind but whole universe. The problem in human life or his social and political formation is the duality. Even Sartre has commented, 'Hell is another person', but with hands off approach, that of involved in life and world, too much snared, rather oppressed or burdened by the trials and travails of routine life. Krishna vouches for being equal (sam) or balanced to negotiate the duality of life.

The existentialist, the rationalist or scientific mind want to have control over life and forces, since man has freedom he could certainly bet that as he is free to do any work or enjoy anything that he puts efforts into with inherent right to have control over its result. From the freedom to work or act in any way, following cause and effect theory as developed in West it must give desired result. But it does not happen always so and more often than not contradicts the cause and effect or causal theory. The uncertainty principal as found by physicist renders cause and effect theory at the best a probability and at the worst a dud.

So the only option remains is action without any attachment or excessive consideration with end or result. As dynamics of action ensures its own consummation with natural law of a cause becoming effect, freedom of being is jeopardized when it is identified with end or result which is as uncertain and infinite as action are.

However, Krishna can be considered as the first psychologist of mankind as Osho or Rajneesh has aptly said in *Psychology of Gita*. The psychology of western culture still seems to be hovering/moving around the mind considering it as fulcrum of the individual

personality. Despite Jung and Adler making significant contribution to make psychology free from its obsession with mind and sex, the western psychology seems not to be going beyond the mind. And if one is stuck up with mind, then it is very difficult to understand human psychology as there are many forces as mentioned by Krishna, going beyond and above and over the mind.

The three forces of sat (goodness), Raj (passion) and Tam (darkness or inertia) which constitute and control the universe and as well as thing or being in universe are the controlling forces and mind is like grid which receives the input and send the inputs. The modern psychology does not recognize anything beyond mind and it seems to be outcome of the same materialist approach dominating other social sciences and natural sciences. Krishna vouches for going beyond the mind as these forces influence the human mind. The mind or Ego has only apparent reality.

According to conventional psychology, if the ego and the mind is integrated and crystallized with reality or the life situations, personality would be developed. But according to Krishna, one should not fight with mind, the more you fight the more it would go against you, one should go beyond it. Unless the limitation of mind is understood and transcended by integrating it with larger reality, the mind would continue to snare being in its mechanical duality.

The general obsession of western philosophy and psychology with mind and matter would not allow the scientist to see the complexity of human personality and society. According to Krishna, unless one integrates the mind and extricate one from poly centrism or poly psychologism which is understood as having many 'selves', there would not be any peace and stability. The western psychology put premium on integrating different selves of person by which one could attain the integrated personality and society. It is based on the Gestalt Psychology which main premise could be understood as

seeing the part as whole and whole as part. This could be better understood with analogy of the overcast sky with clouds where every person sees the clouds in it.

Krishna has propounded transcendent or creative psychology unlike that of prescriptive one of the modern times. The basic premise of modern psychology is that if one knows or aware of his problem or the drive or the motive leading to imbalances or the abnormality, the problem can be surmounted. Krishna exactly did this through Gyan yoga or Smakhya or knowledge but his psychology was transcendent or creative psychology as it not only cure the problem but transform the being.

Bibliography

- Arendt, H (1958) *The Human Condition*, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press
- Aralikatti, R. N (1992) 'Adi Sankarachrya: 'A Champion of Unity and a Practical Social Philosopher' in Gautam Patel edited *Adi Sankarachrya*, published by Directorate Information, Govt of Gujarat, Gandhinagar,
- Barad, Karan(2007) *Meeting the Universe Halfway: Quantum Physics and the Entanglement of Matter and Meaning*, Duke University Press,.
- Barker, *Greek Political theory*, I, p.180
- Barthes, R (1993) *Mythologies*, London: Vintage
- Baudrillard, Jean, 1976, *Symbolic Exchange and Death*, Ian Hamilton Grant (trans.), London: Sage Publications, 1993. (Page reference is to the 1993 translation.)
- , 1981, *Simulacra and Simulation*, Sheila Faria Glaser (trans.), Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1994. (Page reference is to the 1994 translation.)
- Bergson, Henry, *Matter and Memory*, Verso
- Bhatt, R. S, 'Adi Sankarachrya: 12th Century Commemoration Volume', edited by Gautam Patel and Published by Directorate of information, Govt. of Gujarat, Gandhinagar, 1992
- Bradley, F. H, *Mind*, N. S., No 60
- Burnet, J, *Early Greek Philosophy*, 2nd ed. P. 163
- Burnet, J. *Greek Philosophy*, I, 209 f
- Burnet, J (1915/16) 'The Socratic Doctrine of the Soul',

- Proceedings of the British Academy*, VIII, 235
- Caird, (1883) *Hegel*, , p.26
- Cahoone, Lawrence (ed.), 2003, *From Modernism to Postmodernism: An Anthology, 2nd Edition*, London: Blackwell Publishing, Ltd
- Camus, Albert, *The Rebel*, Penguin classics, Reprint, 2000, p 61
- Carr, David, 1970, *The Crisis of European Sciences and Transcendental Phenomenology*, translated , North western University Press, Evanston,.
- Child, Gordon (1992) *What Happened in History?* Penguin: London, 1982
- Crossman, R.H.S (1937) *Plato Today*, P.132.
- Deleuze, Gilles and Guattari, Felix (1994) *What is Philosophy?* Columbia University Press, New York
- Deleuze, Gilles, 1983 [1962], *Nietzsche and Philosophy*, Hugh Tomlinson (trans.), New York: Columbia University Press.
- , 1994 [1968], *Difference and Repetition*, Paul Patton (trans.), New York: Columbia University Press.
- Deleuze, Gilles, and Guattari, Felix, 1983 [1972], *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, Robert Hurley, Mark Seem, Helen R. Lane (trans.), Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Derrida, Jacques, 1973 [1967], *Speech and Phenomena and other Essays on Husserl's Theory of Signs*, David B. Allison (trans.), Evanston: Northwestern University Press.
- , 1974 [1967], *Of Grammatology*, Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak (trans.), Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- , 1978 [1967], *Writing and Difference*, Alan Bass (trans.), Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- , 1982 [1972], *Margins of Philosophy*, Alan Bass (trans.), Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- , 1979 [1978], *Spurs: Nietzsche's Styles*, Barbara Harlow (trans.), Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- , 1987 [1989], *Of Spirit: Heidegger and the Question*, Geoffrey Bennington and Rachel Bowlby (trans.), Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- , 1988, *Limited Inc*, Gerald Graff (ed.), Evanston: Northwestern University Press.
- Descartes, Rene, *Second Mediations*, AT VII 28: CSM II 19
- Descartes, René, *The Philosophical Writings of Descartes*, trans. John Cottingham, Robert Stoothoff, Dugald Murdoch and Anthony Kenny, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 3 vols.1984-1991.
- Dewey, J (1925) *Experience and Nature*, New York, NY: Dover Publications
- Deussen, P (1906) *The Philosophy of Upanishad*, Edinburgh, London, Clark
- Dominguez. Virginia R, (1989). *People as Subject; People as Object*, The University of Wisconsin Press
- Eco, Umberto (2014). *Historical Studies on the Sign and Interpretation*
- Eddington's Letters in *Nature*, 148 (194) 141
- Einstein, Albert 'The World as I See It'.
- Eisler, R. *Weltenmantel und Himmelszelt*, p.693
- Eisler, R, *Revue de Synthèse Historique*, 41, app., p.16f
- Fichte, Johann Gottlieb, (1794/95), *Foundations of the Science of Knowledge*, Cambridge University Press Edition (1982)
- Foucault, Michel, 2006 [1961], *History of Madness*, Jonathan Murphy and Jean Khalfa (trans.), London and New York: Routledge.
- , 1965, *Madness and Civilization: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason*, Richard Howard (trans.), New York: Random House.
- , 1977, *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews*, Donald F. Bouchard (ed.), Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

- , 1985 [1984], *The Use of Pleasure: The History of Sexuality, Volume Two*, Robert Hurley (trans.), New York: Random House.
- Garbe, *Philosophy of Ancient India* ,p.44; (M.B)
- Glileuz, Felix and Guattari, *What is Philosophy?* p.101
- Gorte G, (1875) *Plato and Other Companions of Socrates*, vol iii, 124
- Habermas, J (1994) *Post-metaphysical Thinking: Between Metaphysics and the Critique of Reason*, Cambridge: Polity Press
- Halliday, M.A.K (1985) *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*, London: Edward Arnold
- Graham Harman (1999) "Tool-Being: Elements in a Theory of Objects", Doctoral Dissertation
- Harman, G (2010) *Towards Speculative Realism: Essay and Lectures*, Washington: DC
- Haraway, Donna J(1997) 'The virtual Speculum in the New World Order,' *Feminist Review*, Springer
- Habermas, Jürgen, 1987 [1985], *The Philosophical Discourse of Modernity*, Frederick Lawrence (trans.), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hegel, G.W.F., 1812, *Science of Logic*, A.V. Miller (trans.), London: Allen & Unwin, Ltd., 1969. (Page reference is to the 1969 translation.)
- , 1807, *Phenomenology of Spirit*, A.V. Miller (trans.), Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977. (Page reference is to the translation.)
- , 1823–9, *Lectures on Fine Art*, (Volume 1), T.M. Knox (trans.), Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975. (Page reference is to the translation.)
- Heidegger, Martin (1958) "What is Philosophy?" trans. By William Kluback and Jean T Wilde London: Vision Press, pp29-31
- Heidegger, Martin, 1962 [1927], *Being and Time*, John Macquarrie and Edward Robinson (trans.), San Francisco: Harper & Row.
- , 1991a, *Nietzsche, Volume I: The Will to Power as Art, and Volume II: The Eternal Recurrence of the Same*, David Farrell Krell (trans.), San Francisco: Harper Collins.
- , 1991b, *Nietzsche, Volume III: The Will to Power as Knowledge and as Metaphysics, and Volume IV: Nihilism*, David Farrell Krell (ed.), San Francisco: Harper Collins.
- , 1993, *Basic Writings, 2nd Edition*, David Farrell Krell (ed.), San Francisco: Harper & Row.
- , 1994 [1937–1938], *Basic Questions of Philosophy: Selected "Problems" of "Logic,"* Richard Rojcewicz and Andre Schuwer (trans.), Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- , 1998, *Pathmarks*, William McNeill (ed.), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- , 2000 [1953], *Introduction to Metaphysics*, Gregory Fried and Richard Polt (trans.), New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Henry, M. (1975) *Philosophy and Phenomenology of Body*, trs. By Girard Etzkorn, Martinus Nijhoff, Hague,.
- Hobbes, *De Cive* X:1
- Idhe, D & Selinger (2003) *Changing Techno-Science: Matrix for Materiality*, Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press
- Jabes, Edmond, *The Book of Questions*, V. I, translated by Rosemarie Waldrop
- James, W (2010 [1912]) *Essay in Radical Empiricism*, New York, NY: Cosino
- James, William (1909) *The Meaning of Truth*, Longman
- Joad, C.E. M., (1938) *Guide to the Philosophy of Morals and Politics*, 661
- Joachim, *Appearance and Reality*, First Edition
- Kant, E (1997) *Critique of Practical Reason*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Kant, Immanuel, 1787, *Critique of Pure Reason*, 2nd edition, Norman Kemp Smith (trans.), London: Macmillan &

- Co., Ltd., 1929; reprinted 1964. (Page reference is to the reprinted translation of 1964.)
- , 1790, *Critique of Judgment*, Werner S. Pluhar (trans.), Indianapolis: Hackett, 1987.
- Karve, Irawati (1994) *Yugant*, Disha books-an imprint of Orient Longman, Hyderabad
- Kaufmann, Walter (ed.), 1954, *The Portable Nietzsche*, New York: Viking Press
- Kierkegaard, Soren Unscientific Postscript, p 104
- Kierkegaard, Soren, *Concluding Unscientific Postscript*: users.class.ulf.edu/burt/Kierkegaard concluding Unscientific Postscript.pdf, 06.11.2015
- Kierkegaard, Soren *The Philosophical Fragments*, Pol.ts.com/Research_Files/Source%20Material/ Kierkegaard/Philosophical%20Fragments.pdf
- Kierkegaard, Soren, (1846), *The Present Age*, Alexander Dru (trans.), New York: Harper & Row, 1962. (Page reference is to the translation.)
- Kolnai, A., *The War against the West*, 1938, p.438
- Lacan, J., 1977, *Écrits: A Selection*, Alan Sheridan (trans.), New York: W.W. Norton & Co.
- Lacan, J., 1953–1955, *The Seminar*, Books I (*Freud's Papers on Technique*) and II (*The Ego in Freud's Theory and in the Technique of Psychoanalysis*), edited by Jacques-Alain Miller, transl. by J. Forrester (Book I) and Sylvania Tomaselli (Book II), New York: W.W. Norton & Co., New York, 1988.
- Lacoue-Labarthe, Philippe, 1990 [1988], *Heidegger, Art and Politics*, Chris Turner (trans.), London: Blackwell.
- Liotard, J.-F., 1984 [1979], *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*, Geoff Bennington and Brian Massumi (trans.), Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- , 1985 [1979], *Just Gaming*, Wlad Godzich (trans.), Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- , 1988 [1983], *The Differend: Phrases in Dispute*, Georges Van Den Abbeele (trans.) Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- , 1990 [1988], *Heidegger and "the jews"*, Andreas Michel and Mark Roberts (trans.), Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Latour, B (1993) *We have Never Been Modern*: Cambridge: Polity
- Latour, B (2009) 'Global Trade and the End of the Social', in P. Joyce (Ed.) *The Social in Question: New Beginning in History and the Social Sciences* (pp117-132) London: Routledge
- Leibniz G. W. (1952) *Theodicy: Essays on the Goodness of God, the Freedom of Man, and the Origin of Evil*, trans. E. M. Huggard (New Haven: Yale University Press.), pp. 370–72
- Loon, Joost Van: "The Agency of Ethical Object in Kevin Love (ed) *Ethics in Social Research*' Emerald, UK 2012, page 189.
- Love, Kevein (ed) 'Ethics in Social Research' Emerald, UK, 2012, p.189
- Machiavelli, *Discourses III, I*
- Mannheim, Karl, (1929) *Ideology and Utopia*, p.35
- Marx, Karl, 1867, *Das Kapital*, Volume 1. The section quoted is from chapter 1, "The Commodity", Page numbers from the reprint, *The Portable Karl Marx*, Eugene Kamenka (ed.), New York: Penguin USA, 1983.
- Mascaro, Juan, *The Bhagvad Gita*, Translated from the Sanskrit, Penguin Books
- Meghasthenese, *Indica*
- Mensch, James, 'The current Crisis of Europe from a Phenomenological and Psychological Perspective', academia.edu.in
- , Temporalität and Alterity: Levinas's Account of Time, academia.edu
- Meyer, E. (1915) *Geschichtw des Albertums*, , iii, p428
- Muller, Max, 1999, *Sacred Books of East-Bhagvadgita*, Vo. 8,

- M B Publishers, New Delhi
- Muller, Max, *Sacred Books of East—Vedanta Sutra*, M B Publishers, New Delhi.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich, 1872, “The Birth of Tragedy”, reprinted in *The Birth of Tragedy and The Case of Wagner*, Walter Kaufmann (trans.), New York: Random House, 1967.
- , 1873, “On Truth and Lies in a Nonmoral Sense”, reprinted in *Philosophy and Truth: Selections From Nietzsche’s Notebooks of the Early 1870s*, Daniel Breazeale (ed.), New Jersey: Humanities Press, 1979.
- , 1874, “On the Uses and Disadvantage of History for Life”, in *Untimely Meditations*, R.J. Hollingdale (trans.), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.
- , 1974 [1882], *The Gay Science*, Book III, page 121-122, Walter Kaufmann (trans.), New York: Random House, 1974.
- , 1883–1891, *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*, translation and page numbers from Kaufman 1954: 112–439.
- , 1967 [1887], *On the Genealogy of Morals*, Walter Kaufmann (trans.), New York: Random House.
- , 1889, “Twilight of the Idols”, translation and page numbers from Kaufman 1954: 463–564.
- , *The Anarchist*, para 18 and 60
- Osho, *The psychology of Bhagavat Gita*, Part-1-5, Fusion Books, New Delhi
- , *Gita Darshan, part 3*, p 120, Fusion Books, New Delhi
- Pascal, *Penses*, page 104-106, Penguin classics
- Patoka (1973) *Plato and Europe*
- Perniola, Mario, 1995 [1990], *Enigmas: The Egyptian Moment in Society and Art*, Christopher Woodall (trans.), London: Verso.
- , 2001, *Ritual Thinking: Sexuality, Death, World*, Massimo Verdicchio (trans.), Amherst, N.Y.: Humanity Books.
- Plato, *Republic*, 439 c;
- , *The Law*, 757b-d
- , *Philebus*, 16c
- Popper, Karl, *The Open Society and Its Enemies, Vo I*, Routledge Classics, London and New York
- Popper, Karl, *The Philosophy of History*, 289.
- Poincare, H (1905) *Science and Hypothesis*, The Walter Scott Publishing C. Ltd.
- Radhakrishnan, S. (1996) *Indian Philosophy*, Vol. I, Oxford India paperbacks,.
- Rousseau, Jean Jacques, *Social Contract, Book II*, ch. VII, ch. III and X
- Russell, Bertrand, *Philosophical Essays*, Routledge Classics, London and New York.
- Roth, G and Wittich, C. *Max Webber’s Economy and Society*, p333
- Sartre, Jean Paul, *Being and Nothingness*, , p 21.
- Schiller, *Studies in Humanism*, p 154
- Schwanbeck (Dr.) and McCrindle, J. W (1877) *Ancient India as Described by Meghasthenes and Arrian*,
- Singer, Milton (1991) *Semiotic of Cities, Selves and Cultures: Exploration in Semiotic Anthropology*, Walter de Gruyter
- Spivak, Gyatri’s (1987) ‘In Other World: Essay in Cultural Politics’
- Spinoza, *Ethics, Book I*
- Spinoza, *Political Treatise*, Chapter 10
- Stevenson, C. L (1938) ‘Persuasive Definitions’, *Mind*, NS., Vol 47, pp 331
- Taciturnus, Frater, *Stages on Life’s Way*, SKS 6, p 216:
- Tacitus, *Annals I*, xiii
- Tarn, W. W (1933) ‘Alexander the Great and the Unity of Mankind’, *Proceedings of the British Academy*, XIX, , pp123-124
- Taylor, A. E. *Socrates*, 150, f and 170 f
- Taylor, Victor E., and Winqvist, Charles E., 2001, *Encyclopedia of Postmodernism*, London:

Routledge.

Vattimo, Gianni, 1988 [1985], *The End of Modernity: Nihilism and Hermeneutics in Postmodern Culture*, Jon R. Snyder (trans.), Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Vico, Giambattista, (1725)*New Science*

Wahi, John (1938) *Etudes Kierkegaard-r'diemmes* Paris: Aubier, 226

Webber, Max, *Collected Essays in the Sociology of Religion*, Vol-III

Whitehead, Alfred (1978), *Philosophy of Organ*

Wittgenstein, Ludwig, 1953, *Philosophical Investigations*, G.E.M. Anscombe (trans.), New York: Macmillan.

Zöllner, Günter. *Fichte's Transcendental Philosophy: The Original Duplicity of Intelligence and Will*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Arthur_Schopenhauer#cit_Note-46

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Object-oriented_ontology

<http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/johann-fichte/>

[file:///C:/Users/hp/Documents/Hindu%20Philosophy%C2%A0\[Internet%20Encyclopedia%20of%20Philosophy\].htm](file:///C:/Users/hp/Documents/Hindu%20Philosophy%C2%A0[Internet%20Encyclopedia%20of%20Philosophy].htm) dated 20/08/2014

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Logocentrism> , dated 07.10.2015.)- *footnotes or endnotes*

<http://www.allaboutphilosophy.org/postmodernism.htm> 02.09.2016

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Immanence#cite_ref-6.

The Sourcebook of the Indian Philosophy

Udhav Gita or Ekadesh Skandh of Bhagvat, Published by Gita Press, Gorakhpur, India

Bhagvat, Published by Gita Press Gorakhpur, India

Speaking Tree, The Times of India, 2015

Chowdhary, Gopal, (2014) *The Greatest Farce of History*, published by Partridge India