

An objective reading of the history of human beings has shown us that there are only two fundamental approaches which have enabled us to ascertain the truth of any matter around / and inside us. Then, it appears most natural to investigate into the differences and similarities of these two approaches.

First, the author wishes to clarify that when he uses the term “religious mind”, he doesn’t have any dogmatic, or organized belief in mind. Nor is he referring to any organized tradition, or institution. An inquisitive reader may then ask, if the word “religion” is not used in any of these sense, then why is the author insistent on using this word for his exploration. It is because of the lack of any other word which is capable of emphasizing its meaning, and the feeling which author wishes to communicate through this word has indeed been observed in the writings/sayings of certain extraordinary personalities who appear to be “religious” among the common masses. So, if you kindly permit me, I’ll use this word “religion” which has become highly corrupted. The essence in which the author wishes to use this word shall gradually unfold if the reader is able to put aside the previously ascribed meanings.

How do we first proceed to find out the differences and similarities of these two approaches? On the basis of what, shall we compare the two approaches? I think there are only two methods available to us for comparison. The first being the “comparison of spirit”, and second, the “comparison of method”. I would also like to add another category of “questions of interest”.

In spirit, both the religious and scientific quests are similar. Both are motivated by a desire to understand the world that appears. When ancient men looked at the sky, and the world around him, he was filled with a feeling of wonder. It is certain that the first true science, or the

mother of science, must've been astronomy. As the ancients observed the motion of heavens more closely, they began to notice certain patterns. They noticed that the sun rises not on the east everyday, but as days pass by, it changes its direction. Then they must've noticed a certain pattern in the direction in which sun rises, which repeats on a yearly basis. They must also have noticed very early, the seasonal dependence on which constellations appear in night sky. They began to find out correlations among various phenomena. An appearance of certain phenomena necessarily indicated the appearance of other. With keen observations and records of these observations, they could predict various astronomical events in advance. The investigation of correlations gave to the scientists, a power to predict the future.

The ancients did not limit themselves to the prediction of future based on their limited observations of correlations. They wondered whether their observations could be understood more simply. Whether there is an underlying theme, a simple principle, which could explain all their observations. **The feeling for this unification of all observations under one umbrella, gave rise to the notion of models/theories.** They tried to explain their observations of astronomical phenomena through geometry. They invented various geometrical models in order to explain what they saw. Why did they feel the urge to create these models? My feeling here is that they were endowed with a certain "religious feeling" to unify their observations under one umbrella. It is quite similar (as we will see later), to the "religious feeling" of a religious mind. Their wish to see the universe as a certain whole, based on beautiful principles (as we see, the earlier models demanded the orbits to be perfect circles) compelled them to find these principles. Further, they instinctively differentiated between what were merely independent correlations between two events, and what were cause/effect type relations. If the universe was not based on the principle of cause/effect, the science, as we know today, wouldn't

have been possible at all. Whether cause/effect is a fundamental principle of our universe or whether it applies only under certain limiting conditions is an open question, the answer to which, we may never know!

The religious man, on the other hand, was not so concerned with the study of nature. From the most ancient of times, we find men who have spent their life in seeking beauty, not in the world of nature, but in the world of consciousness. When some men took it upon themselves to live peacefully on this planet, they observed that all their attempts at establishing a harmonious and peaceful society had eventually ended in failure. We see that man has not been capable of addressing this problem even after 2500 years of wars, nor have we put an end to corruption completely. Certain extraordinary men (like the Buddha and many others) attempted to understand the reason for man's inability to live peacefully and harmoniously. These men were never directly involved in politics of their time, since they understood it can never address the problem in its fullest depth. They discovered certain truths about the nature of human beings, and transcended the evil present in men. When one reads the writings of these men, one feels that what they say is rather primitive, and yet, profoundly true. For instance, they say, so long as men is greedy, competitive, aggressive, nationalistic, individualistic, and seeking success, the disorder inside men cannot end. Certain men have talked about love which is beyond all boundaries, and personal desires. We see that very few men are interested in these kind of pursuits in today's world. We are seeking to end/resolve problems through various political and economical actions, but we are not concerned with the corruption, and individualistic behavior present in our own lives. In fact, we have given so much importance to political actions, that we are willing to be corrupt at present for a particular political action in the hope that it'll produce peace in the future.

I notice two fundamental differences which differentiate a scientific mind from a religious mind.

### **1. Theories :**

A religious mind is not concerned with the formation of theories while a scientific mind must form theories. The objective of a scientific study is to explain away the phenomena that have been observed in nature. In order to explain anything, a mind must form theories. While theories help in understanding and making further predictions about the objective world, the concern of a religious mind is not fully addressed by formation of theories. The purpose of a religious mind is not to explain away the phenomena observed in consciousness. Rather, it wants to find out if there's a possibility of complete transformation, and of elimination of the disorder in consciousness. This is where the psychologists differ in approach from a religious person. While they both desire to resolve the disorder inside men, the psychologist, imitating the scientist, tries to find out the cause and go to the root of the problem through analysis and explain away the behavior as a result of certain causes. However, such explanations do not completely resolve and eliminate the disorder.

### **2. Wholeness :**

A scientific mind is concerned with the learning of certain phenomena. His research is not necessarily related to his daily life, or the way he conducts his daily action. His research, as it were, is one of the many separate aspect of his life. While the religious mind is inclined towards the unification and harmonization of all of life. It may conduct scientific research as

well, but it wouldn't be a separate part of the many glued pieces. Rather, it would be an intermingled and indistinguishable element of the whole. The whole of life would then be one flow, and such a mind is wholly integral. This quality is also apparent in the way a religious mind deals with every activity.

This difference, unlike the previous one, is not exclusive. Since a scientific mind can still be a whole mind

These are my personal observations. Just as an experimental scientist wishes to collect precise data of different phenomena, we are interested in collecting precise data about different approaches that have helped to resolve our disorder. This subject is more complex than all of sciences, since we do not have any measuring tool that tells us whether what we are doing is right or wrong, good or bad. In this field, the tool (self) which measures must itself be studied. We are completely on our own!

As a good friend, I invite you to consider these questions on your own, and then we can discuss it together!