

The West Looks East - James B. Klee

1970s - Originally published in Points of Departure (p. 231-264).

It is very unusual for inter-group differences to exceed the spread within the group. East-West differences and as we shall see, North-South (more accurately Tropical-Temperate), pretty much follow suit. The late A. H. Maslow often spoke of the psychic unity of mankind and these area differences, if anything, show the degree of unity. We often forget the continuing interaction between people even over vast differences. Are strangers truly strange and alien? Or are they foreign when we make them so as when we forbid them to ourselves? Now that in itself is a dialectical question more characteristic of Eastern - especially Taoistic - thought but one which also characterizes the psychological work of C. G. Jung. The interactional separation of two forces has long been characteristic of Western Christendom. Think only of our concentrations on the separation of God and Satan, good and evil, man and woman, black and white, pure and impure, spirit and matter. As Jung pointed out what we fail to recognize or deny as ourselves comes back to haunt us as our fate or our "shadows." We often project upon the stranger much we would deny ourselves and thus estrange them even further. This, of course, we have done to the Eastern peoples, religions, and cultures and they have likewise done it to us.

The differences we find to emphasize are often the most trivial physical characteristics. The Orientals to us are slant eyes, slope heads; to them, we are the big hairy noses. You really have to concentrate to see a difference in skin color especially if you compare individuals who spend much time out of doors. Perhaps the more recent Ice Ages account for most of the visible physical differences between the Oriental and the Occidental. In the almost polar cold that covered the Eurasian land mass there was a selection of those people with the roundest, smoothest heads with minimum protuberances. Ears and noses that stuck out too far got frost bitten, turned gangrenous, and when gangrene developed that close to the rich blood supply to the head, the results were usually fatal. Only those people whose facial features did not protrude as such seemed to have survived to reproduce. Photos of especially Tibetans, Nepalese, and central Chinese show this flattening of facial features. Yet it must have been a relatively dry and sunny cold, because skin pigment is needed to protect from poisoning by the sun's rays, especially from too much of what today we identify as Vitamin D. In Western Europe the Ice Ages must have created a condition

where gangrenous level cold failed to develop where facial hair offered sufficient protection but where skin pigment was detrimental to survival. Perhaps body and facial hair cut down on available sunlight. Perhaps cloudy and/or foggy conditions prevailed sufficiently to select for the a more pale-skinned hairy population. At any rate, one is almost shocked by the pigmentlessness of many Irish, Scottish, Dutch, and some Scandinavians. If we divide the world as Alan Watts has suggested, into colored and discolored, one gets the feeling that the Northwestern Europeans are truly discolored with every blood vessel, scar, and acne blemish showing to make the skin a most mottled affair by contrast with the Asian or Southern European, especially those of the Mediterranean area. A distinctly shocking experience is to see the hairlessness of most Hindu peoples. One expects Oriental hairlessness. You have to remind yourself that the population of India is the result of wave upon wave of invaders from the Northwestern parts of Eurasia and that these successive waves - Aryans, various Muslim groups, and finally the British - were closely related to the same stocks that settled Europe. Indeed we class the languages both groups speak as Indo-European tongues. Between Sanskrit and German there are close affinities. The Latin languages are closely related to the same stock.

Perhaps if we turn the problem inside-out and wonder more about the barriers to East-West relations we can get further sooner. Current ideas about the gypsies, for example, trace them to a group of people from the province of Gujarat in Western India who fled West into what we call the "Middle East" and thence into Europe before one of the Islamic invasions about 700 years ago. The spice trade and the silk trade kept up overland for thousands of years connecting the Eastern European areas with the Indian subcontinent and with China. These overland routes were interrupted from time to time yet were probably more continuously functional than we are accustomed to realize. Some of the best and earliest large sailing craft developed in the sea we now call "Arabian" that separated India from Africa, Arabia, the Red Sea, and the Persian Gulf. The fore-and-aft sail design, lug, lateen, and spirit sails developed here while most of the Mediterranean people were rowing their boats and using a square sail which could sail before the wind only. Trade, conquest, raids, and retreats are fairly continual. Although the Aryan invasion was one way into the Indian subcontinent it was also bifurcation into early Europe as well and in a sense in part surrounded the more centrally located North African and European civilizations of the Eastern Mediterranean around Egypt, Crete, the Arabian Peninsula, Persia, and especially the area we now call Turkey. At present these are thought to be the center of the oldest

"civilizations" known to us, those of Mesopotamia and the Tigris and Euphrates Valleys. Indeed the question really is one of why and how East and West even thought of separation, not one of interaction, much less discovery.

Today we are much more willing to see even the separation of Europe and Africa from the Americas in these Taoistic terms. Aside from legendary Atlantis (and many intellectuals are even beginning to give that still a third look), we are not willing to admit at least one way connections between the Phoenicians and the Mayans, Egyptians, and Central Americans, West Africa and Brazil. Certainly many of the legends of various civilizations of Mexico mention apparent European contacts. The "discovery of America" by Columbus was far more "psychological" than "actual" despite views of traditional historians like Samuel E. Morrison. Today we are more curious as to how some Europeans "lost" America than to how it was "rediscovered."

Contacts between Asia and the Americas are even more fascinating. Pots have been found in Peru in the style of Japanese folk utility ware of 3,000 years ago. The elaborate painting and carving styles of much of Mexico remind one of the similar elaborations of early Chinese bronzes and it is said that there is similarity between the step pyramids of Mexico and Indochina with the likelihood that those of Mexico are several centuries earlier. A look at a map of the Pacific shows the ease with which coastal voyages from Southeast Asia could be made along the Chinese, Siberian, and Alaskan coasts via the Aleutians and along the American coasts all the way to Cape Horn. The only real barrier would be the Arctic weather the voyageur could encounter en route. Yet if the seasons were chosen with this in mind the current view of staggering trans-Pacific distances could be bypassed. Many Mayan ruins suggest Chinese and/or Japanese influences, especially the faces of some of the chief figures in the frescoes of Palenque. It is almost as easy today to ask why not as it was a half century ago to ask how possible. Unfortunately for us scholarly types, the Chinese turned their literary backs on their sea coast peoples in their concentration on "the Middle Kingdom" as the center of it all (all that counts, that is) and so far historians have not found or paid attention to the legends of the sea coast peoples. Yet there must have been times of expansion and colonization of the Western Pacific - e.g., Formosa, Japan, and the Siberian coastal islands. Perhaps the new underwater archaeology will fall in that aspect for us in the future. That there was recent expansion in the Southeasterly directions is attested to by the Hindu influences even East of Bali and the vast colonization

into the South Pacific by the "overseas Chinese." Why not expansion earlier from West to East along almost continuous shores, as well?

If we can take for granted at least a fairly continuous East-West contact then our problem is no longer one of discovery of new forms by each of the other but one more of emphasis and degree of specialization. Rarely do we find an idea missing so much as just relatively ignored or relatively poorly formulated or little developed. Perhaps the differences are most magnified when the idea or trait is held necessary as part of a way or the way. That is, the idea has "directional" importance, what we sense as our primary challenge. In a sense these are the kind of belief differences that magnify the relatively minor "factual" or experiential differences. If we are in Washington, D.C. and we have to decide whether we are to go to New York or Chicago, then we magnify the relative values for us of each place. This "intentionality" with which we perceive is a basic part of our outlook in any such comparison. And the degree of magnification is controlled more often by the need than by the actual situations. If we have many different problems or purposes we create an existential pluralism that complicates the external pluralism that William James envisaged. Mutual understanding then is even more difficult as we intend different solutions to our already possibly different problems.

In fact the first major East-West difference is right here in the willingness of each area to face this pluralistic question as such. Western-Judaic-Christian-Islamic-Scientism has had a basic prejudice towards single formations of its whole basic outlook. One of our most valuable ideas we claim to be monotheism. But if we have only one God and He is on our side or we only understand Him and He is already good what then of the others and of evil? We soon get Satan in the backdoor for an automatic dualism. As we make God more masculine in emphasizing power, then what of the feminine? As we emphasize in science the material-mechanical substrate in everything, what then of the psychological and the spiritual? Do we ignore evil, the feminine, or the mental and spiritual? Can we reduce these also to the One? Here the Orient, by not pressing so hard for the single one and only answer, has been more willing to tolerate complexity in its initial problem formulation. When a Hindu philosopher such as Shankara faces this problem he goes beyond God to Godhead, to that which is eternal, indivisible, has no beginning and end and is nondualistic. The man-God separation essential to the I-Thou formulation, perhaps the West's best effort yet at reconciliation, just does not appear at this stage of the formulation. Man and God are

one, there is no 'other.' Atman (the soul) and Brahman are one and indivisible in this formulation. Hence the non-dualism of the advaita philosophers and hence also the emphasis through yoga and meditation on the reunion at all times or any time of part and whole; of resynthesis of something which in principle is never truly separated except by the illusion of Maya - which is separation, definition, and especially measurement of individual things taken apart from the whole and in some specialized exclusivistic way. Buddhism, although it emerged 1500 years before Shankara, makes a similar emphasis on the ultimate unity of it all and, as we shall see later, so does Taoism in China to the North and East of India.

Now, Western thinkers also have seen and said similar things about our relations with God. But we have tended to maintain the emphasis on God and Man in a more personal way. We said God created Man apart at a particular historical moment. The West has emphasized the beginnings and goes then in fear of endings as well. We emphasize the one and only quality of Jesus of Nazareth, God's only begotten son, and even that was seen originally as blasphemous that anyone could claim that close a relation to God. And when one of us today should so claim he would be sent to a "shrink" which some (Foucault) deem even more demeaning than crucifixion. The Western world was, according to a "hand computer" count of the years of biblical chronology made by the Irish Bishop Usher, created only 4004 years before the birth of Jesus and is hence only about 6000 years old. With such a recent beginning one could easily imagine an end; and judgment days have been foretold with each new comet or century or millennium. (The round numbers help us to finish things off more neatly when speculating on these matters.)

The Hindu world is without beginning or end, although in the cycles of days and nights of Brahma there are two periods or kalpas totaling 4320 million years each day or night. True, on the more personal level we are in the last phases of Kali yoga only 432,000 years long after which it will all stop for a night, and it sure feels that way sometimes, but after a sleep of equivalent time it all starts again. So better luck next time, although blessedly we have little or no memory of the last times either within the cycle or between cycles. Yet the bitterness of a once and only existence is tempered by the recycling even to the point where in Buddhism the greatest blessing is to get off the wheel of existences altogether. Again the once and only exclusive and unique quality of a Jesus is spread over many avatars in Hinduism. God, in this sense Vishnu, has appeared not only as a man in form but

as a woman, not only human but as animal-fish, turtle, boar, lionheaded man. He has come as a dwarf, a beggar and/or rishi (a wise old hermit of the woods), and in relatively historical times as Krishna and most recently Rama. Hindus are often willing to give similar avatar status to Buddha and Jesus. (You can imagine the reaction of an ignorant but well-meaning Southern Appalachian fundamentalist missionary telling these 'heathen Hindus' about his superior exclusive all-white Lord's son when he runs into the bland assurance of said Hindu that someone like Jesus had been there many times before and was expected to come again and again and had come as an animal or as a female as well as male.) The Hindu may go on to point out that indeed everyone and everything partakes of, is Brahman, has or is Buddha nature, and hence is God. These ideas are of course not unique to the East. From time to time they surface wholly or in part in the West as well. The civil rights movement - as expressed by many priests, rabbis, and ministers - recognized at least the nonracial quality of man's belongingness to God. Similarly the mystics in the Middle Ages, especially St. Francis of Assisi, expressed similar sentiments and feelings about the participant nature of man's relation to God and periodically a similar position arose among the Jews - especially the Kabbalists and some Hassidic groups - and among the Sufis with Islam.

Many Hindus are as separative in their reaction to their concepts of their relation to the whole acting as if God was wholly other and to be as feared and dreaded as any Protestant fundamentalist of his "God" or "Overseer" Lord. In fact one senses the education and socio-economic level of the individual being is such as to lead him to formulate his ultimate philosophical outlook pretty much in terms of his usual daily experience and vice-versa. The poor, in fact and spirit, are likely to run scared and to try primarily to propitiate those terrifying beings who seem to control and dominate his "fate." The vast majority of Hindus turn to Siva or Kali hoping thereby to briefly stave off their imminent destruction or demise. Yet in India Siva as the destructive-recreative agent of the trimurti (trinity) including Vishnu the maintainer and Brahma the creation (more than creator) is only the most "popular" or frequently observed spirit. Siva is not "exclusive" or the only God. He is rarely considered as having a monopoly of power. But poor Protestants, as most were originally from among the poorest parts of Western Europe except for a few of the intellectual leaders, are similar in their "fear of God." Among the poorest of the Irish Catholics one gets the same emphasis so that one can hardly think of "poor" and the rich universal aspect of Catholicism Roman or Byzantine in the same thought. Today traditionalistic Protestantism is represented by poor

Appalachian whites, the urban blacks, and a few rural and urban poor. The American Catholic poor act in similar ways. The problems one experiences are most likely to set the tone regardless of which religion or philosophy one aspires to. Yet a M. K. Gandhi or M.L. King (themselves originally relatively well-to-do) can by their own personal example pull many followers onto more sophisticated levels of experience and awareness.

Followers of Rama and Krishna legends surrounding the avatars of Vishnu are more sophisticated. Vishnu's consort Lakshmi also is a goddess of affluence. Like the wealthy Roman Catholicism of Europe, the Anglican Church of England, the Episcopalian Church and more recently the Methodists, Northern Baptists, Presbyterians, Lutherans (outside the Missouri synod), and a few other groups in the United States, the sense of maintaining the affluent well-being seems the dominant problem orientation. God's in his Heaven, "all is well, all is well." The fear is still there, don't rock the boat, but we happy deserving few share the good life. Krishna the lover, Rama the former and future king all exude a fundamental well-being that can afford ceremony, pageantry, even a kind of righteous joy, wine, spirit. For the affluent God is love, too, not just fear. Yet even a poor man like Ramakrishna could be a loving devotee of the fearsome black goddess of destruction Kali. Kali is usually shown dancing and trampling on the prone body of Siva her consort. One hand holds a just severed head, another the beheading knife, a third holds a bowl in which to catch the blood, her tongue protrudes so she may lap it up the better. She wears a necklace of severed heads and a skirt (not unlike the hula grass skirt) of severed arms, fingers down to make an extra fringe like a hippies' version of a frontiersman buckskin jacket. Yet her open fourth hand is raised in the usual sign of peace. And Ramakrishna loved her, devoted his whole life to her worship and repeatedly experienced the ecstasy of samadhi in his devotions to her. The poor can love God, but it's easier for the rich albeit their devotion might be much more shallow and untried.

Yet Brahma too has his few devotees but they are more difficult to represent. Brahma is the original creator in fact verges on the creation himself. For every millions of symbols representing Siva, hundreds representing Rama, Krishna, Vishnu, or Lakshmi there are one or two of Brahma. The true brahmite (as against the priestly caste of brahmins who could be devotees of Vishnu or Siva, Ramakrishna was a poor brahmin) has gone beyond the need for such representation and would be the rare true theologian, philosopher whom we can count on our fingers - Lao Tse, Shankara, Socrates, Jesus the man, perhaps a Leonardo da Vinci,

Gautama Sakyamuni (the Buddha), Siddhartha, Chuang Tzu, perhaps a Krishnamurti, Alan Watts, Albert Schweitzer, Paul Tillich or Martin Buber. Or perhaps we never know while they are alive who they are because they would be the last to so designate themselves. Indeed they might be so harmoniously blended with their general situation as to be unnoticed altogether. We are all that to some degree, especially in our aspect as parents, those of us through whom life continues quietly and unassumingly for the most part. In this respect the true brahminite is more frequent than we realize. He or she needs no idol or uniform, nor do they need to be against the idol either. He or she is at the heart of continuity in all its forms. Hence also the value placed in China and India on the family, on the parent, on the ancestor as such.

In a curious way the best individuals feed back into the whole in an unobtrusive way. Hence Lao Tse can say "he who has found the way has lost it." Popular heroes are forever fighting for the one and only way. The truly great ones restore us to all ways. This is the basic insight to what has been called the "middle way" and what has often been confused with middle classness and mediocrity. Perhaps "centering" captures the essence of this realization better but it too can become the bullseye, the dead center of the target. If, as Flaubert has claimed, "success can only be a result not a goal," so also the middle way is an achievement, never an aim. Otherwise it too becomes fixed in the dead center. The "lace curtain" respectability of the mediocre middle class is the antithesis of the middle way. It is not a position one can hold to and is impossible to legislate. Yet the Middle Kingdom, too, also forgot this.

In any case, few individuals in any culture at any time have been able to express these fundamental insights well, much less convince and lead others along similar paths. Most of the intercultural philosophical or religious controversies appear among the "A-" or "B+," not to mention "C-" adherents of a by then degenerated patterns of belief. The lower and poorer the understanding of the problem, the more the part is usually taken for the whole and the more idolatry appears. To a "C+" Brahmin Siva is no more an idol nor no less than a crucifix is to a "C+" Catholic or the New Testament to a "C+" Protestant or the Torah or Ark of the Covenant is to the "C+" Jew. All will fight for their respective idol or bumper sticker. But to the A+ individual from each of the groups the similarities are also great and the differences will be seen as relevant to each one's background. The more superficial the

understanding the greater the differences will appear. The deeper the realization the more "mansions" can be included "in my father's house."

Interestingly, as the West has tried to externalize and absolutize the final nature of God it has also done so for things, as well. Hence the very great emphasis on the external world and its essentially mechanistically concerned nature which is also controllable and manipulable and over which man was "given dominion" much as "The Lord" had dominion over man - a sort of theological peck order. By contrast to the theoretical emphasis on the world as machine as F. S. C. Northrup has suggested in his *The Meeting of the East and the West*, the Orient has been more aesthetically empirical. Curiously where the West manipulates and develops, the East observes and discovers. Two major dimensions of consideration appear here. One relates to the subject-object differentiation so strong in the West; the other to the curious willingness to let experience stand in its own right so characteristic of the East.

The subject-object difference grew in magnification with the "success" of the Judaic-Christian-Islamic-Industrial-Scientific tradition. If God was "out there," was wholly other, absolute beyond man's ken, man's task became that of trying to discover and understand what was out there, to obey it better, or to control it better. Exploration and invention became the later watchwords once the obvious flatness of the world was abandoned. In a sense by emphasizing the external mechanically understood model it was more difficult to change the model. By contrast, where the subject-object differences are not as strong, the model is seen also more as hypothesis and one must take perceptual responsibilities. A statement like "I saw a ___" is much harder to take back than one which says "I thought I saw a ___." The second admits participation and thereby response-ability as a dimension. The first emphasizes validity as if there were other external absolute standards. What was the intelligence which the intelligence test purported to measure? How did we know? Why have many of the tests now begun to fail us? So the East discovered many things by observation that the West developed later by manipulation. I think of gunpowder. It was first teased out of rock formations by Indians and developed by the Chinese, yet not much beyond the level of firecracker and pyrotechnique displays. When the British invaded Canton during the first Opium War, the Chinese cannons were more often tubes, sometimes wood embedded in concrete and neither pointable nor trainable. The British figured their range and sailed by within and

without the fixed trajectory and without casualties to their ships or men. By this time the British had their famous iron "Long Toms" and row upon row of cannons mounted on wheels and capable of being raised and lowered. After gunpowder was introduced to Europe, the process of development continued until we had the "blockbusters" of World War II, the "big bertha" cannon of the Russian artillery, the machine gun and rifle, and the Saturday night special for American people. Similarly the compass was discovered in China, but developed in Europe and resulted in the new voyages to the East around Africa and the expansion of Europe into the Western Hemisphere. The sail as developed in the fore-and-aft sense that enabled men to sail into the wind at least sufficiently to "tack" and to maneuver without oars was also an Eastern "observation" or aesthetic or empirical realization. The lateen version developed in the Arabian Sea. The lug sail was developed by a combination of Pacific Islanders and the Chinese. Perhaps the invention of the stern post rudder was equally important as an alternative to the steering sweep or oar as it enabled the Chinese to build much larger vessels than could be steered by a mammoth oar. Yet the Western Europeans put all these together and soon dominated the seas politically as well as became skillful sailors who taoistically could live with the wind. A people who could realize that it was not necessary to "push the river," who could "go with the flow," who respected the bamboo for its ability to "bend with the wind without breaking" must have seen very clearly indeed.

To put it more positively the Orient had a sense of "such-ness" or "is-ness" which helped penetrate nature to its myriad cores without the West's proclivity to reduce nature to raw materials for producing some model object. Again the Indians lead the way with the emphasis on ta tha ta, or such-ness, an almost Kantian ding on sich, thing-in-itself-ness, that made the experience more absolute than the thing experienced as in the West. It is not that the East was subjective and the West objective so much as the East respected the nature of the experience as such. This gives to most Oriental philosophy and religion a psychological tone which the West still has only begun to explore, and that mostly by the phenomenologists and existentialists - and even they almost verge on solipsistic subjectivism. Hence also the respect for nature and even in human relationships a respect for "face." "Face" acknowledges the discrete individual in his particular circumstances. The individual is not just the abstraction beyond the name. Experience becomes central in each discrete moment, not only its nama rupa - name and form. Experience thus is a form of

truth in itself, not just this sign of some absolute truth which lies obscurely beyond and more real than experience, or "valid" as the early statisticians thought.

This is nuclear to an understanding of M. K. Gandhi's Satyagraha, or "truth" crusade. Gandhi first and above all emphasized Satya - truth - as derived from the Sanskrit Sat, as being. Sat is absolute, God, what really is. In this sense, the atman-brahman relationship is reaffirmed. But as the truth is realized or "known" especially in the biblical sense it is also chit, or the knowledge aspect of God. But this was also experiential, one experiences his part in the whole as "cool" - "at-one-ment" as Alan Watts often emphasized - and to this aspect the name ananda, or bliss-consciousness, was given. Thus the entire truth-knowledge-bliss complex - the sat-chit-ananda - was God in experience. It was not an experience of God as other, separate. But when all three merged, melded, or multiplied (not combined as three separate things) one really "grooved," was "with it." Paul Tillich tried to say a similar thing with "love, power, and justice" as essential each to the others. Similarly W. H. Sheldon's theory of somatypes might be thought to have implied the same with his emphasis on the three primary aspects of the embryo as a basis for human behavior description. The endoderm, mesoderm, and ectoderm are all necessary to the individual and one could see them as enabling the manifestations love, power, and justice in a more physical and organic sense. That there are variations in proportions of each in any one individual is nowhere near as important as that all work together.

The Hindu-Buddhist world then emphasized the veridicality of perceptions in its suchness or its truth-knowledge-bliss. Their truth is not what it is about or of but its facility as such. Yet it is not as a subjective "thrill," "trip," or for "kicks" either. The fact that I have the experience is not the point, either. One rarely meets "experience collectors" in the Orient despite some spectacular "stunt men" among yogis and especially the Sadhus, the "C-" or Ed Sullivan aspect of Hinduism so prevalent in the eyes of the tourist. Meditation which redirects towards this "centering" emphasis on the neither I nor it (or thou) or more positively the non-dual thus becomes one of the most important aspects of the Oriental repertoire of experience. Again, one can practice different emphases in yoga rather than different kinds of yoga. Yoga means union with the ultimate or infinite. The three most obvious emphases relate in a way to sat-chit-ananda. The best known dimension is what we call hatha yoga and/or raja yoga. The emphasis here is on control of one's body through breathing exercises and postural control to minimize the "I" and to a sufficient

degree to let centering develop. One could say that in a negative way hatha yoga emphasizes the sat by non-interference, by reducing the temptations to maya to a minimum. One stills and pacifies the "mind-body" to let one center in all truths without division and distraction by maya. This type is now sweeping the United States and even is demonstrated on television and in physical education classes in our colleges and universities. Hatha yoga is even now appearing in high school gym classes.

The second best known form emphasizes ananda or bliss. Like the hatha and/or raja yoga there are many forms of bhakti yoga, from the chanting of the Krishna Consciousness group now evangelizing in the United States or the devotional qualities of the Divine Light Mission through the many individual expressions. Chanting, dancing, singing, running, performing pujas in many ways, the bhakti yogin tries to recapture the bliss inherent in the sat-chit-ananda trinity of man-god central to the various "holy rollers" or evangelical sects and in Judaism, especially among the Hasidic groups once concentrated in the Central provinces of Eastern Europe - Poland and Southwestern Russia - and so well caught in Fiddler on the Roof and the stories of stetl life in Scholem Aleichem. As each subdivision elaborates and grows, the Bhakti spirit emerges as an aspect. Today the most staid of all Protestant sects, the Episcopalians, allow and encourage speaking in tongues and participation in encounter groups as they go beyond the need for status. The former Shoutin' Baptists now look askance from their newly won heights of lace curtain respectability. One even senses an emergent bhakti quality in the person of Maharishi Mahesh Yogi, especially in contrast to his often over-serious devotees.

But we must also acknowledge the chit, or knowledge, aspect as well. This more formal development called jnana yoga gives a place to the intellectual who because of the relatively non-instrumental quality of Hinduism does not have quite the respectability and dominance of the Western philosopher. The latter counts so much because of the almost entirely theoretical-belief nature of Western traditions which base logic on the relatively infrequent experience of a very few individuals. Yet knowledge as name and form so contemptuously referred to as nama-rupa does have a place, albeit relatively minor compared to the West.

India is notorious for its poorly kept records, its almost total lack of written history, and relatively undeveloped formal philosophy. Indeed although Nagajuna, an early Buddhist philosopher, developed a four-fold logic (it includes the possibility of irreverence as well as

its truths and falsity), that went beyond the either/or logic established by Aristotle but petrified by the church fathers. The general non-linearity of the Indian experience usually kept that type of "scholasticism" or "Talmudism" or "rigorous logical analysis" from exclusive domination. Perhaps the commentaries on the Vedas, the Upanishads, and the Puranas are not unlike the sequence of Torah to Talmud to Midrash in Judaism. Yet the Hindus sought expression in sculpture, which is multi-dimensional, in theater and dance, in painting, in poetry and literature. And above all the Hindus, who are the combined peoples of the original Dravidians and the Aryan immigration, unlike the Jews and Western Christians, had not been displaced from their sourceland. One can see where at least, according to legend, the Gopis, the cowgirls were loved in person by Krishna. We can visit where Rama lived, where Siva stayed or stays, where Indra lived. Gautama Sakyamuni was born here, died there, sat under this tree, lived in his cave, preached his first sermon there. The Ganges Valley is alive with holy places which each individual can experience for himself. In this sense India is a bhakti world, not a place read about or written about from afar as we do of Bethlehem, Jerusalem, Mecca, Nazareth. Sacredness is part of an immediate experience to some degree almost everywhere in India, not just known about from books and the written word. Yet for the human species little experience is experienced without the symbolic dimension of word, gesture or mudra, and the knowledge dimension emerges and becomes important, too. It adds integrative balance to the sat-ananda, to the hatha-bhakti yogic experience. Who has not been at times profoundly impressed by a book, a poem or a play that in themselves were words on paper or in gossamer air but nonetheless meant something. On our experience trip we often forget this. Words mean long before they become "words" to the individual. How shocking it is to find that words can be used as objects for philosophy or semantics. As Ernst Cassirer pointed out a half century ago, symbols are an inherent dimension of human experience. Words are not usually, except in the first phase of learning a foreign language, just tacked on "as names." Certainly no child ever learns language except as a part of immediate experience as a dimension of the whole gestalt. So the truth is also obtainable as chit through jnana yoga and in the longer term ashrams that have long ago come into existence in Varansi (Benares), Rishikesh, Hardwar, and especially sections of South India where the Islamic invasion did not reach - there are groups more similar to the European traditions of the monastery or the University. The great University of Nalanda in Bihar existed as a center of Buddhist studies until Buddhism itself gradually faded away from the Indian scene almost 1000 years ago. Nalanda lasted

about a thousand years and to it pilgrims from China and the Far East came to study especially in the 6th and 8th Centuries. In fact, our records of India are from their diaries and papers. Arthur Waley has translated an old Chinese novel *Monkey* that gives a delightful account of the overland travels of such a Buddhist pilgrim. Many of these accounts are becoming available in English. Nalanda itself is now being restored as are libraries at Bodh Gaya and Sarnath (near Varanasi) by the Indian government and many of the Tibetan refugee lamastic scholars are settling in these regions to continue the way of chit, knowledge. When one visits Nalanda today one is impressed by the large number of scholar visitors from Burma, Thailand, Ceylon, Japan, Indonesia, and many Indians are once more reconverting to Buddhism. The Indian government estimates that today there are about as many Buddhists as Christians in India, a couple of million each.

Buddhism always co-existed with Hinduism. It had developed as a reform movement with Hinduism. It was rarely persecuted to the degree that Christianity was at its inception and it never turned on Hinduism as the Christians did with the Jews. Their person of the Buddha inspired a following that broke through, for a while, class and especially caste lines and humanized what was becoming merely traditional. It in turn became traditional around its source-land and was no longer really needed as it became "one among the many" subjects. Its structure did not demand the fierce loyalty that was the heritage of Judaism in Christianity and Islam. Even though Ashoka made it the state religion a couple of centuries after the death of Gautama (and Ashoka was the first to unify most of the Indian subcontinent and perhaps the only "native" to do so, Akbar was more Mughal in descent), Buddhism retained the "one among the many" quality so characteristic of Hinduism so it hardly ever presented the either/or dilemma so characteristic of religious loyalties in the West. And so as the caste structure reprevaded the Buddhist society and as respectability of the "C+" middle classes grew in Buddhist society, the sense of wholeness and unity it once provided faded away.

Besides, Hinduism was attacked by a new danger - the invasions by Islamic monotheists (monopolists) who attempted to convert the Indian peoples by persuasion and sword. Such was the depressed state of the lower class-caste sudras and the untouchables that many millions did convert to Islam, especially in the Western deserts and in the North of India along the Gangetic Plain all the way through Bengal. The bulk of Muslims in India today are the remote descendants of such converts. Islam continued to spread Eastward, jumping

Burma and Thailand (relatively recent converts of Buddhism) to Malaya and thence to the islands off the Malay Peninsula to seed the Indonesian Archipelago. Islam even spread North to the Phillipine Islands. Partly in response to the challenge of Islam, Sikhism developed in the Northwestern deserts of the Punjab. This is a relatively militant, almost monotheistic reaction that synthesizes many of the aspects of the Jain and Buddhist intellectual economies yet is still loyally Hindu. Like Jainism and Buddhism, the Sikhs are active, responsive, emphasizing the action or behavioral half of the experience-response duality. Hardly a cartoon in India in today's news media would fail to show the taxi, lorry or bus driver, the motorcyclist as a fiercely bearded turbaned Sikh. He is the stereotype of the activist of the non-Islamic Hindu world.

It is difficult to talk of the fourth and last (in the West) form of yoga - Karma Yoga - without saying a few words about history in general and Indian history in particular, and especially how it is conceived to be. As mentioned above, the Hindu cosmology conceived of infinite numbers of kalpas - billions of years in length indeed for eternity. Kalpas were subdivided into four shorter Yugas themselves ranging from the 1,728,000 years of the relatively benign Krita Yuga to the final 432,000 year Kali Yuga. The four yugas, or Maha Yuga, are themselves recycled 2000 times per kalpa. Hence, as Elaide has suggested we have the myth of the eternal return as over against the terror of history. In contrast, the West and the Far East - China - have emphasized the continuous changing nature of history. The Bible carefully lists every patriarch since Adam was created nearly 6000 years ago. It records each new major event and its consequences from the expulsion from Eden, the flood, the contract between Abraham and God on behalf of the children of Israel, the Exodus from Egypt and the new covenant with the followers of Moses and for the Christians the birth of Christ. Each changed the direction of the social group concerned. Islam adds still another event and redirection of its adherents. The changes consequent upon the growing urbanization and the Industrial Revolution keeps this a one-way linear process. Yet, even in the West, people think often longingly of a second coming of Jesus, or the Messiah, or of Judgment Day. In India, Buddhism's fundamental departure from Hinduism was the recognition of history, that "all was change." Man consequently suffered when he failed to recognize change. All was suffering because man desired. He desired that which he had known and with which he was familiar out of his ignorance. He was ignorant of change. This historicism of Buddhism made it more compatible to the Chinese who also sense the historicism of existence and had for many thousands of years kept

meticulous records. The office of the Grand Historian was almost as powerful a post in the Imperial Court as the Prime Minister or his equivalent. Yet the Indian Buddhism emphasized the "Wheel of the Law," the probable recycling of such experience in ignorance for the foreseeable future. The national flag of India still preserves the wheel emblem in its center although the wheel or chakra symbol is also basic to Vishnu and to all mandala symbolism which by definition intends to include everything as a whole.

In a sense what we have is another form of the fundamental dualism consequent upon any attempt to leave Godhead, the indivisible and eternal Brahman. Most all thinking, even in the West, recognizes a fundamental difference in direction between our spatial-qualitative-quantitative direction and the temporal. We can almost reconcile form and substance, even form substance, and quantity as aspects of one another. Almost all our knowledge concerns these three "spatial" dimensions. We may quarrel as to whether form or substance is more basic like the recent particle-wave controversy in physics or the sensation-gestalt debate in psychology. Does one see a circle as a series of retinal stimuli arranged in a circle or is a circle the circular arrangement of a series of retinal stimuli?

Psychology teachers were actually fired (not rehired is more polite) according to which group controlled the department. Today we think little more about this than about gog and magog, the Guelphs and the Ghibellines. At best it is another one of those yin-yang deals. Today we are more willing to day we can't have one without the other. Quantitative ideas like motivational dynamics are easier to recognize as a dimensional problem once the basic absolute-relative resynthesis is achieved, for whatever we distinguish as existing qualitatively or quantitatively also exists to some degree. But time has only recently been discovered on a "mass scale" - i.e., for "mass culture" only since and through the works of Kant and Darwin according to the Toulmins. True, Heraclitus 2500 years ago in Greece - like his contemporary Gautama Sakyamuni - saw "all was change"; but the popular realization and inclusion in culture other than the idea in specialized books of a tiny elite is now beginning to dawn and to be positively regarded. Since then it's always been one damn thing after another. The seasons have long been recognized. The calendar has been around for thousands and thousands of years. The week and its Sabbath also has been recognized for millennia. The Chinese long had water clocks. The Europeans have for several centuries had their clocks in the town hall that struck the hour for all to hear. We have long had the hour glass. But now almost every Westerner and many Easterners have watches and time has a presence like never before. It is reinforced by radio and television

schedules, bus, train, and airline schedules, work and vacation schedules. We now value time economically as well as measure it. Time has now re-emerged as a part of the whole - the gestalt - but it is recognized most poignantly when forms change albeit we measure and conceived it most easily by the repetition of forms, the cycle of days, seasons, and years. In a way the tropic countries suffer least during the cycles. True the recurrent annual monsoon helps the parched semi-deserts of North India. But the degree of drought is a recent thing (geologically speaking) and the subcontinent has been a relatively affluent area in which to live compared to the recently iced-over temperature zones. There winters and spring were often times of great starvation and must be anticipated and planned for. Hence, history is focused on in Europe and China compared to India. India has or had until a few centuries ago a relatively lush "lotus eater" quality. The destruction of Hindu morale by the successive wars of Islamic conquerors and finally the Portuguese-British-French occupations and administration plus the lowered death rate because of Euro-American technology has more recently focused attention on the more marginal desert islands of Rajastan, Gujrat, and the Punjab. We forget that by contrast to the hard life of the temperate zones India was once part of a tropical paradise. So all is change now for India as well.

In recent years Hinduism has of necessity turned from the concentration upon the ultimate sameness of Atman and Brahman to look upon Maya as a possible source of Mana, of inherent power in all phases of life. If Maya is kept to its suchness dimensions or ta tha ta, if the focus is more on the ta twam asi, "thou are that," then it need not be entirely illusory. In a sense Maya as ta tha ta is as much a dimension of Brahman as Atman. But it must be seen in a temporal, or karmic, context as well. Maya has an illusionary quality only when differentiable quality is held in a static atemporal context. Does one love another always, to the same degree or did one love at that time very much? Desire is the result of ignorant re-expectations and reliefless continuity. All things change, to some degree, to varying degrees for different things. Ignorance attempts to maintain as permanent - static-like - the pyramids, those things which are eternal (beyond time) but which hopefully are rhythmical, cyclical. The substantive material (maternal-feminine) aspect of Maya as being something in particular now is crucial if Indians are to survive their serious overpopulation. The subtropical diversity and affluence once characteristic of India no longer suffices, yet because of the enormous concentration in the positive direction Hinduism once had, the Hindus may be in better position to capture in existence what A. H.

Maslow called "being-cognition" as against the deficiency orientation-motivation of the more temperate zone cultures with their accentuated seasonal deficiencies. On the other hand the temperate peoples have developed an instrumental "competence" which helped in the U.S.A., China, U.S.S.R., and Western Europe to create the enormous science-technology complex now threatening the earth with total destruction of "natural" fossil energy resources and by pollution. Yet the next development- e.g., solar energy, etc. - will also be "natural" and may rescue us again. In some ways the Hindus act like "spoiled brats" now that their natural affluence is relatively depleted. Yet we are turning to them for their more ancient exemplary thinking which enables us to deal with the whole in relatively non-competitive terms. There is a natural ecological orientation - for by ta tha ta, suchness, everything gets its due, has its Being value.

Alan Watts has said rhythm is first. We separate rhythm into space and time only afterwards. Rhythm is inherent in eternity - it is the coming pulsing in-and-out focus of life and death, day and night, black and white, good and evil. When Maya is kept in its temporal context it expresses this rhythm as karma. In this sense karma is a fourth dimension of the Brahma-Atman-Maya quaternity. Karma is by Westerners often thought of as "fate," Kismet, in the same way they think of "determinism" as a kind of compelling, "causing." Today we are more willing to see determinism as merely descriptive, or at least it need mean no more than that. This comes very close to - if not identical with - "history" as descriptive of events. Of course technology tries to "make" something or "make it happen." But that is a fairly infantile attitude as we now recognize that "we must rob Peter to pay Paul," that we have to have the something we make in another form in order to have the wherewithal to make the something else. The more we realize the suchness of both, the more we are likely to ask "Is the making worth the while, the effort, the energy, the expense?" Yet we too have had our spoiled affluent past as we plundered the land and resources taken by deceit from Amerinds and Africans as if they were windfalls, "free" from "nowheres." Determinism in the non-"technological-mechanistic" context does not "make" anything or "cause" anything to happen. It describes as best it can what has happened, is happening, and what is most likely to happen - given its limiting sense of ignorance as to all aspects of past, present, and future events. Similarly karma is where you are in the context of where you've been and to much less degree where you think you might be going or hope to go. True, you are ignorant to some degree as to all other aspects of your

descriptive efforts. All is change - many unexpected events will occur. You will find you've bought unanticipated consequences.

Yet, "there you are," tat twam asi, thou art that, "and so it goes." Quo vadis? Now what? The next decision is your's. As Jose Ortega y Gasset has said, man has a history more than a nature. By nature, in Brahman, in eternity he is not necessarily limited. If he persists in ignorance his karma may be a recognizable and predictable one. But as Jean-Paul Sartre suggests, man makes himself, existence precedes essence, man in continuing to "determine" his essence. True, what he has done has left him in his present predicament or position. But now what, what's next? Maya or the ten thousand things can be one damn thing after another. But Maya also provides the stepping stones, the path, the staircase of Karma by which man finds and makes are his way. Where else could he go?

Karma Yoga is not unlike D. T. Suzuki's favorite remark about Zen: "Zen is your everyday life. Before I studied Zen mountains were mountains, trees were trees. After I had studied Zen a little while the mountains became rocks, dirt, ravines; the trees became wood, leaves, roots, bark. But after I achieved satori the mountains were mountains, the trees were trees." No-thing, a void, emptiness, in the way it was conceived. "No-thing special," says Alan Watts. Brahman is not zero, a vacuum. It is still experience, "an immediately apprehended undifferentiated aesthetic continuum," says Northrup. It is full; it is eternal. Time (Karma) is only one aspect of the whole should you existentially care to differentiate. But then, so are maya and atman. These are existentially our analytic divisions, our pluralisms. But they are seen more that way in Hinduism because of this relatively great focus on the whole, on the mandala, less than on the (one and only) way. Karma then is at the "A+" level, very broad and roomy. It could include everything. It is under the aspect of eternity, also. Yet at the less well-conceived level it is like having painted one's self into the corner, been caught out on a limb.

One could say the young die of Karma. They thrust themselves totally after the ball into the streets, race their sport cars blindly down the road, drink or drug to excess. Less dramatic but more tedious are the poorly chosen or arranged marriages, the poorly prepared-for job or occupation, the too-narrow circle of friends or defined religion. Then one is truly hung up by karma. The sins of the fathers will be visited on the sons even unto the third generation. So karma doesn't stop with you, it affects or infects everyone. Karma implies recycling not just because you are but because nothing is ever truly left

behind. Philip Slater recently described Americans as aspiring and conspiring towards a "flush culture." If you flush the wastes away or hide the dirt all will be well. But today we are sadly reminded that the beer cans on the highway don't just go away, someone has to pick them up again. The used tissue dries and is blown down Fifth Avenue into someone else's face. There is only poor recycling or better recycling, never no recycling. The Indian streets are often dusty but relatively litterless by contrast. Food sold in street stalls is served on leaves. When discarded the "sacred cows" eat them and later deposit it back on the streets as dung. It is the job of the younger Indian girls to gather up the dung into her basket, often carried on the head. The mother makes it into patty-cakes and plasters it on the outside walls to dry out. She then burns it for fuel in cooking and heating. The cow is the Indian "friendly gas company." There is little other source for fuel for cooking and heating available to the Indian poor and that is over 85% of them. If the cow were to be removed from the streets, India could die of the plagues endemic and ready to go.

Perhaps the single best statement of karma yoga is that of the section of the great epic Hindu folk novel, the Mahabharata known as the Bhagavad Gita. Here when Arjuna complains he must fight and perhaps kill his own relatives in a great war raging at the time, he is advised and encouraged by Krishna who is serving as his charioteer "to get on with it," as we might say today. Karma yoga is the fulfilling of one's possibilities in terms of the opportunities, responsibilities, and positions in which one finds himself. But one does the best and most creative job one can. One is not "sentenced to fate." One responds fully but in terms of all the variables. Always the mandala is there. And the mandala by definition is a map of the whole.

There seems to be a maturity factor that enters in this respect. As Erik Erikson has pointed out, the youth responds today often to little of any consequence and hence dangerously risks wasting himself in too strong and energetic a loyalty to too narrow an existence. Later the individual becomes more able to respond to the whole situation in its many and varied aspects, thus becoming more wholistic and in Martin Buber's sense, more response-able - able to respond relevantly. Response-ability is the first ultimate meaning of Karma yoga. In India one can see the youth moved first idealistically by principle, the dharma aspect. Later the householder learns to rise above his principles to positions and functions of power, the artha dimension. The Arthashastra long antedates Machiavelli's The Prince. Still later each experience begins to develop its ta tha ta aspect, its suchness and

one is more blissful as this more limited and relevant truth power, a sort of sat-chit-ananda, emerges. This is called kama and the Kamasutra was written to express this and give counsel in this dimension. The Kamasutra is not just a book about sex but also about poetry, food, dance, theater manners, as well. Finally, as all truths are relevantly differentiated as everything falls into place, each serves something else. Full integration and liberation takes place. This final phase of integrative-liberation is termed moksha. We could in good Eriksonian-Piagetian style emphasize the step-by-step progression to moksha as an achievement. But in India, dharma, artha, and kama are given more equal right, four sides of the four-dimensional mandala. You don't have to be first dharma-bound just because you are young. That is only descriptively so. The more you are tempted to make a principle out of or achieve liberation, the more dharma-bound you become. And, of course, few Indians have lived to reach moksha in recent centuries and those who do today no longer find the lush hospitable subtropical rainforest that originally characterized the landscape. Today the jungle is little better than a Texas chaparral, and that's not much of a place even for a rishi or sannyasin.

Karma implies rebirth, reincarnation as well. If man is defined by his history, what he has chosen to do, then the consequences are also to be faced by all still to come. But how do you face these remote genetic consequences of your actions? The knowledge of them which the breadth of mandala consciousness permits should be sufficient. For lesser minds, the attempt has been made to make the consequences appear more concrete, and so one often encounters at the folk level theories of personal reincarnation. The more sophisticated way is to think of the self as a no-deposit, non-returnable bottle, the glass of which will be almost totally redistributed in a completely unrecognizable form. The more up-tight version is that of the returned and reused bottle. In the latter case, you really get what's coming to you again and again and again. But perhaps anyone with such a linear conception of the problem really deserves to be recycled that away. Yet such ideas are not an essential part of the Hindu wisdom. Atman is Brahman and perhaps ultimately so is Maya and Karma. At least to see these as dimensions one of the other would fit in with the mandala or pluralistic consciousness within which West and East may find their ultimate reunion.

It is of course impossible to truly grasp the whole in any particularistic sense. Yet in the rhythmical harmonic structure of consciousness it is possible to try to imagine an alternative

to the West's exclusive emphasis on logical analytic linearity. From time to time we do sense such alternatives in the West. The outburst in the renaissance of a neo-polytheism and pantheism - especially among the painters and sculptors of Italy, the development of humanism by Erasmus, the double-aspectism of Spinoza - all helped in returning response-ability and participation to the European intellectual. Perhaps the Orient played a part in this since some Jesuit and Franciscan missions to the Orient were beginning a feedback process. This would be in addition to the immediate influence of the Islamic cultural explosion in the Middle East. And, as the Philosophes developed, a free-swinging intellectual style also accompanied their efforts at first. The Protestant movements also moved towards greater religious ambiguity even though the narrow sectarian bias of each group was far less tolerant than the church they protested against and withdrew from. The Inquisition also heralded the growing multidimensional quality of thought as people began - secretly and in public - to express their growing doubts, especially of its too-narrow theologically-maintained cosmology now being challenged. This in turn threatened the direction of the linearity inherent in the Judaic-Christian tradition. Yet, like the Protestants, as each new group emerged they were likely to become more narrow, more sectarian, more linear than the group from which they had broken. Herbert Marcuse's recent protest against tolerance would be a case in point. The growth of the various sciences, although if taken as a whole would provide a beautiful example of pluralism of knowledge, still encouraged an even narrower linearity among especially the lesser "B+" adherents of each specialty, as Aldous Huxley once remarked. Indeed, as there are more and more "scientists" alive and practicing today than in all of history together, they have come more and more from the middle of the distribution curve. The numbers game always implies mediocrity because that's where the majority of the people are. Yet today, partly because of the above and very much because of the new interest in the Orient, a sense of the whole is returning. The linearity so precious to the analytic mode is seen more and more as only that, and not the only way for all. We can see it as a true polymorphic perversity, not a sexual one as in Norman O. Brown's Freudianism. We need one which also permits the question, "What does sex mean?" I've reduced this to: "When is sex erectual, and when are erections sexual?" The arranged marriage recognizes the former as far more important than the petty pleasures of a couple. So does the church and so does evolution. Yet if the latter is also not so, the whole thing comes to a halt. (I deliberately avoided the word "grinding" here!) Can one ask which is right? Aren't both essential? Do we not have a

perverse polymorphism as well as the other way around? Brown's Closing Time comes closer to the fundamentally perverse polymorphism.

Arthur Koestler in his Sleepwalkers has not so long ago called attention to this problem. Aristotle has preserved the multiple aspectualism in his thinking. The scholastic tradition hierarchalized the aspects to a greater degree. The rational soul becomes "higher than" the vegetal soul. Newton almost desouled the world, for as a "sleepwalker" he in effect "reduced" God's word to the laws of mechanics and mathematics, a monopolistic or monothematic oneness that dominated thinking for the next several centuries. William Blake - as Roszak has recently said in *Where the Wasteland Ends* - protested, "May God us keep from single vision and Newton's sleep." Pluralism became more and more an obvious necessity with the chemist's periodic table, the Linnaean classification, but the ideal was Newtonian until Einstein's general theory of relativity also brought the existential nature of pluralism once more to the fore as at the very heart of our relations to matter and hence to any other aspect of experience. Percy Bridgeman's "Operationalism" - though temporarily co-opted by the more linear establishment - also suggested this existential pluralism. But in the last few years several men working on the fringe of psychology or in a psychological context have proclaimed the counter-culture (Roszak), consciousness (Charles Reich), the new consciousness (Robert Hunter), the mandala-like four-foldness of W. B. Yeats by William Irwin Thompson, and of William Blake by Roszak. Although Hunter would start a new sectarianistic loyalty to his alone, the spirit of all four writers is in the more Jungian sense of the whole range that is more characteristic of Indian thought, especially its wide-ranging all-inclusiveness.

A return to the notion of will and of freedom also manifests this concern. As long as motivation theory dominated, choice is merely a matter of following an organic (physiological), need reductive (psychological), or social problem solving sequence. But more and more psychologists like George Kelly and A. H. Maslow relatively dethroned motivation for construct theory and B- (being-) Cognition, respectively, as alternatives. The transactional and transpersonal psychologists, the Gestalt psychologists and the Gestalt therapists like Berne, Kurt Lewin, Kurt Koffka, Max Wertheimer, N. R. F. Maier, and Fritz Perls have called our attention to the problem of which game or motive, which *einstellung*, which direction is chosen. This "point of view" problem, the problem of the problem itself, puts us once more at a choice point or crossroads. Once again a map or

mandala characterizes our considerations rather than just the directions of how to get there. Once again we ask, where to go? And in terms of growing and chronic energy crises, it is worth getting there, should you decide where to go? How easy and didactic the motivational analyses of a Freud or Marcuse is by contrast. For them, the goal was "oh, so clear."

The Orient has long considered the paradoxical nature of the choice processes. Good and evil are two sides of the same coin, you can't have one without the other. Similarly, black and white, up and down, etc., etc., can only be seen in contrast with its opposite. India goes even beyond the dualism of the Chinese Yin-Yang into four-foldness, eight-foldness, multipleness. Siva dancing has four arms. Brahma has four heads and four arms. The Trimurti has three heads, six arms; Durga twelve arms. Avalokitesvara has eleven heads and eight arms, and in many Japanese representations he (she as Kannon - he changed sex crossing from India into China in folkways) has a hundred heads and a thousand arms. Each arm or head symbolizes and expresses a different aspect of the whole. Each statue or painting is a mandala, not just a single character as in the West. That is why the linear quality of writing, as Marshall McLuhan has stressed as fine for narrative and descriptive temporal history or causal determinism, never developed as much in India. It couldn't begin to describe what it was all about. You could meditate on "it," the whole - your attention would wander a bit but how else could all be comprehended except by meditation? Karma yoga was for a very few. Better to practice bhakti, hatha, or jnana yoga and feel you were getting somewhere, getting things done. Zazen, oh wow! That's the real discipline! You can count the hours and days to promised satori. But the complexity, the recognition of where next after you got there - that is more difficult. What if you had been there all along? (And getting there wasn't the point after all! We say getting there is half the fun, it isn't all there.) And what's next? Where have you left yourself in regards to your next goal?

Mandala consciousness can, of course, be terribly frustrating too. If its apprehended range out-ranges your competence you might not even get started. And it is often atemporal. The caste system is a good - that is, a terrible - example of the mandala manifest in human social affairs. Originally Aryan and in the Vedas, there were four main castes or varnas (a word also for color). The brahmins were the priests, the kshatriyas were the warriors, chiefs, and administrators, the vaisyas were the trades and craftspeople, and the sudras

the workers of the land, the farmers, and the herdmen. Such divisions of labor were common as social complexity developed beyond the more political class structure of such large social groups as that of Egypt. The twelve tribes of Israel were similarly divided. The members of the house of Levi were the scribes, and priests like Brahmins. The house of Judah were more the warriors. The last two Hindu castes were subdivided into ten - e.g., Dan, Benjamin, etc.. The Hindu castes subdivided almost endlessly today rivals in complexity Australian bushmen kinship systems. The trouble came as these castes became also class structures and were permanetized by being made hereditary and atemporal, not subject to change. True, a father-son apprenticeship often works well in establishing the directions of the son's life, but to be fated and compelled only to the one craft was burdensome to most children to say the least. But then few knew a better way. And those without any caste position in India, roughly half the population, were woe begone indeed. Except for non-caste conquerors, the "unscheduled classes" were the untouchables. And when a conquering Muslim or Englishman lost his political upper hand he quickly fell to the very bottom of the pecking order. Had the caste system retained the non-hereditary forms of the earlier societies - as among the American Indians - all would have been better because, as a multidimensional descriptive effort and organization, it is excellent if only that it gives even the least occupation a respected place.

We see the same today. The I.Q. test busted loose many people recently emigrated from Europe and Asia and kept them from the otherwise social untouchability of the strange foreigner. But now it has become tyrannous in turn. We let it freeze us into atemporal permanence. Similarly, the castes of priests and warriors - Levi and Judah - came to represent all of Judaism. When we look for the other ten tribes of Israel they have disappeared. But the other castes could easily serve other masters and during the diaspora, to the best of our knowledge, they did. Really only the "tribes" of Levi and Judah were forced to flee to preserve their identity. Perhaps it was as in China today; most people serve in Mao's regime. The older "priests and warriors" fled to Taiwan. We let the mind and its handiworks represent us, but what of our bodies? They too become unrecognized, untouchable.

The Hindu culture changed slowly. Its inclusive mandala structure made change difficult, and one has a sense that little by little Hindus were sidelined, wallflowered by the more single-minded sects both within and without India. Such refugee groups as the Parsi

remnants of Zoroastrians from Persia, the black Jews of Cochin, part of the original diaspora who settled in Southern India 2000 years ago and who were recently refused recognition as Jews by the Israeli high priests - the Bene Israelites who fled the European pogroms - were all dynamic forces that often carried India along. The various Islamic conquests similarly moved India along. The Sikh reformists also helped. And finally the British, Portugese, French, Russian, and American economic invasions also injected India with a new sense of history. In many ways, partly as an attempt to neutralize economic control, the British did much to protect, reinforce, and bring Hinduism to a reactive renaissance. Most of the living Hindu temples in the North were built since British administrative control. (There was never a truly military conquest by Great Britain. The British mostly played one raja against another.) The most hated of the great Moguls, the great-grandson of Akbar, Aurangzeb, had fantastically tried to destroy all the outward manifestations of Hinduism and its temples. Today one glimpses the ancient styles in the South of India or to the north in Nepal.

Traces can also be found in a few

places which had fallen to ruins before the Mogul conquests and which had not been deliberately destroyed. One of these, at Khajuraho, contain many statues of couples, trios, groups in sexual embrace among other scenes of contemporary Indian life such as bathing, dancing, writing, grooming, marching, etc.. The sexual stuff catches the eye, especially as one does not associate sex with temple architecture and decoration by Western standards. In part, we are grateful to the protective jungle for preserving these beginnings of Tantric yoga (a kind of hatha yoga) in its many forms - some of which are still practiced into this century in the mountain fastnesses of Tibet, Nepal, and Bhutan, but which now are more written about than practiced. These are stimulating to the American's imagination as his culture begins to face beyond the infantile adolescent stage. But this is more a commentary on the psychology of Americans than on India, which may be said to have gone beyond the "genital stage" into a more equipotential kama and moska orientation, perhaps too far beyond. Can we act prudishly shocked and say the public display of sex prepared for the success of the first of the Islamic invasions? Or is Hinduism truly mature only to be victimized by the raucous adolescent drive of Islam which at that period was sending its missions and troops East and West, North and South to conquer and control what it could of the known world? Was India tired, effete? Or was it wise and thought that in the long run it made little difference especially in terms of the eternal round of cycles? We see a good part of Europe in a similar phase - tired, its colonies gone, sexually mature, perhaps

past maturity, and now the Americans are flirting with maturity too. Will there just be another round of barbarians rushing in and about like eager missionaries and/or fools, or have we all learned a little of the lessons of India?

It was usual in essays and books on Hindu and Oriental psychology for the last hundred years or so to carefully plow through the vast literature and find those nuggets pertaining to sensation, perception, learning and memory, motivation and emotions, thought, personality, and social behavior - even including sex! A good summary may be found of these aspects in *Asian Psychology* by Gardner and Lois Murphy. An even more detailed recapitulation with a bit more Hinduism may be found in S. K. Ramachandra Rao's *Development of Psychological Thought in India*. This chapter has avoided these in favor of a more "directional" approach, one which tries to bring out the directions or *einstellung*, *gestalts* or challenges, as variously seen by East and West. If what problems we formulate determine where we look, what we look at and for, how we act, what motives we subscribe to, then directional analysis becomes very important too. For this is an addition to that, not just a replacement. This is another dimension of the mandala, not just an embellishment. That much of the material covered is what we conventionally regard as "religious" requires recognition, but little comment. Religion is the way we accept and face the flow of what the Chinese called the Tao, or what in India was Karma, or what we call history - the temporal dimension, where we are going, what we anticipate, and expect next. Religion concerns where we come from and where we go and what we are and have been and could be. That this dimension was also seen as psychological is first and foremost an Oriental insight. The West has made much of its uniqueness - of history - but has sadly repeated it, as Santayana recognized. The East saw more of the mandala. With so much to do, so much to be covered, recycling was almost inevitable. The West hoped to "close it out," soon having seen it just begun. Creation was to be followed by Judgment Day. The East has been more patient seeing it as gone on for not only *maha yugas* but *kalpas* as well. The East could psychologize about its beliefs. Beliefs were for the West too recent, too concerned, too close, "uptight." God for most was not just a personage, one mask among many, he was the person, the Man, the Lord, the Big Boss. Nobody "fucks with Hoppy" (Hoppalong Cassady), and that catches too poignantly the Judeo-Christian-Islamic-industrial traditions.

"But that's where the action is," Jean Houston once remarked. Matthew V: 5 should read "Blessed are the debonair" - not the lonely, crawling, God-fearing "meek" of King James. Grace is required to face and to formulate these problems - but if everyone is a part of God, as for the Hindu, then grace is. Grace is here and now, too. Before the "You and me, God," before the "I-Thou," there was the Om - the indivisible all, the whole. We - you and I - make a separation out for some purpose with some intention. The division is ours. We have then to be responsible, as well, because it is our concern. But then you couldn't ask for a better place from which to start. In fact, there is no other.