

Civilization Dialogue: Hinduism and the World (III)

Conference Proceedings

March 5th, 2003

The Sasakawa Peace Foundation

Venue: The Nippon Foundation Building

Participants

(Alphabetical order)

Dr. Kamla Chowdhry

Board Member, Vikram Sarabhai Foundation

Professor Dr. Daisaburo Hashizume

Tokyo Institute of Technology

Professor Kenichi Matsumoto

Reitaku University

Professor Dr. Nobuko Nagasaki

Ryukoku University

Dr. Yasuaki Nara

Chancellor, Professor Emeritus, Komazawa University

Ambassador Kishan Rana

Professor Emeritus, The Foreign Service Institute

His Excellency Dr. Aftab Seth

Ambassador of India to Japan

Program

Date: March 5, 2003

Venue: Conference Room in Nippon Foundation Bldg. 2F

Chairman: Professor Dr. Daisaburo Hashizume

10:00 Opening Remarks

by Dr. Akinori Seki, The Sasakawa Peace Foundation

A Message of Congratulation

by His Excellency Dr. Aftab Seth (Ambassador of India to Japan)

Part 1: Gandhi's Thought in Indian Civilization

10:15 Indian Foreign Policy – A Mirror for Its Heritage and Civilization

Lecturer: Ambassador Kishan Rana

10:45 Gandhi's Thought and Its Relevance for Contemporary Environmental Issue

Lecturer: Dr. Kamla Chowdhry

11:15 Coffee Break

11:30 Discussion by Lecturers

12:15 Lunch Break

Part 2: Modernization of Japan and Indian Civilization

13:15 Chandra Bose's 'Indian National Army' and Mahatma Gandhi's 'Cotton Spindle'

Lecturer: Professor Kenichi Matsumoto

13:45 Mahatma Gandhi and Civilization Dialogue

Lecturer: Professor Dr. Nobuko Nagasaki

14:15 Discussion by Lecturers

15:00 Coffee Break

Part 3: Dialogue between Japan and India

15:15 Mahatma Gandhi Watched by Japanese Buddhists: For the Dialogue between Hinduism and Buddhism

Lecturer: Dr. Yasuaki Nara

15:45 Discussion, Q & A

16:45 Closing Remarks by Mr. Setsuya Tabuchi

Opening Remarks

Introduction: Good morning ladies and gentlemen. We would like to thank you for attending this seminar on Civilizational Dialogue which is sponsored together with the Sasakawa Peace Foundation as well as the Indian Embassy. This is the fourth of our series of seminars and specifically, it is the third seminar in which we are going to be talking about Hinduism. We are going to be talking about the relationship between Japan and India and specifically focusing on Gandhi's thoughts and works.

We have as speakers from India His Excellency Ambassador Kishan Rana and Dr. Kamla Chowdhry. From Japan we have asked Dr. Daisaburo Hashizume to act as a moderator. We also have with us Prof. Kenichi Matsumoto, Dr. Nobuko Nagasaki and Dr. Yasuaki Nara as speakers from Japan.

I would like to call upon Dr. Seki, the Executive Director of the Sasakawa Peace Foundation, to give us the opening words.

Dr. Akinori Seki, Executive Director of the Sasakawa Peace Foundation:

Good morning, my name is Seki from the Sasakawa Peace Foundation. I would like to thank you for joining us this morning, and in particular those who have come a long way from India.

The Sasakawa Peace Foundation has felt since the September 11 incident that there was not much understanding of the cultures and religion of Hinduism and Islam. We realized that we knew very little of these things and this a very simple but important motive for starting this series of seminars. We felt that it was of paramount importance of exposing ourselves to other civilizations, other culture and that in starting a new era, we owed it to each other to understand each other and to be more sympathetic to each other's civilizations and that was the start of our seminars.

This is the fourth dialogue of this year and in 2002 we celebrated between India and Japan the 50th anniversary of the start of diplomatic relations. We had the support of the Indian Embassy of Japan and we focused on Japan and Indian relations and Hinduism. On a personal note, last week I was in Amman Jordan with the Arab League leaders. Some people came up from South Africa and we discussed the attack on Iraq and the conflict between Israel and Palestine. We of course did not come up with any conclusions, but what was considered important is that we need to understand that we are different, that we will respect those differences and that we will find ways to live together and that we need to have an environment that will allow coexistence among different peoples. In that sense, our seminars share a great deal by mutually understanding different civilizations, different cultures and to respect different value systems. On that basis we can build important and new relations in society so that we can live together.

I would like to ask Dr. Hashizume to take the floor and moderate.

A Message of Congratulation

Dr. Hashizume: I would like to call upon Dr. Seth, the Ambassador of India to say a few words.

His Excellency Dr. Aftab Seth, Ambassador of India:

This is the third in the series of lectures organized by the Sasakawa Foundation and I wish to place on record my sense of gratitude for the great efforts that the Foundation has made to convey to our Japanese friends the spirit of Indian civilization in its many manifestations.

Today, we have lectures on the thought and influence of Gandhi with special emphasis on the environment and on the foundations of Indian Foreign Policy in the context of India's civilizational traditions.

We have distinguished speakers from India whom I have had the privilege of knowing for several decades. I am sure, they will share with you words of great wisdom and, therefore, I will restrict myself to making a few introductory remarks.

I must have been about 4 or 5 years old when I saw Gandhi for the first and last time, for shortly afterwards he was assassinated. The occasion was a prayer meeting in a wide-open space, in my hometown, Patna, in Eastern India not far from where Buddha, was born. The wide-open space is now called Gandhi Maidan—or Gandhi gardens. I only remember vaguely, the sight of a frail, toothless old man, surrounded by a sea of people, of all ages and classes—listening in relative silence, I say relative, because Indian crowds are traditionally noisy, standing or sitting in silence, hanging on to the words emerging from the lips of this saintly man, who in his lifetime had been named by Tagore—The Nobel Laureate and universalist.

The Mahatma or “Great Soul”

Many years later, as a student, I read some of Gandhi's works and many other books about him, and his everlasting contributions to the cause of universal human rights, peace and freedom and about his role as the “Father of my Nation”, the leader of our non-violent Independence movement, that brought the mightiest Empire the world had ever seen to its knees, without firing a single bullet. I read all this and conjured up visions of the man that I had seen as a small boy, images that had grown dim over the years.

And then something dramatic happened that brought Gandhi on to the radar screens of many people in the world and to me too in a very personal way, and I refer to Richard Attenborough's splendid film on Gandhi, in which my brother Roshan played the part of Gandhi's closest disciple and India's first Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru.

I was Consul General of India in Hamburg, Germany in the early 80's, when I was invited by Richard Attenborough to attend the premiere of the German version of the film. I shall never forget the audio visual impact of the opening scenes of the film, quoting words of Albert Einstein, which, if my memory serves me right went something like this: “generations to come will scarce believe, that one such as this, in flesh and blood, walked upon the face of this earth.”

How true this is: for Gandhi, like other great saints and teachers, Jesus Christ and Gautama Buddha, was a perfect example of a Karmayogi, a man who did

his duty unflinchingly, without any thought of reward or personal gain, and without any fear of his adversaries. History has some shining examples of Karmayogi in the lives and work of Buddha, Jesus Christ and Gandhi. This concept of Karmayogi is very close to the Japanese '*Bushido*', which emphasizes the same spirit of sacrifice and deep devotion to duty. In Buddha's case, the adversary was the Brahmin Priesthood; in the case of Christ, the Jewish Priests in the temples of Jerusalem; in Gandhi's case, the batons and bullets of the apartheid regime in South Africa and the colonial British in India. True to the spirit of *Bushido* which as I said bears strong resemblance to the philosophy of the Karmayogi—Gandhi said “What I have done will endure, not what I have said or written.” This is the essence of the philosophy of Karma that it is one's deeds that determine one's spiritual future and indeed in Gandhi's case, his spiritual legacy.

Gandhi was above all a human rights activist and a diplomatist in the true sense of the world with a global vision, for he was not concerned with the problems merely of India, but also the downtrodden, the dispossessed and the exploited, throughout the world, whether they were Cornish miners in the UK, or blacks in South Africa or the USA, or peasants in Stalin's communist gulag, or Jews in Hitler's Germany, or the oppressed classes in India. Anything that was undemocratic, intolerant, or violent was a worthy adversary for Gandhi. And he fought his battle on the basis of some fundamental principles; firstly his strength came from his firm belief in the fallibility of man. I quote “I believe that all the great religions of the world are true more or less. I say ‘more or less’ because I believe that everything that the human hand touches, by reason of the very fact that human beings are imperfect, becomes imperfect.” So it was this belief in man's fallibility that underlay Gandhi's life long struggle to encourage tolerance. He said, “I do not share the belief that there can, or will be on earth one religion. I am striving, therefore, to find a common factor and to induce mutual tolerance.” Like all great humanists, universalists and true democrats, Gandhi celebrated human diversity in language, culture and religion, but strove nevertheless to find unifying bonding factors, that expressed the underlying common heritage of all humanity.

Another equally vital ingredient in Gandhi's diplomacy and his struggle for human rights was his non-violence. In the mould of Buddha and Christ, Gandhi said “we can only win over the opponent by love, never by hate. Hate is the subtlest form of violence. Hatred injures the hater never the hated.” This was the basis of his philosophy of *Satyagraha*, or non-violent peaceful resistance to injustice through civil disobedience. As Gandhi said “they may torture my body, break my bones, even kill me, then they will have my dead body, not by obedience.”

The other important dimension of Gandhi's non-violence and diplomacy is that it was imbued with a strong sense of strength and spiritual power. Gandhi said, “I am not pleading for India to practice non-violence because she is weak. I want her to practice non-violence being conscious of her strength and power.” So strong was this belief in non-violence as a positive force that Gandhi, the great apostle of peace, allowed this important exception; he said, “where there is only a choice between cowardice and violence, I advise violence.”

But Gandhi the gentle soul, even though he was utterly determined, could never be really dogmatic as he said, “the very insistence on truth has taught me the beauty of compromise.” That was the essence of his civil disobedience movement, to hate the evil, not the perpetrator of evil, to hate the injustice not the unjust person and to try and win over the adversary by love, and ‘compromise.’

Of equal importance in Gandhi's universal campaign for human rights and human freedom was his merciful and forgiving spirit. Like Buddha and Christ, Gandhi said "I believe in the message of truth delivered by all the religions of the world and it is my constant prayer that I may never have a feeling of anger against my traducers, that even if I fall victim to an assassin's bullet, I may deliver up my soul with the remembrance of God upon my lips." As it happens, Gandhi's last words as he lay shot through the heart and bleeding to death, were '*Hey Ram*'—'O God'.

Gandhi was also a great environmentalist. He, like the other great sage, Tagore, who as I said named Gandhi "Mahatma" or great soul, firmly believed in the essential unity of all natural and living phenomena. Interestingly, when Tagore visited Japan, shortly after getting the Nobel Prize for Literature, in 1913, he found an echo of his noblest thought and love of beauty in the civilization that he witnessed. Gandhi was also a great lover of beauty in nature, both human and non-human. As he said, "we have been taught to believe that what is beautiful need not be useful and what is useful cannot be beautiful. I want to say that what is useful can also be beautiful." Tagore's view of the unity of all living and non-living matter is beautifully put in his own words and I quote "the same stream of life that runs through my veins, night and day, runs through the world and dances in rhythmic measures. It is the same life that shoots in joy through the dust and the earth in numberless blades of grass and breaks into tumultuous waves of leaves and flowers." Both Gandhi and Tagore wanted human beings to love and protect nature and to live in total harmony with it. As Gandhi said, "I venture to suggest that it is a fundamental law of nature without exception, that nature produces enough for our wants from day-to-day and if only everybody took enough for himself and nothing more, there would be no pauperism in this world, there would be no man dying of starvation in this world. Nature provides enough for man's needs not for his greed." So, Gandhi saw clearly the inherent dangers in over-exploiting natural resources, in adhering to the belief that man was somehow superior to nature and therefore, had to conquer it rather than live in peace and harmony with it.

My friend and senior colleague Ambassador Rana will be talking about the civilizational mainsprings of foreign policy but I thought I ought to mention that it was the philosophy of Mahatma Gandhi and those from whom he took inspiration like Jesus Christ and Buddha, that had a profound influence on India's democratic leadership which brought India to Independence under the guidance of India's first Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru. Much of what Nehru espoused and tried to put into practice through non-violence and through the vigorous pursuit of universal peace and disarmament in the early years of our Independence, was the result of his tutelage under his spiritual and political mentor, Mahatma Gandhi.

As we face the multi-pronged dangers of environmental degradation resulting in global warming and violent changes in climatic patterns, and as we face the rising tide of mindless terrorism, a type of violence that is supposedly provoked by some form of injustice but which, in fact, is a negation of all civilized norms of behavior; as we face all these dangers and problems, let us reflect seriously on the profound wisdom of our forefathers, of whom Mahatma Gandhi is truly one of the greatest.

Part 1
Gandhi's Thought in Indian Civilization

Indian Foreign Policy—A Mirror for Its Heritage and Civilization

Lecturer: Ambassador Kishan Rana

Gandhi's Thought and Its Relevance for Contemporary Environmental Issue

Lecturer: Dr. Kamla Chowdhry

Chairman: Dr. Daisaburo Hashizume

Dr. Hashizume: It gives me great pleasure to moderate today's session. This is the 4th of our Civilization Dialogue. Now, I would like to call upon His Excellency Ambassador Kishan Rana.



Ambassador Rana: Thank you very much, Dr. Hashizume, distinguished personalities on the podiums, friends. It is a great honor to appear here at the invitation of the Sasakawa Peace Foundation. I am a relative stranger to Japan. I have only been here once before so forgive me if I show ignorance of Japan. Ambassador Seth has made my task very easier because of the profound manner in which he has spoken of Gandhi and Gandhi's connections to the world at large, the issues of the environment and

to life in its complete sense.

Let me say at the outset that the content of my talk is slightly at odds with the title of the session. If I am honest, I have to confess that some of the practice of India's foreign policy, especially nuclear weapons policy, it would seem that India has moved quite far from the values that Gandhi espoused. But saying that, I would hasten to add that Gandhi was not an absolute pacifist. Ambassador Seth gave the relevant references and the quotations which showed, shall we say, Gandhi's pragmatism and stress on relative aspects of what we would call the context in which a challenge is posed.

The notion of self defense and armed struggle was not alien to Gandhi. There was always a strong streak of pragmatism and practicality in his actions. For example, during the Boer War, he actively helped mobilize Indians to join the war effort. Similarly, during the First World War, he helped to organize and ambulance unit and was awarded a British medal for that effort, a medal which he renounced later on. We should also remember that at the height of World War II, Gandhi took the stand that only a free India could participate in that war. So there was a great deal of relativism to Gandhi's values and as Ambassador Seth stressed, Gandhi said that his actions were his message, not so much his words.

Let me go straight into the issue of foreign policy. I would like to begin by saying that at the start of India's independence movement, around the year 1900, India showed a strong interest in the external environment. It saw the interconnections between India's struggle for freedom and the colonial oppression that took place elsewhere. It was partly because of Gandhi's experiences in South Africa. It was also partly because of the fact that Indians taken to foreign countries, as indentured labor to work on sugar plantations and building railways, were also victims of colonial oppression.

Gandhi's global outlook also contributed to this strong idealism. But I want to stress that this outward perspective, this constant awareness that India's struggle was part of a global movement, was also part of India's universalist values, its heritage, culture and history. I shall offer some examples of this in a moment. In the the post-independence period, right up to the time of the shock of the border clash between India and China in 1962, this stress on external engagement continued within India. But after 1962, there was a relative shift from political issues to international economic issues. I submit that it was a relative shift.

The decades of 60s and 70s was a time when India was deeply engaged, along with other countries, like the G-77, that broad movement of developing

countries for a more fair share of the world's economy. But in the end, that entire effort to gain a place at the high-table of world economic decision making produced frustration and disenchantment. India tried, for example, to join the dialogue of the G7.



You will remember the meeting of the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) in Belgrade in 1988 established a new forum, which was called the G-15. The G-15 represented a leadership of developing countries, of Non Aligned countries that tried to enter into dialogue with the G7. I happened to be India's envoy to Germany at the time and I witnessed how that particular effort to joined the dialogue was unproductive.

Around the time the Cold War ended, when the Soviet Union collapsed, a series of changes occurred within India which are broadly summed up in the phrase 'the launch of economic reform which began in 1991.' In many ways this marks a turning point in the ways India approached the world. We moved from a policy of idealism to a stronger policy of realism. We moved to a policy more attuned to the pursuit of self interest rather than the use of idealistic jargon or terminology. But even in doing this, I should stress that, in fact, India remained true to a universal vision of the world which is very much part of India's heritage and culture.

I propose to speak on four broad themes. First, on India's self image as a civilization. Second, on the external dimensions of cultural plurality as a basic aspect of India's foreign policy. Third, India's internationalism and its commitment to the United Nations and its utilization of sophisticated tools of diplomacy. Fourth, India's nuclear policy; this latter complex subject deserves to be addressed because it is better to speak of it in an open manner than to pretend it does not exist.

Let me begin with the first point, India's self image as a civilization. As Ambassador Seth very eloquently elaborated, the inner concept of Buddhism, Hinduism, and I would submit, of almost all the religions that have grown out of Asia has been one of plurality, in the sense of accepting multiple paths to the higher being or self-realization. This is perhaps a common characteristic of those religions not established by prophets. Thus, we can draw a distinction between Asian religions and those religions that in their formation, had a prophet, be it Abraham, Jesus Christ or Mohammed. There is no notion in Asian religions that we are children of *The Book*. There is no single doctrine that completely unifies any of our religions. We have religious books, of knowledge, of learning, of teachings but none of them are exclusive doctrines.

Sikhism, a religion that came into existence 400 years ago, does have a book, the *Sri Guru Granth Sahib*. In fact, in the center of a Sikh temple, one finds this book and people bow their heads and touch the floor in front of it. But even in Sikhism, there is a sense of universalism; there is a notion that apart from Sikhism, there are other paths which are equally acceptable. In fact, half of the book deals with the concepts of the *Ramayana* and it accepts the *Ramayana* as the source of much wisdom. And the Sikh will as much go to a Hindu temple as a Hindu will go to a Sikh temple. This again makes my point about the universality of values.

As I began by saying, I do not knew too much about Japan. I am a student of China, but it seems to me that both China and Japan pursue relative paths. There is no one central religious doctrine that excludes others.

Prof. Samuel Huntington is a person of whom we have all heard. Many of us do not particularly like the doctrine he preaches, but Huntington forces us to focus on religion and culture and that is good. He is perhaps wrong in articulating the notion that religion is the source of division and conflict in the world today. As Amartya Sen, the Nobel Laureate says, we all have multiple identities; we are not people with one single dimension and therefore, while religion is important to us, we have many other values we also project. Therefore, an exclusive reliance on the Huntington doctrine, almost creates a self fulfilling prophecy, that we are bound to be divided if we only think in terms of differences of religions. It is far better to think in terms of other universal values and that is exactly the point that the Executive Director of the Foundation made in his opening remarks.

India is a country that has never carried out conquests abroad. If anything, there was the notion in Sanskrit of "*Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam*," the notion that the world is our family. This again is part of universal values. Perhaps the best example is the doctrine of Panchsheel, the doctrine that India and China put forward in the modern way in 1954. Perhaps we need to revisit and reframe the doctrine of Panchsheel to make it relevant to today's world. We need to rediscover a way of projecting this notion of peaceful coexistence among nations.

Let me go on to my second theme, the international dimension of plurality. From the start, India practiced some of these values. Consider the Asian Relations Conference that met in Delhi in March–April 1946. At its inauguration Nehru said: "An Indian, wherever he may go in Asia, feels a kinship with the land he visits and the people he meets. For too long, we in Asia have been petitioners in Western courts and chanceries. That story must now belong to the past. We are prepared to stand on our own feet and cooperate with all others who are prepared to cooperate with us. But we do not intend to be a plaything of others." This concept remained the central theme of India's foreign policy, but unfortunately India's focus did not remain on Asia.

Let me turn to the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM). Speaking at the Constituent Assembly which framed our constitution in March 1948, Nehru described this policy saying: "it is not wise to put all our eggs in one basket. Our policy from, the viewpoint of opportunism if you like, is a straightforward honest policy. An independent policy is best."

For Nehru, non-alignment was not a doctrine but a technique to be tested by results. A few years later, non-alignment developed into a movement. So non-alignment became NAM at the hands of Nehru, Nasser and Tito. Even in this NAM, India resisted the notion of pursuing one single set of policies and India opposed the creation of a permanent NAM secretariat which would have turned the movement into a bloc. But the fact is that between 1960 and 1990, the NAM almost became a block.

After 1991, NAM and G-77 have returned to their roots, simply as groupings of developing countries that have certain common concerns and want to do some things together. So the NAM and G-77 have abandoned some of the unproductive practices that they pursued in those 30 years, and we are back to a more universal approach to foreign policy.

Let me turn to the way in which India has reshaped its relations with the rest of the world since 1991, in what I call our normal foreign policy period. We have come back to giving a strong focus to Asia policy. ASEAN is a high priority. With China, complicated border differences have been put on a back burner, put aside while we build mutual confidence. Two way trade between India and China is now at

a level of \$5 billion, over 30 times its level 11 years ago, and it now grows each year at the rate of 35 percent.

Today, India's relationship with the US is transformed. We have a better quality of relationships than at any time since independence. In fact, the political understanding is excellent and the challenge is to build a level of economic exchange that will match this. Our international system currently shows a kind of hybrid character. The US is a hyper power with extraordinary power in military terms, but in the economic arena, in technology and in all the other attributes of soft power, there is a plurality of major actors. It makes sense for India, as it does for each country, to build a set of productive relationships which serves our larger purposes.

Let me say a word about South Asia and Pakistan. In our own neighborhood, our foreign policy has not worked very well. The dispute over Kashmir is a central issue. Pakistan regards this as a precondition to the settlement of all issues in the relationship whereas India believes the root problem in Kashmir is Pakistan's sponsorship of terrorism which continues, despite the assurances which that country gives to the United States, to India and to the rest of the world.

Every initiative that India takes to build mutual confidence lies blocked, whether it is trade, people-to-people contacts, cultural ties or whatever. It seems that Pakistan's self-image as the homeland of Muslims of South Asia is in direct opposition to India's secular image as a multi-cultural, multi-religious state, which incidentally is also home to 140 million Muslims.

It is for you to judge as to which of these is a more modern vision of the nation, and it is for you to judge as to which is more appropriate to the promotion of peace and understanding. I personally believe that India has no choice but to deal with the problems of terrorism. At the same time India should put a little bit aside the current strong focus on Pakistan, and go on to build productive relations with the rest of the world. And this is what is actually happening in South Asia where new relationships are being attempted with Sri Lanka, Nepal, Bangladesh, Bhutan and the other states. We are also building new cross regional linkages with ASEAN, with Myanmar, with Thailand and with the Mekong River countries.

Let me move on to my third theme, internationalism. Internationalism has been central to India. Back in the early 1940s, when Nehru was an involuntary guest of Britain in its jails, he wrote: "There is something unique about the continuity of a cultural tradition through 5,000 years of history. India with her intense sense of identity this is even more so. Nevertheless, India has great faith in the acceptance of international interaction, coordination, and even to some extent the subordination of the independent state to a global organization." This is a remarkably prescient statement. He is almost able to see the future and to see that state sovereignty has to be put aside to serve the global community. This is exactly what we mean by globalization and international commitments. This too is part of the Indian heritage.

Let me go on to my fourth theme, that of India's nuclear policy. We have to understand the context as to why India, which was so opposed to nuclear weapons when they first appeared, has gone on to become a nuclear power. India championed the cause of nuclear disarmament, advocating an end to all nuclear tests up to and beyond the first Chinese nuclear tests of 1964. That argument fell on deaf ears. India opted to stay out of the NPT in 1968 on the grounds that it discriminated between states that possessed nuclear weapons and those that did not. Despite this, India's peaceful nuclear programs came under restrictions under the NPT.

In 1974, India exploded, what India then called a "peaceful nuclear device", although you may not agree with the word peaceful. After that single test it stopped,

and did not go on to develop nuclear weapons. But even this self-restraint was not recognized. Finally, taking into the account of a the development of a clandestine weapon program in Pakistan, India carried out its nuclear weapon test in 1998 and at the same time, announced it would carry out no further tests and that it would practice a no first use policy.

We should recognize that India is not under the security umbrella any nuclear weapons power. In the world in which we live, India came to the determination that it must have a credible minimum deterrence, not a continuing weapons program. At the same time India has consistently upheld and practiced all the non-proliferation regimes and controls even when it is not a member of those control regimes. This is an act of responsibility. India also remains committed to the Rajiv Gandhi proposals of 1988 for the complete elimination of all nuclear weapons, provided that the plan is accepted by all states. It is in these circumstances that India felt compelled to develop nuclear weapons.

Let me finally turn to the question of bilateral relations. India and Japan have enjoyed friendly ties. We swiftly put aside the legacy of World War II and beginning with the 1980s, Japan became India's aid largest donor. But to be honest, we have not moved beyond a formalism. As one scholar said, it is a "low intensity relationship". I think we should be concerned as to why it must remain that way. I offer two examples.

In 1999, a German management company carried out a survey of top Indian CEOs and I was an adviser to this. We found something surprising. In the view of these CEOs, Japan and Russia were the two countries that were the most difficult for them to do business. We were astonished to find that Japan was seen this way. We may not like it, but we need to reflect on their opinion.

My second example relates to the "eminent persons group" (EPG) we now have between India and Japan. This is group of non-official senior personalities who advise the two governments on how to improve the relationship. When I was in Germany, I was involved in a similar German group which has been enormously successful. The success formula of such a group was that it had a clear mandate, to come out with concrete practical suggestions on how to develop the relationship. I submit that between India and Japan, we have the obligation to find a way to develop a similar formula for a result-oriented mutually beneficial relationship that allows us to move forward.

In conclusion, let me say that I have come directly from the annual conference of the International Studies Association held in Portland Oregon. The new president of this Association, Professor Steve Smith, spoke in words evocative of the language the Executive Director used at the beginning of this session. He said that in the study of international affairs there has been too much emphasis on rationality, and too little on understanding. I want to applaud if I may, the Sasakawa Peace Foundation for organizing this event. It is precisely what we need for understanding each other.

Dr. Kamla Chowdhry: I am grateful to the Sasakawa Peace Foundation for the invitation to share my views. I believe that Japan is likely to play an important role in the 21st century because it shares a culture of peace and spirituality, as also the technology of the western world. Therefore, I think Japan can provide the leadership because of its achievements based on its culture, ethics and technology. I am going to start with the concept of what we mean by progress.

The 21st century has been applauded as a great century for achieving great scientific and technological improvements, a century in which we landed a man on the moon, a century in which communication technologies have changed the concepts of time and space, and a century, which has led to globalization. On the other hand, it has also been a century of nuclear bombs, of world wars, of land mines, and other technologies of destruction, as also the widening gaps between rich and poor, and the collapse of the earth's ecosystems. The so-called progress has raised serious questions concerning the future survival of mankind and the Earth itself.



The scientists are warning us that if we do not change our ways, civilization as we know it will not survive. There are daily reports of rising temperatures, rising carbon dioxide, disappearing species and so on. It is important that we realize our murderous ways of achieving progress and

hopefully move away from such progress before it is too late.

As early as 1908, Gandhi questioned the direction in which western civilization was heading—that is, towards greater violence, greater inequities and an economy based on the destruction of natural resources. His arguments were largely based on his concepts of what constitutes a good life and a good society, and his great concern for the poor of the world. The production and consumption of more and more goods, considered as a sign of progress, was evil said Gandhi.

Real progress is that mode of conduct that points out to man what duty should be. Gandhi believed that western civilization, if it continued in its present, would be self-destroyed. The scientists too are now saying the same thing. Paul Ehrlich, the ecologist, also is saying that some is seriously wrong with our progress but if we wait for the full-scale catastrophe, we may not survive. We cannot solve the problems of keeping the planet inhabitable with our old ways of being racist, xenophobic and with greater inequality. We have got to bring the world together so that everyone can work for the survival of the earth and mankind. Wolfgang Sachs, writing on development, also says “the time is ripe to write its obituary. Disappointment, disillusionment, failures and crimes have been the steady companions of development and tell a common story—it did not work.”

Edward Goldsmith too identifies western civilization as the root cause of today's social and ecological problems and is asking for a fundamental reappraisal of western development thinking. Like Gandhi, Goldsmith sees the solution of ecological security in de-industrializing society. And that we face the unacceptable conclusion that our problems can only be solved by reversing these decisions for which there is no alternative. The Worldwatch Institute gives the same message, that “we have fewer than 10 years to turn things around or civilization as we know it will cease to exist.” Looking back in history, it is clear that the great progress in the West has its roots in colonialism, in the philosophy of survival of the fittest, in the arrogant and violent use of power and the piracy of wealth and resources. With unlimited control over nature, the western man began playing god and playing god had its own cruel consequences.

For example, the Indians and the indigenous Americans regard all nature as sacred. I am sure there must be movements in Japan that regard nature as sacred

because you have preserved nature more beautifully than many other countries have. The modern man, like his colonial predecessor, has ruthlessly used natural resources for his economic benefits. Modern science is now recognizing the importance of forests and the role they play in regulating the temperature of the Earth. Forests, which nourished and protected most of terrestrial life now lie in tatters, slashed by timber interests, corporate agriculture, suburban sprawl and plain human greed and carelessness.

In India, when the British came, we had a forest cover of 75 million hectares. The forest cover now is less than 20 million hectares. A study of the World Resources Institute shows that 76 countries have cut all their ancient forests, while 11 other countries have less than five percent of their forests left. In the USA, at least 90 per cent of their forests have been logged at least once, driving many plant and insect and animal species to extinction. Indigenous cultures on the other hand, had a spirituality that meant an intimate and sacred relationship with nature.

In 1854 when Washington was pressuring Chief Seattle to sell his land, he replied in great anguish, "How can you buy or sell the sky, the warmth of the land? The idea is strange to us. How do you own the freshness of the air? Every part of the earth is sacred to my people. Every shining pine needle, every sandy shore, every mist in the dark woods, every clearing, every humming insect is holy in the memory and experience of my people." There is concern and compassion, a sense of gratefulness in these sayings. But the modern man's belief system is based on domination and control of nature. Paul Hawken said given current corporate practices, not one wildlife reserve, wilderness, or indigenous culture would survive the market economy. We know that ever-living natural system on the planet is disintegrating before our eyes. The land, the water, the air and the sea have been transformed into repositories of waste and if I may add, of death.

The sacred relationship that we had with nature has been replaced with a new violence, a new colonialism and a new barbaric control of nature. In scientific experiments that we conduct to lengthen life for the so-called benefit of humans, 65 million animals are killed in the USA in one year. The scientists say the ends justify the means, but Gandhi said that if one takes care of the means, the ends would take care of themselves. Gandhi rejected violence because he said that even when it appears to do good, the good is temporary, the evil is permanent.

Here is an example of economic benefit, as well as of playing God by Japan itself. Japan has developed a drift net technology to catch squid in the high seas. A single net stretches out 50 kilometers wide and 10 kilometers deep. The technology is an indiscriminate killer of every form of life caught in it. Other countries are following suit. The idea of the drift net and the resulting carnage has spread widely in the world. The UN tried to stop this carnage by passing a resolution banning drift nets but the resolution has largely been ignored.

Furthermore, green house gases, an essential output of our modern lifestyle, leads to climate change. Scientists have pointed out that if we do not take rapid action, we may be faced with the greatest catastrophe in human history. Acid rain is also a gift of death from the US to Canada; Great Britain to Norway; from Germany to its neighbors. The adoption of western economic and development model globally had meant the certain death of ecosystems and of the Earth itself. It is imperative to transform our ways of life so that the Earth is saved from man's greed and murderous ways.

The MIT scientists in 1971 produced a book called *Limits to Growth* but nobody took any action. Unfortunately the warning signals of MIT and other studies

have been ignored. And yet another scientific study is now underway with the objective of doing something. The first phase sponsored by the UN and others has cost four million dollars and another 20 million is being invested. Eugene Linden commenting on this study, wrote "The UN has a reputation for studying a problem as a substitute for doing something about it." In the hope of moving the world toward some agreed action, the UN did organize two World Summits, in Rio and Johannesburg. At the end of the Rio Summit, Agenda 21 emerged. The hope was the world would move closer to ecological sustainability. Unfortunately, these hopes remained unfulfilled. At the Johannesburg Summit, 90 percent of the people I met thought no progress was being made.

What does Gandhi mean by saying on these issues? At the beginning of the new millennium, I think it is important to listen to the voice of Gandhi. Almost a century ago, Gandhi questioned the very foundations of Western civilization, its industrial growth and materialism. He emphasized that if we wished to protect the Earth we will have to change our worldview and its paradigm of domination and perpetual growth and focus more on sustainability and spirituality in life.

Slowly, but increasingly, scientists and economists too are realizing that development is a concept that encompasses both the spiritual and the material aspects of life. Personal transformation must go hand in hand with social change and be woven in the fabric of development. Progress must include, as Mahatma Gandhi pointed out, social justice, a sense of community, a sense of the sacredness and spirituality of life. Gandhi did not wish to follow the path of Western civilization. He said, "the incessant search for material comforts and their multiplication is such an evil. I make bold to say that the Europeans themselves will one day have to remodel their outlook if they are not to perish under the weight of the comforts to which are becoming slaves. For India to run after the Golden Fleece is to court certain death."

Gandhi said, "I shall work for an India in which the poorest shall feel that it is their country, in whose making they have an effective voice, and an India in which there is no high class and low class of people. Should not this vision be of the UN's as well?"

Gandhi's great ambition was to wipe every tear from every eye. The life of millions was Gandhi's religion, his politics and economics. He wanted to see that the poor had the basic necessities of life even though we may have to sacrifice the toys of civilization.

Toynbee the great historian has suggested that most civilizations had died 200 years before they realized that they died. So where should we start? I believe Gandhi's answer would have been a concern for the poorest of the poor and an emphasis on truth and non-violence. He adopted a lifestyle, which reflected his constituency. Direct personal action was one of the keynotes of his teachings. Help all you can on the big things but do some little thing yourself.

The UN has organized World Summits but we need to learn from Gandhi's experience how to transform your opponents into your partners. Gandhi practiced what he preached. If he was concerned about the poorest of the poor he adopted the same life style. To achieve ecological security, we will need to develop an inner spiritual strength. As Radhakrishnan pointed out on Gandhi's 100th birth anniversary, his voice is the voice of the age to come. Gandhi is the symbol of love and understanding in a world wild with hatred and misunderstandings. He belongs to the ages, to history!

Dr. Hashizume: We collected some comments from the presenters but it will take some time. So I'd like to start the session with my questions. To Ambassador Rana, Gandhi in Japan is taken to be the perfect non-violent activist. I believe this is very important. We can analyze this aspect through the Gandhi window so to speak. So the question is, regarding Gandhi's philosophy, whether he was an idealist or pragmatist?

Ambassador Rana: I would like to thank Professor Hashizume for asking the most difficult question one can face on this subject. I don't know truthfully how Gandhi would have reacted to the India of today. As you know when India became independent, Gandhi did not play a role in the formation of the government. He is believed to have giving grudging acceptance for India to respond to the attack in Kashmir. So the first armed conflict took place between India and Pakistan in the first days of independence. And Gandhi is believed to have given tacit acceptance of that. Gandhi was both an idealist and a politician. It is debatable how Gandhi's method of non violent resistance to Great Britain would have worked if the dominant power in India were France or Portugal, because he astutely used the British sense of fair play against the British.

I doubt if Gandhi would have rationalized or accepted India's development of nuclear weapons. But equally I have to say it is very hard to practice a policy as a state while living up to those values. I will offer the simple example of what happened after India carried out its nuclear tests. India and the US carried out the most intensive bilateral dialogue between Strobe Talbott and Jaswant Singh in nine formal sessions. An India that had found itself being closed out from various bits of international activity, whether APEC or ASEM, found that its presence was valued a little more in its shape a highly responsible nuclear power. Its relationship with other countries has undergone a qualitative change for the better. In the world in which we live, a country seeking its self interest and for a better world, in that sense I think India was left with no choice.

I am not sure Gandhi would have approved and whether today's India does not live up to Gandhi's ideals. In a large way it does not.

Question to Dr. Chowdhry: In your presentation, you touched upon Gandhi's thought and the relationship between industrialization and Gandhi's philosophy. Of course, the economic strategy to self British products to India, he used homespun to protest. At the same time, India faced poverty and at the same time, poverty is violence and causes violence. How India at the time, after it achieved industrialization, it was going to handle the environmental aspect? What kind of lesson could we learn from the teachings of Gandhi?

Dr. Chowdhry: When India was close to its independence, Gandhi wrote a letter to Nehru, he wrote a letter saying now, "I have named you as my heir and we are close to independence, I want to talk to you about development." He said to Nehru, "yes." Gandhi and Nehru agreed that they needed to have enough food and clothing for everybody. After that, there were large differences. Gandhi said, "we want to start with villages." Nehru said "how can we start with villages, they are poor and the people are not so bright." Nehru was influenced by the west a great deal. He wanted industrialization and science and technology.

Gandhi had a way of reaching Nehru's heart. They always started with different points of views. As you know, Gandhi was shot down in 1949 and he had little influence on India's development process.

We have not been able to rehabilitate the direction of development. If our first priority was to see that poverty was abolished, then the road that one had to choose was a different road but we have not chosen that road.

Dr. Hashizume: Professor Matsumoto has just arrived so let me introduce him. Also, let me ask the Japanese panelists to ask some questions.

Question from panelist: At the end, Mr. Ambassador, you mentioned the Kashmir issue. You said that the main reason was that the people in Pakistan were the cause of the conflict but when I look at it from the historical point of view, India and Pakistan were British territories but then they became separate in 1949. It seems like your two countries could get along very well. East and West Germany were separated, the Koreas were split. But, regarding India and Pakistan, from that perspective, I feel that sort of rapprochement is not very visible. Is there any way your countries can become friends again? If you give a certain amount of sovereignty to Kashmir, or of the area could become a confederation or if you could have something of a layered sovereignty? Could you expand on that?

Ambassador Rana: If you look at India and Pakistan, and I have tried to be objective, there are two broad narratives. Pakistan came into existence on the basis that the Muslims of South Asia had to have their own homeland. The British did not invent the demand but they encouraged it because it was logical to resist an independence movement through divide and rule. East Pakistan spoke languages that were different and had a distinctive culture as well, and it eventually became independent of Pakistan, as Bangladesh.

Today, what India craves is a step-by-step approach to building mutual confidence. This is the normal, classic way of resolving problems. That is what India and China are doing today. It is what the Soviet bloc and the West attempted. India has repeatedly proposed to Pakistan visits of divided families, exchanges of scholars. As you rightly say, our cultures are very close. The music is the same, the dance is the same.

There is a degree of coming together, and a basic affinity that you have to see to believe. But then why are we faced with this kind of divide? It is not natural. I come back to my story of the narratives. Either there is a notion of a Muslim homeland on the Pakistan side, or a narrative of multiple pluralities in India. For us in India, there is a cultural sense of unity that holds us together. The India of today was never one single political entity in the past. Some in Britain said: "we made India, so if we leave, India will collapse." But India has refused to collapse.

It is quite easy to propose, and it is even logical to propose a layered sovereignty in Kashmir. The problem is that the other identities is a country of multiple pluralities. How can we begin the process of further divisions of India? If we do that it may make the Balkans look like a picnic. If we begin the process begins, how does it stop?

There is today a kind of partition along the line of control. Make it a border, but make it a porous border. But that can only happen if we follow a step-by-step approach. Both India and Pakistan are members of the WTO. They are obliged to give

each other MFN status. India gives MFN status to Pakistan but Pakistan says: “no trade with India until Kashmir is resolved.”

Which of the narratives is the correct one? The narrative of plurality or the narrative of the assertion of a dominating religious identity? There is a political problem in Kashmir, I accept that. But it is greatly made worse by the entry of non-Kashmiris who enter and carry out acts of violence. That kind of terrorism is no longer acceptable after 9/11. Pakistan accepts some of that logic. Some of the terrorists of al-Qaeda are being apprehended there. But let us apply the same approach to Kashmir.

Dialogue has to take place, but not on the basis of pointing a gun at you, and shooting at you, and demanding that you talk. How can I talk until you put down the gun?

Part2

Modernization of Japan and Indian Civilization

Chandra Bose's 'Indian National Army' and Mahatma Gandhi's 'Cotton Spindle'

Lecturer: Prof. Kenichi Matsumoto

Mahatma Gandhi and Civilization Dialogue

Lecturer: Dr. Nobuko Nagasaki

Chairman: Dr. Daisaburo Hashizume

Dr. Hashizume: We have Professor Matsumoto and Dr. Nagasaki who will be reporting to us. Professor Kenichi Matsumoto will be speaking to us on Chandra Bose's 'Indian National Army' and Mahatma Gandhi's 'cotton spindle.' Professor Matsumoto, the microphone is yours.

Professor Matsumoto: The topic I would like to talk about is Chandra Bose's 'Indian National Army' and Gandhi's 'cotton spindle.' Dr. Nagasaki has written books on these already and for me to speak in front of her is a little bit of a challenge for me.

In the dialogue with Hinduism, I did touch upon Mahatma Gandhi when I spoke. Last year, we celebrated the 30th anniversary of the reestablishment of Chinese-Japanese diplomatic relations so it was a big year for Japan. 13,000 people went to China to celebrate the revival. However, last year was also the 50th anniversary of opening of diplomatic relations with India but that hardly became news in Japan and the government hardly did anything to celebrate it. Why is that?

I think that from World War II up to the bubble economy period, we measured every country by their economies and we were really focusing on the economy. From that point of view, we cannot ignore China and they are really a threat to Japan. That is also a stand that the Japanese government takes. Against that, when we look at economic relationship with India, I think it stands lower in interest compared with China or the ASEAN countries. This is very much a critical issue.



As we are celebrating the 50th anniversary, there was only one little event and that was to have the Taj Mahal on one of our stamps. When we think back on the long history of Japan we look at the country of India and Hindu civilization, both have a deep meaning for us in Japan. In the cultural tradition of the Japanese people, there is a book of poetry called *Ryōjin Hissho* and this was really the public people's poem that was gathered into a collection of the Heian period. There is a poem that says if you go straight from Awajishima in the western part of Japan, you arrive to Kara in China. If you go straight south, we arrive in Tenjiku, which is in India. That was the perspective of the world that the Japanese people had 1000 years ago. Not only then, but even more recently. There is a primitive *kompira* shrine in Kochi, where the divine alligator of the Ganges river is divinized. It is a religion that has been imported into Japan as a *kompira* sect. In other words, the Indians prayed to something which had power. When you pray to the alligator, you can walk on the water safely or, in other words, you can navigate the waters safely and you will have a successful trade business. When I went to Kochi two weeks ago, I visited the *kompira* shrine. It was a shrine facing the ocean and I said to myself if I went directly south, I would reach India and this is what the Japanese people of the middle ages had as their world map.

Next to the shrine was a Buddhist temple. About 130 years ago just after the Meiji restoration, there was a monk called Fudarako Tenshun and he advocated a movement to throw away Buddhism and go back to Shintoism. This was more of a Shintoist fundamentalism. This temple shows the relationship with India. Tenshun means the very vast heavens. He jumped into the sea, this monk, saying I am going back to India and he drowned. This is a mere 130 years ago and when we look at the middle ages of Japan, we see that it continued on. I personally feel it still lives on

today. We say we learned Buddhism through China but I don't think this is so necessarily. If we follow the sea, we will arrive at India ultimately.

Also there are civilizations that have come to Japan via the sea from India as well. I feel this is still deep rooted in the sentiments of the Japanese people. So this is the relationship between India and Japan. From the cultural point of view I think we have a commonality. Based upon that we should think about diplomacy and the relationship between countries.

I mentioned a stamp having an image of the Taj Mahal to celebrate the 50th anniversary. In a stamp issued in India, they put dark eyeliners of the traditional kabuki dancers and the traditional Indian eyelining to show a cultural link between the two countries. It is a very interesting design and we have to think even about what the stamps depict.

Now from this issue, I go to Chandra Bose and Mahatma Gandhi and I would like to see if there is any relationship. In the first part of our seminar, I think it was mentioned in the form of a question from the audience was about the power of Gandhi to resist the power of the British, Gandhi and Nehru had two different attitudes.

Now, I've asked for a copy of an article to be distributed to you. This is an article from the *Yomiuri* newspaper and it talks about some of the eminent people of the 20th century. I chose the picture to show the difference between the clothing of Gandhi and Prime Minister Nehru. Now in this article, I'm not going to read everything but I would like to point out the important part, about Shumei Okawa, who is considered a rightist. He wrote in 1922 about various issues in Asia. It says that India was led by Gandhi and was going into a new area. It said that Gandhi had promoted an Indian philosophy and said that "the world's greatest revolutionaries are Lenin and Gandhi." Now this is what Okawa said. He put together Gandhi and Lenin as revolutionaries but their philosophies are very different. The direction that Lenin took was imperialism. He was going to put an end to imperialism which he thought was the greatest power around the world. Against this, he said that Gandhi was taking the path of non-violence and this was the method of Gandhi's revolution. We, when we look at the modern history of the world, we look at the Western powers. World history for us was how we were going to meet these Western powers. But when we look still deeper, we see the Communist revolution and that has really impacted Japanese scholars.

Okawa said we must choose the Indian spirit, the non-violent revolution. He said that British colonialism must not be fought with violence because if they should go to violence you could but Britain and India at the same level of evil. Now, Tenshin Okakura of Japan said "Asia is one." Okakura went to India and became close to Tagore's family. Last year we celebrated the centenary of Okakura's and Tagore's friendship but there was not a mention in Japan to celebrate this union.

He said that "Asia is one" and this is the slogan of the Great East Asian War and the interpretation of this was that we must fight this war as one Asian family. After World War II did we look back at this slogan? No, we said this was a slogan to invade the whole of Asia and so the relationship between India and Japan is not symbolized in this slogan. In India however, the picture was totally different. Asianism and Okakura Tenshin was topic of a symposium held in India last December and I was invited to it. We sat down to evaluate this great slogan of "Asia is one." Okakura Tenshin did not say that we have to fight to make Asia as one. But he did say that Europe was united to invade Asia. In other words, he said that the glory of Europe was the shame of India. He said that Asia's esthetic must fight against this great power. He sometimes used the word love. He said that we are one in Asia

through love. We must overcome power politics, not through violent revolution but through a spiritual revolution so that the humiliation of Asia would be taken away. This is what he meant when he said that Asia is one, Asia is beauty.

Gandhi did not attend that celebration of the independence of India. What was he doing that day? He was turning a loom. He was very happy with independence but said that their work is not done by winning independence. To seclude himself is the symbol of what he had in mind.

When India was invaded, the main force to fight against this aggression was Chandra Bose. He established the India National Army and during World War II, when the Japanese Army took some Indian prisoners in the Malay Peninsula he requested they be released to become part of the India National Army. Bose, holding independence as his ambition, didn't hesitate to shake hands with Hitler. That was actually the comment he made. Last year I went to India and bought a cartoon book for children about Bose. This picture on the front page is Bose in a military uniform. In this book, we have a quote saying he would like to lead India to independence even if he had to shake hands with Hitler. The relationship of Chandra Bose and Gandhi were not opposing each other.

When we ask ourselves this question, not only looking at the Japanese situation in the history of modernization but also in China. What will they see in the near future? When we think about this question, we come back to Gandhi and the spindle.

The direction of Chandra Bose is based winning victory through power. However, if we look at the spindler, most of the work is done by women. What is indicated here is that the direction of the change of the world would be in a peaceful manner. This is what I think is represented by the cotton spindle of Gandhi. I will finish here and let others speak.

Dr. Hashizume: Thank you very much Professor Matsumoto. Next we have Dr. Nagasaki.

Dr. Nagasaki: I would first like to talk about how Gandhi is seen in India today. I would then like to talk about the period in which Gandhi lived, and his views of Japan. I also want to cover his view of Europe, in other words modern civilization, and finally about civilization dialogue based on Gandhi's views.

Gandhi was born in 1869, a year after the Meiji restoration in 1868, and died in 1948, or the 23rd year of Showa. So he basically lived from the beginning of the Meiji restoration to the end of the Second World War. During this period, while Japan was forging ahead on the path of economic growth, Gandhi and the Indian people were living under British colonial rule. Gandhi was a leader that organized these nationless people and eventually led them to independence.



As many of you know, Gandhi was born in Gujarat, Pawabunda. Pawabunda means "white city." Gujarat used to be one of the central trading spots on the Indian Ocean, and large ships carrying merchandise such as cotton used to come and go from the port. When Gandhi was young, it was a given that he would go study in London. So Gandhi became a barrister in London, and then returned to Bombay.

But he was not very successful as a barrister in Bombay, so he went to Africa where many Indians were living, in hopes of setting up his practice there. When he got there he saw that many of his compatriots were being subject to discrimination and joined the fight against it.

This was around the time that the European imperialist powers (and later the Japanese) were colonizing the world. The 19th century was also a period of immigration, and a large number of immigrants were working in a variety of places. There were two major flows of immigration: One was the flow of white immigrants from the European continent to the Americas, and the second was the flow of Asian laborers from India and China to warm regions such as Africa and Southeast Asia.

Gandhi rode this wave of immigration to London and later to Africa. As he travelled and saw the world, he began to contemplate ways of fighting discrimination that was consistent with European logic and thinking. In my view, this was one form of dialogue between civilizations. Some people seem to think that Gandhi was simply an old man wearing a loin cloth that lived in remote regions and knew nothing of the world, but this is far from the truth. The 19th century saw large movements of populations, and it was within this context that Gandhi came to be a leader of the people.

Gandhi wrote a book titled *Hindu Swaraj* in 1909, and returned to India in 1915. It was after this that he became a leader of the independence movement based on non-violence. He wrote about Japan in his book *Hindu Swaraj*. It is quite interesting how Mahatma Gandhi perceived Japan at the beginning of the 20th century, around the time of the Russo-Japanese war. Broadly speaking, Gandhi had two views of Japan. One view he held, which is relatively well known, was that the modernization of Japan was in fact westernization; that it was the Union Jack and not the Japanese flag that was flying over the country, and therefore India should not follow in Japan's footsteps.

The second view he had was that Japan had little corruption and was highly committed to education. This was the conclusion that he arrived at when he tried to understand how Japan had succeeded in defeating the Russian Empire. In Japan, primary school education was compulsory and the general population was relatively well educated. Professor Matsumoto talked about Chandra Bose earlier, but Gandhi echoed Bose's view that there was little to learn from the Japanese leaders, but that the ordinary people were to be emulated.

It is interesting that Gandhi commended the ordinary citizens of Japan. Historically, India has had a good education system for the elite, but not necessarily a good primary education. Now India is placing a strong emphasis on improving primary education. Japan is the opposite. We have a good primary education, but our higher education is not as strong, so we need to improve our university education.

Now, that was Mahatma Gandhi's view of Japan, but what was his view of European civilization? I briefly touched on this earlier, but after the end of the Russo-Japanese war, Gandhi had a very negative view of modern European civilization. Gandhi believed that the essence of modern Western civilization was the promotion of production for fulfilling materialistic needs. Gandhi felt that this should not be India's goal, and wanted to create a different civilization. As early as 1909, Gandhi had seen fault in European civilization's promotion of infinite production and consumption. He advocated the exercising of self-control, which he believed would help people free themselves, which in turn would lead to national independence.

He returned to India with these ideas, and started the independence movement. There are two points that I find particularly interesting about Gandhi's independence movement. The first point is that whereas in the past, independence movements in India were led by the elite who sought to win privileges for themselves, Gandhi organized the poor, and even dressed in a loincloth as a kind of symbolic gesture. The second was that he practiced fasting, vegetarianism, ahimsa and abstinence. He had an abstinent relationship even with his wife. He did not eat meat, refusing to take the life of another to feed himself. He learned to control his physical desires, and I think that was the key to his movement.

In the 1930s Gandhi led a resistance movement that came to be known as the "Salt March." Participants were hit and kicked by police forces, but they just kept marching on. Mahatma Gandhi was always surrounded by American and European journalists wherever he went. The journalists wrote about the march and people throughout the world were shocked to hear about what had happened. Although people did not necessarily disagree with Britain's standpoint, many felt that they had gone too far.

Gandhi said that England wanted both power and justice, but that this was not possible because power and justice did not go hand in hand; that you could only have one or the other. We can see that this is true from what is happening in Iraq today. On the other hand, the people of India, who did not have power, could represent justice, and that is the message that spread across the world. Mahatma Gandhi's movement was based not so much on rational logic, but on basic human needs such as hunger, pain, sexual desire, and the desire to live. D.H. Lawrence, the author of *Lady Chatterly's Lover*, wrote that emotions and physical needs can be trusted more than ideas and thoughts. Gandhi had the same kind of idea, and countered the sophisticated philosophies of modern Europe with a more earthbound philosophy based on physical needs.

At the time, the British saw Asia as an irrational, backward, disease-infested region, with feminine characteristics. In contrast, they thought that European or Western society was a civil, masculine and intellectual society. There was a dichotomy between the way Europeans saw Asia and Europe, and Gandhi tried to reverse that through a more feminine approach that utilized the power of the weak; in other words, his philosophy of non-violence. The Indian people were not as well educated or well dressed as the British, but Gandhi told them that they were fine the way they were and did not need to change; that what they lacked was the pride and confidence to be themselves. What Mahatma Gandhi gave to ordinary Indians was pride. Gandhi told those who had nothing, the poor, that they could be themselves. That was Mahatma Gandhi's gift.

Professor Matsumoto touched on this point earlier, but Gandhi used symbols that were familiar to the people. For example, I mentioned earlier about the "Salt March." India is surrounded by ocean, so it was only natural that they made their own salt, but the British Empire maintained their monopoly on the salt market by prohibiting the Indian people from making their own salt. So Gandhi went to the coast to produce Indian salt from India's own waters. These items like salt or cotton are non-religious symbols. They have nothing to do with specific religions but are popular among the general public. One of the characteristics of his activities was the use of these simple symbols.

Next, I want to talk about Gandhi's decision to take a non-violent approach. He said that he used the same method that his mother used to change his father's ideas.

I don't have time to go into detail, but the main point is that his criticism is aimed at the modern nation state. The essence of the modern nation state is private ownership, which allows for the infinite abuse of resources. Nations decide on borders and claim infinite access to the earth's resources within those borders. The modern sovereign state system gives people the right to exclusive, private ownership. For example, if you have a tree in your yard, you are allowed to cut it because it is your private property. In Gandhi's view, however, the tree is entrusted to you by heaven or the gods so you are not free to do as you like with it. Gandhi thought that there should be a limit to private ownership. In that sense, the 20th century, with the modern nation state system, was a very violent era, with violent revolutions and large-scale international wars and other conflicts.

Gandhi believed that humans should return to their body; get back in touch with their fundamental physical needs, and that by doing so, people would realize that we are all mortal creatures, and no different from plants and animals. As a result, it will become possible for people to engage in civilizational dialogue without being led astray by fancy philosophies.

Lastly, I would like to come back to the question of how Mahatma Gandhi's philosophy is seen in modern times. Gandhi envisioned building a civilization, but he was not intent on building a modern nation state. As it happened, however, in the 40s and 50s, many Asian nations such as Pakistan, China and Indonesia became independent and established modern nation systems. These modern nation states were inevitably based on power and violence. However, by becoming independent, these Asian nations bridged the gap that existed between Europe and themselves, especially in terms of income and economic development, so we cannot completely discredit the modern nation state system.

In conclusion, I think that while Gandhi is well respected in India, and his philosophy is highly regarded, there is also a movement to embrace the strength of the nation state, and build a stronger, more masculine India. I will finish here because I have run out of time. Thank you very much.

Dr. Hashizume: Thank you very much. We have had a very forceful presentation and I thank the panelists for finishing on time. I would like to invite the panelists to discuss between themselves. You have just heard the two presentations.

Dr. Nara: It isn't so much a question but a comment inviting you to comment.



Professor Matsumoto spoke on Chandra Bose. I have been at Calcutta University and know Bengal well. I am called Calcutta walla by my Indian friends. Subhas Chandra Bose is a Bengali and he is a hero of Bengal. Even the taxi drivers would say that he is not dead and that he is alive somewhere and he is going to come. He will be more than a hundred years old if he should appear.

Going back to the whole of India, I think Bose was used as a symbol of the direction India should be headed. My curiosity makes me ask this question of you. You have shown us the poster of Chandra Bose in military uniform. What does he represent? I wanted to know where you got it from.

I was interested in Dr. Nagasaki's presentation, in points you made about bodily abstinence, vegetarianism, starving. I was interested that you focused on that. When you talk about bodily matters, the corporal importance, how does that relate to pursuing truth? *Satyagraha*. *Satya* stands for truth, *graha* is grip or grasping. You can talk about pursuing truth but it is no use just talking. You have to adopt it in your bodily affairs or you never get to the truth. My question is that in regard to bodily matters, was that a necessary methodology of adopting that approach? Can that be a justifiable explanation of his fasting and focus on his bodily matters?

Dr. Nagasaki: Since I am not an expert on religion, I feel a little embarrassed being asked this question from a religious expert like Dr. Nara, but in regard to Gandhi's notion of truth, at first Gandhi said that "God is truth," but eventually he changed this to "Truth is God." At first Gandhi believed that politics could not exist without belief, and that what we meant by "God" was "truth."

I'm going to leave this for Dr. Nara to explain in greater detail, but the reason he named his non-violence movement "*Satyagraha*" is very much related to the notion of "truth." I think it all comes down to the idea of discipline and training; about living out your convictions. By applying your philosophy, you arrive at truth. You can't lead a movement without disciplining and improving your self. That I think is what attracted people to Gandhi.

Professor Matsumoto: There was a question from Dr. Nara as to where I bought the calendar of Bose in his uniform. I bought that in Calcutta and the other one in New Delhi. I am very interested in Calcutta and the reasons is that the name of Calcutta, is written like rice in Japanese. Calcutta is a place where the plants, and the reed grows. It comes in Japanese literature as well. Reed grows one after the other because it is very rich mud as well. We also have in our Japanese old literature that this island of reed is floating in waters. We see this commonality in the name of Calcutta.

In the way we think and the way Hindu civilization thinks, I think there is a big commonality as well. We all come out of the mud and all things go back to it. By going back to the mud, the next life is born, comes from us going back to the mud. At the previous Civilization Dialogue, we talked about Hinduism not being a world religion but rather, like Shintoism being an ethnic religion. I still remember somebody having said that at our last dialogue. What that means is that this dirt, this topology, all living things are born of the dirt and goes back to the dirt. Everything that has power to live is born out of dirt. If you think in this way you call this religious pluralism. It will be difficult for monotheism to be born out of this. We also get the attitude in animism.

In monotheism, we say woman was born of the rib of man. In Japan and in Hinduism, men and women are at an equal level. We are equal, men and women. This does not come up in Western philosophy. We are really at odds with this philosophy of the West that says men are higher. Our philosophy is that men and women are equal.

God created everything. This is Western culture but not in Japan. We show that Chandra Bose learned a lot about the Western revolution way but having learned it, he makes his own revolution. The direction that Gandhi took includes Asian naturalism and that concept of dirt.

Dr. Chowdhry: I do want to make some comments actually. The second speaker made five points and one that you mentioned was about discrimination. It seems to me that the turning point in Gandhi's life was a week after he arrived in South Africa when he was thrown out of a train at St. Peter Maritzburg Station. Gandhi talks about this, sitting there the whole night in the cold that he began to go inward. So the process is an inward change first before anything outside can happen. I think that is a very important point, that even in civilizations, unless the inner spirit changes, you cannot change yourself or your community or the world. This is the point we need to understand in civilizational dialogue. The starting point is the change within oneself.

The second point is that in Africa, September 11, 1906 was starting date of the *Satyagraha* movement in Africa. It reminds me of what happened on September 11th in New York. It is interesting how differently America has reacted to problems of suffering and injustice to how Gandhi reacted on September 11th, 1906. And therefore, how do you deal with civilizational changes? These are two stark examples of a civilizational way of handling a major problem, both in New York and in South Africa.

Another point you made about the political part of it, and Gandhi writes about it. He said the turning point came when he wanted to help the poor and he said "I asked myself what was necessary for me in order to change to be untouched by immorality and untruth" and what is known as political games. In our country, there are a lot of political games going on at the moment, and therefore we can't really produce changes. He says "it was a difficult struggle in the beginning and it was a wrestle with my wife, and as I vividly recall, with my children also. Be that as it may, I came definitely to the conclusion that I had to serve the people in whose midst my life was cast and whose difficulties I was a witness from day to day, that I must discard all wealth and all possessions." It is to be able to deal a perfectly pure political life that you have to discard all that. The starting point of his discarding wealth was to be a good politician.

Dr. Nagasaki: What you said is very true. The Indians that moved to Africa were largely from two different classes. The first group was the indentured laborers. After slavery was abolished in 1833, the British introduced a new system of indentured labor, which was in a sense just another type of slavery. The other group was the middle class comprising lawyers and merchants. Gandhi belonged to the latter group. He belonged to the middle class, but he experienced discrimination on the day he arrived in South Africa. Around this time, many Indian people emigrated to other countries. In the latter half of 19th century, the number of people who belonged to the slave-class increased rapidly in Africa. In response to this, countries began to put up barriers to immigration. For example, around the time of World War I, the US limited the number of Japanese immigrants, against which the Japanese protested vehemently. What Gandhi experienced was the transition from one period to another. The Indians thought that if they were not allowed to immigrate to another country and aim for a better life there, they should kick the British Empire out of their country.

Dr. Hashizume: I myself have to confess some ignorance about India. My point is about the role of village farmers in modernization. Professor Matsumoto talked about the relationship between Gandhi and Lenin. They are the two extreme poles of the revolutionary movement. The village farmers did not play major role in the Russian revolution. In Meiji revolution, farmers did not play a major role. Looking at Chinese

revolution, farmers did play a big role. And in the villages of the Chinese rural areas there were lots of enslaved farmers. I believe Mao is located between Lenin and Gandhi. Mao and Gandhi put trust into village farmers. Mao and Lenin have commonality in accepting revolution based on power or violence. I wonder, how Mahatma Gandhi thought about the village peasant.

Dr. Nagasaki: As far as I know, the difference between Mao and Gandhi is that in the case of Mao, even though they were called peasants, the majority of them were employed as Red Army soldiers in the context of the anti-Japanese struggle, while in Gandhi's case, a soldier's rebellion in 1857 had ended in defeat, so he knew that they could not defeat the British by force, and in that sense his stance of non-violence was a pragmatic approach.

As for the question of what united groups existed in India at the time, the middle class—the people that had received the best education at universities such as Calcutta University and were basically trained by the British to rule India—were united and ruled India in collaboration with the British government. That in itself was not a threat to the British. However, Gandhi then came and organized a group other than the middle class for the first time, and completely changed India. It is difficult to say exactly how well Gandhi organized the peasants, but I would say that all over India there were mid-level officers in the army that supported Gandhi, and that these people organized the middle and upper level peasant classes.

While Nehru envisioned a modernized nation state with central rule, Gandhi proposed an India where village communities were linked together, and power was distributed among these various regional communities.

Dr. Nagasaki: Gandhi was good at appealing to the masses. He had charisma; turning himself into a symbol of someone who didn't have anything, thereby connecting with the masses who didn't have anything. At the same time, he was an international lawyer that had received his degree in England, so he also knew how to handle and respond to British logic. Furthermore, he knew how to compromise and won the respect of modern men like Nehru with his modern ideas. For example, he recognized that truth was multifaceted. He said that when he disagreed with somebody, although there was no way he could agree with the other person's opinion, he never doubted the sincerity of that person. In such cases, he recognized that truth was multifaceted and tried to reach a compromise. In that sense, his views were democratic. In conclusion, I think Gandhi possessed both charisma and a modern, democratic way of thinking.

Ambassador Rana: I just have a brief point to offer to the question that Dr. Nara put just now. The actual figure of literacy in India is now 65 percent, not 50 percent. We carry out a national census every 10 years. It is a very detailed census and perhaps the most detailed in the world in terms of history because it started in 1871 and in each year that ends with the digit one, a census is carried out. It is considered to be quite reliable. In the previous census of 1991, the literacy figure was about 56 percent and it is now 65 percent. And it is moving upward all the time. We have some states like Kerala and Tamil Nadu where the literacy rate is 95 and 90 percent. And there are some states where it is further back.

I am not a student of sociology and I am not familiar with the flagpole analogy but my impression is that to compare the social structures of India today to a flagpole, to my limited understanding, may not be reflecting the reality. What has

happened in India in the last 15 or 20 years is a huge growth in awareness by all communities, including our so-called backwards communities, our OBCs. Our “Other Backwards Classes.” It is a strange term but then you know, words and terms are used in countries that have a peculiar meaning. You may know that in our constitution, there are two categories of the underprivileged. They are identified as scheduled castes and scheduled tribes and these two classes receive special positive affirmation programs. That is they receive special facilities in the public service, in education and in many other areas to help their advancement and further development.

Now this new concept has come forward about 15 or 20 years ago of the other backward classes who also receive positive affirmation programs in their favor. One of the strange consequences of democracy, and the political process has been that different communities want to be identified as backward because if they are identified as backwards, they will get benefits. Therefore, there are Christian communities and Muslim communities that say they are also backward and they want these benefits. This is although on paper, in theory, among Catholics and Muslims, there are no backward classes. Everyone is supposedly equal in social structure. So, this is one of the paradoxes and in fact, the polarization of communities or at least, the group identification of communities has become stronger because the political process helps it to. You see, if I am a politician and I have a constituency of two million voters, and that is typical, how can I contact two million voters? How can I conduct public meetings where I speak to them? So it is easier for me to deal with community leaders. I say I will do this for you. Will you deliver votes to me 5,000 votes or 10,000 votes because you are a community leader? So the political process is creating this kind of reassertion of caste identity, of community identity. I don't think the framers of the Indian constitution had in mind that the operation of democracy would make the communities divisions stronger and not weaker. It is one of the paradoxes of democracy.

Professor Matsumoto: I would like to say two things. At the time of the Meiji restoration, the Japanese farmers did not contribute much. When we look at the farmers of Japan, if you read the novel of Toson Shimazaki, *Yoake Mae*, (Before Dawn), you would see that the farmers did participate as a strong force in the reform of Shintoism. A large group of highly literate peasants were concentrated as a small group and became the power of social reform that led ultimately to the Meiji restoration.

As we progress with the modern nation state that followed, the farmers cultivated rice and in the feudal society petty farmers were not really respected and that is why they participated in the reforms. This was a role that Shintoism played. A second point is that their literacy rate was close to 100 percent. Or at least for the petty farmers, it was that high. Education rates were very high and they had a very civilized view of society. In the case of India, the reason why Gandhi became such a great power of reform I think it was because the farmers did not initially participate in the independence movement. I think we can use the words of Max Weber to solve this question. “In the period where you are bound by tradition, the charismatic nature is the unique revolutionary power.”

In the case of the India, especially with respect to the farm class, they were bound by tradition and we can understand that with Gandhi coming in charismatic form, that was the driving force for the revolution.

Dr. Nagasaki: What Gandhi was good at was the mass. He appealed to the mass. He did not belong to anyone and nothing belonged to him. Gandhi was an international lawyer who got his degree in England so he could meet every sort of logic. We talked about the beautiful, the sophisticated people like Nehru who was a very modern man. He looked at the power of this organization, of Gandhi that could fight against Britain. What Mahatma Gandhi had was really the power that he had to attract these people. We talked about the multifacets of truth. In that point of view we have unity in diversity in India today.

Ambassador Rana: I have just one brief comment which was that Gandhi was a great believer in symbols. He understood, shrewdly, all the symbols that he used. He used to travel by third class in trains. In those days, trains had first, second and third classes in India. And he only drank goats milk and he led a very very simple life. One day, he happened to mention this to his people that he leads a simple life. Raj Kumari who was a former princess who gave up all princely heritage and joined Gandhi said “*Bhappu*, only we know what it takes to keep you in that simplicity.” Mahatma Gandhi gave a loud laugh at that because he understood that his simplicity was really a symbol which he used to reach out to the masses. As you said Professor, he shed his Western garb and this Lincoln’s Inn lawyer, and put on a dhoti. Churchill called him that “half naked fakir” going up the steps of the vice regal lodge to deal with the representative of the king emperor. And Churchill was angry that this could happen. But the fakir understood that is the way he reached out to the ordinary people of India.

Part 3
Dialogue between Japan and India

**Mahatma Gandhi Watched by Japanese Buddhists: For the Dialogue between
Hinduism and Buddhism**

Lecturer: Dr. Yasuaki Nara

Chairman: Dr. Daisaburo Hashizume

Dr. Hashizume: This will be the last session. Dr. Nara will be speaking to us on the title of Mahatma Gandhi as seen by Japanese Buddhists and then have a little bit of a free discussion.

Dr. Nara: I am majoring the religious culture in India and not a historian as such. When it comes to Gandhi, I have had a deep interest in him and even my humble study has made me respect and love him very much. And I would like to evaluate him, which I hope may help us poising some aspects toward the dialogue between Buddhists and Hindus. In Japan, I have continued the dialogue between Christians and Buddhists for the past 35 years and I like to make good use of this chance to think of Gandhi, outstanding figure in the Hindu tradition, in view of pushing forward the dialogue between Buddhism and Hinduism.

Now, the principle Gandhi led his political movement by was *Satyagraha* which is often defined as non-violence or passive resistance. It is to fight evil without reverting violence. It is really to fight for the independence against the injustice committed by the British colonists. For example, he applied the “hartal”, a custom to spend days only with prayer and fasting in mourning, to the general strike and made it as an important political strategy. Another means of the non-violent resistance is demonstrations. They proceed surrounded and provoked by army with guns but Gandhi taught them not to resort to any violent actions.

In his writings he says that *Satyagraha* is a passive resistance and if we go further, it is non-violence, a power of the soul. It is a power of compassion and benevolence. Gandhi was a politician and also a leader of the independence movement. Therefore I don't think we can call him 100 percent a religious figure but there is no doubt he had deep faith that was applied directly to his political movement.

How can you use a power of the soul in your political movement when you are going against political power? How can you have that courage to walk in front of all those guns? How is the spiritual strength fostered that made people dare to accept the death of their own lives for the justice? *Satyagraha* is not just a simple technique or a mere strategy. There must be a firm conviction that is supported religious belief. The training is necessary and in the case of Gandhi it is through the process of self-purification in the daily life.

For instance, self-restraint, Gandhi said, is to promote this *Satyagraha*. It is one of the training processes to achieve the objectives of *Satyagraha*. When we see Gandhi's self-restraint, his self-sacrifice was nothing that an ordinary man can do and it is something that we cannot imagine of. For example, when he went to Bombay, his wife said she wanted money because she wanted to buy presents for their grandchildren. Gandhi never gave a cent to his wife and the reason was that he said he did not have a cent to spend on himself. His wife was, of course, not very happy about this but this is one of the episodes we know of him.

At another time, he said to his wife, you must have a hard time living with me, and so why don't we live separately. You should live by yourself with the children and grandchildren, and live a happy life. Nevertheless, she decided to follow him and Gandhi said, “Darling, if you are going to follow me, you must be totally unselfish and contribute to the people of the country.” These are the words he told his wife and he also abstained from any sexual relations with his wife. So this was his self-sacrifice and self-training. Sometime he failed and regretted his failures that he recorded in some of his writings. This is so typical of Gandhi and we love him for his failures as well. This honesty, and this honest poverty is that which he advocated as part of the self-restraint or self-purification.

From a historian's point of view, this implementation of the self-restraint may well be taken as a mere way of training so that they might have morale and courage to fight against the ruler without violence. In the case of Gandhi however it is a kind of religious practice rather than training. There is compassion underlying this self-sacrifice. He himself said that compassion was the basis of everything; being supported by compassion and benevolence you can achieve self-restraint. You have to really restrain yourself with the spiritual power within. Otherwise, you will not become unselfish and unable to serve other people. The people, who followed him and supported Gandhi, at least in the initial times, received this sort of practice. These were really the elite of the people.

Ashram system gave them the place for the practice. It reminds me of a kind of religious monastery. There they lived together in total poverty, studied various aspects of the self-purification and committed themselves to total service. Within this system of *Ashrama*, Gandhi himself lived as did the people who supported him. Through this, the people came to know how to pursue their ideal of non-violence. It seems to me very important here that the *Ashrama* life is not a mere means for the purpose of practice but is itself the end. The *Ashrama* life is at once the manifestation of the truth, *satya*, as is their political action of the non-violence resistance. To put it in another way, *Satyagraha* is basically the way of how to live as a man in good accord with the truth and political actions are nothing but part of this way of life.

The truth remains as a mere idea unless it is put into practice. *Satya* is a Sanskrit word derived from the verbal root "as" equivalent of English "be". *Satya* comes from its present participle form "sat". It is essentially the working of all beings with having nothing to do with our human ego centered contrivance. *Satya*, truth, hits what does exist as-it-is. It is not something that man has created nor conceived of.

In the Judeo-Christian tradition, Yahweh is also translated as "being as it is." Then, truth is, regardless of its being the Eastern or Western, permeating in all beings. This is the background of *Satya*. In India it is in the oldest tradition of the Rig-Veda (I.164.46) that the idea of oneness of *satya* is openly declared. In a beautiful poem a poet, i.e. the wise man who looked into rarity, showed gods with various names after all converge into the one truth.

Another famous case is found in the thought of Rama Krishna (1834–1886), modern reformer of Hinduism. He criticizes the communal controversy between different faiths that just like water is water despite of its various names like *pani* or *jala*, so one and the same truth is preached in all the variety of different religious traditions.

It was in 1956 when I observed the nation-wide celebration of the Buddha *Jayanti* with the full support of the Indian Government and had a chance to witness how this idea is popular even today. Of all celebrations there was a shadow play held in the Patna University performed by the students. It was very impressive. A figure that is seemingly old even in shadow represents Buddha. He was holding small branches of *bodhi* tree in his hand and presented one by one to the figures of Jesus Christ, Mohammed and lastly to Mahatma Gandhi. The one and the same branch, i.e. the truth, is taken up by these religious geniuses to preach their religions differently.

Even Mahatma Gandhi himself seemed to have felt no distance in-between Buddhism and Hinduism as Indian religions. Once in the Maha Bodhi Society, Calcutta, Gandhi said that his friends assured him of behaving according to the Buddhist teachings and he himself accepted it and declared he was going to make his best efforts for the development of Buddhism.

Now from a Buddhist' point of view, we have strong sympathy for some of the Hindu ideas expressed by the total personality of Gandhi. They are for instance the oneness of the truth, the process of manifesting the truth (*satyagraha*) covers our whole life including even political actions, self-purification, compassion as underlying factor of life to "live the truth" (not "live in the truth") and so on. These will surely be the themes around which the dialogue between the Hindus and Buddhists should be conducted.

As for the oneness of *satya*, Gautama Buddha also said the same. "The truth is one and no second. One who looks into it does not dispute. (But) as they highly speak of the view of their own, here are many truths proclaimed" (*Sutta-nipata* 884). "Truth" here is *sacca*, Pali form of *satya*. What is implied here is clear that the truth is one but the verbal expressions of it can be various. What is crucial here is not to dispute for the supremacy of one's own interpretation but to manifest the truth in his living that is to live the truth.

In fact it has now come the time where the "Religious Pluralism" is discussed. Dr. John Hick, David Tracy, John B. Cobb and other scholars have begun to advocate it in contrast to the "Religious Exclusivism" i.e. the attitude to insist on one's own faith as only right religion at the cost of all other religious traditions, and the "Religious Inclusivism", where the spiritual value of other faiths are admitted but only in the premises of one's own religion. John Hick opines that there is "one ultimate reality" from which each religion in the world had developed uniquely under the variety of the cultural situations entailing to the God, Allah, Brahman, Dharma and Tao etc. What is advocated here is very similar to the Indian thinking of the truth. There are now heated discussions going on. How could the "one ultimate reality" represent the reality of all faiths, how can it be attested even if it is the hypothesis, is it not to prove only after the dialogue as the result of experience of it? Inspire of all these academic discussions yet to solve in the future, it cannot be denied that the religious pluralism has created a stir in a constructive way among those who are looking for the better understanding and harmony between different religious traditions. Indian traditions of Hinduism as well as Buddhism, leading the world in the premises of the oneness of the truth, is now obliged to correspond to the religious dialogue.

Earlier I made a question to Dr. Nagasaki. In her presentation, the issue of the corporal was one of the key aspects. What she presented is that the truth is not just words but is an aspect of the corporal, of the body. That truth is not logic or theory but something we have to achieve through the body.

Concerning to this way of "living the truth", let me illustrate it by means of a teaching of Zen Master Dogen, founder of the Japanese Soto Zen Denominations to which I belong. He develops his idea of how the process of the practice is more important than to its result by way of the *Paramita*, Buddhist (*Mahayana*) term for the practice. The word is generally translated in Japan as "reaching the bank beyond" (to *higan*: reaching the bank beyond). Dogen turned the order of the Chinese words and read on purpose "bank beyond (already) reached" (*higan to*: the bank beyond reached). 'The bank beyond' means the highest state of religious practice. He wished to teach that what is important is to walk the Buddha Way. Notwithstanding he is not matured nor lack of the practice, stepping on the Way in his everyday life is but the process of realization, the process of living the truth. How he becomes matured and how he develops the deep insight becomes only possible in this process of walking of the Way.

From the perspective of Dogen's teaching as well as of Buddhism in general, the honesty and poverty are also key factors. Any socio-political reformation and revolutions necessarily aim at bringing the happy affluent life. Gandhi however praises or rather necessitate to lead simple, if not poor, life. This at once shows the religious aspects of his *satyagraha* movement. In any religious faith, looking into the meaning of the self in the premises of the truth necessarily leads him to pursue simple life and see others with love and compassion. The more his wishes to practice are sincere and deep, the more his heart becomes full of the concern to others at the cost of luxurious life. Remembering a famous phrase of Dogen "the practice of the Buddha's Way must be poor" I appreciate the simple life Gandhi admonished in his *styagraha*.

I have to say that the dialogue is not just to compare theories and thoughts. It is not just for the sake of argument or competition of academic doctrines. It is not to do a favor in teaching others. It is my conviction that has come to me on my experiences for more than 30 years that the dialogue is for the mutual understanding and the self-reformation. In pursuing dialogues and exchanging frank ideas on the various problems we are now facing to, Hindus be good Hindus and Buddhists be good Buddhists. Then at the bottom of each faith there must be found something in common to share, to nod with each other and cooperate together. And the thoughts and the life of Mahatma Gandhi give us much to consider when we conduct dialogue between Hindus and Buddhists.

Dr. Hashizume: Thank you very much. Dr. Nara spoke specifically about the dialogue required between Buddhism and Hinduism. Having heard Dr. Nara, are there any comments or questions?

Professor Matsumoto: To Dr. Nara, you have mentioned Rama Krishna's words saying there is only one truth. If you go to Calcutta you will see the temple built by Rama Krishna. It looks like a Hindu or Buddhist or Muslim temple. It is a very strange structure in which you can see all three religions in this temple. This goes to symbolize what he meant when he said that truth is only one. Anyway, there are very wonderful teachings of gods in whatever religion. This is polytheism. My question to Dr. Nara. This direction or way of evaluation is coming to the surface but today we have what we call Hindu nationalism. This is rising in India. It might be close to religious fundamentalism when people say that India is a country of Hinduism.

What is the cause of all this? My interpretation of this is that India is still a poor country but the poorest of the poor are the Hindus. Therefore there is a political nationalism movement that has come to the surface. I feel that this Hindu nationalism movement and what Dr. Nara mentioned about religious polytheism are the two paths by which we evaluate Rama Krishna. How then do we evaluate Rama Krishna and how does this relate?

Dr. Nara: The idea of the oneness of truth is, in the Indian religious contexts, the conviction of old sages. It says all faiths merge into one core of the truth but so to speak the content of the truth is not single but varies in each. Almost all religious traditions in India, China and Japan are surely polytheistic in the form of worship but seeing the one truth under different gods is not polytheism. Rama Krishna may be astonished being told he worships all gods equally at the cost of Ma Kali whom he

worships. I do not also think that there is direct relation between his teachings and the Hindu nationalism.

As for the Hindu nationalism too, we cannot understand as one single movement. Hindu nationalism is definitely the nationalism among the Hindus but it does not mean that the Hindu religious teachings are nationalistic. There is one of my Hindu friends and he is too much political minded, rather fundamentalist. He is too hasty trying to persuade us to his opinions to learn with each other. The dialogue as I understand is not the political debate nor negotiation. We of course talk about politics, economics or any social problems. But we always try to understand with each other more than merely exchanging our own ideas. The Catholic Church in Rome published in 1984 a small book on the dialogue where they showed four types of dialogue. They are the dialogue of life, of working, of the exchange academic ideas and of the exchange of spirituality but all these are aiming at the mutual understanding.

Dr. Hashizume: Are there other questions?

Dr. Chowdhry: I was impressed with Dr Nara's emphasis on compassion. All religions talk about that. The core of compassion is fearlessness. If you are not fearless about what may happen to you, you cannot be compassionate. If you are reduced to zero in life, which is what happened to him at Pieter Maritzburg, years later he said that was the most creative experience of my life. It happened to Christ and to Buddha and to Nelson Mandela.

Mandela said two years ago at a meeting "you sent to us Gandhi but we sent back to you the Mahatma." So it depends on experience. Now compassion was terribly important to Gandhi. It was the reason he identified with untouchables, with the spinning wheel. It was really the poor people in the villages and not technology as such. He also did a great deal for women in our country. So compassion is really identification with people who are poor. It is when you want to do something and where you yourself are not the most important thing.

Dr. Nara: I agree with you. Compassion is a very important factor for Gandhi and he mentioned himself that *Satyagraha* is the power of compassion. What is most impressive about this is that it is not so difficult to have compassion in one movement. It is most difficult to sustain compassion. For that purpose, compassion must be practiced with the help of self-purification. By this practice, compassion may be developed gradually. Gandhi is one of the real persons who have done this.

Dr. Hashizume: Thank you very much. I think that was a beautiful dialogue. Perhaps this is the time to introduce some of the questions from the audience. Let me introduce some of them. To Ambassador Rana, a question related to India and Pakistan. Another has to do with terrorism and a forcible attack on Iraq. The third question is whether every relationship emanating from India related to Gandhi. Another is about how education in India is conducted. Another is about the Ganges River and whether bathing and funerals there are a general practice. A question to Dr. Nara is what the meaning of Gandhi's last words "Oh god." Another question to Dr. Nagasaki is what the meaning of Gandhi's emphasis on the body, on the corporal. Another question is whether Gandhi is male centric or Brahmin-centric. Other questions are open to anyone to answer. One is whether you can really have a dialogue amongst people with different views of religion, philosophy and science.

Ambassador Rana: (Response to Dr. Hashizume) Thank you sir. In the order in which I have noted them down here. There was one question about given the fact that it feels that Pakistan sponsoring terrorism and should stop it as a precondition to normalization, how does India view the UN dialogue and discussions concerning Iraq's disarmament.

Well, we support very much the process that Iraq should carry out complete disarmament as the United Nations has already decided in Resolution 1441. I don't speak for the government but my understanding is that India's position is that at the same time India is perhaps a little uncomfortable with the second demand which is not part of the UN resolution which is that there should be a change of regime in Iraq.

That may happen or it may not happen. And if we force it to happen, we may open Pandora's Box and we may then not always be happy with the results of what happens after it. It is an action that carries, in my personal view, dangerous consequences. The second question is whether India and Pakistan can jointly work on the threats posed by global warming, the melting of the Himalayan glaciers, degradation—instead of criticizing each other. And will not this kind of joint fight against the environment contribute to enhancing confidence.

That is true. That is perfectly correct. If I can give an example. There is a treaty between India and Pakistan on the sharing of the rivers of the Indus system. This treaty was signed in 1960 and in spite of periods of tension, periods of active disputes with the wars we have had in 1965 and 1971 and then the short war in Kargil. This river water treaty has performed flawlessly, to the satisfaction of both countries. It is an example of how sometimes peaceful agreements between two states that have problems can continue quite well quietly without any big political discussions or disputes. We also have between India and Pakistan a very small, limited, agreement on notifying each country of the nuclear installations of the other—of each country.

The idea being that even by accident we should not attack nuclear installations if there is war. If, sadly, war happens. So every year, each side gives to the other a list of its nuclear installations. This again, works very smoothly so we have a capacity to work together and I agree that it would be a wonderful thing if we could jointly tackle the environmental issues in the Himalayas. Not worrying too much about the border disputes or territory but this is the problem I spoke about earlier in the morning. This implies a willingness to accept a step by step approach or a confidence building approach and we would very much welcome that and we hope that our friends in Pakistan will come to an understanding that this is a good method. This is an internationally successful method of overcoming complicated problems.

Regarding the next question, India was close to the USSR before 1990. Is there any link between this and Gandhi's thought? Not really, except that at the time of independence many Indians were enormously impressed with what seemed to be the initial success of the Soviet Union. You may remember there was a British author who visited there. I think this influenced many people, including Nehru. I don't think Gandhi was influenced as much. He was much too hardheaded. In science and technology India is far advanced of Japan. I wish it were true.

General Electric has established its largest research center in India today. It is going to employ 1,400 doctorate level researchers. SAP which is a German software company has nearly 3,000 professional staff in India and the work they do is not developing software. They do that but the real work is quality assurance. They check out all the software that SAP produces around the world and see whether it is

good enough. So there are people who are beginning to use India as a global research platform.

Some pharmaceutical countries are doing it as well. A few more hesitate because they feel that intellectual property protections in India are not yet adequate. You may know that India believes so far in product patents but not process patents. Under the obligations of the WTO, by the year 2005 we have to shift to process patents. When that happens, I think this will move forward and I think we should do this quickly. Process patents are the way of the world. Product patents are the old way, process patents are the new way.

Dr. Chowdhry: I think the problems of India and Pakistan will be solved by the women of India and Pakistan together. We have a group that meets every year and we have been talking about how to do it. It is not the government or politicians that will solve the problems. I think the women will have something to do with it. The other thing about science and technology is the problem that all our talent is going out. Most of the people we train go abroad because they get four times or ten times the salary. We have done well in establishing facilities but all our talent is going out. I was connected with the management institution in our country. We have firms coming in and 80% of the students had offers to go abroad. This is depleting the talent to work for India itself. I don't know what the solution is but it is a problem.

Ambassador Rana: We have tended to take India in the view, that we don't believe in the brain drain as such. We have used sophisticated words like brain bank. It actually does work that way. Not all of them come back but even those who have gone abroad are available. Two thirds of graduates of Indian Institute of Technology (IIT), especially in IT go abroad. I have three nephews. They go abroad but keep more and more a connection with India. They contribute to setting up of new institutions. Again, the old alumni keep their connections. A few come back wearing new hats as representatives of Intel or Microsoft but at the end of the day, it is global talent and it is being cycled and recycled. At the end of the day, when there are good home opportunities, they will come back.

Dr. Chowdhry: Regarding education and practice, the emphasis of Gandhi was on practicing. If you cannot change yourself, how can you change the world? It is an important lesson to learn, especially for the USA these days. If you don't have inner peace you will not have peace outside of the country as well. Therefore, Gandhi who was a lawyer became a spiritual man to change the world. The starting point was changing himself. If we want the world to change, it is the moral force of a person that will change it.

I feel that we need to have science and technology but not at the expense of spirituality. With respect to education, we need to have two banks of the river. One bank is the technology, one spirituality. Without both, the river will overflow. In the last 200 years we have emphasized more than is necessary science and technology. There are many voices all over the world that are emerging which say that if you want peace in the world, this aspect of inner peace must be put forward.

In terms of education, I am afraid to say that we have been copying the West. In terms of the institute I was connected with, it was trying to get the Harvard model. In some ways you don't only get a model, you also get the underlying values attached to it. I don't think we have been teaching Gandhian values and at some stage the nation should wake up to those values. I think the Gandhian institutions are more

active abroad than in India itself. I am sorry to say that but I do think that in the 21st century, Gandhi values will emerge all over the world. The education we are now doing is a borrowed education from Harvard and it is not going to work on poor people.

The other question is about the Ganges and funerals and bathing and whether only a part of the people do such things. Well, it is very common of people who can get to the Ganges. There is a function we have called the *kum mela* where ten million came. In fact I am trying to look for some help from Japan. The Indian, Hindu funeral practice is to burn a body and then throw the bones in the Ganges River. But we have no wood left in our country. So many of the poor people throw the bodies as they are without burning them and this is one of the major sources of pollution there. So I am hoping that Japan, which has done a lot of work on solar energy, whether we could have a solar crematorium. Then in all the places where we do funerals, I hope that Japan would not only give us the technology but also the money to install solar crematoria all along the river. It really is a very important problem but I am told that solar energy has not reached that level yet.

Dr. Nara: When Gandhi was assassinated, his last words were *He Ram*, “Oh god.” What would he have wanted to say afterward? I don’t think he wanted to say anything. He said simply god, with all his spirit and all his mind.

Dr. Nagasaki: There were several questions for me. I would like to begin with the question, “What do you think about the idea being debated in India today that Gandhi’s body-oriented philosophy was in fact a male-oriented philosophy? Especially in terms of his approach to sex.” Gandhi advocated *gra ham charyya*, and maintained a friend-like, abstinent relationship with his wife. I think what some people are saying is that Gandhi enforced this on his wife. My response to this is that although Gandhi was not completely free of male-centric thinking, he was less male-centric than ordinary men. For example, you never hear Japanese political leaders saying that they would like to learn the positive aspects of women. I was surprised when I learned that Gandhi had tried to learn all kinds of work that was considered to be for women, such as sewing and cooking. He even took care of his niece as if he were a mother. I think that he saw aggressiveness at the core of masculinity and wanted his movement to possess a feminine spirit. He wanted to do away with masculine aggressiveness. For example, with regards to the issue of sex, I think he thought even though he was married to his wife, that he was still raping her, and was left with a guilty conscience. He was trying not to be male-centric, but I cannot say he was devoid of male-centric thinking.

The second question was “What do you think of the debate that Gandhi’s stoicism, especially *gra ham charyya*, is a brahmin-centric way of thinking?” I think that Gandhi adopted Brahmin aspects as part of his stoic lifestyle. In the Meiji restoration the term “samuraization” was often used. The idea was that if noblemen, peasants, artisans and merchants were all made into samurai, then all people will be equal, with the exception of the emperor. Gandhi may have been trying to bring equality to Indian society through a kind of brahminization process that was similar to samurization. I also think that Gandhi practiced abstinence because he wanted to bring ethics back into economics and politics, and that these practices just so happened to be brahmin-centric.

The third question was, “Prime Minister Vajpayee is heralded for being a vegetarian and having no wife, but what are your ideas about the relationship between

this kind of Hindu-nationalism and Gandhi's *gra ham charyya*." The answer to this is also basically the same. I don't think it is your responsibility if someone uses or abuses the ideas that you came up with. I suppose you cannot say that you have no responsibility at all, but this kind of thing happens all the time.

The fourth question was, "What do you think about how the Hindu nationalists today respect Gandhi and use his image?" First, Hindu nationalism, as Professor Matsumoto mentioned, is based on the idea that the nation state must save the poor Hindus. Therefore, it can be said that Hindu nationalism surfaced in response to the failure of post-independence economic policy. As a result of this failure, only the vested interests of the elite were fulfilled, and this led to the rise of Hindu nationalism.

Also, the rise of Hindu nationalism has a lot to do with tension between India and Pakistan. It is not really possible to think of Hindu nationalism from a domestic perspective alone. Instead the issue must be approached from a regional or global perspective. Seen from a global perspective, it is not the responsibility of the nation state alone to save the poor Hindus. If you try to save the majority, it would result in oppression of the minority. This may not be the best conclusion to this question, but I think that greater emphasis should be placed on economic reform. I started to talk a little about sovereignty, but basically I think that the borderline must not divide Pakistan and India, and that state sovereignty should be thought about in a more lenient and flexible manner. In East Asia, specifically Hong Kong, two systems coexist within one country. There are many people who are working on solving the problems between the two countries, and as these ideas develop, I think that Hindu nationalism will also take a different course.

Dr. Hashizume: Time is really pressing so I would like to ask Professor Matsumoto to start his comments.

Professor Matsumoto: I have visited India several times and I have often heard that Japanese have missed out in India. When Prime Minister Koizumi tied up a free trade relationship with Singapore and he said he was planning to have a free trade zone in Asia including Japan, China, Korea, but India was excluded. I think this is wrong. It neglects cultural, religious, and historical aspects. Japanese tend to forget spiritual aspects. Culturally Japan has a deep relationship with India.

Dr. Nagasaki: I agree with Professor Matsumoto. I think that Japan should take more of an active interest in South Asia. Currently, India is always the one that initiates relations, and Japan is reactive rather than proactive.

Dr. Nara: I agree with Professor Matsumoto and Dr. Nagasaki. My point was to shorten the distance between Japan and India.

Dr. Chowdhry: I feel that civilizations rise and fall. I think it is the time for civilization of the east to rise and lead the world in the future. Japan has an inner strength that will lead the world away from terrorism and violence. It is a civilization of technology and peace. I think that the Sasakawa Peace Foundation's focus on peace is important for the 21st century.

Ambassador Rana: It is a great privilege to be the last speaker and to express strong agreement with what has just been said. We have expected that the 21st century will

be Asia's century. Maybe we have lost the strong conviction about that but the factors have not changed. Be it on the spiritual cultural side of the economic side, the elements are in our favor. There is one other thought I want to leave you with. There are some who call India's economy the stealth economy. It seems a slow pace but in fact a lot faster than many believe it to be. If you picked up a newspaper In India today you would probably see comparisons to China. There is a feeling that we have to learn from some of the material successes of China. I think we are going in that direction. The reality of what is happening in India is far more impressive than the image we have of it. So, be it on the material side, the news is generally good. And I think that Japan, whether impelled by culture or spirituality or whether Japan rediscovers India from an economic perspective, it doesn't matter, I think we can agree that we are going toward a much stronger relationship. Surely the dialogue of Gandhi and our heritage and our great civilizations will very much be part of that.

Dr. Nagasaki: I am afraid that my comments were misleading. Since 1991, the Indian economy has been growing at a rate of 5 to 6 percent a year, which is much better than the Japanese economy.

Dr. Hashizume: I too would like to say something. The greatest impression I carry away from today's panel is Gandhi's spirituality. Those of us born after the war would feel very guilty. I myself tried to analyze what that means to me and to all of us. Japan, through Buddhism, has learned the spirituality of Indian civilization. We learned realpolitik through Chinese civilization. We learned materialistic civilization, economics and military civilization from the western civilization. Today, we are still skewed to economic civilization and that is not performing well so we are lost. This symposium has taken us back to the spirituality of Gandhi. I feel that the Japanese so far have brought patches of what seemed good from different civilizations but that is not going to give us spirituality with a profound meaning. Gandhi's spirituality is not an innocent one but is very powerful and practical within international political relations and it is a comprehensive approach. What we have lost is the comprehensive approach as human beings. It isn't just about economics or the military but is instead, a comprehensive approach. What Gandhi teaches us is to be fearless to see things as a whole, comprehensively.

Closing Remarks:

by Mr. Setsuya Tabuchi, Chairman of the Sasakawa Peace Foundation

I am happy to serve as the Chairman of the Sasakawa Peace Foundation and my name is Setsuya Tabuchi. You know, the work of a Chairman is to say remarks at the beginning and the end so let me perform my duty. I want to take this opportunity to thank you for staying with us throughout the day, particularly the panelists. My appreciation goes to the panelists for talking about the difficulties and complexity of Indian diplomacy, the greatest of humankind, Gandhi and also on the important relations between India and Japan. I thank you very much on behalf of the foundation. We take away a renewed appreciation of the importance of relations with India. We have a flood of information coming out of China but not so much from India.

When I was still young, as a high school student in the 1940s, if we talked about philosophy, of course it meant Indian philosophy. In the Orient we had Indian philosophy. In the West, we had Greek philosophy and that is still what I believe. China does not have philosophy. Japan does not have philosophy. Philosophy is Indian philosophy. I am reminding myself of what I was taught in high school. I am not a scholar as you are so I do not know as much but Hinduism existed before Christ and it is the oral epic that was used in handing down from generation to generation the Indian philosophy. In that sense, I have tremendous respect for India.

The Sasakawa Peace Foundation started the Civilization Dialogue as a three- year project and we had four seminars in Tokyo. The next seminar we hope will take place in New Delhi. I take this opportunity to ask for your continued interest and support.

Profiles of Lecturers

Kamla CHOWDHRY

Born in 1920

Education:

B.A. (Mathematics) Calcutta University

M.A. Degree of Philosophy at Punjab University

M.A. Degree of Psychology at Michigan University

Doctorate of Social Psychology from Michigan University

Teaching Experiences:

Research Associate, Harvard Business School

Visiting Professor, Harvard Business School

Work Experiences:

Indian Institute of Management, Ahmedabad, India

Ford Foundation, New Delhi

National Wastelands Development Board, Government of India, New Delhi

Current Position:

Board Member of Society for Promotion of Wastelands Development

Board Member of Center for Development Studies and Activities, Poona

Board Member of Gandhi Peace Center, New Delhi

Member of World Commission on Forestry and Sustainable Development (WCFSD)

Daisaburo HASHIZUME

Born in 1948, Kanagawa, Japan

Education:

B.A. the University of Tokyo

M.A. Degree at the University of Tokyo

Doctorate of Sociology from the University of Tokyo

Teaching Experiences:

Professor, Faculty of Engineering, Tokyo Institute of Technology

Current Position:

Professor, Department of Value and Decision Science, Graduate School of Decision Science and Technology, Tokyo Institute of Technology

Kenichi MATSUMOTO

Born in 1946, Gunma, Japan

Education:

B.A. the University of Tokyo

M.A. Degree at Hosei University

Teaching Experiences:

Professor, Kyoto Seika University

Current Position:

Professor, the International School of Economics and Business Administration, Reitaku University

Nobuko NAGASAKI

Born in 1937, Tokyo, Japan

Education:

B.A. the University of Tokyo

M.A. Degree at the University of Tokyo

Doctorate of Literature from the University of Tokyo

Teaching Experiences:

Professor, the University of Tokyo

Current Position:

Professor, Faculty of International Communication, Ryukoku University

Professor Emeritus, the University of Tokyo

Yasuaki NARA

Born in 1929, Chiba, Japan

Education:

B.A. the University of Tokyo

M.A. Degree at the University of Tokyo

Doctorate of Philosophy from the University of Tokyo

Bipradas Palchoudhury Fellow at Calcutta University

Teaching Experiences:

Professor, Faculty of Buddhism Studies, Komazawa University

Rector, Komazawa University

Current Position:

Professor Emeritus, Komazawa University,

Director, Research Center for Soto Zen Buddhism

Kishan S RANA

Born in 1937

Education:

B.A. St. Stephens College

M.A. Degree of Economics at Delhi University

Political Experiences:

Served at the Indian Missions in Beijing and Geneva,

Ambassador to Algeria, Czechoslovakia, Kenya, Mauritius and Germany

Joint Secretary in the Ministry of External Affairs

Commonwealth Adviser to Namibia Foreign Ministry

Teaching Experiences:

Professor of the Foreign Service Institute, New Delhi

Current Position:

Professor Emeritus, the Foreign Service Institute

Visiting Fellow at the Institute of Chinese Studies, New Delhi

