

*In the late '60s The Illustrated Weekly of India published articles by “an especially selected panel of Indian religious leaders, artists, writers, philosophers, scientists and politicians,” under the broad title “I Believe”. Each contributor was encouraged to describe his or her personal philosophy by answering the same set of questions. G.V. Desani’s response (below) was published Dec. 7, 1967.*

*Desani later adapted his article plus his edited summaries of the responses of other participants into an academic paper for the University of Texas Philosophy Department and the UT Center for Asian Studies. The title was An Indian View of God, Cosmos, Love, Marriage, Sex, et cetera.*

*Desani’s edited summaries of participants’ contributions, including, among others, Mulk Raj Anand, Jagjit Singh, Nirad C. Chaudhuri, and Amiya Chakravarty follow his article.*

***I Believe ...***  
***by***  
***G.V. Desani***

I am not complying with the Editor’s tall order to set forth my beliefs about God, religion, love, family life, permissive sex, the institution of marriage, the apparent triumphs of Wrong over Right, a political system best suited to India, and provide a viable formula against frustration, boredom, failure – not forgetting the phenomenon of death and the hereafter. I happen to think that these topics are (1) irrelevant to our situation, (2) that our central problem is that of ethics, and further, (3) we should concern ourselves with attainable goals.

I propose to defend these conclusions.

To begin with, I do not understand why a Hindu, Christian, Muslim, Buddhist, Sikh, Vedantist, anybody at all, should question *me* about “God” unless he or she is a renegade to

his or her faith and doubts the wisdom handed down to him or her. Some people ask questions because they are curious and wish to be diverted. Such people should not be taken seriously. And I am unhappy with the way some people phrase their questions.

Are we agreed about the meaning of the word “God” as we are of “fire” or “water”? Doesn’t the word mean an a, b, c, and d, according to such and such religion, scripture, prophet? Even assuming we agreed on a definition, would “God” be *something* that can be contacted by the senses, be subject to perception, if so, *according to whom*? What’s its nature, function, purpose, use, and use to man? Is it responsible, irresponsible, agent, non-agent, doer, yet not doer, neither or all of these, and what’s its position, magnitude, no-position, no-magnitude? Is it the ultimate cause, a derivative, pure, a modification, being compounded, with all these marks – qualities – or with none? Is it conscious, unconscious, both, neither? A substance, a non-substance, both, neither? Undefinable, incomprehensible – wholly a mystery? If so – *according to whom*?

People who go about asking questions about “God” and demanding satisfaction – without realizing it – request answers to all these questions and more. To put them off with, “... ‘God’ is a word, a symbol, a concept, a construction by the consciousness, a creation of the mind of man,” or “... is a cipher, something intuited, a ‘no, no!’” could be an evasion, a subterfuge, and “no! no!” would be an item quoted from an Upanishad. Some pious folk, on the other hand, are satisfied with the authoritative answers given by the founders of religions. By accepting personal testimony, such people are said to have “faith”. Folk so blessed should not ask anybody questions about “God”. They should look up their scriptures.

I happen to presume, however, that everybody at all believes in “God”: if the word means the *highest value*. It is by one’s *highest value* that one weighs and measures the

worth of anything at all. So – bringing this abstruse term within the compass of empirical knowledge, hence discussion – *money* is “God” for most people I know. *Power* is “God” for some: ego, assertion, conquest, possession – including possessing people, their “love” is covered by the term.

“Religion” – well, once again, *according to whom?* The very fact we have so many religions – and new ones coming – is because we have no agreed definition of the word. Moreover, if you start telling people that “religion” must mean *inquiry after Truth* and *living that Truth*, they are likely to go for you with “Do you think our religion...” – or prophet, guru, scripture, swami, philosophy, reverend, or whatever – “... is false?” The author of *Haji Baba* has a character assert this position with the challenge, “Do you think he is eating his own soil?” The answer to that one is: “I didn’t say so!”

To advance, according to current Hindu stance, that all views concerning “religion” are true or partially true and that all “religious” pursuit does eventually lead to one “God” – even if your “God” happens to be your husband, *patideva*, or *gaumata*, mother cow, a defied river or a book, any image, symbol, sound, or a concept at all – could be an error, indifference to error, a no-submission, or a mannerism. Anyway, if people really believed in such a position, it could be a virtue: it could be a posture of inoffensive innocence (negatively speaking) and of tolerance and understanding (positively speaking). It so happens that those who claim to subscribe to this no- or all-positions “religious” position happen also to follow the caste system, bar foreigners and non-believers from their temples, including the so-called Hindu outcasts, and wouldn’t eat with you or marry you because you don’t belong.

May we tentatively agree that most or all religious testimony is autobiography? The founder said, “I saw,” “I heard.” You overhear this or read about it. You say, “I

believe him.” Presently, you and your co-religionists might say, “We shall defend our belief!” and “We shall fight for it!” “We shall give our lives for it!” etc. Such acts of feigned loyalty must satisfy some deep emotional need of man – the master-slave relationship syndrome probably. Fighting between one group of men of faith and another might have nothing to do with “religion” if the word means *inquiry after Truth and living that Truth*.

A search after “God” is indeed an inquiry after the *Highest Truth* or *Good* – whereby we might assess, weigh, judge lesser good: the things we believe to be good. Belief in such a Principle can be inferred from the evidence around us: of a Great Law, a Grand Design, a Scheme or an Intelligence at work. Belief in the existence – whatever the word might mean in such a dimension, and context – of such a Principle has been defended by logical processes by some very intelligent and capable men. Now, surely, if one wants to, one is free to deify this Principle – as indeed one is free to deify anything. Certain tribals of India have defied the archetypical Indian policeman as ‘*Pulisdeo*’. And don’t the Hindus worship money at Dipavali? And one is surely free to assign to this Principle the qualities of perfect Love, Compassion, Justice and Wisdom. Moreover, faith in the existence of such a Principle, or Being, if genuine, *must* influence the believer to pattern his life after his ideal – and try and be loving, compassionate, and within human limits, wise – and so be a blessing rather than a curse to the creation around him. Religious fanaticism, on the other hand, has been a pretty potent curse.

A man of faith, so defined, would face certain logical difficulties to be sure. For instance, there is this problem of pain, infirmity, incurable disease, death, and possible trouble hereafter. One cannot quite equate these with the Principle, or a Deity, with the qualities ascribed. A reasonable position to take might be to assign additional qualities to it – as pain-making, disease – and death-dealing: a part-time monstrous Punisher (yet Just and

Wise). Now, you might want to deny such a “God” and switch over to another, who is wholly “good”: is altogether pleasure-giving, infirmity-healing, health-and-immortality-giving (not forgetting the gift of paradise hereafter). By so choosing, you would be affirming a “God” who supports and sustains *you*, your *status* – shape, form, concept – all the way, now and forever. It must be obvious that your *highest value* is no “God” but *yourself*. *Money, power*, as pursuits, as passions, are to you “God” only insofar as they serve and further *you*. *You* are your own *highest value*. That being so, the burden of proof – to *prove* that such an all-pleasure, a no-change, no-mortality possibility exists, and that the Provider thereof also exists, rests on you or on whosoever believes in it.

Anyway, such a view – in spite of its possible justification by the force exerted by the instincts of survival and procreation – is unethical and an aberration. All the questions posited by me earlier about “God” apply to *this* “God”. The men and women who believe in *this* “God” ignore the ever-changing, aging and decaying “self” – their *obvious* “me” self.

Pain, infirmity, imperfection, ugliness, want, are real enough though. These are, briefly, misfortune. Now, a cat’s misfortune is the scarcity of mice: surely. And a mouse’s misfortune is to be set upon by a cat. Well, good fortune and misfortune could be opinions, views, two valid interpretations of a single happening, no less real for all that, speaking catwise or mousewise.

Everything in creation, quite obviously, has a set function and things are here to impart experience. And events, and things, have antecedents (past) and fate (future). A couple of my acquaintance, unfortunately, have a (Down syndrome) child. The child’s function seems to be to impart pain experience to them. The parents however are free to accept their misfortune as just, as decreed by a super-human Law, or an all-Wise Deity, from an unknown past cause, and patiently assume responsibility, happy to

serve a purpose by aiding and tending and loving a truly deserving creature – their child – and await a justly decreed happier future: or, they might sentence themselves to a life of misery, cursing their fate, their child and their God. Both views may result from a function or malfunction of the faculty of reasoning.

And, it is obvious, that all situations are subject to change. There is the move and the pause, light and darkness, emergence and decay, birth and death. These rhythmic patterns are experienced by us in time, depending on our position, our situation in space, and indeed the kind of consciousness and reasoning we might possess. Such changing events and patterns are often seen by us as *triumphs of Wrong over Right*. Yet, can any reasonable person deny that when one suffers from a malignant infection – the germs responsible are not having a run of luck? To a starving or a hubristic man a hen's egg might be a blessing. Yet an egg happens to be a "child" of parents and brought about by processes and compulsions no different from those to which the humans are subject. "Wrong" or "Right"? Well, once again, *according to whom?* Relative to *whom* do we so qualify an event?

We might tentatively agree over the cliché that *pursuit of happiness* must be our common goal. Everyone says so. These questions about "God", "religion", ideal social conditions, the hereafter, are secondary: relevant only if they help us attain "happiness". Even such an obviously reasonable proposition about human good might be untenable since we are not agreed about the meaning, the purpose, the object and import of "happiness". It *cannot* be the satisfaction of desire. A sexual pervert's idea of "happiness" is not my idea of "happiness".

Both the nature-interposed and the man-made situations, it so happens, are not static (quiescent): they are, rather, dynamic (flowing, drifting). Situations change. So do the agencies (remedies). We possess faculties. Faculties have specific functions. The ideal function of reason is to trace

causes, observe effects, assess and apply remedies, and so pursue whatever is worth pursuing – depending on your idea of “happiness”. The lay citizen questions you about God, religion, the hereafter, to remedy, restore, repair – so as to avoid possible painful situations – the non-free compelling mouse-situations. Your answers must be of *use* to him. Now it so happens that my beliefs and way of life are opposite in almost every particular to such a lay individual’s. I therefore avoid handing out formulas to people – to invoke metaphysical or earthly good. A certain prescription of mine has recently elicited a protest: “ ... It is all very well for you, with no family responsibilities...” etc. My correspondent diagnoses her situation reasonably enough (a non-free mouse-situation), and resents, unreasonably, that I am not sharing it with her.

The Indian family folk are bedeviled with problems, to be sure. I am thinking of my correspondent’s, though under duress, almost resenting it: I am trying to write this in an Italian hill garden, vastly distracted by the breathtaking blue of Lake Garda, embraced this very instant by an almost immaterial, an ethereal emeraldine mist.... Well, my friend is forced into a typical Indian situation. She is scanning for suitable matches for her offspring. The family have five daughters. The prospective in-laws, being devoted to the same “God” (*money*), are trying to chop the limbs off the family. The dowries they demand for each of the lined up girls is a genuine threat. I do not think a useful purpose would be served if I were to tell the family that their present mouse-situation is a situation of their own making: except that their choices were made earlier (as were mine, for my present position in an Italian villa, my current cat-situation). Their choices were made when they fervently agreed to be harnessed into marriage by their parents, were duly dowered, set up house, opted for home comforts, raised a family, accepted, and continued to accept and indeed uphold a decadent social code which assesses, above all else, the worth of an individual you wed by the money he or she can exact or lay down.

Her present situation, obviously, is an effect – the tail end of a series of past choices, acts and events. The girls in this family are “proper”: they are expected to have their eyes on the ground, be modest, etc., and *never* look at a man – and their self-abnegating virtue is duly rewarded with regular visits to the cinema, and they are provided with the *maximum* stimulation via the radio and the recorded music, till, I suspect, their notion of “love” is that of a distracted nut or a farmyard fanatic – and they are poised to marry men whom they literally do not know from Adam. A few years hence, after they have (from choice) lined up some 20 non-productive idle Indian rich individuals, yet another consumer family unit, in competition with other consumer family units, they would say to me, “ ... It is all very well for you, with no family responsibilities...” etc. When they would be enjoying cat-situations, and their *sons* would be fetching dowries, they would credit themselves with exemplary virtue. “We brought up 10 children...” etc., as if it were a sacrifice or a service given from love and not a compulsion from their nature and the dictates of their willfully accepted social code. These problems, let me add, are not “genuine”. They are self made. And I know of no fool-proof formulas against frustration, failure, and boredom either. There are formulas to be sure. But no fool-proof formulas.

Virtue certainly consists in solving problems. The highest use of the faculty of reasoning is to find solutions to problems. The American hybrid seed, giving us double the yield of wheat, is an instance. Heaven knows your Editor’s questions are important enough. Yet, I find it a sickening spectacle when I see the amount of time wasted in India in discussion, debate, conjecture, and publishing, about “God”, “Reality”, the hereafter, etc., mostly by people who obviously haven’t the equipment – intelligence, competence, capacity, technique, method – to pronounce upon such themes. They parrot ancient texts. If an ancient man’s “clairvoyant” vision is not reliable enough to locate for me the Sahara or Switzerland here on *this* earth – I am searching for such references for years in the scriptures

whose authors are believed to know absolutely all and never err – I don't see why the devil should I trust his "clairvoyant" vision of the earth, outside or beyond it: and his conjectures about God. I happen to think, however, that it is a virtue to believe in an Overlord, in karma and consequence, a life after death, if such a belief makes me loving, compassionate, just, and within my means, wise – the qualities in their fullness we tentatively ascribed to our Deity – if for no other reason than the fear of such as Overlord. Our central problem, quite frankly, is ethics (the rules we ought to live by).

It is sane to pursue *attainable goals*. If my present income were the average Indian per head statistical low, an *attainable goal* for me might be to become a Bombay rupee millionaire. Although in theory possible, for me, to amass the wealth equaling Akbar's might not be an *attainable goal*. I might spend a lifetime talking, speculating, if I would go for Buddhahood, the highest *samādhi*, the *jeevana-mukti*, see "God" with my eyes open, realize Self, Brahma or whatever, and establish missions abroad to help enlighten the unfortunate Europeans and Americans and the world at large. It would not be an *attainable goal* – if my equipment were an excess of ignorance and impudence.

The lepers begging in the streets of Bombay or Madras, their sores exposed to flies – who have no scruples about settling on you, on your wife's or child's face – are mobile agents spreading infection. To treat them, by the known techniques – by isolating them, the act supported by the law – is an act of love, compassion, justice, wisdom, to the victim, to oneself, to one's family, to the society, to humanity – the disease can be exported to other countries – and an act of worship too. The problem of the afflicted beggar is symbolic of a thousand problems, involving inequality, ignorance, dirt, brutality upon animals, upon women, indifference to the suffering of the human aged, the infirm, the young, the weak, which one can see any day in the streets and households of India. These problems

need to be solved by the Indians. They are Indian-made and Indian responsibility.

That is all a religiously-inclined and a God- or wisdom-aspiring man or woman need to know. To aim at solving such problems is an *attainable goal*: and all religion, all the love of God, all good here and hereafter, is contained in the will and the deed. To overlook evil upon one's doorstep, and dream up "world peace" by bringing all the hostile nations of the earth together, cruise here and there to induce "spiritual awakening", etc. is falsehood and an aberration. A form this kind of impiety takes is to alienate oneself from *real* problems, from responsibility: and indulge oneself in speculation, conjecture, and verbal battles about "God", "religion", "love", "Wrong", "Right", death, the hereafter, ideal but impossible family, sexual and political situations, cures and bracers for failure, frustration, boredom – *and* fraudulently crediting oneself with performance, a sense of fulfillment, of achievement, mastery, and a duty done. This will not do. I do not believe in it at all.

Note: In addition to minor editing, the text has been Americanized.

G.V. Desani's writings and lectures are copyright © UNICEF.  
All rights reserved.

---

## Synopsis of comments by other participants in *The Illustrated Weekly of India's* series "I Believe..."

*Valarian, Cardinal Gracias, Archbishop of Bombay.* His Eminence reiterated his belief in God. He did not think that belief and science were antithetical. The Catholic church was established by the person of Christ. The life, work, death and resurrection of Christ are historical facts. Good and Evil co-exist and will. These flow from

freewill in man. There is more virtue than vice and he had faith in the democratic form of government, in the institution of marriage, and regretted permissive sex.

*The Shankaracharya of Sharada Pitha.* “We see evidence of a systematic plan governing the cosmos....” Hence, His Holiness argued, “the plan cannot originate by itself. A plan must have a planner.... We understand him by the word ‘God’.” “... The ultimate analysis ... points to oneness and that one is God. The appropriate word for it is ‘Brahma’.... God also rules (over) Right and Wrong. One must resign oneself to the will of God. That enables one to remain detached – unaffected by pleasure or pain.... Death is not annihilation.... The *Arya-shastras* (Hindu scriptures) accept (the doctrine of) *karma*. One reaps the fruit of one’s deeds.”

*Balraj Sahni.* Mr. Sahni said he was an atheist. “God concept began when man rose above the level of animal.... Marxism is man’s highest achievement. Matter is the only ultimate reality. The claims of men of religion, yogis, metaphysicists, seem ludicrous.... Wrong (injustice) has triumphed over Right because Right (justice) has been reserved for the privileged.... There is no future life or reincarnation.”

*The Shankaracharya of Joytir Math.* “We believe in God because God and the living world have an inseparable relationship.... No God, no living world.... The basis of Right is virtue, and that of Wrong is vice.... Right triumphs over Wrong. Death is just the name for a change of body, with the being remaining intact.... As many as 84,000,000 different designs ... (bodies, organisms) have been built (are found in Nature) for the being to live in.... The being is allotted any one of these, to suit his actions, feelings, and thoughts, from time to time. He gets better facilities on showing good work, and demotion ... punishment, etc.... God awards better or worse ... on the basis of (the being’s) performance.” His Holiness added, “The authority for these beliefs are the *Vedas* and the *Arya-shastras*,” (Hindu scriptures).

*Mulk Raj Anand.* “... Comes upon one the urge to confess ... my mother was a devout, though superstitious woman.... She worshipped the Aga Khan, as one of her gods, and he was rumored to be living a fast life in England.... My mother explained her sufferings at the hand of my father as due to her past *karma*.... (In his youth) in England, I put in for research in philosophy under the Kantian Scholar, Prof. G. Dawes Hicks, in the University College, London. I also attended the lectures of Professors G.E. Moore, C.D. Broad and Bertrand Russell. Philosophy, in those days, had become mostly criticism of the sciences.... (Subsequently) under the spell of

his (Prof. S. Radhakrishnan's) oratory, I hugged the idealistic *Vedanta* theory, with its reduction of the world into the series of *māyās* (illusions)... The contradictions (in his forming beliefs and way of life) tore my soul ... reading philosophy in the British Museum by day and waltzing with the whores in Soho during the nights.... The rains did not come when the farmers prayed ... and God seemed to be on both sides in World War I.... Seldom had Right triumphed over Wrong.... Establishment had always crushed everything. Freedom then (for him) became sacred, all kinds of freedom, even if it bordered on license.... I got beaten up (during the General Strike in England) (along) with some English students, for not blacklegging against the strikers by helping run trains and buses.... A woman ... (about that time) sold me the *Communist Manifesto* by Marx and Engles.... The letters (by Marx, on India, written in 1854, to *The New York Herald Tribune*) ... showed me the possibilities of the new method of history based on the analysis of the means of production as the determinants of consciousness.... While I felt the Soviet Union should be allowed to go on with its experiment ... the excesses of men like Stalin could ... be checked only by a democratic (form of) government.... (Subsequently, in India) I was torn between Gandhi and Nehru, ultimately inclining to the modernist Nehru because he did not believe in God.... I then believed and still believe, that all governments are bad ... and that ultimately Lenin's idea must prevail and the state should wither away.... I believe that children should be born by mutual consent and should be looked after by the egalitarian state ... I believe we have only one life to live and there is no hereafter."

*Nirad C. Choudhuri*. "... Convictions are derived from experience through induction and legitimate inference. Faith ... is always an unquestioning assumption, derived from intuitive perception or perhaps through a gift of grace.... Majority of men do not feel any yearning for such a faith nor do they suffer for want of it.... The ... ordeal by fire through which I put my faith was provided by modern physics and modern biology. I do maintain that no article of faith which contradicts anything established by these two sciences can be valid...." Mr. Choudhuri then summarizes the basis of his faith as: (1) The so-called soul does not exist: therefore, the idea of immortality is false: the individual human personality, it follows, does not survive death; (2) There is no personal God, not to speak of gods, nor another world; (3) The cosmos (as known to science) is not material in the ordinary sense of the world: it is organization, in patterns of motion, of intangible energy: it is that which is perceived as material phenomena; (4) Neither matter nor phenomena exist: these are sensory perceptions: everything is quality; (5) The distinction between phenomena and noumena, appearance and

reality, matter and spirit, are fictitious: but the two are identical; (6) There is no conflict in nature: man, in his corruption, has introduced conflict; (7) In its temporal dimension, the universe is a flow, and may be a process: reason cannot reveal it fully as a process; (8) Intellectual knowledge is partial knowledge: it can tell us how and from where, never why and whereto: it cannot perceive value though it can analyze attributes: this knowledge cannot, therefore, give us full understanding.

*Kapur Singh.* Mr. Singh believed in God but not in a paraphysical or an extra-paraphysical entity. It is such an entity which the atheists and communist intellectuals, he said, deny. In some ways religion goes beyond ordinary facts. Religious experience is experience of God. One is (in such an experience) in contact with the highest reality.... "Ascesis, self-redemption and poverty are better realized in Eastern culture than in Western society...." "... If life is real, so is the state after death, for the real cannot pass into the unreal, through a process, which death is...."

*Hem Barua, M.P.* "Faith in God sustains man, both in physical and moral adventures. Gandhiji's was an ethical adventure.... Organized religions are organized emotion...." "... Marriage as an institution is bound to last through the vicissitudes of life...." Sex in India, Mr. Barua thought, "is mostly under cover. This is as unhealthy a thing as promiscuity in sex is...."

*Krishan Chandar.* "... I make God in my image ... my God is not an ... unerring being...." In one of his short stories, he had depicted God as "a toddler playing marbles in the Milky Way..." "Now this is an image ... that won't do you much good, but it won't do you any harm...." Cosmologically speaking, he went on, there are no Rights or Wrongs. Human code is man-made. "The cave man (once upon an time) could kill his son. Today, he would be hanged.... In some parts of Borneo, unless a man has killed another man and eaten him, he is not considered civilized ... (the institution of) marriage is outdated.... It will be possible to love a person and have several sex relations.... We are all monkeys performing in a zoo before an unseen audience.... If you don't believe me, meet me after 2000 years."

*Justice G.D. Khosla.* "... I am not quite sure about what I really believe, but I feel all the better for it ... I continue to cherish a faith in the goodness of mankind...." "... I cannot say vehemently enough 'I am an atheist' or 'I am not'.... My attitude is further confused by my preference for the theory of *karma*.... I can find no other explanation for unmerited suffering...."

*Prof. Amiya Chakravarty.* “Belief in God means, to me, belief in some ultimate divine power.... I do not believe that (all) institutional religions are of equal worth....” “... I am for democracy, but I am aware of ‘democracies’ which are based not on humanity, spiritual values and judicial equality but guns and economic exploitation, or on hierarchical dispensations....” “...I cannot believe that existence can non-exist; the form may change or even disappear, but the reality of the person is not dependent on form.... (For instance) great characters of history survive physical death.”

*Jagjit Singh.* “I have oscillated between spells of outright atheism ... and special belief in ... a divine creator.... It may seem rather odd to claim that the basic axiom of science itself is an act of faith.... (Orderliness) shows itself in scientific laws and theories, which are laboriously teased out of physical observation, coupled with mathematical deduction like the ‘Orderliness’ Newton discovered.... It is true that ‘reasons of heart’ have impelled every age to infer the existence of God by the light of pure reason.... The latest in this genre is the creationist cosmology of Lemaitre and Gamow.... It is impossible to understand rationally a God in whom one did not believe already.... Having lost my innocence long ago, I believe ... speculation about God, soul, life after death, are futile pastimes....”

*Badr-ud-din Tyabji.* Mr. Tyabji’s belief in God, he confesses, has been sustained by the dialogue that he carries on with the voice within him “which, I believe, emanates from the Being that I conceive to be God....” “...Islam (Muslim religion) does not warrant compulsion but in the name of Islam, as in the name of most religions, strange and terrible things have been and are being done.... The triumph of Right over Wrong is the natural state of affairs, and the triumph of Wrong over Right (is) an aberration of cause and effect.... (There is, however) so much evil ... suffering ... I can see no reason or justification for this.... The question of death has neither interested me nor caused me much concern.”

*Mino Masani, M.P.* “... I believe in the brotherhood of man.” Mr. Masani owned that he did not know if he believed in God. “Human nature is essentially the same ... people react ... the same way to the same incentives and pressures.... I am not inclined to believe ... that the economic and social policies that produce certain results ... in Japan or Germany or the United States would not produce similar results in India. I find nothing unique about the people of our country.... Because nothing good can come out of a system based on force, no good can come out of the Soviet System.... What makes for human happiness is moral.... A test of any action, therefore, should be the overall balance of happiness and unhappiness it produces....”

*Dev Anand.* Mr. Anand pleaded that he had no supernatural experience. “It is better, therefore” he added, “to let God remain in the realm of the mysterious....”

*Gen. K.M. Cariappa.* The General believed in God. His prayers had been answered. He quoted from the diary of Viscount Alan Brooke who, appointed Chief of Imperial General Staff by Winston Churchill, knelt down and prayed for guidance. Gen. Cariappa commended individual and collective *discipline, determination*, a sense of *duty* and *dedication*, “the four Ds.” “... Get to know your job thoroughly. Do not be idle. Be always ready to learn new things. Be thorough in everything you do. Never grumble. Go in search of opportunities to serve, not in search of making money. Never make promises you cannot keep. Always listen to the other side of the story. Never give way to worry. Be natural.”