UNIT 4   INTEGRAL VEDANTA

Contents

4.0   OBJECTIVES

The primary goal of this unit is to introduce the student to the integral vision of life and reality by Aurobindo. All the schools of Indian thought are related to Vedanta in two ways: (i) they all stem from the Vedanta in the sense that they have either accepted or denied its doctrines and (ii) they are articulated as a response to the question of the one and the many. Aurobindo's integral Advaita or Vedanta is no exception to it. Therefore, our primary objective in this unit is to explicate how Aurobindo's predecessors have responded to this question and how Aurobindo is related to them. This is certainly a Herculean task, for it inevitably takes us to the discussion of Vedanta philosophy. We will also discuss in this section the fundamental presuppositions of Aurobindo's Philosophy and how the name Integral Advaita is applied to it.

4.1   INTRODUCTION

Aurobindo's philosophy is known as integral advaita or integral Yoga. One cannot discuss the question of the one and the many in Indian philosophy in isolation of Vedanta; it calls us to delve into the genius of the masters of Vedanta philosophy. In fact, Aurobindo himself develops his metaphysics in dialogue with it. Therefore, as the *Sitz im Leben* of the Aurobindonian metaphysics we will also discuss three major schools of thought, though very briefly, in this unit. Nevertheless, first we look into the central presuppositions of Aurobindonian metaphysics.

4.2   FUNDAMENTAL PRESUPPOSITIONS OF AUROBINDO'S METAPHYSICS

The whole edifice of Aurobindo's philosophy is pillared on certain presuppositions. For Aurobindo, the central problem of philosophy is the problem of harmony. We should give proper attention to the great Vedantic formulas:

"One without a second" and "All this is Brahman" (MU 2,7). What went wrong in the past is that we stressed the first at the expense of the second. Therefore, the goal of Aurobindo was to find out a way for the affirmation of both matter and Spirit. The central problem, therefore, is the problem of harmony. The second presupposition, wherein one observes the originality of Aurobindo and how he transcends the theories of his predecessors, of the Integral (*purna*) Advaita is faith in the "involution" (descent) of the Absolute Reality in the material world which we discuss in detail in this unit. In his theory of the involution of the Absolute into the material world we also have Aurobindo's novel response to the problem of the one and the many. The condition of possibility for the third presupposition, namely evolution of reality, is the "involution." A fourth presupposition of Aurobindo is his faith in "cosmic consciousness." By entering into that consciousness we become aware of the fact that Matter, Mind, and Life are one existence. One can summarize the major conclusions of Aurobindo's integral view of Reality as follows: (i) The realization of the Absolute Reality as utterly transcendent with respect to all forms; (ii) Realization of the Absolute as a personal God, creative and all-pervasive Lord of the universe; (iii) Realization of the Absolute as moving and unmoving, finite and infinite, determinate and indeterminate, immanent and transcendent, etc.; and (iv) Realisation of the various planes of being, linked in graded continuity from the lowest matter to the highest spirit – identification of the evolutionary ascent.

4.3 AUROBINDO AND THE VEDANTA PHILOSOPHY

Aurobindo does not stand isolated in the history of Indian thought. Aurobindo places himself in the Vedanta tradition. He rather built his own system of Integral Advaita, that transcends the *Advaita* (Absolute monism) of Sankara, which stressed the non-dualistic character of reality; the *Vishishtadvaita* of Ramanuja, which proposed a qualified non-dualism; and the *Dvaitavada* of Madhva, which proposed a dualistic conception of Reality. Therefore, we develop Aurobindo's philosophy in dialogue with his great predecessors. In order to understand a philosophy one has to study its formative *Sitz im Leben*. Therefore, our first task is to understand the heritage of Indian philosophy that Aurobindo inherited from tradition. The questions of the ultimate Reality, the one and the many and God-World relation have captured the attention of Indian philosophers from the dawn of history, as it also happened in the West. There have been various attempts by the Indian thinkers to find a reasonable solution to these age-old philosophical problems.

4.4 AUROBINDO'S RESPONSE TO ABSOLUTE NON-DUALISM

Advaitism is associated with the celebrated Indian thinker Sankara (788-820). "The term 'Advaita' literally means "non-two-ness" and it connotes a theory which maintains that the ultimate Reality is not characterized by duality. Sankara is generally considered the greatest of the Indian philosophers. Furthermore, the Advaita of Sankara is qualified as the "temple of metaphysics" (U 333). Sankara is qualified as the great "synthesizer and conciliator" of Indian philosophy. His contribution to Indian philosophy includes a powerful, universal understanding

of the Upanishads, which were interpreted diversely by various thinkers, who preceded him. He established his own philosophy in contradistinction, on one hand, to the heretic nihilism of the Sunyavadins (Buddhists) and, on the other, to the efficacy of Karma as an ultimate means to salvation. Sankara upholds Brahman as the highest transcendental Truth. Brahman is *Nirguna Brahma*. Brahman is the ground (*adhisthana*) of all creation, the consciousness presupposed by all knowing, and the object which is eternally desirable in and for itself. For the Indian thinkers the dilemma consisted, on one hand, in maintaining the oneness of the Absolute (Brahman) and, on the other, in accounting for the many in the phenomenal world. However, our primary concern here is how does Sankara account for the multiplicity of the world once he has established Brahman as the sole Reality. For him, Brahman is both the material and efficient cause of the world. Sankara explains it by his theory of *Satkaryavada* that the material effect preexists in the cause. Sankara maintains that it is a logical conclusion. The point is, if the effect somehow preexists in the material cause, anything could come out of anything. However, Sankara observes that cause and effect cannot be identified in the sense that the effect is only a manifestation of the cause. Therefore, Brahman, the cause, is the only reality, and the effect, the world, is only an apparent manifestation of the cause. Brahman is both the efficient and material cause of the universe. Thus, Sankara advocates an absolute non-dualism.

Sankara and Shankarites in their preoccupation to maintain the Absolute oneness of the Reality, denied the reality of the world. The heart of Sankara's teaching is often expressed by: *Brahma Satyam, Jagat Mithya, Jivo Brahmaiva naparah* (Brahman is real, the world is false, and the self is not different from Brahman). This text has been often quoted and interpreted to support and substantiate the view that Sankara expounded an illusory existence of the universe. However, this concept is very much disputed today.

The Shankarites had to deny the reality of the world to keep the Absolute oneness of Brahman. It was the only possibility open to them. However, Sankara admits the reality of the world from an empirical standpoint and not from a metaphysical or transcendental standpoint. By using his method of sublation (contradiction) which is the mental process of correcting and rectifying errors of judgement, Sankara develops an ontological hierarchy. This is the core of Sankara's absolute non-dualism.

Aurobindo on Advaita of Sankara

Aurobindo clearly repudiates Sankara's absolute monistic view of the world and maintains that 'All this is Brahman' (*Sarvam idam Brahma eva*) does not mean an identity between the phenomenal (*vyavaharika*) world of appearance and the ultimate (*paramarthika*) reality of Brahman. The reality of the Absolute does not nullify the reality of the temporal world. On the contrary, it points to the absolute dependence of the universe on the Absolute. Therefore, Aurobindo designates the philosophy of Sankara as "a qualified illusionism" in the sense that it does not give the external world a real existence. Here the ontological status of the world is "real and yet not really real". The criticism of Aurobindo against Sankara has to be seen in the light of the illusionism alleged against Sankara and which was so prevalent ever since the formulation of his theory. It is this (alleged) contention of the Sankarites that is challenged by Aurobindo. Aurobindo writes in repudiation of Sankara that "Cosmos is not the Divine in all

his utter reality, but a single self-expression, a true but minor motion of his being". This citation highlights Aurobindo's realism very clearly. And his realism itself follows from the fact that the world is a manifestation of the Absolute, which in fact refers to the further truth that the involution of the Absolute is the essence of creation.

Sankara contended that the world is not truly real and the only true reality is Brahman. The inevitable consequence of such a view was that even the self of man was an illusion. In this respect the highest and the noblest ideal possible for human beings was to merge the individual soul into the essence of the Absolute reality. Such a perspective had a very negative consequence on human life; in fact, it promoted inaction and the renunciation of the world and everything in it as unworthy. The one-sidedness of spirituality was always a point of critique for Aurobindo. The ideal of human life is self-fulfillment rather than self-negation. In order to realise the Absolute an individual does not have to deny himself nor the cosmos but "need only deny his own separate ego-existence." Aurobindo is a strong critic of the ideal of self-absorption in the featureless Absolute.

Aurobindo claims that Advaitism can be maintained while accepting the reality of the World. In contrast to Sankara's interpretation of the Upanishads that they establish the oneness of reality as Brahman, at the cost of the reality of the world, Aurobindo points to the "coexistence of the divine and its multiple manifestations". The difference between Sankara and Aurobindo can be summarised in the following way: For Sankara as long as the individual is subject to Maya, he regards the cosmos as real, but once the individual withdraws from the cosmic Maya and attains liberation, he realizes that the cosmos is illusory. However, Aurobindo, maintains that the individual, due to ignorance, is unable to realise the identity of the cosmos with Brahman. Once his limited consciousness transcends into higher consciousness and the ignorance is replaced by true knowledge, he realizes the reality of both Brahman and the cosmos.

4.5 AUROBINDO'S RESPONSE TO QUALIFIED NON-DUALISM

Visistadvaita of Ramanuja

Ramanuja (1017-1137) is the chief exponent of the *Visistadvaita* or the qualified non-dualism. His was a "creative and constructive effort to systematize" the philosophy contained in the classics of Indian philosophy. In the theistic tradition of Advaita he is considered only second to the great Sankara. The chief philosophical problem confronted by Ramanuja, like Sankara, is that of the one and the many. How are we to reconcile the Upanishadic teaching regarding Brahman as the only true reality and the flux of the many of the empirical world? In other words, how can we account for the empirical world without endangering the Absoluteness of Brahman? It is true that Ramanuja concurs with Sankara that Brahman is real. However, unlike Sankara, for whom Brahman is identity without difference (*Nirguna*), for Ramanuja, Brahman is identity-in-difference (*Saguna*). In this respect, Ramanuja is one with Aurobindo who maintains identity-in-difference. Ramanuja maintains that the Upanishadic denial of any negative qualities to Brahman does not mean that he is devoid of any qualities (contrasting with Sankara but concurring with Aurobindo); on the contrary, Brahman possesses a number of positive qualities such as existence, consciousness, bliss, knowledge,

truth, etc. It is these attributes which are responsible for the determinate nature of Brahman.

Ramanuja's Theory of Reality

Ramanuja's theory of reality is an ineluctable corollary of his theory of identity-in-difference. Therefore, unlike Sankara, he postulates three ontological realities: God or Isvara, Souls or Jivas, and the world or matter. Ramanuja's conception of reality is distinct in two ways: (i) he personalized the nature of Brahman, and (ii) he restores more personal attributes to the world and individual souls. Brahman is an organic unity, and thus maintains a real relation between God, soul, and the world (matter). It is a point of convergence between Ramanuja and Aurobindo. They are three factors (*tattva-traya*) of the same Reality.

Though soul and matter (*cit* and *acit*) are equally real, they are nevertheless absolutely dependent on God (*Isvara*). One of the unique contributions of Ramanuja is the understanding that to be real does not mean to be independent. Since, for Ramanuja inorganic matter is also ensouled, the nature of dependence is perceived as that of body upon soul. Matter and individual souls are conceived to be the body of the Absolute and they are directed and sustained by the Absolute. In other words, though matter and soul are substances, in relation to the Absolute they are attributes. The Absolute is the supreme Reality with soul and matter as his integral parts. Brahman is the Absolute reality in the sense that independent of it or outside of it, there is no other reality. In fact, what Ramanuja proposes is an ontology of participation like that of Aquinas.

In this respect also Aurobindo is one with Ramanuja. Ramanuja maintains that the substance can be known only through the attributes. Therefore, it follows from this premise that God can be known only through the world (Branningan 64). In his Vishishtadvaita, Ramanuja clarifies both the immanence and transcendence of the Absolute. Thus, for him, the unity of Brahman is a unity of plurality, containing both conscious and unconscious elements. One has to place Ramanuja's response to the problem of the One and the Many in the context of his theory of reality. How does the one contain the many? Ramanuja explains it through his principle of *Samanadhikarnya* or the principle of coordination. The argument is that different words in the same sentence can point to the same reality. His interpretation of the classical text "This is that Devadatta" explains the theory further. The core of the argument is that Devadatta of the past and Devadatta of the present are not entirely identical, yet both refer to the same person. Ramanuja holds that just as different descriptive modes can denote one and the same person, so also unity and diversity, one and many, can coexist; they cannot be contradictories, rather they can be reconciled in a synthetic unity. The many are real and they characterize the one.

Ramanuja's philosophy clearly emphasizes the immanence of the supreme Reality in all existence. In it one has both the strength and weakness of Ramanuja's ontology. He succeeded in bringing down the Absolute, however, he finds it difficult to explain the precise relationship that exists between Brahman and the world. His theory of 'part and whole' would further question the integrity of the Brahman, since the part is subject to change and decay. It would also question how the temporal changes and the miseries in the universe affect Brahman, a concept which he has not considered adequately. It is also notable that in order to

keep the unity of the universe and the Absolute, Ramanuja has focused on the immanence of God even at the cost of his transcendental dimension. In this respect, both from the religious as well as from the philosophical perspective, Advaita of Sankara is more appealing to the intellect, while Ramanuja's Vishishtadvaita appeals to the heart. Ramanuja in his attempt to safeguard the reality of the world, has altogether denied "the experience of a pure consciousness in an unqualified oneness". Ramanuja advocates a real relation between the Absolute and the world.

Nevertheless, in spite of Ramanuja's sincere efforts, he has failed to account for the subsistence of both *cit* (consciousness) and *acit* (matter) in a single whole – the Brahman. Ramanuja's Brahman is not a synthetic whole which might assimilate all its parts into itself. His concept of Brahman can be compared to a person whose body is composed of two opposing principles: *cit* – the individual consciousness (soul) and *acit* - the primordial matter. It seems that for Ramanuja, spirit and matter include both identity and difference in itself (*bhedabheda*). Such a position maybe applicable in a practical sense, but may not withstand an intellectual, logical scrutiny. Thus, one may have to admit that we are faced with a disjunctive proposition where the individual souls and primordial matter are either identical with or different from Brahman. However, the problem we face here is still acute, i.e., the former conclusion would take us to the Advaita philosophy of Sankara and the latter would demolish Ramanuja's Vishishtadvaita in favour of Dvaita of Madhva where Brahman, individual soul, and matter are really different. This was also the point of criticism by Madhva against Ramanuja.

A comparison of Sankara and Ramanuja in the light of Aurobindo would claim that the latter is more sympathetic to Ramanuja in his approach to Reality. However, Ramanuja's theory of dependence, which claims the absolute dependence of the universe on Brahman, even to the extent of negating the real existence of the universe is hardly acceptable to Aurobindo. Ramanuja, to a certain extent, succeeded in maintaining the reality of the world, but failed to work out the relationship between the two in a reasonable way. Ramanuja influenced Aurobindo with his theory of identity-in-difference and the theory of real relation. However, the merit of Aurobindo is that he succeeded in maintaining the Absoluteness of Brahman amidst his avowal of the temporal universe, where Ramanuja failed.

4.6 AUROBINDO AND ABSOLUTE DUALISM

Madhva (1199-1278) has a unique position in Indian philosophy with his dualistic conception of reality. His is a dualistic realism. The Sanskrit word *Dvaita* comes from the root *dvi* – meaning two. The term *dvaita* etymologically means duality or dualism. Dualism implies difference, which is said to constitute the essence of things. The theory of difference or dualism implies that each substance is unique with its own specific characteristics and nature. The difference is not only qualitative but also quantitative. Even the two objects that look alike are different in the sense that each possesses a self-differentiating characteristic. Madhva advocates, therefore, a pluralistic ontology. Madhva developed a vision of the universe where God, the individual soul and matter are considered really different, and are eternal and absolutely real. The latter two are dependent on God, in the sense that Brahman is the cause and the world is the effect.

Theory of Difference and Dependence

Madhva advocates, on the one hand, purely a theistic philosophy based on the dualism of God and the Jiva, and, on the other, the plurality of the universe. The foundation of his ontology is his theory of perception and his theory of knowledge. Human perception brings before the perceiving subject a world of objects. They are independent objects, independent of the perceiver and the knowledge of the perceiver. It is independent of the knowledge in the sense that knowledge does not create objects, but only reveals them. Perception also brings out the difference between the perceiver and the perceived or the cognizer and the cognized. For example, the perception of a table makes clear that the table is real and it is different from other objects. They are two independent entities which have their own reality in the outside world. These distinctions are real and objective. Thus, Madhva rejects the relation of inseparability, and for him this means that the understanding of the material universe as the body of God is no more acceptable. Matter and souls are rather real and different from Brahman.

Madhva, even though he advocates a pluralistic ontology, does admit the dependence of the world and soul on the Absolute. The core of Madhva's philosophy is the distinction he makes between twofold categories: the independent reals (*svatantra*) and the dependent reals (*paratantra*). For him, the only independent real is the Absolute, Brahman. Madhva is considered as an absolute dualist. The distinctive perception of the Brahman-world relation by Ramanuja and Madhva can be summarised in the following way: for Ramanuja, the impersonal God of Sankara was only an "inadequate and partial realization of 'the Supreme Person' (*Purushottama*)" who is Absolute and eternal. The Absolute is ultimately real, and therefore, whatever comes from it is real, both the universe and the individual souls, but dependent on God. For Madhva, the individual soul was created by God, but never was and would never become one with him or part of him.

Aurobindo's Response

Aurobindo criticizes Madhva for creating an unbridgeable duality between Brahman and the world. Furthermore, while Ramanuja maintained a qualitative monism and a quantitative pluralism with regard to the reality of souls, Madhva advocates both a quantitative and qualitative pluralism. Here Aurobindo concurs with Ramanuja in his repudiation of Madhva. On the other hand, one of the distinctive features distinguishing Aurobindo as well as Madhva from Sankara is that in the former two material realities are not neglected, on the contrary, the individual souls and the material realities of the world are accorded ontological reality.

In the above sections our attempt was to see how the great predecessors of Aurobindo conceived reality and its relation to the phenomenal world. Our discussion also eventually clarified how these thinkers have responded to the question of the one and the many. We have undertaken this analysis with a clear purpose in mind: (i) to clarify what is the relation of Aurobindo to the classical philosophy of India; (ii) to clarify the points of difference as well as points of convergence that Aurobindo has with his predecessors; and (iii) to delineate in a nutshell the constitutive factors of Aurobindo's integral Advaitism. We see that neither the Advaita of Sankara nor the Vishishtadvaita of Ramanuja, nor even the Dvaitavada of Madhva, are devoid of imperfections. Each theory has its own

merits and demerits. Our primary concern is to see how Aurobindo views these respective issues and how he solves the imperfections involved in these systems by his integral Advaita and how adequate and truthful his responses are.

4.7 INTEGRAL ADVAITA

It has already been made clear that Aurobindo places himself in the Advaita tradition. He acknowledges that his philosophy is a realistic Advaita. The question is about why Aurobindo's system is known as integral Advaita or *purna* Advaita? It is integral for the following reasons: (i) Aurobindo presents his philosophy as an advancement of the major Advaitic traditions, and (ii) the designation *Purna* (integral) connotes a stronger intrinsic value vested in the universe than advocated by his great predecessors. For Aurobindo, the Real is one, but this oneness does not point to an exclusion but rather to a totality. It is an identity in difference. It is devoid of any duality, but has a deeper unity of wholeness. Moreover, it is integral in two other senses: firstly, it takes into account the knowledge attained, not through any particular mental process in man, but through his whole being. Thus, it can be said that it is based on an integral epistemology; secondly, Aurobindo's conception of reality is based on neither man, nor God nor the world, nor any of the two alone, but on the integral consciousness underlying these three manifestations of Reality. For Aurobindo, Reality is an integral whole of which the individual, the universal and the transcendental are three facets.

Aurobindo's system is also designated as integral Yoga. By Yoga Aurobindo means a union of the human individual with the universal and transcendent Existence we see partially expressed in man and in the Cosmos. 'Yoga' is essentially a 'spiritual integration'. It basically implies two factors: (i) Immediate contact with the inmost nature of existence in its manifold richness of content; and (ii) an integration of such different provinces of experience as science, art, morality, religion, etc., in the light of one's immediate insight into the heart of reality. Aurobindo defines Integral Yoga as the turning of one or of all powers of our human existence into a means of reaching the Divine Being. Moreover, it is stated that the goal of integral Yoga is a divine perfection of the human being.

In contrast with the ancient systems of Yoga, which maintain a negative attitude towards life and nature, Aurobindo's system includes not only Being but also Becoming, not only the static or silent Spirit but also the dynamic Brahman. His system aims not only at the realization of God but also involves an entire consecration and change of the inner and outer life till it is fit to manifest a divine consciousness and become part of a divine work. Therefore, it is known as integral Yoga. Integral Yoga points to its comprehensive and all inclusive transformation of the state of mind and the life of the individual. Aurobindo's system is integral above all for the reason that it maintains a monistic pluralism.

4.8 DISTINCTIVENESS OF INTEGRAL YOGA

The previous explication of the name "integral" brought out a number of features that are specific to Aurobindo's metaphysics. Therefore, our task in this section is to elucidate further a few more points that pertain to the distinctive nature of the Aurobindonian metaphysics. Integral Yoga is distinct from and goes beyond other Yoga systems by aiming at two higher goals: (1) It aims to assemble,

concentrate and discipline all the qualities, capacities, and motive forces in man and to elevate them to a "diviner spiritual level," and (2) It moves beyond the liberation of the soul into a wholly transcendent realm of isolated unity, to a "cosmic enjoyment [*bhukti*] of the power of the Spirit" which has never been the motive or object of other systems. In fact it is a bolder and larger system. Again, while the traditional Yoga aims at individual liberation, Aurobindo's system is concerned with making Earthly life Divine or bringing God down to Earth.

The question, however, concerns how practical are these ideals? The nature and final object of Integral Yoga can be clarified by the following facts: i) The liberation of the individual soul and the achievement of the perfect union with the Divine; ii) It is a corollary of the first, namely, the enjoyment of the perfect union of the individual and the eternal; iii) The fruits of the divine union are expressed and manifested in the works for promoting spirituality in the world.

Aurobindo's integral vision, in contrast to Sankara's advaitism, does not abandon life and world, but renounces "man's blind attachment to them." Aurobindo states clearly that for the integral advaitism renunciation is merely an instrument and not an object. A unique feature of integral Advaita is that it attempted for the first time in the history of Indian thought a synthesis of the evolutionary perspective of the modern West with the spiritual heritage of India. Aurobindo's philosophy is an Integral Spiritualistic Non-dualism for two reasons: (i) in Aurobindo's perspective all realities emerge from the fundamental spiritual substance, the Brahman; and (ii) the central purpose of Aurobindo's yoga is an inner self-development by which each one who follows it can in time discover the One Self in all and evolve a higher consciousness than the mental, a spiritual and a supramental consciousness which will transform and divinise human nature.

Aurobindo's system is distinctive for the reason that the object of his philosophy is integral reality. For him, reality is integral in that it means not only Being but also Becoming, not only the quiescent, eternal or non-temporal Brahman but also the dynamic Brahman or Brahman manifesting itself through flux and in time. The core of integralism is the acceptance of the Supra-cosmic Transcendence and freedom (*Nirguna Brahma*), cosmic creativity and universality (*Saguna Brahma*), and unique individuality (*Jivatman*) as the three inseparable and equally real modes of existence of the supreme spiritual reality Sachchidananda. Among the three, primacy remains with the transcendent. Thus, it is safe to say that in Aurobindo we have a synthetic reconciliation of the Indian schools of thought.

4.9   LET US SUM UP

In this unit our attempt was to understand the thought pattern of Aurobindo and how his philosophy is different from other Vedantic thinkers. His system is known as integral Vedanta as different from Absolute monism of Sankara, Absolute dualism of Madhva and Qualified monism of Ramanuja. Though he is rooted in Vedantic tradition he presented his thought applying Western categories and thus making it intelligible for people from other philosophical tradition. With this background we are able to move to the next unit where we will discuss the basic unity of reality as suggested by Aurobindo.

4.10 KEY WORDS

Tat-tvam asi :   *Tat Tvam Asi,*   a Sanskrit sentence, translating variously to "Thou art that," "That thou art," "You are that," or "That you are," is one of the Mahavakyas (Grand Pronouncements)

4.11 FURTHER READINGS AND REFERENCES

Amaladoss, Michael. *Making Harmony: Living in a Pluralist World*. Chennai: IDCR, 2003.

Ghose, A. *The Riddle of This World*. Calcutta: Arya Pub. House, 1933.

Ghose, A. *The Life Divine*. New York: Greystone Press, 1949.

Ghose, A. *The Future Evolution of Man; the Divine Life Upon Earth*. London: Allen & Unwin, 1963.

Ghose, A. *On Yoga II: Letters on Yoga.* Pondicherry: Sri Aurobindo Ashram, 1969.

Ghose, A. *The Yoga of Sleep and Dreams: The Night-School of Sadhana.* Twin Lakes: Lotus Press, 2004.

Student Satisfaction Survey

Student Satisfaction Survey of IGNOU Students

Enrollment No.	
Mobile No.	
Name	
Programme of Study	
Year of Enrolment	
Age Group	☐ Below 30 ☐ 31-40 ☐41-50 ☐51 and above
Gender	☐ Male ☐Female
Regional Centre	
States	
Study Center Code	

Please indicate how much you are satisfied or dissatisfied with the following statements

Sl. No.	Questions	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Average	Dissati- sfied	Very Dissati- sfied
1.	Concepts are clearly explained in the printed learning material	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2.	The learning materials were received in time	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3.	Supplementary study materials (like video/audio) available	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4.	Academic counselors explain the concepts clearly	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5.	The counseling sessions were interactive	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
6.	Changes in the counseling schedule were communicated to you on time	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
7.	Examination procedures were clearly given to you	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
8.	Personnel in the study centers are helpful	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
9.	Academic counseling sessions are well organized	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
10.	Studying the programme/course provide the knowledge of the subject	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
11.	Assignments are returned in time	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
12.	Feedbacks on the assignments helped in clarifying the concepts	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
13.	Project proposals are clearly marked and discussed	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
14.	Results and grade card of the examination were provided on time	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
15.	Overall, I am satisfied with the programme	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
16.	Guidance from the programme coordinator and teachers from the school	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

After filling this questionnaires send it to:

Programme Coordinator, 115, G Block, IGNOU, Maidan Garhi, New Delhi-110068