

questioned except by the method of science itself, appear to justify Nandy's skepticism to an extent.

The problem with most articles, starting with parts of the Manifesto itself, is a kind of fundamentalism, particularly a generous use of blanket statements. If the scientific spirit and curiosity is one wonderful human faculty, the Manifesto appears to belittle, even deride, other faculties. The debate is not without its use, though: many partial truths and mutually conflicting viewpoints are thrown about, which the reader can try to join together and make a wholesome picture. Most debaters throw a good deal of mud at religion, rituals, 'obscurantism' and 'god-men'. Significantly, the issue is not joined on behalf of religion and faith by anyone except by the much-criticized Nandy. Interestingly, the attack on religion comes with reference to the good old Galileo episode. The relevance for us of Galileo's tiff with the fundamentalist Christian church of medieval Europe is not clear, considering that there was never any such persecution or inquisition in Hindu India. Nevertheless, the Manifesto appears to hold the "deep-rooted structures of (our) ancient society" as the chief obstacle to the propagation of scientific temper in India.

The review of each article by Subbaram is a mixed bag. He is quite sharp, hilarious at times and virulent at others. His baseline for criticism is his unshakable faith in science, the scientific method and western liberal human values, coupled with a compulsive scorn for religion, particularly of the Hindu variety. He sharply attacks virtually all Indian scientists for having "spirit (spirituality) in their veins instead of science" and bemoans "the tragic fact" that Bhabha chose such scientists as his associates. He ends by calling for a purge of all such scientists from the ranks of the scientific temper movement "
