

ARTICLES

Maharishi Technology and Modern Science

Ever since the Maharishis invaded our shores, there has been a heated discussion regarding the Unified Field. What does this supposedly purely scientific theory claim? That the four fundamental forces of the Universe — Electromagnetism, Gravitation, Strong Interaction and Weak Interaction — are merely manifestations of a superforce known as the Unified Field.

The Maharishis describe these four basic forces as 'types of glue that hold the universe together'. Why this comparison to glue? Because glue binds things together. And gravitation binds bodies to the earth and to one another. Strong interaction force binds together the subatomic particles in the nucleus of the atom; Weak interaction force binds the components of a radioactive substance while Electromagnetism opposite electrical charges to one another like the protons and electrons in the atom.

Modern Physics, being essentially Mathematical Physics, expresses the relation between a force and the entities it acts upon in a mathematical equation which is then known as a law of Nature. To take the simplest example, we have Newton's Law of Gravitation expressed in the formula: $F = G \frac{m_1 m_2}{d^2}$

That is, the force with which bodies attract one another is directly proportional to the product of their masses and inversely proportional to the distance between them, with G as the gravitational constant. The problem that vexed the scientists was how

the force of gravitation could obtain between two bodies even if those were not in contact with each other. This problem of 'action at a distance' was solved by the introduction of the idea of 'field'.

Newton himself had misgivings about forces acting at a distance through empty space, for he once wrote: "It is inconceivable to me that inanimate brute matter should (without mediation of something else which is not material) operate upon and affect other matter without mutual contact".¹ But Newton could not explain why gravitational force seemed to act at a distance and he knew of no other phenomenon that did not. It was Faraday "who leaving aside the question of universal gravitation, turned his special attention to magnetic and electric phenomena and pointed out the supremely important part played in these phenomena by the intervening medium which fills the space between the bodies that appear to act upon one another without mediation".² The intervening medium later came to be known as aether and the space filled by it the 'field'. It was however James Clerk Maxwell who caused the more or less universal acceptance of the idea of 'field' when he proved that light was an electro-magnetic wave vibrating in the aether. Because of this and some other contributions to science, Maxwell is considered a great physicist, by some indeed as the greatest physicist between the time of Newton and that of Einstein.

The mention of Einstein might clarify for us the notion of Unified field. But before we do so, we must mention briefly the idea of the strong and weak interaction forces. Gravitation which united the earth and sky, the macrocosmic world, deals with material bodies, but the best theory regarding matter was that it was ultimately made up of atoms, which etymologically mean indivisible. So it was until in the late 19th century that some scientists succeeded in splitting it. Since a great amount of energy is necessary to split the nucleus of the atom composed of protons and neutrons, it is reasonable to assume that what holds the sub-atomic particles in the nucleus is a strong interaction force. On

¹ *Fundamentals of Physics*. Published for the Science Education Center by the University of the Philippines Press, Diliman, Quezon City, 1971, p. 198.

² P.D. Ouspensky. *A New Model of the Universe*. Vintage Books Edition. October 1971, p. 354.

the other hand, the emission of rays and particles from radioactive substances is spontaneous showing that what holds their components together is a weak interaction force.

EINSTEIN'S CONCEPT OF THE UNIFIED FIELD

But to go back to Einstein. Einstein's magnificent obsession was to develop a theory so general (if possible expressed in a single equation) that will interrelate all physical entities to one another and the basic forces acting upon them. By his formula $E = mc^2$ Einstein interrelated matter (or better still mass) and energy. His space-time continuum interrelated space and time. In this connection I remember an open forum wherein Dr. Brings (who knew Einstein personally) was asked by Father Pedrosa of our university how there could be union between space and time, since the idea of space implied the coexistence of parts, while that of time involved the disappearance of one part with the appearance of the next. As answer a formula was just put on the board which few could understand. Many in the audience indeed thought the question was being evaded. It turns out that the reason was that Einstein held that the world of physical phenomena called 'world' by Minkowski is composed of individual events, each of which is described by four numbers, namely three space-coordinates and a time-coordinate. Furthermore for Einstein TIME was an imaginary quantity, not to say a purely imaginary quantity, expressed by the formula $\sqrt{-1.c.t}$, where c is the velocity of light and t is time as commonly understood.

Einstein sought next to combine the theory of relativity with that of gravitation. There are as all know two theories of relativity. The special theory, according to Einstein himself 'crystallized out from the Maxwell-Lorentz theory of electromagnetism'. Since the special theory did not apply to the domain in which gravitation was operative, Einstein saw the need of developing another theory which took into account the densities of matter. Thus arose the general theory which seem to have succeeded in showing that gravitation was not so much a force in the traditional sense of push and pull as the natural path followed by a particle in the space-time continuum when near an-

other particle. By his general theory Einstein thus seems to have effected the unification of gravitation with electromagnetism.

Einstein's next ambition was to unite the theory of relativity with the quantum theory initiated by Planck, but seems not to have succeeded so well in this attempt. This is not surprising since "the space-time continuum even in its expression reflects its variance with the quantum system where the leading idea is the discrete energy packet".³ That is, the term 'continuous' seems to be incompatible with the term 'discrete' which implies 'discontinuity'. Is this the reason why Prof. Hagelin of Maharishi University said that 'Einstein did not have the tools with which to fulfill his dream'? Anyhow that Einstein's endeavours was oriented to the formulation of the unified field is seen in his description of the universe 'an all-embracing field of energy, thick where there is matter in the ordinary sense, and thin where there is none'.

CONTEMPORARY SCIENTISTS' CONCEPT OF THE UNIFIED FIELD

According to the Maharishis, contemporary scientists have succeeded where Einstein had failed. "The first step was the unification of electromagnetism and the weak interaction force for which Abdul Salam, Steven Weinberg and Sheldon Glasgow won the Noble Prize in 1979; the second phase the grand unification of the weak with the strong interaction force and the third phase the unification of the grand unification with gravitation thus leading to the theory of the unified field."⁴

The latest report on the unified field is to be found in TIME MAGAZINE of October 29, 1984. Let me quote to you some excerpts from the same: "Scientists believe that all four forces are manifestations of one fundamental superforce, which split into different forms after the birth of the universe. Some physicists have proposed that electromagnetism and the weak force, for example, might be combined, but their complex theory required the existence of three extremely heavy particles to complete the

³ Vincent Edward Smith. *Philosophical Physics*. Harper & Brothers, 1950, p. 395.

⁴ PANORAMA. Oct. 7, 1984, pp. 33 and 34.

profile of the weak force: the positive W boson, the negative W boson and the Z boson... Carlo Rubia and Simon van der Meer at CERN have been able to discover these particles for which they were given the Nobel Prize for Physics for 1984".⁵

I want you to concentrate on some parts of the foregoing quotation: In the first place, it says: "Scientists believe... not Scientists know". The idea of a unified field is thus still a *mere hypothesis*. Observe further the phrase: some physicists have *proposed* that electromagnetism and the weak force *might be combined*..." Now 'might be combined' is a far cry from 'are actually combined'. Again the unification of the weak force with electromagnetism is but the first step in the unification towards the unified field and it took five years even to complete the profile of the weak interaction force. How long it will take to experimentally verify the two other unifications, God only knows! I think it is unwarranted on the part of the Maharishis to already consider as an achievement what to the scientists themselves is but an ambition.

But even granting that the second and third unifications will in future be verified, the theory is not proven in the sense of being characterized by *certitude*. For experiments can establish the falsity of a theory but never its absolute truth. Take the case of the most well-established theory in Science: the atomic or molecular theory of matter. To confirm this theory scientists reason thus:

If matter is molecular, then matter is compressible;

But matter is compressible; Ergo, matter is molecular.

The minor premise has been experimentally verified by the liquefaction of gases like oxygen, hydrogen and acetylene and the solidification of carbon dioxide into dry ice. But anyone acquainted with logic can see that the above reasoning is invalid for it consists in positing the consequent in the minor. In short, the conclusion does *not* necessarily follow from the premises. Many experimental verifications can establish at the best only the probability of a theory. Is this the reason that led Einstein to say: "If it is Physics, it is not certain; if it is certain, it is not Physics"?

⁵ TIME Magazine. Oct. 29, 1984, p. 34.

Furthermore the Maharishis seem to forget one important characteristic of a theory and that is, its impermanence. For example the corpuscular theory of light of Newton gave way to the wave theory of light of Huyghens which in turn gave way to the quantum theory of Planck, which in turn will give way to a new theory which will be more successful in what philosophers of science call 'saving the appearances'. There is therefore no guarantee that the unified field theory just like Newton's corpuscular theory of light will not give way to another theory and this still to another theory ad infinitum. Especially as the four basic forces and the fundamental particles like quarks and leptons mentioned by contemporary scientists may turn neither to be the most basic nor the only ones. Indeed the history of Science has shown that it is unwise to consider any list as final. And that is why the physicist David Bohm says: "The possibility is always open that there may exist an unlimited variety of additional properties, qualities, entities, systems, levels etc., to which apply correspondingly new kinds of laws of nature".⁶

MAHARISHI CONCEPT OF THE UNIFIED FIELD

Anyhow the main problem is this: Is the unified field of the Maharishis identical with the unified field of the modern scientists? If so, the Maharishis can very well claim that their technology has a basis in modern Science. Ah, but there's the rub! Whatever the properties of the all-embracing field of Einstein or more contemporary scientists, consciousness does not seem to be one of them. But this is precisely the claim of the Maharishis. For according to Prof. Hagelin: "The unified field, quantum physics tells us, is self-referral: it interacts only with itself. Only consciousness has that property".⁷ In short, the unified field of the Maharishis unlike that of the modern scientists is conscious. Added to which is the claim that "because every human being has a nervous system that generates consciousness, he can therefore *directly experience* the unified field of all the laws of Nature". Which claim is disputed by the Physics Society of the Philippines which says: "The Maharishi International University people claim that

⁶ BACK TO GODHEAD Magazine. Vol. 14, No. 12, p. 26.

⁷ PANORAMA, Oct. 7, 1984, p. 34.

their technology which is basically Transcendental Meditation can make one come into contact with the unified field. If what they mean by that is *experiencing* the unification of all the forces of nature, then that is simply *nonsense*".⁸ Nonsense! No criticism can be more devastating. In this connection, I think that the Maharishis and our physicists are not arguing on the same wave length. For our local physicists mean by Experience 'sensible experience' and one cannot sensibly experience the unified field understood as the all-embracing field of material energy. On the other hand the Maharishis understand by *direct experience* an intellectual intuition of the unified field as the Ground of all Reality. For the Maharishis the contact is between one's individual consciousness and the universal conscious Being known in Hinduism as BRAHMAN.

It may be countered that we and the modern scientists have evaded the argument of Prof. Hagelin, that 'only consciousness has the property of being self-referral' which is logically equivalent to 'all self-referral entities are conscious' and since, according to the quantum theory, the unified field is self-referral, ergo, 'the unified field is conscious'. True enough, that this argument involves neither an undistributed middle nor an illicit minor or major. But let us concentrate on the meaning of self-referral. Now consciousness is self-referral in the sense that it can serve both as subject and object of knowledge. That is, the conscious intellect can think about itself and its own thoughts. In short, the intellect can know that it knows. That is why it is said to reflect, to bend back upon itself. But if, as the Maharishis claim, the unified field is a superforce, it is hard to conceive, nay, it is inconceivable that this force being material can bend back upon itself. Considered as a field, the unified field can only be self-referral in the sense that being the largest space, it cannot, unlike smaller spaces, be referred to a space larger than itself. But this in no way means that the unified field can bend back upon itself i.e. be self-conscious. In short, the argument involves a 4-term construction and is therefore fallacious. Actually the Maharishis (subconsciously perhaps) consider the Unified Field as conscious because they are assuming right from the start that it is identical with Brahman.

⁸ PANORAMA. Oct. 27, 1984, p. 39.

THE VEDIC ANCESTRY OF THE UNIFIED FIELD

That the Maharishi's self-conscious Unified Field is identical with the Brahman of Hinduism is confirmed by this quotation which points out that according to the BHAGAVAD-GITA, "the individual subjective selves of human beings (such as ourselves) are understood to be minute parts of the absolute being that possess the same self-conscious nature. These minute conscious selves *interact directly* with the absolute being through consciousness and they interact *indirectly* with matter through the absolute being's control of matter".⁹ Brahman of course controls matter through the physical laws of nature. And that is why the Maharishis can call that 'the goal of Transcendental Meditation' is for the mind and the nervous system to assert complete mastery over the laws of nature". In short, if Brahman has complete mastery over the laws of nature, once identified with Brahman, we too, that is, our true selves can have complete mastery over the laws of nature.

But for our true selves called ATMANS to be identified with Brahman, we must transcend the states of consciousness associated with waking, dreaming and deep sleep, and through transcendental meditation reach the state of Transcendental consciousness or pure awareness. But the transcendental consciousness of the Maharishis is nothing else than the consciousness we have in the state known in Hindu philosophy as TURIYA (literally the *fourth* in which we have a state beyond the senses, beyond images, beyond everything that can serve as object. As Prof. Villaba-Cue puts it: "In *turiya* the Self is neither outward turned (as in the waking state), nor inward turned (as in the dreaming state), nor an undifferentiated mass of consciousness (as in the state of deep sleep). It is *pure consciousness*. It is the *Atman* itself".¹⁰

True indeed that TM talks of three more states beyond transcendental consciousness. But these only serve to confirm the fact that TM is not anchored so much in modern Science as in Hindu philosophy. This becomes clear from this quotation from the Maharishi Mahesh Yogi himself: "The final step of transcending be-

⁹ BACK TO GODHEAD Magazine, Vol. 14, No. 12, p. 26.

¹⁰ Prof. Magdalena Villaba, *The Unitas Reader*, Vol. 50, Nos. 2-3, p. 594.

gins with the expansion of individuality and when this happens the intellect, losing its individuality, begins to gain the unbounded status of pure creative intelligence. While merging into pure creative intelligence, it cognizes the creative intelligence as its own self and gains bliss consciousness".¹¹ If we remember that the later VEDANTA describes Brahman as 'SACCIDANANDA' which term lists the essential attributes of Brahman as "reality, consciousness and bliss" while the TATTIRIYA states: "Brahman is reality, consciousness and infiniteness"; the emphasis in the above quotation of unbounded and bliss consciousness shows that the Maharishi Mahesh *Yogi* identifies pure creative intelligence with Brahman or perhaps more precisely with the Atman identical with Brahman. In short, the Mahesh Yogi is only reformulating in supposedly scientific terms the ancient Hindu doctrine, the core of the UPANISHADS, that *Atman is identical with Brahman*. Indeed TM exponents admit as much for they say: "TM did not emerge from Western science or culture but has come to us from the *Vedic* tradition of India".¹² Now the Vedic tradition of India as enshrined especially in the *Upanishads*, far from being scientific in the modern sense, is a philosophical religion or a religious philosophy.

MAHARISHI TECHNOLOGY: A RELIGION IN DISGUISE

That the Maharishi Technology is a religion, the Hindu religion in disguise was amply proven by the *Coalition of Concerned Citizens* in an article that appeared in PANORAMA of October 21, 1984. According to this:

1) The stated purpose is religious. Founded as the Spiritual Regeneration Movement, it sought "to bring the light of God to the world".

2) The basis is religious: the Hindu scriptures of the Vedas, the Upanishads and the Bhagavad-Gita.

3) Its structure of practice is religious: The convert joins the sect by undergoing initiation, the crucial element of which is the communication of the secret formula (mantra) to the initiate by the guru.

¹¹ Maharishi Mahesh Yogi. *On the Bhagavad Gita*. 1969, p. 423.

¹² Harold H. Loomfield, et. al., TM 1975, p. 10.

4) The purpose of the initiation ceremony is religious: to give offerings to the Guru Dev, who is worshipped as a personafied deity.

5) The MANTRA is religious: its purpose is to contact the Hindu spirits and gods of Nature.

6) The philosophical teachings are religious: Maharishi in his books teaches classical Hinduism including pantheism as the basic world view and transmigration as part of the Unified Field.

7) The claims are religious, or the YOGI says: "Transcendental Meditation is a path to God" and "a very good form of prayer". It is through TM that man rises to the level of the divine. Through TM everyone can begin to enjoy his own inner divine nature.

8) Maharishi Technology has replaced the Sovereign Personal Creator who has personally revealed himself in Jesus Christ and His word, the Bible, with the unified field of impersonal nature as the ultimate reality.

TM AS MYSTICISM

For that matter, TM is not only a philosophical religion; it is even a mysticism. All mystical experience aims to eliminate the psychological swarming of acts and this is the proximate goal of TM. Normally, the soul has a confused experience of itself only through its acts. But 'the act of abolition of all acts' as in TM or YOGA leaves the intelligence in contact with the sole object which remains: the *self* itself. Hindu Yogis call this *self* the Atman. If for TM, 'the ultimate basis of identity is the boundless inner field of pure creative intelligence, the only aspect of yourself which remain unchanging' then Creative Intelligence can be nothing other than the Hindu Atman.

That the Maharishic' Creative Intelligence is identical with Atman which is Brahman as immanent in Man, is shown by its very definition of Creative Intelligence as the "Life force, which manifests itself in the evolutionary process through the creation

of new forms and new relations in the universe"¹³ for the Upanishads abound with explanations of the nature of Brahman as PRANA, the breath of life that pervades the human body and the universe.

Both *Yoga* and TM talk of the *Void*, which is attained by the complete emptying of the Mind. If we are to believe Maritain, this *Void* corresponds to what the Scholastics call *Esse*, the act—of—existence in the pure state. But since it is experienced in the pure state, without the limitation of the essence, what is known is existence in its metaphysical amplitude. In short, in *Yoga* and other Oriental meditative techniques like TM, we have a negative mystical experience of the presence of *immensity*. This explains Maharishi Mahesh *Yogi's* constant mention of unbounded consciousness and explains his statement that "in the sixth state of refined cosmic consciousness the liveliness of the infinite is cognized on the bed of the finite and that this is only possible when the conscious mind is vibrant with infinite value" which is only a more involved way of saying that after transcending the individual self through TM one reaches the *Atman* which is identical with *Brahman*.

TM IS PANTHEISTIC

Everybody knows that TM claims to relieve stress. So do other meditative techniques. But TM goes further. For according to it, if one becomes completely relaxed one becomes divine. For it says: "Be still (i.e. completely relaxed) and know that YOU are God". How different from the Bible which says: "Be still and know that I am God". "YOU are GOD." If this is not pantheism, what is it? Indeed the Maharishi himself confirms the pantheistic character of TM when he says: "In unity consciousness the same pure creative intelligence which has been the basis of the self (i.e. Atman) from the first attainment of consciousness, is perceived as the underlying essence (i.e. Brahman) of everything in the environment"¹⁴ Faithful to his VEDIC heritage, the

¹³ Maharishi Mahesh Yogi. *International Symposium on the Science of Creative Intelligence*. Maharishi International University, Los Angeles, California, 1972, as quoted by H. A. Bloomfield et. al., TM p. 223.

¹⁴ Harold H. Bloomfield, et. al., TM 1975, p. 184.

Yogi holds that the goal of TM is the realization that the true self or essence of the individual called *Atman* is identical with the true self of every other being called *Brahman*. This coincides neatly with that ARUNI says to SUETAKETU in the CHANDOGYA: "That thou art". Thou art to know that there is an identity between thine essence (*Atman*) with the invisible being of all things" (*Brahman*).

There are those who would temper the identity of *Atman* and *Brahman* in an effort to avoid Pantheism by holding that *Brahman* is to *Atman* as cause is to effect, that *Brahman* is the creator and *Atman* the creature. To do this they quote the following: "He (i.e. *Brahman*) wished, may I be many, may I grow forth, He brooded over himself. After he brooded he thus sent for all whatever there is".¹⁵ Do the operative words 'sent forth' imply 'creation'? Should it not be rather interpreted as 'emanation'? Let me cite a parallel case. 'The sun sends forth its rays', is equivalent to 'the sun emanates (not creates) its rays'. Now emanation differs from creation in two ways. The sun cannot but emanate its rays, and the substance of the ray is identical with the substance of the sun. Transferred to the relation between *Brahman* and the world, one can readily see that these are not features of 'creation' in the strict sense. For in Creation, God was free to create the world and the world is really distinct from God. Incidentally the comparison to the sun emanating its rays is found in the *Bhagavad-gita* which says: "And by his impersonal feature He expands the rays of the BRAHMAJYOTI, which is limitless and all-pervasive. Part of this all-pervasive Brahmajyoti, which is compared to the sun's rays, is covered by the darkness of the MAHAL-TATTVA and this insignificant part is known as the material world" (Ch. 4. Text 14).¹⁶

THE MONISM OF MODERN SCIENCE

What is of interest is to find out why Modern Science can be used for its own purposes by a pantheistic religious mystical philosophy like TM. Is it because Modern Physics, the prototype of

¹⁵ Prof. Magdalena Villaba. *The Unitas Reader*. Vol. 50, Nos. 203, p. 595.

¹⁶ BACK TO GODHEAD MAGAZINE. Vol. 14, No. 12, p. 15.

Modern Science, is mathematical in character and thus has the tendency towards Monism? That Modern Physics is Mathematical Physics cannot be denied. It is so much so that Bertrand Russell used to say that the laws of Physics are differential equations. Now the two sides of an equation are equal. In fact the two quantities can be transposed. $F = ma$ can be written $ma = F$. But one might object that F is the cause and ma is the effect. But what is the relation of 'cause' to 'effect' in mathematics? It is the same as the relation of essence to property. But essence and property belong to one and the same reality. Thus the triangle whose essence it is to be three-sided is identical with the triangle whose property it is to have the sum of its angles equal to two right angles. In short, the mathematical 'cause' and the mathematical 'effect' constitute but *one* reality. How different from the causality involved in the mother-child relation. The mother is not the child and the child is not the mother. They are two distinct realities and their roles cannot be transposed. An example from Physics will clinch our point. Take Boyle's law. If we increase the pressure, the volume will be decreased and vice versa. Now, is the decrease in volume the cause of the increase of pressure or the increase of pressure of the decrease in volume. It was the realization of these that perhaps caused Leibniz, described as Newton's rival in speculative philosophy and his superior in all others, to aver that *causa aequat effectum*, the cause equals the effect, or the whole effect can reproduce the full cause or its equal.

The monistic character of Mathematics has infected Science, so much so, that Meyerson proved in Identity and Reality that "the whole history of the scientific minds shows that (for it) 'to explain is to identify'" As Yves Simon comments: "If we are concerned with change, to explain will consist in showing the underneath appearances which involve novelty, there is something which remains identical. If we are concerned not with change but with sheer multiplicity, to explain will consist in showing that things are not so diverse as they look; that diversity is superficial and underneath is a background of homogeneity. Suppose one day we succeed thoroughly in our endeavor to explain the world through the process of identification. What happens then? We will have to agree with Parmenides that multiplicity and change are appearances (the Hindus will call these illusions) and that

the real world is one and motionless".¹⁷ In short, we will be forced to agree with Parmenides, the MONIST par excellence in the history of Western philosophy. And pantheism is nothing but Monism where the one and only being is called God or better still Brahman.

Now if we consider the relation between God and Nature as an instance of mathematical causality, the end result will be to identify God and Nature. And that is why Spinoza, who mathematicized Metaphysics in his ETHICS, came to the pantheistic conclusion that there is but *one* reality called Substance which from one point of view is called God and from another point of view is called Nature. In much the same way the Maharishi Technology believes in but one reality which from the spiritual point of view is called BRAHMAN and from the physical point of view is called the UNIFIED FIELD. That the Maharishi's unified field corresponds to Spinoza's Nature is clear from the admission by Prof. Hagelin that 'when the mind identifies itself with the unified field, then all thought, speech and action come into alliance with natural law'. To the objection that natural law is not to be identified with Nature we have the additional revealing statement: 'that is the past, this state has been referred to as *enlightenment* or *cosmic consciousness*'. But what the Greeks called *cosmos*, the Latins translated into *natura*.

Anyhow what we want to stress is that Spinoza is not the only Western thinker who had a pantheistic or monistic outlook on the universe. If we are to believe Vincent Edward Smith "Hegel, Marx are guilty of the same error". And he adds: "Monism . . . comes to light in the present day systems of Dialectical Materialism, of Samuel Alexander, of Alfred North Whitehead (whose philosophy influenced the movement known as PANENTHEISM) and (surprise of surprises) in the theory of relativity when it elevates the space-time continuum into a philosophic attitude".¹⁸ Would it then be farfetched to say that the Unified Field of the Maharishis is nothing else than Einstein's space-time continuum raised illicitly to the philosophic (nay religious and mystical) level"?

¹⁷ Yves Simon. *Space and Nature*.

¹⁸ Vincent Edward Smith. *Philosophical Physics*, Harper and Brothers, 1950, p. 131.

Why do we say illicitly? Because in its tendency to be faithful to its Vedic heritage, the Maharishi Technology endows the scientist's unconscious Unified Field with consciousness. On the other hand, in its desire to appear scientific and not religious or mystical it betrays its Hindu ancestry. For as a very revealing article points out: "The difference between the conceptions of modern physics and those presented in the Bhagavad-Gita lies in the manner in which the ultimate causal principle exhibits unity. The goal of many scientists is to find some single extremely simple equation that expresses all causal principles in a unified form. According to the Bhagavad-gita, however the unity of the Absolute Being transcends mathematical description. The Absolute Being is a single self-conscious entity possessing unlimited knowledge and potency. Therefore a mathematical account of this being would be limitlessly complex".¹⁹ We doubt then whether the Maharishis can walk without falling the tightrope they have strung between Modern Physics and Hindu Metaphysics.

We do not want to give the wrong impression that we find nothing good in the Maharishi outlook on the universe. The fact is, as the New Catechism points out: "we Christians can be evangelized by non-Christians". In what sense? These can remind us of truths that belong to our Faith but that we have largely ignored or forgotten. Portions of our Faith appear in non-Christian systems in a very strong light. Most of the times they are one-sided, but at times so much more intensely put into practice that they leave us ashamed. "Who is the Christian who cannot learn from the total dedication of the Hindu, the gentleness of the Buddhist, the self-surrender of the Muslim, the care of the humanist for man, the passion of the Marxist for social justice?" We should be thankful therefore to the Maharishis for reminding us of the importance of meditation for spiritual growth; for their efforts to make Science a handmaiden of Religion; for their emphasis on the immanence of God such that they see everything as it were aflame with God; for their bringing home the truth of the primacy of the spiritual over the material. The fact is, all the foregoing is part of our Catholic heritage but as Sheed pointed out

¹⁹ BACK TO GODHEAD MAGAZINE. Vol. 14, No. 12, p. 27.

long ago, with all the sun for our birthright we (Catholics) are cold, while they (the Marxists or the Maharishis) are aflame with their one ray. Truly we Catholics need another Pentecost such that, inspired by the Holy Spirit, we may add Zeal to Truth and thus renew the face of the earth.

SUMMARY

1. The concept of "field" was advanced to obviate the difficulty of forces acting-at-a-distance.
2. Einstein's ambition was to formulate a unified field theory as shown by his description of the universe as an all embracing field of energy.
3. The theory of contemporary scientists: the four fundamental forces of the universe, e.g. electromagnetism, gravitation strong and weak interaction forces, are ultimately manifestation of the Unified Field.
4. The four fundamental forces act on fundamental entities like leptons and quarks, which are more basic than elementary particles known as protons, electrons, neutrons, etc.
5. The Maharishi's Unified Field differs from that of modern scientist in being endowed with consciousness and indeed seems to be identical with the universal self-conscious Being, the ground of all Reality, called Brahman in Hinduism.
6. The Maharishi Technology, a euphemism for Transcendental Meditation is a religion — whether considered in its purpose, its basis, its structure of practise, its emphasis on "mantra", in its philosophic foundations.
7. TM is mysticism which enables the individual to contact pure awareness or creative intelligence, the latter being nothing less than the Hindu ATMAN in disguise.

8. TM is pantheistic because in the last analysis, it identifies ATMAN and BRAHMAN.
9. TM — a pantheistic, religious and mystical philosophy can use (the scientists would say 'misuse') Modern Physics because the latter being Mathematical Physics has a tendency towards Monism.
10. The Maharishis have set themselves the Mission Impossible of uniting Modern Physics with Hindu Metaphysics.

PEDRO GABRIEL, Ph.D.
University of Santo Tomas