

PHILOSOPHICAL IMPLICATIONS OF PANCHA SILA

By Dr. G.P. Malalasekerad

I am deeply conscious of the great honour that has been conferred on me by being appointed President of this August assembly. I am also profoundly aware of my own unworthiness for such exalted distinction. I recall with immense pride that this Congress had as its first President Rabindranath Tagore, who for more than half a century dominated the intellectual scene not only of India but also of the whole of Asia and further beyond. Since then, the Presidential dais has been occupied by a galaxy of brilliant personages in comparison with whom I would appear a mere glow worm. I derive courage and consolation, however, from the fact that in promoting me to this high office, the Congress has recognised not any particular merit on my own part but the significance of a great event, the Buddha Jayanti, the 2500th anniversary of the Buddhist Era, which has been celebrated with great eclat in many countries and with special splendour in India, the land of the Sakyamuni's birth. By electing a Buddhist to preside over this year's deliberations therefore the Congress has sought to take notice of this significant event and as President of the World Fellowship Of Buddhists, I should like on behalf of the Buddhists of the world to convey to the members of the Congress our profound gratitude for this noble gesture.

Hallmark of the True Buddhist

This same fact has promoted me to select as topic for my address to you as General President, the Philosophical Implications of Pancha Sila, the Five Vows or Precepts, the observance of which every Buddhist voluntarily takes upon himself. So closely is Pancha Sila associated with Buddhism that when someone of another faith wishes to indicate that he has now become a follower of the Buddha, he does so by repeating, in some suitable place, preferably in front of a Buddharupa or at the foot a Bodhi-tree, a formula in which he declares that he has accepted the three Refuges (the Buddha, his Doctrine and the Sangha, the holy Order of Monks) and undertakes to observe the Pancha Sila. This formal act of conversion — if one may so call it — is taken to mean that he has received the hallmark of the true Buddhist. The repetition of this formula, on awaking and on retiring and on every formal occasion of religious character, marks for the Buddhist what would correspond to the "progress" of followers of other faiths. It sums up for him not

only the fundamental principles of his ethical conduct but also the philosophy underlying the whole of the Buddha's teaching.

I do not propose to discuss here whether Buddhism could be better described as a religious or a philosophy. The Buddha himself called his teaching a **patipada**, a Way of Life. Generally speaking, Buddhism is accepted as one of the world-religions, in fact, the oldest of the historical world-religions. There is no need to enter into the perplexing question of the definition of "religion", for we know in a general way what is meant by man's religious faith, opinions and practices. Religious beliefs differ, for instance, from economic or political principles in that though the latter are concerned with very important aspects of life, they are limited in their scope, whereas in our religion we express our total reaction to the universe. It regulates and directs our total reaction to every aspect of experience - or, at least, claims to do so. It is true that in everyday life religion is largely composed of traditional ways of acting and thinking, which are only partially grasped, dimly understood and vaguely accepted by the individual. But religion, in its essential nature, is an all-embracing world-view and the determiner of life's values. All the major concerns of humanity living in society presuppose some belief which is in its nature religious.

Man is an ideational creature. Men's conduct and their institutions are shaped by what they assume to be real and important, true and false, right and wrong. What men desire their society to become, their vision of a tolerably satisfactory community are profoundly affected by the beliefs they hold about the nature of man, about the nature of the universe as a whole and man's relation to it. Our beliefs determine the qualities we want to foster in ourselves and in others. Human beings, thus, develop what are called values, and these constitute their philosophies. Chesterton has declared that every man has his philosophy and that this is the most practical and important thing about him. Philosophy, in the minds of many, is concerned with the abstract, scholarly study of concepts and ideas, far removed from the practical issues of the everyday world. They think of a philosopher as a long-haired eccentric individual, whose chief interest is an attempt to master the secrets of the universe, regardless of whether his search has any useful significance or not.

The True Philosophy

But there is also another concept of philosophy which recognises it as a study that should make life here and now as intelligible, meaningful and purposeful as

possible. Such a concept implies that the most important obligation of any individual is to clarify his basic beliefs and assumptions. He should be able to state, explain, organise and defend the premises upon which he bases his scientific, political, economic, religious and educational practices. It should be the concern of every citizen to develop such a personal philosophy to enable him to cope with the numerous problems arising daily in our complex society. It must be admitted, however, that as far as the vast majority of us are equipped with anything like an outlook on life and the world, it consists mainly of a great deal of superstition about the supernatural, a smattering of social theory, a whole heap of group-prejudices, a few wise saw, a rumour or two from science and a number of slipshod observations about life. So long as this state of mind exists, there will be in our minds only a chaos of immediate experience, like that of small children. Historical man begins definitely in a culture only by bringing order into his experiences and demanding a consistent explanation of them.

A life without a guiding philosophy is narrow and selfish, producing intolerance, ignorance and prejudice. It is not a happy life. A purposeful, intelligible, meaningful life is one that is alert and active, ever-learning and constantly growing. The measure of a man is his character. Certain distinctive qualities mark an individual of character. He holds specific convictions regarding his purpose in life and in the way in which he means to live that life. He has formulated an ideal upon which he bases a personal code of ethics. One can no more rid himself of the notion of moral law than of time or space. Moral law dominates man whether he respects it or defies it. The wise man recognises this and thereby becomes a philosopher. Philosophy has been aptly described as "walking in the path of wisdom". It is this philosophy that gives direction to his intellectual searching and stability to his emotional being. In the case of the others, they are brought to this recognition by the society in which they live. It exercises him the restraining of the mores and public opinion that surround him, and prevents him from going adrift without proper bearing and consequent anti-social behaviour. In the case of the follower of a religion, his religion moulds his character and gives it a motivation and this motivation becomes the determinant of his judgment and wisdom. The precepts of his religion contain the accumulated experience of many ages and provide the necessary guidance for the development of his character. Character involves spiritual man as well as intellectual man. Religious understanding and commitment, a constant observance of moral principles in every phase of life are the necessary elements and expressions of character. For these to be really effective, they must be built on a deep, inner attitude towards life and living. It is this attitude that constitutes a man's philosophy.

Influence of religion on the growth of Cultures.

Throughout the ages, happiness has been the object of all human endeavour. Philosophy guides men in the pursuit of what they consider happiness. But it does more than that. It also provides them with attempts to rationalise the mystery of the universe, to translate in the language of concepts that which is inexpressible in concepts. These attempts have resulted in varied interpretations. These differences have often led to conflicts and even wars. In the modern world, when peoples have become close neighbours through the scientific conquest of space and the technical presence of instantaneous communication, the development of true neighbourliness has become a vital necessity. This is possible only through the promotion of global understanding. Such understanding must be philosophical, in the sense that we should be aware of the different assumptions underlying different cultures. Mankind can realise its unity only by thinking of its unity in terms of its many perspectives, expressions and experiments.

In doing this the various religions that men follow afford a profitable way of approach. The precepts of a religion provide the formulations of the good life as envisaged by its followers, the basic minimum upon which spiritual development could be built. Most historic cultures are the result of such developments that have taken place among large masses of mankind. But not all historic cultures are religions, though they are all based on different worldviews and assumptions and, therefore, on different evaluations of life. Looking back on the history of the world, it would be true to say that cultures differ mostly in affirming or denying a religious world-view. During the last 400 years, for instance, Western civilisation has become increasingly anti-religious as shown by its worship of national and social values or economic and class values. The other predominantly anti-religious civilisation was the one that developed in the last four or five centuries of the Roman-Hellenistic empire.

How Buddhism differs from other religions

Among the religions that have influenced the growth of cultures with spiritual values, Buddhism has been one of the most powerful, in that it has commanded the allegiance of a very large section of mankind for twenty-five centuries. Buddhism is not a "revealed religion". Its world-view differs greatly from that of revealed religions. Revealed religions postulate a god who is absolute and who is outside the world which he has created out of nothing. This creation thus has beginning; it has also a middle and an end and is, therefore, a "transitory history". Man is created in the image of God, as the subject of his actions and responsible for them.

God speaks to man, revealing himself. Man's response to God is faith; by faith he participates in God's life and becomes an initiated co-worker and participant in a divine providence. If he refuses to take notice of God's revelation he falls into nothingness and sin and his existence then becomes meaningless. He is for ever damned.

The most essential feature of man's being is the possession of a soul. It is this which distinguishes him from the beasts, who have no souls. Man's soul is a part of god himself and, therefore permanent. If in this life man has followed god's will, the soul will, on the demise of his body, find happiness by union with god. The will of god is expressed in commandments and dogmas given to mankind by a Prophet who is either a manifestation of god himself or one appointed by him. The accumulation of material goods is only a means to reach a higher objective — unity with god, harmony with his creation and respect for his laws.

The teaching of the Buddha differs fundamentally from all this. There is no transcendent god, there is no personal revelation of god to man. And because man does not believe in god, he does not feel himself called upon to make everlasting commitments. Man is a creator himself and is the master and moulder of his destiny. His "self" is an endless variety of fleeting experiences and perspectives. It is a becoming, developing "self". Life is an educational task. Buddhism seeks the meaning of life in life itself. In this search, life is ennobled. Life becomes an eternal and a fulfilled one. Truth is not a revelation but a discovery. The human person has to realise himself as the subject of knowledge, as socially responsible and as artistically creative.

Buddhism has no - "Thou shalt" or "Thou shalt not". Its ethics are autonomous and independent; moral problems are basically human problems. The moral law is its own foundation. Obligation to one's family or one's neighbours and such virtues, as truthfulness and honesty remain objective tasks in all circumstances, they remain obligatory whether one lives up to them or not. The moral law is identical both in individuals and societies. The State is the individual writ large. Conflict and suffering and sorrow are the result of a great delusion, the delusion of a separate Ego-entity, a self or a soul independent from individual action. There is no such thing, according to Buddhism, as an individual apart from its activities just as there is no life apart from the process of living. This denial of the individual as a separate entity apart from its activities and its relationships is not a denial of the life and reality of the individual. It is the sense of separateness that has to be overcome, because separateness leads to attachment, to craving, to grasping. The goal is "selflessness" and the way to this goal is the steadfast practice in learning to

see that what we call evil is always tied to some particular want. As long as we want something, we create the evil of being frustrated in what we want. Man cannot realise his supreme fulfilment because of his inveterate tendency to identify himself with some assortment or other with the specific goods of the world. Thus, the human being left to itself is always overtaken sooner or later by defeat or self-annihilation. In order to find happiness man must alter the direction and anchorage of his living. When this is done, the pressures and miseries of life are overcome and there is introduced into human living the greatest possible good that man can ever experience.

The Pancha Sila

In order to achieve this end, the mind must be disciplined and for that purpose the Buddha suggests that a beginning should be made by following certain "rules" of conduct which are to be undertaken voluntarily by the seeker after harmony and happiness. These "rules" are formulated as vows and are stated not positively but negatively as abstinences. They are known to the Buddhists as Pancha Sila or the Five precepts and are as follows:

1. I take upon myself the vow of abstaining from causing hurt to living beings.
2. I take upon myself the vow of abstaining from taking that which is not given (by its owners).
3. I take upon myself the vow of abstaining from wrong conduct in the satisfaction of sense-desires.
4. I take upon myself the vow of abstaining from falsehood.
5. I take upon myself the vow of abstaining from drinks and drugs and from things that cause confusion and heedlessness.

It will be seen that these rules of conduct primarily deal with the relationship of the individual with others. Through the understanding of the impossible position of an isolated ego arises naturally the comprehension of its relationships. These are conceived as rights and duties. Buddhism is essentially a teaching of relationships, not of absolutes. This is expressed most significantly in the doctrine of Paticca-Samuppada (Dependent Origination which is summed up in the formula -asmim sati idam hoti -, that being present, this comes to be) i.e. nothing exists by itself, apart from something else. Even Nirvana, which is the goal of Buddhism, exists because of the prior existence of Samsara. The individual cannot exist apart from the community, from society. Individual responsibility for self-improvement and social responsibility are not separate. The individual must trust and hope that the

community will not fail to carry out what the individual can never finish by himself.

This relationship between individual and society is conceived most easily as rights and duties. Very elementarily stated, the right of living involves the duty to respect the life of others. The right to possess the means of living involves the duty to respect the possessions of others. The right to enjoy the pleasure of living involves the duty of recognising that others too have the same right and undue indulgence would, apart from everything else deprive others of their fair share of the good things of life. The right to search for the highest truth involves the duty of truthfulness. No transaction is possible if a man's word cannot be believed. If a man is intoxicated either with drinks or with obsessions and prejudices (which are equally intoxication) he loses his self-respect and his inhibitions and becomes a nuisance.

In the way very briefly stated above, it would be impossible to indicate at all satisfactorily the implications of Pancha Sila. But to do so in detail would involve more than is available for the purpose.

For the sake of clarification, however observations are essential. It is often asked, especially by Westerners, why it is that Buddhism the good life is stated in negative terms. To the Westerner, abstinence or renunciation is a negative attitude, he prefers a positive approach instead. To the Eastern mind, however, contemplation is the acme of activity and renunciation is a very positive thing. Also when we come to think of it is the concept of Freedom, for instance, entirely a positive thing? Is it not, at least in its most inspiring form, a rejection of oppression, a resistance to enormous strangling forces, which keep for every renewing themselves and stifling the spirit of man? The rejection of evil is regarded by the Buddha as a fight and a struggle. "Warriors, Warriors, Lord, we call ourselves - In what way are we warriors?" "We wage war, Brethern, therefore are we called warriors" "Wherefore, Lord, do we wage war?" "For lofty virtue, for high endeavour, for sublime wisdom — for these things do we wage war. Therefore we are called warriors".

This fight has to be waged incessantly; it needs constant vigilance, the ceaseless remembrance of it as a duty. It is a spirit, not a dogma, a process, not an end. The individual is a growing organism; this struggle will help him to grow, correcting bit by bit what is wrong, vigilantly dealing with the new wrongs and the resistances that arise as conditions alter. The goal is freedom, because to be happy one must

be free. Freedom is identified and equated with freedom (mokkham sukham) and freedom is essentially an inner thing.

The Buddhist concept of Ahimsa

To the Buddhists, all forms of life whether high or low are one. By non-injury to life are meant all forms of hurt and harm, of cruelty and oppression, of depreciation and the Buddhist concept of ahimsa or non-injury is not confined to abstinence from killing human beings nor is it confined to the observance of the first precept. It is intimately intentioned with the second precept also. It embraces ethnical conduct in all its boundlessness. Ahimsa does not mean either non-action or inaction. It has been well said that one could draw up a whole declaration of human rights in terms of ahimsa, for denial of human rights is doing injury to human nature. The statement **ahimsa paramo dharmah**, that non-injury is the highest law, implies that the moral factor is the backbone of all law and that the individual and not the State is the ultimate subject of law. It asserts that the rights of man are grounded in a law superior to the laws of the State. It forbids us to commit crimes against humanity including such things as the denial of freedom or the exploitation of others. Thus the law of ahimsa is one of the greatest expressions of human rights, for transcending the ideal of **caritas** found in some other religions.

Ahimsa has also its positive counterpart. It demands not only abstaining from injury but also the practice of friendliness (maitri) helping every living being on its onward way. Maitri begins with oneself; a man who is not his own friend will not act as the friend of another. As his own friend, he seeks his own fullest development. To do this he must recognise that he is much more than an "embodied function", a cipher, that he has social relationships, and that he also has a destiny of his own, self-perfection through enlightenment. This recognition of his own destiny involves the recognition of similar destiny in others as well, the practice of samanatmata (equality). He realises that all men are equal, not in regard to their aptitudes and talents but in their essential quality which lies in the depths of the spirit where the road is open to each man for fulfilling his destiny. He recognises that no man should be treated only as a means and not at the same time as an end in himself. This recognition of equality entails among other things a social order in which there should be equal opportunities for all its members, for education and work, for health and cultural development.

This follows upon a realisation of the fact that human nature is part of Nature and involved in it and that men cannot achieve harmony in living, if the outward conditions of living are unsatisfactory and the inward spirit is distracted.

The goal of good Life

In as much as the goal of the good life is complete Freedom, the third and fifth precepts, are meant to help in the achievement of that Freedom by gradually eliminating man's bondage to craving and delusion, greed and passion and confusion, avarice and motion, false imagination and erroneous speculation which are called **micchaditthi** or wrong views. To enjoy true freedom man must only be free from all forms of tyranny but he must also liberate himself from many "isms" and win his way into insight, the realisation of Truth. The ideal is not merely complete freedom from desires but complete freedom from attachment, the attainment of complete final and absolute detachment. This is Nirvana, and it can be won in this very life. In Buddhism, happiness does not have to be a post mortem achievement. The saint, having won Nirvana, continues to live till he dies. Between the attainment of Nirvana and his death, he has "desires" of a sort because he must eat and drink and sleep and so on but such desires are "rootless", they are not rooted in any self. His personality is not involved or entangled in them. This detachment is one of the **Brahma viharas**, the four kinds of noble conduct, the last of which is **upekkha** equanimity or inner harmoniousness. He is no longer involved in the flux of time and history; he transcends these things and is lifted above them. He has not merely gone through a transition, either spatial or temporal, but a complete transformation in which he has completely realised himself. There is here no question of subordination or merging. In Buddhism, the individual is not part of the universe but the universe itself, so that when he knows himself he knows the universe. He becomes higher than any god or Brahma; he is bhavitatta, completely evolved and **brahmabhuta**, become the highest.

In recent years, the term Pancha Sila has passed into the vocabulary of politics and it may be worth while to examine what kind of relationship, if any, the Pancha Sila of the politicians has with the Pancha Sila enunciated by the Buddha.

Political Pancha Sila

It was Dr. Soekarno, now President of the Republic of Indonesia, who on the 1st of June 1945, introduced Pancha Sila into the domain of politics, as the "Five Principles of the State", during the first Session of the Investigation Committee for Preparation of Independence. They became the Five Principles of International

Conduct, when formulated on April 29, 1954, in the Sino-Indian Agreement on Tibet, as follows:-

1. Mutual respect for each other's territorial integrity and sovereignty;
2. Non-aggression
3. Non-interference in each other's internal affairs;
4. Equality and mutual benefit; and
5. Peaceful co-existence.

In a joint statement made by the Prime Minister of Burma, U Nu, and the Prime Minister of the People's Republic of China, Chou En-Lai, issued on June 29, 1954, the "Prime Ministers, agreed that these (five principles) should also be the guiding principles for relationship between China and Burma. If these principles are observed by all countries, the peaceful co-existence of countries with different social systems should be ensured, and the threat and fear of aggression and interference in internal affairs would give place to a sense of security and mutual confidence".

The President of the Government of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam assured the Prime Minister of India, Jawaharlal Nehru, on October 17, 1954, that he believed fully in the five principles which had been agreed upon between the Prime Ministers of China and India and wished to apply them in the relations of Viet-Nam with Laos and Cambodia as well as with other countries.

This was followed on the 22nd of December, 1954, by the affirmation of the President of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia, Marshall Tito.

On 10th April, 1955, the Asian Conference at New Delhi, attended by 200 delegates from fourteen countries, adopted a resolution pledging support to the Pancha Sila as "the sure foundation of mutual understanding and peaceful co-existence among nations".

Thus these five principles began to constitute a challenge from Asia to the world, a challenge to which each country will have to give a direct answer. Twenty-nine countries of Asia and Africa, comprising nearly three-fifths of the world's population, met on 18th April, 1955, at Bandung in Indonesia and in the final resolution these five Principles were incorporated. Marshall Bulganin expressed in June 1955 his resolve that the friendly Indo-Russian relations shall continue to be informed and guided by the five Principles.

Incorporating the Pancha Sila under three broad heads, the Inter-Parliamentary Union, meeting at Helsinki on the 29th of August, 1955, adopted a resolution on the juridical and moral principles of co-existence. It said that the maintenance of peaceful co-existence required the loyal observance by all governments of the rules of international law and especially of the following principles:-

- a) Mutual respect for the territorial integrity, sovereignty and equality of each country;
- b) Renunciation of all interference in the internal affairs of other countries;
- c) Non-aggression.

On 30th November, 1955, Jawaharlal Nehru in his presidential speech on the occasion of the Civic Reception at Calcutta, accorded to the Soviet Leaders, Bulganin and Krushchev, explained once again and emphasized the Pancha Sila as being 2500 years old for India.

Relationships between Buddhist Pancha Sila and Political Panca Sila

It is sometimes said that the five principles of national and international conduct that have come to the fore during recent times, have, except in name no similarity or relationship with the Buddhistic principles of moral conduct. It is particularly this point which I wish to contradict, and instead, show the harmony, agreement, logical development and natural evolution of the five principles of international conduct from the five principles of individual moral conduct as enunciated by the Buddha, 2500 years ago.

Here we have to consider first of all the specific teaching of the Buddha, which made him the great reactionary and revolutionist among all founders and reformers of religions. For he alone among the many broke down the basic principles for the purpose of upholding which the many had constructed, metaphysical systems ensuring the continuation of that principle, the individual self-entity, the eternal soul. In his categorical denial of such enduring principle, - as a substance upholding the phenomena, as a spiritual principle of intellectual life, as an everlasting individual soul, - the Buddha made use of the method of analysis, adopted many centuries later by several materialist philosophers, and practically all scientists. He analysed the material and the intellectual phenomena of life and reduced even the material elements to the phenomena of extension, cohesion, caloricity and oscillation, which are not properties of matter, but which essentially constitute matter. Similarly, the intellectual faculty was analysed by him into receptive sensation, perceptive absorption, conceptive ideation and conscious

cognition, so many steps in the evolutionary process of thought, without an independent thinker who could be separated from the thought. And thus, in this analytical system, the time-honoured place of the “self” was taken over by “action”, and hence, from the ethical view point, the salvation of a soul was replaced by “right action” (**Dhamma**) as opposed to “wrong action” (**Adhamma**). Now **Dhamma** is whatever is natural, that which forms the constitution, the norm, and **Adhamma** would, therefore, be whatever is against the constitution of nature, abnormal. On this distinction between right and wrong, as between normal and abnormal, natural and unnatural, the five principles of the Buddha’s ethical code are based.

Sanctity of Life

It is natural to protect One’s own life, and it would not be natural to deny that right to another. Hence one should abstain from killing.

It is natural to employ various means to preserve life, and so long as the possession of the means of livelihood does not become a means towards a different end, such as property becoming a source of power, or need becoming greed, it would not be natural to deny the right of property to others. Hence one should abstain from “stealing”.

It is natural to preserve life by satisfying the needs of life, but it would not be natural to allow this satisfaction to become an obsession disturbing one’s inner harmony and a matter of greed depriving others of what belongs to them in order to satisfy one’s lusts, whether lust of passion or lust of power. Hence one should practise self-restraint as a natural thing.

It is natural for the intellect to search for the real meaning of phenomena, of events, of causes and effects and their implications and anything which would thwart this search is unnatural. Hence one should abstain from untruth.

Finally, if the appreciation of human attainment is natural, anything which would degrade this attainment would be unnatural. Hence one should abstain from all things that bemuddle the mind and confuse it.

And so these five principles of conduct, the Buddha’s **Pancha Sila**, are mere natural consequences from his view of life, according to which an individual is not a separate and isolated entity, but an aspect in the process of becoming, in which

each individual action sets up a practically universal reaction. The Buddha's denial of the existence of the individual ego-entity apart from action, as accepted by modern philosophers and men of science, naturally leads to a broadening view of life, in which the individual is a constituent part of the whole. Even the family, the nation, the race are extended individualities without existence of their own, but constituting the total mass of phenomenal life. And with the growing understanding of the place of the individual in the state, and of the individual state in the international political sphere, has come also a growing understanding of those moral principles, which now find their application in the international sphere.

Thus the Buddha's first moral principle, according to which an individual undertakes to abstain from injury to life, finds expression in the five Principles of International Conduct, as the principle of non-aggression, which is also a condemnation of all attempts to subject other countries to political and economic domination.

The Buddha's second moral principle, according to which an individual undertakes to refrain himself from taking what has not been given to him, is expressed on an international scale by the principle of mutual respect for each other's territorial integrity and sovereignty, the principle of equality among states in their mutual relations and in their relations with other states.

The Buddha's third moral principle, according to which an individual undertakes to practise self-restraint becomes internationally a compliance with the principles of mutual respect for, and non-interference in, internal affairs for whatever reason, whether of an economic, political or ideological nature.

The Buddha's fourth moral principle, according to which an individual undertakes to refrain from falsehood, slander and even frivolous talk, assumes international importance as a principle of equality which must be based on trust, a principle of mutual benefit and co-operation, removing all those factors in international relationship which hamper the development and exchange of production in the mutual interest of the nations concerned, eliminating every form of conduct which creates distrust or impedes in any other way the establishing of an atmosphere conducive to constructive international co-operation.

The Buddha's fifth and last moral principle, whereby an individual undertakes to abstain from all things which bemuddle the mind, including the various "isms" that claim for recognition, aims at harmonising the various intellectual faculties and emotional tendencies in the individual himself and the removal of misunderstanding thereby creating an atmosphere of harmony in his surrounding,

which with international application grows out into the principle of peaceful co-existence.

Fundamentals of Human Rights

Thus whether we take the Pancha Sila as enunciated by the Buddha or whether we take it as formulated and adopted at several international conferences quite recently, it constitutes the fundamentals of human rights and duties between individuals, between individual and society, between society and the state and between states mutually. They are based on the understanding of the individual, of his place in and relationship with society; they acknowledge the existence of the individual, but not as an isolated entity; they acknowledge the individual as an essential and integral part of the process, which has no movement, no progress, if not through individual effort. It is the individual who makes the world, and makes the world go round. It is the same individual who has no existence apart from the process, who gives life to the process, and who also takes his life from that same process.

It is, therefore, of the greatest importance that both the individual and the state in its international relationships should be guided by these principles so essential to natural, human life. It is only on the basis of these principles, the Pancha Sila, that maintenance and promotion of international peace and security may be expected.

Peace in the individual is not to be obtained by prayer and sacrifice, but is the result of his being in harmony and accord with his environment. When his inner strivings disagree with the natural tendencies of the universe around him he has to attune himself rather than to expect the universe tuning in to him. Any discord in this harmony finds its origin in selfish isolation and can only be dissolved by an unselfish or altruistic attitude. And only when the individual has attained this harmony, when he can look upon himself no longer as an isolated entity but truly sees himself as a force, however small, which goes to swell this greater force of life on the nation, of the universe, only then may we expect these five principles of individual moral conduct to become effective on the international stage, and individual existence to pave the way to international co-existence*.

* Address delivered by late Dr G.P. Malalasekera. General President of the Indian Philosophical Congress at the 32nd Annual Session held at Srinagar, Kashmir (Jayanti)

Extract from “Sri Lankaramaya Vesak Annual 1979 Published by Singapore Sinhala Buddhist Association, St. Michael’s Road, Singapore