

# DONATION OF THE EYES AFTER DEATH – A CORRECT DECISION?

## MEDICAL EVIDENCE OF THE BLINDS BECOMING MISERABLE AFTER GETTING THEIR SIGHTS.

BY : SCIENTIX

In this life on earth, we are required to take very many worldly decisions. Questions after questions arise every day. "What should I do now?" is the basic one. There is a wide range: from the housewife's question: "What do I cook tomorrow?" to the working husband's questions: "How should I tackle this situation?..... Should I migrate to Australia?". We take decisions after weighing all "facts and circumstances", as are known to us at the time. There are some which we do not know, and some which may happen in future. We make inquiries and take opinions of experienced people. We take risks. We have a reasonably fair idea of what adverse can happen, but "we will see then", we think. We are not sure whether the decision will turn right or wrong; but we have, as on date, reasonably strong materials to take the novel decision and act; the probability of it turning right is high.

**But if you do not have any materials to decide and do not have any idea whatsoever of the risk involved, would you take the decision?**

**The question is : should you donate your eyes?** Now, what are the materials on which you can assess the risk and decide? You will at once see that the matter lies beyond the intellectual barrier, that is, it lies in a realm of which you do not know anything, - the realm of death or life after death. It is not just migration to Australia, about which you can have a good idea through your friends there or from books. But here, you have to transit to a place beyond the three dimensions of length, breadth and height, and you are not even sure which 'you' will go there - because your body, which you thought was 'you' has fallen on the ground and something else within you, 'soul' as it is called, has gone somewhere – know not where. What are the facts and circumstances and the risk on which you can ponder and decide?

The only 'fact' on which you will rely is your good heart, your human feeling for a suffering blind person and a desire to help him or her to see the world and lead and enjoy a normal life. These are very noble sentiments. To be of service to man and animals and whole of God's creation is the teaching of all Religions and all saints, sages and seers.

But is it a 'fact' that you will be helping and serving the blind person to whom your eyes will go after your death? Would you be surprised if I say that it is not a fact, it is a presumption, which is very likely to go wrong? **Your eyes may harm his life.** At this point I am not on any spiritual or mystical aspect of the matter. I shall deal with that later. Here, I want to reveal to you that **there is cogent medical and scientific evidence to falsify your presumption. Not in all cases a blind person getting the eyes to see the world, is able to see it as a normal human person. He may become miserable after getting your eyes, so much so that he may lose all interest in life and may even be led to suicide.** Sounds weird? But there is medical evidence to show that 'seeing' is not just through the eyes. Something else is required. That something is **an inner light of mind**, a visual imagination, in the absence of which the blind with his new eyes becomes miserable. He is led to think that his previous total blindness was much better. Let me explain this and set out here a little of such evidence.

Arthur Zajonc, Professor of Physics at Amherst College has written a "a small gem of a book" (as acclaimed by a famous science writer, James Gleick, author of "Chaos"). Zajonc's book is : **"Catching the Light"**, with an excellent sub title, **"The Entwined History of Light and Mind"** (1995 - Oxford; 1993 - Bantam). The subject matter is 'Light', something – we know not what- with which we see. It is not a treatise on the Physics of light but, as the back cover says, "Blending mythology, religion, science, literature and painting, he reveals in poetic detail the human struggle to identify the vital connection between the outer light of nature and the inner light of the human spirit." (It is a paradox of science that physics, the science of matter, which led the humans to stark materialism is now producing professors who show how physics knocks

the door of mysticism!).

Before taking the reader in the medley of the varied subjects, Prof. Zajonc in his first chapter asserts on medical evidence that even physical sight is not just through the eye alone, but requires an inner light of mind, which means that the blind should have formed visual images in his mind during childhood.

In 1910 two French eye-surgeons, Moreau and Le Prince, operated on a boy of eight years. He had cataracts and was blind from the birth. When the bandages were removed, the boy's eyes were physically perfect. The surgeon waved a hand before his eyes, and asked "What are you seeing?" "I don't know," the boy replied. "Don't you see it moving?" The Doctors asked. "I don't know" was the reply again. He was unable to see the movement of the hand. His hand was then made to touch the Doctor's moving hand, he shouted "It's moving!" "I feel it moving. I hear it move." Yet it was laborious for him to see it moving. The light did enter his eyes, but something from inside his mind was missing. "The child's sight began as a hollow, silent, dark and frightening kind of seeing," Zajonc writes. "The light of day beckoned but no light of mind replied within the boy's anxious, open eyes."

Dr. Moreau then started working on him. He tried to create images of things in his mind, so that the boy can visualise them. But his parents grew restless at the slow progress and he was handed over to a child welfare establishment. Within an year whatever he had learnt to see, due to the efforts of the Doctor, was lost. The Doctor was disappointed. He wrote in his note that in spite of his best efforts he could not help the boy in forming permanent images in his mind. He wrote : **"It would be an error to suppose that a patient whose sight has been restored to him by surgical intervention can thereafter see the external world."** The eyes have got the power to see, but that is not sufficient. Something more is required in the mind, viz. the memory-images, and if they are not there, the eyes are helpless. Dr. Moreau continues:

**"The eyes have certainly obtained the power to see, but the employment of this power which as a whole constitutes the act of seeing, still has to be acquired from the very beginning. The operation itself has no more value than that of preparing the eyes to see; education is the most important factor."**

By education, the surgeon means to train the patient's mind to form visual images. It is a very cumbersome and exhausting exercise.

#### **MISERY AFTER SIGHT.**

This is not a solitary and exceptional case. One British man was blind from his age of ten months. At nine, he was put in a blind school. There he learnt the work of shoe repairing. He could live comfortably on his income. He used to go on long bicycle rides by holding on to the shoulders of a friend. He was fond of gardening and doing things by his hands by using tools. "A confident cheerful and clearly intelligent man."

After living the pleasant life upto the age of 50 years, he was given cornea transplants on 9-12-1958 and 1-1-1959, Two research psychologists Gregory and Wallace were interested in his progress. After about a month from the man's operation, they asked him about his first visual experience after the operation. He said he heard a human voice and when he turned towards the sound, he saw a blur. He just guessed that, that was the Doctor. Otherwise, it was "never easy" for him to see to faces. He had to struggle to see things. On one occasion the two psychologists took him to see a museum of science and technology. Being fond of using tools, he was excited to go. They brought him near a fine screw cutting lathe. "Can you say what is this?" They asked. He was perplexed and said he could not see the thing working. They then allowed him to touch the lathe. He ran his hands over it with his eyes tightly closed. He then went back a little and opened his eyes. "Now that I have felt it, I can see it.

The constant struggle to see things and learn about them slowly was a deep disappointment to the man. **He often tried to escape the agony by not switching on the light at night and going around in his previous normal blinded ways! Within two years of his transplant he died.**

The experts say that this misery after sight happens in many such cases. Often the effort to see is too strainful to bear. "Those newly given sight may give up completely, sometimes even tragically ending their struggle to see by taking their own life". (p. 4 Zajonc). M. Von Senden has studied **66 cases of the sight recovery** in the born blind and observed that for them the world is not made of the light, colour, and shape the normal humans see. Learning to see is for them a project leading to psychological crisis. Their world

previously formulated on their senses other than the eyes, is shattered and a sense of insecurity sets in. "Some decide it is better to be blind in their own world than sighted in an alien one". (Ibid. p. 5).

## **THE BLIND CAT**

Vision researches on animals have confirmed this. If a cat is kept blind between the fourth week and the fourth month, it will not be able to see throughout its life. The act of seeing requires patterns to be formed in the mind while seeing with the eyes. If the patterns are not formed during a critical window in the early years, it is extremely difficult to make up a later time.

As Zajonc concludes, "Besides the outer light and eye, sight requires an "inner light", one whose luminance compliments the familiar outer light and transforms raw sensations into meaningful perception". (page 6)

Please note that here this "light of the mind" has not a figurative or mystical or spiritual connotation or significance. This is purely physical level of the mind, where visual images are required to be stored up from a very young age to enable one to see things with the help of the eye. The two lights - light of the sun and the light of the mind are to be brought together by the physical eye. Without anyone of them, physical eye cannot enable one to see the world of our common perception.

So please ponder. Your presumption that you are helping an unfortunate human being may be false. There is high probability that your help may make him more miserable. It may even lead to suicide!

Prof. Zajonc has given following reference for the scientific data:

1. M. Von Senden, "Space and Sight: The perception of Space and Shape in the congenitally Blind before and after Operation," trans. Peter Heath (Glencoe IL: The Free Press, 1960, pages 20, 40 and 160). (This is Dr. Moreau's eight year old patient and other cases).

2. R.L. Gregory and J.G. Wallace, "Recovery from Early Blindness: A Case study in Perception, ed. Paul Tibbetts (New York: Quadrangle/New York Times Book Co. 1969. (This is the case of the 50 years old blind Britisher.)

3. David H Hubel, Eye, Brain and Vision (New York Scientific American library, W.H. Freeman 1988). (This is the cat study).

■ ■ ■

Now all this is from the view point of the blind. What about the person who donates?

***(Parsi Pukar JANUARY 1998 Vol. 3; No. 7)***

# EYE DONATION - FROM THE MEDICAL TO THE MYSTICAL

by Scientix

We have seen that there is medical evidence to show that a person, who is blind from birth or early childhood becomes miserable after getting a successful eye transplant. Physical eyes, by themselves, are not sufficient to enable one to see the external world. It is also necessary that memory images of the objects to be perceived should be formed in the MIND from the early childhood. As the surgeon Dr. Moreau has pointed out, it is an error to suppose that the transplantation by itself would confer the power to see. The act of seeing is based on the synchronized operation of three things: sun-light, physical eyes and the light of the mind, not in any philosophical or figurative sense, but at a physical level. A fault or deficiency in anyone of the three disturbs the vision. We have seen how a blind child patient of Dr. Moreau, after getting healthy eyes, had to be 'educated' right from the beginning to form images in the mind and how that education was traumatic for the child and meticulously painstaking for the doctor or educator (if there be any). We have seen the case of a fifty years old Britisher who often kept his eyes tightly closed rather than to pass through the agony of making a strenuous effort to form images in his 50 years old mind, and whose happy life as a blind man was not only painfully disturbed but even shortened. He died at 52.

Let us now leave the territory of physical science and enter the immensely vast and unexplored country of mystical science, which is a picturised phase of the Science of Religion.

## Can Religion be a Science?

If the word "science" is given its natural meaning, Religion is not only 'a' science, but "the" Science.

The root of the word "science", says Webster Universal Dictionary, is Latin "Scientia" which has two main limbs: Knowledge and Experience. To 'know' of things is science. "To endeavor to know" is the paraphrase of "the scientific quest". John Horgan a science writer par excellence defines science in this sense, in the Introduction to his illuminating book "The End of Science", as : "By **science** I mean not applied science, but science at its purest and grandest, **the primordial human quest to understand the universe and our place in it.**" (page 6 - Helix - 1996).

It is a quest for **truth**, the ultimate truth. That can well be said of Religion. Religion is, or should be - as the Prophets and Saints say-quest for Truth; and God is Truth and Truth is God. They also say, Life itself is Religion, a quest for God and 'thyself.' KNOW about Him and 'thyself'. Know means have knowledge.

When in 1645 the Royal Society of London was founded in Britan, its aim was stated to be : the improvement of natural knowledge. It was an almost religious aim. But inherent in this aim was a restriction: this science should be strictly based on experiment and observation, and deductions therefrom. Any piece of knowledge which is not based on this method is unscientific and even untrue. That was how the definition of science was bound in a chain and Religion was excluded from its field often arrogantly and with a disdainful laugh.

This went on for almost 300 long years. At the end of the 19th century, the arrogance and self confidence of this science, with its chain of experiment - observation - inference - deduction, reached it zenith. As 20th century dawned, the chain quivered a little with the arrival of Einstien in 1905 and 1915 with his theories of Relativity. But the heavy hammer was struck on the chain in the third decade of the 20th century. Observation and experiment were reported to be not so assuringly reliable. You disturb nature in the very act of observation. (Heisenberg's Principle of Uncertainty.) **With our science, we are not in contact with reality, declared the formidable pioneers of science: Heisenberg, Schrodinger, De Broglie, Jeans, Pauli, Eddington.** A collection of their views appears in a book: "**Quantum Questions**" with a subtitle "**Mystical Writings of the World's Great Physicists,**" edited by Ken Wilber (Shambhala - 1985.)

Mystical writings? From Nobel prize winning physicists? Science - that monopolist of true knowledge or the knowledge of truth-knocking the door of mysticism? And what is mysticism but Handmaid of Religion?

Today, at the end of our bloodiest century, two things have happened. One is : the science of observation to deduction i.e. the empirical science as it is called, has come to an end. No further observation is now possible by the methods of science. It has entered into the world of guess-works and speculations while trying to understand the ultimate reality of nature. The quest for Truth has come to a grinding halt, all the computer-robot-artificial intelligence technologies notwithstanding.

The other phenomena is that books after books are coming out, written by professional scientists,

wherein they do not hesitate to draw materials from the mysticisms of the world.

Truth is no longer the monopoly of science. It is now clear that Religion itself is the science of Nature. It deals with the events, existences, phenomena lying beyond the consciousness of the ordinary non-saintly humans. The Saints are the scientists who are in touch with the realities and mysteries of Nature. Theirs is the science of mysticism. God is one of the main subjects of that science. They say that not the observations in the laboratory of our empirical sciences but the EXPERIENCE of our mind, consciousness and HEART is the method to arrive at the Truth. The EXPERIENCE is to be achieved through the observation (i.e. compliance) of the laws prescribed by Religion. (Gatha 30-2). FAITH and DEVOTION of the HEART are the tools leading to the experience.

Mystical sciences cover subjects ranging from a speck of dust to the Light of God. One of the subjects is LIFE AFTER DEATH and ITS RELATION TO THE LIFE BEFORE DEATH.

Let us enter, then, in this science of Life and Death in so far as it is relevant to our question viz donation of eyes after death. I thought it fit to preface it with an account of the most modern events in the fields of physical and empirical science, in order to convey to my truth-seeking readers that **the days of dismissing mystical science on the strength of modern science are gone**. We are now on more sturdy ground in the revelations of Religions than the explorations of science. Faith in the divine messengers of God is better than the faith in the erring priests of modern science.

### **THE TEACHINGS OF THE MYSTICAL SCIENCE.**

All Religions are unanimous in revealing that a human being has a soul within the body. On death, the body falls and the soul transits into the "next world", which lies beyond the consciousness of the living human. The soul has then a journey in the next world. That journey, they reveal, depends on what the deceased had done during his life on earth. There is something like punishment or retribution to be gone through to wipe off the ill effects of the 'sins' committed in the living life.

**What is sin? It is doing something which God has commanded man no to do; and not doing something He has commanded man to do.** We have the evidence of God's existence and His definition of the sins, through the words of His Messengers. (Would you call them false witnesses?) The basic do's and dont's are defined by them. They are common and unanimous in all Religions. The Parsi Religion calls its dont's as 'Goonah' and do's as 'Kerfey'. A list of both is given in 'Patet Pashemani' and 'Doa Naam Setayashney' prayers, as also in the traditional interpretations of our holy scriptures including the Gatha. There are ten commandments of the Prophet Moses; Sermon on the Mount by Lord Jesus; Eight-fold path of Lord Buddha; Sankhya and Karma Yoga's of Lord Krishna, and the stringent moral code pervading the whole of the holy Quran.

### **THE DOORS & SENSES OF THE BODY**

The great Religions also declare that the deeds of a human being are done through the "doors" in the physical body, like eyes, ears, hands, feet, mouth (Sarosh Yashta Hadokht, Kardeh 1) and also the five sense of seeing, hearing, smelling, tasting, touching. These doors and senses are prompted by the mind to do the deeds. Mind means the process of thinking or the state of consciousness. These deeds can be Goonah or Kerfey or mixture of both. Goonah or sin creates a disorder within the human as also out in the universe, and attracts painful Karmic reaction. (Gatha 43-5, 53-6). Kerfey, the good deed, takes the human further on the Path leading to God. (Gatha 44-1, 17; 49-3; 50-6)

The command of God is thus to do 'kerfey' and avoid 'goonah'. But there are hostile forces within man as also in the 'outside' universe, which attract man towards goonah, the evil do's and dont's (Gatha 49-1, 4). It is the natural tendency of the non-saintly human mind to be drawn away in the powerful current of the hostile forces (Gatha, 53-6). It is therefore ordained that man must generate inherent strength in his thinking process i.e. the mind, to resist the evil thoughts, words and deeds. The religious disciplines and tarikats ('Shyothnaa') are meant to generate this strength. (Gatha 28-1, 34-1). Bhakti-devotion is great generator of this inherent energy. So the rule of life comes to this: resist evil which is trying to manifest itself through the 'door's and senses of the body; control your mind and the senses; otherwise, the painful Karmic reaction will overpower you.

The scriptural evidence indicated above is illustrative, not exhaustive. I invite particular attention to Sarosh Yashta Hadokhta, Kardeh 1, where the doors of the body viz. "Ashi, Ushi, Gava Dvareythra, Zafarey" - eyes, ears, hands, feet, mouth are specifically referred to and it is declared that 'Nemo' i.e. the Bandgi, to be

the 'Bandeh'-servant-of Ahura i.e. to think, speak and act according to His commands, will stop the onslaught of the evil, and wither out all carnal passions and vices emanating through these doors. Therefore Ahura orders Asho Zarathushtra to declare to the mankind that in this physical world and with this physical body, 'Nemo', the 'Bandagi' is the best to lead the humans to the divine Truth (Asha) and divine consciousness (Vohuman). "Nemo Vohu Nemo Vahisstem Zarathushtra Gaethabyo" (A series of Gujerati articles on this powerful Manthric line of 6 words has been already published in this humble Parsi Pukar - Ed.)

The references to the Gatha are based on Framroz Chiniwalla's Khshnoomic translations.

Now consider. The eyes are the doors of the body. It is the most important organ. Seeing is at the basis of all deeds, good and bad. Eyes invite Goonah or Kerfey. Eyes tempt the mind, and the mind may lead to sin; and sin will invite painful reaction or suffering in this and the next world.

Now the question: **If through your donated eyes, the donee is led to sin;** if he sees a woman with lustful eyes; if he sees somebody happy and grows jealous; if he becomes madly angry on seeing some body; if he sees something valuable and thinks of stealing it; if by his eyes he is lured towards thinking, speaking and doing evil, **would you not be partly responsible? Would you not have a Karmic reaction on you also? Would not the divine Forces take notice of the fact that but for your eyes given to him, he would not have committed those sins?** Would there be some sense in thinking that he was deprived of his eyes by the Karmic Forces themselves as a retribution of his past sins; and that you have disturbed the retribution and thereby retarded his journey towards God?

These are more of doubts than questions. But there is no way of finding out whether they have affirmative answers. But if they are true ..... Should you take the risk? They are at least consistent with the mystical sciences. **You don't know what your eyes are going to do to the donee, physically, medically and spiritually; and what your donation is going to do to your own Ruvan** in the next world which you have already reached, when your eyes down below are creating some havoc.

*(Parsi Pukar FEBRUARY 1998 Vol. 3; No. 8)*

## EYE-DONATION

# THE PARSI TRADITION OF TREATING AN AMPUTATED PART OF THE BODY AS THE WHOLE.

## ORGAN TRANSPLANTATION, A MEDICAL FEAT CONVERTED INTO A RUTHLESS TRADE

by Scientix

Two points are made out - one from the medical science, and the other from the mystical science. The first, the medical one, is that there is a high probability of the donee of the eyes becoming miserable after the transplantation because of the lack of image formation in his or her mind. The second, the mystical one, is that the donor of the eyes may have a karmic reaction, if the donee violates the rules of life ordained by the divine Prophets, that is, he or she commits sins through the transplanted eyes.

We now enter into the third grey area, which is related to our Parsi religious traditions.

Unlike the 19th century, the 20th century has piled up materials after materials to show that not all religious and mystical traditions can be brushed aside as superstitions or the products of an alleged primitive mind. The books of a biologist Dr. Lyll Watson, like "Supernature" (Hodder & Stoughton – 1974-1986), "The Romeo Error" (Coronet - 1976), and "Gifts of Unknown Things" (Coronet 1977); of Charles Berlitz like "The Mysteries from Forgotten Worlds" (Laruel - 1975), and "Atlantis" (Fawcett-Crest - 1984); of the biologist Rupert Sheldrake's "Presence of the Past" (Times Books - Random House - 1988), and a host of others provide ample data to show that the days of laughing away the religious traditions on the strength of modern science are also gone. I do not elaborate on this here; it is a long subject by itself.

### **LIFE AFTER DEATH.**

In our Parsi religious traditions, which we have adopted as a way of life for numerous centuries, death is a very very important event in the journey of the Ruvan i.e., the soul, who passes through the earth with a physical body. There is an elaborate procedure and place the Dokhma - for the disposal of the physical body. There are elaborate ceremonies to help the departed Ruvan in the next world. Detailed accounts are provided in our holy Scriptures and Pahalvi writings about the Ruvan's journey after death. That again, is a vast subject not capable of being dealt with here. We shall confine ourselves to a few points and facts relevant to our present subject.

In our Religion, the dead body is given a very special treatment. 'Sachkar' is the first step when the body is bathed and clothed according to set procedures. Avesta Prayers are continuously chanted before the body where fire is kept constantly burning. Certain Sarosh invocations are offered (Sarosh nu Patru). Ahoonvad Gatha with certain preliminaries and end-ceremonies is recited (Geh Sarnu) immediately before lifting up the body for being taken to the Dokhma. In the Dokhma, the body is subject to three forces of Nature: Sun's rays, vultures and the subtle ultra-magnetic fields established within the Dokhma, and in the surrounding atmosphere at the time of the construction and establishment of the Dokhma, through certain ordained rituals (Kriya). The dead body is treated almost as a temple. We kneel before it, pray before it, honour it. WHY? Why such a fuss over a lifeless decaying thing?

It is revealed in our Scriptures, Books and Traditions that the physical body which is the carrier of the Ruvan on this earth, is not just a bag to be thrown away. It is composed of certain ultra-material elements called "Anasar's." These are like subtle nuclei or centers around which the physical body is interwoven.

In modern science, the body is made up of billions of cells. A cell is the smallest unit of the living body. It has tremendous chemical activities going on within it every second. An average cell reproduces itself every twenty minutes. Just read how a biologist describes the amazing movements in a cell :

"A cell works like a big industry, which manufactures different products at different sites, ships them

around to assembly plants, where they are combined into half finished or finished products, to be eventually, with or without storage in intermediate facilities, either used up in the household of that particular cell or else, extruded for export to other cells or waste disposal." - Paul Weiss in "The Living System", quoted in "The New Biology" by Agros and Stancu (Shambhala - 1988).

What is the force or energy behind this tremendous activities in a cell? In the field of modern science, a triangular debate has gone on. It is just a machine, 19th century said. It has some non-physical force in it, say the 'vitalists'. It has some organisation arising out of a "system", which operates on relationship between the parts; no part has the property of the whole.

## **THE ANASARIC ESSENCE.**

The mystical science of our Religion indicates that all activities of the human body, mind and consciousness arise from the subtle non-physical 'Anasar's. They do not have physical form. They are circuits of energy generated from certain energy centers. A cell is a physical manifestation of these Anasarcic circuits. Every living animal has these Anasarcic circuits, or nucleii or essence in its body. During our life on earth, cells fall down and grow again, but the Anasarcic essence remains interwoven in the body. When the animal dies, the physical cells die and decay but the Anasarcic essence remains.

Our Religion ordains that this Anasarcic essence is to be lifted up from the body and taken to the Ruvan in the next world. The Dokhma with its three forces, sunlight, vultures and the spiritual fields, is meant to achieve this. Every organ of the dead body is connected with the Anasarcic essence, and therefore, our tradition requires that the whole of the dead body with ALL its parts should be subjected to Dokhm-e-nashini i.e. taken to Dokhma after the due 'Kriyas'.

The tradition, therefore, ordains that if a part of the body say a foot or leg is cut out or amputated, the severed part should be subjected to the same procedure of Dokhm-e-Nashini, - although the person with his leg amputated may remain alive and live long. Geh Sarna 'manthras' are chanted on the white cloth-covered leg and it is taken to the Dokhma.

Now, apply this to the eye donation. Here, the donor is dead. He is taken to the Dokhma. His Anasarcic essence is transmitted to the next world, to be delivered to the Ruvan at the proper time. But the 'Anasars' attached to the eye will go with the donee, who may live for many years. They will, therefore, be delayed and the donor's Ruvan will have its journey impeded.

I am aware that in the present times, our mental frame-up may not be able to grasp such other-worldly narrations. We do not have any such proofs as may satisfy our limited mental equipment. But, the indications, if not proof, are there. Vendidad Pargarad 8 and 19 have some glimpses of life after death and the transmission of Anasarcic essences of the body to the Ruvan in the next world. The tradition regarding the disposal of an amputated part indicates strong support to such transmission. We may doubt, can this be true? But, we do not have any evidence that it may not be true. The question then once again is: in view of the mystical and traditional indications, should you take the risk? If you don't believe in God and the next world and mysticism, and you believe that life is a machine, and death means just the stoppage of machine, it is a different matter. But, with the belief and faith in Ahura Mazda, Asho Zarathushtra, Khordeh Avesta Prayers, Atash-Padshah and above all, Kriyakaam - the rituals for the death, you have to take into consideration these mystical and traditional indications. There seems to be a risk, a real risk; and when risk is indicated, don't ask for rigid proof; just avoid the risk.

## **WHAT ARE YOU DOING?**

In fine, it is highly probable that by donating your eyes, you will create three major disturbances:

- i) disturbance in the day to day life of the previously blind donee of your eyes;
- ii) disturbance in your own Karmic cycles and reactions, on the donee committing sins through your eyes;
- iii) disturbance in the journey of your own Ruvan in the next world.

There is one more aspect to the matter. In this most inhuman century, science has given much evil power to the humans. Science went out in search of truth, mistook its own presumptions and assumptions as truth and reality, and based on them, provided many inventions, medical as well as military. In the process, the humans lost their humanity. Every product of science has led to selfishness and violence. The scientific psyche means a warring, killing, fiercely competitive psyche. Commercial exploitation of man by man is so rampant that even the medicinal sciences have become trade houses. They can transplant organs from one person to another to cure the latter. But, this has developed into a big trade ! A horribly cruel trade! Brian Freemantle has in his book "Octopus" devoted a whole chapter on this terrifying trade of organ snatchers. The ex-U.N. Secretary-General, Dr. Boutros Boutros Ghali, referred to trafficking in human organs, in a conference on world wide organised crime held at Naples on 21-11-1994. The medical boon of transplantation is in the hands of Mafia groups. In this scenario, who knows what selfish, violent and murderous games would be played on your donated eyes. You want to be humane, to help an invalid; that is a genuinely good feeling. But, that feeling is most likely to be misused and misplaced. It is most likely to create much more harm than good.

***(Concluded)***

[ 'Scientix' will one day present to our readers the horrific story of internationally organised crime. - Editor ]

***(Parsi Pukar MARCH 1998 Vol. 3; No. 9)***