Prabuddha Bharata

उत्तिष्ठत जाग्रत प्राप्य वरान्निबोधत ।
Katha Upa. I. iii. 14.

Arise! Awake! And stop not till the Goal is reached.
—SWAMI VIVEKANANDA.

VOL. XXXII. DECEMBER, 1927. No. 12.

REMINISCENCES OF THE HOLY MOTHER

RECORDED BY A DISCIPLE

My first visit to her was at Kothar in Orissa. On that occasion I had the good fortune of saluting her, but not that of any conversation. I returned home the next day. But feeling a strong desire to see her again, I went very soon to Kothar for the second time. After I had stayed there a few days, I went to her one morning and said that I would leave next day. Mother replied: "Stay another day; go day after to-morrow." I returned to the outer apartment. In a short while a monk came to me and said: "Mother is pleased with you; finish your bath and keep yourself ready to-morrow morning." I did not understand what he meant by Mother being pleased and therefore remained silent.

Next morning, Sister Radhu came and asked me: "Who is Vaikuntha Babu? Mother wants him." When I went in to Mother, she said: "Come, come into this room." As I entered, she asked me: "Will you have a *mantram?*"*

Myself.—If you please. I do not know anything.

Mother.—All right. Sit here.—Of which God will you have the mantram?

Myself.—I do not know anything.

* A mystic formula, by repeating which one gets spiritual illumination.

Mother.—Well, I think this mantram will suit you.

With this she gave me a mantram and thus initiated me into spiritual life.

It was during these days of my stay with Mother that I asked her if I could have another Guru for learning the practice of Yoga. Mother replied that I might not receive initiation from any other Guru, though I might have Gurus for learning other things.

The night before I left Kothar, some one woke me up at 12 P.M. and said, as he gave me a packet of sweetmeats, "Mother has sent these for you to take to-morrow on your journey. She forbids you to take any bazar refreshments."

Later, I went to see Mother at Kamarpukur. This was my first visit to Kamarpukur, the birth-place of Sri Ramakrishna. During dinner, Mother herself served me. When I finished my meal, she said: "Vaikuntha, clear your glass, cups and leaf. You must not leave them behind in the home of your Guru." By this, she of course meant the home of Sri Ramakrishna. For at Jayrambati, she would often clear the plates and leavings of her disciples herself.

Next morning when I saluted her, she asked me when I would return home. I expressed the desire of visiting the Math at Belur before going home. But Mother insisted that I should go home directly. I said: "Mother, I have come so far,—I do not mean to return home without seeing the Math." "No," she replied, "go home directly. You must not disobey your Guru." After that, of course I could only remain silent; but I thought within myself that as soon as I had left Kamarpukur, I would go to the Math, and then, how would Mother know?.....

An interesting thing happened in the mean time. I had kept my money-bag in a niche in the front-gate of the house, which was a most unlikely place to keep one's purse in. Mother happened to see it there and removed it to a safer place inside the house. I did not know this. A while after, she sent Sister Lakshmi to ask me what I had done with my money-bag. Of course I could not find it in the niche. When this was reported to Mother, she sent for me and said: "How can you succeed in the world, if you are so careless? I do not see how you can be a householder if you are not a little careful. Your purse is with me."

The same noon I was called in and asked to read out some of the letters she had received. The contents of one of them I specially remember. It was written from the Udbodhan Office where Sasi Maharaj (Swami Ramakrishnananda) was at that time lying ill of tuberculosis. The letter said that he wished to see Mother and wanted to be guided in his treatment by her

advice. On hearing this, Mother said: "What can *I* say about his treatment? He should be guided by the concerted advice of Sarat, Rakhal and Baburam. And if I go there, he will have to be removed. But is that desirable? I won't go. If anything happens to him, I shall find it impossible to live there. Just write a reply clearly explaining my reasons."..... A brother disciple had sent a letter to Mother through me. As I was going to hand it over to her, she asked me to open and read it. It contained two questions: (1) "I am going to enter a service. Will it prove a spiritual bondage?" (2) "Will marriage be beneficial to me?" In reference to the first question, Mother said: "How can service prove a spiritual entanglement?" As regards the second, she did not vouchsafe any reply, but asked me instead if I had married. When I replied in the negative, she said: "That is very nice. Do not marry. Marriage is a great nuisance."

I myself asked her if the eating of fish and flesh was bad. She said: "Fish-eating is customary in this province. You may take fish."..... I also expressed a desire to have her foot-prints on a piece of cloth. She replied: "That will not be possible here. All do not look upon me in the same way as you do. The Lahas often come here. If I paint my feet to give you prints, I shall have to hide myself when they come."

Next noon, after dinner, I prepared to start. I went in to take leave of Mother. She was preparing betel on the porch of her room. On seeing me, she asked: "Have you made your salutations to Raghuvir?"* I had not. Mother asked me to salute him making money-offering, and added: "If you are short of money, take from me."..... As I took my leave, Mother blessed me heartily and said: "Go home directly from here. You need not go now to the Math or anywhere else. Go home and serve your parents. It is your duty now to serve your father." This earnest injunction drove away the former resolve from my mind and I went home directly *via* Koalpara. On reaching home, I found my father seriously ill. He had been quite well when I had started for Kamarpukur. He died within a week of my return home.

On one occasion I had a quarrel with one of my brothers over some worldly affair. Wanting to leave home and live separately for some time I went to the Udbodhan Office to inform Mother and seek her permission. I saluted her and remained standing. Mother said to Golap-Ma who was there: "Do you know, Golap, Vaikuntha has hurried so far to me, simply because his elder brother has given him a slap! Do not

* Raghuvir is the symbolical image of Sri Ramachandra. The image was got by Sri Ramakrishna's father in a miraculous way, was brought home by him and installed there as a household deity.

people quarrel now and then when they live together? Why making so much of a little thing?" "Go home, my child," she said, turning to me, "such occasional quarrels are inevitable when you live in the same family."

On another occasion, I approached her at the same place with a heavy heart and said: "Mother, I have come to tell you something."

"Yes, tell me," she said.

"When will you be gracious to this unhappy child of yours?"

"My child, the Master will bless you,—call on him. Keep good company and practise *sadhana*. Pray to the Master, everything will be all right."

"But that is how I have gained nothing. How can I call on the Master?—I have not seen him. You have been kind to me. If the Master is to be prayed to, then pray to him yourself on my behalf."

"How can you realise without *japa* and meditation? You must practise them."

"No, I do not want to practise them any more. I have so far gained nothing by them. The evil passions, anger, lust and infatuation, are still as strong in me as before. The dirt of the mind has not cleared the least."

"My child, it will clear by and by, by repeating the mantram. You must practise. Don't be wayward. Whenever you find time, repeat the mantram and pray to the Lord."

"No, Mother, I have not the power to do all these. My mind is very restless. Either free my mind of all evil thoughts and fill it with the consciousness of God or take your mantram back. I do not want to cause you unnecessary suffering; for I have heard that if the disciple does not repeat the mantram regularly, the Guru has to suffer for that."

"What ideas these! I am ever anxious for you. And don't you know that the Master has already blessed you?"

With this Mother burst into tears and earnestly said: "All right, you need not repeat the mantram any more." She meant that she would herself repeat it on my behalf. But I understood her wrongly: I thought she wanted to sever her connection with me. I was filled with a great terror and cried out: "Mother, have you really robbed me of my all? What shall I do now? Am I indeed ruined for ever?"

"What!" she replied with great firmness, "my child to be ruined? No, none can ever ruin my children, those who have come to me."

I asked her what I should do henceforth. Mother said: "Rely on me and live in peace. And always remember that

there is one behind you, who will, when the time comes, take you to the Eternal."

I said: "Mother, so long as I stay with you, I feel quite good. Not a single worldly thought assails my mind. But as soon as I return home, all sorts of evil thoughts come into it, I mix with my old bad companions and do bad deeds. However I may try, I cannot shake off those evil thoughts."

Mother replied:—"This is due to the *karmas* of your previous birth. You cannot shake them off all on a sudden. Keep good company; try to be good,—everything will be all right by and by. Pray to the Master. I am ever with you. Know that you are already free, in this very life. Fear not. When the time comes, the Master will do everything for you."

THE HINDU ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE THEORY OF EVOLUTION

BY THE EDITOR

We have reproduced Sir Arthur Keith's British Association address on Darwinism in our last and present issues. To many of our Indian readers the address may appear innocent. It does not propound any new theory but only goes over the ground that has been covered by research since Darwin's passing. Yet it has succeeded in creating quite a stir in certain circles in England. Of course genuine evolutionists have to say much against Sir Arthur's verdict. Can Darwin's theories as regards the method of the origin of species be accepted in toto? There are other theories not less weighty than Darwin's, and so far as we are aware, no final conclusion has been arrived at yet. But it is not scientists that have challenged the address. The protest has come from Roman Catholics and Protestants and also from third parties.

We hear sometimes of the claim that Christianity is a specific religion. It is often said that Christianity is *the* religion for the world. Only last May, Dr. Ingram, Bishop of London, returning from a 48,000 miles journey in all parts of the world observed that "Christianity is the one thing that is wanted in the world." The learned Bishop further remarked: "At the present moment there is an overwhelming desire for truth, and I only wish that those who profess themselves to be Christians will live and act according to their belief. This desire for the truth must be faced with courage by Christians and teachers of the Gospel." This is no doubt an admirable attitude. But the ugly incident at St. Paul's on Oct. 16 last, when the Rector of the City Church denounced Dr. Barnes, Bishop of Birmingham,

before his sermon, for his modernist teachings and withdrew from the service followed by some four hundred of the congregation, throws a flood of light on the inherent weakness of Christianity, its inertness and fear of truth. Dr. Barnes appears to us to be a sincere lover of truth ; he feels that the crude Biblical theories about the origin and nature of man must be given up and proved scientific theories adopted in stead. He preached a striking sermon in the Westminister Abbey and concluded by saying that "pseudo-religious propaganda is now more shameless and superstitution is more prevalent," and that science has preserved standards which organised religion has frequently failed to safeguard. He also addressed an open letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury after his denunciation by the City Rector, in which he attributes one cause of the weakness of the Church to the apparent determination of religious teachers to ignore scientific discovery. The reply that the Archbishop of Canterbury has given to it is extremely disappointing. He evades the main issue which is whether the Church is ready to accept truth whatever it be. He says that the Bishop's position is not novel to him. But he does not say whether he accepts it. The greatest weakness of Christianity, in our opinion, is its hesitation to accept truth. There must be a readiness to accept truth, even though it clashes with existing dogmas. Only thus can religion survive the growth of human knowledge and minister to the spiritual needs of mankind. We do not say that Christianity must accept the theory of evolution. But if evolution *is* true, and so far as it is true, Christianity *must* accept it. Similarly also of other truths. Of course there is a fear, a real fear, that if it incorporated all such truths into it, it will undergo a change beyond recognition. We do not see, however, how that eventuality can be averted.

The attitude of the Roman Catholic Church is still more narrow and dogmatic. Naturally, no Roman Catholic Bishop stood up for scientific creation theories. On the other hand, the attacks of several Roman Catholic priests on Sir Arthur Keith's address have been very virulent indeed. A "Catholic Scientist," writing in the *Universe*, a London Catholic weekly, takes an ambiguous attitude towards the Biblical theory of creation. He says : "Among the decrees of the Biblical Commission, June 30, 1909, is one which says that the book of Genesis must be taken in the "literal historical sense." From the time of St. Thomas Aquinas the literal sense has been understood to be of two kinds : (1) The "proper," or primary, kind, which is equivalent to literal in the English meaning of the word ; (2) the "improper," or secondary, kind, which is what we call, in English, metaphorical. Hence another decree declares that Catholics are not bound to take "every word and phrase" in the primary literal sense, especially when it is

obvious that they are used "improperly," or metaphorically, or when reason suggests as much. This last little clause is instructive. It practically invites us to form hypothesis. We should remember that, although the substance of Scripture is inspired, the sentences were not dictated. The writers wrote in their natural style." We do not know how far helpful Catholics find these decrees. We, however, do not see how the permission to interpret Scripture even metaphorically improves matters. By no stretch of imagination can we deduce the scientific theory of evolution from the story of the book of Genesis. It is irrelevant to say that all scientists do not agree on evolution. The point is, whether Catholics are ready to discard Biblical myths in favour of theories which are scientifically proved. The above-mentioned decrees do not say so. The attitude of the Church is extremely dogmatic. The attitude of Hinduism will serve as a good example to Christianity in this matter. We also have crude creation myths which were certainly the product of the popular mind. But there are other philosophical theories of creation. • Hinduism does not insist that all its votaries must believe in one particular theory. The fundamentals of Hindu religion, unlike those of Christianity, have been derived from other sources than the story of creation. Hinduism is ready to accept any theory of creation, provided it is rational, without requiring to deduce it literally or metaphorically from its scriptures.

A peculiar feature of this attack on the British Association address has been the reiteration of the special position of man in God's creation. Attacking Sir Arthur Keith's statement that the human brain "reveals no formation of any sort that is not in the brain of the gorilla or chimpanzee," a Dominician father, preaching at Leeds Cathedral, said that the statement was "unscientific, mischievous, misleading and untrue." Another father inferred that "here there was a plain denial of the existence of any spiritual soul in man." "The soul of man," he said, "is wholly different from the "souls" of the lower animals —a conclusion at which Aristotle arrived by pure reason without the aid of revelation. Those who accepted revelation must believe that the soul is the direct creation of God, that it is an immortal spirit, and confers upon man powers and responsibilities utterly different in their nature from anything possessed by lower animals." We confess, we are unable to understand how the denial or affirmation of soul follows from Sir Arthur's statement. We think this question of soul was far from his thought and he simply spoke of the biological and physiological aspects of man. He was, in our opinion, perfectly justified in looking upon man as belonging to the same process of evolution as other animals. It is really astonishing to know that there are people —educated people—in the twentieth century Europe, who

believe that animals have no soul and that man's soul is a special creation. The "Catholic Scientist" whom we have quoted before, says: "There are many forms of "Modified Transformation" which profess to account for the gradual development of organic beings from primitive beginnings even up to the point where a certain creature was like man in all save those higher faculties which distinguish us from the beasts ; at which point God, by a special act, endowed him with a rational and spiritual soul. "And the Lord God formed man from the slime of the earth" (material evolution of the body) "and breathed into his face the breath of life, and man became a living soul." " We may well guess the psychology behind this eagerness to allocate a special position to man in creation : man is extremely reluctant to find himself classified with animals,—his inner spiritual dignity revolts against this idea. But it is not by denying scientific truths and merely harping on man's dignity that Christianity can escape from the impasse that its conflict with science has created. Lesser truths are conquered only by higher truths. Christianity, if it would maintain the dignity of man, must discover higher scientific truths about him, and not seek the support of so-called scriptural revelations. The Hindu view is that if we know *all* realities scientifically, not merely sensible realities, we shall come to truths which will support man's spiritual dignity and at the same time harmonise it with science. Modern science has not yet penetrated beyond the sensible world ; that is why its conclusions seem repugnant to our spiritual sense. Hinduism has fully investigated and systematised the supersensible facts ; that is how it finds in modern science corroborative evidences to its own conclusions. Thus after long investigation, Hinduism has come to know the true nature of the soul, which is quite distinct from the Christian idea of it. The Christian idea of the soul is obviously arbitrary. Reason cannot make a distinction between the souls of animals and that of man in the way Christianity does. Is the so-called rational and spiritual soul a separate principle from that of consciousness in man, through which he knows, feels and wills? If they are one, do we not find the same principle of consciousness in animals also? Sir J. C. Bose's researches clearly indicate that that principle exists also in plants and even in metals. One ultimate life-principle runs like a thread through all things. To the Hindu mind such distinctions between animal souls and human souls, and the special creation of the latter seems extremely crude thinking. Christianity must learn to become more philosophical and more real in its views.

What is the Hindu view? It is true we find in man faculties which are not generally discernible in animals, e.g., reason, thoughts of God and of immortality, etc. This is not, however, a difference in kind, but in degree only. The Hindu

conceives the soul, spirit, Self or Atman as separate from the body and mind, and as attributeless. Nothing can be predicated of it except perhaps that it is Existence-Knowledge-Bliss absolute. This effulgent Atman manifesting in and through mind and body constitutes what is called consciousness or soul-life. The more highly developed an organism, the greater is the manifestation and therefore the higher the soul-life. The difference between animals and man is not a difference of souls, but of the development of body and mind. From the ape to the ape-like man is a natural progression, and it did not require a special intervention of God. The mind developed, the body developed, and naturally the inner Self found a greater manifestation. Reason or spiritual consciousness were not extraneous additions to the animal 'soul' to make up man. These are the light of the indwelling spirit itself ; only being enveloped in the undeveloped body and mind of animals, it could not shine out.

Along with this view of the existence of soul in all beings equally, there is the other idea of *karma* and reincarnation The soul embodies and disembodies itself. According to the development of the mind which accompanies the soul even after the death of the body, as long as the soul does not know its true transcendental nature, the soul assumes a body at rebirth, either animal or human, works out its previously acquired tendencies and acquires fresh tendencies. Thus go the rounds of births and deaths, till through the gradual perfection of the mind its glory shines out fully and it knows itself ; and then it has not to be born any more. This view does not any way conflict with the scientific theory of evolution. Individuals die and are born ; but the species continues and develops according to its laws and environment. Science does not pretend to say that there is no post-mortem existence, nor can it explain why individuals are born with different innate tendencies. The Hindu doctrine of karma and reincarnation really supplements and perfects the scientific view. The species develops according to its environmental changes ; and individuals are born into it as the most suitable field for the working out of their karma, takes advantage of the collective life of the species, and dies in due time to be born again in other species according to the tendencies of their accumulated karmas. This view is slowly gaining ground in the West and very soon Christianity will have to recognise its truth.

We must mention here, however, that the above is but one aspect of the Hindu attitude ; the other, the truer, aspect we shall deal with later on.

The conflict between Christianity and science cannot be resolved, in our opinion, without thorough changes in the fundamental doctrines of Christianity. It must change its idea of

creation and outlook on the world, its ideas of soul and soul-life, its ideas of salvation and the value of a Saviour in the scheme of spiritual life. The progress of science is slowly pushing Christianity towards these changes. It is afraid that the changes, if accepted, will mean the downfall of religion in the West. It is an idle fear. We are confident they will mean its salvation: The West needs a scientific religion.

But dogmatism dies hard. In order to reconcile science and religion the device has been suggested that the sensible and the supersensible facts should be allocated to science and religion respectively, the one guided by proof and reason, the other by faith. Thus Mr. Hilaire Belloc in the *Sunday Herald,* London: "If you mean by religion any system to which some proposition is vital, which proposition has been disproved and rendered in the highest degree improbable by scientific (that is, by organised, exact and repeated) measurement and observation, then there is conflict between your religion and science; and your religion must give way, unless you can produce some basis of certitude stronger than the accumulated evidence and co-ordination of evidence against it." That there are such religions, he admits, though he thinks that they are mostly of recent origin. But he says, suppose a man's religion is not of this kind; suppose its vital conceptions are such as Immortality, the Creative Personal Godhead, the Incarnation, Redemption, Resurrection; where then is there any conflict between it and any body of ascertained facts? "So far we have no example of such conflict. Obviously there is no conflict between any one of these ideas and science on the ground of experiment." "If we are told that the universe was not created, but existed from all eternity and is sufficient to itself.....this is not an affirmation based on *science.* It may be argued in the abstract, but physical proof there can be none. There has not been advanced, and there could not be, a set of proved physical facts leading necessarily to such a conclusion. If we are told that the sequence of natural events can never be interrupted, and that this is scientific—that is, proved—fact, we ask: 'How proved?' "

This is no doubt an ingenious argument of Mr. Belloc's. But it fails to convince. He forgets that the question 'How proved?' can be asked also in reference to the accepted beliefs in immortality, etc. Even supposing that certain things are incapable of *scientific* demonstration, it does not follow that any kinds of beliefs will do. And he overlooks the fundamental tendency of the human mind to refuse to bifurcate itself in its attitude to the sensible and the supersensible realities. We are impelled by our constitution to form a synthesis of both. If certain facts are proved true, the unproved things are bound to be conceived on the basis of the proved facts. It may be

an abstraction. That does not matter. Human nature must have its way. The mind wants to conceive the entire universe of its experience and imagination as a unitary whole, governed by interrelated laws and grounded on a unity. Naturally this conception must be based on the actually experienced facts. All religions therefore have this universal outlook. All of them view man and his life in relation to the entire existence and therefrom deduce his duty and destiny. Religion cannot leave off half the world to science and remain content with peopling the other half with beliefs and dogmas. We do not mean that Christian beliefs in immortality, etc. are wrong. What we want to emphasise is that these must not be mere *beliefs* ; either they must be as incontestably proved as scientific facts or they must give way to theories which follow, may be, as mere abstractions, from proved sensible facts. That is why science is proving such a lion in the path of religions of mere *beliefs*. We must get hold of supersensible facts ; and when all facts, sensible and supersensible, have been known, we shall find that the scientific theories deal with only a fraction of reality and are therefore imperfect and require to be supplanted by higher conceptions. But till this has been done, it is nonsensical for Christianity or any other religion to deny science.

It may be said, "What are we to do with the supersensible? We do not experience it. We must therefore depend on revelation." The answer is that revelation is not a unique event occuring only once in history, to a few selected individuals. It is accessible to all. We deny that certain things must always remain incapable of demonstration and will have to be taken on trust. How did these first come to the knowledge of man? The same method of knowledge is ever open to mankind. Every man is capable of experiencing the supersensible like the original prophets and test the truth of the scriptural assertions. We need not take them on trust. There is a way by which all things sensible and supersensible can be directly experienced by every man. It is called Yoga. When the mind is purified and concentrated, then the truths of all things flash in the mind. The Western mind, we know, will look askance at what we call Yoga. That is because it does not know. It is through Yoga that the Biblical prophets came to experience the supersensible when they really did so,—for there are also many myths in the Bible. The only scientific way is to test the revelations through Yoga and see, for example if the world is really created in the Biblical fashion.

How can we experience the fact of creation *now*, which was done an immemorial time ago? The question arises out of a wrong notion of creation. We assume that creation took place at a particular point of time, whereas the fact is that time itself is a part of created things. Creation really is timeless. It

is not a *past* event. We dare not call it *present* either, for that also will be referring to time. Our present state of consciousness, that is, the so-called normal consciousness, is incapable of conceiving and describing it. We can only negatively state it to be timeless. That state of timelessness we reach by going beyond the present state of consciousness into superconsciousness, and then the truth flashes.

If the Christians are to come to a clear and true idea of what they call revelations, the only method is to attain to the superconscious state and know the truth face to face. Not one individual, but many, will have to be superconscious. They will then have to compare notes and systematise their experience into philosophy. This is the true scientific method. We require a certain preliminary training before we can understand scientific demonstration or ourselves observe and experiment scientifically. We require instruments also. In this supersensible demonstration also, we require a preliminary preparation which is the purification of mind, and an instrument, the concentrated mind. Hindu philosophy and theology was thus obtained. With us, revelation is not a unique thing to be merely *believed*. These revelations have been tested and experienced time and again by legions of saints and seers, and on their combined evidence, the Hindu views of soul, God and the world have been based. And every one is free to test them himself. In fact, the idea of taking things on trust is not considered religious at all. There is no religion in merely believing in scriptural revelations; until and unless we experience them ourselves, we are mere talkers.

A correct idea of the universe and of the inter-relations of things, of whether evolution or any other theory is true or not, can be had only by knowing all, the sensible and supersensible. Hinduism has done so. What is the attitude of Hinduism towards the theory of evolution? Does Hinduism uphold evolution? Yes and No,—is the answer. From one standpoint, evolution is true. But from another, the higher, standpoint, taking the entire universe into view, there is no evolution: the whole 'creation' is timeless. Man is endowed with two kinds of visions, subjective and objective. In the normal state, man conceives himself objectively, as existing in time and space, floating on the stream of world-events. He thinks he is born and dies at certain moments. He finds the world about him changing and growing. He believes in *history*. He finds that the world has age and conceives the idea of evolution; and scientists point out how from a nebula the earth has come to reach its present condition, variegated with multifarious species of plants and animals. From this, the objective, point of view, evolution seems the most cogent version of the becoming of the sensible universe. Even apart from scientific proof, the

concept of evolution furnishes the most convenient form of systematising the history of the world.

But this convenience is only apparent. For the visible is not the only world existing and there is another stand-point, the higher, subjective, vision which is more essential to man than the objective. Objectively, we are creatures of time; subjectively, time itself is our creature. All things derive their reality from our cognition of them. Little effort is needed to demonstrate it. The universe with its variegated forms and sensible properties become non-existent to us as soon as we dissociate our senses from it. Of course the roots of phenomena go much deeper than sense-perception, they reach the deep strata of the mind. But it is possible by the destruction of desires to draw them out of the mind, and then phenomena become nothing. Therefore the more I purify and concentrate my mind, the more do I come to feel that the entire phenomenal world has its centre of existence in me. It is not independent of me, as I find from the objective view-point. I am the axis of the universe. The universe rises and falls with my cognition and non-cognition of it. We may recount an experience of a friend in this connection. He was at that period of life assiduously engaged in reasoning about the true nature of the world; that is to say, he was practising what is known as *Vichâra*. Vichara consists not only in intellectually determining the nature of the world and the Self, but also in correctly feeling and perceiving them as they really are. Our friend was one day deeply immersed in this practice, when he suddenly felt the world shaking and about to fall into crumbles like a burnt leaf. He assured us that the experience was overwhelming. His mind was in a very elevated and concentrated mood at the time of the incident; but before he could realise the shattering of the world into annihilation, his mind slid down and the intensity of concentration was lost. This experience deeply impressed him with the illusory nature of the universe. We believe that he was on the threshold of a supreme experience and that it was no hallucination. It was broad day-light; he was looking on; he was then in the best of his health and was well-known for his keen intellect.

This experience does not seem strange or irrational to us. Whoever practises concentration of mind, will reach this conclusion at one time or another. As we remarked before, the universe does not consist of this sensible world only, of the earth and the stars There are many more finer worlds inhabited by celestial beings. It is said that there are five such worlds between our earth and the Absolute. As the Yogi rises up in meditation and attains superconsciousness, he finds all these worlds gradually merge into his consciousness till he becomes one with the Absolute. He finds that he is not only the axis

of the sensible world, but also of those finer worlds. This is the subjective vision. When the Yogi descends from the realisation of the Absolute, he finds the same process repeated inversely : he finds finer and grosser worlds emanate from him. This dual experience has been very finely described by Swami Vivekananda in two Bengali songs. The first describes the mergence of the phenomenal universe in him. Here is the translation :

> Lo ! The sun is not, nor the comely moon,
> All light extinct ; in the great void of space
> Floats shadow-like the image-universe.
> In the void of mind involute, there floats
> The fleeting universe, rises and floats,
> Sinks again, ceaseless, in the current "I."
> Slowly, slowly, the shadow-multitude
> Entered the primal womb, and flowed ceaseless
> The only current, the "I am," "I am."
> Lo ! 'Tis stopped, ev'n that current flows no more,
> Void merged into void,—beyond speech and mind !
> Whose heart understands, he verily does.

It is to be noted how the Swami at first felt the entire universe float picture-like in his mind, till at last it entered the primal womb, the "I"-consciousness. This "I" also was subsequently annihilated and the Absolute alone shone in its pristine effulgence. This is the subjective vision in its fulness.

The reverse process, the descent from the Absolute, has been described in the other song. Here also the "I" rises first. From the Absolute, "down floweth the river causal, wearing the form of desire radiant, . . . roaring the constant roar, 'I am,' 'I am,' 'I am.' " Out of it take birth "millions of moons, millions of suns"—the "fourteen worlds" of the Puranas, inhabited by innumerable beings and "pleasure, and pain, disease, birth and death."

It is from such experiences that the Hindu cosmological theories have been derived. The Rig Veda (10, 129) in describing the creation of the universe rightly observes that "sages have seen all this in their hearts, sifting existence from non-existence." This, Yoga, is the only method of knowing the secrets of existence, and this is the only true theory of "creation" possible,—for it is no mere theory, but actual experience.

Where, then, is the place of evolution in this cosmic experience? The entire universe consisting of finer and grosser worlds are existent and yet non-existant : they exist when our mind with its out-going tendencies exists ; they become non-existent when that mind dies. The very fact that the worlds exist in the subjective cognition, proves that time, and therefore evolution, has no meaning in relation to the whole. Time

is true only of the parts, of limited, objective vision. The universe is the *form* taken by Ignorance. So long as we are bound by Ignorance, we think ourselves as inhabiting certain worlds, as points of time and space. We find the world stretching around us with its seeming independence and infinitude ; it is only then that the question of how and wherefrom we come arises. ·But when we dissociate ourselves from Ignorance, the worlds appear as categories of Ignorance, existing on our sufference. There is no question then of creation or evolution. The same Rig Vedic hymn very significantly concludes: "Whence this projection arose, whether held or not,—of this, He, the Ruler in the supreme sky, knows, or *per chance even He does not know.*"

Taken as a whole, therefore, evolution cannot be true of the universe: the entire universe with its different planes rises in a timeless, mysterious way which the normal mind cannot conceive. Only to a 'normal' human being, shut up within the earthly existence and isolated from the existence of the remaining universe, does the world seem as existing and growing in time, and to him, then, the idea of evolution appears most cogent. But since the higher knowledge has been made known to men, can this partial view satisfy them?

This Hindu view confers a supreme dignity on the individual,—the highest is always within his reach. Hinduism urges the development of the subjective vision, which is the key to man's true freedom and the charter of his Divinity. The antagonism to the theory of evolution is justified to the extent that it is a conscious or subconscious revolt against the perpetual bondage of Nature, to which the theory of evolution indirectly and practically condemns man. If the whole universe is one evolving whole, individuals are but straws on the current of that evolution and have their fate entirely in the grip of evolutionary forces. This absurd view is sometimes found to have been fashioned into a creed. Nothing can be more erroneous, enervating and demoralising. No, there is no such cosmic law. The only law that subsumes the visible and invisible universe is your own Ignorance, O man, and you *can* break it *any* moment and realise freedom. This is the supreme message of Vedanta.

IDEALS OF INDIAN WOMEN

By Sister Nivedita

As the light of dawn breaks on the long curving street of the Indian village, the chance passer-by may see at every door some kneeling woman busied with the ceremony of the Salutation of the Threshold. A pattern drawn on the ground in lines of

white rice-flour with blossoms placed within it at central points remains for a few hours to mark the fact that cleansing and worship have been performed. The joy of home finds silent speech in the artistic zest of the design. Wealth or poverty is betrayed according as the flowers are a bright net-work of winter gourd blossoms, a stiff little row of two or three white daisies or some other offering, more or less humble as the case may be. But everywhere we read a habit of thought to which all things are symbolistic ; the air upon the doorsill full of dim boding and suggestiveness as to the incomings and the outgoings which the day shall witness ; and the morning opening and settting-wide the door, an act held to be no way safe unless done by one who will brood in doing it upon the divine security and benediction of her beloved.

Such thought was the fashion of a very ancient world—the world in which myths were born, out of which religions issued and wherein vague and mysterious ideas of "luck" originated. The custom bears its age upon its brow. For thousands of years must Indian women have risen at dawn to perform the Salutation of the Threshold. Thousands of years of simplicity and patience like the patience of the peasant, like that of the grass, speak in the beautiful rite. It is this patience of woman that makes civilizations. It is this patience of the Indian woman mingled with this large power of reverie, that has made and makes the Indian nationality.

For the habit of the country, in and by itself, is complete and organic. The steps by which it manifests its orderly unfolding are sequent and harmonious, and imply none of those violent digressions known as progress and reform. The women of Bengal worship their husbands and serve their children and their households, with the rapt idealism of the saints. The women of Maharashtra are as strong and determined as any in the West. The Rajputana queen prides herself on the unflinching courage of her race that would follow the husband even into the funeral fire, yet will not allow a king to include his wife amongst his subjects. The woman of Madras struggles even with agony to reach the spiritual pole-star, and builds up, again and again like some careful beaver, any fragment of her wall of custom that the resistless tides of the modern world may attempt to break away. And the daughters of Guzerat are, like the women of merchant-peoples everywhere, soft and silken and flower-like, dainty and clinging as a dream. Or we may penetrate into the Moslem zenana, to find the same graceful Indian womanhood, sometimes clad in the *Sari,* sometimes in the short Turkish jacket, but ever the self-same gentle and beautiful wifehood and motherhood, though here it beats its breast and cries upon Ali and Hussain instead of prostrating itself before some image.

Nor is there any real monotony of type. Every order of woman finds its strong individual representation. Brunehild herself was not more heroic than thousands of whom the Rajput chronicles tell. Nay, in the supreme act of her life, the mystic death on the throne of flame beside the dead Siegfried, many a quiet little Bengalee woman has been her peer. Joan of Arc was not more a patriot than the wonderful queen of Jhansi, who in the year 1857 fought in person with the British troops. The children of men who saw it talk to this day of the form of this woman's father swinging on the gibbet high above the city walls, hanged there by his daughter's orders after she had killed him with her sword, for the crime of making a treaty with the English to deliver the keys into their hands. They talk, too, of her swift rush across the drowsy midday camp at the head of her troops, her lance poised to pierce, her bay mare Lakshmi straining every muscle, the whizz of the charge so unexpected that only here and there a dazed white soldier could gather presence of mind to fire a shot at the cavalcade already passed. And old men still sing her glory with tears choking their voice.

The Rani of Jhansi was no purdah woman. She was a Mahratta with a passion for her country, and practised since girlhood in the chase. She had been the real head of the kingdom ever since her marriage, for her husband was only a handsome figure-head, who spent in making feeble poetry the time he might have given to rule or to his wife. Her life had been in fact as solitary as that of a mediæval saint. And her ostensible reason for fighting was the right to adopt an heir. There has always indeed been a great development of the political faculty amongst Mahratta women. It is well known that long before the time of Jhansi, the great Sivaji owed the inspiration that led to the national re-awakening to his mother, rather than his father.

The custom of secluding women is thus not nearly so universal in India as is imagined by people who gather their ideas from unreliable accounts of the woes of high-caste women in Bengal. The lower classes move freely in all countries, for household work and the earning of their livelihood compel; and in the aristocratic closeness of her retreat, the Mahomedan woman ranks first, the Rajput second and only thirdly the Bengali, the screen is always more easily lifted for the Hindu than for the Moslem. A thousand considerations intervene to mitigate its severity in the case of the former. And in the South and West it is actually non-existent. By this it is not to be understood that any Hindu women meet men outside their kindred with the same freedom and frankness as their Western sisters. Very old adaptations of the Ramayana shew us the brother-in-law who has never looked higher than the heroine's feet, and the wife who blushes rather than mention her

husband's name. But this power of the individual to isolate himself in the midst of apparently unrestrained social intercourse is necessary in all communities, and has its correspondences in Western society itself. Freedom is granted only to those who are self-disciplined. It might be added too that a true wife has as little occasion to realize the possible jealousy of her husband in the East as in the West and that an unreasonable fit of suspicion would be considered the same weakness and insult by the one society as by the other. Yet the liberty of Madras and Bombay for all its limitations is a reality and in the province of Malabar woman is actually in the ascendancy. The curious country of learned matriarchs and kings who rule as the regents of their sisters will have many disclosures to make to the world, when India shall have produced a sufficient number of competent sociologists of her own blood. It is commonly said to be characteristically polyandrous, but it is not so in the same sense as Thibet. For no woman regards herself as the wife of two men at once. The term matriarchal is more accurate inasmuch as the husband visits his wife in her own home and the right of inheritance is through the mother.

Thus, far from India's being the land of the uniform oppression of woman by uniform method, it represents the whole cycle of feminist institutions. There is literally no theory of feminine rights and position, that does not find illustration somewhere within its limits. If we ask for the dominion of individual beauty and charm, there is the queen to whom the Taj was built. Or the "four perfect women" of Islam—the foster-mother of Moses, Mary the Madonna, Khadiza and Fatima—offer a world in themselves including each of the main types of grave, sweet womanhood, according as her power is temporal or spiritual, individualistic or communal in its display.

But if we look for the unique dignity of ethical achievement for the translation of wifehood not into a novel, but into a religion, we must turn to the Hindu life, suffused as that is with the pursuit of the ideals of the Mahabharata, the Ramayana and the Puranas. Savitri, the Indian Alcestis ; Sati, who gave up the body as one carelessly throws aside a mantle, because it had been guilty of hearing her father abuse her husband ; Uma, who wooed the great God with penances ; and Sita, divine embodiment of steadfastness and strength ; all these are held as the great Hindu exemplars from Malabar to Nepal.

Throughout Asia where social theory has never been confused by the existence of a privileged class regarded as the type, labour, rising into Government, stands side by side with prayer and motherhood as the main opportunities of woman. The cow-house, the dairy, the kitchen, the granary, the chapel, with a hundred other offices, divide the attention of the ladies of the household. A rich family will have its large cooking room for

the cooks, and in addition, not one, but a series of kitchens, for the use of wife and daughters. Old houses are built with their finest gardens and orchards accessible only from the zenana. Nothing is more noticeable in the lives of Indian women than the readiness and spontaneity with which work is sub-divided and the peaceable way in which it is carried out. This is most striking in regard to the preparation of food. Every Indian woman is a cook, often highly skilled, and some years ago there was no compliment so great as an invitation from a neighbouring family, on the occasion of some important festivity, to come and help with the *cuisine*. Even Hindu society, however, is affected by the ideals of Western organization and emergency. Work nowadays tends more and more to be laid on the shoulders of Brahman servants, imported for the occasion.

Modern sociologists say that the theory of the equality of man and woman is essentially a phenomenon of coast life and fisher communities. It is interesting to note in this regard that in the fishing villages outside Calcutta, the wife buys his take from the husband and sells it in the market at her own risk. If on his way home her man has disposed of his load to some merchant, she will follow the matter up and buy it back for her own trade. Possibly the same process of keeping an account against the husband is gone through in Madras and Bombay also, for in all parts of India, it is the woman who brings the fish to the bazar. In this class, there is no question of seclusion, and the fisher-wife in the matter of her freedom and responsibilities is a European woman.

A like liberty obtained, however, amongst the women of the Sanskrit drama. Whatever be the date of the play of Kalidasa, it is evident that that traditional story of Shakuntala round which it is constructed, must have pictured her as studying with the boy disciples of her father and receiving his guests during his absence in unquestioned propriety. It is to be inferred then that such a code of manners was not inconsonant with the memories and the general ideas of the race who transmitted the tale, and if this be so, it cannot be natural to Hindus to cloister and veil their womankind.

But we cannot on the other hand admit that the seclusion of woman is a custom introduced into India by a kind of Mahomedan contamination. This thoughtless explanation, even if historical, would only drive the question a point further,—what induced the Musalman to screen his women? It is unfortune, for those who hold the theory, that Islam derives the religious sanction of its social institutions from Arabia and that the Arab woman is said to enjoy considerable freedom and power. Hence it would seem that even the Mahomedan adopted the practice from Persia, from China or from Greece. If he, again, had been responsible for the custom in India, we might have expected that

in the neighbourhood of Delhi and Agra, the capitals of the Mogul empire, Hindu *purdah* would have been the strictest. This, however, is not the case, Rajputana and Bengal being far more deeply permeated by the habit. The degradation of attempting to explain away a reproach by fastening it on some one else is surely obvious. We must seek elsewhere for the reason of a convention that seems almost instinctive in certain parts of the Orient.

There is some degree of truth in the supposition that society in a military state tends to seclude its women. The mistake probably lies in thinking that this is the only factor in moral evolution that affects their position in this way. Rather it would appear that amongst the primary occupations of mankind,—hunting, fishing, tillage and what not,—there is a distinct tendency to promote different types of institutions. Other things being equal, those occupations that imply a sustained and arduous conquest of Nature tend to equality of rights and similarity of manners for men and women, whereas, under long-settled conditions from which anxiety is somewhat eliminated, there is a progressive inclination towards divergence of their lines of activity, accompanied by the more complete surrender of woman to the protection of man. Thus an important feature of the Hindu as of the Anglican wedding ceremony is the fact that her father "gives away" the bride into the keeping of her husband.

The tendency to divergence of function would be accelerated in Asia by the nature of the climate which makes stillness and passivity the highest luxury. This fact again combines with military prepossessions to make the custom of seclusion especially characteristic of royal households and having once achieved such social prestige, it speedily extends over wide areas. It may be pointed out that even in Europe, the freedom of woman differs widely with her nationality, and that in England and America the accumulation of fortune is often an influence towards restricting the social intercourse of the women of the wealthy family.

If this theory be correct, it would explain the freedom of woman in India during the first Aryan period as an outcome of the struggle with earth and forest. The early immigration of agricultural races across the Himalayas from Central Asia must have meant a combat with Nature of the severest kind. It was a combat in which the wife was the helpmeet of the husband. If he cleared the jungle and hunted the game, she had to help in field and garden. The Aryan population was scanty and she must be ready to take his place. Vicissitudes were many. At a moment's notice, she must be prepared to meet an emergency, brave, cheerful and self-helpful. In such a life, woman must move as easily as man.

It was far otherwise however when the country was cleared, agriculture established on the Aryan scale and when the energy

of the race was concentrated on the higher problem of conserving and extending its culture of the mind and spirit. It is doubtful whether Indian philosophy could ever have been completed on any other terms than those of the seclusion of woman. "This world is all a dream: God alone is real,"—such an ultimatum could hardly have been reached in a society like that of Judaism where love and beauty were avowed before all as the seal of divine approval on a successful life. Not that India despises these happy gifts. But they are the joys of the householder in her eyes, not of the spiritual seer. "The religion of the wife lies in serving her husband: the religion of the widow lies in serving God," say the women, and there is no doubt in their minds that the widow's call is higher.

But while we talk of the seclusion of woman as if it were a fact, we must be careful to guard against misconception. In society and in the streets of Indian cities, it is practically true that we see men alone. This fact makes it a possibility for the religious to pass his life without looking on the face of any woman save such as he may call "mother." Inside the home, if we penetrate so far, we shall probably meet with none but women. But if we live there, day after day, we shall find that every woman has familiar intercourse with some man or men in the family. The relation between brothers and sisters-in-law is all gaiety and sweetness. Scarcely any children are so near to a woman as the sons of her husband's sisters. It is the proud prerogative of these, whatever be their age, to regard her as their absolute slave. There is a special delicacy of affection between the husband's father and the daughter-in-law. Cousins count as brothers and sisters. And from the fact that every woman has her rightful place in some family, it follows that there is more healthy human intercourse with men in almost every Hindu woman's life than in those of thousands of single women living alone or following professional career in the suburbs of London and other Western cities. It is a social intercourse, too, that is full of a refined and delicate sense of humour. Men who have been to Europe always declare that the zenana woman stands unrivalled in her power of repartee. English fun is apt to strike the Indian as little loud. How charming is the Bengali version of the "bad penny that always turns up" in "I am the broken cowrie that has been to seven markets," that is, "I may be worthless, but I am knowing."

We are apt to think only of that towards which we aspire, as an ideal. We rarely think of those assimilated ideals that reveal themselves as custom. Yet if we analyse the conventions that dominate an Indian woman's life, we cannot fail to come upon a great ideal of self-control. The closeness and intimacy of the family life, and the number of the interests that have to be considered, have no doubt made strict discipline necessary

for the sake of peace. Hence a husband and wife may not address each other in the presence of others. A wife may not name her husband, much less praise him, and so on. Only little children are perfectly untrammelled and may bestow their affection when and where they will. All these things are for the protection of the community, lest it be outraged by the parading of a relationship of intimacy, or victimised by an enthusiasm which it could not be expected to share.

This constant and happy subordination of oneself to others does not strike the observer, only because it is complete. It is not the characteristic of the specially developed individual alone, for it is recognised and required, in all degrees of delicacy, by society at large. Unselfishness and the desire to serve stand out in the Western personality against a background of individualistic institutions, and convey an impression of the eagerness and struggle of pity, without which the world would certainly be the poorer. But the Eastern woman is unaware of any defiance of institutions. Her charities are required of her Her vows and penances are unknown, even to her husband, but were they told, they would excite no remark in a community where all make similar sacrifices. This is only to say that she is more deeply self-effacing and more effectively altruistic than any Western. The duty of tending the sick is so much a matter of course that it would not occur to her to erect a hospital or to attempt to learn nursing. Here she misses something doubtless, for the modern organisation of skill has produced a concentration of attention on method that avails to save much suffering. Still, we must not too readily assume that our own habit of massing together all the sick and hungry and insane and isolating them in worlds visited throughout with like afflictions to their own proceeds entirely from a sense of humanity on our part, though it has not failed to secure some excellent results.

Much is sometimes made of the fact that Gautama Buddha, brought face to face with weariness, disease and death, went forth to find for man a new religion, whereas the Christ put out His hand to heal the leper and raise the dead. It would be cruel at such a juncture to point out that both these great personages were Orientals, manifesting different phases of the Asiatic attitude towards pain. It is better, leaving to Europe her unaccountable assumption that she has some exclusive right in the Teacher of Galilee, to enter into the question as it appears to the Eastern mind, on its own merits. So viewed, it would be pointed out that the dead raised must still die again, that the leper healed was still in danger of disease, whereas Nirvana means release as it were into a new dimension, whereupon no consciousness of either health or sickness can ever intrude. Again taking the story of Buddha as it stands, we must remember its background of the *Jataka* Birth stories. And here we see that the Great

Renunciation is only accounted for in the eyes of the Indian people by the inwrought power of the sacrifice of his own life repeated five hundred times for the immediate good of others. The establishment of hundreds of hospitals for men and beasts, nay, the filling of countless hearts with pity and with peace, are only some of the results of Prince Siddhartha's choice.

Women are the guardians of humanity's ethical ideals. The boy would not volunteer to carry the dead to the burning-ghat, if his mother had not brought him up from babyhood to admire the deed. The husband would not be so strenuous to return home at his best, if his wife did not understand and appreciate his noblest side. But more than this, they are themselves the perpetual illustrations of those ideals. The words, "He that will be chief among you, let him be your servant," fall on Western ears with a certain sense of sublime paradox. But the august speaker uttered the merest truism of that simple Eastern world in which He moved. He roused no thrill of surprise in the minds of His hearers. For to each, his own mother was chief and yet servant of all.

Those who, knowing the East, read the list of the seven corporal works of mercy, may well start to imagine themselves back in the Hindu home, watching its laborious, pious women as they move about their daily tasks, never forgetting that the first necessity is to feed the hungry, to give drink to the thirsty, to clothe the naked, to harbour the harbourless, and the like, and that till these things are done, their own wants must not be met. Truly the East is eternally the mother of religions, simply solely because she has assimilated as ordinary social functions what the West holds to be only the duty of officialism, or the message of the church. To those who deeply understand, it may well seem that Christianity in Europe is neither more nor less than a vast mission of the Asiatic Life.

ANTHROPOSOPHY *

(Its View of the Individual Soul and its Destiny)

By Dr. Hans Koester

Vice-Consul for Germany, Calcutta

In order to explain the view of Anthroposophy with regard to the individual soul of man, it is necessary to consider first the common conception of it that now prevails in Europe. *Individualism* is the dominant note in the West of to-day. Christianity has given to it the principal impetus. By the

* See review of the writer's book, *Anthroposophy in India*, towards the end of this issue.—*Ed.*

circles whch take the Christian view seriously, the individual human soul is regarded as immortal, but not pre-existing. It is in each case a new gift of God, going to him after death. The materialism, however, that has swept over most of the people, has not left much of this idea, and has caused individualism to lose its religious justification. Now-a-days, as a matter of fact, individuality is realised only in the struggle of life in the material world. Nevertheless it would be taking a one-sided view to ignore what may be achieved even by such realisation. The endurance, the up-standing character, the not giving up in face of the greatest odds, are characteristics worth the attainment. Moreover, there is always the deeper reality behind, of which this is only the perversion. So Anthroposophy does not look down upon it, or advise it to be rooted out.

On the contrary, a strong Ego developed by *dharma-karma* is a quality of character essential in the pursuit of the spiritual path. What is necessary, therefore, is not to destroy this basic force, but to purify it from its selfish and materialistic attributes. Man has already been too much spoilt by his surrender to materialism.

The personality of man needs to be built up anew, in order to loose his egoistic bandages. Here Anthroposophy steps in by showing the way,—the path of knowledge (*Jnána*) and realisation (*Yoga*).

Man has to proceed along the path that leads from his own limited person to the great Nature that surrounds him and in which he must see and recognise his true and higher body. What continually happens around him,—the day, the night, the air, the rain,—these realities he must approach in a new connection. They are not merely outer facts to be dealt with in a utilitarian manner, but each of them is a world of its own. By widening his mind one becomes aware of their inner life. In India this is well-known since the oldest time, and especially the coming in contact with the air-*tattwa* by proper and disciplined breathing has been practised. In the same way contact may be established with the other elements or *tattwas*. The resulting experiences make for the embracing of the great units as they exist in Nature by means of the corresponding senses slumbering within ourselves, the awakening within us of the consciousness of these entities. The process requires our being freed from all inherited and acquired egotistical attachments and is therefore by no means easy to pursue.

The average man is afraid to go through a process which to begin with will make him utterly empty. Everything in man revolts against being thus given up, and he has to pass through an extremely uncomfortable state of mind till there is reached the preparedness for being filled with new contents. The turning point is indicated when there arises within us a new spiritual

impulse which cannot be compared with anything known before. It is as if we become conscious of the spirit which has been directing us unconsciously ever since our birth. The atmosphere is cleared as after a thunderstorm and all dullness and darkness disappears. We constitute ourselves anew with the all-pervading entities or *tattwas* such as air, light and the rest. We enter as new-born upon a new life. Wherever we may be, we feel ourselves to be in the middle of the world. Whatever we do has its origin from the whole.

Now Anthroposophy holds that experiences like these reveal something of the true nature of the "I", of the innermost being of man. Ideas or logical conceptions taken from the standpoint of ordinary life will never help suitably to express them. To speak adequately about higher realities higher experiences are necessary. Man needs to be reborn in order to realise and express the true nature of man. By the experiences thus gained Anthroposophy proves the truth of the pre-existence of man's eternal nature. And this ground being touched, there follows necessarily the realisation of its immortality after the cessation of this life. The great spiritual impetus can never be exhausted by only one life. It must strive for new reincarnations to fulfil its inherent purpose.

Doctrines may sometimes appear very similar, whereas their life is somewhat different. This is the case with this doctrine of reincarnation as now revealed anew to the West. It is not so much a passive acknowledgment of the "wheel of *karma*," as the active display of the higher "I" which we really are. Therefore we do not shrink from it, but rather welcome it as the means of developing ourselves according to the spiritual impulse that has become active in us. The "path" or method by which man may strive after his higher and truer "I" necessarily requires its continuation in further lives. It is not only that the spiritual task lying before man can never be accomplished within the short space of only one human life, but all the dictates of man's non-egotistical, spiritual, higher "I" are concerned with this earth. To this earth, therefore he has to come back and will come back.

If I have now to attempt a brief statement of the view of Anthroposophy on the destiny or "final goal" of the individual soul, you will permit me a little more figurative language. Such a vision,—for it only can be a vision,—requires an artistic or poetical sense, if it is to be grasped at all. In Europe, though not so much in India, nothing is more condemned than an artistic mind in matters philosophical. There, according to the dominant view in the West, logic must reign supreme. But it may be that in later times such a restriction of philosophy will be looked upon more as indicating lack of true intuition than any necessary limitation of human knowledge.

An Anthroposophical "doctrine" of reincarnation emanates, as I have shown, from a living understanding of the human "I". Repeated incarnation is a "logical" consequence of its innermost spiritual activity. That activity is not, like material forces, exhausted by repeated efforts, but grows ever stronger and stronger, accumulating through its successive lives a substance of its own. This is no mere belief but an actual experience resulting from the awakening of a new living consciousness within us. All spiritual experiences shape themselves into a self-constituent being, and form fresh appendages to the "I". This further reveals the hope that in future these realisations will no longer be rare and broken as now, but form the continuous and natural basis of a higher existence. However such a state of being be called,—angel, god or superman,—it is a true spiritual life where there is no more the same gulf between what we are and what we are to be. If this be accepted as a living vision, then we bear within us our final goal, the great destiny evolving from all our strivings and sacrifices devoted to it.

I have not mentioned upto now one fact which is inseparably connected with what I have said. It is the figure of Christ,—its leading and principal feature. It should be understood that Christ is not only the great prophet teaching and dying on the cross in Palestine, of whom the missionaries preach. That was his life, the individual life of the body. But Christ after death has risen again and as such he is personally present among us in the spirit, that is to say, within the spiritual sphere to which we belong, and which we strive to attain in full consciousness and being.

Whatever I have said about the expansion to the higher "I" and the attainment within us of an "angel" state stands in constant relation to Christ. The impetus as which the "I" reveals itself to us is itself spirit of his own spirit. Without being touched and led by him we could never be active and non-egotistical at the same time ; we could never be sure that we were not unwittingly missing our direction. This danger is exemplified in the times before Christ, especially in the Indian doctrines, when it was held that the "I" could be found only by separation from active work, by throwing all energy into the great quietness. But, after Christ has risen again, we have his spiritual assistance in the "Grace" without which nothing can be done on the spiritual path. He is the co-ordinating factor in which all realisations are centred. It is in the consciousness of his presence that we enjoy the angelic state of the higher beings who are that they should be. As he has sacrificed himself for the earth to which he came back in his risen body, so he wants from us the same. What he has done within one life, we shall have to approach through the coming ages.

There is one thing more to be said. Up to now I have only mentioned what Christ is for us in the spiritual path of our personal development and perfection. But there remains the great outer sphere,—Nature, material world, gross substance,—however you may call it. It would not be possible for us to become spiritualised, if Nature is to remain what she is. Nature must be uplifted to the same degree as we advance to our "Christ goal." Our individual function in respect of this is but small and limited. The "risen" Christ, as the great Spirit of Nature, has himself undertaken the great task of bringing Nature back to himself. What we do,—by his help,—for ourselves, he is doing for the whole world. He is the objective "saviour"—but not without and apart from us. What we realise within us, is given an objective consequence through him.

Anthroposophy, as its name indicates (*Anthroposophia*—wisdom) puts man as a spiritual-physical being in the centre of all investigations. A true conception of man is the key to a true conception of the world. Such an understanding, moreover, leads to the revelaton of Christ who is the living synthesis of both. Therefore Anthroposophy is essentially Christian, not as an exponent of any church, but on a new conception of life and nature.

The importance of this great new spiritual movement of Europe cannot be gauged merely from the number of its present followers. Suffice it that there are among them active and creative personalities. It remains to be seen what influence this great enterprise will be able to command, standing as it does against the overwhelming onrush of the materialism in the West. It is in any event a significant and hopeful beginning which I trust will find sympathisers in India also.

SISTER NIVEDITA

AN IMPRESSION OF EARLIER YEARS

By Eric Hammond

Some quarter of a century ago, Miss Margaret Noble, afterwards Sister Nivedita, conducted a school for girls at Wimbledon, a suburb of London. She possessed a notable faculty for imparting knowledge, and, also notably, a faculty for selecting and advising efficient teachers. Alive from head to foot, vibrant with intellectual energy, endowed with a personality which attracted and dominated, she inspired her pupils with enthusiasm. Her love of literature was evidenced not only by wide reading, but by quick apprehension of the author's meaning. Her voice was singularly musical; her articulation admirable.

It is possible even to-day to recognise her scholars by the clarity of their enunciation, so determined was she that every syllable should receive its just value. Her love of literature was emphasised when, as long since as 1890, she gathered kindred spirits around her and, with them, founded the Wimbledon Literary Society, which alas, has lately written "finis" on its records.

She adored originality and smiled at customary conventions. Parents of her pupils were sometimes aggrieved by her attitude, as when, for instance, she persisted on retaining a bronze of Buddha on the mantelpiece of her studio. She revelled in argument, in disputation. Nothing gave her greater delight than a debate during which speakers became heated and excited. From time to time, on such occasions, she would interpolate some striking utterance calculated to stimulate the combatants, and the fiercer the fight the happier she grew. She admired Walt Whitman, Emerson and Thoreau, quoting with earnest emphasis any passages from the last two authors which endorsed Eastern philosophy. For Buddha and his teaching her reverence was great. The popular presentation of Christianity lost its appeal to her and thus, when Swami Vivekananda arrived in London, she responded to his call as a harp responds to the touch of a master-player. She listened to him at her club, the Sesame ; at Miss Müller's, Wimbledon ; at many religious and philosophical centres in and near London. Everywhere she went she hailed him as the Prophet of the age. She assisted his appearance at various places, including the Christo-Theosophical Society established by Sir Richard Stapley in Bloomsbury Square, where, by the bye, Swami Abhedananda made his maiden speech in English. There is no doubt that her influence and her persuasive faith, backed by Mr. W. T. Sturdy's solidity of aim and pecuniary aid, largely contributed to Swamiji's career in London. Immersed as she came to be in the Vedanta, she employed all her oratorial power on its behalf. Once caught in Vivekananda's wonderful web, she spoke of him and about him unceasingly. "Have you seen and heard the Swami?" she would ask. "If you have not seen him and heard him, you simply must. There is no one like him, no one to equal him, no one at all!" Eloquent, persistent, imperious, she drew friends, acquaintances, even strangers, towards this Son of India who was, she assured them, the Sun of Truth. Her acceptance of, and adhesion to, the Swami's gospel was whole-hearted. It is true, however, that, when the time came for her consideration of leaving for India and devoting herself and her ability to the cause there, she experienced a very natural hesitancy. With the present writer she frequently referred to reasons for and against the proposal. If she went to India with that purpose, she must trust others to

cherish her aging mother ; she must relinquish all those interests for which London claimed her and for which she was endowed with peculiar fitness. Above all, she must endure harsh misinterpretation of her motive, and suspicion and disapproval on the part of the majority of her Christian connections. On the other hand, she realised that "the call had come to her," with clarion sound. It abode with her. It rang in her hearing through the hours and through the days. Finally, not without intense spiritual struggle, she accepted the inevitable renunciation, and, in a phrase, "burnt her boats" ; burnt them, because she was assured that, whatever might occur, she could never return to the old home, the old ways, the old familiar friends, except perhaps for an occasional brief vacation from the work to which she would wed herself. Swamiji, whose heart yearned towards his devoted disciple, felt his own responsibility in the matter profoundly. With his unyielding honesty he urged upon her all possible arguments against her discipleship and her intention to follow him in his mission and to share in its consequent hardships. He accentuated the bitter words and actions of many who would misconstrue her association with him and his fellow monks.

At this juncture we are confronted by a remarkable factor. Margaret Noble was essentially a woman's woman. Her temperament, her sympathies, her personality, all tended to attract persons of her own sex. These, of all ages, from children to adults, and to elders, admired her, reflected her. Men, on the contrary, seldom, if ever, experienced this attraction. Some subtle wizardry of soul held men-folk aloof from her.

She appeared, indeed, to enjoy this attribute of hers ; to find joy in stinging them with a lash of caustic criticism ; in making them comprehend that, in her consciousness, women occupied a loftier level on the mental sphere than man was destined to attain. Thus it was, happily, plainly palpable, that her allegiance to the Swami was not in any wise coerced by his masculinity. It was, rather, the spirit within him ; the spirit of India ancient and abiding ; the spirit that had subsisted through centuries of changing dynasty and dominion ; the spirit which clung to unfailing faith in "That that exists, though men call it variously" ; it was this by which Margaret Noble was claimed and to which she, too, clung tenaciously. Aided by Mrs. Ole Bull, widow of the world-famous violinist, and Miss Josephine McLeod ; befriended by Sir J. C. Bose, she sailed for Hindustan. The lure of adventure beckoned her, and indomitable courage sustained her. Of her work in India much has been told and much will be told in time to come. A period of probation awaited her, followed by initiation. Margaret Noble, as Sister Nivedita, earned due rank as an outstanding personage among those historic figures whose

belief in India's spiritual message to the world made its supreme appeal.

Her portrait, at the period of her sailing, shows us a young but distinctive woman with luminous grey-blue eyes, with hair of light golden brown, with a complexion radiant in its clearness; with a smile ingratiating and alluring. Of medium height; alert in every muscle and movement; eager, enterprising, dauntless. She derived from, and was proud of, Irish ancestry, and, generous, impulsive, ardent, she embodied much of the charm, the power of ready speech, the fascination of the Celt at his best. All this she carried from the Emerald Isle, by way to England, to India, the home of her adoption.

"INDIAN PHILOSOPHY"*

The long looked-for second volume of Prof. S. Radhakrishnan's *Indian Philosophy* reached us duly. We accord a hearty welcome to this noble work of labour and love. The publication of such books is symptomatic of cultural reawakening. And we who fervently believe in India's future, eagerly welcome these treatises inasmuch as they are sure to hasten India's resumption of the role of a world-teacher by bringing to light many precious gems of thoughts that now lie submerged in the national consciousness.

Prof. Radhakrishnan's luminous exposition of Indian philosophy is meant for those who have neither time nor patience nor ability to go through the extensive commentaries of the six systems and the many theistic philosophies that grew and have been growing on the soil of India. The philosophical literature of India is vast, and it often baffles the attempts of readers to arrange the problems of Metaphysics systematically and grasp them thoroughly. The learned professor has tried to compress in this volume the cardinal doctrines of the six systems of Hindu philosophy and the tenets of the Sâkta, the Saiva and the later Vaishnava theism. A number of scholars, Indian and Western, have attempted the subjects problem-wise and to give a complete view of them. Our author has the advantage of coming after them. He has made the best use of the existing materials, often English renderings and interpretations. It was one of his tasks to arrange and criticise them; this he has done in a splendid manner. His command over the English language, choice of fine expressions and acquaintance with the Eastern and

* *Indian Philosophy*, Vol. II by Prof. S. Radhakrishnan, King George V Professor of Philosophy, University of Calcutta. George Allen & Unwin Ltd., Ruskin House, 40 Museum Street, London, W.C. 1. Pp. 797. Price 25/- net.

Western systems of thought have invested the work with an unusual charm and value.

The work is marked with the following features:

(1) Every topic has been treated historically and critically. The historico-critical treatment has given it a high status among works of the same kind. All the systems of thought have been traced back to the Upanishads. How they have been modified by the changing times and influences have been clearly shown. Continuity and clearness of thought have not suffered.

(2) In showing the development of the Nyâya, Sâmkhya and Purva Mimânsâ, the author has started with the atheistic tendencies of each system and culminated in their theism. This change he has explained as a compromise between metaphysical speculation and popular demands. The idea of the personal God has played a very subordinate part in all the six systems. In some it is denied, in others it is neglected. It is more a regulative principle than a metaphysical reality. But in the theological schools of dualism and qualified monism, God is the centre of thought and existence.

(3) The unity of the systems has not been lost sight of. Only common elements have been pointed out, though the synthetic aspect of Reality has been overlooked.

(4) Transcendental and empirical realities have been subjected to the same considerations of logic, and as a result the whole work has been brought down to the level of Empirical Metaphysics i.e. Philosophy in the Western sense. Brahman, Atman, Purusha, Prakriti, Absolute, Infinite, etc. have been treated from a purely realistic standpoint. They have been considered and criticised as if they are physical and mental phenomena. Reason has not only tested but subordinated everything to its rule.

(5) The Western method of exposition has been followed. Apt quotations from Western savants have been often made use of. The different problems of metaphysics have not been jumbled up. Similar notions that often confuse readers have been generally compared and contrasted. The views of Sankara, Ramanuja, Madhva, Vallabha, etc. have been contrasted wherever necessary, and those of Plato, Aristotle, Kant, Fichte, Hegel, Bradley, Bergson, etc. have been compared with those of Kapila Gautama, Badarayana, Sankara, Ramanuja, etc.

(6) The author has maintained the position of an interpreter and not that of a free writer as is the case with some modern commentators. He has tried to be faithful as far as possible, though it cannot be denied that he has also been influenced by Western critics on many points. The modern idea of disinterested public service asserts itself wherever the practical aspects of religion is discussed.

(7) The standpoint of the author seems to be the Ideal

Realism of the Hegelian school. The nature of ultimate realities is considered to be rather objective than subjective. German Idealism combined with the qualified monism of Ramanuja seems to be the stronghold in which he is stationed.

The professor is a man of vast study. Though Western philosophy has struck a deep root in him, he has a deeper love and respect for his national culture. He has no doubt quoted many authors to support his exposition, but he has also criticised some, e.g., Max Muller & Deussen, whenever they have gone astray.

Students of Western philosophy often suffer under a great misconception when they deal with Indian thoughts. They acquire an easy tendency to interpret everything Eastern in the light of Western thought and culture. Nothing is more deplorable than this. Even our best writers are not free from this defect. Indian thoughts are good, they concede, because, forsooth, they resemble or anticipated European thoughts. This seems to be their standard of judgment. The reason is clear ;—these lovers of knowledge are greatly influenced by Western ideas and they naturally and unconsciously lose sight of the point of view from which things Indian have been seen and said by our indigenous scholars. An interpreter of Indian thought should in the first place lead his reader to the centre of Indian life and show how the soul of India has found expression in various ways and forms. Prof. Radhakrishnan is an apostle of Hindu culture as is evidenced by his beautiful lectures on the "Hindu View of Life" and by his defence of Hindu doctrines against alien criticism. He has stated intuition or superconsciousness to be the starting point of the Hindu systems of thought. But he too, we are afraid, has not taken a synthetic view of the six systems, and has failed to treat the problems from the true standpoint which he has himself stated in these words: "The philosophy of India takes its stand on the spirit which is above mere logic, and holds that culture based on mere logic or science may be efficient, but cannot be inspiring." We should no doubt treat these systems separately, but we should not forget at the same time to posit them in their right places in the grand synthesis that the different Hindu philosophies together represent. Unless we show that each system is an attempt to look at the Whole from a particular level of experience, our purpose will be defeated For, (*i*) if the sources of the Sutras are revealed truths, derived from superconscious experience, as the professor admits in a way, they have no value if they contradict one another ; and (*ii*) the three Prasthânas of Hindu philosophy,—the Nyaya Prasthana, the Samkhya Prasthana and the Mimansa Prasthana, —represent but three different standpoints from which Reality has been viewed ;—they are physical, psychical and causal

respectively. When one system is criticised by another, that is done mostly by commentators who are men of intellect rather than of vision. When intellect seeks to interpret Reality in terms of mental categories, differences are inevitable. Some apparent contradictions are no doubt due to the angle of vision that differs with individuals. Reality is undivided and admits of no difference in kind ; but experience has many planes, higher and lower. Truth reveals itself to the experiencing soul on many planes. The Kundalini Yoga makes this fact very clear. Probably some such considerations led Vijnanabhikshu to form a synthetic view of the six systems. "Thus the different systems are not really opposed to one another, but are an attempt to reach ultimate Truth by adapting themselves to a graduated scale of understanding. They are like three concentric circles, the outer circle corresponding to the Vaisesika and the Nyaya, which explains the mystery of the outer world by labelling its contents under certain categories and their subordinate genera. The middle circle represents the Samkhya which brings all the categories of the external world under a single head viz. Prakriti. But it does not similarly succeed in integrating the world of Purushas whose ultimate plurality is, after all, allowed. Now, the human mind is essentially a unity and it gets no peace and satisfaction till it has reduced the entire plurality of things external and internal to the unity of a single principle or reality. This is the task of Vedanta Philosophy which thus corresponds to the innermost circle. The Vedanta is thus like a field enclosed and protected by double fence, a temple that is approached through two outer court-yards."

We must have a clear idea of the relative position of reason and revelation (or intuition) in Indian philosophy before we can truly understand and appreciate it. Westerners have accepted only reason while Hindus have combined both. Knowledge advances by passing from the known to the unknown. How? The Western philosophy has adopted the inductive method of hypothesis and verification, while the Indian philosophy that of revelation and interpretation. The former assumes consistency to be the standard of truth and confines philosophy to the empirical aspect of Reality, while the latter deals with truth in its infinite aspects, one apparently clashing with the other, but every aspect leading to and culminating in one transcendental reality, the Absolute, the meeting ground of all seeming contradictions. This does not mean inconsistency ; but consistency is only one of its phases. Whatever comes within the grasp of reason should be supported by reason ; but it would be a mistake to reason out the transcendental truths. The Rishis of the Upanishads simply stated them ; Buddha kept quiet ; the Sutrakâras or compilers gave

hints ; Sankara quoted scriptures, using reason mostly for destructive purposes. Whenever any commentator has tried to reason them out, he has been involved in self-contradiction. As for instance, pure monism cannot be stated in terms of reason, for a second principle, called Maya, has to be taken for granted. By the way, we find that the professor feels a little uncomfortable at some of Sankara's · arguments tending to subjectivism. But Sankara is not a Subjective Idealist like Berkeley. The world, according to Sankara, has Brahman for its substratum, so it is not illusory ; but when the ultimate Reality (Pâramârthika Sattâ) is realised, the world of appearances vanishes. The world is not real in the sense of the scientific Realism of Locke and Reid, Spencer and Huxley.

How to have an intuition of truth ?—it may be asked. This indeed is one of the main problems of Hindu Darshana. All the systems have laid down certain practical measures for transcending body and mind. This practical aspect gives start to metaphysical speculations. When superconscious experiences are subordinated to reason, Hindu Darshana is deprived of its special characteristics and primal glory. Commentators are intellectualists, they have often distorted truth by over-intellectualism and self-assertion. By Darshana we mean statement of superconscious experiences and their faithful interpretation. The commentators have lowered Darshana to Philosophy. Realisation of truth, straight and simple, and not mere depths of thought for its own sake, is the watchword of Indian life. To miss this fact is to miss the main inspiration of Indian philosophy. Many modern interpreters of Indian life and thought, we regret to say, have been guilty of this defect. It is a pleasure to find that Prof. Radhakrishnan has not forgotten the intuitive basis of Indian thought and has defended many of its characteristics with consummate skill. But we wish he had gone farther. The learned professor has done very well to compare and contrast some of the basic principles with Western thoughts. As for instance, Brahman has been compared with the 'Things-in-themselves' of Kant, 'Absolute Ego' of Fichte, and 'That' of Bradley. His comparative study is illuminating ; he has ably distinguished Brahman from these others ; but the distinction would have been brought to a clearer relief, if he had shown that Brahman is a metaphysical intuition, rather revealed than conceived.

The Samkhya system of thought which has won widespread recognition for its highly developed psychology and cosmology, has been treated with imperfect sympathy. We are made to feel diffident from the very beginning about the value of Samkhya. Conscious Purusha and unconscious Prakriti can never come into contact. It is very much to be doubted if the human mind can ever understand the conscious and the

unconscious states of Purusha and Prakriti. For our utmost understanding of the subject and the object can be only in so far as they are conceived by the Buddhi, the first evolute of Prakriti. The principles of Prakriti and Purusha which are beyond Buddhi cannot be comprehended by the human mind, for human categories stop at Buddhi. These can be accepted as metaphysical realities,—subjects of intuition. In the Advaita Vedanta also the conception of Jivâtma which is the self-conscious Atman supposed to have been enveloped by the darkness of Avidya, is no less a mystery than the relation of Prakriti and Purusha.

The mechanical teleology of Samkhya might be compared with Schopenhaur's and Hartman's theory of the unconscious will. The dualism of Samkhya is based on the theory of causality. This theory therefore could have been more fully discussed, and the different views held by the Buddhistic schools, Nyaya, Samkhya and Vedanta could have been elaborately put forth.

The change from atheism to theism in Samkhya has been thus accounted for: "The later thinkers found it impossible to account for this harmony between the needs of Purusha and the acts of Prakriti, and so attribute the function of guiding the development of Prakriti, by removing the barriers, to God." He quotes Vachaspati, Vijnanabhikshu and Nagesha on this point. It should be noted here that these changes are found in commentators and not in the original treatises of Samkhya.

Prof. Radhakrishnan maintains that throughout the Samkhya there is a confusion between the Purusha and the Jiva. This confusion, we think, is not so great in the Sutras as in their interpreters.

The relation of Purusha and Buddhi is a difficult problem; the confusion has been all the more confounded by the theory of reflection. It required a lucid treatment. But it is not clearly shown in the book which is the reflector and which the reflected. The following lines indicate: "Because of the transparency of prakriti in her sattva part, the purusha reflected therein mistakes the sense of self-hood and agency (abhimâna) of prakriti as belonging to itself." But a few lines below: "Bondage is the reflection in purusha of the impurities of Buddhi."

The Advaita Vedanta of Sankara has been clearly interpreted, supported and criticised wherever necessary. Sankara excites wonder and admiration, but love and reverence is for Ramanuja. Says the author: "Samkara's system is unmatched for its metaphysical depth and logical power. Thought follows thought naturally, until Advaitism is seen to complete and crown the edifice. . . . Samkara holds up a vision of life acceptable in the highest moments of poetry and religion, when

we are inclined to sympathise with his preference for intuition to the light of the understanding. So long as he remains on this high ground, he is unanswerable." But thus in connection with Ramanuja's Theism: "The speculations of philosophers which do not comfort us in our stress and suffering, are mere intellectual diversion and not serious thinking. The Absolute of Samkara, rigid, motionless and totally lacking in initiative or influence, cannot call forth our worship. Like the Taj Mahal, which is unconscious of the admiration it arouses, the Absolute remains indifferent to the fear and love of its worshippers, and for all those who regard the goal of religion as the goal of philosophy—to know God is to know the real—Samkara's view seems to be a finished example of learned error. . . . The world is said to be an appearance and God a bloodless Absolute dark with the excess of light." These remarks appear to be a little self-contradictory and presuppose that religion is not possible with the Absolute as its background. The author, we are afraid, has been carried away by feeling: a thing which is established by reason appears to be an error, simply because it does not satisfy popular demand! One must not forget that a timid heart cannot know even Personal God; and where there is strength and fearlessness, the Absolute is not dark with the excess of light.

His treatment of Sankara would have been more complete if he had touched upon the following points:

(1) There are certain similar ideas in Sankara Vedanta and Buddhism, they often create confusion; e.g., the Atman of Sankara and the Bhutatman of the Mahayanic School, the Brahman of Vedanta and the Bhutatathata of Buddhism, Mukti and Nirvana. They should have been clearly distinguished.

(2) The theory of creation has been incompletely treated. The aggregate and sygregate evolution of Brahman have not been touched at all.

(3) The doctrine of Maya and the theory of ignorance (Avidya) require a fuller treatment. Many theories on these have not been stated and discussed. How Sankara retorts to his opponents in defining Maya as *anirvachaniya,* ought to have been stated. Whether ignorance is a positive entity or not should also have been made clear.

(4) The different schools of Vedanta, specially the later Vedanta schools, have no doubt been referred to in connection with Sankara; but they should have been treated separately and more fully.

(5) The Kalpanâ-vâda of *Yoga-vâsistha* should have been stated and discussed in connection with Sankara; for according to some scholars, *Yoga-vasistha* was written before Sankara

and he was as much influenced by *Yoga-vasistha* as by the Mândukya-Kârikâ of Gaudapada.

(6) The conceptions of God and soul in Vedanta ought to have been compared with those of Nyaya and Vaiseshika.

The learned author, with whom philosophy is not mere intellectual gymnastics, emphasises the practical aspect of Vedanta: "The highest intelligence, according to him (Sankara) consists in the knowledge that intelligence alone is not enough. . . . Brahmajnâna is the spiritual realisation of our rootedness in the eternal, which remains an abiding possession, a part of our being." "What counts is not outer conduct but inner life. Its torturing problems cannot be solved by a reference to rules. Our secret hearts, our prayers and meditations help us to solve the problems of life." "Religion for Samkara is not doctrine or ceremony, but life and experience."

The author's treatment of Ramanuja has been quite clear; he has fully brought out the epistemological significances of Ramanuja and Sankara, pointing out their differences. But the criticism offered by Ramanuja on the doctrine of Maya has been insufficiently stated: it is finished in one paragraph. He has done well in treating the *Sutras* apart. But he might attempt to show whose interpretation approaches nearest to the *Sutras*.

The chapter on Saiva, Sâkta and Vaishnava theism, comprehending the living faiths of India, has been too short. An elaborate treatment is essential. The principles of Siva, Sakti, Sadasiva, Isvara and the Suddha-maya of the Saivas corresponding to those of Brahman, Sakti, Nada, Bindu and the Suddha-maya of the Saktas are not easy to comprehend. The more they are explained, the better. In some of the passages it is not clear whether Sakti is one with or different from Suddha-maya.

Some leading doctrines of the Pancharatra School, those of Madhva, Nimbarka, Vallabha, etc., have been stated and compared; but they have not been sufficiently discussed. The Chaitanya school of Bengal has found a place, but has not been properly dealt with. The contributions of each school should have been fairly emphasised. No attempt has been made to interpret the theories of Svarupa-sakti, Tatastha-sakti and Maya-sakti, and the synthesis attempted by the Chaitanya school. Ramanuja's theory of attributes that soul and matter are attributes of God and the theory of Sakti that Prakriti is the outer energy of God, as propounded by Jiva and Baladeva, should have been fully discussed. According to Prof. Radhakrishnan, the doctrine of Achintabhedâbheda of Chaitanya is nearer to Ramanuja's qualified monism than to Madhva's dualism. Historically, however, the Gaudiya Vaishnavas belong to the

Madhva school, though their leanings are neither towards the emphasis of difference as with Madhva, nor towards identity as with Ramanuja, they remain equitable. The last section* of the author's Conclusion, in which he points out the direction of India's future philosophical development, deserves careful attention. He mentions a few names as partly foreshadowing it. But why is the name of Swami Vivekananda omitted. Surely no modern Indian mind so fully and clearly reflects it as his.

In spite of the few short-comings pointed out above, the book, the only one of its kind existing, has many excellent features which can hardly be over-estimated. Like the author's other works, this also will be specially helpful to Western readers. It will surely add to his already established reputation as a great interpreter of Hindu thought.

U. C. D.

DARWIN'S THEORY OF MAN'S DESCENT AS IT STANDS TO-DAY

By Prof. Sir Arthur Keith, M.D., D.Sc., LL.D., F.R.S.

(Concluded from the last issue)

We made another mistake. Seeing that in our search for Man's ancestry we expected to reach an age when the beings we should have to deal with would be simian rather than human, we ought to have marked the conditions which prevail amongst living anthropoid apes. We ought to have been prepared to find, as we approached a distant point in the geological horizon, that the forms encountered would be as widely different as are the gorilla, chimpanzee and orang, and confined, as these great anthropoids now are, to limited parts of the earth's surface. That is what we are now realising ; as we go backwards in time we discover that mankind becomes broken up, not into separate races as in the world of to-day, but into numerous and separate species. When we go into a still more remote past they become so unlike that we have to regard them not as belonging to separate species but different genera. It is amongst this welter of extinct fossil forms which strew the ancient world that we have to trace the zigzag line of Man's descent. Do you wonder we sometimes falter and follow false clues?

We committed a still further blunder when we set out on the search for Man's ancestry : indeed, some of us are still

* We hope to be able to quote it in some future issue.—*Ed.*

making it. We expected that Man's evolution would pursue not only an orderly file of stages but that every part of his body—skull, brain, jaws, teeth, skin, body, arms, and legs—would at each stage become a little less ape-like, a little more Man-like. Our searches have shown us that Man's evolution has not proceeded in this orderly manner. In some extinct races, while one part of the body has moved forwards another part has lagged behind. Let me illustrate this point because it is important. We now know that, as Darwin sat in his study at Down, there lay hidden at Piltdown, in Sussex, not thirty miles distant from him, sealed up in a bed of gravel, a fossil human skull and jaw. In 1912, thirty years after Darwin's death, Mr. Charles Dawson discovered this skull and my friend Sir Arthur Smith Woodward described it, and rightly recognised that skull and jaw were parts of the same individual, and that this individual had lived, as was determined by geological and other evidence, in the opening phase of the Pleistocene period. We may confidently presume that this individual was representative of the people who inhabited England at this remote date. The skull, although deeply mineralised and thick-walled, might well have been the rude forerunner of a modern skull, but the lower jaw was so ape-like that some experts denied that it went with the human fossil skull at all, and supposed it to be the lower jaw of some extinct kind of chimpanzee. This mistake would never have been made if those concerned had studied the comparative anatomy of anthropoid apes. Such a study would have prepared them to meet with the discordances of evolution. The same irregularity in the progression of parts is evident in the anatomy of *Pithecanthropus*, the oldest and most primitive form of humanity so far discovered. The thigh-bone might easily be that of modern man, the skull-cap that of an ape, but the brain within that cap, as we now know, had passed well beyond an anthropoid status. If merely a lower jaw had been found at Piltdown an ancient Englishman would have been wrongly labelled 'Higher anthropoid ape'; if only the thigh-bone of *Pithecanthropus* had come to light in Java, then an ancient Javanese, almost deserving the title of anthropoid, would have passed muster as a man.

Such examples illustrate the difficulties and dangers which beset the task of unravelling Man's ancestry. There are other difficulties; there still remain great blanks in the geological record of Man's evolution. As our search proceeds these blanks will be filled in, but in the meantime let us note their nature and their extent. By the discovery of fossil remains we have followed Man backwards to the close of the Pliocene—a period which endured at least for a quarter of a million years, but we have not yet succeeded in tracing him through this

period. It is true that we have found fossil teeth in Pliocene deposits which may be those of an ape-like man or of a man-like ape ; until we find other parts of their bodies we cannot decide. When we pass into the still older Miocene period—one which was certainly twice as long as the Pliocene—we are in the heyday of anthropoid history. Thanks to the labours of Dr. Guy E. Pilgrim, of the Indian Geological Survey, we know already of a dozen different kinds of great anthropoids which lived in Himalayan jungles during middle and later Miocene times ; we know of at least three other kinds of great anthropoids which lived in the contemporary jungles of Europe. Unfortunately we have found as yet only the most resistant parts of their bodies—teeth and fragments of jaw. Do some of these fragments represent a human ancestor? We cannot decide until a lucky chance brings to light a limb-bone or a piece of skull, but no one can compare the teeth of these Miocene anthropoids with those of primitive man, as has been done so thoroughly by Prof. William K. Gregory, and escape the conviction that in the dentitions of the extinct anthropoids of the Miocene jungles we have the ancestral forms of human teeth.

It is useless to go to strata still older than the Miocene in search of Man's emergence ; in such strata we have found only fossil traces of emerging anthropoids. All the evidence now at our disposal supports the conclusion that Man has arisen, as Lamarck and Darwin suspected, from an anthropoid ape not higher in the zoological scale than a chimpanzee, and that the date at which human and anthropoid lines of descent began to diverge lies near the beginning of the Miocene period. On our modest scale of reckoning, that gives Man the respectable antiquity of about one million years.

Our geological search, which I have summarised all too briefly, has not produced so far the final and conclusive evidence of Man's anthropoid origin ; we have not found as yet the human *imago* emerging from its anthropoid encasement. Why, then, do modern anthropologists share the conviction that there has been an anthropoid stage in our ancestry? They are no more blind than you are to the degree of difference which separates Man and ape in structure, in appearance and in behaviour. I must touch on the sources of this conviction only in a passing manner. Early in the present century Prof. G. H. F. Nuttall, of Cambridge University, discovered a trustworthy and exact method of determining the affinity of one species of animal to another by comparing the reactions of their blood. He found that the blood of Man and that of the great anthropoid apes gave almost. the same reaction. Bacteriologists find that the living anthropoid body possesses almost the same susceptibilities to infections, and manifests the same reactions, as does the body

of Man. So alike are the brains of Man and anthropoid in their structural organisation that surgeons and physiologists transfer experimental observations from the one to the other. When the human embryo establishes itself in the womb it throws out structures of a most complex nature to effect a connection with the maternal body. We now know that exactly the same elaborate processes occur in the anthropoid womb and in no other. We find the same vestigial structures—the same 'evolutionary post-marks'—in the bodies of Man and anthropoid. The anthropoid mother fondles, nurses and suckles her young in the human manner. This is but a tithe of the striking and intimate points in which Man resembles the anthropoid ape. In what other way can such a myriad of coincidences be explained except by presuming a common ancestry for both?

The crucial chapters in Darwin's *Descent of Man* are those in which he seeks to give a historical account of the rise of Man's brain and of the varied functions which that organ subserves. How do these chapters stand to-day? Darwin was not a professional anatomist and therefore accepted Huxley's statement that there was no structure in the human brain that was not already present in that of the anthropoid. In Huxley's opinion the human brain was but a richly annotated edition of the simpler and older anthropoid book, and that this edition, in turn, was but the expanded issue of the still older original primate publication. Since this statement was made thousands of anatomists and physiologists have studied and compared the brain of Man and ape; only a few months ago Prof. G. Elliot Smith summarised the result of this intensive enquiry as follows: 'No structure found in the brain of an ape is lacking in the human brain, and, on the other hand, the human brain reveals no formation *of any sort* that is not present in the brain of the gorilla or chimpanzee. . . . The only distinctive feature of the human brain is a quantitative one.' The difference is only quantitative but its importance cannot be exaggerated. In the anthropoid brain are to be recognised all those parts which have become so enormous in the human brain. It is the expansion of just those parts which have given Man his powers of feeling, understanding, acting, speaking and learning.

Darwin himself approached this problem not as an anatomist but as a psychologist, and after many years of painstaking and and exact observation, succeeded in convincing himself that, immeasurable as are the differences between the mentality of Man and ape, they are of degree, not of kind. Prolonged researches made by modern psychologists have but verified and extended Darwin's conclusions. No matter what line of evidence we select to follow—evidence gathered by anatomists, by embryologists, by physiologists, or by psychologists—we reach the conviction that Man's brain has been evolved from that of an

anthropoid ape and that in the process no new structure has been introduced and no new or strange faculty interpolated.

In these days our knowledge of the elaborate architecture and delicate machinery of the human brain makes rapid progress, but I should mislead if I suggested that finality is in sight. Far from it ; our enquiries are but begun. There is so much we do not yet understand. Will the day ever come when we can explain why the brain of man has made such great progress while that of his cousin the gorilla has fallen so far behind? Can we explain why inherited ability falls to one family and not to another, or why, in the matter of cerebral endowment, one race of mankind has fared so much better than another? We have as yet no explanation to offer, but an observation made twenty years ago by one on whom Nature has showered great gifts—a former President of this Association and the doyen of British zoologists—Sir E. Ray Lankester—deserves quotation in this connection : 'The leading feature in the development and separation of Man from other animals is undoubtedly the relative enormous size of the brain in Man and the corresponding increase in its activities and capacity. It is a striking fact that it was not in the ancestors of Man alone that this increase in the size of the brain took place at this same period—the Miocene. Other great mammals of the early Tertiary period were in the same case.' When primates made their first appearance in geological records, they were, one and all, small-brained. We have to recognise that the tendency to increase of brain, which culminated in the production of the human organ, was not confined to Man's ancestry but appeared in diverse branches of the Mammalian stock at a corresponding period of the earth's history.

I have spoken of Darwin as a historian. To describe events and to give the order of their occurrence is the easier part of a historian's task ; his real difficulties begin when he seeks to interpret the happenings of history, to detect the causes which produced them, and explain why one event follows as a direct sequel to another. Up to this point we have been considering only the materials for Man's history, and placing them, so far as our scanty information allows, in the order of their sequence, but now we have to seek out the biological processes and controlling influences which have shaped the evolutionary histories of Man and ape. The evolution of new types of Man or of ape is one thing, and the evolution of new types of motor cars is another, yet for the purposes of clear thinking it will repay us to use the one example to illustrate the other. In the evolution of motor vehicles Darwin's law of Selection has prevailed ; there has been severe competition and the types which have answered best to the needs and tastes of the public have survived. The public has selected on two grounds—first

for utility, thus illustrating Darwin's law of Natural Selection, and secondly because of appearance's sake ; for, as most people know, a new car has to satisfy not only the utilitarian demands of its prospective master but also the æsthetic tastes of its prospective mistress, therein illustrating Darwin's second law—the law of Sexual Selection. That selection, both utilitarian and æsthetic, is producing an effect on modern races of mankind and in surviving kinds of ape, as Darwin supposed, cannot well be questioned. In recent centuries the inter-racial competition amongst men for the arable lands of the world is keener than in any known period of human history.

The public has selected its favoured types of car, but it has had no direct hand in designing and producing modifications and improvements which have appeared year after year. To understand how such modifications are produced the enquirer must enter a factory and not only watch artisans shaping and fitting parts together but also visit the designer's office. In this way an enquirer will obtain a glimpse of the machinery concerned in the evolution of motor cars. If we are to understand the machinery which underlies the evolution of Man and of ape, we have to enter the 'factories' where they are produced—look within the womb and see the ovum being transformed into an embryo, the embryo into a fœtus, and the fœtus into a babe. After birth we may note infancy passing into childhood, childhood into adolescence, adolescence into maturity, and maturity into old age. Merely to register the stages of change is not enough ; to understand the controlling machinery we have to search out and uncover the processes which are at work within developing and growing things and the influences which co-ordinate and control all the processes of development and of growth. When we have discovered the machinery of development and of growth we shall also know the machinery of Evolution ; for they are the same.

If the simile I have used would sound strange in Darwin's ear, could he hear it, the underlying meaning would be familiar to him. Over and over again he declared that he did not know how 'variations' were produced, favourable or otherwise ; nor could he have known, for in his time hormones were undreamt of and experimental embryology scarcely born. With these recent discoveries new vistas opened up for students of Evolution. The moment we begin to work out the simile I have used and compare the evolutionary machinery in a motor factory with that which regulates the development of an embryo within the womb, we realise how different the two processes are. Let us imagine for a moment what changes would be necessary were we to introduce 'embryological processes' into a car factory. We have to conceive a workshop teeming with clustering swarms of microscopic artisans, mere specks of living matter.

In one end of this factory we find swarms busy with cylinders, and as we pass along we note that every part of a car is in process of manufacture, each part being the business of a particular brigade of microspic workmen. There is no apprenticeship in this factory, every employee is born, just as a hive-bee is, with his skill already fully developed. No plans or patterns are supplied ; every workman has the needed design in his head from birth. There is neither manager, overseer, nor foreman to direct and co-ordinate the activities of the vast artisan armies. And yet if parts are to fit when assembled, if pinions are to mesh and engines run smoothly, there must be some method of co-ordination. It has to be a method plastic enough to permit difficulties to be overcome when such are encountered and to permit the introduction of advantageous modifications when these are needed. A modern works manager would be hard put to were he asked to devise an automatic system of control for such a factory, yet it is just such a system that we are now obtaining glimpses of in the living workshops of Nature.

I have employed a crude simile to give the lay mind an inkling of what happens in that 'factory' where the most complicated of machines are forged—the human body and brain. The fertilised ovum divides and redivides ; one brood of microscopic living units succeeds another, and as each is produced the units group themselves to form the 'parts' of an embryo. Each 'part' is a living society ; the embryo is a huge congeries of interdependent societies. How are their respective needs regulated, their freedoms protected, and their manœuvres timed? Experimental embryologists have begun to explore and discover the machinery of regulation. We know enough to realise that it will take many generations of investigators to work over the great and new field which is thus opening up. When this is done we shall be in a better position to discuss the cause of 'variation' and the machinery of Evolution.

If we know only a little concerning the system of government which prevails in the developing embryo we can claim that the system which prevails in the growing body, as it passes from infancy to maturity, is becoming better known to us every year. The influence of the sex glands on the growth of the body has been known since ancient times ; their removal in youth leads to a transformation in the growth of every part of the body, altering at the same time the reactions and temperament of the brain. In more recent years medical men have observed that characteristic alterations in the appearance and constitution of the human body can be produced by the action of other glands—the pituitary, thyroid, parathyroid, and adrenals. Under the disorderly action of one or other of these glands individuals may, in the course of a few years, take on so changed an appearance that the differences between them

and their fellows become as great as, or even greater than, those which separate one race of mankind from another. The physical characters which are thus altered are just those which mark one race off from another. How such effects are produced we did not know until 1904, when the late Prof. E. H. Starling, a leader amongst the great physiologists of our time, laid bare an ancient and fundamental law in the living animal body—his law of hormones. I have pictured the body of a growing child as an immense society made up of myriads of microscopic living units, ever increasing in numbers. One of the ways—probably the oldest and most important way—in which the activities of the communities of the body are co-ordinated and regulated is by the postal system discovered by Starling, wherein the missives are hormones—chemical substances in ultra-microscopic amounts, despatched from one community to another in the circulating blood. Clearly the discovery of this ancient and intricate system opens up fresh vistas to the student of Man's evolution. How Darwin would have welcomed this discovery! It would have given him a rational explanation to so many of his unsolved puzzles, including that of 'correlated variations.' Nor can I in this connection forbear to mention the name of one who presided so ably over the affairs of this Association fifteen years ago—Sir E. Sharpey-Schafer. He was the pioneer who opened up this field of investigation and has done more than anyone to place our knowledge of the nature and action of the glands of internal secretion on a precise basis of experimental observation. With such sources of knowledge being ever extended and others of great importance, such as the study of Heredity, which have been left unmentioned, we are justified in the hope that Man will be able in due time not only to write his own history but to explain how and why events took the course they did.

In a brief hour I have attempted to answer a question of momentous importance to all of us—What is Man's origin? Was Darwin right when he said that Man, under the action of biological forces which can be observed and measured, has been raised from a place amongst anthropoid apes to that which he now occupies? The answer is Yes! and in returning this verdict I speak but as foreman of the jury—a jury which has been empanelled from men who have devoted a lifetime to weighing the evidence. To the best of my ability I have avoided, in laying before you the evidence on which our verdict was found, the rôle of special pleader, being content to follow Darwin's own example—Let the Truth speak for itself.

NOTICES OF BOOKS

ANTHROPOSOPHY IN INDIA *by Dr. Hans Koester. Published by Thacker, Spink & Co., Calcutta and Simla. Pp. 44. Price Rs. 2/8.*

The booklet is a collection of four lectures delivered by the author at different times. The information about Anthroposophy given in it is naturally somewhat disjointed. It however helps us to form an idea of it, for not many in India know about this new philosophy. Anthroposophy, though it approaches Hinduism in certain respects, differs from it in many others. The author has attempted to show in several places that Western spirituality is of independent and original growth, though the fact of Christianity being an import into Europe from Asia seems to controvert this position. He holds that the West in its present spiritual development is also original and will travel along an independent path. May be. But why not a repetition of history? When any Westerner professes in these days such doctrines as Karma, Reincarnation, etc. and yet maintains that he does not owe them to the East, his claim, we fear, will be considered rather weak. We hope the author would pursue his study of Hindu religion and philosophy further so that he may come to a clearer understanding of the comparative value of Indian and Western ideas and give us more real comparative studies.

We are indebted to the author for an article on the Anthroposophical view of the individual soul, which we publish elsewhere and which he sent us in response to our request for an outline of the fundamentals of Anthroposophy. The following from the London *Sunday Express* may be found interesting :

"Most people think by logical and rational processes," said Mr. Kaufmann, the secretary of the Anthroposophical Society, to a "Sunday Express" representative. "They are enabled to 'see' the physical and chemical components which form a plant or an animal—the solids, waters, acids, and so on—and they can fully understand the processes by which those components function in everyday life.

"What they have no knowledge of is the life-force and the spiritual forces which compose and control that life-force.

"We believe that by thought and concentration these spiritual forces can become as understandable to the ordinary person as are the chemical and mechanical forces which we harness in everyday life.

"This means that people may still see 'angels' and 'visions,' for angels direct the lives of individuals just as archangels direct the destinies of nations.

"We may see visions and be guided by them just as was Joan of Arc.

"Our conception of the hereafter is also somewhat different from the orthodox, for we think that when a man dies his soul goes into Heaven for a period of rest and recuperation which usually lasts 1,000 years. At the end of that time he comes back to earth, refreshed, re-invigorated, and backed by the instinctive, implanted developments of mind and soul which he has achieved in former existences.

"Many great natural scientists who have achieved their work since the time of Bacon lived their last life on earth in the midst of the Arabic civilisation and learning which flourished in Asia Minor and about Bagdad one thousand years ago.

"The Church for too long has taught its people to avoid 'dabbling' with spiritual knowledge. The result is that many of us have now forgotten that there is such a side of life, and Nemesis has come to the churches, for people are leaving them."

NEWS AND REPORTS

Birthday of Muhammad Celebrated

The Ramakrishna Ashrama, Mysore, celebrated the birthday of the Prophet Muhammad on the 21st September last in the Prayer Hall of the Ashrama. The function began with readings from the Holy Quoran by Syed Zia Muhammad, B.A. He explained the meaning of the verses in English, and this was followed by the chanting of a hymn in Urdu in praise of the Prophet. The audience consisting of both Hindus and Mussalmans remained standing in silence and prayer. Swami Ghanananda next welcomed the lecturer of the evening with a neat speech, in course of which he remarked on the urgent need of the synthetic outlook of religion at the present day. He said, quoting Swami Vivekananda, that future India will be Vedanta brain and Islam body. Such a synthesis is quite possible, for both religions really agree on the ultimate nature of Truth, and saints here been born, e.g., Kabir, Nanak etc., in whose lives, this synthesis was an actuality. The solution of the present communal problem, the Swami rightly remarked, lies in the wide propagation of this synthetic culture.

Syed Abdul Razak, the lecturer of the evening, then made an appealing speech giving out the salient features of the life of the Prophet, bringing out the various excellences in his character, like his democratic spirit and his noble attitude towards women. The lecturer concluded by expressing his agreement with the Swami as to the urgent need of the propagation of a synthetic culture as the only possible basis of communal unity.

The function came to a close with the chanting of another Urdn hymn in praise of the Prophet.

Ramkrishna Mission Relief Works, Accounts from June to November, 1926

Sonthal Pergs. Scarcity Relief Work (June to August). A centre was started at Jamtara from where 10 weekly distributions of rice and other food grains were given to 719 distressed inhabitants of 33 villages. Total quantity of rice distributed was 223 mds., 26 seers, 8 chts.; dal 3 mds.; gram 122 mds.; seeds 60 mds.; salt 20 mds. New cloth 50 pieces and old cloths 752 pieces. Besides there, for the purpose of supplying drinking water 22 wells and one tank were dug and one tank was repaired. For this work the distressed people received doles of rice as their labour.

Midnapore Scarcity Relief Work (July). A centre was started at Paikmajita from where 4 weekly distributions of rice were given to 1077 distressed inhabitants of 45 villages. Total quantity of rice distributed was 136 mds.

Receipts and Expenditure for the above two centres :—

Received by donation Rs. 1,590-11-9. Sale proceeds of rice Rs. 4-15-0, from the Ramkrishna Mission Provident Relief Fund Rs. 2,401-8-3. Total Rs. 3,997-3-0.

EXPENDITURE :—Rice bought Rs. 2,312-9-0, other food grains 630-13-9, clothis 49-5-0, transit 68-7-0, travelling and inspection 166-13-9, equipment 6-10-6, worker's expenses (for 9 workers) 101-12-3, establishment 19-3-6, stationery 5-14-9, postage 25-12-0, printing 6-2-0, pecuniary help 57-8-6, medical relief 8-2-3, agricultural relief 241/-, water scarcity relief 15-4-3, aids for hut building 268/-, test work 0-5-6, sacks 7-13-0, miscellaneous expenses 5-10-0. Total Rs. 3,997-3-0.

Midnapore Flood Relief Work (from 22nd, August to 17th, November). Five centres were started from where 2106 mds., 27 seers, of rice, 25 mds., 15 seers, chira and 1 md. of salt were distributed to 5218 distressed inhabitants of 110 villages. Also 1405 new cloths and 1971 old cloths were distributed.

Receipts and Expenditure for the above work :—

Received by donation Rs. 15,824-13-1½, sale proceeds of sacks and rice etc., 519-4-3, from the Ramkrishna Mission Provident Relief Fund 2,100-3-3. Total 18,444-4-7½.

EXPENDITURE :—Rice for distribution bought Rs. 14,700-1-3, other food grains bought 413-2-9, cloths bought 970-12-0, sacks bought 231-2-9, transit charges 610-4-3, travelling and inspection 467-0-6, equipment 223-10-3, worker's expenses (for 20 workers) 619-12-7½, establishment 70-6-9, stationary 11-15-3, postage 70-5-0, pecuniary help 25-9-0, medical help 3/-, miscellaneous expenses 27-2-3. Total Rs. 18,444-4-7½.

This account was audited on the 10th February 1927 and found correct by Mr. N. K. Majumdar, M.A., G.D.A., Govt. Certified Auditor, who is the Hony. Auditor of the Ramkrishna Mission.

We regret that we could not publish this account earlier.

(Sd.) SUDDHANANDA,
The 21st November, 1927. Secretary, Ramkrishna Mission.

Nellore Cyclone Relief

Swami Suddhananda, Secretary, Ramakrishna Mission, writes :—

The reports of the serious disaster caused by the terrible cyclone which passed over Nellore and its surrounding places have been published in the newspapers. The Ramakrishna Mission from its Madras Branch has started relief work in the affected area. We appeal on behalf of the suffering humanity to the generous public for hely. Contributions will be thankfully received by (1) The President, Ramakrishna Mission, Belur Math P.O. & Dist. Howrah. (2) The Secretary, Ramakrishna Math, Mylapore, Madras.