PRABUDDHA BHARATA

VOL. LX *AUGUST, 1955* No. 8

"उत्तिष्ठत जाग्रत प्राप्य वरान्निबोधत।"

"Arise, Awake! And stop not till the Goal is reached."

NEW DISCOVERIES REGARDING SWAMI VIVEKANANDA—VI

By An American Devotee

I

Sometime ago I warned the reader that because new material keeps coming in as these articles are being prepared he might be called upon from time to time to make some backward jumps in the chronology of the narrative. In the last installment, the story of Swamiji's visit to Memphis, Tennessee, was told from Memphis *Appeal-Avalanche* clippings. These clippings were old ones which I have reason to believe were ordered by friends of Swamiji from a Chicago clipping bureau, and I had assumed they told the story fairly exhaustively. It occurred to me later, however, that very likely the clipping bureaus of that era were not as thorough as they are today. I wrote, therefore, to the librarian of the Public Library in Memphis to request that he look in the old newspaper files of January, 1894 for more news of Swamiji, and the results have been rewarding. Not only was there more news in the *Appeal-Avalanche,* but in another paper, *The Memphis Commercial,* three articles were discovered, two of which I am able to reproduce in the present installment. Last month, as readers will remember, I wrote that Swamiji's first lecture in Memphis was delivered on Tuesday, January 16, 1894. As it turns out that was not correct. Actually, the January 16 lecture was his second, the first having been given on Monday, January 15. Swamiji arrived at Memphis on the preceding Saturday, and on Sunday, as the following article from *The Memphis Commercial* of January 15 will show, he was interviewed by a reporter from that journal. This interview was in certain respects unique and reads as follows:

THE HINDU MONK WHO IS TO LECTURE IN THIS CITY.

SWAMI VIVE KANANDA HERE

He Talks Entertainingly to a Reporter on Various Subjects, Among Them Suspended Animation and Other Marvels Peculiar to His Home.

Swami Vive Kananda, the Hindu Monk, who will lecture this afternoon at 3 o'clock before the Nineteenth Century Club, and tomorrow night at the Auditorium, arrived in Memphis Saturday, and is the guest of Hu L. Brinkley at Miss Moon's establishment, Third Street, near Poplar.

Swami Vive Kananda is in some respects the most interesting visitor Memphis has ever had. Himself a Brahmin, he sacrificed his rank and joined the order of Hindu monks called Sanyasin. He was to Americans at least perhaps the most interesting figure in the World's Parliament of Religions, held at Chicago in connection with the World's Fair. This was not alone because he came as the representative of a religion of a far away land, but because of the excellent speeches which he made during the great religious gathering.

Yesterday afternoon Swami Vive Kananda dined at Col. R. B. Snowden's where he met Bishop Thomas F. Gailor. He had only a short time returned from this visit when a *Commercial* reporter called upon him at Miss Moon's, and was accorded an interview with him in the rooms of Gen. R. F. Patterson, where he was sitting at the time.

Vive Kananda is very striking in his personality. Though quite dark of complexion, his intellectual forehead, large fine eyes and black hair, his easy, graceful manners and fine figure and carriage make him a very handsome man.

Asked by the reporter for his impressions of America, he said:

"I have a good impression of this country, especially of the American women. I have especially remarked on the absence of poverty in America."

The conversation afterward turned to the subject of religions. Swami Vive Kananda expressed the opinion that the World's Parliament of Religions had been beneficial in that it had done much toward broadening ideas.

"What," asked the reporter, "is the generally accepted view held by those of your faith as to the fate after death of one holding the Christian religion?"

"We believe that if he is a good man he will be saved. Even an atheist, if he is a good man, we believe must be saved. That is our religion. We believe all religions are good, only those who hold them must not quarrel."

Swami Vive Kananda was questioned concerning the truthfulness of the marvellous stories of the performance of wonderful feats of conjuring, levitation, suspended animation, and the like in India. Vive Kanada said:

"We do not believe in miracles at all but that apparently strange things may be accomplished under the operation of natural laws. There is a vast amount of literature in India on these subjects, and the people there have made a study of these things.

"Thought reading and the foretelling of events are successfully practiced by the Hathayogis.

"As to levitation, I have never seen anyone overcome gravitation and rise by will into the air, but I have seen many who were trying to do so. They read books published on the subject and spend years trying to accomplish the feat. Some of them in their efforts nearly starve themselves, and become so thin that if one presses his finger upon their stomachs he can actually feel the spine.

"Some of these Hathayogis live to a great age."

The subject of suspended animation was broached and the Hindu monk told *The Commercial* reporter that he himself had known a man who went into a sealed cave, which was then closed up with a trap door, and remained there for many years, without food. There was a decided stir of interest among those who heard this assertion. Vive Kananda entertained not the slightest doubt of the genuineness of this case. He says that in the case of suspended animation growth is for the time arrested. He says the case of the man in India who was buried with a crop of barley raised over his grave and who was finally taken out still alive is perfectly well authenticated. He thinks the studies which enabled persons to accomplish that feat were suggested by the hibernating animals.

Vive Kananda said that he had never seen the feat which some writers have claimed has been accomplished in India, of throwing a rope into the air and the thrower climbing up the rope and disappearing out of sight in the distant heights.

A lady present when the reporter was interviewing the monk said some one had asked her if he, Vive Kananda, could perform wonderful tricks, and if he had been buried alive as a part of his installation in the Brotherhood. The answer to both questions was a positive negative. "What have those things to do with religion?" he asked. "Do they make a man purer? The satan of your Bible is powerful, but differs from God in not being pure."

Speaking of the sect of Hathayoga, Vive Kananda said there was one thing, whether a coincidence or not, connected with the initiation of their disciples, which was suggestive of the one passage in the life of Christ. They make their disciples live alone for just forty days.

Only the members and invited guests of the Nineteenth Century Club will hear Swami Vive Kananda this afternoon; tomorrow night, when he appears at the Auditorium, the public will have an opportunity to see and hear this very interesting man and no less interesting talker.

Vive Kananda will likely go from here to Chicago. He does not yet know how long he will remain in America.

The second item from *The Memphis Commercial* is an announcement of the lecture which Swamiji gave on January 21, the report of which was reproduced in the last installment under the heading "Gave His Farewell Lecture. Swami Vivekananda Makes The Grandest Effort of His Life." (Perhaps it should be explained here that the word "effort" was in those days used to mean an "oratorical production.") Although the following article does not add to our knowledge of Swamiji's efforts in Memphis, it does add to our knowledge of the public reaction to them, and therefore I believe it is worth quoting here:

HE'LL SPEAK TO ALL CLASSES

Swami Vive Kananda Will Lecture on
"Comparative Theology."

Swami Vive Kananda, the Hindu monk, will deliver a lecture tonight at the Young Men's Hebrew Association hall. His subject will be "Comparative Theology."

This lecture will not be in the interest of any institutions, but has been arranged by Col. Hu Brinkley and some other gentlemen who, having heard the oriental orator and conversed with him, have been so impressed with his remarkable learning and talents that they desire all the people to have an opportunity to hear him. Swami Vive Kananda has been entertained in a public and

> private way by the citizens and has created a profound sensation in all cultured circles. His learning embraces such a wide range of subjects and his knowledge is so thorough that even specialists in the various sciences, theology, art and literature, learn from his utterances and absorb from his presence. The topic he has chosen for his oration tonight is one that he can treat with masterly ability and in a manner peculiarly his own. The conditions of the arrangements are such that the man would secure a large audience of all classes of people, as he no doubt will. The lecture will occur at the Young Men's Hebrew Association hall, and will begin at 8 o'clock.

The third article from *The Memphis Commercial* adds nothing new, but enables me to correct an error, for it is none other than the article, "A Plea for Tolerance," which was reproduced in the last installment and mistakenly designated as having come from the *Appeal-Avalanche*. It is for the sake of accuracy alone that I mention it here.

Because of technical difficulties in photostatic reproduction, the arrival of additional material from the Memphis *Appeal-Avalanche* has unfortunately been delayed. If one may judge from the list of items at hand, it promises to be of interest. For instance, one of the articles, entitled "Destiny of Man Discussed" and dated January 18, evidently pertains to a hitherto unknown Memphis lecture.

I am sorry that the readers will have to wait for this material until the following installment, but I am nonetheless happy that I will be able to present it to them even at that late date, and I trust they will forgive its lateness. In the meantime I think this is an excellent place to pause a moment for reflection, and inasmuch as the results of reflection can sometimes come under the heading of "New Discoveries" perhaps the reader will not object too much to this interruption of the narrative.

II

In the last two installments we have been trying to trace Swamiji's footsteps through the midwestern states of America. At times the trail has been clear; at other times, I must admit, it has been altogether lost; but I think that the reader will by now have received a general impression of the nature of Swamiji's lecture tour and of the physical and mental suffering it cost him.

For months, the majority of which fell in the dead of a severe winter, Swamiji traveled almost incessantly, lecturing many times a week. As has been seen in the preceding installments, he spent October and most of November in Chicago and nearby towns. Toward the end of November he traveled farther afield, presumably under the direction of the Slayton Lyceum Lecture Bureau, and commenced his long and arduous tour. The first cities on his itinerary were Madison, Wisconsin; Minneapolis, Minnesota; and Des Moines, Iowa; all three of which he visited within the space of one short week.

Although after this we lose trace of Swamiji for almost two months, we can infer from various sources something of what this period was like. For instance, if the pace with which he began his tour in the last week of November was continued, as no doubt it was, then within the next seven weeks—to make a conservative estimate—he must have lectured in at least fifteen towns. The far-flung location of these towns we can judge from his own words. "Necessity," he wrote to Swami Ramakrishnananda, "makes me travel by rail to the borders of Canada one day, and the next day finds me lecturing in a southern state of America." This information may not be literal as regards the time element, but it nonetheless characterizes the lecture tour. A little of the nature of

this period can also be gathered from the "Memoirs of Sister Christine," in which she writes: "After the Parliament of Religions, Swami Vivekananda was induced to place himself under the direction of Pond's Lecture Bureau and make a lecture tour of the United States. [Recent inquiry has established that it was the Slayton Lyceum Lecture Bureau.] As is the custom, the committee at each new place was offered the choice of several lectures, —'The Divinity of Man,' 'Manners and Customs of India,' 'The Women of India,' 'Our Heritage.' . . . Invariably when the place was a mining town with no intellectual life whatever, the most abstruse subjects were selected. He told us the difficulty of speaking to an audience when he could see no ray of intelligence in response."

Evidently the lecture bureau led Swamiji on a regular "barnstorming" tour, advertising him, as Romain Rolland tells us in "Prophets of the New India," "as if he were a circus turn." The picture which comes to mind of Swamiji making one-night stands week after week, enduring all the hardships of winter travel, keeping account of luggage and of money, meeting the blank and perhaps often stony faces of small-town audiences, being besieged, after having just delivered a lecture on "The Divinity of Man," by questions concerning the feeding of Hindu infants to the Ganges crocodiles, is one which appalls the imagination. Swamiji's visits to the larger cities, as, for instance, Memphis, Tennessee, where intellectual ignorance was less rigid and fundamentalism less pronounced, were no doubt a relief to him, but even there the pace was gruelling and the demands made upon his energy unrelenting.

But lest I give the reader too gloomy a picture of Swamiji's life, I should like to present evidence that there were spots of light in this wearisome and lonely tour. The Middle West was, after all, not a totally unrelieved spiritual desert. Scattered here and there were people who, at least to some extent, understood and spoke Swamiji's language, and to come across such rare souls naturally delighted his heart and lifted for a time the dead weight of his burden. A letter which Swamiji wrote from Detroit to Miss Isabelle McKindley and which has never before been published tells of one of these bright spots of the lecture tour. Since Swamiji rarely wrote to India regarding the details of his American experiences, good or bad, this letter, I believe, is especially valuable, giving, as it does, so intimate and rare a glimpse into his itinerant life. We also can judge from it how very fond he must have been of Miss McKindley, for he writes to her as though to a beloved sister. I am reproducing the letter exactly as Swamiji wrote it. Although chronologically it should be presented later on in the narrative, I do not think it is out of place here.

17th March '94

Detroit

Dear Sister

Got your package yesterday. Sorry that you send those stockings—I could have got some myself here. Glad that it shows your love. After all the satchel has become more than a thoroughly stuffed sausage. I do not know how to carry it along.

I have returned today to Mrs Bagley's as she was sorry that I would remain so long with Mr Palmer. Of course in Palmer's house there was real "good time" He is a real jovial heartwhole fellow, and likes "good time" a little too much and his "hot Scotch" But he is right along innocent and childlike in his simplicity.

He was very sorry that I came away but I could not help.

Here is a beautiful young girl I saw her twice I do not remember her name. So Brainy so beautiful so spiritual so unworldly. Lord bless her—She came this morning with Mrs. M'cDuvel and talked so beautifully and deep and spiritually—that I was quite astounded. She knows everything about the yogis and is herself much advanced in Practice!!

"Thy ways are beyond searching out" Lord bless her so innocent, holy and pure. This is the grandest recompence in my terribly toilsome, miserable life—the finding of holy happy faces like you from time to time The great Buddhist prayer is "I bow down to all holy men on earth" I feel the real meaning of this prayer whenever I see a face upon which the finger of the Lord has written in unmistakable letters "mine". May you all be happy blessed—good and pure as you are for ever and ever. May your feet never touch the mud and dirt of this terrible world. May you live and pass away like flowers as you are born is the constant prayer of your brother Vivekananda

But unfortunately such "holy and happy faces" were few and far between, and on the whole we cannot but look upon this lecture tour as an ordeal in which, as Sister Nivedita writes, using Swamiji's own words, "he was 'bowled along from place to place, being broken the while!' "

No doubt a question has been growing in the reader's mind as to why Swamiji underwent such suffering. I myself have wondered about the real meaning of this strange winter as well as of the period which followed, when, released from the clutches of the lecture bureau, he continued to tour the country. I cannot help but ask: Why did Swamiji undergo this ordeal? What did he think and feel during this time? What motives, conscious or unconscious, guided him, and how are we to interpret the significance of this itinerant period in relation to his mission as a whole? I imagine that the reader must have been asking himself similar questions, for, as far as I am able to discover, no clear or satisfactory answers to them have ever been set forth in the biographies.

One cannot forget that Swamiji was at the peak of his youth and vigor during these many months. They comprised the best time of his life, when his spiritual power was fully matured and his mental and physical energies were still fresh. And it was during these months that he gave of himself unstintingly until, by the end of 1894, his health was already declining and his best energy gone. This lecture-tour period, which extends from the time Swamiji first came to America until he settled in New York at the beginning of 1895, deserves, I believe, much more study than it has hitherto been given; for one cannot believe that Swamiji, "who was born on earth," as Sri Ramakrishna said, "to remove the miseries of mankind," gave the best of his youth and power without sufficient reason—a reason commensurate with his gigantic spiritual stature.

One can distinguish in the biographies three interpretations of Swamiji's activities during this period. First, it is said that he was preaching Vedanta to the West; second, that the primary object of the lecture tour was to clear the ground of much that was false and detrimental in American thought so that later on Vedantic philosophy might flourish in congenial soil; and third, that Swamiji's motive was primarily to obtain material help for India, and also to destroy the missionary-created prejudice against his country, which choked American generosity and stifled reason. Broadly speaking, all three interpretations have been woven together and considered sufficient explanation of Swamiji's tour. But studying this period I have felt, not only that all three interpretations, whether taken singly or as a whole, miss the mark, but that the first two are not even in accord with the facts.

When one tries to learn something of Swamiji's thought, not from what has been said of him, but from what he himself said and did, it is hard not to arrive at the conclusion that the idea of teaching Vedanta to the West did not fully evolve in his mind until the latter part of 1894. It was a complex and profound idea, involving an intimate and mature knowledge of the characteristics and needs of the Western mind. As Swamiji later conceived it, Vedanta was the one unifying force of all the diverse religious, philosophical and cultural outlooks of man. He made it the philosophy of all religions, the ultimate goal of science, the justification of all social, moral, psychic and philosophical efforts of man to realize his own glory, and he made it also the method by which that glory might be fully attained. Vedanta, as he conceived it, was India's saving gift to the world, and for this reason he pleaded with his countrymen to become strong in order to give, and to give in order to become strong. In the early part of Swamiji's American visit one does not find this conception of the function of Vedanta in the modern world fully worked out in Swamiji's mind and put into practical form. It was a development that required time.

Although Swamiji's mature conception of his mission was, of course, incipient in all his earlier activities, and although inevitably he taught some Vedanta, in all his lectures, simply because it was his nature to think in Vedantic terms, still we cannot read the concepts of 1895 into those of 1893 and 1894 without running headlong into complications.

For instance, even a cursory reading of Swamiji's letters during the first year of his stay in this country can leave no doubt that his conscious purpose in coming to America was to obtain material help for the masses of India, whose suffering he felt as only he could feel. "With a bleeding heart I have crossed half the world to this strange land, seeking help," he wrote in August 20, 1893. And again in March 1894 he said in his letter to Swami Ramakrishnananda, "I have come to America to earn money myself, and then return to my country and devote the rest of my days to the realization of this one aim of my life [the regeneration of India]." Again and again Swamiji made similar statements, and it does not appear to me that they are the statements of one concerned essentially with spreading Vedanta in the West. The intensity of Swamiji's desire to obtain American help for India can be gathered from the fact that he never gave up the hope of doing so. As late as April 1897, he wrote to Sarala Devi, a niece of Rabindranath Tagore: "My going to the West is yet uncertain; if I go, know that too will be for India. Where is the strength of men in this country? Where is the strength of money?" (It may be noted here that today, some fifty years later, Swamiji's dream of substantial material help from America to India is beginning to come true.)

Readers will remember that before Swamiji left for America in May 1893, he went to Hyderabad and there delivered his first public lecture. His subject was "My Mission to the West." It cannot be regretted enough that the biographers were able to obtain only one direct quotation from this lecture at a time when many who had heard it must still have been living. This single phrase, moreover, is, for unfathomable reasons, to be found only in the first edition of "The Life." The passage in which it is quoted reads as follows: "Finally he spoke of his Mission, '*which is nothing less than the regeneration of the Motherland,*' and he declared that he felt it an imperative duty to go out as a missionary from India to the farthest West, to reveal to the world the incomparable glory of the Vedas and the Vedanta."

Now I must confess to grave doubts as to the veracity of the indirect part of this quotation, which alone has been retained in the fourth and latest edition of "The Life."

If Swamiji had proclaimed his intention of teaching Vedanta so early in his mission, then why did he not mention it again for so long a time? It is true that he spoke of the philosophy of Hinduism at the Parliament of Religions, but from this it cannot be inferred that his intention in coming to this country was essentially to preach Vedanta.

On the contrary, the Parliament to him was incidental. After his return to India Swamiji said very clearly in his lecture, "My Plan of Campaign": "I travelled twelve years all over India, finding no way to work for my countrymen, and that is why I went to America. Most of you know that, who knew me then. Who cared about this Parliament of Religions? Here was my own flesh and blood sinking every day, and who cared for them? This was my first step." Again during an interview in India he explained, "My mission in America was not to the Parliament of Religions. That was only something by the way, it was only an opening, an opportunity." We know, moreover, that had it not been for the urging, the insistence, of Professor Wright, Swamiji would not have attended the Parliament at all. We know also that his first lectures in this country were not concerned with the preaching of Vedanta ("New Discoveries—I"). Indeed, nowhere during the first year of his visit in America does he speak of the imperative duty of revealing the glories of the Vedas and Vedanta to the West, and nowhere does he ask that his disciples and friends in India help spread spiritual knowledge outside of their country. Rather, again and again he emphasizes his mission as the regeneration of the Motherland by writing inspiring and fiery letters urging his disciples to dedicate themselves heart and soul to India alone—to her downtrodden, suffering millions. It is true that in a letter from America, dated December 28, 1893, he writes: "We will teach them [Americans] our spirituality, and assimilate what is best in their society." But for almost a year we do not again read of this idea, and although the thought may have occurred to Swamiji from time to time, it had obviously not yet taken deep root in his mind. Not until November 18, 1894, does he give any definite indication that he considered it a part of his mission to give India's spiritual treasures to the West in return for material aid. On that date, in his formal reply to the address which he had received from the citizens of Calcutta expressing their gratitude for the great services rendered by him in America to the cause of Hinduism he writes: "Give and take is the law, and if India wants to raise herself once more, it is absolutely necessary that she brings out her treasures and throws them broadcast among the nations of the earth, and in return be ready to receive what others have to give her. . . ." This letter may very well have been intended as a prod to the narrow isolationism of certain orthodox Hindus, but it nonetheless seems to mark the beginning of a new trend in Swamiji's thought.

After making a study of Swamiji's letters, interviews and lectures, I myself cannot but believe that throughout the last part of 1893 and almost all of 1894 he was not conscious of the broad and world-encompassing mission which he later knew to be his. It was only toward the end of 1894 and the beginning of 1895 that the fullness of the message began to take shape in his mind and that he settled down to consolidating it.

The second interpretation of Swamiji's activities following the Parliament comes from the pen of Swami Kripananda, more generally known as Leon Landsberg, one of the three people in America whom Swamiji initiated into sannyasa. In a dispatch to the *Brahmavadin,* Swami Kripananda wrote in regard to Swamiji's work: "Before even starting this great mission [of the teaching of Vedanta in the West], it was necessary to first perform the Herculean labour of cleansing this Augean stable of imposture, superstition and bigotry, a task sufficient to discourage the bravest heart, to dispirit the most powerful

will. But the Swami was not the man to be deterred by difficulties. Poor and friendless, with no other support than God and his love for mankind, he set patiently to work, determined not to give up until the message he had to deliver would reach the hearts of truth-seeking men and women."

Now, there is no gainsaying the fact that one result of Swamiji's lecture tour through America was to correct much that was erroneous in contemporary religious thought; but to interpret his activities prior to 1895 as a conscious and deliberate effort to prepare the American mind for the message of Vedanta would imply that Swamiji intended all along to remain in the West to deliver that message in its fully developed form. We know from his letters that this was not the case. As late as September 21, 1894, he wrote to India: "I hope soon to return to India. I have had enough of this country . . ." And again on November 15, 1894: "I am coming back after some months, and go on sowing the seeds of religion and progress from city to city [in India] as I was doing so long. . . ."

It would seem, then, that the only warranted interpretation of Swamiji's outer activities during 1893 and 1894 is the third and most obvious one. It appears very clear from all the evidence we have at hand that the uppermost, outward motives that guided him were (1) to raise funds for the propagation of his work in India and, incidentally, to provide for his self-support during his stay in this country, and (2) to combat the current misconceptions regarding India. With these correlated aims in mind, Swamiji joined a lecture bureau as the best means of carrying them out—*not* as the best means of teaching Vedanta philosophy to the Western world.

In other words, when we analyze the biographies in the light of history and untangle the motives which have been erroneously attributed to Swamiji from those that are in accord with his own statements and activities, we are left with the fact that an illumined soul of the greatest magnitude gave his best energies to the task of earning money for India, of explaining Hindu customs and religion to the American people, and of answering the questions asked, for the most part, by the ignorant, the bigoted and the dull. I, for myself, find that it is very difficult to accept this as a complete interpretation of the itinerant period of Swamiji's life in America. I cannot help but think that his biographers have overlooked the essential significance of his lecture tour.

In reading the lives of saints and sages, it has seemed clear to me that the activity of an illumined soul must necessarily be understood on two levels. There is, first, the outer activity which deals with the visible purposes of his life and which can be seen and comprehended by all in greater or lesser degree. But strenuous and inspired as such activity may be, it occupies only a part of the mind of an illumined soul. By far the larger and more potent part operates along channels hidden to our view. Indeed, it would seem that the very definition of such a soul lies in the fact that far beneath his surface mind are depths that are fully awake and fully absorbed in God. It is said that in its deepest levels the mind of a saint is so close to God that His effulgence forms, as it were, its very substance and texture. Surely that vast and silent part of Swamiji's mind which was at one with God, even while he was in the midst of the most "cyclonic" outer life, not only served to inform and illumine his surface mind, but had a function of its own which constituted the true and unique significance of his mission.

But strangely enough, this most important aspect of Swamiji's life has been given little importance in his biographies, and the chapters on his life in America have been so presented as to give the reader the impression that he was primarily a "man of action,"

a lecturer and writer—spiritually inspired, it is true, but first and foremost an *intellectual* genius. We do not see him as he must have been: continually in a transcendental state of consciousness, possessed of innumerable spiritual experiences of the highest order and, while undertaking the most rigorous of active lives, performing, on a deeper level, a service of incalculable value to the world.

But before attempting to discover in what that deeper activity consisted, I should first like to make clear that I do not mean to minimize the importance of Swamiji's external accomplishment. The biographers have understandably placed a great deal of emphasis upon his badly needed and magnificent vindication of India, his glowing and convincing oratory and his brilliant exposition of Hinduism in its various phases. All this was certainly the work of great genius and helped to establish India in the eyes of the world as a nation worthy of honor and respect. But I must confess that to Americans Swamiji's patriotism is not as important as it is to his own countrymen. And I believe that as time goes on and India forgets her past degradation and urgent need for national vindication in the eyes of the world, even she will see less glory in it. It would seem, therefore, a serious fault that the interpretation of his mission in this country has been so overweighted in the direction of its patriotic and intellectual aspects that its most important aspect—that which sprang from the depths of his being and which had unique and infinitely more lasting value—has been almost lost sight of.

It is interesting to note in this connection that the biographies of the other monastic disciples of Sri Ramakrishna are rich with accounts of their exalted spirituality and spiritual experiences, but not so that of Swamiji, although, as is well known, he was acknowledged by his Master and his brother monks to have been spiritually the greatest among them. The biographers themselves tell us this, but then, as though forgetting their own words, they seem to become bedazzled by the radiance of his external accomplishments to the neglect of all else. I am afraid that Swamiji has been done as ill service in this respect and that so one-sided a portrayal has left the way open to a great deal of misinterpretation.

For instance, some modern interpreters have carefully explained that Swamiji fulfilled the external aspect of Sri Ramakrishna's mission, while the vast legacy of spiritual power resided elsewhere! Again, one is shocked to read the following sentence in an essay on Sri Ramakrishna and Swami Vivekananda: "If he [Swamiji] had never visited Dakshineswar, he might well have become one of India's foremost politicians." Such evaluations are, I believe, the consequence of the failure on the part of Swamiji's biographers to emphasize strongly and consistently the fact that he was, according to Sri Ramakrishna himself, *nitya-siddha*, eternally perfect, and born to save the world. Surely, it was no accident that Swamiji visited Dakshineswar.

Other interpreters, taking Swamiji's activities during the lecture-tour period at their face value, have been led to remark that he could not have been receiving divine guidance at this time, for his mission was apparently of a temporal nature and was directed, moreover, by his own instincts and his own will. It has been suggested that, as far as his world mission is concerned, this early period was one of groping and of indecision and that, all in all, it was more human than divine.

Now, it would seem to me that the blame for this judgment must also be laid at the door of the biographers; for to criticize Swamiji as not having been divinely guided because at times he seemed to decide matters for himself is to miss the significance of his

spiritual stature. Not only was Swamiji divinely guided in the sense of receiving commands from God, but, if we are to believe the words of Sri Ramakrishna, he was himself *Ishwara-kalpa,* literally Godlike. Living as he did on the very borderland of the Absolute, his will was God's will, his every action the action of God. More than this, he was invested with the tremendous spiritual power of a world-teacher. For the full appreciation and understanding of Swamiji's life, particularly in America where he gave his best, these things must be brought into prominence, for only then can we understand what Swamiji was accomplishing during his long lecture tour.

As I see it, by its very nature the deep center of an illumined mind shines over the relative world, redeeming it and awakening it; and it was this activity, this shining forth in its full perfection and power, that Swamiji gave to America. The fact is that Swamiji's American devotees view him, not as an intellectual expounder of the Vedanta philosophy, but as the first great prophet sent to this country by God. Swamiji himself said that he did not lecture, he gave. Being what he was—a profoundly illumined soul whose heart cried for the suffering of all men—he inevitably poured out his blessings as the sun pours out its light. In and through everything he said and did, his profound calm and peace, his boundless compassion for all humanity and his ready ability to awaken spirituality in others—all these loomed large. And it was these things—not his patriotism nor his intellectual genius—that captured the heart of America.

Wherever Swamiji went, whatever his external activities, his mission was first and always to impart spirituality to whoever was able to receive it. Such was his very nature. Whether he was answering questions regarding India's customs, lecturing on Hinduism, or castigating the bigoted and hypocritical, whether he was attending social gatherings or making chance acquaintances on trains or in hotels, he was, under all circumstances, shedding spiritual light. Quite literally he planted the seeds of spirituality deep in the hearts of innumerable human beings, changing the course of their lives forever. So spontaneously and naturally did Swamiji do this, that it is possible he himself was not aware of it. But such unawareness has always characterized prophets and saviours—just as it characterizes the sun, which does not deliberate upon whether or not it shall shine.

It was during the period of the lecture tour that Swamiji came in contact with more people than at any other time; and if we accept the Hindu belief that every word of an illumined soul bears everlasting, beneficial fruit in the life of the hearer, then we cannot even begin to estimate the spiritual effect of that tour upon the life of America. How many hundreds and thousands received his rare blessings as he went about from city to city in the Midwest, South and East we can never know. Possibly even many of those who received them were at the time not conscious of it, for blessings often work in secret though inexorable ways. Thus, although the outer purpose of Swamiji's tour was to collect funds for India, to spread a true knowledge of her culture and religion and to combat the slander perpetrated against her, his deeper purpose was to fulfill the divine function of a prophet among the people of the Western world, mingling with as many as possible and blessing all. We in America believe that it was this which formed the true substance and inner strength of Swamiji's mission to the West, and we believe that America has been divinely favored.

Perhaps of all his interpreters, Swami Abhedananda, who knew Swamiji as he was in this country, came closest to the American evaluation of him when, in his lecture before the Vedanta Society of New York, on March 8, 1903, he said: "The preachers of truth

are very few, but their powers are felt by those who happen to come within the atmosphere of their divine personality. Such a preacher of truth occasionally appears like a gigantic comet above the horizon, dazzling the eyes and filling the hearts of ordinary mortals with wonder and admiration, and silently passes away into the invisible and unknown realms of the universe. The late Swami Vivekananda was one of those great comets who appeared in the spiritual firmament once perhaps after several centuries."

Yes, truly Swamiji was a great prophet sent by God to America. He was a prophet who prepared us to meet the modern age—an age which not only requires the philosophy of Vedanta to solve its many and complex problems, but which requires thousands of spiritually awakened people to put that philosophy into practice and make it a living force in the future history of the world. And since such a prophet can fulfill his function only by mingling with the people, blessing them through his very presence, it would seem strange had Swamiji *not* traveled here and there, enduring untold hardships and giving of himself without stint. Only thus could he transform and quicken the inner life of this nation; and this therefore is what he did.

It was only after having fulfilled this essential part of his prophetic mission that he settled down in New York to give it concrete intellectual form, to train disciples, to write books and to start a society. One might well say that during the first year of his American visit, Swamiji lit the fire of spirituality in innumerable hearts, and then, during the next year and a half, left a legacy of spiritual and philosophical knowledge by which those fires might be fed for centuries to come.

If I am right in thus interpreting Swamiji's activities during 1893-1894, then the reader will agree that this period forms the most, rather than the least, important part of his mission. It forms a positive and indispensable part of the function of a divine prophet, and I believe that unless we look in this light upon Swamiji and all that he did, we shall fail to understand the significance of his visit to this country. Indeed, we shall fail to understand Swamiji himself.

DOES VEDĀNTA ACCEPT EVOLUTION?

MĀYĀ II

By the Editor

Māyā, then, is both manifest and unmanifest, and the manifest has a meaning with reference to the senses only, even as the unmanifest to reason alone. In common parlance we use the term 'existence' with reference to things that appear to our senses; in that sense the unmanifest does not exist, it is trans-sensory. Philosophers have used 'existence' in various senses, a few limiting it to the unchangeable ground of all phenomena, in which last sense also Māyā is not existence, for it *includes* changes and it *is* change. In the integral vision, we have said, there is no change in the *avyakta,* the unmanifest; it is because the reasoning subject and the *avyakta,* the reasoned object, have become identified; time, the fourth dimension of the scientist's continuum, having been

reduced to one eternal present with reference to both the subject and the object.

While reasoning about the nature of the manifested things and their history and fate —in which process we ourselves, being manifested things, are included—we come to a continuum: (1) that appears as a ceaseless flux in the three-in-one emergences, when looked at individually, and (ii) that, as a whole, is one eternal presence from beyond the incipience to beyond the consummation.

When the reasoning subject ideally keeps itself aloof from the continuum the latter appears as an immeasurable, all-pervading, all-penetrating depth, in which the play of creation and destruction, with an interlude of maintenance, is being enacted in an infinitesimal part of it. When the subject returns to itself and reasons about its own nature, history, and fate, and remembering its previous conclusion, finds itself identified with the depth, the *vṛitti* (the reasoning function) has ceased in the engulfment, the fleeting time has been frozen to an eternal present, and the extensive space losing its objectivity, has been turned to (not the discursive but the ultimate) consciousness that it always has been.

So to the senses the continuum is manifested (*vyakta*); to reason, as an object, it is both manifest and unmanifest (*vyaktāvyakta*), and to pure reason, in the coalescence of the subject and object, it is an awareness unqualified, hence inexpressible, unmanifest (*avyakta*).

Of the three 'emergences'—mass, energy, and consciousness—*tamas, rajas,* and *sattva*— the first alone is directly perceptible to the senses, the second is generally, though not invariably, inferred from effects expressed in the other two, and the third is directly perceptible to itself and not to the senses, and in conjunction with the other two, which gives it the character of objectivity. The first, though directly present to the senses cannot rise to perception without the aid of the other two, for without the help of force or energy it cannot be brought into contact with the senses and except as an object in and of consciousness it cannot be experienced. It is for this reason that the ancients say that they are inseparable and are to be found everywhere in the manifested world. 'Emergences' being but modes, appearances, and effects, they exist in the cause, the unmanifest, which fact accounts for the name, *triguṇātmikā*. As the manifest or the manifested world, Māyā is (*tri-*)*guṇamayā* or constitutive of the *guṇas* or emergences; as the unmanifest primordial it is (*tri-*)*guṇāshrayā,* the ground of the *guṇas*. Nevertheless Māyā, whether as the effect or the cause, whether *tūlā* or *mūlā,* is *triguṇātmikā,* is constitutive of the three *guṇas,* inasmuch as it can only be grasped by reason or the senses as such. Without these ideas Māyā ceases to be, it is they that give it the character of objectivity.

We have seen, however, that there is no such thing as a separate ground of the manifest, it is one continuum, unbroken and unbreakable, that is the manifest and the unmanifest, transcendent and immanent. So the distinction between *guṇamayā* and *guṇāshrayā* is a convenient convention to characterize the apparent yet palpable difference between the manifest and the unmanifest. All the terms like, ground, locus, substratum, *āshraya* used in Vedānta are to be taken in the sense of rope (the locus) appearing as the snake, earth (the substratum) appearing as (the mode of) an earthen saucer, and not in the sense of a room (the container) holding a man (the contained), which are quite separate, the presence or absence of one having nothing to do with either of the other. This convention gives a sort of explanation to the apparent disparateness between the two groups or categories—an explanation holding good in the pragmatic (*vyavahārika*) plane.

So the manifested world is constituted by the three *guṇas,* and the unmanifest is the reasoned-out cause derived from these three data. This appears to be an imposing discovery, as if we have unravelled some mysteries of the universe, which however is not the fact. Nevertheless there is no reason for depression. All theories are like this.

They are no explanation of facts but convenient generalizations, which again are nothing but formulistic statements of facts.

We find that each of the emergences develops out of the others—consciousness (*sattva*) out of life, which is a force (*rajas*) and life out of the elements (*tamas*). Again, when we observe carefully these two kinds of development we are led to think that there is an underlying plan or purpose at the back, that they are not chance products, that there runs an inexorable invariability in them, all of which call for a consciousness whose precision, universality, foresight, etc. are so wonderful that human reason, the greatest wonder known to us, stands aghast in awe. When we throw ourselves back into that dim twilight of the earth's history and observe the development of life from the so-called lifeless elements in marshy places near the ocean in the shape of seeds and eggs growing into moving and non-moving living creatures, rising at last into full-grown men of the modern type with a still surprising future, we cannot but think that there is a conscious force or consciousness which is pulling the elements, arranging and assimilating them, giving them the required shapes and sizes, and endowing the organs, including the brain, with their precise and varied functions. Hence from this standpoint we see consciousness emerging out as force, and force as mass or matter. So the development is not a one-way but a multi-way traffic, from any one any other can emerge, but always subject to definite laws.

Emergence has an implication of abruptness and of a guaranty that it will not revert to the previous stage, both of which are false and bear no analysis. The appearance of suddenness is due to the fact that the process during a certain period was hidden—the chrysalis was slowly developing within the cocoon beyond the ken of human gaze, so the emergence of the butterfly from the caterpillar appears so sudden. The suddenness has at least an objective appearance though false; the guaranty, however, is purely subjective, born in the wishful thinking of man, who fondly hopes for a straight perpendicular progress with no fall or fading out.

If this is true, emergence has a pragmatic value and existence but no real significance or being. If the rise is no rise, has no stages, no direction, no goal, not even the surety of existence, what kind of emergence is it? The same holds good of the fall too. And if there is neither fall nor rise, if it is a process leading nowhere, staying at no time, what sort of a process is that? Continuum is the only word we can apply to it, and the integral vision is the only vision that is right. So these *guṇas* or emergences are merely appearances, and as appearances they exist with infinite degrees, qualities, quantities, and other modes of variety, which comprise our wonderful world of practical existence, *vyavahārika jagat*.

II

One term needs to be explained more explicitly than has been done so far—it is consciousness. The consciousness that is an emergence is somewhat different from the consciousness that runs throughout the manifest and the unmanifest world as its ground and substance, as the continuum. The consciousness that we are aware of in ourselves and in other higher living beings is dependent on the brain and the nervous system in such a way that any injury in one or other of the two or any part thereof brings about change or cessation of the consciousness. In lower creatures, however, in tiny, even microscopic beings, and in plant creation we do not find any nervous system as we understand by the phrase, still it is an undeniable observed fact that these creatures possess consciousness, according to which their lives are lived and adjusted. Whatever that may be, this consciousness is dependent on their physical bodies and is a rather late development, appearing and disappearing with them. There are extra-sensory perceptions too, which though not really dependent

on the sense-organs in the way we know, are yet not altogether independent of the physical bodies, for some sort of bodies, however fine, is necessary for the reception, holding together, and transmission, of the ideas. So whatever variety of this consciousness we may take, its dependence on the individual physical bodies cannot be overlooked—it is somewhere centred in these bodies, and as such there are innumerable things and ideas that are outside of it, though capable of being grasped by and incorporated in it.

This consciousness, though thus limited, is capable of being contracted and expanded from the minutest to the vastest. Yet one limitation it cannot transcend, viz. of being the subject, the knower, of the objects, the known. It may, in its intense rapport, identify itself with its object, tiny or vast, to the extent of forgetting its separate existence, but it will again come to its own and remember that state as its content and experience. It cannot shake off its subjectness permanently. After death what happens is anybody's guess. This consciousness is an awareness of a centre with an expanding and contracting circumference if it wills it swallows the entire known word; or it can settle itself on a pin-point, if it so desires.

It is always associated with life as we understand by the term. Associated with life it travels wherever it likes, knows whatever it wants to know.

Though the existence of a thing never precedes our knowledge of that thing, the consciousness never thinks itself to be the creator of the thing; its knowledge assumes the character of one that was existent. Its identification with an object of knowledge is acquired, laboured, and as such impermanent.

Whereas the other consciousness, the primordial one, is in every respect different from the emergent except in the character of awareness. It is an awareness without a beginning and an end, whose centre and circumference are one and all-extensive. and which feels itself all and everything and goes beyond. As such it is the creator-consciousness, and it extends to both the knower and the known; it is also the one in which there is no such distinction, not due to coalescence but by its very nature. Itself the uncreate, it is the creation and that where creation is not; it is the whole and the parts and every point of the parts and yet remains untransformed and unaffected by the passing off and transformation and affection of them, all and sundry.

As the whole and parts, and the rise, growth, decay, and subsidence thereof, it assumes the personal consciousness of two kinds: When identified with the whole, it assumes the creatorship; when with the parts, the individual beings, who feel themselves drawn by a whirlpool of ceaseless transformation. This primordial consciousness where even the urge and feeling of creatorship is not felt is the ultimate, a beyond to which is inconceivable; it is Shiva or Brahman. With the urge and feeling of the whole, it is the material and efficient cause of the manifest, the developing potential, the unmanifest consciousness holding the creation in its womb, the *Hiraṇya-garbha;* as the fully manifest, with a history and goal, it is the *Virāṭ;* and to the integral vision, the both together, is Māyā, or better named, the Mahā-māyā. Māyā is the continuum—both as the cause and the effect, the *guṇāshrayā* and the *guṇamayā*. And the consciousness in the *guṇamayā* Māyā, i.e. as effects, is the emergent consciousness, one of the three emergences, the subject-object consciousness. In reality it is the ultimate consciousness that, without undergoing any real transformation whatever, appears as the emergent consciousness. These appearances are what we call the *reals* as well as the *ideals,* which are entities in the scientific and pragmatic senses and non-entitles in the highest Advaitic sense, because of their having no fixed characteristics and of their inconstancy, the constancy in the ultimate analysis turning out to be that ultimate consciousness, Brahman.

III

So this continuum, unlike the scientist's, is the basic consciousness. What do we understand by consciousness? Being the ultimate, it cannot be defined, and its description will necessarily involve tautology. Nevertheless, with its own help, we can get admittance into itself. Because it is the ultimate it cannot be analysed. But through the analysis of its effects or modes we get a view of the source of all views.

Consciousness reveals itself in an awareness, in a sort of feeling of its own existence and of its content or object or an 'other' within or beside it. This besideness would however turn out to be, on a deeper analysis, within it but confronting a point that is also within it, the latter point being called the subject.

There is another revelation of consciousness, which, not being different from the above and resting absolutely on it, yet, in its expression and purpose, appears to be the other pole of it. It is termed 'will'. This 'will' is not dfferent from the 'awareness'; it is based on, sustained by, and withdrawn in, consciousness. Yet the 'awareness' has the smack of passivity, whereas 'will' is dynamic, rather it is dynamism. We can never conceive of will except as active—activity or dynamism is its essence. This awareness being all-inclusive and ultimate there is nothing outside of it. So it appears very strange that an all-passive entity can turn out to be, or appear as, all-active without losing its passive awareness. However unaccountable a phenomenon it might be, the fact cannot be gainsaid.

There is another factor to be noticed in this strangeness. The awareness has a subjective bias, while the will has an objective urge. The will turns towards the subject also; but then it does so by objectifying the subject. From this its invariable association with objects and from the fact that the all-inclusive awareness, being passive, cannot create or throw out or project objects, this will aspect of consciousness or consciousness as will may reasonably be taken as the creator of the entire objective world, which, including as it does the knowledge of the subject, comprises the subject also, though as the objectified subject. Thus we see this will is, in a sense, co-extensive with awareness, can never exist for a moment without it, but cannot at the same time remain without being associated, nay, identified with, an object. Will has its roots in a craving or an urge for an other with which it seeks identification.

Being the all-pervasing consciousness why and for what should there be a craving? Before answering this we may discuss whether there can be any awareness without something to be aware of. Even when there is apparently no object in a supreme awareness, if we try to observe carefully, we shall find the self itself or awareness itself as its object—awareness is self-awareness or awareness of the self or of awareness itself; otherwise it is not awareness. This is what is meant by knowledge being self-revealing. So in no consciousness can we get rid of an object. And if at any time there be a consciousness without an object and for the matter of that a subject, then the subject and the object can never come into being, there being no cause or even an occasion for bringing them into existence. As, however, we actually experience their existence now, they must be supposed to be existent from eternity. Thus we see awareness involves the subject-object relation. Individually viewed, there are infinite number of subjects and objects and therefore infinite relations. Integrally viewed there is but one subject and one object, and one relation, which are inseparable. Just as one subject may know, at the same time, a large number of objects by training and application of will, so by intensifying the same method it can know all the objects, or it can identify itself with the entire object world. There is no improbability in it, for the simple fact that before this apparent transformation of one subject-object into multiple subjects and objects, it was but one indi-

visible whole which has been kept up even in the multiple state, which is evident in the successful application of will. So in the ultimate coalescence of the subject and the object there is the deepest identification and rapport with all the bewildering multiplicities, one with other and all, and all with all and each.

This is what the Vedics call the *pralaya,* absolute coalescence. When, again, *sṛiṣṭi,* separation, which is creation, takes place or starts, the identification goes, the rapport breaks; the sense of fullness is changed into one of poverty, the sovereign is reduced to a pauper, so to say. This gives rise to cravings. Deep below each personality there is the eternal integrality, unbroken and unbreakable, and yet on the surface there is the fact of separation and nudity, which gives the poignancy to cravings. The sense of the lost otherness, so dearly held in embrace from all eternity leads man to search for the holy grail in the outer world, which, alas! is a grievous vanity, to be understood at long last only after a mad gasping running after. They say creation is due to loss of balance. This is the tragic unbalance that starts creation—re-union after separation, which is apparent, is sweeter than the joy of the original union.

Will and consciousness are therefore one inseparable entity, having no difference whatever, except an apparent bias—of the first for objectivity, which creating and enjoying multiplicity returns to the original position of losing itself in the subject; of the second for subjectivity which waiting patiently for and attracting the other potently and imperceptibly all the while embraces and coalesces with the long-lost beloved. This coalescence and separation, this concentration and expansion, this *yoga* and *vibhūti,* this involution and evolution is a sport that is being played eternally by consciousness and will, by *Shiva* and *Shakti,* remaining ever united with this much of bias in order to reveal the richness, which, but for the play, would have remained unexplored. This play, this progress and regress is, however, apparent in the sense that the continuum remains the continuum in the integral view, which is the right angle of vision.

The whole of it, the continuum and the apparent play, is Māyā, the *Tajjala* Brahman and the *Shyāma-shavala* Brahman of the *Chāndogya* Upaniṣad. The *Shvetāshvatara,* whose authority has been acknowledged by Vyāsa's *Brahma-Sūtras,* and since then by all the Vedics, is also in favour of accepting Māyā as not different from Brahman. Brahman creates, maintains, and destroys, not with the help of, nor being covered by, Māyā, but as Māyā itself, the power and the possessor of power being not different but identical. Had there been the slightest difference between Māyā and Brahman the main proposition of the Upaniṣads, viz. that knowing Brahman everything is known, that everything is Brahman, etc. would have been falsified. Māyā is not a separate entity, nor is it a non-entity but Brahman itself, only as the Manifold, both as the involute and as the evolute which in its totality, in its integrality, is eternally existing. Māyā is Brahman as Will, *icchāmayī,* the *sisrikṣā* and the *sṛiṣṭi* together. And Will, as we have seen, is the same as the basic Consciousness.

In spite of this there does exist a sort of difference, not in the entity itself but in the conception thereof. We cannot conceive of will without consciousness, though we can conceive of consciousness without will. Consciousness is more fundamental than will. Therefore in the search of the ultimate fundamental the journey ends in consciousness, which is *Nirguṇa* Brahman. Whether we start inward within our discursive consciousness or outward in the vast external world (*kaṁ khaṁ Brahma*) we come to this *Nirguṇa* Brahman, which is Shri Ramakrishna's 'journey's end', the *'ni'* (the highest pitch of the diatonic scale).

But that does not mean that Māyā is sublated; we cannot even say it is transformed as Brahman, even as we cannot say that an earthen vessel when reduced to powder is changed into earth, for that would

amount to saying that in the vessel state it was not earth, which is contrary to fact and reason. To admit the sublation of Māyā would be equivalent to admitting the sublation of Brahman in the Māyā state, which is dangerous. Nor can we say that Māyā is not, in which case, the Scripture, its Advaita, its *sādhana* (practice), salvation—everything will go overboard. Hence Māyā is Brahman, not less nor more by a jot or tittle. As long as the consciousness of separativeness lasts, Brahman appears as the playful Māyā, when it vanishes in *yoga*, in deepest concentration, which is the highest reach of consciousness, the same Māyā flashes as Brahman. *Yoga* and *Vibhūti*, however, being both eternal, the appearance of the Reality as Māyā and Brahman is also eternal. But what the Reality is in itself apart from human experience cannot be formulated in any language, which is only a vehicle of experience and has no jurisdiction beyond.

IV

This Māyā, beyond which our experience cannot go, appears, however, in two aspects in its manifested forms, as we might have noticed if we had followed the above carefully, viz. as the knowing subjects (*cinmayī*) and as the known and knowable objects (*jaḍā*). Viewed fractionally, i.e. as individual historical things and beings, as events and processes, we find the two phenomena of growth and decay in both subjects and objects. In the objective world the growth is indicated by the coming together of what are called the (five) elements and revealing to subjects, especially to man, in pleasing or displeasing sight, sound, smell, touch, or/and taste. Decay is the reverse process, when disintegration takes place. In the subjective world, the process though similar, is somewhat different, because of the peculiarity of knowledge, or consciousness. Here growth is an expansion of knowledge, ordinarily of objects, though not necessarily or even truly of them, but of the instruments of knowledge, especially of reason—of that kind of reason which leads to higher intuition, its culmination. The Western theory of evolution limits itself to growth alone and does not take into account decay; whereas the Indian theory, true to its tendency to integral vision, has accepted both as but one process of describing a complete circle of evolution, so to say, growth being its first semi-circle and decay the second part, the nadir being what is known as the *asti*-state and the zenith the *viparinamate*-state.

This growth and decay is an undeniable fact. That something evolves none can deny. But what does it come to? If the growth, whether in subjects or in objects is invariably followed by decay and completing the circle it reaches back the same point wherefrom it started, why should we call it a growth at all? Is it not a sort of dream, where creatures are born in all seriousness, kick up a row and then fade away in nothingness whence they came? Here also the growth is undeniable, the gravity is as great, and the culmination is as tragic; but the dreamer remains the same. There is growth, as decay; nobody can deny it. But whose growth? Who is benefited? Where is he? At what stage of this growth and decay can we find him? All these questions remain unanswered. Even from the standpoint of particulars we do not get one particular thing that evolves. It is but a continuous process that unfolds wonderful richness; and then slowly folding back the hood the serpent slips into the cave. Is it not funny to talk of evolution without an evolving as well as an evolved thing? The whole of evolution is absolutely momentary; nothing stays beyond the moment of its appearance. And during that particular moment the thing evolving is the same as the thing evolved—what an evolution!

Let us take an example. John is born. What is John? The protoplasmic drop, the baby, the boy, the youth, or the old man? To justify the use of the word 'John', we are to take the whole man, from the time of conception to that of his death. If that is the

truth can we say John has developed? Is it again true that the drop has developed into the youth or the old man? Nor can we say that the power in the drop has grown. It is all an unfoldment. Into what? From moment to moment the change goes on, ultimately to be reduced to we do not know what. At least it is not development. From the unknown to the unknown, from the unseen to the unseen, from the unthinkable to the unthinkable, is surely what we do not call evolution.

Yet evolution is a fact. When we make use of the word we understand what is meant by it. Only it is irrational. Man is proud of his intellect but flinches from following it. He purposely cuts off a portion from the continuum and gives it a form and a name, he purposely keeps his terms vague, he deliberately keeps himself and his things under observation at a particular distance (which again is his conception) and imparts forms to the observed and observable things; and what is ridiculous, he deliberately thinks himself to be permanent and yet admits progress and development in himself, little thinking that if progress be a fact his permanence must be a myth; but he would hug to both. He is surely the continuum's naughtiest pet. However irrational it might be, if we have to accept our world and ourselves as reals and not dreamy substances or myths, we have as well to make use of man's terms in his sense. Either we live and accept *evolution* and put forth our best energy to *evolve* an ever-improving culture and civilization or we keep quiet happily witnessing the world to grow wild, knowing that there is no growth and decay in the continuum, or if impatience seizes us, commit suicide. Both being foolish we are to play our parts, just as the bud unfolds its grace and beauty as the full-blown flower. The bud cannot but do it. There is a compulsion in the continuum, the Māyā, which none can resist, however irrational and otiose he might think it to be. Māyā is irrational both as a whole and in every part of it, and it is the beauty of Māyā that it reveals itself to be so.

Kālī is nude to the discerning eye; but is most gorgeously dressed in Her garb of evolution to others, including the poet and the artist, with never-ending upward and downward grades. Knowing the truth, let us play the part willingly and joyously.

VEDANTA AS A SCIENTIFIC METAPHYSICS

By Dr. Pravas Jivan Chaudhury

Science and Metaphysics

I

Science is said to imply a metaphysics. We must, however, determine the nature of this implication before working out its content, that is to say, we must make sure how far and in what manner science serves as a basis of our researches into the ultimate reality before we start them. Science does not imply a metaphysical principle in a strictly logical sense in which the premises of a deductive syllogism imply their conclusion. The conclusion follows from their premises so that it cannot be false if the latter are true, whereas a metaphysical principle like substance or causality does not follow in this manner from science, which employs these principles in its organization of experience. Science may be true without these principles being so. What science proves is that the phenomena it has studied so far could be organized if certain metaphysical principles

were granted in these cases and that they are quite compatible with the possibility, these principles being operative only in the restricted field of study and for the time being, and not elsewhere and for all times. These principles are not scientific in the sense that they are not derived from experience, for the obvious reason that experience cannot tell us anything of necessary and universal validity, such as, all events are caused. In other words, science presupposes these principles, which are not its findings; and what one can conclude from the fruitful employment of these by science is that they are methodological tools or operational concepts rather than logically necessary and categorical truths. Science at most informs us that some events are causal and it is quite possible and consistent with this information that other events not studied by science, are acausal, that is, casual.

Scientists, while 'sciencing', think as if these principles are universally valid in the world to make science possible. And so far as science may be truly held to be the model of our cognitive enterprise, these principles may also be treated as indispensable conditions of our knowledge. Though they are neither known self-evidentially or demonstratively like geometrical axioms or theorems, nor can they be derived from experience, yet as beliefs which must be entertained in order to make any sense of the world of sensible phenomena they have to be given some place in our knowledge and not waived aside as mere opinions or subjective preferences. Some regard these as self-evidential truths, some as mental determinations having no objective validity, while some others, following Kant, treat them as mental forms having an objective necessity about them derived from their being indispensable conditions of our knowledge. We reject the first of these views as superstitious and the last on the ground that the possibility of knowledge in every sphere of the sensible phenomena is not proved. As to the second view that the principles are a matter of mental habit (or even linguistics or speech forms as some hold), an anthropological fact having no metaphysical status, we have to ask how these habits (or forms) are related to the sensible facts organized under them and why they apply to the latter. Though there is no transcendental necessity of the kind a Kantian would have us to see through a transcendental reflection to be there behind the principles, yet some sort of necessity, that is, objectivity and universality, must be granted to them to distinguish them from our fancies and myths. The straightforward solution would be to regard them as methodological schemes or models, of which it is meaningless to ask whether they are true or false or whether they exist or not; and since they are framed to serve as scaffoldings for the data which are synthesized under them the question why they apply to the data does not arise. In other words they are postulates and we should speak of causality or substance not as we do of chairs or tables or of an empirical law such as 'copper is a good conductor'. The latter *are* there whereas the former are *as if* they are there. Strictly speaking even chairs and tables are constructs, the data which suggest them are sense-experiences. Reification occurs in their case and it is but a very short step from data to them and they are validated so frequently that they appear as 'verifacts' or physical objects. However, there is a difference between an empirical concept, as that of a chair or a table, and a categorical one, as that of causality or sobstance, Now the latter is like a model and even though it is found adequate it cannot be said to be true. It remains a tool or a convenient myth. If it is very convenient to imagine a gas as made up of small rigid balls in order to understand its behaviour, as the variations of its pressure with volume and temperature, it does not mean that these rigid balls actually exist in the gas.[1] The model is not a postulate of an existent and, so, not a directly verifiable thing like a planet or a *bacillus*.

[1] Of course whether the molecules are models or inferred entities is still a controversial subject, but that there are pure models, e.g. lines of force in electricity or waves in wave-mechanics, is admitted.

Causality as a necessary connection between the cause and the effect and substance as a permanent self-identical substratum of a thing are models constructed on the analogy of certain self-evidential characters of our self-consciousness where indeed we find causal efficiency and substantiality. We will and do and we continue to be the same persons in spite of our continual change. Now causality and substance, as principles of synthesis of outer experience are models framed on the analogy of causality and substance as they are actually given in our inner experience; as such they are neither true nor false in the ordinary sense, so that so far as they are derived from science they are not metaphysical principles which must be either true or false, but only models, more or less adequate mental schemes, to bring the sensible phenomena into order. As such they are not descriptive but prescriptive or suggestive having no existential claim. They are nevertheless not mere fictions, for though they are not replicas of any reality, they are analogous to some and they help picturing what is going on in the world. Of course, a particular manner of picturing the inner mechanism of the world may change with our mental development and research when new analogies may replace old ones; but so far as a particular picture is employed by a large community of thinkers in their understanding of the world, which cannot be viewed as a mere complex of sense-data in a phenomenalistic manner, this picture or model has a reality of some sort. It is not as real as chairs and tables but not as unreal as our passing fancies and such myths as mermaids and satyrs.

Some people think that science may be given a purely phenomenalistic interpretation, so that everything there might be expressed in terms of actual and possible sense-data and no such principles as substance and causality, nor any mechanical models, like micro-physical particles or ether waves need be employed. Thus substance is for them a permanent possibility of sensations and causality is but regular succession of these, and we might treat the mechanical models as auxiliary devices or mere vehicles for equations describing certain relations of sense-data. Now this positivistic programme has been possible in some sections of scientific research with respect to mechanical models but not with respect to the psychological ones. Science cannot conceive how there may coexist sensible qualities without *something* having them and how they may succeed one another without *something* remaining permanent and self-identical all along. Again, if we restrict ourselves to a language of sense-data we have to describe an unobserved cause of an observed effect as possible sense-data, that is, as what might have been observed if some one were to observe them under suitable conditions. But then we have to show how a possibility can account for an actuality. Moreover, to say that a chair is a collection of sense-data is not an adequate account of the chair, for what sense-data out of an infinitude of them that one might find about oneself constitute a chair cannot be exhaustively enumerated without the antecedent conception of the chair; and what collects or holds together these data has to be clarified. The category of substance cannot be dispensed with in giving an account of the chair or any physical object. With regard to causality the phenomenalistic rendering of it as succession according to some rule does not appear adequate, for in order to predict future events from the present ones, science has to believe, as a rational policy, in some sort of necessity in the succession on the basis of some laws.

Science certainly does not logically imply substance and causality, which are not scientific principles; but it is plain enough that it does believe in them. This broad metaphysical attitude is also seen from its general aim and method. Science believes in an outer world as an object for its study and causal efficiency. It wants to know and use the world which must be, therefore, something having various attributes which change as their conditions are altered. To know these conditions of change and to produce them to have desired changes in nature is the aim of science. Reliable understanding of nature such as science seeks

implies causal sequences in her; and our use of scientific knowledge to harness nature to our service implies the belief in the necessary connection of our implements with natural objects. Thus though science cannot demonstrate substance and causality, yet it can hardly outgrow its faith in them.

Here then is a situation that calls for philosophical reflection which will bring out and develop the implications of science to the full. What do the metaphysical beliefs of science signify? To express this significance is to lay down the outline of a metaphysics of science.

II

Some mistaken ways of going over from Science to Metaphysics

Before we proceed to draw the outline of the metaphysical background of science, we must clear the way by pointing out some of the mistakes that a philosopher of science commits in this rather slippery task. Some have straightway derived materialism from science because of the fact that science takes for granted the sense-experience and their mechanical interconnections. But this is over-simplification of the issue. For science also has to admit the mind of the scientist that relates facts with facts, invents hypotheses, and seeks to understand or make sense of the given sense-experiences. Moreover, in biology and psychology certain categories such as of self-regulation, reproduction, memory, anticipation, organization, etc. have to be introduced which are not mechanistic and cannot be interpreted on a materialistic basis. The behaviouristic psychology, which wants to do away with everything denied to observation, has proved unworkable and absurd in the face of facts of introspection; the physico-chemical method in biology fares no better. So science is not materialistic.

It cannot be shown to be idealistic either in the easy manner in which many people seek to do it. Some, following James Jeans and Arthur Eddington, argue that science has done away with matter which has been reduced to electricity or energy-waves. But a clear thinker will ask how this can be. If materiality or solidity be no reality but an appearance conjured up by electricity or energy-waves, what is the relation between the two? How can any appearance appear at all? And, then, how can science deny without self-contradiction the appearances or sensible qualities which form its data and which it relates and orders? Hence science cannot disprove matter.

Some say that the ultimate stuff of the world is thought or mind-stuff because science speaks in terms of mathematical formulae which are no things but thoughts. This too is false formalism, for the mathematical forms are correlates of some concrete contents or sensible variables which they subsume and not self-sufficient realities. The law implies an intelligent mind, the law-maker, but it implies also a material field of its application. So that a monistic idealism cannot be derived in this manner from science which appears to be dualistic.

Some idealistic philosophers of science derive an idealism from science by taking recourse to a causal theory of knowledge. An object is said to produce a sensation in the mind which, therefore, cannot speak of an extra-mental object but only of its ideas. This is an age-old fallacy, for the arguer assumes the external objects as the cause of the ideas. If, now, he denies the object and, so, the cause of the idea in his mind, he will be a phenomenalist. For he cannot possibly speak of the ideas as caused by his own mind as the subjective idealist does; this is absurd, inasmuch as his mind does not control the ideas which, moreover, have close agreement and correlation with other ideas in other minds. The hypothesis of a God causing them in this manner will be too far-fetched for him who does not entertain matter being the cause. Now if he is a phenomenalist believing in the self-sufficiency of ideas, philosophically it is not an impossible position but scientifically it is inadmissible. For, as we have shown, science requires a belief in substance behind the sensible appearances. And then to regard the ideas as independent of any mind is to

treat them as substantial or material, only now we have to admit that matter can be both created and destroyed in order to explain change in the sensible appearances. So a phenomenalistic interpretation also will not really suit science which ordinarily believes in the external world of objects or in physical reality. Science also believes in the mind, both individual and universal. The former because it cannot overlook the part played by the individual scientists in scientific research and, particularly, in the inventive part of it where experiments, hypotheses, and mathematical formulate have to be devised. The latter because it cannot forget the implications of the interpersonal communication in scientific enterprise and of the universality of the laws of nature.

Some new results of science have sometimes been used by some scientists to throw light on our metaphysical notions. But generally speaking, no result of science can alter any of our basic conceptions of the world. For science, as a method of enquiry, has to accept the latter and, then, no scientific result can have universal validity, the world of science being an open, and not a closed, system. Thus the principle of uncertainty in new quantum physics has been employed by some to discredit the causal principle. But this is a vain attempt in so far as the uncertainty principle applies only in the case of micro-physical entities and when applied in the case of macro-bodies, the principle will yield certainties in place of probabilities. Besides, science, both in its ordinary and experimental methods, including that which led to the discovery of the uncertainty principle, uses the principle of causality, and the limits of certainty with regard to a micro-body have been laid down with absolute precision; so that even if we admit this uncertainty as objective or in nature and not subjective or in us, we have to see how it cannot allow us to infer from it a universal loose-jointedness. Again to imagine, as many have done, that this principle ensures us our free will is to misconceive the whole situation. For, that our will is free is to be known either intuitively or inferentially from our feeling of freedom and of such moral sentiments as self-reproach and self-approbation. The reign of law in nature cannot lead us to imagine ourselves as determined, for we are not parts of nature, rather we are persons who know nature and its laws and act upon it. To argue that our acts have motives and these must have some further causes and, so, everything is predetermined, is again to think of ourselves after the pattern of a mechanical system. The mechanical analogy should not be used, for the mind is not a machine and, then, psychology so far has not found any indication of a mental determinism in the strict sense. We have certain laws of behaviour but we can at any time transcend them; and to have them is quite compatible with and, in fact, necessary for, our freedom, by which we do not mean absolute haphazardness or caprice, but intelligent behaviour. By freedom we mean self-determinism.

The principle of Relativity has been harnessed by some philosophers of science to undermine our faith in objectivity and universality of empirical facts. But this too is a wrong move. For what Relativity has shown is the relativity of the *measurements* with respect to reference-frames and not to our *minds,* and it seeks and finds objective laws of nature just as classical physics did. How can a physical theory speak of subjectivity of laws without self-contradiction? Then, how could Einstein speak of relativity of lengths and intervals of time in certain circumstances, viz. when the bodies concerned are at great distances and moving with enormous velocities, if he denied absolute lengths and times altogether? He had to accept the latter in the case of measurements undertaken in the immediate neighbourhood of the observer. Otherwise he would have got stuck in absolute scepticism. The theory of Relativity gives us knowledge of nature and, so, objective laws operating in nature. Though it shows that measurements made in different systems moving with different velocities with respect to one another, are different, it gives us

the laws by means of which one can tell from measurements made in one system those to be found in another. So that inter-subjective communication, which is the condition of any knowledge, is fulfilled by this theory. The transformation equations, the law of equivalence, the cosmological constant and cosmical time, which are some of the main features of the theory of Relativity, speak for the basic absolutism or objectivity admitted by any scientific theory. So the Relativity theory cannot serve the cause of idealism in the way it has generally been made to do.

Certain other results of science are used for philosophical reconstruction. For instance, from the second law of thermodynamics, viz. that the available heat energy in a system decreases, some conclude that the universe is heading towards a cold death, that is, a state of affairs where heat will be equally distributed all over the universe—the temperature becoming very low everyhere—and where there will be no exchange of heat anywhere. But this cosmological speculation is very risky, for the second law of thermodynamics is based on observations in the systems available in our world, while the universe at large is an open system and so is science in general. Again, the speculations about the expanding universe are weakly founded for similar reasons. The red-shift found in the spectral lines got on the analysis of the light from distant nebulae indicates that the latter are receding from our world at a tremendous speed, so that the universe may be expanding and all its matter was collected at a place some two thousand million years ago. But any such theory supposes the physical law of red-shift, viz. the Doppler Effect that connects the recession of a source of light with its increase in wave-length (i.e. change towards red), to hold equally throughout the whole space and time where it is applied. Actually the law is found to hold under certain limited conditions and one cannot say what new conditions occur when light is coming from distant nebulae for millions of years, so that such cosmological conjectures on the basis of some results of science are more exciting than enlightening. In any case they should not be made the starting point of far-reaching speculations such as the periodical birth and death of the world. No scientific law, so far discovered, can have a universal application, that is, validity over all space and time, and, therefore, philosophical significance in a strict sense. Observation and experiment carried on in a small part of the universe during a short stretch of time cannot yield us anything to warrant any universal judgement regarding the origin and nature of the universe, much less any proof of some metaphysical theory, either of an idealistic or materialistic type. Science in its results is thus philosophically neutral. But science in its methodological suppositions, however, as already pointed out, suggests a dualistic metaphysics.

(To be concluded)

'Brahman cannot be avoided, since it is everywhere. Brahman cannot be grasped, since it is transcendent. It cannot be contained since it contains all things. It is one without a second. In Brahman there is no diversity whatsoever'.

—*Vivekacūḍamaṇi*

WHAT IS MAN?

By Shri Jagdish Sahai

When we talk of man, we talk of that self-conscious being who is exclusively human, looks before and after, shares the joys and sorrows of his fellow beings, works for individual and common weal, and has a history and a destiny. Both man and his female counterpart, the woman, are such beings, and they jointly contribute to the progeniture of the human race. The human race is one though man's vanity in certain parts of the world would like to emphasize racial differences on the basis of physical and mental traits and cultural types. Leaving aside the superficial differences of colour of skin, there is no proof that groups of mankind differ in intelligence, temperament, or other innate mental characteristics, nor is there any evidence that race mixture produces biologically bad results. Given similar degrees of cultural opportunity to realize their potentialities, the average achievement of the members of each ethnic group is about the same, says a UNESCO report on the subject of race, signed by world's eminent biologists, geneticists, psychologists, sociologists, and anthropologists. So men and women everywhere are the same, no matter which part of the earth they inhabit. They may be under different stages of human evolution, that is a different matter. All the so-called racial problems, in the ultimate analysis, invariably turn out to be problems of culture contact. For the present it will be well to bear in mind that the word 'man' always refers to a human being who may be of either sex. Sex makes no difference in human qualities—the human type is a single species.

Man and the Cosmos

The cosmos is a conceptual universe—a universe which is the outcome of the materialization of cosmic concepts. Man himself is only a concept of the cosmos, a concept actualized in a field of consciousness. Words and concepts are mere signs in language. Concepts are representative and universal in character. 'Man', thus we see is a concept representing all mankind. Man does not belong to himself but to the whole, and cannot be imagined apart from the cosmos. Man is the central figure of the universe. Without man this universe can have neither meaning nor significance. The universe without man would reduce itself to zero, just as a stage without an actor would indicate nothing. Man's place in the cosmos is, therefore, supreme. Among the inhabitants of the earth, man alone is gifted with the capacity for conceptual thought. He thinks, he speaks, he writes, and thus communicates with his fellow beings, expressing his ideas and feelings about objects and events he observes and participates in. Man connects himself with the rest of the world in the form of ideas. His contacts with the external world and his reactions to its phenomena constitute his experience. Immediate experience is something concrete, something connected with my feelings and so I cannot part with it, but I can relate to others my experience in the form of an idea. I, as self, exist and the rest of the world exists for me through my experience. Though individual men and women are born into this world, undergo some experiences for a period, and then vanish with death, the universal man—the 'I' addressing individual—goes on for ever. Thus Man is part and parcel of the cosmos and lives eternally with it.

The most wonderful thing about man is that what is in the cosmos, the macrocosm, is summed up in man, the microcosm. Matter, energy, life, mind, and spirit that constitute the macrocosm are also found concentrated

in the microcosm. And yet it is the macrocosm that really governs the microcosm. 'All parts of the creation are linked together and interchange their influences. The balanced rhythm of the universe is rooted in reciprocity.' Every student of the much maligned and tabooed science of astrology knows that the apparent dualism of man on the one side and the stars and planets on the other is only a figment of man's imagination. In fact, man and the stars and planets are related to one another so intimately that they exist as a single system. Astrology studies man's response to planetary stimuli.

> 'The stars have no conscious benevolence or animosity; they merely send forth positive and negative radiations. Of themselves, these do not help or harm humanity, but offer a lawful channel for the outward operation of cause-effect equilibriums which each man has set into motion in the past . . . . A child is born on that day and at that hour when the celestial rays are in mathematical harmony with his individual Karma. His horoscope is a challenging portrait, revealing his unalterable past and its probable future results. But the natal chart can be rightly interpreted by men of intuitive wisdom: these are few. . . . The message boldly blazoned across the heavens at the moment of birth is not meant to emphasize fate—the result of past good and evil—but to arouse man's will to escape from his universal thraldom. What he has done, he can undo. None other than himself was the instigator of the causes of whatever effects are now prevalent in his life. He can overcome any limitation, because he created it by his own actions in the first place and because he has spiritual resources which are not subject to planetary pressure. . . . The wise man defeats his planets—which is to say, his past—by transferring his allegiance from the creation to the Creator. The more he realizes his unity with spirit, the less he can be dominated by matter. The soul is ever-free, it is deathless because birthless. It cannot be regimented by stars. Man, one by one, escapes from creation's prison of duality as he awakens to consciousness of his inseverable divine unity with the Creator.'

Whether or not the influence of the heavenly bodies can be accurately foretold, scientific experiments conducted in many countries have revealed that cosmic rays may directly affect the life of an individual from the moment of birth. Today scientists think that cosmic rays are responsible for hereditary changes in human beings. Atomic radiation can affect mutation—the hereditary upsets that make children different from their parents. The power, penetration, and speed of cosmic rays are of such intensity that they could well be the practical explanation of the 'occult' influences on human personality. Prof. Georges Lakhovsky, a Russian Electrobiologist, in his book *Le Grand Problem*, published in Paris, writes: 'It is not without reason that the sages of antiquity intuitively attached great importance to the position of the stars in the sky at the moment of birth.' According to him the gametes of the fertilized egg, which compose the chromosomes that determine hereditary characteristics, are attuned to a specific wave-length at the time of conception, and are capable of entering into resonance with the radiations of the same vibratory rate coming from another planet or star.

> 'Consequently the ultra-microscopic field of force constituted by the combinations of the gametes (in the fertilized egg) can enter into resonance with radiations coming from planets and stars having the same oscillatory character. This radiation could very well come from an individual who died ten, twenty, a hundred, a thousand or even a million years before on another celestial body, which harmonizes with the ultra-microscopic field of the gametes, and which animates the egg, communicating its aptitudes, qualities and intellectual faults to the newly formed being.
>
> 'The contact of the spermatozoa and ovum does not by itself produce fecundation immediately. It is indispensable for this fecundation to occur that at this moment a radiation materializes, coming from another planet and the union of the gametes, under such conditions, engenders a specific resonance with the rays coming from other celestial bodies.'

Thus a human being, from the moment of conception, is moulded by inpouring radiations from celestial bodies, and the destiny of a living organism is biologically sealed at birth. Modern scientists have as yet failed to produce life by merely combining matter and energy, and they cannot but accept a 'something'—Spirit, Soul, or Atman—which in combination with matter and energy results in life. 'Life is already involved in matter, and mind in life, because in essence matter is a form of veiled life, life a form of veiled consciousness.'

Evolution of Consciousness

The plan of nature is nothing but an

attempt to bring about a slow and steady unfoldment of consciousness. Man's consciousness is not the only one in creation. Consciousness functions in man, animal, tree, and stone in grades of descending order. Consciousness has evolved from the stone where it is most veiled up to man in whom it is comparatively less veiled. There is a progressive release of consciousness from the mineral kingdom to the kingdom of man. The researches of Sir J. C. Bose have revealed that the so-called inorganic matter does respond to stimulus. He has shown drugs to act on minerals as on plants and animals. In plants consciousness may be compared to a uni-dimensional linear consciousness. But in animals it has, two-dimensional consciousness. Instinct is the ruling factor here. The animal does everything by instinct—it gets its food, mates, procreates and rears, and multiplies its kind. The consciousness inherent in this instinct is further developed as the thinking faculty, reason, and intelligence in man.

> 'When a person sees a stone, consciousness as conditioned in man sees itself in a state of much more limited existence. There is something which is common to both. Cognizing the outer world is therefore not merely cognition but recognition. Thus between the mind which sees and matter that is seen there is no essential difference. . . . They are each forms of consciousness variously veiled and in different collocations. . . . Perception is an act of owning and there can be no owning when the subject is absolutely foreign. No rational theory of perception is possible without essential identity between the self and matter.'

Mind and matter are interrelated. Mind cannot see beyond itself. Even with the most highly developed mind, we are only able to have a three-dimensional view of space. In fact it is the mind with a three-dimensional limitation in consciousness which beholds a three-dimensional universe.

> 'The normal man at the present stage of evolution still identifies himself with this brain-centre of self-consciousness, and is hence restricted to the waking consciousness or consciousness working in the cerebro-spinal system, knowing himself as 'I' distinctly and consecutively on the physical plane, that is in the waking state. . . . The ordinary consciousness of a man is the consciousness working through the physical brain at a certain rate imposed by it, conditioned by all the conditions of that brain, limited by all its limitations, baulked by the varying obstructions it offers. . . . silenced by the decay of tissue.'

But it is not the stone that has evolved into the present man. It is the consciousness that has evolved from the stone to the plant, and from the plant to the animal, and from the animal to man. This has taken ages—an indefinitely long period of evolution.

> 'And yet the whole process unfolds under our very eyes. But we know it not. The entire past history of evolution of consciousness is summed up in the life of every individual between the moment of his conception in the mother's womb to his attainment of adult age. During the ante-natal existence, the consciousness is exceedingly dormant comparable to the first stages of evolution in the mineral kingdom. But the life of the re-incarnating ego that pulsates within, because of its past karma of countless births, incredibly quickens the evolutionary process with the result that ere it is born, it has passed the first stages and clamourously calls for nourishment and sustenance as soon as it is born. Thought functions but feebly in it and it has as yet no idea of the external world. It tries to grasp things near and far alike and stretches its hands to the ceiling to clasp the bright lamp that hangs there. Very soon it develops all the instincts of the animal. It crawls, walks and fights for all its wants. It is intensely selfish. It only knows its own wants. It is a young savage. It kills insects with no compunction. It does not think very much and reasons not. It is not aware of any moral laws. With the advance of years and with the emergence of the mind, everything becomes changed. The necessity of moral and social laws is brought home to him by his environment. In course of time he becomes an orderly being, not because of the outer compulsion but because of an inner necessity. This comes to him because man as a microcosm studies the macrocosm and its reflection in him. His thoughts, his reasoning, and his meditation tell him there is something beyond all appearances. With the urge of evolution, consciousness in man struggles for yet something beyond, for a further release and a lesser veiling.'

Awareness of the External World

It is obvious that among the animals man alone is intensely aware of the external world and the iuternal states of the mind. But this intensity of consciousness differs from man to man. It is not all men who are at all times fully aware of the external or internal states of life. It is only a rare few who are the most sensitive not only to their outer life but to the patterns of their thoughts, emotions, feelings, and ideas. The theory of evolution is, therefore, 'a story of the slow unfoldment of consciousness through more and more complicated and highly evolved equipments.' One continuous thread of life, of growth and develop-

ment, runs through all the manifestations of nature in terms of the varying grades of consciousness expressed from stone-life to man-life. In the stone-life there is mere expression of existence without any awareness or intelligence as such. A rock, for instance, is totally unaware of the external climatic conditions, of place, or the treatment it receives. As compared with mineral life there is a greater degree of awareness in the plant or vegetable life. Plants react to seasons and their corresponding climatic conditions. A plant is aware of the external conditions of humidity and the conditions of the soil. It dries up in the absence of moisture and becomes lively when water is supplied to it. Compared with the plant life a greater degree of consciousness is manifested in the animal kingdom.

> 'An animal not only reacts to the external circumstances; but seems to feel though blindly and perhaps only to a limited extent, the conditions of its own mind and intellect. The birds and animals seem to feel an instinctive responsibility for tending and nourishing their own babes. But in the vegetable kingdom the mother-plant has no sympathies at all with its own young seedlings thriving at the feet of the same tree. There seems to be a bitter competition in the vegetable kingdom, while in the animal kingdom, between the parent and the children, at least during their early days, there seems to be a great amount of consideration, sympathy, tolerance, and even love.'

The cosmic process itself establishes the unity of all life.

> 'Trees and plants feed upon the mineral content drawn from the earth. The soil is thus converted into vegetable and mineral matter,—a process of constant change, of continual flow urged by the directive power of the life-force. What is converted into vegetable and animal matter from the mineral contents of the soil is again associated into a living unity by the cohesive power of the life-stream, and assumes such forms as plants, animals and human beings. But when the cohesive principle of life breaks down, the living things are once again reduced to their rudimentary constituents. They decay and decompose into soil, water, air and other things. What we see as different objects in our experience are only one and the same thing manifesting itself in a protean variety of forms. In fact nothing new comes into existence nor does anything go out of existence. . . . The same force resides both inside and outside every object. It is this Divine force which brings into being the multitudinous forms of life, each growing in obedience to the inner law of its being and fostered by its peculiar environment and climatic conditions.'

It may be said, God sleeps in the stone, breathes in the plant, moves in the animal, and wakes up to individual consciousness and as self-consciousness in man.

The Individual and the Social Aspect of Man

There are grades of self-consciousness in man's life and differences of degree of self-consciousness amongst mankind. The function of self-consciousness may be the same in all men; but actually and as a historical fact it is realized in varying degrees by individual men and types of mankind. Thus attainment of self-consciousness is itself a matter of growth and development in individual life. While all may attain it to a certain degree, imperfection of attainment is not inconsistent with individual success or with the fulfilment of the final end of the supreme self-consciousness. Individual failures to rise to this supreme goal cannot imperil the security or the validity of the final end. Imperfections of a given individual in his society, therefore, do not destroy the stability and order of the general life of the community; his life is so supplemented by the lives of others that unity on the whole is maintained.

The end for man is one and by its very nature common to all individuals. Individuals, therefore, because realizing the same human end, each in his own case, necessarily live a common life. The community of life in this process is just as real as the variety of ways in which all seek their several interests in the one common end. Institutions are the concrete forms in which this community of end as such finds expression.

> 'The conception of a social will working itself out in the various forms of corporate social life, the family, the city, the church, etc., the conception of the general will as the basis of the state, framing, administering and executing the decrees of Government; the conception of property and of contract as fundamental forms of social mind, deriving their origin and ultimate sanction from the idea of the common good which a common will pursues—all these are direct consequences of the objectivity of social institutions as embodiment of the common human end.'

There is an essential unity of individual

and social mind. The social mind may well be spoken of as individual mind 'writ large'. The unity of an individual's moral life is summed up in the operations of his conscience which is the outcome of his social consciousness. In the social mind a common spirit actuates a community, calling for homogeneous social action and emphasizing the unity of social feeling and sentiment in individuals. Again in the individuals there is consciousness of moral laws, some vague, some clearly defined and steadily obeyed. Likewise the life of a community is maintained by a vague sense of order and also by the explicit formulations of and obedience to laws and decrees required to ensure the maintenance of an orderly unity of individuals.

> 'In the individual's moral life, habit and character are the conditions of moral security and continuity of effort; corresponding to this in the social life we have custom, routine and social automatism. The interrelation of ideas and purposes in the individual mind is of a piece with the inter-communication of personalities in the social mind. The sense of guilt and remorse in the individual has its parallel in social disapproval and punishment by the community. The moral disorder of the individual is regarded as identical in nature with social disorder in a community.'

Time and Man

Though the macrocosm governs the microcosm, man's place in the cosmos is of great importance. The only being in the visible universe who has the least idea of age, or of time, or of eternity and who can think about the future, is man. An infinite gulf separates man from the animal. All animals are slaves of their physiological functions, they are not free. What they will do is what they must do. But man has been accorded a liberty of choice. He is a unique mystery in the creation. Though his body may seem to have developed according to the Darwinian theory, his faculties are not accounted for by it. No monkey in the world gives evidence that he possesses them even in the most rudimentary form. Man alone can take note of time—measure it, master it, and rule its issues. He lives in yesterday, today, and tomorrow. Though he lives in the present his thoughts usually centre not on what he is, but on what he is going to be. Tomorrow creates fear, distress, hope, rest. Unlike the animal, he can plan to meet his needs. Sense of time, which is unique in man, makes human life a great adventure. It is always revealing something new about life. Time is man's great discoverer, instructor, preacher, teacher, and innovator. It does not crush the instinct of immortality, but nurtures and streugthens it. Time fashions and moulds man. Cosmic principles operate in time, and the world appears a permanent theatre of perpetual changes. Time is the eternal background of all changes. It is time that makes a lion behave like a jackal; it is time which may make the master serve the slave. All creations arise in time; there is nothing beyond time. God, the Absolute, alone is above it.

Though individual men and women are but mere drops in the ocean of humanity, man's importance in the scheme of life cannot be belittled on that score. While the earth and the stars have no will of their own, man has. He can resist almost every law of nature. But the earth and the stars have to obey the law of gravitation. It is an established law of science that no molecule of matter is allowed permanently to retain more energy than its fellows. But man does. His individual powers create the greatest diversities in society. Just as molecules are compelled to share their energies equally and fairly, so the only function time plays in man's terrestrial life is to adjust the results of his will. This earth of ours may, therefore, be called a time-school in which the faculties of man are developed, not annihilated.

Man and Woman

A feminine principle can be seen to be coexisting with the masculine in the general frame of the cosmos. Man and woman are the twin aspects of a human being dividing humanity into two halves. The dual nature of life—and its essential unity—is clearly demonstrated in the sex characteristics of man and woman. Functionally and biologically, as well as mentally and spiritually, each is complementary to

and provides the fulfilment of, the other, thus establishing perfect equality of status between the sexes. To talk of inferiority or superiority of the one over the other is sheer vanity. Each is great in his or her own place. Every man has his duty and every woman her place in the scheme of human life. Man's reverence for woman is based on this that women are mothers of the human race. The distinctive character of each more than emphasizes the need for keeping their respective roles mutually complementary in promoting human welfare. Men and women are not rivals, they are equal partners in the business of life. If man is the hero, woman is the heroine in the drama of mankind. 'The woman's cause is man's, they rise or sink together, dwarfed or God-like, bound or free.' The maternal instinct, the love of children, the desire for world peace, the gentle virtues of the hearth and home, give woman an abiding place in the scale of ideal humanity. There is no need for her to enter the arena of competition in business or the professions, to display her superiority.

> 'Woman must stand firm and be true to her own inner nature; to yield to the prevailing false conceptions of love is to abdicate her great God-given mission to keep human beings true to themselves, to keep them from doing violence to their inner nature, to help them to realise their potentialities for being loving and co-operative.'

Woman's dependence on male protection in combination with her sacrosanctity tends to render her an object of what eventually ripens into chivalry. Sexual purity, therefore, develops into a virtue of far-reaching influence on the character of men and women. The restraints of the virtuous life are only the restraints which any man must exercise who would be master of himself and would live a truly human life among his fellows. A man must be courageous, temperate, and just, because in no other way can he achieve his good or true happiness. 'The beauty of a woman lies in her delicacy—the beauty of a man in his valour; the grace of a woman lies in her sympathy—the grace of man in his strength; the sweetness of a woman lies in her purity—the sweetness of a man in his tenderness; but the goodness of both lies alike in the soul; and the spiritual requirements of each are ever and always the same.' Men often overlook the fact that woman in the abstract does not exist in society. She is there as a wife, a mother, a sister, or a daughter of someone. In each of these relations and other relations, near or distant, she is always deserving of the highest consideration calling forth the purest of love man is capable of. When mind is cleared of lust the difference between man and woman ceases to be.

But alas! women in the modern age have forgotten their true and natural role. They are further spoiling the cause of women by doing all that men do and which women are not supposed to imitate. Imagine a shaved woman in slacks, the lips heavily lip-sticked, and a cigar between lips. She looks a mimicry of womanhood and the negation of the female. She is incompetent with children and domestically irresponsible. She is a bundle of neurosis protected from the weather by a sticky integument of cosmetics. It is high time that women realize that God has not created them to entertain man, nor to be a toy or plaything to lure humanity to its doom. As mothers of the human race they have come into being only to nurse the civilization and to provide a cradle to virtue to bloom and blossom. The real cosmetics that a woman needs to keep herself ever beautiful are: 'For the lips Truth, for the mind Prayer, for the eyes Pity, for the hands Charity, for the figure Modesty, and for the heart Love.'

(To be concluded)

'I tell you one thing. If you want peace of mind, do not find fault with others. Rather see your own faults. Learn to make the whole world your own.'

—*The Holy Mother*

RAMAKRISHNA*

By Swami Pavitrananda

I feel so happy to talk to you this evening on Shri Ramakrishna. I can visualize, how today in India in many cities, towns, and villages will be celebrated the birthday of Shri Ramakrishna and how thousands of persons will participate in it. In Belur Math, the headquarters of the Ramakrishna Mission, where the relics of Shri Ramakrishna are kept, at least two hundred thonsand persons will come to pay homage to the greatest saint of the modern age. While I was in India I saw, on this occasion, twenty or twenty-five thousand persons would sit together, in several batches, and take meal or 'prasād' or holy food as they call in India, without distinction of caste, creed, or social position. His birthday will be celebrated also in different parts of the world with great feeling of devotion. Here in our Centre in New York, we had special meditation and worship in the morning of Thursday last, which was the real birthday, and today the subject of onr Sunday sermon was Shri Ramakrishna. In America we have 11 Vedanta Centres. In these Centres and the branch Centres the birthday of Shri Ramakrishna is considered an important day of the year. There is special worship on the actual birthday, and the public celebration is performed, as in India, on the following Sunday. What is extraordinary is that even here we find similar, if not more, devotion in at least some of the devotees as in India.

Shri Ramakrishna was born in a remote village in India in the year 1836. He belonged to a very poor Brahmin family. He had not even any school education. But what was there in him that his name is so much honoured, not only in India, but in so many parts of the world? And the number of his followers and devotees is constantly on the increase. It is difficult to name and count them. While I was coming to the States, when our boat touched the pier of New York, I had to appear before an Immigration Officer, who asked me what the number of the followers of Ramakrishna would be. I began to fumble for an answer. I could not give even an approximate number. Thousands of persons depend on the life, example, and message of Ramakrishna for their spiritual sustenance. I frankly told the officer of my difficulty to give him the idea of how widely has spread the message of Ramakrishna by any arithmetical figure. He evidently understood it.

What is the secret of the popularity of Ramakrishna, in an age, when many persons do not believe in religion or have lukewarm or merely formal interest in religion? Well, it is incorrect to say that people have no interest in religion. Religion is the constitutional necessity of a human being. Yearning for spiritual ideal is dormant in every man or woman. It longs for expression. It unconsciously strives for fulfilment. It is not manifest in most of the cases because the man or the woman concerned does not meet anyone who has a religious experience. So if anyone is found who talks of religion not as a Sunday sermon, not as a philosophical speculation, nor as a dead tradition, but as a first-hand experience, many listen with eager ears. Ramakrishna himself would say, 'If you have something to give of religion, people will come to you from a distance of thousands of miles. But if you have nothing to give, you will travel thousands of miles in vain to get people to hear you.' And he himself said with respect to the so-called preachers of religion, 'If one has the badge of commission from God to

* Broadcast by Swami Pavitrananda, Leader of the Vedanta Society of New York, on the occasion of the birthday of Shri Ramakrishna over the 'Voice of America' on Sunday 27 February to Far Eastern Countries.

teach, his words will tell like a thunderbolt. So much power will be in them that people will not be able to resist his message. So one should try first to realize God before one goes out to talk.' He would say very graphically that one tangibly gets commission from God to teach religion.

Ramakrishna got commission from God, or the Divine Mother, as he would say, to awaken the religious sense dormant in many hearts. He did this both by example and precepts.

Ramakrishna began life as a temple priest at Dakshineswar, six miles up the Ganges from Calcutta. He could not be persuaded to go to any school. He did not care for secular education, which was only a passport to worldly prosperity. He wanted that knowledge by which the ultimate problem of life was solved and the secret of nature could be unravelled. Opportunities came when he began to worship the Image of the Divine Mother at the temple. It was not a formal, routine worship with him. He began to think—and think vigorously—within himself whether the Image he was worshipping was simply a stone image or a living deity. This kind of thought grew more and more intense in him till life became literally unbearable with him. Man's extremities are God's opportunities. In life help always comes if we really feel helpless. Ramakrishna also had the first vision of the Divine Mother when he came to such a great crisis in his life. This realization of Ramakrishna might be called a very important event in the history of the modern world. For, here in this age of arid nihilism, prond scepticism, and complacent atheism, he showed that God was not dead, God was not non-existent, God was a reality. To Ramakrishna God was a greater reality than any material object we see or touch or feel. He made this exact statement several times. And such was the power of his spiritual experience that no one could resist the truth of that. Nay, in later years he helped many—amongst them some very sceptical persons—to have similar realizations. Scientists might look askance at this, psychologists may scratch their heads in bewilderment to explain this, but time showed that his was a genuine experience and not the creation of an imaginative mind. For from him—who was almost innocent of the three R's—flowed words of wisdom which poets and philosophers, scientists and divines drank in, in deep veneration. Not only that his words transformed many lives in his lifetime, but that his message in print or from mouth to mouth is doing the same—only in an infinitely greater degree. One illustration is this, that I am talking to you through the wires from such a great distance, on Ramakrishna.

Ramakrishna was not satisfied with only a single piece of realization. His first experience only whetted his yearning for more and more of that. The result was that he passed through the whole gamut of spiritual experience—from the ritualistic worship of dualism to the highest monistic experience when the worshipper and the worshipped become one—or in the Biblical expression, when one feels that 'I and my Father are one.' Spiritual experiences would come to him like torrents, for the mere asking, as it were. Yes, when the mind is pure, perfectly pure, whatever thought or desire comes to the mind, it is fulfilled, it becomes a reality. History has not recorded the case of anyone else who had so many, and so varied realizations.

But Ramakrishna was not content even with this. He prayed to his Divine Mother, that he would like to see how the followers of Christ and Muhammad worshipped the Object of their devotion. So he practised Islam, offered the devotion of his heart to Christ, and got the first-hand experience of the truths of these religions. The greatest contribution to the religious thought of the world by Ramakrishna is that from practical personal experience he showed that all religions were true, that they all led to the same goal. As water quenches one's thirst by whatever name you call it, English, French, Latin, or Greek, even so different religions are only different names of the same search for the ultimate Reality. By this unique message borne out by the spiritual experiment in the laboratory of his

life, Ramakrishna sounded the death-knell to all bigotry and fanaticism in the name of the greatest treasure of humanity—religion. The reasons why the message of Ramakrishna has such a tremendous appeal are, that it is free from any trace of narrowness and that it is based on personal experience.

Ramakrishna said, 'When flower blossoms, bees come from far and near.' It was so true in his own case. When he, the obscure, unknown priest of a temple, had the knowledge of the ultimate Reality and discovered the meaning of existence, people began to flock to him. And he was never weary of giving his message to anyone who sought or needed that. He once said, while he was on his death-bed and doctor forbade him to speak much, 'I am ready to sacrifice a thousand lives, if thereby I can do good to one single individual soul.'

There is a common belief or a standardized misconception that religion makes one selfish and self-centred. The life of any true saint proves how false that conception is. All saints were eager to help others once they had reached the goal of their lives. In the life of Ramakrishna also we find how extremely tender and sensitive he was to the sufferings of other. But the root cause of all suffering was, he stated, that man has forgotten God, man has become spiritually opaque; so man is groping in darkness.

When Ramakrishna passed away in the year 1886, his mantle fell on his chief disciple Swami Vivekananda, who along with eleven other disciples formed the monastic brotherhood known as the Ramakrishna Order. Swami Vivekananda, came to America in 1893 bearing the message of his Master and started the Vedanta movement in this country. Vedanta is the philosophical word for Hinduism. In consonance with the liberal spirit of Hinduism and the message of Ramakrishna, those who are working for the cause of Vedanta, do not make converts but try to make people spiritually better. Whereas the Vedanta movement in America and abroad is concerned only with the preaching work, its corresponding organization at home, the Ramakrishna Mission, is engaged in various philanthropic activities in addition to purely spiritual works.

The basic principle of all religions is, 'Love God and be compassionate to your fellow beings.' With reference to this Ramakrishna once remarked that compassionateness denotes an act of superiority on the part of those who seek to be compassionate; the correct attitude should be the spirit of worshipping God in man through service. Swami Vivekananda found a new revelation, as he said, in this statement of his Master and afterwards started the Ramakrishna Mission enjoining upon its members to do works of public good not merely from the standpoint of philanthropy but as a form of spiritual practice or a substitute for formal worship. Ramakrishna Mission, as many of you know, takes part in various kinds of activities, relief, medical, educational, publication, besides sending out workers abroad for preaching Vedanta. We need not here give you the details of the activities of the Ramakrishna Mission, but what we would like to point out is that out of the life and message of one individual who was born in an obscure village, who had nothing of those possessions which worldly people value, namely, wealth, learning, social position, and so on, Ramakrishna has become a power and an instrnment of doing tremendous good to people all over the world, and his influence is ever increasing. This fact itself indicates the power of the spirit over matter, the value of Idealism in comparison with Realism, the superiority of higher aspirations to gross worldly attitudes to life. From the example of Ramakrishna we can find a clue as to what should be the right ideal of civilization at a time when the world is drifting headlong to a state of chaos, and people are making blunders one after another.

Now, what are the main teachings of Shri Ramakrishna?

They are:

1. That the goal of human life is to realize God or the knowledge of the Self.

2. That all religions are but so many paths to the same goal.

3. That each individual is the image of

God. That to serve man is to serve God, but this service should be done in the proper spirit, that is, with reverence and in all humility.

May this message reach the hearts of a wider circle of people, may it make them better and richer in every respect.

NOTES AND COMMENTS

TO OUR READERS

With 'Vedanta as a Scientific Metaphysics' Dr. Pravas Jivan Chaudhury, M.A., M.Sc., P.R.S., D.Phil., has returned to his thesis adumbrated in the January issue. Tracing the presuppositions of science through what he calls a 'transcendental speculation', Dr. Chaudhury arrives at the Vedantic view, with a slight adjustment of the Kantian theory of knowledge. Readers will note an element of novelty in his interpretation of the *videha-mukti*, especially in its difference from the *Jīvan-mukti*. Shaṁkara's *Vyavahārika-dṛiṣṭi* and *Pāramārthika-dṛiṣṭi* too have received a modernist interpretation, and *Māyā-Līlā* a rational and, at the same time, poetic investiture. . .

'What is Man?' by Shri Jagdish Sahai, of the *Hindustan Times* is a nicely written thoughtful article. With congeries of quotations from astrology, biology, and other branches of knowledge the writer builds his 'man' up from the vast sleeping cosmos from whose bosom he gently rises, moves, and becomes aware of the world, moulds his own world, rears his family, society, and nation, degenerates and regenerates himself and the world in partnership with the cosmos. But Sahai's man is not all divine, his divinity too is the divinity of the common-sense philosophy. His man is 'not a pure soul all divine, nor simply a centre of abstract intelligence, but has senses as well to excite feelings. He has a real soul truly akin in nature to the Divinity that we call God; he has a mind essentially human, full of warmth, feeling, and interests: he has a physique belonging to the material world; and he has a comprehensive intellect—the father of all thought, of which all philosophies, sciences, arts, languages are but offsprings; and he possesses, above all, the senses, the gateways of all varieties of experience. Such is man on earth, and both science and philosophy have failed to take him fully into account.'

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE AT LAST

Reuter has done a great service to America by showing to the world what the people of America are thinking about their government's involvement in the Formosa Strait. It has quoted the opinions of a number of important papers and persons to show that they are strongly critical of the current foreign policy of the Secretary of State. Friends of America, who looked upon the people of this land as the real champions of liberty-loving nations, deplored what they considered to be giving a *carte blanche* to McCarthy, Knowland & Co. For months on end they did not hear a single voice raised against the policy that was slowly alienating the country's tested allies. It is a great relief to note that the people are feeling that the Chinese Nationalists 'are intent on involving the U.S.A. in a war on the "pretext provided by Peking's build-up for assault on Quemoy and Matsu".' *'The Christian Science Monitor* while emphasizing this view adds that "among the reasons is the fact that the U.S.A. cannot declare Peking as an aggressor—as it did in Korea where the Republic was set up under the U.N. auspices".' 'It seems improbable that the President will be won over by the "war party's line" but it offers the theory that Mr. Dulles possibly "hopes the use of war party as an instrument to scare the

U.S.S.R. into clamping down on China at least temporarily''.' . . . ''But this is the kind of devious thinking and bad bluffing which has gotten us into some messes as the present one''.' (*New Republic.*) ''The furore of the last few days is indicative of the strain to which the President is being subjected. This strain is likely to increase as along as the policy is allowed to drift and the danger is that the drift may ultimately leave the country with no alternative to war.'' (*Washington Post.*) Senator Hubert Humphrey, a Democrat on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee 'attacked the U.S. policy in the Far East and accused the Government of ''fumbling and faltering while the issue of peace and war is in the balance.'' He said President Eisenhower and the U.S. Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles owed it to the American people to find out where the allies of the U.S.A. stand ''before rushing headlong into conflict'' if the communists attack the coastal island of Quemoy and Matsu.'

While the above remarks are quite reassuring, influential Senators like Mr. Walter George, Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and Willian Knowland have prophesied about the rejection of a motion to prevent the U.S.A. getting involved in the defence of Quemoy and Matsu; and Knowland 'predicted that the proposal would be rejected ''overwhelmingly''.'

In the meantime alarming news of the Red build-up in the mainland opposite Formosa come pouring in in the U.S.A. Mr. Henry Suydam, State Department spokesman, dubbed the Formosa situation as ''highly tense and highly serious''.' 'Mr. Dulles conferred with President Eisenhower at his holiday retreat in Augusta, Georgia' as a result of which Adm. Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs-of-staff and Mr. Robertson, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs were sent to Formosa. Speculations on both war and peace are rife. Chiang Kai-shek has no dearth of white advisers to teach him to grow stiff. Let us see if he hears the friendly advice of Adm. Radford and Mr. Robertson.

They are reported to have been successful in their mission; and the signs are visible, which raise hopes in human hearts.

REVIEWS AND NOTICES

GOD AND THE UNIVERSE. By Holger Christian Langmark. *Published by Philosophical Library, 15 East 40th Street, New York 16, N.Y., U.S.A. Pages 186. Price $ 4.75.*

This is a queer book. The author has many things in his mind: to express a theological cosmology through mathematical symbols and diagrams which will take the reader's breath away and puzzle him instead of illuminating; to expound a metaphysic as a commentary on some Biblical passages, thereby to help the metaphysic and the Bible with each other; to unite the Jews and the Christians, apparently forgetting other religionists and religions, —yet talking of the world and humanity as a whole; and lastly to vilify and declare 'war' against the Communists in the name of Christianity and the United Nations. We are afraid very few Christians or members of the United Nations, will concur with the author. It is a very dogmatic and somewhat 'unsound' expression of views, presented in a pseudo-scientific garb. The author would have done well if he had contained himself within his cosmological theory, which is quite an original and sensible theory divested of its mathematical garb. To quote two purple heroics (out of many such) from the book: 'Nations, suppressed by bandit governments, must be arrested by military force. . . . No, a criminal, whether an individual or a gang, a nation or the devil himself, must be dealt with by force in order to disarm them'. 'Then the Temple shall be rebuilt by Jews and Christians united' (Nowhere does the author mention other religious groups). Reading such passages one is reminded of Matthew Arnold's famous distinction between Hebraism and Hellenism, between a secular dogmatism and 'sweetness and light'. The author

writes in a Hebraic style which is not in keeping with the best and modern Western tradition which is open and sensitive.

DR. P. J. CHAUDHURY

THE BOOK OF SIGNS. BY G. H. MEES, M.A. (Cantab), LL.D. (Leyden). *Published by N. Kluwer, Deventer, Netherlands. Available from Luzac & Co., 46, Great Russell St., London. Pp. 407 & Supplement.*

This work is the first book of the Revelations in the Wilderness, which has been projected by the author. It is claimed to be an exposition of traditional psychology, which includes in a sense the entire tradition of the world. The tradition to which Dr. Mees refers and recalls to the modern mind is something that is the common spiritual heritage of man. It cannot be arrived at except by the search for the depths of the Spirit which comes to one who has left his worldliness behind and has proceeded to that wilderness in which alone the inspiration arises and illumines one's interior. As Paul Richard once wrote, 'If thou dost not go to the desert, the desert will come to thee'. One knows one's true proportion in such situations and environment.

How the book came to be written is briefly stated by the author in his supplement to the volume under review. It was written, thanks to the inspiration given to him by the saint of Tiruvannamalai, Maharshi Ramana. His own sanctuary at Varkala in Travancore-Cochin State gave him the environment for the production of this work. It is indeed a work of great synthesis and has included quite a vast amount of material drawn from the great spiritual literatures of the world. In a sense it can be said to be a very suggestive piece of interpretation of the fundamental concepts and symbols of eternal significance. The need for the salvaging of man is urgent, thanks to the seriousness of the problems that confront us. Humanity needs unity; and science and psychology have both been at work to make it possible. But the surface psychology or even the analytical psychology of the psycho-analysts cannot do the work unless we enter into much deeper levels of consciousness which are the true springs of unity and difference. The range of cultures runs from the most primitive to the most advanced. But through all these runs a thread of continuity; symbolisms persist more or less modified or distorted or inverted which give the clue to the original elemental eternal pattern of the force that keeps the unity of the human personality everywhere. Thus 'humauity has a treasure-house with many rooms, full of monuments, images and scriptures, containing teachings in the language of symbols, and further rituals, ceremonies, and customs; and orally transmitted traditions to draw upon.' (p. 7.) That traditional psychology has its own dictionary is another point stressed.

It is well known that the deliverances of the inner psychic depths to the surface-consciousness undergo large modifications which, however, have correspondential qualities which suggest each other in different levels. Thus we have manifold significance of words, and the manifoldness is a *real* identity or principle of identification and causal continuity as between the different levels. Dr. Mees emphasizes this aspect of our language which truly represents the culture and psychology of a people. However, it must be pointed out that there is always a great danger in exaggerating the 'suggestiveness' and 'indefiniteness' of words at the expense of the definiteness and directness of the same. (p. 19.) It is suggested that Sanskrit is the most rich in its *'dhvani'*, understood in its correspondential sense rather than in its mere capacity to stimulate associational fantasy. Thus there is a legitimate function of the traditional psychology to take into consideration the psychological dictionary. It is indeed a desideratum, but so far such a perfect dictionary has yet to be framed by each seeker after the goal. We have indeed quite different types of imaginal dictionaries where the same sounds do not mean the same things even at the level of intuition and revelation, as in the *tantra-shāstra*. Thus it is that we have to be rather wary in accepting any one system of interpretation. After all we are yet groping in the dark.

It is however gratifying to find that the task has been undertaken with a particular purpose of discovering the synthesis which would register the harmony in the soul and in the transactions between men. The work is of course written acknowledgedly with a feeling that it expresses correctly the outlook and teachings of the psychological traditions of humanity and not any personal theory. (p. 15.) This is a large claim and yet we could perhaps with justice say that this is but one of the phases or aspects of that traditional psychology, one of the many possible ones at best. This claim however is modest in another sense. Rightly it can be said that ultimately, however subtle the intellectual workings and the correlations and correspondences, the large part of traditional psychology appeals to the psyche within and this psychic part of man is common to humanity. It is because it is so that every one seems to understand and know what he does not intellectually understand and know. 'Traditional psychology is meant for everyone and only ordinary intelligence is required for profiting from its more fundamental teachings.'

The Book of Signs begins with the consideration of the symbolism inherent in the Astronomical zodiacal signs and the planets. The entire work is

devoted to the interpretation of the signs of the Zodiac. Firstly however he considers that the most fundamental symbolism 'is that of the Four Elements of Manifestation': the elements earth, water, fire, and air are the lowest of the seven, which includes ether (*ākāsha*), the Moon and the Sun, as the upper three. The animal and other types of symbolism are also considered. So too the symbolism of the starry heavens or the Zodiac is carefully expounded. The attributes of God are also symbolized in every religion. The interpretation on p. 31 of the five symbols of Viṣṇu is not the only one given by the teachers.

Again 'Nārāyaṇa' does not mean 'son of man' or 'something like that.' (p. 32) Dr. Mees considers the symbolisms underlying desire and fall, virgin birth and the beginning of the spiritual path, dilaceration of man, war and battle, silence and voice and word. The Vision of the Universe-form (Vishvarūpa) implies insight into the basic unity and linking of the great traditions of the world—all are members of the One tradition-body of God. The *Gītā's* vision is explained with a correct accent. The symbolism of the Chariot, the Car, and the wain (p. 79) illustrates the truth that the 'physical body is the vehicle of the soul and that the soul is the vehicle of the Self-God-Reality', a view which is substantially the vision of Sri Ramanuja who claimed for it an eternal tradition. The miscellaneous symbolisms have arisen on the five elements. The corresponding spheres and zodiacal signs symbolized by the symbols of the one yield quite a suggestive integration and unity of the entire cosmos of interpenetrating character. The forces of ascent as well as descent, of rise and fall, and the division of the stellar spheres and spaces between the titans and the Gods, the powers of higher light and the powers of descending darkness are seen to have a correspondential reality and every thing in this world shares the twofold division. The richness of contemporaneous traditions is fully canvassed by Dr. Mees and every level of existence is correlated with corresponding levels in the plant, animal, mental, and supramental worlds so to speak. Rightly we can see that the modern mind which has forgotten this knowledge will be astounded. 'But there is nothing new in the world of tradition though its expression in form changes with the character of the times.' (p. 161.) They are all based on older traditions and claim no novelty. Always the curve of life went from the golden age of spirituality to the siiver age of chivalry, to the copper age of utility and the iron age of materialism. This is also a great traditional truth of the process. Thus the slaying the Medusa, the spirit of materialism, by Perseus is the symbol of the triumph of spiritual life. The interpretation of this legend is given. (pp. 163-169.) The true theology is neither monotheistic nor pure pantheistic or polytheistic. The conception of kathenotheism is 'the encounter and worship of God in his single aspect as including and symbolizing all other aspects also in agreement with the psychological situation at a particular moment or in accordance with a particular stage of the path' (p. 185.) This is undoubtedly a plausible one as we can reconcile the various conceptions of God, who is one only, with the practical and psychological needs which apprehend and appeal to a particular aspect of the Godhead.

It remains true that tradition has to be recovered slowly and in the depths of oneself which is unconscious of its own immortal eternal history. Tradition remembers these disconnected portions of one's eternal history for it is something that is one continuous history of the spirit both in its essence and existence, change and changelessness. In the proper understanding of the symbols of life, death, spirit, and so on we have a complete gain into the mystery of being which does not refute but is reflected by the mystery of becoming or manifestation. It is conceded again and again that the links between the several Vedas or traditions are often bewildering in nature (p. 237.) We know as a matter of fact that Mr. Narayan Aiyangar in his *Mythology* almost entirely interpreted the whole literature as a dialectic of the trinity—Father, son, and the Mother or Holy Ghost, or the Sun-Moon dialectic. There is enough indeed to divert us in this manner, but a single solution is beyond the range of the interpretation. Here the author very luminously suggests several correlations and seeks to reduce it to the astronomical zodiacal conception of the *Devayāna* and the *Pitṛiyāna* or the movement from the Leo-Cancer to the Capricorn in descent and Aquarius to Leo-Cancer in ascent. Saturn-Uranus, who are respectively owners of Capricorn and Aquarius, are son and father in Greek Mythology. Uranus and Sun are in one sense opposites even as Saturn and Moon are. The author ingeniously explains the significance of the Symbolisms of the Horse, the ten plagues of Egypt, and the correspondence with the Zodiacal Year. The year seems to have begun at different months in different traditions, as we know the *Devayāna* begins with Capricorn; those who follow the *Piṭriyāna* with Cancer; with some others it begins with the Aries, which is the centre of the Zodiac on the Northern route and the house of exaltation of the Sun. With some the month of Leo starts the year. Each of this is bound up with a specific symbolism regarding the fundamental celestial bodies, Sun, Saturn, and Moon. But the Zodiac is itself being interpreted as a celestial record of the spiritual evolution. Indeed the correspondence established between the parts of body and the Zodiacal houses is an important *adhyātma* development. It is but

a stage to the identification of the plexuses and *cakras* with the powers of the planets and owners of houses. The interpretation of the *siddhis* is again a close correspondential matter.

Dr. Mees omits nothing that is important and suggestive in this regard. Thus he points out the integration of the symbolisms of the sacred mountain in all traditions. The ten commandments are correlated with the characteristics of the zodiacal houses Aries to Capricorn, and profuse occult interpretations are given from the New Testament. After the initiation in Capricorn one passes on to the Eternal Now of Aquarius (identified earlier as the abode of the Eternal) and Pisces is the house of the next cycle in which the tradition is revealed by the guru for the benefit of the cycle to come. But it is recognized that the upper movement does not happen in all cases but due to *karma* and *avidyā* and *guṇa*, men reverse the path and enter the downward path of temptation. The last sections of the book refer to the symbolisms of Karma and symbolism of the ancestors, and the meaning of the psychical centres known as *cakras*. The last sections deal with the Genesis and the days of the week, the Jewish symbolism of the Zodiac and the symbolism regarding the periods of life.

In a work of this kind one cannot expect to be given the clear picture of the integration of the several levels of consciousness, of existence and experience and of that which comes from several planes and climates of tradition. However it is a very stupendous undertaking revealing great energy of purpose. It is difficult also to criticize or comment on any one interpretation for in a sense all interpretations proceeding from the multiple multitudinous levels cannot be brought to the bar of intellectual coherence and consistency.

DR. K. C. VARADACHARI

SOMNATH THE SHRINE ETERNAL. By K. M. MUNSHI. *Published by Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Chaupatty, Bombay. Pages xvix + 150. Price Rs. 1-12.*

The shrine of Somanatha or Shiva, situated in Prabhasa Patan or Devapattana, on the southern coast of Saurashtra, was traditionally a sacred place even in the days of the *Mahābhārata*. The place has also acquired an additional sanctity as enshrining the *Dehotsarga* or the hallowed spot, (nearly a mile north-west of the temple) where Shri Kṛiṣṇa gave up his body. For centuries the shrine and its environs were beloved of India. It was sacred not merely to the Hindus; pilgrims of other faiths are referred to in old chronicles as visiting it. The history of the temple's destruction and resurrection during the past thousand years is an epitome of the chequered history of the Indian sub-continent.

The destruction and looting of the shrine by successive waves of Muslim iconoclasts beginning with Mahmud of Ghazni in 1025 A.D., the history of the political conditions of the Hindu kingdoms of the period which succumbed to the onslaughts after heroic defence and sacrifice, and the almost miraculous restoration of the temple no less than five times after each wave of onslaught—these form the inspiring theme of Shri Munshi's book. The panoramic survey of the historical and archaeological traditions of the temple, together with original observations and conclusions regarding some obscure historical data, from the versatile pen of Shri K. M. Munshi (Parts I and II), are followed by the 'History of Excavations' (Part III) conducted at the site, by Shri B. K. Thapar of the Archaeological Department. The concluding section presents what the contemporary Muslim chroniclers have said about the temple, and the translation of ancient inscriptions discovered at the site. The story of the reconstruction of the temple, shortly after India regained freedom, is vividly narrated in chapters XVI to XXI of Part I. The book, which is in its second edition, was issued on the occasion of the installation of Somanatha in the reconstructed shrine in 1951. It awakens glorious visions of a forgotten yet vital period of Indian culture and civilization.

THE OCCULT TRAINING OF THE HINDUS. By ERNEST WOOD. *Published by Ganesh & Co., (Madras), Ltd., Madras 17. Pages 128. Price Rs. 4.*

This work purports to present an outline of the Yoga systems of spiritual discipline. The word 'occult', by which the author means Yoga, is a confusing term, as it does not connote the richness and profound spiritual content of Yogic disciplines. Yoga is divided here into seven kinds—three kinds of Rāja-Yoga and four kinds of Hatha-Yoga, the classification and selection being his own. Under Rāja-Yoga have been grouped the Yogas of Patañjali, Karma-Yoga of the *Gītā*, and Jñāna-Yoga. The confusion regarding the classification is heightened by clubbing together Hatha-Yoga, Laya-Yoga, Bhakti-Yoga, and Mantra-Yoga under the second category of 'Hatha-Yoga'. This classification is not sanctioned by tradition. The author's total lack of contact with living Hinduism is further evidenced by his observation that 'the three Rāja-Yogas may be practised up to quite an advanced point without danger . . . without the presence of a personal teacher, but merely with the aid of suitable books.' All Yogas demand the expert guidance of a spiritual preceptor, especially so in the case of the Rāja-Yoga. While theoretical understanding can be had from authoritative books, the details of their practical application in daily life are to be learnt only from a Guru. The book is likely to mislead many an aspirant to spiritual life.

YOGA-SŪTRAS OF PATANJALI. By Dr. J. R. Ballantyne and Govinda Shastri Deva. *Published by Sushil Gupta (India) Ltd., 35, Central Avenue, Calcutta 12. Pp. 157. Price Rs. 3.*

Yoga principles were first collected and codified by Patanjali, about the second century B.C. Afterwards Vyāsa wrote a commentary to make Patanjali's meaning clear; and all subsequent writers on yoga gave their interpretations mainly on the basis of Vyāsa. Vācaspati, Vijñana Bhikṣu, and Nāgoji Bhaṭṭa may be mentioned as the most important workers in this line. Bhojarāja of the later part of the eleventh century also wrote a commentary. But he depended mainly not on the Vyāsa Bhāṣya, but rather on the Pātanjala-*sūtras* themselves. Moreover, Bhojarāja was a believer in action and performance. Accordingly his interpretation of yoga clearly manifests a much greater emphasis on practice rather than on the academic analysis of the subject. Thus Bhojarāja's work, known as *Rājamārtaṇḍa*, may be of special interest to many; and the volume under review, being a translation both of the *Yoga-Sūtras* and the *Rājamārtaṇḍa*, will be welcome by those who cannot go through the original in Sanskrit.

We are, however, sorry to think that all serious students of yoga may not agree with the learned authors in translating some of the important terms in the way they have done. *'Citta'*, for example has been translated as the thinking principle (I.2). But *'citta'* is the ultimate basis of all psychological principles; and surely cannot be identified with thinking, which is only one aspect of the whole. We think it would be better if the technical terms were retained in their original in translating the *sūtras*. Moreover, being too literal a translation, the present volume does not seem to be as much simple and clear in its style and expression as would be expected A translation, again, of any serious work needs an introduction as to the author, the subject-matter, and such other important things. But the present authors do not give any such introduction. This is likely to cause a real difficulty to those who are not very much familiar with the whole literature of the Yoga philosophy. But, nevertheless, the authors and the publishers must be thanked for their co-operative effort to bring out a book on such a serious subject that should no longer be neglected by any student of the science of man.

Anil Kumar Banerjee

BENGALI

GITĀ-SĀRA-SANGRAHA. By Swami Premeshananda. *Published by Ramakrishna Mission, Shillong, Assam. Pages 123. Price Rs. 1-4.*

The *Bhagavad Gita* is of perennial interest to sincere seekers of truth. Its appeal is irresistible. It touches the farthest fringe of human personality irrespective of sectional affiliations of men. Yet there are difficulties for the general readers, not so well-versed in Sanskrit, in following the variety of topics dealt with, which are by no means easy of comprehension. Here is a useful and carefully planned abridgement of the *Gita* by a learned compiler who has made a judicious selection of one hundred representative verses, seeking at the same time to maintain the topical continuity of the *Gita*. Abridgement has necessitated rearrangement of the original chapters, there being ten chapters in this book (instead of the original eighteen). The text (in Bengali script) is followed by Sandhi (disjoining of combined words), Anvaya (prose order), word for word meaning, Vyākarana (difficult points of grammar) and running translation in Bengali. The underlying significance of the philosophically abstruse verses is made lucidly clear. Unlike most editions of the *Gita*, the present one contains relevant grammatical discussions, disjoining of Sandhis, expounding of compounds, derivations of important words, etc. all of which will be particularly helpful to students in schools and colleges. Each chapter starts with an illuminating discourse on the subject-matter of the chapter. Exposition of individual verses is characterized by lucidity and spiritual understanding of their inner meaning.

J. C. Datta

PURUSHOTTAM SRI AUROBINDO. By Anilbaran Roy. *Published by Gita Prachar Karyalaya, 108/11, Manoharpukur Road, Kalighat, Calcutta 26. Pages 52. Price Re. 1-4.*

This booklet deals with the different phases of the life of Sri Aurobindo—the great sage, savant, political thinker, poet, patriot, and Yogi. As an eminent and distinguished personage of his age, he had a definite message to India and the world, as revealed by him in his book *The Life Divine*. His political ideas, his definite plans for winning Swaraj, his imprisonment in the Alipore Bomb Case, his spiritual visitation in Alipore Jail, etc. are all well-known facts of history. The learned author, who knew Sri Aurobindo personally and intimately, presents these events in a nutshell, with great effect, in lucid and delightful language.

Tarakumar Ghosh

SANSKRIT-ENGLISH

SRI RAMANA GITA. By Kavyakantha Ganapati Muni. *Pages xi+146. Price Re. 1-4.*

SAT-DARSHANA BHASHYA AND TALKS WITH MAHARSHI. By K. *Pages xl+133. Price Rs. 3.*

Both Published by Sri Ramanasramam, Tiruvannamalai, S. India.

The teachings of Shri Ramana Maharshi, given in the course of informal conversations with devotees, including the author Ganapati Muni, have been presented in *Sri Ramana Gita* in simple and melodious Sanskrit verses, together with their translation in English. The mode of presentation in the form of dialogues and the Vedantic outlook of the Maharshi's teachings, invest this work with rare charm. The Maharshi's constant emphasis, as revealed in these verses, on *Ātma-vicāra* and *viveka*—an unrelenting process of Self-inquiry and discrimination—is of great value to the modern extrovert world.

Sat-Darshana Bhashya is the Sanskrit translation in verse of Shri Ramana Maharshi's original poetical work in Tamil 'Forty verses on the Truth of Existence'. The text of each verse in Sanskrit is followed by its free rendering and an interpretative commentary in English, setting forth the fundamental theme of the real nature of the Atman. The 'Talks with Maharshi' in English, which occupy the first thirty pages of the work, have been included with a view to introducing the general reader to the subsequent *Sat-Darshana Bhashya* which is more terse and philosophical. The topics discussed in the volume are rooted in traditional wisdom revealed in the scriptures, but the touch of the Maharshi's personality has given the book an originality and power all its own. The book, which is in its fourth edition, is a rich compendium of the Maharshi's elevating spiritual thoughts.

NEWS AND REPORTS

SWAMI VANDANANANDA LEAVES FOR U.S.A.

Swami Vandanananda, who was Editor of the *Prabuddha Bharata* for five years from 1950 to 1954, left for Hollywood on 13 June 1955 by air via Europe. At Hollywood he will be assisting Swami Prabhavananda, Head of the Vedanta Society of Southern California, U.S.A.

RAMAKRISHNA MISSION ASHRAMA, SRINAGAR, KASHMIR

Appeal for funds

After his return from the West, Swami Vivekananda visited Kashmir in 1897-8, and charmed with the natural scenic beauty of valley, he wished to found an Ashrama there. Owing to opposition from the British Resident of the State, he had to give up the idea. In May 1954, however, more than fifty-five years after, the Swami's idea materialized, when an Ashrama of the Ramakrishna Mission was inaugurated in a rented building at Karan Nagar, a suburb of the city of Srinagar. The Ashrama conducts an Allopathic Charitable Dispensary, a public Library and Reading-room, weekly discourses on spiritual and cultural subjects, as also occasional meetings. The Dispensary has already become popular as is evidenced by the number of patients attending it.

The present premises and location of the Ashrama, however, are inadequate to meet its diverse activities, and the need is urgently felt for a large plot of land, with suitable buildings, in a more central part of the city, to accommodate its present activities as well as to provide for future expansion. For this purpose a sum of rupees one lakh is immediately required.

The Ramakrishna Mission, named after Shri Ramakrishna, the Prophet of the harmony of religions, has been carrying on humanitarian work irrespective of creed, colour, or nationality in India and various parts of the world, for nearly six decades. It renders service in cultural, medical, and educational fields, looking upon all beings as manifestations of the Divinity. It is gratifying to note that its services have been widely appreciated. The Srinagar Centre is a branch of the Ramakrishna Mission, and being a brain child of Swami Vivekananda, has a great future before it.

We appeal to all large-hearted and liberal personal to come forward with their contributions to enable this institution to be of real service to all. Contributions will be thankfully received and acknowledged by the undersigned. Cheques or drafts are to be drawn in favour of the Ramakrishna Mission Ashrama, Srinagar (Kashmir), and crossed to ensure safety.

Persons wishing to perpetuate the memory of their near and dear ones can do so by bearing the cost of a building or part of it. Contributions to this Ashrama are exempt from Income-tax under Section 15B of the Income-tax Act.

Ramakrishna Mission Ashrama,
Karan Nagar, Srinagar,
Kashmir. Sd. Swami Asangananda,
20 June, 1955. *Secretary*