

and these bodies cannot respond to vibrations that demand coarse and dense matter. If an evil thought, projected with malefic intent, strikes such a body, it can only rebound from it, and it is flung back with all its own energy; it then flies backward along the magnetic line of least resistance, that which it has just traversed, and strikes its projector; he, having matter in his astral and mental bodies similar to that of the thought-form he generated, is thrown into respondent vibrations, and suffers the destructive effects he had intended to cause to another. Thus, "curses (and blessings) come home to roost." From this arise also the very serious effects of hating or suspecting a good and highly-advanced man; the thought-forms sent against him cannot injure him and they rebound against their projectors, shattering them mentally, morally, or physically. Several such instances are well known to members of the Theosophical Society, having come under their direct observation. So long as any of the coarser kinds of matter connected with evil and selfish thoughts remain in a person's body, he is open to attack from those who wish him evil, but when he has perfectly eliminated these by self-purification his haters cannot injure him, and he goes on calmly and peacefully amid all the darts of their malice. But it is bad for those who shoot out such darts.

*

*

*

*

ANNIE BESANT.

PREDESTINATION AND FREE WILL.

WHAT DO HINDU BOOKS SAY?

No. II.

(Continued from page 716, Vol. XVII.)

IN the last paper, we stated that around the nucleus,—the intelligent or conscious unit,—cluster activities, which by human thought are analysable into virtues and vices. The unit here is the *Atmic* entity, that spiritual centre without which nothing can be predicated, and nothing can be known. Perception requires a perceiver, object presupposes subject; and each must necessarily be spoken of in terms of the other. As Herbert Spencer says in his *Psychology*, vol. I, "*Results*,"—"we can think of Matter only in terms of Mind. We can think of Mind only in terms of Matter. * * * * We find the value of *x* in terms of *y*; then we find the value of *y* in terms of *x*." Round a self-conscious monad, then, cluster the material differentiated environments, which possess the antithetic tendencies of attraction and repulsion. Attraction draws together and constitutes love, concord, harmony, peace, *virtue*; and repulsion pulls apart, and constitutes hate, discord, disturbance, turmoil, *vice*. Were it not for the co-existence of these two antipolar influences, we should not have a compound such as that of Spirit with Matter; we should not have realized a material universe; we should not have anything to philosophize on; and we should not have a necessity for the *Theosophist*, or the *Brahmavâdin*

journal, in the world. How came the union is a different question, and if it is not satisfactorily answered, philosophers are not to blame, for, philosophers even have not reached the ultimatum. As Max Müller says in his "Vedânta Philosophy":—"It has often been said that it is unsatisfactory for a philosopher if he has no more to say than that it is so, without being able to say *why* it is so. But there is a point in every system of philosophy where a confusion of ignorance is inevitable, and all the greatest philosophers have had to confess that there are limits to our understanding the world; nay, this knowledge of the limits of our understanding has, since Kant's Criticism of Pure Reason, become the very foundation of all critical philosophy." According to Hindus, then, they have the conscious *Ego*, and its counterpart the non-*Ego* combined with it. This combined existence is to be recognized not as an inert mass, but by its very inherent nature impelled into acts, which become classifiable by some one method of philosophy or the other into the two sets, called *Punya* and *Pâpa*. We next stated in the last paper (No. I)* that to inquire for an *origin* of this is an *error* of the human understanding, because there is *no* origin; for if there were one, it is tantamount to stating an illogical proposition. For, whatever exists has ever existed, and if there can be no origin for predicates, there can be no origin for the subject; in other words, *Karma*, which is the collective term for *Punya* and *Pâpa*, is beginningless, and the conscious *Ego* to which *Karma* attaches, is itself beginningless, for which (among many other authorities,) one from *Srî Bhagavadgîtâ*, (Adh. II, sl. 12) was cited, *viz.*, नत्वेवाहं, &c.

These two entities then, called *Chit* and *Achit* (the sentient and the non-sentient composing the manifested Kosmos) have their own distinct characteristics. The Soul (Self-conscious *Ego*) is called *Purusha*, and its companion (matter) is called "*Prakriti*", both of which are eternal, as teaches *Bhagavad Gîtâ*, XIII, 19.

प्रकृतिपुरुषंचैव विद्वानादीउभावपि ।

The whole universe is of this composition; and nowhere is it possible to speak or demonstrate the one without the other. No particle or minutest atom is predicable as exclusively inert without detecting in it some grade or stage of consciousness,—consciousness of a kind which may be named 'mechanical' by reason of the latency of the previously habituated will; and consciousness of a kind which may be named 'creative', by reason of much self-assertive energy being manifested from its own inward depths. Later on, we will advert to the subject of consciousness, because it has a bearing on the question of *free-will* and *predestination*. For the present it is enough to state that while consciousness is general and pervades everything, the mysterious *Ego*,—the Soul—is characterized as *self-conscious*. It is this that specializes it from all else; it is this that divides it from matter. This central truth, *viz.*, "soul.

* See *Theosophist* for September 1896.

the *self-conscious* entity," must always be borne in mind to understand the further development of the subject of "free-will and predestination."

The 'self-consciousness' of soul constitutes it the master of (or over) matter, else, *i.e.*, if both were self-conscious, or non-conscious, there had been no need for the great division of the universe into conscious and unconscious parts (spirit and matter),—a division for *thought*, or for *reasoning with*; a division therefore not of parts subjectible to physical or chemical experiment. Grasping then the idea of the self-consciousness of soul, we proceed a step further:—

'Self-conscious' is to be potential for display of will-power, the visible effects of which, through a personality, declare an "actor," "a knower," an 'I,' a distinct *abstract** entity, contradistinguished from the corporate or material visible person. The visible body is material, and this material is the *instrument* through which all acts proceeding from the immaterial Entity become tangible for demonstration. It must also be borne in mind that the Soul-ego is not mere consciousness, for consciousness is a *quality*, which is an attribute of the Soul-*substance*. The Upanishads, such as *Taithirīya*†, *Praśna*‡, *Svetāśvatara*§, *Chhândogya* ||, *Bṛihad-Aranyaka* ¶, &c., establish this important metaphysical doctrine, as again demonstrated and confirmed by, for example,—

Brahma Sûtra II, iii, 57, ज्ञोत एव *i.e.*, "soul is 'knower' for reasons set forth." For an elaborate treatment of this *Sûtra*, the reader is referred to *Srī Bhāṣya*, *Vedānta Sāra*, *Vedānta Dīpa*, &c.** Out of soul-entity then proceeds knowledge, and from knowledge issues action. To be 'knower' and to be 'actor' constitutes the will of soul, or the *free-will* of soul.

Brahma Sûtra, II, 3, 41, runs thus:— कुतप्रयत्नोपक्षस्तुविहित प्रतिषिद्धावैयर्थ्योदिभ्यः। *i.e.*, "God waits for the *first conscious effort* on the part of soul, and thus only the sanctions and interdictions (constituting God's law or moral law) have significance." This shows that "will" is expected of soul.

Brahma Sûtra, II, 3, 33, also, *viz.*, कर्ताशास्त्रार्थवत्वात् । declares soul to be "the actor (or *free-agent*); otherwise, man would not be held responsible for things *permitted*, and things *forbidden*." In other words, if liberty of action for soul is not admitted, he is no more responsible for his acts nor thoughts. There would rest no moral responsibility on him, for whatever he may do. 'What are all the moral codes for'? Rāmānujâchârya

* *Abstract* is here used in a peculiar significance. It does not mean an imaginary or non-existent figment of the mind. It means what is not *discrete*, what is not *perceivable by the senses*, or the "unknowable" of Herbert Spencer.

† विज्ञानंयज्ञंतनुते (V. 1.) ‡ द्रष्टृश्रोताघ्रातास्सयिता (VI.) § ज्ञाज्ञा
॥ अथयोवेदेदं जीव्राणीति सआत्मानसैतान्कामान्पश्यन्मते (VIII. 4. 12.) य
एतेब्रह्मलोकः (VIII. 4. 1.) ¶ विज्ञातारमरेकेन विजानीयात् ॥

** By Srī Rāmānujâchârya, the founder of the Visishtādvaitic School of Philosophy.

asks in his Commentaries on the above *Sûtras*. 'To whom are they addressed? Not to irresponsible insentient things surely, but to those who are endowed with the power of independent action.' *Srî Bhagavad Gîtâ* teems with passages in support of the position held by Upanishads and Vedânta *Sûtras*. And this then is the answer to all those Christian Missionaries who think that *Bhagavad Gîtâ* and other Hindu Books teach mere fatalism. *Bhagavad Gîtâ* breathes in almost every one of its pages the moral responsibility of man, as arising from his inability to be quiet, to be inert like *jada-vastu* (matter-stuff). The 5th verse, 3rd Adh.,

of *Gîtâ* says:— नहिकश्चित्क्षणमपि जातु तिष्ठत्यकर्मकृत् । i.e., 'None for even an instant can remain without doing some act.' Action every instant is an inherent quality of the very being of man. Labor, to ever labor, is the first of all God's Laws; and Lord Krishna ever asks of individual souls to "think of Him," "contemplate Him," "be devoted to Him," "pray to Him," "worship Him," "fall before Him," &c., all which denoting action as from *free-choice*, to first emanate from a conscious entity. There can be no *Karma* without thought preceding it,* (thought = *Jñâna*).

While defending 'free-will' as above indicated, who can doubt at the same time that it is under limitations? Are not souls incarnated on earth under diverse circumstances? What produces the certain tendencies, the certain tastes, the certain predilections, the certain gifts,—gifts of person, gifts of intellect, &c.—which they seem to bring with them when born, which lie as latent potencies in them to be developed hereafter by peculiar environing circumstances attending birth. As like a father to his children, a soul is started on its journey with certain provisions, and henceforth it—the baby-soul—must travel on its own account. The inevitable environments within which one finds himself born are due to past acts or the law of *Karma in operation*. This is indeed *predestination*. The past is thus both an advantage and a disadvantage for the forward stages of the soul. A certain initial velocity is imparted which is done under the Law of *Predestination*. Accelerations or retardations to this initial velocity follow from the Law of *Free-will*. How a soul improves on its derived advantages, or how it overcomes its derived disadvantages lies in its "freely-willing" to do so. Whether man will work for his salvation or for his damnation lies in his own conduct, which is either godly or ungodly, (Consult the XVIth Adhyâya of *Srî Bhagavad Gîtâ* for an exposition of this subject at great length).

Till a Soul *can die* (?) or cease altogether (?)—which is impossible—moral responsibility never ceases; progress and regress are both under the operations of the two Conjugate Laws, those of *Destination* and *Freedom*, respectively. The 'past' is the cumulation or the stored energy, which manifests itself in the *how* of a soul-incarnating. Thus creation in its manifold aspects is not a result of an arbitrary and

* मनःपूर्ववागुत्तरा । also *Bri. Up.* III-4-17: मन एवास्यात्मावाग्जाया

whimsical will, but a scientific evolution from pre-existent causes comprising intelligence and substance.

Predestination is a word which grapples with the difficulty of how to account for the soul's otherwise fullest freedom being circumscribed. Man is given the exercise of his choice, by which he may be swayed either to the committal of a right or the committal of a wrong act, and this swaying—or free inclination—is influenced indeed by the resultant effect of his past acts. “Individual existence is a rope, which stretches from the infinite to the infinite, and has no end and no commencement”*.

It is somewhere said :— स्वकर्मसूत्रग्रथितोहिलोकः†

“The world is bound by the cord of Karma,” and this cord is indeed like the string tied round a top causing it to spin, but with the force which *predestined* the spinning motion, concurrently came into existence the counteracting or resisting forces eventuating in the complete nullification of the predetermining original motion. In this analogy, can be easily recognized the concurrent play of both *predestination* and *free-will*. This is a weak analogy ; but in a sense, it explains our case.

A. GOVINDACHARLU, F. T. S.

(To be continued.)

RAMKRISHNA PARAMHAMSA AND HIS PRECEPTS.

PROF. MAX MULLER has written an appreciative article in the *Nineteenth Century*, concerning the Hindu Sage, Ramkrishna, and says :— “He has left a number of pupils behind who, after his recent death, are carrying on the work which he began, and who are trying to secure, not only in India but in Europe also, a sympathetic interest in the ancient philosophy of India which it deserves as fully as the philosophy of Plato or Kant.”

The Professor styles the teachings of this sage the “spontaneous outbursts of profound wisdom clothed in beautiful poetical language.” And again :— “His mind seems like a kaleidoscope of pearls, diamonds and sapphires, shaken together at random, but always producing precious thoughts in regular beautiful outlines.” And what is of prime importance “he showed how it was possible to unify all the religions of the world by seeing only what is good in every one of them, and showing sincere reverence to every one who has suffered for the truth for their faith in God, and for their love of men.”

This is verily the kind of teaching that the world needs, and should hail with joy. Let us have more of it. Again we read that “he accepted all the doctrines, the embodiments, the usages, and devotional practices of every religious cult,” though his teachings were “essentially Vedantic.” Further, the learned Professor says :—“His religion was not confined to the worship of Hindu deities and purification by Hindu customs. For long days he subjected himself to various kinds of discipline to realise the Mohammedan idea of an all-powerful Allah. He let his beard grow, he fed himself on Moslem

* Light on the Path. Sec. III,

† *Adhyâtma-Râmâyana*.