

would by its very nature and constitution never admit of laboratory verification which is the one goal of all modern scientific methodology.

Not in any manner or by any means to disparage the undoubtedly excellent work of the author but, merely to illustrate definite difficulties that confront the inquirers, I would invite the author's attention to a remarkable and sensational treatise by Dr. Beutner (London, Chapman and Hall, 1939) entitled *Life's Beginning on the Earth* (reviewed by me in a previous number of *Current Science*), towards the end of which the conclusion is thus indicated: "..... life is not a sort of miraculous separate entity, imposed on our earth by a spirit or an invisible something ... Life is one of the developments of the Universe governed by the general laws of nature" (p. 222). If all sciences that pursue the methodology of the laboratory control refuse to proceed beyond the conclusion just indicated, they cannot be blamed. For, on the plane or level of investigation conducted through the instrumentality of qualitative and quantitative analysis, no other conclusion would at all be possible.

This need not, would not mean any disparagement of all metaphysical effort and endeavour that have characterised the higher thought of mankind throughout the ages. Other methods, other methodologies, other weapons, other hypotheses, and other criteria of verification would have to be admitted to be functioning and operative, and it would be *ultra vires* to question or challenge the validity of these from the standpoint accepted by the laboratory disciplines. Trite as it may seem the need of the hour is that *Religion should grow more religious*, and *Science should grow more scientific*. It is not the other way about. The contention that Religion should grow scientific and that Science should grow religious is totally untenable.

Modern Psychology has admitted a multi-lateral or multi-dimensional development of human personality and complete critical caution and circumspection and strictest scientific scrutiny would co-exist in perfect harmony with religious belief. There is no use of forcing down the throat of a scientist the religious beliefs and solutions. Nor is there any of forcing down the throat of the religious the solutions of science. Sir Richard Gregory, the talented Editor of *Nature*, in his arresting volume entitled *Religion in Science and Civilization*, has argued with striking emphasis, clarity, and breadth of philosophical and scientific vision that both Science and Religion are the products of evolution of *homo sapiens* on this planet and both should be treated and evaluated accordingly. One cannot dictate to the other. For, any attempted dictatorship of the one over the other spells dire disaster.

I desire to make just one more comment in conclusion. The author speaks of first establishing causality and then arriving at the existence of God (p. 281). There is exactly the

rub. He refers to a stage "prior to causality" and styles it the potential speaking likewise of potentialities "able to give" and "able to get". But, then, the potentialities *qua* potentialities must have a being which has to be explained and evaluated in reference to the all-comprehensive concept of causality. Are the potentialities *Uncaused*? For, the author definitely writes "prior to causality". Even the use of "prior" would indicate the existence of TIME not necessarily "per accidens".

Be that as it may, the author should endeavour to stabilise his notions of Indian theories. He would have "Vaiseshika", the "Satkarya-vada", and "Vivarta-vada" correspond to "Scientific", "the Metaphysical", and the "Mystical" points of view (p. 253). These are not mutually exclusive species of the same genus, for, each can be well claimed to be all patterned into *triune*. *Vivarta-vada* definitely connotes *illusionism* but, mysticism does not necessarily mean any *illusionism* at all. Dr. Freeman's book is an effervescent stimulus, and stimulant a crisp challenge to modern scientific and philosophical thought. I expect scientists and philosophers would properly respond to it—not armchair pseudo-scientists and pinchbeck philosophers, but, those of the two categories worth their salt.

R. NAGA RAJA SARMA.

Cretaceous Rocks of South India. By. L. Rama Rao. (Lucknow University Studies XVII), 1942. Pp. 78. 4 Figs.

This publication contains two lectures delivered at Lucknow University Palaeobotanical Laboratory in December 1940, which give an excellent conspectus of the knowledge we possess of a number of isolated patches of marine cretaceous strata in Trichinopoly District, near Vridhachalam, Pondicherry and in the vicinity of Rajahmundry. These rock-formations give us a glimpse into one of these rare and transient episodes in India's geological history when the Deccan along its marginal belts was submerged under the sea. Mr. Rama Rao has dealt with each individual cretaceous outcrop in detail, giving its extent, stratigraphic succession, its rock and fossil contents and the geological horizon indicated by the recent examination of the micro-fauna and flora, more particularly the latter, in which Mr. Rao and his collaborators have made a useful contribution. Niniyur division of the Trichinopoly Cretaceous is, on the evidence of the fossil algal contents of the nodular limestones as well as of the embedded flints and cherts, assigned an age astride of the youngest Cretaceous and basal Eocene.

The four figures show the geographical distribution of these interesting rocks and give a helpful picture of the areal extents these rocks must have spread over at a time when the eastern shores of India, from Assam to Trichinopoly, had suffered their deepest invasion by the waters of the Southern Sea.

D. N. W.