THE ARYAN PATH

51, Esplanade Road,
BOMBAY.

CONTENTS FOR

JANUARY.

FEBRUARY.

FORTHCOMING ARTICLES.

THE OCCULT IN THE HISTORY OF MEDICINE.—*By C. J. Thompson, M.D.E.*
HISTORICAL STUDY OF METAPSYCHICS.—*By H. S. Redgrove.*
SPIRITUALISM AND PSYCHIC RESEARCH.—*By David Gow, Editor of "Light."*
THE NEW LIFE OF CHRIST.—*By Professor Krappe.*
THE GREEK SCEPTICS.—*By Dr. Mary Patrick.*
ZOROASTRIAN CALENDAR.—*By Dr. Hadi Husan.*
RAJA JANAKA OF ROME.—*By Sirdar Suraj Singh Bahadur.*
THE OLD DOCTRINE OF MAYA AND MODERN SCIENCE.—*By Ivor B. Hart, O.B.E., Ph.D., Sc.*
SCHOPENHAUER AND THE EAST.—*By Richard Muller-Freienfels.*
RED INDIANS UNDER HOOVER.—*By Carter Field.*
TOWARDS THE RECOVERY OF SPIRITUAL LIFE.—*By Irwin Edmond.*
THE SPIRIT OF INDIAN MUSIC.—*By Leona C. Grugan.*
GROWTH OF DEMOCRACY IN EDUCATION.—*By Shamsul Ghani Khan.*
DNYANESHWARI.—*By S. V. Lele.*
UNDER HEAVEN ONE FAMILY.—*By Arthur Davies.*
CIVILIZATION.—*By Professor C. Delisle Burns.*
IS UNIVERSAL PEACE PRACTICABLE.—*By Raja J. P. Bahadur Singh.*
TORTURED BY KURDISTAN WITCHES.—*By Sirdar Ikbal Ali Shah.*
DRAMA—THE ORGANIC PART OF HUMAN LIFE.—*By Huntly Carter.*
THE WORKER AND THE MACHINE.—*By Henry de Man.*
THE INTELLECTUAL INTEGRITY.—*By C. E. M. Joad.*
THE MYSTIC SYMBOLISM OF SHAKESPEARE.—*G. Wilson Knight.*
GOD GEOMETRISES.—*By E. Hughes-Gibb.*
POETRY OF CHINA.—*By Phillip Henderson*

Per Annum—Rs. 10 India; £1 Europe; $ 5 America.
Single Copy—Re. 1 India; 2s. 6d. Europe; 50 cents America.
Europe —Theosophy Co., Ltd., 293, Regent Street, London, W. 1.
America—Theosophy Co., 245, West 33rd Street, Los Angeles.
America—Theosophy Co., 1, West 67th Street, New York.

Printed by H. W. Smith at the Times of India Press, Bombay, and published by D. C. Townsend, Theosophy Company (India), Ltd., Bombay.

Reg. No. B 2680.

The ARYAN PATH

No. 4. APRIL 1930 Vol. I.

CONTENTS

THEOSOPHY CO. (INDIA), LTD.,
51, Esplanade Road, - - BOMBAY, INDIA.

THE ARYAN PATH

ADDRESS :

51, Esplanade Road, Bombay, India.

PUBLISHERS :—Theosophy Co. (India), Ltd.

SUBSCRIPTIONS :—No subscriptions are accepted for less than one full year of twelve numbers, but subscriptions may begin with any desired number. All subscriptions, orders for single and back numbers, and back volumes, bound or unbound, should be accompanied by the necessary remittance. Price: In India, single copy Re. 1, per annum Rs. 10. In Europe, single copy 2s. 6d., per annum £1 or equivalent; in America, single copy 50 cents, per annum $5; post free.

CONTRIBUTIONS :—Contributions submitted for publication should be typewritten, on one side of the paper only, with wide margin, and copies should be in all cases retained by the writers, as no manuscripts are returned.

CORRESPONDENCE :—Letters from subscribers and readers are welcome, with criticisms, comments or questions on any subject treated in the Magazine. Questions on Theosophical Philosophy and History will be replied to direct, or, if of sufficient general interest, in the pages of THE ARYAN PATH.

BEQUESTS AND DONATIONS :—Gifts and legacies will be gladly received from those in sympathy with the objects of this Magazine, when such benefactions are unencumbered and unrestricted. Donors should make their gifts direct to **Theosophy Co. (India), Ltd.,** 51, Esplanade Road, Bombay, which is an incorporated association, legally empowered to receive such donations and bequests in furtherance of its objects. These objects are :—

(*a*) To form a nucleus of a universal Brotherhood of Humanity, without distinction of race, creed, sex, caste, or colour;

(*b*) The study of ancient and modern religions, philosophies and sciences, and a demonstration of the importance of such study; and

(*c*) The investigation of the unexplained laws of nature and the psychical powers latent in man.

ॐ

Unveil, O Thou who givest sustenance to the world, that face of the true Sun, which is now hidden by a vase of golden light ! so that we may see the truth and know our whole duty.

THE ARYAN PATH

VOL. I. APRIL, 1930. No. 4

The Editors hold themselves responsible for unsigned articles only. They are not necessarily in agreement with the views of their contributors to whom they leave free expression of opinion.

DISCIPLINING THE SOUL.

" Restrain by thy Divine thy lower self
Restrain by the Eternal the Divine."
—THE VOICE OF THE SILENCE.

Our great obstacle in self-discipline is forgetfulness. We are not so much evil as thoughtless. It is not that we do not know better but that we do not remember most of the time what we do know.

Spiritual discipline has for its pivot the virtue of remembering the Self ; every time our consciousness and memory stray away from the fact that the soul is the real centre of life, we fall away from our spiritual discipline.

There may be differences of opinion as to how we should discipline ourselves, but there is no question as to the fact that we should do so ; also, among all the divergencies of various systems of discipline, the one common factor is that we should remember the rules of such discipline, and that whenever we forget we should withdraw into the harbour of our souls and try to collect ourselves. Through thoughts, feelings, words and deeds, soul-energies stream forth into the various constituents of man's being. Thus soul-energy becomes mind-force or emotion-power or word-strength or deed-potency. If in this process of transference the centre of emanation, which is the soul, is forgotten, our minds, feelings or bodies usurp the place of the soul. Through such usurpation their powers of independence fructify. We have always

to remember, not that the mind thinks, but that the soul thinks through the mind. Make a division between mind and soul, and spiritual discipline is broken ; similarly, forget the soul in the process of feeling, and spiritual discipline is violated ; remember that words are living messengers of the soul, and our spiritual discipline remains intact. Do whatever we have to do with all our soul, and we do nothing wrong—and every act becomes sacramental.

To remember the Soul or the Self is of the essence of spiritual training. Two-fold is the task we are called upon to perform—to remember in as unbroken a continuity as possible the nature and character of the Soul ; and every time we forget, to recollect the forgotten fact as quickly as possible.

While the above is a continuous operation, every system of discipline lays down certain fundamental fixed practices of meditation, prayer or inner communion, study, self-examination, and the like as aids for that basic realization. Some systems are extra rigorous—more physical than spiritual ; while others tend in the opposite direction of a do-what-you-like existence—more psychic than spiritual.

Real self-discipline gives its proper place to every constituent of man. Just as right bodily exercise takes cognisance of its seven-fold nature—brain, senses and their organs, nerves, blood, bones, lymph and muscles, so also correct soul-discipline takes into account all the functions and organs of the soul. We need not go into details, but let us briefly consider the most important factors of soul-discipline.

Self-Examination necessarily comes first. Unless a man considers his disposition, including his weaknesses, there is no meaning to spiritual discipline. As each is a two-fold self, that examination implies the higher self reviewing and passing judgment on the lower. This review uncovers the hidden vices, forces on our attention the existence of petty-mindedness and small selfishnesses unsuspected by us. The consideration whence these come and why, and above all, how they shall be overcome, compels us to take the next step—

Study of what the soul or the self is ; why and how we forget it, and by what method we can keep it in mind. The laws of man's being—bodily, mental and spiritual—have been investigated, and the knowledge of the Ancients is more thorough in detail and more complete than any modern attempts. There, however, exists the correct fusion of ancient and modern knowledge to be found in the writings of H. P. Blavatsky. One of the aims of this magazine is to spread broadcast such teaching. Our study of the Wisdom-Religion of the Ancients reveals the important method advocated, which becomes the third factor of soul-life—

Meditation upon the nature of the Higher Self, the Divine in us, which that study has revealed to be identical with the Supreme Universal Self. Knowledge tells us—and we assent because of the inherent reasonableness—that the universe is boundless, that matter is indestructible, and that the consciousness of man is immortal. The man of matter and the man of spirit in us are fused in an inextinguishable

light, which seems as darkness to the senses and mind but which has to be experienced, and contemplation is the only way to it. Even a first slight vision of the boundless and omnipotent soul within us unmistakably reveals that we are linked with all in nature, and that brotherhood in the human kingdom is a fact. This vision compels us to tell this truth to our brothers, and to do certain deeds in order to fulfil our obligation to nature.

Speech (purified by the previous practices) has to be used in the proclamation of the facts of soul-life which we have learnt by study and otherwise. Soul-force follows such correct proclamation, and constantly speaking of the omnipotent divinity within us, we bring to others joy and bliss and the power to move spirit-wards. Control of speech demands silence—a very essential step on the inner path; but equally important is the step of right utterance, born of right knowledge. If to the listening minds our speech proclaims the truth, our obligation to the mentally deaf and dumb is discharged by the method of—

Sacrifice. Sacramental deeds, *i.e.*, actions which are the outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace, are the real deeds of sacrifice. Such deeds, one or two even every day deliberately performed, bring forth hidden soul-power, and unveil the vision of unity and harmony subsisting between ourselves and the whole of nature. The blue sky, the running waters, the towering peaks, the feast of colour that flowers and shrubs spread, are in our soul. The life within us and within them is the same life. Life moves in our thoughts and makes us speak and act; also it whirls in the breeze, blows with the hurricane, sets the air in motion, attracts and repels the waves. Our senses but contact their appearances, our soul knows their reality. Our deeds of sacrifice show to us the kinship which exists between our ideation and divine thought; our compassion and eternal harmony; our words and sound in space; our deeds and the perpetual motion of life in nature. Such deeds of sacrifice alone teach us the lessons which we never, never, want to forget.

THE OLD DOCTRINE OF MĀYĀ AND MODERN SCIENCE.

[**Ivor B. Hart, O.B.E., Ph.D., B.Sc.,** is a name well-known to University students and all interested in aeronautics for his contributions to various scientific periodicals. Since 1920 he has been Education Officer of the first grade under the British Air Ministry and is Honorary Research Assistant and University Extension Lecturer at the University of London. He was in India for some time during the War as well as in Mesopotamia and Italy, and is very interested in Indian affairs. In addition to works on aeronautics he has had published *Matters of Science, Mechanical Investigations of Leonardo Da Vinci, The Great Engineers, The Great Physicists.*—EDS.]

I.

The lessons of history are sometimes strange. A few thousand years ago England was a land of ignorance and of crude civilisation. Yet in fact those days of antiquity were, for many parts of the world, days of culture of a high order. We read of the grandeur that was Rome, of the classical philosophers of Ancient Greece, of the many wonders of Egyptian civilisation—and now we are beginning to learn, more slowly, yet with ever-increasing respect and admiration, of the culture that was India's in days of old.

The facts are emerging slowly through many inevitable difficulties. The ancient Hindus kept no systematic records of their progress in the direction of literary achievement and religious and political thought. Through a period of long antiquity the earliest of India's sacred books, the Vedas, were handed down from father to son by word of mouth. It is easy to understand that under such conditions their origins were inevitably shrouded in mystery. The Vedas were in fact the starting point of a literature that emerged, through time, into the development of a series of philosophical systems which have only in comparatively recent times received the detailed analysis that they in fact deserve.

Nor is it surprising, on analysis, that this great land of the East should have been thus meditating on philosophical fundamentals at a time when many a country of the West was yet shrouded in ignorance. The life of those days in India provided a natural background for quiet, for meditation, and for contemplation on the problems and meaning of Life and the Universe. Ancient India presented no special spectacle of a struggle for existence. Nature was there generous in her provision of the necessities of life, and the people enjoying the warmth and seclusion of a tropical to a sub-tropical climate, found a natural outlet for their mental energies in the evolution of a succession of philosophical systems that, with all their possible imperfections, yet had as a common characteristic an innate honesty and independence.

It is not our purpose here to discuss these systems of India's philosophy. They were, however, on common ground in seeking, and seeking rightly, their expression in terms of three basic channels, through which knowledge may be derived—namely, by perception, by inference and by authority. Certain broad problems of life and existence naturally provided grounds for controversy and argument as between one system and another. With one of these we are here concerned—the problem of Māyā. At different stages in the philosophical evolution of Ancient India the significance of the term underwent modification. Now it signified "illusion"—then "magic"—and then again "deception." But there was a time when, as a doctrine of illusion, Māyā attained a significance and importance which cannot be ignored in the history of philosophy. The doctrine of Māyā, in its best form, may indeed be said to belong to the culminating period of Indian thought—the period of the Upanishads. For not only have the Upanishads provided the main stream of thought for the well-known Sāṅkhya system, but there were also vital points of contact with the otherwise independent Buddhism. Indeed we may well say with Deussen that "to every Indian Brahman of to-day, the Upanishads are what the New Testament is to the Christian."

What, then, is the nature of the old doctrine of Māyā as developed in the Upanishads? Interestingly enough, the seeds of the doctrine were in fact sown in the earlier Vedic philosophy, to which we have already referred, in the idea of the unity of existence. Unity alone is real. "The poets give many names to that which is only one," we read in the Rigveda. The implication is that plurality, as for example, conceptions of proximity in space, succession in time, interdependence of cause and effect, contrast of subject and object, therefore has no reality in the ultimate sense. The Atman, or Brahman (soul, self, God) is the sole reality. Know the Atman and all is known. The appearance of reality and change presented by Nature is mere Māyā—illusion.

This may at first sight seem obscure. Yet a few moments further thought may well disperse the obscurity and at the same time lead us to see how the doctrine of Māyā inevitably developed.

Picture, then, the Indian sages of old, pondering in their jungle solitudes upon the evidences of continual change and transience of "the heavens, the earth and all that in them is." They see in life a perpetual flow. They witness an ever-moving world, into which beings come, out of which beings pass. How can these things be real, since that alone is real that neither passes into being nor passes out of being, but simply *is*? What is there that lasts and which alone therefore has reality? Seek that, know that, and you find the Brahman, the pure ultimate spiritual reality out of which, in its union with the illusory Māyā, proceeds the everchanging cosmical illusion of a world of semblances—a world of countless modes of life, continually replacing each other, bringing fleeting pleasure tinged with pain, or pain tinged with pleasure, and producing its round of births, deaths, movement, change and so on.

And so, quite naturally, quite logically, we see the wise old philosopher of Mother India, seated in rigid and intensive contemplation, striving with all the intensity of his soul to separate out from himself this Māyā, to lay bare the reality behind it, pure and characterless, bereft of the illusory pluralities wrought by the union of Māyā with Brahman and striving to seek that perfect abstraction, that perfect Self which is ultimate truth.

Such, then, is the old doctrine of Māyā. But let us not think for a moment that it is to be dismissed as an historical curiosity. Naturally modified in form, modern philosophy neither attempts nor desires to escape from a continued discussion of its implications. One does not need to be a student of philosophy to know that the great Kant, in his enquiry into the capabilities of the human intellect, in his turn came to the conclusion that the universe is Māyā—that it is appearance only, and not reality. Our philosophers are still seeking for the first principles of life and of the universe. Some seek it deliberately, others by implication. Among the latter we may include our modern scientists. Time was when science was philosophy and philosophy was science. There was no distinction between them. The divorcement came at the time of the Renaissance of Learning in Western Europe, and it endured almost to the beginning of the twentieth century. Now there are signs of a reuniting of forces and the philosophers, who were frankly ignorant as to the facts of modern science, are now seeking to embrace these facts within their ken ; whilst on the other hand the more broad-minded of our great scientists of to-day are frankly enquiring as to the philosophical implications of their own researches. The new physics and chemistry of the twentieth century, with its revolutionary flood of new light on the constitution of matter and the structure of the atom, and its new theories of time and space, are providing more and more evidence as to the illusory nature of our objective world such as gives added pertinence to the doctrine of Māyā of Ancient India.

Let us, then, like the Indian sages of old, continue by research and by meditation to ponder upon life and its mysteries and its illusions, and strive to separate out the Brahman from the Māyā in our quest for eternal truth and reality.

II.

How near, indeed, our modern philosophers are to the standpoint of the Hindu philosophy of old is brought out with startling clarity in the words of Benedetto Croce at the American Congress of Philosophy as recently as 1926. " Since the effectual religiosity of man is, and has never been anything but a confident effort towards purification and elevation, a striving, through joy and sorrow, towards truth and goodness, this modern and human philosophy admits within itself all the earnest and sincere religion which can be in the world." What have we here but a striving to rend the veil of Māyā to seek the Brahman beyond ?

The very isolation of each human entity from his fellows is surely significant enough in itself as a claim for the inevitableness of Māyā. The perception of "awareness" is essentially individualistic. The measure of A's awareness of the quality of "yellowness," for instance, in a coloured object can in no way whatever be related to that of B; and the modern philosopher frankly recognises the truth of this. He agrees, for example, that clear ideas, however specific and definite they may be, are nevertheless not necessarily trustworthy. Doubt seems impossible, yet doubt there must be. For while outer evidences cannot take logical account of inner experiences, yet inner experiences are of the very essence of human life, and cannot be ignored by the true philosopher.

Modern science brings us continually up against evidences of the old Doctrine of Māyā. Your biological chemist may take a living plant to his laboratory, determined to discover of what it is composed. He may analyse it down to its last grain. He may prove up to the hilt that it contains so many grains of this, so many of that, and so many of the other. But he cannot synthesise these constituents back to the living plant. The veil of Māyā obscures the knowledge of that vital force which is lacking to give life to the combination. Again, it has been clearly established that when, say, a stretched string is twanged to emit a pure C note, vibrations of air particles are transmitted at a rate of 256 times per second. Yet the human ear in the vicinity of the string hears a note. It neither sees nor feels the air vibrations. Can we say then that the listener detects air vibrations? What, in fact, is the link between the two—the listener and the note? Is it merely a nervous system? Do we indeed understand all that is fully implied by the term "nervous system"? Modern science, it would seem, makes a theoretical construction of an abstract world, and expresses the inner human experiences of the interplay of colours and sounds and sensations in terms of natural laws and mathematical equations. But mankind is left standing in the dark. For one thing is surely definite to us all, namely, that the universe and the ultimate truth beyond it, is anything but a mere aggregate of natural laws and mathematical equations. Nor, on the other hand, can it satisfy us to believe that the reality and purpose of existence can be explained by a gamut of sounds, sights and other sensations. One man may describe an object in front of him as a thin, flat, circular sheet of copper, $2\frac{1}{2}$ inches in diameter, and brownish red in tint; while another will speak of it as a material object occupying two-dimensional space according to the equation $16x^2+16y^2=25$ (expressed in rectangular co-ordinates with the centre of the object as the origin); that it is built up of molecules of a substance of atomic weight 63·57, with an atomic structure of electrons and protons on a stated pattern; that it exhibits a colour scheme to the observer in accordance with an absorption of electro-magnetic waves of such and such a range of wave-lengths; and so on. Each is describing the object according to his notions of accuracy and exactness. Yet the one is probably no nearer the ultimate truth than the other. We may express it,

as indeed Kant taught it, thus : that precise, detailed, organised Knowledge does *not* give the real nature of things as they are. The real world escapes our Knowledge.

But possibly the most striking evidence of the strong link between the old doctrine of Māyā and modern science is seen in the recent revolution in the conception of time and space embraced in the relativity theories of Einstein and others. Up to the beginning of the present century, it was generally taken for granted that there is only one time and only one space, and that these, both time and space, are completely alike everywhere in the universe. We know now, thanks to the brilliant researches of our leading physicists of to-day, that this is hopelessly incorrect. Our visual outlook on the universe is mere Māyā.

We can well illustrate it by the following example. We on the earth P may hold up a square for the inspection of the inhabitant of another world Q in one of our neighbouring stars, and lo and behold, he tells us that it is a rectangle we are showing him, with sides in the ratio of a : b. He in his turn now holds up a square for our inspection, and we assure him that the delusion is his, and that he is showing *us* a rectangle whose sides are as a : b. We both appeal to a seemingly impartial umpire who inhabits yet a third globe R, and we each hold up our respective squares for his inspection and decision ; and behold our joint chagrin ! For he tells us we are both wrong. Not only are we neither of us holding up squares, but the dimensions of P's so-called square areas a : c, whilst those of Q's so-called square are as a : d. We tell R we do not believe him, and we ask him to show us what *he* considers to be a square. He smilingly obliges, and what happens ? With great indignation we each repudiate R's suggestion that he is showing us a square. We of the earth say it is a rectangle of sides in the ratio of a : c, and Q says it is a rectangle of sides in the ratio of a : d. And clearly an appeal to the inhabitants of yet a fourth globe would only make confusion more confounded.

We are unable, in the space of this article, to attempt an exposition of the modern doctrine of relativity with a view to offering an explanation of the foregoing as one of its consequences. Such readers as are not familiar with the theory of relativity must seek elsewhere for details. We can but point to the facts in so far as they bear on our subject, and these at least are perfectly clear. They afford nothing more nor less than a triumphant vindication of the Old Doctrine of Māyā. The trend of modern science demonstrates this more and more clearly as time goes on.

Nevertheless nothing can remove the fact that the quest for ultimate truth must be maintained.

Let us, then, like Indian sages of old, continue, by research and by meditation, to ponder on life and its mysteries and its illusions, and strive to separate out the Brahman from the Māyā in our quest for eternal truth and reality.

Ivor B. Hart.

MAYA OR ILLUSION.

NOTES ON THE ABOVE.

[So great a confusion prevails among students of philosophy, and misunderstanding is so general among the ordinary people about the doctrine of Maya, treated in an able and interesting way in the above article, that we think it useful to cull and collate a few highly pertinent and illuminating thoughts presented in the *Secret Doctrine* of H. P. Blavatsky, first published in 1888.—EDS.]

The Universe is called, with everything in it, MAYA, because all is temporary therein, from the ephemeral life of a fire-fly to that of the Sun. Compared to the eternal immutability of the One, and the changelessness of that Principle, the Universe, with its evanescent ever-changing forms, must be necessarily, in the mind of a philosopher, no better than a will-o'-the-wisp. Yet, the Universe is real enough to the conscious beings in it, which are as unreal as it is itself.—I. 274.

All that which *is*, emanates from the ABSOLUTE, which, from this qualification alone, stands as the one and only reality—hence, everything extraneous to this Absolute, the generative and causative Element, *must* be an illusion, most undeniably. But this is only so from the purely metaphysical view. A man who regards himself as mentally sane, and is so regarded by his neighbours, calls the visions of an *insane* brother—whose hallucinations make *the victim either happy or supremely wretched*, as the case may be—illusions and fancies likewise. But, where is that madman for whom the hideous shadows in his deranged mind, his *illusions*, are not, for the time being, as actual and as real as the things which his physician or keeper may see ? Everything is relative in this Universe, everything is an illusion. But the experience of any plane is an actuality for the percipient being, whose consciousness is on that plane ; though the said experience, regarded from the purely metaphysical standpoint, may be conceived to have no objective reality.—I. 295-6.

Maya or illusion is an element which enters into all finite things, for everything that exists has only a relative, not an absolute, reality, since the appearance which the hidden noumenon assumes for any observer depends upon his power of cognition. To the untrained eye of the savage, a painting is at first an unmeaning confusion of streaks and daubs of colour, while an educated eye sees instantly a face or a landscape. Nothing is permanent except the one hidden absolute existence which contains in itself the noumena of all realities. The existences belonging to every plane of being, up to the highest Dhyan-Chohans are, in degree, of the nature of shadows cast by a magic lantern on a colourless screen ; but all things are relatively real, for the cogniser is also a reflection, and the things cognised are therefore as real to him as himself. Whatever reality things possess must be looked

for in them before or after they have passed like a flash through the material world ; but we cannot cognise any such existence directly so long as we have sense-instruments which bring only material existence into the field of our consciousness. Whatever plane our consciousness may be acting in, both we and the things belonging to that plane are, for the time being, our only realities. As we rise in the scale of development we perceive that during the stages through which we have passed we mistook shadows for realities, and the upward progress of the Ego is a series of progressive awakenings, each advance bringing with it the idea that now, at last, we have reached " reality ;" but only when we shall have reached the absolute Consciousness, and blended our own with it, shall we be free from the delusions produced by Maya.—I. 39-40.

Matter existing apart from perception is a mere abstraction.... In strict accuracy—to avoid confusion and misconception—the term " Matter " ought to be applied to the aggregate of objects of possible perception, and " Substance " to *noumena* ; for inasmuch as the phenomena of our plane are the creation of the perceiving Ego—the modifications of its own subjectivity—all the " states of matter representing the aggregate of perceived objects " can have but a relative and purely phenomenal existence for the children of our plane.... This does not necessarily lead to the conclusion that it is the same on all other planes.... The co-operation of Cosmic Substance and Cosmic Ideation on the planes of their septenary differentiation results in a septenary aggregate of phenomena which are likewise non-existent *per se*, though concrete realities for the Entities of whose experience they form a part, in the same manner as the rocks and rivers around us are real from the stand-point of a physicist, though unreal illusions of sense from that of the metaphysician. It would be an error to say, or even conceive such a thing. From the stand-point of the highest metaphysics, the whole Universe, gods included, is an illusion ; but the illusion of him who is in himself an illusion differs on every plane of consciousness ; and we have no more right to dogmatise about the possible nature of the perceptive faculties of an Ego on, say, the sixth plane, than we have to identify our perceptions with, or make them a standard for, those of an ant, in *its* mode of consciousness. The pure object apart from consciousness is unknown to us, while living on the plane of our three-dimensional World ; as we know only the mental states it excites in the perceiving Ego. And, so long as the contrast of Subject and Object endures—to wit, as long as we enjoy our five senses and no more, and do not know how to divorce our all-perceiving *Ego* (the Higher Self) from the thraldom of these senses—so long will it be impossible for the *personal* Ego to break through the barrier which separates it from a knowledge of *things in themselves* (*or Substance*). That Ego, progressing in an arc of ascending subjectivity, must exhaust the experience of every plane. But not till the Unit is merged in the ALL, whether on this or any other plane, and Subject and Object alike vanish in the absolute negation of the Nirvanic State (negation, again, only *from our plane*),

is scaled that peak of Omniscience—the Knowledge of things-in-themselves; and the solution of the yet more awful riddle approached, before which even the highest Dhyan Chohan must bow in silence and ignorance—the unspeakable mystery of that which is called by the Vedantins, the PARABRAHMAN.—I. 329-30.

Esoteric philosophy, teaching an *objective* Idealism—though it regards the objective Universe and all in it as *Maya*, temporary illusion—draws a practical distinction between collective illusion, *Mahamaya*, from the purely metaphysical stand-point, and the objective relations in it between various conscious *Egos* so long as this illusion lasts.—I. 631.

The impalpable atoms of gold scattered through the substance of a ton of auriferous quartz may be imperceptible to the naked eye of the miner, yet he knows that they are not only present there but that they alone give his quartz any appreciable value; and this relation of the gold to the quartz may faintly shadow forth that of the noumenon to the phenomenon. But the miner knows what the gold will look like when extracted from the quartz, whereas the common mortal can form no conception of the reality of things separated from the Maya which veils them, and in which they are hidden. Alone the Initiate, rich with the lore acquired by numberless generations of his predecessors, directs the "Eye of Dangma" toward the essence of things in which no Maya can have any influence.—I. 45.

H. P. BLAVATSKY.

THE COLOUR LINE.

["**Explorer**" covers the personality of a writer, who a good many years ago took the highest academic honours at Oxford, and has since filled some of the most responsible staff positions in British journalism. He has specialized upon Labour and International questions. His contribution adds something to the study of the problem pursued in our February number by A. J. Hoffman in "What Civilization has done for the Native," and in our last issue by Lord Olivier who wrote under the title "Some Moral Aspects of the Colour Bar."

"Explorer" has not mentioned the peculiar phenomenon of certain communities, themselves practising the bar in marriage to which he refers, while decrying the discrimination made against their own colour. Thus the Brahamanas of India who are logically vehement about the colour bar practised by the whites against them raise a great hue and cry when a Hindu woman marries a Mussalman; again the Parsi community is notorious for its rigour against 'juddin' marriages, but is irate at discrimination made by the British against "us, the Parsis!" and so it goes on.

In this as in other spheres *individuals* can do a great deal by a sagacious and temperate attitude towards the whole problem. Retaliation cannot work; from within the heart of the individual the right attitude must proceed. That attitude is dependent on the understanding of the ideal of *Universal* Brotherhood—the rejection of its false species, the brotherhood of a clique, in a class or of a community—and the seeking of the only true variety which, as the prefix states, is Universal.—EDS.]

Colour is the most obstinate of human divisions. You can change your religion by conversion or your nationality by naturalisation; or transcend both by harmonising their outlooks with that of world-citizenship. You can learn languages not taught you in the cradle. But the destiny which decreed that you should be white, black, brown or yellow, no human effort can set aside. Its outward and visible signs will cling to you, to your children, and to your children's children, for as many generations as you can usefully foresee.

It is this fact of heredity which has created the "colour line"—a taboo on intermarriage between the colours.

Before 1,500 the line was unknown, and there was little scope for it. The four main colours inhabited regions of the earth naturally separate; and if specimens of one strayed into another's area, they were too sparse for people to mind about, even though a few hybrids resulted. Even in certain areas like Siam and Japan, where hybridisation was on a national scale, there is little if any record of division. Only in India, where successive waves of white invaders burst in to leaven the brown mass on the plains, did these immigrants, while foregoing their race-purity, yet cling to race-privilege, and so found the caste system, which has since been India's chief social peculiarity.

What the Line Amounts To.

In modern times the colour line is drawn principally by peoples of North European and Protestant descent—that is, by the Dutch and British and their North American descendants.

They draw it with utmost rigour against the negro ; a thought less strictly against the yellow Chinese ; rather less again against the brown Indian ; and not at all against the Red Indian in America or the Maori in New Zealand. These last two are considered physically nearest the white race ; and it is true that hybrids between them and whites can go virtually undistinguished among white people, as no other hybrids can.

On biological grounds the line has much to be said for it. Areas like South Portugal and Brazil, where the opposite policy of miscegenation was followed, show scarcely encouraging results. But in any case the peoples who believe in the line, do so with a quasi-religious conviction. There is no prospect of its changing. One must bow to it as a necessity.

In many ways it is an extremely odious one. To begin with, it negates between the colours all true social equality. For the acid test of equal association, whether between races or classes, is whether you admit the possibility of your associate's marrying your sister or your daughter. If you cannot, you imply his inferiority ; and no matter how courteous or just you are, or how deeply you are bound up with him in business or public service, nothing can undo that implication or deaden the sting which it keeps rankling.

Bane of Race Dualism.

But where white and coloured populations live side by side in mass numbers, the evil consequences assume far more gigantic proportions. The wall between them runs through every field of life. Instead of a joint democracy, you get a rigid oligarchy of one colour over the other.

The Southern communities of the United States represent the pattern. Separate and inferior railway-carriages, tramcars, restaurants, churches and schools are set apart for the coloured people. They and the whites mix freely nowhere. They share neither in the government nor in the judicature. No black man can be sure of justice against a white man in the courts. Outside the courts the hideous atrocity of lynching persists.

Parallel conditions obtain in South Africa, where the " Jim Crow car " principle is just as thoroughly applied, and where negroes, though not lynched, get little justice at law. The Dutch attitude is peculiarly harsh ; it can be seen from the Nafts case of last spring, as well as from General Hertzog's Bill.

The blight falls not only on the coloured man. The white suffers also, both morally and in the field of labour. At first he may rejoice to dump the unpleasant tasks upon black hands. But as one job after another becomes black men's work (which therefore no white man may touch), the white manual labourer is stranded. He becomes an unemployable " poor-white "—the most hopeless of all classes.

Hence the Canute-like proposal of General Hertzog in South Africa—to order back the rising wave of Kaffir skill and aptitude by

legally closing against Kaffirs the door to all higher artisan jobs. Hence too the original motive for stopping Asiatic immigration into Australia and New Zealand.

What Remedies are Possible.

How can one lessen these evils? It is extremely difficult. Christianity, for instance, which proclaims that "God is no respecter of persons," has yet had to acquiesce in a system which forbids black people to worship in white churches, even at special services of their own.

In America we may perhaps hope for growing improvement from the more direct attention now paid there to the subject by earnest, forward-looking and philanthropic persons. But in South Africa things seem likely to become worse before (if even) they turn better.

In either area it may be doubted if the maximum of improvement can be more than a mitigation. The evils rampant in a colour-divided society are inherent and not really curable.

What can be done, is to prevent such societies from developing in new lands. In this view Australia and New Zealand are quite right to confine their immigration to white peoples. But it is not only white areas which require to be kept homogeneous. Brown, black or yellow areas have the same need.

I believe it has been a great mistake to allow and encourage white colonists in British East Africa. Already, as self-government is mooted, the evils loom clearer. You can never get the white settlers to share autonomy with a black majority. Yet you cannot confer autonomy on the whites alone with any hope that they will give the blacks justice. Recent legislation in white-enfranchised Southern Rhodesia brings out the point.

The policy pursued throughout British West Africa, as from earlier times in Basutoland and Bechuanaland—development of the natives through native leadership without white settlement—is much longer-sighted.

On the same principle I think it wise to debar Indians and Chinese from settling in Africa; though of course those already settled there are entitled to have their rights respected as fully as white men's.

The sum of experience is, that upon an area with natives of a particular colour incomers of a different colour may confer great benefits as engineers, doctors, teachers, administrators, and so on. But not as settlers. The distinction is quite vital. It should be clearly seen and practically followed.

EXPLORER.

SHALL WE BECOME CIVILIZED?

[**B. M.** is an old-world man living by his old-world methods in our era. We are fortunate in having secured a few reports of his talks to his intimate friends. The Bhagavad-Gita is the book he has mastered through long years of study and meditation; but further, having lived according to its tenets more successfully than is generally possible, his thoughts breathe a peculiar fragrance. The papers have been translated from the vernacular; it should be understood that they are not literal translations, and the translator has adhered more to ideas and principles than to words. Although B. M. knows English, his inspiration becomes impeded in employing that medium of expression, and so he prefers not to use it. We think our readers will find real inspiration in this series.—EDS.]

"The truly devoted, for the purification of the heart, perform actions with their bodies, their minds, their understanding, and their senses, putting away all self-interest."—*Bhagavad-Gita*, V, 11.

India is cursed with millions of idlers who call themselves Sannyasis and are generally accepted as such. They not only make the economic situation of this poor country worse than it already is, but also are a moral plague, for they exploit the devotion of millions of villagers, especially the women. They are false and fleeting shadows, but faintly indicative of the very few and the rarely to be encountered true sons of light, the genuine Sannyasis. To such true ones we give salutations and say—Namastae!.

The *Gita* is the book of rules and conduct for true Sannyasis. Its fifth discourse is named Sannyasa-yoga, yoga or devotion by means of renunciation of action. In the shloka quoted above, we find described by Shri Krishna what a Yogi does. A real Yogi is a truly devoted person, and he performs many kinds of actions. He is not idle either with his body and its senses, or with his mind, or with his discriminative Buddhi.

It is a matter of conviction with us that India's emancipation depends on India producing Sannyasis of the true type. Towards that end the idea should go abroad that to support and feed the idler who poses as a Sannyasi is irreligious and unspiritual, and that it is false charity, for it is given to the wrong person, at the wrong place and at the wrong time. An elimination of false Yogis and Sannyasis must take place.

How can India produce true Yogis and Sannyasis? First, by understanding what the words imply, and then by a few patriot souls setting out not to talk but to practise Yoga and Sannyasa.

A Yogi is one who has taken the path in the direction of his own Inner God, or Higher Self, and recognizing It as his admonisher and sustainer has begun to act selflessly.

A Sannyasi is one who renounces not the doing of actions but the result of their performance. He goes through his appointed work in life, follows the wheel of duty to race and kin, to friend and foe, but endeavours seriously and regularly to close his mind to pleasures as to pains.

These definitions arise, over and over again, in our study of the *Gita*. The Mahatma speaking to his Chela repeats the concepts of real Sannyasa and true Tyaga, and quotes Himself and His like as examples of Men who act, Their renunciation being of the sweet fruits of Their deeds.

There is another thing which the *Gita* brings out. Nowhere do we find that only a caste-man or even an Aryan alone can enter the Path of Renunciation. Can Musalmans become Sannyasis without turning infidels ? Of course they can. Every real Sufi is a Sannyasi, every true Dervish is a Yogi, and the noble word Faqir has been as debased by its application to worthless beggars as the name Tyagi. Can Parsis practise Yoga ? Certainly ; for every Parsi heart is the receptacle of the embers of the Sacred Fire, which when once kindled, makes him the Son of Ahura Mazda. For the Christians, St. Paul's admonition holds true: "If the Spirit of him who raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you." (Romans, VIII, 11). Every true Buddhist knows the injunction of Gotama : "Look within, thou art Buddha." Every Jew familiar with his Kabala knows about the alchemical process whereby the self is raised unto the Self.

Any man or woman acquiring a new attitude to life can tread the Path of Renunciation. Such a man need not give up his home to make the jungle his habitat ; he has to begin to live in the home differently. He must not commit the sin of running away from his duties, but should perform every single one of them, without anxiety about the accruing results. He must train and control his senses ; he must exercise and make agile and healthy his body ; he must act mentally, *i.e.*, study and reflect upon what he studies, and make use of his discrimination born of his meditations in the performance of all acts. Throughout he must bear in mind the object, which the above-quoted *Gita* verse advocates—purification of the heart. Body and its senses, mind and its powers are but the instruments which are to be used to purify the heart.

It is not what we do that alone matters, but also how we do anything. What we should avoid doing are those acts which take us away from our congenital duties; what we should be attentive to is the timely performance of all that is to be done. The method of such performance makes the Yogi, the Sannyasi, the Tyagi—to do our duty by every duty, regardless of consequences ; to learn that in every station of life the Soul is educating itself, and that what matters is that the education continues irrespective of its bestowing on us pleasure or inflicting on us pain. In opulence and poverty alike the Soul grows—more in poverty than in opulence.

To educate ourselves in the school of life we need a discipline, and the *Gita* supplies it for every stage of human evolution. We have to impose that discipline on ourselves. The barbarian in us receives his death-warrant when we take ourselves in hand and energize ourselves to act with thought and deliberation . To be self-reliant is to

be dependent on the Great Self within and not on any outside agency. To acquire true individuality we must live daily by self-induced and self-devised efforts, and even though our past errors may check and thwart us we must persist and ascend through all degrees of intelligence till perfection is reached. To start this journey is to touch civilization, for thus we leave chaos behind and enter the world of order. To start us on that journey the Wise One said :

> Rouse thyself by thy Self, examine thyself by thy Self; thus Self-protected and attentive wilt thou live happily—*Dhammapada*, 379.

B. M.

Ancient civilizations have never sacrificed Nature to speculation, but holding it as divine, have honoured her natural beauties by the erection of works of art, such as our modern electric civilization could never produce even in dream. The sublime grandeur, the mournful gloom and majesty of the ruined temples of Pæstum, that stand for ages like so many sentries over the sepulchre of the Past and the forlorn hope of the Future amid the mountain wilderness of Sorrento, have inspired more men of genius than the new civilization will ever produce.

H. P. B., *Lucifer*, May 1891.

CIVILISATION.

[**Professor C. Delisle Burns, M.A. (Cantab.), D.Lit. (London),** Stevenson Lecturer in Citizenship, University of Glasgow, has been recognized as an authority on economic and civic questions and is now becoming an outstanding figure as a lecturer on problems of the day. He was University Extension Lecturer for the Oxford, Cambridge and London Universities, 1908-15, going to the United States for the Lent terms, 1911-14. Afterwards he was associated with the Ministries of Reconstruction and Labour; with an interval in between at the Labour Office, the League of Nations, and later with the Joint Research Department of the Trade Union Congress and Labour Party. In 1924 he returned to the academic field as lecturer in logic and philosophy, University of London (Birkbeck College), and in Social Philosophy, London School of Economics, 1925-7. Author of several books on philosophy, civics and politics, he was occupied for ten years on a Short History of the World, 1918-1928.

An important implication is made by Mr. Delisle Burns in his sentence—"Modern Civilisation differs from older civilisations deep down in men's minds, not merely in the use of certain mechanisms." Thoughts and feelings shape and mould a people's ways of life and of action, and these give the particular note to any civilization. Our modern civilization is often called a materialistic one, and we think truly, because in the West the ideas and ideals of the general populace are chiefly centred in the power and potency of matter. This reflects itself even in their mechanistic conception of mind and soul—born of matter, these innate powers and virtues must eventually be resolved into an untraceable existence in corporate humanity.

Ideals and thoughts have made the Egyptian or Indian or Chinese or any civilization. The goals of life and objects of existence among early Asiatics were more spiritual, which is the main reason why they preferred to devise methods for the training of the soul than to invent mechanical devices for the comfort of the body. And yet—even on the plane of matter their monuments show them as superior to the modern architects; their jewels and utensils and clothes evince marvellous craftsmanship; and those who thought on the truths of the Vedas and the Upanishads did not live in hovels, and nowhere better practised was the precept *mens sana in corpore sano* than among the Indians, taught by the yogis.

Next month we will publish an article from an Indian Professor who examines judiciously the views here propounded by Mr. C. Delisle Burns and those in the article of Mr. C. E. M. Joad which appeared in our January issue —Eds.]

It is best to think in terms of actual men, women and children, eating and sleeping, working or talking together. Civilised life is merely a certain way of doing such ordinary acts. It is distinguished from barbarism by the variety of the acts performed and the intricacy of the organisation required to maintain any particular way of doing such acts. A barbarian is not less virtuous perhaps, nor less happy than a civilised man: but if a man is civilised, his abilities of intelligence and emotion are more fully "in play," and the number of different ways in which he comes into contact with his fellows is much greater than is possible for the best barbarian. In short, despite appearances, the civilised man is more "alive" than the barbarian.

But types of civilisation differ. Some are very old. Some are the expressions of climatic or biological conditions, which are peculiar to certain parts of the world. China and India produced civilised men and women long ago, when England was barbarian and America unpopulated. But no type of civilisation is perfect : and old civilisations especially tend to restrict the channels through which new generations may express their own vitality. Civilisations which differ because of the climate or race in which they were founded may also differ because they are at different "stages" in their development, just as an Englishman and an Indian may differ, not only by race but also by age, if the particular Englishman in question is only twenty and the Indian is eighty. It is possible that the comparative "age" of what is called "Western civilisation" and the present traditional culture of China or India distinguish them more completely than their racial or biological characteristics ; but "age" in this sense is not merely length of time. The civilisation of China has lasted a very long time : but it is still agricultural and feudal, and therefore less developed than what is called Western civilisation. The characteristic of a developed civilised life is a much fuller vitality of all the men, women and children who live it ; and by "fuller vitality" is meant more to do, more to think about and more to feel. In this sense Western civilisation is at a later stage of development than any other.

Let it be granted however that we are not discussing differences of the types of civilisation. The point for discussion here is the character of *modern* civilisation. What is usually called Western civilisation may have some geographical characteristics which would explain calling it "Western"—but these are negligible for the present purpose. The civilisation of England, France and the United States is "modern" in the sense that it is at a stage of development which has not been reached by the civilisation of China or India. There is no reason why the latter should not become modern too, while retaining all the biological or climatic characteristics which would make it still Oriental ; but at present the dominant "tone," the customs and current beliefs of England and North America must be taken as typical of the modern.

What are the chief characteristics of that kind of life ? For an answer the social must be distinguished from the political and from the economic aspects of life—that is to say the cultural customs, the political organisation and the economic must be treated separately ; and it will be best to begin by considering the cultural or social customs. Superficial observers have supposed that the tramway and the motor-car are the characteristics of modern civilisation ; but a closer observation of facts will indicate that how men behave, the manner of adults talking to children, the attitude towards thunderstorms or droughts, the use of leisure—these will show the true characteristics of the civilised life of to-day and not the mere habit of using electric light instead of candles. Modern civilisation differs from older civilisations deep down in men's minds, not merely in the use of certain mechanisms.

The mechanisms themselves are the results of a profound change of attitude which has not yet taken place in India or China.

The cultural or "social" characteristics of modern civilisation involve a consideration and care for the body. This is not in the Christian tradition; but it is now accepted even by missionaries, who do not see its implications. Sport—that is to say, games and gymnastics—are Greek, not Hebraic. The body is treated in modern civilisation as worthy of full development: the keenness of the eye, skill and force of muscle, endurance of lung and heart, and freedom from oppressive dress—these are assumed to be desirable; and all these, as in the Greek tradition, are aimed at in company. Games provide for rivalry and comradeship combined: they test ability not only of the muscle but of the intelligence and above all the intelligent co-operation which is so seldom taught in the "lessons" of the school-room. This was known as a method in ancient Greece; but modern civilisation has made games and bodily development available for much greater numbers in any society than ever before and, secondly, available to women as well as men. It is difficult for the present generation to remember how recent the custom is which allows not merely girls but women of all ages to show their prowess and to enjoy physical exercises. This will soon do more for establishing a real equality of sentiment between the sexes than many political debates. Not that women can contend against men in physical energy; but that the same methods which have secured for men physical development and skill in co-operation will be available for women.

In the use of the intelligence and in the range of emotion modern civilisation allows—and even promotes—free thought and discussion of all subjects. Traditional dogmas and customs, sexual relations and civic obligations—nothing is too sacred to explore or too dangerous. A few of the more youthful in England, Germany and North America pretend to being advanced by repeating the obscenities of Petronius or Beccadelli: but that must not be confounded with modern civilisation. The freedom of discussion to which reference is here made is new in the sense that more facts are made available by exact observation, and "repressions" are known for what they are, useful but limited in their uses. And those who are, in the modern sense, civilised do not often raise the same old issues: since they are concerned not with abstract discussion but with the production of works of art—in literature or in one of the plastic arts—or with the organisation of society, the art of "politics" in its highest sense. The intelligence and emotion of modern civilisation are "practical" in a sense in which neither the Greek nor the eighteenth century civilisation was practical. And all through, in all forms of culture, the converse of men and women is on the basis of equality—a practice which has never occurred in any earlier stage of civilisation.

Passing now to the economic aspects of modern civilisation, first, "production" is organised on a larger scale than ever before—not merely because there is a greater concentration of power-supply, in oil or electricity, or more complex machinery in steamships or factories,

but also because *finance* is world-wide in its operations. The old world of nineteenth century industry is as obsolete as the middle ages. The modern banking system and the interlocking of industries are established as the basis of production. Consumption also has changed; it is more varied, in most industrial areas, than it was even in 1900. Cinemas, wireless and motor-cars absorb a larger proportion of "consuming ability" than bread and clothes: and, further, such goods are available for millions of folk who in 1900 were still imprisoned by their neighbourhood. In thinking of the new mechanisms—the baths and drains, not merely the wireless—available for nearly all in North America, the attention should be given to the effect upon the minds of men. Economic changes are producing a new attitude. Men are less inclined than they were to accept as inevitable the conditions in which they find themselves. The mind is less conservative, more experimental. This may not be altogether good. There may be many dangers ahead, especially in view of the revolt of the younger generation against the dogmas of old people who call their own bad habits by the lofty name of "experience". But good or bad, modern civilisation is alive and young.

In that part of life affected by political organisation also modern civilisation has characteristics which distinguish it from earlier types. First, its assumptions are those usually connected with the democratic tradition. There is, of course, a retrogression among politically inexperienced peoples, such as the Russians and the Italians, towards democratic forms of tyranny or absolutism. But the main current of modern practice, as in Germany, tends towards making the interests of all citizens the only basis for law and administration; and in most countries each citizen is brought more and more closely into active co-operation, in thought as well as action, with his fellows. Devolution and delegation of functions are proceeding apace. The Great State of the nineteenth century is being decentralised, as may be observed in the new status of British Dominions. But meantime political organisation between States for particular purposes is being elaborated. The system now operating under the name "League of Nations" could not possibly have existed fifty years ago, when States were little more than the organisations for police and defence. Now all modern States have functions in education, public health, commerce and industrial organisation: and in the performance of these functions each State is obliged to co-operate with others—whether it is a member of the League of Nations or not. Modern civilisation, therefore, in its political aspects includes an actually operative organisation which is world-wide and has never been in existence before.

We stand on the threshold of a new era. The transformations involved in what has already occurred are not yet generally understood; but it is quite certain that new social customs, and the new economic and political organisations will affect the deeply rooted religious traditions which survive from earlier and simpler times. It will not long be possible, in a world of aeroplanes and wireless, to accept the

simple assumptions of Christian, or Hindu, or Muslim theology. Not that the old creeds need be disproved. They may not even be denied ; and yet the assumptions on which they rested—the sort of universe and the sort of minds in men which are assumed in the old beliefs and customs—will become as strange as the assumptions of a child's fairy-tale. And a new faith arises. The mind, which has made the new world, is not without its own poetry. The frontiers of experience still exist, although we have explored a large area and the new civilisation which is beginning must therefore produce not merely a new type of mechanism or institution, but a new type of man and woman. The civilised man of the middle nineteenth century is not good enough for our present needs. We need men and women much more subtle in their reactions to experience and, above all, more skilful in their intercourse. Modern civilisation has not only its achievements but its ideals. More important than a knowledge of what England, Germany and North America now have, is a knowledge of the direction in which they are looking. That is the most significant characteristic of modern civilisation. It looks forward to the future. It consists not in the preservation of a tradition, however valuable, but is the experimentalism which makes of life not only a science in accordance with discovered rules but an art. With skill we may yet have a life of common folk all free and all vigorous, without ignorance, poverty or war. Only the first essays in that have been made by modern civilisation ; but the first essays which were made in Europe and America may yet be followed by further progress made in Asia.

C. Delisle Burns.

IS SORCERY EMPLOYED IN MODERN SHOPS?

[**Claire Bergson Endersby,** is an American business woman—one of the growing class which demands that ethics shall be practised in trade and that in the war of gold all tactics should not be regarded as fair. A rather practical problem of business ethics is raised in this article. In copying Western methods of business Indians should beware of the danger-line to which it makes reference —EDS.]

The query is put in all seriousness. It is inevitable that, in a complex civilization, the function of selling should be assumed by a specialized group, but some modern methods for attaining sales volume certainly are open to question from the standpoint of ethics, quite apart from their legality.

There is much talk of the burden of retail failures upon the community, as represented by the creditors of the bankrupt establishment. Sometimes it is overlooked, however, that the salesmen of manufacturer or wholesaler who overpersuade the injudicious retailer, with offers of free deals or tempting prices, to stock commodities he cannot sell or buy in larger quantities than he can profitably handle, not only lack business judgment but are morally responsible to the extent that their selling methods contribute to his failure.

It is the system that is to blame as much as, or more than, the individual salesman. The emphasis laid upon volume of sales, the sales drives and sales contests staged by their firms, almost force salesmen, in many cases, into a choice between high pressure salesmanship and changing their profession.

It is natural, as production has increased and its methods have become more efficient, that emphasis has shifted from production to distribution. It is well that distribution economies should be sought and applied, but it is a serious matter that the process has brought in its train the grave abuses of the merchant's honourable calling that we sometimes find to-day. Time was when a store was primarily a place where goods were bought, but stores are becoming increasingly places where goods are sold.

It is desirable that there should be prompt, courteous, and efficient service of retail customers, but when clerks are trained in the so-called "psychology of salesmanship," the danger-line is approached. When, urged thereto by their employer, they push the lines most profitable to him, regardless of their comparative merits or the best interests of the consumer, and especially when they try to subject the purchaser's will to their own by the power of suggestion, are tney not, consciously or unconsciously, treading the borderlands of sorcery? For what is sorcery but the exercise, for selfish ends, of powers higher than the physical? The power of thought, immeasurably strengthened by the deliberate use of suggestion, is such a power.

Of course these methods are not applied to all commodities. The convenience or utility goods, the humdrum necessities of life, practically will sell themselves, as witness the success of many "self-serve" stores. Applied psychology finds its widest scope in selling so-called "shopping" goods or luxuries. Of course not all stores allow, or all clerks apply, high pressure sales tactics, but it frequently is not the efficient performance of the selling function that is uppermost in the clerk's intent, not showing her stock in the appropriate price range courteously but impersonally, but leading the undecided customer firmly past the milestones of the sales psychologist: Attention, Interest, Desire, Decision, Action.

The psychologized customer, swept off her feet by the clerk's eloquence, often yields up her judgment for the time being. When it reasserts itself, perhaps the recent purchase goes to swell the great volume of returned goods of which the stores complain, but for much of which their own selling tactics are to blame. Some firms' realization of this fact leads them to urge their clerks, not to let customers make their own decisions, which is the obvious solution, but to exercise better judgment in what they sell them, so that the chances of lasting satisfaction in the purchase may be greater.

Anything short of actual misrepresentation of the goods is permitted and encouraged by many stores. Such firms teach their clerks to consider the store's profit and their own sales quota first, and customer's satisfaction as of importance only in so far as it contributes to them. *Caveat emptor!*

A case in point is the following advice offered in a page of suggestions for "selling the group shopper," recently issued by a well-known American merchant's service corporation:

> Once you have definitely decided which of the group is the one to finally decide, your selling talk should be directed to that person. If you can, in an unobtrusive way, without losing caste with the other person, show the one who will make the decision that you recognize her importance in the transaction, you have her on your side. It is easy for the salesperson in the ready-to-wear to do that while one is being fitted. In many other cases it is not so easy. However, a complimentary reference to the good taste of the person who will pass the decision, if not too baldly put, will often get her on your side. Guard against showing too plainly that you know who is making the decision, lest you offend the other person.

In other words, for the sake of making a sale the clerk is urged, throwing straightforward dealing aside, to appeal to the vanity of the customer or her adviser, for what conceivable purpose but to throw her off her guard and make her more susceptible to the suggestions the clerk offers in her selling talk? In sober truth, would not a fitting title for such sales manuals be "First Steps in Sorcery"?

CLAIRE BERGSON ENDERSBY.

TOWARDS A RECOVERY OF THE SPIRITUAL LIFE.

[**Irwin Edman** is Professor of Philosophy at Columbia University, New York, and author of *Human Traits* and other volumes.

In this able article he takes a general survey of how life and philosophy, separated for centuries, are now trying to coalesce. He almost prophesies that the realms beyond the senses will gain recognition, through human experience, which will eventually touch "the imponderables and immediacies."

We find in this hope a justification for our pointing out that the great spiritual philosophers, not recognized by the physical philosophers of the West, have recorded their experiences and realizations long ago. Take the *Bhagavad-Gita* or the Upanishads; take the wisdom imparted by the Buddha in His chain of Nidanas and conception of Nirvana, coupled with His ethical sermons and sayings; so far mostly the Western philologist has used them. They need to be examined as philosophies of practical living by men like Mr. Edman. The recovery of spiritual life in the West will gain strength through such study and examination, to the advantage of West and East alike.—EDS.]

Those who turn to current thinking for a consideration of those ultimate matters which are the concern of all serious speculation, are confronted with two alternative forms of frustration. They look as ever to find in philosophical thought some sanction for their fundamental ideals, some ground in the nature of things for their more dominant aspirations. There is a still living or at least still lingering tradition which uses the old words, eloquent survivals, as the terms for ancient ineluctable interests, the soul of man, his agonies, his hopes, and his salvation. All these words have become suspect, though the interests they represent have remained real. And suspect, too, have become the mythologies with which they are connected and the outmoded pictures they give of the world. We are asked to swallow along with much edifying and exciting counsel, much that we cannot credit or even conceive. The religious formulations of the past bring along with a certain moral elevation a cosmic geography that is hopelessly unbelievable, and an authority that is hopelessly out of date.

Nor is there much more comfort to be derived from those systems of thought so popular since Hegel and so much influenced by him which, by a technique of logic as pure as it is remote, identify the substance of being with the essence of Beauty, Goodness and Truth.

If one turns from the traditional philosophies commingled of moral wisdom and metaphysical childishness to more contemporary thought, one reaches a different but equally calamitous alternative. Say what one will about the thinking that looks towards nature and that speaks the language of physical science, it seems singularly remote in its deliverances from all that it concerns a human being in his capacity as a human being to know or to reckon with,—hope

and love and fear and aspiration. Subtilize as one will the names for our passions or the anatomy of their origins, those passions are still there. Refine as one will the vocabulary of descriptions of that ambient world which confronts us daily and conditions our activities, it is still there obdurately to be dealt with, or at auspicious moments to be loved and enjoyed. That inner realm of passions, that outer world of goods and evils among which our passions find their objects and their deployments,—with respect to all this the language of the new philosophies is highly inept, and its temper curiously alien. We cannot believe in the old philosophies; in the new ones we cannot feel at home. In the former we no longer find incitement, in the latter we do not yet find nourishment for the spiritual life.

The spiritual life! One uses the term diffidently, so outworn a tag does it seem and so loaded with outworn sentimentalisms. Yet there is no other epithet, certainly no better one, to describe the kind of life which turns mechanical energies to human uses and physical impulses to ideal ends. Matter turned to light and flesh made the vehicle of a realizing flame, this is one way of describing the spiritual life. But that light illuminates specific objects and that heat comes from specific sources. The human body moving in a mechanical world touches timeless wonders, to touch which is in turn to be touched to flame. The whole of that section of the religious and philosophical tradition which may be described as wisdom rather than as merely technical or professional chatter, has been concerned with describing the process of the spiritual life or those objects which feed its fire. It has been a language for describing, as in Plato or in Dante, that love by which the soul is moved and all the stars as well. It has been an attempt to describe the eternal objects of its transient adorations. The mystic can, as St. Bonaventura does, delineate the "itinerary of the mind to God." He can like St. Thomas define and discern God himself. Plato can in the *Symposium* have Socrates recount the upward steps in the ladder of love, but he ends by describing that Absolute Beauty itself in which the soul finds itself as it loses itself in ultimate absorption. In the *Pheadrus* he can portray the charioteer of the soul and his heavenly circuit of beholding; he can also enumerate the Truth, Goodness and Beauty which the charioteer in his circling of the Heaven of Ideas beholds.

Where are we to turn in contemporary thinking for an expression of that flaming sensibility and subtilized awareness which constitutes the spiritual life? Where shall we find described those objects upon which that living consciousness may play? The whole atmosphere of contemporary thinking is calculated rather to defeat than to liberate that awareness. For so far as concerns physical science and those physiological analyses, modelled upon physical inquiry, which attempt to explain or explain away our consciousness, we shall find nothing to inform or confirm us concerning our deeper passions and their more permanent objects.

The mystic used the language of poetry to describe a spiritual experience. The psychiatrist uses the language of a kind of bastard physics to explain it away. St. John of the Cross told us of the dark night of the soul through which the parched soul must pass and the light and healing to which it may come. Our newer psychologies, quite oblivious to the genuine experience St. John was narrating, merely explain his language away. Nor, so far as the objects of spiritual absorption are concerned, does contemporary scientific thought leave us very much better off. Juggle time and space into some new combination of time-space, translate the old atoms of nineteenth century physics into lines of force or what you will. The world of physics remains the world of physics; it is concerned with events that happen in time, things that exist in space as these are diurnally known and met with. There is little that it has to say concerning that truth which the operations of thinking involve, that goodness which is the criterion of all our considered actions, that somehow haunting beauty which we detect half realized in some transient earthly incarnation.

There are signs, none the less, that thinking is moving toward a frank concern once more with those eternities toward which thinking naturally veers and imagination turns, and those processes which when we live them we know to be our most free and living moments. The spiritual life and the world in which it occurs are once more calling for attention in their own terms. The reaction is best evident, perhaps, in the revolt against that mechanistic intellectualism which preoccupied the nineteenth century. Bergson was the first to point out the radical error of those theories which held that reality could be known intellectually, those theories which found in theory itself a revelation of truth. Bergson's great strength lay in a brilliant challenging of the claim of the skeletal intellect to be the life blood of reality. There have been more profound attempts since, (Eddington and Whitehead are instances), of philosophical writers who are trying to reinstate as valid other approaches to reality than the so long sanctified "false power of making secondary distinctions." Eddington states once again the claim of the religious mystic. Whitehead reminds us of the poetic faculty which can render in a luminous moment some integrity of experience, colourful and intimate and real, which no scientific abstraction can touch, no formula of action or thought explain away.

In the same way there is a growing insistence on the part of thinkers no longer obsessed with the neat delusion of nineteenth century physical formulas, that there are objects as well as experiences which the world of physics leaves unexplored and unrejected. Some, like Santayana, call them essences, those eternal forms which may for a moment come into physical incarnation, or become actualized in some apprehension or imagining, but whose pure eternity is independent of their actualization in any world. Some may, like Whitehead, speak of the general principle of Possibility as, or as of, a new God. But by whatever names these eternal things are now called, they are

those objects which men have always felt to be implicit in their thinking, their action and their art. The spaceless images of thought, the timeless forms of aesthetic relations, the undying and recurrent standard of goodness which even moral scepticism involves,—all these are beginning to be recognized and recovered to our consciousness, to be part of that reality which, if we are not laboratory provincials, we must take into account.

All this takes us into a kindlier air and a nobler altitude than those lowlands where we have been intellectually residing during this last generation. The realm of morals, of art and of contemplation are beginning to find again metaphysical sanction ; the experiences of love, of religious exaltation, of aesthetic intuition are finding once more a ground in the less narrowly conceived nature of things. The spiritual life, since every kind of life must find its articulation, will in our age, too, find its appropriate language. It will be neither the worn tradition of the past, nor the bleak mathematics of recent thinking. It will be a more generous kind of empiricism than what has passed by that name. It will be a philosophy of experience, but experience will be seen to include those imponderables and immediacies which a too hasty thought has been inclined to brush aside. Immediate insight, the flame of living vision, will be once more philosophically respectable, and the geography of eternal things will once more be recognized by the citizens of time.

Irwin Edman.

THE ZOROASTRIAN CALENDAR AND ITS APPLICATION TO PERSIAN LITERATURE.

[**Dr. Hadi Hassan Saheb, B.Sc. (Bombay), B.A., Hons. (Cantab.), Ph.D. (London)**, is Professor of Persian in the Muslim University of Aligarh. He is the author of *Studies in Persian Literature*, *History of Persian Navigation*, *Falaki-i-Shirwani, His Times, Life and Works*. His learned article is not without interest for the lay reader. —EDS.]

I

There are two calendars of Zoroastrian months—firstly, the era of Yazdigird beginning with the accession of Yazdigird to the throne of Persia on 16 June, 632 A.D., and secondly, the era of Jalālu'd-Dīn dating from the vernal equinox, 15 March, 1079 A.D. These and other calendars have been fully worked out by R. Schram in his *Kalendariographische und Chronologoische Tafeln*, Leipzig, 1908. This work is of exceptional value but has curiously not been noticed by Orientalists. Schram discusses the following calendars: (*i*) the Julian calendar, pp. 2-99 ; (*ii*) the Gregorian, calendar pp. 67-99 ; (*iii*) the Alexandrian calendar pp. 108-157 ; (*iv*) the Republican calendar, pp. 160-171 ; (*v*) the calendar of Jalālu'd-Dīn, pp. 163-171 ; (*vi*) the calendar of Yazdigird (calculated from 1 A.Y. to 1799 A.Y.), pp. 174-181 ; (*vii*) the Egyptian calendar, pp. 183-189 ; (*viii*) the Jewish calendar, pp. 191-235 ; (*ix*) the Japanese and Chinese calendars, pp. 243-280 ; (*x*) the calendar of the Hijra, pp. 284-319 ; and finally (*xi*) the Indian calendar, pp. 322-355. Schram has proceeded methodically by allotting "day-numbers" ; and the equivalence of these day-numbers enables an immediate conversion of dates from one calendar to another. For example, the astronomer-mathematician Aḥmad-i-'Abdu'l-Jalīl-i-Sijzī in his *al-Jāmi'u'sẖ- Sẖāhī*, British Museum MS Or. 1346. f. 57[a] and 90[a], mentions the Yazdigirdī dates 330 A.Y. and 358 A.Y. Now, turning to Schram we get the following equations :—

A

1 Farwardīn (*i.e.*, New Year's Day) 330 A.Y.=2072, 147 (day-number)=5 Ṣafar 350 A.H.=26 March 961 A.D.

30 Isfandārmadh (*i.e.*, last day of the year) 330 A.Y.=2072,511 (day-number)=15 Ṣafar 351 A.H.=25 March 962 A.D.

B

1 Farwardīn 358 A.Y.=2082,367 (day-number)—8 Dhū'l-Ḥijja 378 A. H.=19 March 989 A. D.

30 Isfandārmadh 358 A.Y.=2082,731 (day-number)=17 Dhū'l Ḥijja 379 A.H.=18 March 990 A.D.

These are therefore the exact dates when Aḥmad-i-'Abdu'l-Jalīl-i-Sijzī was alive, and the calculations made by the Orientalist

Mirzā Muḥammad Khān in his edition of the *Chahār-Maqāla*, p. 199, must consequently be amended.[1]

Similarly, the astronomer Abū'l-Ḥasan Kūshyār b. Labbān-i-Jīlī in his *Majmalu'l-Uṣūl*, British Museum MS. Add 7490 f. 22b and 4a, gives the Yazdigirdī dates 321 A.Y. and 361 A.Y. which in terms of the Hijra are as follows :—

A

1 Farwardīn 321 A.Y.=2068,862 (day-number)=28 Shawwāl 340 A.H.=28 March 952 A.D.

30 Isfandārmadh 321 A.Y.=2069, 226 (day-number)=8 Dhū'l-Qa'da 341 A.H.=27 March 953 A.D.

B

1 Farwardīn 361 A.Y.=2083, 462 (day-number)=10 Muḥarram 382 A.H.=18 March 992 A.D.

30 Isfandārmadh 361 A.Y.=2083,826 (day-number)=20 Muḥarram 383 A. H.=17 March 993 A. D.

These are consequently the dates when Kūshyār was living, the equivalence given by Mirzā Muḥammad Khān being again incorrect.[2]

II.

Of greater importance is the Zoroastrian calendar for indirect calculations. The amount of historical imformation contained in the *dīwāns* of Persian poets, who are contemporary with the patrons they address, is small but sometimes there occur passages mentioning the synchronism of Muḥammadan and Zoroastrian months and festivals, the exact date of which can easily be calculated. In the *Dīwān-i-Qaṭrān*, for example, British Museum MS. Or. 3317, I have found no dates whatever, but there occurs on ff. 38b-39a the following remarkable passage :—

خسروِ لشکر شکن سالارِ شاهان بوالحسن
آنکه کمتر سایلش با معطیان احسان کند
آنکه دانست او که روزه پیشِ فروردین بود
از پیِ آن مُلک را نوروز در شعبان کند

The army-annihilating monarch and the chief of kings, Abū'l-Ḥasan, the least of whose servants confers favours on (*i.e.*, is superior to) nobles.

Since he knew that the Fast (of Ramaḍān) was falling in Farwardīn he ordered the Kingdom to celebrate Nawrūz (New Year's Day) in Sha'bān.

[1] Mirzā Muḥammad Khān calculated 358 A.Y. as equivalent to 380 A.H.

[2] He considers 321 A.Y. as equivalent to 342 A.H. *Chahār Maqāla*, p. 202.

As Frähn mentions a coin of Abū'l-Ḥasan 'Alī b. Mūsā Lashkarī with the name of the caliph al-Qā'im, and as Bartholomæi describes a coin of al-Faḍl I Abū'l-Aswār Shāwir, son of Abū'l-Ḥasan 'Alī, also with the name of the caliph al-Qā'im,[1] it is obvious that Abū'l-Ḥasan 'Alī reigned and died during the caliphate of al-Qā'im (422-467 A.H.). Now, turning to Schram we can construct the following calendar :—

A.Y.	1st Farwardīn Day-number.	Equivalence.	A.H.
398	2096, 967	19 Ṣafar	420
399	2097, 332	1 Rabī' I	421
400	697	12 Rabī' I	422
401	2098, 062	22 Rabī' I	423
402	427	3 Rabī' II	424
403	792	14 Rabī' II	425
404	2099, 157	24 Rabī' II	426
405	522	6 Jumāda I	427
406	887	16 Jumāda I	428
407	2100, 252	27 Jumāda I	429
408	617	8 Jumāda II	430
409	982	18 Jumāda II	431
410	2101, 347	29 Jumāda II	432
411	712	11 Rajab	433
412	2102, 077	21 Rajab	434
413	442	1 Sha'bān	435
414	807	13 Sha'bān	436
415	2103, 172	23 Sha'bān	437
416	*537*	*5 Ramaḍān*	*438*
417	902	15 Ramaḍān	439
418	2104, 267	26 Ramaḍān	440
419	632	7 Shawwāl	441
420	997	17 Shawwāl	442
421	2105, 362	28 Shawwāl	443
422	727	10 Dhū'l-Qa'da	444
423	2106, 092	20 Dhū'l-Qa'da	445
424	457	1 Dhū'l-Ḥijja	446
425	822	11 Dhū'l-Ḥijja	447
426	2107, 187	22 Dhū'l-Ḥijja	448
427	552	3 Muḥarram	450
428	917	14 Muḥarram	451
429	2108, 282	25 Muḥarram	452
430	647	5 Ṣafar	453

[1] See an article by Sir. E. Denison Ross on *Three Muḥammadan Dynasties in Northern Persia in the 10th and 11th centuries A.D.* in *Asia Major* 1925, Leipzig. Munajjim Bāshī says Abū'l-Ḥasan 'Alī reigned from 425 to 440 A.H. See also Khānikow, Bulletin Acad. Petersb. 1849, Vol. VI, Historical and Philological Section, p. 195 *et seq.*

A.Y.	1st Farwardīn Day-number.	Equivalence.	A.H.
431	2109, 012	16 Ṣafar	454
432	377	27 Ṣafar	455
433	742	8 Rabī‘ I	456
434	2110, 107	19 Rabī‘ I	457
435	472	29 Rabī‘ I	458
436	837	10 Rabī‘ II	459
437	2111, 202	21 Rabī‘ II	460
438	567	2 Jumāda I	461
439	932	13 Jumāda I	462
440	2112, 297	24 Jumāda I	463
441	662	4 Jumāda II	464
442	2113, 027	15 Jumāda II	465
443	392	26 Jumāda II	466
444	757	7 Rajab	467
445	2114, 122	18 Rajab	468

It will be noticed that Nawrūz (New Year's Day or 1st Farwardīn) in 416 A.Y. fell on the 5th of Ramaḍān 438 A.H. and as the festival of Nawrūz could not be celebrated during the Fast of Ramaḍān, the king Abū'l-Ḥasan ordered that Nawrūz should be celebrated that year in Sha‘bān. The relevant date, therefore, is 1 Farwardīn 416 A.Y.=5 Ramaḍān 438 A.H.[2]=5 March 1047 A.D.

A similar synchronism of Nawrūz with Rajab is mentioned by the poet Mas‘ūd-i-Sa‘d-i-Salmān in an ode in praise of Prince Sayfu'd-Dawla Maḥmūd:

خجسته بادت نوروز و این چنین نوروز
هزار جفت شده با مهِ رجب دریاب

A happy New Year to you! May you see such a thousand New Year Days fall in the month of Rajab!

The epoch concerned is about 469 A.H.—a date explicitly mentioned by Mas‘ūd-i-Sa‘d-i-Salmān in an ode addressed to Prince Sayfu'd-Dawla Maḥmūd.[3] Therefore, proceeding to Schram, we find:

[2]. We know independently that Qaṭrān was living in 438 A.H. for in his *Ṣafar-nāma* Nāṣir-i-Khusraw describes meeting Qaṭrān in 438 A.H. In this particular example, therefore, the accuracy of the calendar is checked both by reference to the life of the poet, and the life of the patron.

[3]. که دیر و زود خطیبان کنند بر منبر
بنامِ سیفِ دول خطبهایِ هفت اقلیم

که پادشاهی صاحب قران شود بجهان
چو سالِ هجرت بگذشت تی و سین و سر جیم

A.Y.	1st Farwardīn Day-number.	Equivalence.	A.H.
440	2112, 297	24 Jumāda I	463
441	662	4 Jumāda II	464
442	2113 ,027	15 Jumāda II	465
443	392	26 Jumāda II	466
444	*757*	*7 Rajab*	*467*
445	2114, 122	18 Rajab	468
446	487	28 Rajab	469
447	852	9 Sha'bān	470
448	2115, 217	20 Sha'bān	471

In 467, 468 and 469 A.H. 1st Farwardīn (New Year's Day) fell on 7, 18, and 28 Rajab respectively. It is obvious, however, that the date required is 1 Farwardīn 444 A.Y.=7 Rajab 467 A.H.=26 February 1075 A.D.

III.

The Yazdigirdī year consists of 12 months of 30 days each (*i.e.*, 360 days) plus 5 intercalary days added at the end of Ābān. The solar year, however, consists of 365 days 5 hours 48 minutes and 46 seconds of mean solar time; consequently, the Yazdigirdī year is shorter than the solar year by 5 hours 48 minutes and 46 seconds. To equalize the Zoroastrian year with the solar year so that the seasons may occur annually at the same time the calendar was reformed by Jalālu'd-Dīn Malikshāh (hence called the Jalālī era), and this new era began on the vernal equinox 15 March 1079 A.D. The Jalālī era consists of 12 Zoroastrian months of 30 days but the intercalary days are sometimes 5 and sometimes 6, and are added towards the end of Isfandārmadh.

Now the Persian New Year's Day or *Nawrūz* is 1st Farwardīn, but 1st Farwardīn fluctuates according to the Yazdigirdī era (because the era itself rotates), whereas it occurs regularly at the time of the vernal equinox according to the Jalālī era (because the era began with the vernal equinox 1079 A.D. and because the Jalālī year is regulated by intercalation with the solar year). To say, therefore, that the Persian New Year corresponds with the vernal equinox is true only of the Jalālī era—a fact overlooked by most Orientalists.[1] The calendar observed by the Parsīs, however, is Yazdigirdī, and for them New Year's Day (1st Farwardīn) takes place this year, 1930 A.D., on the 9th of August, and afterwards as follows :—

[1]. See for example Prof. E. G. Browne, *A Literary History of Persia*, Vol. I., pp. 114, 259, 475 and Vol. II, p. 534, n. 1.

A.Y.	1st Farwardīn Day-number.	Equivalence.	A.D. Gregorian.
1300	2426, 197	9 August	1930
1301	562	9 August	1931
1302	927	8 August	1932
1303	2427, 292	8 August	1933
1304	657	8 August	1934

The existence of two calendars, therefore, after 1079 A.D. makes chronological investigations rather difficult, for we must ascertain separately with every poet whether the calendar to be applied is Yazdigirdī or Jalālī. On the other hand, as odes are usually written at the time of festivals there is no panegyrist who has not produced a number of New Year odes, and if a *dīwān* contains several odes describing the occurrence of New Year's Day at the time of the vernal equinox (as for example the *dīwān* of Falakī-i Shirwānī [1] who lived *c.* 500-540 A.H.) it is obvious that the poet concerned is following the Jalālī calendar because, according to the Yazdigirdī calendar, such a regular annual synchronism is impossible. Having therefore ascertained that the calendar required is Jalālī all that remains to be done is to put in parallel columns the Hijrī and Jalālī data available Says Falakī [2]:

رایتِ عید شد عیان موکبِ روزه شد نهان

سنّتِ عید فرض دان فرضِ صیام نافله

عید و خزان و مهرگان هر سه شدند همقران

گشت میانِ هر سه شان بندگیِ تو واصله

The flag of ʻĪd has appeared and the cavalcade of the Fast has departed; consider the observance of the ʻĪd as obligatory and of the Fast as voluntary.

ʻĪd and autumn and Mihrgān—the three have synchronized: and fealty to thee, (O King), is the connecting-link between them.

The festival of Mihrgān lasts from the 16th to the 21st day of the month Mihr, [3] and the ʻĪd of the Fast of Ramaḍān occurs on 1st Shawwāl. Therefore, by converting 1st Shawwāl, from 500 to 540 A.H., into the equivalent Jalālī dates we get the final result:

522 A.H. (1st Shawwāl)=2133, 330 (day-number)=50 A.J. (19 Mihr)=1128 A.D. (28 September).

Instances of this kind are not rare and all of them are extremely valuable for historical purposes.

HADI HASSAN.

1. Edited by the present writer, Royal Asiatic Society, odes IX, XVIII and XIX.

2. *Idem*, couplets 577 and 579.

3. Al-Bīrūnī's *Chronology of Ancient Nations*, tr. E. Sachau, p. 207.

ORIENT AND OCCIDENT.

[**Sir E. Denison Ross, C.I.E.,** Director of the School of Oriental Studies and Professor of Persian in the University of London is a well known Orientalist. He studied Oriental languages in Paris and Strassburg and spent from 1901 to 1914 in India, first in Calcutta as Principal of the Madrasah and the last three years as Officer in charge of Records of the Government of India and Assistant Secretary in the Department of Education. He has travelled extensively in Russia, Asia Minor, Central Asia, China and Persia. His many works include *The Early Years of Shah Ismail*, *The Heart of Asia*, *Life and Times of Omar Khayyam*, *An Arabic History of Gujarat* and *Eastern Art and Literature*.—EDS.]

In India more than in any other country the national mind finds its favourite occupation and its full expression in religion. The main characteristics of Indian religious thought as illustrated by the Upanishads have persisted down to the present day. They are (1) ritual; (2) asceticism or self-mortification as a means of purifying the soul and obtaining spiritual powers; and (3) the belief that salvation and happiness are only to be obtained by the acquisition of knowledge, for the attainment of which the two first are preliminaries. It is obvious that a culture based solely on speculative philosophy has little chance of developing in other directions. Definite progress is made up to a certain point when a final halt seems to be called, which may be attributed in the case of the Hindus in a great measure to the monopoly enjoyed by metaphysics and abstract thought breeding in them a fear of Mother Earth and of all that is purely material, which thus barred the way to experimental science. It is this strange fiat of arrest which characterises the history both of Hindu and of Muslim culture for later in the world's history the same process was repeated in Islam.

The early Muslim writers, however, during the first centuries of the Hijra were sufficiently open-minded to accept light from east and west. From India they took medicine, mathematics and astrology and from the Greeks philosophy and natural history. But here again in about the IXth century we come to that strange arrestation in culture. Islam stopped and there the orthodox have remained ever since. Muslim civilisation reached its apogee under the early Abbasid Caliph.

For a period, too, Europe stood still. As in Muslim countries so in Mediæval Europe the intense reverence for the written word of scripture barred the way to free investigation of nature. What set Europe in motion again? *It was at any rate some factor or factors which left Asia unaffected.* We should try to realise that the first intercourse between India and Europe, beginning from the XVth century, was an exchange *only of commodities*. There was, then, practically no exchange of ideas. Akbar was apparently the first Indian ruler who made any effort to learn what Europe thought or felt—and he confined his enquiries exclusively to religious matters. European

doctors were welcomed and retained at the Mughal Court (witness Tavernier and Bernier), presumably because their knowledge of medicine was superior to that of the Indians, but we do not hear that any attempt was made by Indian doctors to learn from their European colleagues.

At what stage did cultivated Indians begin to show any interest in European culture ?

Let us remember that the Ottoman Turks with their capital in Europe had every opportunity of knowing what Europe was doing and thinking. Was the fanaticism of the Turk so deep-rooted that he refused to learn anything from the infidels of the west? Why should not the Turks of the XVIIth century have been as open-minded as the Arabs of the IXth? There is no trace of modern European philosophy being studied by Muslims, although this philosophy was the direct descendant of Plato and Aristotle who had been welcomed into Islam with open arms. Then consider Spain in the time of the Moors. There we find as it were a second opening of the door to infidel learning, Jewish and Christian ; but it will be answered that in Spain the " Arabs " were the teachers and the infidels the pupils. Undoubtedly the Universities of Arab Spain were in advance of anything elsewhere in Europe. But what had Europe to offer at the end of the XVth century ?

It was not till the end of the XVIIIth century that the ancient languages and literature of India began to engage the serious attention of Western Scholars. With this investigation a veritable revolution took place in the science of religion and philosophy. We can imagine the effect which was produced on the Scholars of Europe by the discovery of an ancient culture whose existence they had not even suspected, containing works of the highest literary and philosophic quality.

In India itself at that period the knowledge of Sanscrit literature was probably confined to a relatively small number of pundits. It required the propaganda of Western Scholars to teach the people their own history and to reveal to them their past glories. The people of India were for the most part totally indifferent to their beautiful monuments just as it may be said that the Persians cared nothing for Persepolis before the time of Rawlinson.

The result of Oriental Studies in India was to give a new source of pride and unity. The result in Europe was the unveiling of a static past to a civilisation in motion. It gave them for study new stages in human progress. The East has given little to the West by intent, nor has it in the past sought anything from the West. To-day while Western Scholars are devoting energy and money to the unravelling of the ancient past, the people to whom that past belongs are using every endeavour to learn the secret of Western progress. If we have revealed the past to the Hindus and the Muslims we must remember that the result of such revelations may act differently on different men. While some may take the view that their glorious

past is to be accounted for them as a great asset in their place in the world and fills them with legitimate pride, others may resent the work of Orientalists, feeling that they wish to be altogether rid of the past and only to look to the future. The progressive Oriental is greatly amused and partly shocked when he finds the old relics of the past which for generations he has been wont to throw on the dust heap, carefully collected and pieced together and sold for enormous proceeds to the Western collector. When he sees a fellow countryman copying this Western hobby, he laughs outright. Nevertheless, there are many Hindus and Muslims who have shown themselves eager to take their part in the researches initiated by Western Orientalists, and with such men the awakening of a reverence for the past does not blind them to the possibilities of national progress.

E. Denison Ross.

Lady Hosie strikes a true note in her article on "Beauty from China" (*Contemporary Review*, February). Her attitude is unifying rather than separative, and her sympathetic understanding proves that she is in real touch with her subject. She reminds us that beauty is as enduring for East as for West. "The poetry of mysticism and the poetry of life are draughts from the eternal springs which know neither Orient nor Occident and from which Eastern lips drink as thirstily as ourselves." She gives a significant quotation from a book of her father, Professor Soothill, *The Lotus of the Wonderful Law*.

> No Eastern student of the Occident can understand the Occidental attitude to Life, eternal or transient, unless he has perceived at least a faint shadow of the effect of Holy Writ on our civilization. Similarly, no Western student can understand Japan or China unless he catches some glimpse of what the Buddhist sutras have taught the East. Even unread of the masses, the two great Scriptures, Christian and Buddhist, the outpourings of man's deepest heart—and some would say the inpourings of the Heart that beats beyond and through us—have indelibly coloured our respective cultures.

THE SPIRIT OF INDIAN POETRY.

[**Philip Henderson,** for all his youth, is well on the way to achieving a reputation as a man of letters. Yet in the early twenties, he is a frequent contributor to London journals and is at present assisting Ernest Rhys, Editor of *Everyman's Library*, the eight hundred volumes of which are well in progress. Mr. Henderson was Editor of the Verona series of Elizabethan Novels. His "First Poems" will be issued this spring by J. M. Dent and Sons. In a subsequent issue we will publish another article "The Poetry of China"—EDS.]

It has been said that the distinguishing quality of Eastern, as compared with Western, culture is that it is the product of complete Self-realisation. For, while the spiritual energy inherited by both great branches of the Aryan race turned in the West towards materialistic progress and the "conquest of Nature," in India, returning upon itself into immobility and contemplation, it grew into a recognition of the unchanging Principle behind all things. And while philosophers and metaphysicians of the West arrived at their conclusions by a process of laborious intellectual evolution, those of the East had long ago reached contact with reality through a spiritual intuition far transcending thought; they had knowledge of Atman when the soul was the crudest of hypotheses to occidental thought. Indeed, they had discovered that the true light of the spirit can only shine when mental activity has ceased.

This must not be taken to infer that Hindu spiritual intuition has, so to speak, the monopoly of truth. The doctrine of Maya—that which is outside Atman or the Self—is to be found in varying forms in the teaching of Plato and Kant, greatly subordinated it is true; and even science to-day is in some quarters reaching out towards conclusions that have long been known through the Upanishads. But as there can be only one ultimate truth, it is a matter of disposition or taste whether it is reached by mystical metaphysics, science or the teaching of Gautama Buddha, Lao Tzu or Jesus Christ!

Thus, while most occidental art aims at distracting the mind from the ultimate goal of existence and is more often than not a means of false self-congratulation, that of the East, and that chiefly in India, is implicit with such knowledge as most of us Westerners fear to know. It is not always pleasant to contemplate our less than minute human identities in relation to the Infinite—although the Indian conception of the soul or Self is no mere shivering thing in the hand of God, but vast in the grandeur of its unity with the innermost being of universal nature. And in this sense, the *Bhagavad-Gita* dwarfs almost all Western poetry into insignificance. But it should be remembered that this very intensity of concentration on spiritual values has inclined Indian minds away from those æsthetic elements that are the glory of Chinese, Hebrew, and in the West, of English and French poetry. Yet an ever-present religious sense, a capacity for self-recollection and concentration and recognition of all things as the shadow of the

Divine, has of itself given their writing an extraordinary purity, and integrity and vastness of conception that possibly has no equal in any literature.

There are few, great, individual names in the history of Indian poetry. Like the Chinese, the people of India do not value individual genius for itself and fitful gleams of inspiration. To them poetry is the power to translate the mind into the region of inspiration itself, so that the whole conception of the poem is, as it were, inwardly illumined with a divine light. They believe that truth and beauty are everywhere to be perceived, not chained up in a chance string of words. Thus they do not value the unusual man as such, recognition in their eyes not calling for special powers, only sufficient training. So, Kalidasa, the finest master of Indian poetic style, has not so much genius as a fine talent. In him the creative fire does not burn with any great vehemence, but quietly illumines all he writes, or is cooled and imprisoned within the jewel of his form. Again, with Amaru the lines flow with the softness of changing light and his exquisite sensibility to the changes of a lover's heart seems almost the memory or dream of these things. And in the exalted eroticism of Jayadeva's Gita-Govinda everything is as clear as though it moved in a glass, rarified and almost super-sensible in its mystic loveliness.

Indian poetry is particularly rich in imagery. This imaginative wealth sometimes takes the form of over-ornamentation and in the hands of lesser writers becomes grotesque, images being elaborated in all their implications with a kind of naive, poetic logic. Thus if a mountain is compared to a bull, every part and attribute of it is made to correspond literally to something in the animal. But naturally enough, in a country where the growth of nature is so exuberant, where vast forests, withering heat, torrential rain and lightning are all part of common experience, images drawn from these things are bound to be very real (in a relative sense, of course) and not simply part of a literary convention as is often the case in Europe and America. Nevertheless, far from the rank fecundity of the jungle having subordinated, or even entered into, this poetry, something of its rarified quality may, perhaps, be gauged from Kalidasa's youthful *Ritsamhara*, when, speaking of the season or rains, he says: "The tails of the peacocks are spread like separate flowers" and "the woods put out their joy in yellow flowers, in wind-touched branches, and buds breaking their capes like bursts of laughter"—(from Powys Mathers' *Circle of Seasons*). Or again, in Amaru's description of a lover watching in the rain the house of his mistress, the trembling light of which shines in the darkness like a glance through tears. But unlike their sculpture there is very little of the sinister in this poetry—even in the Homeric epic the *Mahabharata* with its immense orgy of slaughter—for throughout there is the consciousness that life is eternal and that neither sword or spear can touch it:

> I say to thee weapons reach not life;
> Flame burns it not, waters cannot o'erwhelm,
> Nor dry winds wither it.
>
> —*Bhagavad-Gita*. Trans. by Sir Edwin Arnold.

There is no other poem which gives so vast a sense of life as a conflict of shadows, but endless, infinite and controlled by that transcendental justice, those compensatory laws of *karma* and *dharma*, that have made the wisdom of India the profoundest that exists.

Here, then, in this poetry earthly life passes as in a clear mirror, troubling and delighting us only a little while : and then once more the mirror is blank and temporal activity passes into intimations of infinity—for

> The Soul that with a strong and constant calm
> Takes sorrow and takes joy indifferently,
> Lives in the life undying.

PHILIP HENDERSON.

Professor D. R. Bhandarkar, in an article on "The Excavations at Besnegar," in the *Modern Review* (January) brings to light some interesting points. An inscription on a Garuda column which dates back to the second century B.C. reveals that this column was erected, "in honour of Vasudeva, god of gods, by Heliodora (Heliodoros), son of Diya (Dion). He is therein spoken of as a resident of Takshasila (Taxila) and as an envoy come from the Indo-Bactrian king Amatalikita (Antialkidas) to the court of the local prince Bhagabhadra." Furthermore in the inscription Heliodoros is called a Bhagavata and a *Yona-duta* (Greek ambassador) which proves beyond doubt that he was of Greek nationality. The erection of a Garuda column by a Greek and his being termed a Bhagavata is taken by Professor Bhandarkar to mean that Heliodoros had embraced the Hindu religion.

> Many European scholars were of opinion that in ancient times there was nothing comparable to Hellenism in point of culture and civilization and that a Greek, who always thought of non-Greeks as "barbarians," would be the last person to embrace any other faith or worship the gods of any other people. The European belief was that an Indo-Scythian could become a Hindu, but not a Greek, who was of a superior cast of mind.

This inscription proves that Hinduism could and did make its appeal to a Greek of culture and position, as Heliodoros, an ambassador, undoubtedly was. The discovery of a *Yajna Kunda*, some tablets and seals reveals that Timitra (possibly Sanskrit for Demetrius) presumably a Greek, performed Yajna. The orthodox among the Hindus at present hold that a person not born a Hindu can never become one, but Professor Bhandarkar tells us that "the performance of a Brahmanic sacrifice by a Greek is not a thing that need surprise us, because we know that many Greeks like other foreign people, such as Sakas and Palhavas, became Buddhists and Hindus."

An interesting find in this excavation was two pieces of metal which were used as wedges to support Heliodoros' column. It was proved on analysis by Sir Robert Hadfield that they were genuine steel. Up to the time of this discovery the use of steel before the Muhammadan period was unknown, but this find shows that the art of manufacturing steel in India was practised in the second century B.C. It is an important point proving the considerable advance of culture existing at that period of Indian history.

PARACELSUS AS PIONEER OF MEDICAL SCIENCE.

[**Dr. Bernhard Aschner,** of Vienna, is eminent as a pioneer of a new-old system of medicine whereby modern technical experience is combined with old and exotic medical science. In fact, he may be called a modern disciple of Paracelsus. Indeed, he is editing a monumental edition of that great sixteenth-century genius in modern German, two volumes of a thousand pages each having been published in 1926 and 1928, and three more being in preparation. In his student days Dr. Aschner's brilliant research work in anatomy led to the discovery of certain hitherto obscure organs of the body which are named after him. He is author of ninety-seven learned articles and three books, the last of which *The Crisis in Medicine Constitutional Therapy and the Way Out* has been well received.

Students of Theosophy hold Paracelsus in high esteem, and Madame H. P. Blavatsky refers to him as "the greatest occultist of the middle ages" and "the cleverest physician of his age". What she said in 1890 is now repeated by Dr. Aschner and others. She spoke out of her occult knowledge while Dr. Aschner and others base themselves on present day medical research and experimentation. This interesting article does not refer to the use Paracelsus made of talismans which he himself prepared for curing diseases nor does it deal with other sides of this giant mind's philanthropic labours. We are planning to secure other contributions on Paracelsus, dealing with his many sided activities.—EDS.

It is a very remarkable fact that during the last decade the name and works of the sixteenth-century Paracelsus are being mentioned with increasing frequency in every sphere of human knowledge. Of late, philosophy, natural science, religion and, more especially, medicine, have been falling back more and more upon his works. What is the reason for this?

Since the French Revolution we have passed through a period of the most extreme technical materialism. It is only since the world war that people have again remembered that the materialistic, atomistic, realistic view of the universe is imperfect and urgently requires to be supplemented by a more comprehensive view which also takes into consideration the mental, spiritual and supersensuous. Hence the movements towards Occultism, Mysticism, Spiritualism, Anthroposophy, Astrology, Faith Healing or Christian Science, etc., which have gone often too far in the other direction.

Theosophy,[1] also, really arose out of the *dissatisfaction with the materialistic way of thought of the nineteenth century*, as also, perhaps, with the ever-deepening gulf between belief and knowledge; and it attempts by methods similar to those of Paracelsus to attain deeper knowledge of the universe as a whole by research into the mutual relations between the human microcosm and macrocosm. But Paracelsus was first and foremost a doctor and an alchemist, and secondly a mystic philosopher. His most tangible significance for the present time, therefore, indisputably lies in the domain of medicine.

---

[1] Our author obviously has in mind the modern expression of the Theosophical movement which began in 1875.

Of the five large folio volumes of his original works, translated by me into modern German and supplied with explanatory annotations, two volumes of a thousand pages each have already appeared, published by Gustave Fischer, Genoa, 1926 and 1928, and quite four-fifths of the contents are concerned with purely medicinal questions. And that is just what is now of the most pressing interest, because medical science all over the world is in a period of revolution to its foundation. That is also why people are speaking of "the present crisis in medical science". Everyone in the world with open eyes can observe to-day that a great part of the population of all countries is dissatisfied in spite of all the modern achievements of present-day scientific medicine, and is turning to unorthodox methods of healing, *e.g.*, homeopathic, chiropractic, nature healing, simples, and others. These unorthodox tendencies must by no means be regarded as charlatanism, superstition or deception, as they are by many academic scientists at present, because they frequently achieve in a simple, straightforward manner the most amazing cures in cases where even the best representatives of scientific medicine to-day declare the sickness to be curable only with difficulty, to be incurable, or to be cured only by serious and sometimes even life-endangering operations that mutilate the patient. But that does not mean that the splendid advance made by diagnostics (such as X-Ray treatment, chemical tests), chirurgy (narcosis, asepsis, chirurgy of the intestines, plastic operations, etc.), and the fighting of plagues (public hygiene, vaccination, serum treatment and bacteriology in general), must be underestimated. At the same time, however, there are numerous sicknesses or diseases, such as acute arterio-sclerosis, nervous and mental illnesses, tuberculosis of the bones, cancer, etc., in which the unorthodox much-abused methods often attain more successful results. How is such a thing possible? People must first recognize that the medicinal system of the last hundred years as taught in every university in the whole world, has been altogether one-sided and incomplete, for it was based chiefly upon anatomic facts ascertained by observation and experimentation on sick or dead people; also upon the organic and cell doctrines of von Bichat in France and Virchow in Germany, as well as upon minutely exact physical and chemical details. Despite all that learning, the fluid constituents of the body, namely the blood and other liquid matabolism—humoral pathology—which for two thousand years was the generally accepted and successful medical doctrine, are altogether too greatly neglected for, after all, it is possible to point to the splendid, often miraculous, cures achieved a hundred, four hundred and a thousand years ago. The unorthodox methods of treatment already mentioned now very often rapidly achieve amazing success owing to the fact that they make use, to the patient's benefit, of humoral pathology, tested by history and experience, which to-day is neglected in a parvenu-like way, so to say, by orthodox medical science. And all these movements can be traced back more or less to Paracelsus. But the treasures buried in Paracelsus' works are only accessible now in the very smallest measure and must really be newly dug out and thoroughly examined in the

same way as the graves of the ancient kings which are being opened in Egypt and Mesopotamia.

A few examples will furnish explanation: Committees for the investigation and treatment of rheumatism are now being established in all countries because, even in the circles of scientific medicine, people are thoroughly dissatisfied with the results of the usual specialistic treatment. For instance, when a person is suffering from rheumatism of the joints (also chronic gout, pains in the back, lumbago, arthritis, etc.), or of the muscles and nerves (different forms of sciatica, neuralgia, neuritis), perspiration-producing remedies (aspirin, hot air, hot baths, etc.), are usually given, or fever-producing injections, etc., are made. Nevertheless these affections last for weeks, months, and years. One of the greatest of English doctors, Sydenham, called the English Hippocrates, stated as late as the seventeenth century that gout was incurable. Paracelsus before his time had uttered the memorable saying that the doctor who was not able to cure gout, dropsy, leprosy, mental diseases, cancer and epilepsy did not deserve the name of doctor at all.

The unorthodox movements of medicine, going back to Paracelsus, are now using internally for rheumatic and gouty affection alchemistic remedies such as mercury and combinations of antimony, as well as numerous herbs often expressly called anti-rheumatic, anti-arthritic or anti-dyscrasic remedies. Such remedies are *Solanum dulcamara, Sarsaparilla, Radix Imperatoriæ*, etc.

But the most astonishing thing is that it is possible to cure the most severe cases of neuritis and neuralgia in a few days by a single application of an oil which produces blisters or irritation. This method is well-known to folk medicine and veterinary treatment, but orthodox medical science has forgotten that, and only a few doctors make use of this method as a treatment which they keep secret. In my book, *Die Krise der Medizin* (The Crisis in Medicine), all these remedies and methods are described exactly and every doctor can easily learn them. In the case of affections of the joints it is again possible, following the methods of Paracelsus, to reduce pains, swellings, inflammations and stiffness in a few days or weeks by the frequent application of plasters (Spanish fly or cantharidal plasters). In more severe cases a simple artificial wound in the skin (a so-called artificial sore or fontanelle, about the size of a small coin) is produced by means of corrosive agents and kept open for several weeks. In this way it is possible very speedily to make half-stiffened joints movable and free from pain. For this Paracelsus laid down a rule which was as simple as it was amazing. He said that when nature produces a pain in any part of the body it means that she intends to eliminate morbid matter. When she is not able to do this herself, then eruptions, blisters and openings in the skin must be produced by methods such as have just been described. Strange to say, the whole medical science of eastern Asia, including that of India, makes use of arm-punctures, breaking the skin with needles, and other such methods.

Not less astonishing are the results of the curative methods of Paracelsus and his successors (even up to the eighteenth century so-called Paracelsists made use of them) applied to mental affections (psychiatry). If a person becomes mentally affected and suffers from dementia præcox (insanity of youth), melancholia, mania or something similar, then according to the present orthodox teaching he is given sedatives, such as bromide, opium, luminal and the like. Apart from that, doctors wait until nature helps herself, or an inevitable prognosis is made and it is accepted that the illness will pass into permanent imbecility. The city of Vienna alone maintains in its lunatic asylums no less than 4,000 mentally affected patients. But if mental affections are regarded from the point of view of Paracelsus and the old humoral pathology, as cases of chronic metabolic poisoning, and treated with aperients, blood-letting, leeches, emetics, excitation of the solar plexus and energetic hydro-therapeutic processes, and if, further, the remedies advocated by Paracelsus are administered, such as *Radix Hellebori* in powder form and Spirits of Tartar (tartaric extract) then it is possible within a few months, often even within days or weeks, to cure in a most astonishing manner a large proportion of the mental patients, especially the younger ones, whom the greatest authorities have pronounced incurable. In my book which I have already mentioned, a large number of cases are described which I myself have seen and treated. One of the most frequent forms of illness which can affect many different organs is inflammation. We need only think of acute and chronic inflammation of the eyes, the ears, the throat, the heart, the lungs, the bladder and arterial inflammations, etc. In such cases also, Paracelsus taught that it is not sufficient to be content with cold compresses and perspiration-producing medicaments, but that the inflammation must be fought artificially from the very beginning by internal application of mild mercury preparations, saltpetre, and by bleeding. Thus, festering and serious operations can be avoided. The difference between former and present-day medical practices can be shown very strikingly in connection with skin diseases. At the present time, only external remedies such as salves, embrocations and radiations are employed in the majority of such cases, often with a negative result, but, if blood-purifying agents are administered internally at the same time, then it is also possible to cure even the severest skin diseases in a short time.

The most astonishing demonstration of the accuracy of the Paracelsic teaching, however, is seen in the latest advance in the treatment of cancer. We know that frequently it is not always possible permanently to cure cancer by means of operation and irradiation with X-Rays or radium. Now, as a result of studying Paracelsus' writings, some one living in Vienna has discovered a salve with which it is possible, as I have proved to my own satisfaction, to cure cancer of the nipples, of the face, of the skin, of the bones, of the womb, and also sarcoma, within two or three months on an average, without an operation. This at first appears incredible, but here again Paracelsus made an assertion that he could definitely do it. Doctors even in

his time declared such illnesses to be incurable because they were unable owing to the lack of necessary knowledge to cure them. In this they were often wrong, and we see history repeating itself in the present-day medical world.

A renaissance movement with particular reference to the works of Paracelsus, however, is now in progress not only in medical science but also in other mental sciences. The transmutation of metals, that old dream of the alchemists for instance, is now considered to be perfectly possible. The transformation of radium into helium, which has quite recently been achieved, confirms the assumption of Paracelsus that all elements appear to be only modifications of one single, primordial element.

Paracelsus' idea of magic as a command over the temperament of nature, and the communication with, as yet, still unknown natural forces, is altogether modern. Likewise his views of the doctrines of signatures and the doctrine of similarity (*similia similibus*) are confirmed by present-day homeopathy. That the works of Paracelsus have such practical interest for us just at the present time is due to the fact that we find ourselves to-day in a mental crisis such as there was during his time, when the discovery of America, the Reformation, the rise of natural science in opposition to the official scholastic science of the Middle Ages, took place as great intellectual and historical revolutions. Even to-day people are speaking of " a new scholasticism in the natural sciences" at the universities, which it is high time to overcome. Just as at that time man was no longer regarded as the sole purpose of nature but as part of the combined universe, so we also, stimulated by the electromagnetic theory of light, are again seeking connection with the cosmos.

B. Aschner.

ART AND RELIGION.

[J. D. **Beresford** reviews the Italian Exhibition in London. It is a thought-provoking analysis, and the article is almost challenging in its frankness. He finds the Italian painters devoid of a religious message however potent their influence on the sense of sight. And yet they painted subjects such as the Adoration of the Magi and the Holy Family and the Crucifixion. There is a lesson in this for the "religious" man of to-day, and we will put it in the form of a question: Is he not satisfying his senses rather than his soul through the practices of his church or his synagogue, his temple or his mosque?

There is another question to which we would like an answer from some Indian Pandit—the Ajanta paintings and their like, are they feeders of sense or soul or both or neither? And turning from the graphic art to architecture: the Creative Spirit built the Gothic Cathedrals of England and Northern France as it built the Shrines of Kashi and Haradwar, of Madura and Conjiveram. Is there a difference of knowledge and perception here between East and West? And going to symbology, what relation, if any, holds between a temple of stone and a temple of flesh? What lies at the back of the Masonic tradition of King Solomon's temple which "was built of stone made ready before it was brought thither: so that there was neither hammer nor ax nor any tool of iron heard in the house, while it was in building."

The Occultism of art and architecture—who will study and teach that? —EDS.]

As I write there is here in London but a single subject worthy of discussion in that world of the graphic arts that deals most notably with painting. Even the popular journals daily print almost unrecognisable reproductions of the great pictures in the Italian Exhibition at Burlington House, with brief descriptions and notes of the painter's work. For weeks before the magnificent loan of the Italian Government arrived, the subject of the transportation and insurance of the collection was a prominent item in the daily press. And now, at the end of January, the Exhibition itself is thronged with such a crowd of visitors as makes inspection for the earnest student a matter of considerable difficulty.

This crowd is, speaking roughly, divided into two classes, but the first is almost negligible in relation to the second. This minority is made up of connoisseurs, artists and critics down to the level of the intelligent amateur, those who go to the Exhibition with a definite and to a certain extent educational purpose. The majority are merely sight-seers, people who go to Burlington House, as they would go to a famous play, the opening of Parliament, or the trial of a *cause célèbre*, because it is an excitement and subject for consequent conversation.

This majority does not concern me in this place. It is representative of that great careless section of the English public with which I am necessarily familiar. But I wish to say something of that educated minority in this place, because I have already had reason to find that their attitude towards Art is liable to be misinterpreted, and particularly the fact that, seen from their point of view, the subject-

matter of a picture is subsidiary to the treatment. Regarded from the expert's point of view, for instance, Titian's "Salome" or his "Portrait of an Englishman" has, *a priori*, an absolutely equal claim to consideration with his depiction of an Infant Christ. The Art Critic is never concerned with the "message" a picture may have, he would deprecate the suggestion that Art could have any message in the sense implied. What interests him are those essentials—some of them making little or no appeal to the untrained eye—that deal with colour, composition, the arrangement of masses, the effect of line and of light, the technique of brush-work and, as an outcome of these and other values, the decorative effect of the picture as a whole, the pattern of it.

Now from this aspect, the Italian Exhibition furnishes some of the finest examples the world has ever known. The connoisseur may find here material for what amounts in a limited sense to ecstasy. So far as regards decorative effect, technique, the management of subject, colour—very particularly colour—these pictures represent some of the world's supreme achievements in painting. Even the careless crowd, if slightly bewildered, is often deeply impressed by the evidence of genius. And, personally, I would not, even if I had the authority, attempt the least depreciation of the assured critical verdict that many of these pictures are examples of Master Art.

Yet I am keenly conscious of a sense of disappointment, and although such disappointment would not perhaps be shared even by those who think as I do on the subject of religion, I will endeavour to explain why I find no great inspiration at Burlington House.

Let me remind you in the first place that the subject of a majority of the pictures painted by the Italian painters between the thirteenth and eighteenth centuries is what is generally known as "religious." They treat again and again of the Annunciation, the Adoration of the Magi, the Crucifixion, the Virgin and the Child, scenes from the lives of the Holy Family or the Saints. Many of them were designed for reredoses, triptyches, or for some place in the churches where the worshippers might reverence the holy image.

Have we not then a clear right to expect that these pictures should stimulate in the observer a strong religious emotion? Was it not in the original instance an important part of their function? But so far as I am concerned, though many excite my critical admiration, not one makes the least appeal to my religious sense.

The reasons for this particular failure are not far to seek, and the chief of them is that the painters themselves were not in the true sense inspired by religion. In mediæval Italy an artist was by convention and habit a "devout son of the Church." He dared not be otherwise. The church was his patron, the ruler of his political destiny, the chief source of his income. If he wished to succeed, no matter whether he belonged to the school of Venice, Florence, Padua, Mantua or any other, his *chef d'œuvre*, his qualification for mastership, must deal with a sacred subject. He painted an Annunciation,

a Crucifixion or a Holy Family, because it was the usual thing to do and the most profitable. He did not, in any sense, degrade his Art by doing that. For, as I have already insisted, judged by the highest critical standards, the subject of a picture is of less importance than its treatment.

And having granted that the inspiration for the painting of all these sacred subjects was not to be found in the artist's deep and urgent desire to benefit mankind, nor to express his own religious conviction, we should not expect to find in his work anything that would quicken the intuitive response of religious conviction in a later generation. Moreover, I doubt whether any message to us of the twentieth century could have been conveyed by an orthodox Christian of that period in Italian history. Religion as it was then taught was extraordinarily mechanical. There was a rigid set of formulas and doctrines, the profession rather than the practice of which, constituted a formal piety of belief, a certificate of orthodoxy. We can see an example of that influence in these Italian pictures. We do not find, for instance, among all these versions of the Virgin and Child, one that seeks to excite a religious emotion. The figures are contemporary portraits. They are only idealised in so far as they are given a conventional as opposed to a realistic treatment. The Infant Jesus is merely a fat, healthy child with a nimbus—the conventional sign of his holiness—and his only departure from the normal is occasionally signified by an expression of rather worldly wisdom. The Virgin is an Italian woman of the period. Throughout the Exhibition, I did not find one imaginative attempt to do what was done by so inferior an artist—judged by common critical standards—as Bouguereau, namely, suggest the supernal mystery of the God made flesh.

Such an idea, indeed, did not come within the purview of the Catholic Church at that time. Its endeavour, so far as there was any endeavour in this direction, was rather to stimulate the formal acceptance of the Church's dogma into active partisanship, than to awaken any deep emotion. All this colour, this display of brilliantly painted figures acting in a formal pageant of traditional religious history, is in effect nothing more than a temporary intoxicant, arousing a momentarily urgent but superficial response. Wherefore so far from emphasising the mystery of the Incarnation, the general tendency of the Roman Church was to elevate the influence of the Virgin Mary and to surround her with a galaxy of lesser saints through whose intermediacy any member of the congregation might strengthen the influence of his or her personal petition. What the Princes of that Church desired from their followers was obedience to their own instruction, and they were in a position to enforce it. What they deprecated, then as now, was the least hint of an individual seeking after truth. Their whole authority was founded on the assumption that all the truth was known to them.

The effect of this attitude upon the life of the period is well known to us. Under the cover of their authority some of the "Princes of the Church" lived such immoral lives that their names, those of

the Medici for instance, have become a byword for profligate crime. But what interests us here is the fact that this false conception of religion is mirrored in the art of these Italian pictures. As Art they are worthy of all the superlatives that technical critics have showered upon them; but I find there no seeking nor reverence for the eternal mysteries.

Nevertheless I am constrained to pause at this point to wonder if it be possible that great art can fail to convey a message. In the graphic arts, it must be remembered, the appeal is solely to the eye. The painter teaches us to see beauty; sometimes even in what we have hitherto regarded as the commonplace or the vulgar. By doing that he exhibits the faculty of genius. Rembrandt, for example, taught us to see beauty in the lined faces of aged peasants; Turner to find new values in atmospheric effects. And living as I do in the English countryside, I can never be sufficiently grateful to Constable for teaching me to see the composition and detail of an English landscape with an artist's eye.

But what have I learnt from the Italians? It is true that the first time I went to Italy I realised that the lovely cloudscapes of the Italian painters were not as I had until then imagined a form of conventional art but an idealisation—and, indeed, that idealisation had not been carried very far—of those skies, the very type of which is unfamiliar to us in the grey North. On the Mediterranean, I found myself already prepared to see those thrilling effects of hard edged, saffron and madder clouds composed against the blue. I was prepared, too, all unconsciously though it may have been, for the value of cypress trees seen against the light. But these and many other values, such as those of a sunlight and of distances, clearer than we can ever know in England, are in these pictures at Burlington House no more than a background.

Wherefore it would appear that the answer to my question as to the message of this great Art, is that it succeeds in that education of the eye which is an important part of our knowledge of material presentation; but it fails—or at least, it fails in my case—to touch the mind to a contemplation of the issues of true religion. And, indeed, I should have no quarrel with Italian Art in this relation, I should be content to accept all, and it is much, that it can give me, if it were not for the urgency of the challenge issued by the prevailing choice of the subject. For in all those presentations of a formal and dogmatic creed, I found no true aspiration, nor reverence, nor any realisation of the supernal wonder of the God in man.

J. D. Beresford.

PSYCHICAL RESEARCH AND SPIRITUALISM

TWO POINTS OF VIEW.

I.

[**David Gow**, the Editor of *Light* for the past sixteen years, is regarded as an authority on Spiritualism and Psychic Research. He is a veteran journalist long connected with the Press of England and Scotland; he was writing for *Young Folks* at the same time that Robert Louis Stevenson was producing in the pages of that paper his earlier stories, *Treasure Island* and *The Black Arrow*. He recently published a book of verse—*Four Miles from any Town*.

If spiritualism has to be judged by the central tenet of its creed, namely, that the immortal souls of the dead come to commune with the embodied beings, then in our opinion the case yet remains to be made out, and we think it never will be made out.

We are convinced that genuine phenomena do take place in the midst of fakes and frauds at spiritualistic séances; we are equally convinced of the immortality of the human soul; but that is quite a different thing from the doctrine of the spiritualists that the immortal soul can, and does, return to commune with those living on earth. Further, Theosophy, ancient as modern, considers the holding of séances attracting the dead—not soulful intelligences but soulless ghosts—among the embodied, quite reprehensible.

Absence of a consistent philosophy from the departed "Spirits," who, according to spiritualists, acquire the added vision of the spirit-world, is the greatest proof of our contention. But of that on another occasion when we print the article of Mr. David Gow on "Spiritualism—Forty Years After."—EDS.]

Theoretically there is a great gulf between Spiritualism and Psychical Research. In practice the gulf is not so wide, and in many specific cases it is non-existent. There are a number of avowed Spiritualists amongst the Psychical Researchers and conversely some keen Psychical Researchers in the Spiritualist movement.

When, in 1882, organised research into supernormal happenings began with the incorporation, under Parliamentary Charter, of the Society for Psychical Research (the first president being the late Professor Henry Sidgwick), it was laid down that membership of that society "does not imply the acceptance of any particular explanation of the phenomena investigated nor any belief as to the operation in the physical world of forces other than those recognised by Physical Science." It was a natural and reasonable proviso; the investigator was left free to examine facts without being bound to accept theories; he was permitted, by implication, *to hold* any belief he might choose as to the causes of the phenomena.

Certain Psychical Researchers, however, appear to consider themselves under a moral obligation *not* to come to any conclusion whatever as to the causes of psychic manifestations; these people seem to fear that the expression of any opinion on the point is, in some way, "unscientific." In their view, apparently, the true function of Psychical Research is to experiment and record—experiment and record *ad infinitum*. Indeed they look askance upon any of their number bold

enough to suggest that there is now a sufficient mass of tested evidence to justify the adoption of the idea of intervention by discarnate intelligence, as in the case of Sir Oliver Lodge and other prominent members, who have made definite pronouncements.

On the other hand a number of Spiritualists are distinctly averse to Research methods, feeling that drastic tests are discourteous, even insulting, to the friendly spirit-presences, of whose existence they are convinced.

All this is very human. And it only applies to a comparatively small section of both parties. As indicated above, in actual practice the convinced Spiritualist and the scientific Researcher may be merged in one person; there are many instances. The British Society for Psychical Research, which is far from being a Spiritualistic body, undoubtedly grew out of Spiritualism. It had Spiritualists amongst its founders. Some were avowed Spiritualists, others either at the time or later accepted the "spirit-hypothesis." These included F. W. H. Myers, a distinguished poet and scholar; the Rev. William Stainton Moses, better known by his pen-name of "M.A. (Oxon.)"; Mr. Edmund Dawson Rogers, a leading journalist, Professor (afterwards Sir) William F. Barrett; and, of course, Sir Oliver Lodge who proclaimed his conviction of survival before the Society not many years ago.

Since its inception the British Society for Psychical Research has done work of incalculable value. It has brought forward a mass of carefully-sifted evidence, cleared away much of the ignorant superstition that gathered round the supernormal area, and turned a flood of healthy and intelligent criticism upon a subject which had been surrounded by much fatuousness, falsehood and futility. It attracted to its membership a host of men and women of the highest intelligence and distinction in every walk of life. It brought psychic research into the ambit of official Science—some leading representatives of which are now investigating it.

A rather acute conflict arose many years ago between those who maintained the reality of psychic phenomena and their implications in connection with human survival, and the large body who maintained that the whole function of the Society is investigation, and not the setting forth of affirmative conclusions. But this conflict died down of recent years, although there are still some undercurrents of difference.

In theory, then, Psychical Research must be regarded as an organised effort to investigate and report upon phenomena, in a purely scientific spirit. Spiritualism proper, on the other hand, is represented by a body of persons who accept the reality of the phenomena as giving, in special cases, absolute proof of human survival, and as carrying strong religious and humanitarian implications.

But, as in all human affairs, these clear intellectual distinctions cannot be carried into practice. Speaking generally, we must regard the Spiritualist and the Psychical Researcher as looking at the same problem from different angles — the human, or social, and the scientific

viewpoints; two wings of a great body of people throughout the world who have penetrated beyond the established borders of Science and Theology—and who either recognise the actual existence of a spiritual world or are inquiring into its reality.

DAVID GOW.

II.

[**H. S. Redgrove, B. Sc., A.I.C.**, lecturer, journalist and research chemist, is well-known in Great Britain as a frequent contributor both to psychical research and scientific magazines, and as author of books on alchemy and chemistry. He is at present lecturing on commercial mathematics at the City of London College and is engaged in research on cosmetical colouring matters, the results of which will shortly be published. An independent thinker and a friend of all movements which ameliorate human affairs, he will identify himself with none of them. At one time he was a keen supporter of the Labour Party in England and closely associated with its work but found the atmosphere of politics too unhealthy. With Mrs. Redgrove (Ivy Mary Louise Cowes) he has collaborated in such biographies as *Joseph Glanvill and Psychical Research in the Seventeenth Century* and *Jeannes Baptista van Helmont.*

This article is but a short preliminary introduction; in subsequent numbers we shall print a very interesting survey and review from Mr. Redgrove's pen "An Historical Study of Metapsychics" in two instalments: I. Psychical Research in the West prior to 1875; and II. Psychical Research from 1875 to the Present Day."

Our own view on psychical research may be thus defined: We understand the scientific spirit and attitude which its followers generally adopt now-a-days in their experimentation; the spirit of doubt, sometimes unhealthily manifested, makes their own work more difficult, but that even is better than credulity. Many of the phenomena observed and recorded are acceptable as authentic, but most of the deductions drawn and explanations given by them are not, in our view, of any real value; for to observe is one thing, to understand another. To understand psychical phenomena knowledge of man's complex constitution is needed, and only in one place is it to be found, in Theosophy or the Divine Wisdom of the Ancients; modern psychical research students spurn the Vedas and the Upanishads as they spurn *The Secret Doctrine* and *The Voice of the Silence*, and therefore go round the circuit of observations without making much headway.—EDS.]

In 1882 The Society for Psychical Research was formed in London, and, in the years which followed, similar societies were established in other parts of the world. Since that date, much valuable experimental work in the domain of abnormal psychology has been carried out, and a mass of information bearing on the potentialities of the human spirit and the possibility of its survival of bodily death has been accumulated.

If, however, I am asked whether psychical research has demonstrated, beyond the possibility of reasonable doubt, the fact of survival, I must return a negative reply. But it would be a qualified negative. I should wish, in the first place, to point out that the object of scientific research is not to prove this, that or the other doctrine to be true. It is, rather, to observe phenomena, to frame hypotheses to account for these, to test such hypotheses by further experimentation so that they may, if found worthy, be raised to the rank of theories,

and finally to arrive at a theory of so general a character that it may be justly regarded as constituting a natural law. Survival, from the scientific point of view, is only one out of a number of possible hypotheses. We are not justified in saying that there is irrefragable evidence of an experimental character for regarding it as a law of the human spirit.

It must, however, be added, that survival does remain a possible, if not a demonstrated, hypothesis. It may be held that, of all possible hypotheses, it is the one which best fits the whole of the facts. And it may, I think, be said, that the results of psychical research, if they have done no more than this, have at least added something to its credibility.

The fact is that the work of the psychical researchers, as well as that of the psycho-analysts, has so enlarged our conceptions of the nature of the human spirit, as greatly to increase the number of possible hypotheses, and has thus rendered more difficult the task of elimination essential to the framing of a natural law. I am only too keenly alive to the logical difficulties which surround the concept of the unconscious self. It is, indeed, extremely difficult to understand how processes can take place in mind which somehow are not in mind. Yet this concept is forced upon us by a multitude of facts.

We may satisfy ourselves as to the moral integrity of a medium, we may eliminate all possibility of conscious fraud. Even so, there remains the possibility that the unconscious mind of the medium is at work all unbeknown to his (or her) consciousness, fabricating messages which purport to come from the unseen world.

If psychical research has established anything, it has established the possibility of telepathy, the communication of one mind with another by means transcending the normal. At one time, it was hoped by some that the ether of space might provide an explanation of this puzzling phenomenon, and there were, indeed, signs that a new Materialism was to arise in which the ether would take the place of matter. The theory of Relativity, however, has reduced the ether to its right position as possibly a useful but certainly not a necessary hypothesis. On the other hand, the fact of telepathy remains, and it is a fact which renders the determination of the true origin of any alleged communication from the other world extremely difficult. Some think that "cross correspondences" have surmounted the difficulty. To others the evidence is not conclusive.

In the domain of the physical phenomena of Spiritualism, doubt reigns. The hypothesis of ectoplasm is extraordinarily fascinating and connects, in an interesting manner, with certain doctrines of the ancients. But in view of the tremendous revolution it necessitates in our ideas of the structure of the physical universe, more conclusive evidence in its favour is necessary before it can be accepted. One has only to contrast the positive conclusions arrived at by the late Dr. Crawford in his experiments with the Goligher Circle, with the negative ones of Dr. Fournier d'Albe, to realise how difficult is the attainment of truth in this domain.

That the will to believe is too often operative there can be no doubt ; though, on the other hand, I should be the last to deny that there is also a will not to believe, or rather to believe in the opposite, the effects of which are equally disastrous. Difficult is it to attain that spirit of indifferency to opinion which, as Locke long ago taught, is essential to the winning of truth ; yet it is not impossible ; and, as research proceeds, human knowledge is enlarged, and our conceptions of the nature and powers of the human spirit asymptotically approach a true picture of reality.

H. Stanley Redgrove.

An editorial in the *New York Times* of January 1, 1930, makes reference to the time when, according to the Scriptures, the whole world was of one common speech. It states that

> If physicists could invent an instrument to recover the words of that speech, which must still keep their identity somewhere in the ether, they might suggest the roots of another universal language.

These words show the increasing tendency among thinkers to admit the existence of some imponderable substance in which the thoughts of men are indelibly impressed. It is generally conceded that thought has a dynamic energy, and that it has an image-making power. Are these images lost when they have gone forth from the mind that formed them? Or is there a vast repository from which they may again emerge?

The teaching of Theosophy clearly points to the existence of such a repository, in which the thoughts and ideas of all races, past and present, exist. It further shows that no form can be given to any thing whose ideal type does not already exist on the subjective plane, and that no form or shape can enter the consciousness of a living man which does not already exist in prototype in the Universal Ether or Akasha.

Therefore within this vast repository there must be records of the speech which once was universal. Who knows that within this same substance there may not be the form of that instrument which will be able to give it again to us?

IS UNIVERSAL PEACE PRACTICABLE ?

[**H. H. Raja J. P. Bahadur Singh** belongs to the State of Nepal and is the founder of the Humanistic Club of India.

The arguments used by the Raja about humans living like animals and evolving to the grade of members of the League of Nations are of course invalid. The Raja ought to know his history better; not to go very far, near his own Nepal, northwards and southwards he will find ample evidence that there flourished better, nobler and more brotherly states reared on humanistic principles than in the Europe of to-day. Humanists will find excellent examples of their ideals practised in Asia and Africa when Europe was still savage. However, we do agree with him in the view that neither legislation nor treaties will bring about peace, but only change of heart in the human individual. But how is this to be brought about ? has the Raja some philosophy to impart to the members of his club? Or are they to become one more group of the blind leading the blind ? Theosophy has something vital to say on this subject. So far back as 1889 Madame H. P. Blavatsky wrote in her *Key to Theosophy :*

"We, Theosophists, say that your vaunted progress and civilization are no better than a host of will-o'-the-wisps, flickering over a marsh which exhales a poisonous and deadly miasma. This, because we see selfishness, crime, immorality, and all the evils imaginable, pouncing upon unfortunate mankind from this Pandora's box which you call an age of progress, and increasing *pari passu* with the growth of your material civilization. At such a price, better the inertia and inactivity of Buddhist countries, which have arisen only as a consequence of ages of political slavery."

"Uproot that most fertile source of all crime and immorality—the belief that it is possible for them to escape the consequences of their own actions. Once teach them that greatest of all laws, *Karma* and *Reincarnation*, and besides feeling in themselves the true dignity of human nature, they will turn from evil and eschew it as they would a physical danger."—EDS.]

It may be due to economic pressure or to other causes, but people of every country, either of the East or of the West, are being divided into more and more parties, classes and creeds, which instead of settling their disputes through rational exchange of views and discussion, try to carry out their ideals by violent demonstration, rioting, rebellion and war.

I have found that in spite of the establishment of the League of Nations and so many peace treaties and pacts and all the institutions working for peace, the antagonistic parties of the world are ready to resort to violence on the least excuse.

Everybody, I take it, wishes to make his life as comfortable and as happy as possible. Now for the security of life and for the attainment of the comfort and the happiness which we all desire, two methods present themselves : One by doing away with anybody who stands in your way, the other by persuading such people as stand in your way to unite and co-operate with you for the mutual preservation of life and for the attainment of mutual comfort and happiness. The former method is naturally applied by the low order of beings, like animals and plants ; but men being endowed with the capacities of reason and deliberation usually adopt the latter way. Even those

who divide themselves into different groups, parties and classes have to unite with persons of their own way of thinking. For they realise that the bigger the numbers of their party, the stronger it is and the more chance it has of self-preservation.

If a strong party or class remains satisfied merely with its strength and superiority it may enjoy the comfort and happiness it desires. But if it goes on to exploit its strength, though it may get a temporary success, it is only at the cost of injury, suffering and distress to some of its own members, and calamity to the weaker party against which it pits itself. Thus if we think rationally we must come to the conclusion that peace, unity and co-operation with one another are the only means of securing safety, comfort and happiness for all.

It was for the purpose, therefore, of showing persons of all classes, creeds, parties and ranks in different countries, the value of unity and co-operation that I started the Humanistic Club in India. But as it cannot be made practicable by one man's effort in one country only, I have come to Europe to plead with every country to make arrangements for the exchange of ideas between the social workers of all nations.

Neither governments nor peoples like fighting with each other, but for some reason or other, whether social, political, economic or religious, they are divided into several groups of parties, classes and creeds, each one wanting the upper hand. Admitted that there must be differences of opinion, yet if all the different units with their different ideas, ways and means try to work for the common benefit of humanity, I do not see any reason why their efforts should not be successful.

But the human race forgets very readily even those things which it should least of all forget. It was for this reason that the preceptors of religion have prescribed either as a hymn or as a prayer something to repeat morning and evening. It is for the same reason that I have been suggesting the establishment of a humanistic club in every country.

I can quite realise the difficulty of persuading people, especially uneducated people, but if some persons in every country take the responsibility on their shoulders of reminding their fellows of their duties as human beings, I do not see any reason why they should not succeed in time in curbing the warlike mind. The mind is after all a pliable thing and if properly guided nothing is impossible for it to attain. We have only to find out how and when to present these ideas to the public, and if it is rightly done they are sure to take up these ideas just as they took up the old destructive ideas in the past.

One cannot prescribe the exact solution for remedying the troubles of every country, but some sort of institution like the Humanistic Club may be useful in devising the ways and means suitable to the circumstances and taste of each people, and so bring about peace and harmony among its different contending classes, parties, communities and creeds.

There has never been a universal religion or a universal state. No two people look alike or think alike. There is nothing like uniformity in nature. If you attempt to impose equality or uniformity on anything you are acting against nature itself, and no such attempt can meet with success. Therefore, our attempts should be to bring about unity in diversity and not uniformity.

It is impossible to bring the whole of humanity to a dead level of wealth or position or principle or thought. If we try to bring about such equality it will be done only at the expense of law and order and hence at the expense of security, comfort and happiness. What we must try to bring about is equality of opportunity.

The question arises whether the world is as yet ready to receive these ideas and follow them. In the brief time that I have been in Europe I have met several persons who think otherwise. But if you only believe in the evolution of ideas of the human race, and persevere in your work of bringing about peace and goodwill, there is every reason to suppose that you will succeed, if not to-day then in the days to come. Those who say that wars and battles will never disappear from the earth preach a doctrine that is wholly contradictory to the history of man's evolution. Was there not a time in the remote past when men lived like animals in caves and forests, suspicious and fearful of one another? But as time went on men learned more and more the utility of unity and co-operation till they formed into little families, and then into tribes and then they built villages and towns and cities and nations and empires and finally the League of Nations. Thus throughout the ages all history shows that the evolution and progress of men depended on the measure in which they united and co-operated. Wars and battles must disappear if man has to proceed on his path of further progress unimpeded, and they will disappear if we only persevere in our work.

Peace is like a great house that you must build slowly, laying stone on stone. Peace cannot be brought about suddenly by a stroke of the pen as it were. No amount of legislation, no amount of treaties and pacts, no amount of high oratory will establish peace and goodwill on earth until the whole of mankind realises the necessity of unity and co-operation in the interest of its own safety and comfort. That is why I suggest that peace must be built by the man in the street and the man in the field.

RAJA J. P. BAHADUR SINGH.

ARTIST AND ACTOR.

An Interview with Sybil Thorndike.

[By one of our London staff. Sybil Thorndike's name is known wherever there is a word for "theatre." She is now England's leading actress, a woman of head and heart, for she has managed her own theatre and produced various plays as well as acted in them. Her great career, during which she has been associated with several theatres that have gone to the making of drama history, began twenty-seven years ago in the United States where she spent four years appearing with Ben Greet in Shakespearean repertory taking a hundred parts in twenty-five plays. After her return to England, she spent a year or two in Miss Horniman's company in Manchester, when repertory began its historic movement at the Gaiety Theatre in 1908, playing leads there some seasons later in the most remarkable plays "discovered" in the cotton city of the North. Shakespearean leads at the Old Vic followed for four years before she startled London in Greek tragedy in 1919. In the years since, her "Judith of Israel" should be mentioned and she crowned her career with Shaw's "St. Joan," which she produced at the Criterion and which she has twice revived at the Regent and the Lyceum.

The English actress's reference to the American playwright, Susan Glaspell, will be of interest to readers other than those in the United States. All students of the Repertory Movement, or the Little Theatre Movement as it is known in America, generally regard Mrs. Glaspell's work as meriting as much international attention as Eugene O'Neill's.—Eds.]

The curtain was to go up on the greatest drama of all—Life, revealed through the mind's eye of genius. But first . . .

This little Chelsea square looked western reality itself in the wan gold of December sunshine. The red General 'buses passed frequently up and down the main street not far away with its ordinary shops where the commodities of everyday life passed over the counters. It was very practical; in fact, London, to those who know it not in other, rarer moods. But the house which was this journey's end withdrew itself from it all, unobtrusive and reticent with its olive-green paint and curtains dispelling instead of seeking attention.

Presently, Sybil Thorndike appeared in the room fronting on that square, which betrayed secrets of a happy English family with at least some musical members. Her hair of spun gold like an aureole, and her yellow attire were the apotheosis of the morning. Gracious and vital one moment, she became remote the next as she sat back in swift thought over the question presented to her. And then the words came, cascading in a deep, rapid, musical stream, her olive eyes seeing other vistas, and nothing of the questioner or the surroundings.

"Have the parts you played had any effect on your life?"

"Oh yes, naturally! All one's work is an expression of what is one's own interest and it naturally enlarges personal experience. It is really vicarious experience, the experience one goes through in a play, yet it is not possible to play any part unless you *know* the actual experience. You have the experience within you in a way in embryo. You have in yourself the possibilities of becoming any person. If

you didn't find anyone in you, a common meeting ground with that person, you could not play the part. That applies to every sort of individual. I believe that in every human being there is every other human being. The more people you are able to bring forth from your being, the greater the actor.

"It is really to let the number of characters inside you come out. It is bound to affect the actor and make him bigger. You aren't dragged down by the petty and mean. You throw it off. . . ." Absorbed in her own thoughts Sybil Thorndike slipped from her chair in one graceful movement to sit on the rug in front of the fire like an entranced child and her shining eyes saw only ideas.

" . . . . So it is with the audience because the audience partakes of the same thing as the actor when they watch the play. As I throw off the mean, personal, low, trivial quality, so they can throw it off. They can take that quality and make it beautiful as the actor does in inventing the character. I think—oh, what is the word ?"

"To sublimate ?"

"Yes, of course, to sublimate. I think to sublimate is a scientific truth. The injurious effects cease in your own personal life."

"You think you have all beings within you ? But how ? Would you explain ? "

"I can only state that as a fact," was her simply and seriously uttered reply.

"You mean that there is something universal within us as well as the personal ?"

"There is a common meeting ground. I have never yet found a human being with whom I could not find some point of contact, a point of contact with everyone. That is to say, under similar circumstances, I might have been twisted into that person. It is the case with every one. You know : 'There but for the grace of God goes me.' That answers for all people, noble people as well as despicable people."

Her voice of extraordinary musical resonance had become stronger and stronger. She ceased suddenly, recollecting something, and her hand went to her throat.

"But I am forgetting," she said *sotto voce*. "I have a first night tonight and I must save my voice."

"Only another question or so. You think there is within us an immortal as well as a mortal being ?"

"I am quite sure of it. That is the principle I must work on or I should just bury myself away in a corner. I believe there is that knowledge that keeps you in the main stream—the main stream of life instead of going off into a little side track."

"You spoke of the audience partaking of the same thing as the actor when the people watch a play. What is that 'something' between you and your audience ?"

"You partake of the same nature. The finest example of an actor and an audience and their different functions is to be found in the Mass of the Church. You have the priest, the actor, bringing in the symbols of the right kind to the people who partake of them. They are of the same nature as the priest. The audience sinks itself, the people become each part—I am talking of an ideal audience, but every audience does it more or less because it is in a semi-conscious state when it is watching. It is in a hypnotised state; it actually impersonates each one of the characters as they are played. The people act every single individual whereas each of the actors act but one part."

"Which is the greater actor, he who is so detached from his part that he is able to judge what is being done or he who loses himself in it? Does the real artist stand outside and watch?"

"Yes, it is necessary. It is a dual thing. The actor who is also an artist weighs every movement, watching every thing he does. He times this and he times that. It would be simply impossible if it were not controlled because you have to alter every night. Each night you time differently according to your audience. Some nights you do things one way and some nights another because you feel the spirit of the audience is moving this way or that. There is the one who is weighing, the artist—he is the one who selects; there is the other thing, the being who is impersonating. And you, the artist, can draw on limitless power. It has to be directed. The artist is the being who says the limitless power must stop there."

Remembering "Madame de Beauvais" for whom the voice must be saved, the questioner regretfully put what had to be the last question:

"What, in your opinion, is the biggest part that you have acted?"

"St. Joan," the reply came at once after one lightning flash of thought.

"And what did you get out of it?"

"Oh," said Sybil Thorndike, after a little pause, "It *is* hard to say, isn't it?" Then, very slowly: "I don't think I could explain what I got out of St. Joan."

Another pause. With what seemed a curiously quiet, underground effort, she re-collected something.

"St. Joan, I suppose everybody gets St. Joan differently. She is so live a person and everybody gets her in a different way, the person who plays her and the audience. It affected the audience more than any other part. It is a most wonderful part because you forget the actors, audience, everything. I forgot who I was and cared nothing about anything except St. Joan herself. I don't think that the audience cared that I played it or who played it. They were only concerned with the girl herself. To my mind, personally. I always find a part bigger when it is impersonal, when I am not

concerned about myself as a person at all. It is always so interesting to play a part that is much bigger than one's self because so often one has to play a part that is much smaller than one's self. Both are good for one as an actress, of course, but much more so, the part that is bigger than one's self. I don't think I have anything more to say about St. Joan.

"There is another play that runs it close in another way which is extraordinarily great to me. It was at the Regent and Edith Craig did it. My husband and I played it. I only played it four times. I am going to do it again for the Masses State and Film Guild which the Independent Labour Party is running. It is called "The Verge," by Susan Glaspell. In that play we touched something that the theatre very seldom touches, abstract thought. It deals generally with human problems but uses humanity as symbolism for some abstract thing. I remember when the play was shown to me that I said 'This is perfectly mad but I believe we may be able to find something in it.' When I read it, I felt 'Here is something absolutely always what I have been wanting to say, something I have been working out in my own mind.' It came as an answer. Some people said it was obscure. To me it was the clearest thing. The actual part was that of a woman who is a great botanist. She was making experiments in another sort of universe—she would get into some other dimension as it were, pushing into new forms, making new shapes. There was the sort of idea that life was a fluid thing and the moment crystallisation came, that was death; that in every circle, in every shape, there must be some part where it was possible to break through and make another form. It was an amazing thing."

The little Chelsea square was still there. It seemed now of doll-like proportions with dream-like figures hurrying down the misty, main street. Yet the sun shone as wanly gold as it ever does in the north on a December morning. But genius had changed perspectives. It had taken us into another world, that of Life, measureless before us and measureless behind us. Wonderful, awful, it stretched in remote vistas and such is its power that, undirected or misdirected, it can kill as well as create. And it was the world of London that was *maya*. It was like a theatre with personalities all absorbed in the parts they played, each for a little period, but a few here and there awakened to the realization of the Immortal Artist within.

The intuitions of genius open the way from the lesser self to the Greater Self so that the personality, controlled, becomes aware of the Actor within who can draw on the limitless power of Life itself.

FROM PARIS.

[**Mlle. M. Dugard** is already known to our readers. Her letter well depicts the trend of thought of Paris, which has such a peculiar influence in moulding the opinions of Europe—EDS.]

"The classical school, with perhaps the exception of Pascal, dealt with man in the abstract, an ideal being. We are tired of the abstract man. We want to exhaust all the possibilities of the real."

This declaration lately made by a French critic shows one of the strongest tendencies of modern minds. What they are interested in, is the individual, the man or groups of men, with their particular characteristics. Since this leads one to forget the eternal elements of human nature, such a tendency is not without dangers. It keeps us, however, from seeing in humanity only an abstraction, and gives birth to many works which show exactly the moral physiognomy of the men of to-day. These works are either autobiographies, "vies romancées," or psychological novels, whose authors try to force the secret doors of unconscious life to explore the unfathomable self; or studies of groups, of mental "types," considered from the social point of view.

The New Man of Lucien Romier is one of these last. It shows how the economic condition which predominates now in social life, condemns the life of the hermit, and forces each man to live more and more in dependence on his fellow creatures. L. Romier points out the most striking qualities of the men of to-day, qualities not unknown in the past, but never so prevalent as now. These are rapidity of decision and action, large-mindedness, a sort of calm audacity and contempt of danger, which makes of courage a habit of daily life. Added to this they display a tolerance which is careful not to obtrude ideas and predilections in a manner that might hurt the sensibilities of the people with whom they must work and live. These qualities have their reverse side. In young men they show themselves sometimes in an affectation of energy, while in all they demonstrate the fact of an invasion of collective manners; an ever-growing supremacy of the exterior world over the interior life; an acceptance of a conformity which tends to kill all originality and creative power; and finally a will to succeed, to dominate. Are these dangers unavoidable? L. Romier does not think so. In the course of his argument, and especially in his conclusion, he never denounces evil without showing a remedy. For him, *to serve is the law of success.* Strength cannot endure a long time without charity. In the long run, the man who succeeds is the beneficent man..... This law is far from attaining its end.

In *The Death of Bourgeoise Thought*, Emmanuel Berl, being less of an optimist than Romier, violently attacks bourgeoise literature, in which he perceives only the compliance and conventionalism of people afraid of innovations, afraid of ideas, afraid of all that can disturb

their tranquillity, of men satisfied with the natural order of things. He sees our civilization running to a complete *embourgeoisement*, where, instead of human beings, we shall have groups with but one single care, the care of their stomachs. Of course such a civilization is doomed to ruin. But from the stones themselves, according to the old legend of Deucalion, will spring other men. "New men are born from buried stones. These men, yet masked, whose mien and aspect I vainly try to guess at, will they be a new type of nomad, not bound by the confines of earth, and escaping from the limitations of space?" Berl cannot tell yet; but, according to him, the duty of every thinker is to fight against the well-to-do who understand no longer the true use of money, and to help the coming of the new men by doing away with the bourgeoise civilisation.

In *Caliban Speaks*, Jean Guehenno also brings civilization to trial. His Caliban, it must be said, is no more the brute of past times, representing anti-culture or eternal savageness. He is a proletarian, but a proletarian acquainted with books and learned enough to teach Prospero. "I am no longer afraid of mind," he says. "Mind and I have made a new covenant." Thanks to his culture, he can analyse the defect of our civilization which unduly connects knowledge and money, and rests on this syllogism: All civilization is aristocratic. Capitalists are the greatest aristocrats. Therefore the only civilization possible to-day is a capitalist civilization. But he believes in the future, and thus is not able to listen to Ariel's voice blaming him for his snarling face and bitterness, explaining that the sufferings of our world come from the mediocrity of men who have not yet "learned to think," and speaking of better days when "people will recognize that what poor Caliban looked for was but a new way of living".

It is also to an optimistic conclusion that Henri Debreuil comes. Having worked for more than a year in the United States as a mechanic, he gives a description in *Standards* of American work as seen by a French operative, a collection of facts and experiences showing not only the superiority of American technics, but also the democratic spirit which pervades them and is a condition of their success. To adopt these methods—and, willingly or not, we are doing so—without modifying the atmosphere of our manufactories, without caring for the human relationships which are to organize themselves around technics, is to miss the essential end which is "to restore joy in work" and to make it a redeeming power in human history.

The differences between France and America, both as regards the characteristics of the peoples and the resources of their respective countries, are discussed in A. Siegfried's *The United States of To-day*. The views therein put forward appeal to one as true, but they are incomplete. The problem treated gives rise to special difficulties, and those who wish to go more deeply into the subject are counselled to read this remarkable book.

Space does not permit my dwelling on *The Destiny of the Occident*, by Réne Gillouin. In this essay, followed by studies on modern

books and problems, the writer makes clear the numerous controversies regarding the future of the West. According to some people, our Western world is on its death-bed, stricken down by a fell disease triple in nature—Renaissance, Reform, Revolution—and its salvation lies in a return to medieval principles. R. Gillouin disposes summarily with such methods of attaining to a Utopia. "The salvation of the West, or rather, to speak more correctly, the salvation of the World, for the two are now but one," is to react against the abuses of individualism, and to co-ordinate the great manifestations of solidarity—trusts, syndicates, economic and intellectual international associations—in order to adapt them not only to our present contingencies, but also to the higher and more permanent aspirations of humanity.

M. DUGARD.

Commenting on a view put forward advocating for India cultural as well as political independence, the former indeed in preference to the latter, *The Times Literary Supplement* (January 16th) says:

> There is much to be said for this view; many friends of India regret what seems a tendency to imitativeness, in social, aesthetic and intellectual life, an imitativeness, too, that often does not choose wisely. But there is an opposite form of error, that of indiscriminate hostility to and rejection of European ideals and civilization.

It is a counsel of perfection and therefore of wisdom to adopt only that which is good in another country, but it is not always easy. In this case England has imposed western ways, political and cultural on India, and it is perhaps but natural that, in trying to get back to her own innate methods of self-expression, India may be led to reject from Western civilization and culture that which might be of advantage to her. But the West, in its turn, must not reject that which is good and valuable in the Eastern civilization and culture. Thus a just balance may be struck.

IN THE WORLD OF BOOKS.

[**Dr. Alexander Haggerty Krappe** is well-known as a writer on mythological and anthropological subjects. Trained in German, British and American Universities, he has devoted his talents to little known fields of learning. He is the translator of Dr. Robert Eisler's *Iesous Basileus ou Basileusas* which is published under the title *The Messiah Jesus and John the Baptist.* What follows is an interesting criticism-summary of his own volume.]

THE NEW LIFE OF CHRIST.

Shortly before the outbreak of the Great War a Belgian writer on mythology and the history of religions expressed himself as follows :

> If the Jew Flavius Josephus had spoken ill of Jesus instead of praising him, one might invoke his calumnies as a certain witness of His early existence under the administration of Pontius Pilate. But the complimentary allusion made by this author to the Founder of Christianity is too much in contradiction with his own ideas to allow us to believe that this Jew had any sympathies for the greatest enemy of his race. (*Mythes et Légendes*, by E. Daanson.)

One could indeed not express more concisely the chief objection which has attached to the genuine character of the famous *Testimonium Flavianum* in Josephus' *Jewish Antiquities* (XVIII. 3. 3) ever since the time of the sixteenth century humanists. Josephus has been known for centuries as an orthodox and highly conservative Jew who could not have shown, and as a matter of fact did not show, the slightest sympathy for the "innovators" among his compatriots whom he held responsible for the downfall of the Jewish State in A.D. 70 and the destruction of the Third Temple. Jesus of Nazareth being obviously a reformer, a declared opponent of the Jewish hierarchy, Josephus if he mentioned him at all, can have done so only in the terms of a hostile critic. The large number of scholars who have consistently declared the *Testimonium* passage to be a Christian interpolation have therefore *prima facie* evidence in favour of their thesis.

However, the mere suppression of the passage in question does not solve the difficulty. How is one to explain in that case the complete silence of Josephus on events (such as the triumphal entry of Jesus in Jerusalem) which cannot but have attracted a certain amount of attention ? Quite true, they happened before Josephus' own time ; but it is to be noted that he mentions episodes vastly more unimportant falling into the same general period. Moreover, the Christian sect was in the reigns of Vespasian and Titus (when Josephus began his career as an historian) already important enough even in Rome to call for some explanation on the part of a writer professing to discuss Palestinian and Jewish affairs. Josephus' apparent silence would thus be inexplicable.

Let us now assume for a moment that he did mention the career of Jesus, what would his attitude have been both toward the reformer and his work ? The answer is self-evident : it would have been anything but friendly. Josephus being, as I have said, an orthodox and highly conservative Jew, he would of course have refused to accept Jesus as the Messiah but would have seen in him one of the pseudo-messiahs or false prophets who made their appearance at more

or less regular intervals, in the reigns of Augustus and his successors, to stir up commotion by threatening the existing order of things and to meet as a rule a speedy death at the hands of the Roman executioners.

Granting furthermore that Josephus did write in such wise of Jesus of Nazareth, his writings would indeed have remained intact and continued to be read so long as the ancient Roman State Religion granted full liberty of conscience, which it did (except to the Christians) until the day of its own downfall. On that fatal day, when in the reign of Constantine the Church obtained control over men's minds, all writings unfavourable to the Founder of Christianity were speedily destroyed by a rigorous censorship. Evidence for such a state of affairs is plentiful. For not only do we still possess the texts of the various imperial decrees granting such authority to the bishops of the church, but certain anti-Christian writers, such as Celsus and Porphyry, have been lost to us in precisely this fashion. In the case of Josephus it was of course impossible and quite needless to destroy his complete works, highly appreciated by the Church for the light they throw on Jewish history from the time of the Maccabees to the destruction of Jerusalem. It was sufficient to expurgate them by ruthlessly erasing all passages unfavourable to Jesus and other characters, connected with the early Church, or else to falsify his statements by adroitly twisting his phraseology into a sense favourable to Jesus and his adherents. Dr. Robert Eisler has applied himself to the task of showing the existence of just such a censorship in the time following Constantine, and the effects it had on all writings dealing with Jesus and Christian origins, and he has reconstructed the original text underneath the famous *Testimonium Flavianum*, which he believes to be not merely a simple interpolation but the result of the falsification of an older text from the pen of Josephus, decidedly hostile to Jesus and the early Christians.

The question naturally arises, how any conclusion can be drawn from the purely negative evidence of the gaps left by the censors in the old Josephus MSS. How can we know what Josephus wrote when everything he did write on this particular subject had disappeared before the fiat of an omnipotent censorship ? The answer is simple. Not all MS copies succumbed to this censorship. The Levantine Jews managed somehow to save some such copies, the text of which was thus sporadically known in Medieval Europe. Dr. Eisler has pointed out a number of traces of such texts in the MS treasures of the European libraries. The texts in question fall roughly into four categories : (1) Latin translations of Josephus, (2) Hebrew translations (generally known under the name of *Josippon*), (3) quotations from unexpurgated Josephus MSS found in the Byzantine chronographers, and (4) an Old Russian translation of Josephus made some time during the thirteenth century from such unexpurgated Greek codices, and extant in eight MSS, one of which was destroyed during the recent revolution. This fourth class is the most important, because it alone gives a connected and logical text, confirming the reconstruction of the *Testimonium Flavianum* as attempted by Dr. Eisler. The

other categories of texts are valuable in so far as they corroborate the readings of the Russian text, from which they cannot be derived, being in fact for the most part considerably older.

It must be admitted that none of these texts, including even the Russian, is free from Christian interpolations. This is natural enough, seeing that the copyists were of course orthodox Christians, who would not allow to pass unchallenged any statement of the MSS derogatory to the Founder of their religion. Sometimes the separation of the wheat from the chaff, *i.e.*, of the original text from the interpolations, is comparatively easy and merely a matter of ordinary textual criticism. In other cases the procedure is more delicate. Dr. Eisler has laid down the following rule: Anything obviously hostile and derogatory to Jesus and Christianity comes from the pen of Josephus; anything favourable is due to Christian interpolations. By omitting the latter class of statements he obtains a clear and concise, though somewhat dry text, quite in keeping with Josephus' stylistic habits and general phraseology, which narrates the events of that fateful Easter week, beginning with Jesus's appearance on the Mount of Olives and ending with the crucifixion. This narrative is not only in substantial accord with the Gospels (except for the point of view), but it lacks certain important facts mentioned by the latter (for example Judas' treason), whilst in other points it gives additional details, so that the story is clearly independent of the Christian documents. More important still, it throws light on a number of Gospel episodes, torn from their original context and hence quite inexplicable. But before discussing the story proper, let us inquire what authority such statements of Josephus can possibly carry.

Josephus never has been in favour with the Jews, for his orthodoxy and conservatism notwithstanding, or mayhap because of them, he was a shrewd and self-seeking individual who in A.D. 68 left the national cause very much as a rat forsakes a sinking ship, and ingratiated himself with the Roman generals, Vespasian and Titus, soon to become emperors, ending up by being their secretary and official propagandist. It is thus clear that whenever his own interests or those of his imperial patrons are concerned, any statement of his must be carefully weighed before being given full credit. In the case of events antedating both his own career and the advent of the Flavian dynasty (such as those connected with the name of Jesus of Nazareth, for example) the problem of his credibility resolves itself largely into the question of his sources. Whence exactly did he draw his information on the administration of Pilate?

Flavius Josephus has long been known as one of those authors who, in spite of their own mediocrity, are of the greatest importance for the historian because they utilised excellent source material. This the emperors placed at his disposal when he was their secretary and paid propagandist, first in the Orient, later in Rome. It consisted chiefly, though not exclusively, of the official reports which every provincial governor was obliged to send to Rome, where they were duly filed in the archives of the imperial chancery. The section dealing

with Jesus in particular is merely a copy of the official report sent by Pilate to Tiberius after the crucifixion. The general form of such reports is moreover well known from the Egyptian papyri discovered in recent years.

The document begins with a personal description of the man Jesus, very much after the fashion of a modern hue-and-cry. His exterior cannot be called prepossessing; a man of dwarfish stature, between forty and fifty years, hump-backed, with a scanty beard and hair parted in the middle and braided, with eye-brows grown together over his nose. His miraculous cures are mentioned in passing and ascribed to witchcraft. Thus he appeared on the Mount of Olives, in front of the city gates, a few days before the Passover of A.D. 21, that is, a few months after the new governor, Pontius Pilate, had profoundly stirred the religious feelings of the Jews by his rash act of introducing the Roman standards with the imperial portrait into the castle of the Temple. Surrounded by a rabble from Galilee, and having brought with him a great reputation as a wonder-worker, he was approached by the anti-Roman party in Jerusalem to make his entry into the city and to massacre the Roman garrison. Josephus says that he did not refuse that offer. The Galileans took the Temple by surprise, having entered the precincts with weapons hidden in their clothes. The Roman garrison was weak and powerless, Pilate absent in Caesarea. In a short time the entire city wall was in the hands of the insurgents, with the exception of a small Roman camp in the west, barely defended by a cohort.

The Jewish hierarchy, taken by surprise, hesitated. On the one hand they cordially detested the Romans; on the other they were quite sure that if the insurrection was crushed they would have to pay dearly for their connivance. They came to a decision when the Galilean prophet proceeded to eject the cattle-dealers and money-changers from the Temple precincts, an action which they could not but regard as an attack on the whole sacrificial system from which they derived their income and social importance. So they sent messenger after messenger to Caesarea urging Pilate to return as quickly as possible. The governor, likewise unprepared for the sudden outbreak, spent some three days in collecting his troops and then marched on the city where he arrived on the Thursday following the Sunday of the triumphal entry. The tower of Shiloam, commanding the water supply at the southern end of the city, fell under the blows of the Roman battering rams, burying its garrison under its ruins. The Temple was recaptured by Pilate's Samaritan auxiliaries disguised as peaceful pilgrims, and the Galileans were massacred as they were slaughtering their Passover lambs. Two leaders of the rebels were captured alive. Jesus had by that time withdrawn to his camp on the Mount of Olives, there to celebrate his last Passover. The same night he was taken prisoner by a detachment of Roman soldiers reinforced by the guard of the highpriests, led before Pilate, convicted of armed rebellion (*seditio*), sentenced to death according to Roman law and crucified before dawn, together with the two ringleaders mentioned before.

Lack of space has compelled me to condense this narrative perhaps more than is just to Dr. Eisler's work. For as a matter of fact, Josephus, or rather Pilate, gives no such colourful account, for the obvious reason that it would have revealed to Tiberius his own negligence and incompetency, and might have brought about his recall. Yet it so happens that the Gospels mention in full detail facts which Pilate had every reason to be reticent about, such as the triumphal entry and the capture of the city and the Temple. Nor does the document give the date (Passover of A.D. 21). As a matter of fact, the extant Greek text of Josephus has at this point been tampered with by clerical interference. From the *Ecclesiastical History* of Eusebius Dr. Eisler unearthed the statement that in A.D. 311 the emperor Maximinus Daza, to deal what he thought the final blow at the Christian sect, published the most damaging piece of evidence against it, the official acts of Pilate, which put the event in the year A.D. 21. There is of course no reason whatever to accuse the imperial chancery of having deliberately altered the date, and Eusebius admits as much.

The documents unearthed or at least utilised for the first time by the Austrian scholar throw an equally curious light on the career of John the Baptist, shown to have been another leader of insurgents against Rome and to have been done to death some time after the crucifixion of Jesus of Nazareth. They also leave no doubt about the fact that the immediate followers of Jesus, anything but pacifists and quietists, repeatedly rose in armed rebellion, particularly in the reign of Caligula (A.D. 37-41), when that mad emperor wanted to have his bust set up in the Temple. In short, the whole Christian movement, until directed into quietist channels by Paul of Tarsus, is shown to have been an integral part of the Jewish fight for independence, a struggle which was doomed to disaster.

All this admits of little doubt, unless the documents can be proved to be Jewish forgeries, a task which in the opinion of the present writer will prove rather difficult, in view of their general character. Where Dr. Eisler treads on more hypothetical ground is in his reconstruction of the career of Jesus before that fatal week. He accepts the tradition according to which he was a carpenter, and he makes him out to have been one of those migratory craftsmen called *Sleb* in the modern Orient, a peaceful and gentle though poverty-stricken tribe. Yet he rejects the equally ancient tradition according to which his father was a Roman centurion called Panthera, no doubt an historical personage. He makes much of the early environment of Jesus, his poor crippled body and the general misery of his people to explain that strange utopistic note in his early preaching. Yet he makes no use whatever of the possible warlike qualities of the prophet, qualities which he may well have inherited from his Roman father and which would explain the far from mediocre strategy shown in the capture of the city. As it is, Dr. Eisler would fain attribute all the glory of the enterprise to the prophet's anonymous lieutenants, and on the basis of a single sentence of Josephus (*i.e.*, Pilate): "He himself did

nothing shameful, but with his words he instigated the whole affair," words which to the present writer have all the earmarks of a Christian interpolation, though it is no doubt the most sensible one of them all.

However that may be, this new *Life of Christ* will provoke a good deal of discussion, and I cannot help hoping that it will be the starting point of a whole series of inquiries into this important corner of ancient history. It will certainly bring about an altogether different outlook on the problem of Christian origins from the one which has hitherto prevailed.

ALEXANDER HAGGERTY KRAPPE.

Christ in Islam. BY REV. JAMES ROBSON, (John Murray, London. Price 3*s.* 6*d.*)

This little book is an interesting addition to the *Wisdom of the East Series.* In an introductory chapter the author deals with the fundamental principles on which the Islamic conception of Christ is based and discusses the sources from which he has drawn. He dwells on the Muslims' rejection of Christ's Sonship as an inevitable consequence of the unity of God and makes interesting references to the Islamic belief in the essential identity of the teachings of all the prophets from Adam to Mohammad. The introductory discussion, however, omits to present a summarised, but complete, statement of all the points of agreement and of disagreement between Christianity and Islam relating to Christ, which might be of considerable benefit to the student of comparative religions. The author also omits to point out how the belief in the return of Christ found its most remarkable expression in the rise of the Qadiani sect which has the most efficient missionary organization in the Muslim world of to-day. In his judgment of the genuineness of the Islamic literature about Christ the author's standpoint is evangelistic rather than rationalistic. The second chapter contains a version of such verses of the Kuran as deal with Christ. By far the largest part of the book is a compilation of "sayings attributed to Jesus and stories about Him which are found in the writings of various Muslim writers," theological and secular, arranged in a topical order. The book is bound to stimulate thought on a subject which admits of a fuller and more scientific treatment.

SHAMSUL GHANI KHAN.

The Makers of Civilisation in Race and History: BY Dr. L. A. WADDELL (Luzac and Company, Great Russell Street, London. Price 28*s.* net.)

To establish a theory in the face of conflicting views is a task requiring intellectual impartiality and a preparedness to examine facts without mental obsession. It is indeed a bold task and this Dr. Waddell has successfully performed in his volume *Makers of Civilization.* There are several works on the origin and history of Civilisation, but whilst most of them give only a hazy and rather superficial idea, the work under review is a masterly exposition of the theory it puts forth supported by records. Dr. Waddell expounds the Sumerian theory of civilisation, a view disputed by many, but

even those who violently differ from him will be forced by the consistency of his arguments and the evidence he adduces to think twice before they make up their minds. The author himself visited certain excavations which have considerably helped him in arriving at his conclusions and the work is, therefore, the result of long labours not only in collecting facts but also in verifying them firsthand.

Dr. Waddell holds that the Sumerians were the oldest civilised people. The Britons, Anglo-Saxons, Scandinavians, etc., belonged to the Sumerian parent-stock and the Aryans of India also came from the Sumerian country. The Sumerians were a highly enterprising people and under their able kings founded colonies abroad. Uruash, a famous king who ruled about 3100 B.C., was the first of a dynasty of sea kings and the colony of Edin in the Indus valley was founded in his time.

The Eastern branch of the Early Aryans migrated to the Gangetic valley from the Kur region (Asia Minor), pressed by enemies around, and led by Dhrita, son of King Vicitra, settled in the valley.

The sheet-anchor of Dr. Waddell's theory is the list of kings. The traditional Sumerian king lists contain the same names as those mentioned in the Puranas. Those in the Indian lists are derived from the Sumerian lists and even certain gaps in the latter are filled by the former. A comparison of the two records shows that the names in both the lists are identical and the dates and achievements exactly the same. This, according to Dr. Waddell, proves that the Aryans came from Asia Minor. The migration is proved in the Vedas by a statement that the Kurus, who derived their name evidently from the Kur land from which they came, were driven from their homeland by a curse. Dhrita was the leader of the migration and his name is mentioned as Dhritarashtra in the Indian lists while his father Vicitra is mentioned as Yudhishtra. The date of the migration, however, as fixed by Dr. Waddell is likely to give a rude shock to those who argue that the Vedas were written many centuries before the Christian era, for, according to our author the great flight from Kur land in Eastern Asia Minor took place on the death of King Vicitra in about 700 B.C.

That the Aryans did migrate into the Gangetic valley is proved by some definite circumstances. When history commenced in India the Gangetic valley was the land of a perfect and well-developed civilisation with social and religious institutions almost in the same form as in modern times. No record of any civilisation before the migration was found in the country. What is more important the description of the climate and the geography of the Aryan homeland as contained in the Vedas could not apply to the Gangetic plain. The word "Aryan" is derived from "Ara" a Sumerian word, the meaning of both being exalted, noble, etc. As "Aryan" is a derivative form of "Ara," the Aryans should have migrated from the Sumerian country. Thus Dr. Waddell establishes that the Aryans were Sumerians and that Indian civilisation spread from the Gangetic plain beginning in 700 B.C.

The recent finds in Harappa and Mohenjo Daro contradict Dr. Waddell's conclusions. While Dr. Waddell places the origin of Indian civilisation at about 700 B.C., the seals and certain other objects found in Mohenjo Daro place it at 4000 B. C. surely before 3378 B.C., the date of the origin of Sumerian civilisation. The ceramic remains and the pictures on the seals help to fix this date definitely. Dr. Waddell himself says that the Indus valley had a great civilisation founded by the Sumerian colonisers. But he persists in arguing that the Indian civilisation first begins only with the great migration, the migration of the Aryans into the Gangetic valley, the centre of Indian civilisation and the homeland of the Aryans. He says :

> The Indus valley on the north-west frontier of India in which a very much more ancient Sumerian civilisation has recently been discovered was never thought of either by these European scholars or by the Brahmins as the ancient centre of Indian civilisation though it is occasionally mentioned in the Vedas or ancient psalms of the Hindus as a settlement of some early Aryan merchants, princes and sages. And it even now appears probable that the Sumerian colonisation of the Indus valley was not extended at least in a like systematic manner, with city settlements, to the Ganges valley, the heart and centre of what has hitherto been called the Indian civilisation which is seen to have begun suddenly there with its fully fledged civilisation with the arrival of a great body of Aryans with their families in what is termed 'the great Aryan migration' or 'the great Aryan invasion' of India and which is now found to be of much later date.

But once it is admitted that the Indus valley had a great civilisation as early as about 3100 B.C. even according to Dr. Waddell, it need not be seriously argued that the Indian civilisation commenced only in 700 B.C. or that the Indus colony did not extend far. The Vedas themselves have in the earliest hymns reference to the river Ravi in that region.

There is great confusion on the subject and it is not easy to assert that one particular view has alone been conclusively proved. Though the author has devoted more space in his book to comparing the king lists and adducing arguments, which are not very strong, than to a detailed discussion of other evidences, yet the few records and finds interpreted deserve careful consideration. The volume contains a wealth of plates. The book is ably written and the records impressively interpreted.

K. R.

Tongues of Fire. Compiled by GRACE H. TURNBULL. (Macmillan & Co., 1929. $3.50).

No anthology has ever wholly pleased and it is certainly no fault of Miss Turnbull if we close this remarkable book slightly disappointed. Miss Turnbull has given 400 pages of gems from the religious books of the "pagan" world. She has stressed the fact that she is not an expert. Her statements on disputed points such as the date of the Bhagavad Gita must, therefore, in spite of the impressive bibliography, not be taken too seriously.

Miss Turnbull writes for Christian readers, for people who believe that the Bible is the "most sublime creation known to man." She

presumes that the Bible is a " tradition of our race, part of the very stuff and structure of our minds." So, though interesting parellels are referred to, no extracts from the Bible seem to her to be necessary. But this detracts from the value of the work not only for non-Christians but also for those to whom the Bible is an intimate reality.

The volume is dedicated to the unknown God. The author gives us extracts from various sources, Egyptian, Indian, Chinese, Zoroastrian, Assyrian, Greek, Roman, Muhammadan, and, surprisingly, from Red Indian prayers. The impression that there is a sameness in the various teachings may be due to the author's avowed intention of giving us not a description of doctrinal development but a body of universal truths. So the characteristic differences of manner and peculiar nuances of thought are subordinated. It would not be fair to say that to a careful reader differences would not be evident. There is even in these extracts evidence of the fundamentally ethical and practical attitude of the Egyptian, Assyrian and Zoroastrian sayings contrasted with the cosmical, speculative nature of Hindu and Greek writings. To people who believe in an exclusive possession of truth this book will come as a revelation.

B. I.

The Assyrians and Their Neighbours. By Rev. W. A. Wigram. (G. Bell & Sons, London, Price 15*s.* net).

Here is history in the old manner—wars and rumours of wars, conquests and massacres, for those interested in that method of viewing the centuries. Here is also insight into the early and medieval Christian Church in several countries of the Near East and China, for the term " Neighbours " may be a liberal one—we should say that Mr. Wigram's absorbing interest is Nestorianism and Monophysitism and such phases of Christianity. But for those who go to *The Assyrians and Their Neighbours* in expectation of ancient manners and customs made plain, there must suffice only an occasional sentence and the ninth chapter. It is not, then, of " one of the original hearts ....from which the fire of civilisation was distributed about the world " we read, so much as of the later stages of development of the Assyrio-Chaldean type.

Rather snatchily, we traverse the ages from 4,000 B.C. to Alexander the Great—who to the author is a genius, destroyer of old and decadent empires in the East, restorer of them by Western strength and life, and would-be unifier of the two civilisations—and thence to the present day. Chronicles of Turk, Kurd, Armenian, Tartar and Mongol crowd the pages, some scarlet with the horror of man's inhumanity to man, to which the author reverts repeatedly. There are interesting asides, so to speak, on the development of the Syriac language, the *lingua franca* of lands from Babylonia to the Mediterranean ; on Bardesanes, author of " the first version of ' The Pilgrim's Progress ' in his wonderful allegory of 'The Search for the Lost Robe' "; on Christianity " even higher than " Zoroastrianism (which is expounded), a mere *ipse dixit* and therefore valueless.

We could wish for more information on the debt Paris and Oxford owe the Assyrian colleges at Nisibis, dating from the fifth century A.D., and at Seleucis, that centre of Hellenism, where Plato was taught and where the Arabs became acquainted with the Greek learning, transmitting through the centuries to the professors at Cordova and Salamanca that which other scholars in Europe later inherited. He does give at length the travels in the late thirteenth century of Soma, a Chinese gentleman and a Christian archdeacon, who amazed the then popeless Cardinals at Rome "as a dignitary of a Church of which they do not appear to have heard at all," was interviewed by the King of France at Paris and celebrated the mysteries for Edward of England but not at Westminster, more probably in Gascony. But dilatory Christianity took no heed of this and similar overtures, so lost the Mongol or Turkish stock to Islam.

The Assyrians to-day resemble their ancestors, Mr. Wigram strongly holds, and illustrations to his text prove the point emphasised. In costume, old-time is preserved. Customs and practices can be traced back unbroken from modern times to the very days of ancient Babylonia.

M. T.

What the Negro Thinks. By Robert Russa Moton (The Student Christian Movement. Price *7s.* 6*d.* net).

What the Negro Thinks is an admirable survey of the American Negro conditions. It is the work of a writer of sound judgment, wide sympathies and solid learning, and one who touches the widest aspect of the subject with a sure hand. Prof. Moton brings out very clearly the patience, powers of endurance, generosity and the eager response of the Negro to the hand of fellowship. He describes the appalling handicaps under which the Negro suffers in every department of life, social, religious, political and educational. Even the laws of the United States are broken to his disadvantage. If he is unsuccessful his failure is exploited to his detriment. If he succeeds, his very success leads to new developments of petty persecution. Despite such overwhelming odds it is consoling to realise the "thinking Negro" is advancing in his economic conditions. The race to-day is better educated and more prosperous than at any time. But the Negro is more aware of the injustice to which he is still subjected, and is less willing to suffer this humiliation.

The problem of the Negro or the colour question is a grave race-problem. Hitherto it has defied man's efforts, yet it makes an irresistible call to those who believe in that Wisdom Religion which binds together the hearts of all men without distinction of race, creed, colour or sex and binds them all to each other with the golden thread of Universal Brotherhood, to face the perils and defy the difficulties. *What the Negro Thinks* is a book for which the thinking world will be grateful and which should do much to illuminate the minds of many sceptics.

D. M.

ENDS AND SAYINGS.

"_____*ends of verse*
And sayings of philosophers."

—HUDIBRAS.

From Rio de Janiero comes the news (*New York Times*, January 5th), that Dr. Barbosa together with General Rondon, Brazil's most famous explorer, discovered Phoenician hieroglyphics, as well as what appears to be a ship, carved on the rock formations of the Cumina River in the Amazon Valley. This has revived the belief that four thousand or more years ago, the Phoenicians discovered America, navigated the Amazon, and built a city. If the decoding, which will take about a year, comes up to the expectations of the archæologists, it is said that excavations will be attempted on the shores of the river in search of the buried dwelling site. According to tradition, the name of the city was *Atlantida*, which some geological and archæological writers say was the name of a continent which once existed in the Atlantic Ocean, and may have formed either a land bridge or link for communication between the old and the new hemispheres. While the task of decoding goes on, it might be well for the genuinely interested student of archæology to turn his attention to gathering whatever facts he can concerning that ancient "fable" of Atlantis, in order to enrich his background, whereon he may place any freshly gained information, gleaned from the coming generation of archæologists. Myths and fables are for the most part considered to be meaningless tales handed down from the ancient world, but when we consider that Plato declares in his *Gorgias* and *Phaedo* that they, as well as symbols, were the vehicles of great truths well worth seeking, and when we further ponder over the fact that Solon, one of the Seven Grecian Sages, told the story of Atlantis to Critias as a boy, the grandsire of Plato, and who thus had it directly told to him, perhaps we shall not so carelessly turn aside from the ancient myth of a great continent now supposed to be reposing under the wide oceans.

The sincere and inquiring student has but to turn to H. P. Blavatsky's monumental works, *The Secret Doctrine* and *Isis Unveiled*, to find therein deciphered many of the mysteries of the archaic past, to find marshalled in panoramic vision and compared, the legends, the myths, the symbols of nation after nation of the ancient world, to see gathered together the great truths uttered by succeeding generations of seers and sages. In those books we may discover how the Phoenicians themselves are the descendants of the last of the Atlanteans, and that their "vessels had circumnavigated the globe, and spread civilization in regions now silent and deserted," (*Isis Unveiled* I, 239), and that there are "scattered throughout the world, a handful of thoughtful and solitary students, who pass their lives in obscurity, studying the great problems of the physical and spiritual universes."

> These men believe the story of Atlantis to be no fable, but maintain that at different epochs of the past, huge islands, and even continents, existed where now there is but a wild waste of waters. In those submerged temples and libraries the archæologist would find, could he but explore them, the materials for filling all the gaps that now exist in what we imagine is *history*. (*Isis Unveiled* I, 558).

Dr. Rabindranath Tagore has a way of hiding gems in unexpected places. In a letter written last October from his beloved Santiniketan, he is led by the fact that it was the Festival of Lakshmi Purnima into a consideration of the place of festivals in Indian life. He then digresses suddenly and gives his views on Indian conditions and Gandhiji's favourite weapon, the Charka. He writes :

> Imagine for a moment that the Mahatma had demanded that each peasant must grow at least one more bushel of crops in every bigha, and had laid it down that Swaraj would be won in strict proportion to the success of this programme.

We need not follow him in his cogent arguments ; it serves our purpose to present the central practical idea. We are aware that some, however few, have endeavoured by speculation and conjecture to find some feasible plan : it has taken a creative mind to formulate one in a few words. But who will labour for its application ?

A set of paradoxes confronts the reader of four articles comprising an Educational Survey in the January *Nineteenth Century and After*. Implicit in them is an indictment indeed of western educational methods ; implicit also is the only solution to the problems the writers discuss. Mr. Harold Hodge gives us to realize that the educational system has destroyed the faculty of thinking in teachers and therefore in the pupils. Mr. H. C. Dent depicts two English nations distinct and separate, one knowing not the other—the Public Schools *versus* the rest. Mr. Stephen H. Foot shows boys whose god is games, incapable of concentration, for whom the spiritual and intellectual life does not exist. Dr. Basil A. Yeaxlee discloses the inevitable result in adulthood—a quest for truth, for the divine in man will not be denied. As Dr. Cyril Norwood is summarized, " No education can produce an educated democracy which does not place spiritual values first."

Spiritual values first, and all the rest will be added unto them—strong will, keen mentality, pure feelings, physical well-being. But who is to elucidate these values to the learners ? Is the modern teacher capable of the task ? How much has he realized of the spirit of things, events and persons—beginning with himself ?

Mr. Hodge would like the teachers to take heart though they are not duly recognized and though " they are often lonely," for " Christ Himself did not refuse the title of teacher." We say there is a positive aspect of this loneliness in the Christ drama to which teachers should pay heed—Christ's persistent and constant companionship with the Father, with whom he was one. The loneliness in the world of men is often a passport to the proximity of the Divine within

us. The modern teacher following the ideal of perfect teachers, as Gautama and Jesus, should resort to spiritual communion within himself, and feel the power of his own godliness of heart and mind; otherwise he will continue to fail in his real mission. Through study and meditation he must acquire the qualities of his caste given in the *Gita* xviii, 42. They are tranquillity, self-control, austerity, purity, patience, rectitude, and belief in his own Higher Self.

We have pleasure in welcoming the formation of a new association, called the All Peoples Association (A.P.A. to rhyme with "Harper") which has just been started in England. The chief promoter is Mr. Evelyn Wrench, the Editor of the *Spectator*, and the founder of the Over Seas League, and the English Speaking Union. This association seems to be another milestone on the way towards Universal Brotherhood. It is comprised of men and women of all nations and seeks to remove prejudice and misunderstanding between the peoples of the world. Most important, it "recognizes no distinction of colour, race, class, creed or political party." It has "no political objective in the narrow sense; it is not connected with the League of Nations, nor does it seek alliances between any peoples." The sole purpose of A.P.A. is "to make the peoples of the world better known to one another and to promote friendship among them". In pursuance of its aims it hopes shortly to issue a magazine, each article being printed in four languages.

Special assurance is given that no one will be asked to do anything in conflict with his duties as a loyal citizen of the country of his birth or adoption. Will not such a precaution militate against the real aims of the Association, for it would seem to foster a partial viewpoint? The highest patriot, the profoundest loyalist is he who has clear vision, and is able to regard dispassionately the merits and demerits of his own country as those of another country. If his country is acting unjustly towards another country, it is his loyal *duty* to prevent this wrong as far as in him lies. Nothing can be unpatriotic or disloyal which is consonant with Universal Brotherhood.

Then, again, in the application for membership, we come across another curious precaution. The candidate must be proposed by either a member of A. P. A., a J. P., an Officer in H. M.'s Forces, a Minister of Religion, a Bank Manager, or a prominent business man. Why not a Barrister at Law?—but why make any distinction of class at all?

CORRESPONDENCE.

Character Building.

Your extract from Sir Michael Sadler's article about conscience (March, p. 207) and your remarks raise the following question: Is not conscience but part of character? The power to listen to my conscience is within my character; it requires some virtues, like patience, and some will-power to go by one's voice of conscience. We who are preparing to face the struggles of existence are eager to know something about the science of building character. We know what our fathers knew, that we ought to be good and honourable—but how? The momentum of heredity is against us—we shall most probably do what our fathers did and ask our children to be good and honourable. In our schools and colleges there is no *direct* impartation of knowledge; and work in class and play in field give us but indirect hints, and we eat morals as we eat food, in an unscientific manner—gobble it up and hope we shall grow in health and strength of character. Does The Aryan Path propose to fill the gap that our school and college curricula have left?

Bombay. An Undergraduate.

[Yes, The Aryan Path has that ambition; but it will require the co-operation of the young and we are glad "An Undergraduate" has written to us. We shall stress only two points here. (1) The divorce between morality and intellectual perception stands in the way of the young. The general view is that intellectual attainment is not hindered by moral weakness, and in justification examples are given of mental eminence at work in persons morally weak. This, of course, is false. (2) To operate the fundamental law of character-building, *viz.*, that Thought Builds Character, youth must possess some metaphysical basis to his thinking. Mere sermons help not character-building; application of what is read or heard does. Now, application demands a certain detachment, a certain impersonal outlook, and these are greatly aided by a dwelling on cosmic ultimates, on universals. We shall try to deal at length with the subject of the above letter in one of our subsequent numbers. The Aryan Path will always be glad to receive questions and problems affecting those who are the promise of future humanity.—Eds.]

A Plea for Simplicity.

There is an urgent need of such a journal as The Aryan Path. Rarely can journalism have been so "flat, stale, and unprofitable" as to-day: never has there been so much need for inspiration in human conduct. I am one of the many who have "failed to gain contentment and understanding in the old religions or the new creeds," and I think it likely that the new synthesis of life will be achieved not easily or by one person but in the sweat of struggle and by the

co-operation—and conflict—of many. THE ARYAN PATH is excellently named—it is the opportunity for us to help our fellows.

A word of warning: Let us not have any arbitrary division between idea and fact, between abstract and concrete, between spiritual and material—with the emphasis on the idea, the abstract, the spiritual. But a fact is an idea, and a statement of fact is only important in so far as it opens the floodgates of imagination to comprehend causes, motives, implications, heaven-reaching philosophy. The barest fact may be transfused with the intensest spirituality, but the spirituality which moves entirely in the abstract is comprehensible only to the trained philosopher and the religious visionary: and abstract verbiage is not necessarily philosophy.

This may sound trite enough: but try to explain the doctrines of, let us say, Plato to an audience of miners. There are some deeply intellectual men among the miners, well read in philosophical speculation and capable of abstract argument: but, as I know from experience if a teacher cannot relate the most abstract ideas to the facts of the miners' life, he will not be successful among them. The simple presentation of facts so as to give them new and profound significance has ever been the province of even the most prophetic of our artists: widespread wisdom depends on simplicity and concreteness as well as on universality.

London. S. H. F.

[We are in general agreement with the views of our correspondent. It is profoundly true that the capacity to put forth great philosophical truths in simple language is determined by our own inner understanding and assimilation of the principles expounded. That is why our knowledge, as our ignorance, is only fully revealed to us when we try to teach others the facts we claim to know. The greater the teacher the simpler his message when delivered to the masses. That is why all great spiritual instructors of mankind have always addressed the multitudes in a way understood by them. This, however, does not alter the fact that the greater the capacity to write or speak directly and simply on profound subjects, the greater must be the metaphysical grasp of the expounder. The would-be teacher of spiritual facts must acquire depth of vision and unfold the capacity to dwell on metaphysical and impersonal ideas.

THE ARYAN PATH aims not only at presenting great truths in simple garb but also at developing inner depth in those who may desire to fit themselves to help and teach others. The world is in sore need of such. They must be capable of planting the seeds of truth in the hearts of the simple and the humble, but that very capacity depends upon their own assimilation of truths which are as yet beyond the grasp of mere physical vision or the observation of facts.

—Eds.]

A Reply.

A question arises from the perusal of Mr. Rajagopalachari's Note on my article—"India's Freedom." Since "the best in India in spiritual and philosophic effort was produced during the period when she was politically and economically free"—how did she lose that freedom? May it not have been by a gradual degeneration in her spiritual and philosophic life? If so, the remedy would seem to be obvious. I hold this view, and in my article I endeavoured to point out that in order to work off the bad Karma of India, an endeavour should be made to alter the original cause of it, not to concentrate on striking at what after all are but effects. I repeat: "I long for the hastening of that day [India's political freedom] but my fear is that India in her attempts to secure that freedom, may sacrifice her greatest treasure—her spirituality."

I agree heartily with Mr. Rajagopalachari that "Karma is not a philosophy of idleness," and that "the Ancient Wisdom is not inconsistent with either Political Freedom or efforts to retrieve it". But the efforts, in my opinion, should be more of an inner and self-reforming nature, than the methods ordinarily employed in political struggles.

Mr. Rajagopalachari feels that "foreign domination is not to be tolerated." There seem to be two ways open: the way of the flesh—ejection of the foreigners; or the way of the spirit—winning the foreigners over by the power of the inner life, so that they realise that in our freedom lies their freedom. But perhaps it may be thought that this is a very convenient point of view for a Britisher.

Bombay. T. L. Crombie.