THE ARYAN PATH

Point out the "Way"—however dimly, and lost among the host—as does the evening star to those who tread their path in darkness.

—The Voice of the Silence

VOL. XIX AUGUST 1948 No. 8

GREAT IDEAS

[Helena Petrovna Blavatsky was born at midnight hour of August 11-12, in 1831. She was the chief Founder of the Theosophical Movement in 1875 and in her books and numerous articles is enshrined the message of Theosophy, to which this journal owes its inspiration. Below we give some extracts from the pen of that valiant and devoted server of humanity, H. P. B.—ED.]

Our Voice is raised for spiritual freedom, and our plea made for enfranchisement from all tyranny, whether of Science or Theology.

The silent worship of abstract or *noumenal* Nature, the only divine manifestation, is the one ennobling religion of Humanity.

...the essence of Theosophy is the perfect harmonizing of the divine with the human in man, the adjustment of his god-like qualities and aspirations, and their sway over the terrestrial or animal passions in him. Kindness, absence of every ill feeling or selfishness, charity, good-will to all beings, and perfect justice to others as to one's self, are its chief features.

It is not the policy of self-preservation, not the welfare of one or another personality in its finite and physical form that will or can ever secure the desired object and screen the Society from the effects of the social "hurricane" to come; but only the weakening of the feeling of separateness in the units which compose its chief element. And such a weakening can only be achieved by a process of *inner enlightenment*.

The ever unknowable and incognizable *Karana* alone, the *Causeless* Cause of all causes, should have its shrine and altar on the holy and ever untrodden ground of our heart —invisible, intangible, unmentioned, save through "the still small voice" of our spiritual consciousness. Those who worship before it, ought to do so in the silence and the sanctified solitude of their Souls; making their spirit the sole mediator between them and the *Universal Spirit*, their good actions the only priests, and their sinful intentions the only visible and objective sacrificial victims to the *Presence*.

TOWARDS ECONOMIC DEMOCRACY

[Co-operation is in the blood of Bombay's Finance Minister, whose portfolio includes also Co-operation and Village Industries. **The Hon. Shri Vaikunth L. Mehta,** who writes here on the possibilities of a co-operative commonwealth for India, is the son of the late Sir Lalubhai Samaldas Mehta, who played so prominent an unofficial rôle in the Co-operative Movement in this country. His evaluation of its achievements and potentialities is encouraging for the solution of many of the great and pressing problems which face free India, and he speaks with the authority of his own long and faithful service of Co-operation, with the working of which he has been intimately associated for very many years.—ED.]

In the preamble to the draft constitution of India, the declaration is made that it will be the aim and the duty of the sovereign democratic republic of India to secure to all its citizens the blessings of justice, liberty, equality and fraternity. The term justice is intended to cover economic life, and so is the term equality. Both justice and equality are to be secured on the basis of liberty and fraternity, which represent the maintenance of the freedom of thought and the dignity of the individual. The acceptance of these objectives connotes, thus, not only a change in the political status of India, but a recognition of the need for the establishment of a new social order.

That the dominant political party in the country, the Indian National Congress, fully appreciates this transformation in the outlook before the country is obvious from the fact that by a resolution adopted in November last, at a meeting of the All-India Congress Committee, the Congress was called upon to address itself to the next great task, namely, the establishment of real democracy in the country and of a society based on social justice and equality. In the constitution of the Congress which was adopted in April this year, the goal before the country which the Congress seeks to achieve has been defined as the establishment of a co-operative commonwealth.

When the country is asked to accept this as its goal, it becomes necessary to examine, first, the basis for this decision and, secondly, the manner in which it can be implemented. The co-operative method of social reorganization is preferred, apparently, because it provides for a transformation of the social order gradually, voluntarily, non-violently. With it are not associated the bludgeon of the State, the liquidation of entire groups in the social structure, the conflict and the bitterness normally associated with revolutionary changes. The revolution will certainly be achieved ultimately. It will,

however, be not a revolution organized from above or from outside but a gradual, peaceful revolution brought about as a result of the building up of the material and moral strength of the people from the bottom upwards. This seems more in harmony not only with the precepts of all great religions but also in tune with the conception of Swaraj as expounded by the latest among our great teachers, Mahatma Gandhi.

India is a vast country, and economic democracy cannot take the same form with us, as, for instance, with Switzerland. Decentralization of economic, as also of political power, becomes a matter of greater import to us than to smaller nations. Small territorial units or functional groups should have the satisfaction of feeling that they have an effective control over their economic life. While local authorities of various descriptions help in the process of decentralization of political power, it is only through co-operative organizations which are "built upon the most numerous and smallest economic units" and which provide, therefore, "the broadest basis and the deepest foundation" for the social structure that decentralization can proceed in the economic sphere. It is not only decentralization that is secured by the acceptance of the co-operative method, but also the achievement of distributive justice and equality of sacrifice and privilege.

The co-operative form of economic organization, though based on self-help, mutual aid and voluntary effort, does not stand for the economic scramble and chaos into which unrestricted private capitalism such as has run rampant in India for a hundred years has led us. In the world conditions of today, progress is practically inconceivable without planning. The co-operative system suitably lends itself to planned action, inasmuch as it represents not individual small-scale units but postulates a closely knit, well-integrated federal structure. Authority and direction are, however, not exercised by an external agency, but by the federal organizations to which the federating units surrender part of their autonomy, because it is on the basis of freely accepted discipline that the federations function. Sovereignty is shared in a manner which can ensure that planning can be put through "without tears." Planning by attraction and planning by inducement, such as is postulated by the co-operative method, are always alternatives preferable, in a democratic order, to planning by direct compulsion.

Lastly, democratic institutions, as Mr. Aldous Huxley has observed in *Science, Liberty and Peace*, are likely to work best at times and in places where at least a good part of the citizens have access to enough land and possess enough tools and professional skill to be able to provide for their subsistence without recourse to financially potent private capitalists or to the Government. It is the peculiar characteristic of

the co-operative movement that this is rendered feasible without detriment to efficiency in all spheres of economic activity, particularly in respect of distribution, agriculture, and such industrialized production as can and should be carried on suitably on a decentralized basis. The movement provides scope for the development of the personality, the intelligence, the skill, the political ability of groups of persons working in different types of democratic and self-governing institutions.

To assert that the co-operative movement provides a basis for a democratic society is not enough. What exactly is connoted by the term a "co-operative commonwealth" and, in a practical sense, by what steps in relation to the accepted objectives is it proposed to advance towards the goal? Fortunately for the country, the foundations of a co-operative structure have already been laid; and in the sphere of banking at least the progress achieved in India is comparable to that recorded anywhere else in the world. But, hitherto, the co-operative system was rarely looked upon as an integral part of the economic life of the people either in rural or in urban areas. Taking the foundation as it is, its legal basis and the administrative framework, it is now necessary to bring about such integration and provide for building the new order on a broader basis with a widened outlook and aiming at completion by more rapid strides than have been taken so far.

The plan of development has, fortunately again, been sketched for us by two bodies, one an officially appointed committee and the other an equally if not more responsible authority. The first is the Co-operative Planning Committee which was appointed by the Government of India in January 1945. The report of this Committee which was published in 1946, attempts, for the first time in the history of the co-operative movement in India, not only to draw up a comprehensive plan of co-operative development but to dovetail the plan into the framework of the general plan of economic development for the country. There is no aspect of the economic life of the nation which is ignored by the Committee, for it has extended its attention even to questions relating to housing, health and better living, transport and civil construction.

Analysing the causes of the limited progress achieved by the co-operative movement during the last 44 years, the Committee comes to the conclusion that the comparatively poor results achieved so far are due to the failure of the movement to tackle the life of the individual as a whole and to the *laissez-faire* policy of the State. Planning postulates the end of *laissez-faire* whether in the field of co-operation or in any other field. It cannot be taken in hand, the Committee stresses, even in this field unless the State assumes responsibility for guidance and direction.

It is a moot question whether planning in and for co-operation does

not involve a departure from the voluntary principle which is the basis of the co-operative form of economic organization. The Committee does not visualize an abandonment of the principle but urges an adjustment of the scheme of working so that responsible nation-building departments of the Government with a new outlook will be able "by means of education, propaganda, persuasion and demonstration to bring about the organization of co-operatives along planned lines without resort to compulsion." The co-operative society becomes, in the opinion of the Committee, a suitable medium for the democratization of economic planning, providing as it does the local unit which can fulfil the dual function of educating public opinion in favour of a plan and executing it. In utilizing this agency, Government may extend to groups that are co-operatively organized facilities which may not be made available to those who prefer to act individually. The policy of indirect compulsion by denial of concession or privileges may, the Committee believes, be almost as effective as direct compulsion.

The authors of this plan were confirmed co-operators or officials with a sympathetic bias. The members of the Committee appointed by the All-India Congress Committee last year to draw up an economic programme for the Congress are all veteran statesmen and seasoned national workers, but hardly any one of them was in the past associated with the co-operative movement. They came, however, to almost identical conclusions. It is these conclusions that form the basis on which they urge the Congress to establish a co-operative commonwealth for India. From this point of view it is pertinent to set forth such of those conclusions as provide for the employment of the co-operative method for planned economic development in the sphere of production and distribution.

In the forefront of the programme of agrarian reform is put forward the view that all intermediaries between the tiller and the State should be eliminated and that middlemen should be replaced by non-profit-making agencies such as co-operatives. Inasmuch as the individual peasant is generally so ill-equipped that he cannot be expected to assume complete responsibility for better farming, the needed implements, manure, seeds, bullocks and other essential means of production should be made available through a provincial agency, not directly but through village multi-purpose co-operative societies. Provision for grain storage, manure collection and preservation and rural communications should, it is suggested, be made under co-operative auspices. To finance agricultural operations and development, the State should organize agricultural finance corporations which should function, it is recommended, through co-operative societies. Proceeding a stage further, the Committee proposes that the State should organize

pilot schemes for experimenting with co-operative farming among small-holders and should set up co-operative colonies for Government lands unoccupied but cultivable. Pending the extension of co-operative farming the Committee advocates the systematic organization, in accordance with a definite plan, of co-operative multi-purpose enterprises and their unions. The main task of these should be to cut down the costs of agricultural credit, of the processing and marketing of agricultural produce and of the supply of manufactured goods from the towns to the villages and from the factories and industrial co-operatives to the villagers.

Co-operation figures equally prominently in the plan for the promotion of industry. Industries producing articles of food and clothing and other consumer goods, the Committee urges, should constitute the decentralized sector of Indian economy and should, as far as possible, be developed and run on a co-operative basis. The primary unit should be the industrial co-operative society that undertakes to supply raw materials, to guide production, to sell the goods turned out by members and, where necessary, to provide a common workshop where production can be carried on jointly. The primary units should constitute part of a strong federal structure, with their regional unions and associations and a provincial organization at the apex. The various co-operative agencies should make themselves responsible for the supply of tools, the procurement of raw materials, the provision of workshops, and the organization of marketing, the cottage worker and the artisan being left free to concentrate on production.

Arrangements should be entered into, it is further proposed, with Government for obtaining forest produce serving as raw material at standard rates and not in competition with contractors. State aid to workers in cottage industries should be made available only through the agency of co-operative societies. Loans and subsidies should, the Committee recommends, be granted through the medium of co-operative societies ; and, where necessary, Government should guarantee advances made by co-operative banks. In order to reduce pressure on the transport system and with a view to promoting self-sufficiency, arrangements should be devised for the sale of goods through local multi-purpose agricultural societies or through neighbouring consumers' societies. Sales depots may, however, have to be established in towns. Government and local bodies as well as large-scale industrial establishments, the Committee desires, should extend their patronage to the products of co-operative industrial societies. While doing so, they should not expect the societies to submit tenders, but they should adopt a system of placing orders at standard rates. Lastly, the Committee advocates the establishment of a cadre of organizers, secretaries, technicians, devoted to

the work of co-operation for service in these bodies, whose terms of remuneration should be so fixed as to attract persons of ability and integrity.

The reorganization of the distribution system on co-operative lines is deemed necessary by the Committee to secure a balanced progressive economy in which regulated distribution forms an integral part of the economic plan. If wages are to be controlled and consequently the prices of agricultural products and manufactured articles, the distribution of consumers' goods should be controlled by the encouragement of co-operative effort. Integrated economy should be secured in rural areas, the Committee suggests, by the formation of multi-purpose co-operative societies with branches for agricultural producers, consumers and small industries. The adoption of this form of organization will, the Committee believes, reduce the need for transport over long distances and minimize the use of money. Consumers' societies should be organized, the Committee recommends, for the conduct of the retail trade in what are necessities of life for the humbler sections of the population. As in other spheres of economic life, Government should encourage such effort by the grant of special facilities for transport, storage, commercial intelligence and by establishing contact between urban consumers' societies and agricultural or industrial producers' societies in rural areas.

That is the pattern, in rough outline, of the economic democracy of the future as sketched by the Economic Programme Committee. There are details to be filled in and touches to be given before we have a complete picture of the entire structure. For these details, resort may be had to the elaborate recommendations of the Co-operative Planning Committee, to which a reference is made earlier in this article. How this plan of co-operative development fits in with the machinery for credit, the transport system, the State enterprises for electricity and water supply, the nationalized basic and key industries, the remaining sector of private industrial and commercial enterprise, will, again, have to be considered and determined.

In any event, the plan, as it is presented, makes it clear that the basis of the planned economy will be the development of a self-reliant, industrious community which is still predominantly agricultural. As Dr. A. D. Lindsay has observed, it is only such a community that has the social basis of democracy secure. Rural civilization does not necessarily connote concentration on agriculture. The only difference will be that it will be based on rural industry and not on urban industry such as has been the course of development recently in most parts of the world. This is in consonance with the social philosophy of Mahatma Gandhi who even more

than eminent social thinkers elsewhere believed that the creation of a rural civilization was the greatest need of our time. The imparting to this new social order, as we wish to see it evolve, of a co-operative aspect is also in conformity with Gandhiji's teachings and outlook on life. With the break-up of the village community, our rural populations, as the Irish poet-philosopher Æ said of his country, are in no sense a community. "They are no more closely connected for the most part than shifting sands on the seashore." Individualism is rampant in the countryside, and even much more so in urbanized society.

The reordering of economic life on a co-operative basis will, it is fervently hoped, revive the instinct for working in common and provide common interests and possessions. Besides, for combining efficiency of administration with individual liberty, no better medium of organization has yet been devised. Then, again, in spheres of economy which affect the daily life of millions, the establishment of an equalitarian society cannot be brought about by schemes of nationalization of large industrial or other economic enterprises. Organization of their own economic life on a co-operative basis will, however, ensure for them the results of economic equality. Under such a régime, the acquisitive profit-making propensity of capitalism and the regimentation of a totalitarian state, to quote the words of the Economic Programme Committee, will both be excluded. "The most propitious environment for equality," Mr. Aldous Huxley has noted, "is constituted by a society where the means of production are owned co-operatively, where power is decentralized and where the community is organized in a multiplicity of small, inter-related but as far as may be self-governing groups of mutually responsible men and women." It is definitely towards this equalitarian society that we shall move, if we accept and implement the comprehensive plans put forward by the Economic Programme Committee of the All-India Congress Committee.

VAIKUNTH L. MEHTA

If the action of one reacts on the lives of all, and this is the true scientific idea, then it is only by all men becoming brothers and all women sisters, and by all practising in their daily lives true brotherhood and true sisterhood, that the real human solidarity, which lies at the root of the elevation of the race, can ever be attained.

—H. P. BLAVATSKY

THE MENACE OF VIVISECTION

[**Mr. M. Oldfield Howey,** an old contributor to our pages, has interested himself largely in the fields of ancient religious myth and symbolism, on which he has published *The Horse in Magic and Myth, The Cat in the Mysteries of Religion and Magic* and *The Encircled Serpent: A Study of Serpent Symbolism in All Countries and Ages.*

Even the article on "Human Vivisection" by Dr. Emanuel M. Josephson in our December 1947 issue can hardly have prepared our readers for the extent of the infamous practice as brought out here. Mr. Howey is shocked, as all right-thinking people must be shocked, by the iniquities he reveals, the responsibility for which rests not only on the perpetrators, but also on the public which tacitly condones them by making a fetish of the body, to keep which in health no sacrifice of others is deemed too great. It is high time we cried halt! to the vivisectors, before our humane qualities are atrophied and that which rightly horrifies us now should come to be accepted as a commonplace.—ED.]

The horror and iniquity of vivisection paralyses the progress of our vaunted Western civilisation in every quarter of the world to which it has penetrated and, by its searing effect on the conscience of mankind, has opened wide the door to further revolting crimes that today threaten to overwhelm humanity with death and hell.

It may be argued that the general public has no conception of the fiendish, sadistic tortures that are continually perpetrated in Physiological Research Laboratories on helpless animals. This is so, but when some inkling of the facts is forced upon their attention, they stop their ears and shut their eyes lest they be personally pained by the revelation. Contemptible cowards, thinking only of self, had they but the courage to face the fearful truth and realise their personal responsibility for the diabolical atrocities vivisection involves—to man as well as to animals—they would not, nay, could not, tolerate its continuance for one additional moment, far less directly or indirectly lend it their support. To believe otherwise is to assign to mankind a moral delinquency so flagrantly base and contemptible that the destruction of humanity could scarcely be deplored. The cold, calculated ruthlessness which is absolutely essential to the success of vivisectional research, is necessarily inimical to all that makes for moral welfare and true progress. For, to torture creatures in cold blood to increase knowledge under the hypothetical excuse that it is done for the sake of humanity—to do evil that good may come of it—is as reprehensible as any other crime, and as assuredly fatal in its ultimate consequences. Even more tre-

mendous—if that be possible—than the baseness of such bargaining with the powers of darkness, is the madness of supposing that we could ever get the best of such a transaction. So far from obtaining the coveted relief from the sufferings that beset us, we find ourselves blinded and baffled and led to wrong conclusions, as today our vivisecting scientists are compelled to confess. One of the most noted surgeons in the history of medicine, and the pioneer of the present-day method of aseptic surgery, the late Professor Lawson Tait, F.R.C.S., etc., voiced this truth as follows:—

Vivisection as a method of research has constantly led those who have employed it into altogether erroneous conclusions, and the records teem with instances in which not only have animals been fruitlessly sacrificed, but human lives have been added to the list of victims by reason of its false light.

Sir Frederick Treves, BT., C.B., L.L.D., M.D., F.R.C.S., the late Serjeant Surgeon to King Edward VII, was equally emphatic. He wrote in *The British Medical Journal*, November 5, 1898:—

Many years ago, I carried out on the Continent sundry operations on the intestines of dogs, but such are the differences between the human and the canine bowel that when I came to operate on man I found I was much hampered by my new experience, that I had everything to unlearn, and that my experiments had done little but unfit me to deal with the human intestine.

Many other such confessions could be adduced did space permit. What use can it be to try the effect of a drug on a dog, whose gastric juice contains six times as much pepsin, and nearly twice as much hydrochloric acid, as that of man? It was noted by Livingstone that the tsetse fly causes certain death to ox, horse, or dog, but is powerless against the mule, the ass and the goat, as it is against man. What is the subtle difference between ox and buffalo, or horse and zebra which can explain the anomaly? Mouse typhus, imported from Europe to destroy mice in Java, proved to be fatal to some species but harmless to others.

The unreliability of results obtained by experiments on animals when they are applied to human beings has led to the predictable and logical conclusion: The last experiment must always be on man. As the late Dr. Hadwen, M.D., M.R.C.S., L.R.C.P., L.S.A., etc., pointed out, it is absolutely ridiculous to suppose that by the exploitation of living animals we could ever gain the experience that is needed for human diseases. It is quite impossible to reason from an animal to a man—to learn human diseases from animals of an entirely different species.

The unreliability of results obtained by experiments on animals when applied to human beings has incited certain well-known vivisectors openly to advocate and proclaim the practice of direct experiments on man. Dr. A. T. Brand wrote in his work on *Cancer: Its Cause, Treat-*

ment and Prevention, published in 1922 :—

It is most important that much more should be done in experimental inoculation, and it is even more necessary that such experiments should be made on the "*genus homo.*" Fortunately there is abundant material for this purpose, although it is at present annually wasted by the common hangman ! No doubt there would be a great outcry from the shrieking sisterhood of both sexes ; but they should of course be simply ignored, for science must be permitted to pursue the calm and even tenor of her way undisturbed and undeterred by the vapourings of irresponsible cranks !

Dr. Brand's views have been many times echoed. We may quote Dr. C. G. Douglas, President of the Section of Physiology, who, at the 1927 Meeting of the British Association, was reported in *The Times* of September 3, 1927, as having said that "in the interest of knowledge, man himself, rather than an animal should be experimented on. Man is in many instances a far more advantageous subject for investigation."

Facilis descensus Averno. From words vivisectionists have proceeded to deeds. And little children are not spared. "The high priest of medicine has managed to get his foot into the schools, and children are exposed to any medical outrage that happens to be dominant," observes *The Individualist*, April 1932.

As an example we may take the case recorded in *The British Medical Journal* of January 19, 1935. A series of experiments with various immunising mixtures was therein described by C. J. McSweeney, M.D., M.R.C.P.I., D.P.H., in an article entitled "An Evaluation of Modern Diphtheria. Prophylactics." In it he stated that the "experimental material" consisted of children from two residential institutions, nine smaller homes, a hospital and two elementary schools, "a total of 642 children."

Another scientist subjected children to starvation experiments, and the following extract from his recorded account, part of a paper read at the annual meeting of the British Medical Association by the Physician in Charge of the Department for Diseases of Children, Guy's Hospital, London, was published in the *British Medical Journal* of November 1st, 1931. We are not told where the experiments took place—perhaps from motives of prudence !

The reaction of young children to hypoglycæmia and ketonæmia, induced experimentally by starvation and by a diet with little sugar and a high content of fat, has recently been investigated and recorded in an interesting communication by Salomonsen....

Fifteen young children between the ages of one and four were subjected by Salomonsen to periods of starvation of from thirty-six to seventy-two hours....

Twelve children between the ages of five and fourteen were suddenly put upon a diet poor in carbohydrate and rich in fat. In both series symptoms were produced, the intensity of which varied very much in different individuals, but which comprised pallor,

anorexia, somnolence, vomiting, loss of weight, increased excretion of nitrogen, hypoglycæmia, and sometimes a palpably enlarged liver....

It must not be thought that these cruel experiments are isolated instances of the vivisector's turning from the animal to the child. They are merely typical and illustrative of the soul-destroying effect of vivisection on those who practise it.

The evil is world-spread and not confined to any one continent. The New York *Medical Record* of September 10th, 1892, described how an American physician deliberately inoculated twenty little children with "the most horrible disease that afflicts the human race today, without the slightest thought of benefit to his victims and *solely as an experiment.*" The account of these experiments, written by the experimenter, showed them to have been carried out on children who were in his charge at a "Free Dispensary." (See *The Vivisection Controversy*, by Dr. A. Leffingwell.)

The gruesome accounts of human vivisection in the German Torture Camps are still fresh in everybody's mind. The first case to come to public notice was that of the Camp at Struthof Natzweiler. An account of it was given in *The Manchester Guardian* of December 28, 1944, wherein it was stated that the Camp was operated as an annex to the medical faculty of the German University of Strasbourg. It was furnished for testing the effect of toxic gases on prisoners and also for vivisection. Horrible experiments with blinding gases were performed on women prisoners, who were subsequently subjected to various injections to try to discover remedies. All these miserable victims were ultimately murdered whether the cures were effective or not.

Ravensbruk was a similar hell where the experiments were directed to the observation of nerve reactions to pain and large holes were burned in women's limbs and the behaviour of their nerves recorded with special instruments (*Evening News*, February, 1945).

Dachau Camp, says Beverley Baxter, M. P., writing in *Everybody's Weekly* (September 29, 1945),

> was not merely a hell...of starvation, flogging and mutilation.—It was a scientific laboratory as well, whereat tests were made to find the exact level at which life ended. Prisoners who arrived in robust condition were used to determine the precise moment that death came to men of normal strength. Even our generation, inured to horror, is not ready yet to be told the complete story of Dachau.

Volumes could be written about the terrors of the German Vivisection Camps, but these few instances must suffice. Equally appalling atrocities were perpetrated in Japanese Murder Camps. But enough surely has been said to condemn the appalling crime of vivisection and to urge us to fight it as the greatest menace that confronts our civilization today. For, even more terrible than the atom bomb (which has also claimed an-

imal victims to perfect and prove its potentialities of destruction) are the new bacterial weapons which can cause wholesale, lingering death from the most repulsive diseases. For these, vivisection is wholly responsible. The very existence of mankind is threatened by the continuance of this immoral and unscientific practice.

"Such being the case," you may ask, "How may we fight disease? Must we fold our hands and submit to its ravages?" A thousand times —No! Disease is an indication of something wrong in our mode of living that ought to be remedied. *The Theosophical Movement* (17th June, 1947) indicated how it could best be combated by methods that have invariably been successful when faithfully applied. Though India is the country named, the principles are of world-wide application. Here is the paragraph:—

India needs sanitation, not vaccines; as she needs protective and nourishing foods more than medicine. Public health efforts too often concern themselves largely with vaccination and inoculation schemes. They ought to mean primarily sound sanitary measures and the education of the people in elementary hygiene. Let the poverty of the masses be relieved, protective food in abundance brought within their means, housing improved, maternity and infant welfare information spread, and the health problem would be in a fair way to being solved, as far as physical measures alone could solve it.

To the above I would add that clinical observation and post-mortem examination provide the best avenues of truly scientific research.

The Black Art of today is no more productive of good than was the necromancy of the dark ages. The goal of both is identical—to attain desired end by evil means. But, "Do men gather grapes of thorns or figs of thistles?"

M. OLDFIELD HOWEY

COW PROTECTION

The miserable state of the cow in India has moved Gandhiji's English disciple Mira Ben to impassioned protest in an article "Protect the Indian Cow!" which appeared in the *Bombay Chronicle Weekly* for 20th June. She deplores the neglect of proper breeding practices to improve the strains of Indian cattle, the indiscriminate slaughter which the law forbids but does not prevent, and the actual torture of the cow through the barbarous practice of *phooka*, to make the hapless creature yield the last drop of her milk. This practice also is illegal, but, according to Mira Ben, is common among commercial dairymen. It is good to learn that some of the more enlightened "Gowshalas," both religious and commercial, are beginning to co-operate with the Government, as in the United Provinces, for cattle betterment.

It is to be hoped, however, that the various groups like the Go Seva Sangha and the Govadh Nivarak Sangha, as well as individual humanitarians, will interest themselves also in putting a stop to the exploitation of cattle in the vivisection laboratories where they are tortured in connection with the production of vaccines.

EDUCATIONAL REFORM

["Educate! Educate! The children are our salvation," wrote H. P. Blavatsky. Every country recognises the value of educating the young but, generally speaking, education is regarded as investment for the future well-being of the State; only a few put the child first, educating him for himself, to make him grow as a man, a citizen of the world and not as a sectional patriot devoted only to his own nation and state. The following three articles should be examined in the light of these glowing words of H. P. Blavatsky :—

> Children should above all be taught self-reliance, love for all men, altruism, mutual charity, and more than anything else, to think and reason for themselves. We would reduce the purely mechanical work of the memory to an absolute minimum, and devote the time to the development and training of the inner senses, faculties and latent capacities. We would endeavour to deal with each child as a unit, and to educate it so as to produce the most harmonious and equal unfoldment of its powers, in order that its special aptitudes should find their full natural development. We should aim at creating *free* men and women, free intellectually, free morally, unprejudiced in all respects, and above all things, *unselfish*. And we believe that much if not all of this could be obtained by *proper and truly theosophical* education.

—Ed.]

BASIC EDUCATION IN THE LIGHT OF THE EDUCATIONAL WISDOM OF THE AGES

[**Miss Margaret Barr, M.A.,** whose article "Some Thoughts on Basic Education" appeared in our February issue, here shows Gandhiji's Nai Talim to have supporters among the best educational thinkers of the past. Especially valuable is her refutation of the false claim for the value of the competitive spirit in stimulating children to effort.—Ed.]

Most people in India probably think that Mahatma Gandhi's Basic Education (or *Nai Talim,* as he preferred to call it) is something new in the educational world, and there is a sense in which that is true. But when we come to analyse its underlying principles we find that all of them are to be found in the annals of educational theory. The real newness of Nai Talim lies in two things: first, in its putting together in a logical, workable and co-ordinated form educational theories culled from many different ages and races; and, secondly, in the attempt made, under the inspiration and guidance of the greatest Indian of modern times, to work out the scheme on a nation-wide scale.

Hitherto the theories have, for the most part, remained *theories*, to be studied and applauded by students of pedagogy, and practised, if at all, in one or two "freak" schools that nobody took very seriously. In Nai Talim these progressive ideas, which are to be found in the writings of the world's great educationists from Plato onwards, are for the first time being worked out in practice in the sphere of mass education. It is this fact that is new, and it is this that is causing wide-spread suspicion and consternation. For most people are incurably conservative-minded; they welcome new ideas so long as they remain *ideas* only and no one makes serious efforts to upset the established order by putting them into practice.

For at least a hundred years every student under training for the teaching profession has had to read the writings of Plato, Rousseau, Pestalozzi, Froebel, etc., and during the last fifty years Montessori, Dewey and others whose theories are built upon the foundations laid by their predecessors. Apart from the negligible proportion who have been fortunate enough to get posts in exceptionally progressive experimental schools, has there ever been a candidate for the teaching profession who has not been disheartened to find, on starting work, how different the reality was from the theory, and how impossible it was to carry out in practice any of the high-sounding theories that he had written about so learnedly and so enthusiastically in his B. T. examination? This glaring contrast between educational theory at its best and the wide-spread practice of the schools is one of the things that Nai Talim is designed to abolish.

The first objective of Nai Talim as laid down in the Revised Syllabus for Basic Training Schools is "the balanced and harmonious devolopment of all the faculties—physical, intellectual and spiritual—of the individual and the evolution of a new social order based on co-operative work." There is little that is new in that; everyone who has ever written a treatise on education has said as much. Yet the schools have continued to regard formal book work as the only matter that concerned them. In Nai Talim, however, formal book work is relegated to a position of comparative unimportance, and the daily life of the child, both as an individual and as a member of a co-operative community, is given the place of first importance. The book work is there (plenty of it for the older children) but instead of being imposed artificially, it emerges spontaneously and naturally from the daily work and life of the school.

For example, instead of learning by heart from their Hygiene book about the meaning and importance of a balanced diet, the children themselves plan and prepare a school meal. Having consulted the books for the food values contained in the various kinds of food available, and having discussed with their teacher

the shortcomings of their home diet (owing to ignorance or poverty) they then decide on a meal which will help to remedy the deficiency while at the same time being palatable to the children. In this way the Hygiene book comes to life as it never did before and never could so long as it was merely learnt by heart for the sake of passing an examination. This is just one small illustration of the way in which Nai Talim works.

One of the points about Nai Talim that is most misunderstood and vilified is its making craft and daily life, and not books, the chief medium of education. Yet this development is clearly envisaged in Pestalozzi's *Leonard and Gertrude*, a book which the writer intended as a constructive contribution to educational theory and not just as an idyll of village life. Gertrude's school, if it ever really existed apart from Pestalozzi's mind, was the first Basic school. In it the children did housework, gardening and spinning at the same time as learning the Three R's. Her scheme of education "embraced a true comprehension of life itself" and could not therefore be cut up into "subjects." Everything that she taught linked with something concrete and intelligible that the children were already familiar with and interested in.

Her verbal instruction seemed to vanish in the spirit of her real activity, in which it always had its source. The result of her system was that each child was skilful, intelligent and active to the full extent that its age and development allowed.[1]

There is no end to the passages one might quote from this book, written well over a hundred years ago, to show that at least one educationist of those days was familiar, at least in theory, with the principles and practice of Nai Talim.

Another of the main objectives of Nai Talim is training for citizenship, about which we find a great deal in Plato's *Republic*. Indeed that book, though the first, is still the standard work on this subject. He writes :—

We must look for those who are the best guardians of the indwelling conviction that what they have to do is what they at any time believe to be best for the state.

Nai Talim also looks for this, but, instead of selecting for special training in leadership only those children who reveal such character in childhood, as Plato suggests, it seeks to create such character in every child, those who are destined to be leaders in later life and those also who will be average citizens. For is it not the first requisite of a successful democracy that the true meaning of citizenship should be understood by all, and that all should be able and willing to take a share, be it large or small, in the responsibility of government? Here again Nai Talim is in harmony with the wisdom of the ages while going it one better.

[1] This and the following quotations in this article are taken from *Three Thousand Years of Educational Wisdom*. By ROBERT ULICH. (Harvard University Press).

Another point about Nai Talim that many people find it difficult to understand or agree with is its abolition of competition as a motive in education. They seem to think that it is useless to expect children to make an effort for any other motive. Yet many writers have pointed out the poisonous effects of sowing the seeds of competition and rivalry in the immature minds of children. Montessori is very definite about this, but the most clear and explicit, though by no means the only one who stresses the point is Rousseau :—

> Beware of making comparisons between your pupil and other children; let him have no rival, no competitor. ...I had much rather he should not learn at all whatever must be taught him by means of vanity or jealousy. I would content myself with remarking his annual progress, and comparing his situation and exploits in the present year with those of the past. I would say to him, You are grown so much since such a time; here is the ditch you leaped, the weight you lifted, the distance you threw a stone...let us see what you can do more at present. Thus would I excite him to emulation, without making him jealous or envious of a rival: he would be desirous indeed to excel himself, and so he ought to be; I see no inconvenience in this kind of emulation.

The teaching of Nai Talim on this point could hardly be better expressed than in that passage.

It would take too long to quote, or even to refer to, all the passages in this great anthology of educational documents which have a bearing upon Nai Talim. And if all the people in India who have ever studied and believed in these theories will turn their attention and energy now to making a success of this courageous attempt to put them into practice, the future of Basic Education will be assured.

MARGARET BARR

THE VILLAGE SCHOOL IN ENGLAND

[Mass production even of goods has its drawbacks in human values sacrificed. The case for maintaining a measure of decentralisation in education is presented here by **Miss Elizabeth Cross** with her usual clarity and robust common-sense.—ED.]

The village school in England is almost impossible to describe because, like so many other English institutions, it varies so much. What is more, it is now in a state of transition and, in some smaller hamlets, may soon disappear.

The explorer will, however, find schools that fit in somewhere between the well-equipped new buildings and the out-of-date old ones. Find, too, that most of the efficiency of the schools depends on the personality and self-sacrifice of the teachers,

whatever physical conditions they have to contend with. Our older schools need every ounce of energy and ingenuity from the teachers to make them fit for the children. Many village schools need complete reconstruction or rebuilding; they have no proper sanitary arrangements, merely buckets (emptied once a week and extremely distasteful to use), no water and inefficient methods of heating. Children have to bring water to drink in little bottles while the school teacher or care-taker carries a bucket of water for washing and washing up. There is no kitchen, there are no cooking facilities, but some of these schools do have hot dinners brought from a nearby town in a special van. Altogether, the worst of the schools mean real hardship for children and teachers, particularly when the children have to walk from outlying farms in bad weather, for there are no easy means of drying wet clothes or shoes and no special room for meals; everything has to be done in the actual class-room.

In contrast to these old schools we have some splendid buildings constructed just before the war. I teach in one of these new schools and appreciate the convenience and comfort that the children enjoy. The class-rooms are large, well and safely warmed (by central heating and concealed pipes) and have splendid windows which slide so that the whole of one side of the room is open when required, and which also let in every scrap of much-needed sunshine. The cloakrooms contain warm pipes for drying clothes, convenient hooks and sufficient small wash-basins to make hand-washing for dinner a real lesson in hygiene instead of a nightmare. The large Assembly Hall is used for music, meals and indoor play and exercise in wet weather. There are a well-equipped kitchen, decent lavatories for boys and girls, proper store-cupboards, a room for the doctor's and the dentist's visits, and the whole place is decorated in a light, cheerful manner. The playground is large enough and there is a climbing frame for the smaller children. Trees were planted by the Head-Mistress some years ago.

Unfortunately even these better schools cannot serve the children so well as their teachers would like. Today, even though there is this intense interest in education and the new move in keeping the children at school until the age of fifteen, there is still misplaced economy. The economy is in the teachers. There are far too few teachers in all our village schools. Sometimes the classes are over-large (forty or more small children in a class, making individual attention very difficult and obliging the teacher to adopt methods she feels are not the best); sometimes the age range is too wide. At the moment there has been a change in so far as children of eleven and over have been removed from the small village schools and are taken by school bus to the nearest large school. This may benefit some

children but there are still many "two-teacher" schools struggling with a variety of children aged from five to eleven. Thus you may have far too great a difference between the youngest and the eldest in a class, so taxing the ingenuity of the teacher to the utmost, and although most village teachers make splendid efforts to overcome these difficulties, by grouping the children and giving them much individual work, yet time is wasted and the children cannot possibly do as well as in properly graded classes. It is a matter of argument between us as to whether large classes or mixed classes are the worse to deal with —both are bad. When it comes to large classes it is important to realise just how time is inevitably wasted; purely owing to the physical impossibility of organising, say forty small children, quickly. How to get forty books and pencils distributed, forty sets of handwork materials, forty pairs of shoes off for drill (and, much worse, forty pairs of shoes on again when their owners can't lace them up!)?

Many teachers and other educationists feel that more would have been accomplished by reducing the sizes of classes (or, in the case of the small village schools, by regrading the age-groups) and using any extra teachers in this way, instead of adding on the extra school year. With more teachers available, the children would benefit so much by their present school years, have more chance to learn and *do* instead of having so often to sit and listen, that the result would be a truly better educated population. This criticism applies, of course, to all schools, town as well as country.

Another criticism, which applies more particularly to our village schools, is that the education authorities might well be a little more pliable with regard to occasional visits and extra teaching from non-professional teachers. The head teacher could, surely, be entrusted to invite people she considered suitable to give the children extra talks on matters of interest, travel, etc. Many villages are still extremely isolated and the children would benefit from contact with new "teachers."

A further criticism that may be made is that, within recent years, there has been a tendency to allow the teacher's house to disappear, or to fail to provide one. This has greatly added to the difficulty in obtaining suitable teachers for our village schools. Most villagers feel, very strongly, that to have the teacher living in the village is a great advantage. It often means much more work for the teachers, but as they seem to be a peculiar race, much given to self-sacrifice, everyone is happy! The village people like to have their teacher living in their midst; the teacher holds things together, is able to take an interest in general activities, and so on. When he or she is obliged to live in lodgings in a near-by town everyone is the poorer. It is less con-

venient for the teacher as it means two journeys each day and it also means that it is almost impossible for her to attend village functions without great difficulty. Local authorities would do well to consider the provision of suitable, convenient houses for the village teachers; this would, I feel sure, encourage many more to take up village work and to settle down permanently.

The village school has, in the past, made a very worth-while contribution to our civilisation and most of us feel that it would be a great tragedy if it were to disappear now. However grand the central schools may be (to which there is some idea of transporting even the children under eleven in buses from surrounding villages) they will not have the local interest and individuality of the smaller ones. For the younger children, at least, it is important that they should graduate slowly from their family circle, first through the small local school and then on to the wider world. To deprive our villages of their schools would be to rob them of a real centre of interest and life, so it is to be hoped that the majority of villages will keep them and improve them and, possibly, that their number may grow instead of diminishing. Village life has, many think, a special part to play and a special value, and the village school contributes to this in no small measure.

ELIZABETH CROSS

SOCIAL EDUCATION
A NOTE

[These reflections on a most pertinent and vital theme are from the pen of a veteran server of the Visva-Bharati and of other idealistic causes, whose modesty makes him prefer to sign them simply as **"A Social Worker."** There is nothing more essential for India's well-being than an enlightened electorate, which depends very largely on education in the fundamentals of citizenship in a democracy. We commend "A Social Worker's" suggestions to the consideration of those responsible for adult education, with its vast potentialities for national as well as individual good.—ED.]

At first sight the term "Social Education" is likely to convey the idea that it is almost akin to adult education. But there is a difference between the two. As the Hon. Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, Minister for Education, Dominion of India, said at a press conference held at Delhi on May 31, 1948,

Social education lays more emphasis on the production of an educated mind in the absence of literary education, and the inculcation of a lively sense of the rights and duties of citizenship, both as individuals and as members of a nation.

And the scheme, which in the first instance will be worked out in Delhi

but later in all the other provinces, has not been initiated a day too soon. For, with the introduction of adult franchise, it has become essential that the citizen be educated wisely in the exercise of the vote. To this end, the area of his awareness has to be enlarged; he has to be made conscious of his place and purpose in the context of his own environment —geographical, social and historical; he has also to know himself as a unit in the economy of the larger life, ranging from his rural "co-operative" and his country to the whole world; and, finally, he has to attune his own heart-beats to the heart-beats of humanity, so that he can transcend sectarianism of all sorts.

To begin with, he will have to refresh and renew intelligently his acquaintance with folk literature and folk-song, which are not fairy-tales but valuable material for the true history of a people's culture, to keep himself abreast of contemporary history, to study the cycle of the seasons, to understand the rhythm of crop-growing, to appreciate personal and social hygiene and cultivate the art of co-operative living—and even laughing and labour. The Government, therefore, will press into service the film and the radio, the projector and the loud-speaker, so that the village schools may become centres not only of instruction but also of recreation. They will, it is hoped, however, beware of the lurking twofold danger and insure, to meet it,—first, that the educational part of the programme shall not recede into the background under the pressure of entertainment and, secondly, that the instruction imparted to the people is strictly free from the blighting effect of partisan politics.

Again, in the matter of instruction in hygiene, for instance, in preventive health measures, it will be prudent to stress the significance and usefulness of indigenous and "non-violent" principles and practices and to avoid the wholesale adoption of everything that is modern, and especially of that which involves avoidable injury to any sentient creature.

In conclusion, man, being more than the machine, should himself be the pivot of all projects for the welfare of his fellow-men. In every village, therefore, there should reside permanently an educated person who, through daily personal contact with the villagers and sharing of "cultural goods," will integrate the effects of the instruction given them by "tinned teachers" like the film. Thereby he will be able to bring them out of their present state of stupor, born of the fusion of feebleness and fatalism.

The periodical visits of groups of graduates to the villages, as in the United Provinces and in the Central Provinces and Berar, are good in their own way. But, unless these are followed up by sustained welfare work, whatever enthusiasm they may arouse in the villagers will before long evaporate. Therefore, the Government should train a large number of persons, preferably from among the villagers themselves, in social education.

A SOCIAL WORKER

WORDS TELL THEIR OWN TALES!

[**Prof. U. Venkatakrishna Rao,** M.A, Lecturer in Sanskrit at the Tambaram Christian College, brings out in this interesting article the part which the science of word meanings and their development can play in bringing home to human beings their fundamental unity.—ED.]

Words tell their own interesting tales in their march through the centuries if we trace their origin and changes in meaning; some words may now emphasise some particular aspect of a sense conveyed by them formerly, others become completely obsolete in their former sense. A proper study of Semantics or the history of the evolution in the meaning of words is really interesting.

"A sound etymology does not depend merely on sound," declared our ancient *Nairuktakas* or etymologists long before the Christian era. To connect the English "drink" with the Telugu "trāgu" or English "luck" with the Samskrit "lakshmī," for example, would be futile and even absurd. An attempt is made in the following paragraphs to trace the history of some words commonly used in Samskrit, in English and in the modern Dravidian languages.

The term "*Āryaputra*" in Samskrit dramas is used by the wife in addressing her husband. It means "Son of the respectable," *i.e.*, of the father-in-law. Even in the most ancient dramas, those of Bhāsa and of Kālidāsa, we find the wife addressing the husband thus. But in the epics the wife used freely to call her husband by his own name. Perhaps the conception of the "*Patidevatā*" or the deification of the husband as emphasised in the Smritis almost from the beginning of the Christian era, coupled with the rules of dramaturgy which expressly rule that the wife should address her husband thus only, slowly crept also into society at large, and in about two or three centuries there came the definite rule that the wife should in no case mention her husband's name at all. Bāṇa in the seventh century A.D. refers to the way in which Kādambari refrained from mentioning her lover's name under any circumstances.

In this connection, it would be interesting to note how the Samskrit word "*puruṣa*" meaning simply "man" has become specialised in sense in Tamil and in Tulu, two Dravidian languages of South India. (The latter has no literature.) It might have been due to the frequent association of the word "*para*" with the word "*puruṣa*"; "*para-puruṣa*" would mean "another's husband," who, according to strict Hindu customs, should be respectfully kept at a distance by the wife of another.

The restriction of the meaning of the word "*Samsāra*" when it came into vogue in Tamil seems similar.

It means "worldly existence" in Samskrit but its connotation is restricted in Tamil to the woman who ties one down thereto, *i.e.*, one's wife. In Malayalam, another Dravidian language, this restriction of the meaning seems to be carried still further; in Malayalam the word has become a verb meaning to converse or to further the interests of worldly existence.

Words change their meaning in the march of centuries. The Vedic Samskrit word "*dama,*" used in the first hymn glorifying Agni or fire in the *Rigveda* meant "home." In that sense it has become obsolete; it now means simply "tame" with which English word it is also philologically connected. But it is interesting to note how through the centuries after many vicissitudes in various languages—perhaps Latin "*domus,*" "a house" and Italian "*duomo,*" "a cathedral,"—it has come into modern English as "dome," a roof shaped like a half sphere on a church or a temple, after all, a house of God. The Greek word "demein" means "to build"; the Greek "*domos*" means "house" and the Anglo-Saxon or English "timber" is also building material!

The Vedic Samskrit word "*ajra*" meaning "a field" can hardly be recognised in its English descendant "acre," which restricts the meaning to 4,840 square yards of a field only.

The old English word was "æcer" and the corresponding Latin word was "*ager,*" also meaning "field."

"*Jāni,*" a Vedic Samskrit word meaning "wife" is now obsolete in classical Samskrit. It is retained at the end of compounds only, as in "*Sitā-jāni*" which means "one having Sita as his wife." The immediate old English antecedent "*cwen*" had broadened the sense to mean "a woman" in general but, in modern English, the word has become further restricted in sense to mean the king's wife only, when it became "queen." (Cognates are: in Persian "*Zan,*" "woman"; in Avestan "*Jaini*"; Gothic "*Kwino,*" "a woman"; in Anglo-Saxon "*Cwene*"; the English "queen" is a related word, but has a long vowel, as belonging to a stronger grade; the Armenian "*Kin,*" the Russian "*Zena*" and the Polish "Zona," all meaning "woman.")

The word *Seemantini* in Samskrit seems to have an interesting history behind it. Its etymological sense is a woman the hair on whose forehead is parted in the middle. The word which was thus used with reference to any woman in general became in course of time restricted to a married woman, who alone, according to the Smritis, can draw this line with the comb. The widow was denied this privilege; the word "*analaka,*" applied to widowed women in Kālidāsa's *Raghuvamsa,* Tenth Canto, clearly refers to the prohibition on their trimming their forelocks. Thus, according to Kālidāsa, the widow was denied the use of the comb and Bāṇa remarks that she should wear white clothes only. Except for these

two peculiarities (and possibly the denial of ornaments like earrings and bangles), the widow and the married woman looked alike till after Bāṇa. Who it was that started the barbarous practice of shaving the widow's head completely is a point for future research.

The words "*anukūla*" and "*pratikūla*" preserve another interesting aspect of the life of our ancestors. The word "*Kūla*" refers to the "river-bank" and the two words "*anukūla*" or "*pratikūla*" probably started with sailors whose boats on the river were driven by the wind either towards or away from the bank. That the favourableness or otherwise applied to the wind was later forgotten and the words have now come to mean simply favourable or the contrary.

Is it not our duty to emphasise such affinities in thought and social customs between the peoples of different nationalities so that their former oneness may dawn on them and bring them nearer to each other? The message of the last hymn of the *Rig Veda* is to come together and to understand each other's hearts and minds and this can be easily accomplished if we approach the study of various languages in such a reverential spirit.

U. VENKATAKRISHNA RAO

TRAINING THE BLIND

The First Provincial Conference for the Blind, held at Bombay from June 18th to 21st, was a milestone on the road to an enlightened and humane approach to the problem of India's sightless persons, who, Shri B. G. Kher, Bombay Prime Minister, pointed out in his address inaugurating the Conference, number about 2,000,000. The number of institutions for their care is totally inadequate, providing, he said, for only a small fraction of the group.

Aside from the provision of adequate treatment, the protection of the partially blind from treatment by unskilled quacks and the maintenance of establishments for their adequate care, the greatest need is for such education as will make the blind man a useful member of the community. A handicap is not necessarily a disqualification for the race of life and the Chairman of the Reception Committee, Shri R. M. Alpaiwala, who himself is blind, deplored the attitude so general in India, that the blind man is a burden to society, to be given alms instead of employment. Education and training of the right type could make the blind man a useful member of society, capable of earning his own living, while higher education could fit him for any of several careers.

The Conference recommended legislation on several lines for improving the lot of the blind, whose presence in numbers at the opening session lent poignancy to the appeals on their behalf. We hope that before the next Conference is held there will be marked progress to report in this most commendable humanitarian effort.

NEW BOOKS AND OLD

THE MYTH OF PROMETHEUS *

An Interpretation of the "Prometheus Bound" of Æschylus in the Light of "The Secret Doctrine"

[Below we print the report of the review of the book presented to the Discussion Group of the Indian Institute of Culture at Bangalore by **Shri V. A. Thiagarajan,** M.A., on the 27th of May 1948.—Ed.]

A great work of literature is like a stream of awareness in which each generation finds what it seeks. Hence the need for the re-interpretation of ancient classics. Rex Warner's recent translation of the *Prometheus Bound* of Æschylus shows us of what perennial interest the story of Prometheus is, and we remind ourselves of how at different times creative minds have tried to reconstruct the story after their own individual predilections. Thus there are Shelley who wrote *Prometheus Unbound* and Robert Bridges with his *Prometheus the Fire-Bringer*. Though written in different ages they are held together by a bond of sympathy, that touch of Nature which makes the whole world kin. When we take the three plays together Prometheus stands not *gerichtet* but *gerettet*, not judged but saved. Jung has pointed out in his *Two Types of Psychology* how Prometheus stands as a contrast to Epimetheus who begins as a king and ends as a beggar, thus representing the degradation of the soul. We may say that by contrast the physical descent of Prometheus the fire-bringer from heaven to earth is a symbol of the ascending consciousness, and that he stands for us as the symbol of the modern man in quest of a soul.

Speaking of the problems which the play raises, the translator says that it is an investigation, although a partial investigation, into the problem of injustice; that the action of the play is supplied by symbols of philosophical ideas; that its interest is allegorical; and that it deserves to rank among the prophetic books of the world.

We are reminded of an observation by Madame Blavatsky who says, speaking of the hidden meaning in every religious and profane legend, "No mythological story, no traditional event in the folk-lore of a people, has ever been, at any time, pure fiction." According to her, mythology is a primitive mode of thinking the early thought and should be viewed as a series of graphic pictures enshrining a scientific fact.

The modern interpreter of the legend of Prometheus should have a correct scale of æsthetic values. Such a scale of values we find in Keats, who takes us from the concrete to the abstract, thus showing us the correlation between truth and beauty in a world which he would fain regard, not as the vale of

---

* (*The Prometheus Bound of Æschylus*. Translated by Rex Warner. (The Bodley Head, London, 6s.)

tears, but as the vale of soul-making. The play itself supplies us with the key to its right understanding. It gives us three types of outlook—those of Prometheus the Titan, of Zeus, the dictator of the totalitarian state of heaven, and of the Chorus, the human spectator idealised. While gods and men are alike bound by a sense of exclusive loyalty to heaven and to earth, the Titans, as the children of heaven and earth, feel a conflict of purpose and the misery of exclusive loyalty. This conflict of purpose comes to a head in Prometheus. He does not wish to fare like his brother Titan, Atlas, bearing the burden of heaven upon his shoulders, at once the dupe and victim of the gods. From the point of view of Prometheus, "the deep-scheming son of right-minded Themis," intelligence rather than brute force is the governing principle of the world. If he allies himself with the gods as against the Titans, it is because the gods are wiser than the Titans. The Titans were unacquainted with sorrow and had missed the educative value of suffering. First in knowledge is first in power. Just as he has elevated the gods above the Titans by knowledge, so also, by the same gift of knowledge, he desires to elevate man above the brute level. He would fain give man the prerogative of the gods. He is represented as stealing fire from heaven because fire is the teacher of all kinds of crafts to mortals. Elsewhere in the play Prometheus says that he has taught man how to calculate the rising and the setting of the stars, the science of numbers and of letters, how to tame animals, how to build houses, chariots and ships. He has taught man the knowledge of simples. In short, he has given light to eyes which were dark and dim. Fire thus stands as the symbol of knowledge. Before men were endowed with this divine gift, they had eyes and saw not, had ears and heard not.

As a correct interpretation of the legend of Prometheus depends upon right understanding of the fire symbol, it is worth while to pause for a moment to understand the significance of Agni in Eastern thought. Agni is referred to as *Jathavedas*, the knower of all things that are born, and, therefore, almost omniscient. The prayer is addressed to Agni to lead man through the good path to achievement. It reminds the conscious soul that it comes from the great fire and goes back to it. Agni, whether it be in the Sun, or the terrestrial sacrificial fire, or the vital fire in the individual is, as Agni, one and indivisible, although it takes many shapes according to the body which it informs. It is synonymous with that which is, the highest existence being the Eternal. Fire thus is a symbol of that spiritual awareness which makes man claim kinship with the Divine. Without this vital spark of awareness man remains hardly distinguishable from the brute. As Madame Blavatsky quotes,

> "That light which burns inside thee, dost thou feel it different in anywise from the light that shines in thy Brother-men ?"
> "It is in no way different...."

According to her, fire is the symbol of the Divine, the one flame that permeates heaven and earth. The son of thought is the light-bringer. The breath of fire is absolute intelligence. The fire-bringer is a deity born in time to instruct mankind and to evoke the spiritual sun. He shows the unity of life from the star to the atom. In the

eyes of Zeus, Prometheus stands condemned for making the terrestrial into a divine man. When we translate the term Zeus or Jupiter into the corresponding Sanskrit forms Dyaus and Dyauh-pitar, Space or the Father of Space, the anger of the presiding deity of the heavens or space becomes an easily understandable myth. Without fire, as Mme. Blavatsky says, man remains an empty bhuta, for, though the earth gives man his body, in the absence of the luminous intelligence, of the spirit which envelopes the universe, man is devoid of *jnana sakti*, of *ichchha sakti* and of *kriya sakti*. The god giving light to the dark becomes the symbol of the creative intellect. An extra-cosmic god cannot instruct mankind. It is necessary that he should descend among men. The fallen god becomes a "demon," and his fall is regarded as an evil karma, to be atoned by years of expiation, although it does not necessarily make him an evil spirit.

The moment we understand the inner significance of fire, the anger of Zeus becomes explicable. The Upanishads say that just as a man is unhappy when he loses a cow, because the cow is the source of his well-being, so also the gods are unhappy when they lose the worship of man. That is why they guard jealously the secret of Atma-jnana from mortals. If we accept the imperfect definition of Thrasymachus that "justice is the interest of the strong," the conduct of Zeus becomes identical with his interest. The person who has gained power desires to perpetuate it, by force if necessary. Society, whether human or divine, is based upon organised cruelty, and it does not permit individuals to outgrow their station in life. From the point of view of the gods Prometheus is a thief. He is the stealer of fire, and the punishment of Prometheus is part of the purchase price of knowledge. "Wisdom is...more precious than rubies."

Prometheus does not care to regain his freedom "with womanish upturning of the hands." It is not stubbornness, but strength of will that guides him. He offers himself as a willing sacrifice to the winged hound of Zeus, the blood-red eagle, which comes insatiate to its daily feast on the heart of the immortal. Madame Blavatsky points out that the gift of knowledge, as in the Bible story, brings with it pleasure and pain, and she identifies the vulture of Zeus with the insatiability of *kama*, although one would say that Prometheus is the victim of the *krodha* of Zeus, and Io of his *kama*. Zeus the father of the gods is apparently too fond of the daughters of men. But the result is the same, for Io becomes in turn the victim of the anger of Hera, and the redemption of Prometheus comes out of the labours of the progeny of a fellow sufferer. Incidentally the dramatist gives expression to maxims of worldly wisdom, as that one should wed within one's station.

Prometheus is not a mere thief, nor is he a criminal except in the eyes of the gods. The *tapasya* of Prometheus on the Caucasus is a symbol of the fact that intelligence rather than brute force is the governing principle of the world, and by that principle he stands redeemed. If our sympathy goes out to him it is because he is a representative of humanity, active, industrious and intelligent, but also ambitious. The defiance of Prometheus represents man's unwillingness to be a menial of

the gods. At the same time, the advice to him of the Chorus to restrain his speech is based on the normal human desire to avoid the evils that one knows not of. The words of the Chorus, "Those who bow down to Adrasteia show wisdom," would specially appeal to a Greek audience, although to a modern it reads like the way of a trimmer.

If wisdom is the highest dower of gods, Titans and men, and if, as the Upanishads say, there is no freedom except through knowledge, there must be a way out of this cruel entanglement. Although the play ends with an appeal to the all-compassing light of heaven to see the injustice of it all, we feel that it is like the last gasp of Eurydice, as she stands on the borderland of light and darkness. We do not know what kind of reconciliation Æschylus brought about between Prometheus and Zeus, but so long as we have faith in the saving power of knowledge, it can redeem those who suffer and those who inflict wrong. In that saving power of knowledge, as the *Brihadaranyaka Upanishad* points out, the gods can learn the virtue of *dama* or self-control, the demons can learn the virtue of *daya* or kindness, and men can learn to esteem the worth of *dana* or gift. Such reconciliation, one feels, would be in harmony with the Greek outlook on life which esteemed virtue as a mean between extremes.

In the story of Prometheus, of the wisdom god apparently becoming an angel of evil in order to be the servant of the good, we see the power of thought directing cosmic energy along right lines. Just as Rousseau said that man, though born free, is everywhere in chains so that he may convert his potential freedom into real freedom, so also we may say that Prometheus becomes bound so that he may convert the potential power of knowledge into the freedom of the moral self. In the words of Madame Blavatsky, the story of Prometheus envisages the process by which man, the most perfect of animals, becomes a potential god, "a Prometheus indeed, because a conscious, hence a responsible entity." The bondage of Prometheus signifies that he has exchanged the evils of responsible existence for the unconscious perfection of passive objectivity. We cannot conclude better than by repeating the sentiments expressed by Robert Bridges in his Choric song in praise of Prometheus the fire-bringer:—

> He is the one alone of all the gods,
> Of righteous Themis the lofty spirited son,
> Who hates the wrongs they have done.
> He is the one I adore,
> For, if there be love in heaven with evil to cope—
> And he promised us more and more—
> For what may we not hope?

V. A. THIAGARAJAN

Man will rebecome the *free* Titan of old, but not before cyclic evolution has re-established the broken harmony between the two natures—the terrestrial and the divine; after which he becomes impermeable to the lower titanic forces, invulnerable in his personality, and immortal in his individuality, which cannot happen before every animal element is eliminated from his nature.

—H. P. BLAVATSKY

North Indian Saints. (G. A. Natesan and Co., Madras. Rs. 2/-); *The Master and the Disciple.* By D. S. SARMA. (Sri Ramakrishna Math, Mylapore, Madras. Rs. 2/-); *My Saviour.* By S. SUBRAHMANYA SASTRI, M. A. (Author, Trivandrum)

Pointing out the genuine catholicity of Hinduism to a Western Missionary recently, your reviewer met with the retort that Hinduism does not count at all over large areas of the world as against a religion like Christianity which has spread all over the globe. Militant Christianity has indeed staked a claim for spatial catholicity, though its way has mostly been that of the cannibal devouring other religions and involving itself in internecine warfare for mutual extermination among its own conflicting creeds. But there is another catholicity extending in time, not treading the path of aggression, but patiently waiting for the slow evolution of the human spirit in its growth towards fulness of understanding. Such is the spirit of the *Sanatana Dharma* which is Indian only because it has had its clearest expression in Indian scriptures and in the unending succession of Hindu saints. That conviction has been deepened by the three books under review. They give a record, not equally well presented, of the lives and teachings of India's saints, who in different ages and in diverse manners have borne witness to the reality and the fascination of the Eternal, with the unmistakable stamp of the Unseen deeply engraved upon its human manifestation.

North Indian Saints recounts the lives and teachings of the saints of India, from Ramananda to Rama Tirtha. The course of what may be called a Protestant Reformation in Hinduism, but without the fierce antagonisms provoked by its counterpart in Christian Europe, is traced in the lives of its leading exponents. Written by various hands and treating the themes in text-book manner the sketches are of unequal merit, but all are readable and are enriched by copious extracts from the sayings of the saints.

The Master and the Disciple is a masterly presentation of the message and the significance of two of the most outstanding religious geniuses of modern Hinduism. A reprint of the chapters dealing with the Ramakrishna movement in the author's *Renaissance of Hinduism,* the book sets the two masters against the background of India's religious evolution and in the forefront of her modern renaissance. The two studies in this present form ought to find a large and grateful reading public.

The same cannot be said of the last book. *My Saviour* is a loosely written, unconscionably long record of the life of Swami Subbier of South India. The saving consisted mostly in curing a disease of the eyes when failing sight threatened the author with loss of his job. "Mr. S.," as he is constantly referred to, seems to have had remarkable powers of healing; a scientific study of his cases and his healing methods might well throw valuable light on the powers of the human mind. But, on the strength of that, to compare him with Christ, whose so-called miracles of healing were almost wrung out of him from compassion for the masses, and to bring parallels of resurrection appearances of Mr. S., seem to be to stress the non-essentials in religious realization.

S. K. GEORGE

Newton Demands the Muse. By MARJORIE HOPE NICHOLSON. (Princeton University Press, Princeton, and Geoffrey Cumberlege, Oxford University Press, London. $2.00 and 11s. 6*d*.)

With the partiality of a great poet Keats asked: "Do not all charms fly at the mere touch of cold philosophy?" There is far more in common between poetry and philosophy than Keats's question would imply. It is rather poetry and science that are poles asunder. The scientist's devotion to facts is suspicious of the poet's imagination, and the poet with his dreams feels an innate antipathy to the calculating exactitude of the scientist. This conflict is seen to best advantage in the mystic Blake who finds in Art the "Tree of Life" and in Science "The Tree of Death." So this book's title arouses curiosity as to how Newton "demands the Muse." Yet it is not Miss Nicholson's fancy. It was Richard Glover who coined the phrase in honour of "England's justest pride," and Miss Nicholson claims that the book "insisted upon being written," much as Pope "lisped in numbers for the numbers came."

That Newton opened up a new world of thought cannot be denied and it is understandable that his contemporaries and posterity alike should have gloated over his achievements. About the time of his death in 1727 his fame was at the zenith and he was almost deified as an astounding genius. Pope, not always generous in his appreciation of greatness, permitted himself to write:

> Nature and Nature's Laws lay hid in night;
> God said, 'Let Newton be!' and all was light.

Desagulier spoke of "Newton the unparallel'd." Poets for once were not slow in paying homage to the spirit of science. This is quite intelligible, for all genuine poetry must in the last resort be dominated by the spirit of truth.

But another aspect of Newton constitutes Miss Nicholson's main thesis and that is to show how his "Opticks" influenced poets so that they wrought a mere scientific theory into the warm texture of poetry. That she has done this work wonderfully well cannot be denied, and she can never be praised sufficiently for the wide reading she displays and the exactitude with which she has studied Newton's *Optics* and shown how the poets of the eighteenth century were nourished on it; similes and metaphors flowed so naturally from Newton's theories as to justify the idea that he demanded the Muse of Poetry to be at his service.

If Miss Nicholson has laboriously unearthed all the praise that Newton demanded from the Muse, with scientific impartiality she has brought out fully the rancour with which Blake pursued Newton along with Bacon and Descartes, *e.g.*, "God forbid that Truth should be confined to Mathematical Demonstration" and "God is not a mathematical Diagram." We may wonder whether Blake would not have relented if he were living in the present and had read Sir James Jeans's description of the world as the work of a mathematician.

Whether this work was necessary will remain a matter of opinion. Lovers of poetry will perhaps not care for this type of scholarly industry, and scientists will not care whether their theories receive the hall-mark of poetry; Miss Nicholson herself admits that "the scientific poets, while instructed, could

hardly be said to delight." But there are people who are alive to the living contacts between poetry and science and the book will find a warm welcome in their libraries.

A. R. WADIA

The Common Sense of the Exact Sciences. By WILLIAM KINGDOM CLIFFORD; edited with a Preface by KARL PEARSON; newly edited, with an Introduction by JAMES R. NEWMAN. (Alfred A. Knopf, New York; Sigma Books Ltd., London. 15*s.*)

This is a new edition of a very important book. "The Common Sense of the Exact Sciences" is an apt title for a book which expounds modern scientific and mathematical thought to the non-mathematical. It is apt for another reason. In the Cambridge of Clifford's days and in the Cambridge of later days, it seems as if it is *all* "Common Sense" whether we speak about the foundations of Mathematics or of Logic, or about First Principles in Metaphysics.

William Kingdom Clifford, it is said, was one of the earliest of Mathematicians in England to call attention to the philosophical ideas relating to the foundations of Geometry and to the "logic" of Mathematics. Since Clifford's day, books on the philosophical foundations of Mathematics have been quite a few, but most of these are abstract and difficult, due in many cases to the symbolism used. This book is happily free from symbolism except for a few algebraic illustrations, which can be intelligible even to the non-mathematical if they will have a little patience. They are such as Professor C. D. Broad of Cambridge would describe as those which "we learnt at our mother's knee."

Clifford's book has five chapters: "Number," "Space," "Quantity," "Position," and "Motion"; all, as James R. Newman, Clifford's new editor, truly says, "brilliant examples of the didactic art." The five chapters not only embody "the first principles of successful teaching"; they also set those who would write on the philosophy of mathematics a fine example of how it is possible to convey in prose the fundamental ideas of the exact sciences.

The reviewer began reading straightway the text of Clifford's book and read the Introduction by James R. Newman only afterwards. This rather perverted procedure helped him to discover the latter's excellence. Newman's Introduction has some biographical notes on Clifford's life; and it explains, with lucidity and with much scholarship, the postulates behind Clifford's ideas; traces, briefly, the development of Clifford's thought on the Philosophy of Science and gives relevant extracts from Clifford's other writings. Thus we have before us a connected account of Clifford's philosophical ideas about mathematics and something of an insight too into the possibilities of their development in Clifford himself, had he not been removed by death at the early age of thirty-five. *The Common Sense of the Exact Sciences* is a classic.

N. A. NIKAM

Rabindranath Tagore: Valkayum Kavithayum (Life and Poetry of Rabindranath Tagore). By K. CHANDRASEKHARAN. Tamil. Second Edition. (A Kumari Malar Publication, Associated Printers, Mount Road, Madras. Rs. 2/-)

Those connected with the Calcutta University had difficulty in the early days in understanding Rabindranath Tagore. When the Nobel Prize was awarded to him it was a surprise to them; then the University reconciled itself to the verdict of the world.

But Madras has not been so ready to submit to that verdict. Tagore was in a way outside the ken of the Madras *élite*. In one Madras home, however, "Ashram," the home of Mr. K. Chandrasekharan, the genius of Tagore was all along appreciated with understanding and with sympathy. Both men and women of the household were regular students of Tagore's teachings. No wonder that Mr. Chandrasekharan, with an intimate knowledge (quite akin to personal acquaintance) of the great teacher has been eager to give the Tamil reading public an account of Tagore's life and poetry. This book does not purport to be a biography. It is a more precious thing, an account of the genesis of the poetry of Tagore as revealed in his life.

Poetry, we may say, is the reaction of a sensitive human soul to the truth imbedded in the things of this world. The home in which Tagore lived had exceptional features which brought out the faculty of the young child with an ease comparable to that with which the bud opens into flower. Further, the young Tagore was lucky enough to rebel against school and so freed himself from the deadening influence of school and teacher.

Mr. Chandrasekharan's book is full of thoughtful and thought-provoking truths and he has hit the mark very well. Five thousand copies of the first edition have been sold. That means that the Tamil public have succeeded in entering into the spirit of the Teachings of Rabindranath Tagore, led by the sympathetic hand of Mr. K. Chandrasekharan.

T. K. CHIDAMBARANATHA MUDALIAR

The Great Sannyasi. By ANILCHANDRA ROY. (Amiya Library Ltd., 19, Bhupendra Babu Avenue, Shyambazar, Calcutta. Rs. 2/-).

It is difficult to determine the precise character of this publication—whether it is a piece of fiction or a page from the philosophy of Sri Aurobindo. For, though the framework is that of a story set in the resurgent East Bengal of the present century, the filling in is of thoughts of some of her well-known patriots, particularly of the Sage of Pondicherry. The atmosphere, therefore, is more didactic than dramatic, while the characters talk either too complacently or, on crucial occasions, more in quotations than with the spontaneity of persons who have been stirred to expression by the exigencies of the situation. In character, the Great Sannyasi impresses one as a faint carbon copy of Sri Aurobindo. As a story, consequently, *The Great Sannyasi* does not quite hit it off; as a sermon on striving with zeal for the achieving of all-round self-fulfilment and freedom, however, it is likely to stimulate.

G. M.

CORRESPONDENCE

MISCONCEPTIONS OF METAPHYSICS

I.—By Raymond Frank Piper

The unpromised outcome of Professor Chubb's article on "The Value of Metaphysics" in THE ARYAN PATH for January, 1948, is a serious reduction of that value. This deflating consequence seems to be due to five underlying confusions in his argument:

(1) Metaphysics and reality are confused. Metaphysics indeed is real as mental activity, but not as an equivalent to the dynamic totality of things. The aim of metaphysical thinking is adequate knowledge of this totality, of which it is itself a small phase.

The wise man says, Let me possess reality. Yes, but how can he know that a particular experience is real rather than illusory? The answer is: Only by hard philosophical criticism based upon the solid evidence of experience.

Metaphysics then is a kind of knowledge, carefully verified in human experience. It differs from the special sciences in being more comprehensive, fundamental and integrated in character. It is no more speculative than other empirical studies. It demands the same bold, creative faith as other fruitful researches: namely, the faithful trying out of, the acting upon, one tentative hypothesis after another, in the hope that some hypothesis will lead to new facts which will test its validity. Metaphysics consists of an organized body of proved propositions, just as any other science does. Reality in its most general character is the subject-matter of which metaphysics is the illuminating interpretation.

To avoid this first confusion one needs to remember that truth exists in several forms: As scientific propositions, poetic metaphors, or self-realization. Of these not even the last is "self-revealing," for the significance of any momentary selfic intuition requires a rich background of thought construction. When Jesus said, "I am the truth," he did not mean that he was a scientific proposition or a figure of speech. His idea might be expressed in the words of Krishnamurti: "Truth is the completeness of thought and feeling in action, in the present."

Now if one remembers that metaphysics yields truth of the first kind, he avoids confusing it with reality. Truth is reality as possessed by mind in terms of ideas. Such a grasp of reality is of course limited, but it has all the power and the wonder of verified ideas.

(2) A second confusion relates to the kind of experience with which metaphysics deals. If ultimate truth is beyond experience, then obviously we can say or know nothing about it, and it would be impossible to discover any "discrepancy between the ultimate truth and the truth of our experience." Nothing which cannot come within the range of human awareness in some form can ever have meaning to the mind.

Hence, we must guard against the double error (*a*) that metaphysics is concerned with entities beyond experience, and (*b*) that it is not concerned with ordinary or normal experience. To limit metaphysics to supernormal or transcendent experience is to destroy its very nature, namely, the search for totality of view. An elemental rule of metaphysical procedure is that the philosopher may neither neglect any important aspect of experience nor distort it to defend his theory.

Within experience, then, there are both ordinary and extraordinary events to be interpreted; both near and far implications to be traced—but all within experience. There is no way of escape from present experience except by developing a new experience out of it. The philosopher dares not overlook the important task of making clear the principles or laws implicit in ordinary living. Metaphysics could be called the science of the obvious, if people were not so blind to the obvious.

What, then, are some of the principles which are involved in knowing any simple thing? Similarity and difference; quality and quantity; time and space; causality and purpose; and a few others. These are categories or relations which constitute the structure of things as we know them. They are real in the sense that things could not exist without them, so far as we know. They are not primarily sensations but concepts, and they are readily found by analyzing any familiar object in daily life. Any metaphysics, therefore, which confines attention to speculation about realities that transcend normal experience is doomed in advance to a fractional and, therefore, unmetaphysical view of the universe.

(3) Several mistaken notions of metaphysics arise from confusion concerning the capacities and functions of the intellect. A good philosopher will not demand more of intellect than it can give—or less. The special function of intellect or reason is to discover and clarify the relations which exist among things, notably causal laws, upon which our survival depends. But a causal law is not perceived; it is thought. Immediate experience provides qualitative data or events which reason weaves with much labour into significant wholes for the guidance of life. Kant proved that percepts without concepts are blind and concepts without percepts are empty.

One may, of course, choose to follow a split or fragmentary way. He may refuse the responsibility of thinking and try to confine himself to the passing throbs of sense, but this approach yields no wisdom, much pain, and is not metaphysics. Or one may refuse responsibility to concrete facts and play the game of developing metaphysical postulates, but that yields no wisdom and is not metaphysics. The latter is indeed a kind of "nescience" but it is not characteristic of the main philosophical tradition of Europe.

Serious philosophers are bound by two duties: (*a*) To respect the facts (data, events, phenomena)—to present facts and all the new facts which the process of experimental verification may create, and (*b*) to integrate those facts into illuminating systems. Philosophical reason, therefore, cannot be "autonomous," but it must be intellectual; that is its nature and its contribution: to exhibit the existing connections among things for the safer guidance of life.

(4) Another confusion concerns the conception of freedom. The author suggests that metaphysics "can liberate the mind from all conditioning." But how can the mind exist, grow, become educated, realize values, without conditions? If it were a perfectly static point which existed by itself apart from time and space—but it isn't.

Liberation is not detachment but control; not independence of conditions but mastery of them. The business of metaphysics is to provide reliable knowledge about the basic conditions and values of abundant self-realization. The wise man is one who in the pursuit of the good life knows and observes the laws of reality. Foolish is he who tries to run his own show without utilizing all the advantages that the rules of existence constantly offer to him. Such a man certainly would not be a metaphysician.

(5) Finally, metaphysics and religion are sometimes confused. Metaphysics is not religion, but a desirable foundation for religion, as it is also for fine art, morality, engineering, statesmanship and many other activities. If a metaphysician ends with a conception of a Supreme Reality worthy of worship, then he may quickly become a religionist by practising the arts of worship. One practical outcome of an adequate metaphysics, then, is religion, but the religious attitude differs in quality from the metaphysical quest, although the mind readily passes from the exploration of evidence for a Cosmic Mind to the adoration of that Mind.

In general, when a man has attained a solid philosophy, he can then proceed to realize more safely and effectively whatever values he wishes. Every human pursuit gains significance in the light of metaphysical perspective.

RAYMOND FRANK PIPER
Syracuse University,
U. S. A.

II.—By J. N. Chubb

I have been asked by the Editor to reply to Professor Piper's criticisms of my article on "The Value of Metaphysics" in the January ARYAN PATH. The proper method of discussing a subject is for the participants to approach it without allowing pre-formed conclusions to influence the discussion and with merely the intention to find out the truth. This can be done by playing about with the subject until a ground of agreement is found, and from there proceeding *together* step by step to the discovery of truths which possibly neither participant could have come to by himself. Merely to take up antagonistic positions and hurl opinions at each other, in however dignified a manner, is to debate and not to discuss. Discussion is a communion of minds in which there is only agreement and exploration, but never disagreement.

I find it is necessary to say this because a discussion as I understand it can only be oral. In print one is perforce confined to an exchange of opinions, which has but limited value. In it there is more opposition than communion. I should therefore like my "reply" to be read in the context of this limitation. But even in a discussion in print one should not expect

to convince, much less to silence, the other party.

Professor Piper has rightly discovered that the consequence of my article was to deflate the value of Metaphysics. That was also my intention. I could have wished, however, that Professor Piper had not confined himself to pointing out the "misconceptions of Metaphysics" according to "the main philosophical tradition of Europe," but had discussed the point of view which I presented (and which is also the Indian point of view), from which I sought to limit the value of Metaphysics. It is this very European philosophical tradition which I have criticised and which I hope to see replaced, at least in Indian Universities, by a totally different spirit and approach, which would be more or less in uniformity with the ancient Indian tradition, in which philosophy is not an intellectual activity, static in its own structure and presuppositions, but a means of self-transcendence (what I have called "dynamic faith") into a *darshana* or direct seeing of the ultimate Truth. The Indian point of view is expressed in the following quotation from Prof. K. C. Bhattacharya:—

> Philosophy (including Metaphysics) is for meditation and *is not knowledge*.

The aim of metaphysical thinking as such cannot, therefore, according to the Indian view, be "adequate *knowledge* of the totality of things."

I shall try to explain again what I regard as the proper function of Metaphysics, before replying to Professor Piper's detailed criticisms.

I take it that there is this in common between us, that neither is a Materialist or a Logical Positivist and hence would not reject a Reality that transcended sense-experience. The "totality of things," for instance, has a nature or is an experience which is not discoverable in any partial or limited existence. Even this assumption of a Reality not recognised by the Positivist is not necessary for my argument, but I make it for convenience as it provides a common ground for this discussion. Now Metaphysics is the activity of the intellect or mind, which is mainly speculative, in the sense that its conclusions about Reality as such are of the nature of "must" and not of "are" or of "are" only because of "must." The so-called metaphysical truths cannot be verified in sense experience, but are to be accepted on the authority of Reason, which is not, in its very nature, self-luminous (*swayam-prakash*). What is only a necessity of thought is not a discovery or *darshana* of Truth. We say the sun *must* be shining only when we do not *see* the sun. Different philosophers have found conclusions to be rational, and so necessary, which are not in consonance with each other, which means that Reason reaches conclusions according only to its own background or conditioning. It is the instrument of the conditioned mind and, far from being the "divine element" in man as the Greeks thought, is the expression in part of Craving and Fear, the twin aspects of unsuspected Nescience.

Professor Piper rejects the view that Metaphysics is speculation. Whatever may be said about Epistemology (the topics mentioned in the last paragraph under point 2) there is a branch of Metaphysics called Ontology which is surely speculation and not verified truth. Would Professor Piper say that his Metaphysics is the *discovery* of

God's presence in the world and in himself, that it gives him the experience that transcends Space and Time or that it regenerates him and makes him whole? No, Metaphysics as understood in the European (not Scholastic) tradition is only gossip about God and the "things unseen" and, like all gossip, is both stupid and useless. Philosophy, I assert deliberately, has taken an entirely wrong turn in the West.

What then is the limited value of Metaphysics according to the Indian stand-point? It is certainly not to give an "illuminating interpretation" of Reality, for Reason, which is its instrument, is, as I have said, in part a product of an unsuspected Nescience and therefore its interpretations will always be in accordance with the particular twists in Nescience affecting individual minds. The light within it is always darkness and in relying on it alone we can have only what Sri Aurobindo calls an "Evolution in Ignorance." Metaphysics properly understood is not knowledge (*jñāna*) but an *aspiration* for such knowledge. This knowledge is first revealed in the Vedas and other sacred texts or through a living *Jnānin* (not a Metaphysician) like Sri Aurobindo and Sri Ramana Maharshi and presented to the unillumined intellect in its own terms, not to be accepted or rejected by it, but to awaken it to a new dimension of experience in which the intellect as such ceases to function. "The Atman is first to be *heard* and then meditated upon." When the Sage declares the Atman, it is not intended to be a proposition which the intellect can appropriate and pass off as its own discovery.

There is an unexpressed rubric attached to all propositions that are revelations of Truth, *viz.*, "Realise that." Thus the Upanishadic statement "All this is Brahman" is not to be taken as a proposition which the intellect can repeat and turn into its own truth, understood as a logical necessity. The statement is really a *Mantra* meant to *awaken* the mind to the need for self-transcendence and not to confirm it in its ignorant groping for the Truth. The statement when expanded runs thus: "Realise (not believe) that all this is Brahman." In other words, the Truth "All this is Brahman" does not become *known* to the intellect, but is presented to it for meditation as something yet to be realised. Statements about the ultimate reality are meaningless (so far Indian philosophy seems to agree with Logical Positivism!) if they are taken without the rubric, "Realise that."

The actual metaphysical activity consists in clarifying intellectually, as far as possible, the concepts of Brahman and Atman and their essential identity, but with the clear recognition that this clarification can result only in a dynamic faith or a dim suspicion that there is a direct understanding of Truth or of the true nature of one's being in which the intellect and its concepts are transcended. The only valid metaphysics is that which is coupled with *Yoga* or a *Sadhana* in which this transcendence is effected. Metaphysics without *yoga* is puerile and barren and leads to a use of the intellect for which it was not intended.

This point was, I think, made sufficiently clear in my article and it seems to me that Professor Piper has fallen into a rather strange misunderstanding

when he attributes to me the view that Metaphysics is identical with Reality or that it is Metaphysics that liberates the mind from all conditioning. In fact, I suspect that he has somewhat missed the point of the article, since, whether he agrees with it or not, he has paid no attention to the central thesis which elaborates the distinction between static and dynamic faith.

This is evident also in the remarks he makes concerning the connection between Metaphysics and Religion (Point 5) and the function of the mind (Point 4). I shall try to clarify my position on these two points.

If by Religion is meant simply worship of a Reality claimed to be known by thought, *i. e.*, if Religion is that action or attitude of the mind which, as Professor Piper suggests, has metaphysics for its foundation, then its value is strictly limited. But by Religion may also be meant a *Sadhana* which consists in achieving union with a secret divine will by a total surrender of the limited and separative will of the individual, [1] or in realising, beyond the mind, the truth that is communicated to the limited mind for meditation. In other words, Religion in this sense is *Yoga* (*Bhakti Jñāna*). So understood, Metaphysics has meaning only when it is also Religion.

This does not mean that Metaphysics is the foundation of Religion in the sense that a certain Truth is first intellectually established and then a practical attitude of worship is taken up towards it. This, I know, is the view of the relation between Philosophy and Religion held by European thinkers from the Greeks onwards (excluding Medieval thinkers). Professor Piper has shown that his Metaphysics can become dynamic not only for Religion but also for all human activities. Now this raises a point most important to understand, as it has, I think, been missed even by those who claim to expound the Indian point of view. It has been said that Indian philosophy is practical, while Western philosophy is merely intellectual. This is a false distinction and is made by those who are not able to grasp the real differences between the two philosophies. Philosophy, according to the Indian tradition, is not merely practical in the sense that one is required to use one's Philosophy to guide and control the rest of the mind's activities, or to live one's Philosophy in one's daily life. European philosophy too is practical in this sense. Without denying its practical aspect, Indian thinkers conceive the real function of Philosophy to be totally different.

I may make this clear by the distinction between the two expressions "Change *in* Consciousness" and "Change *of* Consciousness." Philosophy that is practical, *i.e.*, put into practice, produces merely a change *in* consciousness, that is, a modification of the same stuff of consciousness with which it starts. But Philosophy in India is intended to lead to a change *of* consciousness, that is, a radical transformation of the very stuff of consciousness itself. Not that Philosophy itself brings about this regeneration of the individual, but the *Sadhana* to which Philosophy points, and to which it must give way. Here it is not a question of putting a known truth into

[1] As the will is surrendered, all mental ideals and ideas about God have to be surrendered as well, since such ideas and ideals can only give strength to the separative will.

practice, but of seeking, by transcending all mental functioning, to know a truth which is suspected by the mind.

From the Indian stand-point it is a familiar delusion that one can know or possess the Real by "hard philosophical criticism." Such criticism can at best prepare the ground to a limited extent because it is, after all, an action of the conditioned and unregenerate mind. A philosopher as such (as distinguished from a *Jñānin*) has no authority to say what the real is, any more than a stupid man can lay down what it is to be wise. But the stupid man can shed his stupidity and so become wise. In the same manner the philosopher may strip his mind of all its commitments and ego-centred insistencies and let his Mind as such cease to function, for the Mind, as a mystic text asserts, is "the great Slayer of the Real."[1]

There are only two ways in which Man can come to possess the Real, or better, to be possessed by it, and Metaphysics is not one of them, except as a preliminary, though by no means necessary, stage. The two ways are ultimately one, as they lead to the same result, which is a radical transformation in which the individual puts on Divinity and immortality, not through effort according to the mind's rules and conceptions, but by a total surrender of all mental urges and constructions. It is at a very early stage in this *Sadhana* that the metaphysical approach is transcended.

The Mind which slays the Real must therefore die in order that the Real may be perceived. The mind is the prospective functioning of consciousness in which it either chooses or concludes, the choice or the conclusion being based on a background of conditioning consisting of many layers reaching down to the unconscious, of which it is naturally not aware. The mind's action therefore is not luminous at the source. It emerges out of a dark background of Nescience and is only partially lit up at the surface. This superficial surface action we call intelligence, not recognising that it is only a very feeble light that reaches us in our mind's action from that Intelligence (*Chit*) which is all light, but which has filtered through an abysm of darkness (*Avidya*). A deeper understanding will therefore show that what we call thought (the instrument of Philosophy) is not pure Aspiration towards the Real, but is mainly the expression of unsuspected fear and craving—the natural states of the separative egos in us which we mistakenly regard as our true selves.

Professor Piper is right when he says that the mind cannot "exist, grow etc., without conditions." But de-conditioning consists not in emphasising but in transcending the values of the mind, so that in the unconditioned Consciousness mind as such ceases. Here, too, European Philosophy shows a strange blindness in not seeing the difference between Mind and Consciousness, though this cannot be said of the Medieval philosophers who distinguished Mind from Spirit.

What then is Consciousness or Spirit of which the mind is an obscure formation, and in which the mind must die in order that the Real may be revealed? To put it differently, is it possible to transcend all conditioning so that action has no dark origin, but reflects

[1] [*The Voice of the Silence*, p. 2.—ED.]

directly the light of Truth? Incidentally, there is no distinction between Reality and Truth. *Brahman* is *Satyam*. The distinction made by Professor Piper is one that is familiar in Western philosophy but its validity stands or falls by the assumption that a thought process can reveal the nature of Reality. The mind's construction is certainly not Truth, for the mind can only suspect and not know the Real. Truth is the direct revelation of Reality beyond thought.

To return to our question, by what process is the action of conditioned mind brought to a standstill? I can only indicate the answer briefly because it opens up the vast subject of *Yogic Sadhana*. The de-conditioning takes place through self-knowledge which consists in shifting the centre of our being from the mental consciousness or the ego to what is called the *Sakshi* or Witness Consciousness. A genuine aspiration for the Real implies an intention to find out the Truth, the naked Truth, and not a mental idea according to a particular conditioning. Now conditioning operates only when there is a judgment explicit or implicit, which means a conclusion or a decision. But if there is a stand-back attitude in which Consciousness becomes a silent Witness of all mental modifications, in other words, when there is a still yet active awareness, without identification or condemnation, then the gathered *sanskaras* (memories and tendencies) cease to operate and consciousness begins to experience freedom from all conditioning. As there is a witnessing of the total process of the mind, the mental centre (Character, Personality or Self in Western philosophy) is automatically dissolved and reappears in a new dimension of conscious experience. This is what Sri Aurobindo calls the Emergence of the Psychic (as distinguished from mental) being, which is our link with the Divine, and in which Consciousness is open without resistance to "the influx of the Unknown and the Supreme." Consciousness is completely purged, and whatever action is then performed, leaves no deposit in the form of a *sanskara*. Krishnamurti, whom the Professor seems to have misunderstood, describes this experience as one of constant dying and renewal, without time or causation.

In any case, the thought process (Philosophy) must completely cease and there must be a total silence in all parts of our being in order that Reality may be perceived. A *Jñānin*[1] recently described to me the progress of spiritual experience thus: The first step, and the most difficult, is the shifting of the centre of consciousness from the mental modifications (*citta-vritti*) to the passive Awareness (*Sakshi*). From passive Awareness there is a rapid transition to Self-Awareness and from there to pure Awareness. In the final stage even this Awareness drops and there is an identification with an ineffable Reality about which one can only say that it is "felt without feeling."

Apart from these heights of mystic experiences, I think it is within the reach of all to transcend the field of the Mind and to act from the background of an unconditioned Consciousness. It seems to me therefore that Professor Piper's conception of Freedom is rather elementary.

[1] Sri Krishna Menon of Trivandrum.

"Liberation," he says, "is control and mastery of conditions." But what is the instrument that is going to control and master? It is again the Mind which is a product of the very conditions it proposes to master. The Mind can only control according to its own conditioning and its action therefore can only result in further strengthening the vast subconscious and unconscious background of individual and racial memories—the unassimilated deposits of past experiences.

Liberation (*Moksha*) is the transcending of Mind and its projections of Space, Time and Causation. The actions of a liberated Soul (a *Jivanmukta*) are the spontaneous expressions of *Ananda* and not the laboured mental reactions which have Craving at their root. They are direct translations of a divine Truth and to such a person Philosophy, to adapt the *Gita's* words, is as useful as a tank of muddy water to a person living beside a clear mountain-stream. This integral and unconditioned consciousness is not a "static point." There is a dynamism or a force which is the true expression of the Spirit, but in which all craving and *nisus* have been totally destroyed.

J. N. CHUBB

MODERN INDIAN TEACHERS ON THE SENSE OF "I"

[In publishing the following communication from our old and valued contributor, **Swami Jagadiswarananda,** we have observed our practice of allowing free expression to those who write in our pages. That more than one opinion is possible, however, on a number of the points made, *e.g.*, the Personal God idea, is obvious. The writer is a Swami of the Order organised by the great Vivekananda which promulgates the teachings of Sri Ramakrishna, rightly adopting the Western mode of propaganda. Similarly, Sri Ramana Maharshi has been made known through the books of Paul Brunton and other devotees. There is also Sri Ramdas whose completion of twenty-five years of spiritual life and labour was celebrated by admirers and devotees at his ashram. In India the tradition of the Sannyasi seeking Liberation has been widely followed. It was the emphasis laid on the Path of Renunciation in H. P. Blavatsky's *Voice of the Silence* (1889), which pointed to the example of the Great Buddha, that has resulted in a new order of Soul-service in the India of today.—ED.]

Dr. C. G. Jung of Zürich is a psychologist of international reputation. He is also a philosopher of rare insight and has made valuable contributions to philosophy, religion and mysticism. As a genuine admirer and exponent of Indian spirituality he has extolled its unique excellences many a time. His appreciation of the Indian spirit is superordinary and whole-hearted. In the *Golden Jubilee Souvenir* published in September 1946 in commemoration of Sri Ramana Maharshi's residence at Arunachalam for five decades Dr. Jung has an interesting article on Sri Ramana and his message to modern man. The article consists of extracts from Dr. Jung's introduction to Dr. Zimmer's German work, on the way to the self or the life and teachings of Sri Ramana Maharshi.

In that thought-provoking article Dr. Jung looks upon Sri Ramakrishna and Sri Ramana as modern prophets

and compares their teachings in these words:—

Sri Ramakrishna adopted the same position in regard to the Self, only with him the dilemma between the "I" and the Self comes a little more closely to the foreground. Sri Ramana declares unmistakably that the real purpose of spiritual practice is the dissolution of the "I." Ramakrishna, however, shows a somewhat hesitating attitude in this respect. Though he says, "As long as the I-sense lasts, so long are true knowledge (*Jnana*) and liberation (*Mukti*) impossible," yet he must acknowledge the fatal nature of *ahankara.*" He says, "How very few can obtain this Union (*Samadhi*) and free themselves from this 'I'? It is very rarely possible. Talk as much as you want, isolate yourself continuously, still this 'I' will always return to you. Cut down the poplar tree today and you will find tomorrow it forms new shoots. When you ultimately find that this 'I' cannot be destroyed, let it remain as 'I' the servant." In relation to this concession Sri Ramana is certainly the more radical.

Dr. Jung concludes, as evident from the above statement, that the attitude of Sri Ramakrishna on the dissolution of self is somewhat hesitating whereas that of Sri Ramana is certainly unmistakable and radical. Let us now look into the sayings of Sri Ramakrishna on this point and see whether his attitude is hesitant or radical. Sri Ramakrishna points out the illusoriness of the ego in these words:—

What is my ego? Ponder deeply and you shall know that there is no such thing as "I." As you peel off the skin of an onion, you find it consists only of skin; you cannot find any kernel in it. So on analysing the ego it will be found that there is no real entity that you can call "I." Such an analysis of the ego convinces one that the ultimate Reality is God alone.

And again the great Master says:—

The individual soul and the Universal Being are separated owing to this "I" coming between them. If a stick is placed on the surface of water the water will appear to be divided into two sections. The stick is the Aham, the "I." Take it away and the water again becomes undivided.

Then the Master shows how the ego obstructs Self-realisation as follows:—

The true nature of man is eternal existence-knowledge-bliss. It is due to ego that he is bound by so many limiting adjuncts and has forgotten his divine nature. The sun can give heat and light to the whole world; but it cannot do so when the clouds shut out its rays. Similarly, so long as ego veils the man Self cannot shine upon him in full glory. "I" and "Mine" is ignorance. "Thou" and "Thine" is knowledge.

Then the Master points out clearly that enlightenment immediately follows the total removal of ego thus: "When shall 'I' be free? When 'I' shall cease to be."

According to the Vedanta, Brahman alone is the real and everything is unreal like a dream. There is this stick of "I" lying on the surface of the endless ocean of Brahman, and divides it, as it were, into two parts. In Samadhi the ego is blotted out completely and the knowledge of Brahman dawns. In Samadhi the least trace of ego is not left. Without Samadhi Jnana never comes. Jnana is like the mid-day sun in which one looks around but finds no shadow of oneself. So when one attains Jnana (Knowledge of Brahman) one retains no shadow of ego; just as when camphor is burnt no residue is left. When the knowledge of Brahman is attained there is neither "I," nor "Thou" nor the "Universe." When the ego is effaced, the jiva dies and then follows the realisation of Brahman in Samadhi.

Thus Sri Ramakrishna makes it crystal-clear that annihilation of the ego is the sole condition of Brahma-Jnana. He does not hesitate to declare in unmistakable terms that Brahma-Jnana is impossible without the dissolution of the ego. How then does Dr. Jung conclude that Sri Ramakrishna's attitude is hesitant? In fact, the Master

was not less radical on this point than any knower of Brahman either of the present or the past. We are, therefore, constrained to opine that a great thinker like Dr. Jung has made an uncharitable remark about a modern prophet whose teachings have thrown new light on the modern world of religion.

But, as the knowers of Brahman are few and far between, Sri Ramakrishna, as a religious teacher, had to point out under painful necessity the obstinate persistence of the ego. So he says:—

> But even if there be a little ego left after self-realisation it is due to the Prarabdha Karma. Know for certain that it is now composed of wisdom and not ignorance. The petals of the lily drop off in time but they leave their marks behind. So the ego of a man does go away entirely after self-realisation; but traces of its former existence remain. This however, does not produce any evil.

But the Master makes it clear that the individuality of a liberated man is a mere appearance, like that of a child. A knower's ego thoroughly transformed by self-realisation is absolutely harmless, and cannot produce ignorance.

According to Sri Ramakrishna, there are two kinds of ego, one "ripe" and the other "unripe."

> The ego that asserts, "I am the servant of God" is the characteristic of the devotee. It is the ego of wisdom and is called the "ripe" ego. The "I" which makes a man worldly and attached to lust and wealth is mischievous, and called "unripe."

"As a piece of rope when burnt," observes Sri Ramakrishna, "retains its form but is no good for binding, so is the ego which is burnt by the fire of the supreme wisdom." The Master beautifully illustrates this point by the following homely example. "A man dreams that someone is coming to cut him into pieces. Frightened, he awakens with a groaning noise and sees that the doors of his room are closed from within and that no one is inside it. Even then his heart continues to beat fast for some minutes. So does our sense of "I" leave behind it some momentum even when it departs."

Sri Ramakrishna also says that there are some great souls who are pleased to keep, after self-realisation, a little ego for the good of mankind, but their ego, he avers, is only a shadow like a line drawn across water and is the same as the Supreme Self. According to the Master, Sankaracharya and other ancient teachers retained the ego of wisdom for the teaching of others. He believes that Hanuman, Narada, Sanaka, Sanandana, and Sanat Kumara were blessed with the realisation of the Supreme Self; but they kept the ego of a servant of God. The master further adds:—

> Narada and others had attained the highest knowledge but still they went on like murmuring waters of the rivulets, talking and singing the praise of God. This shows that they too kept this "ripe" ego, a slight trace of individuality, to mark their separate existence from the Deity for the purpose of teaching others the saving truths of religion.

Sri Ramakrishna also says that even those that have realised the Absolute have just sufficient ego left to hold communion with the Personal God. It is very difficult, he remarks, to raise the voice incessantly to "*Ni*," the highest note of the gamut. Hence the necessity of devotion to the personal God. The *Bhagavata* too corroborates this view of Sri Ramakrishna by saying that the knowers of "Atman" do have devotion to God Hari. But the Master also emphasises that the

ego of the wise is like a thin line, a length without breadth, just sufficient individuality to communicate his spiritual vision to others. This ego enables him to see *jiva* and *jagat* and his own self as the veritable manifestation of the same Brahman in different forms. Again the Master says :—

When the head of a goat is severed from its body the trunk moves about for some time, still showing signs of life. Similarly though "Ahankara" is beheaded in the perfect man, yet a little of its vitality is left to make such a man carry on the functions of physical existence; but it cannot bind him again to the world.

And again he says "Can there be Maya in the emancipated soul ? Ornaments cannot be made of pure gold; some alloy must be mixed with it. So long as man has a body he must have some 'Maya' to carry on the functions of that body ; a man totally devoid of Maya will not survive more than twenty-one days." Someone asked Sri Ramakrishna : "Do you have, Sir, the slightest idea of ego when you are merged in Samadhi ? " The Master answered that usually a little ego remained.

"It is like the particle of gold leaf which, if rubbed on a lump of gold, does not wear itself off completely. All outward consciousness disappears but the Lord keeps a little ego to enjoy Him. Sometimes, however, He drives away even that little; this is the highest Samadhi. No one can say what that state is, it is the absolute transformation of one's own self into the Divine. The image made of salt plunged into the ocean to measure its depth. But no sooner did it touch the water than it was dissolved. Then who could come up to give information as to how deep the ocean was ? "

The Master also has said that holy personages like the incarnations of God possess a thin ego through which God is always visible.

Sri Ramakrishna speaks of all these varieties of spiritual experiences from his own life and his statements fully agree with our scriptures. His own ego was so completely obliterated that he could not say "I" or "Mine." Like the Buddha he used to say "here" with regard to himself. How then could he hesitate, as Dr. Jung wrongly thinks, to say that the ego dissolves in Brahman in Samadhi ? Sri Ramakrishna is as radical on this point as any modern or ancient prophet. But the Master points out that the shadow of ego persists even after self-realisation by the Jivanmuktas due to Prarabdha Karma till the fall of the body. This is true also in the life of a Jivanmukta like Ramana Maharshi. When litigation went on some years ago in connection with his hermitage the Maharshi had to declare in the court that the hermitage belonged to him and not to others.

From all that has been explained, it will be obvious that the contrast drawn by Dr. Jung between the sayings of Sri Ramana Maharshi and Sri Ramakrishna, must have sprung from a distorted appreciation of an isolated extract from the sayings of Sri Ramakrishna on the question of the destruction of "Ahamkara" or the dissolution of the "I" sense. The declaration ascribed by Dr. Jung to Sri Ramana Maharshi is no doubt a true enunciation of an abstract metaphysical idealism which has been previously set forth in our religious scriptures. But the saying of Sri Ramakrishna which he has quoted in contrast therewith, is the precept—an ideally *practical* one—of a world-teacher to souls struggling for self-realisation while encased in physical bodies. Indeed, there can be

no contrast between the two, other than this—that while both speak of one and the same ideal, one stops there, but the other proceeds to deal with the practical difficulties in attaining the ideal and the solution of such difficulties. In this blessed land of ours, there has been no dearth of prophets and seers who have preached the highest philosophical truths; but why the world of today turns particularly to Sri Ramakrishna is for his simple, practical and realistic teachings born out of the actual experiences of a life that lived the principles of such truths.

SWAMI JAGADISWARANANDA

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION IN INDIA

It is difficult to find words with which to express one's gratitude for Mr. K. G. Saiyidain's outspoken and inspiring article on "Religious Education" in the May Number of THE ARYAN PATH. To know that there is at least one man in as prominent a position in Education as his who is both able and willing to give a lead on this vexed question, is enough to put fresh heart into those of us who have been struggling for years to promote such ideas as are there expressed.

But, as the writer points out, there are tremendous practical difficulties to be faced. On the one hand there are those who feel that religion should have no part in school education and, on the other, those who feel that it is of supreme importance to teach only their own particular creed and to discourage children from either knowing or caring about anything else. Personally I feel, and have long felt, that the State is failing in a very important part of its duty to the rising generation if it takes the side of either of these extremes, either by abolishing all religious instruction or by subsidising institutions whose educational work is designed to proselytise for one particular religion.

The teaching of Comparative Religion, through readings from the great scriptures of the world, study of the lives and message of the world's great religious leaders and explanation of the religious festivals as they occur, should become an intrinsic part of the curriculum of every school, as indeed it will, if the Syllabus for Basic Education comes into general use throughout India.

I agree with every word of Mr. Saiyidain's article and feel that the matter could not be better stated. One word of caution, however, I feel is called for. He writes:—

> ...if, for practical reasons, the State finds itself obliged to do so (*i.e.*, to leave out religious instruction) facilities should be given to enlightened religious organisations to cater for this side of the child's education.

A truly excellent idea if Mr. Saiyidain, or someone who sees the matter as he does, is to be the judge of "enlightened religious organisations." One fears, however, that it is more likely that the decision would fall into the hands of those who are themselves either partisan or indifferent, in which case the end of the matter would be that we should find ourselves exactly where we are today, with large numbers of sectarian schools claiming and securing public support.

Surely the thing to press for is not the granting of such special facilities to any religious organisation, however "enlightened," but to insist that the study of Comparative Religion be made compulsory in all Training Schools and Colleges, so that teachers may be turned out as competent to teach that subject as any other. All truly "enlightened" religious organisations would welcome such an addition to their curriculum and be glad to accept the help of visiting specialists to instruct their students in the subject. I suggest that such willingness should be made the acid test of their "enlightenment"!

MARGARET BARR

Shillong.

ENDS AND SAYINGS

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

The political sky of India is overcast : Kashmir and Hyderabad, refugees and overpopulation and other difficulties darken our lives. Weakness of character has been manifesting in the well-to-do as in the wage-earner and has lowered India's good name even in foreign lands. But, for all that, the Congress Government deserves support as it tries to rise above unexpected difficulties which have precipitated themselves on such a colossal scale. The stock-taking speech of the retiring Viceroy, Lord Mountbatten, on 20th June strikes a cheering note about constructive achievements. Of the Draft Constitution he declared that it

> takes its place among the great documents of liberty and human rights. Be worthy of it. ...It is not the fact that high ideals are written into your constitution that will help you, but the stern resolve with which you yourselves determine to suppress all that could militate against these ideals being put into practice.

It is to be noted that while recognising the need of advance in education and the social conscience he pointed to the Country's greatest asset—" the character of her people." And it is reassuring to have his opinion about " the raw material " for future labour.

> I myself saw the most stupendous crowds in my life in India—on Independence Day, at Gandhiji's funeral, at the *mela* at Allahabad and on other historic occasions. The good nature and friendliness of these vast masses were unforgettable; I realised then that I was seeing before me the raw material of India's future greatness.

India is to be congratulated that her first Indian Governor-General, Shri Rajagopalachari is one deeply impressed with the value of India's spiritual heritage. He has personally made a contribution to the popularisation of the ancient teachings by his own writings and translations. His speech on the occasion of his being sworn in as Governor-General on June 21st referred to " the spirit that is laid down in our scriptures with regard to the task that falls to any one, " as having been that in which his predecessor, Lord Mountbatten, had done his work, and it was in the spirit of those scriptures that he appealed for the doing of " what will make good thoughts grow." He appealed in effect also for the thinking from which good acts would flow when he called for the abandonment of communal and territorial isolationism and for the devotion of the best talents in every community to the service of the whole State.

Especially significant in the present state of tension between the Dominions of India and Pakistan were his words about the fundamental unity among the peoples, words to which those on both sides of the border may respond with sympathy, as not a challenge to sovereign rights but an appeal for brotherly collaboration :—

> Whatever be the technical phraseology that public law may use to describe it, what disturbs the peace of India now is internecine discord pure and simple, and it is utter folly. Our economy has not yet had time to separate

into two parts corresponding to the political division to which we have agreed. It is very doubtful if it ever can be so split. We are far too interdependent, and whatever we might do, there will yet be vital links that can never be severed. It is folly to quarrel and make into a scene of strife and misery what has been shaped by the pressure of age-long forces into a field of beauty and joy.

It was by no coincidence that India's Prime Minister, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, brought together in his speech at New Delhi on June 7th an appeal to the people of India to put down all separatist tendencies and an expression of concern over the wide spread of corruption and bribery. For the "great dire heresy of separateness" is the common source of the provincialism that demands the maximum inclusion of territory in one's own linguistic unit and the self-seeking that prompts venality in public office and profiteering and black-market practices in private business.

No business that depends upon or affects society—and which does not ?—is properly termed private business. Fair prices and a reasonable profit are responsibilities to the community in the wider sense. The Vaishya who enriches himself unfairly in trade at the expense of his fellow-citizens, or the employer who takes advantage of the necessities of the poor to pay starvation wages, betrays his social duty.

But the venal public servant betrays not only his own conscience but the government he disserves, bringing it into contempt along with himself. Bribery and corruption are like white ants undermining the national structure, already honeycombed through their activity when the new Government took it over. Everyone recognises bribe-taking as a moral evil but bribe-giving has to be recognised as only less of a disservice to the State. Nothing can stop them but a wave of moral reformation such as followed the Buddhist revival. What is it that keeps it from arising ?

The inimical forces of Kashmir and Hyderabad should not be allowed to throw into the shade the splendid constructive work of Sardar Patel and Mr. V. P. Menon with literally hundreds of States which are now parts of the Indian Dominion. It is an achievement worthy of India's best traditions. That, as also the other work already accomplished, fully supports Shri Vinoba Bhave's appeal appearing in *Harijan* of 27th June :—

There was now in existence a State which everybody could claim as his own. It was the duty of everyone to make that State strong. It was necessary for that purpose to maintain peace throughout the country. Under no circumstances should one take the law in one's own hands. He wanted to urge that even if there was a political strife, members of every community must show respect to every other religion.

But the Central and Provincial Governments should speed up reform work. To energise them to do this, the Congress organisation, under the leadership of the respected Shri Rajendra Prasad, should become more active. Let it not be said of the Indian National Congress that it allows its own Governments to do what it objected to during the days of British Imperialism.

The United Nations Commission on Human Rights has completed a draft International Declaration of Human Rights, though Shrimati Hansa Mehta, Indian member of the Commission, explained on her return to India late

in June that the Convention and the implementing machinery were still to be formulated. Nations ratifying the Declaration after its acceptance by the General Assembly will accept in principle its " morally binding " summary of fundamental civic, social, economic and other rights.

Rights rather than duties are perhaps naturally to the fore in the draft Declaration, though Article I asserts that

> all human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. They are endowed by nature with reason and conscience and should act toward one another in a spirit of brotherhood.

Most commendably it declares that " everyone is entitled to all the freedoms set forth,...without distinction of any kind such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, property or other status, or national or social origin. " But how many are prepared to accept the implication that equal rights are denied whenever there is failure to show to another—man or nation, or communal, racial or economic group—the same justice, kindness, consideration or mercy which one desires for oneself or one's own group ?

To set up " a common standard of achievement for all peoples and all nations " is well, but the difference between lip assent and heart conviction which finds expression in appropriate action is sometimes wide indeed. And the more loudly and frequently ideals are expressed without being implemented, or without sincere attempt to implement them, the greater the dangers of self-deception and of the undermining of moral integrity by hypocrisy and cant, which has been well called the most loathsome of all vices. What nation or what people can accept in full in principle the draft Declaration and its implications and not find itself arraigned before the tribunal of its own conscience ?

The reservations in the draft Declaration itself, moreover, however necessary from some points of view, seem liable to abuse. The preamble reaffirms " faith in fundamental human rights and in the dignity and worth of the human person, " but elsewhere it is stated that rights are limited, first, by " the rights of others, " and, secondly, " by the requirements of morality, public order and general welfare in a Democratic society. " May not medical orthodoxy, unless its growing power is curbed, invoke this last clause for overriding " the dignity and worth of the human person " in the interests of the medical fetish of the moment ?

Unless the Ego takes refuge in the Atman, the ALL-SPIRIT, and merges entirely into the essence thereof, the personal Ego may goad it to the bitter end.

The closer the approach to one's *Prototype*, in " Heaven," the better for the mortal whose personality was chosen, by his own *personal* deity (the seventh principle), as its terrestrial abode. For, with every effort of will *toward purification* and unity with that " Self-God " one of the lower rays breaks and the spiritual entity of man is drawn higher and ever higher to the ray that supersedes the first, until, from ray to ray, the inner man is drawn into the one and highest beam of the Parent-Sun.

—H. P. BLAVATSKY