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. XVI FEBRUARY 1945 No. 2

THE HOLLYWOOD HALLUCINATION

[**James Harris**, an American lecturer and teacher of dramatic subjects, writes here upon a theme of direct interest to every thoughtful person. The formative power of the cinema is almost incalculable. Mr. Harris rightly places much of the blame for objectionable films upon the people who support them. Cinema-goers must boycott morally objectionable films or share in the responsibility for the great harm they do, especially to the young.—ED.]

The above title, which is also that of a recent book by Parker Tyler, hints through its alluring alliteration at readable pages of analysis and description of the fascinations of the cinema. Hallucinations, as everyone knows, by their inciting yet illusory reality, mislead their victims into serious or comic errors and bring deplorable or amusing effects. The author of the book referred to never disclaims reality for the cinema as a collection of various objects, yet he casts light on the *bewitchments* and deceptions—for good or evil—caused by the pictured glorifications. Mr. Tyler is not greatly concerned about the aspect of the cinema called moral. He is neither worried nor exactly indifferent. "The Hollywood Hallucination" is for him an extremely effective name for the big *phantasmagoria* produced by the cinema and operating on the public.

But this title may suggest a philosophic view in addition to the views of the cinema creators and their public, a view emphasizing the element of morals. This philosophic moralistic view gladly acknowledges the great power in the cinema for good, but is compelled to regret vigorously the perversion of that power by an unnecessary descent into the a-moral or the positively evil. The frank admission must be made at once that any dramatic or narrative presentment of human nature cannot avoid some evil, for evil is logically and actually a necessary part of life. But excess of evil and emphasis on it at the expense of good, may and should be avoided.

In this moralistic view, the special point of the word "hallucination" is that, though theoretically most persons acknowledge the mixed action of good and evil in the cinema, few believe such double action is controllable. Still fewer attempt the control. Among these few there is little co-operation, for the power of evil in the hallucination often seems too huge to be attacked. Such inaction is doubly unwise. Its passivity encourages existing conditions in the hallucination, and weakens the ability of those who at heart wish to gain some relief from the unwholesome delusions operating in both the industry and the art.

As an industry, any thoughtful person knows that the cinema is a vast profitably commercialized befooling machine. It deludes its commercial owners and creators into believing that anything whatever which yields money is thereby justified. It befools the public by inducing the belief that what the Screen shows is, as persistently claimed, "real life." Thus there is a constant interplay between the eager greed of the commercials and the equally eager acceptance of the sensation-hungry public.

No one today denies that the cinema surpasses all other arts in popularity and in effect on its audience—and its audience is world-wide. Its possible benefits are enormous. It may present correct standards of thought and disseminate broad knowledge of human nature and modes of living. It can build character, foster right ideals, emphasize correct principles; and all this in an attractive dramatic form. It may thus become an extremely powerful force for the improvement of mankind. Because of this very great influence, it cannot fairly be viewed as "just a business" or "just an art."

Everybody forgets far too often that there really is a moral issue in arts that portray human life, for the simple reason that men are moral in their nature; moral, because they have the power and are indeed compelled by natural law to act on their own choosing, thereby becoming responsible for the effects of their acts. This moral aspect of men's nature is so fundamental as to settle, at the last, all questions of their destiny—of what becomes of them in the near and the far future. The cinema, therefore, as representing men's lives, cannot evade the moral issues connected with those lives.

Cinema creators and producers have in some measure accepted their inevitable moral responsibility, though they would prefer not to be bothered by it. Desirable moral changes must come. They can come only by intelligent study and courageous efforts to enlarge what public demand there is for improvement and to create a spirit of co-operation between the more moral-minded public and the morally indifferent many-headed complex of writers, actors, producers and owners, all of whom, all the time, have an eye on the box office.

This last fact makes it clear that the final control is with the public itself. If ticket buyers censor the box office, no other censor is needed. Thus the whole process of improvement must spring from the people themselves, to whom that " many-headed complex " also belongs ; and the " complex " may in time somewhat soften their indifference to moral-mindedness. For they know well that no art makes so swift an appeal in entertainment, and none so wins the confidence of persons of all classes and conditions, and in however remote places. The cinema has gone everywhere and taken with it all the fruits, bad and good, of present civilization. It is *the* art of the masses. And in this connection it must be remembered that the larger the audience, the less is the power to resist lowering suggestion. Also, at the same time, the flexibility of machinery, the vivid realness of effects, and the uncounted abundance of show-houses, create an intimacy with the boundless audience that again intensifies the accountability of the cinema.

The specific urge of the moralistic observer is in behalf of the young—those who in a few years will be the active workers and makers of human society. The results of the pictures on this particular part of the world-audience can scarcely be measured, either for good or evil. Their eyes and ears are all alert to get fresh impressions ; they are hungry for experience, direct or indirect. They hear spoken words as in real life, they seem to see living people, and they make almost no distinction between the actual and the pictures. Their eager uncritical minds accept as real what the pictures show. The appearance of furnishings, of outdoor scenery, impressions of general social customs and of moral behaviour, all are absorbed and adopted with little question. If, therefore, pictures emphasize the baser aspects of life and environment, and make these appeal either through curiosity, enjoyment or horror, they assume a serious moral responsibility. Far too much corruption exists already. Any art or entertainment should try to serve mankind by lessening the corruption and using its privilege of selecting its material with the purpose of lifting its observers into greater nobility. For the very least that may be expected of any art is that its effects on impressionable adults, and especially on children, should not be degrading.

Still another element in the complicated problem is the almost irresistible identification of the actor or actress with the characters they portray. They become bearers of the moral effects, good or bad, of those characters. And the personal attachments for these glorified beings moving on the stage are stronger now than any that history records—alluring as actors and the stage have always been. Besides, these personal attachments and glorifications are constantly being " played up " by the theatre personnel itself, by newspapers and radio. The

theatre, more than any other power of the present day, "sets the style" in everything; for the Hollywood Hallucination is at the peak of its power. Can it for one instant be denied that the personal fascination which actors have for audiences carries a moral responsibility?

Another thing, often overlooked because more subtle, is that the underlying feeling in the minds of the picture makers is important. For instance, if their feeling, even though half unconscious, is indifference to moral quality; or, still more, if their feeling leads the audience to agree that evils are unavoidable, that it is silly to be puritanical about them, or that, after all, they are stimulating and attractive—if these feelings prevail in the makers of pictures, the audiences catch those feelings, adopt and reflect them. Feeling is a living force, transmitting its power unhampered by machinery or other externals. Mind speaks to mind, heart calls to heart. This moral law applies to all dramatic arts. These arts "do not have the duty to *reform*—they have only the duty not to *deform*."

The moral responsibility, however, is always two-edged. It not only cuts all people of the theatre; it cuts just as keenly the unthinking men and women, boys and girls, who carry their fantastic exaggerated foolish idealizations of "stars" to a despoiling of their own common-sense and natural modes of life. For it is too often true that the only "real life" depicted by the cinema is the life of those who create, bask in, and profit by the falsities of the "hallucination." How far can the world afford to imitate such life?

Many efforts have been made by individuals and by committees in the U. S. A. to use these facts in procedures that are regulative. Some have been wise and effective, locally if not generally. Even projects of national scope have been operated with good results. But far too little has been accomplished to be a controlling power in the vast production and vast consumption of motion pictures. Some persons have regarded the objections made by committees and others as of little value. Some have feared a lessening of the artistic quality or of the realism. At times pictures of a decidedly questionable nature have been continued regardless of committee objections; and in some cases pictures strongly objected to by committees have been given a wide and unexcited reception by cinema-goers.

Unsuccessful efforts at regulation have been due—more than to any other one cause—to lack of a corresponding interest in a large proportion of the public. The responsibility for protecting the people at the producing mechanical end is heavy, and lies with the producers. But on the people themselves rests the duty of improving their own standards of right living and their judging of what their children should be familiarized with. Also, they must consider what is worth while and constructive, instead of destructive, in

the creations of an art that has the world for its audience. The standards that the public create will produce the art that the public will pay for. The public as holders of the money-bags are always in actual control. This is the situation in essence.

Producers will conform at least measurably. As decent individuals, they have no set intention to corrupt their contemporaries. In America they have already shown themselves open to suggestions of regulatory committees, and they will act again with the public. But the public must work too. They cannot fill the cinemas in idle mood, be swayed by the fascinations of the evils or the virtues, without thereby taking a foremost share in the duty to lessen or destroy the evil. If pictures are not to suggest that low forms of sex relation are the accepted thing, picture-goers must see that they do not attend shows giving this impression. If the cinema is not to present vicious, alluring or horrid scenes of crime and war, its patrons must reject pictures that glorify crime and war. So with all other lines. The public must waken to what they are doing, to what they are storing in the minds of their children and youth. And the public, be it noted, are not just "other people." The public are I myself and You yourself. WE are the heads of this vast concern. Now the deplorable fact is that very many of US have been thoughtlessly satisfied or indifferent. *Moral indifferentism in the big public is the root of the whole problem of evil picturing*, and of the avid absorption of evil by the young. MORAL INDIFFERENTISM is the thing to attack.

What can YOU and I do about it?

JAMES HARRIS

AYURVEDA

Dr. Jivraj Mehta asked a pertinent question of his audience at the inaugural meeting of the Association of Physicians in India held on November 11, 1944, at Madras—what their attitude was going to be towards their own indigenous system of medicine, Ayurveda. As he observed, he did not desire thereby "to put back the hands of the clock by a thousand years or more." He only pleaded for a proper study of the classics on the subject and made a suggestion that medical graduates might submit theses on their studies in the system for M. D. or Ph. D. examinations. He further advocated that instruction in the science of medicine should be imparted through the mother-tongue in order to make it more effective and accessible to the masses.

OUR BEGGAR PROBLEM

[**Mr. John Barnabas** is the Organising Secretary of the Social Service League and the Poor House at Lucknow. He analyses here a prominent if superficial symptom of India's economic malady. The fundamental cause lies deeper than he suggests and a radical cure calls for far-reaching measures. In the mean-time the painful surface symptoms must be treated, but let us not delude ourselves into regarding beggary as an isolated phenomenon or its cure as a solution of mass misery.—ED.]

In a recent issue of THE ARYAN PATH [June 1944] we considered the different aspects of charity in India and found that neither ancient teaching nor practice approves of the present-day indiscriminate, unorganised charity. One of the evils of the wrong type of charity is the existence of innumerable beggars on our streets. We shall therefore try to analyse this problem and to suggest a way out.

Perhaps India is the only country in the world (except China) where fourteen lakhs of its population wander about the streets in perfect freedom, living on the spontaneous, unorganised charity of individual citizens. Again, it is India alone where the Census Report can consider it fit to list "beggary" and "vagrancy" among the occupations or means of livelihood, though unproductive. In this age of science, it is India alone which, unlike other progressive countries, gives beggary a professional status. Though beggars may be found in other parts of the civilized world, it is here that the public, without the least feeling of disgrace, tolerate persistent, open and methodical begging in public places without let or hindrance. In the West, the beggars beg on the sly—and that too under cover of some petty trade—and the citizen gives alms with a feeling of remorse. In India the beggar begs importunately with the attitude of one demanding his daily wages or with the contentment of one proudly carrying on his parental profession. The citizen, in his turn, doles out his charity with religious unction and the self-satisfaction of doing a good deed. Indeed, public begging is so common in our country largely because, on the one hand, it carries with it no invidious implications while, on the other, it claims to have the support of religion.

How many of us would be proud of our cities if we were to judge them by the standard laid down by A. M. Biswas, the Founder-Superintendent of the Refuge for Beggars at Calcutta: "The status of a place can best be judged by the number of its beggars"? Sufficient unto the day would be the evil thereof if it affected only the beggar. But it leads to physical deterioration, mental incompetency, preventable disease and starvation, and wrecks lives by

forcing them into crime, mental abnormalities, family maladjustments, and social irregularities of every description. As it is vitally inter-related with other social problems like unemployment, intemperance and poverty, its right solution requires the utmost care on the part of social workers and students.

The best way to find a solution is first to understand the different types of beggars that infest our society. Since there is no authentic or accepted classification I would suggest the following groupings based upon my study of the problem in a very practical form: (1) The able-bodied, (2) The child beggar, (3) The physically handicapped, (4) The mentally defective and mentally ill, (5) The sufferers from (*a*) infectious and (*b*) non-infectious disease, (6) The tribal or the hereditary beggar and (7) The religious mendicant. Any observant pedestrian can easily discern these types among the beggars he sees. Without going into detailed descriptions we shall consider the much discussed subject of the causes of beggary.

Theorists have always accused "poverty" as the main cause and left it at that. But to one who has been studying the problem by working among beggars for some years, that answer seems very inadequate. Beggary persists in the form it does because there are people to give alms indiscriminately. At least fifty per cent. of the beggars would find respectable avenues of living if only begging ceased to be the profitable pastime it is today.

Out of 300 beggars whom I interviewed 54 per cent. were handicapped in one way or another by disease, blindness, mental disturbance, old age, dumbness or lameness. But the remaining 46 per cent. were able-bodied. An analysis of the causes of beggary in 130 of these cases revealed poverty as the cause in only 20; constitutional laziness in 27; *wanderlust* or the desire for new experience in 19. In 23 cases beggary had been taken up on being orphaned or widowed; in 27 others, due to family disharmony. In 8 cases the whole family were begging; 3 of the able-bodied individuals were begging to support themselves while on a pilgrimage; 3 others considered beggary as good a profession as any other.

More often than not, the able-bodied, who form the majority, take to beggary for more reasons than one. Though only three of those interviewed answered very frankly that they considered it as good a profession as any other, I am of the opinion that the large majority have this mental background. Beggary in India is not disreputable. Poverty may lead to laziness or laziness may have led to poverty. If beggary were regarded as anything undesirable, an orphan would try to find work or be willing to be looked after by a near relative; a wife with a grouse against her husband would make up and stay at home; a brother would not leave home only because he was denied a small demand; a son would not take to

the streets when the father gave him a beating to make him work properly in the field. Family disorganization would not be as quick and as thoughtless as it is today in the villages if only the streets were not open to them and if the public were not so thoughtless in its charity. Our social customs and wrong religious concepts have conspired to remove all sense of self-respect from the individual and to make him a willing parasite. The fact that more than 50 per cent. of the total population of beggars in India are able-bodied lends force to my contention.

Let us try to understand this majority group from another angle. I would summarise my observations under several heads. (1) The seasonal nature of our agriculture forces many to take the road to the city with great expectations and consequently lands them in pauperism. (2) The uncertain condition of our industries, few as they are, causes many to become unemployed, and makes some unemployable, due to industrial accidents. (3) Then there are those who suffer from personality defects. The vagabond is primarily a psychopathic type. The usual defects in them seem to be feeble-mindedness, constitutional inferiority, emotional instability and ego-centricity. (4) Sometimes a person takes to vagrancy as a result of some crisis in his personal life. It may be family conflict, it may be a feeling of being a misfit in a given community or place, that drives him out of a settled life and he gradually drifts into permanent vagrancy. (5) Lastly there is *wanderlust*—the longing for new experience. This I consider to be one of the most important causes why children take to begging. A child starts with the yearning to see new places, to feel the thrill of new sensations, to encounter new situations, and to know the freedom and exhilaration of being a stranger. It finally leads him to a life of change, danger, instability and social irresponsibility. The only purpose the able-bodied beggar seems to have in life is to offer disproof in his own obtrusive person to that saying of Adam Smith's:—

> As it is ridiculous not to dress, so it is in some measure, not to be employed, like other persons.

The rest of the causes listed above would come under the general category of persons begging because they have no other means of existing. Physical inability caused by disease, a handicap or old age straightway sends persons to swell the beggars' ranks. A glance at the following figures will make us wonder why there are not more beggars than we see on the streets.

According to the 1931 Census Report, there were 24 schools and hospitals for the blind, accommodating 910 of the country's 601,370 blind people. Out of 230,895 deaf-mutes only 882 were in the 23 schools and hospitals provided. There were 98,449 insane; and 19 schools or hospitals with 9,518 inmates. There were 14,000 lepers in schools or hospitals out of the

country's 147,911. These totals of the 1931 Census Report are in the view of experts far less than the real state of affairs. They put the total number of lepers at 1,000,000 and say that for every blind person there are three persons with more or less damaged vision from eye-disease. The number of the insane does not take into account the large number of mentally affected or the feeble-minded. We have also to take into account the victims of venereal disease, tuberculosis and other infectious diseases which make a person unemployable and drive him to beg. While India has the largest proportion of such sufferers it has the least number of institutions for them and hardly any social security scheme.

At least 25 per cent. of the total number of beggars are children. They are the ones, who, if not handled in time, will fill our prisons and the under-world. They are the ones who evoke much sympathy from the public, who toss coins to them, little knowing that every pice that they offer to a child on the street, instead of relieving his misery and want, rivets the chain that binds him to his ugly profession. The beggar child is the most valuable asset to those who have adopted beggary as their profession. Investigations have disclosed many instances of cruelty meted out to these helpless children by adult able-bodied professional beggars. In Bombay it was found that such beggar children were sold, bartered or mortgaged.

But why is all this tolerated? Why does not society rise in revolt against this? Why does not the Government stop all this social waste? The fact that beggary and charity are closely associated in the popular mind with religion makes it difficult to put through measures of control. The common belief is that beggary has the sanction of religion and that individual alms giving is essential for salvation. The poor are always with us, they say, and the beggar is there as a perpetual reminder, to the more fortunate, of the miseries of mankind, a reminder which may have a sobering effect on the natural tendency of the average man to be worldly. Then again, the beggar is there, we are told, by divine sanction to give an opportunity to the privileged to be charitable and store up merit for their own salvation. He undergoes physical damnation for the spiritual benefit of others! If the beggar thus fills a moral necessity in society, why, they ask, should the State try to eliminate beggary and thus deprive others of the opportunity of attaining Nirvana through the giving of alms?

In 1919 a Committee appointed by the Bombay Government concluded:

> The opinions collected by us leave no room for doubt that whatever may be the interpretation of the texts of Hindu or Mohammedan sacred literature on the question of begging, there is a consensus of opinion that begging in public streets and places as a

profession is contrary to modern notions of religious sanctity.

Similarly, a special Committee appointed by the Mysore Government in 1943, dealing exhaustively with the subject, concludes that under Hindu Law only an ascetic is allowed to beg. And even he who embraces asceticism must first make provision for the maintenance of his wife and sons. As for Islam, the direct descendants of the Prophet stated "Curse be on him, who, though capable of bearing his burden, throws it on another." Islam also ordains for the Fakir that his "first duty is to earn his livelihood by hard work." Likewise Zoroastrianism does not permit begging: "Man is born to work and prosper, not to rest and rust....Work is the law of life, for the poor and the rich alike."

What then shall we do? It is a welcome sign of the times that the public conscience is being stirred to tackle this social malady. Societies are being set up to tackle the beggar problem systematically. Governments and Municipal Boards are being moved to take action against public begging. Madras, Lucknow, Calcutta and Nagpur have made a beginning by passing legislation and housing beggars in institutions. Bombay, Karachi, Delhi, Indore, Travancore, Gwalior, Baroda, Cochin, Lahore and Cawnpore are all in the process of considering or passing Legislation preventing public begging. But I am afraid the speed with which social legislation is being dealt with in these places is in the mood of one on a week-end holiday.

I am convinced the problem can be tackled, with reasonable success, if only both the public and the authorities make consistent and serious efforts to tackle it. In Lucknow we have got the Government to provide the necessary legislation, and have started a Poor House where beggars are being housed, fed, clothed, taught some vocation and given some education. Children are being reclaimed to society, able-bodied persons are being made to work, the old and decrepit are being nursed and the diseased are being cured. Yet we are far from success, though we are well on the way to it.

The only way of tackling beggary is by legislating the beggar off the street into institutions meant for the different types of beggars. The Central Government should pass a Vagrancy Act making all kinds of begging illegal and punishable with detention in institutions specially meant for beggars. In every town and city of a Province there should be a Receiving Centre. In every Province there should be one central children's home, a labour colony, a leper asylum and a leper hospital, a hospital for those suffering from infectious diseases, all situated in one city, preferably the capital of the Province. The Receiving Centre in each city will also function as an infirmary.

The Charity Organisation Society, to which we referred in our article "Whither Indian Charity?" may well take up as one of its functions

so to organise charity and so to divert it as to enable the immediate tackling of beggary. The social consciousness is gradually awakening in this country. The public must be made to realise that indiscriminate charity given directly to the beggar, far from helping the victim of circumstances to get out of the rut, demoralises him more and more, to the detriment of both the individual and society at large. Why then should we not mobilise India's traditional sense of the presence of God-in-man, in the unfortunate, the downtrodden, and the miserable, for this modernised programme of philanthropy and social welfare? It is then that Western institutionalism and Indian respect for the glory of the human individual, however impoverished or fallen, may combine in varied and expansive channels of social goodwill and service, transforming the ancient religious law of charity and compassion into an efficient code of social morality of the future.

JOHN BARNABAS

EDUCATION IS PEOPLE

Every generation has a slogan which sums up all that it expects of its particular education pattern. At one time it was "Education is for life," later, "Education is for livelihood." Then the ideals of education were made subservient to certain special ends of State or Church. What was often overlooked was, on the one hand, that true education caters for the whole man, and, on the other, that its purpose is to teach the art of living together.

The post-war period may well have as its slogan, "Education is people." For, as Mr. Ordway Tead says editorially in the Annual Education Number of *The Saturday Review of Literature* (September 16, 1944):—

> It is people in a certain kind of conscious, vital, creative relation to each other. It is people with a little more experience with life and with organised areas of knowledge, guiding with specific intent the exploratory experience of the less mature and less aware. It is the explicit effort to widen and deepen the sensitiveness of persons that they may the more wisely and with fuller kindness cope with an obdurate world of man in nature.

To this end, it is essential that education should aim at, first, imparting *general* knowledge, as against "specialist" or sectional, with an eye to the inherent interrelationship of the different branches of study; secondly, substituting as "dynamics to action" a *social* motive for an ego-centric one; thirdly, imbuing the learner with a cosmic spirit of sympathy; and, finally, instructing him, to quote Mr. Tead, in, "a way of understanding, appreciating and using the material environment of a given age." For even the best of projects come to grief if the general level of the people's conscience, culture and conduct is not raised effectively and integrally by the schools.

DE VALERA: EIRE'S MAN OF DESTINY

[**R. M. Fox** is the author of several books on industry and travel and modern Irish history, in addition to being well-known as a literary and dramatic critic. In THE ARYAN PATH for May 1943 he coupled the name of Gandhiji with that of Arthur Griffith as "Prophets of National Self-Reliance." In this sketch of Eamon de Valera he brings out qualities in him also recalling India's great leader.—ED.]

When—in the spacious days before the World War—I travelled on the European Continent I found little knowledge of Ireland and its problems. Yet, when I mentioned Ireland, the invariable verbal reaction was "De Valera!" often from those who could not speak a word of English. The name had penetrated where Ireland was unknown. And then, in a "March of Time" film, I saw the tall, broad-shouldered, dignified figure of the Irish leader move across the screen in a Paris cinema. What is the secret of de Valera's hold on his countrymen, which so often baffles the stranger and even puzzles many of his contemporaries in Ireland? He shares with Gandhi an air of calm self-confidence, a simplicity of manner, a single-mindedness of purpose, that is undeflected by good or ill fortune. This gives him a greater personal ascendancy than any other Irish leader of our time.

No one since Parnell has evoked such a degree of loyalty and affection. Like Parnell he is by no means a consistently great orator. His speeches can be dull. But he always conveys the impression of passionate sincerity. Often he seems to be examining his conscience in public. He subjects everything to a moral as well as an intellectual test and does not rely on mere cleverness alone. In a country where eloquent spellbinders are three a penny, the tone of aloof authority and moral purpose will dominate.

To hear this tall, black-coated, spectacled ex-professor of mathematics talk of the national tradition is to get him in his right setting. For all his militant past he makes a conservative approach. Yet Eire is so undeveloped politically and economically that he is compelled to act as an innovator and a pioneer. He strives to bring about the inevitable changes in a way which will least disturb the detached mood of rural Ireland, always suspicious of the new and the strange.

No wonder the world finds de Valera hard to understand. They have looked upon him as a gunman, a revolutionary—without seeing that he was always warring for a traditional way of national life. The truth is revealed in *Eamon de Valera* by M. J. MacManus (Talbot Press, Dublin. 8*s.* 6*d.*), a careful study of the man against the background of his times. De Valera joined the

Irish Volunteers before the Easter Rising of 1916 and soon became a captain in that force. He commanded a rebel post at Bolands' Mill. One of his students described him at that time as "considerably over six feet in height, a very serious-looking young man in his early thirties, with a long nose and spectacles and a strangely foreign complexion." MacManus completes the picture :—

He wore rough Irish-made homespuns and a deerstalker's cap. A singularly impressive figure he must have been, with his commanding stature, his sombre burning eyes, his harsh strong voice, his foreign look, his homely garb.

As Republican Commandant of Bolands' Mill he escaped execution after the surrender only because of his American birth and he received a life sentence instead. When he came out—the following year, on a general amnesty—he was on the rising Republican wave. Nominated for Clare, he was elected as a standard-bearer for the Sinn Fein movement and was soon recognised as its natural leader. Yet, as he has emphasised again and again, he is neither a "doctrinaire" Republican, nor an "extreme" Republican. In fact he never cared for the label "Republican," though always asserting the claim for National independence.

In America, where de Valera went after escaping from Lincoln Gaol—a key had been smuggled in to him concealed in a cake—he had wordy tussles with the old Fenian leader, John Devoy and his equally powerful ally, Judge Cohalan of the New York Supreme Court. When de Valera launched an appeal for funds to Irish sympathisers in America he wrote of "peasants" and Cohalan objected that the word meant much the same as "peons" in America and had a degrading significance. Characteristically de Valera refused to alter the word, maintaining that "peasant" had a poetic flavour.

Without doubt he would have clashed with these strong personalities on some other issue if not on that, for Cohalan was a stubborn opponent of President Wilson and the League of Nations idea. De Valera never allowed himself to be manœuvred into opposing either Wilson or the idea of the League. Indeed, as MacManus shows in his book, de Valera believed in the setting up of such an assembly, to which Ireland or any other oppressed nation could appeal. This conflict culminated in a stormy meeting at the Park Avenue Hotel in New York, called by the Devoy-Cohalan faction to down de Valera. The Irish leader had been announced to speak in another city hundreds of miles away. But he heard of this meeting and was unexpectedly present. He so turned the tide that his enemies apologised abjectly. This American episode not only underlines his unwavering resolution but also emphasises his belief in democracy as a world faith.

Back in Ireland at the time of the London Treaty of 1921—out of which came Eire's independence—

de Valera had sharp divisions with close colleagues. Differences narrowed down to schoolmaster-like definitions. While de Valera concentrated on exact, literal and dialectical utterances the country drifted into civil war. He played no part in the military strategy of that time but in the political strategy of succeeding years his name looms so large that almost no other name can be recorded. His side was defeated and broken in the civil war and he himself was imprisoned for eleven months, being arrested by the military on an election platform in Ennis, Country Clare, where he was standing as Republican candidate. It was an exciting scene. Shots were fired, troops advanced with fixed bayonets. De Valera refused to go into hiding after the military defeat, saying "There will be no wild geese this time!" This was a reference to the Irish struggles of earlier generations when soldiers fled to the Continent and spent their lives in the service of other lands. His steadfastness bore fruit when, in 1932, he led the side that had been defeated in battle to political victory; and he has held power in Eire ever since. A few weeks ago he stood again in Ennis and his side was triumphant at the polls.

Step by step he has extended the independence of Eire until he is able to declare that if only the boundary question of Northern Ireland could be solved Ireland would have no grievance left. De Valera has pursued a policy of friendliness towards Britain both politically and economically. He has won his biggest victories not by battle but by moral power and by the recognition that the destinies of Ireland and Britain must be closely intertwined. Both nations have much to gain by close trade relations and it is de Valera's argument that Ireland's independence should mean greater friendliness between them.

In the international sphere a thorny question has been Eire's neutrality. Those who have followed de Valera's career will recall his speeches at the Assembly of the League of Nations when he presided over the deliberations of that body. Imperialist aggression has received no sharper reproof than that administered by Mr. de Valera. Because of this, many people have been mystified at Eire's determined stand for neutrality. Very largely this is a matter of perspective, including the forces of geography and history. Eire has that strong traditional bent for isolation that characterises some of the Middle-Western States in America. To the Irish peasant farmer Europe seems as remote as it does to America and a similar sense of detachment is felt, aggravated of course by the comparatively recent struggle for independence and the sense of weakness which a small nation must have in the present world clash. De Valera has certainly interpreted the country's feeling on this matter and has shown his sound political instinct, apart altogether from emotional sympathies which

undoubtedly exist.

One story reveals that saving grace of humour which lightens de Valera's solemnity. When his paper, the *Irish Press* was founded, de Valera interviewed a timid young man on the editorial staff.

"Do you think you could write leading articles?" he asked.

"I'll try," said the young man. "But I'm not politically minded."

"Curiously enough, neither am I," said de Valera smiling.

Such quiet humour is rare in a man who is often regarded as a fanatical zealot. This is another quality which he shares with Gandhi. And although de Valera is one of the shrewdest political leaders in Europe it remains true that his appeal is not primarily political. When you listen to him you forget you are listening to a politician. He stands on the platform carefully examining his conscience. Not until he has finished with himself does he seem to become aware of his audience. And then suddenly he appears to be speaking as the voice of a nation.

R. M. Fox

NATURE CURE

It is increasingly being realised that the modern system of medicine is at best negatively curative but not positively health-building in its effects. For it only attends to, and attempts the elimination of, the symptoms of the disease, instead of tackling the latter at its tap-root. Pills and phials, vaccines and serums are but short-cuts to recovery and, like all other short-cuts, turn out, in the end, to be much longer than they promise. And yet if people resort to them it is because they overlook the fact that the secret of good health consists in their living in close conformity to the laws of Nature. Therefore, the essence of the matter is the dissemination of a knowledge of these laws among the people through lectures in the school and college class rooms and outside, and suitable, simply-written literature. In this connection a reference may be made to *The Life Natural* which has been published every month for the last four years from Ganeshnagar, Pudukkottai, S. I. Rly., by Shri Sarma K. Lakshman, who runs there a Naturopathic sanatorium. In the issue of October 1944, he sounds a timely note of warning against half-baked Naturopaths, who have begun to enter the field without the indispensable equipment of a deep and detailed study of the philosophy of Nature-cure, and as a remedial measure suggests the starting of educational institutions "where the teaching will have a definite bias to the natural way," together with clinics and sanitaria, run on the right lines.

PREVENTION OR PUNISHMENT?

[**Miss Mary Frere,** who writes here on a timely topic, is a novelist, playwright and poet. She pleads for recognition of what history should long since have made amply plain to all—the futility and inconclusiveness of retaliatory measures.

There have been other formulations of man's duties than that of the ten commandments, the re-interpretation of which she urges. And some of these rise definitely higher than the Mosaic law. But what the world today requires is not so much new statements of man's duties as the fulfilment, by nations as by individuals, of duties recognised in theory by all.—ED.]

At the moment there is in the world's thought a determination that those who have perpetrated crimes, both political and social, shall be brought to account. But if this resolution allows only the black picture of past evil to shape its action, it will lead nowhere.

Memory is a bitter pill, but it should not be swallowed as a palliative. The end of a criminal or many criminals is not the end of cruelty. To other potential criminals vanity or greed still will whisper that there are other chances and that all that is needed is greater subtlety and secrecy.

Mercy is no good without justice. That we have learnt from past mistakes. But neither should we deceive ourselves with the belief that punishment is the sole solution. These are both extremes of the same misconception about law. For we have now come to the stage in our history when it is clear that there is a higher law which demands a toll for wrong-doing, and a sense of justice far wiser and wider than our human law; and to infringe this law by any man-made code is only to show that we are unaware of its power.

Men do not make sacrifices and even give their lives that other men may be punished, but rather that there may be no need for punishment in a world that understands that evil breeds the seed of its own destruction.

If a man cannot work out a problem in mathematics he does not need to be punished. He punishes himself by not getting the result desired, and reason tells him that next time he must put the correct rules in operation.

No man can inflict on another man, either through the sanction of a Court or through retaliation, so great a punishment as that which is self-inflicted. War has already shown that. But, should punishment be meted out willy-nilly by any form of human sanction, so subtle is ill-founded logic that the delinquent will have a weapon by means of which he can revert to his former beliefs instead of recognising their falsity. This will most likely justify

further misdeeds. So progress will again be obscured and there will be a repetition of cynicism or barbarism far more terrible.

"Prevention is better than cure" is an old saying. But punishment seems to be no cure. Ordinary crime records have shown that. Therefore prevention is better than punishment. Only a prophet can look across the centuries and foresee what reforms are necessary. But today's ideas become tomorrow's actions. If an idea has the sanction of wisdom, the action that follows will meet the world's need. And prevention is a better idea than punishment, for prevention opens a door, while punishment closes it until vision is shut out. We need to watch the trend of world thought in connection with ourselves, for, like a thief in the night, it can steal in and rob us of our most valuable possession of far-sighted reasoning.

Many of us remember our reactions as children when we were punished. It did not seem to prevent a repetition of the offence. But who knows? If some wise grown-up had pointed out that we were really punishing ourselves our whole outlook on life might have been revolutionised.

The same monster that tempts the child victimises the man. And what is this monster but a growing edifice of destructive beliefs which bring about self-imposed captivity? What are these beliefs? Chief among them is the supposition that one man or one country can obtain dominion over another man or country. The conqueror and the conquered! The structure of home, economic and financial policy has too often been based on this assumption.

The present conflict, which is fundamentally one of ideas, has shown us what a need there is to change the basis of the whole social system; not only in one country but in all those prepared to add their contributions to world equality. One of the most imperative calls is to reinterpret the law. Justice is changeless and immovable and the right of all, but the sacrifices offered for its appeasement are as varied as human opinions. "An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth" was the groundwork of the old Roman law. Yet two centuries after this was proved to be a false premise it is still adhered to and looms large in the public consciousness.

One has to remember, of course, that there are two kinds of sinners; those who are so hardened that they seem to be impervious to punishment and look upon it merely as physical discomfort; and those who are so sickened by sin that they have an urge to break away but can find no alternative, and are even afraid of the alternative. To those in the first category ordinary physical punishment is like snow to ice. To the latter group it presents a barrier between them and any better way of life, a justification for their previous choice, until they are further away from an acceptance of justice than they have ever been. On the

other hand, mercy makes moral cowards of those who are indulging in it when they know quite well that it is going to have the effect of making the delinquent more wily. For it is shirking the issue and giving the devil access to further contracts.

Therefore we must now try to evolve some means which steers between these two blind alleys down which men and nations, both the punishers and the punished, plunge to their moral destruction. This is not easy in a world where individuals are all at different stages of thought, where the human mind is bent on mischief, and where weak wills sway to any wind of good fortune or adversity. But until we do find some kind of solution to this problem by approaching it at an entirely new angle, no other problems, social, civil, religious, economic and political, can hope to be resolved, for they all take their life-blood from the tenets of law—that law which makes for dissension or harmony between man and man in any community—that law which must also be between man and man in an international community, which determines whether his behaviour shall be merely destructive or freely constructive. Surely it all comes back to the beginning. Moses was inspired by wisdom when he established the ten commandments. If they could be re-established by being re-interpreted to cover modern conditions, what a means of prevention they could become to individual and collective crime!

MARY FRERE

LEADERSHIP

What are the traits of leadership? Are these different in the case of boys and girls—the men and women of tomorrow? Raleigh M. Drake, in "A Study of Leadership," contributed to *Character and Personality* for June 1944, has given the results of some experiments made with 106 college girls and 200 boys in respect of the correlation of various traits with leadership. It must be borne in mind, however, as he rightly remarks, that although traits are not to be considered static qualities which in every personality and environmental constellation remain the same, they do frequently represent general habit tendencies and attitudes which are characteristic of individuals in many different situations. The writer has categorised the conclusions arrived at, as follows:—

(*a*) In general there is a high degree of trait consistency in leadership even for dissimilar groups, for leadership depends upon internal personal factors and is not entirely the result of environmental needs or "field forces"; (*b*) In self-confidence, sociability and desire to impose will, girls are consistently higher than boys, all other traits being of about equal importance; (*c*) the most important traits positively related to leadership are originality, aggressiveness, common-sense, cheerfulness, humour, emotional stability, trustworthiness, tact, persistence and desire to excel; and (*d*) the traits negatively correlated with leadership are readiness for anger, conceit, introversion, selfishness, pure-mindedness (?), quick oscillation, occasional extreme depression and excitability.

TRUTH

THE STAGES IN ITS PURSUIT

[The well-known Sanskrit scholar **Rajasewasakta Shri V. Subrahmanya Iyer** brings out well here some fundamental differences in the ancient Eastern and the modern Western approaches to the quest of Truth.—Ed.]

O Mother, one man says this ; another says that. Pray, tell me thou, what is " the Truth."—Sri Ramakrishna.

Though everyone seems to feel that the meaning of " Truth " is quite evident, yet the greatest thinkers have pointed out the futility of the attempt to state exactly what it signifies. To quote one of the latest authorities, H. Wildon Carr says :—

It is impossible to think that we do not know what such an ordinary simple notion as that of truth is, yet the attempt to give a definition of its meaning brings quite unexpected difficulties to light, and the widest divergence at the present time...is in regard to the theory of the nature of truth.

Why all men think it to be so simple and yet such widespread disagreement prevails is because of the *almost* universal impression that truth is " what agrees with things that one loves or likes ; or disagrees with things that one hates," in spite of the underlying fallacy. This is well illustrated not only in our everyday life, mysticism and religious faith, but also in scholasticism and academic philosophy. The mystic as well as the religionist holds his truth to be *unquestionable.* He is ready even to sacrifice his very life for its sake. But what of the countless differences of the myriad 'isms, creeds, cults, sects, missions, societies, denominations etc. (or, as the same are known in India, *matams, samajas, sanghas, samitis, siddhantas, sampradayas* and so forth) springing up every day *ad libitum,* according to men's "*tastes, temperaments and intelligence,*" as the ancient truth seekers of India say. Every individual tries to set himself up as the sole authority in finally determining what truth is, which only leads to a multiplication of differences. When, however, one is not able to think deeply, he or she only follows others, actuated probably by the herd instinct. There are also some that rely upon the doctrine that what " works " in practice is truth, even in the world of religion.

Apart from these, there are other kinds of truth such as *logical, legal, ethical, æsthetical, scientific, metaphysical, mathematical* and so forth, representing the several departments of human knowledge. They have each their distinctive characteristics.

Having seen this bewildering multiplicity of truths, thousands of

years ago, the Hindu Truth seekers asked the question: What is the *common* feature of the several truths known to man ? Their aim was to get at truth divested of all the differentiating factors, truth *as such* or truth *universal*.

Let us turn next, for a moment, to ordinary life for an illustration. When a number of persons, visiting some land unknown to them before, casually look at a distant ridge at the top of a hill in the midst of a forest, they may form different ideas as to how much of the ridge is covered by the clouds or mist on it, or how much is enveloped by smoke that may have risen from some burning wood in the neighbourhood. As they draw nearer the ridge, their knowledge becomes more and more definite and they have fewer differences. When they all reach the ridge itself and when all disagreements cease, the truth *as such* could be said to be definitely known. If, however, they do not reach the goal and if any of them have defective eyesight or other disadvantages, each is obliged to find satisfaction in what he knows, *which he will naturally consider to be the truth.* And there may be several truths, or some may prefer to remain in doubt. All the same, if everything be normal the nearer they come to the object, the fewer are their differences and the nearer will they come to truth *as such*.

Similarly, the seekers after truth *as such*, or truth *universal*, pass through many stages, each next higher being characterised by fewer differences and the highest having none at all. The intervening steps are marked by various degrees of disagreement and agreement. The last is not, it will be noted, a " stage." It is the goal.

Some distinguished thinkers have held that the goal of differenceless *Truth* is *unknowable* (or unknown). But there are others that ask whether such statements can have any meaning if the term " truth " *as such* be " unknowable," *i. e., meaningless*. Further, it has been pointed out by other equally great thinkers that no effort at attaining the highest truth in any field of knowledge will be fruitful unless this *goal* without differences and beyond the possibility of doubts is constantly kept in view, as is the pole-star by one on the high seas.

The existence of stages or steps leading to Truth *universal* or *ultimate*, or Truth *as such*, has been noticed and they have been grouped under several heads by the thinkers of the past as well as the present. Further, the stages are such that each succeeding one naturally grows out of the preceding, though the time taken for the change varies in different cases. The growth being, therefore, continuous, each succeeding one cannot be demarcated and separated. So each of them bears some characteristics of the preceding as well as of the succeeding stages, which is one of the chief causes of the endless disputations of all men at all the stages, except the goal or truth

ultimate, where no differences are possible.

In the following tabular statement, if only particular heads are referred to, that is because they are recognised by most thinkers, Eastern as well as Western. It must not be thought that the rest of human knowledge, especially the various phases of practical or everyday life, are ignored. *Truth is the concern of all knowledge*, the whole of which it comprehends. These select heads are noted especially because they make the search after truth one of their *main* objects, whatever their conclusions be. In other fields men do not feel the need to think beyond the *satisfaction* they derive. Some reach the *speculative* stage, which they nowadays designate as "Philosophy." But it is also characterised by differences, well-known as "'isms." Evidently then, no "Philosophy" as now understood reaches *Truth universal or ultimate*. And it is no wonder that some thinkers confound philosophy with mysticism.

It may, however, be asked whether, as the Western philosophers say, truth *as such* or truth *pure* is no more than a verbal or conceptual horizon which is never reached. The reply of the ancient Truth seekers of India is that nothing is more *actual* or *real* and more verifiable *universally*, in this world, than this truth *as such*. Here the reader has to bear in mind a fact. To every man only such things appear to be truth *perfect* or truth *final* as relate to the stage at which he is. And "a truth that one does not understand becomes an error." To pursue anything beyond his stage appears to him to be a wild-goose chase. Only he that has reached "Truth" *as such* knows, it is said, at what stages *others* are. But as others cannot understand him he has to talk to everyone else in the language of the stage to which he or she has risen. An old proverb says:—

He that speaketh the truth to the unprepared is a liar in his own despite.

Of all the known stages, as a large majority admit, the most clearly marked and the most important is that of Science. Till this is reached, it is *self*-satisfaction that determines truth. *Self*-interest with reference to this world or the world to come after death, as they think, rules. Scientific pursuit begins by laying the axe to the root of this "self" and also of the wranglings actuated by *one's own "likes and dislikes,"* so characteristic of the speculative truth seekers. But the scientist limits his efforts to the fields of his research. Beyond them, his ego or self asserts itself and is as powerful as in other men, whereas the seeker after Truth *universal* purges himself *clean* of the "poison," as it is said, of the "self" or "ego," inasmuch as truth *universal* comprehends the *whole* of human experience.

How this "truth," the *common* feature of all truths, or truth *as such* or *universal, final* or *perfect*, is to be attained *in this world* has been indicated in a previous article. (THE ARYAN PATH, January 1942) One

fact, however, has to be referred to here. In all departments of knowledge or experience, agreement, generalization, harmony, unification or, more clearly, elimination of differences, in various degrees, is the high-road to Truth.

There is in man a natural urge to combine into groups, which the psychologists call the "herd instinct." But what does it imply further? It means the elimination of the sense of differences, *to a certain extent*. It is also an urge to pursue truth, of which herding is but the external manifestation. Men do not understand it in all its aspects inasmuch as they do not care for anything beyond the satisfaction of their "Emotion and Intellect." They know not that there is something higher, called Reason, which has also to be satisfied. Most men confound "Intellect" with "Reason." If they only dive deeper, they see, as careful thinkers like Bradley, Carr and others have pointed out, that every act of thinking is an effort at knowing the Real, which is not different from an effort at seeking "truth" *as such*, as the ancient Hindu wise men have said.

Generalisations are only steps in the direction of the elimination of factors of difference. Some, like the politicians, artists, social leaders, seek to gain admirers and co-operators by their skilful appeal to emotion and intellect, which make them forget differences, *in certain respects*, for the time being. But ordinarily the most rigorous eliminators are the scientists. *Depersonalization*, which signifies the purging of divergences of view with the object of getting at truth *common*, is a fundamental principle in science. But its sphere, as indicated above, is limited. It does not aim at *complete* elimination, which alone leads to truth *perfect or universal, i.e.*, of the whole of human knowledge.

Of all the stages, that of the mystic appeals to the *largest* number, including many that are distinguished for their intellectual culture. Mysticism is found mixed with other kinds of knowledge at every stage in various degrees, *excepting at the goal*. It gives one complete relief from the worries and the effort inseparable from the several stages. It emphasises the belief that whatever one loves or likes is truth *ultimate*, and that whatever is privately, internally and individually realized is bliss *divine*, and knowledge extraordinary. The mystic above all need not care what becomes of the rest of the world, what differences there are between his and others' views and what sufferings human beings other than himself are subjected to. All that is God's dispensation and each one's own lookout. Above all, mysticism is most consolatory to *all* such men and women as have met with disappointments and misfortunes of so many kinds in life, which often become unbearable. Such people want peace, and that with the least effort. Even those that feel exhaust-

ed in their scientific or philosophical, *i. e.*, speculative, adventures seek refuge in it, *at times*. It has, therefore, been rightly called "Escapism." Lastly, of all the kinds of mystics, the religious mystic commands the highest admiration, because his views are *irrefutable, being of another world*. Often his studied silence or obscurity of language on all matters that are too deep for him passes for the highest wisdom. "I do know of those that are reputed wise for saying nothing," says Shakespeare.

A little thought is enough to show at once the worth of religion or mysticism. In times of peace, plenty and prosperity and of individual or private distress, its trumpet is most loudly blown. But when wide-spread suffering occurs like that entailed by famines, plagues and especially the calamities of wars, earthquakes and the like, which call for common remedies, religious mystics are obliged to confine themselves to caves or temples, mosques, churches and monasteries. Their mesmeric or hypnotic powers are of little avail. Individual satisfaction is no *test* of truth *as such*.

"A Plato dissatisfied is any day superior to a pig satisfied." If, as is held by some, the aim of philosophy be the attainment of truth *universal*, the spheres of truth and philosophy are identical. The stages of the former are as much the stages of the latter.

The difference between one that consciously pursues truth and one that does so unconsciously is known only when one asks oneself the question: "How do I know that what I feel or know, or what I become aware of internally, is *truth?*" Until and unless this question is answered one cannot be a *real truth-seeker*, whatever else one may be in this world. As Robert Browning wrote,

> When the fighting begins within himself
> A man is worth something.

Of what use to the world at large is a knowledge of Truth *pure* and *ultimate* in times like the present, when the entire world of man is subject to the utmost anxiety and suffering? This question is really a most pertinent one. To quote from the *Mahābhārata*:—

> Truth alone can free the world from sorrow and suffering.
>
> The ignoring of *truth* leads to wrath, lust, loss of judgment, doing evil to others, jealousy, malice, pride, envy, slander, incapacity to bear the good of others, greed, unkindness and fear. All these disappear when the knowledge of truth is gained by a survey of the *whole world* or *life*.

One interested in Truth *as such* should ask himself which of the stages in the following table interests him most, and then proceed with the enquiry till he reaches the Goal of Truth *universally verified*.

V. SUBRAHMANYA IYER

STAGES

Basic division. (General)	Basic division. (Hindu)	The stages. (Hindu equivalents)
I *Truth* characterised by *differences* and possibility of contradictions.	I *Matam.* Emphasises personal, private belief and judgment or feeling. Emotion or ego dominates reason and intellect.	1 Tamasa, Rajasa and Sattwika Karmas, Mantras, Yagas, Yajnas, Pujas, Japas (including mental and physical discipline), Muda Bhakti.
		2. *Higher.* Sruti, Smriti, Sutra, Tapas, Upasana.
		3. *Next higher.* Pandityam, including Sastras, Tarka, Samkhya to support Upasana, Bhakti, etc.
		4. *Considered much higher by some.* Yoga of different kinds, Maunam and Dhyana and Para-Bhakti.
		5. *Still higher.* Prakriti and Purusha vicharam. Various Sastras, sectional Tattwas or Truths. *All* schools of thought including Jain, Buddhistic and agnostic or atheistic schools.
II Truth characterised by the entire absence of differences and of all possibility of contradictions.		6. *Highest.* Tattwa vicharam (The goal). Kevala or Paramartha Tattwa. Absence of *all* doubts and differences. Ultimate Truth; within man's reach. Ego eliminated completely and *Absolute* certainty reached. *Peculiar to India.*

CLASSIFIED

The stages. (Western equivalents)	Explanations.
Religion. Beliefs; Actions based upon Scriptures, priests' teaching, worship, ritual, prayer, faith, etc., which imply certain mental and physical disciplines. Sacrifices, Meditation (of mystics).	Satisfaction for hope, fear, sorrow and suffering. Individual or private satisfaction relied upon as "Test" of Truth.
Theology with elements of mysticism and Meditation.	Knowledge based on Authority, Revelation or Scripture in support of belief, faith, creed, prayers, ritual, etc. More intellectual.
Scholasticism.	Argument and Interpretation with the help of Logic, Grammar etc., to *support* belief, revelation, authorities, etc., dogma, further intellectual striving.
Mysticism at its height (with Art in Maturity), Ecstasies, Visions, Intuitions.	*Actual*, individual or private realisations of beliefs (without argument). Escapism. Emotion dominates in all these four stages. "Baulked struggles and strained emotion" move the aspirants most.
Verified knowledge, Sciences; physical, natural, mental, political, ethical, historical, sociological etc. Also speculations and theorizations of other Western culture and Metaphysics. Academic philosophy.	Intellect begins to dominate speculations based on logical and scientific enquiry regarding the value of the four previous steps, beliefs and opinions. Verifications in particular fields of knowledge. Emotion still influences, though to a less extent. Baffled enquiries lead to "Escapism." The West is most distinguished in "compartmental" knowledge; sometimes coupled with Mysticism.
Here enquiries aim at perfect Ultimate or Final Truth or Reality. *The West holds such universal Ultimate Truth to be unattainable.*	Sole *rational* evaluation of all knowledge, life or experience. The meaning of Truth investigated with a view to attaining the Ultimate Truth of *all* existence. This is not attempted in Europe or America, where complete elimination of Ego or emotion is not thought of. Reason above all leads to this.

NEW BOOKS AND OLD

THE FALLACY OF RACE*

This is a brilliantly written and provocative work by an eminent anatomist whose name is associated with the Hahnemann Medical College and Hospital, Philadelphia. The author has declared war on the orthodox anthropological findings. We are permitted to recognize five or six great divisions of mankind—Mongolian, Caucasian, Negro, Australo-Melanesian, and Polynesian—within which there exist many mixed local types. As a geneticist, however, Dr. Ashley Montagu (in common with Professors Hogben, Haddon and Julian Huxley) refuses to accept the conception of "race" ordinarily held, namely,

> the existence in nature of groups of human beings comprised of individuals each of whom possesses a certain aggregate of characters individually and collectively serving to distinguish them from the individuals in all other groups.

As a historical note, he mentions that the term *race* was first introduced into the literature of natural history by Buffon in 1749.

What, then, are the grounds of the geneticist's quarrel with the out-moded anthropologist? They may best be expressed by an enumeration of the factors which arise as conditioning evolutionary change. In Dr. Ashley Montagu's words these are:—

> a. The inherent variability of the genetic materials composing each individual member of the group.
>
> b. Physical change in the action of a gene associated, in a partial manner, with a particular character, that is, gene mutation.

From this point of view, "race" is defined as "merely an expression of the process of genetic change within a definite ecologic area." It is a dynamic, not a static condition, and

> so-called "racial" differences simply represent more or less temporary expressions of variations in the relative frequencies of genes in different parts of the species population.

What are the materials of evolution? The genetic view is that they are "discontinuous packages of chemicals, each of which is independent in its action and may be only partially responsible for the ultimate form of any character." These chemical packets are known technically as genes, and it is with some relief that we find, after we had thought that perhaps the irrevocable last word had been uttered, that in answer to the question of what aggregation of gene likenesses and differences constitutes a "race," or, preferably, an ethnic group, Dr. Ashley Montagu tells us that the answer awaits further research! Who knows but that further research will result in the introduction of other factors into the evolutionary process such as may lead to a modification of the "chemical packages" outlook? In any case, we have come far from the eighties of last century when we find our author asserting that "there is no demonstrable relationship between cultural and intellectual status, and brain size"!

**Man's Most Dangerous Myth: The Fallacy of Race.* By Dr. M. F. Ashley Montagu. (Columbia University Press, New York; Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press, London. 15*s.* 6*d.*)

The demonstration may not have gone far beyond the walls of the laboratory; but, at least, it is on record!

What makes Dr. Ashley Montagu's treatment of his subject of more than ordinary interest is his insistence upon the modern theory that "race is not a biological problem at all," and his removal of the controversy to the realm of social factors. Indeed, he goes so far as to say that "race problems in the world today are essentially caste problems," and the racial difficulties peculiar to America he views as problems created by a caste system. It naturally follows that

> race prejudice is easily generated in our society because our society is socially and economically so organized as to be continually productive of frustrations in the individual; these in turn produce an aggressiveness for which the individual must find expression in some way.

How is such prejudice to be eliminated? Here we are driven to consider psychological factors, and Dr. Ashley Montagu asks society to "assume the task of educating the individual, not so much in the facts of 'race' as in the processes which lead to the development of a completely integrated human being."

One or two observations may be made upon this general survey of the field of racial studies. The fundamental affirmation of this and most other works of a scientific or sociological nature is given in the author's own words: "Man is a domesticated, a self-domesticated animal." Again: "Fundamentally, man is quite an intelligent animal, but he is a victim, alas, of the two-handed engine of his culture which distorts his mind and renders him unintelligent." On this basis, it is useless to cross swords with Dr. Ashley Montagu in his contention that if we, with our present genetic background, had been born and brought up among a group of Australian aborigines, we should have been, culturally, Australian aborigines, though physically we would remain members of our own variety. The question arises, however, is not this expert judgment an over-simplification of the issue? Is the geneticist, for instance, prepared to stake his reputation for scientific acumen on the hazard that the converse of this interesting possibility is also true? If the Australian aborigine were born and brought up among a group of American citizens of the Pilgrim stock of the United States, would he be, culturally, by virtue of physical and ecological factors, a civilized man? Or would not it be truer to say that the Australian aborigine, whilst thus transformed, it may be, into an accomplished *homme d'esprit*, could not but still remain outwardly only an intellectual parrot? Evidence may yet be forthcoming, before the century closes, in support of a polygenetic origin of Man, with all that such a genesis implies, and of a variety of modes of procreation in the process of human evolution before the method familiar to the geneticist today. There are some who even have the temerity to suggest that palingenesis may have its individual and ethnic application in a given life cycle! The emergence of new evolutionary factors may not be excluded if we accept Dr. Ashley Montagu's dictum that "it is not possible to apply the methods of breeders of animals to the case of man."

Students will be grateful to the author for a distinguished and indispensable work. There is a most useful bibliography, and an appendix listing State legislation against mixed marriages in the United States of America.

B. P. Howell

"MILTON AMONG THE KABBALISTS"*

In recent years Milton has been something of a bone in a literary dog-fight with Mr. T. S. Eliot, Mr. C. S. Lewis, Mr. F. R. Leavis and Mr. Logan Pearsall Smith as the main contestants. Mr. Eliot's party have even gone so far as to suggest that Milton by his use of general imagery was responsible for demoralising English verse for nearly three centuries. Mr. Lewis on the other hand has leapt to the defence not only of Milton's style but of his Christian orthodoxy. And it is here that Professor Saurat comes into the picture. His book, of which this is a revised edition with an additional section devoted to a fuller account of the doctrines of Robert Fludd and of the Mortalists, by whom he has shown that Milton's thought was much influenced, was first published in English in 1925. His approach to his subject was not in the narrow sense literary nor had he any Protestant or Catholic axe to grind. His aim was to present Milton's philosophy as a whole and to relate it to sources of which most previous critics and commentators, bound within the provincial limits of Protestant theology, had been ignorant. The result may be described in his own words. At the end of the section in which he proves the poet's debt to the *Zohar* and the Kabballah:—

> Milton's original value may thus be diminished, but his historical significance becomes much greater. He is not an isolated thinker lost in seventeenth-century England, without predecessors or parallels. He becomes, at a given moment, the brilliant representative of an antique and complex tradition which continues and widens after him; for the problem becomes larger. "Milton among the Kabbalists"—this is, as it were, a gap blown into the very fortress of English literature, and much may here come in.

Much, indeed, may, and students of *The Secret Doctrine* should be among the first to applaud an investigator who has thus breached one of the loftiest and most revered bastions of the Anglican defences, though it must be admitted that Christian apologists have not been very convincing in their attempts to acquit so sublime and irreducible a nonconformist of heresy. There have been few men with a more colossal ego than Milton. One passion, as Professor Saurat remarks, was dominant in him, the passion for liberty and at bottom that was only the pride of his individual development. This passion, expressed alike in the violence of his polemics as a pamphleteer and in the grandeur of his style as a poet, compelled him to denounce all bonds, whether it was dogmatic orthodoxy, Presbyterianism, the Marriage laws, royalism, republicanism or Cromwellian tyranny. Each in turn was proved wanting because in contradiction with his high idea of himself and of human nature. Because his idea was so high his egotism was never limited to itself. It was egotism raised to the Nth degree. And so when each cause that he had championed failed, he remained, blind, solitary, but not disillusioned. For there was still one reality which he could serve. He could identify himself with God and be not only a very part of, but also the spokesman of the Divinity. In Professor Saurat's words, "Disappointed in all parties on earth,

**Milton: Man and Thinker.* By DENIS SAURAT. (J. M. Dent and Sons, Ltd., London. 15s.)

he will belong only to God's party," and he will confer the same privilege on all men worthy of it, few though he believe them to be. It is in his conception of God as essentially Absolute, non-manifested, unlimited and unknowable and of the Son or God-Creator as Relative and limited that he breaks with Christian theology and links himself not only with the teaching of the Kabbalah, but with the Vedanta and its distinction between the One and Ishvara. Equally significant is his acceptance of the idea of "retraction" to explain the process by which the Absolute Self-sufficient One created matter and infused it with infinite potentiality.

To students of the ancient uncorrupted wisdom these will be the most interesting of Professor Saurat's discoveries. But his book is a complete and rounded study of all Milton's writings and of his character in which pride of intellect co-existed and strove with a fundamentally sensual nature. It was this conflict which dictated his morality, the ruling of desire by reason, as of woman by man. In this he was a Puritan, though of majestic cast, hardly conceiving that reason itself might be pride and negation, as in the "Urizen" of Blake's showing, or that beyond the conflict of reason and passion there might be a creative state in which they served each other as equals. But his morality was always noble within its limits, as his egotism was too unconsciously sublime ever to be narrow. He was in fact a great "original" despite all his borrowings, as Professor Saurat shows.

HUGH I'A. FAUSSET

The Āryā-Śataka of Appaya Dixita. With a Sanskrit Commentary of V. RAGHAVAN; edited by N. A. GORE. (Editor, 12, Vishnu Sadan, 327, Sadashiv, Poona 2. Re. 1/4)

Āryā-Śataka is a composition of a hundred slokas in the Āryā metre written a century and a half ago by Appayya Dixita, the celebrated author of *Kuvalayānanda.* Unlike his other great works, this little poem had not been known to Sanskrit readers until Mr. Gore launched it into world by editing it so cleverly. He had three manuscripts to help him in this laborious task. They presented variant readings but Mr. Gore wisely selected the most suitable of these, as he did the title of the work. One can hardly say that *Āryā-Śataka* is the author's best work but, written in a lucid style, it is an outpouring of the soul of an ardent devotee of Lord Shiva. The simplicity of the language adds to its literary beauty and it will undoubtedly be an acquisition to the ocean of Sanskrit literature. Dr. Raghavan's learned explanatory "Teeka" after each verse simplifies the reading considerably for the average reader with a limited knowledge of Sanskrit. Both Mr. Gore and Dr. Raghavan deserve great credit for their pains in editing the *Āryā-Śataka,* which would otherwise have remained buried in obscurity.

PANDITA KSMABAI ROW

Your Food. By M. R. MASANI. (Published for Tata Sons, Ltd., by Padma Publications Ltd., Bombay. Re. 1/-)

What is eaten determines partially the person's health, holiness and happiness. And, in an agricultural civilisation, because the people lived in conformity with the laws of Nature, there was no "food problem" as such, in the sense either of the physician or that of the pundit of economics.

Today, however, conditions have changed; and the problem in question has become a many-sided subject for study. Mr. Masani, whose book *Our India* is a classic demonstration in the art of packing essential information nicely in a small compass, has now dealt with food in his usual chatty, convincing style. He has covered the whole ground, from the farm to the kitchen, and proved why India is a civilised nation and what could be done to convert it into the A1 class, if only the State would help to raise the people's standard of income. For, as the author observes at the close of his argument:—

> It [the food problem] is bound up with the fight for the abolition of poverty, which is one of the biggest crusades on which we as a nation should launch.

It is too true, alas, that—to vary a well-known saying—no nation has ever marched to prosperity on pinched stomachs.

The charming illustrations by Mr. A. R. Acott have only emphasised the appeal of "scarlet," skeleton facts and figures embodied in Mr. Masani's thesis. The public, however, needs to be told the truth. The present volume, which is the first of the series sponsored by the Tatas "to stimulate interest in some of India's vital problems and to educate public opinion," does this admirably. It is, indeed, a happy augury of the subsequent volumes to which one should look forward eagerly.

G. M.

Guru Tegh Bahadur. By RAJA SIR DALJIT SINGH. (Author, Strawberry Hill, Simla E.)

It is a noble portrait that is painted here. The ninth Guru of the Sikhs taught universal principles—karma, the overcoming of desire, uprightness, aspiration to the Divine in oneself and in all. His teachings, interestingly woven into this story of his life, appeal by their simplicity, their common-sense and their freedom from sectarian bias, and by their sincerity. It was characteristic that he would not prescribe for an ailing boy the giving up of his *gur* after meals before he had himself gone without it for three days. The lofty ethics Guru Tegh Bahadur preached, he lived. The account demonstrates the power of moral and religious non-violent resistance, as Shri Umrao Singh Sher-Gil Majithia brings out in his Introductory Note. Guru Tegh Bahadur's life of contemplation, teaching and self-forgetting service ended with the fearless laying down of his life as a martyr to the Emperor's proselytising zeal. Aurangzeb's fellow-religionists, remembering their great Husain, will not, for communal considerations, withhold their admiration from this seventeenth-century Guru of the Sikhs, who died as bravely for a principle. Moral grandeur levels all distinctions.

E. M. H.

The Teacher's Case for Religious Instruction. By CHARLES T. SMITH. (C. A. Watts and Co., Ltd., London. 6*d.*)

There is proceeding just now in England a trend that few appreciate, and of which even more are unaware. I refer to the drive being made by the Church of England, as by law established, to "put itself over," if that vulgarism is permissible.

In place of a courtly prelate, totally divorced from the life of the common people, we have had an aggressive propagandist as head of this church, and one with a sound appreciation of the salients of the problem confronting the church today.

If the late Archbishop of Canterbury saw that to aim at monopolistic control of doctrine in the schools was the most thoroughgoing method of keeping the Church of England alive, and, along with it, much religious doctrine long since discredited both by knowledge and common-sense, he proved himself a clever politician, but nothing more than that. The author has sound ideas upon the validity of this technique for securing a priestly monopoly, and takes the view that if teachers are to teach religion it should be on the comparative method, in effect, if not avowedly. In other words, he regards the teacher's task as that of instruction rather than edification, and many parents will deem him right in this. The method would cease to be characterized by that sort of sanctimoniousness which makes the school services broadcast daily by the B. B. C. so completely nauseating. It would introduce the objective method and provide instruction in religion in the same way as instruction in biology or any other subject.

Mr. Smith is not by any means merely a destructive critic. On the contrary, he offers a syllabus for the teaching of religion for both preparatory and primary schools. It ranges from the Living Earth—an account of the dawn of religious sentiment, to the birth of worship, magic, priests, kings and gods, the root religions that survive, or of which we have knowledge, to the later prophets and messiahs. His appears to be a very excellent corrective to the superstition pumped into the formative and receptive minds of our children by politically-minded and worldly-wise religious corporations.

Much is wrong with the world today, but if one thing is certain it is that we have to inculcate the truth in the class rooms of the world and not half-truths, or legends in the guise of truth.

All the churches in this matter behave little better than the directorates of the great cartels whom, in more ways than one, they resemble.

This little book should be in the hands of every man and woman who has the onerous duty of forming the minds of the post-war generation. They will not rid themselves of all priestcraft, but they can do much to thwart the monopolistic trend which today defaces what passes in the West for the application of the teaching of Jesus Christ.

GEORGE GODWIN

Curiosities of Psychical Research. By CHARLES J. SEYMOUR. (Rider and Co., London. 8*s.* 6*d.*)

It is refreshing to read in this work by the author of *This Spiritualism* that "facts *are* to be recorded, even facts that one does not particularly like—perhaps those especially." An

admirable maxim, and one which, if it had been followed by spiritualists generally since the phenomena associated with the Fox sisters in the United States in the 40's of last century, might have altered greatly the subsequent history of what has become known as the Spiritualist Movement. Mr. Seymour mentions that his experiences, up to the time of writing his book, had been gained amongst ninety-two mediums, and his judgement is that "the processes behind mediumistic phenomena generally may be more complex and far more wonderful than is within the power of anyone (let us grant on this side of the veil) to conceive." He is not averse to a "physical" theory to account for a large body of well-attested hauntings. He writes :—

> On what we know as "matter," there can be and are recorded impressions of events that have occurred in its presence, and... under suitable conditions, these events can again become dynamic.

The author summarises his beliefs, as a result of much investigation, under four heads: (1) Communication by the dead is, in a great many instances, not what it is thought to be; (2) After death, the individual consciousness, "although it persists as individual sentiency," ceases to have the separative existence that it has here; (3) "No true picture has been or can be given of 'conditions' of life after 'death'"; (4) What has become the spirit-entity of man reincarnates: "Personality does not reincarnate."

It will be seen that Mr. Seymour has written an open-minded work that is bound to arouse healthy discussion. Further study and investigation may lead him to the conclusion which others have reached in similar circumstances, namely, that the whole question of phenomena rests on the correct comprehension of old philosophies. Those philosophies may be found in the *corpus* of thought embodied in such works as *Isis Unveiled* and *The Secret Doctrine*, published in 1877 and 1888, respectively.

B. P. H.

...And One Did Not Come Back: The Story of the Congress Medical Mission to China. By KHWAJA AHMAD ABBAS. (Sound Magazine Publication Department, Sir Phirozeshah Mehta Road, Bombay. Rs. 2/8)

A story of suffering and endurance is here narrated with a vigour almost crude. It is not merely the story of sacrifice and hazard of the five Indian doctors who led the Congress Medical Mission to the remote corners of China. It is the story of China at war, heroic in her resistance to the invaders, determined to a man to give the aggressor his due. Admirable indeed as was the work of the five "warriors without weapons" and tragic as was the loss of one of them, the suffering and the supreme sacrifice of Dr. Kotnis are a symbol of China today. The doctor did not come back. The Chinese, until they have rescued the cause of human freedom, will never come back. And who that has read, in this book as elsewhere, of China, stronger in her determination than in her arms, can doubt that the pall of death and smoke that darkens now that ancient land will lift ere long?

It is a skilled reporter that recounts the tale. What the Mission did for China is as important as how China fights her war. Of both Mr. Abbas's book gives a vivid account.

V. M. INAMDAR

CORRESPONDENCE

"THE STARLIT DOME"

I

As a writer who has been privileged to review Professor Wilson Knight's work over a long period of years, I feel it is impossible to allow Mr. John Stewart Collis's notice of *The Starlit Dome* (THE ARYAN PATH, May 1944, p. 226) to pass without comment, which seems essential in the cause of justice and also in the service of literature.

I note a phrase in Mr. Hugh I'A. Fausset's review of *The Russian Horizon*, in the same issue, which explains why certain types of readers and critics are unable to understand, and therefore to value, Mr. Knight's unique approach to poetry: "The real revolution in the hearts and minds of men has yet to come." It has come in the hearts and minds of a few, an infinite minority, and such individuals are inevitably misunderstood by the majority in whom such a revolutionary change has not taken place. This explains the inadequacy of Mr. Collis's treatment of the book, and, to a considerable extent, his "hostility" to it also. But it is deplorable, in the cause of both justice and literature, that such a judgment should appear of a work which has not only received a rich measure of praise from critics of the highest standing (*e.g.*, the full-page article in *The Times Literary Supplement*, January 3rd, 1942) but is of incalculable value not only in the sphere of literature but of life itself.

DALLAS KENMARE

Lynthurst Hill,
Burnt Green, Worcs.

II

I am always open to correction. My judgment in matters of this kind is quite remarkably sound, but I wouldn't put it past me to slip up now and then. It may have been that Mr. Knight's lack of literary skill made me lose patience and see nothing in *The Starlit Dome* but academicism; moreover, I admit that at times he appeared to be saying badly what Mr. Murry and Mr. Fausset say so brilliantly (*e.g.*, on Keats's "Moneta"). Unfortunately, Miss Dallas Kenmare's letter does not assist me in making a fresh judgment. If the work of Mr. Knight is really "of incalculable value not only in the sphere of literature but of life itself" I feel that Miss Kenmare should have given us some hint as to his message. No use saying—"Can't be done in a few words." If a person has something to say it can always be summed up. If Miss Kenmare will explain herself a bit more and expound Mr. Knight I shall study what she writes with care. Pending something of this sort I must remain somewhat sceptical as to Miss Kenmare's credentials. She should realise that nothing is sillier than to defend an author by saying to one critic that other critics "of the highest standing" (of course), take a more favourable view.

JOHN STEWART COLLIS

Blandford,
Dorset.

ARE THEY TO CRY ETERNALLY?

I

It is admitted by all, that animals are not so many automata without sensation: these poor animals tremble and give forth the very indications of suffering that we do: theirs is the cry of pain: they show the unequivocal signs of pain: they put on the same aspect of fear when a blow threatens: they exhibit the same distortions of agony after a blow has been given: the bruise or the burn or the fracture or a deep incision or a fierce encounter with one of equal or superior strength affects them similarly to ourselves: their blood circulates as ours: they have pulsations in various parts of the body as we have: they fall ill, grow weak with age and finally die just as we do. They possess feelings and instincts. An animal robbed of its little one or the bird whose household has been stolen sends out pathetic cries. These facts are manifest. The only point is the poor animal cannot express in words the intensity of suffering against which it can offer no defence. But there is an eloquence in its silence.

Despite these facts, thousands of animals are killed every day or are injured, sometimes in the name of Religion, sometimes from a humanitarian point of view, most often for feeding mankind.

Many animals are sacrificed to propitiate the gods but whence the sanction for this I cannot see. All the religions without exception teach "Kill not." Hinduism proclaims *Ahimsa Paramodharma*. Buddhism again lays stress on *Ahimsa*. Jains do not use open lights at night lest insects be lured into them and killed. Christ says "Kill not." I am sure Islam also does not favour killing or cruelty.

The reason, I think, for the present state of affairs, is that man has become accustomed to flesh eating, and probably thinks that before he eats, he must offer it to the God of his heart. How could God, who created all beings, revel in seeing some of His own children killing His other creatures to propitiate Him? A cocoanut or a pot of milk offered, and man is saved seeing a creature of God writhing in agony.

Humanitarians consider that instead of witnessing an animal suffering from any incurable disease, it is advisable to have it shot. When an old man suffering from an incurable disease is allowed to drag on and to die a natural death, why not the animal?

Aristotle is reported to have defined man as a social animal. I think the appropriate definition would be "Man is a selfish animal," for he has laws for members of his species and different laws for others. A man who kills another man is punishable with death: but the law tolerates man's killing of animals, equally God's creation. The civilized man abhors cannibalism but he perpetuates the killing of animals by men and using their flesh as food. The sooner this abominable system ceases, the better for all.

Non-vegetarians claim that if animals were allowed to breed, there would not be sufficient food for all. This is far-fetched. There is a controversy going on with regard to over-population, but no man or child would be allowed to be killed.

The other creatures might have been intended by God for the use of man, but it can never have been the intention that they can be killed for man's food or misused for man's pleasure.

Man raises his voice of protest one day or another. What about the dumb animals ? Are they to cry eternally ? Cannot our circle of love circumscribe them ? Should not civilized man extend his sympathy and support ?

H. NAGASUBRAHMANYAM

Mazagaon,
Bombay.

II

Among the many ugly scenes that a cruel war has forced on the people of Ceylon the shortage of meat and the consequent disgraceful scramble for it stands foremost in its ghastliness. It is well to remember that there are three million Buddhists in the Island. And it is shocking to note that the majority of those in the beef queues are followers of the Buddha. Yet this is only a sign of the times. Even before the war the Sinhala Buddhists were beef-eaters. The scarcity in this commodity has only presented to the public in all its naked horror—a flesh-eating nation of Buddhists !

Beef is part and parcel of Buddhist life in Ceylon today. No wedding is complete without several dishes of various kinds of meat prepared in the most un-appetizing manner.

So far have the Buddhists in Ceylon degenerated that they now clamour for beef and more beef. The tragedy is that a Buddhist Government has thought it necessary to ration this luxury article of food. This is a blunder. It would have been better to leave the blood-thirsty cannibals to fend for their carrion. Thrice a week you see this horrible spectacle of meat eaters waiting for hours in a beef queue, defying sun and rain—for half a pound of beef !

Be it said to the everlasting credit of the hundreds of thousands of ignorant, illiterate villagers and the much despised "ordinary men" that they are no players in this hideous drama. The villains of the piece are the pampered English-"educated," the haughty England-returned and those "gentlemen" who play cards far into the night, eating meat sandwiches between their games. The dull routine of Kandy town life was recently galvanized into stark horror when they saw sixty students of a leading missionary school in the Island parade the streets with banners proclaiming "We Want Beef." The irony of it was that two members of the staff of that school led those school-boy idiots ! That is education in Ceylon today.

We are asked to show our ignorant brothers and sisters the way to a better and fuller life. Do you expect selfish, craving society folk to uplift the masses ? How dare they, under the guise of various sweet-sounding *sabhas* and *samithis* attempt rural reconstruction ? Let the "educated" flesh-eaters of India and Ceylon leave severely alone the illiterate, starving thousands. These may wallow in their misery—but they do not hunger for flesh.

J. C. M.

Rikillagaskada,
Ceylon.

ENDS AND SAYINGS

"_____ends of verse
And sayings of philosophers."
HUDIBRAS

An inspiring prophecy of India's future was made by Shrimati Sarojini Naidu in her Convocation Address at the Viswa Bharati at Santiniketan, which *The Free Press Journal* of 8th January reports. We should again be able, she declared, to offer our gifts to the world, in philosophy and art, in knowledge in its various shapes. But that could only be when we were free, free from the enslavement that has been imposed on us, from racial and religious feuds, from shackles of division that have no reality.

When all the present tumult is over, she declared, "we shall affirm and again prove that the genius of India lies in universality, not in segregation."

Religion should be not a barrier but a bridge between man and man. There is no greater handicap to world or national peace than the "heresy of separateness." Shrimati Sarojini Devi, in her address at Santiniketan on Christmas Day, referred in this connection to the Lord's Prayer. It summed up, she declared, the message of Christianity, and was "the Magna Carta of fellowship," as a few days later she called the Quran "a great Magna Carta of freedom." "Let us never," she urged, "commit the unforgivable sin of dividing humanity."

The need for an ethical approach to the reorientation of economic and political institutions in the post-war world is emphasised in the well-argued and documented presidential address of Prof. Devidas D. Vadekar, before the Ethics and Social Philosophy Section of the Indian Philosophical Conference held at Lucknow late in December. Through all the growth and development of corporate life, from the clan to the community, the society and the nation, certain ethical values are implicit and these have always recognised the right to self-development without infringing upon similar rights of others. This equalitarian recognition and the willing limitation of personal liberty in the interest of corporate welfare have been the foundation of civilised life.

What is true of individuals is true of nations and Professor Vadekar would have this ethical approach implemented in post-war reconstruction. Since economics is but the organisation of resources, and politics the organisation of power, both always properly for collective human welfare, the need for ethical standards in these departments is as urgent as it is in individual lives. One morality for all—for individuals and communities or groupings large or small—means recognition of our common being and existence. Professor Vadekar sees in the progressive development of the sense of a common life, "the sense that we are all humans, for all our differences," the only hope of progressive universal peace and happiness. In other words, he sees the ethical problem for post-war political

policies as that of "a re-affirmation and a re-interpretation of the concept of the state as a *moral* institution." It must have, he stresses, a *double* orientation, as the guardian of the values and liberties of individuals and groups within the nation on the one hand, and "as a willing, co-operating and self-sacrificing constituent of a world community" on the other.

A man must be blind, mad or savage who, having lived through this war or the last war or both, can believe that civilised life will survive a third and that the world is not yet ripe to take the necessary steps to prevent it because the fetish of the sovereign state must be given its bloody offering, the sacrifice of millions of human victims, until the end of time.

Thus Leonard Woolf in his closely reasoned plea for an international authority, political and economic, in the post-war world, in his essay *The International Post-war Settlement*. Dismissing as prompted by capitalist interests, the usual criticism that the idea of collective security and international order is utopian, he avers that there is no alternative but to create such an order backed up by a determined will to work it. The League of Nations failed because it was never seriously worked.

Discussing how such an international authority can function Mr. Woolf squarely faces the danger which irresponsible national sovereignty has meant to the modern world. If war is to be kept out there is no way but for the nations to surrender willingly portions of their economic and political rights to a larger body. International authority cannot materialise without such partial surrender of national rights and it cannot effectively function or prevent relapse unless it is clothed with coercive power against possible offenders, its foundations resting upon political and economic justice for all nations. As such, its judgments will be in terms of international law and in accord with collective welfare. Between governments, co-operation would take the place of competitive hostility and organised law that of diplomacy.

The measure of success which such an international authority can achieve depends upon how intensely the nations want peace for their peoples. If it is true that the drift of world forces has been towards internationalism, the sufferings of two wars in a generation must accelerate its acceptance as a dynamic force in post-war readjustments. But are the Allied Nations morally and spiritually ready for such a reasonable and just approach to the problem?

The Proceedings of the Conference on Africa, convened at New York early last year by the Council on African Affairs, Inc., have just reached us. It was a Conference of Negro and white Americans, with representatives of the peoples of Africa and the British West Indies in attendance. It demanded specifically the abolition in the African colonies of forced labour, racial discrimination in employment and unfair trading practices.

It is worthy of note that the resolutions demanding such bare human equality, in opportunity, effort and achievement, made common cause with the rest of the colonial peoples of the world whose problems are similar. The Conference on Africa repeatedly stressed that the colonial problem was a single problem and demanded treatment in accord with the professed aim of the Allied Nations to establish democracy and peace. How vital to

the Americans as to any other nation the colonial question is, was well stated by Paul Robeson, the Chairman of the Council on African Affairs, in his opening statement. He said that the welfare of the dependent peoples who made up almost half the world's population was something that directly concerned the welfare of others. Neither the attitude of "holding one's own" nor a misleadingly apologetic self-justification could fit in any just scheme of international planning. Rightly was it insisted by Max Yergan in the main address of the Conference that "the future of Africa and of other colonial areas must be worked out on the plane of world-wide international agreements and action." This is as true as the conviction growing upon all thinking minds, and accepted by all save those who consider that their interests would suffer from such acceptance, that the success of the planners of the post-war world in shaping a world of security, peace and democracy will depend in large part on how they deal with the colonial problem.

Prof. S. V. Puntambekar of the Benares Hindu University, presiding at Jaipur over the Indian Political Science Association's session on 2nd January called for a new political theory. It must have primarily a human purpose, decreasing tensions and building understanding of and respect for different ways of life. *The Hindu* reports him as including among the ideals and functions of the world state the promotion of social service and social insurance and the raising of the standard of human life and welfare. A complete international Government would be necessary, with a monopoly of armed force and with leaders of superior type, recruited internationally. This would be incompatible, he warned, with the division of authority among great powers and their retention and augmenting of old conquests and vested interests. Nationalism must be neutralised by taking away from the nation independent political power and self-seeking economic control.

"Our independence," he insisted, "has now become all-pervasive and all-embracing, and it must be so organised."

There are no permanent majorities and minorities in any country unless we apply sociologically false racial and religious interpretations to our history and society.

This challenging statement should help to clear the atmosphere of political thinking. We were all a mixture, Professor Puntambekar declared, of various blends and patterns in beliefs and institutions, racially, religiously, economically, culturally and territorially. The divisions were interpenetrating. Common interests had to be centrally guarded and the special interests of groups locally and functionally secured, but partitioning was not the solution.

It is interesting in this connection to note that on the following day of the Conference Sir Mirza Ismail, Prime Minister of Jaipur, came out strongly for a united, federated India. "As a Muslim," he said, "I would not be a party to the vivisection of India."

The rôle of scientific research in India's industrial and economic progress, and how it could help in raising of standard of living, were chief points stressed in the Presidential Address read by Prof. S. N. Bose on behalf of Sir Shanti Swarup Bhatnagar at the