THE ARYAN PATH

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

VOLUME III

January-December 1932

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

INDEX

Index of Articles

Index of Book Reviews

Index of Correspondence

Index of Names and Pseudonyms of Writers of Articles, Reviews and Correspondence

𝔄 𝔘 𝔐

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

THE ARYAN PATH

VOL. III. JANUARY 1932 No. 1

CONSCIENCE—THE BRIDGE

The Inner Life is a discipline. From remote antiquity, the culture of consciousness has been regarded as an intimate life-experience. Self-control or self-expression, Second-Birth or Integration, whatever the name—it is an *inner* realization, not a mental recognition. In this lies the stupendous, nay the unbridgeable gulf between the method of acquiring ordinary knowledge and that of acquiring esoteric wisdom which is *sui generis*. What the mind learns it learns by inner experience, not with the help of the outer senses. What the Soul intuits it does by an inner ideation, not dependent on mental reflection. The only process analogous to it in ordinary life is the functioning of the voice of conscience—sometimes valued as the infallible voice of the Soul, whereas it is but the voice of the accumulated experience of the lower or the personal man; and at times the voice of desire and fleshly impulses is mistaken for it. What the voice of conscience is to the human brain and blood, that—and something more—is the voice of the Spiritual Soul to the human heart and the inner invisible sensorium.

The greatest service which conscience renders is not in its protective action which tells us what *not* to do, but in its provocativeness which is a mysterious, silent symbol. Conscience is an awakener, it gives the indication that an inner universe exists. The universe of gods, heroes, geniuses, is glimpsed when we wake up to this second and symbolic aspect of conscience. The lighthouse affords a good comparison: it flashes its message of "don't come near here". The message is ever active and beneficently protective.

But the lighthouse is also a silent symbol—the steady, revolving, and blazing power which tells the sailor what not to do, leaving him to find out, by other means, how to reach his haven of safety. It is self-evident that the lighthouse has a silent and invisible message about the existence of the port and the way thereto.

This double inter-working is the only link between the world of mortals and that of gods, heroes, and geniuses. Conscience is the internal organ, the path or the bridge, between the desire-frought mind of man and his Spirit-illumined Soul. The Divine Ego and the personal self are joined by conscience. From the lower side it stores the innumerable experiences gathered in the world of senses; into the higher it opens the Door to the Holy of Holies. The bridge lies inward, behind and beyond the jungle of the world, and leads to the garden of Eden.

The first requirement for the higher life is that a man should know himself. The starting point of self-knowledge is this internal organ called conscience whose "don'ts" must be heeded and ***while heeded must be understood.*** The paths are many; Muhammed's description is graphic—there are as many ways to God as there are breaths of the children of men. The conscience-organ represents the evolution of the past; it exists in the foolish as in the wise man; therefore its injunctions and modes of assistance differ for each. But feeble or strong it exists, and ***in each it is the starting point.*** Its first or protective help which warns us against repetition of old blunders makes for the discipline of ordinary life. The idea of what is proper in life is formulated by conscience which keeps us away from the pit-falls of the soul. Good people mostly live by "don'ts," because they live by the voice of conscience; it is well that they heed that voice, but that is not sufficient; they must probe and ascertain its why and wherefore. "It is not done," is conservatism and orthodoxy; a consideration of why it is not or should not be done liberalizes and then liberates. The higher life is a liberalizing pursuit. It is not merely repetitionary like ordinary life; it cannot be said of it ***labitur et labetur.***

The discipline of life reveals ideals—we live in a particular way because we aspire to live up to particular ideals. One's code of morals has a soul and a body—ideals are the Soul, and conduct forms the body. Scientific cultivation of conscience is the very first right step. Why shall a person not lie, nor steal, nor commit adultery? Why is it better to be generous than to be mean; why is it noble to be sympathetic and ignoble to be scornful? Why is cruelty bad and compassion good? These and like questions enable a man to know himself—his virtues and peccabilities. This enquiry leads him to the preparation for Second Birth. Strange as it may sound, there are

illegitimate twice-borns, and we have the phenomenon of the libertine genius, the voluptuary poet, the debauchee and drunkard who creates not in spite of, but because of, debauchery and drink. Eastern Occultism warns—beware of illegitimate ways; they lead to Abaddon.

The legitimate way to the inner life lies through Conscience—the Path of Communication. It is the fearless questioning of one's own beliefs, habits and hopes. We have to free our minds from all the ideas which we may have derived from heredity, from education, from surroundings, or from sundry teachers. This freeing of the mind from the bondage of acquired habits is spoken of in Eastern Occultism as the courting of the Soul, before the betrothal which is followed by the consummation of marriage. The period of courtship is full of adventures, mishaps, happinesses and dejections. It more often brings forth failure, as the rules of the subtle game of Soul-courtship are not observed, mostly because of ignorance, but sometimes because of the spirit of venture or self-opinionatedness or impatience. These three are the dangers in Soul-courtship. Do not be impatient; leave self behind, fight and overcome all obstacles not by spasmodic and fitful ventures, but by steady thinking and steadfast adherence to the rules of this most ancient of games. Just as a man's whole routine of life undergoes a change when he falls in love and goes a-courting, so also the moorings and discipline of life undergo a transformation when the Inner Enchanter is encountered. The glamours of sense, of mental deception, of selfish attachment are seen in their true light; a revision of discipline takes place; new modes of thought and of labour are perceived; above all, the beauty and the truth of things take new values. The result of the whole experience compels the man to give up more than one personal habit, such as practised in ordinary social life, and on the other hand to adopt some few ascetic rules.

. Conscience then is the first step.

THE WAY OF INTUITION

[**Hugh I'A. Fausset** writes on a subject near to his heart—a subject which has been discussed by scientists, philosophers and mystics and which affects the well-being of every one. His arguments and conclusions are reminiscent to a great extent of ideas presented so far back as 1877 by H. P. Blavatsky in her *Isis Unveiled*. We append a few extracts to show this.

Mr. Fausset's view that the western world has become increasingly stricken with a disease which he calls "exclusive and morbid development of one instrument of his being, his intellect," brings to mind a grave warning given in 1880 by a Theosophical Mahatma:—

> The intellectual portion of mankind seems to be fast dividing itself into two classes: the one unconsciously preparing for itself long periods of temporary annihilation or states of non-consciousness, owing to the deliberate surrender of intellect and its imprisonment in the narrow grooves of bigotry and superstition—a process which cannot fail to lead to the utter deformation of the intellectual principle; the other unrestrainedly indulging its animal propensities with the deliberate intention of submitting to annihilation pure and simple, in case of failure, and to millenniums of degradation after physical dissolution.—EDS.]

One of the most notable symptoms of the reaction against the exclusive rationalism of modern science is to be found in the amount of attention which is being given to-day to the faculties of Instinct and Intuition. That the two terms are so frequently and indiscriminately linked together betrays in itself the confused condition in which the Western world finds itself in this age of transition. Yet there is much that is hopeful even in this confusion, not only because there *is* a vital relation between these two faculties, but because the hunger for a more real state of being than the divided consciousness allows, which dictates the attempt to renew and replenish the primary instincts, must ultimately lead to a realisation that the only possible return to nature for self-conscious man is through the unfolding in him and establishment of intuition. When, in short, man has become divided in himself through the exclusive and morbid development of one instrument of his being, his intellect (and the whole Western world since the Renaissance, apart from a few backward regions, has become increasingly stricken with this disease), he reaches eventually a condition of inward death and discord from which either he must be reborn into a new life and consciousness, or die slowly and painfully of a cancerous growth. But for most men it is easier to look back than forward. Hence the number of mentally tortured men, who think with Whitman that they could turn and live with animals. And there is a truth in their desperate recoil from a diseased humanity to the health of the subhuman. For on his unconscious level the animal has unity and it is a spiritual

unity. As a creature he obeys the Creative Will; his instincts are wholly submissive to that Eternal Mind which transcends the human dichotomy of intellect and instinct. But in the animal, as in the plant, that Mind and Will manifest themselves at an elementary level. And it is a level to which no man in whom self-consciousness has awoken can return. In man, as he develops, the creative unity is broken up. He falls into dualism and it is through this dualism that he becomes conscious of himself. But it is not of his true Self, of the eternal I AM, that he at first becomes conscious, but of the instruments of that true Self, his physical and rational faculties. In him the Eternal Mind no longer rules unconsciously the instincts. It evolves instead the intellect as a special function of Itself and one that is complementary to that of instinct. Through the intellect man knows consciously both himself and reality in their material form; through instinct he identifies himself unconsciously with the life spirit, which seeks materialisation. Ideally these two faculties are mutually adapted and necessary to each other. They are, when creatively harmonised, the instruments of the Eternal Spirit potential in all men and purposing through human evolution a completer realisation of Itself. But the necessity of self-knowledge and the freedom of will, which are the conditions of man's advance towards spiritual realisation, involve at first a fall from that elementary state of spiritual unity in which the purely instinctive creature lives. The spiritual bond is weakened, if not broken. *In learning to know himself, man loses the secret of being more than himself.* In discovering and exploring his singularity, he forgets his essential identity, and this both in his own inward being and in his relation to the universe. He is no longer at home in the world nor at peace within himself. If he thinks, his thought is not vitally related to his being, while if he seeks to renew his vitality by a blind surrender to instinct, he finds after repeated failures that such surrender is no longer possible to him. For the intellect which he strives to submerge is tenacious in its resistance. With the subtlety of the serpent it poisons the fruit that he would unthinkingly absorb. It closes against him the channel of either impersonal or super-personal ecstasy, and offers him instead only enervating thrills of pleasure. Because the two faculties of intellect and instinct have become for him material ends, instead of spiritual means, he can only alternate between barren thought and sterile sensation. But a way can be found out of this prison. It is found by some men only when the inward struggle has been so intense and so protracted that they can sustain it no longer. The intolerable tension breaks, or rather they are broken and, no longer able to possess life and themselves through mental asser-

tion or sensuous gratification, they surrender to the Spirit which is beyond human thought and feeling but which can enter into these and fulfil them in unity. This is the way of Conversion, but if it is a true conversion, the sudden moment of surrender is only a starting point. It is a convulsive rebirth out of death into creative life; but the new being may be lost. It must not only be allowed to grow; it must be nourished, shaped, and consolidated. Nor need the prison-walls of self be broken down by such a violent convulsion. That conversion of this kind has been so common in the West, so infrequent in the East, is not so much due, as a recent Christian writer on the subject has suggested, to "low moral standards, apparently acquiesced in by Hinduism and other religions, which weaken the sense of self-value," as to the vicious individualism which the West has mistaken for a true sense of self-value and with which even the Christian churches have been infected. The infrequency in fact of violent conversion in the East has been due in large measure to its deeper spiritual wisdom. The Eastern Sages have not only possessed a finer psychological insight into the laws of being, but they have constantly emphasised the truth, both in their teaching and their practice, that *the spiritual life, like the physical, is one of organic growth through ascending degrees of self-realisation.* The way out of the prison of the lower self need not in fact be one of rupture. It can be a way of knowledge, cultivated, controlled, and directed, so that the faculties of the lower man can be gradually shaped and tempered to fulfil his higher need, to receive and transmit more and more light from the source of all light, until that final stage of illumination is approached in which "we shall know, even as we are known".

This is the way of Intuition. For intuition is not, as it is so generally conceived in the West, a fortuitous and uncontrollable faculty, a happy gift of second-sight. Those flashes of divination which all of us have experienced in moments of exaltation, that dream-like vividness and splendour which invested the world of childhood but too often fades "into the common light of day," were the radiations of an Eternal Sun. The artist who breaks through the conventional ways of looking at things and unveils the reality within is living, at least momentarily, in the light of that Sun; while the whole purpose of the Mystic is so to cultivate his being that in every act and thought and feeling he may radiate that light with a steady constancy.

The fact, however, that the West has begun to realize the significance of intuition as a creative faculty is due less perhaps to the artists or the mystics than to a philosopher. For in the writings of Bergson all those who were reacting against the intellectual self-sufficiency of modern science found a convincing justi-

fication. No philosopher has demonstrated with more cogency and charm the relativity of an exclusively intellectual approach to truth. Reality to Bergson is neither solid matter nor thinking mind, but living evolution. It is an unceasing becoming, and we perceive it; not by an intellectual act such as that by which we perceive objects around us and their relations in time and space, but by a direct inner perceiving, an intuition. We know reality by becoming an active centre of this universal flow.

But although Bergson has brilliantly disproved the dualism of matter and mind, while his conception of life as a continual new creation and his insistence that we are free only when our acts spring from our whole personality are finally true, he has never attempted of course to suggest how this intuitive consciousness may be realised. Moreover his conception of "the flow" and the emphasis which he lays upon the process of "becoming" are at times definitely misleading. While doing so much to liberate Western thought from the mechanism of intellect, he has tended to tie it to the vitalism of instinct. Life, he has insisted, is unceasing change. Its apparent immobility is only the temporary equilibrium of incessant action and reaction, as in the electric charges of which the atom consists. Consequently for him duration, change and movement are the whole and only reality, and knowing is a means not an end. It is for the sake of action. The emphasis which Bergson lays upon incessant movement and action as the reality of which all life consists is central to his philosophy. But however satisfactory it is as an explanation of the real nature of the physical world, it seems to me to simplify unduly and dangerously the problem of realising the spiritual life. At least for the individual who would tread the path of intuition it is not enough to say that reality does not lie within us in the mind nor without us in the world of things, but in life. For *Life itself must be evaluated if we are to avoid falling into a merely phenomenal flux*. Life is not ours; it is given to us. In this sense it is the only reality. But according as we condition ourselves to receive the gift, we perceive and manifest its reality. And the purer our response to life becomes, the more disinterestedly we embody it in our consciousness, the more sure we are that change and action are only the outward expression of changelessness and inaction, and that both knowledge and action are ultimately a means to being. Being is the end as it is the origin of all life. From a Spiritual centre we have been born into a revolving universe and our destiny is to return to that centre by realising it in ourselves. And only when we have firmly reëstablished it, when we rest upon it even in our most strenuous actions, can we go out to any point in life's circumference without losing our integrity, or partake of life abundantly without a waste of spirit. It is by recognising and gradually adjusting our

mental and physical faculties to that creative centre of vibrant stillness that we learn the secret of intuition and possess it, not in momentary and tantalising flashes, but as an abiding light. To recognise the Eternal Spirit within us is the first essential. And recognition can only come through an abandonment of egotism with its conflicting faculties of sense and thought, and a reawakening, through inward contemplation, of the essential self which is at one with the spiritual source of all Being and which, when fully awakened, transforms the physical faculties from agents of death into organs of life.

It is thus only through selflessness that the true Self can be realised, and because love, disinterested work, and the desire to understand all involve an abandonment of the lower self, all may lead to and further recognition. Every effort to increase and enhance what is positive in ourselves and to transmute what is negative into a positive quality, relates us more closely to the Creative Spirit and enables it to work more fertilely within us. In this sense every moment of our lives is in reality a new creation, as Bergson writes. But the way of intuition is not a mere surrender to the *élan vital*. It is an expressive concentration of the Eternal Spirit in an individual and finely tempered consciousness, until every impulse springs from this centre, until the knowledge that life and truth are given to us becomes so real that we too desire to possess nothing for ourselves but only to give. To attain to this height of selfhood and selflessness is doubtless beyond most of us. But every gleam of intuition points the way towards it and to that wholeness of being and inner freedom which come of obedience to the creative inspiration of life. For intuition is not an accidental faculty. It is the sum of all other faculties and their coördination in a higher unity. And it may be cultivated and made constant by those who will study the laws which govern it and strive patiently and unceasingly to quicken the Spirit within them.

HUGH I'A. FAUSSET

Reason, which, as Cabanis says, develops only at the expense and loss of natural instinct, is a Chinese wall slowly rising on the soil of sophistry, and which finally shuts out man's spiritual perceptions of which the instinct is one of the most important examples. Arrived at certain stages of physical prostration, when mind and the reasoning faculties seem paralysed through weakness and bodily exhaustion, instinct—the spiritual *unity* of the five senses—sees, hears, feels, tastes, and smells, unimpaired by either time or space. What do we know of the exact limits of mental action? How can a physician take upon himself to distinguish the imaginary from the real senses in a man who may be living a spiritual life, in a body so exhausted of its usual vitality that it actually is unable to prevent the soul from *oozing* out from its prison?

H. P. BLAVATSKY, *Isis Unveiled* I, 145

Macaulay's Blackfoot Indian is more to be trusted than the most instructed and developed reason, as regards man's *inner* sense which assures him of his immortality. Instinct is the universal endowment of nature by the Spirit of the Deity itself; reason the slow development of our physical constitution, an evolution of our adult material brain. Instinct, as a divine spark, lurks in the unconscious nerve-centre of the ascidian mollusk, and manifests itself at the first stage of action of its nervous system as what the physiologist terms the reflex action. It exists in the lowest classes of the acephalous animals as well as in those that have distinct heads; it grows and develops according to the law of the double evolution, physically and spiritually; and entering upon its conscious stage of development and progress in the cephalous species already endowed with a sensorium and symmetrically-arranged ganglia, this reflex action, whether men of action term it *automatic*, as in the lowest species, or *instinctive*, as in the more complex organisms which act under the guidance of the sensorium and the stimulus originating in distinct sensation, is still one and the same thing. It is the *divine instinct* in its ceaseless progress of development. This instinct of the animals, which act from the moment of their birth each in the confines prescribed to them by nature, and which know how, save in accident proceeding from a higher instinct than their own, to take care of themselves unerringly—this instinct may, for the sake of exact definition, be termed automatic; but it must have either within the animal which possesses it or *without*, something's or some one's *intelligence* to guide it.

Ibid. I. 425

Logic shows us that as all matter had a common origin, it must have attributes in common, and as the vital and divine spark is in man's material body, so it must lurk in every subordinate species. The latent mentality which, in the lower kingdoms is recognized as semi-consciousness, consciousness, and instinct, is largely subdued in man. Reason, the outgrowth of the physical brain, develops at the expense of instinct—the flickering reminiscence of a once divine omniscience—spirit. Reason, the badge of the sovereignty of physical man over all other physical organisms, is often put to shame by the instinct of an animal. As his brain is more perfect than that of any other creature, its emanations must naturally produce the highest results of mental action; but reason avails only for the consideration of material things; it is incapable of helping its possessor to a knowledge of spirit. In losing instinct, man loses his intuitional powers which are the crown and ultimatum of instinct. Reason is the clumsy weapon of the scientist—intuition the unerring guide of the seer. Instinct teaches plant and animal their seasons for the procreation of their species, and guides the dumb brute to find his appropriate remedy in the hour of sickness. Reason—the pride of man—fails to check the propensities of his matter, and brooks no restraint upon the unlimited gratification of his senses. Far from leading him to be his *own* physician, its subtile sophistries lead him too often to his own destruction.

Ibid. I. 433

Like everything else which has its origin in psychological mysteries, instinct has been too long neglected in the domain of science. "We see what indicated the way to man to find relief for all his physical ailings," says Hippocrates. "It is the instinct of the earlier races, when cold reason had not as yet obscured man's inner vision. . . . . Its indication must never be disdained, for it is to instinct alone that we owe our first remedies." Instantaneous and unerring cognition of an omniscient mind, instinct is in everything unlike the finite reason; and in the tentative progress of the latter, the god-like nature of man is often utterly engulfed, whenever he shuts out from himself the divine light of intuition. The one crawls, the other flies; reason is the power of the man, intuition the prescience of the woman!

Ibid. I. 434

THE STUDY OF PHILOSOPHY IN INDIA TO-DAY

[**Professor A. R. Wadia**, President of the Indian Philosophical Congress is the Director of Public Instruction in the progressive Indian state ruled by the deservedly respected Maharaja of Mysore.

Our readers will do well to read our Editorial Notes in THE ARYAN PATH of February and of October 1931; for, our author examines and criticises views presented there in this able article. We cannot attempt a full answer here, and further, before doing so ourselves, we should like to see the subject discussed by others of the same distinction as our author, and with the same judicious reasoning.—EDS.]

Philosophy is generally regarded as too technical a subject to interest the general reader, and proceedings of philosophical congresses are apt to be passed by in silence. Hence the interest evinced by the editors of THE ARYAN PATH in the presidential addresses at the last session of the All India Philosophical Congress is all the more encouraging and prompts me to write on the study of philosophy in India to-day.

If philosophy means love of truth and a man in the East *qua* man does not differ from a man in the the West, it follows that philosophy can know no geographical limitations. Philosophy by its very essence must be universal or it ceases to be philosophy. When we talk of Indian philosophy and European philosophy it cannot mean that there is one philosophic truth in India and another in Europe. The difference can only be in this, that the former has been developed by Indians and the latter by Europeans. The truth in either must be universal, and given opportunities of contact there is bound to be reciprocal influence. It is, however, true that a difference in environment and a difference in history leave behind their traces even on so universal a subject as philosophy or religion.

I

There are a few well marked differences between philosophy as developed in India and in Europe. The first difference is to be found in the method of approach to philosophical problems. It was India's good fortune that very early in her philosophic career the Upanishads came to be developed and have served as a veritable reservoir of inspiration to all succeeding generations. To determine their exact date is a task well nigh impossible. But it has been recognised by even the orthodox that they did not see the light of day all at the same time or that they all are the work of one mind. They have grown silently and imperceptibly, as things in India will grow, for the lure of historical immortality does not play any great part in the Hindu mind. They have sprung from different minds separated at times by centuries. Under the very circumstances of their birth they were bound to be different in their contents, and it is certainly doubtful if they present

as unified a system of thought as the editorial comments in THE ARYAN PATH seem to imply. It is equally true that the Upanishads do not present a closely reasoned-out system of thought. They are rather the deliverances of advanced souls, as much mystical and poetical as philosophical. They constitute a mine of profound truths, which a seeker after truth will not find ready-made, but will have to travail for through years of striving.

The very greatness of the Upanishads has prevented a free growth of philosophic thought. They have carried their authority through the ages and no first rate Indian thinker has dared to go beyond them. They and the *Gita* have become the alpha and omega of Indian thought. Even intellectual giants like Sankara and Ramanuja have been content to develop their thought in the humble guise of mere commentaries on the old inherited wealth of Upanishadic experience. This has given a certain unity to the history of philosophy in India, for Vedanta has been the only live force for centuries, while other systems of thought had their brief span of existence and live only in books. This has not been altogether an advantage for India. The time when the Samkya and the Mimamsas and the Buddhistic schools, and even the atheistic Charvakas flourished showed that there was living thought in India. People then had the courage to think and start new lines of thought. But once Vedanta became supreme, the freshness of philosophic endeavour lost its edge and philosophy became dogmatic till it has now become a matter of inheritance like goods and chattels.

European philosophy started with very humble beginnings. Nobody developed a cut and dried system of thought. Its very puerility in Thales and his like stimulated thought generation after generation, till the endeavours of some three centuries blossomed forth in the triune genius of Socrates, Plato and Aristotle. They have stamped on all European philosophy three distinctive features. First, an uncompromising challenge to all authority as such. Man shall think. Reason shall be his only guide, and in the history of pure thought Socrates has been the greatest martyr. Secondly: the search after truth shall be supreme; truth before friendship, declared Aristotle, and it continues a living truth in Europe even to-day. Thirdly: the love of truth shall not estrange any man from his duty to living men. Plato laid a burden on the philosophers of his *Republic* that they shall not lose themselves in their selfish enjoyment of knowledge, but that they shall return to the world and be prepared to give the benefit of their knowledge to their fellow men. And yet practical considerations were not to affect the ideal of knowledge for the sake of knowledge. The fruits of knowledge may be shared by all, but the pursuit of knowledge has to be

disinterested, has to be just for itself. That is why in Europe a number of most important discoveries have been made in a most casual fashion. The scientist of to-day, as the philosopher of every age, has only one aim: Knowledge. Hence, while in India the approach to philosophy has been for several centuries from the standpoint of intuited truth as formulated in the Upanishads and the *Gita*, the approach to philosophy in Europe has been through the reason of the individual bent on discovering knowledge through a disinterested pursuit of it. Knowledge for the sake of knowledge: that has been the guiding inspiration in the West. It is here that we find the second most profound difference between the thought of India and of Europe.

The European philosophers have always aimed at knowledge: their main purpose has been to understand the universe. The Indian philosopher has aimed at *mukti*, which has been generally translated into English as realisation. The European temperament on the whole has been a joyous one except where the Christian sense of suffering has been emphasised by the mystics or a stray thinker like Schopenhauer. It has believed that the world on the whole has been worth living in, and as it has not accepted the theory of karma—exceptions apart—there has been in them no incentive to be rid of the cycle of births and deaths. It is content just to know more and more of the secrets of the universe, including Deity or the Absolute. To know, to understand: that is the sum and substance of the philosophic venture in the West. It is this attitude which leaves even the most earnest Indian student of Western philosophy somewhat cold and positively discontented, for through the ages he has wanted something much more concrete than mere knowledge from a study of philosophy. In other words philosophy in India is not merely speculative, it is essentially pragmatic, not in the American sense of what works in this work-a-day world, but in the sense of what works in terms of eternal liberation.

From these distinctively different approaches to philosophy there arises a third vital difference which manifests itself in the opposed attitudes of philosophy to religion in Europe and in India. From the beginning of European philosophy the Greek temperament in its unaided effort to think came into sharp conflict with the mythological religion of the populace. Very early Xenophanes had the courage to write:—

> Yes, and if oxen and horses or lions had hands, and could paint with their hands, and produce works of art as men do, horses would paint the forms of the gods like horses, and oxen like oxen, and make their bodies in the image of their several kinds.
>
> The Ethiopians make their gods black and snub-nosed; the Thracians say theirs have blue eyes and red hair.

In the spirit of a philosopher he wrote about "one God, the greatest amongst gods and men, neither in form like unto mortals nor in

thought". This conflict came to a head in Socrates. In his struggle against the lascivious in the religion of his day he died a martyr to the spirit of philosophy, so gloriously immortalised by Plato in his *Apology*. To this spirit philosophy in Europe has kept true except in the Middle Ages when philosophy was content to play second fiddle to religion, but a religion not debased as in Greece, but as exalted as religion can be within the limits of a highly organised church. Thinkers like Bacon and Descartes and Leibnitz and even Locke thought it best to keep on the right side of the forces of religion, but in the course of their thought they disdained to base their arguments on the dogmas of the Church. With the growth of toleration and a spirit of free inquiry in many cases philosophers have boldly gone their way, whether their teaching made religion possible or impossible. Freedom of thought may produce its free thinkers and its atheists, but they were men bold and fearless in the pursuit of what they conceived to be truth. It was not for nothing that J. S. Mill earned the title of the Saint of Rationalism and gained the respect of so avowedly narrow a churchman as Gladstone. But it would be a mistake to imagine, as many do in their ignorance, that Western philosophy is all atheism or materialism. It has its spiritual peaks. It has its prophets who by their thought have elevated mankind—I say mankind advisedly for recently their thought has affected, apart from Europe and America, not merely India but even free countries like Japan and China, Turkey and Persia.

In India philosophy has grown out of religion as embodied in the Vedas, of which the Upanishads are taken to be a part. Philosophy taking the form of a commentary on the Vedas shares in the religious character of the Vedas. Apparently there is no room for conflict and if ever the conclusions of philosophy have tended to militate against the cherished religious convictions of the orthodox masses as in Sankara, the conflict has not taken an open form, for it has been nullified by the esoteric view of philosophic truth as something so sacred that it can be looked in the face only by the *élite*, who have by a long series of births so developed their *atman* that they alone have the *adhikara* to rise above religion and be pure philosophers. It is he, the *gnyani*, that by his intuition can bear witness to the inner meaning of the Upanishadic or Gitaic truth, which lies embedded beneath crusts of ritual and formulæ. Not reason, but intuition becomes the instrument for the discovery of the highest truth.

II

The discerning cannot fail to see the strong points and weak points of European and Indian philosophy alike. In the former there is an overweening faith in the capacity of reason to solve all problems. This has had the defect that many have confined reason

to the domain of the material and have deliberately clipped its wings so that it dare not soar beyond the physical. Even among those, who are known as Idealists, there is just a belief in Deity or in the Absolute. In India on the other hand all materialism has been driven out, but philosophy has become stereotyped, dogmatic. Seers talk of their intuitions, but the intuitions of the Advaitin, Visista-advaitin and the Dvaitin differ so radically as to make an appeal to reason absolutely inevitable. Reason may be scoffed at, but in the last resort it is the only barrier against superstitions, dogmatisms, and even intuitions. Emphasise mere intuition and you open the flood-gates of quackery and charlatanism. And who will deny that the soul of India has been poisoned through the ages by the uncritical worship of the saffron robe and surrender of reason to the dogmatism of seers as of theologies? For one Ramakrishna of gold there are a thousand pinchbeck sadhus, who thrive on the sweat and the credulity of the masses.

Philosophy in India had come to that stage when it had become stagnant: the same old problems, the same old answers went their weary way through centuries. Conquerors came and went. India changed, but her changing needs met no response from philosophy except to smother all disquieting questions by dismissing empires and exploitation and poverty alike as mere maya: in eternity time does not matter. Is the notoriously benumbing poverty of India the result of this philosophy, as is generally supposed, or is this philosophy the result of dire poverty, as Dr. Will Durant will have us believe? Whichever view is correct it is not possible to be blind to the fact that India is poor and a beggar in the comity of nations. If philosophy can contribute its mite to a change for the better, should it not do so? But where is the energy to come from? It has been supplied by the West, and not the least potent force in this is the Western emphasis on reason, which with all its limitations is yet the only solvent of all the accretions of centuries.

III

Universities in India have admittedly been very imperfect instruments of culture, but with all their faults they have opened out new visions which, but for them, would not have helped to create a new India. The exclusive emphasis on western culture which our universities till lately enforced had at least the effect of shaking up our lethargy, and European philosophy in all its phases has created a new zest for thought which is finding vent in the All India Philosophical Congress. Considering the soil from which it has sprung there is nothing surprising in its conscious and unconscious emphasis on western modes of thought, especially at a time when the East and the West are but relative terms in their physical and cultural import. The editors of this journal plead for a place for the

pundits in the fold of the Philosophical Congress. After all the frank admission of the shortcomings of the Punditic mind that the editors themselves have made, what is left of their importance to the Congress? Nothing but massive learning, dogmatic and uncritical. They have their use. The discerning will tap them as valuable sources of information and knowledge, but in themselves unless and until they pass through the purgatory of fearless criticism of their dogmas at the hands of reason they have no place as thinkers. But I entirely appreciate the zeal of the editors for Indian thought, and in fact this was the burden of my presidential address last year. The Congress has great work to do in the resuscitation of the time-honoured Indian genius for thought, and reviving or establishing truths not as dead formulæ, but as living truths.

A. R. WADIA

The reasonableness of *Conscious* Existence can be proved only by the study of the primeval—now esoteric—philosophy. And it says "there is neither death nor life, for both are illusions; being (or *be-ness*) is the only reality." This paradox was repeated thousands of ages later by one of the greatest physiologists that ever lived. "Life is Death" said Claude Bernard. The organism lives because its parts are ever dying. The survival of the fittest is surely based on this truism. The life of the superior whole requires the death of the inferior, the death of the parts depending on and being subservient to it. And, as life is death, so death is life, and the whole great cycle of lives form but ONE EXISTENCE—*the worst day of which is on our planet.* He who KNOWS will make the best of it. For there is a dawn for every being, when once freed from illusion and ignorance by Knowledge; and he will at last proclaim in truth *and all Consciousness* to Mahamaya:—

"BROKEN THY HOUSE IS, AND THE RIDGE-POLE SPLIT!
DELUSION FASHIONED IT!
SAFE PASS I THENCE—DELIVERANCE TO OBTAIN."

H. P. BLAVATSKY, *Lucifer*. Vol. I, p. 119

ONE HUNDRED YEARS OF SCIENCE

THOUGHTS ON THE CENTENARY CELEBRATION

[**J. W. N. Sullivan** plays an important part in popularizing abstruse and difficult scientific theories and ideas for the British public. Among his books, *Three Men Discuss Relativity; Aspects of Science: Second Series; Galileo or The Tyranny of Science*, have attracted much attention. *The Contemporary Mind* will be published shortly.

In the following article he deals with the trend of modern science which, as our readers will see, is in the direction of Theosophy and Occultism. In that connection we draw their attention to a letter from a qualified scientist who has culled from H. P. B.'s *Secret Doctrine* telling and thought-provoking quotations to show how she wrote over fifty years ago what General Smuts puts forth as the most recent findings of Modern Science.—EDS.]

The last hundred years has witnessed the greatest change in the scientific outlook that has taken place since the time of Newton. Indeed, it is the greatest change that has ever taken place since science became a coherent and definite body of thought. The typically materialistic scientific outlook has always been based chiefly on the science of physics. Astronomy, by demonstrating the material insignificance of the earth, has also contributed an element, and the biological theory of evolution, in its attempt to show that man might have originated and developed by a mechanical and purposeless process, also played a very important part in the formation of scientific materialism. But the chief backing of this theory was always provided by the science of physics. The idea that matter is the sole ultimate reality, and that the universe is strictly determined—the "iron laws" of the Victorians—arose from the science of physics. Other sciences were not in a position to demonstrate the exact correspondences that determinism required. The fact that the change that has come over the scientific outlook is due precisely to physics, is, therefore, of fundamental importance. The new ideas do not originate from some shadowy borderland of scientific speculation; they originate in the very heart of the severest and most exact of the sciences.

In considering the change that has come over science during the last hundred years it happens to be quite convenient to go back exactly one hundred years, and to start with Faraday's discovery of electro-magnetic induction in 1831. The essential characteristic of Faraday's achievement, from our present point of view, was that he showed that so-called empty space is an active and important agent in the scientific scheme. The mathematicians of Faraday's time believed that electrical effects were produced by "action at a distance". An electrified body was supposed to influence another body at a

distance "directly". Space merely played the rôle of separating the bodies. Gravitation, then and for long afterwards, was supposed to act in a similar way. But to Faraday space was not a mere vacuity; he saw it as a medium uniting the two bodies and transmitting the electrical effects from one to the other. In his imagination it was filled with "lines of force," with stresses and strains. A so-called "isolated" electrified body, according to Faraday, influences the whole of space.

For some time the mathematicians ignored Faraday's profound vision. This was partly due to the fact that he expressed himself in unorthodox language, for Faraday was entirely ignorant of mathematical technique. He could not, himself, give his ideas mathematical expression. But in the same year that Faraday discovered electromagnetic induction James Clerk Maxwell was born, a mathematician who had an imagination akin to Faraday's own. In 1856, when Maxwell was twenty-five, he gave his first mathematical interpretation of Faraday's ideas. Subsequent development, where these ideas were investigated ever more profoundly, culminated in his enunciation of the electromagnetic theory of light, the greatest physical discovery of the nineteenth century. It was established that electric and magnetic effects are propagated from point to point through space, that these effects are propagated in the form of waves, that these waves travel with the velocity of light, and that light itself is one particular form of these waves. Maxwell died before the scientific world realised what he had done. Some years later, in 1886, Hertz succeeded in experimentally producing Maxwell's electromagnetic waves. As a bye-product of this research we have wireless telegraphy and telephony.

The problem of "space" now became acute. Already, before the period we have been considering, it had been accepted that space is filled with an "ether," a sort of material medium stretching to the farthest star. This medium was invented in order to explain the propagation of light. But now that light had been shown to be an electromagnetic phenomenon, the whole question had to be investigated anew. The old ether theory was shown to be unsatisfactory. Entirely new ethers were designed, but none of them could be made to work. The problem of the ether threatened to be insoluble. This was the state of affairs when Einstein published his first Relativity paper in 1905. At one stroke he resolved all the difficulties—or, rather, showed that men of science had been concerning themselves with pseudo-problems,—but only at the cost of revolutionising our ideas of space and time. Space and time, it now appeared, are merely aspects of a more fundamental reality. This reality, in technical phraseology, is the four-dimensional continuum. Neither space nor time exists separately and "objectively" in Nature. They

are man-made to the extent that observers with different motions split up the four-dimensional reality, which is always one and the same, into different spaces and times. The further development of this theory reveals to us an ever more abstract world. Not only space and time, but even matter, are seen to be aspects of the four-dimensional continuum. If these further developments are confirmed it will appear that, so far as the material universe is concerned, the four-dimensional continuum is the one reality, and that everything else arises as a consequence of the mind's selective action on this raw material.

We see that a great change has taken place. The analysis of space has led, as one consequence, to the dethronement of matter from its position as a fundamental, *ultimate* reality. But a second great line of research can be traced through the last hundred years and we shall see that a somewhat similar position has been reached by the direct analysis of matter itself. The theory that matter consists of atoms, each chemical element having its own kind of atom, had been put forth as a definite scientific theory early in the nineteenth century. These atoms were regarded as small, hard, and probably spherical particles—the ultimate, simple units out of which all matter is built. But even as early as 1864 there were indications that the atoms were not so simple. Curious similarities between various chemical elements roused the suspicion that atoms have a structure, and that they are constructed on some sort of recurrent plan. This suspicion remained a suspicion until 1895.

Between 1895 and 1900 took place that extraordinary series of experimental researches which have completely revolutionized our ideas of matter. By passing an electric discharge through a vacuum tube the existence was demonstrated of tiny electrified bodies nearly two thousand times smaller than the lightest known atom—the hydrogen atom. It was immediately conjectured that these tiny electrified bodies, called electrons, were the ultimate constituents of matter. During the same period X-rays were discovered, and Radium, with its marvellous and unprecedented properties, was isolated. The ground was prepared for the construction of the modern electrical theory of matter. It is this theory that takes us into the most interesting and the most baffling regions of modern science, and which has necessitated a complete revolution in the scientific outlook.

The first shock came when it was found that the electrons were *nothing but* electricity! They were not little particles of "ordinary" matter carrying electric charges—they were little particles of electricity. Since matter is built up of electrons, it follows that matter is electricity. This was a difficult idea to grasp. It seemed to rob matter of all substantiality. We had to make our notions of matter more abstract. The notion of "substance" had to

be replaced by the notion of "behaviour". Anything that behaved like matter was matter. A further shock was experienced when it was found that the electrons in the interior of an atom do not obey the established laws of nature. It was found, however, that the electrons do obey the extraordinary and enigmatic laws of the Quantum Theory, deduced from the phenomena of heat radiation by Planck in 1900. These laws cannot be "understood" but they can be used for the purposes of calculation. On the basis of these laws it seemed that science could now give in a formal and mathematical fashion, at any rate, a detailed description of the structure of the atom. This hope proved to be illusory. Experiment did not confirm calculation. Within the last three or four years entirely new and very strange concepts have had to be introduced. Matter, instead of being the solid, substantial, familiar object of experience, turns out to be the most elusive entity with which science has ever concerned itself.

The ultimate constituent of matter, the electron, seems to possess, at one and the same time, two contradictory properties. It is both a wave and a particle. In certain experiments it behaves as a particle; in other experiments it behaves as a system of waves. It has been suggested that the aspect of the electron as a particle is merely the way our mind translates its nature as a wave system—analogous to the way we translate the molecular vibrations of a hot body into the sensation of hotness. But this suggestion, difficult enough in itself, becomes still more difficult when we examine in detail the wave theory of matter. For it appears that every electron requires a three-dimensional space to itself. Two electrons cannot exist in a space of less than six dimensions; three electrons require nine dimensions, and so on. It seems impossible to take these multi-dimensional spaces seriously. Yet *experiment* shows that electrons have the characteristics of wave systems. It seems evident that science has here stumbled on results that it cannot yet make into a coherent system. Matter, at present, baffles comprehension. Perhaps some further extraordinary revision of our notions of space and time will be necessary before the nature of matter can be understood.

Another, and very important result, that has emerged from this recent analysis, is the so-called Uncertainty Principle. It states, briefly, that strict causality cannot be established for the ultimate processes of nature. We can never, by means of observations, show that the universe is strictly determined. The reason for this is that the mere act of observing these processes interferes with them in an unpredictable way. If, therefore, nature is strictly determined, we shall never be able to discover it. Is there any advantage, then, in postulating strict determinism? Some scientific men not only reject an undiscoverable determinism, but

insist that something like free-will must be put at the basis of natural phenomena.

It will be seen that the change that has come over the scientific outlook is truly fundamental. At the beginning of our hundred years it was generally held that matter, space and time were the fundamental realities and that the universe was strictly determined. We now know that neither matter, space, nor time are fundamental. Science is in touch with a reality that lies behind them, but science tells us nothing of the nature of this reality. All it can do, in its mathematical language, is to tell us something about its structure. And even the doctrine of causality, the leading principle of science from its beginning, is now in process of being abandoned. The last hundred years has witnessed by far the greatest revolution that has ever occurred in scientific thought.

J. W. N. SULLIVAN

So far as Science remains what in the words of Prof. Huxley it is, viz., "organized common sense"; so far as its inferences are drawn from accurate premises—its generalizations resting on a purely inductive basis—every Theosophist and Occultist welcomes respectfully and with due admiration its contributions to the domain of cosmological law. There can be no possible conflict between the teachings of occult and so-called exact Science, where the conclusions of the latter are grounded on a substratum of unassailable fact. It is only when its more ardent exponents, over-stepping the limits of observed phenomena in order to penetrate into the arcana of Being, attempt to wrench the formation of Kosmos and its *living* Forces from Spirit, and attribute all to blind matter, that the Occultists claim the right to dispute and call in question their theories. Science cannot, owing to the very nature of things, unveil the mystery of the universe around us. Science can, it is true, collect, classify, and generalize upon phenomena; but the occultist, arguing from admitted metaphysical data, declares that the daring explorer, who would probe the inmost secrets of Nature, must transcend the narrow limitations of sense, and transfer his conclusions into the region of noumena and the sphere of primal causes. To effect this, he must develop faculties which are absolutely dormant—save in a few rare and exceptional cases—in the constitution of the off-shoots of our present Fifth Root-race in Europe and America. He can in no other conceivable manner collect the facts on which to base his speculations. Is this not apparent on the principles of Inductive Logic and Metaphysics alike?

—H. P. BLAVATSKY, *The Secret Doctrine* I, 477–8

THE LIFE OF THE SOUL ACCORDING TO JESUS

[**Benjamin Wisner Bacon, D. D., Litt. D. (Oxon)**, is a veteran theologian who has been publishing books and contributing to periodicals on his special subject for forty years. Since 1897 he has been Professor of New Testament Criticism and Exegesis at Yale University. Our contributor is undoubtedly profoundly learned in the science of words and the deciphering of documents,—but there is something more; and we would not have our readers forget that there is a hidden side to the Gospels. In this connection we draw their attention to a series of articles which appeared in *Lucifer* (Nov. and Dec. 1887, Feb. 1888), from the pen of Madame H. P. Blavatsky, entitled "The Esoteric Character of the Gospels".—EDS.]

The question before us hinges almost exclusively upon another, a question of sources: What value are we to give to the Fourth Gospel in comparison with the other three called Synoptic, which in both elements, teaching and narrative, represent all we have of report derived at first or second hand from the Apostle Peter?

The Fourth Gospel, traditionally ascribed to the Apostle John, is anonymous, late, and dependent. There still remain, however, some conservative scholars, such as the veteran Zahn, who continue to maintain that this tradition of apostolic authorship (to the assertion of which the Fourth Gospel owes its acceptance to canonical standing) must be given consideration. Few indeed continue to assert that the evangelist's aim is to present historically the actual remembered sayings and doings of Jesus. All who to any extent have felt the pressure of modern critical argument admit that with the afflatus the Apostle, (if indeed in any real sense the author) had become, through lapse of years and changed environment at the close of the first century or beginning of the second, "another man". The evangelist is aiming not so much to report what he remembers Jesus to have said as to weave into more or less artificial dialogue with "the Jews" what Jesus *might* have said and done to meet the objections and heresies of the post-apostolic age.

In the Synoptic Gospels there is scarcely anything in which Jesus takes less concern than "the life of the soul". In the Fourth Gospel there is no subject in which he is more deeply concerned. If we rely mainly on Petrine tradition we shall conclude that a main element in Jesus' teaching was "Take no thought for your life (soul)." "Whosoever seeks to save his life (soul) loses it; whosoever is ready to lose his life (soul) for my sake and the gospel's shall save it." If we rely mainly on Johannine (?) tradition we shall conclude that the main object of Jesus' coming into the world was to reveal the true nature of "life" (meaning "the life of the soul" in distinction from mere bodily existence); and that the incarnation of himself as pre-existent Source of life was in order that believers might have it, have it in greater abundance, and have it eternally.

Before attempting to solve the question of what Jesus thought of the life of the soul one must first decide which of these two utterly irreconcilable representations of his teaching one will accept; or, if one insists upon according some degree of credibility to each, on what grounds the one or the other shall be preferred, and to what extent.

The verdict of critical opinion is not in doubt. By general consent Petrine tradition, however modified by adaptation to the needs of religious edification on various sermonic occasions (primeval tradition acknowledges this propensity), does aim to be true to historic fact. To what extent this can be said of Johannine tradition (if the Fourth Gospel be in any sense of the word "Johannine") is very much in dispute. To take it as reflecting to any appreciable extent the actual sayings of Jesus on its favourite theme of the life of the soul would violate every canon of historical judgment, especially when Synoptic (Petrine) tradition is so emphatic in declaring that Jesus always put first the social ideal of "the Kingdom (sovereignty) of God," and demanded the unconditional subordination to it of every personal interest including life itself. In contrast with this the Fourth Gospel never mentions "the kingdom of God" but once throughout its entire extent, and then only to say that something else is to be put first, *viz.*, "new birth from the Spirit". Without this, says Jesus to the Pharisee Nicodemus, no man can "see the kingdom of God".

Petrine tradition, as reported in the Gospel of Mark, our oldest and most reliable source, also depicts Jesus as confronted with the supreme question of the Pharisee: "What shall I do to have (soul) life?" A young man of great possessions comes running, kneeling to him to ask this all important question, hoping for some new rule of conduct by which the heavenly reward of "a share in the world to come" may be insured. Jesus offers no insurance of it at all. Not even renunciation of all one's possessions, not even the martyrdom faced by those who have taken up the cross will guarantee it. The future lies wholly in God's hands. The young man will be welcomed into the group of disciples on their way to Calvary if he will follow this advice: "Go, sell all that thou hast and give to the poor, and come, follow me." But that was not the Pharisee's idea of "eternal life".

Again, just before Calvary itself, Jesus is asked by the Sadducees concerning the Pharisees' hope of resurrection and the "life (of the soul) to come". He rejects the crudities of current apocalyptic teaching to fall back upon the Mosaic hope of a "kingdom of God". God did not bring Israel out of Egypt in order to reign like Pluto over a world of the dead. His promise to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, to be a God to their seed meant a living relation of persons to living persons. Jesus shared to this extent in the

Pharisees' hope for a life (of the soul) to come. He believed in "the kingdom of God". Just how much was implied in this belief he never undertook to say. Striking indeed is the contrast between his reverent silence regarding those heavenly rewards the righteous may expect in "the world to come" and the volubility of the apocalyptic writers. "Lo, we have left all and followed thee, what then shall we have?" clamour the twelve. The answer is "There is no man that has left all for my sake and the gospel's sake but shall receive a hundredfold *now, in this time*—together with persecutions—and in the world to come eternal life." But if we ask, Just what is implied in "eternal life"? there is no better answer than the Farewell to "his own" depicted by the fourth evangelist in his fourteenth chapter, the heart of "the heart of Christ". One would like to believe that there is more than devout imagination in that gentle deprecation "If it were not so I would have told you," wherewith apocalyptic dreams of the "many mansions" in the Father's house are set aside. Positive rejection of the Synoptic apocalypse, with its doom of Jerusalem and last assize, appears in Jesus' answer to Judas (not Iscariot) when he asks, "Lord, what is come to pass that thou wilt manifest thyself unto us and not unto the world?" In spite of the late date and Hellenistic propensities of this Ephesian evangelist one would like to believe that he is truly reflecting that doctrine of Inwardness which even in Synoptic teaching dominates Jesus' thought of the coming "kingdom (sovereignty) of God". If the Sermon on the Mount and the Lord's Prayer mean anything it is that in all Jesus' thought and action he "sought first the kingdom of God" and lived as he prayed "Thy kingdom come". This social ideal meant to him not externalities but the doing of the Father's will on earth even as it is done in heaven. It was first of all "within you". And Paul, oldest and best of witnesses, gives us reason to believe that to Jesus the kingdom of God was indeed "not eating and drinking, but righteousness and peace and joy in the Spirit of consecration". Perhaps then the Ephesian evangelist, follower of Apollos and Paul a generation later, has after all not gone so far astray in his attempt to depict the heart of the heart of Christ.

But we must return to our oldest and most authentic record. Mark knows neither Sermon on the Mount nor Lord's Prayer, yet he shows no less clearly than the underlying teaching source employed by Luke and the relatively late and Jewish-Christian First Gospel, how completely Jesus' thought of soul-life was dominated by this one principle: Inward control of the Father's will. At the very end of Jesus' public teaching Mark tells of a scribe who asked Jesus to define the essence of the Law. Jesus answered with the simplest teaching of Jewish religion, the Shem'a—utter, unreserved, unqualified, willing devotion to God

and His divine purpose for the world. To this as his summary of religion Jesus added his summary of ethics: Brotherly service to our fellow men. Mark's witness to the Recollections of Peter is very simple but sufficient. Whatever we conclude regarding Jesus' thought as to the life of the soul must be dominated, if we reason as historical critics, by this simple testimony. Jesus' one purpose was to achieve the sovereignty of his Father in heaven upon the earth. But he thought of that divine sovereignty as chiefly concerning the life of the soul.

B. W. BACON

The Gnostic Records contained the epitome of the chief scenes enacted during the mysteries of Initiation, since the memory of man; though even that was given out invariably under the garb of semi-allegory, whenever entrusted to parchment or paper. But the ancient Tanaïm, the Initiates from whom the wisdom of the Kabala (*oral tradition*) was obtained by the later Talmudists, had in their possession the secrets of the mystery language, and it is *in this language that the Gospels* were written. Thus while the three Synoptics display a combination of the pagan Greek and Jewish symbologies, the *Revelation* is written in the mystery language of the Tanaïm—the relic of Egyptian and Chaldean wisdom—and St. John's Gospel is purely Gnostic. He alone who has mastered the esoteric cypher of antiquity—the secret meaning of the numerals, a common property at one time of all nations—has the full proof of the genius which was displayed in the blending of the purely Egypto-Jewish, Old Testament allegories and names, and those of the pagan-Greek Gnostics, the most refined of all the mystics of that day.

H. P. BLAVATSKY, *Lucifer* Vol. I, p. 493

FROM AUTHORITY TO INSPIRATION

[**Lawrence Hyde** is the author of two remarkable books: *The Learned Knife, An Essay on Science and Human Values* (1928) and *The Prospects of Humanism* (1931). He is at present engaged on a third volume, dealing with the problem of Modern Religion.

In this article our author may be said to be chronicling the net result of the religious struggle of the last fifty years. It should be noted that in the eighties of the last century H. P. Blavatsky saw transpiring what Mr. Hyde records has now taken place *viz.*, (1) the rejection of the church tribunal or its equivalent in the East as final authority in matters of morals and of social life; (2) the tendency to refer all individual or collective actions at the bar of the Self or God within.

Something more was and is being taught by Theosophy—not to mistake emotional impulse for spiritual intuition, the sensing of the invisible for the understanding of both visible and invisible. The teaching was imparted that there exists an ancient body of knowledge, a philosophy consistent in all its propositions, which may be used as a gauge, a measuring-rod, to evaluate one's own mystic, subjective, and inner experiences. No genuine mystic worth his name can or will overlook that his own subjective experiences may delude him, any more than a trained scientist can or will overlook the possibility that his eyesight may prove deceptive. Every subjective and mystic experience is no more fortuitous than the Cosmos is the fortuitous concurrence of forces. Law operates everywhere. Effects, understood or baffling, have their causes, perceived by or unfathomable to, human intelligence. Thus the true mystic checks, verifies and confirms his own experiences by those of others, and especially by the light of the Body of Knowledge above referred to.

This is a new phase which the religio-psychological world is now fast entering upon. Just as there is verifiable knowledge about matter, so is there verifiable knowledge about Spirit. Thus the arbitrary distinction between Occultism and Mysticism to which our author refers vanishes.—EDS.]

It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that at the beginning of the present century the religious life of the world entered upon a new phase. The forces which had been operative throughout the previous cycle lost their potency; the spiritual consciousness of the race became quickened with a new life; the foundations were laid for an altogether new Dispensation.

On this point the great majority of sensitive and imaginative people to-day find themselves in substantial agreement. But as to the precise nature of the change which was involved, few are able to speak with any real confidence. And this comprehensibly enough, for we are still only at the dawn of the new era.

Certain broad issues, however, are already fairly clearly defined. It is evident that in the light of the findings of modern Science a large number of our traditional beliefs must be rejected as being henceforward untenable. There are others, on the contrary, which are proving to be based upon a more profound insight into the nature of reality than that of the materialistic thinking by which in appearance they are discredited. For just as valid science sweeps

away the conclusions of false religion, so also does valid religion sweep away the conclusions of false science. Again, there are certain aspects of religious experience which seem to have become of peculiar significance to us only in the present age: witness our steadily growing interest in the phenomena of spiritualism and the occult. But the really *central* element in the twentieth-century situation would seem to be our marked tendency to transfer the seat of authority in religion from without to within. Dean Inge has written that "the real trend of religion among the younger generation is away from dogmatic and institutional Christianity, and towards an individual and personal faith resting not on authority but on experience".* There can be little doubt that what is true of Christianity is true also of all other established religions.

II

Perhaps the most notable manifestation of this disposition is to be found in the growth of the scientific spirit. But this is not at first sight obviously apparent. For the attitude of modern Science is distinguished before everything by its insistence on objectivity. The whole aim of your physicist, your chemist, your astronomer, is to get away from mere subjective judgments and establish the truth on the plane of concrete fact. He has a deep distrust of impressionism, inspiration, transcendentalism; his aim is to lift the whole situation above the plane of the personal altogether. Yet it is no less plain that from another point of view he is an out-and-out subjectivist. For, as has been frequently pointed out, the appeal which he makes is in the end to the private judgment of the individual. He does not, like his medieval precursors, say that certain laws must be operative because the principles of metaphysics demand it, or because Aristotle once laid down that they existed. What he says is that every person, provided only he is properly instructed, may verify the facts for himself. And if any individual, after undertaking such verification, disputes his claims, he is willing to modify his original judgment. In a word, Science ultimately takes its stand upon that which is "common to all (duly qualified) observers," *i. e.*, on a consensus of private judgments. It admits no evidence which is not available for inspection by all. Its standards are essentially *democratic*—however true it may be that in practice only a small minority are capable of putting the experts' conclusions to the test.

This resolute determination to democratize knowledge has naturally had a profound effect upon the character of modern religious thought. The rise of modern science was fatal to the ascendancy of the Medieval Church: he who repudiates external authority in one sphere will very soon be impelled to

* *Assessments and Anticipations*, 1929, p. 83.

do so in every other as well. So it was inevitable that the attempt of the Reformers to discover an external authority in the Bible should speedily fail, and that the consistent Protestant should in the end find himself thrown back upon his own private and personal interpretation of Scripture. And when finally a ruthlessly logical minority had brought themselves to face the fact that it is ultimately the individual who decides what is, and what is not, to be characterized as Revelation, the transition to the post-Renaissance Age was complete.

This advance was, however, only secured at a price. The development of the new scientific spirit brought with it of necessity a powerful concentration upon the objective, measurable, concrete aspects of experience, and this made for an excessively materialistic attitude to life. So much so that by the end of the nineteenth century even very intelligent people had come to accept the devastating conclusion that the nature of Life could be adequately explained in terms of the movement of minute, solid, particles of matter. The confusions and contradictions which were implicit in this conception soon, however, became apparent, and one of the important consequences was that the primacy of Mind over Matter could again be more confidently affirmed. Now in 1931 we have reached a point when the theories of physics may be said to support the view that it is consciousness which is the basis of form, and not form which is the basis of consciousness.

III

This weakening of the hold of Materialism not only removed a cloud which was darkening the horizon of those who were disposed to find ultimate reality in the spiritual alone; it also coincided with the emergence of a definitely inspirational type of religious philosophy. For to-day the imaginative everywhere are awakening to the possibilities, not only of realizing the spiritual directly within, but, what is no less important, of utilizing spiritual forces to transform the world without. In fine, the characteristic tendency among progressive religionists at the present time is towards working in every sphere from within outwards, rather than from without inwards. In this connexion one need only point to the remarkable growth in recent years of interest in such subjects as spiritual healing, yoga, spiritualism, new thought, Christian Science, Theosophy, and the like.

It is true that from one point of view we are here concerned with what may be described as an extension of the province of physical science. The theosophist, for instance, in so far as he is an occultist, is occupied with research into the hidden laws of nature. But the fact remains that such laws relate to matter as it exists in a more refined form, to activities which lie behind, and thus finally control, those which are studied by ordinary science. So that even in this field we have to do with a transcendence of the materialistic

plane. There is a passage involved from the visible to the invisible, from the world of the senses to another which has reality only for those whose higher faculties have been quickened.

But this withdrawal from externals is most significantly expressed in the mystical, rather than in the occult, side of the new movement. Men and women are to-day looking for light primarily within, placing their trust in the Divine Spark which they feel to be alive in the deepest place in their consciousness. Their faith is in a Power within, a greater Self which is at the same time in some mysterious way their own. Their assumption is that this greater Self can know, act and feel in a manner in which the limited individual self is precluded from knowing, acting and feeling. And they believe that as they identify themselves with it more and more their potencies in all directions will be vastly increased.

All this makes, of course, for a disposition to exalt intuition and inspiration above science—at least above *ordinary* science. For it is assumed that when the individual is thus elevated he draws upon a source of knowledge and power which is not at the command of the normal intelligence; his being is controlled from an altogether higher centre. So we have as a consequence trust in immediate intuition rather than reliance upon the "sound" and accredited principles which have been evolved by solid and uninspired scholarship; healing by the powers of the soul rather than by recourse to material means; an increasing emphasis upon the significance of telepathy, clairvoyance and the influence of the Unseen generally; a growing interest in all those practices and disciplines which make for securing a source of stability and peace inside oneself. The contact which is established with Reality is interior and direct; not primarily through the medium of the senses.

People are to-day more and more concerned to find God within. And the corollary of this fact is that all those religious institutions which base their claims upon either revealed scriptures or traditional authority are steadily losing prestige in their eyes. The twentieth-century individual refuses to entertain the notion that responsibility for the welfare of his soul can be vested in anyone but himself. He will have no *localization* of grace. He rejects decisively the idea that any Church is divinely empowered to accord to, or withhold from, him the privilege of entering into union with the Divine. Nor does he believe that he can ever be saved from corruption except by the influence of his own highest self. And he considers himself free to criticize and evaluate the teachings of all scriptures just as he does any other products of man's creative imagination. By this faith he stands or falls. And indeed he has no other real alternative, for to submit to external authority in this one sphere while repudiating it in every other would be to

create a fatal division within the depths of his own spirit.

IV

It remains to observe that this democratization of religion necessarily fosters a spirit of religious universalism. There can be no exclusiveness about the outlook of a man who bases his philosophy on the belief that it is by union with the One Self which is within each of us that the world is to be redeemed. The plane of regional and ethnic religion is completely transcended. Men are drawn together across the frontiers of country and race because they unite in taking as the foundation of their lives faith in science and mysticism, both of which represent the response of the universal in man to the universal in Life. The Hindu, the Moslem or the Christian who responds to the appeal of this New Religion thereby passes beyond the limitations imposed by his traditional beliefs; his attention becomes centred upon man who is the same everywhere because he is the microcosm of the Macrocosm; he becomes concerned more and more with those realizations which are enjoyed by all men in common in so far as they rise from the plane of Nature to that of Spirit. The more profound the mysticism, the more complete the transcendence of nationality and creed. To live in the One is to meet all men, whatever their race, at that central point where they are most representatively human. This is not to say, of course, that distinctions between nations and peoples are to be obscured; the spiritual and the standardized remain firmly opposed. But it is at least to assert that in the mind of the twentieth-century mystic appreciation of those individual manifestations by the variety and complementary character of which the infinite nature of the One is symbolized will be subordinated to a penetrating and sustaining sense of the Unity which underlies all differentiation.

LAWRENCE HYDE

THE ART OF WRITING IN ANCIENT INDIA

[**Professor S. V. Venkateswara**, whose researches have drawn the respect and attention of western savants, has already written for THE ARYAN PATH. In the following article he returns to the old tale of the Orientalists about the origin and knowledge of the art of writing in Ancient India. He employs their own methods to confute them.

Many years ago, under the inspiration of the Theosophical Mahatmas, a very able answer was given to the question:—"Was Writing known before Panini?", in *The Theosophist* for October 1883, to which we would draw our readers' attention.

We also append two extracts from H. P. Blavatsky's *Secret Doctrine* to give the Theosophical view of the subject.—EDS.]

European scholars, following the lead of Max Müller, have held that writing was unknown in India before the times of Pāṇini. They were led to this position by the supposed absence of any mention of "writing, reading, paper or pen in the Vedas," or even in the latest Vedic literature of the Sutra period. It was also held that there was not a single word in Pāṇini's terminology which presupposes the existence of writing. It becomes necessary to re-examine these positions. If the finds in the Indus valley belong to India and are documents connected with Indian culture, the pictographs on the seals of Harappa and Mohenjodaro become inconsistent with a theory of ignorance of the art of writing in Pre-Pāṇinian times. For these documents are admittedly earlier than Pāṇini by a few millennia.

I

Pāṇini mentions the *Grandhikas*, who gave public recitations expounding the stories embodied in their *grandha* or text, and illustrating the same with episodes, oral explanations and pantomimic representations. Among the mythological stories thus preserved in his day were the *Sisukrandīya*, *Yamasabhīya* and *Indrajananīya*. Patanjali adds to this list ancient stories like those of Vasavadattā and Bhaimavatī. But the greatest subject of all was a religious one with symbolic significance, the story of Kamsa being slain by Krishna.

Symbols for writing were known already long before Pāṇini's day. Certain symbols for numerals were marked on the ears of cattle indelibly with a red-hot metal. This was an ancient practice dating from Vedic times, as *ashtakarni* cows are mentioned in the *Ṛg-Veda*. There were also *vishṭakarṇi*, *panchakarṇi*, *bhinnakarṇi*, *maṇikarṇi*, *chhinnakarṇi*, *chhidrakarṇi*, *sruvakarṇi*, and *svastikākarṇi*. His point is that the vowel is short in all these cases, whereas it was lengthened to describe the cattle marked with symbols like the sickle (*dātrākarni*), which had apparently no numerical significance. He derives the terms *lekha* and *lipi*, knows the Greek (*yavanāni*) mode of

writing and uses the terms *lekhaka* and *lipikāra* in the sense of scribes. In the Buddhist *Suttas* and in the Pāli *Jātaka* texts the words used for writing are *lekha* and *lekhaka*, not *lipi* and *lipikāra*. *Lipimudra* is a later term and is found in *Lalitavistara*. Even as late as the *Milinda-praśna*, (the second century B.C.) the term *lekha* appears, along with *mudra* which apparently means *lipimudra*. It is clear that no theory in regard to the Art of Writing before Pāṇini's day could be based on the derivation of *lipi* instead of *lekha*.

Western Scholars like Bühler have based the idea of borrowing on the word *dipi* used in the Asokan texts, and on the circumstance that there are reminiscences of a mode of writing from right to left instead of from left to right. As regards the latter, it is not difficult to understand how the alphabet looks engraved in the reversed fashion when read from the inside of a cave, while it had been inscribed by the engraver from the roof or the top of the cave. Sometimes it is only the first line that is inscribed in this fashion, and the other lines read regularly as they were inscribed from the inside of the cave. It is also possible that ease in carving demanded that lines should be carved alternately from left to right and from right to left, more or less in the fashion of furrows in ploughing or the serpent's winding way. It is not without significance that the term *nāgarī* is connected with *nāga*, the serpent. Thus it would be dangerous to base with Bühler a theory of the foreign origin of the Indian alphabet on the fact that the Eran coin shows letters engraved from right to left and shows each letter reversed.

Bühler considers *lipi* to be a loan-word. The word for *lipi* occurs as *dipi* in the Asoka inscriptions on the North-West frontier, and Hultzsch has pointed out that the derivation of *lipi* from *lip* "to besmear," after the school of Pāṇini, is out of the question. He would derive the word for writing from the Persian, bearing in mind also the expression *nipisita*. But these forms can be easily explained as local variations (ḍ, ḷ, and ṇ,) of the same original sound which was Indo-Iranian. *īḍe* and *īḷe* are variant forms in the Vedic texts, *e.g. agnimīḍe purohitam*. (It appears as *īḍe* in the *Ṛg-Veda* and *īḷe* in the *Yajur Veda*.) So also in modern vernacular: *e. g.*, *giḷi* and *giṇi* for "parrot" in Kannada. The language of the North-West frontier, where the Kharoshthi inscriptions of Asoka are found, would be a Sanskrito-Dravidian *lingua franca*, judging from the Dravidian affiliation of the language of the Brahuis of Beluchistan. Prof. Rhys Davids, a profound student of the Pali texts, was so little impressed with the argument from *dipi* that he preferred a pre-Sumerian to a Sumerian origin for the Indian alphabet. Students of Dravidian languages would be equally little impressed by the arguments from *dipi*. It should also be borne in

mind that Asoka uses the term *lekhāpita, i. e.* "engraved," in his inscriptions.

Aksha, it is well known, means a piece of dice. It comes from the root *aksh*, which means to mark or to cut, and the word in this sense is found actually in use as early as the Vedic texts. Much confusion has been caused in the history of the Maurya period by taking *Akshapaṭala*, who was the Accountant-General in the Maurya times, as described in the *Artha-śāstra*, as connected with gambling. This officer has his counterpart in *Akshāvāpa*, who is one of the ministers of state in the Vedic times. It is ludicrous to connect these officers with gambling. The reference is certainly to the numerals cut on the dice, which were essential for use in calculation. It would be necessary to carry the history of the word *akshara* to Vedic times in order to understand Pāṇini's derivation of the term, as a letter of the alphabet.

II

The term *akshara* is found throughout the range of Vedic literature. It comes from the root *aksh*, which means to cut a mark, and appears clearly in this sense in the *Maitrayani Samhita*. The term *akshara* denotes the imperishable, the carved letter as opposed to the bedaubed or besmeared symbol. Its later derivation from *a-kshara* certainly reminds one of the earlier and the later derivations of *Asura* (*asu-ra* versus *a-sura*). In the Vedic hymns dealing with gambling there are references as early as the *Ṛg-Veda* to the cuts or the marks on the dice and to the cut figures being described as *apsaras*, who were propitiated with ghee. The very term *apsara* is only a variant of *akshara*, but the latter would be the earlier word in the light of the history of the sounds *p* and *k* which are variants in Vedic phonology. The term *varna* (appearing in Tantra texts as *arna*) likewise points to a visible symbol, and is used as a synonym for *akshara* in the *Taittiriya Upanishad*. *Varna* is here contrasted with *svara* (sound). A word of similar significance is *rūpa* which is contrasted with *nāma*.

We can trace the evolution of writing and the use of written documents from the earliest texts of the *Ṛg-Veda* through the later Vedic texts, down to the times of Pāṇini. But it is first necessary to clear one's mind of cant and prejudice. The roots *likh* and *lip* are traceable in the Vedic texts.* The former means to make a scratch or a cut, and the latter to bedaub or besmear. The former process was considered orthodox and has eventually effloresced in the art of sculpture. The latter process would lead to painting, which was regarded as unorthodox. *Ullekhana* and *parilekhana* were processes of making deep cuts in and around the sacrificial altar for protection against enemies and in-

* Both are Indo-European roots. *Likh* has given rise to our *lecture* through Lat. *legere*, *lectura*, Mid. Eng. and Old Fr. *lethrun*. Our very word *write* originally meant *score* or *cut* (German *reissen*, tear). *Lip* has given birth not only to *Library* but to *libel*! "Graph" and "Scribe" are derived from the root *skarbh* to "engrave," cut or dig out.

vaders. *Lepa* or *repa*, "something sticking" was invariably used in a bad sense, *e. g.*, *nakarmaṇā lipyate pāpakena* —"one is not tainted by his bad acts (if he be in this condition)". The use of *lepa* in this sinister sense is found as early as the *Taittiriya Brahmana*. It is obvious that the origin of writing in India should be looked for in the direction of *lekha* and not of *lipi*. Even in the Pali *Jātaka* texts the words used are *lekha* and *lekhaka*, and not *lipi* and *lipikāra*.

Two early Vedic texts clearly refer to written documents preserved in boxes and periodically taken out for purposes of study. Hymns 68 and 72 of the nineteenth Book of the *Atharva Veda* do not permit of any other interpretation. They have been thus translated: "Both of the broad and the narrow, I with power unclose the mouth. With these when we have taken up the *Veda* we pay the holy rites." "Within the chest wherefrom we before took out the Veda, this do we now deposit. Wrought is the sacrifice by the power of Brahma. Through this fervour assist me here, Ye Gods." The *Kauṣika Sutra*, which is the ritualistic commentary on the *Atharva Veda*, says that the former of these hymns was used at the beginning of Vedic studies and the latter at the end of the studies (K. S. 139, 10 and 23). Here we have the earliest reference to the *Grandha* or bundle of leaves, which were used as material inscribed on with a style. It also accords with the view above expressed that the earliest writing was in the way of making cuts or scratches in the materials instead of bedaubing the same with paint of some colour.

III.

We may now consider the bearing of the ancient paleography of Egypt and Sumeria on our subject. The alphabetical marks of ancient Egypt have been discussed by Flinders Petrie. The pottery of pre-dynastic Egypt contains such marks incised by the owners. The marks were cut into the finished pot, and it was seldom that two signs are found together. The First Dynasty signs are also cut in pottery, but more firmly, and sometimes mixed with regular hieroglyphs. Groups of two or three signs were not uncommon now. The alphabetical signs were so foreign to Egypt that they were regarded as aphonic, *i. e.*, as representing no sounds at all. They were evidently borrowed. Prof. Petrie comes to the conclusion that the system of representation by alphabetical signs is older than the system of picture writing.

Gadd describes the combination of pictorial and phonetic writing in Sumeria. Pictorial writing constitutes the skeleton, and phonetic symbols are used to cover it with the flesh of grammatical structure. Many of the Sumerian signs are polyphonous, and the actual reading of a sign depends on the context. Conversely also, entirely different signs share the same phonetic value. In Egypt several hieroglyphs are similarly used to depict the same (initial) sound. The use

of an alphabetical symbol to represent a particular sound and that sound only, was the glory of ancient India.

The Sumerians in historical times used the syllabary system, representing each syllable and not letter by a symbol. But in the oldest Sumer inscription so far studied the name of the king *Za-ga-ga* is given alphabetically. It is clear that the period of syllabary was preceded by one when sounds were represented alphabetically. This alphabetical system was foreign to the genius of Sumeria and was given up, though relics of it survive in Egypt and in Sumeria in historical times. Where then was the alphabet invented?

The Boghar-Koui inscriptions give us the clue. They are documents of Vedic culture and religion. There is reference in them to the Himalayas (*Zimalaya*). The Gods invoked are the Vedic Gods, *Indra*, *Mitra*, *Nāsatya*, etc. All these names are spelt alphabetically, and so also are the common words :–*Pa-ra-a* (*par* in Sumerian), *va-a-tar* (*ba-dur*), *kha-at-ti* (*khat-ti*), *in-da-ra* (*in-dara*). Here also we find the Indian practice, not found in the West, of using alphabetical signs as numerals, which was later on adopted by the Phœnicians and adapted by them to their alphabetical system. The style of writing is *boustrophedon i.e.* the plough-wise one of alternating directions, what has been termed serpentine above. In these inscriptions, therefore, we have the fullest survival in Western Asia of the alphabetical system which is admittedly more ancient than the Egyptian hieroglyphs or the Sumerian syllabary.

The Boghar-Koui inscriptions, the Kassite records and the Tel-el-Amarna letters belong culturally to the period of centuries eighteen to fourteen B. C. They represent a later phase of Vedic religion, as among the Gods invoked we find the most ancient of the Vedic Gods, namely Agni, conspicuous by absence. The reference to the Himalayas shows that this culture was an off-shoot of the Indian Aryan. Already by 2,100 B. C. the Vedic horse had travelled to the West and is found described as the ass of the East in the Babylonian tablet of Hammurabi. Several Vedic hymns indicate the migration of Vedic culture westwards, already in the earliest stratum of the *Ṛg-Veda* (Bks. VI. VII. and VIII.).

IV

In India we have the alphabetical system of writing right through the ages. The Goddess of learning is represented as having an *akshamālā*, *i. e.*, a wreath of letters in her hand. *Rupas*, *i. e.* letters of the alphabet and numerical symbols, are associated with the *maṇikāra* in the Brāhmaṇa texts. *Maṇikāra* has been interpreted as jeweller, and may well denote also the carver on crystal or bead. The Vedic term *lekhana* has survived in *lekhaka*, which means writer or secretary in historical times. *Lipikāra* meant painter not writer, and *lipi* in later times came to mean writing, after writing materials came into use.

The art of writing grew up with the efforts of man to immortalise fleeting forms of expression. The symbols were drawn either from the members of the human body or after external objects or phenomena. The oldest Sumer writing, of the fourth millennium B. C., the oldest writing in predynastic Egypt, and Indian writing through the ages, are alphabetical. The pictographs of Harappa and Mohenjodaro and the square seals of the new finds at pre-Sumerian Kish which contain similar pictographs, must also be interpreted on the same lines. The finds at Kish are admittedly earlier than 4,000 B. C. The alphabetical system of writing in ancient India belongs, therefore, to a period so early and is both ancient and indigenous.

Attempts have been made to trace the origin of the letters of our alphabet on the lines of the Tantra texts. These texts are of a very late date and arose when the art of writing became full-fledged in India, with the complete Indian alphabet of 50 letters. At the same time, the basic principle on which the system is based appears to be ancient, and in the case of some letters there is a continuity of tradition from Vedic times. For instance, the letter *k* represents an earlier stage in phonology than *t* or *p* (cp. *skambha, sthambha* ; *anushtuk* and *anustup*). In Vedic texts *k* is definitely mentioned as a form of Prajapati and in the Tantra it denotes Siva or Maheśvara. It is not without significance that Pāṇini bases his groupings of letters expressly on the ancient system of Maheśvara. In religious mysticism *k* is symbolised by the cross, which means the body, and the numbers one and ten—*eka* and *daśa*, associated with Prajāpati. In the Brahmi script *k* has the form of the cross (+). *E* or *ai* is represented by a triangle which was the triple cone of fire, and Agni is described as three-headed in the *Ṛg-Veda*. Some other letters of the alphabet can be derived on similar lines.

S. V. VENKATESWARA

Writing was invented by the Atlanteans, and not at all by the Phœnicians. Indeed, such a claim as that writing was known to mankind many hundreds of millenniums ago, in the face of the philologists who have decreed that writing was unknown in the days of, and to Pâṇini, in India, as also to the Greeks in the time of Homer, will be met by general disapprobation, if not with silent scorn. All denial and ridicule notwithstanding, the Occultists will maintain the claim, and simply for this reason : from Bacon down to our modern Royal Society, we have a too long period, full of the most ludicrous mistakes made by Science, to warrant our believing in modern scientific assumptions rather than in the denials of our Teachers. Writing, our scientists say, was unknown to Pâṇini ; and this sage nevertheless composed a grammar which contains 3,996 rules, and is the most perfect of all the grammars that were ever made! Pâṇini is made out to have lived barely a few

centuries B. C., by the most liberal; and the rocks in Iran and Central Asia (whence the philologists and historians show us the ancestors of the same Pâṇini, the Brahmins, coming into India) are *covered with writing*, two and three thousand years old.—*The Secret Doctrine*, II, 439–440.

In his third Hibbert lecture (1887) Professor Sayce of Oxford, speaking of newly-discovered Assyrian and Babylonian cylinders, referred at length to Ea, the God of Wisdom, now identified with the Oannes of Berosus, the half-man, half-fish, who taught the Babylonians culture *and the art of writing*. This Oannes, to whom, thanks only to the Biblical Deluge, an antiquity of hardly 1,500 B.C. had been hitherto allowed, is now spoken of in these terms:—

"His city was Eridu, which stood 6,000 years ago on the shores of the Persian Gulf. The name means 'the good city,' a particularly holy spot, since it was the centre from which the earliest Chaldean civilization made its way to the north. As the culture-god was represented as coming from the sea, it was possible that the culture of which Eridu was the seat was of foreign importation. *We now know that there was intercourse at a very early period between Chaldea and the Sinaitic peninsula, as well as with India.* The statues discovered by the French at Tel-loh (dating from at latest B. C. 4,000) were made of the extremely hard stone known as diorite, and the inscriptions on them stated the diorite to have been brought from Mazan—*i.e.*, the Sinaitic peninsula, which was then ruled by the Pharaohs. The statues are known to resemble in general style the diorite statue, Kephren, the builder of the second Pyramid, while, according to Mr. Petrie, the unit of measurement marked on the plan of the city, which one of the Tel-loh figures holds on his lap, is the same as that employed by the Pyramid builders. *Teak wood has been found at Mugheir, or Ur of the Chaldees, although that wood is an Indian special product; add to this that an ancient Babylonian list of clothing mentions sindhu, or 'muslins,' explained as 'vegetable cloth'.*"

Muslin, best known now as *Dacca* muslin, known in Chaldea as Hindu (Sindhu), and *teak* wood used 4,000 years B. C.; and yet the Hindus, to whom Chaldea owes its civilization (as well proven by Colonel vans Kennedy), were *ignorant of the art of writing* before the Greeks taught them their alphabet—if we have to believe Orientalists!—*The Secret Doctrine*, II, 225–226.

UNEMPLOYMENT

PAST KARMA AND FUTURE HOPE

[**J. D. Beresford's** name is much in evidence because of the appearance of "The Old People," the first part of a trilogy—*Three Generations*. Recently he said that his books "might have been quite different" if he had been perfectly free; referring, however, to his articles in THE ARYAN PATH he added: "I enjoy turning my mind on theoretical and philosophical problems and writing those articles gives me genuine pleasure." In the following essay Mr. Beresford reviews the subject in his own idealistic way.—EDS.]

The present misery and unemployment throughout Europe and in the United States of America is a lamentable instance of another of the vicious circles that are the inevitable outcome of War. In the years immediately following the Armistice, the credit basis upon which all modern finance rests, encouraged a great inflation of values and permitted the free spending of money that had in various ways been drawn from the National purse. In England, at that time, we were, as a plain matter of fact, living upon the National Debt. At the same time production, so far as it was represented by Export Trade, was already on the decline; and although there was much work to be done at home to make up the deficiencies of the war years, in manufactures, building, road-making and so on, the greater part of it was but another phase of living upon our capital. Thus within ten years of the signing of the Peace, the Nation had come to precisely the same crisis as would overtake the individual in the same conditions. It had been living above its income, and its earning capacity, represented by its export trade, had steadily declined. It lost old customers and could find no new ones, because other nations were in the same difficult position, eager to sell, loth to buy. Economies necessarily followed, and with these economies we come into a clear view of the vicious circle. Every cut in the cost of production, every bankruptcy, even the fall in the cost of living, represented a reduction in the employment of Labour; and the figures in England mounted steadily from something under one million to nearly three, while in such countries as Germany and the United States they are much higher still. This increase of unemployment put the further burden of out-of-work pay upon the State, (England pays a higher rate than any other country in the world), and aggravated the dangers of non-production. Instead of living upon our capital we had to live upon our income, only to find it steadily decreasing year by year. To break this vicious circle some bold remedy was necessary, and the obvious one was to reduce the value of the pound sterling by abandoning the Gold Standard. And if the pound sterling can

be maintained at its present value (at the moment of writing, about four dollars or a hundred French francs) the saving in costs of production as judged by foreign currencies may enable Great Britain to break the circle, and will in any case momentarily relieve trade depression.

This in the fewest possible words is a résumé of the economic position that has led to the present low-water mark of employment in Great Britain. In a sense, this crisis was unavoidable, since it was induced by conditions acting upon a people who had not the inclination even if they had had the capacity to think of the future. Many of our economists foresaw what was coming and stated their beliefs in the clearest possible words, but public opinion is not to be influenced in this matter by the statements of the few, any more than it is in the matter of things spiritual. For, whether the unit be the nation or the average individual, we shall find the same desire to enjoy the moment and to hope that the evil day to come may somehow be averted, because we have no true sense of responsibility either to ourselves or to one another. If we had had such a sense, there can be no shadow of doubt that the present conditions could have been avoided; for there is a power in mankind, at present feeble and undeveloped, that can override economic and even what we term physical laws. But the development of that power as a remedy for all ills, is a process that is governed in its turn by a higher law whose workings are at present beyond our full understanding; only we know that the law of Karma whether as applied to individuals or to nations must be fulfilled.

Coming, now, from causes to effects, it may be worth while to turn to the influence of the past two years or so upon those three millions of ours that are now out of work. And in the first place we have to face the unpleasant conclusion that they represent what I must call the sediment of humanity. They are not, of course, all destined to settle at the bottom of the mixture for the same reasons. Some are really incompetent; others are idle, slow, lacking in initiative, untrustworthy, weak of purpose, alcoholics, confined by set habits of thought and living, immobile, or with that tendency to a fierce egotism which so often finds an expression in what we call crime. But this re-agent of economic crisis infallibly separates in the first instance those who are least fitted to struggle against the conditions. It is indeed a matter of common experience that a certain type of man and woman is never unemployed in any class of society; the most characteristic distinction that separates this type from the sediment being greater mental and physical energy.

The most casual observation of those who wait day by day outside our Labour Exchanges will confirm this statement; and, be it remembered, those who do thus make their daily enquiry represent the more active of the un-

employed; there is a still more stagnant level even than this. But we see those who do, at least, take the trouble to join the daily queue, lounging, smoking, gossiping; influencing us to the unavoidable inference that they prefer living on the dole to engaging themselves to regular work at a slightly higher rate of pay. The majority of them, in fact, exhibit in a more legible character that same indolence of mind, and lack of the sense of responsibility that, as I have indicated, determined in the first place the present condition.

Moreover it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that lack of employment among those on this level of consciousness, tends to increase the disinclination for work. *The little flame of the spirit needs to be tended if it is to burn more brightly.* And since all the functions of activity derive their forces ultimately from this spirit, which is consciousness, life, the failure of even such a stimulus as hard necessity to overcome all the inertias of the gross corporeal envelope we call the flesh, tends to weaken the flame and lower the bodily and mental energy. Wherefore *the longer the present conditions continue, the greater will become the number not only of the unemployed but of the unemployable.*

Analysis, or dissection, is a worthless process unless it is used as a means of gaining knowledge that will enable us to build up, reconstruct,—a point of view that I elaborated in a critical article for THE ARYAN PATH, some eighteen months ago. And what we have to ask ourselves is whether, having put our finger on the weakness, we can do anything to combat it.

What that weakness is I have already suggested, but it may be as well to emphasise it by a restatement. It derives, then, in my opinion, from what I may call the isolation of the individuality. In those years of spending that immediately followed the armistice, there was a craze for ostentation and luxury in every class. In other words there was an exhibition of selfishness, which characteristic as it is of humanity at all times, was then more painfully evident than usual. For this is but another example of the failure to tend that feeble flame of the spirit, and as in the former case, the ability to tend it diminishes by neglect. And as we know by all the examples of history *it is prosperity rather than adversity that destroys the soul of a nation.*

The effect in all cases is much the same. Luxury and idleness weaken the higher aspirations and compel us to live self-centred within ourselves. (There may be possible exceptions to this rule, the majority of them more apparent than real, but broadly speaking the rule is general enough to be accepted as universal.) As a consequence that ideal of the self which we form throughout life—a false ideal since it is built up mainly by exclusions rather than by a desire to broaden our outlook—becomes still more restricted. Generosity is weakened, jeal-

ousy increased, noticeably between the various classes, and, most typical of all, we lose one of the main inspirations to personal and national responsibility by our unwillingness to look beyond the day.

Now, if that period of inflation and spurious prosperity had been longer drawn out, if, *a fortiori*, it had been not a seeming but a real wealth, we should in all probability have drifted into a class-war. (We may do that still but if we do, it will be for a different reason, and find inception not in the revolt of labour but of the unemployed.) As it is, I find a cause for hope in our present adversity, and the prospect of future suffering.

For the only remedy for our condition is through such an experience of forced unselfishness as may compel us to break through that shell, I called the false ideal of self, and substitute a true ideal in its place. All else, economic reconstructions, a revival of trade, the return of plentiful and well-paid employment, is but another turn of the wheel that will lead to a high point of commercial prosperity and, inevitably, pass on to another descent. That it may come in the course of a few years is not improbable. Very much the same thing happened in the nineteenth century, culminating in what we know as the hungry 'forties and the great revolution year of 1848. But history, in fact, does not exactly repeat itself, and the people of to-day, however adversely affected by the experiences of the past thirteen evil years, have a higher ethical standard and a wider outlook than those of a hundred years ago.

What I look for, then, as an outcome of the imminent distress that will affect all classes in England, each according to its degree, throughout the next few years, is a revival of the religious spirit, by which I do not mean a reinvigoration of the orthodox churches—though that, too, will play its part,—but a truer realisation of the Self in its relation to humanity as a whole. I wrote at the beginning of this article of the need for the sense of responsibility both to ourselves and to others, and it will be by a quickening of this sense that the sum of true happiness in the world may be increased. It is not, however, an end in itself, but only a means by which we may come to a measure of self-realisation.

The negation of selfishness as we commonly understand that word, the understanding of the true relation of the ego to that which we falsely believe to be the personality—fostering that belief as a rule by every means in our power—is an end that may be attained only by those who have suffered a long toll of experience. But the road to self-knowledge and to the quickening of the world-spirit is by way of the understanding that to live for our own enjoyment is a form of spiritual suicide.

J. D. BERESFORD

THE LEISURE OF THE FUTURE

[**Prof. C. E. M. Joad's** practical application of philosophic principles has been greatly appreciated by thinking people. Our readers have enjoyed his theories and ideas and we are glad to publish below an essay in which philosophical universals are made applicable to the details of daily life-problems.—EDS.]

I

In a recent number of THE ARYAN PATH I wrote an article on "The Civilised Use of Work and Leisure," in which I suggested that the appropriate use of leisure consisted in the exercise of our highest faculties at full stretch. The suggestion was, admittedly, vague, and in the present article I shall try to amplify it and at the same time to give it great precision.

In order that I may do this, it is necessary that I should assume the truth of three philosophical positions. I have endeavoured to set forth the reasons for these positions elsewhere.* As I cannot defend them here, I must content myself with briefly stating them.

(1) I hold in the first place that life is an independent principle or force, which manifests or expresses itself in a material medium. The result of life's manifestation or expression in matter is an individual living organism. The distinction between life and matter is on this view ultimate, and living organisms including human beings are to be regarded as units of matter temporarily animated by a stream or force of life.

(2) The activity of life is mainly cognitive; it is, that is to say, an activity of knowing. Knowing is a process in which mind becomes aware of something other than itself; it is, that is to say, never the same as the object known. This distinction between knower and known obtains at all levels of knowing. It is as true, in other words, to say that when I know God or Beauty I remain distinct from and am in no sense merged in what I know, as to say that, when I know a table, I remain distinct from and in no sense become the table.

(3) Knowing is in no sense limited to the knowing of material things. On the contrary most of the objects which we know do not belong to the material world. Consider, for example, an historical object such as Cæsar. Of what am I thinking when I am thinking of Cæsar? A thought about Cæsar is clearly not a thought about a piece of matter, since Cæsar as a piece of matter no longer exists, or, if he does, he is by now so diffused through the substance of the planet and our own bodies, that he is no longer isolable as a piece of matter. Yet thinking about Cæsar is certainly a thinking about something; this is clear, if only because a thought of Cæsar is different from a thought of Alexander; therefore, Cæsar must in some sense exist, both in order that he may be

*See my *Matter, Life and Value* published by the Oxford University Press.

thought about and also that he may possess the property of being different from Alexander. Nor is it the case that to think about Cæsar is to be aware of a notion or idea in one's own mind, a concept, as it is sometimes called. If this were so, we should each of us be thinking about something different when we thought about Cæsar, namely, about a different idea in each thinker's mind, and intelligible discussion about history would be impossible. Indeed communication of any kind between people would be impossible, since no two people would or could think of the same thing. Secondly, if Cæsar were only an idea in the mind of the thinker, the abolition of all people thinking about Cæsar would mean the abolition of Cæsar; or, to put the point generally, the total elimination of mind from the universe would involve the going out of existence of history, not, that is to say, of the ***knowledge*** of history, but of all those events and personages which make up the content of the history we know. But a present event such as the abolition of thinking persons cannot affect a past event such as the battle of Waterloo, nor does there seem any reason to suppose that the fact that the battle of Waterloo was fought in 1815 ceases to be a fact merely because nobody is thinking about it. Objects such as Cæsar and the battle of Waterloo seem therefore,

(*a*) not to be material things;

(*b*) not to be mental ideas or concepts. Nevertheless they indubitably exist and are something since we cannot think about nothing and we can certainly think about them. I propose, therefore, to call them non-committally objects of thought.

Proceeding on these lines, I should interpret the activity of thinking, as opposed to the enjoyment of sensory experience, as the mind's awareness of non-material objects of thought. It is objects of thought that we know in history, geography, science, mathematics and philosophy. I should further hold that behind and beyond objects of thought, there are objects of value. Of these we can discern three, goodness, truth and beauty, and I agree with Plato in holding that these too are changeless, eternal objects known by mind, but in no sense its products. Manifested in the world of changing matter they are the source of the beauty of works of art, the ethical qualities we admire in character and conduct, the truths of science and philosophy. Behind these again, possibly their source, possibly their unity, possibly their sum, many have believed themselves to have experienced intimations of a further and more fundamental object, which they have named Deity.

II

I can now proceed to state the view which I wish to put forward. Life, it is obvious, develops and evolves. This development may, I hold, be described in terms of an increase in the power, scope and subtlety of the faculty of knowledge

on the part of living organisms. Life at a more highly evolved level is life knowing more of the contents of the universe than life at an earlier level and knowing new types of contents. Already life has evolved in us to a point at which the knowledge of objects of thought is habitual; there is even a fleeting and intermittent awareness of objects of value. Life's evolution in the future will, I hold, consist in a further extension of the range of subtlety of knowledge, so that our remote descendants will enjoy a continuous and untrammelled apprehension of the value which we now know only uncertainly and intermittently.

I will now seek to apply this general view to the particular problem of the use of leisure by human beings at the stage of evolution which in us life has reached. Life, I am assuming, appears initially in a world of matter, and infuses itself into the material of this world, in order to create living organisms. Now life as expressed in these organisms is characterized by a two-fold relationship to matter. It knows or is aware of it, and it is dependent upon it. By life's knowledge of matter I mean merely that the interest and attention of earlier forms of living organisms are directed exclusively upon material objects. The attention of plants is largely concentrated upon themselves; they are aware of their own bodily needs—of the need for sustenance, for example—and of the need to reproduce themselves. Needs of this kind—the *feelings* as we may call them, of the plant—can be analysed in terms of the plant's awareness of chemical changes in its own material structure. Animals, aware of their own needs, are aware also of material objects external to themselves; for example, they know other animals. But although the scope of their awareness has widened, their attention is still directed almost exclusively upon material objects. It is probable that some animals are capable of the rudiments of thought, but if they think, they do so rarely and intermittently, their actions being, with the exception of a few doubtful cases, adequately accounted for in terms of reaction to material stimuli. When we come to human beings there is a change. Savages, indeed, think little more than animals, and their lives are spent largely in knowing and attending to matter: but in civilized man thinking has become normal. Life, that is to say, has in him emerged for the first time at a level at which its attention is more or less continuously directed not upon the world of matter, but upon non-material objects of thought.

In order that we may realise how this advance has become possible, let us consider the other aspect of life's relationship to matter—namely, its dependence upon it. Life as manifested in the early forms of living organisms is almost completely at the mercy of its material setting. The mind is enslaved by the body, and by the ills that beset

the body, while the organism as a whole is a plaything for the brute forces of nature. It is the sense of our helplessness before matter that has been the motive force of much religion, the power of a semi-human God being invented to compensate for the powerlessness of man.

It is the primary achievement of civilization that it has lessened this domination of matter over man. In the first place we attain to an increasing mastery over the matter which constitutes our own bodies. We have changed, and continue to change, the structure of our bodies by the uses to which we put them. These changes have been wrought unconsciously; but we also possess power over the body which we exercise consciously. With each generation that passes, we can prevent the body from decaying for longer periods, and, when at last decay sets in, we can hold life in the body and so prevent dissolution for longer periods.

Parallel with our growth of power over our bodies is our increasing mastery of the forces of nature. Instead of fearing or worshipping them, we have harnessed them to our uses. By the construction of appropriate machines we have made not only gravitation our slave, but also electricity and magnetism, atomic attraction, repulsion, polarization, and so forth. We can utilise these forces to transcend our limitations by making for ourselves new limbs to supplement our original bodily inheritance, cranes and elevators to do the work of arms, and trains and motors to take the place of legs. We have learned to fly and supply ourselves with wings in the shape of aeroplanes.

Now, every fresh advance in power over matter diminishes our need to know it. For example, we do less with our hands than our ancestors; we do not carry weights about, defend ourselves from attack, or develop great muscular strength. Compared with primitive man, we make but little use of material, physical, objects. So true is this that the ordinary clerk or professional man can, broadly speaking, go through the day without using his hands at all, except to dress and feed himself and to write. Our senses decay as the need for awareness of physical objects grow less; the savage can hear noises to which we are deaf, and our sense of smell grows duller with each generation. Every advance in applied science is, indeed, rightly considered, merely a contrivance for diminishing our need to have intercourse with matter. The proper function of machines is to intervene between us and matter, and so to release us from our dependence upon the material world. Machines, in fact, are the extra limbs which we have made outside ourselves to do our business with matter for us. Machines no doubt are themselves material, but our intercourse with machines can be reduced in theory to the necessity for pressing an occasional button; and as we succeed in delegating more and more of

our dealings with matter to them, the obligation to direct our attention upon matter will disappear. The energy and attention thus released will come to be directed increasingly first upon objects of thought and later upon objects of value. Thus the evolution of life consists in a progression from a knowledge of the world of matter through a knowledge of the world of thought to a knowledge of the world of value.

III

We are now in a position to come directly to the problem of leisure-using. Effort and endeavour have been, as I suggested in my previous article, the law of life's development in the past. Biologists speak of this law as the struggle for existence. The struggle for existence on the physical plane has been largly transcended; we no longer fight one another with tooth and claw for the available food supply, and although the crudely physical competition with our fellows has been superseded by a struggle in the economic field over wages and prices, this is carefully restricted to business hours. When they are over, we think that we are entitled to relax and to take our ease; our leisure, we feel, should be free from struggle. This belief is delusion. In all ages men who have had the opportunity to try every kind of life, combined with the energy and the talents to give the more exacting lives a fair trial, have seemed to reach agreement on this one point, that the only things which can give permanent satisfaction are the employment of our best faculties at their highest pitch, alternating with the recreation of the mind in music and art and literature and the conversation of our friends.

Now, what I wish to suggest is that life has now reached a stage at which the appropriate field for effort and endeavour lies not in the world of matter but in the world of thought. Not only is it the case that effort in the world of thought is as real and as exciting as effort in the world of matter, but life has now reached a stage at which such effort alone is permanently satisfying, so that, just as the urge of life once drove men to acquire new qualities of physical skill and to lay up fresh reserves of physical endurance in the struggle against nature, so it now finds its most appropriate expression in the effort to paint a picture or to remodel a social system, to realize life imaginatively in fiction or to grapple with the problems of existence. Thinking, which is the knowledge of objects of thought, is now the appropriate activity of normal, educated men, just as the apprehension of objects of value in artistic creation and mystical contemplation is the privilege of the race's most advanced representatives.

To the suggestion of my last article that the full exercise of our faculties in effort and endeavour and not relaxation and ease are the appropriate activities to leisure, I now add, therefore, that they must be exercised on the intellec-

tual and spiritual planes, that is in the knowledge of the worlds of thought and value. For, granted that the activity appropriate to the level of development which our species has reached is the knowledge of objects of thought and the endeavour to know increasingly objects of value, it will follow that effort and endeavour on the physical plane will no longer be found completely satisfying. It is, nevertheless, on the physical plane that most of us still seek occupation for our leisure.

To whack small round bits of matter about with long thin ones in the shape of bats, clubs, racquets, cues and mallets, or to introduce pieces of metal into the bodies of birds and beasts from a distance still constitute, under the title of games and sport, the chief leisure occupations of the Western world. These occupations are, as I have already pointed out, found to be increasingly unsatisfying. The suicide rate among the unemployed rich is higher than in any other class of a Western community, and those whose economic position enables their sole anxiety to be the discovery of occupations for leisure are engaged in a continual struggle with their enemy boredom.

My suggestion is that boredom is a menace, because we habitually seek our occupations at a lower level of activity than that for which life has now fitted us; that we fail, that is to say, to live up to the challenge of our most recently evolved faculties. We are like children, who will insist on playing with toys that they have outgrown. It is time that we discarded our toys, and remembering that it is only children who identify reality with what they can see and touch, occupy ourselves with the exploration of the non-material world of thought and the cultivation of the world of value. The pursuits of Shaw's Ancients in the last play of the "Back to Methuselah" Pentateuch afford a good example of what will, in my view, be the occupations of the leisure of the future, and a hint to the wise in the present.

C. E. M. JOAD

SEEK FOR THE LARGER VIEW

(*An Interview with Lord Haldane*)

[**R. L. Mégroz** whose literary and biographical work is gaining recognition among men of letters reports the following instructive conversation with a man whose mind was profound and whose heart was discerning.—EDS.]

One day in 1925, I went to see Lord Haldane at his house in Queen Anne's Gate, which being next door to Whitehall and Buckingham Palace, was his residence when work in London kept him away from the village of Cloan, his Perthshire home. As I entered, my dominant impression was of quietness and light—an impression which was confirmed when I came into his small, neat, bright study and was gently motioned to a leather armchair. Perhaps I expected to find some kind of Carlylean disorder and wildness in the philosopher's house. For a moment I lost my cue and did not speak. "Well ?" said Viscount Haldane, smiling across his little desk at me.

"I wanted to ask you, er, a curious question," I stammered, for suddenly the question I had in mind seemed outlandish in that business-like room.

"Because you have somehow linked modern science and philosophy together, Lord Haldane, I want to ask you if the spectacle of the stars in the sky ought to be comforting to us, or depressing. Ought not the contemplation of the stars to encourage the individual to face personal misfortunes ?"

"The stars are dead things," Viscount Haldane answered without hesitation, and with no attempt to laugh at me. "They are mere externality. *External things cannot help.*"

"How then should the individual use his mind to live on the highest level ? What does the rest of the universe mean to each of us ?"

"The first and most important thing is to realise what experience means. We start from our experience. We must not overlook any of its phases, nor, on the other hand, must we misconstrue or add to them. We live in a world in which we do more than live. We are always more, however humble we are, than we take ourselves to be. The experience which seems to confront us cannot be separated as though it were some distinct entity from the mind which appears merely to contemplate or be aware of it.

"The experience of a dog is much more limited than that of a man," he continued, developing his exposition without a pause in the clear flow of his sentences. "The dog knows nothing of beauty, or of the State, or of strikes, or of aeroplanes. He has a universe, but it is a very local and limited one. The beetle has a world still more limited; and yet each, the dog and the beetle, show their intelligence in construing their experience. The dog has his kennel, and distinguishes his master and may show affection for him.

"But in the case of man there

is a universe much more wide. We are aware of what comes to us through seeing, feeling, hearing, smelling, touching, and tasting, and yet that awareness goes far beyond the mere sensations of the senses. We construe these, and as construed they make up our experience. But it is an experience with many levels or orders in it. Orders stand not only for degrees in reality, but for degrees in our knowledge of that reality. We begin to find that what we take to be an experience independent of ourselves, a world of objects, is not really independent of the mind that perceives it. We begin to see also that we have been led into a mistake about these by assuming that our minds are more or less particular kinds of objects, of which we have experience and of which what we call *knowledge* is treated as being a property, an activity which the mind may display or may not display. And yet we know nothing of the mind apart from its knowledge. Within that knowledge every object of experience, actual or possible, falls. It is some kind of knowledge about it that gives meaning to the object, and apart from meaning, the object has not any significance. Even an atom, apart from the meaning, the interpretation we attach to it, has no significance for us. It could not be recognised and it would not in any sense *be*. It is only as possessing significance, actual or possible, for knowledge, that there is any reality. But if this be so within the mind, can it (the mind) be a thing standing in some external relation separable from itself, which we call knowledge? The mind and the objects of the mind alike fall within knowledge. Knowledge must be taken in the widest sense, as including feeling as well as abstract thought. And feeling and abstract thought are not separable. All feeling, in order to be recognised, involves reflection in some form, and reflection is nothing more apart from feeling, which enters into it and on which it is based, than a mere abstraction. We express our reflections in images, in which we think. We think, in other words, in metaphors. Even in mathematics, one of the most abstract of sciences, x and y are marks on the paper with which we perform operations, and which we either represent upon the paper or image to ourselves. Yet the identity in the abstract knowledge we thus get is not an identity of things in space and time; it is a set of identical thoughts. And the set of thoughts of Euclid about his 47th proposition are literally the same thoughts, as ours in learning the proposition; although his papyrus was quite different from the paper on which I, for instance, present the same set of mathematical operations of my thinking as he did.

"The mind is therefore just knowledge, which in an abstract kind of way divorces itself from every particular elementary experience, and has its essence in its general principles. It is only by an abstraction that it makes itself,

what experience under a partial aspect takes it to be—an object in that world. Therefore when we look at the world of experience, we find in it mind as well as another abstraction—matter. We classify and turn into abstract propositions the various phases which experience presents; but as our thoughts do not wholly construe experience and there is always the element of the particular which has to be construed into knowledge in order to give us meaning and reality, thought does not make things. It is only an essential phase which experience has to present if it is to have meaning and reality. We cannot divorce thought from things or things from thought. In the world of experience there are many kinds, all of which depend upon the conceptions which we apply as appropriate to them in giving the meaning. There is order in externality, such as the order we can see in numbers and atoms external to one another. There is the order of life, in which we are not concerned with causes and effects external to one another in time and space, but with ends realising themselves immediately and giving rise to the behaviour of living organisms. There are higher orders, such as those of freedom, of personality, of the State, of beauty, of religion."

"But you began by saying that there was no help for the individual in considering the stars," I interjected. "If there is in the infinite heavens an external order which in sequences and harmony resembles the order of human life, should not man find a religious inspiration in contemplating it? Or are all the poets wrong?"

"We may find inspiration in the beauty and grandeur of the spectacle of the heavens," Haldane replied, "but the predominating externality of the heavenly bodies and the endlessness of their number exemplify not a higher, but a lower order of conception than that of the mind. We do not find the entirety is the whole. It is only a whole for the mind that constructively embraces it."

He then resumed the train of his thought, speaking as unhesitatingly now as before:

"Now human experience, with its many phases, is nevertheless not final or complete. The power of reflection knows no barrier. It is always capable of an unlimited range—although in terms that are abstract or general, and therefore do not give us that fact of the particular which we require if we are to have a concrete individual object before us as reality. But thought, nevertheless, is always pointing to an ideal which is above ourselves and above our individual minds, conditioned, as they are, by the necessity for their existence as objects in time and space possessing an organisation and a place and station within nature. Evolution accounts for that organisation, and explains its range and its limitations, but the world which evolution pre-supposes as the world in which it is to take place, first pre-supposes the mind to which it owes existence. We thus come back to mind as the foundation of the universe.

Subject and object are only artificially separated. They seem to be only aspects of a larger whole which we cannot exhaust. Our sense of the divine is the indication that there is more in our universe than mere mechanism or mere life or mere finite personality. We are pointed to something beyond, which we cannot envisage, because it is only an ideal in our experience and no object of which we can have direct experience. That is how we come to the conception of God, and that is how our metaphors about God and the divine are always insufficient, although they are not less the vehicles by means of which we approach our final ideal."

While the level voice had travelled smoothly over these extensive tracts of thought the listener had formed another question. Haldane spoke of reflection as being without barriers, and yet as an abstraction apart from feeling. This, although he did not so word it, implied that reflection was necessarily personal and could not achieve that purely objective quality which is generally (and perhaps falsely) implied by the term scientific. If reflection must embody and express feeling, is it not limited by the individual's emotional temperament? Reflection may lead one man to a belief in God and another to a denial of any beneficent or intelligent Personality in the universe. And how can mere ratiocination reach any reliable judgment on points of view which are ultimately personal? I tried to put the difficulty to Lord Haldane, and without offering any criticism of it, I will simply report his reply:—

"Feeling has no reality apart from reflection, which gives it reality. All the terms I have been using are, of course, symbols in general knowledge. Feeling may not be such as enables us to form an image of what lies beyond, and therefore the reflection is what I have called abstract; that is to say, is given only in general conceptions, for the expression of which our images are mere metaphors or symbols. With regard to the difference between one man's experience and another's, the sense of the divine is a sense which overcomes the barrier between subject and object and the happenings to the individual. A man must learn to get a point of view which includes the universe and himself in it. If he does that he will believe in the ultimate reality of the universe—believe its foundation in mind—believe in God. This is, of course, a doctrine of immanence. Browning has said the same thing, you remember:

> There are flashes struck from midnights,
> There are fire-flames noondays kindle,
> Whereby piled-up honours perish,
> Whereby swollen ambitions dwindle,
> While just this or that poor impulse,
> Which for once had play unstifled,
> Seems the sole work of a lifetime
> That away the rest have trifled.

I could not, obviously, push the Lord High Chancellor of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Dominions beyond the Sea into fresh ramifications of this endless theme, so I contented myself with a last and simple test question. I asked him to tell me what, to him, was the lesson that life has to teach.

"To try always to rise to a wider outlook," came the characteristic response at once. "The secret of real success in life is in the individual's point of view. Goethe taught that to seek for the larger view should be our chief aim.

External success matters very little, after all; and neither does external failure."

In re-reading my verbatim notes of this wise man's talk I am once more impressed—and many readers must be similarly impressed—by something more than the breadth of Haldane's search for truth; by a spirit which seems to bring him very close to many teachings which we rather vaguely describe as "the wisdom of the East". But when one reads that noble last chapter of his Autobiography, this haunting sense of something that was still developing in his outlook is found to be justifiably linked with the Orient. There he confesses that in his later years he had studied India's philosophical literature, for it had "often struck me that we of the Western world have contracted our outlook by failure to take in the full significance of the development of reflection on ultimate things in India . . . There is in Bengal particularly a philosophical outlook which has moulded even Indian political aspirations among Mohammedans as well as Hindus."

And then, reverting naturally to the practical side of this question, he goes on to point out the connection between Indian thought and the best means of carrying out reforms in the system of Indian government. And he reminds his western readers that "want of knowledge has brought in its train want of sympathy".

R. L. MÉGROZ

The seeds of Wisdom cannot sprout and grow in airless space. To live and reap experience, the mind needs breadth and depth and points to draw it towards the Diamond Soul. Seek not those points in Maya's realm; but soar beyond illusions, search the eternal and the changeless SAT, *mistrusting fancy's false suggestions.*

For mind is like a mirror; it gathers dust while it reflects. It needs the gentle breezes of Soul-Wisdom to brush away the dust of our illusions. Seek, O Beginner, to blend thy Mind and Soul.

THE VOICE OF THE SILENCE.

THE TWO H. P. BLAVATSKYS

[**R. A. V. Morris** is a student of Theosophy who is not connected with any Theosophical organization. For long years he has *studied* Theosophical philosophy and Theosophical history and is admired for his strong commonsense, judicious impartiality and sweet reasonableness.

In his article our author makes important points on the subject of phenomena and spiritualism which should be considered in reading the review-article of Mr. Middleton Murry which follows.—EDS.]

No one who is familiar with the history of the modern Theosophical movement can fail to have wondered at the glaring contrast between the picture of H. P. Blavatsky as revealed by her own writings and the narratives of her friends and colleagues, and the H. P. Blavatsky depicted by her enemies and slanderers. The two characters are utterly inconsistent and it is one of the minor puzzles of history how both can have been attributed to the same individual.

In choosing which of them we shall accept as the true one, we must always bear in mind that what is inconsistent with a proven truth cannot itself be true; and the stories—for the most part repeated on the merest hearsay—detrimental to H. P. Blavatsky's reputation, which have recently been revived by a sensational journalist, are entirely inconsistent with the great mass of well attested and substantiated facts.

The charges brought against H. P. Blavatsky relate to all sides of her character and every period of her life. According to the Solovyoff-Witte-Coulomb legend, her whole career, from the day that she left her husband, as a girl of seventeen, was a long series of scandalous adventures. To put the case in a nutshell, she was a thoroughly immoral, dishonest and unscrupulous person; and her Theosophy an invention, concocted to bring her money or influence. Her phenomena, if we can rely on Dr. Richard Hodgson's judgment, were all fraudulent; her Masters myths, and their letters forgeries. The Hodgson charges, being more definite and relating to matters less inaccessible in time and place, are more easily met than the legends, derived from Russian sources, which purport to describe her life in the years prior to her arrival in America in 1873; and have been effectively analysed and replied to on various occasions. One of the latest and ablest of these replies, is Mr. William Kingsland's "Was She a Charlatan?—" in which he proves to demonstration that Dr. Hodgson's claim to have investigated the Blavatsky phenomena was groundless, for he neither saw any of the phenomena for himself nor did he invite the evidence of H. P. Blavatsky herself or her friends. All he did was to collect statements from her avowed enemies and to build conclusions

on them. At best his famous Report is an *ex parte* judgment delivered not from the bench, but by the attorney for the prosecution.

But the older and more extensive class of slanderous stories has never been subjected to systematic and detailed criticism from the point of view of the defence. This might have been done in the year 1891 had not the death of H. P. Blavatsky brought automatically to a close the libel action she had launched against the *New York Sun*. This newspaper had in July 1890 published a long attack on H. P. Blavatsky, in which a whole long series of charges and slanderous stories were detailed—seven closely printed columns of them, covering the period from 1857 onwards. Proceedings for libel were immediately instituted and were pending in May 1891 when Madame Blavatsky died. In an interim report of the progress of the action, dated March 1891, we are told that:—

> The *Sun* put in a long answer to Mme. Blavatsky's complaint and her lawyers demurred to its sufficiency as a defence. That question of law was argued...in the Supreme Court, and on the argument the lawyers for the *Sun* confessed in open court their inability to prove the charge of immorality on which the suit lies, and asked to be allowed to retain the mass of irrelevant matter in the answer.....Judge Beach sustained Mme. Blavatsky's objection and ordered that the objectionable matter be stricken out.

Although under no legal obligation to do so, the *Sun*, by that time fully convinced of the injustice of its attack on H.P.Blavatsky, in September, 1892, withdrew the charges in an editorial, and printed a long article by Mr. W. Q. Judge eulogising her life work and character.

In addition to the slanders included in the *New York Sun's* indictment and retractation, there were others of the same general type, which were printed for the first time in *A Priestess of Isis* by V. Solovyoff in 1894. This book, the tone and method of which are open to grave critical objection, contains, *inter alia*, a letter alleged to have been written by H.P. Blavatsky as a "confession" of her guilt in regard to certain charges, but which, even in Solovyoff's untrustworthy translation, is obviously not a confession but a denial in rather hyperbolical language.

Inasmuch as all the slanders we have been discussing relate to a period earlier than 1873, and as some of them are concerned with things that are supposed to have happened in such places as Russia, Turkey and Egypt, the difficulty of *proving* them to be untrue will be apparent. It should not be necessary to do so, for in every system of equity the burden of proof is upon the accuser, and the accused person is held to be innocent until proved guilty; but, when a prominent individual, especially if he be the champion of an unpopular cause, is slandered, this fundamental rule of justice is apt to be disregarded, and we have the proverbial saying that if enough mud is thrown, some of it will stick.

While disproof of *all* the libels on H. P. Blavatsky is in the circumstances difficult if not impossible, at any rate it is safe to say that none of them can be proved, and those that cannot be demonstrated to be false, can be shown to be extremely improbable. But, despite this, there are people who will still think that so much smoke shows there must have been some fire; that there must have been some foundation of fact for so imposing an edifice of fancy. Perhaps the best way in which this attitude may be met is to account for the slanders by showing how and why they became current. In order to do this, it will be necessary to refer briefly to H. P. Blavatsky's social environment in Russia, where most though not all of the slanders were launched, and to certain phases of thought in America, India and elsewhere, where every gibe, every libel, every attack on H. P. Blavatsky was eagerly accepted and circulated.

To begin with, it must be remembered that Madame Blavatsky was utterly unconventional and indifferent to what people thought of her. Her very freedom from some of the ordinary attributes of humanity—sex love, for instance—her contempt for shams and the merely outward respectabilities, led her at times into saying and doing things which she would have sedulously avoided had she really been the cunning and selfish schemer we are asked to believe her. While H. P. Blavatsky was thus, the environment into which she was born was in violent contrast. Her mother was a member of the most exclusive and conservative circle of the old Russian aristocracy, and her father a military officer of a noble German family long settled in Russia. In that now vanished Russian *ancien noblesse*, we can picture on the one hand elements of the narrowest primness and propriety, and on the other much dissoluteness and decadence. What could such a society, in the mid-nineteenth century, make of a portent like H. P. Blavatsky? In England at that period a woman who rode on the top of an omnibus was considered "fast"; and forty years later, in the eighteen-nineties, a woman bold enough to wear knee breeches for cycling was jeered at and abused, while if she used lip salve or face powder, she was dubbed forthright a "painted Jezebel". What then must a still narrower and more primitive society have thought of one who left home and husband to go a-voyaging, unchaperoned, into outlandish places, who smoked cigarettes, and generally assumed all the liberty of action which then was held to be the sole prerogative of the male sex? Can we not imagine the spiteful cackle that must have gone the rounds of the drawing-rooms and mess-tables of Petersburg and Odessa? Would not such a challenger of conventions have been believed to be capable of anything? "Have you heard the latest about that Blavatsky woman? So-and-so saw her in Constantinople riding in a circus, or in Cairo living with a man, or in Athens running a drinking bar,

or in Timbuctoo, or where you will?"

That none of this cycle of legends were believed by her nearest relatives, by her father, uncle, aunt and sister, who remained to the end in close and affectionate touch with H. P. Blavatsky, should be sufficient indication of their origin in mere gossip. Some distant connections, like Witte, on the other hand, who were never in close touch with her, seem to have swallowed them, just as many people to-day are ready to welcome piquant scandal when told of slight acquaintances and distant relatives, which they would immediately denounce as false and incredible if related of some one they really knew and loved.

This theme might be developed at length, but enough has been said to show that in a society like that of the Russian upper class in the mid-nineteenth century, a woman such as Madame Blavatsky *must* necessarily have served as a peg on which to hang all sorts of scandalous anecdotes. So much for the origin of the older cycle of stories. Now let us glance at the conditions in which they and subsequent accusations of fraud found currency.

It is not easy at the present time when all the beliefs, once considered axiomatic in religion and science, are either wholly discarded or in the melting pot, to realise the hard and fast dogmatic frame of mind which was well nigh universal in the West in 1875. In that cocksure age the battering of the critics had as yet made no decisive breeches in the citadel of orthodox Christianity. What is now the creed of the ordinary educated Protestant would then have been pilloried as rank infidelity, while the Protestantism of 1875 survives now only in such benighted little sects as the Four Square Gospel and the Plymouth Brethren. Even the unchanging Roman Church no longer stresses doctrines repugnant to the spirit of the present age; but two generations ago, Christians generally found no difficulty in accepting the horrible doctrine that people were condemned to an eternity of hell-fire by an all-merciful and loving God!

The scientific opponents of Christianity were quite as dogmatic in their materialism. They believed with no shadow of doubting that the universe was a mechanism like a more complex steam engine, and that Dalton's atoms were the ultimate reality.

Then there were the Spiritualists who took refuge from the rival dogmas of religion and science in a new set of hard and fast beliefs. They found at once rest for the mind and comfort for the heart in the assurance that the personalities of the dead survived and could communicate through mediums.

There were no half lights in those days; all was certain and sharply defined.

And then came H. P. Blavatsky with a challenge to all the rival camps that could not be ignored. The Spiritualists were the first to listen and to be upset. The pub-

lication of *Isis Unveiled* and the well vouched reports of occult phenomena taking place in New York created a new situation for them. They were used to opponents who denied altogether the reality of what occurred at their séances and also to those who ascribed all of it to the wiles of Satan. Such contentions did not disturb them, for they had convincing evidence to set against the first group of hostile arguments, while the theory of Satanic intervention could be annoying only to those who believed in Satan. But here was one who, while admitting the genuineness of the séance room phenomena, not only explained them in a wholly unacceptable and, be it said, uncomfortable way, but was said herself to be able to repeat many of them at will. *Isis Unveiled* was like a stone thrown at the Spiritualist hive and the bees swarmed out to sting the rash intruder. At all costs she must be discredited that the cherished beliefs she challenged might be maintained. And so old slanders were revived and new ones put into circulation, while a painstaking gentleman, named Coleman, made it his life work to prove that *Isis Unveiled* was nothing but a conglomeration of unacknowledged quotations.

The man who can advance reasons for his theories of life will always be prepared to meet objections by argument; but when beliefs held irrationally are challenged, their holder invariably gets angry and tries to defend his darling illusions by assailing the personal character of his opponent. The American spiritualists reacted in this way to H. P. B.'s criticisms in 1877 and the years that followed; but it was not until the Indian phase of her career that the ranks of her enemies became reinforced by the weight of orthodox Christianity.

Prior to the arrival of the Theosophical delegates in Bombay in 1879, the missionaries had had things all their own way. With the prestige of the governing race behind them, they could persuade themselves that Brahmanism, being the creed of an "inferior" race, was necessarily an inferior religion, inevitably doomed in the course of time to be replaced by Christianity. Accordingly, when *The Theosophist* was started and an active movement for the revival of the native religions in their primitive purity set on foot by a group of Europeans with Indian associates, the missionaries recognised the danger to their racial and religious dominance, and adopted the time dishonoured tactics of blackening the reputation of their leading opponent as a preliminary to driving her and her society out of the field. In the perfectly sincere belief that a critic of their views must necessarily be a bad person, whose elimination as a controversialist must be sought by any and every means, the missionaries and their supporters seized eagerly on every rumour damaging to H. P. Blavatsky and used it as a weapon against her. It was the bait of a sum of money paid them by the Presbyterian

mission at Madras that induced the Coulombs to betray their trust and their benefactress by supplying faked documents as "evidence" of her supposed frauds.

While both Spiritualists and orthodox Christians had what seemed to them to be urgent reasons for defending their pet doctrines by attacking Madame Blavatsky, the Materialists had, from their point of view an even stronger case against her. If her phenomena were genuine, then their materialism must needs be untrue: the alternative was simple and obvious. The convinced old-fashioned Materialist was compelled to reject, as the product of mere trickery, *all* phenomena incapable of being reproduced in a chemical or physical laboratory. To him, the people responsible for such happenings were simply cheats, and as such, capable of any kind of mean and disgraceful conduct. The Materialists were therefore quite as ready as Christians and Spiritualists to believe and pass on whatever they heard to the discredit of H.P. Blavatsky.

In conclusion, it appears to have been inevitable that a person with the strongly marked individual characteristics of H.P. Blavatsky, a woman moreover, and one utterly unconventional and careless of public opinion, should have been the butt of malicious tongues. But when such a woman came as a breaker up of grooves of thought and as the bearer of irrefutable testimony against the religious and scientific orthodoxies of the day, it would have been nothing less than a miracle if she had escaped the calumnies of those whose personal complacency and dearly held errors were threatened by her teachings.

R. A. V. MORRIS

You can never know her as we do, therefore—none of you will ever be able to judge her impartially or correctly. You see the surface of things; . . . we find a profounder wisdom in her *inner* Self than you will ever find yourselves able to perceive. In the superficial details of her homely, hard-working, common-place daily life and affairs, you discern but unpracticality, womanly impulses, often absurdity and folly; we, on the contrary, light daily upon traits of her inner nature the most delicate and refined, and which would cost an uninitiated psychologist years of constant and keen observation, and many an hour of close analysis and efforts to draw out of the depth of that most subtle of mysteries—human mind—and one of her most complicated machines—H. P. B's mind—and thus learn to know her true *inner* Self.

—MAHATMA K. H.

NEW BOOKS AND OLD

THE FIRST BOOK OF MADAME BLAVATSKY*

[**John Middleton Murry** reviews *Isis Unveiled*, first published in 1877, and his criticism is offered from the point of view of one who, believing in his own psychological subjective experiences, is not inclined towards facts of psychical science, occult arts, and Occultism. Naturally, therefore, the real value of this article lies in the views on topics with which Mr. Murry is positively related, and not in the opinions of a negative character on ideas with which he has not made himself fully familiar. As to the latter, the article immediately preceding this has some valuable and interesting points showing that the occult powers and psychic phenomena have a place in the scheme of things, just as much as the elevated ethics and spiritual intuitions of the Mystics.—EDS.]

In 1889 Madame Blavatsky, while publicly correcting a mistake in *Isis Unveiled* over which an exaggerated fuss had been made, concluded her correction with the words: "The work was written in exceptional circumstances, and no doubt more than one great error may be discovered in *Isis Unveiled*." Her candour was admirable; in face of it, for a modern reader of her work to insist on dubious points of detail would be worse than ungracious. There was in Madame Blavatsky herself a largeness of nature, and in her work a comprehensiveness which forestalls by anticipation all trivial and pedantic criticism. It is but simple justice to recognise that the composition of *Isis Unveiled* was an astonishing achievement.

It was written in a bare two years, in the midst of engrossing activities. As a mere piece of composition, the writing of these two large volumes now made accessible in one was a formidable task. As a comprehensive collection of material of every kind and quality, the work was prodigious. And when we consider that the audience to which it was immediately addressed consisted almost exclusively of spiritists, whom we know to be rather more impervious than mechanical materialists to spiritual truth, and that Madame Blavatsky was addressing them in a language not her own, we must allow that the circumstances in which the work was written were something more than "exceptional". They might fairly be called unique.

From my own quite personal point of view, there are two main elements in *Isis Unveiled*, of which one, I must frankly confess, makes no appeal to me whatever. These two elements are, first, the insistence, with a wealth of supporting evidence, on the essential truth and fundamental identity of all high religions; and, second, the endeavour to convince the public

**Isis Unveiled*: A Master-Key to the Mysteries of Ancient and Modern Science *and* Theology, Centenary Anniversary Edition, Two volumes bound in one. (The Theosophy Co., Los Angeles, California. $ 7·50)

of the reality of occult powers. For some reason or other, I have never been able to take even a faint interest in occultism. I have never been sufficiently interested even to be sceptical of the astonishing phenomena said to be produced by Eastern "adepts"; to me these belong to the same order as the miracles of the New Testament. Whether or not they really occur is indifferent to me, because they seem to me irrelevant to that spirituality which I hold to be of supreme worth. Occult phenomena—of which I have absolutely no experience—would never be to me the evidence of spirituality. In this matter, the truth, as I understand it, was spoken for all time by St. Paul.

> And though I have prophecy, and know all the mysteries and all the gnosis, and though I have all the faith so as to be able to remove mountains, but have not love, I am nothing.

St. Paul, of course, definitely believed in the reality of occult powers, and probably set great store by their possession; but they seemed to him of no account beside the spiritual rebirth which, in his language, was described as "being possessed by Christ"—not by the individual and historical person, but the eternal spirit which was manifest in him.

Madame Blavatsky's real attitude in this matter in *Isis Unveiled* I find hard to grasp. Towards the end of the second volume (p. 634) she writes:

> By those who have followed us thus far, it will naturally be asked, to what practical issue this book tends; much has been said about magic and its potentiality, much of the immense antiquity of its practice. Do we wish to affirm that the occult sciences ought to be studied and practised throughout the world? Would we replace modern spiritualism with the ancient magic? Neither; the substitution could not be made, nor the study universally prosecuted, without incurring the risk of enormous public dangers. . .
>
> We would have neither scientists, theologians, nor spiritualists turn practical magicians, but all to realize that there was true science, profound religion, and genuine phenomena before this modern era. We would that all who have a voice in the education of the masses should first know and then *teach* that the safest guides to human happiness and enlightenment are those writings which have descended to us from the remotest antiquity; and that nobler spiritual aspirations and a higher average morality prevail in the countries where the people take their precepts as the rule of their lives. We would have all to realize that magical, *i. e.*, spiritual powers exist in every man, and those few to practise them who feel called to teach, and are ready to pay the price of discipline and self-conquest which their development exacts.

Here, I must confess myself completely non-plussed by this simple equating of the magical and the spiritual. Whether or not spiritual powers are ever connected with magical powers (of which, unfortunately, I know nothing), I am convinced that there is no *necessary* connexion between them.

This may be simple ignorance on my part; but it is indurated and apparently unchangeable. Therefore it is not in the insistence upon and the evidence for the reality of magical powers that I find the main importance of *Isis*

Unveiled. Madame Blavatsky herself came to lay less stress upon them; and she wrote, in *Five Messages*, that "the ethics of Theosophy are more important than any divulgement of psychic laws and facts". Her great achievement, in my opinion, was the simultaneous onslaught which she made on the deadly enemies of true spirituality. On the one side she conducted a vigorous and victorious criticism of scientific materialism. At the time she wrote materialism was rampant. To the ordinary educated Western man there appeared, in the 1870's, to be but two alternatives: conventional religious orthodoxy, and mechanical materialism. Madame Blavatsky smote both the one and the other. As against the merely biological evolutionists, she insisted on the simple fact that the Life outside ourselves which Science examines is but the corpse of Life. The only place where Life can be immediately and truly known is in the soul of man. As against the religious sectarians, she pointed triumphantly to the universally valid spiritual knowledge enshrined from times immemorial in the sacred wisdom of India.

To this twofold effect roughly corresponds her division of her work into two volumes: the first, Science; the second, Theology. As against the narrowness of so-called Science, she maintains, in accordance with the highest philosophical tradition of East and West, that the most important of the sciences is the science of the human soul; and that this science is not, as crude scepticism would assert, unattainable. On the contrary it really exists, and has existed for ages; it has always been the substance of lofty religions, and that substance has always been identical with itself. What has varied is the mode of statement, the necessary imperfection that attaches to the utterance of the unutterable. This imperfection changes from being external and accidental, and becomes inward and essential, so soon as any particular statement of the universal and eternal truth claims for itself exclusive validity. On p. 639 of *Isis Unveiled* (Vol. II) she writes:

> Our examination of the multitudinous religious faiths that mankind, early and late, have professed, most assuredly indicates that they have all been derived from one primitive source. It would seem as if they were all but different modes of expressing the yearning of the imprisoned human soul for intercourse with supernal spheres. As the white ray of light is decomposed by the prism into the various colors of the solar spectrum, so the beam of divine Truth, in passing through the *three-sided* prism of man's nature, has been broken up into vari-colored fragments called RELIGIONS. And, as the rays of the spectrum, by imperceptible shadings, merge into each other, so the great theologies that have appeared at different degrees of divergence from the original source, have been connected by minor schisms, schools, and off-shoots from the one side or the other. Combined, their aggregate represents one eternal Truth; separate, they are but shades of human error and the signs of imperfection.

That is Madame Blavatsky at her best. The truth she utters is vital, and the expression is

admirable, even in detail. One observes the particular emphasis on the three-fold nature of man. This conception—which is, I think, fundamental to high religion—is expounded in two remarkable chapters on Christianity in Vol. II (pp. 123-209). (It should be said, in passing, that Madame Blavatsky's discernment of the part played by Gnosticism in the early Christian Church, and her rehabilitation of Marcion against traditional denigration have been since amply confirmed by unbiassed scholarship.) She insists on the indubitable fact that Jesus never claimed for himself a position of privilege with regard to God. He was indeed and claimed to be "the son of God," never "the only son of God". To represent him as making this claim is to make nonsense of his teaching, of which the all-important article was that men should learn how to become "sons of God". When, therefore, he became, for the author of the Fourth Gospel, "the only begotten son of God," the historical Jesus had been lost in the eternal Christ: "begotten of his Father, ***before all worlds***." There is truth in both conceptions. It is thus expressed by Madame Blavatsky:

> "God's son" is the immortal spirit assigned to every human being. It is this divine entity which is the "*only man*," for the casket which contains our soul, and the soul itself, are but half entities, and without its overshadowing both body and astral soul, the two are but an animal duad. It requires a trinity to form the complete "man". (II. 195.)

This is the true significance of the Christian mystery of "the indwelling Christ". By following the true teaching of Jesus—utterly distinct from the compromises and distortions of church Christianity—at all times men have attained what Jesus told them they would attain: the sense of being "sons of God". Thereby, they have attained veritable communion with the Jesus who showed them the path; but not with the personal Jesus, rather with the impersonal and omnipresent spiritual reality to which he attained, and in which he eternally lives. To this realm of reality belong by an equal title all the great masters of religion.

This is the veritable world of spirit. It is, and must be, impersonal. As a brilliant writer in the September number of THE ARYAN PATH (p. 653) puts it:

> SELF is not personal; Law is not personal; action is not personal; nature is not personal; only *human* nature is personal. This is so because only in mankind is the three-fold evolution, Spiritual, Intellectual, Physical, conjoined, albeit not yet *identified* as one and the same SELF in all. SELF is *impersonal* in every man, as in all Nature.

Self, in this supreme sense, is the final discovery of Spirit. True Self and true Spirit are given together. In the world of Spirit alone does universal brotherhood become reality, although this "becoming" is but an effect of perspective due to our own immersion in the sensual flux. The process of "becoming" is the process of the liberation of our impersonal self from the flux. The imperso-

nal self is eternal; and it knows, simply and immediately, that universal brotherhood is not an ideal, but a fact. Our struggle to attain to knowledge of this fact may be arduous; but the fact is lucid and unchanging. Our personal reality, if we will but inquire diligently into the nature and submit ourselves humbly to *all* experience that comes to us, leads us directly to a reality which is impersonal, yet most truly ours. This is our veritable essence; and this essence, once known, is known to be of one spiritual substance with the essences of all men and all things, past present and to come.

This doctrine, which I believe to be true, was presented by Madame Blavatsky more fully in *The Secret Doctrine*. In *Isis Unveiled*, she was content with a more cursory statement. But the second and third articles of her "fundamental propositions" in Chapter XII, Vol. II (p. 587) are perfectly definite:

> 2d. Nature is triune: there is a visible, objective nature; an invisible, indwelling, energizing nature, the exact model of the other, and its vital principle; and, above these two, *spirit*, source of all forces, alone eternal, and indestructible. The lower two constantly change; the higher third does not.
>
> 3d. Man is also triune: he has his objective, physical body; his vitalizing astral body (or soul), the real man; and these two are brooded over and illuminated by the third—the sovereign, the immortal spirit. When the real man succeeds in merging himself with the latter, he becomes an immortal entity.

There is to me in this nothing occult, nothing magical. It is simply spiritual truth. I might express it somewhat differently; but it is in the nature of things spiritual that the same eternal truth should be capable of being expressed differently in terms of different individual experience. If it is occult and magical, then I must be something of an occultist and a magician without knowing it. Occult, in the sense of being concealed from many, of course it is. Wisdom is not to be had for nothing.

> What is the price of Experience? Do men buy it for a song,
> Or wisdom for a dance in the street? No, it is bought with the price
> Of all that a man hath—his house, his wife, his children.
> Wisdom is sold in the desolate market where none come to buy,
> And in the wither'd field where the farmer plows for bread in vain.

William Blake's moving and beautiful words find their response in every man who has learned a little by suffering. Wisdom is always incomprehensible to those who lack the experience which precedes it.

But this incomprehensible quality of wisdom is not what is ordinarily understood by "occult". And here is my chief grievance against *Isis Unveiled*. As it would be ungracious to insist on dubious details, so it would be dishonest in me to conceal a more essential dissatisfaction. I regret that Madame Blavatsky allowed herself so frequently to be turned aside from her work of exposition of spiritual truths. That is, at best, no easy task; but it seems to me that Madame Blavatsky complicated it enormously by her addiction to mystery. Spiritual truth is

mysterious; but it is also simple. The parables of Jesus, the sayings of Buddha—these are mysterious, but they are not complicated. One does not have the feeling, in their presence, that enormous labours, prodigious journeys, strange initiations, are necessary before they can be comprehended. Or take the wonderful description of Yoga from the *Bhagavad-Gita*, lately quoted in these pages by Professor Sarma:

> That in which the mind is at rest restrained by the practice of concentration, that in which he beholds the spirit through the mind and rejoices in the spirit;
>
> That in which he knows the boundless joy beyond the reach of the senses and grasped only by the understanding, and that in which when he is established, he never departs from Truth;
>
> That on gaining which he feels there is no greater gain, and that in which he abides and is not moved even by the heaviest of afflictions—
>
> Let that be known as Yoga.

To such spiritual purity we respond immediately, or not at all. If we respond, we *know* that this blessed condition is within our reach. We have but to look steadily within ourselves, mortifying and rejecting from our essence all that is the false, material self. We do not need to compass earth and sea; we do not need vast knowledge, or strange encounters, only the unshakeable determination to reach the truth of our own inward being. That is hard; but it is not hard in the way Madame Blavatsky too often makes the quest for truth appear in *Isis Unveiled*.

I do not mean that a man can travel the path altogether alone. That would be quite false to my own small experience. I owe the great masters an infinite debt. When I groped after the meaning of my own experience I found it uttered by them. The masters of East and West have equally been my guides. But they have been masters open to all: books you can buy for half-a-crown. I have never felt the need of any more secret doctrine; nor do I really believe that, if there is a more secret doctrine, it is a whit more truly spiritual than the doctrine open to all.

Therefore, I am out of sympathy with Madame Blavatsky's tendency to make a mundane mystery of things that are mysterious only because they are spiritual. It seems to me that this tendency disfigures *Isis Unveiled*, and to it I attribute another great defect: that it is a baffling and disordered book. There is no steady progress to a conclusion, no gradual gathering of the manifold into simplicity, no final illumination. Everywhere there are flashes of true insight, passages of wisdom; but they disappear. To me, speaking as an unbiassed critic, it is as though *Isis Unveiled* were the work of one who had not yet truly made up her mind. That is not astonishing, considering the immense mass of material she handled and the short time she had to deal with it. But it prevents me from regarding the book with the same unqualified admiration as others to whom the works of Madame Blavatsky are as scriptures.

JOHN MIDDLETON MURRY

Dawn. By Theodore Dreiser. (Constable, London. 10*s.* net.)

I have just read a review of this book, dismissing it as vulgar, nothing more, and I am divided between contempt for the wilful, and pity for the real, blindness of that reviewer. Deliberately I would name this a great book, or at the least a book that only a great man could have written. Its faults may be admitted, of style, of selection, even of offence against current and local standards of good taste, but it has a deep honesty, a final integrity, which would override such failings a hundredfold increased. Its special quality, beyond that deep responsibility to truth, is not easily definable; it lies, perhaps, in the pervading presence of a pity born of a very terrible despair. The book is autobiography, the detailed account of the first twenty or so years of Dreiser's life; the second volume has already (previously) appeared as *A Book about Myself*, and the story will presently be completed in two further volumes. In the present history of childhood, boyhood, adolescence, and younger manhood, nothing is omitted, nothing palliated, nothing shirked. It is not a very happy story; his infancy, he says, was "a dour and despondent period which seems to have coloured my life for ever," and all his youth was oppressed by sectarian moral and religious dogmatisms delivered and enforced without explanation or understanding. At last, with a great sigh of relief, he cast them from him; in these pages he cries out upon them again and again as things of evil—but with nothing to set in their place. He sees birth as the beginning, death as the end, and between, no meaning, only experience pointing nowhere. "I take no meaning from life other than the picture it presents to the eye—the pleasure and pain it gives to the body." Man he declares a chemically-propelled mechanism perhaps "useful to a larger something which desires to function through him as a machine," but in whose purposes man has—can have—no conscious or individual participation. "The mental and physical appetites of man alone explain him. He is, regardless of ideals or dreams or material equipment, an eating, savage animal, and in youth, and often in age, his greatest appetite, sex. And from that, as I have always said and still stand prepared to maintain, arises all that we know. . . . There is no other direct first cause for man." Here indeed is the ultimate reduction of the materialist "Western" point of view to —to what? Certainly not to absurdity; it is too truly, too tragically held for that. Scorn is dumb before a stoicism so nobly sustained. Dreiser, and in his monumental person how much of the spiritually barren soul of the West, scans the heavens and sees no light, not even that of the power within him which sustains him and drives him to self-expression,—development, and —explanation. That is his significance; his greatness lies in a pity so deep, so authentic, for the sadness of human suffering he sees as beyond his explanation. There is no mockery in the man, and to share as one may in these pages the life-experience of such a one, however limited one may deem it, is no small privilege.

Geoffrey West

The Contemporary and His Soul. By Irwin Edman. (Jonathan Cape and Harrison Smith, New York. $2.50.)

By its failure to adapt itself to the needs of a changing civilization, religion has brought about a crisis in the modern world. Having lost his confidence in the old time religion, the modern man is now in search of a new way of life, whereby he may find integrity or peace of mind. In his book *The Contemporary and His Soul*, Dr. Edman presents the different ways of release offered to the moderns, and tries to see if in man's search for salvation a new technique for the good life can be found. Of the seven essays, the first one "The Soul of Man under Modernism" states the main theme, to a description of which the next five essays are devoted. But it is only in the seventh or final essay, "Note Concerning Salvation for this World,"

that the reader gets an insight into Dr. Edman's own orientation.

The several modern tempers, which are put forward as metaphysical way stations to serve the twentieth century pilgrims, appear in the first essay. Mr. Joseph Wood Krutch is made the archetype of the "embittered or ensoured group"—those who believe that they can save themselves by a complete disillusion. Happiness can only be found, says another group, by abnegating all but the external, sure and non-existent; —its spokesman is George Santayana. These must go back, thinks Dr. Edman, to Plato or to Hindu philosophy for their salvation. John Dewey and his followers find their anchorage in "creative intelligence". Still others, protesting against the sickliness, gutlessness and sexlessness of this generation, seek their oblivion in sex; and with Mr. D. H. Lawrence as their leader, they have raised sensuality to a cult.

Though these various ways of salvation are stated differently at different times, the quest of the soul, maintains the author, is the same through the ages. Without making any serious attempt to examine the validity of these and other current faiths, he merely surveys them as symptoms of that still persisting quest, in which the soul soliloquizes, in this age as in ages past, of its own hopes and of the obstacles it meets with in itself, in society and in nature.

All these, however, are ways of life beyond life, and they emphasize but one aspect of the world or of the soul of man as the means to his salvation. But since the individual is himself so largely the expression of the society in which he lives, and his soul so characteristically a product of that social order, no theory of life, which is unrelated to all the phases of his environment, can ever be satisfactory. One cannot really be at peace even with himself in a society that is not in its whole organization at peace—so intervolved have contemporary lives become. And the good life is therefore contingent upon a thousand factors of economic and social well-being. The abrasive and corrosive factors of modern life must be reduced to proportions which can be spiritually assimilated, and the materials of felicity must be more equitably distributed. And so the author stresses politics, which, he believes, may, in a nobler form, become the inevitable concern of the spirit lodged not only in a body but in a world containing other spirits in other bodies. The sense of participation in a comprehensive enterprise raises life from the trivial or the absurd. Hence Dr. Edman concludes that the intuition of immortal things, the sense of participation in an enterprise, infinite, and yet very human, are all the religion that one needs in our generation.

JAGADISAN M. KUMARAPPA

Dreamers and Doers. By O. P. HAMILTON. (Noel Douglas, London. 3*s.* 6*d.*)

This short play in two scenes delineates two main types of individuals, "the dreamers who are few in number" and the "doers who form the majority". The former is represented by James, an artist, and the latter by Rudolph, a soldier. A brief indication is also given of a third, but rare, type—the "dreamer-doer," as for example Jesus. The arguments of James are directed to show to Rudolph the futility of a life lived purely in terms of the physical, and to indicate that we are here for the purpose of "the purification of our souls," for elevation of our desires, to "conquer matter" and "not deny it," "to mould the world and not be moulded by the world".

Even so, James's arguments still fall short of the methods of true spiritual wisdom. Not by seeking "solitude to realize more fully," or by mere "duty to oneself" can one become a co-worker with the "eternally beneficent *forces* in Nature," but by the acquirement of real knowledge, right ethics and by having the constant desire to serve mankind. And this James has still to gain, if he wants to influence hard headed Rudolphs.

L. M.

Grimhaven. By ROBERT JOYCE TASKER. (Alfred A. Knopf, New York. $3.00.)

It is futile to hope to comprehend the criminal fully by reading books on criminology written by those who have never run athwart the laws. Equally impossible is it to understand prison life without undergoing it. The latter is so well recognized that men, the famous Thomas Mott Osborne, for instance, have voluntarily had themselves incarcerated in order to get a taste of what society is inflicting on its undesirable members. Proposals have been seriously made in America that every judge of a criminal court and every prosecuting attorney should be required to serve a prison term before taking office—they would then have some idea of what an inferno they are sending their fellow men into. You may say that one cannot learn much from the criminal's account of himself because, being a criminal, he must of necessity be a liar: which is as true, and no more, as that nearly all of us are liars when we try to put on a good appearance, to make ourselves out what we are not and know we are not. But an autobiography by a convict is just as good as any other autobiography.

If you would understand the criminal you must associate with him, or, at least, listen to what he has to say of himself and of his associates. If you will do that you will learn more than by reading all the bibles and discourses on sin ever written, and all the books on criminology, valuable as they may be. Therefore books written by prisoners on prison life have a deep interest and a great value.

One of the famous books on American prison life is Donald Lowrie's *My Life in Prison*, a narrative of his ten years' experience as an inmate of San Quentin prison, one of the two great California bastiles. But the San Quentin of Donald Lowrie's day is not the San Quentin of to-day, bad as this still is. In Lowrie's day the one idea was that of punishment, brutal and prolonged; the officials were simply brutes who maintained discipline by a system of terrorism backed by torture. To-day, while the dungeon, or "hole," is still maintained for recalcitrants, ample opportunity is given to those who would make something of themselves to acquire an education, not alone by classes held in the prison, but by correspondence courses offered gratuitously by the University of California. One can even learn how to sail a ship or fly an airplane while sitting in his cell!

Grimhaven is a narrative by a San Quentin prisoner of some refinement who utilised his time in cultivating the art of writing. H. L. Mencken took an interest in him and published some of his shorter articles in his *American Mercury* magazine. Beginning with his first day in prison and giving glimpses of the inside, Tasker's chief aim was to picture to us the various inmates with whom he came intimately into contact: he gives us pen-pictures of many prisoners with whom he cultivated either a friendship or a more or less pronounced dislike. One by one they are paraded before us with a fellow convict as showman. Tasker, being a thoughtful person, his chosen associates were men who, while often betraying the coarsest traits, still had some disposition to use their brains and often their pens. It is a weird and fascinating picture.

The writer is somewhat of a cynic. One class of person chiefly incited his ire, the ladies, the "sob-sisters," as he calls them, who visit prisons with the purported object of "saving souls," but in reality, so he thinks, and it is doubtless often true, for the purpose of getting for themselves a credit on the Book of Life—so many souls saved, so many more chances of a front seat with cushion in the Grand Opera of the New Jerusalem. His scorn for these is simply withering. Probably his attitude is extreme; he had an overdose of the brand of religion handed out to convicts, and it has permanently ruined his taste for "things of the spirit". The chapter devoted to this is one of his best; it fully confirms the attitude of Chaplain Geisert, whose book, *The Criminal*,

was reviewed in the August ARYAN PATH, that the less you talk of dogmatic religion to convicts the better. These ladies who were rolling up a big bank account for themselves in heaven, so they thought, simply aroused a spirit of hypocrisy in their subjects, many of these acting all the phases of conviction and confession of sin, conversion, praying aloud in meeting, grace and redemption through the blood of the Lamb, just as a pastime to amuse themselves and fellows, and laughing heartily afterwards, while incidentally causing the ladies to plume their feathers over their achievements. Theosophists—who have done not a little work among the San Quentin prisoners—he regards as thoroughly honest, but thinks that it is only the bizarre aspects of a certain brand of Theosophy which appeal to the majority —they like to think of floating about on the astral plane instead of being locked in a narrow cell. That aspect was exploited in Jack London's *Star Rover*, and I myself knew a prisoner who used to boast to his fellows of getting out of prison for one-third of his time, while he slept. To the man in confinement anything which gives him a supposed brief release is welcome. Well, it may help the poor devils to that extent, even if they fail to be persuaded that a belief in karma should reconcile them to their fate.

Two other especially interesting chapters deal, the one with the frequent hangings occurring in the prison and the effect on the inmates, the other with confinement in the dark "holes," with bugs as companions and a scanty allowance of bread and water, the bread being thrown to them upon the bespittled floor, and with beans as an occasional relish—beans being one of the items for which this prison is renowned. There is no meal at San Quentin without beans; beans for breakfast, beans for dinner, beans for supper; BEANS!

The reader of *Grimhaven* may, perhaps, yawn occasionally over conversations which seem to lead nowhere, but he will, if he reads it through, close the book with the conviction that our American prisons are not doing as they could and should in salvaging social waste, but are rather helping to turn possibly redeemable material into worthless rubbish.

H. N. STOKES

The Children of Mu. By JAMES CHURCHWARD. Illustrated. (Ives Washburn, New York. 1931.)

The caution with which archæologists regard alleged new discoveries is laudable only when its motive is reverence for truth and when it is accompanied by an open-minded readiness to listen to and weigh the evidence for such finds as tend to subvert existing theories. Only too often, however, discoveries are rejected or set aside, not because they are supported by insufficient evidence, but on *a priori* grounds as being inconsistent with the scientific preconceptions of the moment.

For a long time archæologists were shackled by the limitations of the biblical chronology, into which all traces of man's past had to be made to fit; and the flint implements, found in Western Europe, were variously looked upon as Celtic weapons, or thunderbolts, or as having been planted about by Satan in order to mislead the faithful and upset belief in the Garden of Eden.

When Darwinism ousted the Bible as the popular creed, archæological discoveries had to answer to a new test. Man, according to Darwin, was evolved from an ape-like ancestor in the tertiary age; and into the mould of this theory all new facts must be pressed: if they were unsqueezable, then the evidence for them must be pronounced incomplete. When the skeletal remains of ancient man were unearthed, they were readily accepted as authentic and given an honourable place in museums and textbooks, provided they presented no features inconsistent with the tertiary ape ancestor; but a Calaveras skull or Galley Hill skeleton, which seemed to carry the origin of modern man farther

back into the past than the Darwinian theory allowed, were rejected as unproven.

The esoteric tradition, which is supported by universal legend and by the general drift of recent discoveries, alleges that man—civilised man—has existed on earth for a much longer period than has heretofore been admitted by even the most liberal and unprejudiced of orthodox scientists, whose theoretical position, however, has for some time shown a continuous approximation to the archaic Eastern teachings. If these teachings are true, then all genuine archæological finds, when correctly estimated, must tend to confirm them; and they will require no other support. The man who rests on truth will welcome all new facts. On the other hand, he will never put forward, in proof of his position, doubtful or unprovable statements; for, if he should do so, he would only be giving to conservative archæologists a legitimate excuse for the suspicion with which they receive every new item of knowledge that seems to conflict with their Darwinian orthodoxy.

The general acceptance of the archaic occult teachings as to the prehistory of mankind has been retarded by nothing so much as by the appearance from time to time of spurious archæological works based on "clairvoyant research," or information given by "spirits," or some other euphemism for the unbridled fancy of the author in question.

Of this kind of quackery Mr. Churchward's book is a flagrant example. He asserts that he is the pupil of a "Rishi," from whom he learned of the existence of the "lost continent of Mu," formerly located in the Pacific and submerged about 12,000 years ago. "Mu" seems to have been plagiarised from the occult traditions of Lemuria; but, presumably in order to give his statements a flavour of originality, Mr. Churchward has altered the details of what is a plausible and probable account into sheer nonsense.

From "Mu," Mr. Churchward assures us, the rest of the world was settled by colonists who sailed their ships through the canals which, "before the Andes were raised," connected the Pacific with an inland Amazonian sea.

Mr. Churchward claims to possess, or to have access to, documents and tablets in unknown languages, an ancient Tibetan map of S. America as it was 25,000 years ago, inscriptions in "Naacal" with details of the history of "Mu," and many other wonderful things that our museums have missed. He can decipher ancient glyphs with an ease and certainty that does much credit to his "Rishi" instructor; and he even tells us how certain vowels were *pronounced* by the inhabitants of "Mu"! He neglects, however, to acknowledge his very free borrowings from some of the more fanciful and unreliable of the writings of the late Dr. Le Plongeon, an example of which may be found on p. 34 where are set forth in tabular form the "Mu," Maya, and Egyptian alphabets. In this table, which has a very impressive appearance, the "Mu" alphabet is shown as almost identical with that of the Mayas, which is somewhat awkward for "Mu," inasmuch as the Maya alphabet never existed outside Le Plongeon's imagination—*vide* table comparing the "Maya" alphabet discovered by Dr. Le Plongeon" with that of Egypt, in that author's *The Origin of the Egyptians*, chap. VI.

Among other fantastic statements made on the authority of Mr. Churchward's "Rishi," are: that there never was a glacial epoch; that "the mountains were raised" a few thousand years B. C., before which the earth appears to have been flat; that there are "great gas belts" running under the surface of the earth, the "blowing out" of chambers in which has been the cause of cataclysms; and so on.

The most charitable judgment on Mr. Churchward is that he is trying to perpetrate an elaborate, but rather clumsy, practical joke on those modern Tertullians who measure the credibility of a statement by its absurdity, and are always agape to swallow greedily every new "revelation".

R. A. V. M.

The Education of the Whole Man. By L. P. JACKS, D.D., LL.D., D. Litt. (University of London Press, Ltd. 6s.)

Education is still generally treated as something available only in class-rooms, stored up in text-books, guaranteed by teachers and designed to be taken, willy-nilly, by pupils, in order that they may become good citizens. But man is a unity, and those who educate him must regard him as a unity and realize that the well-being of his body and soul have to be attended to in addition to that of his mind.

This is the plea being made by progressive educationists all over the world. It is fortunate, therefore, for this cause that the author of *The Inner Sentinel*, better known as the Editor of *The Hibbert Journal*, very definitely, in the book under review, advocates not only that "education should be the key industry of civilization," and "an equal partner in a community of interests," but that it should also be a system which will connote the "co-education of mind and body," "a complete education both for leisure and for labour".

Dr. Jacks has a fascinating and forceful style which is evident even in the titles of his chapters. Seven of these were originally written as articles or addresses, but have been deservedly given a place in this volume. The freshness of his imagination, his extensive learning and his sense of humour make the book delightful reading.

Not all that has been pleaded for in this book is new, of course. Some of the ideas are already in practice in countries educationally more advanced. A host of progressive educators, who have drunk deep at the fountain source of Dewey's educational philosophy ever since the beginning of this century, have never been tired of proclaiming those very truths in one form or another, and Dr. Jacks' support brings further strength to the movement.

G. S. KRISHNAYYA

A Peep into the Early History of India. By Sir R. G. BHANDARKAR. (D. B. Taraporevala, Sons and Coy, Bombay. Rs.4.)

This is a valuable second edition of a book which has long been considered a classic of its kind. It gives, in unpretentious language, an authentic survey of the early history of India from the rise of Buddhism to the revival of Brahmanism under the Gupta kings, and embraces a period of nearly five centuries. The narrative of the infancy of a great sub-continent and the succinct yet deeply scholarly exposition of the literature, religion, philosophy and science of India in earlier ages, should provide a nucleus for more ambitious studies. The author has reconstructed this history from archæological remains, coins and inscriptions. Nor are the writings of foreign travellers disregarded, and the author proves their practical utility in his work.

Again, the book derives peculiar importance from another point of view. It is almost a truism to repeat that ancient India was the seat of the wisdom of the world, and much of the light that later radiated throughout the other countries emanated from this fount and source of spiritual instruction. To-day, any Westerner wishing to study the ancient history of this country must begin with this fundamental fact in view, and to any so inclined, this book will give a preliminary peep into the glory as well as the stage of mental development that had been achieved in India. The author has also succeeded in showing how desire was even long ago considered as at the root of worldly existence, and how conquest and uplift of the personal self alone brought bliss within human reach.

Invasions by foreign rulers, and empires springing out of conquest, were not unknown even to the early history of this complex country which in spite of political misfortunes has ever been the home of truth.

S. V.

Essays on the Natural Origin of the Mind. By C. A. STRONG. (Macmillan. London. 12*s.* net.)

No science, among the special sciences of to-day, is more strongly marked by an increase of interest than psychology. In fact, if the latter part of the nineteenth century was the age of evolution, the early part of this century might be spoken of as the age of psychology. Though the older or traditional psychology was chiefly speculative or metaphysical in its initial assumptions and given over to introspective analysis, the psychology of to-day is gradually developing into a natural science; and as such it is more physiological in its interests and empirical in its outlook. In this respect the contributions of Darwin to natural science have been largely instrumental in changing the intellectual to the biological point of view in psychology. Could not the same natural processes, which have produced body, have also brought the mind into being? This problem, namely the problem of the evolution of the mental nature of man, is now engaging, as never before, the attention of modern psychologists.

In his book, Mr. Strong makes, in line with this new departure, a serious attempt to construct an evolutionary psychology. Four, out of the eight essays, contained in this volume have already appeared in *Mind*. In the first two of these essays, the author sets forth an hypothesis as to the manner in which sense data or data of intuition, come into being. Of the remaining six essays, four deal, in the light of his general theory, with the problems of reality and appearance, of space and time, of body and mind, and of the one and many in the realm of the mind. The next is an illuminating essay "On Images and Thinking" wherein the author contributes the view that the essence of a mental image consists in evoking the right reaction; he maintains that the images with which we think are the merest symbols, and therefore what is really fundamental is not the sensible content of images but their meaning. The last essay is devoted to a defence of Mind-Stuff, where, in the course of his very clever refutation of the criticism of this hypothesis by William James, with the weapons furnished by James himself, the author introduces the reader to his own "soul dust" theory.

The main effort of the author in all these essays is to make such an analysis of the mind and give such an account of the ultimate elements of which the world consists, as shall permit us to understand how the mind can arise naturally. Maintaining that, if the gulf between mind and matter is to be bridged, the chief contribution must come from the side of psychology, Mr. Strong so re-conceives matter that mind can intelligently come out of it. While the ground plan of the mind, according to this author, is in the nervous system, the key to the mind's activities is in its function. This position, he believes, is supported by the correlation that exists between mental states and events in the nervous system. Hence the facts, that consciousness or awareness arises by natural processes, and that this consciousness cannot be produced by a purely material world, form the base on which Mr. Strong rests his psychology. In his interpretation of the whole world of experience, and in his construction of the self out of what he calls "soul-dust," the author makes sharply a number of unfamiliar distinctions which render his arguments rather difficult for the reader to follow. Besides, his work, being an exposition of a special point of view, has its own limitations which make it necessary to exclude issues by no means yet settled among psychologists. Nevertheless, this volume, embodying as it does years of serious thought and research, easily enlists the reader's sympathetic consideration of the view-point presented by the author.

JAGADISAN M. KUMARAPPA

[In the short space at his disposal our reviewer could not present the tenet of Asiatic psychology, which is that mind and self-consciousness are *not* products of sense-activity and brain-cerebration. On the contrary, it is the human soul that is the fashioner of the

senses, organs, and the brain. This is a view that is too hastily rejected by Western psychologists, because for its accurate perception a careful study of Evolution as taught in Eastern Esoteric Science is absolutely necessary. —EDS.]

Initiations and Initiates in Tibet. By ALEXANDRA DAVID-NEEL. (Rider, London. 12*s.* 6*d.*)

To the Westerner new to the Orient one of its most bizarre phenomena is the mysticism that colours so much of its daily life even in the most material of environments. But the Westerner who knows the East from inside, as it were, realizes the deep truth that the apparently uncanny qualities of the intangible and trackless wastes of the immaterial soon resolve themselves into merely a closer contact with spirituality which results from the Oriental's way of living in more intimate touch with nature that guides the upward trend of his thoughts. The object of this book is "to supply those interested in the manifestations of Oriental spirituality with definite information regarding the nature of the Lamaic rites of initiation and the teachings given to the initiates, both during and subsequent to these ceremonies." To do this, the first thing the authoress does, and we think rightly, is to explain the much misunderstood term "mysticism". She shows that while in the West a mystic is a devout person tearing himself from what he still often continues to think of as the good things of this world, the Tibetan ascetic is sometimes almost an atheist and "envisages renunciation as a happy deliverance" and finds ecstasy in the immensity of Tibetan solitudes.

> What will keep him in a state of attentive immobility day after day, month after month, and year after year, will be the contemplation of the working of his thought in self-analysis, effacing its own functionings according as they are discovered to be untrue, until the time comes when reasoning ceases because it has been replaced by direct perception.

This book, then, gains peculiar interest from the fact that its authoress has lived for many years among the Tibetans; and she reports that she herself has practised many of the psychic exercises. Yet her conclusions and exposition must be taken with a certain amount of reservation, for though she professes to be a practising Buddhist, she is a Westerner at heart and a disciple of Descartes. In many places also, the authoress fails to penetrate fully into the inner significance of ceremonies and rites whose outward forms she here describes.

In describing the Tibetans, the authoress talks of them as "people who, instead of seeing before them the commandments of a God whom they conceive as being in their own likeness, consider nothing but the law of cause and effect, with its manifold combinations. Perhaps the philosophers of Tibet themselves conceived these ideas or perhaps they borrowed them from India." Their position will become more clear if we read the above statement in the light of what H.P. Blavatsky says in the *Secret Doctrine* (I. p. xx):

> Esoteric philosophy proves the necessity of an absolute Divine Principle in nature. It denies Deity no more than it does the Sun. Esoteric philosophy has never rejected God in Nature, nor Deity as the absolute and abstract *Ens*. It only refuses to accept any of the gods of the so-called monotheistic religions, gods created by man in his own image and likeness, a blasphemous and sorry caricature of the Ever Unknowable.

The real Tibetan mystic, in the contemplation of the Universe, restores in his mind the idea of the Absolute, and, experiencing reality from within, he penetrates intuitively the eternal principle of Nature. If the book succeeds in enhancing the respect of the West for this doctrine of the God Within, and of the Impersonal Law without, it will have fulfilled its purpose.

S. V.

CORRESPONDENCE

WHAT IS DOGMA?

There are few problems which call for more discriminative handling than that of dogma. For the majority of religious minds, the subject is practically "taboo," and for the unbelieving it is a thing of the past. Moreover, not to mention the interesting article of Mr. J. D. Beresford, so many studies, so many books have appeared on the nature of dogmas, their genesis, their evolution, and their death, that one has the impression of coming too late on to the field of discussion. However, since in the THE ARYAN PATH of September the Editors ask their readers and collaborators to "advance their opinions," I shall allow myself to make a few remarks.

First of all, dogma, in the orthodox sense, is in no way essential to religion. No doubt it is impossible to conceive of a religion without beliefs, no doubt all religions imply a teaching which cannot be communicated without more or less intelligible affirmations; but these beliefs, and this teaching do not take *ipso facto* the form of doctrinal propositions. In reality there exist religions without dogmas. One such was that of which Christ and his immediate disciples have given an example. We read, it is true, in *The Acts of the Apostles*, that wherever they came St. Paul and his companions delivered into the keeping of the brethren "the decrees (Greek: *dogma*) that were ordained of the apostles and elders which were at Jerusalem"; and at the beginning of the second century A. D., the Bishop of Antioch, St. Ignatius, wrote to the Magnesians that they should hold fast the "*dogmas* of the Saviour and the Apostles". But no one, however little versed in the vocabulary of the time, can ignore that the term "dogma" signifies nothing more than "precept"—a rule of conduct presented with authority.* These rules might be of a material order; might be concerned, as with the fastidious Jews, with rites and precautions against impurity. Or, as in the New Testament, they might be exclusively of a moral character. In the one case as in the other, however, they never left the domain of facts and had no metaphysical character. When Jesus preached repentance, faith in the Heavenly Father and his Messiah, the bringer of good tidings; when He said: "Lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither moth nor rust doth corrupt"; when He gave counsel for preparation for the coming of the Kingdom of God; when He enjoined "love one another"—he formulated divine imperative prescriptions, but strictly speaking there was in them no dogma. Before declaring to sinners that their faith had saved them, if the Master of the Gospel had regard for their spiritual state, never did he ask them to adhere to doctrinal theses. The original Christianity was essentially undogmatic.

Nevertheless, in the schools of Greece, the word "dogma" was applied to formulas which expressed the fundamental ideas of a system. Thus men spoke there generally of the "dogmas" of Plato or Pythagoras. Later, when spreading beyond Palestine the Message of Jesus was in some degree shaped by the mould of Greek thought, the propositions in which the Christian philosophers enclosed the primitive ideas of the faith took in their turn, the name of "dogmas". But far from being dogmatic in the later sense of the word, they were presented as approximations only of religious reality, as symbols always subject to revision, in order to remain in accord with reason and with the spiritual life. It was only later—in the Middle Ages—that their character changed. Under the influence of Latin formalism and Barbarian ignorance,

* "Dogma" can also have the meaning of "decision," "edict". Thus the third Evangelist wrote:—"There went out a decree (Greek, *dogma*) from Cæsar Augustus that all the world should be taxed. *Luke*, II. 1.) And the author of *The Acts of the Apostles* tells how it was said of Paul and Silas that they acted "contrary to the decrees (Greek, *dogma*) of Cæsar". *Acts* xvii,7.)

Scholasticism laboured, in fact, to convert them into crystallised, intangible theories—an expression *ne varietur* of the absolute truth. The business was completed in the sixteenth century by the Council of Trent, which regulated and defined all in the faith, and rendered it impossible to alter or modify anything either in meaning or in form. The work of Scholasticism led finally in the Roman Church to a fixed dogmatism, doomed for that very reason to become unintelligible. This is why, even while continuing to maintain that there can be no "real" discord between belief and the understanding, and that if such occurs, it is because reason or science is misinformed, Catholic theologians have come to recognise that the fact that a dogma is "unthinkable" "exacts from our reason an act of humility and of submission to the incomprehensible."* And this is why, again, even when a particular dogma seems probable, they cannot admit that its authority exists by virtue of an intrinsic truth recognised by the light of reason. "That which produces the adhesion of the mind to the truth is in no way the light which springs more or less powerfully from that truth, it is the authority alone of the One who has spoken"†—that is to say, of God interpreted by the Church.

But—and this is a fact that cannot be too strongly emphasised—if of the understandable ideas of the faith, scholastic theology has succeeded in making unintelligible propositions which bear now but the weight of its authority, in the measure in which it has triumphed, the dogmas have lost their empire. Officially they persist, and, in the Roman Church especially, they retain their severity; but they are, as it were, relegated to the background of religious life. When the catechists give instruction in dogmas, it is to those of an age at which these ideas present themselves as merely meaningless phrases; and when the preachers treat of the great spiritual truths or of the daily moral duty, they avoid any dwelling on the subject of dogma, and have done so since the time, already distant of Bourdaloue and Massillon. In fact, by a contradictory attitude full of grave consequences, the Roman Church, even while she maintains her doctrine with absolute intransigeance, shuts her eyes to the belief of the faithful; and these profit by her tolerance in that respect to take the most incredible liberties with dogma. As for the other churches, it has been proved by the overtures of union made in late years, that if some of them seem strictly attached to their orthodoxy, the majority seems strongly convinced that dogmas, in the scholastic sense of the word, have scandalously divided Christianity, so much so indeed, that they no longer lay their special emphasis on belief or on activities specifically evangelical.

Are we to conclude from this, then, that doctrinal formulas are doomed to disappear? Although many speak at present of "the death of dogma," it seems to me that this would be a superficial conclusion. In all dogma there is a mystic element which, in accordance with the faith, and as essentially a part of the religious life, is of an imperishable nature, or at least can only cease to be when belief in the religion is lost. On the other hand, as water cannot be carried without some vessel in which to contain it, so the mystic element, in order to be communicated or even simply thought of, must have an intellectual container—and this is given by Theology in the form of propositions. But it is clear that if these propositions are not to become outworn, they must follow the evolution of the human mind and be readjusted from age to age.

In a word, going back to the views of the first Christian philosophers, to me dogma appears to-day as the symbol of a spiritual reality which infinitely surpasses it and would therefore that it be ever perfectible. What Claude Bernard wrote in *The Introduction to Experimental Medicine* concerning scientific theories

* Mgr. Mignot, *Critique et tradition.* (*Le Correspondant*, Jan. 10, 1904)

† *La foi Catholique*, by l'Abbé Lesêtre, p. 37. (G. Beauchêne, Paris, 1923)

equally applies to dogmas: "They are only partial and provisionary truths which are necessary to us like the steps on which we rest to advance in the investigation. They represent only the actual state of our knowledge and, in consequence, they must be modified with the growth of science." If such relativity disquiets or irritates the ignorant and turns him into a sceptic, it does not lead the scientist to doubt science, the exactitude of which is proved by its effects. In the same way the necessity of reshaping the doctrinal formulas from age to age, does not lead the true believer to doubt spiritual reality because, in living it, he proves its value.

If the Editors should tell me that these are truisms, I repeat to them that I write on this subject too late to bring any new contribution. But I will add that as we live in an epoch where the most evident truths undergo so many eclipses, it is not useless to discuss the subject once more. And if the truisms of which I speak were more brought forward, humanity would certainly be nearer to union and spiritual joy.

Paris M. DUGARD

SCIENCE NEARS OCCULTISM

From the following extracts of General Smuts's address to the British Association for the Advancement of Science on "The World-Picture of To-day," and from the statements of Madame H.P. Blavatsky in her monumental writings, one can see how all the trend of modern science has been anticipated in the Ancient Science and was known to the philosophers of old.

(1) "The principle of uniformity of nature was established...The unity and interconnections of life in all its manifold forms have been clearly recognised... Life behaves as a whole."

> The radical unity of the ultimate essence of each constituent part of compounds in Nature—from Star to mineral Atom, from the highest Dhyan Chohan to the smallest infusoria, in the fullest acceptation of the term, and whether applied to the spiritual, intellectual, or physical world—this is the one fundamental law in Occult Science. (*Secret Doctrine*, 1888, Vol. I, 120.)

It is on the acceptance or rejection of the theory of the *Unity of all in Nature, in its ultimate Essence*, that mainly rests the belief or unbelief in the existence around us of other conscious beings...(*S. D.* I, 276.)

The unity and mutual relations of all parts of Kosmos were known to the ancients, before they became evident to modern astronomers and philosophers. (*S. D.* I, 480.)

Occult philosophy, viewing the manifested and the unmanifested Kosmos as a UNITY, symbolizes the ideal conception of the former by that "Golden Egg" with two poles in it (*S. D.* I, 556.)

It is a fundamental principle of the Occult philosophy, this same homogeneity of matter and immutability of natural laws, which are so much insisted upon by materialism; but that unity rests upon the inseparability of Spirit from matter, and, if the two are once divorced, the whole Kosmos would fall back into chaos and non-being. (*S. D.* I, 640.)

(2) "Thus below molecules and atoms still more ultimate entities appeared; radiations, electrons and protons emerged as elements which underlie and form our world of matter. Matter itself, the time honoured mother of all, practically disappeared into electrical energy."

The atom, as represented in the ordinary scientific hypothesis, is not a particle of something, animated by a psychic something, destined after æons to blossom as a man. But it is a concrete manifestation of the Universal Energy which itself has not yet become individualized. (*S. D.* I,178.)

The atom belongs wholly to the domain of metaphysics. It is *an entified abstraction*...and has nought to do with physics, strictly speaking, as it can never be brought to the test of retort or balance. (*S. D.* I, 513.)

It is on the doctrine of the illusive nature of matter, and the infinite

divisibility of the atom, that the whole science of Occultism is built. (*S. D.* I, 520.)

It must be remembered that the words "Light," "Fire," and "Flame" used in the Stanzas have been adopted by the translators thereof from the vocabulary of the old "Fire philosophers"—not the Mediæval Alchemists, but the Magi and Fire-Worshippers, from whom the Rosicrucians or the Philosophers *per ignem*, the successors of the theurgists borrowed all their ideas concerning Fire, as a mystic and divine element—in order to render better the meaning of the archaic terms and symbols employed in the original. Otherwise they would have remained entirely unintelligible to a European reader. But to a student of the Occult the terms used will be sufficiently clear.

All these–"Light,""Flame,""Hot," "Cold," "Fire," "Heat," "Water," and the "water of life," are all, on our plane, the progeny; or as a modern physicist would say, the correlations of ELECTRICITY. Mighty word, and a still mightier symbol! Sacred generator of no less sacred progeny; of fire—the creator, the preserver and the destroyer; of light—the essence of our divine ancestors; of flame—the Soul of things. Electricity the ONE Life at the upper rung of Being, and Astral Fluid...at its lowest. (*S. D.* I, 81.)

(3) "There is no doubt about the reality of organic evolution which is one of the most firmly established results in the whole range of science."

With the old philosophers, evolution was a universal theorem, a doctrine embracing the *whole*, and an established principle.....(*Isis Unveiled*, 1877, Vol. I, 134.)

Modern, or so-called *exact* science holds but to a one-sided physical evolution, prudently avoiding and ignoring the higher or spiritual evolution, which would force our contemporaries to confess the superiority of the ancient philosophers and psychologists over themselves. The ancient sages, ascending to the UNKNOWABLE, made their starting-point from the first manifestation of the unseen, the unavoidable, and from a strictly logical reasoning, the absolutely necessary creative Being, the Demiurgos of the universe. Evolution began with them from pure spirit, which descending lower and lower down, assumed at last a visible and comprehensible form and became matter...(*I. U.* I, xxx.)

...While the Occultists and Theosophists believe thoroughly in the doctrine of Evolution as given out by Kapila and Manu, they are *Emanationists* rather than *Evolutionists.* The doctrine of Emanation was at one time universal. (*Theosophical Glossary*—"Emanation".)

The Evolutionist stops all inquiry at the borders of "the Unknowable;" the Emanationist believes that nothing can be evolved—or, as the word means, unwombed or born—except it has first been involved, thus indicating that life is from a spiritual potency above the whole. (*I. U.* I, xxxii.)

(4) "The general trend of physics has thus been towards the recognition of the fundamental organic character of this material world . . . Hitherto the great gulf in nature has lain between the material and the vital, between inorganic matter and life. This gulf is being bridged."

Each particle—whether you call it organic or inorganic—*is a life.* Every atom and molecule in the Universe is both *life-giving* and *death-giving* to that form, inasmuch as it builds by aggregation universes and the ephemeral vehicles . . . and as eternally destroys and changes the *forms* and expels those souls from their temporary abodes. (*S. D.* I, 261.)

Occultism discerns a life in every atom and molecule, whether in a mineral or human body, in air, fire or water. . . (*S. D.* I. 225 ft. note)

ALL IS LIFE and every atom of even mineral dust is a LIFE, though beyond our comprehension and perception, because it is outside the range

of the laws known to those who reject Occultism. (*S. D.* Vol. I, 248–249.)

Esoteric philosophy is not the only one to reject the idea of any atom being *inorganic*, for it is found also in orthodox Hinduism. (*S. D.* I, 454.)

. . . no single atom in the entire Kosmos is without life and consciousness . . . (*S. D.* II. 702 ft, note.)

Now the Occultists, who trace every atom in the universe, whether an aggregate or single, to One Unity or Universal *Life*; who do not recognise that anything in Nature can be *inorganic*; who know of no such thing as *dead* matter—the Occultists are consistent with their doctrine of Spirit and Soul when speaking of *memory* in every atom . . . (*S. D.* II, 672.)

Foremost of all, the postulate that there is no such thing in Nature as *inorganic* substances or bodies. Stones, minerals, rocks, and even chemical "atoms" are simply organic units in profound lethargy. Their coma has an end and their inertia becomes activity. (*S. D.* I. 626 ft. note.)

(5) "Materialism has gone . . . by the board, and the intelligible trinity of commonsense (matter, life and mind) has been interpreted and transformed."

We are at the very close of the cycle of 5,000 years of the present Aryan Kaliyuga; and between this time and 1897 there will be a large rent made in the Veil of Nature, and materialistic science will receive a death-blow. (*S.D.* I, 612.)

(6) "The world truly becomes process, where nothing ever remains the same or is a duplicate of anything else, but a growing, gathering, creative stream of unique events rolls forever forward. . . . . .Life through the ages shows clearly a creative advance to evermore complex organisation and ever higher qualities. . ."

It is a fundamental law in Occultism, that there is no rest or cessation of motion in Nature. That which seems rest is only the change of one form into another, the change of substance going hand in hand with that of form. (*S. D.* I, 97.)

The Secret Doctrine teaches the progressive development of everything, worlds as well as atoms; and this stupendous development has neither conceivable beginning nor imaginable end. (*S. D.* I, 43.)

(7) "Nature is not a closed physical circle but has left the door open to the emergence of life and mind and the development of human personality...the potencies of the universe are fundamentally of the same order as its actualities."

"*Every form on earth, and every speck (atom) in Space strives in its efforts towards self-formation to follow the model placed for it in the* 'HEAVENLY MAN'...*Its (the atom's involution and evolution, its external and internal growth and development, have all one and the same object—man; man, as the highest physical and ultimate form on this earth.*"—(*S. D.* I, 183.)

Every atom in the Universe has the potentiality of self-consciousness in it and is...a Universe in itself, and *for* itself. *It is an atom and an angel.* (*S. D.* I, 107.)

"Man tends to become *a* God and then—GOD, like every other atom in the Universe." (*S. D.* I, 159.)

It is evident from the few foregoing extracts of General Smuts's presidential address that the drift of modern science is palpably in the direction of liberalism and philosophy. So far, modern science has ignored the philosophical basis and metaphysical trend of Ancient Science. But modern science, if she wants to become the "magician of the future," will have to pay more heed to the Occult Science which has the seal of research, reasonableness, profundity and integrity on it.

London PH. D.

ENDS AND SAYINGS

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

HUDIBRAS.

OUR THIRD VOLUME

THE ARYAN PATH begins its third year with the present number. While we are not sectarian, we acknowledge having had a definite object in view in all the articles so far admitted to our columns.

The object before our eyes when we agreed to carry on this project was to shed spiritual light on the problems which affect the deeper aspects of life, to point to the traces of the Ancient Path of the Aryans, the Nobles, whose native land is the whole world, whose race is humanity, whose religion is loyalty to truth and whose ritual is to honour every truth by use. One of such enlighteners of the Narrow Way was H. P. Blavatsky, at whose fount of instruction we have assuaged our thirst; and so our second object has been to show how she presented to the modern world the ancient Light.

Forty years ago H. P. Blavatsky finished her earthly work. She put into motion great ideas and these are fast penetrating different spheres of knowledge and research. If the modern era honours Edison for the gift of electric light on the plane of matter, it will soon come to honour the Bearer of the Torch of Spiritual Truth, H. P. Blavatsky, in the world of mind. THE ARYAN PATH aspires to bring about that recognition by constantly and consistently showing the Blavatsky point of view, the truly Theosophical angle of vision. That noble word "Theosophy" has fallen into disrepute. It has become necessary to take this occasion to re-define the position of this journal in its relation to Theosophy; we wrote in January 1930:

> It is very necessary to clear the position of this journal in reference to the word Theosophy, a term deliberately used. Deploring the injury caused to its fair repute, this journal has as one of its objects the cleansing of that noble word of the contamination it has contracted during the last twenty-five years, by a dignified presentation of real Theosophic ideas. THE ARYAN PATH is not connected with any Theosophical Society. It is to be devoted to the consideration of the great ideas found in the principal literatures, philosophies and religions of the world; of all activities irrespective of political parties or shibboleths, working for human betterment; of all movements which spiritually advance the thought of the Race. This is the real Theosophy, the truths uttered by the great seers, sages, poets, writers existing in every nation from modern times extending back into the pre-historic past—not the present current misconceptions clustered around the name.

What was the Theosophical programme and policy of H. P. Blavatsky? Writing in *Lucifer* of September 1888 on "Our Third Volume," she said that which has

been our guiding light:

> Making no pretence to float a single new idea in philosophy, religion, or science, but only to revive and popularize the knowledge of the ancients upon these major human problems, it has played the part of the interpreter, not that of the iconoclast. Absolutely tolerant with respect to the several faiths of Humanity, its equal endeavour has been to uncover the ruin-encumbered universal foundation of religion upon which all rest alike.

And so we go on with a firm faith in the mercy and supremacy of the Law to whose fiat we bow; and in doing so we pray the prayer of old—

Aum! Let the Desire of the Pious be accomplished. Aum!

The depression in the entire business world is responsible for numerous phenomena, and among them there are two, the moral significance of which is worth noting. Big business had succeeded in raising the standard of life to a high level and in the Western world, especially in America, "noble" living implied a motor car, a radio set, a refrigerator. Cares and worries of life were ameliorated for the average man by the big business—with its instalment plans for purchases and all its other devices. The financial crash and the consequent poverty, of almost everybody has become a compelling force which makes men and women think. This is a recompense sufficient in itself. Their line of thought is naturally, however, one of economics. People desire to cut down expenses, and albeit against their will are forced to simplify their modes of life. That is an education with a deep spiritual value. This is the first of the two phenomena, and it has become a general topic for preachers and journalists.

With a light touch, Mr. Goodspeed, Professor of Theology at the Chicago University, writes on the theme in the November *Atlantic Monthly* under the heading, "The Uses of Adversity," showing how weakening to morals and character was the trinity of Security, Prosperity, Publicity. He shows how adversity is being practised as a fine art, is taken as a medicine, and is revealing itself as the most social force in the world. Professor Goodspeed does not however bring out the fact that while they are making a good effort to live cheaply, the vast majority are expectantly looking forward to the return of "prosperity". Their line of thought but tries to evolve a temporary expedient for what is taken as a passing wave of adversity which, once gone, the good old days will return.

And that brings us to the second phenomenon.

Economist-philosophers and thoughtful moralists see in the present crisis a grand opportunity to impress the masses with the fact that life as lived before the £ and the $ crash was wrong in method as it was weak in objective. Sense-life and its natural products, sex-extravagance and crass selfishness, have been playing havoc

with the minds of men. Psycho-analysis, physiologic-psychology, birth-control-sociology are in the main responsible for the philosophy by which the western masses live an exaggerated life of sense enjoyment and sex-licence. It is not that psycho-analysts and the advocates of these systems recommend sex-licence and selfishness; but the natural corollary of their theories, perhaps unforeseen by them, is an enhanced sense-life enervating to the body and deadly to the soul. Though the economists, moralists and philosophers, to whom we have already referred, may not recognize nor accept the causes to which we trace the evil, they are hitting upon the correct remedy—simplify life, control and train the senses, quiet the roaming mind, and use labour and leisure for soul uplift and heart enlightenment. We wish these colleagues of ours success in their venture of educating the mass mind; but will they agree with us that the primary necessity is clear thinking and the evolution of philosophic principles?

The method they suggest is that of self-training; they recommend " a new asceticism," "a carefully prepared discipline of life," "a supreme effort to become whole," a sustained effort " to be born again". Simple living and high thinking, thoroughly neglected in the past, should be systematically practised. To such educators the present world-crisis offers a most suitable peg on which to hang their philosophies. But if they are to achieve *permanent* reform they will have to examine more judiciously these philosophies. The thesis Professor Goodspeed advances is sound and its view has long been recognized by master minds. Four centuries ago Francis Bacon said that "Prosperity is the blessing of the Old Testament; adversity is the blessing of the New"; he also pointed out that "prosperity is not without many fears and distastes, and adversity is not without comforts and hopes". The exiled Duke in the Forest of Arden declared that "sweet are the uses of adversity". Economists and even philanthropists of the last decades do not seem to have believed in that wisdom spoken in the forest, and Bacon's view strengthens the conviction that Christendom has given the go-by to the doctrines of the Christ.

One of the peculiarities of the present economic phenomenon is that the rich who were living on the interest of their capital, in many cases unearned income, are harder hit. The middle class salaried men and women have not suffered to the same extent; most of them had not much of capital to lose and especially they do not feel the loss of luxuries which had become "necessities" with the rich. Between the outlook of the well-to-do and that of the rich the difference is substantial; the former can face the loss of luxuries with a finer equanimity than can the rich, who as a class (of course there are notable, noble exceptions) have been displaying greater

thoughtlessness and unbrotherliness, and Karma for this will take its toll; but the same Law also affords that class avenues of self-discipline and improvement—the *practice* of the grand ideals they have read about, discussed in their drawing-rooms, heard from many a platform and given assent to, without assimilating them. The turn of the rich has come, not to go down in life and suffer, but to rise to the height of their spiritual opportunity and live differently. "Give up thy life, if thou would'st live," says *the Voice of the Silence;* but they will need a philosophy, a basis for thought and conduct. All this is equally true of the other class, though a little differently.

The East, and especially India, steeped in poverty, longs for the wealth of New York and Chicago, as the early European trader and traveller once longed to shake the pagoda tree of prosperous India. The Gandhi philosophy of life may come to this ancient country as a saving force—but there is more than one pit-fall on that road also. Prosperity and adversity on the plane of economics are rooted in their spiritual counterparts on the plane of morals and thought, and Theosophy in this as in all else recommends the Middle Path of the *Gita* and says that unless a reform of the human individual is undertaken along correct lines, the dust of adversity will dirty the soul as much as does the gold of prosperity. Pride in jewelled robes is not much worse than pride in sackcloth and ashes.

How does Theosophy view the prevalence of moral laxity of the present period? H. P. Blavatsky wrote in her *Secret Doctrine* (II. 110):

> In sober truth, vice and wickedness are an *abnormal, unnatural* manifestation, at this period of our human evolution —at least they ought to be so. The fact that mankind was never more selfish and vicious than it is now, civilized nations having succeeded in making of the first an ethical characteristic, of the second an art, is an additional proof of the exceptional nature of the phenomenon.

Why then do sense exaggeration, sex-licence and petty selfishness flourish everywhere? The answer is that the West which has been guiding the march of progress in both hemispheres has encouraged and emphasised the wrong philosophy of life; it has enabled the selfishness of the lower personality to infect strongly the *inner* man with its lethal virus, so that the upward attraction has lost all its power on the thinking, reasonable man. Give the human mind a base for correct ideation and a man's words and deeds, as also his home and state, will change for the better, will become noble instead of continuing in the welter of mean and miserable earthiness. The ancient kingdoms of the Hindu Rama or Buddhist Asoka were rich both in the things of this world as in those of the Spirit, and their secret has its lessons for the modern rich who are struck by adversity, as well as for the modern poor who yearn for wealth.