

THE ARYAN PATH

51, Esplanade Road,
BOMBAY.

CONTENTS FOR

FORMER ARTICLES.

- CONCERNING THE TITLE "THE ARYAN PATH."—
By Prof. A. V. Williams Jackson (New York).
- PSEUDO-MYSTICISM AND MODERN SCIENCE.—
By John Middleton Murry.
- WHAT EASTERN RELIGION HAS TO OFFER TO
WESTERN CIVILIZATION.—*By C. E. M. Joad.*
- THE LEAGUE'S TENTH BIRTHDAY.—*By the Rt.
Hon. Lord Parmoor, P.C., K.C.V.O.*
- THUS HAVE I HEARD—*By Shrivaka.*
- PHILOLOGY AND PHILOSOPHY.—*By W. Stede,
Ph.D. (School of Oriental Studies).*
- THE CONSTRUCTIVE SIDE OF BUDDHISM.—*By
M. G. Mori (Japan).*
- ON REINCARNATION.—*By Algernon Blackwood.*
- SOME MORAL ASPECTS OF THE COLOUR BAR.—*By
Lord Olivier.*
- THE DIGNITY OF LABOUR.—*By Hon. James J.
Davis.*
- THE BARBARITY OF BLOOD SPORTS—*By Henry
S. Salt.*
- ART IN PARIS.—*By J. Buhot.*
- PERSIAN ISLAMIC MYSTICISM.—*By Margaret Smith.*
- ALCHEMY.—*By E. J. Holmyard.*
- WHAT HURTS LIBERALISM IN EUROPE.—*By N. B.
Parulekar.*
- WHERE EAST AND WEST MEET.—*By A. N. M.*
- THE NEXT RENAISSANCE.—*By A. R. Orage.*
- THREE KINDS OF READING.—*By T. Chitnavis.*
- THE INNER LIFE OF SOCIALISM.—*By G. D. H.
Cole.*
- THE SPIRIT OF INQUIETUDE.—*By M. Dugard.*
- RELIGIOUS TENDENCY IN JAPAN.—*By Prof. E. E.
Speight.*
- THE PATH.—*By G. T. Shastri.*
- MAN OR VERSUS NATIONALISM.—*By Norman
Angell.*
- THE OLD DOCTRINE OF MAYA AND MODERN
SCIENCE.—*By Ivor B. Hart, O.B.E., Ph.D.*
- CIVILISATION.—*By C. Delisle Burns.*
- THE ZOROASTRIAN CALENDAR.—*By Dr. Hadi
Hassan Saheb.*
- TOWARDS A RECOVERY OF THE SPIRITUAL LIFE.—
By Irwin Edman.
- PARACELSUS AS PIONEER OF MEDICAL SCIENCE.—
By Dr. Bernard Aschner.
- ART AND RELIGION.—*By J. D. Beresford.*
- IS UNIVERSAL PEACE PRACTICABLE?—*By Raja
J. P. Bahadur Singh.*

OUR LAST NUMBER.

- THE MARCH OF THE SOUL.
- THE MESSAGE OF THE HEROES.—*By John Middle-
ton Murry.*
- VAISAKH—A FESTIVAL MONTH.—*By N. Kasturi
Iyer.*
- REINCARNATION BEING TRUE.—*By H. W. R.*
- PROSPICE ET RESPICE.—*By Prof. A. R. Wadia.*
- INTELLECTUAL INTEGRITY.—*By C. E. M. Joad.*
- THE EXAMPLE OF DENMARK.—*By Francis Perrot.*
- PRAYER FOR EVERY MORNING.—*By Dr. W. Stede.*
- THE MUI TSAI SLAVES.—*By J. H. Harris.*
- ON CONTROLLING THE MIND.—*By B. M.*
- RED INDIANS UNDER HOOVER.—*By Carter Field.*
- REMOVE THE HANDICAPS: AN INTERVIEW WITH
HON. RAY LYMAN WILBUR.
- FROM LONDON.—*By J. D. Beresford.*
- IN THE WORLD OF BOOKS.—*By L. S. S. Kumar,
H. D. Sethna, Karl Steiger and others.*
- CORRESPONDENCE.
- ENDS AND SAYINGS.

FORTHCOMING ARTICLES.

- IS A NEW RELIGION EMERGING?—*By D. L.
Murray.*
- PARABRAHMAN IN EASTERN AND THE ABSOLUTE
IN WESTERN PHILOSOPHY.—*By G. R. Malkani.*
- RELIGION AND DRAMA.—*By Dr. Fred Eastman.*
- CONCERNING CAPITAL PUNISHMENT.—*By Charles
Duff.*
- SCHOPENHAUER AND THE EAST.—*By Richard
Muller Freiensfels.*
- WHAT BUDDHISM MAY DO FOR RUSSIA.—*By
M. G. Mori.*
- DEMOCRACY AND CULTURE.—*By Dr. L. P. Jacks.*
- THE PURGATION OF SUFFERING.—*By John Middle-
ton Murry.*
- THE OCCULT IN THE HISTORY OF MEDICINE.—
By C. J. S. Thompson.
- ART FORMS IN NATURE.—*By Ana M. Berry.*
- TORTURED BY KURDISTAN WITCHES.—*By Sirdar
Ikkal Ali Shah.*
- THE SYMBOL OF THE TREE.—*By G. T. Shastri.*

Per Annum—Rs. 10 India ; £1 Europe ; \$ 5 America.

Single Copy—Re. 1 India ; 2s. 6d. Europe ; 50 cents America.

Europe—Theosophy Co., Ltd., 293, Regent Street, London, W. 1.

America—Theosophy Co., 245, West 33rd Street, Los Angeles.

America—Theosophy Co., 1, West 67th Street, New York.

Publications of Theosophy Co. (India), Ltd.

THE OCEAN OF THEOSOPHY

BY

W. Q. JUDGE

A faithful condensation of H. P. Blavatsky's
SECRET DOCTRINE.

Price Re. **1**, or **2** sh., or its equivalent.

FIVE MESSAGES

FROM

H. P. BLAVATSKY

“ These letters exhort us to spiritual service; warn us against the dangers of religious bigotry, rank materialism, but above all against the dangers of an ever-growing psychic craze manifesting everywhere.”

Price annas **4**, or **6d.**, or its equivalent.

THEOSOPHY CO. (INDIA), LTD.

51, Esplanade Road, BOMBAY.

Advt.



The
ARYAN PATH

No. 7.

JULY 1930

Vol. I.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
MASTERS IN DAILY LIVING	417
PARABRAHMAN, THE ABSOLUTE—IN INDIAN PHILOSOPHY— <i>By</i> <i>G. R. Malkani</i>	420
DEMOCRACY AND CULTURE— <i>By Dr. L. P. Jacks</i>	429
IS A NEW RELIGION EMERGING?— <i>By D. L. Murray</i>	437
THREE BASIC IDEAS— <i>By H. P. Blavatsky</i>	442
LET US STUDY DEATH— <i>By Faquir</i>	444
CONTACTING THE INVISIBLE	446
THE BOOK FOR HUMANITY— <i>By G. V. Ketkar</i>	450
PEACE IDEALS AND THE HEART OF A CHILD— <i>By Jeannette Wallace</i> <i>Emrich</i>	454
THE UNBRIDLED TONGUE— <i>By B. M.</i>	457
SCIENCE AND RELIGION— <i>By J. D. Beresford</i>	460
THE UNCHANGING EAST— <i>By K. S. Shelvankar</i>	464
IN THE WORLD OF BOOKS— <i>By Margaret Thomas, Lionel Giles,</i> <i>Margaret Smith, and others</i>	467
CORRESPONDENCE	473
ENDS & SAYINGS	477

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

THE ARYAN PATH

ADDRESS :

51, Esplanade Road, Bombay, India.



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

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

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

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

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

- (a) To form a nucleus of a universal Brotherhood of Humanity, without distinction of race, creed, sex, caste, or colour ;
- (b) The study of ancient and modern religions, philosophies and sciences, and a demonstration of the importance of such study ; and
- (c) The investigation of the unexplained laws of nature and the psychical powers latent in man.

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. I.

JULY, 1930.

No. 7

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

MASTERS IN DAILY LIVING.

“ We are content to live as we do—unknown and undisturbed by a civilization which rests so exclusively upon the intellect. . . . The world, bad as it is in the present state of transitory period, can yet furnish us with a few men now and then.”

MAHATMA K. H.

The breakdown of scientific materialism, in the first decades of this century, is producing its effects everywhere, save perhaps in Russia and in those who are touched by its atheistic influence. Fortunately, with the breakdown of that materialism there is also a disintegration of the power of the churches and the creeds, in East and West alike—for religious creeds are a kind of intoxicant which befogs clear thinking and enchains the human mind to fear and superstition.

No greater service has Science rendered than compelling man to recognize the Theosophic truth that an Impersonal Law governs the visible universe ; and as the prime expression of that Impersonal Law is order and uniformity, it is but an act of simple logic to deduce that the same Impersonal Law must govern the invisible universe of hell and heaven.

This dual breakdown of Materialism and Religionism has freed the human mind from its negation of Spirit and from superstition concerning the origin and destiny of Soul. Among the effects produced there is none so potent as the desire to live the daily life differently, by some high ideals. Of ideals there is no dearth ; but on every side aspirants to simple living and high thinking encounter difficulties and experience frustrations. This is because the practice and realization of those ideals is not regarded either as a science, or as an art.

“The Art of Living” is the subject of Editorial Notes in the London *Everyman* of 17th April, in which the following appears :

The fact is that few of us are taught that life is an art at all. We hardly know of its existence until we have got well into it. We are taught all manner of things which we learn more or less well : how to write, how to speak, how to address our letters, how to make money, how to drive a motor car, how to cook, perhaps even music or painting or some other fine art, and to learn them we sit before some teacher. But the art of life we pick up as we go along, much as we learn how to dodge about the London streets without being knocked down in the traffic ; for there is no master to teach us.

There is a great deal of truth in this ; but perhaps the thoughtful Editor of *Everyman* does not suspect that his voice is the echo of hundreds, who like himself are responsible for this negative attitude. Having ceased to rely on religious notions many began to lean on the crutch of one-legged science, which dogmatizes—“What cannot be enunciated by me is no knowledge.”

The defect of modern western mysticism (outside of purely Theosophical ranks) is the view that each unfolding mystic needs to grope and experiment till Light dawns, and that there is no sure knowledge, no certain method, no definite step to be taken by the Soul. Such mystics believe in their forebears, who are absent not present ; who are dead teachers teaching through such partial record of their experiences as are left behind, not Living Masters who having solved the mystery of death know the art of soul-life, and who don the robe of flesh to keep company with mortals as their guides, philosophers, and friends.

Theosophy teaches that the science of soul-life is an exact science, and its doctrines are definite and arrived at by long search and prolonged experimentation. It confidently asserts that the existence of Deity and the immortality of man’s Spirit can be demonstrated like a problem of Euclid ; that Man-Spirit proves God-Spirit, as one drop of water proves a source from which it must have come ; that blind faith is not necessary, for priceless KNOWLEDGE exists ; and that it has been hidden only from those who overlook it, deride it, or deny its existence. Science, theology, every human hypothesis and conception born of imperfect knowledge lose for ever their authoritative character when Theosophy is *really* contacted. Lest this claim sound high or dogmatic, it is necessary to say that by Theosophy we mean that immemorial Wisdom-Religion, Bodhi-Dharma, which ante-dating Buddhism, and the still earlier Brahamanical Vedism, underlies every great religion. That Theosophy ever bases its moral ethics on three fundamental principles :

- (1) Everything existing exists from natural causes.
- (2) Virtue brings its own reward, and vice and sin their own punishment.
- (3) The state of man in this world is probationary.

These are axioms of the science of the soul. Occult physiology, occult psychology, occult spiritualism are the three branches of that perfect science, defined by its KNOWERS as the mathematics of the

soul. Our modern physiology has in store for its honest votaries great secrets, for it is one of the two great magicians of the future, the other being chemistry, both of which are destined to open the eyes of mankind to great physical truths; modern psychology is on the wrong track and will have to abandon its present-day tendencies and turn in the direction of the Master-Psychologists of ancient Asia; modern spiritualism is chasing but dangerous spooks which it takes for spirits, and it will have to reform itself and study the soul-satisfying philosophy of the Aryans, if it really wishes to help mankind.

This ancient Wisdom-Religion is at once a philosophy, a science, and an art. Its most modern expression is to be found in the recorded writings of H. P. Blavatsky who claimed "an intimate acquaintance with Eastern Adepts and study of their science,"—which claim she fully and completely justifies in her teachings. In her monumental *Secret Doctrine* she describes these teachings thus:

To the public in general and the readers of the "Secret Doctrine" I may repeat what I have stated all along, and which I now clothe in the words of Montaigne: Gentlemen, "I have here made only a nosegay of culled flowers, and have brought nothing of my own but the string that ties them."

Pull the "string" to pieces and cut it up in shreds, if you will. As for the nosegay of FACTS—you will never be able to make away with these. You can only ignore them, and no more.

From these Teachings to the Teachers is but a step, though a stupendous one. A long line of Teachers exists, known in India as the Guruparampara chain. These Teachers are Living Mahatmas, suffering with the suffering humanity, guiding those who desire guidance, instructing those who will to be instructed; and They do not labour for any definite organization, church or society, but work for a change in the Manas and Buddhi of the Race, *i.e.*, to enlighten the human mind and bring to birth within it the power of Intuition.

All earnest seekers will find Them, provided they leave behind dead Christs, vanished Buddhas, absent Acharyas and look for LIVING ONES who wait for and watch the lonely sore-footed pilgrims on their way to Perfection. Let the Editor of *Everyman* and his like study the science of the soul with fearless intellectual honesty, and they will find out for themselves the fact which Theosophy teaches about these Masters, the Bearers of the Torch of Truth across the ages.

PARABRAHMAN, THE ABSOLUTE.

I, IN INDIAN PHILOSOPHY.

[Prof. G. R. Malkani is the Managing Editor of *The Philosophical Quarterly* and is in charge of the Indian Institute of Philosophy at Amalner.

This article is in two parts : the first, printed below, presents the position of Advaita Vedanta, the recognized leading school of Indian philosophy ; the second will examine the views of Spinoza, Hegel, and Bradley in the light of Advaitism.

In the whole range of Knowledge there is no teaching which so frees the mind of passion and material consideration as the majestic concept of Parabrahman or the Absolute, which is the impersonal and nameless universal Principle. All persons and all forms having names are but aspects of IT—the state of Be-ness. While not a subject for speculation or debate, nor an object of worship or propitiation, It can be *sensed spiritually* by those who have gained the power to do so. Ordinary intellects are purified by an earnest consideration of Its Nature and Law ; personalities gain some impersonal perception thereby ; impractical materialism dies and practical idealism is born through it. Above all, the crude and degrading religious superstition of the control of human destiny by an anthropomorphic personal god or gods, which obsesses our race everywhere, vanishes like the shell of a spook when man's consciousness even glimpses this Truth of all truths.

To enable our readers to undertake this consideration we append to this article a few extracts from *The Secret Doctrine* of H.P. Blavatsky, which are indicative of the fact that she must have been one of those rare minds who spiritually sensed the Reality behind all masks.—Eds.]

Most of the systems of Indian thought have a religious aim. They arise out of the consciousness of the pain of life. Philosophy is only a means to the attainment of freedom from pain. This freedom or liberation is called Moksha. Pre-eminent among these systems is the system of Advaita-Vedanta or strict non-dualism. The aim of this system of thought is final liberation through wisdom. This liberation, however, does not mean absence of positive bliss. For Reality, according to it, is not merely self-existent and intelligent, but it is also of the nature of pure joy. Only this joy is not the kind of joy with which we are ordinarily acquainted. We know only that joy which involves the dualism of the enjoyer and the enjoyed. But reality being strictly non-dualistic, the joy of perfection or of fulfilment, the very acme of joy, is pure and without a subject enjoying and an object enjoyed. This bliss is of the very nature of reality. It is hidden from our view by the pain of life. This pain is ultimately due to the ignorance of the true nature of reality. When the ignorance is dispelled by means of right knowledge the joy shines forth. Knowledge of reality then is the only means to final beatitude. Religious practices and devotion have their value. But that value is secondary. They help to purify our mind and make it fit for transcendent knowledge. The ultimate destiny of man is self-realisation through knowledge.

The nature of Ultimate Reality is revealed to us in the Vedas. But to know, through the Vedas, the nature of Ultimate Reality, is not to have any direct knowledge of it. It is this knowledge only that will make us free, and not the knowledge of the Vedas. We must therefore analyse our own experience of reality, and thus verify what the Vedas declare to be the truth. What, however, do we find? Our experience relates to the finite and the manifold. We have no experience of the one Absolute, the Parabrahman, which the Vedas declare to be the only reality, self-luminous, blissful and immortal. This knowledge then is *prima facie* not our natural possession. How is it to be arrived at? It cannot be arrived at by some mysterious discipline or mystic intuition. We can only get at it by means of reason. Our ignorance, and so our bondage, lies in the inability of reason to resolve its own questions and its own doubts. This resolution of doubts will indeed make a change in our understanding, or our outlook upon things; it will make no change in our experience as such, which will remain the self-same experience for the person who knows and the person who does not. Advaita Vedanta cannot therefore be said to be a cut and dried philosophical system. Some of its positions may even appear inconsistent. But each of them embodies an appropriate answer to some particular question. The test of knowledge is the absence of any real or incipient question; therein also consists true freedom. The test of knowledge is not the possession of some uncommon intuition. This view of the knowledge of Parabrahman is based upon the Vedantic contention that the Absolute can be no other than the true Self of man; and since we can have no intuition of the latter which we do not already possess, and since it is not of the form of an object with more or less content, the Absolute is fully known even to the most ignorant man. Only reason is the barrier. It creates doubts and uncertainties. When these are removed by proper discrimination, there is left nothing to be known.

The first important point to be considered in this discriminative analysis of our experience is the absolute distinction of the Self and the not-self. It is evident that everything that is in some sense real and that forms part of our experience, falls under one of these two categories. There is nothing that is real that is neither of the nature of the Self, nor of the nature of the not-self. These two terms include under them all that there is. We know the Self to be only one entity of its kind; we know it is the direct intuition of our own being; other selves there may be. But we have no intuition of them as we have the intuition of our own self. Their reality to us therefore is the reality of what is different from our self, or the not-self. All the diversity that we know, the whole universe of things and persons, in fact everything that is objective to us in knowledge, partakes of the nature of the not-self. The self is that which is never an object; it is always the subject. It is the aim of the Vedantic philosophy to show that this so-called individual self is really the Universal Self, the Absolute or the Parabrahman, and that it constitutes the reality of the whole phenomenal universe.

A few of the arguments employed to prove that the Self constitutes the reality of the not-self may be briefly summarised here :

(a) Our intuition of our Self is of something that cannot be grasped as an object. It cannot be grasped at all. It is always that which grasps—it can never be itself grasped. Some would argue that since the Self cannot be grasped by thought it is nothing. But if “to be grasped by thought” is the *sine qua non* of being real, and if on that account the Self is unreal, then there would be no one to know or to grasp. And if there is no one to know, there will be no objects known, and nothing that will be real. The reality of the Self therefore cannot be doubted, notwithstanding the fact that it is empty of all content, and has no such nature that may be known as we know the rest of the universe.

The same certainty does not attach to our knowledge of objective being. We have always a doubt whether a thing that appears to us to be such and such is really as it appears to us. But apart from this doubt which is inherent in all our knowledge of objects, there is another difficulty in regarding the not-self as being equally real with the Self. In order that both should be real, they must have a common character. It is, however, evident that nothing can be common between what is essentially some knowable content, and what is essentially not such a content. We may suppose that reality itself is their common character. But if this character is a sensible character (and we use the term “sensible” in the general sense of “being objective”), it can never belong to the self or the subject which is not sensible. If on the other hand it is not a sensible character, it can never belong to the not-self, which has no part of its nature that is not sensible. What is then the common ground of the reality of the self and the not-self? We cannot conceive anything neutral that constitutes the reality of both. We have already seen that these two forms of being are mutually exclusive and together inclusive of the entire range of being. The conclusion is forced upon us that there is no sense of reality in which both can be proved real. At the same time we have seen that the reality of the Self is beyond doubt. If the Self were unreal, there would be nothing else that could be proved real. It is the ground of the reality of the not-self. The latter therefore must be pronounced to be a form of being that lacks reality. It is called by Vedanta “superimposed being,” or being that is illusory in character.

(b) That which is real must not depend for its reality upon anything beyond it. If it thus depends, its reality must be sought in the reality of that on which it depends. *Ultimately there will be only One Reality which does not depend upon anything else.* Applying this principle to the problem under consideration, we find that the not-self, however it is conceived, can only have dependent reality. The world of ideas, including all forms of mental content and mental activity, is evidently dependent upon the reality of the Self. It is impossible to find an actual thought without a thinker, or an actual will-act without the person who wills. Coming down to the world

of matter, we find that it not only arranges itself according to our sensations, but that it could not have the form it has without them. There can be no form and colour without visual perception. Our vision then is the seat of all visual matter. There can be no sound which is not a heard sound. Our hearing then is the seat of all sounds. There can be nothing rough or smooth that is never felt so by contact. Our tactual sense is then the seat of all tactual matter ; and so on with all objects of objectivity that constitute the sensible world around us. Thus the senses are the seat of whole known universe, and these senses are simply instruments of sensible activity of the One Self. The eye does not see. It is the seer that sees through it. The ear does not hear. It is the inner person that hears through it. It is one and the same Self that pervades the whole body, and uses it for knowledge and action.

The whole known universe has no independent being. It is what it is perceived to be ; and all perception belongs to the Self. The reality of the Self on the other hand can never be shown to be dependent upon the reality of anything else ; for it has no form ; it is never known ; it is the eternal knower, and therefore the ultimate ground of all things known. It alone is self-dependent ; because it alone is self-known as self-illuminated ; it does not shine in the light of aught else.

(c) What is real can never cease to be real ; it cannot also begin to be real. Its negation then should never be found either in any time that is past, or in the present, or in the time to come. It should be of the timeless essence. But there is nothing in the known universe which is timeless. Everything changes. It comes into being, appears to endure for some time, and then ceases to exist. The Self alone, in all this flux, is changeless. It not only knows itself to be self-identical, but it also knows change. If it itself changed, it could never know change. A universal flux of all things including the Self would mean a universal darkness or a universal nothingness, in which change itself would not be change.

These are some of the reasons why the world of objects, or the not-self, cannot be real. But at the same time this world is not unreal in the sense in which a self-condemned object like " the son of a barren woman " is unreal. The son of a barren woman can never even appear to be real. The world of matter does appear to be real. In that sense only it is to be distinguished from absolute unreality. Its unreality is the unreality that belongs to an illusory appearance. The snake seen in the place of a rope is not real ; but it appears to be a real snake as long as the rope itself is not seen. Just as in this case, the illusion of the snake would not be possible if the rope were known, and must therefore ultimately be traced to the ignorance of reality, namely, the rope, so in the case of the world-illusion. The world-illusion is due to the ignorance of reality, namely, the Brahman. When the knowledge of this reality has dawned, the illusion can remain no longer. It is the only possible explanation of the world consistent with a non-dualistic view of reality.

We have tried to show so far that Brahman is to be conceived under the notion of Self, and that the individual self is not distinct from it. It will here be contended: But we do not know the Universal Self. All we know are finite individuals that are quite distinct in their being, one from another. The reply of Vedanta is that it is the Absolute Self or Brahman that every individual in truth calls *his Self*. Every one who uses the term "I" uses it to signify an entity that is ultimately one and the same, the pure ground of intelligence. The difference between one individual and another which we signify by the terms "I" and "you" is to be traced to the difference of bodies, and the individuation in experience which they entail. In real nature, every individual is the same Absolute Self or Brahman.

It is often charged against this view that it involves what is called solipsism, or the fallacy of one experient. If the Vedantic view as stated above is correct, there must be only one experient that must experience all that I, you and all finite individuals experience. But this is not possible. For individual experience is a closed circle; it is too subjective to be shared by any other individual. There is no barrier greater in this respect than the barrier between one individual and another. If two individuals can have the same experience they will cease to be two. It is then a truth beyond dispute that no man can pry into another man's mind, or have an experience identical with the experience of that mind. And yet the above view wants us to believe that there is only one experient that experiences all that any one does experience. This can never possibly be the case, and it is not the case so far as known facts go.

It is pertinent here to ask: But how do you know that one man cannot have the experience of another man, and does not in fact have it? We can evidently know this only when we can in fact and reality go beyond our strictly private and so-called individual experience, and differentiate it from some other experience which is not, we say, our own. That we can in this way transcend our experience and know its limits is clear testimony that we are not truly limited by what we call our private experience. We know that our experience is different from the experience of another individual and in that knowledge we have already gone beyond our own experience, and demonstrated that in our capacity as intelligent beings we are more than finite individuals; we are the universal intelligence; and it is this that each man in his way calls his own particular self, not knowing that the particularity and finiteness do not belong to the Self as such, but to the non-intelligent concomitants of that Self, namely, the body and the *associated* mental processes. We are all one intelligent substance. At the same time, empirically considered, there are as many experients as there are individuated bodies. *The unity of individuals is fundamental; their differences are merely on the surface, superficial.*

The doctrine of Vedanta may be summed up as follows:—Brahman is the only reality. This Brahman is without any quality. It is pure being, characterless, and without any kind of determination.

Still it would not be wrong to describe it as a being that is essentially of the nature of intelligence and of bliss. These are not really its qualities. But we cannot talk of the Absolute without distinguishing in its nature elements that fall more or less asunder in our human experience. This Absolute is not far off, or incomprehensible so far as finite intelligence is concerned. For although, taken objectively, it can never be comprehended and must always remain as something transcendent, still, it constitutes the inmost Self of man, and as such, it is the most comprehended of all things. It is indicated in the well-known saying of the Upanishads, "That art thou"—meaning that the Brahman is not somewhere else, unknown and unknowable; it is "your very self," and nothing can be more immediate and more fully "taken" in knowledge. The visible world is neither a creation of this Absolute nor does it in any way manifest it. It is just a mere appearance, non-existent in itself, that has the Absolute for its ground and reality. There is only one real thing; and that is Brahman. We perceive it as the world; and therein consists all our bondage. Knowledge of Brahman, or the knowledge of our own true Self, alone will set us free.

G. R. MALKANI.

The followers of one of the greatest minds that ever appeared on Earth, the *Advaita* Vedantins are called *Atheists*, because they regard all save Parabrahm, the *secondless*, or Absolute Reality—as an illusion. Yet the wisest Initiates came from their ranks, as also the greatest Yogis.—*The Secret Doctrine*, I. 522.

It is wrong and unjust to regard the Buddhists and Advaitic Occultists as atheists. If not all of them philosophers, they are, at any rate, all logicians, their objections and arguments being based on strict reasoning. Indeed, if the Parabrahman of the Hindus may be taken as a representative of the hidden and nameless deities of other nations, this absolute Principle will be found to be the prototype from which all the others were copied. Parabrahm is not "God," because It is not *a* God. "It is that which is supreme, and not supreme (paravara)," explains Mandukya Upanishad (2.28). It is "Supreme" as CAUSE, not supreme as effect. Parabrahm is simply, as a "Secondless Reality," the all-inclusive Kosmos—or, rather, the infinite Cosmic Space—in the highest spiritual sense, of course. Brahma (neuter) being the unchanging, pure, free, undecaying supreme Root, "the ONE true Existence, Paramarthika," and the absolute Chit and Chaitanya (intelligence, consciousness) cannot be a cogniser, "for THAT can have no subject of cognition." Can the flame be called the essence of Fire? This Essence is "the LIFE and LIGHT of the Universe, the visible fire and flame are destruction, death, and evil." "Fire and Flame destroy the body of an Arhat, their essence makes

him immortal." (*Bodhi-mur, Book II*). "The knowledge of the absolute Spirit, like the effulgence of the sun, or like heat in fire, is naught else than the absolute Essence itself," says Sankaracharya. IT—is "the Spirit of the Fire," not fire itself; therefore, "the attributes of the latter, heat or flame, are not the attributes of the Spirit, but of that of which that Spirit is the unconscious cause." Is not the above sentence the true key-note of later Rosicrucian philosophy? Parabrahm is, in short, the collective aggregate of Kosmos in its infinity and eternity, the "THAT" and "THIS" to which distributive aggregates can not be applied. "In the beginning THIS was the Self, one only" (*Aitareya Upanishad*); the great Sankaracharya explains that "THIS" referred to the Universe (*Jagat*); the sense of the words, "In the beginning," meaning before the reproduction of the phenomenal Universe.—I. 6, 7.

Parabrahm is not this or that, it is not even consciousness, as it cannot be related to matter or anything conditioned. It is not Ego nor is it Non-ego, not even Atma, but verily the one source of all manifestations and modes of existence.—I. 130.

Parabrahm is the field of Absolute Consciousness, *i.e.*, that Essence which is out of all relation to conditioned existence, and of which conscious existence is a conditioned symbol. But once that we pass in thought from this (to us) Absolute Negation, duality supervenes in the contrast of Spirit (or consciousness) and Matter, Subject and Object.—I. 15.

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. Our "Universe" is only one of an infinite number of Universes, all of them "Sons of Necessity," because links in the great Cosmic chain of Universes, each one standing in the relation of an effect as regards its predecessor, and being a cause as regards its successor.

The appearance and disappearance of the Universe are pictured as an outbreathing and inbreathing of "the Great Breath," which is eternal, and which, being Motion, is one of the three aspects of the Absolute—Abstract Space and Duration being the other two. When the "Great Breath" is projected, it is called the Divine Breath, and is regarded as the breathing of the Unknowable Deity—the One Existence—which breathes out a thought, as it were, which becomes the Kosmos. (See "Isis Unveiled".) So also is it when the Divine Breath is inspired again the Universe disappears into the bosom of "the Great Mother," who then sleeps "wrapped in her invisible robes."—I. 43.

As the foetus develops amidst the *liquor amnii* in the womb, so the Earths germinate in the universal ether, or astral fluid, in the womb of the Universe. These cosmic children, like their pigmy inhabitants, are at first nuclei; then ovules; then gradually mature; and becoming mothers, in their turn, develop mineral, vegetable, animal, and human forms. From centre to circumference, from the imperceptible vesicle to the uttermost conceivable bounds of the Kosmos, those glorious thinkers, the Occultists, trace cycle merging into cycle, containing and contained in an endless series. The embryo evolving in its pre-natal sphere, the individual in his family, the family in the state, the state in mankind, the Earth in our system, that system in its central universe, the universe in the Kosmos, and the Kosmos in the ONE CAUSE. . . . thus runs *their* philosophy of evolution. . . .

All are but parts of one stupendous whole,
Whose body Nature is, and (Parabrahm) the soul. . .

II. 188, 189.

Moreover, in Occult metaphysics there are, properly speaking, two "ONES"—the One on the unreachable plane of Absoluteness and Infinity, on which no speculation is possible, and the Second "One" on the plane of Emanations. The former can neither emanate nor be divided, as it is eternal, absolute, and immutable. The Second, being, so to speak, the reflection of the first One (for it is the Logos, or Eswara, in the Universe of Illusion), can do all this.—I. 130.

Gods or Dhyān Chohans (Devas) proceed from the First Cause—which is not Parabrahm, for the latter is the ALL CAUSE, and cannot be referred to as the "*First Cause*,"—which First Cause is called in the Brahmanical Books Jagad-Yoni, "the womb of the world."—II. 108.

As somebody—Colonel Vans Kennedy, if we do not mistake—remarked, "the first principle in Hindu religious philosophy is *Unity in diversity*." If all those Manus and Rishis are called by one generic name, this is due to the fact that they are one and all the manifested Energies of one and the same Logos, the celestial, as well as the terrestrial messengers and permutations of that Principle which is ever in a state of activity; conscious during the period of Cosmic evolution, unconscious (from our point of view) during Cosmic rest, as the Logos sleepeth in the bosom of THAT which "sleepeth not," nor is it ever awake—for it is SAT or *Be-ness*, not a Being.—II. 310.

Chaos-Theos-Kosmos, the triple deity, is *all in all*. Therefore, it is said to be male and female, good and evil, positive and negative: the whole series of contrasted qualities. When latent (in pralaya)

it is incognizable and becomes the *unknowable Deity*. It can be known only in its active functions ; hence as *matter-Force* and *living Spirit*, the correlations and outcome, or the expression, on the visible plane, of the ultimate and ever-to-be unknown UNITY.—I. 347.

The fundamental Law in the Secret Doctrine, the central point from which all emerged, around and toward which all gravitates, and upon which is hung the philosophy of the rest, is the One homogeneous divine SUBSTANCE-PRINCIPLE, the one radical cause.

“ Some few, whose lamps shone brighter, have been led
From cause to cause to nature’s secret head,
And found that one first Principle must be . . . ”

It is called “ Substance-Principle,” for it becomes “ substance ” on the plane of the manifested Universe, an illusion, while it remains a “ principle ” in the beginningless and endless abstract, visible and invisible SPACE. It is the omnipresent Reality : impersonal, because it contains all and everything. *Its impersonality is the fundamental conception* of the System. It is latent in every atom in the Universe, and is the Universe itself.—I. 273.

One has to acquire *Paramârtha* lest one should become too easy a prey to *Samvriti*—is a philosophical axiom. In clearer words : “ One has to acquire true Self-Consciousness in order to understand *Samvriti*, or the origin of delusion.” *Paramârtha* is the synonym of the Sanskrit term *Svasam-vedana*, or “ the reflection which analyses itself.”—I. 44.

Paranishpanna, remember, is the *summum bonum*, the Absolute, hence the same as Paranirvana. Besides being the final state, it is that condition of subjectivity which has no relation to anything but the one absolute truth (*Para-mârthasatya*) on its plane. It is that state which leads one to appreciate correctly the full meaning of Non-Being, which, as explained, is *absolute Being*. Sooner or later, all that now *seemingly* exists, will be in reality and actually in the state of Paranishpanna. But there is a great difference between *conscious* and *unconscious* “ being.” The condition of Paranishpanna, without *Paramârtha*, the Self-analysing consciousness (*Svasamvedana*), is no bliss, but simply extinction (for Seven Eternities). Thus, an iron ball placed under the scorching rays of the sun will get heated through, but will not feel or appreciate the warmth, while a man will. It is only “ with a mind clear and undarkened by personality, and an assimilation of the merit of manifold existences devoted to being in its collectivity (the whole living and sentient Universe),” that one gets rid of personal existence, merging into, becoming one with, the Absolute, and continuing in full possession of *Paramârtha*.—I. 53, 54.

DEMOCRACY AND CULTURE.

[Dr. L. P. Jacks, who has been Principal of Manchester College, Oxford, for fifteen years, Editor of the *Hibbert Journal* since its foundation twenty-eight years ago, and author of numerous valuable books, needs no introduction to the English-speaking world. We count it a privilege to be able to print his lecture "Democracy and Culture" delivered at Leeds, February 10th, and at Cardiff, March 8th, of this year.

The theme of the paper has a universal bearing but our Indian readers especially will find in it many thoughts of high practical value.

In Theosophical philosophy Leisure and Labour are a pair of opposites—two aspects of one whole—through which the Soul gathers experience and grows. Labour is a compelling instrument of Karma, the Law of ethical causation, and Nature is merciful inasmuch as she insists that man shall earn his bread by the sweat of his brow. For this, training of body and mind are necessary, and with this modern education is concerned.

The culture of man is inherent in him, the quality of his soul. If efficiency in labour, bodily or mental, depends mainly on education, a man's culture expresses itself more naturally in his recreation. Dr. Jacks uses a word which we, as students of the *Gita*, very much like—excellence. Excellence is of the soul, is born of Soul-skill, as efficiency conveys to us the idea of mind-and-body-skill.

Excellence and skill, two words used by our respected author, are ancient words: soul-excellence, *atma-vibhuti* expresses itself through skill in action, and therefore the *Gita* (II.50) says योगः कर्मसु कौशलम् —"Yoga is skill in the performance of actions." How soul-glory, spiritual excellence results from the right discipline and training for the whole man, to whom Dr. Jacks refers, is shown in the *Bhagavad-Gita* and *The Voice of the Silence*.—Eds.]

I think it may be said without any kind of hesitation that who-soever has control of the education of a people has the control of that people's destiny either for good or for ill. Accordingly we find that Plato, in that ideal state for which he sketched out a constitution, laid it down, as an essential condition of the state's prosperity, that the Minister of Education should always be Prime Minister as well. The two offices were to be considered as one. The Minister of Education was to be the guiding hand of the State. He was to represent the will of the people in the matter of education, which Plato regarded, I think rightly, as the most important function that government can exercise, and because it was the most important he was to be considered Prime Minister. I commend the idea to Mr. Ramsay MacDonald and his colleagues.

In laying down that condition Plato took a long view. There are other functions of government which may seem more important for the moment and which certainly produce more spectacular effects. But in the long run the fortunes of the people, the fate of the people, their ultimate destiny will depend more on the way they are educated than on anything else. On no account, therefore, would Plato allow

education to be treated as a side-show, or made into anything less than the central business of the State, and the business of the Prime Minister.

Now according to the theory of democracy the people themselves are the controllers of their own destiny. That is the meaning of government by consent. But if Plato is right, and I think he is, no people can control its destiny unless it controls its education. It may control legislation about all other matters, it may control its foreign policy and its finance and the whole of its domestic organization, but if it fails to control its education also, it will not be the master of its own fate. The real masters of its fate will be those persons, or those institutions, or those traditions which determine that the people, in the persons of the children to begin with, shall be educated in this way and not in that.

The situation is certainly difficult; one might even say paradoxical. Nobody in his senses would propose to settle the lines on which children are to be educated by taking a vote of the children. And if the mass of the people happen to be themselves uneducated and ignorant a vote of the parents would hardly give you better results. Things were pretty much in that condition in this country when compulsory education was established sixty years ago. At that time the mass of the people, however hungry they may have been for education, were too uneducated to be competent judges of the kind of education they needed. That part of the question, and it is vital, had to be settled over their heads by the people who were supposed to be wiser than they and who were already in possession of such educational machinery as there was, and at the time it could hardly have been settled in any other way. The kind of teaching given was the kind which the existing body of teachers was competent to give, the three R's and the rest, and which the existing machinery was competent to work, a kind of teaching the main lines of which had been laid down in schools and colleges and universities long before democracy existed in these islands, long before the people had a chance of expressing their will in the matter. If the people had said: "We don't want your history and geography, your classics and your mathematics, and don't care much even about your three R's, but we do want instruction in the arts and crafts of life," the answer would have been: "You can't have that sort of teaching because no body of teachers exists that could give it, and the State has no machinery adapted for that kind of thing." As it happened the people said little or nothing about it. They accepted the kind of culture which men of learning had created and the well-to-do part of her community had long enjoyed, as equally suitable for the masses at large. There was no alternative. The State had nothing else to give and the people were not yet awakened to the need of anything more.

There have been great changes since then; all of them tending to bring education more into line with the actual needs of human life as is now lived by the masses of the people; the process has gone far and will go further in the future. But so far as I can see

hardly any of these changes have originated in the will of the people demanding the change. They have been the work of a comparatively small body of educational reformers and have come down so to speak from above. The people have continued to demand education ; they have even demanded that the highest education shall be made accessible to all classes of the community ; but when it becomes the question of what education is, of what shall be taught and how it shall be taught, democracy has not yet made its voice effectively heard and has to content itself with the kind of culture which the educational expert decrees to be the best. Fortunately our educational experts are much more enlightened and wideawake and public spirited than they were. I doubt if there is any body of experts more deserving of public confidence. Had it not been for their labours and the reforms they have carried out, often in the teeth of fierce opposition from reactionary forces, I have no hesitation in saying that the education of this country to-day would be in a deplorable condition. And they have done something more. It is mainly owing to what they have done that the people themselves are waking up to the immense importance of this thing we call education and are beginning to see the truth of what Plato said long ago, that whoever controls the education of a people controls that people's destiny.

In the United States the connexion between democracy and education is closer than in this country, not always with good results I must say. But you can at least say this for the American people—they have a very lively sense of the importance of education as a decisive factor in the well-being of the community. In the course of a recent visit in connexion with educational affairs, one of many I have paid to that country, I had the honour of a few minutes conversation with President Hoover and I ventured to say to him that education had become the key industry of the United States—a remark from which I am glad to say he did not dissent. It ought to be the key industry of every country.

Let us suppose then that democracy becomes active not only in demanding education in general terms, but in prescribing the particular kind of education that it insists on having. Can any forecast be given of the lines this new demand would take ?

Many people think that the effect would be to give the system a decided twist in the direction of what is known as vocational training—the training of young people for the particular trades or other occupations by which they are to earn their livings. This is pretty much what is happening in America—not always as I have said, with good results. Some of our best educationalists are strongly opposed to it on the ground, which I think on the whole is a sound one, that what education should aim at is the *all round culture of the whole man and not a partial efficiency in a particular occupation*. I have one or two remarks to make about that.

In the first place there is a sense in which all education ought to be vocational. It ought to train men and women for the grand

vocation of human life—the grand vocation of a good citizen. It is a failure if it does not.

In the second place we must remember, and this is often forgotten, that those very elements in our present system which aim at general culture, the insistence on the humanities as they are called, the great tradition of the classics—all that was intensely vocational in its origin. It was intended for those whose vocation would be that of the learned professions—in the Church, in the Law—and for those who were likely to become members of Parliament, or political orators. Advocates of the great classical tradition—and it is a great tradition and one which it would be a calamity to lose—need to think twice before hurling the reproach of vocational training at those who, while they honour that tradition, are yet pleading for something wider. It is a reproach that may easily come back to roost.

Whether vocational training is a good thing or a bad depends on the kind of vocation you are training for. If the vocations themselves are pitched on a low level, if their motives are mean and their objects are sordid, then the education which trains for those vocations will naturally be mean and sordid to correspond. But if the mass of the citizens have a sufficiently high conception of their vocations as workers for the common good, the more directly you train them for that work the more you will be ministering to their all round culture as human beings. The argument about vocational training all turns upon that.

I believe that things are moving in that direction towards a higher conception of the citizen's vocation and towards an education fitted to prepare him for it. But I know very well how dangerous it is to indulge in forecasts, especially in a critical matter like this. It is better to refrain from prophesying what is going to happen and speak only of what one hopes for and aims at. That is what I will do.

I have sometimes thought that educators, or educationalists, as they are now commonly called, might be divided into three parties bearing the identical names which distinguish the three great political parties in the State, Conservative, Liberal and Labour, but bearing those names in a strictly educational sense and without any political significance whatsoever. I will endeavour to explain what I mean.

A Conservative in education is a person who stands fast by the old classical tradition; a person who believes that culture consists, as Matthew Arnold defined it, in "getting to know the best that has been thought and said," and who believes in addition that the best that has been thought and said is to be found in the Greek and Latin Classics and in the literature and philosophy derived from these. This kind of Conservatism is strongly represented in our older universities, especially in Oxford, and in our great public schools—strongly represented in these places, but not of course, exclusively.

By a Liberal in education I mean the kind of educator who gives the first place to science and the second place to the classics and humanity. I think I am not wrong in saying that this kind of educational Liberalism is strongly represented in our provincial universities, in most schools that are supported by public money, and in Cambridge more than in Oxford.

The Labour man in education is not so easy to define. The important point is not to get him confused with his political counterpart, the Labour man in politics—for the two are not always the same. Perhaps you will not misunderstand me if I describe him as follows:—Man in this universe has two main occupations, the occupation of saving his soul and the occupation of winning his daily bread—of earning his living, as we commonly phrase it. Now the Labour man in education is one who pleads for the closest connexion between those two important occupations—his spiritual interests on the one hand and bread winning on the other. He is out for a system of education in which the labour of men's bodies and the labour of their minds shall become united and form in their union a grand system for the education of the whole man, body and soul together. His views at present are somewhat peculiar. Many people regard him as a crank. Others dismiss him as an impractical dreamer. Some go the length of calling him mad. But though his views are peculiar they are not narrow-minded. He is far from despising the old classical tradition of the Conservative, the tradition of the humanities. He has the utmost respect for the science of the Liberal. But he believes that neither the humanities nor the arts will ever flourish as they deserve to flourish until you get a much closer connexion than now exists between the work of society and the culture of society, between the labour by which men earn their living and the labour by which they cultivate their souls. The fundamental unity of bread winning and soul saving would serve, perhaps, as a motto for the Labour Party in education. And now I have to confess that I belong to that party myself—always using the term in its strictly educational sense.

But I have had my doubts whether Labour is quite the best name for this movement. I sometimes think that the Leisure Movement would be an equally good name for us. And I will tell you why. If you study the work that is being done in the world to-day, if you go the round of the various industries that minister to our many wants, you will be struck by the fact that a very large proportion of these industries are occupied in supplying us with what we want for enjoying ourselves in our leisure time. Some of the most prosperous are doing so. Is it not a remarkable fact, for example, that some of the great tobacco companies which supply us with the wherewithal for filling our pipes are paying enormous dividends, while the farmers who supply us with the wherewithal for filling our stomachs are having a bad time all over the world. I wonder if Mr. Baldwin, who is a smoker like myself, has ever considered the significance of that. It seems to me a highly significant fact. And there are many more of the same kind. They suggest to me that *the labour of the people*

and the leisure of the people are very closely connected ; they react upon each other in a thousand ways ; so that any system of education which deals with the one will have to deal with the other as well. Labour and Leisure taken together form the basis on which the culture of the people rests, and from which that culture must be built up stage by stage until it comes to its crown and glory in science and in art, in literature and philosophy, in morals and religion. Those high things, man's spiritual interests as they are commonly called, are never lost sight of by our movement. But they are not things that you can manufacture. They are not things that you can impose from above on people whose daily lives are pitched in a different key. They are not makeweights, or compensations, or beneficent extras which come from a different world from that in which the work and play of the community goes on. They are flowers that grow on the tree of life ; not artificial flowers made by educational experts and then stuck on to the tree to give it the appearance of being highly cultivated, but the natural outcome of the vigour and health of a nation's life. If you would have them you must grow them. And the soil in which they grow and from which they get their nourishment is the Labour and the Leisure of the people.

We believe further that there is something in human nature which responds to all this. In every human being who is not mentally defective there is a latent power which, when once it is awakened, can accomplish the most astonishing results. I call it the passion for excellence, and I regard it as the primary object of education in all its stages, from the kindergarten to the university, to awaken and to foster this passion for excellence in human beings, child or man as the case may be. My notion of an ideal system of education is framed on these lines. An ideal system of education, as I conceive it, while doing many other things would do this first and foremost ; it would rouse the passion for excellence in all classes of the community, and let it loose like a mighty flood to do its work in every department of labour and in every department of leisure. With this passion for excellence at work in a community I would be content to leave all else on the lap of the gods.

The first effects would be seen, I think, at the leisure end of life and the effect would gradually flow down from that to the labour end. There seems to be no doubt that the amount of leisure enjoyed by human beings is going to increase ; it has increased in the recent past, will increase still more in the future. As it increases we shall find that our social problems will shift their centre of gravity from the labour end towards the leisure end of life. As leisure increases, more and more will come to depend on the way people spend their leisure time ; on the quantity and quality of the goods they need to support their pleasures, of the services that are demanded in order to keep them amused and happy.

When we go for our holidays it is always wise to remember that other people who are not on their holidays are kept busy in transporting us from one place to another and supplying us with what we

want when we get there. We should find ourselves in a queer fix, for example, if all the people on the roads and the railways were to take a fortnight's holiday just at the moment when we were taking our own. This thing is too obvious to be enlarged upon, though, like so many things that are obvious, it is frequently forgotten.

But what is leisure? If anyone defines leisure as that part of a man's life which he devotes to enjoying himself, or to having a good time, I am the last to quarrel with his definition. There is no question as to our right to enjoy ourselves in our leisure time. That is granted. The question is rather—how far do we succeed in doing so? I have an impression, nay a conviction, that *all of us might enjoy our leisure far more than we do if we had been better educated*. If we could import into our amusements and our leisure occupations generally something of that passion for excellence which is so necessary in other connections, I believe the effect would be to increase our enjoyment of leisure enormously. I have tasted many sorts of pleasure in my life and I will tell you what my experience has been—not because I think it unique or peculiar but because I believe it to be very common. The pleasures that have given me most satisfaction, the times when I enjoyed myself most completely, were the times when I was exercising some kind of intelligent skill. I am far from counting myself a skilful man, but I have just enough skill to know the enjoyment that comes from it. The pleasures that I have enjoyed most are not those which I bought ready made on the market, but those that I made for myself by exercising the very modest amount of skill I happen to possess. I believe that all men and women are made that way. And out of that simple experience, which I think is a very common one, there arises a rough and ready formula which can be applied to this great question of Education for leisure. No one ought to be considered educated, whether boy or girl, man or woman, until he or she has acquired at least the elements of some sort of skill. There is no better protection against folly and vice. There is no surer road to the real enjoyment of leisure. I have often said, and I will repeat it here, that the greatest of our undeveloped national assets, at the present moment, is the skill of the people. Much has been said about making knowledge accessible to all classes of the community. We need to go further by making skill accessible to all classes of the community. There is no opposition between knowledge and skill. Skill is knowledge in action. Skill, you may say, is knowledge completing itself by doing the thing that it knows. Skill is important in labour—we all acknowledge that. What we have not yet realized as we ought is that skill is equally important, perhaps more important for leisure. The key to this problem of education for leisure lies, I am convinced, in that little word.

In connexion with that there is an important point to which I will now call your attention. I have long been convinced that our existing system of education overvalues the human mind in its relation to the human body. In a sense, of course, the human mind cannot be overvalued, but you can value it in a one-sided way which leaves the value of the body undeveloped. There is such a thing as the higher

education of the body*, as well as the higher education of the mind, and we are only just beginning to realize its importance. It is something quite distinct from what athletics aim at ; and goes much further than any of the matters which the Ministry of Health looks after or which hygiene in general is concerned with—much further than what we mean when we talk about *mens sana in corpore sano*. It regards the human body as a whole as capable of being developed by proper training into an instrument of the highest skill, governed by a perfect self-control and exercising a beautiful economy of power which far from being opposed to mental culture is itself a mental culture of a most valuable kind, and at the same time a basis from which a yet higher culture can be developed. Immense possibilities are waiting to be realized in this direction. In this country so far we have heard little more than a rumour of them. We have heard a great deal about hygiene and athletics but very little about the higher education of the body. In foreign countries, notably in Scandinavia, Germany, Italy and Czecho-Slovakia the matter is more advanced. The idea that the higher education of the mind and the higher education of the body must go hand in hand, that mind and body must be educated not separately but together as an auxiliary process has got a firm hold on leading educators both on the Continent and in the United States. These educators have realized that you cannot graft an A₁ culture of the mind on a C₃ culture of the body, and instead of leaving the body to the care of hygienists and athletic trainers, they bring it into the sphere of education proper and turn it into an instrument for the development of intelligence and character. Unfortunately, we in this country are still in the grip of a very old tradition which regards mind and body as somehow hitched together in an ill-sorted partnership, the mind a celestial thing and the body an earth-born and inferior thing which one has to tolerate as best one can. This false idea, however, will not last for long. We shall come to see, as many see even now, that the being whom we have to educate is always the whole man, body and mind together. When that is generally recognised, the higher education of the body will be made accessible to all classes of the community along with the higher education of the mind—the higher education of the whole man.

L. P. JACKS.

*Interested readers will do well to see p. 345 of our May number—a short letter containing important hints on this topic.—EDS.

IS A NEW RELIGION EMERGING ?

[D. L. Murray, after a brilliant career at Oxford, served in the Intelligence Department of the War Office from 1916-19. He is the author of various books, and was the dramatic critic of the *Nation* and *Athenæum* from which he has risen to a position of literary eminence.

In his able contribution our discerning author attempts a definition of the fundamentals of the Universal Religion of which Mr. J. D. Beresford wrote in our March Number and which they both feel, in company with so many others, must arise, once more, phoenix-like, out of the ashes of the many dogmatic and ritualistic religions of the world of to-day.

Is it a coincidence that Mr. D. L. Murray lays down in bold type three basic ideas of the Religion of Soul or the Religion of Daily Living which so strikingly resemble the Three Fundamental Propositions which H. P. Blavatsky establishes in her *Secret Doctrine* ? We append to this article a few extracts from that book to show the close identity of the ideas.

In reference to the emergence of this new Religion our author points out how its signals are to be found in literature, in science, even in political statesmanship, but not in theological creeds ; here is a fresh application of the adage "the nearer to the church the further from God." But this is very strictly a Theosophical view familiar to all students of *Isis Unveiled* and *The Key to Theosophy*.

There is another interesting point which our author makes : there will be union of reason and instinct ere the Universal Self-consciousness is felt, sensed and finally realized. Theosophy defines intuition as divine instinct, *i.e.*, instinct rationalized : what is done by birds and beasts instinctually without self-consciousness will be done by the twice-born (dvija) instinctively in full self-consciousness. (See *Isis Unveiled* I. 145 ; 433-34.)

Mr. D. L. Murray's article is certainly a sign of the times—Theosophy is no more merely in the diffused air as thirty years ago, it is filling the lungs and energizing the hearts of the most advanced thinkers who have freed themselves from the grip of churches, mosques and temples.—EDS.]

One need not look further than the columns of the newspapers to observe how widespread is the demand for a fresh religious assurance to-day. And one need hardly go beyond the same sources to realize that as a body the professional theologians are unable to meet this demand. This is said with all respect for their ability and devotion, and with due recognition of the mental strength they often display in grappling with the technical problems of metaphysics. But it remains that they do not speak a language to which the modern consciousness responds ; while too often their best efforts are thwarted by the explosion of historical religious rancours, Protestant against Catholic, Darwinist against Fundamentalist, Trinitarian against Unitarian, until one feels in the storm that it would be better for people not to feel an interest in religion at all if this is the consequence. While, therefore, the sense of religious need disclosed in these discussions seems answer enough to those who hold that the religious sentiment is to be classed with the "complexes" of the psycho-analysts and will disappear when it is understood, the ineffectiveness of professional apologetics suggests that it is not any of the older forms of Faith that will reap the harvest. From time to time men and

women of high intellectual, artistic and moral gifts are reported as converts to the Roman and other Churches which champion the old theology, but that theology remains none the less a riddle to the mass of enquiring minds. We must look elsewhere for the signs of religious revival.

They are to be found in surprising profusion among the works of writers whose primary concern appears not to be with religion at all. Critics of literature, novelists, and poets, students of physical science, statesmen, dreamers of social Utopias suddenly startle us by speaking of the realities of religious experience with a freshness and intimacy that we have ceased to expect in formal theological treatises. And the really significant thing is not that they should thus be found speaking of religion, but that the religion of which they speak should be recognizably of the same type. Differing widely in age, in interests, in cast of mind, they yet appear without the promptings of a common creed, to be reaching independently a common Faith. That Faith drawn from contact with life itself, rather than from speculation about its origins and ends, may well represent the next stage in the development of Man's religious consciousness.

This new Faith is no more easy to define in a phrase than any of its predecessors. But, since the roughest of definitions may serve as a dim lantern to guide us in our enquiry, let us say that the essence of the new religious intuition lies in the triple perception that LIFE IS ONE, THAT IT IS DIVINE, THAT THE DIVIDED HUMAN CONSCIOUSNESS CAN BE RECONCILED WITH THE WHOLE. And since abstract phrases are never very compelling in religious matters, let us follow the advice of Matthew Arnold (who in his day was not far from this Faith) and use a passage of poetry, to shadow forth a meaning that is richer than plain words can formulate.

For thou shalt be in league with the stones of the field ; and the beasts of the field shall be at peace with thee. And thou shalt know that thy tabernacle shall be in peace ; and thou shalt visit thy habitation, and shalt not sin.

This text from the Book of Job has been placed by Mr. Hugh Fausset on the title-page of his remarkable book *The Proving of Psyche*, a work to which we must return, and it sums up the emergent religious consciousness of our day with inimitable majesty. Let us note a few of the forms in which this consciousness has found expression in late years, before considering the practical bearing of the new vision it brings.

It was just after the terrible exposure of human division afforded by the World War that the veteran poet and sociologist, Edward Carpenter, who had years before voluntarily abandoned the comforts and dignity of an academic position in order to live in close communion with Nature as a rural worker, published in 1920 his elaborate review of human religions, *Pagan and Christian Creeds : Their Origin and Meaning*. The contention of this work is that Man has passed through three stages of mental growth :

- (1) That of the simple or animal consciousness.
- (2) That of self-consciousness.

(3) That of a third stage of consciousness which has not as yet been effectively named, but whose indications and precursive signs we here and there perceive in the rites and prophecies and mysteries of the early religions, and in the poetry and art and literature generally of the later civilisations.

This Third Stage, which Carpenter believed to be at hand when he wrote, he elsewhere described as "a Consciousness which shall have Unity as its foundation-principle, and which shall proceed from the direct *sense and perception* of such an unity throughout creation." The animal creation, so we may try to paraphrase Carpenter's statement, lives in harmony with the Universal Life *at the level which it is possible for it to attain*. From that proceed the strength, the grace, the joyousness of bird and beast. Untroubled by remorse or despair, they are in communion with the Divine to the extent that their nature permits. Man, called to realize a deeper and subtler penetration into the mysteries of the One Life, has been driven to separate himself from the blind stream of instinct and energy that suffices for the brute. By refining his self-consciousness he has gained an independence that allows him to see further into the meaning of Life and to draw from the stream that circulates through his own being harmonies and beauties to which the simpler organisms could never aspire. To develop these capacities has meant a struggle that has partially destroyed his spontaneity; put him in conflict with the Universal Life he has sought to canalize for nobler ends; and slowly produced a bitter sense of alienation from a Universe that does not seem to respond to his self-conscious ideals. The repressions of morality, the menaces of religion, the tyrannies of social organization have all been necessary steps to the Second Stage of Consciousness, and until the Second has been passed, the Third is not attainable. But the Third will mean a return to Nature, now more fully apprehended, the union of reason and instinct, the fusion of flesh and spirit, the service that is perfect freedom. As Mr. Fausset puts it in the admirable essay *The Proving of Psyche* to which we have already alluded, the fullest and most forcible statement of the new religious attitude that has yet appeared:—

Those who assume that conflict is a basic condition of moral achievement are not only blind to the ruin which it is working in human life but to its lack of conformity with the creative purpose, as distinct from the accidental processes, of Nature. Conflict, indeed, and the moral dualism which seeks to justify it, instead of being fundamental to Nature, characterizes only a transitional stage in human growth, a stage in which man has sacrificed his original unity to the development of his individual will and intelligence. But will is only an element and not the whole of Personality. It is by opposing his will to his desires that the individual becomes conscious of himself. But he cannot complete himself until he has reconciled his will with desires that rise in him from a deeper source, from the original unquenchable fount of life. Then only does his mind cease to be the enemy of life, and become "the eye with which the universe beholds itself and knows itself divine."

It is neither by banning Nature, with the old dualistic theologies, as the field of evil, nor by shutting his eyes, with the Materialists, to the spiritual splendour that gleams just as really through the stuff of the Universe as any ray of chemical heat or light, that the

disciple of the new religion will seek to harmonize his experience. But he will have to realize and confess that the new perception after which he is striving, the breaking down of the barriers of self-consciousness and communion with the heart of the universal Life, is likely to baffle, when it comes, the resources of definition and analysis. He must look to poetry rather than dogma, to parable rather than metaphysics, to convey his apprehension of the Sublime Reality which human faculties cannot yet, at any rate, reduce to a plain and intelligible object of thought. The method of parable is not new; and neither, if writers like Mr. Fausset and Mr. Middleton Murry are to be believed, is the consciousness which we are now invoking them to express a wholly new achievement. According to Mr. Murry's *Life of Jesus* (1926) this consciousness of Union was the underlying meaning of the "Kingdom of God" which Jesus preached.

There were, for him, three stages in the life of man: the unconscious life of the child (analogous, surely, to what we have called the "animal" stage), the conscious life of the man, and the new life of the member of the Kingdom. In the unconscious life of the child there was spontaneity and wholeness; in the conscious life of the man there was inhibition and division; in the new life of the member of the Kingdom, there was spontaneity and wholeness once more. Jesus taught, in the fullest sense of the word, the necessity and possibility of rebirth not in the narrow and sectarian meaning, but with a new positiveness.

Mr. Middleton Murry has since discussed the possibility of this "rebirth" of the soul endowed with a fresh consciousness of the harmony and divinity of Life in a number of brilliant works, culminating in his recent study of "metabiology"—the science of the spiritual values inherent in the natural universe—entitled *God*. It is worth while to compare with his conclusions the philosophy of organic unity to which General Smuts, its creator, has given the name of Holism, and Professor Julian Huxley's vindication of the religious sense as a true and fitting attitude towards the universe disclosed by science in his volume *Religion without Revelation* (1927). Amid particular differences there is a striking agreement here among thinkers whose work and experience have been widely distinct, that in the creative energies of the Life-Force the realities that stir the religious consciousness can be discerned by those whose faculties are developed enough to perceive them. To the philosopher the unity of Life is a probability; to the religious mystic, the nature worshipper, the artist and the lover, this unity in its divine sufficingness becomes a felt reality. Again one turns instinctively from the dead words of theory to the living words of a poet. Mr. D. H. Lawrence, in spite of his unrest, his obsession of ugliness and spasms of mockery, has alike in his prose and verse expressed this dawning sense of the reconciliation of Nature and Man, of the blending of the individual and the universal Life, with a more sensitive response than any other living writer.

When I look at this pine-tree near the sea,
that grows out of rock, and plumes forth, plumes forth,
I see it has a natural abundance.

With its roots it has a grand grip on its daily bread,
and its plumes look like green cups held up to sun and air
and full of wine.

I want to be like that, to have a natural abundance
and plume forth, and be splendid.

These lines like many others in his volume of poems called *Pansies* sound like the first notes of the hymnody of the new Faith, a salute to the undivided God in Man and Nature.

It remains to ask whether the new religion is capable of being organized. So far as external organisation may be needed, it is the experience of the past that it springs up quickly and lavishly, only too quickly and lavishly perhaps, so soon as a great religious idea is on the way. And for cult, the ritual of the past, laden with profound intimations of the sacredness of Life and its pervasive unity, is likely to be absorbed and transformed for the worship of the future. There is no need for anxiety or haste on these accounts. A more pressing need, if the channels of communion between man and living nature are not to be choked, is for reaction against the progressive mechanization of existence. As Bergson showed some time ago, the organic is the upward jet of expanding life, the inorganic the falling detritus of forms from which the life has escaped. Dead matter has its part to play at the base of the living activities in Man and Nature, and dead machinery may serve to abridge the effort required for dealing with it. But to substitute unnecessarily the mechanical for the living agent in the higher concerns of mankind is to prefer the repetition of the exhausted past to the creation of the incalculable future. If faith in Life and its Divine Unity took firm hold of mankind we should see a complete transformation of the habits of civilised peoples. There would be a flight from the cities to the country, that men might live at the fountains of natural beauty. Agriculture in all its phases, which is the rearing of life, would largely replace mechanical industry which is the fabrication of dead blocks. The hand of the craftsman would return to give the impress of individuality and creation to every article of furniture or clothing, every tool as well as every ornament, on which a value was set. The artificial speeding up of existence and the lust of mileage would abate as men turned from skimming the surface to probing the depths of life. Except for emergencies the horse would oust the motor-car; voices and fingers would be trained to displace the gramophone; drama and dance in which the spectators were actors and the actors spectators would banish the memory of the cinematograph reel clicking its course out in halls of inertia and gloom. Only an inward faith, no manipulation of political conditions or calculation of material advantages, can make realities of such dreams as William Morris's *News from Nowhere* or Mr. H. G. Wells' (only partially demechanized) world in *Men like Gods*. But neither those who place eternal life in some transcendent sphere apart from the Nature which is given us for our dwelling, nor those whose dream of "progress" seems to be the progressive reduction of man to a Robot in a world of wheels, will ever set Man in his place at the heart of the great torrent of creative

Life, which will pass him by as a crumbling wreck if he seeks to drift out of its main-stream into the spent back-water of mechanical revolution. Only Life-worshippers will foster the flame of life successfully. Then, in a true Renaissance, which uses without being bound by the Greek love of vital rhythm, the medieval adventurousness of soul, the Socialist passion of brotherhood, we may find a humanity that combines the culture of "civilisation" with the acute perceptions of the primitive "savage" to whom the animals, the fields and woods speak a daily language that our senses have grown too dull to hear. "For thou shalt be in league with the stones of the field; and the beasts of the field shall be at peace with thee"; the child will return to the breasts of the Great Mother and transmute her life to fresh energies in its own veins.

D. L. MURRAY.

THREE BASIC IDEAS.

[In our Foreword to the preceding article of Mr. D. L. Murray we refer to the Three Fundamental Propositions of the *Secret Doctrine*. They will be found in Vol. I, pp. 13-18.

Below we print a few extracts we promised in that Foreword from the truly and literally epoch-making book, the *Secret Doctrine*.—EDS.]

The whole of antiquity believed in the Universality of life.—II. 703.

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.
 "The worlds, to the profane," says a Commentary "are built up of the known Elements. To the conception of an Arhat, these Elements are themselves collectively a divine Life; distributively, on the plane of manifestations, the numberless and countless crores of lives. Fire alone is ONE, on the plane of the One Reality; on that of manifested, hence illusive being, its particles are fiery lives which live and have their being at the expense of every other life that they consume. Therefore they are named the "DEVOURERS." "Every visible thing in this Universe was built by such LIVES, from conscious and primordial man down to the unconscious agents that construct matter" "From the ONE LIFE formless and Uncreate, proceeds the Universe of lives.—I. 248-50.

Now the Occultists, who trace every atom in the universe, whether an aggregate or single, to One Unity, or Universal Life; who do not recognize 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, of *will and sensation*.—II. 672.

The whole secret of Life is in the unbroken series of its manifestations.—I. 238.

The Secret Doctrine teaches the fundamental identity of all Souls with the Universal-Over Soul, the latter being itself an aspect of the Unknown Root; and the obligatory pilgrimage for every Soul—a spark of the former—through the cycle of Incarnation (or “Necessity”) in accordance with Cyclic and Karmic law, during the whole term. In other words, no purely spiritual Buddhi (divine Soul) can have an independent (conscious) existence before the spark which issued from the pure essence of the Universal Sixth principle—or the OVER-SOUL,—has (a) passed through every elemental form of the phenomenal world of that Manvantara, and (b) acquired individuality, first by natural impulse, and then by self-induced and self-devised efforts (checked by its Karma), thus ascending through all the degrees of intelligence from the lowest to the highest Manas, from mineral and plant, up to the holiest archangel (Dhyani Buddha). The pivotal doctrine of the Esoteric philosophy admits no privileges or special gifts in man, save those won by his own Ego through personal effort and merit throughout a long series of metempsychoses and reincarnations.—I. 17.

“Man can neither propitiate nor command the *Devas*,” it is said. But, by paralyzing his lower personality, and arriving thereby at the full knowledge of the *non-separateness* of his higher SELF from the One absolute SELF, man can, even during his terrestrial life, become as “One of Us.”—I. 276.

It is on the right comprehension of the primeval Evolution of Spirit-Matter and its real essence that the student has to depend for the further elucidation in his mind of the Occult Cosmogony, and for the only sure clue which can guide his subsequent studies.—I. 277.

LET US STUDY DEATH.

[**Faquir** is a genuine aspirant who specializes in the mastery of Death, of which there are many kinds, and one by one the human soul has to conquer them all. The death of the body, universally recognized as a supreme fact, is at the same time the symbol of a greater spiritual reality. H. P. Blavatsky has taught of the death of the body, of the astral body or Linga Sarira, of the animal soul, and of the Higher Ego. The last named is the metaphysical death which men name birth and in itself represents the terrible possibility of the *death* of the soul, that is, its severance from the Ego on earth during a person's lifetime. Of all these and other cognate matters Faquir will write in **THE ARYAN PATH**, and our hope is that it will be done with regularity which as a principle of life all faquirs do not approve.—EDS.]

“Death—how can such a subject be profitably studied?” may well ask the busy man of the twentieth century. When told that he can at least *prepare* himself by enquiry—reading what the seers and sages have taught, and reflecting quietly in his heart on death as a universal experience and its effect on human nature, he will still object on the ground that he is occupied with life, not with death. Life is, for him, too absorbing and too interesting to allow him any time or inclination to dwell upon such a remote and unpractical subject as death. It is enough for him that he must meet it sooner or later. “All the more reason,” he convinces himself, “to make the most of life while it lasts.”

Thus the “advanced” man of modern times. Otherwise with the ancients. In eras gone by, life was valued in terms of soul experience and men made time to dwell upon nature's mysteries. In one of India's most ancient poems, the *Bhagavad-Gita*, we find that Krishna, describing the nature of the true wisdom, mentions definitely as one of the practices of the aspirant, “a meditation upon birth, death, decay, sickness, and error.” How far away from this old injunction have strayed our Mental Healers, and advocates of Christian Science and New Thought who not only do not advise us to meditate on “death, decay, sickness and error,” but even strongly urge us to deny their obvious existence, thus deluding ourselves.

“But what could Krishna have meant?” it is asked. Alas, not only has it become difficult to understand the wisdom of his advice, it is also equally hard to comprehend the very meaning of the words he uses, for our modern civilization has lost the art of true meditation. However, without attempting to practise meditation, let the reader try to observe the effect that contact with death has upon the human mind and the human heart.

Such an experience, with its anguish and pain, is an accurate teacher of man's moral stamina, and a strong revealer of his inner nature. The violence of the shock destroys the outer mask made up of traditions and established habits, and shows up the inner faith and the heart quality. One who had thought himself liberated from the fetters of theological dogmas, seeks refuge in the church; another who had

professed belief in his creed sees his faith shattered to pieces and turns away in despair from his former God; a third takes to drink unable to endure the agony of his own incertitude; still another in the sincere sorrow of his loss resolves to abandon old vices and begins to walk the path of virtue. The effects are different, as temperaments and characters vary, but in each test the test brings out the true nature of the individual and puts to shame all lip-professions and outer declarations.

Such shocks may seem cruel and unnecessary to the ordinary person. The student of the spiritual side of the universe, the aspirant for soul unfoldment, views them as beneficent powers, because they offer man the opportunity of abandoning old grooves of mental and moral action, and of seeking for new and better modes of life.

Many indeed are the souls whose first attention to the spiritual life is drawn by the severe sorrow which follows the death of a loved one. Especially is this so in the case of those men and women, the smooth current of whose lives has made them slaves of prevalent ideas and prejudices. Under the sudden suffering which befalls them they awake from their sleep of passive acceptance and begin to question for themselves. Within them springs up the desire to find out, to know for certain what death is and what is its place in the scheme of things. And questioning honest and perseverant, this is the first step upon the long and eventful ladder which leads to the discovery of Nature's secrets. Thus from sorrow is born the beginning of wisdom, and its value as an educator is perceived.

Of all deaths, the most cruel and perplexing is that of the babe or the young child. There the contrast and apparent injustice are such that the parents are almost compelled to ask "why"? Mere belief cannot help them, and they seek knowledge and thus become candidates for the Spiritual Path.

Hence we say—Let us study Death.

FAQUIR.

CONTACTING THE INVISIBLE.

I.—INTERCOMMUNICATIONS.

[This month we print the first of four instalments of a carefully prepared statement on the subject of intercommunication in occultism. There are invisible worlds, their denizens and citizens, and to them this visible world and its progeny, including humanity, are more closely related than is ordinarily supposed. Between visible and invisible cosmoses there is constant interplay. Human intelligence has ever tried to understand the invisible by experiment and research. This paper details the Theosophical view which all our readers will find instructive and useful.—EDS.]

Theosophists are not alone in their belief in the existence of other worlds interpenetrating our own, and in the possibility and probability of communication between our world and these other ones. Fundamentally, the same beliefs have always been a deeply-rooted conviction among both civilized and aboriginal peoples.

All religions are grounded on this belief both in theory and in practice. Necromancy and black magic as well as beneficent Occult arts and sciences are founded upon it. The common belief in the survival of the dead, as well as all doctrines of pre-existence, are manifestations of the same faith, for if Souls exist prior to their physical birth they must have their habitat in time and space, while the same is true of those who die. These "other worlds," then, do not and cannot exist *outside* of space and time, even though metaphysical to us. They must be substantial, in at least the same sense that force and intelligence are substantial, and we know that both these can and do affect matter as known to us and are equally affected by it—in other words: matter, force, and intelligence interpenetrate and interact. But the existence of different states and forms of matter, of force, of intelligence, proves that these terms are not, with us, fundamental. They are composites, and hence one state or form of matter can and does exist *within* other and coarser states and forms; and so with the finer forms and states of force and mind.

While our modern sciences do not as yet admit that Nature is animate, in whole and in every part, it is none the less the fact that those sciences have been built up because of the interactions mentioned. This, in itself, is a species of intercommunication, so that our science may be justly called a kind of materialistic spiritism. Some day, perhaps in the not distant future, scientists will themselves perceive that it is inherently more reasonable to postulate Nature living than Nature dead, and their present-day theories be regarded as intellectual aberrations. When that day comes, scientists will no more consider Nature as essentially one-sided, with all the intelligence on their side, but will seriously undertake to deal with the Mind in nature and all her manifestations. This is pure Occultism.

From these broad general considerations it becomes very evident that both from the standpoint of pure theory and from that of available testimony belief in intercommunication is exceedingly well fortified, whatever may be thought of any particular communication claiming to be from ex-human, sub-human, or preter-human sources.

It is no valid objection to the theory that all such communications come to us through human beings as their mouth-piece. The objection is answered by simply asking: How else could they come and be intelligible to us so long as we ourselves are unable to open up such communications directly for ourselves?

Another objection, raised rather against the doctrine as a practice than as a theory, is that it has ruined so many of its votaries, and has been the source of incalculable evils inflicted by human beings on each other. Admitting this objection, it is easily vanquished. Death and disease also inflict untold evils on the race: are birth and human life therefore inadvisable? The same as to all that we call good in the progress of humanity: every great religion, invention or discovery has given rise to an infinity of evils. Shall we therefore throw away our birthright to experience, to experiment, to learn, and to know what is that world in which we live and of which we are a part? The rises as well as the destructions of civilizations have been concurrent with and in large part, at least, due to the virtues inculcated, as well as the excesses stimulated, by revelations professedly coming from Beings of another order than those of the Kingdoms of Nature partially known to us.

What does plainly appear from all history is that this subject should be approached, if at all, with the extreme of precaution and preparation. We know that these are well-advised even in the affairs of this world. How much more, then, must they be essential prerequisite conditions for one who proposes to himself to experiment with worlds and beings totally unknown to him? If these other worlds do in fact interpenetrate space and time along with ourselves, if intercommunication is possible, it must follow that all these worlds possess laws, principles, forces, and substances in common, as well as those characteristics peculiar to each, and which distinguish the one from the others. Surely, then, the right preparation must consist in finding out what these common *media* are, before plunging headlong into the Unknown.

Most men are satisfied with mere belief in "other worldliness," as they are satisfied with mere belief in the things of this world concerning which other men have knowledge, not opinions. Initial curiosity gratified, cursory doubts set at rest, a formula of faith adopted, the average man goes on his way, intent on his purely mundane preoccupations and little affected by his belief in invisible entities. Some upsetting shock may arouse, but in such case his usually overpowering tendency is simply to seek this possible aid in regaining his worldly equilibrium.

But there are other men—many of them, in point of numbers if not of percentage—who find that, once their attention is turned to this subject, they cannot stop, cannot return to their former attitude of mind. Some inner affinity lures them on, whether in right or wrong direction.

In right or wrong direction : for the investigator soon sees inescapably that there are two poles to this subject, two currents of action set up by these communications—as indeed must be the case, since action of any kind is possible only by opposing means, and the mere theory of evolution implies its opposite, retardation or retrogression. But it is to be strictly noted that these two distinctions of right and wrong direction apply only to the observer, not to the actual practitioner of Occultism. The more one studies what the late Professor James has classically designated “the varieties of religious experience,” the more one finds that each Occultist is irrevocably convinced that he is “right.” The wizard is just as certain that his path is the only true one as is the wonder-working saint, the medium as the *Yogi*, the “Brother of the Shadow” as the *Mahatma*. Once fully embarked on the sea of Occultism, one or other of these subtle currents quickly carries the devotee out of sight of all the familiar charts and landmarks of human life and conduct. He becomes, in no metaphorical sense, “the law unto himself.”

His first step taken, the proof that it *is* a first step is at once apparent, for there is then no difficulty in sifting out the genuine from the pseudo-practitioners of Occultism, the merely book-learned from those who speak out of first-hand experience, whatever the nature of their messages. He has already found out for himself that only the dabbler, the tyro, the charlatan, and the faker can stand with—

“one foot on sea and one on shore,
to one thing constant never.”

One could easily spend a life-time poring over books dealing with Magic in its various aspects, and at the end be no wiser practically than when he began—less so, in fact, for books do not write themselves. Most of them are written at second-hand. Occultism, if one is to be an Occultist, must be studied as well as experienced at first-hand. So the first step taken confers an enormous advantage, but at the same time discloses an enormous difficulty.

Must one go blindly, as one goes blindly into the darkness before birth and at death, or can the nature of the different paths be ascertained in advance with sufficient certainty to justify one in entering or in refusing to enter? For it is already evident that the fully committed Occultist cannot change from one path to the other—any more than one can leap from life into death, and rescind his choice. In fact, in sober fact, actual entrance into Occultism appears, from all that has been disclosed in regard to it, to be just that—a life or death matter. A life *and* death matter, rather, seeing that the various practitioners do live on in the human world, though dead to those considerations which govern human life for most men.

But to see all this is, in reality, to have taken the second step in Occultism, albeit without, of course, knowing it until the step has been taken. Seeing that he has to choose for himself; seeing that he has to choose without reservations; seeing in short that he, also, must accept the consequences of "becoming the law unto himself"—seeing all this, the investigator cannot fail to seize the overwhelming inference that there must be as many levels of life and action on "the other side" as there are in the familiar world. What he has learned already will tell him unmistakably that in that other world, however, there are no mixed natures, no compromises; that "over there" each entrant instantly, by force of some kind of a law of gravity in himself, finds his own appropriate level; that henceforth that level, whatever it is, becomes for him *reality*.

There are said to be three paths in Occultism, concerning each of which there exists an abundant literature, theoretical and practical, as well as a fourth path of which much is written and nothing whatever known in the world experimentally. To those at all interested in the subject of Intercommunications, or practical Occultism, some commentary on these various paths may be useful.

[The next instalment will be on "Mediums and Mediumism."]

THE BOOK FOR HUMANITY.

[G. V. Ketkar, B.A., LL.B., is one of the two founders of the Gita Dharma Mandal—an institution started in 1924 in Poona, for the study of the *Gita* and the spread of its teachings. While its main activities are at present confined to Maharashtra, the Association has become well known throughout India because of the propaganda in connection with the Gita-Day celebrations. It was ascertained from various references that the Mahabharata War commenced on the eleventh day of the bright half of Margashirsha according to the Hindu Calendar. This day was already recognised as an auspicious day in the Hindu Calendar. It is called "Mokshada Ekadashi," i.e., the eleventh day that gives salvation. It was on this first day of the Mahabharat War that Krishna delivered the divine message to Arjuna on the field of battle. This was selected as a day in the year on which all lovers of and admirers of the *Bhagavad-Gita* can join together in commemorating the birth, as it were, of the divine song. The day is observed usually by reading and reciting the *Gita*, lectures on the *Gita*, examinations and prize distributions to students of the *Gita*, distribution of leaflets on the *Gita*, etc.]

All true Theosophical students recognise the *Bhagavad-Gita* as a very highly important text book for the grasping of metaphysical ultimates as for the practical living of a better and higher life day by day.

H. P. Blavatsky, the greatest Theosophist of our age, referred to it as a work "pre-eminently occult or esoteric" (*Glossary*). In her *Isis Unveiled* (1877) Vol. II, p. 562—she writes that "the grandest mysteries of the Brahmanical religions are embraced within this magnificent poem."—EDS.]

The *Bhagavad-Gita* serves the purpose of a common religious scripture for all Hindus. It is also regarded along with the Upanishads as an essential part of Vedanta. But the *Gita* is something more than this—it is a scripture of the Soul. Humanity is larger than the Hindu community and life is greater than Vedanta. The *Gita* is a scripture for humanity, for it is a treatise on life and soul. Everybody can appreciate the deep reverence of the orthodox Hindu and the fascination of the Vedantin for it. As a Hindu scripture it is priceless, as a treatise on Vedanta it is profound; but as a book of life for the guidance of humanity it is incomparable.

The old passive ways of religious thought have blinded many of our commentators to the social aspect of the *Gita*. No doubt it is mainly the message of the Master to his disciple, individually, but that message was not delivered away from society and far from the madding crowd. It was given in the midst of a mass of humanity and at a time of a great upheaval, a deadly civil war. The disciple, Arjuna, is not only anxious to save his own soul but also to save the people from material and spiritual disaster. The Master responds with a universal message, the central motif being that as each individual performs his Dharma, Duty, the evil in human society will disappear, and a harmonious and prosperous state will arise. The Master's message is: "Do your duty as a soul to your soul, and you will save society, the state, the race."

The great and the small in the world are inter-dependent, each has his own duties, responsibilities and privileges. By helping each other all can achieve the highest good of the state and society. This help is best rendered by the performance of duty. Duty is that which is due from each to all others; therefore the nature of pure duty is sacrificial. This arrangement of natural dependence is not the result of a contract. It is the basis and foundation of the universe, visible and invisible (3 : 10, 11). This mutual dependence resting in sacrifice forms the wheel of sacrifice, and the universe (note the universe, not India) is imaged as a wheel in motion. He who does not help the turning of this wheel, is a sinner—a man whose life is utterly useless (3 : 16). Do your own duty, act your own part in this arrangement and you will be useful to save and elevate the world.

We must reserve for another occasion the consideration of details as to how this Path of Duty should be trodden, our main contention being that since duty and its discharge are universal phenomena in the human kingdom, the message of the *Gita* touches all. Different communities and nations separated by their temples, mosques and churches into warring sections can meet on the common ground of knowledge imparted by this book.

The conditions in which the *Gita* message was given were very similar to those we find in the world just now. That which India was in its warring creeds and disquieting philosophical schools, such is the world to-day. Torn into a thousand sects our civilization is looking for some solution. We ask: Why not listen to the soul-piercing words of the mysterious Krishna, words which fly like straight arrows to the mind, when earnest and intent.

In those ancient days there were different systems of philosophy and each had developed its own terminology. The main theme of the *Gita*, Dharma, is examined in the light of each of these systems in turn. Everything that was acceptable in all of them was incorporated and adapted to support the main teaching about Duty. The *Gita* was not a spiritual message delivered to people who knew little about religion or philosophy. It was given at a time when a number of schools of religious thought had been formed and crystallised. The disciple, Arjuna, knew all these systems. Krishna had to convince Arjuna that His own view was the best in the light of all these varying schools of thought. Such a message could not by its very nature be narrow or sectarian. It is broad and comprehensive. As Arjuna was a man of action and was standing in the field of action, the philosophic message could not have been one of idleness or inaction. This setting of the *Gita* is peculiar and unique in the annals of religious lore.

Unfortunately the message delivered on Dharmakshetra (1 : 1) of India, has become the battlefield of Pandits with their Shastraic quibbling. The layman dazed with these wordy and technical disputations in utter dismay turns his back upon the *Gita*.

The best way to understand the *Gita* is to read it for one's self. It must be borne in mind that it is all written with one purpose and one view. If different words from different systems of philosophy are used, they are used to strengthen, illustrate and amplify the main path which the *Gita* wants to lay down. Read in this way, it ceases to be a stumbling block. It presents the main theme of that unselfish, altruistic and sincere path of duty, in all its aspects and in the language of all schools of thought. As such, its message is to all mankind. Its appeal is universal. If a citizen of the world sits down to collect materials for the construction of a world-religion, the *Gita* will perhaps make the most valuable contribution. The modern scientific world is in need of a religion and that religion must be broad, catholic, rational and scientific, unlike any extant religion of to-day. That world-religion will not attribute implicitly all wisdom to one prophet, one book or one revelation. It will not be a wooden, hide-bound religion giving little latitude to individual differences of temperament and circumstances. The *Gita*, while laying down definite principles for the guidance and regulation of life and human action, makes proper and full allowance for differences in human temperament and environment. All beings act according to their own nature (3 : 33) and each soul, being spiritual, can get detached from that nature if he means to attempt it seriously and earnestly. There is the internal freedom of will, and as the inner attitude of mind is the chief criterion for judging good and bad action, man is, according to the *Gita*, the architect of his own spiritual fortune (6 : 5). If he does not take advantage of this internal self-determination, he has to thank himself for it ; he is his own enemy (6 : 5). Truth is revealed to the world from time to time as the world needs it and the Avatar with the divine message of truth comes to the world to save it from unrighteousness and selfishness, from time to time (4 : 8). The message is always the same in substance—the path of disinterested altruistic action. The outward form may differ according to circumstances. The *Gita* does not ask men to believe that truth is revealed to the world only once and through one agency, and that this one revelation is the first and last of its kind. The divine message was delivered from time to time in the past, and will again and again be delivered in the future—but it will be one and identical, constant and consistent.

The disciple of the *Gita* is not asked to believe everything implicitly without troubling the reasoning faculty. He is asked to acquire knowledge from the seers, by questioning and cross-questioning ("Pariprashnena"—4 : 34), and then he must test and develop that knowledge by action in his own life (4 : 38). Thus by action and experience, acquired knowledge is assimilated and perfected. In acquiring knowledge the *Gita* gives the greatest latitude to honest doubt. In its assimilation by action, the *Gita* gives the greatest latitude to individual temperament and environment.

The world-state will be in need of a religion, not a state-religion, not a trite dogma enforced by law, but an all-accepted philosophic basis of thought which alone can furnish the real motive power behind

all human endeavour. The *Gita* can furnish that philosophic basis of action in all aspects.

Mahatma Gandhi once said that in trying circumstances of life the *Gita* gave him that peace of mind which no other book could give. It gives peace to the deeply introspective mind. It also satisfies the mind of a social thinker who wants a common formula acceptable to all humanity as a philosophic basis of action. For the *Gita* does not lose sight of the society while thinking of the individual and does not neglect the individual while thinking of the society.

It would be a false pride on the part of the Hindu to claim the *Gita* as his own monopoly. Its message has already reached the remotest corner of the world and has secured unstinted homage from thinkers of all nations.

The Hindu should try to spread its message still more, so that the *Bhagavad-Gita* will have a prominent and permanent place in world-thought from which it will fulfill its own real purpose of elevating and purifying all springs of human endeavours.

G. V. KETKAR.

PEACE IDEALS AND THE HEART OF A CHILD.

[**Jeannette Wallace Emrich** is the author of a charming book *Dolls of Friendship* published by the movement known as "World Friendship Among Children" of which she is the organizing secretary. She is a lover of children, and organised relief work for 6,000 of them who were suffering in Constantinople.

All true Theosophists are lovers of children. They believe in the great power for potential good each child represents as a soul returned to the old fields of its own labours.—Eds.]

Some one has said that "what you would put into the future you must hide in the heart of a child."

If time has taught us anything it is that the elimination of racial misunderstanding and hatred, of religious intolerance, depends on conserving the natural friendliness of children and directing its growth along the normal healthy lines of understanding, appreciation and respect for the best in other races and religions. Surely this is a necessary preliminary, a natural starting point towards the ultimate realization of world friendship and goodwill even though that goal may be seen by some as very far in the distant future.

People want to know each other better. This ideal is centuries old but the crystallization of the movement to attain it can be placed within the last ten years. We do not want for the children of to-day the narrowness in ideas and doctrines that was tolerated and even respected a decade or so ago.

The most tangible outcome of the last war is the world-wide desire for peace. We learned one thing out of the horror of those years—that if it is possible for men, regardless of race, colour and religious beliefs to go out together and die for a cause, it is equally possible for them to join together and live and work for the thing they believe in and to give to their children a breadth of tolerance and understanding toward all peoples that they themselves perhaps were not taught.

What are some of these ideas which are not new in themselves but only in our acceptance of them, and which we desire to become such a natural part of the youth, thinking to-day that they will be thought habits for the next generation?

There should be placed first, because it is basic, the fact that there are no inferior races. All are struggling toward achievement and some have gone farther than others for the moment. Who can say what the positions will be a few hundred years hence on this road toward self-realization? To be a member of a certain race indicates neither inferiority nor superiority. So many of our old ideas and beliefs must be laid aside and our children must learn that men must be judged as men and by their individual accomplishments and not by the race to which they belong.

Secondly, the children of to-day must understand the complete dependence of nations one upon the other. There are nations with different languages and customs but there are no foreign nations—nor can any one nation claim civilized life as its private possession. Pity and sentimentality are not strong foundations on which to build world friendship and goodwill.

A third habit of thought for these leaders of to-morrow is that a nation is poor indeed that does not know the best that another has to offer it. We dislike what we do not understand ; we criticize that about which we are most ignorant. The war showed us our need of education. New values and standards by which to judge other nations must be created and the old false ideas and obsessions must go.

The writer, before going to Mexico some months ago, was warned by a friend that that country was not safe because of its bandits and its revolutions. The letter of caution arrived on a day and in a city in the United States which carried in the headlines of its papers accounts of three murders. While in Mexico, the charming wife of an official said : “ We had thought to send our son to an American University but have decided not to because we don't believe it's safe in the United States ! Your auto-bandits, your hold-ups and murders are dreadful.”

Two neighbouring countries, and each through the newspapers knowing only the worst of each other ! It is a different habit of thinking that the children of to-day must be taught if they are in the future to enlarge national conception and promote goodwill among the nations of the earth.

A fourth thought for the generation just starting out that will make for world peace is that all men should have their rightful chance for economic and intellectual development. There must be equality of opportunity for all.

The geographical isolation known to the older generation has been their excuse for not knowing other nations and for not concerning themselves in what the rest of the world was doing. This attitude is old and useless for the world to-day and the new generation must have safer thinking to guide it on its way.

It has been said that one generation of mothers thinking clearly and intelligently and with the right ideals could remake the world. Add to the mothers the enormous influence that teachers have. Suppose for example that every young child in the world to-day could be so influenced by some wise and tolerant older person that fair play and justice, friendliness and belief in human brotherhood would become the very foundation of his life and thought. We would move far and rapidly along the road toward world peace and understanding.

One other habit that should become a natural part of a child's thinking is an attitude of respect toward all other children no matter how different they may appear to be. When names of race contempt are no longer thought or used by children, when the racial and religious customs of others are always held in respect by them and when

they learn to emphasize the likenesses among the peoples of the world and not their differences, there is not likely to develop a generation of narrow, intolerant and bigoted adults.

What a power for peace the forming of such early mental attitudes might be and how race and class prejudice would fall before them.

We of the older generation are thinking more intelligently than ever before and we are honestly admitting that we have woefully failed to interpret the spirit of brotherhood. Is there a better place to turn for a solution than to the children, the new generation that might, if we were wise enough to let them, grow up really to put into action the ideals that their elders have only talked about?

We want peace-thinking to become a habit. Let us then begin writing it in the hearts of our children.

JEANNETTE WALLACE EMRICH.

A proper and sane system of education should produce the most vigorous and liberal mind, strictly trained in logical and accurate thought, and not in blind faith. How can you ever expect good results, while you pervert the reasoning faculty of your children by bidding them believe in the miracles of the Bible on Sunday, while for the six other days of the week you teach them that such things are scientifically impossible? Children should above all be taught self-reliance, love for all men, altruism, mutual charity, and more than anything else, to think and reason for themselves. We would reduce the purely mechanical work of the memory to an absolute minimum, and devote the time to the development and training of the inner senses, faculties and latent capacities. We would endeavour to deal with each child as a unit, and to educate it so as to produce the most harmonious and equal unfoldment of its powers, in order that its special aptitudes should find their full natural development. We should aim at creating *free* men and women, free intellectually, free morally, unprejudiced in all respects, and above all things, *unselfish*. And we believe that much if not all of this could be obtained by *proper and truly theosophical* education.

The Key to Theosophy pp. 213-214.

THE UNBRIDLED TONGUE.

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

“ Among the wise of secret knowledge I am their silence.”—*Bhagavad-Gita* X.38.

In the tenth discourse of the *Gita*, Krishna, as Ishvara the Lord, describes his powers and excellences—Vibhutis. The Parsis will find a similar description in their Ahuramazda Yasht, and thus see that Krishna and Ahuramazda are but two names of the same omnipresent force or power that ordinarily we call Deity or God.

Among these divine excellences the Mahatma names—Silence. Those who are wise keep silent about many things. The speech which is necessary is alone indulged in by great Souls. Speech being a creative power and its effects more widespread than ordinarily recognized, those who start to tread the Path of Holiness are called upon to control their tongue and purify their speech. Not only angry and ugly words are to be discarded but also unnecessary ones. The young chela is known as a shravaka, a listener ; and Pythagoras, taught by his Aryan Gurus, introduced in his own school at Crotona the degree of—the hearers. Modern society is mostly run on talk. The art of conversation has very greatly degenerated and useless talk is the order of the day. As is to be expected such useless talk soon degenerates into gossip, and kind men and women turn cruel. To kill the reputation or fair name or character of another is greater cruelty than to kill his body.

We have to learn the scientific fact that speech is creative, that words have power. Those who have observed the effects of mere physical sounds in the formation of complex patterns in fine sand can understand how the same sounds must produce in invisible substances like Ether other forms and effects. Add to this the fact that our words carry feelings and thoughts, and it is logical to deduce that the potency residing in the spoken word is tremendous indeed.

Often we do not learn of the mischief caused by our own talk. We indulge in small talk and even in gossip thoughtlessly. Though we all are aware that there are beings who call themselves humans who talk loosely and abominably of a set purpose, and indulge in gossip deliberately, fortunately the number of such wicked ones is not great. Most of us slip into the sin of injurious speech, and pay for the slip and

the sin in the form of a debasing influence on our own character. A foul-mouthed person, an unconscious gossip, a small talker or a shop talker, as a silent muni, all carry the marks of their habit and indulgence in their own characters.

What shall we do, those of us who desire to ennoble our characters, purify our conduct, and perform self-less actions? We are taught by all great sages to practise mortification and austerities of speech. They, knowing the intimacy subsisting between thought and word, ask us to proceed to the root and guard our internal thoughts. Words are like bodies and their souls are thoughts. Therefore, we are told to read and repeat words embodying grand and glorious ideas. Every religion imposes on its believers the task of reading and repeating the scriptures. In these generations the wise and salutary injunction is either not observed, or when it is observed it is casual, formal, not understood and a travesty of efficacious practice. Prayers muttered without understanding are useless; reading of the Holy Writ with attention, and reflecting on the Teachings which they impart are great energizers, and raise our consciousness to an elevation from which a quiet survey of life-events and happenings is possible and profitable.

No man can see clearly without some reflection; no man can act worthily without elevating ideas. In stress of circumstances we cannot succeed without a storing of noble thoughts in quiet hours. Thus it becomes essential that each one of us keep the company of inspiring words, of potent words, day by day and secure for ourselves the beneficent influence they emit. Gentle speech, truthful speech, friendly speech flowers from a dwelling on and recitation of great words such as are to be found in the *Gita* and the *Upanishads*, in *Dhammapada* and *Suttanipata*, in the *Gathas* and the *Yashats*, in *Tao-Teh-King* and Sermon on the Mount and that priceless gem for all aspirants of the higher life, *The Voice of the Silence*.

Another course is also laid down: every day we must practise silence and control of speech. We must give Mother Nature a chance to speak to us; she has songs for our soul's ear; we fail to hear them because our mind, with its memory and attention, is engaged with things of the senses and the flesh. Before the day's activities begin, or after they come to a close, we must remain silent making our own mind-contents silent and then repeat some memorized idea or another expressed by a master mind and dwell thereon. During the activities of mundane life we must learn to guard our tongue, and though hard is the task, gradually success will be attained, for man can do what men have done.

As a third step we are told that we must keep the company of holy men. Sat-sang, good company, is a necessity of the higher life. Not in solitude but in company of like-minded souls is real progress made. The company of students of the Wisdom and of wise persons gives us the practice to speak good and holy words. Every time wise words are uttered, the power to speak them again is unfolded. "Attain to

knowledge and you will attain to speech" it is said. Knowledge comes from written and spoken words, and to keep contact with them is beneficial.

Therefore it is said—"Learn the value of a man's words and expressions, and you know him. Each man has a measure of his own for everything. This he offers you, inadvertently, in his words."

B. M.

The religious and esoteric history of every nation was embedded in symbols; it was never expressed in so many words. All the thoughts and emotions, all the learning and knowledge, revealed and acquired, of the early races, found their pictorial expression in allegory and parable. Why? Because *the spoken word has a potency unknown to, unsuspected and disbelieved in*, by the modern "sages." Because sound and rhythm are closely related to the four Elements of the Ancients; and because such or another vibration in the air is sure to awaken corresponding powers, union with which produces good or bad results, as the case may be. No student was ever allowed to recite historical, religious, or any real events in so many unmistakable words, lest the powers connected with the event should be once more attracted. Such events were narrated only during the Initiation, and every student had to record them in corresponding symbols, drawn out of his own mind and examined later by his master, before they were finally accepted. Thus was created in time the Chinese Alphabet, as, before that, the hieratic symbols were fixed upon in old Egypt.

SCIENCE AND RELIGION.

[**J. D. Beresford** here presents a somewhat different view from that which Mr. J. Middleton Murry gave in our January number.

We would fully agree with Mr. Beresford if he distinguished between Religion and religions. Religious creeds as expounded and held by the vast majority have to be rejected ere a real reconciliation between Science and Religion can take place. To give but one example—common to most religions—is the belief in a Personal God under whatever name. Unless and until religions are purged of this crude and illogical belief how can there be any joining of hands between Science and Religion?

But it will not suffice merely to differentiate between Religion and religions; something more has to be done. That Religion has to be defined, its fundamentals and propositions have to be put forward. Can present-day Science do this?

Because Science is getting less materialistic, we cannot say that it is becoming more spiritual. It is true that its "Matter" is now-a-days immaterial, and so it is able to accept the old doctrine of Maya. But while it may serve the purpose of priest-made religions to proclaim this world mayavic, so that they may draw attention to heaven and hell, god and gods, can we expect Science to be satisfied by such a make-shift arrangement? By its present methods Science will go on subdividing the shell of the universe to find "immateriality," and change and—void.

Who will be satisfied by the knowledge of what the Universe or Man is not? Human yearning is to know what the Universe *is* in actuality, and what Man is in Reality. Unless Science accepts aid from Divine Philosophy, its dicta must be negations. The last word of Divine Philosophy is not Maya. It teaches a Reality behind Maya; Gnosis (Vidya) in place of Agnosticism (Avidya).

What is that Divine Philosophy? We say it is the Wisdom-Religion of Theosophy, the Atma-Vidya, the Bodhi-Dharma, the Gnosis.—EDS.]

The quarrel, in its modern form, between Science and Religion dates only from the Renaissance, although the germ of it can be found in that criticism of the gods which brought Socrates to judgment. Before the great revival of learning there could be no powerful divergence of opinion in this connection. The "natural sciences" were within the province of the Church, and the fathers of English science, Robert Grosseteste and Roger Bacon were ecclesiastics. It was not until the ardent enquiry into the causes of familiar phenomena produced answers which did not agree with the Church's traditional beliefs that we can trace the true elements of what appeared as a fundamental antagonism.

By the nineteenth century we could recognise the real point at issue as arising from a difference of method. Religion takes its mandate from inspiration. Its chief instrument is Faith, its method subjective. Science demands that within the limits of proof imposed by its material we shall seek "exact knowledge." Its sole instrument is ultimately one of measurement. Its results cannot be accepted unless they can be demonstrated by experiment. Its theories must cover all the facts; and the scientist must be ready to abandon any or all of his beliefs if they prove inadequate to account for the observed phenomena.

This fundamental antagonism may appear to be insuperable, and did so appear during that unprecedented expansion of knowledge which gives the nineteenth century an unique place in the history of the world, so far as it is known to us by any documentary record. In my early manhood, religion and science were generally regarded as antinomies, representing two incompatible attitudes towards the problem of existence; and as, although I have always had a strong religious tendency, I dearly loved science, I believed that it was necessary for me to choose between them. In those last years of the nineteenth century the science uppermost in the public mind was biology, and the trend of its teaching and its influence upon philosophy were in the direction of materialism. It seemed to many thoughtful people that man was accounted for. He had arisen from a speck of protoplasm and the means of his development was not too incredible. Only one or two further steps were necessary to explain the whole world of life.

Those steps have not yet been taken. Biology could not go further back than protoplasm, and the Darwinian doctrine of "the survival of the fittest" as a final explanation of the means of evolution began to lose supporters. There followed—though not alone for this reason—a curious shift of interest, and the developing philosophic thesis showed an increasing tendency to forsake biology in favour of physics. It was undeniable that the biologist's function ceased when it came to the analysis of protoplasm, and that the enquiry into origins must be undertaken by a different branch of science.

The result of that shift of interest, so far as I am concerned, has been to clear away my old difficulty, my regard of religion and science as antinomies; and since the issue is still so bitterly maintained by both sides, I feel an urgent desire to reason with one of the two parties in this old quarrel. To the scientist I have nothing to say. This belief in "exact knowledge" is an inclusive, if limited, creed that does not demand any reference to religion. His concern with cause and effect is confined to the region in which phenomena can be tested by experiment. But I maintain that the mystic has no reason for rejecting science, nor, at the present time, any cause for quarrel with certain of its findings.

I have been greatly strengthened in this view by reading Professor Whitehead's *Process and Reality* which represents in his own words, "An endeavour to explain the philosophy of organism, and to frame a logical and coherent cosmology in terms of which every element of our experience can be interpreted." Necessarily that endeavour can only be a tentative one. "In philosophical discussion," he writes at the close of his preface, "the merest hint of dogmatic certainty as to finality of statement is an exhibition of folly." And for my present purpose, I propose to quote his authority only on a point or two here and there, rather than attempt any summary of his argument, which would be, indeed, an impossible task within the limits of this article.

I may take as my text a quotation from the first essay which deals with speculative philosophy :

Philosophy frees itself from the taint of ineffectiveness by its close relation with religion and with science, natural and sociological. It attains its chief importance by fusing the two, namely, religion and science, into one rational scheme of thought.

In this view, then, we may consider philosophy—that newer philosophy which takes account of the fact that “it is the part of the special sciences to modify common sense”—as a mediator, and having justified the possibility of reconciliation between our old antagonists, attempt to vindicate the way of atonement. And since this article is intended to be a personal confession rather than a piece of ratiocination, I will choose the instance from my own experience.

Biology, as I have already suggested, failed to provide me with a means for agreement between what I falsely imagined to be two different modes of thought. Biology is not an exact science, because the material of its experiments has an intrinsic waywardness that continually evades the inclusive generalisation. The study of heredity, for example, has made comparatively small progress since the rediscovery and enunciation of the Abbé Mendel's ingenious principles ; and seventy years after the publication of the *Origin of Species* we are no nearer agreement as to how far acquired characteristics are heritable, nor why the original variation should arise. Beyond this, the biologist deals only with secondary effects. The phenomena he weighs, measures and classifies, are only the material consequences of what we call “life.” Wherefore when he attempts to fit them into some general hypothesis of bio-chemical reaction he is forced to deal with isolated events and loses sight of the process.

A sense of this inevitable failure of biology, no doubt, influenced me in my change of interest ; but the prevailing cause was the growing importance of the discoveries in atomic physics. Clerk Maxwell's kinetic theory of gases stimulated a new line of research that promised to be far more exact in its methods and deductions than any that had preceded it. The subject of it was the ultimate constitution of that material which in its infinite compounds and tendencies to variation had eluded the generalisations of the biologist.

Now no science is less mystical in its methods and manner of approach than atomic physics. From the beginning its chief instrument was mathematics. Theories were based upon and checked by the most delicate and searching physical experiments that have ever been attempted, but the process of discovery was by way of the formulation and satisfaction of a set of equations. As Professor Whitehead puts it :

Mathematical physics translates the saying of Heraclitus, “All things flow.” into its own language. It then becomes, All things are vectors. Mathematical physics also accepts the atomistic doctrine of Democritus. It translates it into the phrase, All flow of energy obeys “quantum” conditions.

But mathematics was only the instrument of discovery. What of the conclusions to which the physicists have been compelled by

its use? Let me give a few instances. By the "quantum theory" we have to assume that energy is discontinuous, that light and heat, for example, are projected and arrive in a series of quanta or packets. This has necessitated regarding light as "corpuscular" for various reasons, although the "wave theory" cannot be disregarded and we are asked to accept two antagonistic accounts of the nature of light as being true simultaneously. Another astonishing deduction with regard to the structure of the atom is that an electron may change its orbit without any interval of time whatever, so that in this connection we must subsume what in common experience can only be regarded as a miracle. Finally this ultimate particle of matter completely eludes definition, and Professor Eddington suggested last year that the final element of the universe, the "material" of the electron, might be consciousness. In short, as Professor Whitehead wrote in his earlier book, *Science and the Modern World*:

The new situation in the thought of to-day arises from the fact that scientific theory is outrunning common sense. . . Heaven knows what seeming nonsense may not to-morrow be demonstrated truth.

The effect upon me of this reading was to break down my last resistances. Once I regarded science as a bar to belief in the existence of the Spirit and the continuity of consciousness. I found that scientific theory tended to account more and more completely for life as the outcome of a mechanical process. I now find the last element of "matter" to be immaterial. I find in it, from a scientific point of view, an explanation of the doctrine of Maya. The more deeply I contemplate the theorems of atomic physics, the more certainly I realise that the appearance of this beautiful world is a form of illusion, that the basis of it is not "matter" as I once regarded it, but eternal spirit manifested through thought and life.

And it is for these reasons that I would plead for tolerance from those mystics who still angrily criticise the methods and deductions of science. Neither of these, I admit, is in any sense mystical but in these latter days the findings of science uphold rather than refute the spirit origin of the universe. Furthermore although the scientist must by the nature of his enquiry make certain abstractions and exclude any spiritual account of the universe, the mystic cannot afford to make an abstraction of any sort. For him the One in the Many and the Many in the One are identical, and by excluding any one of its functions he vitiates the all-embracingness of his creed. Writes Professor Whitehead:

God and the World stand over against each other, expressing the final metaphysical truth that appetitive vision and physical enjoyment have equal claim to priority in creation. But no two actualities can be torn apart; each is all in all. Thus each temporal occasion embodies God, and is embodied in God. In God's nature permanence is primordial and flux is derivative from the world; in the World's nature, flux is primordial and permanence is derivative from God. . . . Creation achieves the reconciliation of permanence and flux when it has reached its final term which is everlastingness—the Apotheosis of the World.

THE UNCHANGING EAST.

[**K. S. Shelvankar** is a much travelled Brahmana who has been educated in India and the United States. He took his doctor's degree in philosophy at the University of Wisconsin, and is at present engaged in some interesting research work in London.

About a year ago in the American *Forum* a typical debate took place between Mr. V. B. Mehta, at one time art critic to the *Bombay Chronicle*, and Mr. G. K. Chesterton. Mr. Mehta flung down the challenge in a paper entitled "Is the West Decaying?"—and Mr. Chesterton took it up. Mr. Chesterton writes with a brilliance which gives to his arguments the appearance of a validity which they do not possess, and Mr. Mehta's contribution was far the more solid and thought-provoking. In view of Mr. Joad's contribution in our January number on "What Eastern Religion has to offer to Western Civilization" the following article, which uses Mr. Chesterton's reply to Mr. Mehta as a general background, will be of interest. Mr. Chesterton, as a devoted member of the most conservative Church in Christendom, sees everything through the light of his dogmatic creed; consequently his view on the Orient is naturally coloured by his mental and religious predispositions.—EDS.]

It is an error to think of the East, with Mr. Chesterton and a host of others, as uncritical and unchanging. Our knowledge of Oriental history is yet very defective but we have enough evidence to challenge these trite epithets. The rise of Islam which supplanted as it spread all former superstitions and gave to large decadent populations the rule of temperance and frugality; the reforms that the Buddha achieved; the growth of what we call Hinduism to-day; the astonishing advance of Japan to the rank of the great Powers;—these and similar indisputable facts hardly consort with the prevailing notion of an East wrapt in everlasting slumber. Mr. Chesterton affirms that holidays and saturnalias in the West denote a keen perception of the value of change for its own sake. Perhaps, but there is assuredly no lack of these in the East. Nor is there lack of those other modes of adventure practised by Alexander and Cæsar, and pirates, and highwaymen, though patriots in India and China will gladly allow Mr. Chesterton to keep a monopoly in them for the West. Even if one were to agree that Eastern society has displayed a measure of forbearance toward evil custom, Mr. Chesterton must in fairness concede to it a countervailing merit: it has protected the East from the organized antagonisms, the debauches of religious and political hatred which continually seduce the West and make its career a veritable rake's progress. The social systems of the East have further prevented over a longer period than has been possible elsewhere the outbreak of disastrous class-conflicts that a Western prophet has said to be our doom until we embrace communism.

Still less defensible than the comparisons based on terms like adventure and progress, lending themselves as they do easily to the accomplished sophistry of Mr. Chesterton's style, is the assertion that Christianity is the parent of criticism and reform. The dogma of the Fall, he argues, teaches the Christian that "everything if left to itself

is continually falling," continually going from bad to worse, while the dogma of the Redemption commands him continually to arrest the decay. This is a delightful method of reasoning. Could we not trace a relation by its aid between skyscrapers and the dogma of the Ascension? Mr. Chesterton however refutes his theory in the very article where he propounds it: he claims that Cæsar was a reformer, but surely Cæsar derived no inspiration from Christian doctrine? And are there not other pagans, Plato, Aristotle, and others, with some little fame as critics? And is it not indeed an opinion widely received that the thirst for reform was awakened in Europe by going beyond Christianity and renewing acquaintance with the Greeks?

We may admit the claim that Christianity has provoked and kept alive a struggle against sin; criticism itself was branded during many centuries as a sinful exercise. But if the East has held back from this war, we may well ask whether it abstained through wisdom or from want of grace. Sin in this disobliging world does not wear a scarlet letter; it has to be discovered, even as truth; but few men have patience to search, or strength to restrain, while they search, the impulse to fight. The great majority need no encouragement; when they are authorized to fight sin they are willing to exploit the license and suspect sin in whatever happens to ruffle their small notions of truth and propriety. They are not worthy to fight sin. As a great Anglican bishop said, "Zeal is only fit for sages, but it is most in practice among fools." So it was sin at one time to think of the earth as round or the sun as stationary; so it is sin to-day to drink beer, or read Boccaccio or Voltaire, or wear short skirts; and if, as has been known to happen, war should break out, the enemy would instantly become sin incarnate. There is no little reason for the suspicion that under the lofty pretence of defending morality and fighting sin and worshipping God the peoples of the West have somewhat readily unleashed the many intolerant and aggressive passions that lie hidden in man.

The East has avoided this self-deception by accepting morality for what it is, as glorified convention, "the inevitable and hygienic rules of a particular race of animals." The moral order is not a perfect and unalterable dispensation laid upon mankind but the varying requirements of a stable society. Moral rules are consequently linked up not with religion, but with the relations of family and caste and tribe. Sin, as Mr. Rhys Davids has truly said, is quite antagonistic to the Indian way of life. But Mr. Chesterton will ask, has not the East, far from placing morality on a level with convention, exalted it to the plane of religion? Has not custom been sanctified? We believe that the objections betray a misconception of the spirit of Indian religion. We do not deny that from a variety of causes custom is exceptionally powerful, and religion, in a sense, "woven in and out of all the web of human life." Nevertheless morals and manners have remained inviolate, so far as they have, not because they are sacred but because they are profane; it is a sign of ignorance to strive to correct them: they belong to the world of *Maya*; the sage and the saint would seek to pierce the *Maya*. Paradoxical as it may seem, it is precisely among

a people who mingle religion with every concern of life that the fullest recognition is given to religion as superior to almost every concern, as a liberation. The man who aspires after *moksha* transcends the customary moral rule, breaks his caste, and becomes *sanyasi*. Not that superstition has vanished, by no means ; but it is not, as in the West, confounded with the very substance and meaning of religion and delivered from the most exalted pulpits and issued from august assemblies of clerical dignitaries. The West has in fact no principle by which to distinguish religion from superstition, being unable to determine whether religion is devotion to God or to a corporation or to both simultaneously. Every cultivated Hindu at any rate knows that religion is the attainment of *moksha*, of union with *Brakman*, by the purification of the self and the casting aside of the illusory.

This view has fundamentally more truth in it than the doctrine of fighting sin that has so grievously misled the West and that Mr. Chesterton now offers to us, for it is based upon the cardinal principle that sin, in the only valid sense of the term, lies within the individual and cannot therefore be extirpated by organization or strategy or violence, but in secrecy and loneliness, in the depths of the heart ; in "impassioned contemplation," as the Buddha, under the Bodhi tree, is said to have done. Had Mr. Chesterton understood this he would not have written that the sense of fight against sin is dangerously absent in the East. What is absent is fight by troops and battalions, by Holy Roman Empires and anti-Saloon Leagues, dedicated to the maintenance of righteousness and the defence of the Lord their God. It is this incessant warfare gives to the history of the West the character of a crusade, a fight against sin, a struggle with shadows ; while the history of the East appears as an endless pilgrimage, a search for the Divine, for the Light. And if, in defiance of every trumpery "exposure," we speak of the East as spiritual, we mean that the East has enshrined a view of religion that presents it still as a high and appealing goal ; not as a curb on immorality, not as a faith in creeds drawn up with infinite wrangling and palmed off as the divine will, not as a means of keeping the lower orders in their place, not even, as Mr. Chesterton suggests, as a "spur to progress," but as the possibility of an exquisite and ultimate disenchantment from the spell of the personal and the transitory.

K. S. SHELVANKAR.

IN THE WORLD OF BOOKS.

ANCIENT CIVILIZATION.*

[Margaret Thomas is a journalist of much experience, and has had a varried and interesting career in South Africa, the United States, and Great Britain—EDS.]

Everyone is familiar with the simple thesis of a certain school of scientific historians that civilizations gradually evolved from the primitive to the complex. This, on the one hand—not everyone is aware that its proponents maintain it by ignoring facts and leaving unanswerable questions alone. Our author in *Life and Work in Prehistoric Times* is no exception. Professor Renard continues the myth that humanity started in savagery. This learned scholar of the Collège of France calls himself a prehistorian. So he confines himself here to those times when there were no written documents, he considers, to preserve the memory of past achievements. But he is not as sure of his ground as his early chapters would like us to believe. Let us take but a few instances (and the italics are ours) in addition to his acknowledgment that the experts are divided on the origin of man (p. 22):

In many places, for reasons *which we do not yet understand*, stand menhirs, elevated stones sometimes single, sometimes placed in a circle and painted with red circles with a black spot in the centre, sometimes in shape like that of a tortoise or set up in rows as at Carnac. *They remain enigmas* At Saint Sernin in the Aveyrom a menhir which was perhaps an idol roughly represents a woman. We may connect it, perhaps, with the colossal rock statues of Easter Island (p. 178)).

In Mexico as among the Scandinavians graven signs have been found *of which we do not always recognise the meaning* and the most part of which will remain for ever dead letters (p. 220).

He describes the caves of Tuc d'Audoubert where outside on the cliffs are "drawings of a wolf and a lioness accompanied by marks *whose significance we do not yet know*" (p. 26). He declares that nothing is known how or when the art of tempering steel came to man. He shows not an ever-rising tide but a degeneracy at work in specific instances in art (p. 177)—and horses (p. 114). He says on page 34 that the hypothesis of man as a vegetarian can be partially accepted, if not in the case of humanity as a whole, yet six pages later does not hesitate to affirm "Everything goes to show that cannibalism existed everywhere and that it existed for a variety of reasons for a very long time." He leaves unanswered "one of the minor marvels of history," how obelisks, columns, pyramids and menhirs were hewn and put into place so that *they were common to every country at a very early date* (p. 87). He refers to Quetzalcoatl of Mexico as "perhaps a

* *Life and Work in Prehistoric Times*. By PROFESSOR G. RENARD, translated by R. T. Clark (Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner and Co., Ltd., London, Price 12s. 6d.)

refugee of Atlantis" (p. 121). He acknowledges the fervent adepts of occultism "able by methods kept carefully secret to emerge triumphant from the ordeal of fire and boiling water. Certainly they made more than one discovery about the hidden potentialities of human nature" (p. 186).

There is no consistency here. On the other hand, as opposed to the myth that humanity started in savagery is the widespread tradition of a universal civilization, maintained by those very adepts of occultism, where as to-day sages and savages existed at the same time. There has been no age of the world when savagery and civilization did not struggle together. In our world live scientists and philosophers of Western nations and the jungle tribes of India, the Veddahs of Ceylon, the pigmies of Equatorial Africa, the negrito peoples of the Philippines and New Guinea, the Sakai and Semang of the Malay Peninsula and the Andaman Islanders. Were a tremendous catastrophe to engulf the earth to-morrow and some hundreds of centuries hence on its upheaved surface an archæologist to excavate the domestic implements of one of our Indian or Andaman Island tribes, he would be justified in concluding on the logic of our present prehistorians that the twentieth century peoples were just emerging from the Stone Age. Prof. Renard himself gives *present* instances of modern cave dwellers in the valleys of the Loire and the Cher, and Eskimo huts extant which have scarcely changed their form since a remote past (pp. 76-7) and comments on the superb gold open work of Egypt and Chaldea *thirty centuries ago* as well as the wonderful whiteness and delicacy of the linen of the land of the Pharaohs and the exquisite examples of the ceremonial garments worn by the chiefs and priests in ancient Mexico and Peru. "The luxury of fine dresses . . . Its origin goes back to a remote past" (p. 102). To the days of the beginnings of pre-history and primitive man? He wonders why in the most ancient civilizations there were sphinxes with the head and shoulders of a woman on a lioness' body, gods with the heads of rams, bulls with wings and the faces of men. Inexplicable as is ancient symbology to the prehistory of Kali Yuga, this age of iron, which in its own symbols can yet significantly say "In our own time, do we not estimate the place of a people in the scale of civilization by the amount of iron which it uses?" (p. 73), it seems clear enough in the transmitted history of the Golden Age.

Professor Renard does not take into account the law of cycles and the rise and fall of civilizations, countries and cultures. If there has been an evolution of civilization steadily from primitive beginnings to the present "apotheosis," what of Chaldea, Egypt, Greece, Rome and the attainment of heights in the first two as yet unreached by us, with "mediæval ages" of darkness between each? Can we reconstruct the Pyramids? Can our artists decorate our walls with imperishable colours as bright and vivid to-day as they were 4,000 years ago? Can we build walls such as those of Syene some 5,400 years old so that at the precise moment of the solar solstice the entire disc of the Sun is "reflected on their surface—a work which the united skill of all the astronomers of Europe would not now be able to effect?"

Not without significance is Prof. Renard's reference to the colossal rock statues of Easter Island, remnant as they are of the Lemurian civilization which perished 700,000 years before the beginning of the Tertiary Age. When secondary period man is rediscovered, with him will appear knowledge of his long-forgotten civilization. Atlantis, too, makes fleeting appearance in his pages. Atlantis, that most brilliant civilization which the world has ever known, flourishing in the early part of the Tertiary Age. Scientific historians would confess less often that they did not know, had the records traced on the tanned skins of gigantic antediluvian monsters in primitive Atlantean libraries not been destroyed in the cataclysm that overwhelmed a continent.

As widespread as the tradition of a great civilization in prehistoric times, pointed to by Rawlinson, Jacolliot, Maspero, Lenormant, W. J. Perry, is the tradition of the existence in every ancient nation of divine kings who ruled early races. They were the guides of infant humanity and from them came the first notions of all the arts and sciences, as well as of spiritual knowledge, whence were sown far and wide the first seeds of universal culture.

MARGARET THOMAS.

The Philosophy of Confucius. By C. Y. Hsu. (Student Christian Movement, London. 1s. 6d.)

This little book will do much good if it succeeds in correcting some of the foolish notions which have so long been current about China's greatest teacher. It has taken the Western world a long time to realize that Confucianism, so far from being a formidable rival to Christianity, is rather to be regarded as an ally. For the teachings of Confucius in no way conflict with those of Christ: they formulate ethical truths in different language and under a different aspect, but so far as human conduct is concerned, they are fundamentally the same. Into religion in the narrower sense of the word Confucius did not seek to penetrate, but merely enjoined respect towards the spirits, adding that it was best to keep aloof from them. It is clear he was no agnostic, for he speaks with awe of the worship of Deity (Shang Ti) as practised in his own day.

On the whole, however, he may be said to have made the relation of man to man his chief concern. In his opinion, "man is born good," which is only a compendious way of stating that every man is endowed with certain good instincts, and that if he does not obey these instincts, his conscience will tell him that he is doing wrong. In other words, man has a natural capacity for goodness which may be developed to a boundless extent by moral education, though it may also be stifled by the want of it. One who has cultivated his innate feelings of love, sympathy and benevolence, is the "nobler type of man" (chün-tzu) whom Confucius is fond of contrasting with his opposite, the "little" or "mean man."

Mr. Hsu has given an excellent account of Confucian teaching both on its moral and its political side—which are of course animated by the same principles. Of especial interest at the present day are the remarks on anti-militarism. Confucius and his followers were always opposed to violence, and they saw that the main cause of war between nations was the seeking of gain. “It will be useless to try to prevent war merely by saying that war is inhuman and evil; war can only be abolished by finding out its cause and abolishing that.” Mencius was even more thorough-going a pacifist than his master: “There are men who say—‘I am skilful in marshalling troops, I am skilful in conducting a battle!’—they are great criminals. If the sovereign of a state love benevolence, he will have no enemy in the empire.”

If there is any criticism to be made of Mr. Hsu’s work, it is that here and there he has allowed himself to be misled by Legge’s translation of the sayings, which is far from faultless in its terminology. Thus, in the famous passage where Confucius enunciates the Golden Rule in its negative form, he renders *shu* by “reciprocity,” whereas it stands for something much higher, being in fact almost equivalent to *jên* (love, charity, or goodness of heart), only with the idea of altruism more explicitly brought out. A more grotesque example occurs on the preceding page: “The filial piety of now-a-days means the support of one’s parents. But dogs and horses likewise are able to do something in the way of support.” The real meaning is that filial piety should not be merely a question of supplying our parents with food, since we do as much even for our dogs and horses. It is also a pity that Mr. Hsu has admitted a dialectal pronunciation of proper names which leads him to write *Yen-fai* for Yen Hui, the favourite disciple of Confucius. Unless the standard Mandarin is retained for all proper names, confusion is bound to arise.

LIONEL GILES.

Reincarnation. BY DR. GUSTAVE GELEY, translated from the French by Ethel Archer (Rider Co., London. 1s.)

This little essay is in effect a reply of the author to an international questionnaire on Reincarnation instituted by Dr. Innocenzo Calderone of Palermo. It was written as early as 1912, and since that time the author has died. Dr. Geley was a staunch adherent to the doctrine of Reincarnation because it was to him “from the moral point of view fully satisfying, from the philosophic absolutely rational, from the scientific seemingly true, and better still, probably true.” From these three points of view, therefore, he examines the subject. There are many admirable things in this little treatise, but we deplore the fact that Dr. Geley seems not to have been acquainted with the true Theosophical teachings on Reincarnation and its twin doctrine, Karma. He apparently has come into touch with some so-called Theosophical teachings which he feels are likely to set back the future of reincarnationist philosophy, but had he seriously contacted the work of H.P.B., he would have found an explanation which would

have undoubtedly satisfied him. There are certain contradictions, it appears to us, in his thought, and he has not been able rightly to evaluate the place of the different kingdoms in nature. But he puts up a strong case for the probability of reincarnation which may draw the attention of many who have not yet contacted the subject, and lead them to seek for further information in the writings of those who have mastered the true teaching and given it out to the world. *The Key to Theosophy* by H. P. Blavatsky is one such book, *The Ocean of Theosophy* by W. Q. Judge is another.

F. E.

A Preface to Morals. By WALTER LIPPMANN (George Allen & Unwin, Ltd., London. 10s. net.)

Under this unassuming title Mr. Lippmann has succeeded in writing one of the most thought-provoking books of our day. His analysis of the world to-day refers to the West, but there are not a few in the East, who too have been caught in the whirlpool of modern unrest, and what Mr. Lippmann has to say will assuredly not fail to interest them. The book shows a masterly grasp of the realities of the educated life to-day; the mind has gone beyond the stage when as if opium-dosed it could swallow any cock and bull story that masqueraded as a religious mystery; but also it has lost its bearings, and finds itself in an ocean of doubt. Deprived of the consolations of religion the educated man "discovers one day that he is no longer sure" that anything is "worth doing." Philosophers offer up-to-date interpretations of God, but Mr. Lippmann says: "...a conception of God, which is incomprehensible to all who are not highly trained logicians, is a possible God for logicians alone." In the midst of this uncertainty the question arises what are the teachers to think. This really is "the preface to everything else." The dogmatic moralists are out of tune. The moralist of to-day has to *elucidate* "what the good is."

"The acids of modernity have dissolved the adjustments of the ancestral order." A new order has taken its place and it requires its own thinkers. Mr. Lippmann puts forth in a masterly way a plea for humanism "because in the kind of world I happen to live in, I can do no other." He pleads with Whitehead for religion as "the art and the theory of the internal life of man." This is the religion of the greatest among mankind and this is the religion which has not been touched by the acids of modernity. The true religion is the religion of the Spirit, whose essential principle is disinterestedness. The old type of religion, as cosmic government, tended to be uninterested in human affairs. The religion of to-day is profoundly humanistic and for that very reason disinterested.

To become detached from one's passions and to understand them consciously is to render them disinterested. A disinterested mind is harmonious with itself and with reality. This is the principle by which a humanistic culture becomes bearable.

Our author proceeds to show how this spirit of disinterestedness works in the scientist,—“pure science is high religion incarnate,”—in the civil servant, loyal to his traditions whatever party be in power, in short in every walk of life. In the realm of spirit he succeeds most who most forgets his self ; he leads, who can prove himself to be most disinterested. Given this spirit, socialism can be as good as capitalism; without it socialism can be as stupid and as grasping as capitalism.

In the world of love there is an emphasis on freedom, which ultimately cannot but shake the institution of marriage to its foundations. In an acute analysis of modern love, Mr. Lippmann vividly brings out the ennui of mere love : “Love and nothing else very soon is nothing else.” “It is this understanding that love cannot successfully be isolated from the business of living which is the enduring wisdom of the institution of marriage.” For this very reason it cannot be a matter of compulsion “except the compulsion in each man and woman to reach a true adjustment of his life.”

The way out of the morass of uncertainty and doubt is this religion of spirit, of disinterestedness. In this God becomes the supreme symbol in which man expresses his destiny. The man who has lost faith in God as conceived in popular religions, and who has lost his faith in morality can do nothing better than read and digest this preface to morals, which may conceivably prove to be a preface to a new life of hope and faith and service.

A. R. W.

Mysticism and the Eastern Church. By NICHOLAS ARSENIOW. Translated from the German by Arthur Chambers. (Student Christian Movement, London, 5s. net.)

In this book, with a preface by Prof. Friedrich Heiler and a brief introduction by Miss E. Underhill, Prof. Arseniew, well-known in Russia as a writer on Mysticism, deals first with the “Spirit of the Eastern Church,” and then with the “Transfiguration of the World and of Life in Mysticism.” The Spirit of the Eastern Church he shews us to be ruled by faith in the Resurrection, and the joy which springs from that faith, mingled with the realisation that asceticism is the price of transfiguration. The first step on the Path is contrition, and those who strive after purity of the spirit, must first conquer the self. When sinful thoughts are overcome, and the heart purified, for the quickened sight the whole creation is transfigured and ennobled. The Christian consciousness has always recognised the transience of evil and suffering, over against the abiding presence of the all-subduing Eternal Life, apart from which nothing at all has any real existence. Students of Mysticism, whether of the East or the West, will find in this book a most interesting introduction to the mysticism of the Eastern Church, and also a message (for all who look for a reconciliation of the near and the far, the heavenly and the earthly) of the manifestation in this visible world, here and now, of the Divine glory, which is Life Eternal.

MARGARET SMITH.

CORRESPONDENCE.

BARBARITY IN SPORTS.

It is, I suppose, useless to write you a rejoinder to the article in your magazine on "Blood Sports." Few of your readers have much knowledge or interest in hunting I gather, and I should not trouble to do so nor to take up your time except for the point of clear thinking and philosophy involved. It is quite time we ceased to smear the grandeur of Nature with our petty little morals. Eat and be eaten is a law of nature—and to be feared and hated only by the cowardly and wrong-headed. Hunter and hunted, eater and eaten, live side by side and at *peace*. Each creature finds its own food and should not grudge to be either food or fertilizer in return. Greed and pride on the part of mankind have made him try to blink his eyes at this wholesome and natural economy.

As to the fox and the stag, man cannot farm against unlimited numbers of these . . . they are beautiful and happy creatures and should be allowed to live—as they do live—partly protected, *viz.*, protected during the mating season and *allowed to die a natural death*. To die by being hunted *is the natural end of stag and fox* ever since there have been stag and fox. To meet this end their finest qualities of speed and cunning have been evolved. Few animals in the wild state have the horrible end of death from decrepit old age. Left to themselves men and farmers trap foxes, cunning and speed are useless to them then. Held by one torn foot till they tear off their own foot or wait to be clubbed,—the stag is trapped in pits where he breaks his legs—or he is shot by inexperienced shots. Where is man's justice? Where his humanity? Where even his reason? The rat, every bit as much a highly evolved mammal as the stag, may be killed by any kind of dreadful torture—because he dares to try and share the bounty of man! Four days' calves are torn from their mothers and the pitiful creatures driven to market to be slaughtered—for our cheap milk and meat! This is *unnatural*, cruelty is unnatural, but hunter and hunted and a clean kill is not unnatural nor cruelty. Bull hunting out in open unfenced land is natural sport. Bull-baiting in an enclosed ring where, even if victorious, he cannot escape, is not natural. It is time we went to school again to our mother Nature and then we might realise how blind our pride and conceit has made us.

Man was ever a hunter, in hunting he also learned his finest qualities. The words of holy men are caught and killed like moths upon the pin of a letter. Do we believe—who believe the words of the Buddha holy—that He would have us crawling with lice? And our flocks and herds miserable with parasites? I think not—but we need not kill *unnaturally* nor wantonly, *i.e.*, without reason.

Yeovil, England.

I. G. BARTHOLOMEW.

[It is the policy of THE ARYAN PATH to let both sides speak, and so we print the above letter ; with its even hardly specious but certainly immoral doctrines (we have heard of them before) no humane mind will agree ; these are invented by the cunning animal brains which every hunter, sooner or later, acquires through his cruelty, and to the detriment of his intellectual and intuitive nature ; how he acquires the animal propensities, especially the evil ones, is clear to any thinking student of our Theosophical philosophy.

It is the height of impudence for any one belonging to the "sporting" class of our correspondent to invoke the name of the Holy Buddha to justify his acts of degrading cruelty. According to tradition, from first to last, the Buddha practised the law of compassion and taught:—

“ Kill not,—for Pity’s sake—and lest ye slay
The meanest thing upon its upward way,”

and who showed real sportsmanship in offering his own body in a previous life to the famishing tigress. Let our correspondent ponder over that incident so well described by Sir Edwin Arnold in the fifth book of his *Light of Asia*.

Below we print an answer to a question on the subject given by H. P. Blavatsky in *Lucifer*, Vol. II, pp. 258-259 so far back as 1888 to show what the real spiritual view of the matter is.—EDS.]

Question.—Why do the noblest animals suffer so much at the hands of men ? I need not enlarge or try to explain this question. Cities are torture places for animals who can be turned to any account for use or amusement by men ! and these are always the most noble.

Answer.—In the *Sutras*, or the Aphorisms of the *Karma-pa*, a sect which is an off-shoot of the great Gelukpa (yellow caps) sect in Tibet, and whose name bespeaks its tenets—"the believers in the efficacy of Karma," (action or good works)—an Upasaka inquires of his Master, why the fate of the poor animals had so changed of late ? Never was an animal killed or treated unkindly in the vicinity of Buddhist or other temples in China, in days of old, while now they are slaughtered and freely sold at the markets of various cities, etc. The answer is suggestive:—

“ . . . Lay not nature under the accusation of this unparalleled injustice. Do not seek in vain for Karmic effects to explain the cruelty, for the *Tenbrel Chugnyi* (causal connection, *Nidana*) shall teach thee none. It is the unwelcome advent of the Peling (Christian foreigner), whose three fierce gods refused to provide for the protection of the weak and *little ones* (animals), that is answer able for the ceaseless and heart rending sufferings of our dumb companions.”

The answer to the above query is here in a nutshell. It may be useful, if once more disagreeable, to some religionists to be told that the blame for this universal suffering falls entirely upon our Western religion and early education. Every philosophical Eastern system, every religion and sect in antiquity—the Brahmanical, Egyptian,

Chinese, and finally the purest as the noblest of all the existing systems of ethics, Buddhism—inculcates kindness and protection to every living creature, from animal and bird down to the creeping thing and even the reptile. Alone, our Western religion stands in its isolation, as a monument of the most gigantic *human* selfishness ever evolved by human brain, without one word in favour of, or for the protection of the poor animal. Quite the reverse. For theology, underlining a sentence in the Jehovistic chapter of "Creation," interprets it as a proof that animals, as all the rest, were created for man! *Ergo*—sport has become one of the *noblest* amusements of the upper ten. Hence—poor innocent birds wounded, tortured and killed every autumn by the million, all over the Christian countries, for man's recreation. Hence, also, unkindness, often cold-blooded cruelty, during the youth of horse and bullock, brutal indifference to its fate when age has rendered it unfit for work, and ingratitude after years of hard labour for, and in the service of man. In whatever country the European steps in, there begins the slaughter of the animals and their useless decimation.

"Has the prisoner ever killed *for his pleasure* animals?" inquired a Buddhist Judge at a border town in China, *infected* with pious European Churchmen and missionaries, of a man accused of having murdered his sister. And having been answered in the affirmative, as the prisoner had been a servant in the employ of a Russian Colonel, "a mighty hunter before the Lord," the Judge had no need of any other evidence and the murderer was found "guilty"—justly, as his subsequent confession proved.

Is Christianity, or even the Christian layman to be blamed for it? Neither. It is the pernicious system of theology, long centuries of theocracy, and the ferocious ever-increasing selfishness in the Western civilized countries. What *can* we do?

FREUD & COL. LYNCH.

I have but one criticism of THE ARYAN PATH to make. I deplore the violent attack on Freud by Col. Arthur Lynch which is quoted on the last page of No. 2. Freud has done a great work in the West—a work of necessary destruction. Destruction is not the same as construction, we know, but, in its right time and place, the destruction of the false is the necessary preliminary of the construction of the true. And Freud's great construction has been a *necessary* work of destruction: unnecessary no doubt in India, but utterly necessary in Europe. Therefore I beg THE ARYAN PATH not to print attacks on Freud which show no appreciation at all of his great service.

London.

J. M. M.

It is a pity that the columns of such a valuable journal should waste space on the unworthy and unscientific comments of a so-called psychologist, Colonel Arthur Lynch. It is true that Col. Lynch has

published two volumes of "Psychology—A New System" (1912). Possibly, that is why Freud's work is not a scientific exposition at all.

Let me begin by saying that it is only a Freudian who is capable of criticising Freud's work. After being fed on his doctrine in theory and practice for many years, it becomes a solid basis whereon to argue about the taste of that food.

Freud is sufficiently materialistic to be a true scientist. His work on the dynamic nature of the Unconscious Mind has revolutionised the whole of the older psychology. Moreover, he has provided a working basis for the alleviation of certain pathological conditions. The totality of his work, I quite agree, is reduced to a sexual basis. Even so, like "the curate's egg, it is good in parts". We must admit the force of our animal desires and appetites to a very large extent, but we cannot accept that all and every concept is sexual.

The chief objection to Freud seems to be his one-sidedness. Negativity and pessimism are both predominant in his pages. If we have these brute-like appetites, this is no reason why anyone should remain at that level. *It is the constructive bent that is not stressed by the workers in Psycho-Analysis. Therein lie its dangers.* Concepts of gods, devils and what nots are razed to the ground, and the released energy, in many cases, is capable of disintegrating the organism by the dénouement it entails.

If Colonel Lynch were less tinged with that dogmatism that he attributes to Freud and if his criticism were more temperate, his opinions would carry more weight.

London.

EX FREUDIAN.

[Our only regret is that our correspondent has not put his name to the letter. He speaks with the authority of one practising in Harley Street.—EDS].

ENDS AND SAYINGS.

“_____ends of verse
And sayings of philosophers.”

HUDIBRAS.

During the month of May was held at Erode (South India) the Second Provincial Conference of an organization which works for engendering self-respect among the masses as well as the classes of India. It is regarded as “the movement of the poor” and if it follows the advice of Mr. M. R. Jayakar who presided over the Conference it will serve India worthily and mightily :—

You must not make the hatred of any community the basis of your movement at all. Hatred is a lever but a lever of very short duration. It is a brittle lever, if I may say so. It breaks very soon. It may lift a stone here and there but yet it is not a lever which will give you any power for a long time. Place your movement on goodwill and justice.

How are the promoters and active members of this promising movement to practise goodwill and justice? Mere desire, aspirations only, have never availed. It is ancient advice which Mr. Jayakar has repeated, to be found in the *Gita* and in the great saying of the Buddha—“Hatred ceaseth not by hatred, but by love”. The practice of goodwill and justice necessitates some knowledge of the Law of Karma, of Ethical Causation, the restorer of disturbed harmony. Says the *Secret Doctrine* (1. 643).

Nor would the ways of Karma be inscrutable were men to work in union and harmony, instead of disunion and strife. For our ignorance of those ways—which one portion of mankind calls the ways of Providence, dark and intricate; while another sees in them the action of blind Fatalism; and a third, simple chance, with neither gods nor devils to guide them—would surely disappear, if we would but attribute all these to their correct cause. With right knowledge, or at any rate with a confident conviction that our neighbours will no more work to hurt us than we would think of harming them, the two-thirds of the World’s evil would vanish into thin air.

Karma is an Indian doctrine but much misunderstood in modern India. It is neither *Kismet* nor a passive submission to one’s lot; it is *action* which should be undertaken by the Soul to overcome obstacles, failing which obstacles overtake the Soul.

At the same time and place another self-respect conference was held especially for youths, over which Mr. P. Chidambaram Pillai of Nagarcoil presided. He reiterated the basic idea of the self-respect movement—Brotherhood without any distinction, and gave his young listeners this advice :

Perhaps you may not have heard of the late Sri Narayan Guru, the spiritual head of the Ezhavas or Tiyas of the Malabar Coast. They number about two millions and they are now one of the foremost communities on the West Coast. They come of the untouchables of Malabar. Within

a quarter of a century, their Swamiji raised them to the deservedly high position in society which they now occupy. According to this guru, India will never find any salvation whatever, unless there be one God, one religion and one caste throughout the length and breadth of the land. Retain caste and there is no salvation for the Hindu or for India.

This is good advice, but once again is partial: people cannot live by negation. By all means do away with the evil of many castes, but what shall the "one caste" live by? What kind of "one God" and "one religion" is it to be? Unless a positive philosophy guides young minds to a nobler mode of life in the family and in the state, a mere cry of "down with the castes" may prove dangerous, and the outcome more ignoble than the existing situation. There is a proper basis for breaking caste, of overcoming the evils of separative religions; our young friends will find that in the life-experience narrated (1880) by a true Theosophist, Damodar K. Mavalankar in "Castes in India" which is now available in pamphlet form in the office of THE ARYAN PATH.

It is with some amusement that we recently noted that the example of the Archbishop of Canterbury had been followed by the Parsi Dastur at Udvada, both of whom "prayed to God" for peace and good will in India which is suffering from political dissensions. Leaving politics alone we cannot refrain from commenting on these acts of "piety." May we know what his Grace of Canterbury *did* to prevent the arising of the conditions which now prevail, or what he is doing now to translate the hopes and demands of political India, to enlighten the ignorance or remove the misunderstanding of his flock and his countrymen? Equally may we know from the priest of the sacred Fire how far he has achieved in kindling the fire of understanding if not in other hearts at least in his own? It has ever been an easy way out of the difficulty to throw on the shoulders of God the ills of irresponsibility. What wise God is it that confuses the minds of mortals, that envelops them in ignorance and that refuses to listen to the prayers of his devotees at Canterbury and at Udvada? For though many days have gone by since they prayed, conditions are certainly worse. If these religious "shepherds" would think and act, instead of indulging in verbal prayers to a deaf, because a non-existing, Personal God, they would serve their respective communities better. Jesus taught that prayer is a silent communion with our Inner Soul, the Self in the Heart, the Father in Heaven. Zoroastrian Fragments advocate fight with the druj—the devil of uncleanness, of impurity of thought, word, and deed. All Great Souls emphasise the gaining of understanding which enables man to live in peace with his fellows, to help them intelligently. Lord Irwin and Gandhiji will look in vain for any aid from any outside God—call it Jehovah or call it Ahuramazda. Both will find enlightenment in their own Souls, in proportion as pride and prejudice are removed, as lessons of true history are pondered over, but above all as a sincere effort is earnestly made to solve the problem with mutual respect and tolerance. To the men of Canterbury, Udvada

and their like, may we present for meditation these words of a real Doctor of Divinity, a true Fire Lord, Son of Ahuramazda :—

The God of the Theologians is simply an imaginary power, *un loup garou* as d'Holbach expressed it a power which has never yet manifested itself. Our chief aim is to deliver humanity of this nightmare, to teach man virtue for its own sake, and to walk in life relying on himself instead of leaning on a theological crutch, that for countless ages was the direct cause of all human misery.

From America, however, we hear that a better note has been struck. In an address before the New York Society for Ethical Culture on March 31, 1929, Dr. Felix Adler uttered some profound truths concerning the spiritual nature of man and the necessity for a truly spiritual religion. Theosophical students will see the source of these in their own very ancient philosophy.

Dr. Adler defines a purely spiritual religion as one which does not invoke the authority of an extraneous God. Such a God as is worshipped in the Churches and Synagogues he finds inconceivable. No one Being could be omniscient or altogether holy, since holiness consists in the harmonious interaction of one life with all other lives.

The attributes of divine being must be ascribed to an infinite number of spiritual beings, among whom every man and woman counts in so far as there is within them a spiritual self. In our ultimate, most real nature we are eternal, we are partners in perfection, we are destined to holy intercourse with all fellow spirits.

How can we know that there is a spiritual nature in man? Dr. Adler says that this knowledge is to him a matter of inner experience. He finds it impossible to consider man as a physical being that lives, grows, withers and dies. Man is to him an *exceptional* being who has risen above the forms of life that lie below him. Physical evolution explains to him only the physical part of man's nature, and fails to account for the divine. The latter is not merely a second man wrapped up in the sheath of the body; it is not a ghost, not a material particle.

The spiritual is the divine; nothing else is spiritual. It is the supreme word and should be used only for the supreme epiphany of the unknown essence of man.

What are the characteristics of this divine being that is man? There are three, says Dr. Adler. First it is *eternal*. Only that which persists and endures is absolutely real; all else is relative. Secondly, it is *perfect* being, including the totality of possible being. Thirdly, it is *holy* in the sense that whatever exists in it is in harmony with whatever else exists within it, conflict and friction being excluded. For highest harmony and holiness are identical. This is another way of describing a Mahatma.

In this lecture, Dr. Adler urged his listeners to stop appealing to some Divinity outside themselves, and to begin to look for the God within themselves and their fellowmen. Make this an hypothesis, he says, assume that there is such a presence, and see what effects

will follow. If men once perceived the connection between liberty and the spiritual part of man, there would be no more dictators, but each man would become the master of his own destiny.

Nor if it were assumed that there is a spiritual nature in the backward populations of the earth, latent but present, would there be the commercial raids that decimate these unhappy populations, nor should our present civilization with all its glitter be shadowed by that dark cloud of the next war with its inconceivable horrors that weighs to-day upon mankind.

How an individual, suffering from a disease in childhood, will as a result find his entire life changed, is brought forward by Dr. H. W. Newell, of the Virginia State Mental Hygiene Clinic (Science-News Letter March 1930) who has traced the history of twin girls, one of whom in early babyhood contracted infantile paralysis, so that now whereas in appearance she is almost identical with her healthy sister, in personality she is entirely different, being backward, both mentally and physically, this bringing with it a great deal of suffering.

Medical science with all its arduous investigation, can but state a fact like the foregoing, but can offer no consolation or explanation to the unfortunate girl so afflicted for the remainder of her life term. Explanation, however, does exist in the soul-satisfying philosophy of the Aryans, which has recorded the twin doctrines of Reincarnation and Karma.

The Ocean of Theosophy teaches :

Heredity in giving us a body in any family provides the appropriate environment for the Ego. The Ego goes only into the family which either completely answers to its whole nature, or which gives an opportunity for the working out of its evolution, and which is also connected with it by reason of past incarnations or causes mutually set up When we look at the character in human bodies, great inherent differences are seen. This is due to the soul inside, who is suffering or enjoying in the family, nation and race his own thoughts and acts which past lives have made it inevitable he should incarnate with.

Individual unhappiness in any life is thus explained : (a) It is punishment for evil done in past lives ; or (b) it is discipline taken up by the Ego for the purpose of eliminating defects or acquiring fortitude and sympathy. When defects are eliminated it is like removing the obstruction in an irrigating canal which then lets the water flow on. Happiness is explained in the same way : the result of prior lives of goodness.