AUM

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. II JULY 1931 NO. 7

A MANTRA FOR MEDITATION

Nothing is more wretched than a man who traverses everything in a round, and pries into the things beneath the earth, as the poet says, and seeks by conjecture what is in the minds of his neighbours, without perceiving that it is sufficient to attend to the dæmon within him, and to reverence it sincerely. And reverence of the dæmon consists in keeping it pure from passion and thoughtlessness, and dissatisfaction with what comes from gods and men.

MARCUS AURELIUS

We are fast approaching a time when even large masses of people will evince recognition of the world which lies within each one of us, and which shapes for each the world without. Dependence on objects is giving place to dependence on ideas. This is a long step towards the world within. Happiness is more and more seen to be the product of a creative intelligence in the human heart. Some if not many recognize that the creative action of the heart increases in proportion as thirst for objects of sense decreases. In passing it might be pointed out that a consideration of this decrease brings a subtle perception which refines and does not destroy our sense life.

Both these facts are surrounded by a great deal of vagueness. Many vaguely feel that God is within but they have obviously not yet arrived at a clear-cut perception of the truth, for such perception revolutionizes the whole of life. Some few vaguely recognize that between creative moral intelligence and sense-life there is intimate kinship, but they have not begun educating themselves to ascertain its nature and depth.

In every country of the world the thinking few are deliberately turning to the God *within*—the unchanging Consciousness which is the witness of the ever-changing subjects of thought and objects of sense. "The Spirit in the Body" is gaining for Itself a deserved place among the most advanced concepts of to-day.

"The Spirit in the Body" is a veritable *mantra*, i. e., it has the power of enlightening the mind which repeatedly meditates on it. It is a simple seed-idea with the power to fructify abundantly. One of the earliest effects of meditation on this *mantra* is the new value it compels us to give to the body, which is the Holy of Holies, and which has come well-nigh to be poisoned by monkish superstition and to be degraded by scientific materialism.

Marcus Aurelius calls the Spirit in the Body the Dæmon and urges upon men to attend to and to reverence him. He repeats the old doctrine of the *Gita* that passion leads to thoughtlessness and these envelop the Spirit as smoke surrounds fire. Two contending forces reside in the body, which is not itself the enemy of the Spirit; for it is not molecularly constituted matter, least of all the human body, that is our grossest constituent but verily the passions —the real animal centre. The body is but its shell, the irresponsible factor and medium through which the beast in us acts all its life. But also, through it, the Light of the Spirit shines; for, in it, the God also abides.

Passion and thoughtlessness are an inseparable pair. All our thinking is so mixed up with desires and longings that the energy of thought itself has assumed a destructive aspect. Competitive thoughts, selfish thoughts, war-like thoughts, are destroying agencies; they are more powerful than trade-unions and big-business-trusts, more penetrating than armies, navies and air-forces. To free the mind from passion means gaining the power to attend to the creative faculty of Consciousness. The mind wanders among the objects of desire because it has not perceived the truth that it can as easily be impressed by the Spirit in the Body as by the Satan in the body. Earnest and religious people are so busy fighting the devil, and are so concentrated on him that they forget to seek the company of the God within. Neither by chastisement, nor by cursing, nor by fighting can we evict the Devil from the mind. When the mind *ignores* the Satan, because it is busy listening to the song of the Spirit, then only shall we succeed in living the higher life. The grand urge of evolution is not the withdrawal of the Spirit to its own shining and blissful abode, but to bring out its inherent Radiance and Joy as Benediction for the world of matter.

To seek the company of the Spirit in the Body is to engage in meditation on the nature of the Spirit. This brings not only peace but also knowledge. Then only

can the Spirit in the Body act outwardly, that is, become as it were an extraneous Potency.

Meditation is the prime need, and that the thoughtful admit. To what theme shall our meditation be directed? To the Spirit in the Body. Each human being is an incarnation of his God. So many men on earth, so many Gods in Heaven, and yet these Gods are in reality *One*. All that an average man can know of his God is what he knows of, through and within himself.

To aid him in his search the Spirit in the Body is given certain names, and repeated contemplation on them enables him to know It's nature. They are :—(1) Spectator (Upadrashtri), (2) Admonisher (Anumantri), (3) Sustainer (Bhartri), (4) Enjoyer (Bhoktri), (5) the Great Lord (Maheshwara). This is the starting point of the meditation. It is however necessary, so the Divine Science teaches, to remember from the very outset that the motive for acquiring knowledge and gaining power is the service of our fellowmen.

Others can be helped and inspired by us with the help and inspiration of the God within ourselves. We must prepare ourselves to permit the God in us to act outwardly, i. e., to become as it were an extraneous Potency. Thus meditating on the *mantra* "The Spirit in the Body" we shall free ourselves from passion and thoughtlessness, and then know Its Creative Potency, make It act on the outward plane. Inspired acts are like a flame; in their turn they produce other inspired acts. A real picture is the mother of many pictures; a real poem begets more poetry; a real idol reveals the hidden ideals. A new meaning of the exquisite lines of Keats dawns upon us—

> A thing of beauty is a joy forever;
> Its loveliness increases; it will never
> Pass into nothingness.

Meditation is prayer: Invoking the Spirit in the Body our minds gain illumination; our desires are purified; and our deeds become the shining creatures through which the radiance of eternity breaks upon this drab world of toil and poverty.

CRIME AND PUNISHMENT

[**George Godwin** is a very versatile writer. He has made two contributions to the well-known "To-day and To-morrow" series. He is also a novelist of promise and Gerald Gould, writing in the *Observer*, included Mr. Godwin's *The Eternal Forest* and *Why Stay We Here?* among the best novels of 1930. His latest work is a biography of a great eighteenth century navigator—*Vancouver: A Life.*

Our author points out that in reference to habitual and other criminals the obsolete absurd plea of sin has been replaced by mental disease—scientific terminology. But is not mental disease as vague and glamouring an expression as sin? The doctor may talk of disease, as the priest of sin; a disease may be the cause of a sin, but whence mental disease? Heredity does not answer the problem, for, who has not known of criminals born in non-criminal families and vice versa? The problem of criminology *is* psychological; can we not get at a better system of educating the criminal by taking into account the Law of Reincarnation and all it implies? Asiatic psychology has something practical to offer in the curing of crime—be it named sin or disease.—EDS.]

Society is always faced with the problem of those of its members who either will not or cannot accept and abide by the rules of conduct laid down by the majority.

The offender against tribal customs is dealt with arbitrarily; it is retribution. This element of revenge by Society upon the offender against it has continued down to the present day, much modified, it is true, and tempered by a growing element of clemency. This element of revenge in modern punishment is sufficiently obscured to pass unrecognised by the average citizen, yet it remains, and, remaining, obscures the proper objective of all punishment as postulated by both ethics and science.

What is the real problem of the anti-social individual, briefly stated? It is the protection of Society; the cure of the curable; the disposal of the irreclaimable residue.

When you read in your newspaper that some defaulting financier has been sentenced to seven years penal servitude you would do well to examine your emotions. They should be precisely those you would experience on hearing that the same individual was about to undergo a major operation for a serious, but curable, malady.

But they will not be anything of the kind. "Serve him right" about sums up the reactions of the average individual in such circumstances. He feels, quite naturally, that this swindler merits the mental agony and physical discomforts he is about to experience through the long years of his servitude. What ultimate *good*, either to the individual or to Society, will result is probably a question never asked, an aspect of the problem never present in the mind.

Yet it is obviously vital. For the captivity of an individual involves the punishment of all, since

each must contribute to his maintenance, while the only dividend that may be hoped for is restoration of the thief to the average honesty of the community.

In a word, we are to-day far more concerned with the reform of the wrong-doer than with the infliction upon him of mental or physical suffering.

In passing it must be mentioned that there are still some thinking people who hold that suffering in itself has a salutary effect. It is true that fear of suffering may deter, but it does not reform: *suffering, to purge, must be self-inflicted.* So it seems both ethically and scientifically sound that punishment should have as its chief objective what may be called a change of heart in the wrong-doer: in short, his reform and restoration to Society as a law-abiding and useful citizen.

The pursuit of this end is the preoccupation of a few brilliant minds to-day. As they envisage this problem, it is concerned always with the soul of man, with his psychological make-up, with his mental infirmities.

A few years since, and sometimes even to-day, such pioneers are belittled as visionaries, whereas, of course, they are very practical utilitarians. Their concern is always with causes. Why does one man elect to live upon his fellows instead of in co-operation with them? Why does one man surrender to the lust to kill; another to erotic perversions?

Formerly, the answer was always the same: It was summed up in the word Sin. The psychologist uses another ideology. For right and wrong he substitutes normal and abnormal, mental health and mental disease.

The realm already explored by the psychologist concerned with criminal behaviour is too vast to touch on here. Man has in recent years probed to the rim of the Universe, uncovering immensities of space appalling to the human mind and beyond its comprehension. But he has also uncovered within the bony structure of the human skull an immensity no less staggering in its complexity.

Sin and virtue are not the simple attributes they once seemed to be, but of tremendous intricacy.

The causes that lead individuals to crime are many. It may be that the delinquent is mentally below the average and is consequently handicapped in the battle for existence. He finds that he cannot compete with his fellows so long as he observes the rules, that is, the laws, and he decides to play life's game without them. In our prisons, being steadily made less capable of struggling on the open market, are thousands of delinquents who are mentally below the average, or sub-normal.

Such men and women alternate between prison and brief spells of freedom. They are without social sense or morality because they are without intellectual equipment; for it is fairly certain that morality rests upon an intellectual basis, and for lack of it disappears.

These sub-normals should, surely, be the wards of Society: they

are to be pitied rather than punished, since they are the victims of a bad heredity. Very true is the saying that a man should choose his grandparents with great care.

Turn from the sub-normal types and we still have the problem of the individual equipped with excellent brains but who yet elects for an anti-social line of conduct. An individual may have a first-class intellectual apparatus and yet become anti-social in conduct by reason of emotional defect or instability. Modern psychology is making quite surprising discoveries with regard to this class of offender. It is becoming more and more certain that in a very large number of such cases of delinquency the root cause lies in the sex life of the offender, though, strangely enough and for reasons too complex to go into here, the sexual psychopath as often as not commits the non-sexual offence.

But the salient facts of the whole problem of the delinquent are fairly obvious to-day. We shift from the realm of the criminal lawyer to the quiet atmosphere of the psychologist's clinic. Much, if not all crime, is a manifestation of disease of mind or disease of body. The problem, then, is one of scientific treatment rather than of punishment. The object is reform, or reclamation, an object whose merits need no stating, since they are obvious.

There remains the problem of the individual who can never be restored to Society, and for him it would seem only one remedy is possible. Such individuals must be segregated and cared for in the same way as we deal with those whose mental machinery has entirely broken down. The hopeless degenerate is an insoluble problem in himself, and his elimination probably lies by way of sterilization, though opinion as to this remedy is to-day divided among experts.

To-day, we lump all classes of convicted offenders into penal institutions that ignore the wide variety of defects in their unhappy inhabitants. Brutality, it is true, has disappeared: it did so when the social conscience of the community was roused by exposures of prison atrocities not so many years ago. But although actual torture, semi-starvation and other abominations have gone, there is little or nothing in modern prison life to make a "bad" man better, though there is much to make a "good" man worse.

The system is hopelessly unscientific and wasteful of public money and human material, and that is sufficient ground for its condemnation. The very fact that the prisoner is absolved from the salutary discipline of the struggle for existence must weaken him, so that, when he emerges, a free man, he is the worse of his experience in that he has forgotten the art of life and the capacity to struggle. Moreover, his self-respect has been wounded and an attitude of mind fostered that makes him see in every fellow creature a potential enemy, and in Society as a whole, a vast and amorphous threat to his existence,

an organization completely hostile to him.

"Every sentence," wrote Oscar Wilde after two years in Reading Gaol, "is a life sentence." That is as true to-day as it was when Wilde wrote it.

And it is true whether the first-offender never again returns to prison or becomes a recidivist. Of all offenders who come up for trial at our Assize courts and Quarter Sessions more than seventy per cent are persons previously convicted. That is a poor advertisement for the social usefulness of our prisons and is their condemnation.

It is probable that no radical reforms will come until there is a widespread demand for them from Society as a whole. There is not very much indication of any such awakening. Moreover, most of those who administer justice in our criminal courts or punishment in our prisons are extremely conservative: tradition means much in the realm of criminal law, and often the attitude of judges towards the man of science is tinged, unhappily, with a certain degree of contempt. There are judges whose minds are of an era that has passed: they stand for old and bad things, and the new rouses in them suspicion and sometimes hostility. Such judges continue to advocate flogging, a method which carries its own condemnation from the single fact alone that it must necessarily brutalize the inflicter of it.

How should Society deal with the murderer?

Recently a Committee of the House of Commons heard evidence and issued a Report on this subject. That Report has been the subject of an immense amount of criticism in the lay Press. The makers of it have been dubbed sentimentalists and so forth, and its conclusion, namely, that capital punishment, on balance, stands condemned, has been challenged.

The question of capital punishment may have fewer difficulties than is generally supposed. It is inflicted, of course, on the old Mosaic law—An eye for an eye: a tooth for a tooth. If you accept that doctrine, then no argument is of avail. Otherwise, much remains to be said.

I think the very strongest argument against capital punishment is that advanced by that able and tireless opponent of it, Mr. Fenner Brockway M. P. Mr. Brockway advances many sound grounds for its abolition, but none more impressive than this inherent quality of every death sentence passed: It is the irrevocable sentence of a fallible court.

We are assured that no innocent man could possibly be hanged for a murder he had not committed. That may possibly be, and nobody would question the care and scrupulous fairness of a trial for murder in a modern criminal court in this country. Even so, in the past, innocent men have been wrongly sent to the gallows. They may be again, and particularly is this a real danger where there is doubt as to the moral responsibility of the accused. For to hang an

epileptic for murder may be as great a miscarriage of justice as to hang an innocent normal individual.

The chief argument for the retention of capital punishment is that it acts as a deterrent. The experience of those modern States that have either completely abolished it, or have allowed it to fall into desuetude, would not appear to bear out this argument. Eighteen modern States have abolished the death penalty and without apparent increase in murder statistics.

The part played by every description of punishment involving either loss of liberty or loss of life depends upon the inevitability with which it follows the event. Certainty of punishment, whatever its form, is a deterrent. And when our prisons become the psychopathic institutions they should be, the fear of them will be just as much a deterrent as the present fear of Dartmoor. Man, above all, prizes life and liberty, and the conditions of the loss of the latter is a minor matter.

America, which has in most of its States capital punishment, has the world's highest murder rate. It has it because there it is the exception, rather than the rule, for the murderer to expiate his offence on the gallows or in the electric chair.

To sum up, the whole problem of crime and punishment is a scientific one. Hitherto it has been handled and mishandled by empirical methods. They have failed and therefore stand condemned. Of that there is no question: there remains the choice of an alternative: we have to continue as we are, *manufacturing criminals*, or we have to recognize the central truth.

It is that only by mastering the causes of crime can we understand the mind of the criminal: only by applying the processes of psychological treatment can we hope to reduce crime to its irreducible minimum.

GEORGE GODWIN

The chief point is, to uproot that most fertile source of all crime and immorality—the belief that it is possible for them to escape the consequences of their own actions. Once teach them that greatest of all laws, *Karma* and *Re-incarnation*, and besides feeling in themselves the true dignity of human nature, they will turn from evil and eschew it as they would a physical danger.—H. P. BLAVATSKY, *The Key to Theosophy* (p. 208 Indian Ed.; p. 248 American Ed.)

THE PATH OF JESUS

[St. John (xiv. 6.) attributes to Jesus the claim: "I am the way, the truth, and the life." There is so much confusion surrounding the personality of Jesus that widely different view-points about his message and mission exist. Below we print two articles typical of such divergence. Different minds interpret the life and works of Jesus each from its own standpoint; conversely there are those who seek in them a measure for their own depth of vision and discernment. These two essays present two such findings.—EDS.]

I

JESUS—THE NATIONALIST

[**Alexander Haggerty Krappe, Ph. D.,** is the well-known translator of the much discussed volume *The Messiah Jesus and John the Baptist*, by Robert Eisler. Theosophists and mystics will not readily accept his views and deductions about Jesus, his ways and teachings, but that is sufficient reason to let our scholarly author present his case in THE ARYAN PATH.—EDS.]

Christianity, alike in this to all the great religions which have conquered the world, is a compound product sprung from many rather diverse roots, and no history of Christian ethics which fails to make due allowance for this important fact can be called scientific in the ordinary sense of this term. Nor is it to be supposed that Christian ethics as such are identical with the ethics taught by the nominal Founder of the Christian religion. His views on ethical problems, it would seem, could be ascertained with relative ease from the Synoptic Gospels. Unfortunately, in their present shape these documents represent little more than a series of aphorisms, somewhat resembling the *Pensées* of Blaise Pascal, with this important difference that, whilst we know the date of these and the general circumstances attending their writing, the biography of the prophet known under the name of Jesus of Nazareth has down to present times been an insolvable enigma. But it stands to reason that the ethical aphorisms embodied in the Gospels cannot be separated with impunity from the occasions on which they were uttered, and these are still in large part hidden from us. Still, from the general tenor of these maxims and with the help of the recent grandiose reconstruction of the Founder's life by Dr. Robert Eisler* we can in a certain measure form an idea of his personality and guiding principles. Above all, we may say with a certain amount of assurance what Jesus of Nazareth was *not*.

In the first place, Jesus was no ascetic; as a matter of fact, he was anything but that. No matter what has been said to the contrary, Judaism and the Semitic religions in general never did favour asceticism, and the existence of Jewish sects in the period of Christ

* *Cf.* THE ARYAN PATH I, 273 sqq.

holding ascetic views is to be explained on the basis of the state of mind created in any nation that is being ruthlessly oppressed by an alien conqueror. The New Testament leaves no doubt whatever about the fact that Jesus bitterly opposed the Pharisees, a sect with clear-cut ascetic tendencies, precisely because asceticism struck him as superfluous and, if not coupled with absolute sincerity, as downright pernicious. According to his view, if this earth was a vale of tears, it was so because man had made it so, in flagrant opposition to the purposes of a kind and benevolent Creator, who had wanted every Jew to enjoy his fields and his vineyard, and it was not through ascetic methods that the original state of bliss could be brought back. One can then not think of a greater contrast than that existing between the views of the Founder of Christianity and those of the ascetic orders of monks and nuns in the Byzantine Empire and the Christian Occident.

In the second place, Jesus was no philosopher in the classic sense. If the extant Gospels represent him somewhat in the rôle of a wandering sage, say of the cynic school, resembling in more ways than one the famous Apollonius of Tyana, this fact must be set down to literary tendencies all powerful in the Hellenistic world. The ancient Jews (like all the Semites) lacked the purely intellectualistic outlook to produce philosophers, and if the Sadducees, the author of the Book of *Koheleth*, and Philo of Alexandria seem to form exceptions to this rule, these apparent exceptions must be set down to the all powerful influence of Hellenism and Greek culture.* Jesus was no intellectual, and to compare him to Socrates is as absurd as to compare John Wesley to Voltaire. Had he been an intellectual, he would have attacked his problem from quite a different angle; he certainly would not have attracted the type of followers he did attract, among whom there was no Plato nor even an Alcibiades.

Lastly, Jesus was no mystic, quite different in this from the founders of later religions, Mohammed, John of Leyden, Joseph Smith, etc., but alike to the ancient Jewish prophets, an Amos, a Jeremiah, a Hosea. Whatever statements in the Gospels may convey a seemingly contrary tendency are either ill-supported or downright forgeries. On the other hand, the accounts of his last hours are remarkably sober and quite devoid of the exaltation one would expect to find even in personages working under no religious impulse.

Jesus of Nazareth was chiefly, if not exclusively, a great nationalist leader and a social reformer; his ethical code can be understood only on the assumption of this premiss. To us moderns these terms appear only too contradictory, for in America and Europe at least the social reformers are

* I have dealt with one aspect of this all-powerful influence in a brief study published in the *Revue des études grecques*, XXXIX, 351 sqq.

precisely the ones who reject the nationalist claim. In the Jewish state of that time matters were altogether different. The upper classes, though by no means enthusiastic over the Roman rule, yet supported it because they saw in the Roman legionaries the pillar and support of the state of society as it then existed, which was obviously favourable to them. For the same reason the have-nots were the most bitterly opposed to the domination of the Holy Land by aliens; they were the most "nationalistic". Liberation from Rome then meant also liberation from the yoke of a feudal and capitalistic aristocracy and an oppressive hierarchy. The ethical teaching of Jesus, as embodied in the Sermon on the Mount, must be largely understood as the sum total of directions given by a general to an army about to take the field or to a garrison besieged in a fortress. This teaching implied two things, of equal importance to the minds of the fighters and their leader: a propitiation of the angry deity and a general peace among the fighters for freedom, that is, a cessation, not only of all private feuds, but also of all law-suits and of all legal wrangling. To make such a state possible, a universal peacefulness, a patience not ordinarily found among humans, and an equally rare helpfulness and charity were enjoined upon the faithful. In view of human nature everywhere, it must have been clear even to an idealist of the type of Jesus of Nazareth that such rules were enforceable only for a limited period and under extreme stress, the common danger threatening all. It must therefore be doubted whether Jesus himself ever thought of attributing to his rules a permanency which by their very nature they could not possess.

Jesus did not and could not presume, in view of the Jewish religion, to proclaim these rulings on his own authority. He had to invoke Jahveh, the terrible god of the ancestors, as his ultimate authority. This produced, even in the most Christian parts of his ethical teaching, a queer twist which has vitiated Christian ethics to this day. The dogma of rewards and punishments after death having been adopted by all classes of the Jewish people, with the sole exception of the Sadducees, Jesus probably felt that he could not dispense with this notion as a moral support of his ethical code, a concession which was fraught with the most fatal consequences for Christianity.

Equally fatal, particularly from the purely practical view-point, was his adoption of the messianist hopes of the Jewish people. The type of mind receptive to such ideas, from the social point of view among the most dangerous, is invariably the product of a ruthless oppression: we have witnessed a similar sort of thing in Ireland and Poland. A large proportion of the Jewish people of the period were firmly convinced that Jahveh would not tolerate the Roman domination indefinitely

but would put a stop to it, and that soon, by destroying the oppressors and restoring the Holy Land to His chosen people, nay, that He would bestow upon that people the rule over the whole earth. This was in the idea of Jesus the "Kingdom of God," the "Civitas Dei," a sort of paradise here on earth, brought on by supernatural means, the action of Jahveh, in which every Jew, nay, every Messianist, would enjoy in peace his vineyard and his olive-trees, freed from the grinding taxation of his oppressors, the Roman State and the Jewish hierarchy. This faith Jesus took with him to the cross; even in his last moments he is reported to have promised to one of his two fellow sufferers a stay with him in paradise, and that the very same day of their death. What was meant was of course no heavenly paradise such as we find in later Christianity, a notion sprung from the Babylonian astral religion, but the earthly paradise, the oasis in the desert, with its palm-trees and its fresh waters, the true ideal of the poor Bedouin.

Pacifists have in and out of season laid a peculiar stress on what may be called the Pacifist trend in Jesus' teaching; they have been all too anxious to bolster up, as it were, their claims by some great religious authority—as if human Reason alone did not furnish the best basis and *raison d'être* of their views, which are after all nothing but sound common sense. The problem of the pacifism of Jesus of Nazareth is somewhat more complicated than most people are ready to admit. When he enjoined peace on his own followers, he did of course nothing more than what is done by any governor of a besieged fortress, and it is impossible to set these rules down to his pacifistic doctrines. Quite true, there is a good deal of evidence that for some time he preached a sort of doctrine of non-resistance with regard to the Roman oppressors. At all events, when he lays down the rule: "If some one compels thee to walk one league with him, walk thou two," it is difficult not to see in that "some one" a Roman officer forcing the Jewish husbandman or fisherman to serve him as a guide. At the same time it is clear that toward the end of his career Jesus abandoned these pacifist views and took up the sword. There is no reason to condemn him for this: mankind has not to this day evolved a method of resisting oppression without bloodshed. The Jews of the first century of our era were no nation of pacifists, and a purely pacifist Jesus would thus be a huge and unthinkable anachronism.

If in all these respects Jesus of Nazareth was a child of his time, it would be most unjust to overlook or neglect his character as a great reformer, although upon closer scrutiny he will be found to have stepped into the traces of the great Jewish prophets. Ancient religion was vitiated by an oppressive, wasteful, and, from the aesthetic point of view, disgusting and degrading sacramentalism;

the altars of the gods, not excepting Jahveh, reeking with the gore of the sacrificed victims. The Jewish prophets of old had attacked it, vainly. All they had been able to accomplish was the creation of the synagogue, the house of prayer, where the faithful assemble to worship Jahveh in spirit and in truth. Jesus' whole career and his final downfall are bound up with his hostile attitude toward the Third Temple and the sacrificial system of the Jewish priesthood. The new religion which he founded, though guilty of numerous relapses into the sacramental and ritualistic system he condemned, at least did away with the slaughter of animals on the altar of an imaginary bloodthirsty deity. What he could not accomplish with the more conservative portion of the Jewish people, the Romans accomplished for him: the fall of the Third Temple in A. D. 70 did away with the sacrificial system for good and all. The triumph of Christianity abolished it in Mediterranean and Northern Europe.

One is more hesitant about calling a step in advance his attitude toward individual responsibility, like so many other items of his teaching clearly a heritage from the Jewish past. The Greeks held a more humane and no doubt more correct view when they attributed the larger share of what we are pleased to call "guilt" to exterior forces, called "gods" or "fate" by their tragedians, but which we moderns identify with the mysterious forces of inheritance, environment and the reaction of social and economic facts upon the individual. The Judeo-Christian idea of personal responsibility has left a sinister mark on the penal system of all Christian nations, and we know that we have no reason to be proud of the record.

In most other respects Jesus of Nazareth shared the fate of all reformers: he condemned the hierarchy, and it found its way back into his own religion; he condemned ritualism, and the ritual of the Christian churches outdid even the ritual of the Third Temple; he rejected asceticism and the monastic orders carried asceticism to even greater extremes than the Pharisees ever had; he had died attacking the State, and as late as the fifth century one of his most noble disciples, Saint Augustine, repeated his challenge; yet all this did not prevent the State, in the fateful years from 1914 to 1918, from sacrificing a hecatomb of ten millions of Christian men and women for an idea as un-Christian as any idea could possibly be. Truly, Julian the Apostate was wrong when he exclaimed with his dying breath: "Thou hast conquered, O Galilæan."

ALEXANDER HAGGERTY KRAPPE

II

THE HISTORICAL JESUS AND THE COSMIC CHRIST

[**William Kingsland** is an old time Theosophist, who wrote *The Esoteric Basis of Christianity* many years ago. His more recent book is *The Real H. P. Blavatsky*, which presents as true an account of her life and mission as has yet been given. Mr. Kingsland is a devoted student of H. P. Blavatsky and we welcome him among the contributors of THE ARYAN PATH.—EDS.]

For the student of Theosophy —the Ancient Wisdom, not the modern psychic perversions— both the Old and the New Testament writings bear on their face the hall-mark of their origin in the carefully guarded secrets of the Hierarchy of Initiates who have preserved the esoteric or Gnostic teachings from time immemorial. Thus Philo writes in the first century A. D.—

> Most excellent contemplators of nature and all things therein, they [the ancient sages] scrutinise earth and sea, and air and heaven, and the natures therein. . . They have their bodies, indeed, planted on earth below; but for their souls, they have made them wings, so that they speed through aether and gaze on every side upon the powers above, as though they were the true world-citizens, most excellent, who dwell in cosmos as their city; such citizens as Wisdom hath as her associates, inscribed upon the roll of Virtue, who hath in charge the supervising of the common weal. . . Such men, though (in comparison) few in number, keep alive the covered spark of Wisdom secretly, throughout the cities (of the world), in order that Virtue may not be absolutely quenched and vanish from our human kind.

Philo expounded the *Logos* doctrine, and even uses the term "Only Begotten Son,"* but he makes no mention of Jesus with whom he was contemporary.

But the Old and the New Testament documents as we have them to-day also bear on their face sad evidences of mutilation, perversions and additions at the hands of those who never had the key to their inner esoteric interpretation; at the hands of those who endeavoured to historicise the narrative and materialise the doctrine: their success being only too evident in the darkness, superstition and cruelty in the name of "Christianity" which closed in on the Western World after the second and third centuries, and which survives even to-day in numberless "Christian" communities.

The fanaticism of the early Christians is well enough known. The ancient monuments of Egypt bear sad witness to the effort to destroy every trace of the origin of the Christian doctrines in the earlier religions and myths, whilst the destruction of thousands of documents which would have given us the now much desired evidence in that direction is also on record.

* Max Müller, *Theosophy or Psychological Religion*, p. 412.

But the student of Theosophy is not so much concerned with historical evidences as are some of our scholars and apologists. The evidences for the derivation of the Biblical records from earlier sources are gradually emerging, and may well be left to take care of themselves. Possibly their complete disclosure would be too great a shock for the many sincere and devout Christians whose whole outlook on life, both here and hereafter, is bound up with the literal historical narrative and the traditional doctrines.

Origen wrote:

> The narratives of the Doctrine are its cloak. The simple look only at the garment, that is, upon the narratives of the Doctrine; more they know not. The instructed, however, see not merely *the cloak, but what* the cloak covers.

Note that it is only the "instructed" who recognise the inner esoteric meaning of the narrative. Who are the instructed? Where and how did they obtain that instruction? Obviously not from the Church, unless in those times the Church had a real "Esoteric Section"; for the traditional doctrines of the Church are based on the literal narrative. The history of the Christian Church, indeed, is one long record of the persecution of those who endeavoured to teach the inner doctrine. These were the "heretics"; and we all know the cruel record of the Church in its dealings with them. We all know how bitter even to-day is the feeling of the upholders of the literal narrative against those who in any way dispute its veracity.

Are there then none to-day who can instruct us in the inner doctrine. Assuredly there are; but the individual must have cast aside all his prepossessions as to the narrative before their instruction can appeal to him; and he must seek, and seek earnestly, before he can obtain "the pearl of great price," the pearl of spiritual truth.

It is hardly possible to recognise "what the cloak covers" by a mere examination of the "cloak," however closely it may be studied. The narrative must be interpreted in the light of a wider and deeper knowledge derived from other sources. Take for example the first two chapters of *Genesis*. Suppose that we had nothing else than this narrative to instruct us as to the origin of the material world and of humanity. Suppose that we knew of no other similar narratives of an earlier date than that of *Genesis*. Suppose that we had no scientific evidence as to the processes of nature, or the age of Man on the Earth:—how then could we interpret the narrative otherwise than literally? But such was practically the state of affairs up to the commencement of the XIXth century, when geology began to challenge the *Genesis* narrative. It was only in the middle of that century that biology also issued its challenge as to the origin of Man.

But even so, the challenge was only in relation to physical facts, and hardly touched the spiritual aspects of the question apart from theological dogmas.

We find Man, humanity, imperfect, debased, evil, sinful: yet struggling and aspiring to reach a *spiritual* perfection. We may use the term *spiritual* to cover the effort to achieve a perfection of truth, goodness, and beauty, and not in any special theological sense. Man is conscious of his imperfection; conscious also of a possibility of perfection; and, indeed, is not without historical examples of those who have attained to it in a marked degree. Among such was Jesus of Nazareth.

Here in fact is the great problem of Humanity. It lies in the vast difference in the degree of attainment of a *spiritual* quality of life between one individual and another; between one race or community and another. Why is one individual an ignorant savage, another a Confucius or a Plato, a Buddha or a Christ?

For Christianity, which only grants to the individual one life on earth, and no pre-existence—although an eternity of post-existence—the problem is insoluble. It must necessarily fall back on "the Will of God." The only teaching that offers any solution is that of Reincarnation and Karma; or briefly the evolution of the individual through a natural law of cause and effect operating in the spiritual as well as in the material world, and the interaction of the two.

But for evolution we must have a driving power; and we are undoubtedly conscious that that driving power is *within* ourselves. We are conscious of a power within ourselves which is a potentiality for a higher and still higher degree of attainment in truth, goodness and beauty.

These are *spiritual* qualities; and moreover, be it noted, they are, in so far as they are desired in and for themselves, absolute values; that is to say, being desired solely for themselves, they have no *relational* value. We consider that they are impure if we give them any relational value. The man who only tells the truth because it is expedient to do so, has no spiritual quality of truth in him. The man who is "good," i. e., *moral*, merely because the community demands it of him, has not necessarily any spiritual quality of goodness in him. Christian teaching is sadly lacking in this matter. It countenances killing for "sport". The man who goes out to kill for sport may be a good man in the Christian conventional sense, but he is not a good man spiritually. He has not taken to heart the maxim, "Thou shalt not hinder the meanest creature upon its upward path." Probably he never heard of such a maxim, for it belongs to a higher code than that of conventional Christian ethics.

The confusion in the Christian Church between morality, expediency, and the spiritual quality of goodness is perhaps nowhere better illustrated than in the conditional countenancing of contraception by the late Lambeth Congress of Bishops.

As regards beauty, it is more clearly recognised that our aesthe-

tic sense has an absolute value. And though "art for art's sake" may possibly sometimes degenerate into a shibboleth, at root it is recognition of the spiritual and absolute quality of beauty.

What, then, is the source and origin of this spiritual quality in our nature which is ever seeking a fuller expression? We may consider it quite apart from any theological speculations or teachings. Since we undoubtedly as individuals have this spiritual quality in greater or lesser degree, and since it is a constant inner urge to attain to a higher and still higher perfection—unless, indeed, we "quench the spirit"—is it not evident in the first place that what we are seeking is a realisation of *ourselves*. We are seeking self-knowledge, self-expansion, self-expression: urged to that, not by force of outward circumstances but by an inner urge which overpasses mere expediency.

This is not to deny the pressure which environment undoubtedly exercises; and of which, in the earlier stages, it is possibly the predominant factor. To be compelled to do right because of community values, has at least a restraining as well as a directing influence towards the higher values of truth, goodness, and beauty for their own sakes; but they can never in themselves give the motive for the pure and absolute value of the thing in itself.

This inner impulse towards a realisation of spiritual values lies, then, in the impulse of our own higher spiritual nature. We strive to realise *ourselves* in an ever increasing degree of perfection.

But to realise ourselves thus is to realise our oneness with God —if we must use that term for the Root and Source of All. The ancient writers of the *Upanishads* realised it when they wrote:—

"What that subtle Being is, of which this whole Universe is composed, that is the Real, that is the Soul, "*That art Thou.*"

Gautama the Buddha (the Enlightened) realised it when he preached the liberation of *Nirvana*—the full return in consciousness to that spiritual Source from which we went out, but from which we have never been separated. Jesus the Christ (the Anointed) realised it when he claimed his divine Sonship—and ours.

If man has a physical body, it is because there is a cosmic physical world. If man has a mental nature, it is because there is a Cosmic Mind; though this is not so clearly or universally recognised. Professor Eddington has recently made some approach to it in his work *The Nature of the Physical World* by suggesting that the ultimate *Substance* of the Universe may be "Mind-Stuff". Possibly "Mind-Stuff" may be the ultimate *Substance* considered as possibility of object or phenomenon as distinguished from subject or Self; but it cannot *be* that subject or Self, for Mind is just as clearly an instrument of the Self as is the physical body. That Cosmic *Self* we do not call Mind, but *Spirit*—or God considered as the Absolute.

If Man, then, has a spiritual nature it is because there is a Cosmic Spirit. The root fact is that nothing can appear or be manifested in the individual which is not in the first instance cosmic in its nature. The individual is only a particular example of the universal.

The Gnostic and mystical character of the IVth Gospel can hardly be disputed. In that Gospel Jesus speaks as the *Logos*, just as Krishna does in the Hindu Gospel the *Bhagavad-Gita*. Theology would have us believe that the claim of Jesus to be the "Son" of God was a unique claim ; not even recognising that the use of the terms "Father" and "Son" are concessions to the poverty of human conceptions. They are purely anthropomorphic conceptions. Moreover it leaves out the "Mother" of the *divine* Trinity, Father-Mother-Son ; but to make up for this it introduces the "Holy Ghost," and deifies the earthly physical Mother of Jesus.

But as regards the oneness of Jesus with that Cosmic Spiritual Principle of the Universe commonly called "God," we have seen that the writers of the *Upanishads* had already arrived at the conception of that oneness, and it is contained in many other pre-Christian documents.

If for weaker minds the conception of a heavenly *Father* who personally superintends every detail of their lives is necessary, it was perhaps part of the method of Jesus to supply that need, even as Paul found it necessary. "And I, brethren, could not speak unto you as unto spiritual, but as unto carnal, as unto babes in Christ. . . . Howbeit we speak wisdom among the full-grown . . . God's Wisdom in a mystery. "

Paul's central doctrine was the indwelling Christ, the Cosmic spiritual principle, even as it has been the teaching of the Initiates of all ages. "Christ in you," the Cosmic Logos, the "divine spark," the "light which lighteth every man coming into the world," if the man would but fan it into a divine flame. It is the innermost divine nature of every individual—nay, of every atom; for in its ultimate nature—or shall we not rather say, in *reality*—there is nothing which is not the very *Substance* of "that Subtle Being of which this whole Universe is composed".

But *in appearance*, *i.e.*, in our consciousness, *things* appear to be individual and separate. The trouble with man is that he has lost the consciousness of his spiritual divine nature, albeit he is painfully struggling back to that consciousness. It is a consciousness which he possessed before his "Fall". It is the loss of it which constitutes the "Fall". As that fine Theosophist Jacob Böhme says, it has "faded" with his fall into physical generation. But thereby hangs an esoteric anthropology which is far beyond anything that modern science can disclose, or that traditional theology can accept. Yet it is plainly there in the Bible when you are "instructed ". And not in the Bible me-

rely, but in the writings and sayings of mystics and initiates in all ages. It is the ancient Wisdom Religion or Theosophy.

The historical Jesus, then, we say, was a man like unto ourselves, but one who had realised his divine nature in a supreme degree. And so for us, if we call ourselves Christians, it would be in the sense that we endeavour to do the same thing, and take Christ as our example. Religon (*re-ligo*) is not the worship of or dependence on a man-made concept of a transcendental personal Being, but it is the effort to attain to an ever increasing consciousness of our own inner and essentially divine nature in its unity with the ultimate Cosmic Principle—about which all human speculation in terms of the formal mind is futile. As we attain to that fuller consciousness of unity our powers for action in this world increase, even to the extent of so-called miracle; though anything of that nature consciously performed is merely a deeper knowledge of natural law. Spirit is omnipotent, and can accomplish "miracles" of healing as well as in other directions.

How immensely it would simplify all our "Christianity" if this were universally recognised. Is it not in fact the *Gospel* of the future: "Christ *in* you"? But theology stands in the way with its doctrines of the Trinity, the Virgin Birth, the Atonement on the Cross, the physical Resurrection, and what not: all derived from the acceptance of the literal narrative from *Genesis* to *Revelation*.

All these theological concepts were formulated at a time and in a community when knowledge and concepts of the Cosmos and of Man's nature were exceedingly primitive. They survive to-day, but are exceedingly in question, and, indeed, are rapidly being overpassed. They certainly cannot survive for many more generations notwithstanding our modern "Fundamentalists".

And with a reformed Christianity there may possibly be the chance of a reformed world, and an end to crime and war.

Finally, and as regards other religions, we may take to heart the words of Krishna in *Bhagavad-Gita*, where he speaks also as the *Logos*, the universal or cosmic *active* spiritual principle.

"In whatever form a devotee desires with faith to worship, it is I alone who inspire him with constancy therein."

Call it Christ or Krishna, which you will; but it is the *Cosmic* Spiritual Principle which is the innermost nature of everyone of us—did we but realise it in some practical degree.

A general recognition of this would mean an end to all religious strifes and hatreds.

WILLIAM KINGSLAND

THE PATH

A ZOROASTRIAN VIEW

[**Dr. Sir Jivanji Jamshedji Modi** is the well-known author of books and brochures too numerous to mention. The following simple presentation will interest all Parsis and those others who are not familiar with Zoroastrian view-points.—EDS.]

The English word "path" is patha or pathan in the Avesta (Sans. panthan पन्थन, Germ. pfad). It comes from the Avesta root "path," Sans. "path" पथ् to go. Pathma is another similar word in the Avesta for "path". From this word comes the Avesta word pathmainya which, besides meaning path, "road," or "way" has come to mean "provisions (to be carried for the road.)" Like the English word "door," which is Avesta dvara, it has taken a religious signification, meaning "the path leading to righteousness". The word pantan is the basic form of pathan.

There is an Avesta saying, mentioned in the colophons of several old manuscripts, which signifies vividly the religious signification of the word. It says: "*Aêvô pantâo yô ashahê. Vîspê anyaeshâm apantâm.*" *i.e.* "*There is only one path viz. of Asha (righteousness). All other paths are no paths.*"

Different religions have different words, expressive of the different principal guiding characteristic of the teachings of those religions. They may be called the watch-words of those religions. For example, Love is such a word for Christianity, Beauty for the ancient religion of the Greeks. So, for Zoroastrianism, we have *Asha*. It is one of the few technical words of Zoroastrianism which cannot be exactly rendered into any other language. It corresponds to Sanskrit rta ऋता of the Hindu writings. The English word "right" comes close to this *rta*, this *asha* of the Avesta. So *Asha* is Righteousness—righteousness in thoughts, words and deeds. Hence the above saying that "Righteousness is the only path. Others are no paths."

Now a path leads us somewhere. Where is the *path of righteousness* expected to lead us? It leads us to happiness in this world, to happiness in the next world. It is the path of, and to, salvation. As said by Dr. Haug, the moral philosophy of Zoroaster "was moving in the triad of thought, word and deed."* As said by Prof. Harlez, the notion of "vertue" (virtue) sums itself up in that of *asha*. According to the Vendidad, *asha* or righteousness is practised by the preservation of good thoughts, good words and good deeds (humata, hukhta, hvarshta). A dialogue in a Pahlavi Book of Advice (pand-nâmeh)† thus presents to us the importance of this

* Haug's Essays on the Parsees, 2nd ed. p. 309.

† *Ganj-i-Shâyagân*, Dastur Dr. Peshotan's Text 2-7.

triad which lead to the path of Asha.

Q. Who is the most fortunate or happy man in this world?

Ans. He who is the most innocent.

Q. Who is the most innocent man in the world?

Ans. He who walks in the *path* of God.

Q. Which is the path of God and which that of the devil?

Ans. Virtue is the path of God and vice that of the devil.

Q. What constitutes virtue and what vice?

Ans. Good thoughts, good words and good deeds constitute virtue; and evil thoughts, evil words and evil deeds constitute vice.

Q. What constitute good thoughts, good words and good deeds and what constitute evil thoughts, evil words and evil deeds?

Ans. Honesty, Charity and Truthfulness constitute good thoughts, good words and good deeds; and dishonesty, want of Charity and falsehood constitute evil thoughts, evil words and evil deeds.

The Pahlavi *Viraf-nameh* gives an instructive and inspiring message regarding the only true path, the path of righteousness. Ahura Mazda says to Ardâi Virâf, the Iranian Dante, the Iranian St. Adamnain:

"O Ardâi Viraf! tell the Mazdayasnans of the world that there is only one path and that (is the path) of Righteousness, which has come down from old for religious-minded people. The others are no paths. You follow that only path of Righteousness. Never turn away from it in prosperity or in adversity or in any other circumstance. Practise good thoughts, good words and good deeds. . . . Follow the path of virtue and shun that of vice. Be informed of this, that your cattle will be reduced to dust, that your horses will be reduced to dust, your gold and silver will be reduced to dust, the bodies of men will be reduced to dust. (But) that man will not be reduced to dust who will praise Righteousness and do righteous acts of meritoriousness."

Work or industry helps righteousness. It leads one to the path of righteousness. Want of industry leads to misery. An Avesta maxim says: "*Nôit érézijyoi frajyâitish, nôit fshuyantê dregvanç, pairî*" *i.e.* "No harm comes to the honest and to the diligent, (even when) living among the evil-minded." Here, we see that Industry is associated with Righteousness as saving one, even when surrounded by evil-minded persons. Both, one's honesty and diligence, act, as it were, as one's saviours. The Pahlavi version of the above Avesta maxim puts the signification in clearer words when it says: "No disaster (occurs) unto him who lives aright, nor unto him who is diligent." We learn from the Vendidad that Zoroastrianism elevates Work to the position of Worship. It advocates very strongly the cause of agriculture, which, in ancient Iran, served as a typical industry. So, Gibbon (*Decline and Fall of Roman Empire.* Edition of 1845 Vol. I p. 124) very properly speaks of the Iranian teaching of the advocacy of agriculture as "a wise and benevolent maxim".

The Avesta goes to the length of saying that the spread of agriculture is the spread of religion itself. We read the following dialogue:

O Holy Creator of the Material world! Wherein lies the spread of Mazdayaçnan religion? In the plentiful sowing of the corn. He who sows corn, sows Holiness. He (thereby) causes the spread of the Mazdayaçnan religion, as it were, with hundredfold acts of Yaçna recitals. Where grows corn, there, the Daêvas or evil (influences) are destroyed.

Here, we see that the work of agriculture is raised to the position of reciting prayers. Agriculture, as the archetype, the type of types, of all good work, is raised to the level of Worship. "Laborare est orare" is a maxim of the Avesta. We are reminded of another Latin proverb, "servire est

regnare" (to serve is to reign). Whenever and wherever you have to serve, serve well, serve with all your heart. Such service is no service in the ordinary sense of the word, but it is equivalent to reigning, or ruling. "Do your work well and you are not a *servant* but a ruler." According to the *Vendidad* (Chap. IV), when you owe a duty to somebody, and you do not do that duty, you rob the person to whom duty is due, of something that is due to him.

However poor the nature of work, whatever it be, one must work with honesty, energy and diligence. There is no reason to be ashamed of one's poverty. Ruskin puts it very beautifully. The nature of your work must matter little. How you do it matters much. Goethe in his Parsinameh or *Buch des Parsen* (Book of the Parsees), represents an old ancient Iranian as making his "testament of the Old Persian faith". The testator asks his Persians even the poorest of the poor, to have courage and self-respect, and to look to their work —of however low sort it may be —with a kind of consolation that the result of work, however poor, will, if well done, serve a Higher purpose. He says to a poor wood-cutter or wood-carrier and to a poor labourer who collects cotton from fields: "If you carry wood do it joyfully; for you carry the seed of the early sun. If you pluck *pumbah* (cotton) you may confidently say: This will be made into a wick and bear the Holy." (Vide my Paper on *Goethe's Parsi-nameh* in my Asiatic Papers, Part II p. 144). What Goethe means to say is this: The followers of the old Persian faith were asked to look on their work, however low and humble, with self-respect and dignity, taking it, that all good work goes to or adds to the Glory of God. A poor wood-carrier while carrying wood may elevate his spirit with the inspiring thought that the wood he carries or cuts has in it the seed of the Sun the great Luminary of the earth. If we carry on Goethe's idea further, we may say that a wood-cutter or wood-carrier may be inspired with the thought that, poor though his work was, the result of that work *i.e.* the wood which he cut or carried, was in the end to cook the food of a royal personage as well as that of a peasant, or that it was to burn on the high altar of a sanctuary where stood a king or peasant for worship. The labourer who plucks cotton-flowers is to take a solacing and inspiring thought, that however poor his work may be, the result of that work, *viz.* the cotton that he plucked, will go to illuminate the lamp of a great holy sanctuary.

A Pahlavi writer gives, as it were, a concrete instance of how Work serves the purpose of Worship. A Parsee is asked to say his prayers three times during the day; (*a*) in the early morning, (*b*) at noon, and (*c*) in the afternoon at 3 o'clock. Now, it is said there, that it is not incumbent on a good housewife to say these three pray-

ers. If she diligently attends to her domestic duties and busies herself in that work, her work is like worship.

In the *Ganj-i-Shâyagân*, the Sun himself is represented as giving a message at the above three periods of the day, to the people of the world to be alert on the path of duty. (*a*) The early morning (Hâvan gah) message is: Be busy (tokhshâk) in virtuous deeds; (*b*) the mid-day message is: "Do not forget the duties of a married life; (*c*) the afternoon message is: Repent for acts of omission of duty, if any. This teaching means: "Read duty in your prayers of the three periods of the day." It is well said that "Prayer is a self-preaching sermon."

Heaven is the abode of happiness or Bliss and one goes there by his good work. According to the Vendidad (XVIII 26-27) the fire of the family-hearth when kindled in the early morning by a good diligent housewife, blesses the family, saying: "May Cattle increase in thy house. May thy progeny increase. May thy mind be active. May thy life be active. For all the nights that thou mayest happen to live (*i.e.* for all thy life) may thou live in the pleasure of a happy life." Even the earth blesses the workers and curses the idlers (Vend. III 25-29). The result of one's action increases with interest. One's good deeds do good, not only to the present generation, but even to future generations. The standard of the sense of duty must be high. Duty, when done well, brings happiness; duty neglected brings misery. One's kunashna, kerdâr, (karma) deeds have lasting effects.

JIVANJI JAMSHEDJI MODI

THE COLOUR BAR

[**H. S. L. Polak,** is now prominently identified with the cause of the coloured races for which he has worked for some thirty years. He was with Mr. Gandhi in South Africa from 1904 to 1910, and during the time he was out of England from 1903 to 1917 touched East Africa and several times visited India where he last was in 1928. He writes on the subject he has made his own.

He is chairman of the Executive Committee of the newly-formed Joint Council for the Promotion of Understanding between White and Coloured Persons in England, honorary secretary of the Indian Overseas Association, and the London representative of the Imperial Indian Overseas Citizenship Association. He has represented East African Indians on various occasions; and expects to be in close touch with East Africans in connection with the forthcoming Joint Select Committee of Parliament on Social Union in East Africa.

On this subject THE ARYAN PATH has already published contributions from Lord Olivier, J. D. Beresford, "Explorer"and others.—EDS.]

The complex, difficult and dangerous problems associated with race and colour have probably, from very early times, produced friction and separateness among groups of people. There are to be found a number of old references to these problems, which doubtless baffled those who, in ancient times, sought solutions and found them, as we do occasionally to-day, in domination and destruction, where they were not discovered in intermarriage and miscegenation.

In our time, race and colour problems have become the more acute and difficult of solution as a materialist concept of life has spread among the nations—and especially the Western nations—and rapid means of transport have brought masses of people, at different levels of civilisation or of economic development into closer contact with each other, before they were ethically prepared for the more intimate association. This unpreparedness has upset the delicate balance of human relations, and has resulted in an artificial and unstable equilibrium of forces, brought about by temporary tutelage, exploitation, and imperialist adventures of different kinds. Speedier means of intercourse have resulted in unsettlement, instability, spiritual unrest and political discontent. The dominated have sought to displace the dominant, the exploited to expel the exploiters, the so-called inferiors to assert their equality with the so-called superiors. The friction and separateness have thus become more accentuated and obvious. Sensitive people of both groups have become more aware of the difficulties thrown up by an increasing race and colour consciousness, and are seeking for means by which the friction may be removed and the separateness converted into a collaboration of individuals, groups and races.

The first thing has been to

recognise the fact of the existence of these problems, and even that, in some places, they have, in recent years, become more widespread and disturbing. In England, for example, the realisation of the colour-bar has resulted in the setting up of a Joint Council for the promotion of a better understanding between the native white inhabitants and the coloured people who are, either temporarily or permanently, resident among them. In hotels, restaurants, flats and boarding-houses, it has been found increasingly difficult to obtain suitable accommodation for coloured visitors, however distinguished. Untenable excuses for refusing it are being analysed and an attempt is being made to rationalise the fear and prejudice upon which the refusal is often based. In the Universities, colleges, Inns of Court and hospitals, similar impediments are found and have to be overcome. In social life, contacts are apparently less easily made than of yore, and an endeavour is being made to examine into the nature of this most unpleasant and undesirable feature and to provide a remedy, if possible.

It is interesting to study and try to understand the causes to which some observers attribute the growth of race and colour prejudices in England. In the first place, though not, perhaps, the most important, is the missionary influence. *It is not unnatural that Christian missionaries should have emphasised the spiritual darkness of the barbarous and semi-barbarous tribes among whom their lot has been cast, or stressed the differences of outlook and practice and the weaknesses of the votaries of the great non-Christian faiths among whom they have pursued their vocation.* And so barbarism and degraded practices have become popularly ascribed to people of colour who have come to England from time to time for purposes of business, study, professional occupation, or merely as visitors. The criticism among the uninformed—and they are the majority of the population—has been undiscriminating, and idolatry and polygamy, disease and dirt, not to speak of more unmentionable things, have been associated in the public mind with the coloured representatives of the most ancient alien cultures.

Another adverse influence has been the return to England, during the last two generations, of white administrators and their families from India, and their settlement upon retirement in certain semi-fashionable suburbs in London, and in various parts of rural England, especially in the warmer South-Coast towns. There they bring into general circulation the imperialist prejudices that belong to an older era of Indian administration, and that have become the more hardly crystallised as nationalist assertiveness and resentment of foreign domination in India have become more vocally manifest. The challenge to white supremacy has but too often produced a bitterness and a

vindictiveness on the part of the retired bureaucrat or business-man that find their target in the sensitive Indian student or other visitor from the East who seeks admission to institutions and social quarters in this country that would enable him to understand our ways and customs, and would help him to acquire that balance of knowledge and judgment that should assist him, in his turn, to place racial relations in a truer human perspective.

Yet another influence making for bad blood between the races has been the great influx of visitors from America and from the Dominions, during recent years. The anti-Negro bias of the former and the "white" race-cult of the latter have done much to increase racial tension, and such instances as the refusal of entertainment, even in the best hostelries in London, to such great Negro artists as Paul Robeson and Roland Hayes may be directly attributed to these factors. Associated with the American and Dominion influence, too, is the effect, in the University of Oxford, of the presence of the Rhodes scholars from overseas upon academic opinion; whilst the retired Anglo-Indian official who has settled in the University centres, where he not infrequently occupies a position of importance, sometimes helps to create prejudice by circulating, in private, if not in public, doubts as to the fundamental equality of capacity or character on the part of Indians.

On the part of the British, there is an objection to the encouragement of the more intimate side of social intercourse, on the score of difference of cultural values, religion, or social custom, which would render undesirable those relations of the sexes that would ordinarily lead to intermarriage. On the side of the visitors, the prejudice is accentuated by an ignorance of the habits of the country, a crudeness of outlook, an unfamiliarity with the ways of thought of the average citizen, a frequent tendency to draw disparaging conclusions based upon a superficial apprehension of the manners and customs of the strangers among whom they have come to reside, and a readiness to contrast them unfavourably (and audibly) with the more familiar ones of the homeland. In the case of Indians, there has been a growing national consciousness that has often expressed itself in language and conduct of a kind that have, in their turn, offended against the canons of good taste and the obligations of the hospitality that they as guests, have accepted. In most cases, on both sides, instances of friction resulting in bitterness attributed (not always truly) to racial ill-will, would have been avoided with a modicum of imagination, common-sense and good manners.

Economic competition in professions and occupations plays its part, too, in the estrangement of people. At the ports, there are occasional racial riots, due to resentment on the part of the white seamen against the coloured men

whom they suspect of underbidding them for employment. Such cases as these are likely to occur especially when, as now, unemployment is widespread. Curiously enough, complaints from the coloured doctors, of racial prejudice among their clientele, are infrequent, due probably to the fact that, where economic competition is absent, the working classes, among whom most of these doctors ordinarily practise, do not readily react to colour-prejudice; from which one draws the conclusion that this strange aberration is largely a matter of class, and is most frequently evidenced among the classes that are being dispossessed of a monopoly or a vested interest which has given them heretofore a position of privilege or advantage that is now being challenged and endangered.

It is difficult to see where the remedy lies, though, to some extent, the solution is to be found in the turn of events themselves. As the coloured peoples' assertion of rights in their own country becomes recognised and they obtain the management of their own affairs, it is likely that the reactions upon their representatives in England will grow more favourable and that friendlier relations, founded on equality of status and a readier perception of mutual dependence, will be developed. It is certainly less probable that discourtesy and prejudice will survive, in some circles, at least, where they now are not uncommon, when it is more clearly realised that self-governing communities and groups are happier and more amenable than those that are ruled and whose affairs are administered for them by alien people, who can never escape from the suspicion that they are not altogether disinterested, but have private ends of their own to serve at the same time. The self-governed, too, will be the less prone to self-assertion and aggressiveness, as their energies are more fully and profitably engaged in the management of their own affairs, and their virtues and qualities are allowed to speak for themselves. And when racial tension is thus relaxed by the removal of these preoccupations on either side, there is the greater likelihood of the disappearance of the colour-bar, the establishment of mutual esteem among the races, and the more general recognition of the special contribution to the common treasury of human culture that each can make, when putting forth its own best and most constructive and spontaneous effort.

Hy. S. L. Polak

TWO CONCEPTIONS OF GOD*

WITHOUT OR WITHIN?

[**Edmond Holmes**, the venerable educator, derives great inspiration from the Upanishads, as his article in THE ARYAN PATH for September 1930 showed. In this essay he examines the root cause of the wrong conception of deity held by the Western world. Aristotle, who struck a *new* path in philosophy, rejecting his master Plato and the Pythagorean school in which he was brought up, succeeded in confounding issues, confusing generations of scholars and misleading the Western world for over 2000 years. In this first instalment our author surveys the argument and defines the concept put forward by Aristotle—a concept which he finds unsatisfying. In his concluding instalment, to appear next month, he shows how the Upanishadic conception of Deity satisfies both the intellect and the heart.—EDS.]

Whatever else we may mean by the word God, we mean what is intrinsically real, real in its own right. Where is such reality to be found? In self or outside self? In the inner or in the outer world? In the mind that knows or in the objects of its knowledge?

Man does not begin by asking himself this question. He begins by looking out upon the world around him, the world of his sense-experience, and assuming that it is as real as it seems to be. This on the one hand. But on the other hand he affirms his belief in his own reality by peopling the world around him with invisible spirits, replicas of his own invisible self. This tendency on his part is known as *animism*, a word which is sometimes used as a term of contempt and reproach. But what's in a name? The animistic stage in man's development is one of profound significance, which holds in itself the potentialities of two widely divergent conceptions of God.

Let us see what these are. There comes a time when man begins to reflect on his experiences and his instinctive assumptions. Then a question arises which he cannot help asking himself: Is the visible and tangible world—with or without the spirits that people it (for these may or may not have died a natural death)—real in its own right, or does it depend for its reality on some power, some source of being, beyond itself? In his attempts to answer this question, he may allow his animistic instinct to transcend itself in an outward or in an inward direction. He may pass on from belief in a multitude of "nature spirits" to belief in one Supreme Spirit—*a magnified and glorified replica of himself*—the maker, preserver and ruler of the universe whom he will worship henceforth as the Most High God. But this magnified and glorified replica of himself will be entirely outside himself, for it will be separated from him by the world of his

* The writer of this essay desires to thank Dr. W. D. Ross, Provost of Oriel College, Oxford, for permission, freely given, to include in it extracts from his learned and valuable work, *Aristotle*, without a careful study of which the essay could not have been written.

normal experience, the world of "Nature," the creation of the Supernatural God. Or he may end his exploration of the world around him by rejecting as invalid all its claims, whether natural or supernatural, to intrinsic reality, and turning back from it to the exploration of his own inner life. Or, once more, he may end as he began—but with the difference that he has now outgrown his animism—by assuming that the outward and visible world is as real as it seems to be, and that there is no higher reality outside it or beyond it.

With the last of these three conceptions of reality we need not concern ourselves, for it is atheistic and does not pretend to be anything else. Let us, then, compare the two conceptions of reality which lead up to the rival conceptions of God. Let us begin with the conception which is characteristic of Western thought. *The Western mind, in its quest of ultimate reality, looks outward, not inward.* This will, I think, be generally admitted. It has led the human race in the investigation of the material world, and the analysis and interpretation of physical phenomena. And the deities whom it has taken seriously have all been supernatural beings, separated from man by the whole breadth of Nature, "distinct really and in essence" from him and his world. The Western mind owes the outward trend of its thought and its vision, in no small measure, to the influence of Greek philosophy in general and of Aristotle's philosophy in particular. For the Greek, as a thinker and as a liver of life, looked outward, not inward. And Aristotle, in his attitude towards the world in which he found himself, was a typical Greek; the many-sided intellectual curiosity which was characteristic of the Greek mind having reached in him its maximum of intensity, and the Greek intellect its highest level of vigour and efficiency.

As a thinker Aristotle was as great as it is possible for a man to be who is neither a poet nor a mystic and who ignores the occult and the supernormal. He faced the master problems of existence and strove, by dint of sheer hard thinking, to solve them and their subsidiary problems *within the limits of the normal man's normal experience.* Had his own experience, had the range of human experiences—even of sense-experience—of his day, been commensurate with his intellectual power, he might have gone far in his attempt to "understand the universe".

How far did he go? He was a logician first and foremost. Before he could begin to think he had to forge for himself an instrument of thinking.* He therefore studied the procedure of human thought, marked out its central tendencies, and formulated the laws which, in his judgment, ought to govern it. In doing this he limited the range of his own

*" Logic is in Aristotle's view a study preliminary to science and Philosophy." *Aristotle* by Dr. W. D. Ross.

thought, and imposed on himself disabilities for what was really the main work of his life—the observation and study and interpretation of "Nature". Also, he predetermined, in part at least, the issue of his metaphysical speculation, from which he may be said to have borrowed in advance the fundamental "Laws of Thought" which dominated his logic.

It was as a physicist (in the widest sense of the word) and more especially as a biologist, that Aristotle was truly great. For him "the universe around us," the universe which man looks out upon, and looks into and thinks about, was intrinsically real,—and alone real, for there was nothing outside it or beyond it.* The self, the soul, the inner life of man, was of interest to him because it too belonged to the environing world. Self-exploration, in the mystic sense of the word, was not for him. Self-contemplation was for God, not for man. As a physicist, Aristotle was chiefly interested in the phenomena of life; and psychology, as he understood the word, was in the main a branch of biology. There was soul-life, of a kind, in plants; soul-life, of a higher kind, in the lower animals; and soul-life, of a still higher kind, in man. But what made the soul-life of man higher than that of the lower animals and of himself as a rational animal, was the presence in it of an element which was more than "physical," which belonged to a world, the study and interpretation of which were the function of that highest branch of philosophy which Aristotle called "First Philosophy" or Metaphysics. But that world, the world of Pure Form, was an outer, not an inner world. In virtue of his "active reason" man belonged to it, just as in virtue of his body and his "nutritive," his "sensitive" and his "passively reasonable" souls, he belonged to the world of Matter and Form. But the life of the Beings that were wholly immaterial,—the life of the "Intelligences" that moved the planetary spheres, and (above all) of God, "the Prime Mover,"—was inconceivably remote from the life of man.

I have said that as a physicist, and especially as a biologist, Aristotle was truly great. But he was great in spite of his logic, not because of it. To start thinking with a ready-made framework of thought leads to the undervaluing and the consequent misinterpreting of experience, whether observational or experimental; leads to undue reliance on one's own instinctive assumptions and implicit theories; and leads at last to the *a priori* interpretation—one might almost say construction—of the Universe.

But Aristotle, the physicist, did not undervalue experience. He was a close, a patient and an intelligent observer, and a careful collector and cautious interpreter of the evidence of others. Both as an observer and as an inter-

* When I say that for Aristotle the outer world was alone real, I mean that there was no return on his part, in his quest of ultimate reality, to the inner life of man.

preter he was guided by the conviction that there is a meaning, an objective purpose, in all the ways and works of Nature; and when he was dealing with complex things, and especially with the phenomena of life and growth, he "studied the parts in the light of the whole, instead of treating the whole as merely the sum of its parts." In his conception of Nature as "innate impulse to movement," and his consequent recognition of grades of being through the antithesis of potentiality and actuality, he provided an antidote (the efficacy of which he did not fully realize) to the dualism of his own logic, and an effective disproof of the uncompromisingly static and dualistic philosophy of the Eleatics, and he prepared the way for the philosophy of Becoming and the scientific doctrine of evolution. Says Dr. Ross:

> In biology, whether we have regard to his powers of observation, his collation of the evidence of other observers, or his theoretical discussion, he was far ahead of his time; he was indeed the greatest of ancient biologists; and the greatest of modern biologists could say of him "Linnæus and Cuvier have been my gods, though in very different ways, but they were mere schoolboys to old Aristotle."

This is high praise. But there is another side to the picture of Aristotle as a scientific investigator of Nature. "The bulk of Aristotle's Physics," says Dr. Ross, "is what we should call metaphysics. It is not an inductive inquiry into natural law, but an *a priori* analysis of material things and the events that befall them." This sentence sets one thinking. Dowered to the full with the curiosity of the true scientist, supremely great as an observer of Nature, and as a collector and collator of the observations of others, Aristotle fettered himself, as an interpreter of Nature, by this too ready acceptance as authoritative of the laws of thought which he had formulated as a logician, laws which reflected, in part at least, an inevitably imperfect insight into the central tendencies of the world which surrounded him. And this was not all. It was as a metaphysical logician, not as a biologist, that Aristotle dominated thought in the Middle Ages, with the result that he, one of the boldest and greatest of scientific explorers, was doomed, by some strange irony of Fate, to arrest for centuries the progress of physical science.

But it is with Aristotle as a metaphysician, and more especially as a theologian, that I am now concerned. What did Aristotle mean by metaphysics? "Is a single supreme science of metaphysics possible—a synoptic science which shall study the nature not of this or that reality but of the real as such, and deduce the detailed nature of the universe from some central principle?" Dr. Ross tells us that Aristotle asked himself this question and answered it in the affirmative. But what did he mean by "the real as such"? He saw in the universe "three orders of entity,—those which have separate substantial existence but are subject to change, those which are free from change but exist only as distinguishable aspects of concrete realities, and

those which have separate existence and are free from change. These are studied by three distinct sciences—physics, mathematics and theology or metaphysics." "The true nature of being is exhibited in that which is both substantial and unchangeable." This is "the real as such".

But what did Aristotle mean by "substantial"? The idea of *substance* plays a leading part in his philosophy. What is substance? "That which is not asserted of a subject, but of which everything else is asserted." "A qualityless substance is as impossible as a quality which does not presuppose a substance." Here substance is thought of as "the individual concrete thing". But sometimes it is "thought of, not as the concrete thing but as the *essential nature.* And this double meaning pervades the whole of Aristotle's treatment of substance."

Let us for the moment think of substance as "the individual concrete thing". The world around us is full of such substances. But they are all subject to change. Movement is of the essence of Nature; and movement implies change. Material or "sensible" things are therefore all subject to change.* Is there any reality which is both substantial and unchangeable? "Universals" such as "being" and "unity" are unchangeable; but they are not substances. "They exist as characteristics of individual concrete things." The objects of mathematics are not substances. "They are free from change but exist only as distinguishable aspects of concrete realities." But there are entities which are non-sensible, and therefore unchangeable, and also substantially real. These are: (1) God, the unmoved mover of the world. (2) The intelligences which move the planetary spheres. (3) The active element in human reason. These are substantial and unchangeable. Is this all that we can say about them? No. "*Form* exists separate and unchangeable in each of them." They are made (so to speak) of *pure form.*

But *form* is the antithesis of *matter*; and the physical world is the world of matter and form. It is clear, then, that, for a fuller understanding of Aristotle's metaphysical philosophy, we must study his *Physics*, the bulk of which, as we have seen, " is what we should call metaphysics." How did Aristotle conceive of the world which surrounded him, the world of sense-experience? He assumed that " sense-perception proper, free from any admixture of association or interpretation, is infallible". The world is full of individual concrete things which are all substances and all as real as they seem to be. This "naively realistic" assumption applies to man as well as to the rest of the outward and visible world. "Soul and body are not two substances, but inseparable elements in a single substance." The soul

* There is one passage in which the heavenly bodies are spoken of as *sensible and eternal.* But this seems to be a divergence from the main movement of Aristotle's speculative thought.

is not thought of "as a pure spiritual being to which its body is as much a part of the outside world as other physical things." "A notion, like that of Descartes, that the existence of the soul is the first certainty and the existence of matter a later inference, would have struck Aristotle as absurd. The whole self, soul and body alike, is something given and not questioned."* So too is the physical world, to which soul and body belong.

The outward and visible world is the real world, and man himself, who looks out upon it and contemplates it and tries to understand it, belongs to it. There is indeed an element in him which lifts him above it, just as there is an element in it which lifts it above itself. But for the moment we must think of man as belonging to the world which surrounds him, and of that world as compounded (so to speak) of *matter* and *form*.

Matter and form: these words explain themselves. They are antithetical and therefore correlative terms: Each of them has its meaning in and through its opposition to, or contrast with, the other, and neither can survive the disappearance of the other. Strictly speaking, there is no matter without form, and no form without matter. The conception of *pure form*, to which, as we shall see, Aristotle was driven by what Dr. Ross calls his "naïve realism"—his search for the "real as such" *outside himself*—was illogical; and it introduced an element of confusion into his metaphysical system of thought. Says Dr. Ross:

> Matter, is not for Aristotle a certain kind of thing, as we speak of matter in opposition to mind. It is a purely relative term—relative to form. It is the materials of a thing as opposed to the structure that holds them together, the determinable as opposed to the determinant. And the distinction of matter and form may be drawn at many different levels within the concrete thing. In the realm of art, iron, which is the finished product of the smelter, is matter for the founder . . . . Prime matter never exists apart; the elements (earth, air, fire and water) are the simplest physical things, and within them the distinction of matter and form can only be made by an abstraction of thought.

Closely akin to the antithesis of matter and form is that of *potentiality* and *actuality*. These "form the leading features of Aristotle's metaphysics. The two antitheses are closely connected, but, broadly speaking, in the one the world is being regarded statically, as it is at a moment of its history, and in the other dynamically, as it is in process of change." In the second antithesis, as in the first, the terms used are correlatives, each of them being dependent for its meaning on its opposition to the other; and just as iron, which is a *formal* product for the smelter, is matter for the founder, so what is actual relatively to A may be potential relatively to B.

The antithesis of potentiality and actuality is more significant

* Does human personality survive death? What answer would Aristotle have given to this question? "Soul and body are inseparable elements in a single substance"; and that substance does not survive death. This is clear; but the "active reason" which has somehow or other been added to man's body-and-soul, being "pure form," is eternal. What becomes of it when the body and soul die, is left obscure. That its continuance involves anything like personal immortality is doubtful, to say the least.

than that of matter and form; partly because the world to which it introduces us, "being regarded dynamically," is infinitely self-transcendent (for the actual is in the last resort the *ideal*), which the world of matter and form is not; partly, because it is in itself the nucleus of a higher logic than that with which Aristotle fettered himself and his disciples in all ages,—the logic of Becoming, as opposed to the logic of Being. If I do not say more about this ever fruitful antithesis the reason is that it bears less directly than does the antithesis of matter and form on Aristotle's conception of God.

It is through a strangely fantastic chain of reasoning that Aristotle works his way to his conception of God. Says Dr. Ross:

In book XI of the *Metaphysics* we find him arguing for the existence of a God so remote from popular religious ideas that no element of accommodation to the intelligence or the prejudices of his audience is to be suspected; and arguing from principles that are deep-seated in his metaphysics. The argument . . . . . may be set out as follows. Substances are the first of existing things. Therefore if all substances are perishable, all things are perishable. But there are two things which are imperishable, change and time. These cannot have come into being and cannot cease to be, since that would mean that there was a time before time was, or that there will be a time after time has ceased. And change must be equally continuous with time, since time is, if not identical with change, a concomitant of it. Now the only continuous change is change of place, and the only continuous change of place is circular motion. There must therefore be an eternal circular motion.

To produce eternal motion there must be eternal substance . . This eternal substance must be capable of causing motion . . . . It must not only have this power but exercise it. Its essence must be not power but activity, for otherwise it would be possible for it not to exercise this power, and change would not be eternal i. e. *necessarily* everlasting. It must be immaterial since it must be eternal.

This result is confirmed by experience, which shows that there is something that moves with an unceasing circular motion, viz. the starry heavens. There must be something that moves it. Now that which moves and is moved is an intermediate with which we cannot rest content; there must be something which moves without being moved. And the unmoved mover to which experience points must be the eternal, substantial, purely actual being whose existence has already been proved.

Now, how can anything cause motion without being moved? The physical causation of movement implies the mutual contact of mover and moved, and therefore a reaction of the moved on the mover. The unmoved mover must therefore cause motion in a non-physical way, by being an object of desire."

This unmoved or prime mover—God, as we may now call Him—"is not in space".

Is God "the final cause, or the efficient cause as well, of change?"

God is the efficient cause by being the final cause, but in no other way. Yet He is the final cause not in the sense of being something that never is but always is to be. He is an ever-living being whose influence radiates through the universe in such wise that everything that happens . . . . . depends on Him. He moves directly the "first heaven," i e. He causes the daily rotation of the stars round the earth. Since He moves by inspiring love and desire, it seems to be implied that the 'first heaven' has soul. And this is confirmed by statements elsewhere that the heavenly bodies are living beings . . . . . The movements of the heavenly bodies are due to the 'intelligences'. These, too move 'as ends'; i. e. they move by being desired and loved. Their relation to the first mover is not specified; but since the first mover is the ruler of the universe, 'that on which the heaven and the whole of nature depend' we must suppose that it moves the intelligences as to the object of their desire and love. The detail of the system is somewhat obscure, but we must probably think of each heavenly sphere as a unity of soul and body desiring and loving its corresponding 'intelligence'.

We may now turn to Aristotle's account of the prime mover itself. Physical activity being excluded by its immaterial nature, he ascribes to it only mental activity, and only that kind of mental activity which owes nothing to the body, viz. knowledge; and only that kind of knowledge which involves no process, no transition from premises to conclusion, but is direct and intuitive. . . . .

"Now knowledge, when not dependent, as in man, on sense and imagination, must be of that which is best; and that which is

best is" the prime mover itself, is "God". The object of God's knowledge is therefore God Himself.

It has been contended by some of Aristotle's commentators that, since all things other than God owe their being entirely to God, God's self-knowledge must be at the same time a knowledge of all other things. Says Dr. Ross:

> This is a possible and a fruitful line of thought, but it is not that which Aristotle adopts. For him that God should know Himself and that he should know other things are alternatives, and in affirming the first alternative he implicitly denies the second. Indeed he denies explicitly much that the second would involve; he denies to God all knowledge of evil and all transition from one object of thought to another. The result of the wish to exclude from the divine life any relation to evil and any 'shades of turning' is the impossible and barren ideal of a knowledge with no object but itself.
>
> God, then, as conceived by Aristotle, has a knowledge which is not knowledge of the universe, and an influence on the universe which does not flow from His knowledge. He has not created the world. For Aristotle matter is ungenerated, eternal; he expressly argues against a creation of the world . . . . The 'intelligences' appear to be independently existing uncreated beings . . . . and there are passages in which the eternal pre-existence of 'reason' is clearly maintained.

Nor is God to be identified with Providence. It is true that "one of the most conspicuous features of Aristotle's view of the universe is his thoroughgoing teleology. . . . Does he mean that the structure and history of the universe is the fulfilment of a divine plan?" There are passages in which he seems to ascribe "to God a general ordering of the universe". "But it is remarkable how little trace there is of this way of thinking, if we discount passages where Aristotle is probably accommodating himself to common opinions; he never uses the word 'providence' of God, as Socrates and Plato had done; he has no serious belief in divine rewards and punishments; he has no interest as Plato has in justifying the ways of God to man." His teleology is not theistic. "In the works which express his maturer views adaptation is usually ascribed to the unconscious teleology of nature rather than to the working out of a divine plan."

This is an unsatisfactory conception of God. It cannot satisfy either the heart or the head.

EDMOND HOLMES

The ever unknowable and incognizable *Karana* alone, the *Causeless* Cause of all causes, should have its shrine and altar on the holy and ever untrodden ground of our heart—invisible, intangible, unmentioned, save through "the still small voice" of our spiritual consciousness. Those who worship before it, ought to do so in the silence and the sanctified solitude of their Souls; making their spirit, the sole mediator between them and the *Universal Spirit*, their good actions the only priests, and their sinful intentions the only visible and objective sacrificial victims to the *Presence*. —H. P. BLAVATSKY (*The Secret Doctrine*, I. 280.)

THE PHENOMENA OF SPIRITUALISM

[**J. D. Beresford** has written a most interesting article, and its chief value lies in his earnest attempt to explain logically the main springs of the variety of spiritualistic phenomena. The prevailing race tendency is to "seek a sign" instead of an explanation. The article rightly endeavours to stress the *understanding* of what is seen or heard. The third object of the Theosophical Movement is "The investigation of the unexplained *laws* of nature and the psychical *powers latent in man*."—EDS.]

The enquirer who sets out to investigate the subject of spiritualism is liable to suffer one of two misadventures. The first is absorption. Many of the phenomena he will meet with are of a kind that are inexplicable by the physical laws of cause and effect with which he has been familiar all his life. He will, for instance, hear voices that seem to him to speak in the phrases and even sometimes in the very tones of dead friends and relatives. He will see heavy objects moved without any apparent physical agency. He will see matter produced from the body of a medium, matter so ethereal and subtle that it can at the will of some mysterious operator be built into the semblance of human forms (take shape temporarily, for instance, as a perfect model of a human hand complete in every detail), and then be withdrawn again almost instantly into its source of origin.

The effect of such phenomena on certain minds is to carry complete conviction. Scientists, eminent writers, sensible, well-informed men and women of various degrees have been so deeply impressed by these exhibitions of what from a materialist standpoint can only be called miracles, that they have conceded the whole spiritualist position and publicly acknowledged their belief that the workers of these wonders were the spirits of the dead. No other agency seems to them possible, and the wish to believe being a dominant factor—for they take these wonders as a sure proof of personal immortality—they either shut their eyes to the awful discrepancies involved in many of the phenomena or seek to account for them by the building up of various ingenious theories, rather in the manner of the old mathematicians who sought to account for the real or apparent movements of sun, moon, planets and stars on the supposition that the earth was a fixed centre about which the visible universe revolved.

The second misadventure is of another kind. It consists in a complete denial of the validity of the phenomena. Spiritualistic mediums have often been found cheating, and those enquirers who are determined not to believe, find their chief support in the affirmation that all the effects are fraudulently produced. In face of the evidence it appears almost incredible that any genuine in-

vestigator could attribute all the phenomena to this source; and such attribution in many cases must imply a belief in human ingenuity that passes all the bounds of probability. But the human mind is capable of believing in any absurdity if the inner will to believe is sufficiently dominant—a fact of which Jesus showed himself fully aware when he said: "If they believe not Moses and the Prophets, neither will they believe though one rose from the dead." We have, in fact, in this and many other connections, to face that wonderful faculty of human reason, by which it is able to rationalise a complete system of deductions from almost any set of premises that are not in obvious contradiction one with another.

My own escape from both these misadventures may be attributed to a characteristic, and it may be somewhat unusual, habit of mind. As readers of my earlier articles in THE ARYAN PATH will have realised, I have from a comparatively early age attempted in all my approaches to such a subject as this to keep my mind as free as may be from prejudice and prepossession. And although, when I first became deeply interested in psychical research after reading—nearly thirty years ago—F. W. H. Myers's *Human Personality*, I had an inner wish to believe the contention that certain spiritualistic phenomena at least, were due to the fully conscious spirits of the recent dead. I was never convinced. There were times when I was able temporarily to persuade myself that this was the only hypothesis that would cover all the facts, but sooner or later I was always reconfronted with some glaring improbability that set me doubting again.

For example, my reason, or possibly some inner stirring of old knowledge, definitely refused to accept the various accounts of life in the "beyond" that have been pictured at various times by spiritualistic mediums and writers. Some of them seemed to me to have some element of truth in them. I remember being impressed by a little known book entitled *Gone West* by J. S. M. Ward published in 1917, an account of spirit life in which I found passages here and there that satisfied my sense of truth. But the bulk of this literature, such as Sir Oliver Lodge's *Raymond*, Miss Estelle Stead's messages from the supposed spirit of her father set out in *The Blue Island*, or, most recently, the Rev. Vale Owen's descriptions of life in the Spirit-land, among many others, completely failed to convince me. The very obvious discrepancies between one account and the next, might be accounted for. What repelled me was the fundamental silliness that characterised all these communications, the lack of what I regarded as true spiritual values. I honestly tried to make allowances for these failings, but could only arrive at the conclusion that the agents behind these messages, whether discarnate spirits or the subconscious minds of the mediums involved, were on a very low plane

of spiritual and intellectual development.

On the other side, my reading tended more and more to convince me that a reasonably high proportion of spiritualistic phenomena must be genuine.

(I must underline the fact that my knowledge was all derived from the literature of the subject, since I had a strong intuitional aversion from attending séances or coming into personal touch with "mediums".)

I found, for example, evidence that I consider to be above dispute, concerning the production of that strange material I referred to in my opening paragraph, now known as ectoplasm or teleplasm. The experiments of Von Schrenck-Notzing in Paris, those of Dr. Crawford with the Goligher family in Belfast,*and, within the past few months, the production of ectoplasm under stringent test conditions at the College of Psychic Science in Queen's Gate, London, a report of which I have had from an absolutely trustworthy source, these accounts among others appear to me as irrefutable evidence. Moreover, they confirm one another in important particulars such as the essential conditions, the mediums' reactions, and the nature and functions of the exuded plasma.

Finally, in this connection, I find it unreasonable to suppose that certain persistent beliefs of humanity can rest on no foundations other than those of superstition and imagination. The Irishman's belief in fairies, the evidence of Indian Fakir magic, the well authenticated stories of African Ju-jus, the witness of folklore, and, I may add, that of the Bible, form a body of testimony that, taken with the material I have submitted in this article, must convince the unprejudiced mind of the necessity for seeking some explanation outside the realm of what is known to science as "natural law".

Now, speaking from the point of view of the intellectualist, what is demanded in this case as in any other problem submitted to the intelligence only, is some hypothesis that will cover *all* the facts, and, other things being equal, the simpler hypothesis must be given preference over the more complicated. For, just as one finally authenticated instance is sufficient to establish a case, such as, for instance, the case for an extra-human agency, so, also, one undeniable exception is sufficient to disprove a hypothesis however well-founded otherwise. And what I have now to ask is whether there is any explanation that will account for all the phenomena of modern spiritualism?

(Before answering that question, however, I feel constrained to make some explanation of my own attitude, since it is essential for readers of this article to realize that although I find Theosophy

*This, despite the subsequent report of E. E Fournier d'Albe (Watkins 1922), since I still find it incredible that Dr Crawford could have been consistently deceived throughout his long series of experiments with this family. See W. T. Crawford's three books published by Watkins in 1916, 1919 and 1921.

the most far-reaching, the most deeply founded and the most convincing creed that is known to us, I am not writing this as a professed Theosophist, nor am I appealing, in the first instance, to those who have finally subscribed to Theosophist doctrines. In what follows, therefore, it must be clearly understood that while I acknowledge and adopt the explanations put forward by Madame Blavatsky nearly fifty years ago, I do so on intellectual grounds only, and address, in the first place, those who are in my own position.)

Let me begin by saying that I have been unable to accept any materialistic explanation of the facts. I can understand the attitude of those scientists who say that since the existence of spirits is not susceptible of proof by laboratory methods, they prefer to leave the whole question alone; but I find it difficult to understand how those trained in logic and method can still assert that all the phenomena of spiritualism can be accounted for by cheating, illusion and telepathy. I have no space to argue the point here, but mere commonsense alone would urge me to reject a tortuous, strained and finally inconsistent theory which, even so, does not cover all the facts.

But, having assumed that many if not most of the phenomena in question, are due to an extra-terrestrial agency, we have still to decide its nature. Madame Blavatsky in that astounding work of inner knowledge and erudition *Isis Unveiled*, examines at some length in Chapter IX of the first volume, the evidence for the existence of elementary spirits, and indicates a class of "elementals proper," to which may be attributed a proportion of the effects common in spiritualistic séances. She writes:

> The most solid of these bodies is ordinarily just immaterial enough to escape perception by our physical eyesight, but not so unsubstantial but that they can be perfectly recognised by the inner, or clairvoyant vision. They not only exist, and can live all in ether, but can handle and direct it for the production of physical effects . . . . More than this; they can so condense it as to make themselves tangible bodies, which by their Protean powers they can cause to assume such likeness as they choose, by taking as their models the portraits they find stamped in the memories [conscious or subconscious] of the persons present.

Now even if this statement were unsupported by authority drawn from credible sources, I should be willing to accept it, provisionally, for the simple reason that it does cover all the facts known to me in relation to the lower manifestations such as poltergeist phenomena, the production of ectoplasm, and all the more foolish demonstrations of the séance room. With regard more particularly to the ectoplasm, this passage, written nearly thirty years before the experiments of von Schrenck in Paris, covers so far as I can see the whole ground. In these sittings, carried on under the strictest test conditions, some very remarkable but in many cases very puzzling results were obtained and extensively photographed. All of these could be satisfactorily accounted for on the simple and inclusive theory here quoted from the works of Madame Blavatsky, who in this

case was writing long before the event (1877) so far as modern research in this direction was concerned.

We are perhaps on less sure ground when we come to that now large body of communications collected from automatic writing, from messages spoken by an entranced medium, and from various other sources. Some of this material evidences a strong, although somewhat simple, ethical tendency which I should hesitate to attribute to the hypocritical pranks of an elemental. Moreover, there is abundant testimony to the reception of veridical messages concerning the details of the earth life of the person whose spirit is assumed to be communicating, some of them almost beyond the reach of explanation by telepathy between living minds—a theory that, in any case, has been overstrained to the point of absurdity.

Madame Blavatsky does not, however, deny the possibility of such communications coming from the spirits of the dead. Many of them she says, are "human disembodied spirits" (Vol. 1. p. 67), going on to add that "whether the majority of such spirits are good or *bad*, largely depends on the private morality of the medium, much on the circle present, and a great deal on the intensity and object of their purpose." Nevertheless, it should be noted in this connection that she insists in many places that "*pure* spirits will not and *cannot* show themselves objectively" (Vol II. p. 595); and the whole tendency of her writing goes to show that the true self, (the ego or the soul) is not, save in exceedingly rare cases, concerned in these messages from the dead.

Is it not, in any case, far more likely that they come from another entity the existence of which has for many years seemed to me probable on *a priori* grounds. In the course of our lives we build up a simulacrum which passes in the world as our *personal* individuality. In part this represents a collection of physical and mental habits which in the majority of cases becomes so firmly established that after middle-age we are unable to alter them in any considerable particular. For the rest it consists of the thoughts and desires that have been chiefly instrumental in modelling the image of what we regard as our personal character. And since after physical death, this shell will persist for a time without change, it is reasonable that it should retain those interests which have given it shape; and that the nature of its communications, whenever such are possible, should be of precisely that nature which we find in the records of spiritualistic literature. Such entities would find no sudden illumination after bodily death, acquire no new knowledge. They would hanker after such physical comforts as those described by Raymond Lodge and many others. They would, under examination, seek to invent accounts of the spiritual world, just as a child will describe the adventures

of its imagination in preference to the imperfectly realised details of its physical circumstances. In short, if we carefully examine the literature of the subject we shall find a complete and satisfying concordance between the nature of spirit messages and that which we should reasonably expect from such a source.

Space does not permit me to elaborate this general explanation of the phenomena of spiritualism in the present article, but for me, at least, it has solved a host of difficulties, chief among them that inherent silliness which is characteristic of the body of spirit communications. For the rest, I must refer readers of THE ARYAN PATH, whether professed Theosophists or not, to that astounding book *Isis Unveiled*, in which they will find a reasoned analysis not only of those phenomena which had been obtained fifty years ago but many anticipations of others of which there was no modern record when the work in question was written.

J. D. BERESFORD

To comprehend modern mediumship it is, in short, indispensable to familiarize oneself with the Yoga Philosophy; and the aphorisms of Patanjali are even more essential than the "Divine Revelations" of Andrew Jackson Davies. We can never know how much of the mediumistic phenomena we *must* attribute to the disembodied, until it is settled how much *can* be done by the embodied, human soul and the blind but active powers at work within those regions which are yet unexplored by science. . . . The reader will observe that the primary issue between the theosophical and spiritualistic theories of mediumistic phenomena is that the Theosophists say the phenomena may be produced by more agencies than one, and the latter that but one agency can be conceded, namely—the disembodied souls. . . . Theosophy can be styled the enemy of Spiritualism with no more propriety than of Mesmerism, or any other branch of Psychology. In this wondrous outburst of phenomena that the Western world has been seeing since 1848, is presented such an opportunity to investigate the hidden mysteries of being as the world has scarcely known before. Theosophists only urge that these phenomena shall be studied so thoroughly that our epoch shall not pass away with the mighty problem unsolved. Whatever obstructs this—whether the narrowness of sciolism, the dogmatism of theology, or the prejudice of any other class, should be swept aside as something hostile to the public interest.—*The Theosophist* (of H. P. BLAVATSKY), October 1879.

THE SPIRIT OF INDIAN MUSIC

[**Leona C. Grugan** who acquired her fine technique at the piano early in life under Teresa Carreño, has been rendering silent service for many years to the Cause of Music in the City of New York. As a teacher she uses the element of synthesis underlying the different arts, and teaches music not only through the instrument, but also through drawing, poetry and dancing.—EDS.]

There is an ever growing tendency among modern thinkers to turn back to the soul-inspiring philosophies of the early Aryans for inspiration and guidance. This tendency is noticeable among a certain class of Western artists, who are beginning to turn toward the art of the ancient East for an expression of philosophical ideals upon which the art of the future may be reared.

To the casual observer, a study of these ancient art-forms may appear of little value; to some it may seem that a return to the ideals embodied in them would be retrogression rather than advancement. But when we dispassionately examine the materialistic trend of modern art, the general neglect of inner meanings and the vain squandering of artistic power for the sake of material reward, it becomes apparent that something must be done if art is to assume its rightful function and achieve its noble destiny.

Every Western student who makes a serious attempt to understand the art of the East helps to forge a link in that chain of mutual understanding and appreciation which is destined to unite the East and the West. That chain seems very fragile to the Western musician when he listens for the first time to the music of the East. He finds it as difficult to appreciate the beauty of a pure melodic line unsupported by a rich harmonic background as it would be to contemplate the beauty of a cloud detached from its surrounding atmosphere of sky and sunlight. His ear, accustomed to the crude progressions of the tempered scale, becomes perplexed when it attempts to subdivide these tones into infinitesimal intervals. His rhythmical sense, trained to respond to strongly accented, regularly recurring pulsations, becomes confused when confronted with several subtly opposing rhythms. But when he becomes more familiar with Eastern airs, and learns *how* to listen to them, he finds their lack of harmony more than compensated by their smoother flow of melody, and discovers in their elusive intervals and sinuous rhythms a delicacy of suggestion and a depth of meaning not always found in the more virile music of his own land. As Pierre Loti says, speaking of these fine-spun Eastern airs:

> They convey to us the extreme sensitiveness of a humanity which has drifted far away from us during the course of centuries, but of one which is not radically different from ours.

The musical scale of the Hindus

comprises seven tones, which are subdivided into 22 smaller tones, called *srutis*. From the *srutis* were formed the three *Gramas*. The term *Grama* has gradually fallen into disuse, to be replaced by the word *Raga*, which implies a succession of notes so arranged as to awaken a certain sentiment or feeling. The *Ragas* constitute the basis of Hindu melody and in the Hindustani method they are divided into six "male" *Ragas*, each of which has five or six "wives" or *Raginis*, while their "children" are called *Putras*. The possibilities contained in this charming musical "family" are of course without number.

One distinctive feature of Indian music is found in the use of "grace notes," one Sanskrit authority claiming that "a melody devoid of embellishment is like a moonless night, a river without water, or a creeper without flowers". The constant use of *portamento* also strikes the Western listener, and when he learns that the interval, or space *between* the notes, is of greater importance than the note itself, he ceases to wonder why European music sounds "full of holes" to the Oriental.

The rhythm of Indian music is very complicated, Sarngadeva specifying 120 categories. Accent is practically ignored, contrast being sought in the *quality*, rather than the quantity of tone. The Western musician listens for the beat on the bar, while in India the phrase is considered as the metrical unit. Therefore, in listening to Indian music, it is best to pay attention to the phrasing and ignore the pulsation.

By reason of its mobile nature, music is peculiarly adapted to the expression of the emotions, and of all the arts is the one best fitted to translate the feelings of one race to another. But, in order to appreciate these feelings, we must first understand the *ideas* which lie behind them. All differences in human expression may be traced in their final analysis to the ideas which underlie the innermost faith of the human soul. As the beginnings of music, in East and West alike, are closely interwoven with religion, a consideration of the religious ideals of the ancient Indians may serve to explain some of the differences between the music of the East and West.

The religion of the ancient East was extremely philosophical in character, being based upon the teachings of highly evolved individuals who transmitted their doctrines in unbroken continuity from one generation to another. This same line of transmission is claimed for Indian music. Brahmâ, it is said, first taught the art to the sage Bharata, who communicated his knowledge to the Rishis, whence it has descended through successive generations of masters and disciples. Thus the true art-music of India appears as a direct descendant of the music of the ancient schools, clothed in traditions which the true Indian artist strives to keep pure and undefiled.

Like the Pythagoreans, who claimed the Deity (or Logos) as

the Source of Harmony, and declared that the construction of the universe followed the laws of musical proportion, the Indian artist turns to the Deity to find the Source from which music sprang. As the *Vishnu Purana* says: "All songs are a part of Him who wears a form of Sound." But this Deity is not a personal God, but a universal Principle, and one of the first things to strike the Western musician is the impersonality and universality of the subject matter of Indian music.

The performance of a piece of Indian music is translated by Dr. Ananda Coomeraswamy in terms of its universal application. The Tambura, which plays before, during, and after the melody, is compared to the "Timeless Absolute" which exists before the world comes into being, continues during the whole period of manifestation, and is not destroyed even after the universe has ceased to exist. The melody of Indian music is likened to the ceaseless movement of Nature which emerges from its primal Source and returns to it again at the close of the cycle, while the Harmony existing between the rhythmical Background and the intricate Pattern of the melody is compared to the union of spirit and matter.

The Vedas are said to possess a dual meaning—one expressed in the literal sense of the words, the other indicated by the intonation and the metre. Sound possesses a tremendous power, if applied with knowledge; and in the proper chanting of the sacred texts there lies a potency which, to the average musician, would appear magical.

In the episode of the Mahabharata known as the *Bhagavad-Gita*, Krishna alludes to Himself as the *Sama-Veda*, or the Veda of Song. This statement contains a reference to the power of sound to make matter move and change in response to its action,—a fact which formed the basis of many of the experiments of the German physicist Ernst Chladni during the early years of last century. Krishna also identifies Himself with *Gayatri* among the metres, and calls Himself *Narada*, who is said to have been the inventor of the Vina, or Indian lute.

It thus appears that the Indian people should possess a knowledge of the power of sound and rhythm as their natural heritage. Although much of this knowledge seems to have been lost, remnants are still to be found in the chanting of their sacred texts and in their method of teaching children to spell by chanting and to recite mathematical formulae by the singing of verses.

The relationship between colour and sound seems also to have been known to these ancient peoples. In the Vedas the words "sound" and "light" are always closely associated, and the Sanskrit verbal root *ARC* is used to denote two meanings—"to sing" and "to shine". Raja Sir Sourindro Tagore refers to this relationship in his works on Indian music, and also groups the seven tones to corres-

pond with the four Indian castes. This grouping, he says, furnishes the key to the combination which should be resorted to in setting a piece to harmony, while the arrangement of colours furnishes an important guide in the arrangement of chords.

With such a background as this, it is not surprising to find a veneration for music in India which is not always apparent in Western lands. The true Indian musician considers his art a sacred calling, and dedicates his life to it. Knowing that his performance will reflect his own inner state, he strives to keep his life pure and above reproach. This close connection between the artistic and the moral life may seem strange to the Western musician, who finds few indications of such ideas among his own contemporaries. In India the opinion prevails that no voluptuous or luxury-loving person could possibly become a good musician, and the Indian pandits define the rules and conditions of musicianship in terms of *morality*. For, it is claimed, if one would learn the *science* of music, he must first understand and practise the *spiritual ideals* which lie at the root of his art.

Many attempts have been made to render Indian music more intelligible to the European ear by translating it into the music-language of the West. Although the motive prompting such efforts has been a noble one, the results achieved are far from satisfactory. The Western musician must realize that the subtle intricacies of Eastern music cannot be confined within the limits of the tempered scale. The piano is absolutely unsuited to the performance of the *Ragas*, and all attempts to harmonize these lovely Indian airs can only result in their disfigurement.

If Indian music is to be understood and appreciated, it must be approached as it *is*. The Western musician who wishes to listen to it intelligently must seek to recover his lost sense of pure intonation and be willing to forget all implied harmonies. If he desires to *understand* it, he must learn to know the soul of the Indian people; for, as Yeats has said, "Indian music is not an art, it is life itself!"

The time is not far distant when more will be demanded of music than the expression of purely personal emotions. When this time arrives, the musician will be obliged to awaken purer, higher and more spiritual emotions in himself if he hopes to be worthy of his calling. And in this period of spiritual awakening, the music of ancient India will have an important part to play.

LEONA C. GRUGAN

THE GROUND OF BROTHERHOOD

[**Robert Sencourt** has come into greater prominence since we published his article "The British in India" in our April number, because of his *Life of Empress Eugenie.*

In this thoughtful essay, the full depth of which is appreciated when re-read, he searches after a principle of universal relationship. Interdependence is the very order of Nature, in which man participates—in a few things knowingly, but in most unconsciously to himself. The Theosophical Movement of every era proclaims the fact of Brotherhood, because its Great Founders have the conscious realization of it, and this fact They desire to teach to mankind. An intellectual recognition has to precede a spiritual realization; the former is immediately possible to man, the latter follows, transforming him into an Immortal God. Between the two is the link of practice, of application in life, of that which the mind perceives. Dwelling on such ideas as are contained in this essay the human mind loses its narrowness and expands itself; only as the mind's sympathies towards its environment grow do those higher ethical principles founded on Impersonality become our guides.

—EDS.]

" . . . make the earth
One brotherhood. . . ."
—Shelley. *Prometheus Unbound*, II, ii, 95.

I

Since invention captured the air, the swiftness with which steam and electric traction shortened space has hastened again the commerce of ideas. The exchanges of the nineteenth century led to material wealth: the exchanges of the twentieth mean fuller impacts between philosophies and modes of life. But the nineteenth century, and the range of its organisations, led to concrete imperialisms in which a wider organism was strengthened only to clash with another. It created brotherhoods which were majestic enough to be more menacing each to each and so to the unity of the world. It had no sense of universal order. It forgot even that "the dust of the rose petal belongs to the heart of the seller of perfumes".

National organisation, heedless of the complex exchange by which it grew strong, hurried to the disaster of obstinate crash. The war into which the nations hurled themselves came at the moment when the vibrations of the air were made by Science the messengers of men. But the new commerce, though it deals rather with words than with gross merchandise and aims at providing diversion rather than comfort, has no more given us order than the old. There is still but a small stock of wisdom. A clash and medley of ideas is added to the growth of nationalism: and in this confusion of impacts we feel in new ways *the danger of proximity without unity.* The brotherhoods that had been formed have become less certain of themselves. And unless

there is a principle which gives them among themselves a universal relation, imperial brotherhoods are obviously a threat to the wide exchanges by which we live.

What the war has made obvious with regard to empires, a still fiercer disintegration may do with regard to brotherhoods of attitude towards life, which means massed minds in action, minds guided by philosophies true or false, or huddled together aimlessly like the atoms of wandering stars in agglomerations of stupidity.

Universal brotherhood, which means the wise family partnership of all men in a great charity, can be attained only where there is a general acceptance of certain principles of order. Unity is the order of variety. It can be widely effective only when wisdom is sure of governing intricacies.

> Evermore the simpler essence lower lies.
> More complex is more perfect, owing more
> Discourse more widely wise.

This acceptance of order, not only as the accompaniment, but as the means and the defence of freedom, was one of which Milton wrote with great eloquence in his *Essay on Church Government.*

> Discipline is not only the removal of disorder; but if any visible shape can be given to divine things, the very visible shape and image of virtue, whereby she is not only seen in the regular gestures and motions of her heavenly paces as she walks, but also makes the harmony of her voice audible to mortal ears. Yea the angels themselves . . . are distinguished and quaternioned into their celestial princedoms and satrapies, according as God himself has writ his imperial decrees through the great provinces of Heaven.

II

But discipline, like the very word order itself, implies something of constraint. On the other hand the thought of that blessed unity, which is the very end of love, is the consummation of man's highest freedom. Love is spontaneous and magnetic. The blood leaps at the magic of its earliest human lure, and in its spiritual irradiation the adventure of romance is lasting. By it life is at first enhanced, and from this interrelation in joy, new relations with separate existences are procreated that, in Milton's words, "our happiness may out itself in a thousand vagancies of glory and delight". Such is the process of all life, and of all thought. The universe is arranged in a series of magnetic attractions vibrating each in its own ether which may or may not interpenetrate the world of sense. Each kind continues life by this consummation of attractions within itself, beyond which it cannot procreate.

And as this generative communion is life, so also is it thought. Shelley, on a summer day in Italy, watching the glitter of the sunlight thrown upward from water into ivy, and seeing the bees busy with its bloom, said that from these the poet could create forms more real not merely than the bees but than living man himself. The mind attaining through the senses to an apprehension of that intellectual reality which informs the world of sense, apprehends exterior things

within itself, and, by giving them a sense expression of its own, conceives them in a new creative act which manifests to the outward world "the shapes that haunt thought's wildernesses".

So by the spontaneous movement of philosophy and mysticism man passes from the unities of the sense to those of the spirit. He sees that through thought, which taking names from things perceived by the senses to speak of unseen realities, he is himself in a central place between, or rather combining, the seen and the unseen. He traces the magnetism upwards through all the orders of being, until it passes from thought into that diviner ether which is to thought darkness as well as light. He attains to wonder beyond wonder; he sees eternity as a ring of pure and endless light

> . . . in which the world
> And all her train were hurled.

To the Neoplatonist, Dionysius and to Plotinus, the eternal seemed dark though excessive bright; but Dante, like Vaughan, conveyed his sense of it in images of air, light and fire, till with the words of touch, sight or breath he has given us a vision of the ultimate reality as again a ring—or rather as a sort of fiery arc—in which the three dominant colours, like rainbow from rainbow, seem to intermingle their reflected and interpenetrating rays.

Such is the fount and centre of all unity. All that had enduring or even temporary reality, and all the modes of being, were both contained in their intrinsic virtue in this mystic ring; and yet throughout an hierarchic and subordinate order, each was allowed also a distinct being and activity, as partakers, and in a sense agents, of the final reality, which was not only the beginning, and the end, but also the means and measure of existence. All were fused and ordered into unity with the Divine Essence:—

> I saw in its abysmal deep immerst
> Together in one volume bound with love
> What is throughout the universe disperst.

III

Such is the high secret of order, both among things visible and those invisible. Love which is, in Aristotle's words, the moving power of the universe is no blind or chance attraction. It is a hierarchy of attractions as complete, as ordered, as salutary as the force of gravitation which draws the ripe walnut to earth, which holds the moon in our sky, and which populates the remote heaven of astronomy with the circling planets of many solar systems stretching out beyond all reach of our devices into a distance "at which even soaring fancy staggers".

But we have no need to go so far: to learn through knowledge how to unite ourselves with what we know; to do so with that glow of the heart by which the will is melted to a quicksilver activity, and so to know love; to love with the wisdom which keeps the passionate impulse in harmony with truth and law: this in itself is to be initiated into the wisdom and

spirit of the universe. It is a partaking of the life which is the light of men.

It is the function of fulfilled love to create the family. The family, therefore, must not be confused with the dominant magnetic creative attraction of love, but it is the harmonious order of a new creation which results from love. Love, said Dionysius, is "the power which tends towards making natures one". It is, wrote Shelley, in the *Defence of Poetry*, "a giving out of our nature and an identification of ourselves with the beautiful which exists in thought, action, or person not our own". It is a coming together of two strange existences in an exquisite surprise. But in this romantic sense, the harmony of the family knows little of mutual love. Brothers are diverse expressions of a unity which means different things at different times and in different ways because it is the combination of loaded and even varying complexities.

Brotherhood can never attain the salutary magic of romantic love: it can never attain the same fruitful consummation. It has another function: out of a common lot and long fellowship, it works through interaction. It is the relation of elder and younger: of protection and learning: and it has the differences in likeness which ask—if seldom for romance—for faithfulness, for comradeship, for understanding, for loyalty. It is a means of adjustment to the world. It gives an easy, at times, a boisterous, interplay of experience and criticism, and by it new unities spread out from a joint interest and affection.

Brotherhood is, therefore, a word that one applies with particular ease to nations which have a common origin, such as those different parts of the British Empire which are populated by the British race; and in fact to the whole English-speaking world. There is criticism, there is often misunderstanding: but there is throughout a brotherly sense of loyalty, based on something common which is treasured. It applies, perhaps still more closely, to the Spanish republics of the Americas. It applies even to the Latin nations of Europe, all closely modelled on the same civilization, the same law, the same language, and retaining the same religion. It applies in a certain sense obviously to all nations which have inherited a particular religion. And it is not too much to say, that it applies to all nations who have developed from a common race; and finally to all nations whatsoever, because all alike inherit the dignity of the human race. In these days when, as we began by saying, commerce is a matter of complex interdependence, and when this means also a new fullness of sharing knowledge, ideas, and modes of life, the common dignity has a new immediacy of meaning and a new range.

But it is plain that except when race and culture is very close, it is not so much a relation of in-

dependent comradeship as the surprising exchange of different but assimilable wealths which lead to a new fruitfulness in unity. The word brotherhood, therefore, is not in itself enough for the order of universal concord and peace; because there is so much that partakes more of the nature of romance and charity. There is, therefore, a double interdependence in the world to-day: firstly that of divers and independent kindreds, working towards their end in give and take with one another: secondly the more vital interdependence, the mutual relation of heart and mind, the need of mutual surprise, the creative interplay of inward principles of life, between nations and races which began by having little in common with one another.

IV

Yet though this is the richer of the two kinds of mutual dependence, it will in itself avail little, unless it takes to itself also the ideal of brotherhood. For the origin of brotherly love, the root of family strength, is the fact of a common origin which is accepted also as authority.

Commerce, like balance, is excellent, but exchange and moderation will neither have nor offer security against chaos, unless there is a principle of order. Such a principle of order, being authoritative, must belong to the higher life which is the life of thought, and to that magnetism of thought itself which is the love awakened by delight in intellectual beauty. When the perception of beauty means such joy to the heart that the will is brought to guide the whole trend of life towards unity with what is beautiful, then interdependence is enriched into a planetary and rhythmical system of life. Its vibrant radiance of mutual relation is charm.

> Charm is the secret which makes
> Art of the poet divine.
> Love is the secret of charm.

There are some personalities who have on the one side so clear a view of common principle, and on the other in warmth of heart so strong a power of charm, that in their presence barriers dissolve. Instinctively, they

> . . . hope till hope creates
> From its own wreck the thing it contemplates.

In them the power of the hero and the saint symbolises and exerts both mutual trust and the dignity of order. It is in these spirits, whether they live from history as a motive power in to-day's events, or whether they live among us in the flesh, that we move away from chaos, and even friction, to that concord of mutually dependent lives in the order of charity in which the whole family of heaven and earth can alone find their at-one-ment. For that unity is a hierarchy of love, ordered in all things and sure.

ROBERT SENCOURT

IDEALS IN BUSINESS

[**Charles Dernier** is a keen business man of America, which implies that he has ideals and some philosophy of action. It is a marked feature of American business life, and contrasts favourably with that of other countries, that there is a growing idealism and that a desire for genuine co-operation is in evidence. The American business man has a peculiar civic sense which we hope will also come to birth in Europe and especially in India. The Vaishyas of old were great benefactors of the State, and the reintroduction of the old world ideal of business as service of the community is one of the crying needs of this civilization in which the lust for money is so rampant.—EDS.]

"If it is not for the good of the public it is not for the good of business." This is the motto of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, which stands to-day as one of the foremost examples of an industrial and commercial nation. However defective this motto is from the standpoint of pure altruism, it is significant, in this day of the ascendancy of trade, with the Vaishya or merchant caste at the helm. It bespeaks a practical recognition of community of interest, which represents at least a step in the direction of Brotherhood.

The failure to grasp earlier the close tie between the interests of business and the common good has been responsible for many of the difficulties that have followed in the wake of the industrial revolution—the avoidable hazards workers have had to face, the long hours and unsanitary conditions, low wages, night work, and the labour of children.

The conscience of "big business" has been slow to stir except as improved conditions were seen as promising concrete returns in heightened efficiency and improved morale. Unless labour was able, because of scarcity of workers or through efficient organization, to bring pressure to bear upon employers, its plea for adequate wages went long unheeded. The United States, however, has had a convincing large-scale demonstration in recent years that a high wage level, albeit reluctantly conceded, by raising the purchasing power of the masses, increases the home market and redounds to the general advantage of industry and trade. How far genuine solicitude for the public good motivates the new attitude of business is perhaps open to question, but not the fact that its stand on this point has changed.

In line with its motto, the same national Chamber of Commerce took as the theme of its last annual meeting, "The Growing Responsibilities of Business". None can challenge the appropriateness of the theme, but the recognition by business of those responsibilities generally has not grown apace with them. Humanitarians outside the ranks of business have brought about many of the changes for the better that have been effected.

The question of adequate com-

pensation is only one phase of it. There has been increasing pressure to shorten working-hours, especially of women and children, and even to abolish child labour, to improve working conditions, and to reduce industrial hazards to a minimum. The experiments in numerous countries with various forms of social insurance, to safeguard the working class against financial distress due to sickness, accident, unemployment, and old age, are all indications of the quickening of the social conscience and the obedience of business to its behests.

The motto of the foremost trade body in the United States accords ill with the practice of many in that and other countries. The most obvious implication of that motto is that the public good must be consulted in every case and the decision made in accordance with what is believed to be conducive to it. Its general acceptance would rule out, automatically, all sharp practice and double dealing, eliminate exorbitant profits, and establish an honest value at an honest price as the invariable basis for trade.

It must be granted that many industries are making a determined effort to eliminate all trade practices conceded to be unfair. There are many accepted policies of business not in this class, the ultimate public benefit from which remains to be demonstrated. It is questionable, for instance, whether the public good is served by business whetting, by skilful advertising or high pressure salesmanship, the desire for goods beyond the purchaser's means, and then encouraging him to mortgage his future by buying on open credit or the instalment plan. Hundreds of millions are spent each year for such advertising, and the volume of credit purchases mounts to hitherto undreamed-of heights, but whether the benefit to the public from the resulting stimulus to production outweighs the harm done there is no serious attempt to determine.

There are doubtless other countries which recognize, no less than the United States, the responsibilities of business to the State and the Community, but the world at large is far from accepting the motto of the United States Chamber of Commerce, unless "the public" is very narrowly defined. The interest of business in the public weal tends to stop at least at the borders of the country.

That it may not safely do so is apparent from the increasingly important part played by the commercial interests of the several nations in stirring up international rivalries which too often culminate in armed conflict. The history of modern imperialism, despite its cant about the public good, is largely the record of the selfish commercial ambitions of the empire-seeking powers.

None disputes the right of any country to set up trade barriers to foster artificially industries which could not thrive within its borders in free competition with the products of other regions; but the good sought is obviously not that of the world at large. At best,

the nation indirectly benefits—at worst, but a favoured section or group.

It is the good of the individual nation alone or a section of it that is considered when citizens are urged to use home products to the exclusion of those of foreign lands. It is not primarily from prejudice against other countries but simply lack of the international viewpoint and inability to visualize the situation and needs of a distant country and weigh dispassionately its interests against their own.

"Enlightened self-interest" is acclaimed as the formula for individual success which will benefit the community as well. Applied to the nation, the fact that war does not pay is the strongest argument the Pacifists can muster, in our materialistic civilization. Once business is convinced that war represents an economic waste, with no compensating economic gain, even to the victors, commercial interest as well as the common good will be seen to dictate the maintenance of peace.

Let us not, however, fall into sophistry and, focusing attention on the word "enlightened," ignore the remainder of the formula, nor fancy that any amount of enlightenment can transform self-interest—a euphemism for selfishness—into altruism *pur sang*. Only when industries and nations whole-heartedly adopt and apply the slogan "Each for all, and all for each," will the public good become in all sincerity the criterion of business and of national policy.

CHARLES DERNIER

What is this about "the soldier not being free"? [Referring to the dilemma of an F. T. S. soldier in the army, presented to her.] Of course no soldier can be free to move about his physical body wherever he likes. But what has the esoteric teaching to do with the outward man? A soldier may be stuck to his sentry box like a barnacle to its ship, and the soldier's Ego be free to go where it likes and think what it likes best. . . No man is required to carry a burden heavier than he can bear; nor do more than it is possible for him to do. A man of means, independent and free from any duty, will have to move about and go, missionary like, to teach Theosophy. A man tied by his duty to one place has no right to desert it in order to fulfil another duty, let it be however much greater; for the first *duty* taught in Occultism is to do one's duty unflinchingly *by every duty*.

—H. P. Blavatsky (*The Path*, Vol VII, p. 122)

RENASCENT INDIA

[This is the third of the series of articles, each independent in itself, written by Dr. N. B. Parulekar who has been on an extensive tour in India to study the hidden springs of the coming Indian Renaissance.

The previous two articles were "The Educated Exploit, The Illiterate Build" and "Cross Roads—Secular and Spiritual".

Next month will appear "India—Where East Meets West".—EDS.]

COMMUNAL RIOTS—THE UNDERWORLD IN INDIA

The lion and the lamb may drink at the same fountain but not the Hindu and the Moslem. Such is the impression created by thousands of sign boards on railroad stations in North India directing the two communities to separate places for drinking water, for tea and for refreshments. The segregation, however, is not so complete as it appears. The first and second class passengers walk into the first or second class refreshment rooms, or use the luxurious dining cars wherein food and drink is not labelled for Hindu or Moslem; there it is served on the basis of quality and cost instead of community or caste. These are used by upper class Hindus and Moslems indiscriminately without apparently violating each other's religious susceptibilities. Why then should Indian legislators, lawyers, many of the so-called leaders, travelling in the first or second class, have been instrumental in sustaining religious prohibitions primarily for the poor? Why do they want to provide caste regulations for others, which they themselves feel far too clean, too shrewd and superior to observe? If instead of signs that separate, clean water, tea and wholesome food were provided with the sign "for all," it would then be seen where the third class travellers would turn. Why are not the people given the chance to educate themselves? I have seen similar boards marking out different locations for the coloured and for the white in southern sections of the United States of America. But the Hindu-Moslem discrimination at railway stations surpasses them, because it has not even the element of colour in it. More than 90 per cent Moslems are of the same race as the Hindus and all show the same pigmentation of skin. What then is back of it?

The question presented itself in another way. This time the scene is laid in Lahore. Just as Punjab is the land of five rivers so Lahore, its capital, is the city of five religions. There the Hindu, the Sikh, the Arya, the Moslem, and the Christian are thrown together as probably in no other city in India. Stepping into the local Y.M.C.A.

one finds the billiard room and the bridge tables crowded with young men in short coats, smart trousers, and expensive neckties, giving the impression that one is in England or on the Continent and not in a province of poverty and political distress. Among them are represented all the five religions and the "Y" authorities are proud of the menagerie. They are glad to collect under one roof young men of diverse religious persuasions who care not at all for their caste or community differences and join each other in fun, pleasure, and partaking of food. It is possible to recognise from among them the future Civil Service men, barristers, legislators, municipal mayors, and men who would collect votes and write communal memoranda. But it is not so easy to understand just what takes them later to bigotry and communal partisanship.

Another section of the city, far from this social pleasantry, cultivated cleanliness, and imported fashion, is inhabited by the toiling majority, sweating for one meal a day, crowded in alleys within alleys and living in hovels more fit for vermin than for human beings. I had to walk, sickened by the nauseating stench, through heaps of dirt, slumbering dogs, and open drainage running criss-cross on the road. Rickety children without clothes were playing as though they belonged to nobody. I passed by butchers' shops where heaps of flies fed themselves on suspended meat, shops where men spat and drank, and grocery stores selling poison and food in the form of rotten eggs, spoiled fruits, and stale vegetables. Occasionally one had to make room for a creaking cart dragged by panting men, whose day's labour could hardly earn for them a bowlful of rice. In the heart of such an environment was located the house of the man with whom I wanted to discuss. He was reputed to be a leader of his community and I was advised not to miss seeing him.

His arguments I had heard many times before repeated almost verbatim. In fact the questions and answers touching Hindu-Moslem relations have been crystallised into a kind of catechism, couched in impenetrable phrases. But what was new to me and struck me as utterly incomprehensible was the scale of values in the mind of such a man. He lived in a locality where street cleaning was a primary necessity of life and political privileges could hardly benefit a people unless shown applicable to relieve the surrounding misery. Are Hindus and Moslems worse enemies of one another than filth, poverty, ignorance, epidemics and abject political slavery? William James proposed a moral equivalent for war. How can these apparently educated men think of civil war when human life is pressed to its lowest ebb and so much can be done through co-operation?

"Is there any religious issue back of Hindu-Moslem riots?" I asked, and the uniform answer was, "Not at all." Among those who shared

this view was a Maulana of Ajmere, proprietor in part of the Holy Shrine, which to Indian Moslems is sacred next only to Mecca, a leader of the Ahmedia movement, a president of a Moslem University, the Moslem Home Member of a provincial government, and a leading advocate, who is a descendant of the priests of the Mogul Empire. On the other hand they uniformly told me that those who are instigating the riots are not all religious. They mostly come from the educated class, nurtured in non-sectarian schools, good mixers in "Y" programmes, and turned out of universities certified as having received a liberal education. On the other hand the humble village folk still continue to call respected neighbours of other communities as uncle, grandfather, brother, and so on, *i.e.*, in terms, of family relationship. Hindu and Moslem ask each other's counsel, share each other's sorrows, attend marriage festivals as well as funeral processions. But to the educated exploiter all are simply voters in a political machine where power and profits can be had for those who know how to divide and dominate. Naturally he does not care if his co-religionists continue to live in squalor, ignorance, and starvation.

"The M. A.s are fighting and the poor are following," exclaimed the seventy-year old Moslem Home Member of the United Provinces, where riots are more frequent than in other parts of India. Analysed into its elements, much of the communal strife, *i. e.*, the most frightful part of it, dissolves itself into rivalry among small groups of the educated for bread and butter or a standard of living as much above it as possible. Owing to centuries of foreign rule mixed with indigenous autocracies India has had the misfortune of government posts carrying with them all the public prestige. During the British administration in particular the few higher offices open to the Indians are coupled with extravagant salaries in excess of those in the U. S. A. or England. These are looked upon as an anchorage by the educated ambitious. Moreover, with the advent of Swaraj or self-government, more of these posts hitherto occupied by the Britishers will be thrown open to the native candidates. A scramble for these is in progress *from now on*, and a class of people are anxious to whip up communal feelings to get as many posts as possible reserved under communal auspices, but in reality for themselves and relatives. On the other hand the sons of farmers and far off villagers who make up almost 90 per cent of the country's population, Hindu or Moslem, have as remote a chance of aspiring to any one of these as to the White House in Washington.

The same is true in professions and trades in affected places. A Hindu lawyer would condemn Hindu clients for going to a Moslem lawyer, apparently on the ground of religion, though in his heart of hearts he desires business more than religion. Merchants

would like to insure trade, contractors to secure deals and office holders to patronise their own relations in the name of their community. Even under such circumstances men do not buy or sell on the basis of religion but on purely economic considerations. A very important Moslem advocate told me in Cawnpore that 85 per cent of his clients were Hindus. People do not call a doctor because he is a Moslem but because he knows his job. However, to a losing man any excuse is good enough. The greatest among them is the money lender, who though he himself remains casteless, colourless, and creedless like the capital he deals with, yet nevertheless accounts for more trouble between the Hindus and Moslems than all the so-called religious issues of processions before the mosques and temples put together. For example, the total rural indebtedness of the province of Behar and Orissa according to the Banking Enquiry Committee Report 1929–30 "may be put at 1550 million rupees" while the money value of the total land produce is around 1200 million rupees, which means that even if the entire crop of a year is sold and given away to the money-lender there will be still left an indebtedness of 350 million rupees. The Marwari and the Pathan, representing Hindu and Moslem, charge the same high interest irrespective of religion, ranging from 30 to 150 per cent. Money is dearer to them than religion and they are clever enough to utilize religious pretexts to promote business. The men who are dispossessed of their lands and have had to liquidate all their property to pay off the debt migrate to cities and are ready enough to play with fire when trouble starts. The sins of the usurers are laid on their religions. *To my mind the really bigoted and religious fanatic is far less dangerous than these cool calculating money lenders, in fanning communal troubles and keeping them burning.* The Pathans are bordermen from the hilly sides of Afghanistan, who make a roaring business with small cash and a big stick or knife to compel the debtors to pay. They are their own court and collectors. These half-savage, half-civilized men are spreading into cities from where they percolate into rural areas for their work of daylight plunder. One of them started a Hindu-Moslem riot in Bombay by forcibly taking away the wife of a mill hand as part of his unpaid interest.

The government is the largest single employer of clerical labour. Year after year universities turn out young men by thousands who are fit for no other job except to teach or to add figures. A government official told me that for ten posts ranging from 300 to 500 rupees he received 10,000 applications. That there is no exaggeration in this can be checked up by the following. An Official Committee appointed to inquire into the unemployment among the educated middle classes in Madras Presidency asked the Superintend-

ing Engineer, Mettur Project, to insert a test advertisement in the newspapers for a clerk's post of Rs. 35 per month, with the result that 666 applications were received. Afraid of this educated unemployment, the Government is playing into the hands of communal leaders by agreeing to take in men not on the basis of merit but merely because they are members of certain communities. The man who wants to exploit for his own advancement is doubly rewarded in promoting separative elements in religions. He can bargain with the alien government on the one hand, who want to enlist allies at a time when national forces are against them. Then, on the other hand, he hopes to please his respective electorate, which again is separate for the Hindu and the Moslem, by demanding concessions and a few posts for the educated unemployed multitude. He thinks he gains both ways by the simple trick of pretending to be a hundred percenter for his particular religious group. He does not care if the administration of the country be demoralised by a policy of patronage and men get their heads broken in wild riots. Never was so much premium put on a man for working against his nation.

Political advance has given additional prospects to the educated trouble maker. He sees new vistas of unlimited power open up. If one can secure votes not so much by educating the voter as by stirring him up; not by national service but by holding out prospects of communal gains; not on account of personal merit but by simply belonging to a community, he is sure to do it, the latter being easier than the former. The records of the communal leaders show therefore that in real national service and large-scale selfless work they are either nowhere or only occupy a remote place. With foreign power entrenched within and anxious to hold on to the last; with partial democratic institutions introduced in a spirit of fear, suspicion, and suppressed hostility; with no corresponding democratic education; and last but not least with a type of educated unemployed whose struggle is for power and economic betterment, there is little wonder if Hindu-Moslem troubles should show a rising curve symmetrical with the so-called political reforms.

What I have so far described refers to a class of men who do the planning and hope to profit by it most; we may call them the brains. The muscles however are supplied by another set who are neither Hindu nor Moslem but are products of an entirely different process. With the advent of machines there have sprung up in the country fresh cities like Bombay, Calcutta, Karachi; old ones like Cawnpore have expanded considerably, under the pressure of commerce and manufacture and technique on Western lines. The process has not failed to breed large numbers of Gundas (loafers), Badmashes (gangsters), similar to those in Chicago, New York and other cities in America and

Europe, playing precisely the same rôle. *The underworld in India has grown to an appreciable size.* It recognises no religion except that of recklessness, runs brothels, opium dens, and can be hired to do any dirty job. It is no accident that the Hindu-Moslem troubles are frequent in those cities where this element is known to have gathered considerable power. At the end of March 1931 there broke out Hindu-Moslem riots in Cawnpore, a commercial and manufacturing centre in Northern India. Nearly 500 people were killed and some 2000 homes and shops were burnt or otherwise damaged. Before the subsequent Enquiry Commission, Mr. Barron, the British City Magistrate of Cawnpore, gave as his opinion that both the intensiveness and the extent of the riots were due to the badmashe (gang) element, which revelled in chaos and loot. Murder and arson were also partly resorted to by miscreants to cover up their tracks. The officer further testified that the problem of gangsters in Cawnpore was a serious one. They enjoyed the protection of rich and influential people who used them for their own ends. Even after the riots, men arrested on charges of murder and arson had found no difficulty in lodging cash securities of Rs. 30,000 for bail and in one instance an Honorary Magistrate had stood surety for a notoriously bad character.

In other words Hindu-Moslem troubles result when profiteers and gangmen have a chance to get together. There is a pretty well worked out riot line in the country. It is not so much prominent in places known to be sacred either to the Hindus or Moslems, where religious fanaticism may be expected to be most rampant, but includes mostly commercial centres and a few select cities containing lawless elements. The ordinary citizen has to submit to them because he is completely taken by surprise. He does not know just what incident may be seized on by the rowdies and turned into an opportunity for daylight murder, arson, and loot. In 1928 a riot broke out in Cawnpore. For forty days shops remained closed, business was paralysed, and citizens were afraid to step out unguarded for fear of being butchered. More than 200-300 persons were injured, many were killed, mosques and temples were demolished, considerable property was looted and destroyed in broad daylight. And all this started because of an altercation between a Moslem woodcutter and a Hindu schoolmaster over a matter of a few annas. If a truly religious war were to break out in this country the havoc would be appalling. There are 70 million Moslems spread out in the whole of India, living as neighbours with some 220 million Hindus. Sometimes just a handful of followers of one religion are living in a far-off village wherein the majority are of another faith. Ninety per cent of the population live in rural areas. There are no barriers and no policemen; no threat of law could hope to cope

effectively with lawlessness, and no amount of constitutional safeguards could secure peace if the adherents of one religion wanted to exterminate those of another. The rural communities live however practically undisturbed, and the trouble occurs in the urban population which is only ten per cent of the entire population. Now if we add the populations of the cities in disturbance it will amount to a fraction of the 10 per cent city population, and even in those troubled places the men who do engineer riots and actively participate in them are a still smaller fraction of the peaceful citizens. The Hindu-Moslem troubles are therefore highly localised, and more of a menace to civic life in certain cities than to any religion or its followers. That is why the number of deaths from such riots in the whole of India during the last 20 years is smaller than that caused by automobiles in the U. S. A. in one year.

Two more questions remain: What is the attitude of the British, and what is going to be the future of this problem? Though it is undeniable that as an alien government the British are forced to play one community against another in politics, administration, in efforts to lobby legislators and to postpone their day of departure from India as far as possible, I do not believe that the Government as a whole has any hand in these matters. A good deal however depends upon the local police and the inefficiency or indifference of British police officers in charge of a particular centre. Before the recent Enquiry Committee of Cawnpore came witness after witness testifying how the police remained indifferent and how they encouraged the violent elements to devastate and destroy on a much larger scale than they could ever have dared. Four British military officers, including the commanding officer, alleged that the police were not working. Babu Vikramjitsingh, Mayor of the City and a member of the Provincial Legislative Council, said that the police were "only playing the part of spectators, while rioting was going on". The Commissioner of the Division, the Mayor, and a Moslem leader, Hafiz Mohammad Sadique, going together on a round, actually saw "looting going on and people coming in and rushing away with booty and an armed guard was standing at some distance." The fire brigade chief described at length the activity of that body. He testified to the utter inactivity of the police. He saw the whole bazaar was a mass of flame. He saw the police pickets on the main road, and when he asked them what the orders were they replied, "No orders." Mr. R. T. Gavin Jones, Managing Director of Cawnpore Chemical Works, Ltd., a British concern, and a delegate to the Round Table Conference, said before the committee: "Hundreds of homes had been burnt down and many more Mohallas (residential sections) had been practically destroyed. Hundreds of people had been slaughtered and yet only a few

shots had been fired to protect the people. I believe I am right in saying that not a single policeman was injured." Mr. Sale, the District Magistrate reported that during one day 49 corpses and 215 injured persons were received in hospital (the riots went on for four days) and 8 arrests were made. Many responsible citizens stated before the Committee that the British Police Commissioner and other police authorities when asked to save the people and property said, "Let the Congress men do it," or "Get your leaders to help you. We cannot do anything." I am only giving excerpts from the *official* Enquiry Committee's proceedings. There is a Congress Enquiry Committee going on. Nevertheless it is sufficient to indicate that local British authorities can do or leave undone a great deal.

The future? The picture is dark but not as hopeless as the interested paint it to be. Under existing circumstances and for some time to come, there may be riots in a limited number of cities, and a temporary dislocation of peace and order in limited tracts of land. But any talk of civil war, internecine struggle, etc. is merely a bluff. The communal leaders have had an unchallenged field so far because the Congress and the Nationalists refused to stand for elections, thus participating in the Government but pursue a policy of non-co-operation until their demand for self-government is conceded. But when this cleansing force enters into Government machinery there may begin to operate a check on the activities of self-seeking elements. Already they are thrown on the defensive. The nation carried out its programme of civil disobedience quite regardless of their co-operation which they put at first at a very high price and thought was so essential. Then the demand for separate electorate and communal representation for the Moslem is being attacked from within—the Nationalist Moslem Conference condemned them at its recent session at Lucknow. Maulana Shaukat Ali, the leader of the Moslem hundred percenters was greeted with black flags and shouts of "Go Back," at Lahore which is the capital of the Punjab where Moslems are in a majority over Hindus and Sikhs put together. These leaders have practically little following in Peshawar and the Frontier Province, which is 80 per cent Moslem, because there Gandhi and the Congress predominate.

But what is impossible to minimise is the rise of a Gang World in Indian cities and a likely control of city life through it by self-seeking elements in society, irrespective of the Hindu, Moslem, Sikh or Christian religions. The roots of the so-called Hindu-Moslem riots have been laid bare during the past year of upheaval in India as never before, and the peril of a religious war is definitely exploded. The country however faces a new element, disruptive of civic life, in the form of gangsters and an underworld not heretofore known in the country. The Thugs appear-

ed in India during the transition from the Mogul and Maharatta Empire to the British Empire. Now a similar situation has arisen when once again governments are changing. In the transition from foreign rule to Swaraj or self-government another class of criminals, Gundas and Badmashes or gangmen are cropping up. Moreover, the passage is not simply from government to government. An old medieval system existing for centuries is crumbling before a new order, a fifteenth century economic world is being battered down and replaced by twentieth century industrialism and commercialism; populations are shifting, men are being forced out of old jobs and waiting for new ones; in short the country is passing at present through an eventful period of history when civilisations, governments, institutions, and life itself are undergoing enormous changes. During the interval it is but natural that there should be men without moorings and small groups of profiteers without principles trying to control the reins of growing urban life. How long they may continue to disturb peace and authority is to be decided in future. What is evident is that the Moslem Mullah or the Brahmin priest are alike spectators and sufferers and have no control over the situation. There are greater forces operating and the troubles generally described as Hindu-Moslem riots are more civic than religious.

N. B. PARULEKAR

AN INDIAN RISHI TO HIS BRITISH CORRESPONDENT.

There was a time, when from sea to sea, from the mountains and deserts of the north to the grand woods and downs of Ceylon, there was but one faith, one rallying cry—to save humanity from the miseries of ignorance in the name of Him who taught first the solidarity of all men. How is it now? Where is the grandeur of our people and of the one Truth? These, you may say, are beautiful visions which were once realities on earth, but had flitted away like the light of a summer's evening. Yes; and now we are in the midst of a conflicting people, of an obstinate, ignorant people seeking to know the truth, yet not able to find it for each seeks it only for his own private benefit and gratification, without giving one thought to others. Will you, or rather they, never see the true meaning and explanation of that great wreck and desolation which has come to our land and threatens all lands —yours first of all? It is *selfishness* and *exclusiveness* that killed ours, and it is selfishness and exclusiveness that will kill yours—which has in addition some other defects which I will not name. The world has clouded the light of true knowledge, and *selfishness* will not allow its resurrection, for it excludes and will not recognise the whole fellowship of all those who were born under the same immutable natural law.—MAHATMA M.

IN THE WORLD OF BOOKS

Equality. By R. H. TAWNEY (Allen and Unwin, London. 7*s*. 6*d*. net.)

In this remarkable book, worthy of one who has long been known as the most humane of English social thinkers, Mr. Tawney puts forward, with equal eloquence and clarity, the one decisive argument in favour of the effort to secure social and economic equality for all men within a nation. There are two sides from which this question can be approached, and from one of which it must be approached, if it is approached at all. The ideal norm of equality can be looked at either by those who are below it, or those who are above: and in a large and general way it may be said that most of those below desire to have more possessions, and most of those above refuse to have less. The struggle, thus regarded, is purely materialistic: defence of the possessors and aggression of the dispossessed. But in England and America the simple nature of the struggle is obscured by the false philosophy of 19th century "liberalism". It is still almost instinctive in the rich man of business to regard the accumulation of wealth as a moral achievement. Nor is this instinct in the possessing classes alone. Mr. Tawney says truly:

> The leaders of the working-class movement . . . . denounce, and rightly, the injustices of capitalism; but they do not always realize that capitalism is maintained, not only by capitalists, but by those who, like many of themselves, would be capitalists if they could, and that the injustices survive, not so much because the rich exploit the poor, as because the poor in their hearts admire the rich.

That is, if anything, an understatement. Few symptoms are more disquieting than the fact that any English newspaper which wishes to be popular and to achieve the maximum of circulation must devote large space to the imbecile activities of the idle rich. Mr. Tawney himself remarks bitterly on "the proletarian snobbery which inspires the British working-class with a tenderly wistful interest in the racuous doings of the upper ten thousand".

The worship of wealth, for its own sake, is indeed a national characteristic of the English. (They have other, and more worthy, national characteristics.) And the consequence is that the average member of the Labour movement, or indeed the average Labour leader, has much more in common with its direct adversary in the materialistic struggle—the rich man who defends, by hook or crook, his wealth and its privileges—than he has with Mr. Tawney.

For, fundamentally, Mr. Tawney's concern is with the things of the spirit and the spiritual man. What he desires, at the bottom of his heart, is that all men should have the opportunity of leading the spiritual life. And since this underlying love of his fellow-men is genuine, he is not led away by *the specious and satanic doctrine that because spiritual ends are utterly distinct from material ends, therefore the spiritual man must be indifferent to the material conditions of his fellows*. Mr. Tawney knows that *the truly spiritual life is a full life*, and that the sickly child and the hungry man are debarred from it. Starvation is not an apprenticeship to asceticism, as various well-fed ecclesiastics would persuade themselves and others. To go without sunlight, or the country-side, or good food throughout one's childhood is not at all the same as eating only fish in Lent. Mr. Tawney is quite proof against these diabolical equivocations. He demands some measure of material equality among men as a necessary means to their spiritual advancement. He is in calm and reasoned, but profound and passionate revolt against men's continued tolerance of a system which condemns the majority of a people to a complete pre-occupation with material cares.

Again, he is under no delusion. He knows that veritable equality can never

be attained among men, and that it would be destructive of life if it were. There is a diversity of gifts, and on that everlasting diversity life itself depends. It is simply in order that these diverse gifts, these manifold and unique potentialities in men, may be unfolded, that he urges us to seek the maximum of equality where it can be attained. Yet, in the last resort, even this he would not have us seek for its own sake alone, but chiefly for ours. He is calling upon us to be spiritual men: to approach the whole vast question of modern social and economic conditions in the industrial West in the spirit of indifference to our own material situation, and therefore of disinterested concern with the material conditions of others less fortunate than ourselves. It is the old profound appeal of *Noblesse oblige*, transposed entirely into the spiritual order. It is an appeal to those who have attained some measure of spiritual freedom to do their part that others also may be enabled to attain, or at least may not be disabled from attaining, a spiritual freedom like their own: and it is, in reality, a challenge to them also. If you claim to have attained spiritual freedom, says Mr. Tawney, in effect, here is your chance to prove it.

I leave aside, deliberately, in this brief account of Mr. Tawney's book, all his acute analysis of the modern economic situation, and his masterly description of the processes by which it came into being. It is so terribly easy to seize on detail as an excuse for glancing aside the impact of an appeal like Mr. Tawney's. I have not read a single review of it in the English press which gave an honest account of its vital argument; and even when I attempted to do so myself, and declared myself wholly in favour of the abolition of educational privilege which Mr. Tawney rightly puts foremost among his practical measures, I was deluged with criticisms on the ground that educational uniformity is a bad thing, or even that education itself was a bad thing. Such criticism is completely irrelevant. So long as the material prizes and the social privileges in a nation are largely reserved for those who have undergone one particular kind of education, from which the majority of children are debarred, so long must we press for the abolition of that educational privilege. Not because we believe in educational uniformity, or because we believe in "education," still less because we believe that the material prizes and the social privileges are goods worthy to be aimed at; but because we believe that only by the determination to eradicate actual privilege, as far as may be, can we gradually bring into being among the mass of mankind a larger portion of the humane understanding and the spiritual vision which sees that material advantages are truly irrelevant to the advancement of the adult human soul. But they *are* relevant to the growth of the child. When the child has become a man, healthy and free, so far as it is in human power to secure it health and freedom, then we may leave him to acquire his own wisdom. If he knows as a young man that he need not *fear* for the well-being of the children he brings into the world, nor must he slave to secure them privileges which no longer exist, then he may be free to live and to learn from life. To achieve this security for the child, this freedom from fear for the man, we must eradicate the prejudices and change the hearts of the privileged in our Western civilization. It is a specifically Western problem. It *looks* material; Mr. Tawney demonstrates to all but the wilfully blind that it is, as all vital problems are, spiritual to the core. By conquering fears in ourselves, we ultimately conquer them in the souls of others: by freeing ourselves from the chains of materialism, we free our brothers. That is, at bottom, Mr. Tawney's message. But he calls upon us to show our freedom not in words only, but in deed.

JOHN MIDDLETON MURRY

After Two Thousand Years. A Dialogue between Plato and a Modern Young Man. By G. LOWES DICKINSON. (Allen and Unwin, London. 6s.)

It is by now almost an impertinence to praise Mr. Lowes Dickinson's style; much more important judges than the present reviewer have enthusiastically celebrated its limpidity and its chiselled perfection. No living English author can offer to imitate a Platonic dialogue with less presumption, for the spirit of the Master has clearly breathed a benediction upon the disciple. It is a great deal to say that we feel the "Plato" of this dialogue with a Modern Young Man to be the real Plato—no doubt in one of his lighter moods—but one cannot say less; if the aphorism "Truth cannot shock me and error may be refuted" is one of Mr. Dickinson's coinage and not a reminiscence unknown to this reviewer from Plato himself, it is a peculiarly felicitous attempt to create a Platonic dictum, and it is not the only one in this fascinating little book.

A fascinating book—but not a particularly cheering one. For as the Modern Young Man, meeting the shade of Plato in the Elysian fields, seeks to interest him in the problems of our own time, it quickly appears that nothing has improved much since the days when Socrates and *his* "modern young men" debated the problems of Athens and the future of Hellenic civilisation. English "democracy" is no more satisfactory than Athenian "democracy"; we are still at a loss for intelligent governors; wealth still seems as badly distributed—though we fancy Plato might have cross-examined a little more closely Mr. Dickinson's (or is it simply the "Modern Young Man's") rather facile acceptance of the Socialist brief against private property and enterprise. War is more destructive than Plato in an age of spearmen and rowing-galleys could have credited; the population problem more menacing, and not to be solved with the simple callousness of the Greeks in getting rid of superfluous infants; religion, after attempting during the dominance of the medieval church to put into force some of Plato's favourite ideals, has emerged damaged in prestige and just as much discredited, apparently, by modern science as the myths of the Greek gods were discredited by the primitive science of Thales, Heracleitus and Anaxagoras.

Indeed, so far from having solved the problems that tasked Plato in his day, our age, it seems, is abandoning some of the chief of them as insoluble. The Modern Young Man is inclined to think that "the higher Goods might well be sacrificed if the masses could have a sufficiency of the lower ones—an instructive glimpse into the goal of equalitarianism!— and he is highly sceptical of the value of faith in religion and in immortality.

If by the end of the debate Plato can do no more than exhort him to nourish his faith and his ideals despite all discouragements, it may be because both Plato and the Young Man still place their trust so heavily in argument and the attainment of clear ideas. Yet the modern speaker in the dialogue has an inkling of something more profound. He points out how the behaviour of the animal creation, its herds and communities, shows that "common standards are earlier and more natural than individualistic self-interest," and he suggests that the Ideal—that which gives us our standards of value despite the promptings of egoism, —is "something embedded somehow, in the beginning, deep within primitive life, like a chrysalis lying enchanted in its cocoon". In other words (and far less eloquent than those Mr. Dickinson could find) the dialogue may be the least effective way of discovering the immanent Divine upon union with which depend the vitality and happiness of individuals and societies. *The secrets of Life are discerned by living it deeply; the argumentative intellect only chips the surface.*

D. L. MURRAY

The Golden Phoenix: Essays on Chinese Art and Culture. By MRS. ALFRED WINGATE. (Herbert Jenkins Ltd., London. 7*s.* 6*d.*)

There are many elements of interest in this book which will make it attractive to the general reader. The ten essays of which it consists treat of a wide variety of subjects—so wide, indeed, that only a scholar of the first rank could do justice to them all. This, unfortunately, Mrs. Wingate is not. She has a good sense of style, and writes very well so long as she knows what she is writing about. Her enthusiasm for Chinese culture is great, and evidently sincere; she has read widely, though perhaps too carelessly; and she certainly has the gift of making her subject interesting. But a book of this sort is too ambitious a venture for one who is entirely ignorant of the Chinese language, and is therefore at the mercy of other writers and translators, good, bad or indifferent. The result is that the author is apt to flounder in a mere morass of words. Thus, we are told that the "transcendental but earthly spirit" of the Koei dragon [*i.e. k'uei*], "as opposed to the heavenly spirit or that of mid-space, appeared in terrifying shape on the earliest bronzes." The meaning of this is obscure. On another page, a number of sayings in inverted commas are attributed to Lao Tzu, though they do not appear in the *Tao Tê Ching*, the only collection of his sayings recognized as genuine. The same is true of the "dictum of Sun-tzu, the author of *The Art of War*: An army is necessary to inspire respect." This does not occur in Sun Tzü's work, nor indeed is it an utterance of such profundity as to make it worth quoting.

Mrs. Wingate has a good deal to say about Chinese religion, but little that inspires confidence in the soundness of her studies. The ancestral tablet, she says, "is in no sense the abode of the spirit". On the contrary, it is worshipped precisely because the spirit of the deceased ancestor is supposed to reside in it. Again, "according to the Confucian: Heaven is the peace of a heart free of passion. Hell is the trouble of a heart filled with remorse." Furthermore, the Taoist asks nothing better than that "whatever pains he could imagine should eternally be inflicted on his enemies".—These statements are unfounded, and introduce Western ideas which are quite alien to the Chinese. "Heaven" and "hell" would have no meaning to a Confucianist. Lao Tzu said, "Requite injury with kindness"; and eternal punishment is a conception which seems to be peculiar to Christian theologians. Buddhism fares no better: the Bodhisattva Avalŏkitēśvara is identified with Amitābha Buddha, while the modern worship of T'ien Hou (Queen of Heaven) is confused with that of Kuan Yin. And from Mrs. Wingate's remarks on Hīnayāna and Mahāyāna it is evident she has no clear idea of the meaning of these terms.

The number of serious mistakes is too great to be dealt with in detail, but here are a few:—

P. 83, 87. The Socialist Minister Wang An-shih is placed in the 9th instead of the 11th century.

P. 107. "No living elephants were actually brought to China till the 12th century A.D." Now, it is known from the *Tso Chuan* that elephants were used in battle as early as 506 B.C., and there is also a record of tame elephants having been presented to the Chinese Court in 121 B.C.

P. 117. "The faculty of thought, which the Chinese rather beautifully call to produce seed." This is a piece of false etymology.

P. 151. Marco Polo is said never to have been at "Li-ngan (a mistake for Lin-an) Fu, the present Hangchow." Yet he distinctly tells us that he saw the city with his own eyes, and (according to the Ramusian version) visited it frequently.

P. 166. "The Chinese engraved or painted word was first derived from a pictograph representing a concept rather than a fact." The author probably meant "ideograph"; but even so the statement shows a strange confusion of ideas.

P. 167. The invention of paper is placed in the 2nd or 1st century B.C., while books are said not to have

been written in ink till early in the Christian era. The case is just the other way about. Ink was used at a very early date for writing on wooden tablets, whereas paper does not appear until much later; and there is no reason to doubt the Chinese tradition that it was invented by the eunuch Ts'ai Lun who died in A.D. 114.

"In A.D. 930 appeared the first printed book, achieved with blocks and movable type of baked clay." The earliest block-print, to be seen at the British Museum, is dated 868. Movable types were not invented until two centuries later.

P. 179. "The lady Yang Kuei" is a truncated form which must sound funny to a Chinese ear. The second word should be *Kuei-fei*, which means an Imperial concubine of the second rank. Her death, by the way, was not self-inflicted. She was executed during her flight with the Emperor by a mutinous mob of soldiers.

LIONEL GILES

Edward Carpenter, In Appreciation. Edited by GILBERT BEITH (Allen and Unwin, London. 7*s.* 6*d.*)

Edward Carpenter provided by his life and work the most significant prophecy of what may be; and by his death the most illuminating proof of what is. No man perhaps save Rabindranath Tagore has done more in his life to bring East and West together. When he died not one single obituary, as far as I know, made any allusion to his metaphysical contribution, and concentrated solely upon his socialistic activities.

No one should dream of belittling those activities—nor any man's socialistic activities, if they are sincere. No sacrifice is too great nor work too hard in order to bring about an equal distribution of opportunity for all. But is it not extraordinary that so *few realise that while socialistic work is going on, and indeed before new social values can become active, the individuals must have changed the values in themselves*? The capitalist system is the expression of the fact that everyone thinks in terms of money and more money. If we are dissatisfied with the result we must change our values; we must not be thinking of the motor car we want to buy during our socialistic committee meeting. We must change ourselves. When a sufficient number of people have done that then we can begin to use the systems of organisation which men like Mr. G. D. H. Cole have prepared.

These platitudinous thoughts would be inexcusable were it not for the fact that the West has not yet decided to act upon them. They are supposed to be too vague for serious men. It is apposite to recall here that Mr. Cole said in these columns last January that he had no interest in them—"no interest in the East"—he put it. Yet his candid mind would have a use for them if he knew there was something practical involved; he would have a use for them if he did not imagine that Gandhi's line of thought is Eastern—(for the difficulty about Gandhi is that he is a giant of moral-political action and a confused thinker whose mentality, so far from being typically Eastern, shapes itself after Tolstoy and Ruskin). He would have a use for them if he knew that the East offers *an applied science of inner growth.*

Edward Carpenter, though a leader of the great Victorian social rebellion, never forgot this. He returns to it again in *The Art of Creation*, in *Pagan and Christian Creeds*, in *A Visit to A Gnani*, and in his lectures on the Upanishads. In these books he addressed himself to the task of examining the position of our present stage of consciousness, of prophesying the higher stage it may reach (personally witnessed to in his *Towards Democracy*), and of emphasising the steps which we must take in order to bring it about. For he belonged to the school of modern philosophers who are of the opinion that Man has one inch of Free Will which finds expression in the capacity to take part in the act of creation. From now onwards we are

to be no longer in the hands of God but can become God's hands.

The science of inner growth. What is the first step suggested by Edward Carpenter in his *Visit to A Gnani*, and elsewhere? To master our own thoughts. If we can do that it will be the thin end of the wedge by which we will overcome our slavery to the whirlwind of non-purposeful, disconnected thought-desires. And how can we do that? By practising every day (even if only for a few minutes) a concentration of the mind upon *one* object or *one* thought or upon nothing.

We try it. We are appalled at what happens. Within the compass of ten minutes, so far from having concentrated upon one thing, we have thought of a tea-party, an ambition, a book, a joke, a hatred, a theatre, a love, an enmity, a hope, a problem, a regret, a solution, a memory, a need. We stand afar off lamenting the appalling pageant. It is hopeless. We give it up.

But we must not give it up, urged Edward Carpenter. We must fail, for years if necessary, until we succeed. "Who is there who can make muddy water clear?" asked Laotse. It is impossible we think. Until we hear the answer—"If you *leave it alone* it will become clear of itself." It was that splendid answer Carpenter never forgot. To be the prey of any thought!—

> This is an absurd position for man the heir of all the ages to be in, hag-ridden by the flimsy creatures of his own brain. If a pebble in our boot torments us we expel it. We take off the boot and shake it out. And once the matter is fairly understood it is just as easy to expel an intruding and obnoxious thought from the mind. About this there ought to be no mistake; no two opinions. The thing is obvious, clear, and unmistakable. It should be as easy to expel an obnoxious thought from your mind as to shake a stone out of your shoe; and until a man can do that it is just nonsense to talk about his ascendancy over Nature and all the rest of it. He is a mere slave and a prey to the bat-winged phantoms that flit through the corridors of his own brain.

If we cannot do that, if we cannot take the first step, how can we be called *practical* men? Only when we have taken steps towards inner growth can we claim to have forsaken the realms of illusion and fantasy and to have become men of action and result: then only can our socialistic activities bring about not just reform, but also, what has never yet happened in history—Progress. Then only will we work towards democracy.

Since Carpenter's prime there has been much appreciation of the East. There have been many words written—and even some understanding. And East and West have met with a crash on the political plane. But how many have used the applied science of inner growth provided by the East? If we, brilliant slaves, took the hint the final result might be something better than East or West have done alone. But we have still to ask how soon, if ever, Edward Carpenter will cease to be a prophet of the future and become a symbol of the present.

This book can hardly be said to answer that question. But the fact that it has been compiled is significant enough. The importance of Carpenter is somehow or other felt and we in the West are unwilling to let him die. Hardly any of the contributors show understanding as regards his written work, but it is interesting that each either says openly or hints—*he changed me*. Instinctively they realise that they could say nothing more important than that he could fecundate inner growth. And the end of the book has a chapter by Mr. Raymond Unwin which is more encouraging than any other. He puts his finger on the key of religion and quotes the best passage in the best and wisest poem of the sage:—

> Have faith. If that which rules the universe were alien to your soul, then nothing could mend your state—there were nothing left but to fold your hands and be damned everlastingly.
>
> But since it is not so—why what can you wish for more?—all things are given into your hands.

J. S. COLLIS

The Indian and Christian Miracles of Walking on the Water. By NORMAN BROWN (The Open Court Publishing Co., London & Chicago. $ 2.)

This is a very welcome publication. It examines the "miracle" of walking on the water, and the learned author ascribes its origin to India saying that the story of Jesus "is possibly a reflection of the story of the Buddha's conversion of the Kasyapas"; and that "much stronger is the case for an Indian origin of the legend concerning Peter which may convincingly be derived from a story of which one example is the introduction to Jataka 190".

To the Theosophical student the value of the book is twofold. Every time the claim for a unique miracle breaks down, the human mind is bound to accept the Theosophical fundamental that there are no miracles, therefore enquiring intellects will seek its rationale. So the second service which this volume renders is in the natural enquiry which would ensue about the *modus operandi* of this abnormal phenomenon. The book mentions different ways adopted in producing it, such as levitation, by persuading a god to make the waters shallow, etc. But what are our modern scientists going to say? Will they assert that all these examples are but evidences of religious superstition? And will the intelligent man in the street blindly accept the dictum?

S. B.

My Host the Hindu. By MURIEL LESTER. (Williams & Norgate, Ltd. London. 5*s*.)

There is in this age of hustle an incessant craving by the public who live on their nerves, for news, sensational or otherwise, which gives an admirable opportunity for a hasty writer or a conscienceless critic, to make a rapid tour of any country and write a book. Hence travel books are often superficial or biased. Coming to India, a sightseer travels between Peshawar and Pondicherry, between Chittagong and Quetta, between Trivandrum and Kinchingunga, contacting only the web of the Indian railway system. He sees much, but understands little, forgetting that there is as great a gulf between seeing and understanding, as there is between book knowledge and soul culture. Although hundreds of westerners go to India, their tourist methods do not give them any opportunity to assimilate the facts of Indian history, religion, philosophy and culture. The author of "*My Host the Hindu*" is, however, exceptional in this respect.

Miss Muriel Lester, whose name is familiar to readers of THE ARYAN PATH as one engaged in the service of the betterment of the poor in East London, recounts her impressions of India during her visit in the winter 1926-27. In her pen picture of Mr. Gandhi, whose guest she was, she brings out the fact that he "disallows violence and when things went wrong punished himself instead of the culprit". She tells how he has refused "riches, honours and luxury and chooses to live on the minimum of necessaries, considering himself actually in debt to the peasant and the coolie," how he "calls on all he meets to give themselves to the service of the poor," and how he tries to abolish the evils of drinking and untouchability. Miss Lester was also the guest of Dr. Tagore, the poet, and was much impressed by his high ideals, and the perfect freedom and simplicity of his school *Shantiniketan*. Her catholicity of view enabled her to avail herself of every opportunity—to contact real India, as her accounts of "a student of the mystics" and "Hindu villages" show.

My Host the Hindu is not a panegyric of India, but an unbiased presentation of the life of Indians, their customs, religion and culture. The author does not spare her criticism on the many evils and abuses—opium, drinking and untouchability—extant in the country, but the book is not melodramatic. It reveals how India is shaking off many of her evil customs and is beginning to stand up for the old Aryan Ideals.

D.

Mysticism in the Bhagavad-Gita. By MAHENDRANATH SIRCAR, M. A., PH. D. (Longmans Green & Co., Calcutta.)

The author is of course right in pointing out that men holding different philosophic or social view-points read in the *Gita* their own cherished opinions. This proves, perhaps as nothing else does, the real eclectic nature of the *Gita*. In this volume the author's learning as well as his own independent reflection find expression, and there are numerous ideas worthy of praise, *i. e.*, are worth the readers' while to ponder over. The mysticism described is more that of the psyche in man than of the Spirit, and the method of discipline examined at some length pertains more to the hatha yoga system than to the superior Raja-Vidya, the kingly science which is guhya, secret. The student of Theosophy will perceive several of his own teachings, while unfortunately he will also detect, here and there, pseudo-theosophic tenets. There is much of value in the book as a theoretical presentation, but the ardent aspirant, looking for practical advice, will close it with a sense of some disappointment.

S. B.

The Antiquity of Hindu Medicine and Civilisation. By D. CHOWRY MUTHU, M. D. (Baillière, Tindall and Cox, London. 3*s.* 6*d.*)

Slowly but surely the knowledge of the Aryans of antiquity is gaining recognition. Dr. Muthu shows how Ancient India attained signal and outstanding success in the domains of science, art and philosophy. As to the antiquity of medicine our author depicts in a brief but illuminating way how in Vedic times healers were divided into three classes, surgeons, physicians and magic doctors, and the existence of sound knowledge among them in "surgery, midwifery, medicine, therapeutics and child management". Further, they were well acquainted with the three humours of the body —"*Vayu*, nerve force; *Pitta*, metabolism and heat production; and *Kalpa* which presides over heat regulation and mucous and glandular secretions." But we have understood that there are four kinds of humours connected with the work of the four types of Elementals or Devatas of earth, water, air and fire? He sketches the achievements of the ancients in the Epic period (2500–600 B. C.) when they "reached the zenith of their glory," introducing the reader to the famous physician Charaka, and the great surgeon Susruta. We are also given a bird's-eye view of the famous medical schools of the Universities of Taxila and Nalanda, in the Buddhistic period (600 B. C.—600 A. D.). It is of interest to note how from these earliest times down to recent years (1600 A. D.) the use of anæsthetics, a considerable knowledge of the anatomical and physiological processes, the elaborate and precise instructions for attending the sick, were common knowledge among the healing practitioners.

In the second part of the book Dr. Muthu shows the drift of the Aryan civilisation from the North to the South of India and westwards to Europe. Modern archæologists may dispute the authentic remark of our author that "India is the cradle of civilisation," but the facts are too many to refute the contention. Students of *Isis Unveiled* will recall in this connection H. P. Blavatsky's statements that Egypt received her laws, arts and sciences from pre-Vedic India from whence she was colonized during the dynasty of Soma Vanśa, and that Greece also derived her inspiration from India and Egypt.

The glory of the splendid civilisation of ancient India was due to the realisation by her people, that first, "man is a spiritual being" and that progress comes from within without. To use Dr. Muthu's words: "To them the material was the *maya* and the spiritual was real. And in that reality they saw further and deeper and achieved more than it would have been possible for the West."

B. Sc.

Myths and Legends of Flowers, Trees, Fruits and Plants. By C. M. SKINNER. (Lippincott, London. 12*s.* 6*d.*)

Mr. Skinner has undertaken an impossible task in endeavouring to compress within one volume the myths and legends of flowers, trees, fruits and plants. Yet his work is of unusual appeal, and includes a large and varied selection of the innumerable fables and superstitions connected with vegetation. But he has not sufficiently emphasised the importance of plants in religious symbolism. In vain we search his pages for light upon "the mysteries of wheat," so prominent in the allegorical ritual of ancient Egypt, since Isis revealed to mortals that Divine Seed, (*Secret Doctrine* Vol. II. 374) which, personified in Osiris, symbolised the Resurrection, and, in later centuries, as the Bread of Life, represented the Christ.

We also fail to find that key to the interpretation of arboreal legends offered by Madame Blavatsky. "Throughout all Asia Minor," she wrote, "the Initiates were called the 'trees of Righteousness,' and the cedars of Lebanon as also were some kings of Israel. So were the great adepts in India, but only the adepts of the left hand." (*S. D.* II, 494–95.) "Jesus is called 'the tree of Life,' as also all the adepts of the good Law, while those of the *left* Path are referred to as the 'withering trees'. John the Baptist speaks of 'the axe' which 'is laid to the root of the trees' (Matth. III, 10); and the king of Assyria's armies are called *trees* (Isaiah, X. 19)" —*S. D.*, II. 496.

We are disappointed again when we look to Mr. Skinner for an interpretive account of what he himself describes as "one of the first figures in the leading cosmogonies"—the "Tree of life guarded by a serpent," and once more Mme. Blavatsky provides the missing explanation. From her we learn that in antiquity a Tree was the universal "Symbol for Sacred and Secret Knowledge," whilst the Serpent represents the Wisdom that guards it (*S. D.*, I, 128–9). She devotes a whole chapter to "Tree and Serpent and Crocodile Worship" which should be considered in this connection (*S. D.* I. 403-11).

It would be easy to point out many more such omissions, but those who do not probe too deeply will be able to pass some happy hours in the company of this pleasant book.

M. OLDFIELD HOWEY

Rudi Schneider: A Scientific Examination of His Mediumship. By HARRY PRICE. (Methuen & Co., Ltd., London. 10*s.* 6*d.* net.)

Modern Psychic Mysteries: Millesimo Castle. By GWENDOLYN KELLEY HACK, with preface by Professor E. Bozzano. (Rider & Co., London. 18*s.* net.)

Materialization, levitation, apports, voices, knowledge of personal affairs, prophecies and transportation of the medium—the phenomena recorded in one or other, or both, of these works are along lines more or less familiar to every student of psychical research. For fifty or more years continuously, there has been an ever increasing number of phenomena, so Mr. Harry Price's confession of "our present state of ignorance of the laws that *must* govern phenomena" is all the more interesting.

The so-much discussed Rudi Schneider séances attracted attention in many countries because the manifestations took place under test conditions controlled by electrical apparatus, and in the presence of such scientific investigators as Dr. William Brown, Mr. C. E. M. Joad, Prof. Nils von Hofsten of Sweden, Prof. A. M. Low, Dr. Eugene Osty and Dr. David Efron of Paris, Prof. A. F. C. Pollard and Dr. F. C. S. Schiller, to cite but a few of the many who attended at various times. Apparently, only Lord Rayleigh inhibited phenomena. What is the result ?

We have discovered that the phenomena are *real* and can be produced to order—surely a conclusion of paramount importance. As to

the *causation* of the manifestations, that can be determined only after many more experiments with many more mediums. But we have succeeded in adding our quota to the fund of general knowledge of the subject, and it is only by the piling up of data, obtained under conditions which are beyond valid criticism, that we shall ever arrive at the truth which underlies psychic phenomena. The question whether these manifestations prove survival or whether they are merely the outward and visible signs of some natural law will be settled only in the laboratory by scientific means. (*Rudi Schneider*, P. 219.)

Mrs. Hack has made her volume bulky by incorporating in it contemporaneous articles on the psychic investigations at the medieval castle of Millesimo, the home of the Marquis Carlo Centurione Scotto. She also gives numerous quotations from books which support her view.

In both the books under review, the reader is made aware how tedious and, what is worse, how dangerous séances may be. There is so much repetition of the same kind of thing.

That low "spirits" are present is brought out again and again in Mrs. Hack's book, and Olga in *Rudi Schneider* is obviously no spiritual entity as witness her love of approbation, her wilfulness, her sulks, and her determination to have her own way. After many séances and "confidential talks" Mr. Price declares: "I—and I am speaking for myself only—have discovered no evidence that she is a spirit." (216)

These phenomena in Italy and England afford evidence of the unvarying position of the Theosophist, whether in the days of Iamblichus or our own, that masquerading entities who desire vicarious life and can obtain it by vampirising medium and sitters, are but soulless spooks. Other "spirits" may be those who have been deprived of the physical body before the term of their "natural life" was ended, and who therefore are in no subjective state—suicides, executed murderers and the like, in a word, elementaries.

It is a significant point that the dearly-loved son, Vittorio, whose death caused the Marquis Centurione to turn to spiritism, never "manifested" in his own home though he is said to have communicated in London and New York. "Pure spirits will not and cannot show themselves objectively; those that do are not pure spirits, but elementary and impure." (*Isis Unveiled*, Vol. II, 595.) Is this not the explanation why this young aviator, no earth-bound entity to judge from reports of his life, never manifested in his own home where he surely would otherwise have appeared?

Are we to accept the evidence given that Napoleon, Rabelais, and Victor Hugo manifested at Millesimo Castle? That subtle and elusive something which means individual style in speech or writing, and which certainly marked these men in life, is absent in their so-called after-death communications, as for instance:

Napoleon: Over a hundred years ago, I passed through this place with my army. I inhabited this castle. There was a battle . . . You will find traces of it. . . There are musket balls in the cloisters . . . I present my homage to the Marquis and Marchioness. Good night."—(*Modern Psychic Mysteries* p. 108)

Victor Hugo: "Monsieur le professeur, I wish to speak to you. Do you understand me? I am Victor Hugo. If I speak it is for the good of humanity . . . It is terrible; it is terrible that all these truths are not recognized by the Christian religion. I address myself to you; do what you can to spread the knowledge."—(*Ibid*, p. 132)

Rabelais: "I suffered too much during my life. My brain was in advance of the time in which I lived. . . If I had lived in this century, many people would have understood me"—(*Ibid*, p. 132)

Very different is this staccato style, so similar in the communications, from that of the real men.

Direct voices are claimed to be unusual manifestations at the Italian sittings. *Isis Unveiled* (Vol. I, p. 68) gives a clue on the subject of this phenomenon.

It is clear from the frequent references either to the necessity for sitting together to gather power, or inability to bring about manifestations owing to waning power, that phenomena are accomplished only at the expense of the nervous strength of medium and sitters. The depletion of the medium's strength is often referred to. Without an understanding of loosely controlled nervous

systems, manifestations will never be understood. Dr. Francis Gerry Fairfield, writing as long ago as 1877 in the *Library Table* (quoted in *Isis Unveiled*, Vol. II, 595), describes the effect of the "application of the poles of a horse-shoe magnet to the apparition of a hand which caused it to waver perceptibly and threw the medium into violent convulsions—pretty positive evidence that *the force concerned in the phenomenon was generated in his own nervous* system". In this connection we may notice the stress laid in both books under review (but which they do not explain) on the necessity of no light or a dim red light during a séance. Mr. W. Q. Judge pointed out some forty years ago that light causes constant agitation and alteration in the magnetism of a room, so dimness is requisite, otherwise the astral substance is disturbed in a violent manner and astral projection rendered difficult if not impossible. As for the many "caresses" recorded at the Italian sittings, these "feathery touches" were also explained by Mr. Judge as "caused by the ethereal fluids from within us making their way out through the skin and thus producing the illusion of a touch. When enough has gone out, then the victim is getting gradually negative, the future prey for spooks and will-o'-the-wisp images." (*The Path*, Dec. 1890.) The more passive the sitters, the more successful the séance.

Pseudopods, in to-day's terminology, were explained by Madame Blavatsky in *Isis Unveiled* (II,595). They are either the extrusion of the medium's inner or astral limbs, or made of materials from the combined aural emanations of all persons present.

We are told that there must be free interchange of conversation or music, before sittings can be successful. A formal, stiff and dignified atmosphere, "heavy" in Mr. Price's word, and the presence of a man apparently with marked views like Lord Rayleigh, suffice to inhibit phenomena.

What is the explanation of icy breezes so perceptible at Millesimo Castle but also noted at many other sittings? Just as warm wind must rise and cold air rush in to take its place, so when the nervous systems of sitters are more or less disorganized the fiery nature of the spirit departs and the cold *vapoury* of the lower astral takes possession.

As regards levitation and apports, the phenomena are too well authenticated to be any longer denied. Spiritism, however, has never been able to account for them. Again we may turn to *Isis Unveiled* (I,497).

Mrs. Hack furnishes the explanation of the passage of apports through sealed and locked doors, namely that inert matter is disintegrated, passed through walls and recombined. But this however, cannot account, as she says, for what is given by her as the most remarkable phenomenon of the Millesimo Castle series, the disappearance of the medium, the Marquis Centurione, from a securely blocked room, his absence for some three hours and the discovery of him after much search some distance away asleep on hay in a stable. Living animal organisms cannot be disintegrated and reintegrated. (*Isis Unveiled*, Vol. II, 589) Perhaps the explanation of how Apollonius of Tyana vanished suddenly before thousands of people to "reappear" an hour latter in the grotto of Puteoli (*Isis Unveiled*; Vol. II, 597) may hide the clue of this phenomenon which is not the same but similar in character.

Such a book as *Rudi Schneider* adds convincingly, and one like *Modern Psychic Mysteries* interestingly, to records of undoubted phenomena: but for the explanations which every thinking mind seeks, it is necessary to look not to the future as modern investigators hold but to the past. All these things were known and understood in far-off days.

M. T.

CORRESPONDENCE

REINCARNATION

[In a note appended to Mr. M. A. Venkata Rao's article "The Doctrine of Karma and Kant's Postulates of Morality" (ARYAN PATH, May 1931) it was shown how in Kant we had an example of "a soul who unconsciously to himself remembered and expressed knowledge acquired in previous lives without perceiving the Law of Reincarnation". So he had to find "a way of progress through Free Will to Immortality by creating a God, while all he needed was a perception of the doctrine of Reincarnation". Below we print a defence of Reincarnation, but one which bases itself on the concept of a Personal God. Philosophically and logically this is an impossibility, since Reincarnation and Karma are rooted in impersonality. But it is interesting and instructive to see the attempt at such reconciliation of the irreconcilable, by a mind which is convinced of the justice of Reincarnation, but which cannot divest itself of the bugbear of a Personal God.—EDS.]

The theory of reincarnation in its most general form asserts that the human ego exists both before and after death and is periodically re-born on earth, until, having exhausted the whole range of experience that earthly life can give, it becomes "a pillar in the temple of God and goes no more out". In some systems of thought the self is regarded as a development of an original unit of consciousness that passes through all the stages of the mineral, vegetable, and animal kingdoms, and, after completing the cycle of its human evolution, goes on to still higher levels of life. But this conception is not necessarily implied by the doctrine of reincarnation which may be restricted to the human world only, applying merely to the development from the lowest to the highest type of man. There are considerable differences in the way the details of the doctrine are interpreted by its various exponents; thus *e. g.*, there is no consensus of opinion as to the length of the interval between any two incarnations or as to the manner in which that interval is spent—though it seems to be generally agreed that most of it is a period of blissful rest.

Reincarnation has been taught by various religions and schools of mysticism since time immemorial, and if the prevalence of a belief is an argument in favour of its truth, the doctrine of re-birth certainly has good credentials. At all times too there have been men who claimed to remember their past lives, and said that anyone could do so after undergoing a certain training. But a great number of people who have no direct evidence of reincarnation and who doubt the authority of others, believe the theory to be true because it makes the world intelligible and satisfies their sense of justice.

Now it is only on the basis of certain metaphysical assumptions that the reasonableness of a theory may be taken as an argument in favour of its truth. If the world is essentially irrational and hostile to man, there are no grounds for expecting it to satisfy our spiritual demands; but if it comes from God and is adapted for the realisation of values, we are right in looking for meaning and system in the incoherent medley of facts and in being prejudiced in favour of theories that help us to do so. The theory of reincarnation justifies the ways of God to man, and this is its strongest claim on our attention.

Those who believe in God as the source of all existence and all value have to face the question of the apparent triumph of evil over good, and of the consequent futility of our striving after perfection. Moral evil, illness, pain, old age, death, and the final victory of the blind forces of nature over the highest achievements of the human spirit are hard to reconcile with Divine goodness and wisdom if the individual is annihilated when his physical body dies. True, if our trust in God is deep enough we feel that, whatever happens, He knows best, and in a life of religious experience the problem of evil loses its sting; but it cannot be ignored, if only for the sake of those who are baffled by it.

It is generally supposed that the hypothesis of personal immortality meets

the case, but this depends upon the way immortality is conceived. If it be believed that after death man may be sentenced by God to everlasting torments, the problem becomes far more formidable than on the assumption that death is the end; and the supposition of a "general amnesty" and eternal bliss for all, makes moral effort seem pointless. The only reasonable conception of immortality is one which allows for the development of the soul after death—but then this is the cardinal principle of the reincarnation theory. If one assumes the idea of spiritual growth, one may as well adopt a hypothesis that makes the facts of life intelligible. Immortality without pre-existence and rebirth does not explain why our opportunities in this life are hampered by circumstances over which we have no control; why, if life on earth is necessary for our evolution, some die no sooner than they are born; why there is such striking inequality in men's natural endowment, why, if each soul is created afresh at conception, does God create congenital idiots, criminals and all those who are a curse to themselves and to others?

The answer given by the reincarnation theory is that our character and destiny are determined by ourselves and not by the arbitrary will of the Creator; our handicaps in this life are the result of mistakes made by us in the past, and it rests with us, by making the best of our present incarnation, to build up a better future for ourselves. Each human self, working like all else in nature, by the method of trial and error, gropes its way through a long series of lives to its ideal destination—to being that which it ought to be as a member of the Kingdom of God. Every human soul is unique and individual, but the full development of the ideal aspect of its individuality needs time, and effort, and experience, which one life on earth fails to supply. The hypothesis of many lives, with intervals of rest that enable the soul to assimilate the impressions gathered on earth, does away with the inequality of opportunity that is so glaring an injustice of this life and allows everyone a chance of growing "unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ".

In the last resort, theoretical arguments for reincarnation amount to saying that it must be true because otherwise life would be too stupid and cruel—and obviously this consideration can only be convincing to those who acknowledge the existence of a just and merciful God; since if there is no God, there is no reason why life should not be stupid and cruel. But those who deny the existence of God because they cannot reconcile it with the facts of pain, evil and death, would do well to consider reincarnation as a working hypothesis, for it would help them to see each individual life as part of the harmonious pattern of the life of the universe.

London NATALIE DUDDINGTON

THE LORD OF THE THIRUPATHI HILLS

I was at a post office a little time ago when a certain money order was rejected. The man who had wanted to send it took it back with a puzzled look and gave it to me to discover what was wrong with it. A glance at the name and address of the payee explained to me why it was not accepted for transmission, though it was not clear to me whether such refusal was a gesture of philosophical despair, or merely an observance of post office Regulations, on the part of the postal clerk. On the money order form was written: "Pay rupees six only to the God Venkatachalapathi of Thirupathi." In the coupon there was: "Remitting six rupees as per my humble promise when I was ill."

This incident at first appealed to me for its apparent absurdity. But on deeper reflection, I began to doubt if it was really so absurd. I began to realize that it was a wonderful revelation of an attitude. I felt, here was possibly an approach to God which is denied to those who are less "unsophisticated". Might this not be interpreted as the manifestation of a mystic mood?

To the Indians, especially to the South Indians, Sri Venkatachalapathi, the God of Thirupathi, is no abstract conception. He is a living presence; as real, access-

ible, as a father is to a child. He is the Guardian Deity of almost every home in South India, whether it is the home of a Vaishnavaite or a Saivite, a Brahmin or a non-Brahmin, a rich man or a poor man. In every crisis in life, it is the name of Sri Venkatachalapathi that first comes to one's lips as one closes the eyes in prayer for help. Whenever a vow is made to him a piece of cloth is dipped in saffron and a knot is tied with a small gold or silver coin in it. (This coin is later taken to Thirupathi and dropped into the God's money-box there.) This knotted piece of cloth may be considered as a bond or a reminder. Open any family box in South India and in some dark corner of it will be found at least some dozen of these yellow knotted pieces of cloth.

The receptacle for gifts to the God in the Thirupathi temple is a wonder. It is about six feet in height with a wide mouth at the top. Not a minute passes but some pilgrim or other comes and drops his promised offerings into it. These may be anything: a handful of coins, a tuft of hair (the most common offering), jewels, etc., etc. Every two or three hours the receptacle is emptied in the middle of a safe-room before a Panchāyat. The heap is sorted out into coins of various metals and denominations, jewels, articles of gold and silver, and so on. These are appropriated for the temple expenses for the most part. What is left over is auctioned at the end of every year.

Seven hills have to be crossed to reach the temple. It means some four or five hours of steady effort for an adult of average strength. For a couple of rupees carriers can be engaged, but this is resorted to only by old people and children. The majority, whether they feel able or not, prefer to trudge up, trusting in God to support them, fearing neither sun nor rain. Here the rich man and the beggar walk side by side, their eyes shining with piety, and their looks fixed beyond the seventh hill. Every pilgrim feels specially blessed to be going up those steps, touching the dust that millions of other *bhaktas* have trodden. Those rough-hewn granite steps have become smooth and polished with the tread of pilgrims. There are, too, sounds peculiar to this holy place. They are incessantly coming from far and near and filling the air: the boom of cymbals, the shrill blowing of conch shells, and the ecstatic cry rising from the hearts of the pilgrims struggling up, "Venkatramanaswami! Govinda! Govinda!" Surely my friend of the post office is one of the God's most worthy devotees.

Mysore R. K. NARAYANASWAMI

ZOROASTRIANISM AND THE SUFIS

In the April issue of THE ARYAN PATH Dr. Margaret Smith has written an article on Al-Hallaj, the Sufi Mystic and Martyr. In that article she says: "One writer tells us that his [Al-Hallaj's] grandfather was a Zoroastrian." The editorial footnote on this statement draws attention to the view held by an Indian esoteric school "that the early centres of Sufi learning received help from Zoroastrian scholars".

In the *Conference of Birds* (A Sufi Allegory) by Mr. R. P. Masani, a Parsi scholar, some relevant information as regards the above topic is to be found. Mr. Masani thinks that the most important link between Zoroastrianism and the Sufis is Neoplatonism. Plotinus and Proclus are two outstanding Neoplatonists who were deeply impressed by the philosophy of Zoroaster. Mr. Masani cites Professor Browne to show how Sufism is more indebted to the school of Plotinus than to any other, and this theory has also been worked out in detail by Dr. Nicholson. Sufism, therefore, must thus ultimately be in debt to the philosophy of Zoroaster. Plotinus and Proclus give us in their writings enough evidence of the Zoroastrian influence on their thought. This evidence together with Professor Browne's conviction that Sufism owes its greatest debt to the school of Plotinus, throws much light on the question of the relationship of Zoroastrianism and Sufism.

Bombay D. G. V.

ECHOES OF THEOSOPHY

"The sun of Theosophy must shine for all, not for a part. There is more of this Movement than you have yet had an inkling of."—MAHATMA M.

Modern education aims to offer greater material prosperity which in other words means to create greater selfishness and the craving for greater personal enjoyment. But in ancient India the aim of education was to ensure greater ethical and moral progress.—(*Prabuddha Bharat*)

What's past isn't past. It's alive here in me, in everything I think, or do, or am.—LOUISE K. MABIE (*Saturday Evening Post*)

The present-day city does not fulfil its function as a centre of civilization because it is not itself a civilized thing.—C. B. PURDOM (*Everyman*)

The oriental who comes under the influence of the white man's civilization becomes thereby demoralized.....That European sophistication is bad for the Soul of the East is a simple truth which needs, I think, no demonstration. It confronts the traveller, self-evident, and undeniable, at every turn of the road, from Tokiyo to Mandalay, from Calcutta to Canton. It is equally undeniable, though less conspicuous at close range, in the semi-Westernized type of Oriental which emerges from English and American universities or from the educational establishments of missionary societies.—J. O. P. BLAND (*English Review*)

"Intuition," "Faith" and "Inspiration" untested by reason, had been a most potent factor in perpetuating human ignorance and increasing human misery. They stifled in the past the spirit of free enquiry after Truth. . . . . Triumph of blind faith means the reversion to the dark age. If "arrogant" faith, scorning the very idea of independent reason, needs any chastisement, there is no more effective chastisement than the human refusal to submit to its illegitimate guidance.—SWAMI NIKHILANAND (*Modern Review*)

But do not let us imagine that discoveries in the world of the higher mathematics, of physics, or biology are going to remove or even reduce our difficulties on the moral plane. It is not necessary to be a great mathematician to be a saint or even a good citizen. There are simple truths which seem hidden from the high and mighty and revealed to farm labourers and charwomen. I am not despising science. I am only suggesting that moral values, eternal in their quality, transient in their form and application, are the foundation of a country's greatness.

—STANLEY BALDWIN

The honey of the sacred labouring bees *is* eternally shielded and withdrawn from desecration.—C. F. Schreiber (*Saturday Review of Literature*)

A rickshaw makes social inequalities indecently obvious. Civilisation has produced the internal-combustion engine, which makes it possible to hide the coolie in the chauffeur.—(*The Manchester Guardian*)

ENDS AND SAYINGS

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

HUDIBRAS.

As this journal champions the cause of Immemorial Theosophy, re-taught by H. P. Blavatsky some fifty years ago, many are the enquiries it has received about a recent publication which is advertised as her biography. The book was reviewed in our last issue. We do not think it is necessary to answer the falsehoods with which its pages are strewn, especially as they are not even new falsehoods. The foul attacks on H. P. Blavatsky's character, etc., were *all* fortunately repeated by a single great newspaper in her life-time—the *New York Sun*—thus enabling her to sue it for libel. Mr. W. Q. Judge, who followed the legal profession, and who knew Madame Blavatsky most intimately, was in control of the case on her behalf. Lawyers who defended the *Sun* admitted in open court that they were unable to prove the veracity of the charges of immorality with which the newspaper had defamed her. Before judgment could be delivered Madame Blavatsky died and the case lapsed. But the *Sun*, then edited by the famous Charles Dana, showed justice and generosity by withdrawing all its allegations, admitting that it was wrongly informed, and publishing an article by Mr. Judge in its own columns, entitled "The Esoteric She". Both the withdrawal and the article have just been published in pamphlet form, and copies are available at our office.

———

In regard to all this, there is an important feature to which we would like to draw our readers' attention. THE ARYAN PATH has consistently shown its devotion to the philosophy of Theosophy as taught by H. P. Blavatsky, by emphasizing her *teachings*. It is a striking fact that the logic and cogency of these teachings have never been seriously questioned; nay more, there have been hardly any attacks on the ideas and views presented in her books. Abuse and attacks have been hurled at her, but those indulging in them have shown singular ignorance of her philosophy. The attackers are verily in a dilemma when they are challenged to examine those old-world teachings. They cannot overthrow the ideas, proving them to be false; and they are not strong enough, in heart and mind, to give up their own cherished beliefs on religion, their own habits and ways of life which Theosophy proves to be incorrect and even questionable. It *is* difficult to appreciate the personality of H. P. Blavatsky without evaluating her teachings, and so the earnest student of Theosophy must show patience and forbearance towards those who, for

their own reasons, choose to play the coward's game of abusing a dead personage without examining what *lives* as an heirloom, *viz.*, the truths taught and the facts held out. H. P. B.'s work cannot help gaining ground and obtaining an ever-wider hearing among those who seek truth so that they may live pure, sacrificing and inspiring lives.

Any student of the magazines and press of the western hemisphere these last few years must have observed how bitter experience is forcing upon the minds of the day, the interdependence of the world and the necessity of learning the solidarity of man. In July 1930, this tendency was marked in Great Britain and in America. The Inter-Parliamentary Union in its meetings at Westminster in September of that year exhibited a huge relief map of Europe with solid tariff-walls barring off each country, more eloquent of the evils of this form of unbrotherliness than any torrent of words. More recently, leading economists have been inculcating it unconsciously in discussions about the evils of "the gold standard" and the ills of our sick world. And now Mr. Harold Cox in *The Sunday Times* of May 17th, commenting on "World Trade," the journal of the International Chamber of Commerce, writes:

> ...all the nations of the world are dependent on the prosperity of one another. For example, the misfortunes of Central Europe, which followed the war, reduced their purchasing power of English and German cotton goods, and that in turn led to a reduction in the demand for raw cotton from the United States, with the result that a considerable part of the cotton area in the Southern States had to be abandoned.

He designates the ill as the unfortunate spirit of "economic nationalism" in a day when no country can live to itself, and asks: "How far is it possible to liberate the world from this nationalistic spirit as applied to trade?" To rid ourselves of tariff barriers blocking the trade of the world, would mean that each concentrates on the things that it produces best. He continues:

> The value of that principle has been recognised for thousands of years by individual human beings, each man aiming at doing the thing that he thinks he can do best, and trading with his neighbours for the things that he wants. In a well-organized world, nations would apply to one another the same practice that individuals instinctively have adopted.

The inexorable Law of Karma, of which the law of demand and supply is an aspect, is fast producing a crisis all over the world, in facing which humanity must undergo a change of heart, if it is to survive. Multiplication of desires multiplied objects of desire; many things were quickly demanded and Nature supplied through the agency of inventive minds even more than many things. "Ask, and it shall be given you." To-day people are not famishing for lack of food but suffer through overproduction and dumping; men and women are clad in rags while bales of cotton, woollen and silk piece-

goods lie unopened; supply is plentiful and demand is pressing, but the link to buy the wherewithal is absent. Sir Jogendra Singh is a practical politician and a reformer of insight. He is minister of agriculture in the important province of the Punjab. After visiting that province, as well as Oudh, he gave it as his considered opinion that "a situation of grave emergency has arisen and requires immediate action". He did not see any scarcity of food, but there was famine in money. The people had had a bumper crop, and would have been full of rejoicing, had there been an adequate supply of money. Put side by side with the above quotation of Mr. Harold Cox the further views of Sir Jogendra Singh:

> Famine in money was not produced by any supernatural agency. Rapid communications have linked the world. The volume of trade has enormously increased while the mind of man has not travelled with the same speed to realise the meaning of economic unity and to devise a common measure, giving a correct value to every unit of labour. In the early days commodities were exchanged and measured by the labour involved, that is, in scales which secured uniformity. The currencies of the world now measure labour but the scales do not mete out the same measure. Exchanges are constantly disturbing values.

Among the remedies suggested by Sir Jogendra Singh is to "place an embargo on all imports of non-essential products and learn to do without them"—*i.e.* to practise some kind of asceticisim and to begin to live the simple life.

On a similar note an earnest appeal is made in a remarkable volume reviewed elsewhere by Mr. Middleton Murry. Mr. R. H. Tawney, the author of the book, makes the old profound appeal of *Noblesse oblige*, transposed entirely into a spiritual order—"by freeing ourselves from the chains of materialism, we free our brothers". It is the same remedy—confine life to essentials.

The question naturally arises—What are non-essential products that we must learn to do without? Mr. Gandhi would produce a very short list of essentials; most leaders of thought would find it more easy to prepare a list of the few non-essentials. Mr. Murry in his review presents ideas which are very Theosophical. Confusion of thought prevails as to what constitutes spiritual life—simple living and high thinking. As evolution proceeds from within without, ideas impressed on and held by the mind, in process of time manifest themselves in resolves and deeds. Ideals shape ideas; ideas formulated lead to resolve and to action. H. P. Blavatsky once wrote of Theosophy:

> Its doctrines, if seriously studied, call forth, by stimulating one's reasoning powers and awakening the *inner* in the animal man, every hitherto dormant power for good in us, and also the perception of the true and the real, as opposed to the false and the unreal. . . . Theosophy gives a clear and well-defined object, an ideal to live for, to every sincere man or woman belonging to whatever station in Society and of whatever culture and degree of intellect.
