UNITED LODGE OF THEOSOPHISTS
BANGALORE CITY.

LIBRARY COPY

THE ARYAN PATH

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

VOL. XVII MARCH 1946 No. 3

STANDARD OF LIVING AND A NEW WORLD ORDER

[Under this title we have brought together two articles with a very different approach. One is by our esteemed Indian contributor **Shri J. M. Ganguli,** M. Sc., LL. B., and the other by an English friend and sympathiser long resident in India, **Mr. John S. Hoyland,** M. A., whose pen is often active in the service of our people and the interpretation of them and their needs. Acceptance of the main theses of both involves no syncretism. The ideal of simple and restrained living which Shri Ganguli upholds does need to be preached to some, even in India, though there can be few countries whose people in the mass are less exposed to the temptation to luxurious living! But between the freely chosen simple life of dignity and beauty and the grinding poverty in which our millions willy-nilly live there is a gulf which Mr. Hoyland's article brings home the need to fill. There are certain minima of decent, healthful living which must be made available to all the world's "slum areas" or we shall never have a New World Order worthy of the name.—ED.]

I.—BY J. M. GANGULI

One underlying thought in all schemes for a "New Order" is about the standard of living. That is the central idea which not only imagination and theory, but also social and political propaganda and movements, struggle and competition, diplomatic disagreement, rupture and wars, converge to and originate from. "Their standard of iving must be raised before they can be admitted into fellowship with civilized and independent countries," is the stubborn argument of those who want to maintain self-assumed trusteeship over a foreign people. "We want to raise their standard of living" is the clever propaganda of capitalists and big industrialists. Boys' imagination, youths' ambition, old men's regret for missed chances centre round it.

The very purpose and end of education are directly or indirectly presented in terms of it. "If you study well you will have a good career and luxurious living."

One's culture and refinement are measured by one's standard of living. A modern visitor is impressed by the furniture and decorations in his host's room, some well-bound (though usually scarcely used) books on the shelf and the high class of smoke offered to him. The expensive organ, the well-laid garden, the fineness of the structure, and even the neat conventional vestments attract people to the cathedral. The dress of the teacher forms the subject of student comment. Thus, on external evidences of the standard of living rests judgement of human values, culture and "advancement." The friend who meets you first surveys your dress and, if there be anything wanting or worn out, that attracts his notice and diverts his thoughts. The worn-out pair of shoes, which I find comfortable to wear, almost invariably draws the first notice of most of my acquaintances.

The external forms naturally catch the eye but on them judgement must not rest. It is because of too much stress on appearances that in Western civilization insight into things and appreciation of essentials have been stunted and misdirected. A Westerner meeting a half-clad sadhu under a tree or a Gandhi in loin-cloth in his village environment will hardly be struck by the thought that mental elevation, which generates detachment from trivial material possessions and takes the mind into other channels, may have led him to discard the objects which Westerners, and others with similar outlook, consider natural and even necessary ingredients of civilized life.

With such an outlook it is natural that the Western mind should turn to materialism which appears to be capable of bringing physical comforts and satisfaction of sense hankerings. On the material aspect of things, therefore, outlook and imagination tend to be focussed. It is not that in the East and in ages and places uninfluenced by the present European culture material prosperity has not fired ambition and allured the mind, or has not been the cause of strife and competition. But in Eastern, particularly Hindu, culture there has always been an insistent reminder that all this leads nowhere and that more luxury and "higher living" are only causes of more worry and more discontent. The spirit of *tyaga* (त्याग) and *nivrittih* (निवृत्ति:), which very evidently runs through the Indian mass mind, and the sense of reverence, found even in people who lead a different life, for those who can follow that spirit in practice, are the results of that reminder. There is apparently something in the soil and atmosphere of India which deepens that effect.

The pity is, therefore, that even in India there is not merely a growing leaning, particularly among the educated, towards luxurious living, but more and more unthinking acceptance of it as an ideal. Are they thereby advancing? Does high living lead to moral and spiritual elevation or to enduring peaceful happiness or even to good health?

First, to acquire the means of high living one has to devote most of his precious little time to work and that in an association and an environment which can hardly help the development of thoughtfulness, of high moral sense, of the attitude of contentment and of a generous and sympathetic outlook on fellow beings. On the contrary, more desires grow, and with them grow more discontent, more disregard of scruples and principles which lie in the way of convenience and gain, and more callousness towards the needs and feelings of others. Besides the time and labour given to earning more money, there is constant anxious thought regarding the investment of that money. And what to do with the property, how it will be used or misused by those into whose hands it will pass—such thoughts must naturally cause anxiety at the retirement age.

It is said that wealth can give luxury, comfort, good food and the pleasure of other satisfied desires. But those who are frugal in eating and take simple food keep good health and escape the miseries of disease. Most complicated diseases can be directly traced to "good" and "tasty" eating. Much stress is given these days to vitamins and nutritious food; but those brought up on a carefully selected diet, in spite of apparently good body formation, do not develop the stamina and immunity that their forefathers had and that those possess who live a simple life and on a simpler diet. It seems that vitality, strength and health depend less on the nature of the food than on the power of assimilation. A mule can extract more strength and nutrition from hay and straw than a man can from vitamin tablets. And assimilating power depends on simple and rather hard living—simple eating, even under-eating and frequent fasting—and on good, unexcited and religious living and thinking. The less anxiety and worry, the less ambition for material gain, the less impetuosity to satisfy desires and hankerings, the more quiet the nerves remain, the more healthfully tranquil is the mind, the more smooth and natural is the working of the organs and the greater the consequent development of the brain and of its thinking and concentrating power.

Thus all-round good, all-round development and all-round progress towards peace, happiness and mental and spiritual culture, and also an unenvious and sympathetic relation with neighbours and all human and other beings depend vitally on simple living and high and unselfish thinking. High living, indeed, not only develops vanity, which is a great barrier to human understanding and human sympathies, but raises class distinctions and prejudices, which separate man from man more rigidly and uncompromisingly than the caste system or religions are supposed to do. No scheme will fructify for good and no arrangement will succeed if the fundamental causes leading to individual, class and race prejudices and misunderstandings, to unsympathetic and exploiting tendencies, and to mere pleasure and comfort seeking are not recognised and removed.

It has been urged that with wealth much good can be done, and charitable institutions giving relief to the public can be established. That is true, no doubt, and I used to admire the sentiments of those who founded or donated to such institutions. But since then there have been reactions in me and I have wondered about any real utility of such institutions. It strikes me that their founders must have directly or indirectly exploited the poor, the weak and the unintelligent to make their fortunes, and thereby have caused misery and unhappiness to many. Wealth amassed is drawn from many sources and in many ways—from many unsuspecting individuals, many unguarded cottages, many befooled people.

Capitalism and big business appear in the last analysis to be little else than such exploitation. "Smoke for health," "Drink for energy," "Take a dose of this or a tablet of that for added vitality," "Come to this cinema for recreation"—such propaganda and unscrupulous adulteration are common means of picking the pockets of the masses. People's health and morality are thus ruined, and then, to add insult to injury, the huge farce of opening hospitals and almshouses is played. Blood is sucked in many ways by tempting people and by crushing local production under the steam-roller of heavy organized industries with the connivance of the authorities and with the applause of the unthinking educated who feel nervous at their "backwardness" compared with modern industrialized and machine-ruled countries. And, after the blood has been sucked, figuratively speaking, blood-banks are opened and investments in kindness are invited for them.

The accumulation of wealth causes uneven distribution followed by unbalance in the social order, by envy, by competition and by quarrelling. Perfectly equitable distribution may not be practical, but even the likelihood of its impracticability cannot detract from its brightness as an ideal nor can the acceptance of its impossibility be compatible with universal brotherhood of all creatures. The man inspired by that ideal is moved to action accordingly as he begins to realize it and love and sympathy flow from his heart to his divine brothers around him. How can he think of hurting them ? How can he exploit them or snatch away their possessions ? How can he bear their want and misery and enjoy himself at their expense ? How can he take a full loaf when they hardly have a morsel ? Who could eat in the presence of his hungry son or of starving dear relations? In the midst of misery and want who can have the heart to keep anything to himself for his pleasure and comfort?

What wonder that Sidharta relinquished everything and became a bhikkhu! All great souls and human benefactors have become sanyasis and bhikkhus. Do we not ourselves feel a similar impulse at the sight of crying want and agonising misery? Only our weakness and unsteadiness hold us back from the great leap from material illusions into the depth of wisdom. As we move on in our divine evolution our attachment to what we call our possessions loosens and as we gain enlightening experience things we have treasured lose their charm. They begin to appear as troublesome loads and shackles. The inclination to throw them off is then more natural than the thought of "higher living" by taking on a further load of things of luxury and "refinement."

But which is the more important thing—the inner attitude of relinquishment or the mere giving up of the externals? That question is often asked, and rightly too; because it is quite true that the real thing is the mind and the attitude. But possessions have strong charms and in their midst the attitude of detachment is very difficult to develop. The example of a king sanyasi like Janak is only an exception to the rule.

A new human order, if it is to change the present state of human misery in body and mind, must be based on a different outlook on life. The conviction must be inculcated from early youth that only simple living can give immunity from disease, freedom from the tortures of sense hankerings, the bliss of contentment and the sweet happiness of living in a loving, sympathetic and trustful relation with all around. Then nothing will be coveted, nobody will be envied, none will be exploited and no want will be felt. All education, through literature and otherwise, should be directed to building solidly such a conviction, which should be further strengthened by the personal examples of teachers and of social and political leaders, and also by unremitting condemnation of luxury and exploitation.

Those who are raising the cry of a New Order are only misleading people, camouflaging the real issue and also deceiving their own conscience, because they do not look at the world problem from the point of view of personal and national unselfishness. Under the haze of platitudes, introductory to their schemes, there lies concealed the desire to remain with their interests undisturbed by any violent change which wars and political agitation threaten. There is no offer of even their superfluous possessions for the needy. Their schemes are, therefore, insincere, aimed rather at perpetuating the evils of the past than at undoing them. Hence, when disillusionment comes to the oppressed and the exploited there will rage once more the racial and national fury which envelop the world again and again in mistrust, hate and carnage, tears and woe.

The world in the past tried to follow the lead and the injunctions of Rishis, Saints and Prophets, whose examples and ideals were held in high esteem. Today it should find and follow unselfish *tyagi* (त्यागी), simple-living, high-charactered, far-seeing men like Gandhi, and keep at a distance the selfish and the luxurious who can frame deceptive phrases, take advantage of the simplicity and weakness of the masses and come to leadership by manipulating and controlling votes. In disowning these lies the way to light, wisdom, world peace and human happiness. Then there will be no racial and national misunderstandings and barriers and, living simply, people's minds will not be concentrated on luxury and on securing it by all means, fair or foul, but will naturally turn to higher aims and aspects of human life, to the development of the finer sentiments of love and sympathy for all and to the inspiration of the Divine Spirit in them.

There are those who feel unbearably tormented by the endless suffering all around, accompanied by periodic carnage and large-scale manslaughter perpetrated by heartless political leaders, who covet living well at the expense of the simple and the weak, by taking their land and their home or by preserving extraterritorial possessions so acquired in the past. Let all these ponder deeply and in all sincerity whether simple and restrained living is not the only bed-rock on which a happy New World Order can be solidly and enduringly reared.

J. M. GANGULI

II. —BY J. S. HOYLAND

A conservative Government estimate, made some years ago, shows that the amount of peasant indebtedness in India increased by five times between 1911 and the outset of the great depression. Peasant indebtedness is a very sound criterion by which to judge of the incidence of poverty. It is therefore perfectly certain that the average Indian peasant is today several times more poverty-stricken than his father or grandfather at the beginning of the century.

This grinding and ever-increasing poverty shows itself in a variety of ways, especially in vast problems of disease and under-nourishment, and in an average length of life which is now lower than twenty-seven years. As poverty grows, the power of the village money-lenders, who batten upon poverty, grows also ; and the peasantry become more and more helplessly subjected to the power of a tyrannical parasitic class, under whose control the land is rapidly passing. This money-lending class, who have generally become great landowners through their money-lending, control the means of subsistence of the people as a whole. Into their storehouses comes the bulk of the produce of the fields at harvest time in payment of interest, reckoned at fantastic rates, on debts whose origin often goes back several generations. During the twelve months before next harvest the peasants are apt to subsist on wretched doles of food, made to them at high prices by the money-lender-*cum*-food-hoarder, the prices at which they were credited in payment for the same food-grains last harvest time having been very different. At any time of scarcity, when food prices are rising, an almost irresistible temptation presents itself to the money-lender-*cum*-food-hoarder, that he should hold on to his stocks of precious food-grain, in the hope that prices will rise higher still and that so he will be able to make vast profits. Consequently, no doles of grain come through to the peasants, and they begin to starve.

Broadly speaking, this is the sequence of events leading up to a full-scale Indian famine, like that which occurred in Bengal in the autumn of 1943. As the Viceroy declared, in the great speech on the famine which he made to the Calcutta Chamber of Commerce on December 20, 1943, this vast tragedy was not primarily due to failure of rainfall or to the Japanese capture of Burma, or to any other external cause, but to food hoarding, *i. e.*, to psychological factors of human iniquity. Not without cause a great Western sociologist, after prolonged investigations, has proclaimed his belief that this class of Indian food-hoarders-*cum*-money-lenders-*cum*-landlords exercises the most rapacious form of capitalistic exploitation now existing on earth.

The origin of the power of this robber-class goes back to the Permanent Settlement made for the revenue-system of Bengal in 1793 by Lord Cornwallis. No doubt that Settlement in some sense merely codified tendencies already prevalent, through the impact of Western commercialized civilization upon India; but since it formed such a codification, the Permanent Settlement of 1793 is an outstanding landmark. Its effect was to individualize the peasantry of the still largely communal Indian village system, by establishing the peasant in proprietorship of that section of the village lands occupied by him at the time, and by requiring taxes to be paid individually through a hereditary Zemindar, who thus became at one stroke a great landed proprietor instead of a village official. As population increased, there being no law of entail in India, the peasant holdings became divided and subdivided amongst the sons of the family until a very high proportion of these holdings became economically unproductive. The average of cultivable land per head of the Indian population is now between two-thirds and three-quarters of an acre. In the West it is reckoned that to keep an agricultural population above the poverty line the average must be 2½ acres of cultivable land per head. Here, then, is one potent cause of Indian poverty.

The individualization of the peasantry by the Permanent Settlement, which was copied with various emendations (none of them permanently effective) in other parts of India, meant that, as the land was fragmentized, the peasant had no one to rely upon to help him, except his own family, with the essential guarding of the crops and other agricultural operations on his minute fields, which were scattered widely at long distances over the village lands. Both in East and West, the mediæval communal village had acted as an automatic check on undue population increase, since every child was in a sense a liability to the community. But with the individualization of the peasantry this check ceased to operate. On the contrary, a large family of children became urgently necessary, to guard the crops on the scattered fields. Hence population began to increase by leaps and bounds. The same tendency showed itself in England with the breaking-up of the common-field village there, population increasing by 400 per cent. between 1750 and 1900. The Indian population also increased by 400 per cent. between 1793 and 1943, but in this case the surplus population remained for the most part on the land, whereas in England it went to the new industrial cities. The result for India was a rapid increase of land-fragmentization and a terrible growth of peasant poverty.

Taxes were now paid in cash, and each year, as the time of the inexorable demand for them came round, the individualized peasant found it more and more difficult to meet that demand (in the old days tax-payments had been the collective responsibility of the village as a whole). Inevitably, with land fragmentized and decreasing productivity on what was left, the peasant defaulted—or rather, defaulting being impossible, had to borrow at extravagant rates the cash for his tax payments from the money-lender, who was often also both his landlord and the tax-collector. These agricultural debts are handed on from father to son, and it is regarded as a sacred duty to try to pay them off.

The land-tax, thus " collected " from an impoverished and enslaved peasantry, is the mainstay of government finance and therefore of the imperial system for which we, as British electors, are responsible in India. This is where our individual and personal responsibility comes in. As the dreadful social consequences of such a system become more and more apparent, for instance in the growth of child-marriage, in the shortening of the average expectation of life, in the growing hostility between Hindus and Moslems, which is fundamentally economic in its origin (some of the worst of the money-lenders and the money-lenders' henchmen being Moslems), we

Britishers must realize that so long as we maintain the existent imperial system such evils are inevitable. The responsibility for the past mass of dreadful misery and heartless exploitation which is the Indian economy in town as well as country —for in the cities the power of the money-lenders over the mill hands is even more tyrannical—lies at *our* door.

In various modern " Plans " for the reconstruction of Indian economic life, emanating both from left and right, it is somewhat light-heartedly proposed that Government should take over the vast mass of the peasant debt from the money-lenders, and fund it, perhaps in bonds self-eliminating after a generation, so as to provide adequate but not more than adequate compensation to vested interests. It may, however, be confidently predicted that if any such course were followed, without further provisions, the Indian peasantry would be deep in debt again a week later. In the absence of any other means of obtaining ready cash, the money-lender is an absolute necessity, to prevent wholesale starvation ; for it must be realised that from day to day the peasants live on what they receive from the money-lenders in cash to buy food or in food itself—food which they themselves have grown and handed over to the money-lender in payment of debt interest. Until the place of the money-lender is adequately taken by, for instance, the rural co-operative society, with its cheap credit and its facilities for collective marketing and buying, the money-lender is indispensable.

Prof. E. H. Carr, in his book, *Conditions of Peace*, which has already become a classic, pronounces it as his opinion that the possibility of permanent peace depends upon mankind's being offered a new moral incentive to strenuous and united effort, to take the place of the war-motive. He suggests that such a motive may be found, and found uniquely, in the solving, by united world action, of the problem of poverty in what he calls the great " slum areas " of the world, Africa, China, the Balkans, India—areas where the standard of living is notoriously and conspicuously too low. He suggests that a great world organization of "Lend-Lease" should be instituted, to provide the food and the goods to raise adequately the life standard in these distressed regions ; and he believes that by undertaking such an enterprise the richer nations of the world would be enabled to save themselves from post-war industrial depression and unemployment, the fertile cause of new wars. The thing can obviously only be organised on a world-scale by such a world-authority as is now proposed in the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

One of the first problems that will face the organizers of such a world-assault upon poverty is that of the liberation of the Indian peasantry from their present debt slavery. A first essential will be the establishment of an independent and united Indian government, with which the authorities of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations can co-operate. How, in the first place, will such a free and independent Indian government seek to set things right in its own house? This question can be easily answered, because during the twenty-seven months in 1937, 1938 and 1939, when Gandhi governments controlled the chief Indian Provinces and Indian governments imitating the Gandhi governments controlled the other Provinces, extremely important experiments were made in the revolutionary project of liberating the peasantry from their class bondage to the money-lenders-*cum*-landowners, and that under the benevolent ægis of the British imperial government. Money-lenders were to be registered, interest rates were to be limited, imprisonment for debt was to be abolished, debt-conciliation boards were to be set up, increases of rent (taxes are paid in with rent in a number of Provinces) were to be cancelled, village-councils were to be established. Above all a great advance in popular education was planned (it is one of the chief disgraces of the British system in India that we only spend on an average 1*s*. 6*d*. per head of the Indian population on education per annum, whereas in our own country, when the Education Act is fully implemented, it will be about £5 per head). Their illiteracy puts the peasants helplessly in the power of the rapacious money-lenders, since the peasant cannot read or check the money-lender's accounts, which are often grossly "cooked" against him. Gandhi is undoubtedly right in believing that one of the primary necessities for the improving of the peasant's lot is to give him just enough knowledge of the three R's to enable him to check the money-lender's accounts.

Unfortunately, the war brought this immensely important enterprise of large-scale social reconstruction to an end; but at any rate enough had been effected to demonstrate that Gandhi and his followers know what is wrong with India, know how to put it right, and have the energy and the determination to translate their ideals into practice.

The enterprise of raising the living standards of the 400 millions in India is envisaged in Article 55 of the United Nations Charter as the task of the new Economic and Social Council. It will be a task to be undertaken in co-operation with a new independent Indian government, and along the lines already laid down by the hundred-thousand-odd co-operative credit societies already existing, and by the Gandhi Provincial governments of the 1937-39 "honeymoon period." It is a task of the building of co-prosperity "both in East and West." Above all it is a task of justice and of pity —of pity for the neediest and most downtrodden of humankind, who must be treated justly by the rest of mankind because they are enslaved. Only as such justice is done can the rest of the world avoid the abyss of post-war depression and unemployment. Yet this reciprocal effect of the doing of justice on behalf of the Indian poor can never be the main motive of such action. Justice must be done: India must be liberated, and adequately fed and rehabilitated, because justice and good-will are ultimately one, and their demands are absolute.

JOHN S. HOYLAND

CHILDREN IN EUROPE

Today's Children—Tomorrow's Hope, published by His Majesty's Stationery Office for the United Nations Information Organisation, is the story of the children in thirteen occupied countries. The occupation of any country by a foreign power involves almost inevitably some disturbance and some suffering. This picture is particularly shocking for the evidence it gives of destruction as a deliberate policy.

The generously illustrated brochure unfolds a tragic tale. Occasional child executions are among the deepest stains on the war years. The deaths from undernourishment were more numerous. Many Greek and Yugoslav children lived for months on grass, until their stomachs became unable to digest normal food without a course of convalescent fare. Neurasthenia and other types of debility are common and the deficiency diseases are rampant. The repercussions will continue to be felt for many a year.

But, saddening as is the tale of suffering, there are inspiring notes: The dedication, in many countries, of teachers and pupils alike to the maintaining of national educational ideals at whatever cost. The vigorous and continued opposition to Nazi anti-Jewish measures in the Netherlands. The rallying of patriotism to meet the effort to crush out national pride.

The children's firm resistance to indoctrination with the Nazi theories holds out great hope and offers solid ground on which the democratic structure of the future can be reared. The brochure is well named.

EDUCATION IN ANCIENT INDIA

AS MIRRORED IN SANSKRIT FOLK-TALES

[**Shri M. A. Mehendale** shows here how much light the Sanskrit folk-tales—and especially the collection known as the *Kathāsaritsāgara*—can shed on education in the India of a thousand years and more ago. It is not alone on social customs and cultural advance that folk-tales can shed light. They enshrine many a gem of wisdom beneath their surface purpose, which was to entertain. That deep student of symbology, Madame Helena P. Blavatsky, declared that "popular folklore and traditions, however fanciful at times, when sifted may lead to the discovery of long-lost, but important, secrets of nature."—ED.]

Much has already been written on education in ancient India. The Sanskrit folk-tales, collected in works like the *Kathāsaritsāgara*, give us data which agree in general with the information obtained from other sources. But they also preserve certain interesting customs which help us in getting a profile of society in those days. It is very difficult to fix the date of the origin of a particular tale, for the storehouse of Indian folk-tales has existed since very early times and must have been enriched by further additions at successive stages. At any rate the collections of Sanskrit folk-tales that we have today date mostly from the eleventh century A. D. onwards.

It is now well established that, from the Smṛti period onwards, the Brahmins were the chief custodians of learning and hence we find in these folk-tales many students approaching a Brahmin preceptor for their education. It was not considered meet for a Brahmin boy to indulge in dainties, to wear rich garments and ornaments, and to give himself up to betel-chewing and sensual pleasures instead of devoting himself to his studies. For the sake of specialisation in a particular subject many students had to leave their homes and go to distant countries for further studies under expert guidance. It is significant that in the story literature we find many students proceeding to the Deccan for their studies. It seems that the period required to cover all the higher studies was a very long one, though it is very difficult to dogmatise on the point.

Some students, we find, underwent severe penances in order to get their education. Perhaps education, like wealth, was regarded as a special boon conferred by the deity on his devotee. It was the deity Kartti-keya who was generally resorted to for this purpose. Yet it seems that a section of public opinion looked with disfavour on this method of acquiring learning. Thus, when a certain Brahmin went to the Ganges to acquire learning by austerities, Indra appeared before him in the form of a Brahmin and reproved him for having adopted such a method of educating himself. In very clear terms Indra told him that it was impossible to educate oneself without reading and listening to the discourses of a teacher. (*Kathāsaritsāgara*, 7. 6. 15 ff.)

We learn from Alberuni that long before the tenth century Vaiśyas had left off Vedic studies and that in his own time only a few Kṣatriyas followed them. In the folk-tales, however, we find Kṣatriya princes engaging themselves in the pursuit of knowledge and the acquirement of varied accomplishments. For instance, the son of King Merudhvaja is in his eighth year invested with the sacred thread by a hermit who instructs him during the following eight years in different sciences, accomplishments and the use of mighty weapons. (*Ibid.*, 17. 5. 46-47) Nor were such intellectual pursuits the monopoly of royal families. On certain occasions Kṣatriya and Brahmin lads are shown receiving their lessons together. (*Ibid.*, 13. 1. 25)

Our knowledge about the spread of education among the merchant and the servant classes is rather scanty. Yet it may be gathered from the few references that we have, that the members of the Vaiśya class were not altogether illiterate. The mother of a Vaiśya boy is seen persuading a teacher to teach her son writing and ciphering. And when he has learnt these elementary things she says to him, "You are the son of a merchant, so you must engage in trade." (*Ibid.*, 1. 6. 32 ff.) The lower classes, however, seem to have been completely illiterate; a certain porter, for example, could not read the letters of the king's name engraved on a bracelet which he had found. (*Ibid.*, 10. 1. 15. 19)

It was a bright aspect of ancient Indian education that the students were not required to pay regular fees to their teachers. The teacher gave them instruction in return for the personal services he got from them and at the most in expectation of some lump sum at the end of the studies. Thus the Brahmin Viṣṇuśarman, in the *Pañcatantra*, declined to sell his knowledge for any fixed sum. The relations between the teacher and his pupils, who used to stay with him, were usually very cordial. In the case of a clash, however, the student left the house of his preceptor, leaving behind him his stick and water-vessel. (*Ibid.*, 12. 30. 24-30)

In the ancient history of India kings have all along shown a benevolent attitude towards the cause of education by extending patronage to learned scholars. I-tsing observes that many scholars, after finishing their studies at the universities, repaired to the royal courts to get suitable appointments in the State service. It was a fashion in those days, with learned scholars and artists, to carry on discussions in the learned assemblies[1] and to exhibit their art in royal courts. Those who came out victorious in such assemblies or were able to make their mark by proficiency in a particular art were richly rewarded by the king. (*Ibid.*, 10. 10. 566)

In early days caste distinctions did not determine the occupations of youths; to this fact even the Chinese traveller Yuan-chwang, who visited India in the seventh century, bears testimony. In the story literature we come across many Brahmin youths who were adept in the use of weapons and hand-to-hand fighting. Not only this, the Brahmin and Kṣatriya youths are occasionally shown to have acquired remarkable skill in such fine arts as music and dancing. Guṇaśarman, a Brahmin friend of King Mahāsena of Ujjayinī, was versed in the Vedas and in the use of weapons and this over and above other accomplishments. Once he was requested by the king and his queen to exhibit his skill in dancing. He, however, thought it improper to dance in a court and especially before the king with his queen. The king then assured his friend that his performance would not be looked upon as a stage exhibition but merely as a private display of skill in the company of friends. Thereupon the Brahmin acceded to their request and danced with great skill. (*Ibid.*, 8. 6. 8 ff.; 8. 6. 162-164) This incident also shows that such arts were pursued by the members of the higher castes only as a matter of personal accomplishment and not for exhibition in public.

So far as the education of women is concerned, the evidence afforded by Sanskrit folk-tales is very meagre. But there is ample testimony from other sources that in very early days women in India were as freely educated as men and were even required to undergo, like them, the rite of initiation. Later on, education came to be restricted only to women of higher families. The story of King Sātavāhana suggests that at times the ladies in the harem were more accomplished than the king himself. For, as the episode runs, the king was unable to follow the correct meaning of the expression "*modakais tāḍaya*" used by the queen while disporting herself in the water. The queen is specifically described as being quite at home in the science of grammar. (*Ibid.*, 1. 6. 114 ff.)

The cultivation of the fine arts such as music, dancing and painting formed for some time an important item in the education of women. Yet it was not considered decent for a girl to attend a public school of art, despite a few persons' holding the contrary view. King Caṇḍamahāsena of Ujjayinī would not agree to send his daughter to Udayana to learn music but wanted the latter to come to his palace to teach her. (*Ibid.*, 2. 4. 3 ff.) King Harivara, having witnessed the skill of an artist in music and dancing, appointed him an instructor for the ladies of his harem.

---

[1] A similar custom in the Medieval Universities still lingers in the title "Wrangler."

(*Ibid.*, 9. 2. 265 ff.) Haṁsāvali, the daughter of Vidiśā, was expected to exhibit her skill in dancing before her father when her course was complete. So the princess danced to the "music of a great tabor, looking like a creeper of the tree of love agitated by the wind of youth, shaking her ornaments like flowers, curving her hand like a shoot." (*Ibid.*, 12. 4. 73 ff.) Proficiency in such fine arts formed an important qualification for a princess in a matrimonial alliance, and on many occasions the ambassador who came to a king's court to seek the hand of the princess for his master was entertained with an exhibition of her skill in dancing, music and other accomplishments. (*Ibid.*, 2. 1. 36 ff.)

Soon after the twelfth century this pleasant diversion came to be regarded as disgraceful for women of the higher classes and gradually it became restricted to the class of dancing girls who took it up as a profession. Sir Atul Chatterjee in his valuable foreword to the ninth volume of *The Ocean of Story* (p. xiv) asks whether its disappearance in later days was due to the introduction of the custom of strict seclusion of women or was a result of the contact with the puritanic ideals of Islam.

M. A. MEHENDALE

THE PRIMITIVE TRIBES

In the Second World War some of the primitive tribes like the Nagas on the Assamese frontier, by their exemplary courage and integral loyalty to India, have earned the right to be accorded a place in the various post-war reconstruction schemes which have been evolved for the rehabilitation—economic as well as cultural—of the people. Will they then be admitted into the precincts of present-day civilisation or will they continue to be kept "in cold storage," as they have been unfortunately for centuries? Writing on the subject in *Concord* for October 27, 1945, Dr. D. N. Mazumdar of Lucknow University pleads for a recognition of their claim:—

> Numerically the tribal groups form seven per cent. of the total Indian population, they form a quarter of the population of Assam, one-fifth of Orissa, one-sixth of C. P. and Ajmer, one-eighth of Coorg and one-thirteenth of the Bombay Presidency.

Now they have to be either assimilated or segregated. The latter alternative is not feasible inasmuch as the country, like the whole world, is growing more and more interdependent. Therefore, they will have to be provided with the impact and essential amenities of modern culture through contacts with their comparatively educated and enlightened fellow-beings.

> That is why we need contact, more of it, and less friction; out of contacts will arise a design for living, and if it does, as it is bound to, there will be one India, one culture, one standard.

But unusual discretion will have to be exercised in bringing the tribal people within the context of such contacts, lest there be once again a tragic repetition of the dubious contacts hitherto made *via* the Church missionary and the exploiting merchant.

G. M.

WHAT PRICE PATERNALISM ?

[**Mr. Paul J. Braisted** is Programme Director of the Edward W. Hazen Foundation at Haddam, Connecticut. That institution, one of the smaller of the Foundations in the U.S.A. working for cultural and idealistic aims, has for twenty years been focusing attention largely upon problems of student development, especially in the college and university years. The place and function of religion in higher education, the international exchange of students and the possibilities of co-operation among peoples of different cultures have been among the important subjects studied, and several thought-stimulating brochures have been issued. Mr. Braisted does well to condemn paternalism in the family beyond the stage of youthful immaturity; and in international relations it does all the harm that he ascribes to it. But, as he implies, the guidance of the more experienced, even in the international field, within certain limits is not to be condemned.—Ed.]

The achievement of a more humane world society of peoples, of orderly and mutually helpful intercourse among nations, is fundamentally a matter of attitudes. The same is true of normal family relations. Everyone has seen families wherein freedom, mutual understanding and respect created an atmosphere in which the life of each member developed naturally, in which the life of all was harmonious. Such an achievement is the fruit of an inward spirit free from guile and deceit. Likewise nearly everyone has, unhappily, observed families where relationships have been strained by the dominance of a parent whose unimaginative and immature attitudes thwarted the normal growth of others in the group. In such a situation a virile child assumes a rightful measure of freedom at the appropriate time even though the family is disrupted. The more passive nature may sink into an abnormal frustrated existence wherein childhood is extended far beyond adolescence. In this small theatre of human life paternalism can be seen for what it is in essence—unnatural prolonged dominance of the weak or inexperienced by the strong. All relationships are out of focus and normal life becomes impossible.

The same phenomenon appears in the relationships of peoples, and is a primary cause of retarded social conditions to be observed in many places. It may be observed in white Americans in their treatment of ethnic minorities and frequently among Europeans in their colonies. No informed or intelligent person will be befuddled in his appraisal by the obvious fact that paternalism always wears the guise of benevolence. It is its essential nature to disguise its psychological immaturity with the mask of fatherly concern, with an innocent and easily wounded self-righteousness. This spirit is one of the attitudes which can have no place among peoples in an orderly world society. It is intolerable. Perhaps it would disappear more readily if its costliness were more generally recognized, and if its hypocrisy were unmasked. What, then, is its cost? Is the price to be endured among civilized and intelligent folk? If not, what can be done to change the situation so that this attitude cannot longer flourish? The costliness of paternalism in human relations may be appraised by recounting its toll in terms of each party to the relationship, and in terms of the relationship itself. But the full price can be known only when one considers its bearing upon the advancement of all peoples.

What is the cost to the weaker party? First, unnatural delay in achievement of maturity. Natural aspirations are suppressed. Practical efforts toward self-advancement are misconstrued and thwarted by irrelevant, mistaken, short-sighted, or sometimes even vicious considerations. Frustration tends toward unprofitable excess. Then "backwardness" is used as a reason for perpetuation of the unnatural relationship! Second, creative energies are deflected from the primary social, economic and other cultural problems and drawn into an absorption with artificial restricted political problems. Thus, an aspiring people is deprived of the fruits of these vast energies which are, so to speak, frittered away. Advancement is further delayed. Third, an unconscious awareness of this abnormal situation produces distrust which warps thought and stultifies relationships. Fourth, reflection upon the situation produces a deepening bitterness born of frustration which corrodes even the will to such advancement. In many varied ways frustration, dissipated powers, distrust and bitterness exact their heavy toll. No people can afford such a price, and it is never paid; it can only be exacted as tribute.

What is the price to the stronger party?

First, rationalization of all actions. Reasons must at all costs be found. Thus the "backwardness" caused by the condition—the misdirected energies, the awkward actions, the frustrated desires, the divided aims—are generally advanced as plausible factors requiring perpetuation of an admittedly undesirable situation. This is simple hypocrisy. That it is practised by so many otherwise intelligent, amiable and competent persons only emphasizes its enormity.

Second, blindness to true achievements of the aspiring folk. Thus some highly intelligent students of art, literature and culture with wide experience, suddenly go blind among their colonial peoples because they do not escape their rationalized hallucination. Obviously there are those who rise above this but the phenomenon is so general as to be readily observed in the journals and biographies of some of the ablest of statesmen and thinkers, men of the calibre of James Bryce, to take an example.

Third, blindness to new and unique possibilities of social or political development. Imagination atrophies, and important, perhaps crucial, factors are disregarded in favour of obstinate insistence upon standards only partially if at all relevant to the expanding life of another people. Thus, politically it is required that advance follow precisely the familiar stages of another's progress in a different age. Or it is maintained that a people, a group, a race, is incapable of industrial advance, or of self-rule, a judgment with no scientific foundation, thinly disguising fear of loss of special privilege.

Fourth, unnatural restrictions upon intellectual and spiritual intercourse, a phenomenon to which Westerners are especially prone if we are to folow a historian like Toynbee. Thus exclusive practices not only add much irritation and injustice, but also, and this is the factor of greatest import, deprive one of those occasions of communication in which understanding and appreciation would develop, in which knowledge of capacities, abilities and inherent possibilities would become known. Such knowledge would be of infinite worth, and no amount of "independent" scholarship from an Olympian remoteness can compensate for this deficiency.

Fifth, distrust of the motives of others. This produces petulance and sometimes leads to contempt. In the end there will be a sense of frustration growing from the unnatural situation. These, then, are some of the costs of paternalism to the stronger partner. They are self-imposed, and paid for from intellectual and spiritual resources. Simple intellectual or spiritual integrity finds the transaction repugnant and refuses to pay the price.

Presumably it is unnecessary to comment at length upon the manner in which relationships are hampered by such a spirit. Obviously there can be no real agreement upon assumptions, and hence no real and effective co-operation toward ends mutually satisfactory and helpful. This stultification of activities cramps and binds those persons of good-will who would do otherwise. It prevents freedom of communication and so thwarts appreciation and understanding. It leads from conflict to conflict, always ending in two opposed interpretations of what occurred. It fosters distortion of facts. While stimulating ever more offensive arrogance and display of injured innocence on the one hand, it stimulates despair and resort to violence on the other. Co-operation is impossible, unless one will allow the term to describe servile and contemptuous collaboration for puny gain.

But this is not all, for today it is impossible for one nation to treat other nations or peoples without regard to the effect of their action upon other parties not directly related to the action. A world community of peoples is emerging and all institutions are seeking to find their new orientations. In this larger community paternalism exacts a new toll, this time upon the peoples of the world.

First, there is the confusion thrown into international dealings. In the present state of education people know so little of one another that it is not possible for well-meaning folk to decide between the two interpretations of affairs offered by the dominant strong and the aspiring weaker peoples. The truth is obscured and ambiguous. Some tend to accredit the paternal interpretation because it is so plausible and because it wears the guise of benevolence. Others tend instinctively to accept the position of the weak. There is no firm basis for opinion. Men of clear mind know that the truth lies somewhere between but it is difficult, under pressure of events, to disentangle the facts from the protestations.

Second, public opinion is warped since usually only one side of the story is made available. This is because the party in whom the paternal spirit exists is in possession of the means of propaganda, and able to spend large sums for dissemination of "free" information, that is, to carry on propaganda for its view-point. Thus, for many, deviation from the official view-point is discredited as a protest, weak and therefore representing only an insignificant minority; extreme, therefore suspect; impatient and insistent, therefore accounted petulant and unrepresentative of the "silent masses."

Third, from confusion comes further distrust to blight and hamper constructive forces of good-will and generosity.

Thus tensions between peoples of differing accomplishment and opportunity become irritants among many nations and peoples. When they reach a high tempo they unite with other conflicts to prepare the ways of war. It goes without saying that mutual effort with fresh sincerity and with thoroughgoing, enthusiastic commitment is an essential of co-operation among the nations. Important new steps have been taken among the United Nations which are full of promise. They reflect the faith and steadfast devoted efforts of many individuals of many nations who have taken the long view, subordinated parochial considerations, abandoned hypocrisies of out-moded diplomacy, disavowed falsehood, and boldly sought to lead out toward a more humane goal. It would be an intolerable tragedy if the deceitful spirit should creep back to poison relationships, to handicap further less advanced peoples, whenever found, and to sow further seeds of international violence and slaughter with their legacy of bitterness and hatred.

The price, then, of survival of paternalism in the modern cultural scene is simply too great for humanity to pay. But how is the costly thing to be eliminated from human affairs or rendered null and void? Surely there is nothing so obscure or esoteric about this query, since the solution requires only a commitment to normal relations and abandonment or denial of acquiescence in the abnormal, the unnatural. Obviously, both long-range and short-range views must be taken, but the former is absolutely essential. Simple sincerity must be clearly apparent in intercultural and international political dealings, whether official or governmental. Actual deeds must be substituted for repetition and reformulation of promises and postponement. Truth must be fostered and honoured, however painful or embarrassing the record, or however exacting the consequences before the bar of world opinion. Its clear statement usually will help clear the atmosphere and rally the support of good-will everywhere to assist in rectifying the situation.

A new far-sighted and courageous statesmanship is needed to lead toward a bold " new birth of freedom, " to mark out new paths, to fashion new instruments of collaboration, to weld peoples into common efforts for mutual well-being and mutual helpfulness, while recognizing difference and so maintaining the richness of plural cultural interchanges. A more realistic education is needed in which each shall be acquainted with the life and culture of all, in which the things which unite will not be forgotten, where knowledge of a common humanity and a common destiny in a world community shall be the common possession of all educated persons—and so eventually of all people. Men and women of religious faith may play an affirmative, constructive rôle permeating many phases of cultural activities.

Signs of improvement are not lacking—such as the bill of human rights in the Charter of the United Nations Organization and the Social and Economic Council with its mandate to work for constructive ends, both strongly backed by the peoples of Asia. The proposed international office of education, the new programmes for student and professorial exchanges which are breaking over some of the barriers of the past, a growing popular interest seen in journals and books, and, in the United States, many new college courses in the culture of other peoples are also promising.

It is for the strong, the powerful especially, to demonstrate beyond the possibility of misunderstanding or equivocation that they act in all good faith, to disavow any of their number who resort to the unnatural and primitive and out-moded ways of paternalism. They can do more than any one else to eliminate the costly tribute of other days, and to stimulate free developments. Any one of them can change the course of the history of human relations by bold, transparent initiative.

Wisdom suggests that some form

of international oversight of less advanced or less privileged peoples would make clear the basic intent of co-operation free from ulterior motives, Failure to seek such international co-operative oversight may henceforth of itself become condemnation before enlightened world opinion. Initiative in seeking such a solution regionally would be a convincing demonstration, and reluctance will only perpetuate the evil, raising still higher the spiritual and social toll.

The victims can do much also, in so far as they achieve the far harder task of overcoming resentment and bitterness in devoted commitment to co-operation among all peoples, and work with full energy at creative tasks, never countenancing or acceding to violation of truth or facts, or overstating them in reply, or resorting to self-defeating violence. This is asking, on their part as upon that of the powerful, an accomplishment of the spirit which is never easy. Neither is it impossible, since men were made for this life of continuing growth and harmonious living, and the vast yet undisclosed advances of creative cultural intercommunication. It is in the nature of things, and all needs of a post-war world cry aloud for advance on this highroad. The spiritual forces which unite men in this endeavour are mightier than any barriers which divide.

PAUL J. BRAISTED

REFORM AND RELIGION

The curse which orthodoxy uttered, creating the large class of Hindus who are the Untouchables or the Pariahs, has been working like a boomerang, making the caste Hindus more and more irreligious and their Motherland more and more enslaved. Some years ago the Indian State of Travancore set the noble example of throwing open the Padmanabhan Temple to all Hindus, caste or no caste. And now under the influence of Gandhiji another orthodox shrine of Southern India has been thrown open to the Untouchables. The famous Minakshi Temple at Madura is no more the un-aryan or ignoble symbol of creedal orthodoxy; it is to be used by Hindus of all castes and classes. This is a social reform of great value and will influence the minds of many Hindus towards a better appreciation of the true philosophy and ethics of the *Gita*, the *Upanishads* and the shastras generally.

SUPREME ART

AN EXPRESSION OF THE UNCONSCIOUS

[**Shri B. S. Mathur** brings out clearly here that genuine art has a higher source than the ordinary reasoning mind. But why call that source the unconscious? It is the poverty of nomenclature of modern psychology—reflecting a graver poverty of concept—that has no name but unconscious or subconscious for that which is inexplicable in terms of ratiocination. Real art springs from the superconscious, the intuition, which is the higher aspect of mind; when it does not, as sometimes, spring from the Divine in man, as Inspiration, when man lays hold imaginatively of the Divine Archetypes, his reproduction of which is the true measure of the greatness of his art.—Ed.]

A person approaches an artist in *Don Quixote;* the artist is in the act of creation and when he is questioned about his object he is upset and cries out "That is as it may turn out." That is art. Here the artist is subject to emotions; he is trying to generate original emotions as he has begun to create from his inspiration and he wants none to stop the free flow of his art. But he is not conscious of his purpose, of what he is going to do. This is the moment of perfect art when he has forgotten everything; this is the moment when he is driven on by some unseen power to the creation of beauty and perfection. Now he is associating with the Goddess of Art and Beauty. He is completely oblivious of his design or purpose. In fact he has forgotten himself, and he is driven like a child, who, for want of experience and knowledge, is not in a position to look after himself. If he is an artist the Goddess of Art will take his hand and lead him on to the creation of artistic work. He is truly an unresisting agent or mouthpiece of art. Then he can communicate what he must.

So the fundamental truth is that he is an unconscious artist, although he is the giver of a message which he delivers most vividly and most mysteriously. At the time of creation he cannot stop to think and, if he stops, the entire structure of what is to follow disappears and falls to pieces like a house of cards. At that unique moment when he has to rise to the level of great art he cannot turn critic; criticism is definitely inferior to art-creation. Art begins in sentiment and in sentiment there is no reason or rime. Art cannot be worshipped objectively and critically. Art is really to tend to beauty and truth. Blindness is needed along with unique trust, and Art will beget Beauty. Art cannot stand any questioning; even as happiness, which does not tolerate scrutiny, especially self-scrutiny or self-consciousness. "Ask yourself whether you are happy and you cease to be happy," says John Stuart Mill in his Autobiography. Art therefore can flourish in blessed forgetfulness, and not in consciousness. At the moment of artistic creation the artist is lifted above the world and he begins to dream of heavenly things. His songs, poems, images and pictures are not only personal facts but divine facts. Hence human reason is out of place: his work is sacred.

Art has to be wild like flowers and plants in nature which grow into beauty and grandeur of themselves. What their purpose is in growing, and what they are going to be, is all uncertain. Beauty grows without a design and it requires an eye to see it. It is not there at the time of creation. The observer discovers it or, to be more precise, it is he who creates it. So he too deserves credit for the creation of beauty.

Take the case of a potter. He is busy turning innumerable pots of clay. Ask him what he is creating and his answer is that he is making pots. There he stops. Ask him his design. He has no answer. His only purpose is to make pots. Although he is a crude artist he knows his design no better than a real artist. He is not sure of the complete shape of things to come. His hand is turning and he is communicating with the rest of the world through his clay objects.

Similarly an artist is engaged in an ideal imitation. He has learnt his art from Nature and he is busy with the expression of his joy, or we may call it his self-revelation. But he is writing for the world, although at the time of creation the world is in the background. He is not imitating studiously in detail. He is simply transferring the great conception of beauty and art that he has come to value in his whole course of life. That is what his share of sunshine has allowed him to seize. That is something precious about him. That is his great reality, that is his life, that is what he cherishes most. This he tries to make permanent. Of course, there is also the contribution of the appreciators of beauty, because without them art will remain unobserved.

The unconsciousness of aim and design may not completely describe the attitude of the potter at the time of creation. He is a crude artist and, because of his poverty, he is certainly thinking of market values. He thrives on pottery and pottery may not thrive in him. But he too is not definite as to the shape of the things he is making. Now think of the Divine Potter. What is this universe? Our religious books say that in the beginning there was nothing but vacancy, and in the course of time God, who was all alone, felt an urge to reveal Himself in the many. So, according to the *Rigved*, the universe is the outcome of that urge. God is in all and we can, if we so wish, kill the evil in us by the help of the divine essence. Let us stop here in our thought of creation. Beyond this urge we are not aware of anything.

The Artist, let us add, the Divine Artist, has no open purpose. What has He to gain from the universe ? The great storehouse of beauty is open to all. The universe is a divine art-gallery where things grow into beauty and wealth darkly : there is no set purpose. Here is a great garden of artistic achievement. The gardener is lost in his garden. That is His art. Yet He is there where you try to see Him. He is inseparably connected with His art exhibits. His art is free and spontaneous. There are no rules. George Bernard Shaw says that the golden rule is that in art there are no golden rules. The artist is a thinker in emotions about emotions : emotions to be perfected require no logical thinking. Then who can think of purpose behind real art, the end product of our excess emotional energy ?

If art has any purpose, the artist is not conscious of it at the time of creation. It may justly be stated that before the actual moment he may or may not know his purpose. The moment he comes to grips with art he forgets all and, if he does not forget, art flies from him. The artist can feel or think. Either is possible. If the artist creates because of some urgent purpose art is lowered and becomes a slave to purpose. The artist must have the capacity of thinking intensely ; this thinking goes on for some time and then a moment comes when he must forget all, himself, his purpose and his art. Then he is not on this earth and is in communication with God. "The thirst that from the soul doth rise doth ask a drink divine." At this moment it will not be wrong to say that the subconscious self expresses itself through his hand.

That is why, in spite of all forgetfulness, there is no work of art that is exempt from purpose. His subconscious self knows it. Shakespeare has written works of beauty and truth. He has influenced all very powerfully. But who can say that he was conscious of his purpose when he set out to create ? It is the critics who have endeavoured to find many things in his works.

This is true of all great artists, who are beings of intense mental and emotional activity. They live with their eyes open and their ears alert and the entire universe is conveniently lodged in their minds. They are tensely strung vinas ready to break forth in music at the least touch. And when they so break forth they do not think. So whatever purpose goes into the making of things is hidden in the subconscious self, and when the artist is aware of it constantly he cannot be trusted to produce good art or literature. " Art for Art's sake " is a good maxim for great artists. That is why art demands worship and courtship. That too without a seeming end. Mind, without a *seeming* end. It means the end is there but it is hidden altogether at the moment of creation. Obviously, there is no purpose behind art.

B. S. MATHUR

DOES WRITING PAY?

[**Mr. E. M. Forster,** the distinguished critic and novelist, whose *Passage to India* is perhaps his best-known work, visited India recently in connection with the All-India Writers' Conference held at Jaipur in October under the auspices of the All-India Centre of the P.E.N. He came as a friend and a sympathiser and some of his constructive suggestions to his Indian *confrères* are embodied in this article, broadcast on the 12th November 1945 from the Calcutta Station of All-India Radio, with whose kind permission we are publishing it. The very real plight of the Indian author was discussed in our pages in January 1943, when Mr. R. K. Narayan, the South Indian novelist, wrote on "The Writer in India"; and *The Indian P. E. N.* has since published many contributions on this important subject, but none more practically suggestive than this of our English friend.—Ed.]

I am a writer myself, and my desire is to meet my fellow writers in India. I want to compare notes with them and hear about their problems. I am delighted to find how active they are, mainly in their own languages where unfortunately I cannot follow them, but also in English and in translations in English. They seem to be stimulated not only by the urgent political problems of our days, but by their desire to work in words which lies at the very root of literature. They are active, they are serious. I don't intend to mention any names in this task—that would be invidious—but I may perhaps refer to a couple of translations that I have been reading this morning; one in an anthology of Urdu poetry from the seventeenth century to the end of the nineteenth, and the other is a translation from a contemporary Hindi poet. Both struck me as admirable. And speaking over All-India Radio from Calcutta tonight I should like to salute my colleagues.

I should also like to discuss something with them, namely, Does Writing Pay? Do authors in India get properly remunerated for their work? And if writing does not pay, can anything be done about it? It is a problem which profoundly concerns writers—even the most idealistic—and it is of interest to the general public also. Does Writing Pay? I went to a literary conference last month up at Jaipur—it was a meeting of the P.E.N. All-India Centre and the opinion expressed there certainly was that writing does not pay. Indeed I heard some rather disquieting talk. For instance, one author had only received Rs. 30 for the entire rights on his book. Another had been promised a certain sum on an edition of 1,000 copies; he was paid all right, but later on he discovered that the book had been a big success, and that the publishers had issued many additional copies without telling him about it. A third writer, who had sold the magazine rights only in a short story, was told by the proprietors of the magazine that they had thus acquired all the rights. I also heard many tales of infringement of copyright. Indeed, the Conference was so disquieted by these that it appointed a subcommittee to examine into the copyright law and its workings.

No doubt there are factors on the other side—good reasons why India couldn't be at the present moment an author's paradise. There is a paper shortage, book production is expensive, distribution difficult, and the reading public is small compared to the entire population. So the profession of writing can't be lucrative. And no doubt there are publishers whose conduct is admirable and who pay the author quite as much as they can afford or he expects. All that has to be remembered. But I came away from Jaipur with the impression that authors are usually underpaid in India, and sometimes not paid at all, and the impression has been strengthened since. Can anything be done ?

Perhaps it is undesirable for a visitor like myself to advise my Indian colleagues. They understand the situation from inside and I don't. But it occurs to me that I might help them if I describe what we, in England, have done to help ourselves, and then they can consider whether similar action might be helpful here. We have, in the first place, the Society of Authors. This is not a Government body; it has no Government subsidy; it is paid for by the authors themselves by means of annual subscriptions, and most writers belong to it. What does the Society of Authors do ? I will first say what it does not do. It does not place manuscripts, it does not provide literary criticisms, it does not as a rule negotiate directly with publishers, and it does not favour any particular type of writer —left against right or *vice versa.* Its job is legal and technical. It advises. Its secretary is a lawyer, and through him it advises an author whether the contract his publishers send him is a fair one, and, if the contract is broken, it advises him what steps to take, and in some cases finances him through the Courts. It advises him over translation rights, dramatic and film rights etc. And in one case—that of broadcasting—it has carried on useful direct negotiations, and has succeeded by friendly representation with the B. B. C. in obtaining certain minimum standards of payment. These are the chief facts about it. It exists to see that the author, good or bad, big or small, left or right, doesn't get cheated. That's all. But it is a great deal. The Society is independent not only of the Government but of any political body, and here lies its strength.

Now, could you have a similar society over here ? An All-India Authors' Society, to which writers should subscribe, whatever their mother-tongue, whatever their opinions, and whatever their political and communal affiliations? A Society for legal advice whose function it was to protect authors from exploitation? I offer the suggestion diffidently, for I know well that England and India are different places. But I think the suggestion worth considering. And I think the society would have to be an All-India one. Sectional societies representing various communities would not be equally effective. The dominating idea would have to be that of law, and the protection of all writers against economic injustice.

And now for another point. We in England have not only a Society of Authors but a Publishers' Association, a reputable and well-established body. The publishers in it keep accounts, which are properly audited; statements are sent in to the authors yearly or half-yearly; and if any author suspects he is being cheated he or his representative has the right to inspect the accounts. There is a second safeguard against exploitation. We didn't always have a publishers' association. In the eighteeenth century books were mainly published through the booksellers, and I believe that is largely the case in India today. Authors found the position unsatisfactory, and were always complaining, and the modern publishing started about the time of Lord Byron and the firm of John Murray. Since then there has been an improvement—more sense of security and mutual trust. Perhaps if publishers in India were better organised, with duly organised accounts, the situation would improve here too.

Here again I don't know that the change can be made. I am only pointing out that it is a change which occurred in England at the beginning of the nineteenth century and seems to have been beneficial to all concerned. If an All-India Society of Authors was established it would probably press for the establishment of an All-India Publishers' Association. The two are, as it were, opposite numbers, and where they both exist conditions in the book world tend to improve. I am, by the way, confining myself to books in this talk, and not considering the connected problem of journalism. Books interest me specially, partly because I have tried to write them, partly because I regard them as spiritual assets, which will be considered by the historians of the future, when our countries come to be judged. They are spiritual, but the men who write them are men, who cannot live upon air. Men must, in our present economic system, support themselves. And I have purposefully ignored the lofty side of literature in this talk, in order to concentrate on its economics, and to ask, What Can Be Done?

In all talks on writing it is usual to blame the writer about something or other, so I will conform to the usual model and end my talk with a word of rebuke to us all. I think that we are all—whether English or Indians—too vain and too vague, and that our pockets often suffer in consequence. Vanity has its good side, it is an aspect of generosity and many noble-minded writers, Tolstoy among them, have desired to give their work away gratis. And vagueness, no doubt, is connected with poetical idealising and inspiration. All the same—watch your vanity and vagueness. Take care that they aren't being exploited by Messrs. So and So. And remember, when you are placing your work, that it is better to be prudent beforehand than sad and peevish afterwards.

Many other points remain. It has been suggested to me, for instance, that foreign writers have a grievance against India since their work is constantly being pirated here, and published without payment or acknowledgment. But I don't mind so much about foreign writers. They have been making money elsewhere, so their grievance is a minor one. Let us tackle the major injustice first. It is a major injustice that Indian writers, writers of integrity and genius, should not get properly paid in their own country, and I do hope they will do something about it.

E. M. Forster

INDIA: AN EXAMPLE

A salutary warning was sounded by Mr. Reginald Sorensen at Karachi on February 9th, on the eve of his departure from India, when he characterised "the idea of separate sovereign states on the basis of religious considerations" as "bad and dangerous." He personally believed that every country needed minorities and that to establish a nation on the basis of a single religion was bad and dangerous for the threat of totalitarianism implicit in it.

> He would like to issue a friendly warning to the Muslim ... friends who demanded Pakistan on the basis of religion that the demand on that consideration would, if carried to its logical conclusion, have very unfortunate consequences on mankind....If you can establish a new India with your communal problems solved and do so without bitterness and strife...it will be a magnificent example to the whole world.

The majority of the Mussalmans in the country, he said, had been converts. But by conversion they had not ceased to be Indians. Whatever the view—for or against Pakistan—those who held it lived in India and they were Indians.

NEW BOOKS AND OLD

TOWARDS A MORAL STANDARD FOR NATIONS *

Sir Stafford clearly bases his ideas of democracy on the Christian teaching of universal brotherhood and love:

> The Kingdom of God upon earth is to be achieved, and it will be accomplished through this divine power of love. The outward and visible sign of that inward and spiritual grace is a brotherly and self-sacrificing co-operation in ordering the affairs of this world.

He vitiates his whole theme, which is otherwise sound, by making the book a direct attack on Nazism. He misses the mark when he attributes all the evil in the world to the growth of Nazism and Hitlerism. Is not British or American Imperialism in the same boat? What he fails or refuses to acknowledge is that the belligerent tendency of all nations is based on covetousness and greed, and the consequent jealousies. Have the Britishers no part in this? Can Sir Stafford afford to throw stones at the Nazis?

Sir Stafford is obsessed with the evils for which the Nazis have been responsible.

> First, we, as Christians, necessarily reject completely and absolutely the Nazi materialist conception of society, which is the right to dictate by brutality, turning the human individual, made in the image of God, into nothing more than one of millions of cogs in the machine of material efficiency, and the unlimited persecution and enslavement of all by a self-chosen class or race.
>
> As a positive alternative, we insist upon the dignity of human life and the right of all persons—whatever their class, creed or colour—to contribute equally to the orderly development of their and our civilisation. This must follow from the basic Christian teaching of the brotherhood of all peoples.

If, wherever he uses the word "Nazi" or "Hitlerism," "British" were substituted, many of us would grasp the meaning better. Should not Sir Stafford see the beam in his own eye before he offers to take out the mote from his brother's?

He says,

> Second on our positive list of Christian advocacy, we declare for a democratic way of life, because only in that can we give value to Christian brotherhood in our national life. The very idea of dictatorship is wholly contrary to that equality which brotherhood implies; nor can we acknowledge any human being as supreme or as fit to control and order the destinies of others, whether in the political, social or economic spheres of our life.

To this all India will say "Amen."

The author says, "Just as today the brutality and violence of our enemies, and the intensity of our own suffering, strengthens our resistance and our determination, so must our spiritual force and power react to the attack upon the Christian way of life."

Sir Stafford forgets that it is the greater brutality and violence of the Allied Nations and the atomic-bomb users that hold the field today. It will not do to harp on the violence of the Axis Powers.

While analysing the international situation, Sir Stafford sees a glimpse of truth when he says:—

> We are today suffering not from any lack of technical progress but from a complete

---

* *Towards Christian Democracy.*—By STAFFORD CRIPPS. (George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., London. 5*s.*)

> lack of the moral control of our material achievements. We could indeed afford to give our scientists a rest, if our religious leaders would take up the task of bringing our moral and spiritual progress into line with our material progress.

In other words, we have to call a halt to the machine civilisation until our character develops sufficient strength to control our desires. He states that

> we must have some standard by which to judge what we believe to be fundamentally right and just. It is therefore of the essence of our proper use of these technical advances that we should have a firm and unchallengeable moral basis with which to control their use. And that is what our religion has to do with aeroplanes and railway engines. The controlling power must be neither the machine, nor the man, but the power of God within men.

And again, "Industry has been looked upon as a means of making profits, or salaries, or wages, the higher the better, rather than as a means of contributing service to the community."

All this is the cult of the Charkha put in a different way, and so we agree whole-heartedly with his statement that

> we have become too self-reliant and too much centred upon our own ingenuity and cleverness. The war, however, has changed that for many of us. We have learnt most bitterly that, with all his cleverness, man has only brought about his own destruction. Wireless, aircraft, ships, submarines and motor cars are now the instruments of death and destruction. We have learnt how to build them, it is true, but not, alas, how to control them. We have excelled on the material side, but not on the moral side. It is this neglect of moral and spiritual values which has brought the world to its present appalling plight.

He being an astute lawyer, his logic has driven him to non-violence which he acknowledges grudgingly when he says:—

> Neither Christianity nor democracy encourage us to use violence ourselves; in fact, they both equally impose upon us obedience to the will of the majority, and self-discipline. But we must not give way to violence or threats of violence in others, any more than we have given way to Hitler's threats or the Nazi violence. And above all, we must not yield to our own interests, preferences or convenience, where they clash with what is clearly our duty to the brotherhood of man.

Sir Stafford expects the Church to interpret the principles that should govern our social and political relationships. Does he not realise that ever since the Church became a vested interest pulling its weight with the State it is a broken reed and we cannot lean too heavily on it? Should we not rather go to the fountain-head of all inspiration? Can mere interpretation do? What is religion? Is it a set of rules of ethical conduct or a way of life? If it is the latter, then we need to let the light so shine before men that, seeing the good works, people will glorify the Father; so the interpretation, if any, should take the form of action. The leaders of religion have to act in the way they would have their followers act. Sir Stafford would absolve the Church from political activity. This is divergent from the teachings of Jesus.

This little book brings a ray of hope that people in the West are now beginning to think of sacrifice, self-control and self-discipline not only in individuals but amongst nations. If this adherence to principles is strengthened by the abandoning of the philosophy of indulgence, we may still hope that civilization may survive.

J. C. KUMARAPPA

Twin Rivers : A Brief History of Iraq from the Earliest Times to the Present Day. By SETON LLOYD. (Oxford University Press, London. Rs. 6)

This book by Mr. Seton Lloyd of the Iraq Department of Antiquities gives a concise but very clear account of the history of Iraq, from a period before 4500 B. C., up to the present time. The story of the earliest period shows that the people of Iraq were some of the first in the world to attain to architectural accomplishment, for they were builders and decorators, and they were also probably the first to introduce the art of writing. The account of the period of the kings of Sumer and Akkad (*c.* 3000 to *c.* 1970 B. C.) shows that the arts and crafts were raised to a high level ; and the social organisation and the concepts of morality had much influence on the nations who came after them.

Under the Chaldæan dynasty, including Nebuchadnezzar (604-562 B. C.) who was a great builder, much was contributed to the older Babylonian culture: religion was a living reality and literature was developed, and also the science of astronomy.

Iraq was next conquered by the Achaemenian Persians and became part of a great Empire stretching from the Black Sea to the Nile and from the Mediterranean to the Oxus. Later, it came under the rule of the Sassanian kings, one of whom, Chosroes II, arranged for the translation of Indian writings into Persian and also introduced the game of chess from India.

For a thousand years Iraq had been conquered by a succession of foreign powers, Medes, Persians, Greeks and Romans and again Persians, and now it was the turn of the Arabs from the South. Under the 'Abbāsid Caliphs—the most famous of whom was Hārūn al-Rashīd—who made Baghdad their capital, Iraq reached a state of great magnificence and traded with East and West. Paper had just come into use and gave a great impulse to learning, and Baghdad, at this time, became a central meeting-place for grammarians, poets and religious writers.

The last chapter, on Iraq in the twentieth century, might well have been longer, for this period is probably of most interest to the modern reader. The author himself writes in conclusion, " So the long story of the land of Twin Rivers reaches the present—a present most closely bound up with its illustrious past," but he might have written more fully on the present ! This is, however, a most readable and attractive book, which can be thoroughly recommended to all those interested in Iraq, past or present.

MARGARET SMITH

Spiritualism. By HERBERT V. O'NEILL. (Burns, Oates and Washbourne, Ltd., London. 5s.)

This is one of the volumes in a series on present problems, written from the stand-point of Roman Catholic theology. The Author's hope is that those spiritualists who attack his church may be led to study Catholic text-books, and thus to alter their views completely. It seems to be a forlorn hope ! The Roman Catholic Archbishop of Liverpool, who contributes a preface, writes strongly of the culpability of attending a séance— " The Catholic who attends does a thing which the Church in her wisdom has forbidden in the gravest possible manner." This prohibition removes the problem from the sphere of scientific examination, and we are plunged back, in all essentials, to the days of the Marquis de Mirville, that uncompromising Roman Catholic "who, having studied the *Zohar* and other old remnants of Jewish Wisdom under the 'Chevalier' Drach, an ancient Rabbi Kabalist converted to the Romish Church, wrote with his help half a dozen volumes full of slander and calumnies against every prominent Spiritualist and Kabalist"—as we have been told by H. P. Blavatsky.

The issue, as presented here, has been over-simplified. Spirit-messages, in Fr. O'Neill's view, "practically all come from the wishful thinking of either the medium or the sitters." On the other hand, the test of the genuineness of the divine origin of Revelation is given as "Miracles." Add to all this the author's inevitable assertion: "There is only one authoritative Church, the Catholic Church.... And the Vatican represents the Catholic Church," and we can see at once that the old contest between the party of the public conscience and the party of reaction still has its theological significance!

An instance of Fr. O'Neill's readiness to sacrifice truth to special pleading is to be found on p. 39, where he refers to what he calls "Mme. Blavatsky's 'New Theosophy'"! One wonders what this phrase may mean in the author's mind. As a piece of propaganda for the Vatican this essay has its points; but as a critical survey of spiritualistic phenomena it has no value.

PHILIP HOWELL

The Crimson Thorn: Poems for Lovers: 1931-1941; In English Fields: Poems from Books: 1931-1941. By JOHN GAWSWORTH. (Susil Gupta, 1, Wellesley Street, Calcutta. Rs. 3/- each).

Those who like to be told what to admire, and why, may possibly appreciate the four pages of deserved encomiums of Mr. Gawsworth's poetry which appear in each of these twin volumes, as if to give the lie to his own lines in *The Crimson Thorn*:—

> Poet was never honoured for a lay
> Since bays of Greece have sered to dusty-brown.

Others may find this guide to appreciation unflattering to their intelligence. But they will do well not to be put off by it, or by the prosaic board bindings or by the occasional typographical error, especially regrettable when, as in *In English Fields*, it mars such a fine line as "Like pumas, world(l)ings pace a den." For here is poetry—not verbal acrobatics, not emotional contortions and—the gods be thanked!—not propaganda.

Mr. Gawsworth's emotions ring true and that "princedom of the phrase," for which he prays in "Suppliant" (*In English Fields*) is his.

> I have no bread to eat,
> Yet still words warm me.

In "Llanthony Abbey" in the same collection, he evokes a mood of quietness as effortlessly, subtly, surely, as the falling snow.

Mr. Gawsworth uses the traditional verse forms, sometimes with variations. Some of his sonnets are felicitous, *e. g.*, "The Divinity" (*The Crimson Thorn*), which expresses pure æsthetic response to beauty, free from the shadow of acquisitiveness.

There are delightful poems, limpid lines, in both collections, but the reviewer found *The Crimson Thorn* the more rewarding.

E. M. HOUGH

This India. By D. F. KARAKA. (Thacker and Co., Ltd., Bombay. Rs. 6/14)

This book is a strange mixture of the sublime and the ordinary. It is most refreshing to find a young Indian writer who has such a clear view of the fundamental troubles in the make-up of his country, which are raising so many obstacles to progress, and who has the courage to voice his opinions on this subject without fear or favour. The most essential quality for a nation's progress is the power of fearless self-criticism and this must come through its writers and public leaders. If, as Mr. Karaka has so pointedly illustrated in his book, the public leaders fail to take advantage of the opportunities given to them to draw their country's attention to its own weaknesses and failings, but instead waste their time in doling out pretty speeches and worn-out platitudes for fear of hurting people's feelings or their own business interests, they fail lamentably in their duty to the public. Unfortunately, in these days there are far too few public men in India who are ready to place their own self-interest below their interest in their country. In consequence, India is suffering from the state of affairs so ably illustrated by Mr. Karaka. A social boycott of outspoken criticism in debate, designed to protect the over-tender skin from too much exposure to healthy public gaze. A gagged and inefficient Press, too timid in all but a few notable exceptions to launch out into any original journalism. And public speeches remarkable only for the constant and tedious repetition of conventional pleasantries; vague, unmeaning promises of better times to come and the continual placing of the blame for lack of progress on the shoulders of somebody else.

As the opinions of a keen-sighted journalist, the word pictures of some of the leading political figures in India today and the ideals for which they profess to stand are extremely stimulating. The views of the author sweep through the hot and dusty emotionalism of so much of contemporary political writing in India with a welcome freshness.

Technically there is room for improvement in the printing of the book. The type and layout are rather tiring to the eyes for sustained reading. Also, a little less chattiness and displaying of "underwear" would have helped to maintain the higher levels of thought and criticism to which the author rises. It is rather jarring to find the sublime mixed up with the frivolous.

LAURENCE E. MOORE

My Life and Mission. By SWAMI VIVEKANANDA. (Advaita Ashrama, Mayavati, Almora, Himalayas. As. 8)

This lecture, delivered by Swami Vivekananda before the Shakespeare Club of Pasadena, California, in 1900, is of especial and autobiographical interest, because in it, for the first time, we are told of his early struggles to implement his own spiritual aspirations and achievements in terms of many-sided ministry to the indigent and illiterate masses of India, but all within the framework of the central truth of Indian culture and civilization that "the real is God." Hence his ideal, "to preach unto men their divinity and how to make It manifest in every movement of life," and the price to be paid, "the bleeding heart placed upon the altar."

G. M.

Back to Humanity. By ERNEST RAYMOND and PATRICK RAYMOND. (Cassell and Co., Ltd., London. 5s.)

This is one of the best books written during the War. It will be read and pondered over by people during the leisure that must follow victory, and their moods will be chastened by its refreshing sanity of outlook.

There are a variety of ways in which the subject-matter of this interesting little book could be expressed. I shall, for brevity's sake, describe its central idea as Gandhian.

> Violence makes a lot of noise and creates weird patterns in the sky, but it says nothing. Rather it seems to raise its eyebrows.

This is not to suggest, however, that the Raymonds, father and son, have merely borrowed their idea from someone else. No; the Raymonds have the heroic in them—the heroic and the humane! Their experience of the War, its brutality and its tragedy, has awakened them to a great truth, which is this: They see, and are convinced, that an enemy—a ruthless enemy like the *Nazi*—must be resisted; in this sense, their book "is designed to be a small part of the English Resistance." But what of the future? "If you are fighting a brutal enemy, sooner or later you partake of the evil you are fighting." This is their apprehension and they perceive that as a danger to Peace, to Civilization, and to the spirit of Man. So they say: "Back to Humanity!" When mass killing stops,

> if civilization is not really to perish, we must get back to humanity at once—sharply, sternly, passionately, and with joy as of men released.

The Humanism of the Raymonds is spiritual; it is not dogmatic Atheism, or dogmatic Agnosticism, or dogmatic Theism. "If man believes in nothing spiritual, he will attempt no spiritual grandeur." Christ did not create humaneness in man, the humaneness in man created Christ.

The Great Humanes endure," (Buddha and Christ, Plato and St. Paul, Confucius and Asoka); the "Great Inhumanes" (Jengis Khan and Napoleon, and Hitler and Mussolini) "and their empires pass very quickly away." The Humanism of the Raymonds rests on this enduring Faith. And so, unlike their statesmen, they are not unwilling to surrender a little of their nationalism; at least, if nationalism cannot be transcended, they want to enlist "this passionate force" which is Nationalism in the service of their ideal.

> To have an empire on which the sun never sets is a child's boast; to have sown some freedom and decency and the best attainable justice over a great part of the world is a grown man's pride. The glory that grown men crave for Britain is a spiritual glory, and the leadership a moral leadership.

May the spirit of Ernest Raymond, the fifty-year-old father in the Home Guard, and that of his son Pat—Patrick Raymond of the R.A.F.—permeate post-war England; and "may their tribe increase." And may the England of their conception forge a "humane" relationship with the country which is under the leadership of that man described by Ernest Raymond as "the international prophet of passive resistance and non-violence, Mahatma Gandhi," with a quotation from whom this excellent book begins, and startles you: "If you have a sword in your heart, take it out and use it."

N. A. NIKAM

CORRESPONDENCE

HINDU CULTURE

I owe the following reflections to the thought-provoking article on "Hindu Culture" by Shri J. M. Ganguli in the July 1943 number of THE ARYAN PATH. He writes with deep feeling and reverence for the sages of old "who prescribed the various rules of living and thinking." Breathing the spirit of intolerance of the "rationalists of today," he doubts whether they realise

> one important and essential thing about Hindu Culture, namely, that its prescriptions and enjoyments, its taboos and prohibitions, the rites and ceremonies specified for performance by different individuals, its rules of self-discipline in eating, sleeping, talking, and other activities of daily life. . . that these have practical significance which cannot be disregarded.

While fully appreciating the sincerity, the zeal, the enthusiasm and the intense desire of Shri Ganguli that "Hindu Culture" must actualise itself in our daily life, one sadly misses a true understanding of the nature of the culture for which he pleads.

What exactly is the relation between the spirit of a culture and its concrete expression in the life of the individual and society? An unequivocal answer to the question is urgently called for, specially in the India of today, whose cultural values are undergoing great transformation in a world which is ceaselessly crying for "a trans-valuation of all values."

The question concerns the activity of the human spirit—individual and social. The individual is not an isolated phenomenon. He is born as a social individual. He inherits a large part of his culture from the society to which he belongs. He finds himself amidst customs, habits and traditions of the family, the community and the society in which he is born. He develops his personality through constant interaction with his social and intellectual environment. The routine of life prescribed by society and the cultural atmosphere created by it form the starting-point, the initial capital, with which the individual strenuously strives to achieve a harmonious synthesis, and a fuller realisation. At all stages of social evolution we meet with highly endowed individuals assimilating the traditional culture, making it living and vital, in their own selves as well as in their fellow-men.

In this process of revitalization of a culture there emerges a higher cultural level revealing a more concrete Reality—a reality constituted by and constitutive of the three intrinsic values of human life—Truth, Beauty and Goodness. In the conflict between tradition and reason, priest and prophet, is born a more ennobling life of spirit. When the spirit expands itself, realises a wider assimilation, the old traditional bonds—the rights and obligations, the prescriptions of the routine of life—are not broken into shreds and patches, but are internalized by the spirit. The enlarged activity of the spirit may require a new framework, a new form, and each age must and does express itself in a cultural universe of its own comprehension and of its own choice.

It is true that the eminent Hindu Rishis of old, with their outstanding intellect and character, fathomed the profounder depths of life, led a pure life of self-discipline and devotion and had the courage and the tenacity to live the life they idealized. Born of their life and ideals is the social organization of the Hindus, an organization accommodative of the noblest and the highest of human values. With a burning faith in the catholicity of Hindu Culture one cannot find oneself in agreement with the view that " one important and essential thing about Hindu Culture" is constituted by the "rules of self-discipline in eating, sleeping, talking....etc."

This appears to be a caricature of Hinduism. Its dynamic spirit refuses to be cast in the fixed mould of a scheme of habits to be followed with inexorable necessity for all time without change or variation. It is one thing to say that a certain culture must find concrete expression in the daily lives of the people through customs, manners, rites and ceremonies, etc.; but to say that it must express itself *only* in the way in which it found expression in the lives of the sages of old is quite another. The latter makes us slaves to tradition, binds us hand and foot to an outworn and antiquated creed. The concentrated wisdom of our ancients would protest against such blind acceptance. The road to truth lies in the former. Acceptance must always be a preparation for adventure. The spirit of the preparation for adventure. The spirit of the culture that is inspiring us is free and spontaneous. The spirit finds for itself a concrete form and an embodiment appropriate to itself. A spirit that allows itself to be hampered by the body *ipso facto* ceases to be spirit. The spirit annihilates the body that arrests the richness of its expression.

Reverence for the cultural heritage of the glorious past of India should not crush in us the spirit of free enquiry, the desire to live a reflective and enlightened moral life, born of the dedication of the spirit to the service of those ideals which humanity is struggling to express in and through the intense and complicated forms of the social life of today. We are far too keenly alive to the psychological insight and intellectual acumen of the sages of antiquity to accept merely the rules of discipline rather than the law of their lives. No habit, custom or tradition, however good, is valid for all time. Old clothes are not therefore the best.

It is true that "*The great Mukta-Purushas* of old, who prescribed the various rules of living and thinking, had realized...through personal experience." But it does not follow that it is "wisdom to accept respectfully the *authority* [Italics mine] of those saints in regard to the mode of living, eating...etc." They became what they were, not because they ate and slept in a particular manner but because they led a life of reason and spirit in the light of the guidance and inspiration of the permanent elements of Hinduism treasured up in the sacred lore. We can never forget the intellectual eminence of the great Acharyas—Sankara, Ramanuja and Madhwa. They did not shrink under the weight of tradition to which they were born. Each was a law unto himself, though fired with the same zest for the richness of life and zeal for informing the forms of things with the spirit of an undying and noble culture—a culture that has conserved the eternal values of spirit in the lives of individuals and society, nay, even in the lives of the modern intellectual leaders of thought and life whom Shri Ganguli might include among the many "intellectual and spiritual degenerates," because they disregard those rules.

C. V. SRINIVASA MURTY

Mysore.

ENDS AND SAYINGS

> "_____________ends of verse
> And sayings of philosophers."
> HUDIBRAS

"At any cost the [Pakistan] idea should be resisted," declared Sir C. P. Ramaswami Aiyar, Dewan of Travancore, presiding on January 31st over the Diamond Jubilee celebrations of the Madras Mahajana Sabha. There is no doubt that once the unity of India had been destroyed the tendency would be towards further fragmentation. All are familiar with the great ideal of a united India that fired the Indian Emperors of the distant past—Chandra Gupta, Asoka, Harsha. Another aspect which the speaker also mentioned is less widely recognised than it deserves to be. That is the contribution of the British Government to "the reordering of the unity which was once ours."

> We may deride the English language, but the impetus given by English education for national unity was great. Even the Britisher cannot take back that gift. The British Government should not in honour suggest the dissection of the country to the building of whose unity they have done something.

We heartily agree, as also that the Indian States are an integral part of India and of the present problem. We stand indeed today, as Sir C. P. Ramaswami said, at the parting of the ways, as Lincoln stood in 1861. He did not hesitate to plunge his people into civil war to save the Union and the high ideals for which it stood. Hindus and Muslims have far fewer differences, social, economic, educational, than those which divided the North and the South in the U. S. A. some eighty years ago. The American Union was saved and the children and grandchildren of the intransigents now recognise that it was worth maintaining even at the cost of years of internecine strife. Our fundamental problem is the same which Lincoln faced and solved. India will need a solution and Indians should not permit their country to become an enlarged copy of divided Ireland. Lincoln's war proved he was right, and Indian leaders can and should follow his determination to prevent India's unity being destroyed, and now it can be done by non-martial means. By argument and proper arrangements among themselves, by different classes of Indians, the result can be achieved. With all our vigour we oppose the vivisection of the Motherland.

Reviewing Dr. Douglas Guthrie's *History of Medicine* under the title "Heartbreak Hospital," Mr. Bernard Shaw, the inimitable or the incorrigible, according to the point of view, returns with vigour undiminished by the years to the congenial avocation of doctor-baiting. The fact that *The Animals' Defender* liked his review so much that it reprinted the review entire in its December and January issues, proves how little it is likely to appeal to medical orthodoxy. Mr. Shaw has a memory most disconcerting to assumptions of medical infallibility. He passes in review the barbarous treatments that have had their vogue and passed, from bleeding as a panacea onwards. For treatments changed just as the patients changed, because people got tired of them; and doctors, like milliners, had to be in fashion.

Especially interesting is Mr. Shaw's treatment of the history of vaccination, neither sparing its plebeian antecedents nor hesitating to point out that, in England, while sanitation had made an end of plague, cholera, and typhus epidemics and of endemic fever, smallpox had persisted under vaccination, compulsory since 1853. Before compulsion was "swept away by popular fury," smallpox had culminated in "two appalling epidemics in 1871 and 1881."

> At present vaccination is more fatal and revaccination more disabling than smallpox, and is suspected of including in its sequels not only the known horror of generalized vaccinia, medically certified as indistinguishable from hereditary syphilis at its worst, but also of producing infantile paralysis and other troubles. Not a word of all this from Dr. Guthrie. His date in 1945 on the subject is 1853.

This apparently applies as well to some at least of the guardians of the public health in India, to judge from the enthusiasm with which vaccination has recently been urged in the usually responsible press as offering sure immunity from smallpox. Statistics prove conclusively that it does nothing of the kind and that, moreover, "poisoning people into health" is dangerous business. Abolish dirt and squalor, isolating smallpox sufferers meanwhile, and this disease will go the way of other whilom scourges, to the benefit of everybody but the vaccine interests.

The need for a central health organisation was considered at the Olympic Village on February 5th, by representatives from several Provinces and Indian States. The objects of the proposed All-India association would include the creation of national health consciousness and education of the people to improve health and physique.

Dr. G. F. Andrews, Director of Physical Education, Madras, who presided at the meeting, pointed to the structure and achievements of the American Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation, with its thirty-two committees and its Bill of Rights for childhood and youth in these three fields. That document included medical examinations for school children, correction of remediable defects in childhood, recreational development, athletics etc. A subcommittee was set up to study the proposals for the new all-India association of the same name and to submit its recommendations at a future meeting.

The scope for such an effort needs no arguing, though the fundamental causes of the poor physique and the short life expectancy of Indians lie deeper than lack of health education and of recreational opportunities. But ameliorative efforts are not to be despised because they do not promise a radical cure. An adequate level of national health and longevity cannot be hoped for till the people's dietary needs are met and their dire poverty mitigated. Meanwhile, by all means, let us have for India health education and athletics, recreation and everything that holds out any hope of fitter bodies for tomorrow's citizens.

In *The Care of Homeless Children* (Fabian Publications, Ltd., Research Series No. 107) Miss Helen Donington analyzes briefly the problem of the homeless child—delinquent or only in need of care or protection—and how England has been meeting it and can meet it better. The roots of the problems of child deliquency and destitution lie in the family. "Our institutions are full of the children of broken homes." The absence of the father in wartime may be unavoidable, but some other causes of the breakdown of the home—unemployment, overcrowding, lack of training in home-making and in the responsibilities of parenthood and absence of wholesome recreational facilities must, at least in part, be laid at the door of a society not sufficiently alive to its responsibilities.

The different types of institutions—Public Assistance, Voluntary and Remand Homes, Wartime Hostels and Approved Schools—vary greatly between each other and within the groups but no "Home" can take the place of family life at its best and "boarding out" with the right type of foster-parents and under proper helpful supervision is recognised as offering the homeless child a more normal and satisfying environment than the average institution can.

There are admittedly great defects in the system. The atmosphere in too many Homes is institutional if not actually penal; the Voluntary Homes are often rigidly sectarian and exclusive; the staffs are isolated, underpaid and often incompetent; the background, needs and possibilities of the individual child are not sufficiently studied; children boarded out have sometimes been cruelly treated. Lack of co-ordination is a major criticism and Miss Donington's proposal that the responsibility for reclaiming all homeless children, delinquent or not, should rest on the Ministry of Education has much to commend it.

In spite of its defects, however, the English system of homeless-child care is immeasurably better than the Indian system of homeless-child neglect. The few and overcrowded Homes we have are hopelessly inadequate to cope with the great number of child waifs. Our Institutions and our Special Schools are largely city streets; their graduates—the beggars and the rowdies of tomorrow. We need to ask ourselves, in Ruskin's words,

> whether, among national manufactures, that of Souls of a good quality may not at last turn out a quite leadingly lucrative one.

The speech delilvered in London last October by Sir John Boyd Orr, M. P., now Director-General of the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organisation, at the National Peace Council's Conference on "The United Nations and the Future Peace," has been published in *Welfare and Peace* (N. P. C. Peace Aims Pamphlet 34). Sir John's enthusiasm for the better times that he declares to be within our grasp should prove infectious. Apropos of the possibilities held out by recent advances in biological science he says:–

> In India, where the average expectation of life is only 27 years, we could, by applying the power that we have, raise it to 70 years. It is not impossible; New Zealand has done it.

Begin to co-operate, he urges, and pool resources to provide sufficient food for all and it will be easier to co-operate in other fields. Adequate food production will demand great industrial expansion, producing farming implements of all sorts by the million; add housing on a health standard and "you will have the greatest industrial boom the world has ever seen" and "there will be no unemployment." He spreads before our dazzled gaze a land flowing with milk and honey and invites us in.

"No use trying to build the new world from the top down," Sir John declares, but he is right only by virtue of his explanation that he means by "top" only "political ideas of spheres of influence and so on." For it is only from the "top" that we can build for permanency, as Sir John tacitly admits in seeing the world's poverty as poverty in spirit, and in urging that the common people of the world of all the different grades "should be got to meet" and to "realise that they are one human family, with common interests."

For surely Sir John's world of plenty is not, as he affirms, "the kingdom of heaven" preached by Jesus! That were to change the Sermon on the Mount to read that, seeking first the good things of material life, we should have added unto us "the kingdom of God and his righteousness." Exegesis has its legitimate limits. The world's material wants must be provided—that is imperative—but Epictetus has a word for us on that:—

> You will confer the greatest benefit on your city, not by raising the roofs but by exalting the souls of your fellow-citizens. For it is better that great souls should live in small habitations than that abject slaves should burrow in great houses.

The dependence of the solution of the world food problem upon enormous changes in social and economic attitudes, was underlined by Mr. G. D. H. Cole, who, speaking after Sir John Orr, depressingly applied the brakes. His speech, published in the same Peace Aims Pamphlet 34, brings out the difficulties.

He feared that, while it might be technically possible to feed the whole world in the next few years, it would not be economically and socially possible. World nutrition problems could not be taken out of their economic setting. Feeding the people adequately would demand reorganisation of the world's transport and it would not be possible to raise all peoples to real nutritional efficacy without lifting them also to a comparable standard in respect of other necessities. For this a other reasons the food problem w intimately bound up with large-sca international investment, and mon tary problems in their turn were i extricably intertwined with the vex questions of international trade.

Mr. Cole's analysis of the differenc between Great Britain and the U. S. on matters of trade and finance illustrative of the conflict of immedia self-interest that must arise at almo every turn. When he spoke, each wa standing, firm as a rock, on wha it saw as its own interest, each righ enough from its own point of view The reconciling of conflicting interest will demand not only the best brains c all nations but also positive good-wi and the recognition that locking horn is a particularly unintelligent way c ending a dispute.

Mr. Cole sees the best hope of by passing the difficulties in a vast worl expansion—"international investmen on a really colossal scale." Larg sums, for instance, would be needed t implement the schemes for the propose economic development of India and o the Colonies. Such an expansion, o something like Lease-Lend terms, is no possible, he says, unless the U. S. A takes the initiative, making "a much larger and more generous gesture than has ever been made by any people." He sees a difficulty in the fact that, rich as the nation is, the individual Americans are poor. But it is not the poor that are proverbially hard of heart. Mr. Cole does not do justice to the idealistic strain in human beings, of which the Americans have their share, when he lowers the appeal to the pocket level:—

> You have somehow to get it across to them that they can best meet their own needs by helping to meet the needs of the rest of the world, so that we can all prosper together.

Is not what is needed rather an appeal not to self-interest but to man's better nature? Convince them that the sacrifice is necessary, and never doubt that the response will be in kind.